

# Identity Concealment Games: How I Learned to Stop Revealing and Love the Coincidences <sup>★</sup>

Mustafa O. Karabag <sup>a</sup>, Melkior Ornik <sup>b</sup>, Ufuk Topcu <sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, The University of Texas at Austin, TX, USA*

<sup>b</sup>*Department of Aerospace Engineering, The University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign, IL, USA*

<sup>c</sup>*Department of Aerospace Engineering and Engineering Mechanics, The University of Texas at Austin, TX, USA*

---

## Abstract

In an adversarial environment, a hostile player performing a task may behave like a non-hostile one in order not to reveal its identity to an opponent. To model such a scenario, we define identity concealment games: zero-sum stochastic reachability games with a zero-sum objective of identity concealment. To measure the identity concealment of the player, we introduce the notion of an average player. The average player’s policy represents the expected behavior of a non-hostile player. We show that there exists an equilibrium policy pair for every identity concealment game and give the optimality equations to synthesize an equilibrium policy pair. If the player’s opponent follows a non-equilibrium policy, the player can hide its identity better. For this reason, we study how the hostile player may learn the opponent’s policy. Since learning via exploration policies would quickly reveal the hostile player’s identity to the opponent, we consider the problem of learning a near-optimal policy for the hostile player using the game runs collected under the average player’s policy. Consequently, we propose an algorithm that provably learns a near-optimal policy and give an upper bound on the number of sample runs to be collected.

*Key words:* Markov models; Game theory; Optimal control; Stochastic control; Learning algorithms.

---

## 1 Introduction

In an adversarial environment, an agent interacts with a non-cooperative opponent. For a hostile agent, it may be important not to expose its identity since the opponent might attempt to hinder the agent’s operation knowing that the agent is hostile. For instance, intelligence services often instruct the agents who are under surveillance to *dry-clean*, that is, to evade surveillance in a way that looks accidental, not intentional, since intentional evasions cause suspicion [16]. This behavior motivated video games such as Spy Party [9] and Garry’s Mod Guess Who [17] where the goal is to complete tasks behaving like a non-playable character, i.e., a bot. While identity concealment is a significant behavior in reality, it has not been studied in the literature of zero-sum games, which is a common formalism of adversarial settings [12].

We formalize the above notion of *identity concealment* in two-player zero-sum reachability games. We consider a graph as the state space of the game. The goal of a *hostile player* is to reach a set of target states, but in a way that its behavior looks similar to the behavior of non-hostile players, i.e., the hostile player aims to make its win look coincidental. The goal of the opponent is to distinguish between hostile and non-hostile players. As a reference point, we introduce an abstract notion of an *average player* to measure the identity concealment of a hostile player. The average player’s policy represents the expected behavior of non-hostile players. For example, in a cyber interaction scenario, hostile players are attackers who perform a denial-of-service attack against a server, and average players are real clients interacting with the server. The attackers’ goal is to overwhelm the server and make it fail to provide service to real clients while not being identified. The server is the opponent that aims to distinguish the attackers from real clients. We measure the identity concealment by the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence between the distribution of runs in a game played by a hostile player and the distribution of runs in a game played by an average player. As the KL objective function increases, the opponent can dis-

---

<sup>★</sup> This paper was not presented at any IFAC meeting. Corresponding author M. O. Karabag.

*Email addresses:* karabag@utexas.edu (Mustafa O. Karabag), mornik@illinois.edu (Melkior Ornik), utopcu@utexas.edu (Ufuk Topcu).

tinguish a hostile player from a non-hostile player more easily. For example, in the cyber interaction scenario, a game run can represent the history of the client’s requests and the server’s responses. Particular, possibly complex or time-varying, behavior (such as repeated requests for unrelated computationally heavy resources) may indicate that the client is hostile.

We define the *identity concealment game* as the two-player zero-sum reachability game with the KL divergence objective function. We first identify the conditions for which the value of the KL objective function is finite, i.e., the opponent is never sure the player is hostile. Then, we show that there exists an equilibrium policy pair for a hostile player and the opponent such, which can be synthesized using value iteration.

The hostile player can achieve a lower value than the equilibrium value if the opponent follows a non-equilibrium policy. In this case, an equilibrium policy is not necessarily optimal for the hostile player against an imperfect opponent. The hostile player needs to learn and respond to the opponent’s suboptimal policy to achieve the optimal value. However, the player’s ability to learn in the described setting is limited in that an active learner would quickly reveal its identity during exploration. We consider the question of whether it is possible to passively learn a near-optimal policy by solely using the game runs collected under the average player’s policy. The output policy needs to be near-optimal in that the KL objective function is  $\epsilon$ -optimal, and the probability of winning is at least  $1 - \lambda$  where  $\epsilon$  and  $\lambda$  are the input parameters of the algorithm.

We provide an algorithm that solely uses a finite number of runs collected under the average player’s policy to learn a near-optimal policy. To show the near-optimality in the KL objective, we utilize and improve some of the probably approximately correct Markov decision processes (PAC-MDP) learning results [6,13,22]. To show the near-optimality in the probability of winning, we show that under the output policy, the hostile player can lose the game only if an unknown state, i.e., a state with a low number of samples, is visited. Then, we show that the unknown states cannot be visited with a high probability if the number of sample runs is high enough.

We give the proofs of some technical results in Appendix B.

## 2 Related Work

The KL objective function is used for different purposes including *deception in supervisory control* [11], *game balancing* [8], *inverse reinforcement learning* [2], and *reinforcement learning* [7,19]. The paper [11] utilized Sanov’s theorem [4] and the KL divergence of the path distributions in MDPs for deception in supervisory control. In

that paper, the supervisor designs a reference policy to an agent, which is supposed to follow this policy, but it deviates from the reference policy to achieve a malicious task. The goal of the supervisor is to design a reference policy that minimizes deviations. While we use the objective function for the same purpose, this paper differs from [11] in that the opponent (analogue of the supervisor) does not design the average player’s policy (analogue of the reference policy). Instead, the opponent designs a policy that determines the observability of the player (analogue of the agent). The paper [8] used the KL divergence objective for game balancing in two-player stochastic games. Aside from the contextual differences, the objective function in [8] has a discount factor. We, on the other hand, do not have a discount factor that significantly differs the proof for the existence of an equilibrium. Goal and plan obfuscation [15,14] are similar to the concept of identity concealment. We consider a measure based on statistical hypothesis testing, whereas the cited papers consider measures based on the distance of the observation sequences generated by a game run.

The learning algorithm provided in this paper is related to PAC-MDP algorithms [13,22]. While these algorithms guarantee near-optimality after a finite number of sub-optimal actions, there are no guarantees on the sub-optimality of the transient learning period due to exploration. In the adversarial setting described in this paper, the use of PAC-MDP algorithms would reveal the identity of the player during the learning period. The algorithm provided in this paper differs from PAC-MDP algorithms in that it uses a fixed policy, the average player’s policy, to learn, whereas PAC-MDP algorithms learn in an exploratory manner. The algorithm we provide is similar to off-policy evaluation [5,20] as we collect samples using a policy that is not the target policy.

## 3 Preliminaries

A *zero-sum two-player stochastic reachability game* is a tuple  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}^1, \mathcal{A}^2, \mathcal{P}, s_0, \mathcal{S}^R)$  where  $\mathcal{S}$  is a finite set of states,  $\mathcal{A}^1$  is a finite set of actions for Player 1,  $\mathcal{A}^2$  is a finite set of actions for Player 2,  $\mathcal{P} : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}^1 \times \mathcal{A}^2 \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is the transition probability function,  $s_0 \in \mathcal{S}$  is the initial state, and  $\mathcal{S}^R \subset \mathcal{S}$  is the set of *winning states* for Player 1. For a state  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ ,  $\mathcal{A}^1(s)$  and  $\mathcal{A}^2(s)$  denote the set of available actions for Players 1 and 2, respectively, where  $\sum_{q \in \mathcal{S}} \mathcal{P}(s, a^1, a^2, q) = 1$  for all  $(a^1, a^2) \in \mathcal{A}^1(s) \times \mathcal{A}^2(s)$ . We use  $S$  to denote the cardinality of  $\mathcal{S}$ , and  $A$  to denote the maximum of the cardinalities of  $\mathcal{A}^1$  and  $\mathcal{A}^2$ . The *successor states* of state  $s$  is denoted by  $Succ(s)$  where state  $q$  is in  $Succ(s)$  if and only if there exist actions  $(a^1, a^2) \in \mathcal{A}^1(s) \times \mathcal{A}^2(s)$  such that  $\mathcal{P}(s, a^1, a^2, q) > 0$ . We assume that every winning state  $s \in \mathcal{S}^R$  is *absorbing*, i.e.,  $Succ(s) = \{s\}$ .

The game has infinite steps. At every time step  $t$ , Players 1 and 2 choose their actions,  $a_t^1$  and  $a_t^2$ ,

simultaneously and transition to state  $s_{t+1}$  from  $s_t$  with probability  $\mathcal{P}(s_t, a_t^1, a_t^2, s_{t+1})$ . The history  $h_t = s_0 a_0^1 a_0^2 \dots s_{t-1} a_{t-1}^1 a_{t-1}^2 \dots s_t$  at time  $t$  is the sequence of all previous states and actions. The set of all possible histories at time  $t$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{H}_t$ . A *policy* for Player  $i$  is a sequence  $\pi^i = \mu_0^i \mu_1^i \dots$  where each  $\mu_t^i : \mathcal{H}_t \times \mathcal{A}^i \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is a function such that  $\sum_{a^i \in \mathcal{A}^i(s)} \mu_t^i(h_t, a^i) = 1$  for all  $h_t \in \mathcal{H}_t$ . A *stationary policy* for Player  $i$  is a sequence  $\pi^i = \mu^i \mu^i \dots$  such that  $\mu^i : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}^i \rightarrow [0, 1]$  and  $\sum_{a^i \in \mathcal{A}^i(s)} \mu^i(s, a^i) = 1$  for all  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ . The set of all policies for Player  $i$  is denoted by  $\Pi^i$ . The set of all stationary policies Player  $i$  is denoted by  $\Pi^{i, St}$ . For state  $s$ , we use  $\pi^i(s)$  to denote the action distribution under Player  $i$ 's stationary policy  $\pi^i$ . A *run*  $\gamma = s_0 a_0^1 a_0^2 s_1 a_1^1 a_1^2 \dots$  is an infinite sequence states and actions under policies  $\pi^1$  and  $\pi^2$  such that  $\mathcal{P}(s_t, a_t^1, a_t^2, s_{t+1}) \mu_t^1(h_t, a^1) \mu_t^2(h_t, a^2) > 0$  for all  $t \geq 0$ , i.e., all transitions are feasible. The probability distribution of runs under  $\pi^1$  and  $\pi^2$  is denoted by  $\Gamma^{\pi^1, \pi^2}$ .

The event of eventually reaching set  $C$  is denoted by  $\diamond C$ . Under policies  $\pi^1$  and  $\pi^2$ , the probability of reaching set  $C$  from state  $s$  is denoted by  $\Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(\diamond C | s)$ . The probability of reaching set  $C$  from state  $s$  in  $L$  time steps is denoted by  $\Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(\diamond_{\leq L} C | s)$ . Player 1 *wins* if and only if the game run  $\gamma = s_0 a_0^1 a_0^2 s_1 a_1^1 a_1^2 \dots$  satisfies  $s_t \in \mathcal{S}^R$  for some  $t$ , i.e.,  $\gamma$  satisfies  $\diamond \mathcal{S}^R$ . A policy  $\pi^1$  for Player 1 is *winning* if  $\Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(\diamond \mathcal{S}^R | s_0) = 1$  for all  $\pi^2 \in \Pi^2$ . We denote the set of winning policies for Player 1 by  $\Pi^{1, win}$ .

A *Markov decision process* (MDP) is a tuple  $\mathcal{M} = (S', A', P', s'_0)$  where  $S'$  is a finite set of states,  $A'$  is a finite set of functions,  $P' : S' \times A' \times S' \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is the transition probability function, and  $s'_0$  is the initial state. An MDP is a two-player stochastic game where one of the players use a known, fixed policy.

The support of a discrete probability distribution  $Q$  is denoted by  $Supp(Q)$ . For discrete probability distributions  $Q_1$  and  $Q_2$  where  $Supp(Q_1) = \mathcal{X}$ , the *Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence* between  $Q_1$  and  $Q_2$  is  $KL(Q_1 || Q_2) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} Q_1(x) \log(Q_1(x)/Q_2(x))$  where  $\log$  denotes the natural logarithm. Data processing inequality [4] states that any transformation  $T : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  satisfies  $KL(Q_1 || Q_2) \geq KL(T(Q_1) || T(Q_2))$ . For the simplicity of notation, we will use  $KL(\pi^1, \pi^2 || \pi^{Av}, \pi^2)$  to denote  $KL(\Gamma^{\pi^1, \pi^2} || \Gamma^{\pi^{Av}, \pi^2})$ .

#### 4 Problem Statement

We consider a zero-sum two-player stochastic reachability game  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}^1, \mathcal{A}^2, \mathcal{P}, s_0, \mathcal{S}^R)$ . In this game, Player 1 may be *hostile*, i.e., it may aim to win the game for malicious purposes. For example, in the cyber interaction scenario, Player 1 may be a client performing a denial-of-service attack. Player 2 is not aware of the identity of

Player 1. In the cyber interaction scenario, Player 2 represents the server and does not know whether the client is an attacker. When Player 1 is hostile, its goal is not to expose its identity while winning the game. Player 2, on the other hand, aims to detect the identity of Player 1, i.e., determine whether Player 1 is hostile, in addition to making Player 1 lose the game. In the cyber interaction scenario, the goal of Player 1, i.e., a hostile client, is to perform an attack while not being detected by the server, and the goal of Player 2, i.e., the server, is to provide service to well-meaning clients while identifying hostile clients. In this setting, we assume that both players have full information on the current state and full information on each other's previous actions.

We consider an average player as the reference point to measure identity concealment. The average player's policy encodes the expected behavior of a non-hostile player interacting with Player 2, and can be used to measure how much Player 1's policy  $\pi^1$  exposes its identity and how well Player 2's policy  $\pi^2$  distinguishes hostile agents. The average player's policy  $\pi^{Av}$  is not necessarily designed to win the game against Player 2., but the average player can accidentally win the game due to the stochasticity of the environment or its policy. For example, in the cyber interaction scenario,  $\pi^{Av}$  may represent the average behavior of non-hostile clients, i.e., real users, interacting with the server. These clients may cause a denial-of-service, but their goal is not necessarily to cause a breakdown. We assume that the average player's policy  $\pi^{Av}$  is common knowledge.

Because an average player can win the game with a positive probability, a win in the game does not immediately identify Player 1 as hostile. Therefore, Player 1 aims to make its win look accidental and indistinguishable from an average player's win. On the flip side, Player 2 aims to design its policy in a way that the identity concealment of Player 1 is minimized, i.e., an average player and a hostile Player 1 produce different game runs.

We measure the identity concealment with the KL divergence  $KL(\pi^1, \pi^2 || \pi^{Av}, \pi^2)$  of the distribution of runs under Player 1's policy  $\pi^1$  and Player 2's policy  $\pi^2$ , and the distribution of runs under the average player's policy  $\pi^{Av}$  and Player 2's policy  $\pi^2$ . By Sanov's theorem [4],  $\exp(-nKL(\pi^1, \pi^2 || \pi^{Av}, \pi^2))$  measures the probability that  $n$  random game runs with a hostile Player 1 occur under the average player's policy. Consequently, as the number  $n$  of game runs or  $KL(\pi^1, \pi^2 || \pi^{Av}, \pi^2)$  increases Player 2 is more likely to identify a hostile player. More formally, as  $nKL(\pi^1, \pi^2 || \pi^{Av}, \pi^2)$  increases, the accuracy of likelihood-ratio test [10] increases. The goal of Player 1 is thus to minimize  $KL(\pi^1, \pi^2 || \pi^{Av}, \pi^2)$ , while the goal of Player 2 is to maximize this value.

We define an *identity concealment game*  $IC = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}^1, \mathcal{A}^2, \mathcal{P}, s_0, \mathcal{S}^R, \pi^{Av})$  as a two-player stochastic

game with objective functions  $1 - \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(\diamond \mathcal{S}^R | s_0)$  and  $KL(\pi^1, \pi^2 || \pi^{Av}, \pi^2)$ , where Player 1 is the minimizer and Player 2 is the maximizer for both functions. We remark that the game is not well-defined due to multiple objective functions. We thus pose the following problem that constrains the value of the objective function  $1 - \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(\diamond \mathcal{S}^R | s_0)$  to 0.

**Problem 1.** For a given identity concealment game  $IC$ , compute the equilibrium value of  $KL(\pi^1, \pi^2 || \pi^{Av}, \pi^2)$  subject to the constraint that Player 1 wins the game with probability 1.

**Remark.** We state that Player 1 aims to win with probability 1 and assume that there exists such a winning policy. If there is not such a policy, one can use the weighted zero-sum objective function  $KL(\pi^1, \pi^2 || \pi^{Av}, \pi^2) + \alpha(1 - \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(\diamond \mathcal{S}^R | s_0))$  where  $\alpha \in [0, \infty)$  is the weight of the winning objective. As  $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ , the weighted zero-sum objective function recovers Problem 1.

Player 1 can achieve a lower value than the equilibrium value of the game if Player 2 uses a suboptimal non-equilibrium policy. In this case, the optimal policy of Player 1 is not necessarily the equilibrium policy, and the hostile Player 1 may need to learn Player 2's policy to synthesize the optimal policy. While it is possible to learn Player 2's policy with a high amount of exploration, learning in this way is undesirable in the described adversarial setting since naive exploration would quickly reveal the identity of the hostile Player 1. Furthermore, Player 1 may not be able to collect game runs by directly interacting with Player 2 and may only observe Player 2's interactions with average players. Hence, the hostile Player 1's goal is to learn Player 2's policy from runs collected under the average player's policy and compute the optimal policy. We propose the following problem.

**Problem 2.** For an identity concealment game  $IC$ , let  $\pi^{2,*}$  be Player 2's policy that is unknown a priori to Player 1. Given  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ , and  $\delta \in [0, 1]$ , find an algorithm that uses a finite number of runs that are collected only using the average player's policy so that the output policy  $\pi^1$  of the algorithm satisfies  $\Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond \mathcal{S}^R | s_0) \geq 1 - \lambda$  and  $KL(\pi^1, \pi^{2,*} || \pi^{Av}, \pi^{2,*}) \leq \min_{\pi^{1,*} \in \Pi_{IC}^{1,win}} KL(\pi^{1,*}, \pi^{2,*} || \pi^{Av}, \pi^{2,*}) + \varepsilon$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ .

## 5 Equilibrium Policies for Identity Concealment Games

In this section, we prove the existence of an equilibrium for the identity concealment game and provide the optimality equations to compute it. We have the following assumption which ensures the computational tractability of the proposed problems.

**Assumption 1.** The average player's policy  $\pi^{Av}$  is stationary on the state space  $\mathcal{S}$ .

Action  $a^1$  is *permissible* for Player 1 at state  $s$  if  $\Pr^{\pi^{Av}}(s, a^1) > 0$ . Note that if Player 1 takes an impermissible action with a positive probability, then  $KL(\pi^1, \pi^2 || \pi^{Av}, \pi^2)$  is infinite, i.e., with a positive probability Player 2 is certain that Player 1 is not an average player, since an event happens with a positive probability under Player 1's policy and zero probability under the average player's policy. Without loss of generality, we assume that all actions are permissible for Player 1.

We also assume that there exists a winning policy  $\pi^1 \in \Pi^{1,win}$  such that  $\max_{\pi^2 \in \Pi^2} KL(\pi^1, \pi^2 || \pi^{Av}, \pi^2) < \infty$ . To find such policies, we first identify the states at which Player 2 can win the game with a positive probability. These states can be found with a procedure similar to solving reachability games on graphs [3].

State  $s$  is a *trap* state for Player 1 if there exists a policy  $\pi^2 \in \Pi^2$  that satisfies  $\Pr^{\pi^{Av}, \pi^2}(\diamond \mathcal{S}^R | s) = 0$ . The set of trap states are defined by  $\mathcal{S}^{trap}$ . It is easy to prove that if Player 1 visits a trap state with positive probability, then either it loses the game with positive probability or the objective function is infinite since an average player never leaves the set of trap states. The set of trap states is easy to find: Since  $\pi^{Av}$  is stationary, it induces an MDP for Player 2 given the game. On this MDP, to find  $\pi^{2,trap}$  we solve a reach-avoid problem where the objective is to avoid the winning states  $\mathcal{S}^R$  for Player 1. There exists a stationary policy  $\pi^{2,trap} \in \Pi^{2,St}$  that minimizes  $\Pr^{\pi^{Av}, \pi^{2,trap}}(\diamond \mathcal{S}^R | s)$  for every  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  [1]. Since the trapping policy minimizes the winning probability of an average player for every state, we have  $s \in \mathcal{S}^{trap}$  if and only if  $\Pr^{\pi^{Av}, \pi^{2,trap}}(\diamond \mathcal{S}^R | s) = 0$ .

We find the set  $\mathcal{S}^+$  of states for which there exists a policy  $\pi^1$  for Player 1 that reaches  $\mathcal{S}^R$  with probability 1 for all  $\pi^2 \in \Pi^2$  and avoids  $\mathcal{S}^{trap}$ . The set  $\mathcal{S}^+$  of potentially winning states can be found by iteratively expanding  $\mathcal{S}^R$  as in the attractor computation for two-player reachability games [3]. If a pair of equilibrium policies exist, then only the states in  $\mathcal{S}^+$  are visited with a positive probability since from all states in  $\mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^+$  there exists a policy for Player 2 such that  $\mathcal{S}^R$  is reached with a probability strictly less than 1. We define that at state  $s$  action  $a^1$  is *safe* for Player 1 if and only if  $\mathcal{P}(s, a^1, a^2, q) = 0$  for all  $a^2 \in \mathcal{A}^2(s)$  and  $q \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^+$ .

The following proposition shows that if the objective function is finite, then the expected total time at all states, but the states in  $\mathcal{S}^R$  must be finite. Formally, a pair  $(\pi^1, \pi^2)$  of policies is prolonging if  $\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(s_t = s | s_0) = \infty$  for some  $s \in \mathcal{S}^+ \setminus \mathcal{S}^R$ . All prolonging pairs  $(\pi^1, \pi^2)$  of policies satisfy  $KL(\pi^1, \pi^2 || \pi^{Av}, \pi^1) = \infty$ .

**Proposition 1.** For an identity concealment game  $IC$ , if  $s_0 \in S^+$ , then there exists a policy  $\pi^{1,fin} \in \Pi^1$  that satisfies  $KL(\pi^{1,fin}, \pi^2 || \pi^{Av}, \pi^2) < \infty$ , and  $\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \Pr^{\pi^{1,fin}, \pi^2}(s_t = s | s_0) < \infty$  for all  $s \in S^+ \setminus \mathcal{S}^R$  and  $\pi^2 \in \Pi^2$ . Furthermore, if  $\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \Pr^{\pi^{1,inf}, \pi^2}(s_t = s | s_0) = \infty$  for some  $s \in S^+ \setminus \mathcal{S}^R$  and  $\pi^{1,inf} \in \Pi^1$ , then  $KL(\pi^{1,inf}, \pi^2 || \pi^{Av}, \pi^2) = \infty$ .

We use Lemma 2 to prove Proposition 1. The proof of Lemma 2 follows from that  $\sum_{n \in C'} \mathcal{D}^1(n)n = \infty$  where  $n \in C'$  if and only if  $\mathcal{D}^1(n) > c_1 \exp(-nc_2/2)$ .

**Lemma 2.** Let  $\mathcal{D}^1$  and  $\mathcal{D}^2$  be discrete probability distributions such that  $Supp(\mathcal{D}^1), Supp(\mathcal{D}^2) \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ . If  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{D}^1(n)n = \infty$  and there exist  $c_1, c_2 \in (0, \infty)$  such that  $\mathcal{D}^2(n) \leq c_1 \exp(-c_2n)$ , then  $KL(\mathcal{D}^1 || \mathcal{D}^2) = \infty$ .

**Proof of Proposition 1** We prove the first part of the proposition by constructing a policy using safe actions and the definition of potentially winning states. For the second part, we lower bound the KL objective using the data processing inequality, and the time distributions at the states in  $S^+ \setminus \mathcal{S}^R$ . We show that the lower bound and, consequently, the objective function are infinite if the Player 1's policy has infinite expected time at  $S^+ \setminus \mathcal{S}^R$ .

The objective function  $KL(\pi^1, \pi^2 || \pi^{Av}, \pi^2)$  can be represented as the sum of costs for each time step where the cost for each time step  $t$  is a convex function of Player 1's (possibly history dependent) action distribution  $\mu_t^1$ .  $KL(\pi^1, \pi^2 || \pi^{Av}, \pi^2)$  is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\gamma \in Supp(\Gamma^{\pi^1, \pi^2})} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(\gamma) \log \left( \frac{\Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(\gamma)}{\Pr^{\pi^{Av}, \pi^2}(\gamma)} \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{s_{t+1} \in \mathcal{S} \\ a^1 \in \mathcal{A}^1 \\ a^2 \in \mathcal{A}^2}} \mu_t^1(h_t, a^1) \mu_t^2(h_t, a^2) \mathcal{P}(s_t, a^1, a^2, s_{t+1}) \right. \\ & \quad \left. \log \left( \frac{\mu_t^1(h_t, a^1) \mu_t^2(h_t, a^2) \mathcal{P}(s_t, a^1, a^2, s_{t+1})}{\pi^{Av}(s_t, a^1) \mu_t^2(h_t, a^2) \mathcal{P}(s_t, a^1, a^2, s_{t+1})} \right) \middle| h_t \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \sum_{a^1 \in \mathcal{A}^1} \mu_t^1(h_t, a^1) \log \left( \frac{\mu_t^1(h_t, a^1)}{\pi^{Av}(s_t, a^1)} \right) \middle| h_t \right]. \end{aligned}$$

If  $\pi^1$  is stationary,  $KL(\pi^1, \pi^2 || \pi^{Av}, \pi^2)$  is equal to

$$\sum_{\substack{s \in \mathcal{S} \\ a^1 \in \mathcal{A}^1}} \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(s_t = s) \pi^1(s^1, a^1) \log \left( \frac{\pi^1(s^1, a^1)}{\pi^{Av}(s^1, a^1)} \right).$$

Having showed that the objective function can be represented as the sum of costs for each time step, we now show the existence of a stationary  $\pi^{1,fin}$  by construction.

At states in  $S^+$ ,  $\pi^{1,fin}$  takes all permissible, safe actions uniformly randomly. Note that  $\max_{a^1 \in \mathcal{A}^1} \pi^{1,fin}(s, a^1) \log \left( \frac{\pi^{1,fin}(s, a^1)}{\pi^{Av}(s, a^1)} \right) = C_{max} < \infty$  since  $\pi^{1,fin}$  takes only permissible actions. By definition of  $\mathcal{S}^+$ , there must exist a state  $s_t \in S^+$  and such that  $\Pr^{\pi^{1,fin}, \pi^2}(s_{t+1} \in \mathcal{S}^R | s_t) > 0$  for all  $\pi^2$ . Similarly,  $\Pr^{\pi^{1,fin}, \pi^2}(\diamond_{\leq |S|} \mathcal{S}^R | h_t) > 0$  for all  $h_t \in \mathcal{H}_t$ . Since the game ends in every  $S$  steps with a positive probability, we have  $\sum_{s \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^+} \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \Pr^{\pi^{1,fin}, \pi^2}(s_t = s) < \infty$ . Therefore we have  $KL(\pi^{1,fin}, \pi^2 || \pi^{Av}, \pi^2) \leq \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \Pr^{\pi^{1,fin}, \pi^2}(s_t = s) C_{max} < \infty$ .

We now prove that if  $\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \Pr^{\pi^{1,inf}, \pi^2}(s_t = s) = \infty$  for some  $s \in S^+ \setminus \mathcal{S}^R$ , then  $KL(\pi^{1,inf}, \pi^2 || \pi^{Av}, \pi^2)$  is infinite. We first claim that for all  $\pi^2 \in \Pi^2$ ,  $t \geq 0$ , and  $h_t \in \mathcal{H}_t$  such that  $s_t \in S^+ \setminus \mathcal{S}^R$ , we have  $\max_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \Pr^{\pi^{Av}, \pi^2}(\diamond\{s_t\} | h_t) < 1$ . Note that stationary policies for Player 2 suffice to maximize the reachability probability to a state in the MDP induced by  $\pi^{Av}$ . If  $\Pr^{\pi^{Av}, \pi^2}(\diamond\{s_t\} | h_t) = 1$  for some  $\pi^2 \in \Pi^2, s_t$ , then we have  $\Pr^{\pi^{Av}, \pi^2}(\diamond \mathcal{S}^R | s_t) = 0$  and  $s_t$  must be a trap state. This yields a contradiction since  $s \in S^+$  and  $S^+ \cap \mathcal{S}^{trap} = \emptyset$ . Thus, for all  $\pi^2 \in \Pi^2$ ,  $t \geq 0$ , and  $h_t \in \mathcal{H}_t$  such that  $s_t \in S^+ \setminus \mathcal{S}^R$ , we have  $\max_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \Pr^{\pi^{Av}, \pi^2}(\diamond\{s\} | s_t = s) < 1$ . Let  $N_s^{Av, 2}$  be a random variable denoting the number of times that  $s \in S^+ \setminus \mathcal{S}^R$  appears in a random run under  $\pi^{Av}$  and  $\pi^2$ . Similarly, let  $N_s^{1, 2}$  be a random variable denoting the number of times that  $s \in S^+ \setminus \mathcal{S}^R$  appears in a random run under  $\pi^1$  and  $\pi^2$ . Since  $\max_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \Pr^{\pi^{Av}, \pi^2}(\diamond\{s\} | s_t = s) < 1$ , there exists a  $c \in [0, 1)$  such that  $\Pr(N_s^{Av, 2} = k) \leq c^{k-1}$  for all  $k \geq 1$  and  $\Pr(N_s^{Av, 2} = 0) \leq 1$ . If  $\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \Pr^{\pi^{1,inf}, \pi^2}(s_t = s) = \infty$  for some  $s \in S^+ \setminus \mathcal{S}^R$ , then by Lemma 2, we have  $KL(N_s^{1, 2} || N_s^{Av, 2}) = \infty$  for some  $s \in S^+ \setminus \mathcal{S}^R$ . By the data processing inequality, for all  $s \in S$  we have  $KL(N_s^{1, 2} || N_s^{Av, 2}) \leq KL(\pi^{1,inf}, \pi^2 || \pi^{Av, inf}, \pi^2)$ . Thus,  $KL(\pi^{1,inf}, \pi^2 || \pi^{Av}, \pi^2) = \infty$ . ■

We note three facts: 1) All prolonging pairs  $(\pi^{inf, 1}, \pi^2)$  of policies for which  $\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \Pr^{\pi^{inf, 1}, \pi^2}(s_t = s) = \infty$  for some  $s \in S^+ \setminus \mathcal{S}^R$ , satisfy  $KL(\pi^{1,inf}, \pi^2 || \pi^{Av}, \pi^2) = \infty$ , 2) There exists a winning policy for Player 1 that induces a finite KL objective function value, and 3) The KL objective function can be represented as the sum of costs for each time step where the cost for each time step is a convex function of Player 1's action distribution and a concave function of Player 2's action distribution. Due to these facts it is sufficient to consider only the stationary policies to find an equilibrium policy pair [18].

**Proposition 3.** For an identity concealment game  $IC$ , if there exists a winning policy  $\pi^1$  for Player 1 for which  $\Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(\diamond \mathcal{S}^R | s_0) = 1$  for all  $\pi^2 \in \Pi^2$ , then there exists an equilibrium which can be achieved by stationary policies  $\pi^1 \in \Pi^{1, St}$  and  $\pi^2 \in \Pi^{2, St}$  for Player 1 and Player 2.

**Proof of Proposition 3** Without loss of generality assume that Player 1 only takes actions that are permissible and safe. Let Player 1's actions  $\mathcal{A}^1(s)$  be enumerated from 1 to  $|\mathcal{A}^1(s)|$  and Player 2's actions  $\mathcal{A}^2(s)$  be enumerated from 1 to  $|\mathcal{A}^2(s)|$  for all  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ . Denote the  $n$ -dimensional probability simplex by  $\Delta^n$ .

Define a zero-sum two-player stochastic game  $\hat{\mathcal{G}} = (\mathcal{S}, \hat{\mathcal{A}}^1, \hat{\mathcal{A}}^2, \hat{\mathcal{P}}, s_0, \mathcal{S}^R)$  with compact action spaces where  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}^1$  and  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}^2$  are metric set of actions for Players 1 and 2, respectively. Player 1 and 2's policies are  $\hat{\pi}^1$  and  $\hat{\pi}^2$ , respectively. At time  $t$ , Player 1's one-step policy is  $\hat{\mu}_t^1 : \mathcal{H}_t \rightarrow \Delta^{|\mathcal{A}^1(s)|}$  and Player 2's one-step policy is  $\hat{\mu}_t^2 : \mathcal{H}_t \rightarrow \Delta^{|\mathcal{A}^2(s)|}$ .  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}^1, \hat{\mathcal{A}}^2$ , and  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$  satisfy the following:  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}(s, \hat{a}^1, \hat{a}^2, q) = \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{A}^1(s)|} \sum_{j=1}^{|\mathcal{A}^2(s)|} \hat{a}^1(i) \hat{a}^2(j) \mathcal{P}(s, i, j, q)$  for all  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ ,  $\hat{a}^1 \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}^1(s) = \Delta^{|\mathcal{A}^1(s)|}$ ,  $\hat{a}^2 \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}^2(s) = \Delta^{|\mathcal{A}^2(s)|}$ ,  $q \in \mathcal{S}$ . Define cost function  $\hat{c}(s, \hat{a}^1, \hat{a}^2) = \sum_{a^1 \in \mathcal{A}^1(s)} \hat{a}^1(i) \log(\hat{a}^1(i) / \pi^{Av}(s, a^1))$  for all  $s \in \mathcal{S}^+ \setminus \mathcal{S}^R$ ,  $\hat{c}(s, \hat{a}^1, \hat{a}^2) = 0$  for all  $s \in \mathcal{S}^R$ , and  $\hat{c}(s, \hat{a}^1, \hat{a}^2) = \infty$  for all  $s \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^+$ . We consider  $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$  with the objective function  $\mathbb{E}^{\hat{\pi}^1, \hat{\pi}^2} [\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \hat{c}(s, \hat{a}_t^1, \hat{a}_t^2)]$  where Player 1 is the minimizer and Player 2 is the maximizer. Note that the cost function is a convex function of  $\hat{a}^1$  and a concave function of  $\hat{a}^2$ . We note that  $\mathbb{E}^{\hat{\pi}^1, \hat{\pi}^2} [\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \hat{c}(s, \hat{a}_t^1, \hat{a}_t^2)]$  is equal to the value of  $KL(\pi^1, \pi^2 || \pi^{Av}, \pi^2)$  if for all  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ ,  $t \geq 0$ , we have  $\hat{\mu}_t^1 = [\mu_t^1(s, 1), \dots, \mu_t^1(s, |\mathcal{A}^1(s)|)]$  and  $\hat{\mu}_t^2 = [\mu_t^2(s, 1), \dots, \mu_t^2(s, |\mathcal{A}^2(s)|)]$ .

Due to Proposition 1 and the above equivalence between the objective functions of  $IC$  and  $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ , all prolonging policy pairs  $(\hat{\pi}^1, \hat{\pi}^2)$  has an infinite objective value for Player 1. Similarly, due to Proposition 1, there exists a policy  $\hat{\pi}^1, \hat{\pi}^2$  that incurs a finite objective value for Player 1 for all policies of Player 2.

Since all prolonging policy pairs incur an infinite objective value for Player 1 and there exists a policy  $\hat{\pi}^1, \hat{\pi}^2$  that incurs a finite objective value for Player 1, by Proposition 4.6 of [18], there exists an equilibrium policy pair for  $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ . Furthermore, there exist stationary policies  $\hat{\pi}^1, St$  and  $\hat{\pi}^2, St$  which achieve the equilibrium. We also note that the convexity of  $\mathbb{E}^{\hat{\pi}^1, \hat{\pi}^2} [\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \hat{c}(s_t, \hat{a}_t^1, \hat{a}_t^2)]$  in  $\hat{a}^1$  and the concavity in  $\hat{a}^2$  implies that the deterministic policies suffice for Player 1 and Player 2 in  $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ . Since there is a one-to-one mapping between the stationary deterministic policies of  $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$  and stationary policies of  $IC$ , there also exists an equilibrium stationary policy pair for  $IC$ . ■

Knowing that the stationary policies suffice to find an equilibrium policy pair, we can represent the cost of each step as a function of Player 1's policy and find a set of equilibrium policies via value iteration. Let  $\pi^1(s)$  and  $\pi^{Av}(s)$  denote the vector of Player 1's and average player's policies at state  $s$ , respectively. Also, let  $v(s)$  denote the cost-to-go at state  $s$  such that  $v(s) = 0$  for all  $s \in \mathcal{S}^R$  and  $v(s) = \infty$  for all  $s \in \mathcal{S}^{trap} \cup \mathcal{S}^{cliff} \cup \mathcal{S}^{exile}$ . For all  $s \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^+$ , we have the optimality equation

$$v(s) = \min_{\pi^1(s)} \left( KL(\pi^1(s) || \pi^{Av}(s)) + \max_{\pi^2(s)} \sum_{q \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{\substack{a^1 \in \mathcal{A}^1(s) \\ a^2 \in \mathcal{A}^2(s)}} \mathcal{P}(s, a^1, a^2, q) \pi^1(s, a^1) \pi^2(s, a^2) v(q) \right)$$

where the arguments of the minimum are the equilibrium policies for Player 1. Similarly, by the first-order optimality conditions, we can show that for all  $s \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^+$ , the equilibrium policies for Player 2 satisfy

$$\pi^2(s) = \arg \max_{\pi^2(s)} \sum_{a^1 \in \mathcal{A}^1(s)} \pi^{Av}(s, a^1) \exp \left( \sum_{\substack{q \in \mathcal{S} \\ a^2 \in \mathcal{A}^2(s)}} \mathcal{P}(s, a^1, a^2, q) \pi^2(s, a^2) v(q) \right)^{-1}.$$

## 6 Passive Learning of Player 2's Policy

In this section, we give a passive learning algorithm to learn Player 2's policy and synthesize a near-optimal policy for Player 1. We define some notation before formally introducing the algorithm. The equilibrium value of the game is denoted by  $v^*$ . Player 2's true policy is  $\pi^{2,*}$ . For a state  $s$ , the number of collected sample transitions is  $\hat{m}_s$ , and the empirical action frequencies for Player 2 using only the first  $m$  samples independently drawn from  $\pi^{2,*}$  is  $\hat{\pi}^2$ . Player 1's optimal winning policy against  $\pi^{2,*}$  is  $\pi^{1,*}$ , i.e.,  $\pi^{1,*} = \arg \min_{\pi \in \Pi^1, \text{win}} KL(\pi, \pi^{2,*} || \pi^{Av}, \pi^{2,*})$ . For the potentially winning states  $\mathcal{S}^+$ ,  $C_{max}$  denotes the maximum KL divergence between the safe action distributions for Player 1 and the action distribution for  $\pi^{Av}$ .

We have the following assumption on Player 2's policy. Assumption 2 ensures tractability of estimation for the transition probabilities.

**Assumption 2.**  $\pi^{2,*}$  is stationary on  $\mathcal{S}$ .

Algorithm 1 takes the game model  $IC$  and a finite number of sample runs collected under the average player's policy (Line 4), and estimates the policy of Player 2 (Line 7). A state is *known* if there is a certain number  $m$  of samples for estimation (Line 8), and is *unknown* otherwise.

---

**Algorithm 1** Passive learning of Player 2's policy

---

- 1: **Input:** An identity concealment game  $IC$ .
  - 2: **Output:** A policy  $\pi^1$  for Player 1.
  - 3:  $\mathcal{S}^K := \emptyset$ .
  - 4: Collect  $n$  sample runs under  $\pi^{Av}$ .
  - 5: **for**  $s \in \mathcal{S}^+$  **do**
  - 6:     **if**  $\hat{m}_s \geq m$  **then**
  - 7:         Set  $\pi^2(s)$  as the empirical distribution of first  $m$  actions of Player 2 at state  $s$ .
  - 8:          $\mathcal{S}^K := \mathcal{S}^K \cup \{s\}$ .
  - 9:  $\mathcal{S}^U := \mathcal{S}^+ \setminus \mathcal{S}^K$ ,  $\mathcal{S}^{end} := \mathcal{S}^U \cup \mathcal{S}^R$ .
  - 10: Construct a modified identity concealment game  $IC'$  that is the same with  $IC$  except that all states in  $\mathcal{S}^{end}$  are absorbing, and  $\mathcal{S}^{end}$  is the set of winning states. For  $IC'$ , synthesize the optimal stationary policy  $\pi^{1'}$  for Player 1 using the estimated policy  $\pi^2(s)$  for all  $s \in \mathcal{S}^K$ .
  - 11: For  $IC$ , define  $\pi^1 := \mu_0^1 \mu_1^1 \dots$  such that  $\mu_t^1(h_t, \cdot) := \pi^{1'}(s_t^1, s_t^2, \cdot)$  if  $s_k \in \mathcal{S}^K$  for all  $0 \leq k < t$ , and  $\mu_t^1(h_t, \cdot) := \pi^{Av}(s, \cdot)$  otherwise.
- 

The output policy  $\pi^1$  of the algorithm uses the optimal policy against Player 2's estimated policy until reaching an unknown state and uses the average player's policy after reaching an unknown state (Lines 10 and 11).

If the number of sample runs is large enough, unknown states are reached with low probability under  $\pi^{Av}$  and will be visited with a low probability under the output policy  $\pi^1$ . Since the value of the objective function is close to the optimal value for the known states, the algorithm satisfies the requirements given in Problem 2.

We define that a stationary policy pair  $(\pi^1, \pi^2)$  has an  $(L, \beta')$ -contraction, if  $\min_{s \in \mathcal{S}^+} \Pr(\diamond_{\leq L} \mathcal{S}^R \cup \mathcal{S}^U | s_0 = s) \geq 1 - \beta'$ . To show the near optimality of the output policy, we make the following assumption, which ensures the finiteness of the expected length of a game run.

**Assumption 3.** The policy pair  $(\pi^1, \pi^2)$  has an  $(L, \beta - \frac{\varepsilon(1-\beta)^2}{C_{max}L})$ -contraction where  $\beta$  is a constant strictly lower than 1.

The validity of Assumption 3 can be checked after termination of the algorithm since both  $\pi^1$  and  $\pi^2$  are known. If the assumption is not satisfied, one can increase  $\beta$  and rerun the algorithm. We remark that  $\beta - (\varepsilon(1-\beta)^2)/(C_{max}L)$  is an increasing function of  $\beta$ , and the policy pair  $(\pi^1, \pi^2)$  has to have a  $(S, \beta - (\varepsilon(1-\beta)^2)/(C_{max}S))$ -contraction for some  $\beta < 1$  since otherwise  $\pi^1$  has to incur infinite cost. Therefore, there always exists  $\beta < 1$  that satisfies the assumption.

The following proposition shows that Algorithm 1 indeed results in a near-optimal policy using only the game runs collected under the average player's policy.

**Proposition 4.** Let  $w = (v^* + \log(2) + \varepsilon)/\lambda$ . Under Assumptions 1-3, if  $m \geq \frac{4C_{max}^2 L^4 (2 \log(2)A + \log(2S/\delta))}{(1-\beta)^4 \varepsilon^2}$  and  $n \geq e^{2w} \log(4/\delta) / 2 + 2Se^w m$  in Algorithm 1, then the output policy  $\pi^1$  satisfies  $KL(\pi^1, \pi^{2,*} || \pi^{Av}, \pi^{2,*}) - KL(\pi^{1,*}, \pi^{2,*} || \pi^{Av}, \pi^{2,*}) \leq \varepsilon$  and  $\Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond \mathcal{S}^R | s_0) \geq 1 - \lambda$  with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ .

We use a series of lemmas to prove Proposition 4. Lemma 5 shows that with high probability, the estimated action distribution  $\pi^2$  and the actual action distribution  $\pi^2$  for Player 2 are close for all known states. The proof follows from the Chernoff-Hoeffding inequality and union bound since the action samples for Player 2 are independent.

**Lemma 5.** For any  $\delta_k \in (0, 1]$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta_k$ ,  $\|\pi^{2,*}(s) - \pi^2(s)\|_1 \leq \sqrt{\frac{2(\log(2)A + \log(S/\delta_k))}{m}}$  for all  $s \in \mathcal{S}^K$ .

Lemma 6 shows that if the estimated and actual transition probability distributions are close, and the policy pair  $(\pi^1, \pi^{2,*})$  has an  $L$ -step contraction, then the values of the objective function are close for  $(\pi^1, \pi^{2,*})$  and  $(\pi^1, \pi^2)$ . The paper [22] showed this property for  $(1, \beta)$ -contractions. We extend this result to  $(L, \beta)$ -contractions. Since  $(\pi^1, \pi^2)$  has  $L$ -step contraction lower than or equal to  $\beta - \varepsilon(1-\beta)^2/(C_{max}L)$  and  $\|\pi^{2,*}(s) - \pi^2(s)\|_1 \leq \varepsilon(1-\beta)^2/(C_{max}L^2)$  for all  $s \in \mathcal{S}^K$ , then  $(\pi^1, \pi^{2,*})$  has  $(L, \varepsilon\beta/C_{max})$ -contraction. Since  $(\pi^1, \pi^{2,*})$  has a contraction, and the estimated and true transition probabilities are close, by representing the KL objective as a sum of costs per time step, we can show that difference between the value functions is bounded.

**Lemma 6.** If  $\|\pi^{2,*}(s) - \pi^2(s)\|_1 \leq \frac{\varepsilon(1-\beta)^2}{C_{max}L^2}$  for all  $s \in \mathcal{S}^K$ ,  $|KL(\pi^1, \pi^2 || \pi^{Av}, \pi^2) - KL(\pi^1, \pi^{2,*} || \pi^{Av}, \pi^{2,*})| \leq \varepsilon/2$

The following lemmas show that the probability of losing is low if the number of sample trajectories is high. Lemma 7 shows that if a state is unknown then the probability of reaching that state is low with high probability. Lemma 8 shows that if a state is reached with high probability under  $\pi^1$  and with low probability under  $\pi^{Av}$ , then the value of the objective function is high.

**Lemma 7.** Let  $\hat{m}_C$  denote the number of transitions from set  $C$  of states using  $n$  runs independently sampled under policies  $(\pi^{Av}, \pi^{2,*})$ . For  $m' \geq \hat{m}_C$  and for any  $1/2 \geq \sigma > m'/n$ , with probability at least  $1 - 2 \exp(-2n(\sigma - m'/n)^2)$  we have  $\Pr^{\pi^{Av}, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond C | s_0) \leq \sigma$ .

The proof of Lemma 8 is an application of the Chernoff-Hoeffding inequality using the fact that number of collected action samples from a state is higher than the number of sample runs that visit the state. The proof of Lemma 7 follows from that the KL divergence between

the distributions of game runs is lower bounded by the KL divergence between the reachability probability to set  $C$  by the data processing inequality.

**Lemma 8.** If  $\Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond C | s_0) > \frac{-(v^* + \log(2) + \varepsilon)}{\log(\Pr^{\pi^{Av}, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond C | s_0))}$  then  $KL(\pi^1, \pi^{2,*} || \pi^{Av}, \pi^{2,*}) > v^* + \varepsilon$ .

The proof of Proposition 4 consists of two parts. We first show that the learned policy  $\pi^1$  is near optimal. At the unknown states,  $\pi^1$  is the same with the average player's policy  $\pi^{Av}$  and incurs 0 cost. Consider a modified identity concealment game where the unknown states are included in the winning states. The equilibrium value of the modified game is less compared to the original game. For the known states, Player 2's estimated policy will be close to the true policy due to Lemma 5. Since the estimated policy is accurate,  $\pi^1$  is near optimal for the modified game. Thus,  $\pi^1$  is near optimal due to Lemma 6. To show that the probability of losing is small, we use Lemmas 7 and 8. Since the ratio between the numbers of sample paths and sample transitions is high enough, Lemma 7 implies that the probability of reaching an unknown state is bounded under  $\pi^{Av}$ . Since  $\pi^1$  is near optimal, the probability of reaching an unknown state is also bounded under the learned policy due to Lemma 8.

**Proof of Proposition 3** At time  $t$  define  $\pi^{1'}$  such that  $\pi^{1'}(s) := \pi^{1,*}(s)$  if  $s_k \in S^K$  for all  $0 \leq k < t$ , and  $\pi^{1'}(s) := \pi^{Av}(s)$  otherwise. For notational convenience define  $v_{(1),(2)} := KL(\pi^1, \pi^2 || \pi^{Av}, \pi^2)$ ,  $v_{(1),(2),*} := KL(\pi^1, \pi^{2,*} || \pi^{Av}, \pi^{2,*})$ ,  $v_{(1'),(2),*} := KL(\pi^{1'}, \pi^{2,*} || \pi^{Av}, \pi^{2,*})$ ,  $v_{(1'),(2)} := KL(\pi^{1'}, \pi^2 || \pi^{Av}, \pi^2)$ , and  $v_{(1,*),(2),*} := KL(\pi^{1,*}, \pi^{2,*} || \pi^{Av}, \pi^{2,*})$ . Also define  $w := (v^* + \log(2) + \varepsilon)/\lambda$ .

By Lemma 5, if  $m \geq \frac{4C_{max}^2 L^4 (2 \log(2) |S^2| + \log(\frac{2}{\delta}))}{(1-\beta)^4 \varepsilon^2}$  in Algorithm 1, then with probability at least  $1 - \delta/2$ , we have  $\|\pi^{2,*}(s) - \pi^2(s)\|_1 \leq \varepsilon(1-\beta)^2 / (C_{max} L^2)$  for all  $s \in S^K$ . Then by Lemma 6, we have  $|v_{(1'),(2),*} - v_{(1'),(2)}| \leq \varepsilon/2$  and  $|v_{(1),(2)} - v_{(1),(2),*}| \leq \varepsilon/2$  with probability at least  $1 - \delta/2$ . Since  $v_{(1),(2)} \leq v_{(1'),(2)}$  due to the optimality of  $\pi^1$  against  $\pi^2$ , we have  $|v_{(1'),(2),*} - v_{(1),(2),*}| \leq \varepsilon$  with probability at least  $1 - \delta/2$ . We also have that  $v_{(1'),(2),*} \leq v_{(1,*),(2),*}$  since  $\pi^{1,*}$  and  $\pi^{1'}$  induce the same cost until reaching an unknown state, and  $\pi^{1,*}$  induces a non-negative cost after reaching an unknown state whereas  $\pi^{1'}$  induces 0 cost after reaching an unknown state. With probability at least  $1 - \delta/2$ , we have  $v_{(1'),(2),*} \leq v_{(1,*),(2),*} + \varepsilon$ , i.e.,  $KL(\pi^1, \pi^{2,*} || \pi^{Av}, \pi^{2,*}) \leq KL(\pi^{1,*}, \pi^{2,*} || \pi^{Av}, \pi^{2,*}) + \varepsilon$ .

We now show that if  $n/m \geq e^{2w} \log(4/\delta) / 2m + 2Se^w$  and  $m$  is as above,  $\Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(\diamond S^R | s_0) \geq 1 - \lambda$  with probability at least  $1 - \delta/2$ . Let  $S^U$  be the set of un-

known states. Define  $y := e^w \log(4/\delta) / (2mS)$  and  $c := y + 2$ . We have  $n/m \geq Sce^w$ . Also define  $c' := (y + \sqrt{y}\sqrt{y+4} + 2) / 2$ . Note that  $y \geq 0$  and  $c \geq c' \geq 1$ . The number of sample transitions from  $S^U$  is lower than  $mS$  by the definition. By Lemma 6, with probability at least  $1 - 2 \exp(-2n(1-1/c)^2 e^{-2w})$ , we have  $\Pr^{\pi^{Av}, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond S^U | s_0) \leq e^{-w}$ . Since  $c \geq c' \geq 1$ , we have  $2 \exp(-2n(\frac{c-1}{c})^2 e^{-2w}) \leq 2 \exp(-2mSc'(\frac{c'-1}{c'})^2 e^{-w}) = \delta/2$ . Thus, we have  $\Pr^{\pi^{Av}, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond S^U | s_0) \leq e^{-w}$  with probability at least  $1 - \delta/2$ .

If  $KL(\pi^1, \pi^{2,*} || \pi^{Av}, \pi^{2,*}) \leq KL(\pi^{1,*}, \pi^{2,*} || \pi^{Av}, \pi^{2,*}) + \varepsilon$ , we have  $KL(\pi^1, \pi^{2,*} || \pi^{Av}, \pi^{2,*}) \leq v^* + \varepsilon$  since  $KL(\pi^{1,*}, \pi^{2,*} || \pi^{Av}, \pi^{2,*}) \leq v^*$ . By Lemma 7, the probability  $\Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond S^U | s_0) \leq \lambda$  with probability at least  $1 - \delta$  since  $\Pr^{\pi^{Av}, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond S^U | s_0) \leq e^{-w}$  with probability at least  $1 - \delta/2$ . Since Player 1 can lose the game only by reaching an unknown state, the probability of losing is at most  $\lambda$  with probability at least  $1 - \delta/2$ .

Combining the near-optimality result for the objective function and the result for the probability of losing, we conclude that  $\pi^1$  satisfies  $KL(\pi^1, \pi^2 || \pi^{Av}, \pi^2) - KL(\pi^{1,*}, \pi^2 || \pi^{Av}, \pi^2) \leq \varepsilon$  and  $\Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(\diamond S^R | s_0) \geq 1 - \lambda$  with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ . ■

**Remark.** The bound given in Proposition 4 has exponential dependencies on some parameters whereas PAC-MDP [13,22] methods have polynomial dependencies in the relevant parameters. This difference is because PAC-MDP methods are active learning methods while we use a passive learning method for Problem 2.

## 7 Numerical Examples

In this section, we give numerical examples on the equilibrium policies for identity concealment games and passive learning of Player 2's policy.

### 7.1 Detection of Hostile Clients in Cyber Interaction

We demonstrate the effect of identity concealment on the detection of hostile clients in the cyber interaction scenario. The game is played between a client (Player 1) and the server (Player 2), and the states of the game represent the remaining times for the client's processed requests if there are any. At every time, the client can disconnect, make a request or wait. The server can accept or reject the client's potential request. However, the server cannot reject the request again if the client has been rejected previously for that request. If the request is accepted, it takes a certain number steps to process the request. The attacker's goal is to cause a denial of service by overwhelming the server, and it wins the game if and only if the server concurrently processes multiple






Figure 1. Receiver operating characteristic curve of the likelihood ratio classifier that identifies hostile clients. True positive rate is the ratio of detected attackers to all attackers. False positive rate is the ratio of real clients identified as an attacker to all clients.

requests of the client. At every state, the real clients’ policy, i.e. the average player’s policy, is randomized, and is more likely to make a request if there are no requests being processed or there is a rejected request. The details of the setting are given in Appendix A.

In Figure 1, we observe that when the server uses its equilibrium policy  $\pi^{2,*}$ , hostile clients are identified with high accuracy compared to policy  $\pi^{2,U}$  that accepts or rejects the requests with equal probabilities. This is because, unlike  $\pi^{2,U}$ , the equilibrium policy  $\pi^{2,*}$  is state-dependent, and using  $\pi^{2,*}$  the server can drive the game into a state where the hostile client’s behavior is different from the real clients’ behaviors. Similarly, a hostile client is less likely to be detected when it uses its equilibrium policy  $\pi^{1,*}$  compared to the greedy policy  $\pi^{1,G}$  that makes a request at every time step. We also observe that an additional interaction, i.e., a game run, improves the accuracy of classification as explained in Section 4.

### 7.2 Equilibrium Policies for a Pursuit-Evasion Game

We show the behavior for hostile Player 1 in a pursuit-evasion game. Player 1 is an evader and Player 2 is a pursuer. The environment is a two-dimensional grid where each node represents an intersection. At each time step, every intersection is occupied with probability 0.5. If the pursuer’s intersection is clear, it can move in  $+x$ ,  $-x$ ,  $+y$ ,  $-y$  directions by 1 or stay at its current intersection. If the intersection is occupied, the pursuer stays. Regardless of the state of its intersection, the evader can move in all directions by 1 or 2 blocks, or stay at the current intersection. We encode the states of the game using the relative distances on  $x$  and  $y$  coordinates between the players, the states of the evader’s intersection, and the state of the pursuer’s intersection. If the block distance between the players is 6 or more the evader wins the game, and if the block distance is 0, the pursuer wins the game, i.e., traps the average evader.

The average player’s policy only depends on whether its intersection is occupied and is given in Table 1. If the intersection is occupied, with high probability the average player waits the intersection to be cleared and with low probability the average player “illegally” crosses the

Table 1  
The policies of the average and hostile evaders. O denotes an occupied intersection and C denotes a clear intersection.

Evader Type	State	Probability of Action								
		Stay	x	2x	y	2y	-y	-2y	-x	-2x
Average	Intersection Occupied	0.80	0.10	0	0.05	0	0.05	0	0	0
	Intersection Clear	0	0.40	0.10	0.20	0.05	0.20	0.05	0	0
Hostile	(2,0,C,C)	0	0.41	0.23	0.12	0.06	0.12	0.06	0	0
	(1,0,C,C)	0	0.31	0.33	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0	0
	(1,0,O,C)	0	0.62	0	0.19	0	0.19	0	0	0
	(1,0,O,O)	0.74	0.16	0	0.05	0	0.05	0	0	0

intersection. If its intersection is clear, with high probability the average player moves with a normal speed, otherwise it “overspeeds”, i.e., moves by 2 blocks.

The equilibrium policy of the hostile evader is given in Table 1 for some states. If the evader is close to the pursuer, for instance at state  $(1, 0, C, C)$ , the evader tends behave more suspiciously by “overspeeding”. When the distance is higher, for instance at state  $(2, 0, C, C)$ , the evader does not flee and behaves more closely to the average player. Similarly, the hostile evader chooses to move at state  $(1, 0, O, C)$  since otherwise the evader may get caught. On the other hand, the hostile evader chooses to stay at state  $(1, 0, O, O)$  with high probability since the pursuer has to wait. Overall, the hostile evader behaves dissimilar to the average player only if it is in a dangerous position, which matches the intuition of concealing the identity by behaving in an unsuspecting way.

### 7.3 Passive Learning of the Pursuer’s Policy

In this example, we show the empirical performance of the proposed passive learning algorithm for different number of sample runs  $n$  and number of estimation samples  $m$  per state. Note that we do not give optimality guarantees for the demonstrated values of  $m$  and  $n$ . We use the same environment with the previous example where the initial state  $s_0$  is  $(1, 0, O, O)$ . At each time step the pursuer stops tracking the evader, and the evader wins with probability 0.2. If the pursuer does not stop, it takes allowed actions with uniform probabilities.

In Figure 2a, we observe that the evader is able to learn the pursuer’s suboptimal policy and lower the objective function compared to the equilibrium value of the game. For lower values of  $n/m$ , the value of the objective function is lower than the value of the objective function under the optimal safe policy. If  $n/m$  is lower, then fewer states becomes known and the hostile evader reaches unknown states with higher probabilities. Consequently, the evader follows the average player’s policy and incurs 0 cost, which lowers the value. When  $m = 3 \times 10^5$  and  $n = 10^5$ , all states are unknown, and the output policy is equal to the average player’s policy. In Figure 2b, if




Figure 2. The value of the objective function and the probability of losing for different values of  $m$  and  $n$ . The dashed line in (a) marks the value of the objective function for the optimal winning policy. The dashed line in (b) marks the probability of losing under the average player’s policy.

$n/m$  is low, then the probability of losing is high for the hostile evader since it follows the average player’s policy with high probability. In fact, for some values of  $n/m$  the probability of losing is higher than the probability that the average player loses the game. This result matches the intuition behind Lemma 8 and the  $n/m$  ratio given in Proposition 4: The learned policy may reach unknown states with a higher probability compared to the average evader’s policy, and to ensure that the probability of losing is low, the  $n/m$  ratio should be sufficiently high.

## 8 Conclusion

We formalized the notion of identity concealment zero-sum games and defined identity concealment games. We showed that there exists a stationary equilibrium policy pair for identity concealment games. We then showed that a hostile player can learn a near optimal policy if the opponent is not following an equilibrium policy. In detail, we presented an algorithm that solely uses a finite number of game runs collected under the average player’s policy. The output of the algorithm is a policy for the player that guarantees near optimality in the identity concealment objective and the probability of winning.

## Acknowledgements

This work was supported in part by AFRL FA9550-19-1-0169 and DARPA D19AP00004.

## References

- [1] Christel Baier and Joost-Pieter Katoen. *Principles of Model Checking*. MIT Press, 2008.
- [2] Abdeslam Boularias, Jens Kober, and Jan Peters. Relative entropy inverse reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 182–189, 2011.
- [3] Krishnendu Chatterjee, Thomas A Henzinger, and Nir Piterman. Algorithms for Büchi games. *arXiv preprint arXiv:0805.2620*, 2008.

- [4] Thomas M Cover and Joy A Thomas. *Elements of Information Theory*. John Wiley & Sons, 2012.
- [5] Mehrdad Farajtabar, Yinlam Chow, and Mohammad Ghavamzadeh. More robust doubly robust off-policy evaluation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1447–1456. PMLR, 2018.
- [6] Claude-Nicolas Fiechter. Efficient reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Conference on Computational Learning Theory*, pages 88–97. ACM, 1994.
- [7] Roy Fox, Ari Pakman, and Naftali Tishby. Taming the noise in reinforcement learning via soft updates. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 202–211. AUAI Press, 2016.
- [8] Jordi Grau-Moya, Felix Leibfried, and Haitham Bou-Ammar. Balancing two-player stochastic games with soft Q-learning. In *Proceedings of the 27th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 268–274. AAAI Press, 2018.
- [9] Chris Hecker. SpyParty. <http://www.spyparty.com/>, 2018. Online.
- [10] Robert V Hogg, Elliot A Tanis, and Dale L Zimmerman. *Probability and statistical inference*, volume 993. Macmillan New York, 1977.
- [11] Mustafa O Karabag, Melkior Ornik, and Ufuk Topcu. Deception in supervisory control. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2021.
- [12] Erim Kardes and Randolph Hall. Survey of literature on strategic decision making in the presence of adversaries, 2005.
- [13] Michael Kearns and Satinder Singh. Near-optimal reinforcement learning in polynomial time. *Machine learning*, 49(2-3):209–232, 2002.
- [14] Sarah Keren, Avigdor Gal, and Erez Karpas. Privacy preserving plans in partially observable environments. In *Proceedings of the 25th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 3170–3176, 2016.
- [15] Anagha Kulkarni, Siddharth Srivastava, and Subbarao Kambhampati. A unified framework for planning in adversarial and cooperative environments. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Third AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 2479–2487, 2019.
- [16] Ben Macintyre. *The spy and the traitor: the greatest espionage story of the Cold War*. Viking, 2018.
- [17] Garry Newman. Garry’s Mod Guess Who. <https://gmod.facepunch.com/>, 2015. Online.
- [18] Stephen D Patek and Dimitri P Bertsekas. Stochastic shortest path games. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 37(3):804–824, 1999.
- [19] Jan Peters, Katharina Mulling, and Yasemin Altun. Relative entropy policy search. In *Twenty-Fourth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2010.
- [20] Doina Precup, Richard S. Sutton, and Satinder P. Singh. Eligibility traces for off-policy policy evaluation. In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 759–766, 2000.
- [21] Alexander L Strehl, Lihong Li, and Michael L Littman. Reinforcement learning in finite MDPs: PAC analysis. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 10(Nov):2413–2444, 2009.
- [22] Alexander L Strehl and Michael L Littman. An analysis of model-based interval estimation for Markov decision processes. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 74(8):1309–1331, 2008.

## A The Details of the Numerical Example in Section 7.1

The game consists of 11 states, which are given in Table A.1.

Table A.1

The states of the game for the cyber-interaction example.

State Number	Server & Client Status	Request Status
1	No work in progress	Client is not rejected for a new task
2	No work in progress, Client is rejected for a new request	Client is rejected for a new task
3	A work is in progress with 3 steps until completion	Client is not rejected for a new task
4	A work is in progress with 2 steps until completion	Client is not rejected for a new task
5	A work is in progress with 1 steps until completion	Client is not rejected for a new task
6	A work is in progress with 3 steps until completion	Client is rejected for a new task
7	A work is in progress with 2 steps until completion	Client is rejected for a new task
8	A work is in progress with 1 steps until completion	Client is rejected for a new task
9	-	Client is rejected twice for a new task
10	Two works are in progress	-
11	Client is disconnected	-

The initial state of the game is State 1, and the set  $\mathcal{S}^R$  of winning states of Player 1 is {10}.

The average player's policy, i.e., real clients' policy, is given in Table A.2.

Table A.2

The average player's policy for the cyber-interaction example.

State	Probabilities		
	Wait	Request	Leave
1	0.4	0.5	0.1
2	0.25	0.7	0.05
3	0.85	0.1	0.05
4	0.65	0.3	0.05
5	0.45	0.5	0.05
6	0.65	0.3	0.05
7	0.45	0.5	0.05
8	0.25	0.7	0.05
9	1	0	0
10	1	0	0
11	1	0	0

The transition probability function is given in Table A.3. Note that states 9, 10, and 11 are absorbing. State 6 is unreachable by construction. State 9 is unreachable since the server cannot reject the client twice for the same new request.

Table A.3

The transition probability function of the game for the cyber-interaction example. All transitions are deterministic.

State	Server's Action	Client's Action	New State
1	-	Wait	1
1	Accept	Request	3
1	Reject	Request	2
2	-	Wait	2
2	Accept	Request	3
2	Reject	Request	9
3	-	Wait	4
3	Accept	Request	10
3	Reject	Request	7
4	-	Wait	5
4	Accept	Request	10
4	Reject	Request	8
5	-	Wait	1
5	Accept	Request	3
5	Reject	Request	2
6	-	Wait	7
6	Accept	Request	10
6	Reject	Request	9
7	-	Wait	8
7	Accept	Request	10
7	Reject	Request	9
8	-	Wait	2
8	Accept	Request	3
8	Reject	Request	9
9	-	-	9
10	-	-	10
11	-	-	11

## B The Proofs for Technical Results

We use Lemmas 9 and 10 to prove Lemma 2.

**Lemma 9.** Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a discrete probability distribution such that  $\mathcal{D}(n) \geq 0$  if  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\mathcal{D}(n) = 0$  otherwise, and let  $c_1, c_2 \in (0, \infty)$  be arbitrary constants. Define set  $C$  such that  $n \in C$  if and only if  $\mathcal{D}(n) > c_1 \exp(-nc_2)$ . If  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{D}(n)n = \infty$ , we have

$$\sum_{n \in C} \mathcal{D}(n) \log \left( \frac{\mathcal{D}(n)}{c_1 \exp(-nc_2)} \right) = \infty.$$

**Proof of Lemma 9** Fix arbitrary constants  $c_1, c_2 \in (0, \infty)$ . We partition  $\mathbb{N}$  into three disjoint subsets  $C_1, C_2$ , and  $C_3$  such that  $n \in C_1$  if and only if  $\mathcal{D}(n) \leq c_1 \exp(-nc_2)$ ,  $n \in C_2$  if and only if  $c_1 \exp(-nc_2) \leq \mathcal{D}(n) < c_1 \exp(-nc_2/2)$ , and  $n \in C_3$  otherwise. Also define  $C := C_2 \cup C_3$ .

We have

$$\sum_{n \in C_1 \cup C_2} \mathcal{D}(n)n \leq \sum_{n \in C_1 \cup C_2} c_1 \exp(-nc_2/2)n \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_1 \exp(-nc_2/2)n = \frac{c_1 \exp(c_2/2)}{(\exp(c_2/2) - 1)^2} < \infty$$

since  $c_1, c_2 \in (0, \infty)$ .

Since  $\mathcal{D}(n)n \geq 0$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{D}(n)n = \sum_{n \in C_1 \cup C_2} \mathcal{D}(n)n + \sum_{n \in C_3} \mathcal{D}(n)n.$$

Since  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{D}(n)n$  diverges and  $\sum_{n \in C_1 \cup C_2} \mathcal{D}(n)n$  converges, we must have  $\sum_{n \in C_3} \mathcal{D}(n)n = \infty$ .

We have

$$\sum_{n \in C} \mathcal{D}(n) \log \left( \frac{\mathcal{D}(n)}{c_1 \exp(-nc_2)} \right) = \sum_{n \in C_2 \cup C_3} \mathcal{D}(n) \log \left( \frac{\mathcal{D}(n)}{c_1 \exp(-nc_2)} \right) \quad (\text{B.1a})$$

$$\geq \sum_{n \in C_3} \mathcal{D}(n) \log \left( \frac{\mathcal{D}(n)}{c_1 \exp(-nc_2)} \right) \quad (\text{B.1b})$$

$$\geq \sum_{n \in C_3} \mathcal{D}(n) \log \left( \frac{c_1 \exp(-nc_2/2)}{c_1 \exp(-nc_2)} \right) \quad (\text{B.1c})$$

$$= \sum_{n \in C_3} \mathcal{D}(n) \frac{nc_2}{2} \quad (\text{B.1d})$$

$$= \infty \quad (\text{B.1e})$$

where (B.1b) is due to  $\mathcal{D}(n) \geq c_1 \exp(-nc_2)$  for all  $n \in C_2$ , (B.1c) is due to  $\geq c_1 \exp(-nc_2/2)$  for all  $n \in C_3$ , and (B.1e) is due to  $\sum_{n \in C_3} \mathcal{D}(n)n = \infty$  and  $c_2 > 0$ .  $\blacksquare$

**Lemma 10.** For all  $n \geq 0$ , the optimal value of

$$\min_{x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n} KL(x||y)$$

subject to  $0 \leq x_i \leq y_i$  for all  $i \in [n]$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^n y_i \leq c$ , is  $-c \exp(-1)$ .

**Proof of Lemma 10** By the convexity of KL divergence and symmetry, it is easy to see that at an optimal solution  $(x^*, y^*)$  all elements of  $x^*$  are the same and all elements of  $y^*$  are the same, i.e.,  $x_i^* = a^*$ ,  $y_i^* = b^*$  for some  $a^*, b^* \geq 0$ .

The optimal value is  $na^* \log\left(\frac{a^*}{b^*}\right)$ . Since  $na \log\left(\frac{a}{b}\right)$  is a monotonically decreasing function of  $b$ , at the optimal solution we have  $b^* = c/n$  by the constraint  $\sum_{i=1}^n y_i = nb \leq c$ . Therefore, the optimal value is  $na^* \log\left(\frac{na^*}{c}\right)$ .

Now assume that  $0 < a^* < c/n$ , i.e.,  $y^*$  is in the interior of the feasible region. We must have

$$\left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial a} na \log(na) \right]_{a=a^*} = n \log\left(\frac{na^*}{k}\right) + n = 0.$$

Hence,  $a^* = c \exp(-1)/n$ . Note that it satisfies the assumption  $0 < a^* < c/n$ . Thus, the optimal value is  $na^* \log(na^*) = -c \exp(-1)$ .  $\blacksquare$

**Proof of Lemma 2** We partition  $\mathbb{N}$  into three disjoint sets  $C_1$ ,  $C_2$ , and  $C_3$  where  $n \in C_1$  if  $\mathcal{D}^1(n) \leq \mathcal{D}^2(n) \leq c_1 \exp(-c_2n)$ ,  $n \in C_2$  if  $\mathcal{D}^2(n) < \mathcal{D}^1(n) \leq c_1 \exp(-c_2n)$ , and  $n \in C_3$  if  $\mathcal{D}^2(n) \leq c_1 \exp(-c_2n) < \mathcal{D}^1(n)$ .

We first lower bound the KL divergence on subsets  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ . For subset  $C_1$  we have

$$\sum_{n \in C_1} \mathcal{D}^2(n) \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{D}^2(n) \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_1 \exp(-c_2n) = \frac{c_1}{\exp(c_2) - 1}.$$

By Lemma 10, we have

$$\sum_{n \in C_1} \mathcal{D}^1(n) \log\left(\frac{\mathcal{D}^1(n)}{\mathcal{D}^2(n)}\right) \geq -\frac{c_1 \exp(-1)}{\exp(c_2) - 1} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

since  $\mathcal{D}^1(n) \leq \mathcal{D}^2(n)$  for all  $n \in C_1$  and  $\sum_{n \in C_1} \mathcal{D}^2(n) \leq \frac{c_1}{\exp(c_2) - 1}$ . For subset  $C_2$  we have

$$\sum_{n \in C_2} \mathcal{D}^1(n) \log\left(\frac{\mathcal{D}^1(n)}{\mathcal{D}^2(n)}\right) \geq 0 \quad (\text{B.3})$$

since  $\mathcal{D}^2(n) < \mathcal{D}^1(n)$  and consequently  $\mathcal{D}^1(n) \log\left(\frac{\mathcal{D}^1(n)}{\mathcal{D}^2(n)}\right) > 0$  for all  $n \in C_2$ .

Therefore we have

$$KL(\mathcal{D}^1 || \mathcal{D}^2) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{D}^1(n) \log\left(\frac{\mathcal{D}^1(n)}{\mathcal{D}^2(n)}\right) \quad (\text{B.4a})$$

$$= \sum_{n \in C_1} \mathcal{D}^1(n) \log\left(\frac{\mathcal{D}^1(n)}{\mathcal{D}^2(n)}\right) + \sum_{n \in C_2} \mathcal{D}^1(n) \log\left(\frac{\mathcal{D}^1(n)}{\mathcal{D}^2(n)}\right) + \sum_{n \in C_3} \mathcal{D}^1(n) \log\left(\frac{\mathcal{D}^1(n)}{\mathcal{D}^2(n)}\right) \quad (\text{B.4b})$$

$$\geq -\frac{c_1 \exp(-1)}{\exp(c_2) - 1} + \sum_{n \in C_3} \mathcal{D}^1(n) \log\left(\frac{\mathcal{D}^1(n)}{\mathcal{D}^2(n)}\right) \quad (\text{B.4c})$$

$$\geq -\frac{c_1 \exp(-1)}{\exp(c_2) - 1} + \sum_{n \in C_3} \mathcal{D}^1(n) \log\left(\frac{\mathcal{D}^1(n)}{c_1 \exp(-c_2n)}\right) \quad (\text{B.4d})$$

where (B.4c) is due to (B.2) and (B.3), and (B.4d) is due to  $\mathcal{D}^2(n) \leq c_1 \exp(-c_2n)$ .

We note that  $n \in C_3$  if and only if  $\mathcal{D}^1(n) > c_1 \exp(-c_2n)$ , and  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{D}^1(n)n = \infty$ . By Lemma 9, we have  $\sum_{n \in C_3} \mathcal{D}^1(n) \log\left(\frac{\mathcal{D}^1(n)}{c_1 \exp(-c_2n)}\right) = \infty$ . Therefore,  $KL(\mathcal{D}^1 || \mathcal{D}^2) = \infty$ .  $\blacksquare$

**Proof of Lemma 5** By Lemma 14 of [21], with probability at least  $1 - \delta_k/S$ , we have  $\|\pi^2(s) - \pi^{2,*}(s)\|_1 \leq \sqrt{\frac{2(\log(2^A - 2) + \log(S/\delta_k))}{m}}$ .

Combining this result with the union bound over  $\mathcal{S}^K$ , with probability at least  $1 - |\mathcal{S}^K|\delta_k/S$ , we have  $\|\pi^2(s) - \pi^{2,*}(s)\|_1 \leq \sqrt{\frac{2(\log(2^A-2)+\log(S/\delta_k))}{m}}$  for all  $s \in \mathcal{S}^K$ . Hence, with probability at least  $1 - \delta_k$ , we have  $\|\pi^2(s) - \pi^{2,*}(s)\|_1 \leq \sqrt{\frac{2\log(2)A + \log(S/\delta_k)}{m}}$  for all  $s \in \mathcal{S}^K$   $\blacksquare$

**Proof of Lemma 6** We first establish that if the policy pair  $(\pi^1, \pi^2)$  has  $(L, \beta - \frac{\varepsilon(1-\beta)^2}{C_{max}L})$ -contraction, and  $\|\pi^2(s) - \pi^{2,*}(s)\|_1 \leq \frac{\varepsilon(1-\beta)^2}{C_{max}L^2}$  for all  $s \in \mathcal{S}^K$ , then  $(\pi^1, \pi^{2,*})$  has  $(L, \beta)$ -contraction.

With an abuse of notation let  $\mathcal{P}_{s,q}^{(1),(2)}$  denote the transition probability from state  $s$  to state  $q$  under policies  $\pi^1$  and  $\pi^{2,*}$ , and let  $\mathcal{P}_{s,q}^{(1),(2),*}$  denote the transition probability from state  $s$  to state  $q$  under policies  $\pi^1$  and  $\pi^2$ . Also, let  $\mathcal{P}_s^{(1),(2)}$  denote the vector of transition probabilities at state  $s$  under policies  $\pi^1$  and  $\pi^2$ , and let  $\mathcal{P}_s^{(1),(2),*}$  denote the vector of transition probabilities at state  $s$  under policies  $\pi^1$  and  $\pi^{2,*}$ .

We first note that if  $\|\pi^2(s) - \pi^{2,*}(s)\|_1 \leq \frac{\varepsilon(1-\beta)^2}{C_{max}L^2}$ , then  $\|\pi^1(s) \otimes \pi^2(s) - \pi^1(s) \otimes \pi^{2,*}(s)\|_{1,1} \leq \frac{\varepsilon(1-\beta)^2}{C_{max}L^2}$ , where  $\|B\|_{1,1} = \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^l$  for a  $(k \times l)$ -matrix  $B$ .  $\mathcal{P}_s^{(1),(2)}$  and  $\mathcal{P}_s^{(1),(2),*}$  are linear transformations of  $\pi^1(s) \otimes \pi^2(s)$  and  $\pi^1(s) \otimes \pi^{2,*}(s)$ , respectively, with a stochastic matrix that represents the transition probability function. Hence, we also have  $\|\mathcal{P}_s^{(1),(2)} - \mathcal{P}_s^{(1),(2),*}\|_1 \leq \frac{\varepsilon(1-\beta)^2}{C_{max}L^2}$

Let  $\pi^{2,T}$  be a Markovian policy for Player 2 that is equal to  $\pi^2$  for  $t = 0, \dots, T-1$  and  $\pi^{2,*}$  for  $t = T, \dots, L-1$ . Note that  $\pi^{2,0}$  is equal to  $\pi^{2,*}$ , and  $\pi^{2,L}$  is equal to  $\pi^2$ . Define  $\mathcal{S}^{end} := \mathcal{S}^R \cup \mathcal{S}^U$ . Also, let  $\Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(\diamond_{=k}C|s)$  denote the probability of reaching set  $C$  for the first time from state  $s$  in exactly  $k$  steps, and  $\Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(\diamond_{\geq k \& \leq l}C|s)$  denote the probability of reaching set  $C$  for the first time from state  $s$  in more than or equal to  $k$  and less than or equal to  $l$  steps. For  $L-1 \geq T > 0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,T}}(\diamond_{\leq L}\mathcal{S}^{end}|s_0 = s) \\
&= \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,T}}(\diamond_{< T}\mathcal{S}^{end}|s_0 = s) + \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,T}}(\diamond_{=T}\mathcal{S}^{end}|s_0 = s) + \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,T}}(\diamond_{\geq T+1 \& \leq L}\mathcal{S}^{end}|s_0 = s) \\
&= \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(\diamond_{< T}\mathcal{S}^{end}|s_0 = s) + \sum_{q \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(s_{T-1} = q \& s_0, \dots, s_{T-1} \notin \mathcal{S}^{end}|s_0 = s) \\
&\quad \left( \sum_{w \in \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(s_1 = w|s_0 = q) + \sum_{w \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(s_1 = w|s_0 = q) \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond_{\leq L-T}\mathcal{S}^{end}|s_0 = w) \right) \\
&= \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(\diamond_{< T}\mathcal{S}^{end}|s_0 = s) + \sum_{q \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(s_{T-1} = q \& s_0, \dots, s_{T-1} \notin \mathcal{S}^{end}|s_0 = s) \\
&\quad \left( \sum_{w \in \mathcal{S}^{end}} \left( \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(s_1 = w|s_0 = q) - \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(s_1 = w|s_0 = q) + \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(s_1 = w|s_0 = q) \right) + \right. \\
&\quad \left. \sum_{w \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \left( \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(s_1 = w|s_0 = q) - \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(s_1 = w|s_0 = q) + \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(s_1 = w|s_0 = q) \right) \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond_{\leq L-T}\mathcal{S}^{end}|s_0 = w) \right) \\
&= \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(\diamond_{< T}\mathcal{S}^{end}|s_0 = s) + \sum_{q \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(s_{T-1} = q \& s_0, \dots, s_{T-1} \notin \mathcal{S}^{end}|s_0 = s) \\
&\quad \left( \sum_{w \in \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(s_1 = w|s_0 = q) + \sum_{w \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(s_1 = w|s_0 = q) \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond_{\leq L-T}\mathcal{S}^{end}|s_0 = w) \right) \\
&+ \sum_{q \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(s_{T-1} = q \& s_0, \dots, s_{T-1} \notin \mathcal{S}^{end}|s_0 = s) \\
&\quad \left( \sum_{w \in \mathcal{S}^{end}} \left( \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(s_1 = w|s_0 = q) - \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(s_1 = w|s_0 = q) \right) + \right.
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{w \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \left( \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2} (s_1 = w | s_0 = q) - \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}} (s_1 = w | s_0 = q) \right) \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}} (\diamond_{\leq L-T} \mathcal{S}^{end} | s_0 = w) \\
& \geq \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2} (\diamond_{< T} \mathcal{S}^{end} | s_0 = s) + \sum_{q \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2} (s_{T-1} = q \ \& \ s_0, \dots, s_{T-1} \notin \mathcal{S}^{end} | s_0 = s) \\
& \left( \sum_{w \in \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}} (s_1 = w | s_0 = q) + \sum_{w \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}} (s_1 = w | s_0 = q) \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}} (\diamond_{\leq L-T} \mathcal{S}^{end} | s_0 = w) \right) \\
& - \sum_{q \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2} (s_{T-1} = q \ \& \ s_0, \dots, s_{T-1} \notin \mathcal{S}^{end} | s_0 = s) \\
& \left( \sum_{w \in \mathcal{S}^{end}} \left| \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2} (s_1 = w | s_0 = q) - \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}} (s_1 = w | s_0 = q) \right| + \right. \\
& \left. \sum_{w \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \left| \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2} (s_1 = w | s_0 = q) - \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}} (s_1 = w | s_0 = q) \right| \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}} (\diamond_{\leq L-T} \mathcal{S}^{end} | s_0 = w) \right) \\
& \geq \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2} (\diamond_{< T} \mathcal{S}^{end} | s_0 = s) + \sum_{q \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2} (s_{T-1} = q \ \& \ s_0, \dots, s_{T-1} \notin \mathcal{S}^{end} | s_0 = s) \\
& \left( \sum_{w \in \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}} (s_1 = w | s_0 = q) + \sum_{w \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}} (s_1 = w | s_0 = q) \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}} (\diamond_{\leq L-T} \mathcal{S}^{end} | s_0 = w) \right) \\
& - \sum_{q \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2} (s_{T-1} = q \ \& \ s_0, \dots, s_{T-1} \notin \mathcal{S}^{end} | s_0 = s) \sum_{w \in \mathcal{S}} \left| \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2} (s_1 = w | s_0 = q) - \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}} (s_1 = w | s_0 = q) \right| \\
& \geq \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2} (\diamond_{< T} \mathcal{S}^{end} | s_0 = s) + \sum_{q \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2} (s_{T-1} = q \ \& \ s_0, \dots, s_{T-1} \notin \mathcal{S}^{end} | s_0 = s) \\
& \left( \sum_{w \in \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}} (s_1 = w | s_0 = q) + \sum_{w \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}} (s_1 = w | s_0 = q) \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}} (\diamond_{\leq L-T} \mathcal{S}^{end} | s_0 = w) \right) \\
& - \sum_{w \in \mathcal{S}} \left| \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2} (s_1 = w | s_0 = q) - \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}} (s_1 = w | s_0 = q) \right| \\
& \geq \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2, T-1}} (\diamond_{< T} \mathcal{S}^{end} | s_0 = s) \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2, T-1}} (\diamond_{= T} \mathcal{S}^{end} | s_0 = s) + \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2, T-1}} (\diamond_{\geq T+1 \leq L} \mathcal{S}^{end} | s_0 = s) \\
& - \sum_{w \in \mathcal{S}} \left| \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2} (s_1 = w | s_0 = q) - \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}} (s_1 = w | s_0 = q) \right| \\
& \geq \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2, T-1}} (\diamond_{\leq L} \mathcal{S}^{end} | s_0 = s) - \sum_{w \in \mathcal{S}} \left| \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2} (s_1 = w | s_0 = q) - \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}} (s_1 = w | s_0 = q) \right| \\
& \geq \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2, T-1}} (\diamond_{\leq L} \mathcal{S}^{end} | s_0 = s) - \frac{\varepsilon(1-\beta)^2}{C_{max} L^2}
\end{aligned}$$

Finally we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2} (\diamond_{\leq L} \mathcal{S}^{end} | s_0 = s) - \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}} (\diamond_{\leq L} \mathcal{S}^{end} | s_0 = s) &= \sum_{T=0}^{L-1} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2, T}} (\diamond_{\leq L} \mathcal{S}^{end} | s_0 = s) - \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2, T+1}} (\diamond_{\leq L} \mathcal{S}^{end} | s_0 = s) \\
&\leq \sum_{T=0}^{L-1} \frac{\varepsilon(1-\beta)^2}{C_{max} L^2} \\
&= \frac{\varepsilon(1-\beta)^2}{C_{max} L}
\end{aligned}$$



and consequently

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}} (\diamond_{\leq L} \mathcal{S}^{end} | s_0 = s) &\geq \Pr_s^{\pi^1, \pi^2} (\diamond_{\leq L} \mathcal{S}^{end} | s_0 = s) - \frac{\varepsilon(1-\beta)^2}{C_{max}L} \\ &\geq \beta, \end{aligned}$$

i.e., the policy pair  $(\pi^1, \pi^{2,*})$  has  $(L, \beta)$ -contraction.

Note that once Player 1 reaches  $\mathcal{S}^{end}$ , policy  $\pi^1$  incurs zero cost. Without loss of generality, we assume that the states in  $\mathcal{S}^{end}$  are absorbing and incurs 0 cost. For notational simplicity, let  $KL(s)$  denote  $KL(\pi^1(s) || \pi^{Av}(s))$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} &KL(\pi^1, \pi^2 || \pi^{Av}, \pi^2) \\ &= KL(s_0) + \sum_{q \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(s_1 = q | s_0) \left( KL(q) + \sum_{w \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(s_2 = w | s_1 = q) (KL(w) + \dots) \right) \\ &= KL(s_0) + \sum_{q \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(s_1 = q | s_0) \left( KL(q) + \sum_{w \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(s_2 = w | s_1 = q) (KL(w) + \dots) \right) \\ &+ \sum_{q \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \left( \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(s_1 = q | s_0) - \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(s_1 = q | s_0) \right) \left( KL(q) + \sum_{w \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(s_2 = w | s_1 = q) (KL(w) + \dots) \right) \\ &\leq KL(s_0) + \sum_{q \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(s_1 = q | s_0) \left( KL(q) + \sum_{w \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(s_2 = w | s_0) (KL(w) + \dots) \right) \\ &+ \sum_{q \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \max \left( \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(s_1 = q | s_0) - \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(s_1 = q | s_0), 0 \right) \left( KL(q) + \sum_{w \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(s_2 = w | s_1 = q) (KL(w) + \dots) \right) \\ &\leq KL(s_0) + \sum_{q \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(s_1 = q | s_0) \left( KL(q) + \sum_{w \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(s_2 = w | s_1 = q) (KL(w) + \dots) \right) \\ &+ \sum_{q \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \max \left( \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(s_1 = q | s_0) - \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(s_1 = q | s_0), 0 \right) \left( C_{max} + \sum_{w \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(s_2 = w | s_1 = q) (C_{max} + \dots) \right) \\ &= KL(s_0) + \sum_{q \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(s_1 = q | s_0) \left( KL(q) + \sum_{w \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(s_2 = w | s_1 = q) (KL(w) + \dots) \right) \\ &+ \sum_{q \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \max \left( \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(s_1 = q | s_0) - \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(s_1 = q | s_0), 0 \right) \left( \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(\diamond_{=t} s | q) C_{max} \right) \\ &\leq KL(s_0) + \sum_{q \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(s_1 = q | s_0) \left( KL(q) + \sum_{w \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(s_2 = w | s_1 = q) (KL(w) + \dots) \right) \\ &+ \sum_{q \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \max \left( \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(s_1 = q | s_0) - \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(s_1 = q | s_0), 0 \right) \left( \sum_{t'=0}^{\infty} L \beta^{t'} C_{max} \right) \\ &\leq KL(s_0) + \sum_{q \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(s_1 = q | s_0) \left( KL(q) + \sum_{w \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(s_2 = w | s_1 = q) (KL(w) + \dots) \right) \\ &+ \sum_{q \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \max \left( \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(s_1 = q | s_0) - \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(s_1 = q | s_0), 0 \right) \frac{LC_{max}}{1-\beta} \\ &\leq KL(s_0) + \sum_{q \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(s_1 = q | s_0) \left( KL(q) + \sum_{w \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(s_2 = w | s_1 = q) (KL(w) + \dots) \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$+ \frac{\varepsilon(1-\beta)}{2L}$$

where the last inequalities are because the policy pair  $(\pi^1, \pi^2)$  has  $(L, \beta)$ -contraction.

By repeating the above steps for the inner parentheses, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & KL(\pi^1, \pi^2 || \pi^{Av}, \pi^2) \\ & \leq KL(s_0) + \sum_{q \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(s_1 = q | s_0) \left( KL(q) + \sum_{w \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(s_2 = w | s_1 = q) \left( KL(w) + \dots \right) \right) \\ & + \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \sum_{s_t \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond_{=t-1} s_t \ \& \ s_0, \dots, s_t \notin \mathcal{S}^{end} | s_0) \frac{\varepsilon(1-\beta)}{2L} \\ & = KL(\pi^1, \pi^{*,2} || \pi^{Av}, \pi^{*,2}) + \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \sum_{s_t \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^{end}} \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond_{=t-1} s_t \ \& \ s_0, \dots, s_t \notin \mathcal{S}^{end} | s_0) \frac{\varepsilon(1-\beta)}{2L} \\ & \leq KL(\pi^1, \pi^{*,2} || \pi^{Av}, \pi^{*,2}) + \sum_{t'=0}^{\infty} L\beta^{t'} \frac{\varepsilon(1-\beta)}{2L} \\ & \leq KL(\pi^1, \pi^{*,2} || \pi^{Av}, \pi^{*,2}) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequalities are because the policy pair  $(\pi^1, \pi^{2,*})$  has  $(L, \beta)$ -contraction. ■

**Proof of Lemma 7** Let  $\hat{m}_C^{unq}$  denote the number of sample runs that contains a transition from a state  $s \in C$ . By Chernoff's inequality we have

$$\Pr \left( \left| \Pr^{\pi^{Av}, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond C | s_0) - \hat{m}_C^{unq}/n \right| \geq \sigma - \hat{m}_C^{unq}/n \right) \leq 2 \exp \left( -n (\sigma - \hat{m}_C^{unq}/n)^2 / 2 \right)$$

where the outer probability is over the randomness of sample paths.

Note that  $\hat{m}_C^{unq} \leq \hat{m}_C \leq m'$ . Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left( \Pr^{\pi^{Av}, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond C | s_0) \geq \sigma \right) & \leq \Pr \left( \left| \Pr^{\pi^{Av}, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond C | s_0) - \hat{m}_C^{unq}/n \right| \geq \sigma - \hat{m}_C^{unq}/n \right) \\ & \leq 2 \exp \left( -n (\sigma - \hat{m}_C^{unq}/n)^2 / 2 \right) \\ & \leq 2 \exp \left( -n (\sigma - m'/n)^2 / 2 \right) \end{aligned}$$

which yields the desired result. ■

**Proof of Lemma 7** We first note that

$$KL(\pi^1, \pi^{*,2} || \pi^{Av}, \pi^{*,2}) \geq KL \left( Ber \left( \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond C | s_0) \right) || Ber \left( \Pr^{\pi^{Av}, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond C | s_0) \right) \right)$$

due to the data processing inequality. Therefore, it suffices to show that if  $\Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond C | s_0) \geq \Pr^{\pi^{Av}, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond C | s_0)$  and

$$\Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond C | s_0) < \frac{v^* + \log(2) + \varepsilon}{-\log \left( \Pr^{\pi^{Av}, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond C | s_0) \right)}$$

then

$$KL \left( Ber \left( \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond C | s_0) \right) || Ber \left( \Pr^{\pi^{Av}, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond C | s_0) \right) \right) > v^* + \varepsilon.$$

We have

$$KL\left(Ber\left(\Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond C|s_0)\right) \parallel Ber\left(\Pr^{\pi^{Av}, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond C|s_0)\right)\right) \quad (\text{B.13a})$$

$$= \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond C|s_0) \log\left(\frac{\Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond C|s_0)}{\Pr^{\pi^{Av}, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond C|s_0)}\right) + \left(1 - \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond C|s_0)\right) \log\left(\frac{1 - \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond C|s_0)}{1 - \Pr^{\pi^{Av}, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond C|s_0)}\right) \quad (\text{B.13b})$$

$$\geq \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond C|s_0) \log\left(\frac{\Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond C|s_0)}{\Pr^{\pi^{Av}, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond C|s_0)}\right) + \left(1 - \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond C|s_0)\right) \log\left(1 - \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond C|s_0)\right) \quad (\text{B.13c})$$

$$= -\Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond C|s_0) \log\left(\Pr^{\pi^{Av}, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond C|s_0)\right) + \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond C|s_0) \log\left(\Pr^{\pi^{Av}, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond C|s_0)\right) \quad (\text{B.13d})$$

$$+ \left(1 - \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond C|s_0)\right) \log\left(1 - \Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond C|s_0)\right) \quad (\text{B.13e})$$

$$\geq -\Pr^{\pi^1, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond C|s_0) \log\left(\Pr^{\pi^{Av}, \pi^{2,*}}(\diamond C|s_0)\right) - \log(2) \quad (\text{B.13f})$$

where (B.13f) is because of that  $\min x \log(x) + (1-x) \log(1-x)$  subject to  $x \in [0, 1]$  is  $-\log(2)$ .

We get the desired result by rearranging the terms in (B.13f). ■