

# Span-Based Optimal Sample Complexity for Weakly Communicating and General Average Reward MDPs

Matthew Zurek and Yudong Chen

Department of Computer Sciences, University of Wisconsin-Madison  
 {matthew.zurek,yudong.chen}@wisc.edu

## Abstract

We study the sample complexity of learning an  $\varepsilon$ -optimal policy in an average-reward Markov decision process (MDP) under a generative model. For weakly communicating MDPs, we establish the complexity bound  $\tilde{O}\left(SA\frac{H}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$ , where  $H$  is the span of the bias function of the optimal policy and  $SA$  is the cardinality of the state-action space. Our result is the first that is minimax optimal (up to log factors) in all parameters  $S, A, H$  and  $\varepsilon$ , improving on existing work that either assumes uniformly bounded mixing times for all policies or has suboptimal dependence on the parameters.

We further investigate sample complexity in general (non-weakly-communicating) average-reward MDPs. We argue a new transient time parameter  $B$  is necessary, establish an  $\tilde{O}\left(SA\frac{B+H}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$  complexity bound, and prove a matching (up to log factors) minimax lower bound.

Both results are based on reducing the average-reward MDP to a discounted MDP, which requires new ideas in the general setting. To establish the optimality of this reduction, we develop improved bounds for  $\gamma$ -discounted MDPs, showing that  $\tilde{O}\left(SA\frac{H}{(1-\gamma)^2\varepsilon^2}\right)$  samples suffice to learn an  $\varepsilon$ -optimal policy in weakly communicating MDPs under the regime that  $\gamma \geq 1 - \frac{1}{H}$ , and  $\tilde{O}\left(SA\frac{B+H}{(1-\gamma)^2\varepsilon^2}\right)$  samples suffice in general MDPs when  $\gamma \geq 1 - \frac{1}{B+H}$ . Both these results circumvent the well-known lower bound of  $\tilde{\Omega}\left(SA\frac{1}{(1-\gamma)^3\varepsilon^2}\right)$  for arbitrary  $\gamma$ -discounted MDPs. Our analysis develops upper bounds on certain instance-dependent variance parameters in terms of the span and transient time parameters. The weakly communicating bounds are tighter than those based on the mixing time or diameter of the MDP and may be of broader use.

## 1 Introduction

The paradigm of Reinforcement learning (RL) has recently received much attention and demonstrated remarkable successes in various sequential learning and decision-making problems. Empirical successes have motivated extensive theoretical study of RL algorithms and their fundamental limits. The RL environment is commonly modeled as a Markov decision process (MDP), where the objective is to find a policy  $\pi$  that maximizes the expected cumulative rewards. Different reward criteria have been considered, such as the finite horizon total reward  $\mathbb{E}^\pi\left[\sum_{t=0}^T R_t\right]$  and the infinite horizon discounted reward criterion  $\mathbb{E}^\pi\left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_t\right]$  with a discount factor  $\gamma < 1$ . The finite horizon criterion only measures performance for  $T$  steps, and the discounted criterion is dominated by the rewards received in the first  $\frac{1}{1-\gamma}$  time steps. In many practical situations where the long-term performance of the policy  $\pi$  is of interest, we may prefer to evaluate policies in terms of their long run average reward  $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}^\pi\left[\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} R_t\right]$ .

A foundational theoretical problem in RL is the sample complexity for learning a near-optimal policy when we have access to a generative model of the MDP [Kearns and Singh, 1998], meaning the ability to obtain independent samples of the next state given any initial state and action. For the finite horizon and discounted reward criteria, the sample complexity of this problem has been thoroughly studied and well understood (e.g., Azar et al. 2012, Gheshlaghi Azar et al. 2013, Sidford et al. 2018, Wainwright 2019b,

Agarwal et al. 2020, Li et al. 2020). However, despite significant effort (reviewed in Section 1.1), the sample complexity of the average reward setting is unresolved in existing literature.

In this paper, we resolve the sample complexity of weakly communicating Average-Reward MDPs (AMDP) in terms of  $H := \|h^*\|_{\text{span}}$ , the span of the bias (a.k.a. relative value function) of the optimal policy. We show that  $\tilde{O}\left(SA\frac{H}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$  samples suffice to find an  $\varepsilon$ -optimal policy of a weakly communicating MDP with  $S$  states and  $A$  actions. This bound, presented in Section 3 as Theorem 2, is the first that matches the minimax lower bound  $\tilde{\Omega}\left(SAH/\varepsilon^2\right)$  up to log factors.

To establish the above result, we adopt the reduction-to-discounted-MDP approach pioneered by Jin and Sidford [2021] and Wang et al. [2022], and develop an improved bound for the complexity of certain discounted MDPs (DMDPs). This result for discounted MDPs, which is our Theorem 1, shows that  $\tilde{O}\left(SA\frac{H}{(1-\gamma)^2\varepsilon^2}\right)$  samples are sufficient for finding an  $\varepsilon$ -optimal policy in the discounted setting, assuming that the MDP is weakly communicating and a mild assumption that the effective horizon is sufficiently large so that  $\gamma \geq 1 - \frac{1}{H}$ . In this setting, the above result circumvents the well-known minimax lower bound of  $\tilde{\Omega}\left(SA\frac{1}{(1-\gamma)^3\varepsilon^2}\right)$  for sample complexity of discounted MDPs.

Note that the span  $H$  is always upper bounded by the diameter  $D$  of the MDP, by the mixing time  $\tau^*$  of any optimal policy, and in turn by a uniform upper bound  $\tau_{\text{unif}}$  on the mixing times of all policies; see Section 2 for formal definitions. Consequently, our two results above immediately imply sample complexity bounds in terms of  $D$ ,  $\tau^*$  and  $\tau_{\text{unif}}$ , though our span-based bounds are often substantially stronger. In particular, these results for weakly communicating MDPs do *not* require uniform mixing (i.e.,  $\tau_{\text{unif}} < \infty$ ) or strongly communicating (i.e.,  $D < \infty$ ), which are common but restrictive assumptions used in the average-reward MDP literature.

Furthermore, we initiate the study of sample complexity for *general* average-reward MDPs [Puterman, 2014]. General MDPs are not necessarily weakly communicating and include multichain MDPs. In this setting, the span  $H$  *alone* cannot characterize the sample complexity, as shown in the lower bound in Theorem 3 by exhibiting instances which require  $\gg HSA/\varepsilon^2$  samples. This observation motivates our introduction of a new *transient time bound* parameter  $B$ , which in conjunction with  $H$ , captures the sample complexity of general average-reward MDPs. Specifically, our Theorem 7 shows that  $\tilde{O}\left(SA\frac{B+H}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$  samples suffice to learn an  $\varepsilon$ -optimal policy, and our Theorem 3 provides a minimax lower bound of  $\Omega\left(SA\frac{B}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$  samples (which can be combined with the aforementioned  $\Omega\left(SA\frac{H}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$  lower bound to match our upper bound).

We again use the strategy of reducing to a discounted MDP: we prove a new reduction Theorem 5 analogous to those used in the weakly communicating setting, but which requires more delicate analysis and we believe to be the first of its kind for general MDPs. We then develop an improved bound for certain discounted MDPs, our Theorem 6, which demonstrates that  $\tilde{O}\left(SA\frac{B+H}{(1-\gamma)^2\varepsilon^2}\right)$  samples suffice to find an  $\varepsilon$ -optimal policy for general MDPs, assuming that  $\gamma \geq 1 - \frac{1}{B+H}$ .

To prove the above results, we make use of the algorithm from Li et al. [2020] for discounted MDPs, but provide a specialized analysis using the span parameter  $H$  and the transient time bound  $B$ . By improving upon the analysis used in previous reductions from average-reward to discounted MDPs and extending them to non-weakly communicating settings, we believe our work sheds greater light on the relationship between these two problems. Our approach is discussed further in Subsection 1.2, and a more detailed proof sketch is provided in Section 4.

## 1.1 Related Work

### 1.1.1 Average-reward MDPs

We summarize in Table 1 existing results on the sample complexity of weakly communicating average reward MDPs under a generative model.

Method	Sample Complexity	Reference	Comments
Primal-Dual SMD	$\tilde{O}\left(SA\frac{\tau_{\text{unif}}^2}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$	Jin and Sidford [2020]	requires uniform mixing
Reduction to DMDP	$\tilde{O}\left(SA\frac{\tau_{\text{unif}}}{\varepsilon^3}\right)$	Jin and Sidford [2021]	requires uniform mixing
Policy Mirror Descent	$\tilde{O}\left(SA\frac{\tau_{\text{unif}}^3}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$	Li et al. [2022]	requires uniform mixing
Reduction to DMDP	$\tilde{O}\left(SA\frac{\tau_{\text{unif}}}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$	Wang et al. [2023b]	requires uniform mixing
Reduction to DMDP	$\tilde{O}\left(SA\frac{H}{\varepsilon^3}\right)$	Wang et al. [2022]	
Refined Q-Learning	$\tilde{O}\left(SA\frac{H^2}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$	Zhang and Xie [2023]	
Reduction to DMDP	$\tilde{O}\left(SA\frac{H}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$	Our Theorem 2	
Lower Bound	$\tilde{\Omega}\left(SA\frac{\tau_{\text{unif}}}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$	Jin and Sidford [2021]	implies $\tilde{\Omega}\left(SA\frac{H}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$
Lower Bound	$\tilde{\Omega}\left(SA\frac{D}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$	Wang et al. [2022]	implies $\tilde{\Omega}\left(SA\frac{H}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$

Table 1: **Algorithms and sample complexity bounds for weakly communicating average reward MDPs** with  $S$  states and  $A$  actions. The goal is finding an  $\varepsilon$ -optimal policy under a generative model. Here DMDP = Discounted MDP,  $H := \|h^*\|_{\text{span}}$  is the span of the bias of an optimal policy,  $\tau_{\text{unif}}$  is a uniform upper bound on the mixing times of all policies, and  $D$  is the diameter of the MDP, with the relationships  $H \leq 8\tau_{\text{unif}}$  and  $H \leq D$ .

To the best of our knowledge, no prior work has considered the sample complexity of general MDPs. Existing results make assumptions at least as strong as that the MDP is weakly communicating. Regret guarantees are impossible without restricting to weakly communicating MDPs [Bartlett and Tewari, 2012], since the agent may be trapped in a closed class of low reward states in general MDPs. However, no such obstacles exist in the generative setting.

Various parameters have been used to characterize the sample complexity of average reward MDPs, including the diameter  $D$  of the MDP, the uniform mixing time bound  $\tau_{\text{unif}}$  for all policies, and the span  $H$  of the optimal bias; formal definitions and more comparisons are provided in Section 2. All sample complexity upper bounds involving  $\tau_{\text{unif}}$  require the strong assumption that *all* stationary policies have finite mixing times. Otherwise, we have  $\tau_{\text{unif}} = \infty$  by definition, which occurs when, for example, there exists any policy which induces a periodic Markov chain. The situation  $D = \infty$  is also possible, while  $H$  is always finite for finite state-action spaces. As shown in Wang et al. [2022], there is generally no relationship between  $D$  and  $\tau_{\text{unif}}$ ; they can each be arbitrarily larger than the other. On the other hand, it has been shown that  $H \leq D$  [Bartlett and Tewari, 2012] and that  $H \leq 8\tau_{\text{unif}}$  [Wang et al., 2022], so either minimax lower bound in Table 1 implies a lower bound  $\tilde{\Omega}\left(SA\frac{H}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$  and thus the minimax optimality of our Theorem 2.

The work Jin and Sidford [2021] was the first to develop an algorithm based on reduction to a discounted MDP with a discount factor of  $\gamma = 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{\tau_{\text{unif}}}$ . Their argument was improved in Wang et al. [2022], which removed the uniform mixing assumption and used a smaller discount factor  $\gamma = 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{H}$ . After analyzing the reductions, both Jin and Sidford [2021] and Wang et al. [2022] then solved the discounted MDPs by appealing to the algorithm from Li et al. [2020]. To the best of our knowledge, the algorithm of Li et al. [2020] is the only known algorithm for discounted MDPs which could work with either reduction, as the reductions each require a  $\frac{\varepsilon}{1-\gamma}$ -optimal policy from the discounted MDP, and other known algorithms for discounted MDPs do not permit such large suboptimality levels. (We discuss algorithms for discounted MDPs in more detail below.) Other algorithms for average-reward MDPs are considered in Jin and Sidford [2021], Li et al. [2022], Zhang and Xie [2023]. The above results fall short of matching the minimax lower bounds.

While preparing this manuscript, we became aware of the work Wang et al. [2023b], who considered the uniform mixing setting and obtained a minimax optimal sample complexity  $\tilde{O}\left(SA\frac{\tau_{\text{unif}}}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$  in terms of  $\tau_{\text{unif}}$ . Although developed independently, their work and ours have several similarities. We both observe that it is possible to improve the variance analysis of the algorithm from Li et al. [2020] to get a superior complexity for discounted MDPs in regimes relevant to average-to-discounted reduction, which involves a large value of  $\gamma$  or equivalently a large effective horizon  $1/(1-\gamma)$ . They accomplish the improvement by leveraging the uniform mixing assumption, whereas we make use of the low span of the optimal policy. Note that  $H \leq 8\tau_{\text{unif}}$

holds in general and there exist MDPs with  $H \ll \tau_{\text{unif}} = \infty$ , so our Theorem 2 is strictly stronger than the result of Wang et al. [2023b].

### 1.1.2 Discounted MDPs

We discuss a subset of results for discounted MDPs in the generative setting. Several works Sidford et al. [2018], Wainwright [2019b], Agarwal et al. [2020], Li et al. [2020] obtain the minimax optimal sample complexity of  $\tilde{O}\left(SA\frac{1}{(1-\gamma)^3\varepsilon^2}\right)$ , but only Li et al. [2020] are able to show this bound for the full range of  $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}]$ . (Note that now the goal is to find an  $\varepsilon$ -optimal policy in the discounted MDP, so  $\varepsilon$  has a different meaning than in the average-reward setting; more detail is given in Section 2.) As mentioned above, the reduction from average reward to discounted MDPs requires a large  $\varepsilon$ , making it unsurprising that all of Jin and Sidford [2021], Wang et al. [2022, 2023b] as well as our Algorithm 1 essentially use their algorithm. The matching lower bound is established in Sidford et al. [2018] making use of the techniques from Gheshlaghi Azar et al. [2013].

As mentioned earlier, both we and the authors of Wang et al. [2023b,a] independently observed that the  $\tilde{\Omega}\left(SA\frac{1}{(1-\gamma)^3\varepsilon^2}\right)$  sample complexity lower bound can be circumvented in the settings that arise under the average-to-discounted reductions. The authors of Wang et al. [2023b,a] assume uniform mixing and  $\frac{1}{1-\gamma} \geq \tau_{\text{unif}}$  and obtain a discounted MDP sample complexity of  $\tilde{O}\left(SA\frac{\tau_{\text{unif}}}{(1-\gamma)^2\varepsilon^2}\right)$ , first in Wang et al. [2023a] by modifying the algorithm of Wainwright [2019b], and then in Wang et al. [2023b] under a wider range of  $\varepsilon$  by instead modifying the analysis of Li et al. [2020]. Wang et al. [2023a] also proves a matching lower bound. Our Theorem 1 for discounted MDPs attains a sample complexity of  $\tilde{O}\left(SA\frac{H}{(1-\gamma)^2\varepsilon^2}\right)$  under the requirement  $\frac{1}{1-\gamma} \geq H$ , assuming only that the MDP is weakly communicating. Again, in light of the relationship that  $H \leq 8\tau_{\text{unif}}$ , our sample complexity as well as our condition on  $\gamma$  dominate their results (ignoring constants), and their lower bound also establishes the optimality of our Theorem 1.

## 1.2 Our Approach

Now we give a high-level description of our techniques. We apply a reduction-based approach to solving average-reward MDPs, reducing this problem to solving a discounted MDP with the same reward and transition kernel and a judicious choice of discount factor  $\gamma$ . This method was first developed by Jin and Sidford [2021], who assumed bounded mixing times for all policies, and later improved by Wang et al. [2022] in the weakly communicating setting to only require a bound on  $\|h^*\|_{\text{span}}$ . We record their result as Lemma 8.

Now we describe how we obtain the optimal  $\tilde{O}(SAH/\varepsilon^2)$  sample complexity for weakly communicating average-reward MDPs. By using the reduction from Wang et al. [2022], to obtain an  $O(\varepsilon)$ -optimal policy for the average-reward MDP, it suffices to obtain an  $H$ -optimal policy for the discounted MDP with discount factor  $\gamma = 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{H}$ . If we had an algorithm for discounted MDPs which required  $\tilde{O}\left(SA\frac{H}{(1-\gamma)^2\varepsilon^2}\right)$  samples to obtain  $\varepsilon$ -accuracy, then setting  $\varepsilon = H$  and  $\gamma = 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{H}$  would yield an optimal sample complexity of  $\tilde{O}\left(SA\frac{H}{(1-\gamma)^2\varepsilon^2}\right) = \tilde{O}\left(SA\frac{H}{(\varepsilon/H)^2H^2}\right) = \tilde{O}\left(SA\frac{H}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$  for the average-reward MDP. Note that Wang et al. [2022] show a similar calculation, but they use a discounted MDP oracle complexity of  $\tilde{O}\left(SA\frac{1}{(1-\gamma)^3\varepsilon^2}\right)$ , leading to an additional factor of  $\frac{1}{\varepsilon}$ .

At a high level, our key insight to improving the sample complexity for discounted MDPs is the observation that the  $\frac{1}{(1-\gamma)^3}$  factor arises from an upper bound on a certain instance-dependent variance parameter, which can actually be bounded by  $\frac{H}{(1-\gamma)^2}$  in the setting of weakly-communicating MDPs with  $\|h^*\|_{\text{span}} \leq H$  and with large discount factors ( $\frac{1}{1-\gamma} \geq H$ ). Here we highlight some essential ideas for proving this improved variance bound and defer a more detailed description to the proof sketch in Section 4. To relate the variance parameters to  $\|h^*\|_{\text{span}}$ , the key ingredient is a multistep version of the variance Bellman equation [Sobel, 1982, Theorem 1] with a carefully balanced number of steps. In addition, the variance parameters must be controlled both for the true discounted optimal policy  $\pi_\gamma^*$  as well as the policy  $\hat{\pi}_\gamma^*$  that is optimal for an empirical MDP constructed from samples. This is accomplished by using the multistep variance Bellman

relation to bound the variance in terms of the suboptimality of  $\widehat{\pi}^*$ , yielding a recursive bound on the suboptimality of  $\widehat{\pi}^*$ .

For general average-reward MDPs, we take a similar high-level approach. First we observe  $\mathbf{H}$  alone is insufficient to capture complexity, intuitively because now we must ensure highly rewarding state-actions are not transient. This motivates our bounded transient time parameter  $\mathbf{B}$ . We then extend the reduction approach to this general setting by proving our Theorem 5, giving a reduction from general average reward MDPs to discounted MDPs in terms of both  $\|h^*\|_{\text{span}}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$ . Principally because the optimal gain function  $\rho^*$  is not constant in general, our Theorem 5 requires substantially more delicate analysis. Still, an analogous conclusion holds, which is that an  $O(\varepsilon)$ -average-optimal policy can be obtained by finding a  $(\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H})$ -optimal policy for the discounted MDP with  $\gamma = 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H}}$ .

We also show that, for this discount factor and under the bounded transient time assumption, the sample complexity of discounted MDPs can analogously be improved to  $\widetilde{O}\left(SA\frac{\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H}}{(1-\gamma)^2\varepsilon^2}\right)$ . Again, the analysis of variance parameters in the general case is more complicated. For reasons elaborated upon in the proof sketch Section 4, for the variance parameters related to the discounted optimal policy  $\pi_\gamma^*$ , we can first control the variance associated with recurrent states using more careful versions of the analysis which worked in the weakly communicating setting, and then for the transient states, we can leverage these bounds as well as our bounded transient time assumption and a novel law-of-total-variance-style argument.

## 2 Problem Setup and Preliminaries

A Markov decision process (MDP) is given by a tuple  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, P, r)$ , where  $\mathcal{S}$  is the finite set of states,  $\mathcal{A}$  is the finite set of actions,  $P : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{S})$  is the transition kernel with  $\Delta(\mathcal{S})$  denoting the probability simplex over  $\mathcal{S}$ , and  $r : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is the reward function. Let  $S := |\mathcal{S}|$  and  $A := |\mathcal{A}|$  denote the cardinality of the state and action spaces, respectively. Unless otherwise noted, all policies considered are stationary Markovian policies of the form  $\pi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{A})$ . For any initial state  $s_0 \in \mathcal{S}$  and policy  $\pi$ , we let  $\mathbb{E}_{s_0}^\pi$  denote the expectation with respect to the probability distribution over trajectories  $(S_0, A_0, S_1, A_1, \dots)$  where  $S_0 = s_0$ ,  $A_t \sim \pi(S_t)$ , and  $S_{t+1} \sim P(\cdot | S_t, A_t)$ . Equivalently, this is the expectation with respect to the Markov chain induced by  $\pi$  starting in state  $s_0$ , with the transition probability matrix  $P_\pi$  given by  $(P_\pi)_{s,s'} := \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi(a|s)P(s' | s, a)$ . We also define  $(r_\pi)_s := \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi(a|s)r(s, a)$ . We occasionally treat  $P$  as an  $(\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A})$ -by- $\mathcal{S}$  matrix where  $P_{sa,s'} = P(s, a, s')$ . We also let  $P_{sa}$  denote the row vector such that  $P_{sa}(s') = P(s, a, s')$ . For any  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  and any bounded function  $X$  of the trajectory, we define the variance  $\mathbb{V}_s^\pi[X] := \mathbb{E}_s^\pi (X - \mathbb{E}_s^\pi[X])^2$ , with its vector version  $\mathbb{V}^\pi[X] \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S}}$  given by  $(\mathbb{V}^\pi[X])_s = \mathbb{V}_s^\pi[X]$ . For  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ , let  $e_s \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S}}$  be the vector that is all 0 except for a 1 in entry  $s$ . Let  $\mathbf{1} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S}}$  be the all-one vector. For each  $v \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S}}$ , define the span semi-norm  $\|v\|_{\text{span}} := \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} v(s) - \min_{s \in \mathcal{S}} v(s)$ .

A discounted MDP is a tuple  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, P, r, \gamma)$ , where  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  is the discount factor. For any stationary policy  $\pi$ , the (discounted) value function  $V_\gamma^\pi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is defined, for each  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ , as  $V_\gamma^\pi(s) := \mathbb{E}_s^\pi [\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_t]$ , where  $R_t = r(S_t, A_t)$  is the reward received at time  $t$ . It is well-known that there exists an optimal policy  $\pi_\gamma^*$  that is deterministic and satisfies  $V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}(s) = V_\gamma^*(s) := \sup_\pi V_\gamma^\pi(s)$  for all  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  [Puterman, 2014]. In discounted MDPs the goal is to compute an  $\varepsilon$ -optimal policy, which we define as a policy  $\pi$  satisfying  $\|V_\gamma^\pi - V_\gamma^*\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon$ . We define one more variance parameter  $\mathbb{V}_{P_\pi} [V_\gamma^\pi] \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S}}$ , specific to a given policy  $\pi$ , by  $(\mathbb{V}_{P_\pi} [V_\gamma^\pi])_s := \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} (P_\pi)_{s,s'} [V_\gamma^\pi(s') - \sum_{s'' \in \mathcal{S}} (P_\pi)_{s,s''} V_\gamma^\pi(s'')]^2$ .

**Average-reward criterion** In an MDP  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, P, r)$ , the average reward per stage or the *gain* of a policy  $\pi$  starting from state  $s$  is defined as  $\rho^\pi(s) := \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \mathbb{E}_s^\pi [\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} R_t]$ . The *bias function* of any stationary policy  $\pi$  is  $h^\pi(s) := \text{C-lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_s^\pi [\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} (R_t - \rho^\pi(S_t))]$ , where C-lim denotes the Cesaro limit. When the Markov chain induced by  $P_\pi$  is aperiodic, C-lim can be replaced with the usual limit. For any policy  $\pi$ , its  $\rho^\pi$  and  $h^\pi$  satisfy  $\rho^\pi = P_\pi \rho^\pi$  and  $\rho^\pi + h^\pi = r_\pi + P_\pi h^\pi$ .

A policy  $\pi^*$  is Blackwell-optimal if there exists some discount factor  $\bar{\gamma} \in (0, 1)$  such that for all  $\gamma \geq \bar{\gamma}$  we have  $V_\gamma^{\pi^*} \geq V_\gamma^\pi$  for all policies  $\pi$ . Henceforth we let  $\pi^*$  denote some fixed Blackwell-optimal policy, which is guaranteed to exist when  $S$  and  $A$  are finite [Puterman, 2014]. We define the optimal gain  $\rho^* \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S}}$  by  $\rho^*(s) = \sup_\pi \rho^\pi(s)$  and note that we have  $\rho^* = \rho^{\pi^*}$ . For all  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ ,  $\rho^*(s) \geq \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} P_{sa} \rho^*$ , or equivalently  $\rho^*(s) \geq P_\pi \rho^*$  for all policies  $\pi$  (and this maximum is achieved by  $\pi^*$ ). We also define  $h^* = h^{\pi^*}$  (and we note

that this definition does not depend on which Blackwell-optimal  $\pi^*$  is used, if there are multiple). For all  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ ,  $\rho^*$  and  $h^*$  satisfy  $\rho^*(s) + h^*(s) = \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}: P_{sa}\rho^* = \rho^*(s)} r_{sa} + P_{sa}h^*$ , known as the (unmodified) Bellman equation.

A weakly communicating MDP is such that the states can be partitioned into two subsets such that in the first subset, all states are transient under any stationary policy, and in the second subset, any state is reachable from any other state under some stationary policy. In weakly communicating MDPs  $\rho^*$  is a constant vector (all entries are equal), and thus  $(\rho^*, h^*)$  are also a solution to the stronger modified Bellman equation  $\rho^*(s) + h^*(s) = \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} r_{sa} + P_{sa}h^*$ . When discussing weakly communicating MDPs we occasionally abuse notation and treat  $\rho^*$  as a scalar. In the average reward setting, our goal is find an  $\varepsilon$ -optimal policy, defined as a policy  $\pi$  such that  $\|\rho^* - \rho^\pi\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon$ .

**Complexity parameters** Our most important complexity parameter is the span of the optimal bias function  $\mathsf{H} := \|h^*\|_{\text{span}}$ . In addition, a new notion which we introduce for the setting of general MDPs is that of *bounded transient time*. For any policy  $\pi$ , let  $\mathcal{R}^\pi$  be the set of states which are recurrent in the Markov chain  $P_\pi$ , and let  $\mathcal{T}^\pi = \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{R}^\pi$  be the set of transient states. Let  $T_{\mathcal{R}^\pi} = \inf\{t : S_t \in \mathcal{R}^\pi\}$  be the first hitting time of a state which is recurrent under  $\pi$ . We say an MDP satisfies the *bounded transient time property with parameter B* if for all policies  $\pi$  and states  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  we have  $\mathbb{E}_s [T_{\mathcal{R}^\pi}] \leq B$ . In words, for any starting state  $s$  and any policy  $\pi$ , the expected time spent in transient states (with respect to the Markov chain induced by  $\pi$ ) is bounded by  $B$ .

We define several other parameters that have been used in the literature to characterize sample complexity. For each  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ , let  $\eta_s$  denote the hitting time of  $s$ . The diameter  $D$  is defined as  $D := \max_{s_1 \neq s_2} \inf_{\pi \in \Pi} \mathbb{E}_{s_1}^\pi [\eta_{s_2}]$ , where  $\Pi$  is the set of deterministic stationary policies. For each policy  $\pi$ , if the Markov chain induced by  $P_\pi$  has a unique stationary distribution  $\nu_\pi$ , we define the mixing time of  $\pi$  as  $\tau_\pi := \inf\left\{t \geq 1 : \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \left\| e_s^\top (P_\pi)^t - \nu_\pi^\top \right\|_1 \leq \frac{1}{2}\right\}$ . If all policies  $\pi \in \Pi$  satisfy this assumption, we define the uniform mixing time  $\tau_{\text{unif}} := \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \tau_\pi$ . Note that  $D$  and  $\tau_{\text{unif}}$  are generally incomparable [Wang et al., 2022], while we always have  $\mathsf{H} \leq D$  [Bartlett and Tewari, 2012] and  $\mathsf{H} \leq 8\tau_{\text{unif}}$  [Wang et al., 2022]. It is possible for  $\tau_{\text{unif}} = \infty$ , for instance if there are any policies which induce periodic Markov chains. Also,  $D = \infty$  if there are any states which are transient under all policies. However,  $\mathsf{H}$  is finite in any MDP with  $S, A < \infty$ .

We assume access to a generative model [Kearns and Singh, 1998], also known as a simulator. This means we can obtain independent samples from  $P(\cdot | s, a)$  for any given  $s \in \mathcal{S}, a \in \mathcal{A}$ , but  $P$  itself is unknown. We assume that the reward function  $r$  is deterministic and known, which is a standard assumption in generative settings (e.g., Agarwal et al. [2020], Li et al. [2020]) since otherwise estimating the mean rewards is relatively easy. Specifically, to learn an  $\varepsilon$ -optimal policy for the discounted MDP in our setting, we would need to estimate each entry of  $r$  to accuracy  $O((1-\gamma)\varepsilon)$ , which requires a lower order number of samples  $\tilde{O}\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)^2\varepsilon^2}\right)$ . For this reason we assume (as in Wang et al. 2022) that  $\mathsf{H} \geq 1$ . Using samples from the generative model, our Algorithm 1 constructs an empirical transition kernel  $\hat{P}$ . For a policy  $\pi$  and state  $s$ , we use  $\hat{V}_\gamma^\pi(s)$  to denote a value function computed with respect to the Markov chain with transition matrix  $\hat{P}_\pi$  (as opposed to  $P_\pi$ ). Our Algorithm 1 also utilizes a perturbed reward function  $\tilde{r}$ , and we use the notation  $V_{\gamma, \hat{P}}^\pi(s)$  to denote a value function computed using this reward (and  $P_\pi$ ); more concretely, we replace  $R_t$  with  $\tilde{R}_t = \tilde{r}(S_t, A_t)$  in the definition above of  $V_\gamma^\pi$ . We use the notation  $\hat{V}_{\gamma, \hat{P}}^\pi$  when using  $\hat{P}$  and  $\tilde{r}$  simultaneously. Since we only ever consider the state space  $\mathcal{S}$  and action space  $\mathcal{A}$ , we often omit reference to them when describing MDP parameters and simply write  $(P, r)$  or  $(P, r, \gamma)$ .

### 3 Main Results

In this section, we present our main results for weakly communicating MDPs and general MDPs.

#### 3.1 Weakly Communicating MDPs

Our approach is based on reducing the average-reward problem to a discounted problem. We first present our algorithm and guarantees for the discounted MDP setting. As discussed in Subsection 1.1, our algorithm

---

**Algorithm 1** Perturbed Empirical Model-Based Planning

---

**input:** Sample size per state-action pair  $n$ , target accuracy  $\varepsilon$ , discount factor  $\gamma$

- 1: **for** each state-action pair  $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$  **do**
  - 2:     Collect  $n$  samples  $S_{s,a}^1, \dots, S_{s,a}^n$  from  $P(\cdot | s, a)$
  - 3:     Form the empirical transition kernel  $\widehat{P}(s' | s, a) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}\{S_{s,a}^i = s'\}$ , for all  $s' \in \mathcal{S}$
  - 4: **end for**
  - 5: Set perturbation level  $\xi = (1 - \gamma)\varepsilon/6$
  - 6: Form perturbed reward  $\tilde{r} = r + Z$  where  $Z(s, a) \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \text{Unif}(0, \xi)$
  - 7: Compute a policy  $\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{p}}^*$  which is optimal for the perturbed empirical discounted MDP  $(\widehat{P}, \tilde{r}, \gamma)$
  - 8: **return**  $\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{p}}^*$
- 

of choice, Algorithm 1, is essentially the same as the one presented in Li et al. [2020], with a slightly different perturbation level  $\xi$ . Algorithm 1 constructs an empirical transition kernel  $\widehat{P}$  using samples from the generative model, and then solves the resulting empirical (perturbed) MDP  $(\widehat{P}, \tilde{r}, \gamma)$ . As noted in Li et al. [2020], the perturbation ensures  $\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{p}}^*$  can be computed exactly in  $\text{poly}(\frac{1}{1-\gamma}, S, A, \log(1/\delta\varepsilon))$  time by multiple standard MDP solvers. We remark in passing that the  $SA$ -by- $S$  transition matrix  $\widehat{P}$  has at most  $nSA$  nonzero entries.

Our Theorem 1 provides an improved sample complexity bound for Algorithm 1 under the setting that the MDP is weakly communicating and the span satisfies  $H \leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma}$ .

**Theorem 1** (Sample Complexity of Weakly Communicating DMDP). *Suppose the discounted MDP  $(P, r, \gamma)$  is weakly communicating,  $H \leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma}$ , and  $\varepsilon \leq H$ . There exists a constant  $C_2 > 0$  such that, for any  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , if  $n \geq C_2 \frac{H}{(1-\gamma)^2 \varepsilon^2} \log(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon})$ , then with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , the policy  $\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{p}}^*$  output by Algorithm 1 satisfies  $\|V_\gamma^* - V_\gamma^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{p}}^*}\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon$ .*

Since we observe  $n$  samples for each state-action pair, Theorem 1 shows that  $\tilde{O}(\frac{HSA}{(1-\gamma)^2 \varepsilon^2})$  total samples suffice to learn an  $\varepsilon$ -optimal policy. The theorem requires the span  $H = \|h^*\|_{\text{span}}$  to be no larger than the effective horizon  $\frac{1}{1-\gamma}$ , or equivalently for the discount factor  $\gamma$  to be at least  $1 - \frac{1}{H}$ . This assumption holds in many situations, as can be seen by using the relationships  $H \leq D$  or  $H \leq 8\tau_{\text{unif}}$ . For instance, the requirement  $D \lesssim \frac{1}{1-\gamma}$  means that it is possible to reach any other state within the effective horizon, and the requirement  $\tau_{\text{unif}} \lesssim \frac{1}{1-\gamma}$  means that all policies have enough time to mix within the effective horizon. On the other hand, in the regime with  $H > \frac{1}{1-\gamma}$ , the known minimax optimal sample complexity for  $\gamma$ -discounted MDPs of  $\tilde{O}(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)^3 \varepsilon^2})$ , also achieved by Algorithm 1, is superior. In this regime, the discounting effectively truncates the MDP at a short horizon  $\frac{1}{1-\gamma}$  before the long-run behavior of the optimal policy (as captured by  $H$ ) kicks in.

Now we present our main result for the average-reward problem in the weakly communicating setting. Our Algorithm 2 reduces the problem to  $\bar{\gamma}$ -discounted MDP with  $\bar{\gamma} = 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{12H}$  and then calls Algorithm 1 with target accuracy  $H$ .

---

**Algorithm 2** Average-to-Discount Reduction for Weakly Communicating MDP

---

**input:** Sample size per state-action pair  $n$ , target accuracy  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ ,  $H = \|h^*\|_{\text{span}}$

- 1: Set  $\bar{\gamma} = 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{12H}$
  - 2: Obtain  $\widehat{\pi}^*$  from Algorithm 1 with sample size per state-action pair  $n$ , accuracy  $H$ , discount  $\bar{\gamma}$
  - 3: **return**  $\widehat{\pi}^*$
- 

We have the following sample complexity bound for Algorithm 2.

**Theorem 2** (Sample Complexity of Weakly Communicating AMDP). *Suppose the MDP  $(P, r)$  is weakly communicating. There exists a constant  $C_1 > 0$  such that for any  $\delta, \varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ , if  $n \geq C_1 \frac{H}{\varepsilon^2} \log(\frac{SAH}{\delta\varepsilon})$ , then with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , the policy  $\widehat{\pi}^*$  output by Algorithm 2 satisfies the elementwise inequality  $\rho^* - \rho^{\widehat{\pi}^*} \leq \varepsilon \mathbf{1}$ .*

Again, since we observe  $n$  samples for each state-action pair, this result shows that  $\tilde{O}\left(\frac{HSA}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$  total samples suffice to learn an  $\varepsilon$ -optimal policy for the average reward MDP. This bound matches the minimax lower bound in Wang et al. [2022] and is superior to existing results for weakly communicating MDPs (see Table 1). We note that since Algorithm 1 and its proof work so long as  $H$  is any upper bound of  $\|h^*\|_{\text{span}}$ , Algorithm 2 also only needs an upper bound for  $\|h^*\|_{\text{span}}$ .

### 3.2 General MDPs

Unlike the weakly communicating setting, the complexity of general average-reward MDPs cannot be captured solely by  $\|h^*\|_{\text{span}}$ . This is established in the following minimax lower bound.

**Theorem 3** (Lower Bound for General AMDPs). *For any  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/4)$ ,  $B \geq 1$ ,  $A \geq 4$  and  $S \in 8\mathbb{N}$ , for any algorithm Alg which is guaranteed to return an  $\varepsilon/3$ -average-optimal policy for any input MDP with probability at least  $\frac{3}{4}$ , there exists an MDP  $\mathcal{M} = (P, r)$  such that:*

1.  $\mathcal{M}$  has  $S$  states and  $A$  actions.
2. Letting  $h^*$  be the bias of the Blackwell-optimal policy for  $\mathcal{M}$ , we have  $\|h^*\|_{\text{span}} = 0$ .
3.  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfies the bounded transient time assumption with parameter  $B$ .
4. Alg requires  $\Omega\left(\frac{B \log(SA)}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$  samples per state-action pair on  $\mathcal{M}$ .

A similar minimax lower bound holds for the discounted setting.

**Theorem 4** (Lower Bound for General DMDP). *For any  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/4)$ ,  $B \geq 1$ ,  $A \geq 4$  and  $S \in 8\mathbb{N}$  for any algorithm Alg which is guaranteed to return an  $\varepsilon/3$ -optimal policy for any input discounted MDP with probability at least  $\frac{3}{4}$ , there exists a discounted MDP  $\mathcal{M} = (P, r, \gamma)$  such that:*

1.  $\mathcal{M}$  has  $S$  states and  $A$  actions.
2.  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfies the bounded transient time assumption with parameter  $B$ .
3. Alg requires  $\Omega\left(\frac{B \log(SA)}{(1-\gamma)^2 \varepsilon^2}\right)$  samples per state-action pair on  $\mathcal{M}$ .

Note that since the lower bounds of  $\tilde{O}\left(\frac{H}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$  from the weakly communicating setting still apply in the general setting, Theorem 3 implies a  $\tilde{O}\left(\frac{H+B}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$  lower bound for general average-reward MDPs.

Now we lay the foundation for our matching upper bound by proving a new reduction to discounted MDPs in terms of the parameters  $H$  and  $B$ .

**Theorem 5** (Average-to-Discount Reduction for General MDP). *Suppose  $(P, r)$  is a general MDP, has an optimal bias function  $h^*$  satisfying  $\|h^*\|_{\text{span}} \leq H$ , and satisfies the bounded transient time assumption with parameter  $B$ . Fix  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$  and set  $\gamma = 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{B+H}$ . For any  $\varepsilon_\gamma \in [0, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}]$ , if  $\pi$  is any  $\varepsilon_\gamma$ -optimal policy for the discounted MDP  $(P, r, \gamma)$ , then  $\rho^* - \rho^\pi \leq \left(3 + 2\frac{\varepsilon_\gamma}{B+H}\right) \varepsilon$ .*

As demonstrated by the example in Figure 1 below, the  $\gamma$  used in this reduction cannot generally be decreased to depend only on  $H$ , contrasting the weakly communicating setting (see Lemma 8 for the analogous theorem from Wang et al. [2022] for weakly communicating MDPs).

Next we establish an improved sample complexity for the discounted problem in the setting relevant to this reduction. This bound matches the lower bound in Theorem 4 up to log factors.

**Theorem 6** (Sample Complexity of General DMDP). *Suppose  $B + H \leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma}$  and  $\varepsilon \leq B + H$ . There exists a constant  $C_3 > 0$  such that, for any  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , if  $n \geq C_3 \frac{B+H}{(1-\gamma)^2 \varepsilon^2} \log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)$ , then with probability  $1 - \delta$ , the policy  $\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, P}^*$  output by Algorithm 1 satisfies  $\|V_\gamma^* - V_\gamma^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, P}^*}\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon$ .*

Finally, we present our algorithm for general average-reward MDPs and its sample complexity, matching the lower bound in Theorem 3 up to log factors.



---

**Algorithm 3** Average-to-Discount Reduction for General MDP

---

**input:** Sample size per state-action pair  $n$ , target accuracy  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ ,  $H = \|h^*\|_{\text{span}}$ ,  $B$

1: Set  $\bar{\gamma} = 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{6(B+H)}$

2: Obtain  $\hat{\pi}^*$  from Algorithm 1 with sample size per state-action pair  $n$ , accuracy  $B + H$ , discount  $\bar{\gamma}$

3: **return**  $\hat{\pi}^*$

---

**Theorem 7** (Sample Complexity of General AMDP). *There exists a constant  $C_4 > 0$  such that for any  $\delta, \varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ , if  $n \geq C_4 \frac{B+H}{\varepsilon^2} \log\left(\frac{SA(B+H)}{\delta\varepsilon}\right)$ , then with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , the policy  $\hat{\pi}^*$  output by Algorithm 3 satisfies the elementwise inequality  $\rho^* - \rho^{\hat{\pi}^*} \leq \varepsilon \mathbf{1}$ .*

## 4 Outline of Analysis

### 4.1 Weakly Communicating MDPs

As discussed in Subsection 1.2, our main Theorem 2 on the complexity of weakly communicating average reward MDPs follows from using the reduction of Wang et al. [2022] with the improved discounted MDP sample complexity from Theorem 1, and the key to obtaining this improved complexity is a careful analysis of certain instance-dependent variance parameters. More concretely, the arguments in Li et al. [2020] (repackaged in our Lemma 9) demonstrate that it would suffice to bound the variance parameters

$$\left\| (I - \gamma P_{\pi_\gamma^*})^{-1} \sqrt{\mathbb{V}_{P_{\pi_\gamma^*}} [V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}]} \right\|_\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| (I - \gamma P_{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma,p}^*})^{-1} \sqrt{\mathbb{V}_{P_{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma,p}^*}} [V_{\gamma,p}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma,p}^*}]} \right\|_\infty \quad (1)$$

each by  $O\left(\sqrt{\frac{H}{(1-\gamma)^2}}\right)$ . The first of these variance parameters, which pertains to the optimal policy  $\pi_\gamma^*$  of the discounted MDP, is more straightforward to bound. By Lemma 11 (which is a well-known law-of-total-variance-style argument [Gheshlaghi Azar et al., 2013, Agarwal et al., 2020]), it suffices to bound the variance of the total discounted reward as  $\left\| \mathbb{V}^{\pi_\gamma^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_t \right] \right\|_\infty \leq O\left(\frac{H}{1-\gamma}\right)$ . Note that this bound improves upon the obvious bound of  $\frac{1}{(1-\gamma)^2}$ , which follows from the fact that the total reward in a trajectory is bounded within  $[0, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}]$  and is used in, e.g., Agarwal et al. [2020], Li et al. [2020] to obtain a sample complexity scaling with  $\frac{1}{(1-\gamma)^3}$ . The first step of proving the improved bound is to decompose  $\mathbb{V}^{\pi_\gamma^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_t \right]$  recursively like

$$\mathbb{V}^{\pi_\gamma^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_t \right] = \mathbb{V}^{\pi_\gamma^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{H-1} \gamma^t R_t + \gamma^H V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}(S_H) \right] + \gamma^{2H} \left( P_{\pi_\gamma^*} \right)^H \mathbb{V}^{\pi_\gamma^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_t \right]$$

(see our Lemma 12). This is a multi-step version of the standard variance Bellman equation (e.g., Sobel [1982, Theorem 1]). Ordinarily an  $H$ -step expansion would not be useful, since the term  $V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}(S_H)$  by itself appears to generally have fluctuations on the order of  $\frac{1}{1-\gamma}$  in the worst case depending on  $S_H$  (note  $S_H$  is the random state encountered at time  $H$ ). However, in our setting, we should have  $V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}(S_H) \approx \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \rho^* + h^*(S_H)$ , reducing the magnitude of the random fluctuations to order  $H = \|h^*\|_{\text{span}}$ . (See Lemma 10 for a formalization of this approximation which first appeared in Wei et al. [2020].) Therefore expansion to  $H$  steps achieves the optimal tradeoff between maintaining  $\mathbb{V}^{\pi_\gamma^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{H-1} \gamma^t R_t + \gamma^H V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}(S_H) \right] \leq O(H^2)$  and minimizing  $\gamma^{2H}$ . This yields the desired bound of  $\left\| \mathbb{V}^{\pi_\gamma^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_t \right] \right\|_\infty \leq O\left(\frac{H^2}{1-\gamma^{2H}}\right) = O\left(\frac{H}{1-\gamma}\right)$ , where the fact that  $\frac{1}{1-\gamma^{2H}} \leq O\left(\frac{1}{H(1-\gamma)}\right)$  is an elementary fact that requires our assumption of a large effective horizon (a  $\gamma$  large enough that  $\frac{1}{1-\gamma} \geq H$ ). See Lemma 14 for the precise bound on this variance parameter.

We would like to use a similar argument as above to bound the second variance parameter in (1). The first issue is that we must analyze the variance in the MDP with perturbed reward vector  $\tilde{r}$ , but for suitably small perturbation, this is a relatively minor problem. The more significant problem is relating the policy  $\hat{\pi}_{\gamma,p}^*$  back to  $\pi_\gamma^*$ . Since  $H \leq O(\tau_{\text{unif}})$ , the arguments from the previous paragraph immediately imply a bound involving  $\tau_{\text{unif}}$  in place of  $H$ , and if we assumed a uniform mixing time for all policies, then such arguments

would easily apply to  $\hat{\pi}_{\gamma,p}^*$  in place of  $\pi_\gamma^*$ . However, we hope to characterize the sample complexity in terms of our bound  $H$  on  $\|h^*\|_{\text{span}}$ , and there is no a priori relationship between the variance of  $V_\gamma^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma,p}^*}(S_H)$  and  $\|h^*\|_{\text{span}} = \|h^{\pi^*}\|_{\text{span}}$ . To overcome this issue, we bound variance parameters involving  $\hat{\pi}_{\gamma,p}^*$  in terms of both  $H$  and the suboptimality  $\|V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*} - V_\gamma^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma,p}^*}\|_\infty$ . This leads to a recursive bound on the suboptimality of  $\hat{\pi}_{\gamma,p}^*$  which ultimately obtains the desired sample complexity.

## 4.2 General MDPs

Our first important observation is that  $\|h^*\|_{\text{span}}$  is insufficient to characterize the difficulty of general average-reward MDPs, as can be seen from the simple example in Figure 1. Note that  $\|h^*\|_{\text{span}} = 0$ , but clearly  $\Omega(T)$  samples are required to observe a transition  $1 \rightarrow 3$  (so the sample complexity must depend on  $T \gg H$ ) and also even if we had perfect knowledge of the environment, the optimal  $\gamma$ -discounted policy would not choose the optimal action  $a = 2$  until the effective horizon  $\frac{1}{1-\gamma} \geq \Omega(T)$  (so  $\frac{1}{1-\gamma} \approx H$  is insufficient for the reduction to discounted MDP). Our formal lower bound Theorem 3 uses improved instances which also capture the correct dependence on  $\varepsilon$ .




Figure 1: A general MDP where  $\gamma$ -discounted approximation fails unless  $\frac{1}{1-\gamma} = \Omega(T) \gg \|h^*\|_{\text{span}}$ .

To prove our upper bounds, as discussed in Subsection 1.2, we take an overall similar approach: approximating the average reward problem by a  $\gamma$ -discounted problem with carefully chosen  $\gamma$ , and then demonstrating that the discounted problem can be solved with an improved sample complexity by bounding certain variance parameters. Our reduction from average-reward to discounted MDPs for the general setting, Theorem 5, requires more complicated analysis than the analogous result for the weakly communicating setting. Letting  $\pi_\gamma^*$  again be the optimal policy for the  $\gamma$ -discounted MDP, our first key observation is that  $\rho^*$  is constant within any irreducible closed recurrent block of the Markov chain  $P_{\rho^*}$ , essentially because all states in this block must be reachable from each other with probability one (see Lemma 16). Leveraging the optimality of  $\pi_\gamma^*$ , this enables us to bound both  $|V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}(s) - \frac{1}{1-\gamma}\rho^*(s)|$  and  $|V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}(s) - \frac{1}{1-\gamma}\rho^{\pi_\gamma^*}(s)|$  by  $O(\|h^*\|_{\text{span}})$  for any  $s$  which is recurrent under  $\pi_\gamma^*$ , which when combined demonstrate that the gain  $\rho^{\pi_\gamma^*}(s)$  of  $\pi_\gamma^*$  is near-optimal for its recurrent states. See Lemma 20. We then leverage the bounded transient time assumption to guarantee that for transient  $s$ ,  $V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}(s)$  is dominated by the expected returns from recurrent states, since at most  $O(B)$  time is spent in transient states. We complete the proof of Theorem 5 by combining these facts, as well as extending them to accommodate approximately optimal policies.

Now we discuss the techniques behind our improved sample complexity for general discounted MDPs. Analogously to the weakly communicating case, we again bound the variance parameters (1), this time each by  $O\left(\sqrt{\frac{H+B}{(1-\gamma)^2}}\right)$ . Again, by using Lemma 11, if the variance of the cumulative discounted reward starting from a state  $s$  satisfies  $\|\mathbb{V}_s^{\pi_\gamma^*}[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_t]\|_\infty \leq O\left(\frac{H+B}{1-\gamma}\right)$ , then that would suffice to prove the desired bound. Such a bound does in fact hold for  $s$  which are recurrent under  $\pi_\gamma^*$ , and this is because  $\rho^*(S_t)$  will remain constant to  $\rho^*(s)$  for all  $t$ , since as mentioned  $\rho^*$  is constant on closed irreducible recurrent blocks, and all  $(S_t)_{t \geq 0}$  will stay in the same block as  $s$ . Therefore we can almost reuse our argument from the weakly communicating case. However, if  $s$  is transient, it is easy to see that  $\|\mathbb{V}_s^{\pi_\gamma^*}[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_t]\|_\infty = \Omega\left(\left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma}\right)^2\right)$  in general (even under the bounded transient time assumption), since we can consider an example where from  $s$  we transition in one step with equal probability either to a state  $s_1$  where we will then obtain a cumulative

discounted reward of  $\frac{1}{1-\gamma}$  (ex. if  $s_1$  transitions to itself and collects reward +1 each time), or to a state  $s_2$  where we would obtain a cumulative discounted reward of 0. Thus, when  $s$  is transient, instead of loosely bounding the variance parameters (1) in terms of  $\left\| \mathbb{V}^{\pi^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_t \right] \right\|_{\infty}$ , we improve upon Lemma 11 and develop a novel law-of-total-variance-style argument which limits the total contribution of transient states to the variance parameters (1). See Lemma 25 for more details.

## 5 Conclusion

In this paper we resolved the sample complexity learning a weakly communicating average-reward MDP in terms of the span of the optimal bias  $\|h^*\|_{\text{span}}$ , removing the assumption of uniformly bounded mixing times and matching the minimax lower bound. We also initiated the study of the sample complexity of general average-reward MDPs, obtaining sample complexity bounds in terms of  $\|h^*\|_{\text{span}}$  and a new transient time bound parameter  $B$ , which is shown to be necessary by our minimax lower bound. In both settings, we refined the analysis for reducing to a discounted MDP, for which we also obtained improved sample complexity bounds, circumventing the minimax lower bound for discounted MDPs under the settings relevant to our reductions.

We believe these results shed greater light on the relationship between the discounted and average reward settings, and we hope that our technical developments can be useful in future work.

## Acknowledgement

Y. Chen and M. Zurek were supported in part by National Science Foundation CCF-2233152 and DMS-2023239.

## References

- Alekh Agarwal, Sham Kakade, and Lin F. Yang. Model-Based Reinforcement Learning with a Generative Model is Minimax Optimal, April 2020. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1906.03804>. arXiv:1906.03804 [cs, math, stat] version: 3.
- Mohammad Gheshlaghi Azar, Remi Munos, and Bert Kappen. On the Sample Complexity of Reinforcement Learning with a Generative Model, June 2012. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1206.6461>. arXiv:1206.6461 [cs, stat].
- Peter L. Bartlett and Ambuj Tewari. REGAL: A Regularization based Algorithm for Reinforcement Learning in Weakly Communicating MDPs, May 2012. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1205.2661v1>.
- Mohammad Gheshlaghi Azar, Rémi Munos, and Hilbert J. Kappen. Minimax PAC bounds on the sample complexity of reinforcement learning with a generative model. *Machine Learning*, 91(3):325–349, June 2013. ISSN 1573-0565. doi: 10.1007/s10994-013-5368-1. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10994-013-5368-1>.
- Yujia Jin and Aaron Sidford. Efficiently Solving MDPs with Stochastic Mirror Descent, August 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2008.12776v1>.
- Yujia Jin and Aaron Sidford. Towards Tight Bounds on the Sample Complexity of Average-reward MDPs, June 2021. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2106.07046>. arXiv:2106.07046 [cs, math].
- Michael Kearns and Satinder Singh. Finite-Sample Convergence Rates for Q-Learning and Indirect Algorithms. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 11. MIT Press, 1998. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/1998/hash/99adff456950dd9629a5260c4de21858-Abstract.html>.
- Gen Li, Yuting Wei, Yuejie Chi, Yuantao Gu, and Yuxin Chen. Breaking the Sample Size Barrier in Model-Based Reinforcement Learning with a Generative Model. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 12861–12872. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2020/hash/96ea64f3a1aa2fd00c72faacf0cb8ac9-Abstract.html>.

- Tianjiao Li, Feiyang Wu, and Guanghui Lan. Stochastic first-order methods for average-reward Markov decision processes, May 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.05800v5>.
- Martin L. Puterman. *Markov Decision Processes: Discrete Stochastic Dynamic Programming*. John Wiley & Sons, August 2014. ISBN 978-1-118-62587-3.
- Aaron Sidford, Mengdi Wang, Xian Wu, Lin Yang, and Yinyu Ye. Near-Optimal Time and Sample Complexities for Solving Markov Decision Processes with a Generative Model. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 31. Curran Associates, Inc., 2018. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2018/hash/bb03e43ffe34eeb242a2ee4a4f125e56-Abstract.html>.
- Matthew J. Sobel. The variance of discounted Markov decision processes. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 19(4):794–802, December 1982. ISSN 0021-9002, 1475-6072. doi: 10.2307/3213832. URL <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/journal-of-applied-probability/article/abs/variance-of-discounted-markov-decision-processes>. Publisher: Cambridge University Press.
- Martin J. Wainwright. *High-Dimensional Statistics: A Non-Asymptotic Viewpoint*. Cambridge University Press, 1 edition, February 2019a. ISBN 978-1-108-62777-1 978-1-108-49802-9. doi: 10.1017/9781108627771. URL <https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/9781108627771/type/book>.
- Martin J. Wainwright. Variance-reduced  $Q$ -learning is minimax optimal, August 2019b. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1906.04697>. arXiv:1906.04697 [cs, math, stat].
- Jinghan Wang, Mengdi Wang, and Lin F. Yang. Near Sample-Optimal Reduction-based Policy Learning for Average Reward MDP, December 2022. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2212.00603>. arXiv:2212.00603 [cs].
- Shengbo Wang, Jose Blanchet, and Peter Glynn. Optimal Sample Complexity of Reinforcement Learning for Mixing Discounted Markov Decision Processes, February 2023a. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.07477v3>.
- Shengbo Wang, Jose Blanchet, and Peter Glynn. Optimal Sample Complexity for Average Reward Markov Decision Processes, October 2023b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.08833v1>.
- Chen-Yu Wei, Mehdi Jafarnia-Jahromi, Haipeng Luo, Hiteshi Sharma, and Rahul Jain. Model-free Reinforcement Learning in Infinite-horizon Average-reward Markov Decision Processes, February 2020. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1910.07072>. arXiv:1910.07072 [cs, stat].
- Zihan Zhang and Qiaomin Xie. Sharper Model-free Reinforcement Learning for Average-reward Markov Decision Processes, June 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2306.16394>. arXiv:2306.16394 [cs].

## A Proofs for Weakly Communicating MDPs

In this section, we provide the proofs for our main results in Section 3.1 for weakly communicating MDPs. Before beginning, we note that given that  $H \geq 1$ , we may assume that  $H$  is an integer by setting  $H \leftarrow \lceil H \rceil$ , which only affects the sample complexity by a constant multiple  $< 2$  relative to the original parameter  $H$ . Let  $\|M\|_{\infty \rightarrow \infty} := \sup_{v: \|v\|_{\infty} \leq 1} \|Mv\|_{\infty}$  denote the  $\ell_{\infty}$  operator norm of a matrix  $M$ . We record the standard and useful fact that  $\|(I - \gamma P')^{-1}\|_{\infty \rightarrow \infty} \leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma}$  for any transition probability matrix  $P'$ , which follows from the Neumann series  $(I - \gamma P')^{-1} = \sum_{t \geq 0} (\gamma P')^t$  and the elementary fact that  $\|P'\|_{\infty \rightarrow \infty} \leq 1$ .

### A.1 Technical Lemmas

First we formally state the main theorem from Wang et al. [2022], which gives a reduction from weakly communicating average-reward problems to discounted problems.

**Lemma 8.** *Suppose  $(P, r)$  is an MDP which is weakly communicating and has an optimal bias function  $h^*$  satisfying  $\|h^*\|_{\text{span}} \leq H$ . Fix  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$  and set  $\gamma = 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{H}$ . For any  $\varepsilon_{\gamma} \in [0, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}]$ , if  $\pi$  is any  $\varepsilon_{\gamma}$ -optimal policy for the discounted MDP  $(P, r, \gamma)$ , then*

$$\rho^* - \rho^{\pi} \leq \left(8 + 3\frac{\varepsilon_{\gamma}}{H}\right) \varepsilon_{\gamma}.$$

From here, we will first establish lemmas which are useful for proving Theorem 1 on discounted MDPs, and then we will apply the reduction approach of Lemma 8 to prove Theorem 2 on average-reward MDPs. As mentioned in the introduction, a key technical component of our approach is to establish superior bounds on a certain instance-dependent variance quantity which replace a factor of  $\frac{1}{1-\gamma}$  with a factor of  $H$ . Before reaching this step however, to make use of such a bound, we require an algorithm for discounted MDPs which enjoys a variance-dependent guarantee.

The work Li et al. [2020] obtains bounds with variance dependence that suffice for our purposes. However, they do not directly present said variance-dependent bounds, so we must slightly repackage their arguments in the form we require.

**Lemma 9.** *There exist absolute constants  $c_1, c_2$  such that for any  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , if  $n \geq \frac{c_2}{1-\gamma} \log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)$ , then with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , after running Algorithm 1, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \widehat{V}_{\gamma, P}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right\|_{\infty} &\leq \gamma \sqrt{\frac{c_1 \log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{n}} \left\| (I - \gamma P_{\pi_{\gamma}^*})^{-1} \sqrt{\mathbb{V}_{P_{\pi_{\gamma}^*}} \left[ V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right]} \right\|_{\infty} \\ &\quad + c_1 \gamma \frac{\log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{(1-\gamma)n} \left\| V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right\|_{\infty} + \frac{\varepsilon}{6} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \widehat{V}_{\gamma, P}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, P}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, P}^*} \right\|_{\infty} &\leq \gamma \sqrt{\frac{c_1 \log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{n}} \left\| (I - \gamma P_{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, P}^*})^{-1} \sqrt{\mathbb{V}_{P_{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, P}^*}} \left[ V_{\gamma, P}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, P}^*} \right]} \right\|_{\infty} \\ &\quad + c_1 \gamma \frac{\log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{(1-\gamma)n} \left\| V_{\gamma, P}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, P}^*} \right\|_{\infty} + \frac{\varepsilon}{6}. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

*Proof.* First we establish equation (2). The proof of Li et al. [2020, Lemma 1] shows that when  $n \geq \frac{16e^2}{1-\gamma} 2 \log\left(\frac{4S \log \frac{e}{1-\gamma}}{\delta}\right)$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \widehat{V}_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right\|_{\infty} &\leq 4\gamma \sqrt{\frac{2 \log\left(\frac{4S \log \frac{e}{1-\gamma}}{\delta}\right)}{n}} \left\| (I - \gamma P_{\pi_{\gamma}^*})^{-1} \sqrt{\mathbb{V}_{P_{\pi_{\gamma}^*}} \left[ V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right]} \right\|_{\infty} \\ &\quad + \gamma \frac{2 \log\left(\frac{4S \log \frac{e}{1-\gamma}}{\delta}\right)}{(1-\gamma)n} \left\| V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right\|_{\infty}. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Now since

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \widehat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbf{p}}^{\pi_\gamma^*} - \widehat{V}_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*} \right\|_\infty &= \left\| (I - \gamma \widehat{P}_{\pi_\gamma^*})^{-1} \widetilde{r}_{\pi_\gamma^*} - (I - \gamma \widehat{P}_{\pi_\gamma^*})^{-1} r_{\pi_\gamma^*} \right\|_\infty \\ &\leq \left\| (I - \gamma \widehat{P}_{\pi_\gamma^*})^{-1} \right\|_{\infty \rightarrow \infty} \|\widetilde{r} - r\|_\infty \\ &\leq \frac{\xi}{1 - \gamma} = \frac{\varepsilon}{6}, \end{aligned}$$

we can obtain equation (2) by triangle inequality (although we will choose the constant  $c_1$  below).

Next we establish equation (3). Using Li et al. [2020, Lemma 6], with probability at least  $1 - \delta$  we have that

$$\left| \widehat{Q}_{\gamma, \mathbf{p}}^*(s, \widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{p}}^*(s)) - \widehat{Q}_{\gamma, \mathbf{p}}^*(s, a) \right| > \frac{\xi \delta (1 - \gamma)}{3SA^2} = \frac{\varepsilon \delta (1 - \gamma)^2}{18SA^2} \quad (5)$$

uniformly over all  $s$  and all  $a \neq \widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{p}}^*(s)$ . From this separation condition (5), the assumptions of Li et al. [2020, Lemma 5] hold (with  $\omega = \frac{\varepsilon \delta (1 - \gamma)^2}{18SA^2}$  in their notation) for the MDP with the perturbed reward  $\widetilde{r}$ . The proof of Li et al. [2020, Lemma 5] shows that under the event (5) holds, the conditions for Li et al. [2020, Lemma 2] are satisfied (with, in their notation,  $\beta_1 = 2 \log \left( \frac{32}{(1 - \gamma)^2 \omega \delta} SA \log \frac{e}{1 - \gamma} \right) = 2 \log \left( \frac{576S^2 A^3}{(1 - \gamma)^4 \delta^2 \varepsilon} \log \frac{e}{1 - \gamma} \right)$ ) with additional failure probability  $\leq \delta$ . The proof of Li et al. [2020, Lemma 2] then shows that, assuming  $n > \frac{16e^2}{1 - \gamma} 2 \log \left( \frac{576S^2 A^3}{(1 - \gamma)^4 \delta^2 \varepsilon} \log \frac{e}{1 - \gamma} \right)$ , we have

$$\left\| \widehat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbf{p}}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{p}}^*} - V_{\gamma, \mathbf{p}}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{p}}^*} \right\|_\infty \leq 4\gamma \sqrt{\frac{\beta_1}{n}} \left\| (I - \gamma P_{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{p}}^*})^{-1} \sqrt{\mathbb{V}_{P_{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{p}}^*}} [V_{\gamma, \mathbf{p}}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{p}}^*}]} \right\|_\infty + \frac{\gamma \beta_1}{(1 - \gamma)n} \left\| V_{\gamma, \mathbf{p}}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{p}}^*} \right\|_\infty \quad (6)$$

where we abbreviated  $\beta_1 = 2 \log \left( \frac{576S^2 A^3}{(1 - \gamma)^4 \delta^2 \varepsilon} \log \frac{e}{1 - \gamma} \right)$  for notational convenience.

We can again calculate that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| V_{\gamma, \mathbf{p}}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{p}}^*} - V_\gamma^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{p}}^*} \right\|_\infty &= \left\| (I - \gamma P_{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{p}}^*})^{-1} \widetilde{r}_{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{p}}^*} - (I - \gamma P_{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{p}}^*})^{-1} r_{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{p}}^*} \right\|_\infty \\ &\leq \left\| (I - \gamma P_{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{p}}^*})^{-1} \right\|_{\infty \rightarrow \infty} \|\widetilde{r} - r\|_\infty \\ &\leq \frac{\xi}{1 - \gamma} = \frac{\varepsilon}{6}, \end{aligned}$$

so  $\left\| \widehat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbf{p}}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{p}}^*} - V_\gamma^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{p}}^*} \right\|_\infty \leq \left\| \widehat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbf{p}}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{p}}^*} - V_{\gamma, \mathbf{p}}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{p}}^*} \right\|_\infty + \frac{\varepsilon}{6}$  by triangle inequality, essentially giving (3).

Finally, to choose the constants  $c_1$  and  $c_2$ , we first note that  $2 \log \left( \frac{4S \log \frac{e}{1 - \gamma}}{\delta} \right) \leq \beta_1 < c'_1 \log \left( \frac{SA}{(1 - \gamma)\delta\varepsilon} \right)$  for some absolute constant  $c'_1$ , and therefore also all our requirements on  $n$  are fulfilled when  $n \geq \frac{16e^2}{1 - \gamma} c'_1 \log \left( \frac{SA}{(1 - \gamma)\delta\varepsilon} \right) = \frac{c'_2}{1 - \gamma} \log \left( \frac{SA}{(1 - \gamma)\delta\varepsilon} \right)$  for another absolute constant  $c'_2$ . Lastly we note that by the union bound the total failure probability is at most  $3\delta$ , so to obtain a failure probability of  $\delta'$  we may set  $\delta = \delta'/3$  and absorb the additional constant when defining  $c_1, c_2$  in terms of  $c'_1, c'_2$ , and we also then increase  $c_1$  by a factor of 4 to absorb the factor of 4 appearing in the first terms within (4) and (6).  $\square$

Now we can analyze the variance parameters

$$\left\| (I - \gamma P_{\pi_\gamma^*})^{-1} \sqrt{\mathbb{V}_{P_{\pi_\gamma^*}} [V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}]} \right\|_\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| (I - \gamma P_{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{p}}^*})^{-1} \sqrt{\mathbb{V}_{P_{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{p}}^*}} [V_{\gamma, \mathbf{p}}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{p}}^*}]} \right\|_\infty,$$

which appear in the error bounds in Lemma 9. We begin by reproducing the following inequality from Wei et al. [2020, Lemma 2].

**Lemma 10.** *In a weakly communicating MDP, for all  $\gamma \in [0, 1)$ , it holds that*

$$\sup_s \left| V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}(s) - \frac{1}{1 - \gamma} \rho^* \right| \leq H.$$

The following relates the variance parameter of interest to another parameter, the variance of the total discounted rewards. This result essentially appears in [Agarwal et al. \[2020, Lemma 4\]](#) (which was in turn inspired by [Gheshlaghi Azar et al. \[2013, Lemma 8\]](#)), but since their result pertains to objects slightly different than  $P_\pi$  and  $\mathbb{V}_{P_\pi} [V_\gamma^\pi]$ , we provide the full argument for completeness.

**Lemma 11.** *For any deterministic stationary policy  $\pi$ , we have*

$$\gamma \left\| (I - \gamma P_\pi)^{-1} \sqrt{\mathbb{V}_{P_\pi} [V_\gamma^\pi]} \right\|_\infty \leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{1-\gamma}} \sqrt{\left\| \mathbb{V}^\pi \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_t \right] \right\|_\infty}.$$

*Proof.* First we note the well-known variance Bellman equation (see for instance [Sobel \[1982, Theorem 1\]](#)):

$$\mathbb{V}^\pi \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_t \right] = \gamma^2 \mathbb{V}_{P_\pi} [V_\gamma^\pi] + \gamma^2 P_\pi \mathbb{V}^\pi \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_t \right]. \quad (7)$$

Now we can basically identically follow the argument of [Agarwal et al. \[2020, Lemma 4\]](#). The matrix  $(1-\gamma)(I-\gamma P_\pi)^{-1}$  has rows which are each probability distributions (are non-negative and sum to 1). Therefore, by Jensen's inequality and the concavity of the function  $x \mapsto \sqrt{x}$ , for each row  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  we have

$$\left| (1-\gamma) e_s^\top (I-\gamma P_\pi)^{-1} \sqrt{\mathbb{V}_{P_\pi} [V_\gamma^\pi]} \right| \leq \sqrt{|(1-\gamma) e_s^\top (I-\gamma P_\pi)^{-1} \mathbb{V}_{P_\pi} [V_\gamma^\pi]|}.$$

Using this fact we can calculate that, abbreviating  $v = \mathbb{V}_{P_\pi} [V_\gamma^\pi]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma \left\| (I - \gamma P_\pi)^{-1} \sqrt{v} \right\|_\infty &= \gamma \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \left\| (1-\gamma)(I-\gamma P_\pi)^{-1} \sqrt{v} \right\|_\infty \\ &\leq \gamma \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sqrt{\left\| (1-\gamma)(I-\gamma P_\pi)^{-1} v \right\|_\infty} \\ &= \gamma \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\gamma}} \sqrt{\left\| (I-\gamma P_\pi)^{-1} v \right\|_\infty}. \end{aligned}$$

In order to relate  $\left\| (I-\gamma P_\pi)^{-1} v \right\|_\infty$  to  $\left\| (I-\gamma^2 P_\pi)^{-1} v \right\|_\infty$  in order to apply the variance Bellman equation (7), we calculate

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| (I - \gamma P_\pi)^{-1} v \right\|_\infty &= \left\| (I - \gamma P_\pi)^{-1} (I - \gamma^2 P_\pi) (I - \gamma^2 P_\pi)^{-1} v \right\|_\infty \\ &= \left\| (I - \gamma P_\pi)^{-1} ((1-\gamma)I + \gamma(I - \gamma P_\pi)) (I - \gamma^2 P_\pi)^{-1} v \right\|_\infty \\ &= \left\| ((1-\gamma)(I - \gamma P_\pi)^{-1} + \gamma I) (I - \gamma^2 P_\pi)^{-1} v \right\|_\infty \\ &\leq \left\| (1-\gamma)(I - \gamma P_\pi)^{-1} (I - \gamma^2 P_\pi)^{-1} v \right\|_\infty + \gamma \left\| (I - \gamma^2 P_\pi)^{-1} v \right\|_\infty \\ &\leq (1-\gamma) \left\| (I - \gamma P_\pi)^{-1} \right\|_{\infty \rightarrow \infty} \left\| (I - \gamma^2 P_\pi)^{-1} v \right\|_\infty + \gamma \left\| (I - \gamma^2 P_\pi)^{-1} v \right\|_\infty \\ &\leq (1+\gamma) \left\| (I - \gamma^2 P_\pi)^{-1} v \right\|_\infty \\ &\leq 2 \left\| (I - \gamma^2 P_\pi)^{-1} v \right\|_\infty \end{aligned}$$

Combining these calculations with the variance Bellman equation (7), we conclude that

$$\gamma \left\| (I - \gamma P_\pi)^{-1} \sqrt{v} \right\|_\infty \leq \gamma \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\gamma}} \sqrt{2 \left\| (I - \gamma^2 P_\pi)^{-1} v \right\|_\infty} \leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{1-\gamma}} \sqrt{\left\| \mathbb{V}^\pi \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_t \right] \right\|_\infty}$$

as desired.  $\square$

The following is a multi-step version of the variance Bellman equation, which we will later apply with  $T = \mathbf{H}$  but holds for arbitrary  $T$ .

**Lemma 12.** For any integer  $T \geq 1$ , for any deterministic stationary policy  $\pi$ , we have

$$\mathbb{V}^\pi \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_t \right] = \mathbb{V}^\pi \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \gamma^t R_t + \gamma^T V_\gamma^\pi(S_T) \right] + \gamma^{2T} P_\pi^T \mathbb{V}^\pi \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_t \right]$$

and consequently

$$\left\| \mathbb{V}^\pi \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_t \right] \right\|_\infty \leq \frac{\left\| \mathbb{V}^\pi \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \gamma^t R_t + \gamma^T V_\gamma^\pi(S_T) \right] \right\|_\infty}{1 - \gamma^{2T}}.$$

*Proof.* Fix a state  $s_0 \in \mathcal{S}$ . Letting  $\mathcal{F}_T$  be the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $(S_1, \dots, S_T)$ , we calculate that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}_{s_0}^\pi \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_t \right] &= \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^\pi \left( \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_t - V_\gamma^\pi(s_0) \right)^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^\pi \left( \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \gamma^t R_t + \gamma^T V_\gamma^\pi(S_T) - V_\gamma^\pi(s_0) + \sum_{t=T}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_t - \gamma^T V_\gamma^\pi(S_T) \right)^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^\pi \left[ \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^\pi \left[ \underbrace{\left( \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \gamma^t R_t + \gamma^T V_\gamma^\pi(S_T) - V_\gamma^\pi(s_0) \right)}_A + \underbrace{\left( \sum_{t=T}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_t - \gamma^T V_\gamma^\pi(S_T) \right)}_B \right]^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_T \right] \end{aligned}$$

Using the above shorthands and opening the square, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}_{s_0}^\pi \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_t \right] &= \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^\pi \left[ \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^\pi [A^2 + B^2 + 2AB | \mathcal{F}_T] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^\pi [A^2 + \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^\pi [B^2 | \mathcal{F}_T] + 2A \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^\pi [B | \mathcal{F}_T]] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^\pi [A^2 + \mathbb{E}_{S_T}^\pi [B^2]] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^\pi \left[ \left( \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \gamma^t R_t + \gamma^T V_\gamma^\pi(S_T) - V_\gamma^\pi(s_0) \right)^2 + \mathbb{E}_{S_T}^\pi \left[ \left( \sum_{t=T}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_t - \gamma^T V_\gamma^\pi(S_T) \right)^2 \right] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^\pi \left[ \left( \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \gamma^t R_t + \gamma^T V_\gamma^\pi(S_T) - V_\gamma^\pi(s_0) \right)^2 + \gamma^{2T} \mathbb{E}_{S_T}^\pi \left[ \left( \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_t - V_\gamma^\pi(S_T) \right)^2 \right] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{V}_{s_0}^\pi \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \gamma^t R_t + \gamma^T V_\gamma^\pi(S_T) \right] + \gamma^{2T} e_{s_0}^\top P_\pi^T \mathbb{V}^\pi \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_t \right], \end{aligned}$$

where we used the tower property, the Markov property, and the fact that  $\mathbb{E}_{s_0}^\pi [B | \mathcal{F}_T] = 0$  (which is immediate from the definition of  $V_\gamma^\pi$ ). Since  $e_{s_0}^\top P_\pi^T$  is a probability distribution, it follows from Holder's inequality that  $|e_{s_0}^\top P_\pi^T \mathbb{V}^\pi [\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_t]| \leq \|\mathbb{V}^\pi [\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_t]\|_\infty$ . Therefore, it holds that

$$\left\| \mathbb{V}_{s_0}^\pi \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_t \right] \right\|_\infty \leq \left\| \mathbb{V}^\pi \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \gamma^t R_t + \gamma^T V_\gamma^\pi(S_T) \right] \right\|_\infty + \gamma^{2T} \left\| \mathbb{V}_{s_0}^\pi \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_t \right] \right\|_\infty$$

and we can obtain the desired conclusion after rearranging terms.  $\square$

We also need the following elementary inequality.

**Lemma 13.** If  $\gamma \geq 1 - \frac{1}{T}$  for some integer  $T \geq 1$ , then

$$\frac{1 - \gamma^{2T}}{1 - \gamma} \geq \left( 1 - \frac{1}{e^2} \right) T \geq \frac{4}{5} T.$$



*Proof.* Fixing  $T \geq 1$ , we have

$$\frac{1 - \gamma^{2T}}{1 - \gamma} = 1 + \gamma + \gamma^2 + \dots + \gamma^{2T-1}$$

which is increasing in  $\gamma$ , so  $\inf_{\gamma \geq 1 - \frac{1}{T}} \frac{1 - \gamma^{2T}}{1 - \gamma}$  is attained at  $\gamma = 1 - \frac{1}{T}$ . Now allowing  $T \geq 1$  to be arbitrary, note  $\frac{1 - (1 - \frac{1}{T})^{2T}}{1 - (1 - \frac{1}{T})} = T \left(1 - (1 - \frac{1}{T})^{2T}\right)$  so it suffices to show that  $1 - (1 - \frac{1}{T})^{2T} \geq 1 - e^2$  for all  $T \geq 1$ . By computing the derivative, one finds that  $1 - (1 - \frac{1}{T})^{2T}$  is monotonically decreasing, so

$$1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{T}\right)^{2T} \geq \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} 1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{T}\right)^{2T} = 1 - \frac{1}{e^2}.$$

□

We can now provide a bound on the variance of the total discounted rewards under  $\pi_\gamma^*$ .

**Lemma 14.** *Letting  $\pi_\gamma^*$  be the optimal policy for the weakly communicating discounted MDP  $(P, r, \gamma)$ , if  $\gamma \geq 1 - \frac{1}{H}$ , we have*

$$\left\| \mathbb{V}^{\pi_\gamma^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_t \right] \right\|_{\infty} \leq 5 \frac{H}{1 - \gamma}.$$

*Proof.* By using the multi-step variance Bellman equation in Lemma 12, it suffices to bound the quantity  $\left\| \mathbb{V}^{\pi_\gamma^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{H-1} \gamma^t R_t + \gamma^H V_{\gamma}^{\pi_\gamma^*}(S_H) \right] \right\|_{\infty}$ .

Fixing a state  $s_0 \in \mathcal{S}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}_{s_0}^{\pi_\gamma^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{H-1} \gamma^t R_t + \gamma^H V_{\gamma}^{\pi_\gamma^*}(S_H) \right] &= \mathbb{V}_{s_0}^{\pi_\gamma^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{H-1} \gamma^t R_t + \gamma^H \left( V_{\gamma}^{\pi_\gamma^*}(S_H) - \frac{1}{1 - \gamma} \rho^* \right) \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\pi_\gamma^*} \left| \sum_{t=0}^{H-1} \gamma^t R_t + \gamma^H \left( V_{\gamma}^{\pi_\gamma^*}(S_H) - \frac{1}{1 - \gamma} \rho^* \right) \right|^2 \\ &\leq 2 \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\pi_\gamma^*} \left| \sum_{t=0}^{H-1} \gamma^t R_t \right|^2 + 2 \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\pi_\gamma^*} \left| \gamma^H \left( V_{\gamma}^{\pi_\gamma^*}(S_H) - \frac{1}{1 - \gamma} \rho^* \right) \right|^2 \\ &\leq 2H^2 + 2 \sup_s \left( V_{\gamma}^{\pi_\gamma^*}(s) - \frac{1}{1 - \gamma} \rho^* \right)^2 \\ &\leq 4H^2 \end{aligned}$$

where in the final inequality we used Lemma 10. Taking the maximum over all states  $s$  and combining with Lemma 12 we obtain

$$\left\| \mathbb{V}^{\pi_\gamma^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_t \right] \right\|_{\infty} \leq \frac{4H^2}{1 - \gamma^{2H}}.$$

Combining this bound with the elementary inequality in Lemma 13, which can be rearranged to show that  $\frac{1}{1 - \gamma^{2H}} \leq \frac{5}{4} \frac{1}{(1 - \gamma)H}$ , we complete the proof. □

We also need to control the variance under  $\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, p}^*$ , which requires additional steps. This is done in the following lemma.

**Lemma 15.** *We have*

$$\left\| \mathbb{V}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, p}^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \tilde{R}_t \right] \right\|_{\infty} \leq 15 \frac{H^2 + \left\| V_{\gamma}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, p}^*} - \hat{V}_{\gamma, p}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, p}^*} \right\|_{\infty}^2 + \left\| V_{\gamma}^{\pi_\gamma^*} - \hat{V}_{\gamma, p}^{\pi_\gamma^*} \right\|_{\infty}^2}{H(1 - \gamma)}.$$

*Proof.* In light of the multi-step variance Bellman equation in Lemma 12, it suffices to give a bound on  $\left\| \mathbb{V}_{s_0}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, P}^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{H-1} \gamma^t \tilde{R}_t + \gamma^H V_{\gamma, P}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, P}^*}(S_H) \right] \right\|_{\infty}$ . We have for any state  $s_0$  that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{V}_{s_0}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, P}^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{H-1} \gamma^t \tilde{R}_t + \gamma^H V_{\gamma, P}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, P}^*}(S_H) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{V}_{s_0}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, P}^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{H-1} \gamma^t \tilde{R}_t + \gamma^H V_{\gamma, P}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, P}^*}(S_H) - \gamma^H \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \rho^* \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, P}^*} \left( \sum_{t=0}^{H-1} \gamma^t \tilde{R}_t + \gamma^H V_{\gamma, P}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, P}^*}(S_H) - \gamma^H \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \rho^* \right)^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, P}^*} \left( \sum_{t=0}^{H-1} \gamma^t \tilde{R}_t + \gamma^H \left( V_{\gamma, P}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, P}^*}(S_H) - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*}(S_H) \right) + \gamma^H \left( V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*}(S_H) - \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \rho^* \right) \right)^2 \\
&\leq 3 \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, P}^*} \left( \sum_{t=0}^{H-1} \gamma^t \tilde{R}_t \right)^2 + 3 \gamma^{2H} \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, P}^*} \left( V_{\gamma, P}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, P}^*}(S_H) - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*}(S_H) \right)^2 \\
&\quad + 3 \gamma^{2H} \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, P}^*} \left( V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*}(S_H) - \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \rho^* \right)^2 \\
&\leq 3 \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, P}^*} \left( \sum_{t=0}^{H-1} \gamma^t \tilde{R}_t \right)^2 + 6 \gamma^{2H} \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, P}^*} \left( V_{\gamma, P}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, P}^*}(S_H) - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*}(S_H) \right)^2 + 6 \gamma^{2H} \left\| V_{\gamma, P}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, P}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right\|_{\infty}^2 \\
&\quad + 3 \gamma^{2H} \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, P}^*} \left( V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*}(S_H) - \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \rho^* \right)^2, \tag{8}
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used triangle inequality and the inequalities  $(a+b)^2 \leq 2a^2+2b^2$  and  $(a+b+c)^2 \leq 3a^2+3b^2+3c^2$ . Now we bound each term of (8). First, we have

$$3 \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, P}^*} \left( \sum_{t=0}^{H-1} \gamma^t \tilde{R}_t \right)^2 \leq 3(H \|\tilde{r}\|_{\infty})^2 \leq 3H^2(\|r\|_{\infty} + \xi)^2 \leq 6H^2 \left( 1 + \left( \frac{(1-\gamma)\varepsilon}{6} \right)^2 \right) \leq 6H^2 \left( \frac{7}{6} \right)^2,$$

where we had  $\frac{(1-\gamma)\varepsilon}{6} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{6H} \leq \frac{1}{6}$  because  $\frac{1}{1-\gamma} \geq H$  and  $\varepsilon \leq H$ . Clearly it holds that

$$6 \gamma^{2H} \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, P}^*} \left( V_{\gamma, P}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, P}^*}(S_H) - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*}(S_H) \right)^2 \leq 6 \left\| V_{\gamma, P}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, P}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right\|_{\infty}^2.$$

By an argument identical to those used in the proof of the error bounds in Lemma 9, we get

$$\left\| V_{\gamma, P}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, P}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right\|_{\infty} \leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \xi = \frac{\varepsilon}{6},$$

so  $6 \gamma^{2H} \left\| V_{\gamma, P}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, P}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right\|_{\infty}^2 \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{6} \leq \frac{H^2}{6}$  since  $\varepsilon \leq H$ . Finally, using Lemma 10, we obtain

$$3 \gamma^{2H} \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, P}^*} \left( V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*}(S_H) - \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \rho^* \right)^2 \leq 3 \sup_s \left| V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*}(S_H) - \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \rho^* \right|^2 \leq 3H^2.$$

Using all these bounds in (8), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{V}_{s_0}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,P}^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{H-1} \gamma^t \widetilde{R}_t + \gamma^H V_{\gamma,P}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,P}^*}(S_H) \right] \\
& \leq 3 \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,P}^*} \left( \sum_{t=0}^{H-1} \gamma^t \widetilde{R}_t \right)^2 + 6\gamma^{2H} \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,P}^*} \left( V_{\gamma}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,P}^*}(S_H) - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*}(S_H) \right)^2 + 6\gamma^{2H} \left\| V_{\gamma,P}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,P}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,P}^*} \right\|_{\infty}^2 \\
& \quad + 3\gamma^{2H} \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,P}^*} \left( V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*}(S_H) - \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \rho^* \right)^2 \\
& \leq \left( \frac{49}{6} + \frac{1}{6} + 3 \right) H^2 + 6 \left\| V_{\gamma}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,P}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right\|_{\infty}^2 \\
& \leq 12H^2 + 6 \left\| V_{\gamma}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,P}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right\|_{\infty}^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Finally, we use the elementwise inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} & \geq V_{\gamma}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,P}^*} \\
& \geq \widehat{V}_{\gamma,P}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,P}^*} - \left\| \widehat{V}_{\gamma,P}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,P}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,P}^*} \right\|_{\infty} \mathbf{1} \\
& \geq \widehat{V}_{\gamma,P}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} - \left\| \widehat{V}_{\gamma,P}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,P}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,P}^*} \right\|_{\infty} \mathbf{1} \\
& \geq V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} - \left\| \widehat{V}_{\gamma,P}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,P}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,P}^*} \right\|_{\infty} \mathbf{1} - \left\| \widehat{V}_{\gamma,P}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right\|_{\infty} \mathbf{1},
\end{aligned}$$

from which it follows that  $\left\| V_{\gamma}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,P}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right\|_{\infty} \leq \left\| \widehat{V}_{\gamma,P}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,P}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,P}^*} \right\|_{\infty} + \left\| \widehat{V}_{\gamma,P}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right\|_{\infty}$ . Combining this with (9), we conclude

$$\mathbb{V}_{s_0}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,P}^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{H-1} \gamma^t \widetilde{R}_t + \gamma^H V_{\gamma,P}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,P}^*}(S_H) \right] \leq 12H^2 + 12 \left\| \widehat{V}_{\gamma,P}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,P}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,P}^*} \right\|_{\infty}^2 + 12 \left\| \widehat{V}_{\gamma,P}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right\|_{\infty}^2. \tag{10}$$

Now combining with Lemma 12 and then using Lemma 13, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \mathbb{V}_{\gamma,P}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,P}^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \widetilde{R}_t \right] \right\|_{\infty} & \leq \frac{\left\| \mathbb{V}_{\gamma,P}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,P}^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{H-1} \gamma^t \widetilde{R}_t + \gamma^H V_{\gamma,P}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,P}^*}(S_H) \right] \right\|_{\infty}}{1 - \gamma^{2H}} \\
& \leq 12 \frac{H^2 + \left\| V_{\gamma}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,P}^*} - \widehat{V}_{\gamma,P}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,P}^*} \right\|_{\infty}^2 + \left\| V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} - \widehat{V}_{\gamma,P}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right\|_{\infty}^2}{1 - \gamma^{2H}} \\
& \leq 12 \frac{5}{4} \frac{H^2 + \left\| V_{\gamma}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,P}^*} - \widehat{V}_{\gamma,P}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,P}^*} \right\|_{\infty}^2 + \left\| V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} - \widehat{V}_{\gamma,P}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right\|_{\infty}^2}{H(1 - \gamma)} \\
& = 15 \frac{H^2 + \left\| V_{\gamma}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,P}^*} - \widehat{V}_{\gamma,P}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,P}^*} \right\|_{\infty}^2 + \left\| V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} - \widehat{V}_{\gamma,P}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right\|_{\infty}^2}{H(1 - \gamma)}
\end{aligned}$$

as desired.  $\square$

## A.2 Proofs of Theorem 1 and 2

With the above lemmas we can complete the proof of Theorem 1 on discounted MDPs.

*Proof of Theorem 1.* Our approach will be to utilize our variance bounds within the error bounds from Lemma 9. We will find a value for  $n$  which guarantees that  $\left\| \widehat{V}_{\gamma,P}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right\|_{\infty}$  and  $\left\| \widehat{V}_{\gamma,P}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,P}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,P}^*} \right\|_{\infty}$  are both  $\leq \varepsilon/2$ , which guarantees that  $\left\| V_{\gamma}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,P}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right\|_{\infty} \leq \varepsilon$ .

First we note that the conclusions of Lemma 9 require  $n \geq \frac{c_2}{1-\gamma} \log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)$  so we assume  $n$  is large enough that this holds.

Now we bound  $\left\|\widehat{V}_{\gamma,\mathbb{P}}^{\pi_\gamma^*} - V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}\right\|_\infty$ . Starting with inequality (2) from Lemma 9 and then applying our variance bounds through Lemma 11 and then Lemma 14, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\|\widehat{V}_{\gamma,\mathbb{P}}^{\pi_\gamma^*} - V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}\right\|_\infty \\
& \leq \gamma \sqrt{\frac{c_1 \log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{n}} \left\|(I - \gamma P_{\pi_\gamma^*})^{-1} \sqrt{\mathbb{V}_{P_{\pi_\gamma^*}}[V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}]}\right\|_\infty + c_1 \gamma \frac{\log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{(1-\gamma)n} \left\|V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}\right\|_\infty + \frac{\varepsilon}{6} \\
& \leq \sqrt{\frac{c_1 \log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{n}} \sqrt{\frac{2}{1-\gamma}} \sqrt{\left\|\mathbb{V}^{\pi_\gamma^*} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_t\right]\right\|_\infty} + c_1 \gamma \frac{\log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{(1-\gamma)n} \left\|V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}\right\|_\infty + \frac{\varepsilon}{6} \\
& \leq \sqrt{\frac{c_1 \log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{n}} \sqrt{\frac{2}{1-\gamma}} \sqrt{5 \frac{H}{1-\gamma}} + c_1 \gamma \frac{\log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{(1-\gamma)n} \left\|V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}\right\|_\infty + \frac{\varepsilon}{6} \\
& \leq \sqrt{\frac{c_1 \log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{n}} \sqrt{10 \frac{H}{(1-\gamma)^2}} + c_1 \frac{\log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{(1-\gamma)^2 n} + \frac{\varepsilon}{6}
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we used the facts that  $\left\|V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}\right\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma}$  and  $\gamma \leq 1$ . Now if we assume  $n \geq 360c_1 \frac{H}{(1-\gamma)^2 \varepsilon^2} \log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|\widehat{V}_{\gamma,\mathbb{P}}^{\pi_\gamma^*} - V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}\right\|_\infty & \leq \sqrt{\frac{c_1 \log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{n}} \sqrt{10 \frac{H}{(1-\gamma)^2}} + c_1 \frac{\log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{(1-\gamma)^2 n} + \frac{\varepsilon}{6} \\
& \leq \frac{1}{6} \sqrt{\varepsilon^2} + \frac{1}{6} \frac{\varepsilon^2}{H} + \frac{\varepsilon}{6} \\
& \leq \varepsilon/2
\end{aligned}$$

due to the fact that  $\varepsilon \leq H$ .

Next, to bound  $\left\|\widehat{V}_{\gamma,\mathbb{P}}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,\mathbb{P}}^*} - V_\gamma^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,\mathbb{P}}^*}\right\|_\infty$ , starting from inequality (3) in Lemma 9 and then analogously applying Lemma 11 and then Lemma 15, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\|\widehat{V}_{\gamma,\mathbb{P}}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,\mathbb{P}}^*} - V_\gamma^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,\mathbb{P}}^*}\right\|_\infty \\
& \leq \gamma \sqrt{\frac{c_1 \log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{n}} \left\|(I - \gamma P_{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,\mathbb{P}}^*})^{-1} \sqrt{\mathbb{V}_{P_{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,\mathbb{P}}^*}}[V_\gamma^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,\mathbb{P}}^*}]}\right\|_\infty + c_1 \gamma \frac{\log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{(1-\gamma)n} \left\|V_\gamma^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,\mathbb{P}}^*}\right\|_\infty + \frac{\varepsilon}{6} \\
& \leq \sqrt{\frac{c_1 \log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{n}} \sqrt{\frac{2}{1-\gamma}} \sqrt{\left\|\mathbb{V}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,\mathbb{P}}^*} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \widetilde{R}_t\right]\right\|_\infty} + c_1 \gamma \frac{\log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{(1-\gamma)n} \left\|V_\gamma^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,\mathbb{P}}^*}\right\|_\infty + \frac{\varepsilon}{6} \\
& \leq \sqrt{\frac{c_1 \log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{n}} \sqrt{\frac{2}{1-\gamma}} \sqrt{\frac{H^2 + \left\|V_\gamma^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,\mathbb{P}}^*} - \widehat{V}_{\gamma,\mathbb{P}}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,\mathbb{P}}^*}\right\|_\infty^2 + \left\|V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*} - \widehat{V}_{\gamma,\mathbb{P}}^{\pi_\gamma^*}\right\|_\infty^2}{H(1-\gamma)}} \\
& \quad + c_1 \gamma \frac{\log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{(1-\gamma)n} \left\|V_\gamma^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma,\mathbb{P}}^*}\right\|_\infty + \frac{\varepsilon}{6}.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining with the fact from above that  $\|\widehat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^{\pi^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\pi^*}\|_{\infty} \leq \frac{\mathbb{H}}{2}$ , as well as the facts that  $\|V_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^{\widehat{\pi}^*}\|_{\infty} \leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma}$ ,  $\gamma \leq 1$ , and  $\sqrt{a+b} \leq \sqrt{a} + \sqrt{b}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\widehat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^{\widehat{\pi}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\widehat{\pi}^*}\|_{\infty} &\leq \sqrt{\frac{c_1 \log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{n}} \sqrt{\frac{2}{1-\gamma}} \sqrt{15 \frac{\frac{5}{4}\mathbb{H}^2 + \|V_{\gamma}^{\widehat{\pi}^*} - \widehat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^{\widehat{\pi}^*}\|_{\infty}^2}{\mathbb{H}(1-\gamma)}} \\
&\quad + c_1 \frac{\log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{(1-\gamma)^2 n} + \frac{\varepsilon}{6} \\
&\leq \sqrt{\frac{c_1 \log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{n}} \sqrt{\frac{30}{\mathbb{H}(1-\gamma)^2}} \left( \sqrt{\frac{5}{4}\mathbb{H}^2} + \sqrt{\|V_{\gamma}^{\widehat{\pi}^*} - \widehat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^{\widehat{\pi}^*}\|_{\infty}^2} \right) \\
&\quad + c_1 \frac{\log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{(1-\gamma)^2 n} + \frac{\varepsilon}{6} \\
&= \sqrt{\frac{c_1 \log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{n}} \sqrt{\frac{30}{\mathbb{H}(1-\gamma)^2}} \left( \sqrt{\frac{5}{4}\mathbb{H}} + \|V_{\gamma}^{\widehat{\pi}^*} - \widehat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^{\widehat{\pi}^*}\|_{\infty} \right) \\
&\quad + c_1 \frac{\log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{(1-\gamma)^2 n} + \frac{\varepsilon}{6}.
\end{aligned}$$

Rearranging terms gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left( 1 - \sqrt{\frac{c_1 \log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{n}} \sqrt{\frac{30}{\mathbb{H}(1-\gamma)^2}} \right) \| \widehat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^{\widehat{\pi}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\widehat{\pi}^*} \|_{\infty} \\
&\leq \sqrt{\frac{c_1 \log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{n}} \sqrt{\frac{75\mathbb{H}/2}{(1-\gamma)^2}} + c_1 \frac{\log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{(1-\gamma)^2 n} + \frac{\varepsilon}{6}.
\end{aligned}$$

Assuming  $n \geq 120c_1 \frac{\mathbb{H}}{(1-\gamma)^2 \varepsilon^2} \log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)$ , we have

$$1 - \sqrt{\frac{c_1 \log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{n}} \sqrt{\frac{30}{\mathbb{H}(1-\gamma)^2}} \geq 1 - \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon^2(1-\gamma)^2}{\mathbb{H}} \frac{1}{\mathbb{H}(1-\gamma)^2}} = 1 - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\varepsilon}{\mathbb{H}} \geq \frac{1}{2}$$

since  $\varepsilon \leq \mathbb{H}$ . Also assuming  $n \geq (75/2) \cdot 24^2 c_1 \frac{\mathbb{H}}{(1-\gamma)^2 \varepsilon^2} \log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)$  we have similarly to before that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sqrt{\frac{c_1 \log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{n}} \sqrt{\frac{75\mathbb{H}/2}{(1-\gamma)^2}} + c_1 \frac{\log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{(1-\gamma)^2 n} + \frac{\varepsilon}{6} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{24} \sqrt{\frac{(1-\gamma)^2 \varepsilon^2}{\mathbb{H}} \frac{\mathbb{H}}{(1-\gamma)^2}} + \frac{1}{24} \frac{(1-\gamma)^2 \varepsilon^2}{\mathbb{H}} \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)^2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{6} \\
&\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{24} + \frac{\varepsilon}{24} + \frac{\varepsilon}{6} = \frac{\varepsilon}{4}.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining these two calculations, we have  $\frac{1}{2} \| \widehat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^{\widehat{\pi}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\widehat{\pi}^*} \|_{\infty} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4}$ , so  $\| \widehat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^{\widehat{\pi}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\widehat{\pi}^*} \|_{\infty} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$  as desired.

Since we have established that  $\| \widehat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^{\pi^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\pi^*} \|_{\infty} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ ,  $\| \widehat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^{\widehat{\pi}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\widehat{\pi}^*} \|_{\infty} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ , since also  $\widehat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^{\widehat{\pi}^*} \geq \widehat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^{\pi^*}$ , we can conclude that

$$V_{\gamma}^{\pi^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\widehat{\pi}^*} \leq \| \widehat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^{\pi^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\pi^*} \|_{\infty} \mathbf{1} + \| \widehat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^{\widehat{\pi}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\widehat{\pi}^*} \|_{\infty} \mathbf{1} \leq \varepsilon \mathbf{1},$$

that is that  $\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, p}^*$  is  $\varepsilon$ -optimal for the discounted MDP  $(P, r, \gamma)$ .

We finally note that all our requirements on the size of  $n$  can be satisfied by requiring

$$\begin{aligned} n &\geq C_2 \frac{H}{(1-\gamma)^2 \varepsilon^2} \log \left( \frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon} \right) \\ &:= \max \left\{ \frac{c_2 H}{(1-\gamma)^2 \varepsilon^2}, \frac{360c_1 H}{(1-\gamma)^2 \varepsilon^2}, \frac{(75/2)24^2 c_1 H}{(1-\gamma)^2 \varepsilon^2} \right\} \log \left( \frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon} \right) \\ &\geq \max \left\{ \frac{c_2}{1-\gamma}, \frac{360c_1 H}{(1-\gamma)^2 \varepsilon^2}, \frac{(75/2)24^2 c_1 H}{(1-\gamma)^2 \varepsilon^2} \right\} \log \left( \frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where we used that  $\frac{H}{(1-\gamma)^2 \varepsilon^2} \geq \frac{H^2}{(1-\gamma)\varepsilon^2} \geq \frac{1}{1-\gamma}$  (since  $\frac{1}{1-\gamma} \geq H$  and  $H \geq \varepsilon$ ).  $\square$

We next use Theorem 1 to prove Theorem 2 on average-reward MDPs.

*Proof of Theorem 2.* Using Theorem 1 with target accuracy  $H$  and discount factor  $\bar{\gamma} = 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{12H}$ , we obtain a  $H$ -optimal policy for the discounted MDP  $(P, r, \bar{\gamma})$  with probability at least  $1 - \delta$  as long as

$$\begin{aligned} n &\geq C_2 \frac{H}{(1-\bar{\gamma})^2 H^2} \log \left( \frac{SA}{(1-\bar{\gamma})\delta\varepsilon} \right) \\ &= 12^2 C_2 \frac{H}{H^2} \frac{H^2}{\varepsilon^2} \log \left( \frac{12H SA}{\varepsilon \delta\varepsilon} \right) \end{aligned}$$

which is satisfied when  $n \geq C_1 \frac{H}{\varepsilon^2} \log \left( \frac{SAH}{\delta\varepsilon} \right)$  for sufficiently large  $C_1$ .

Applying Lemma 8 (with error parameter  $\frac{\varepsilon}{12}$  since we have chosen  $\bar{\gamma} = 1 - \frac{\varepsilon/12}{H}$ ), we have that

$$\rho^* - \rho^{\hat{\pi}^*} \leq \left( 8 + 3 \frac{H}{H} \right) \frac{\varepsilon}{12} \leq \varepsilon 1$$

as desired.  $\square$

## B Proofs for General MDPs

In this section, we provide the proofs for our main results in Section 3.2 for general MDPs. Again, we can assume that  $H + B$  is an integer, which only affects the sample complexity by a constant multiple  $< 2$ .

First we develop more notation which will be useful in the setting of general MDPs. Recall we defined, for any policy  $\pi$ , that  $\mathcal{R}^\pi$  is the set of states which are recurrent in the Markov chain  $P_\pi$ , and  $\mathcal{T}^\pi = \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{R}^\pi$  is the set of transient states. We now present a standard decomposition of Markov chains [Puterman, 2014, Appendix A]. For any policy  $\pi$ , possibly after reordering states so that the recurrent states appear first (and are grouped into disjoint irreducible closed sets), we can decompose

$$P_\pi = \begin{bmatrix} X_\pi & 0 \\ Y_\pi & Z_\pi \end{bmatrix} \quad (11)$$

such that  $X_\pi$  are probabilities of transitions between states which are recurrent under  $\pi$ ,  $Y_\pi$  are probabilities of transitions from  $\mathcal{T}^\pi$  into  $\mathcal{R}^\pi$ , and  $Z_\pi$  are probabilities of transitions between states within  $\mathcal{T}^\pi$ . Furthermore, supposing there are  $k$  irreducible closed blocks within  $\mathcal{R}^\pi$ ,  $X_\pi$  is block-diagonal of the form

$$X_\pi = \begin{bmatrix} X_{\pi,1} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & X_{\pi,2} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & X_{\pi,k} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The limiting matrix of the Markov chain induced by policy  $\pi$  is defined as the matrix

$$P_\pi^\infty = \text{C-lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P_\pi^T = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} P_\pi^t.$$

$P_\pi^\infty$  is a stochastic matrix (all rows positive and sum to 1) since  $\mathcal{S}$  is finite. We also have  $P_\pi P_\pi^\infty = P_\pi^\infty = P_\pi^\infty P_\pi$ . Additionally,  $\rho^\pi = P_\pi^\infty r_\pi$ . In terms of our decomposition, we have

$$P_\pi^\infty = \begin{bmatrix} X_\pi^\infty & 0 \\ Y_\pi^\infty & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (12)$$

where

$$X_\pi^\infty = \begin{bmatrix} X_{\pi,1}^\infty & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & X_{\pi,2}^\infty & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & X_{\pi,k}^\infty \end{bmatrix},$$

each  $X_{\pi,i}^\infty = \mathbf{1}x_{\pi,i}^\top$  for some stochastic row vector  $x_{\pi,i}^\top$ , and  $Y_\pi^\infty = (I - Z_\pi)^{-1}Y_\pi X_\pi^\infty$ . Also we have  $(I - Z_\pi)^{-1} = \sum_{t=0}^\infty Z_\pi^t$ , and  $\sum_{t=0}^\infty Z_\pi^t Y_\pi = (I - Z_\pi)^{-1}Y_\pi$  has stochastic rows (each row is a probability distribution, that is all entries are positive and sum to 1).

With the same arrangement of states as within the above decomposition of  $P_\pi$  (11), let

$$V_\gamma^\pi = \begin{bmatrix} \overline{V}_\gamma^\pi \\ \underline{V}_\gamma^\pi \end{bmatrix}$$

decompose  $V_\gamma^\pi$  into recurrent and transient states, and generally we use this same notation for any vector  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S}}$ : we let  $\overline{x}$  list the values of  $x_s$  for recurrent  $x \in \mathcal{R}^\pi$ ,  $\underline{x}$  contain  $x_s$  for  $s \in \mathcal{T}^\pi$ , and we assume the entire  $x$  has been rearranged so that  $x = [\overline{x} \ \underline{x}]^\top$ . Note that the rearrangement of states depends on the policy  $\pi$  so this notation has potential for confusion if applied to objects relating to multiple policies at once, but the policy determining the rearrangement will always be clear from context in our arguments.

The main reason we decompose  $P_\pi$  into recurrent and transient states is the following key observation.

**Lemma 16.** *For any policy  $\pi$ , if  $s, s'$  are in the same recurrent block of the Markov chain with transition matrix  $P_\pi$ , then  $\rho^*(s) = \rho^*(s')$ .*

*Proof.* Define the history-dependent policy  $\tilde{\pi}$  which follows  $\pi$  until its history first contains  $s'$ , after which point it follows  $\pi^*$ . Since  $\rho^*(s)$  is the optimal gain achievable starting at  $s$  by following any history-dependent policy [Puterman, 2014], we have  $\rho^*(s) \geq \rho^{\tilde{\pi}}(s) := \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \mathbb{E}_s^{\tilde{\pi}} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} R_t$  (where  $\mathbb{E}_s^{\tilde{\pi}}$  is defined in the natural way from the distribution over trajectories  $(S_0, A_0, \dots)$  where  $A_t \sim \tilde{\pi}(S_0, A_0, \dots, S_t)$  and  $S_{t+1} \sim P(\cdot | S_t, A_t)$ ). Let  $T_{s'} = \inf\{t \geq 1 : S_t = s'\}$  be the hitting time of state  $s'$  and let  $\mathcal{F}_{T_{s'}}$  be the stopped  $\sigma$ -algebra (with respect to the filtration where for all nonnegative integers  $t$ ,  $\mathcal{F}_t$  is the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $S_0, A_0, \dots, S_t, A_t$ ). Then

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \mathbb{E}_s^{\tilde{\pi}} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} R_t &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \mathbb{E}_s^{\tilde{\pi}} \left[ \mathbb{E}_s^{\tilde{\pi}} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} R_t \middle| \mathcal{F}_{T_{s'}} \right] \right] \\ &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \mathbb{E}_s^{\tilde{\pi}} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{T_{s'}-1} R_t + \mathbb{E}_s^{\tilde{\pi}} \left[ \sum_{t=T_{s'}}^{T-1} R_t \middle| \mathcal{F}_{T_{s'}} \right] \right] \\ &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \mathbb{E}_s^{\tilde{\pi}} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{T_{s'}-1} R_t + g(T, T_{s'}) \right] \\ &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \mathbb{E}_s^\pi \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{T_{s'}-1} R_t + g(T, T_{s'}) \right] \\ &\geq \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \mathbb{E}_s^\pi [g(T, T_{s'})] \end{aligned}$$

where  $g(T, k) := \mathbb{E}_{s'}^{\pi^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{T-k-1} R_t \right]$ , and we used the tower property,  $\mathcal{F}_{T_{s'}}$ -measurability of  $\sum_{t=0}^{T_{s'}-1} R_t$ , the strong Markov property, and the definition of  $\tilde{\pi}$ . Now note that  $T_{s'} < \infty$  almost surely since  $s$  and  $s'$  are in the same recurrent block, and on the event  $\{T_{s'} = k\}$  for any natural number  $k$ , we have that

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} g(T, k) = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \mathbb{E}_{s'}^{\pi^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{T-k-1} R_t \right] = \rho^*(s')$$

because we can bound

$$\frac{1}{T} \mathbb{E}_{s'}^{\pi^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} R_t \right] - \frac{k}{T} \leq \frac{1}{T} \mathbb{E}_{s'}^{\pi^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{T-k-1} R_t \right] \leq \frac{1}{T} \mathbb{E}_{s'}^{\pi^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} R_t \right]$$

and both sides converge to  $\rho^*(s')$ . Therefore  $\frac{g(T, T_{s'})}{T}$  converges almost surely to the constant  $\rho^*(s')$ , and also this random variable is bounded by 1, so by the dominated convergence theorem we have

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \mathbb{E}_s^\pi [g(T, T_{s'})] = \mathbb{E}_s^\pi \left[ \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} g(T, T_{s'}) \right] = \rho^*(s').$$

Thus we have shown that  $\rho^*(s) \geq \rho^*(s')$ . Since  $s$  and  $s'$  were arbitrary states in the same recurrent block we also have  $\rho^*(s') \geq \rho^*(s)$ , and thus  $\rho^*(s) = \rho^*(s')$  as desired.  $\square$

**Lemma 17.** *For any state  $s$  which is transient under a policy  $\pi$ , if the MDP satisfies the bounded transient time assumption with parameter  $B$ , we have*

$$\left\| \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} e_s^\top Z_\pi^t \right\|_1 \leq B.$$

*Proof.* Let  $T = \inf\{t : S_t \in \mathcal{R}^\pi\}$ . Notice that  $\|e_s^\top Z_\pi^t\|_1 = \mathbb{P}_s^\pi(T > t)$ . Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} e_s^\top Z_\pi^t \right\|_1 &\leq \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \|e_s^\top Z_\pi^t\|_1 \\ &= \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_s^\pi(T > t) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_s^\pi [T] \\ &\leq B, \end{aligned}$$

where we used a well-known formula for the expectation of nonnegative-integer-valued random variables, and the bounded transient time assumption.  $\square$

**Lemma 18.** *Let  $s$  be a transient state under  $P_\pi$ . Then*

$$e_s^\top (I - \gamma P_\pi)^{-1} = \underline{e}_s^\top \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \gamma^k Z_\pi^{k-1} Y_\pi (I - \gamma X_\pi)^{-1} \underline{e}_s^\top \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t Z_\pi^t.$$

*Proof.* Using the decomposition of  $P_\pi$ , we can calculate for any integer  $t \geq 1$  that

$$P_\pi^t = \begin{bmatrix} X_\pi^t & 0 \\ \sum_{k=1}^t Z_\pi^{k-1} Y_\pi X_\pi^{t-k} & Z_\pi^t \end{bmatrix}.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} e_s^\top (I - \gamma P_\pi)^{-1} &= e_s^\top \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t P_\pi^t \\ &= \underline{e}_s^\top \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \sum_{k=1}^t Z_\pi^{k-1} Y_\pi X_\pi^{t-k} \underline{e}_s^\top \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t Z_\pi^t \\ &= \underline{e}_s^\top \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{t=k}^{\infty} \gamma^t Z_\pi^{k-1} Y_\pi X_\pi^{t-k} \underline{e}_s^\top \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t Z_\pi^t \\ &= \underline{e}_s^\top \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \gamma^k Z_\pi^{k-1} Y_\pi \sum_{t=k}^{\infty} \gamma^{t-k} X_\pi^{t-k} \underline{e}_s^\top \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t Z_\pi^t \\ &= \underline{e}_s^\top \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \gamma^k Z_\pi^{k-1} Y_\pi (I - \gamma X_\pi)^{-1} \underline{e}_s^\top \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t Z_\pi^t. \end{aligned}$$



Note that we are able to rearrange the order of the summation in the third equality because all summands are (elementwise) positive.  $\square$

## B.1 Proof of Theorem 5

Theorem 5, our result which helps reduce general average reward MDPs to discounted MDPs, is proven as a straightforward consequence of the following sequence of lemmas, some of which will also be needed for the proof of our discounted MDP sample complexity bound Theorem 6.

**Lemma 19.** *We have*

$$\left\| V_\gamma^{\pi^*} - \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \rho^* \right\|_\infty \leq \|h^*\|_{\text{span}}.$$

*Proof.* We begin by observing that  $\pi^*$  satisfies

$$\rho^* + h^* = r_{\pi^*} + P_{\pi^*} h^*.$$

Therefore, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} V_\gamma^{\pi^*} &= (I - \gamma P_{\pi^*})^{-1} r_{\pi^*} \\ &= (I - \gamma P_{\pi^*})^{-1} (\rho^* + h^* - P_{\pi^*} h^*) \\ &= (I - \gamma P_{\pi^*})^{-1} \rho^* + (I - \gamma P_{\pi^*})^{-1} (I - P_{\pi^*}) h^*. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $P_{\pi^*} \rho^* = \rho^*$ , we can calculate that

$$(I - \gamma P_{\pi^*})^{-1} \rho^* = \sum_{t \geq 0} \gamma^t P_{\pi^*}^t \rho^* = \sum_{t \geq 0} \gamma^t \rho^* = \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \rho^*.$$

It also holds that

$$\begin{aligned} (I - \gamma P_{\pi^*})^{-1} (I - P_{\pi^*}) &= \sum_{t \geq 0} \gamma^t P_{\pi^*}^t (I - P_{\pi^*}) \\ &= \sum_{t \geq 0} \gamma^t P_{\pi^*}^t - \sum_{t \geq 0} \gamma^t P_{\pi^*}^{t+1} \\ &= P_{\pi^*} + \sum_{t \geq 0} (\gamma^{t+1} - \gamma^t) P_{\pi^*}^{t+1} \end{aligned}$$

and  $\sum_{t \geq 0} \gamma^{t+1} - \gamma^t = (\gamma - 1) \sum_{t \geq 0} \gamma^t = -1$ . It follows that

$$\|(I - \gamma P_{\pi^*})^{-1} (I - P_{\pi^*}) h^*\|_\infty \leq \|h^*\|_{\text{span}}.$$

$\square$

**Lemma 20.** *If  $\pi_\gamma^*$  is optimal for the discounted MDP  $(P, r, \gamma)$  and  $s$  is recurrent under  $\pi_\gamma^*$ , then*

$$\left| V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}(s) - \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \rho^*(s) \right| \leq \|h^*\|_{\text{span}}$$

and

$$\left| V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}(s) - \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \rho^{\pi_\gamma^*}(s) \right| \leq 2 \|h^*\|_{\text{span}}.$$

These facts can be written as  $\left\| \overline{V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}} - \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \overline{\rho^*} \right\|_\infty \leq \|h^*\|_{\text{span}}$  and  $\left\| \overline{V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}} - \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \overline{\rho^{\pi_\gamma^*}} \right\|_\infty \leq 2 \|h^*\|_{\text{span}}$  respectively.

*Proof.* First note that if  $s$  is recurrent for the Markov chain  $P_{\pi_\gamma^*}$ , then all states in the support of  $e_s^\top P_{\pi_\gamma^*}$  are in the same recurrent block as state  $s$ , and  $\rho^*$  is constant (and equal to  $\rho^*(s)$ ) within this recurrent block by Lemma 16. The (unmodified) Bellman equation states that

$$\rho^*(s) + h^*(s) = \max_{a: P_{sa}\rho^* = \rho^*(s)} r_{sa} + P_{sa}h^*.$$

Since we established that  $e_s^\top P_{\pi_\gamma^*}\rho^* = \rho^*(s)$ , all actions  $a$  in the support of  $\pi_\gamma^*(a | s)$  satisfy  $P_{sa}\rho^* = \rho^*(s)$ , and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^*(s) + h^*(s) &= \max_{a: P_{sa}\rho^* = \rho^*(s)} r_{sa} + P_{sa}h^* \\ &\geq \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_\gamma^*(a | s) (r_{sa} + P_{sa}h^*) \\ &= e_s^\top (r_{\pi_\gamma^*} + P_{\pi_\gamma^*}h^*). \end{aligned}$$

Since this holds for all  $s \in \mathcal{R}^{\pi_\gamma^*}$ , we can rearrange to obtain that

$$\overline{r_{\pi_\gamma^*}} \leq \overline{\rho^*} + \overline{h^*} - \overline{P_{\pi_\gamma^*}h^*} = \overline{\rho^*} + \overline{h^*} - X_{\pi_\gamma^*}\overline{h^*}.$$

Now we can follow an argument which is similar to that of [Wei et al., 2020, Lemma 2]. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}} &= \overline{(I - \gamma P_{\pi_\gamma^*})^{-1} r_{\pi_\gamma^*}} \\ &= \overline{(I - X_{\pi_\gamma^*})^{-1} \overline{r_{\pi_\gamma^*}}} \\ &\leq \overline{(I - X_{\pi_\gamma^*})^{-1} (\overline{\rho^*} + \overline{h^*} - X_{\pi_\gamma^*}\overline{h^*})} \end{aligned}$$

using monotonicity of  $(I - X_{\pi_\gamma^*})^{-1}$  in the final inequality. Due to the observation above that for all  $s \in \mathcal{R}^{\pi_\gamma^*}$ , all actions  $a$  in the support of  $\pi_\gamma^*(a | s)$  satisfy  $P_{sa}\rho^* = \rho^*(s)$ , we have  $X_{\pi_\gamma^*}\overline{\rho^*} = \overline{\rho^*}$ . Therefore we have

$$(I - X_{\pi_\gamma^*})^{-1}\overline{\rho^*} = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t X_{\pi_\gamma^*}^t \overline{\rho^*} = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \overline{\rho^*} = \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \overline{\rho^*}.$$

For the second term, by using an argument which is completely analogous to that used in Lemma 19 we have  $\left\| (I - X_{\pi_\gamma^*})^{-1} (\overline{h^*} - X_{\pi_\gamma^*}\overline{h^*}) \right\|_\infty \leq \|h^*\|_{\text{span}}$ . Combining these steps we obtain that

$$\overline{V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}} - \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \overline{\rho^*} \leq \|h^*\|_{\text{span}} \mathbf{1}.$$

To obtain a lower bound, we can combine the optimality of  $\pi_\gamma^*$  for the  $\gamma$ -discounted problem with Lemma 19 to obtain the bound

$$\overline{V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}} - \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \overline{\rho^*} \geq \overline{V_\gamma^{\pi^*}} - \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \overline{\rho^*} \geq \|h^*\|_{\text{span}} \mathbf{1}.$$

Therefore we can conclude that  $\left\| \overline{V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}} - \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \overline{\rho^*} \right\|_\infty \leq \|h^*\|_{\text{span}}$ .

For the second bound in the lemma statement, we first note that, as observed in Wang et al. [2022],

$$P_{\pi_\gamma^*}^\infty V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*} = P_{\pi_\gamma^*}^\infty \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t P_{\pi_\gamma^*}^t r_{\pi_\gamma^*} = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t P_{\pi_\gamma^*}^\infty r_{\pi_\gamma^*} = \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \rho^{\pi_\gamma^*}.$$

Also, as discussed previously, if  $s \in \mathcal{R}^{\pi_\gamma^*}$  then  $e_s^\top P_{\pi_\gamma^*}\rho^* = \rho^*(s)$ , so then we also have  $e_s^\top P_{\pi_\gamma^*}^\infty \rho^* = \rho^*(s)$  (which can be seen directly from the definition of the limiting matrix  $P_{\pi_\gamma^*}^\infty$ ). Equivalently,  $e_s^\top (I - P_{\pi_\gamma^*}^\infty)\rho^* = 0$ . Using

both of these two observations, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}(s) - \frac{1}{1-\gamma}\rho^{\pi_\gamma^*}(s) &= e_s^\top (I - P_{\pi_\gamma^*}^\infty) V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*} \\
&= e_s^\top (I - P_{\pi_\gamma^*}^\infty) \left( V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*} - \frac{1}{1-\gamma}\rho^* \right) \\
&= \bar{e}_s^\top (I - X_{\pi_\gamma^*}^\infty) \left( \overline{V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}} - \frac{1}{1-\gamma}\overline{\rho^*} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \overline{V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}} - \frac{1}{1-\gamma}\overline{\rho^*} \right\|_\infty &\leq \left\| (I - X_{\pi_\gamma^*}^\infty) \left( \overline{V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}} - \frac{1}{1-\gamma}\overline{\rho^*} \right) \right\|_\infty \\
&\leq \left\| \overline{V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}} - \frac{1}{1-\gamma}\overline{\rho^*} \right\|_{\text{span}} \\
&\leq 2 \left\| \overline{V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}} - \frac{1}{1-\gamma}\overline{\rho^*} \right\|_\infty \\
&\leq 2 \|h^*\|_{\text{span}}
\end{aligned}$$

using the first bound from the lemma statement in the final inequality.  $\square$

**Lemma 21.** *We have*

$$\left\| V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*} - \frac{1}{1-\gamma}\rho^* \right\|_\infty \leq B + \|h^*\|_{\text{span}}$$

and

$$\left\| V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*} - \frac{1}{1-\gamma}\rho^{\pi_\gamma^*} \right\|_\infty \leq B + 2 \|h^*\|_{\text{span}}.$$

*Proof.* Note that by combining with Lemma 20, it suffices to prove for any transient state  $s \in \mathcal{T}^{\pi_\gamma^*}$  that

$$\left| V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}(s) - \frac{1}{1-\gamma}\rho^*(s) \right| \leq B + \|h^*\|_{\text{span}}$$

and

$$\left| V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}(s) - \frac{1}{1-\gamma}\rho^{\pi_\gamma^*}(s) \right| \leq B + 2 \|h^*\|_{\text{span}}.$$

Let  $s$  be transient under  $\pi_\gamma^*$ . Then starting by using Lemma 18, we can calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}(s) &= e_s^\top (I - \gamma P_{\pi_\gamma^*})^{-1} r_{\pi_\gamma^*} \\
&= \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t e_s^\top Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^t r_{\pi_\gamma^*} + \gamma \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t e_s^\top Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^t Y_{\pi_\gamma^*} (I - \gamma X_{\pi_\gamma^*})^{-1} \overline{r_{\pi_\gamma^*}} \\
&= \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t e_s^\top Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^t r_{\pi_\gamma^*} + \gamma \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t e_s^\top Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^t Y_{\pi_\gamma^*} \overline{V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}} \\
&\leq \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} e_s^\top Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^t r_{\pi_\gamma^*} + \left( \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} e_s^\top Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^t Y_{\pi_\gamma^*} \right) \overline{V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

By Lemma 17 we have that

$$\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} e_s^\top Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^t r_{\pi_\gamma^*} \leq \left\| \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} e_s^\top Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^t \right\|_1 \left\| r_{\pi_\gamma^*} \right\|_\infty \leq B.$$

Now we can obtain the two bounds in the lemma statement by bounding the second term of (13) in two different ways. For the first bound in the lemma statement, we can use the first bound in Lemma 20 to calculate that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left( \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} e_s^\top Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^t Y_{\pi_\gamma^*} \right) \overline{V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}} &\leq \left( \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} e_s^\top Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^t Y_{\pi_\gamma^*} \right) \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \overline{\rho^*} + \left( \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} e_s^\top Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^t Y_{\pi_\gamma^*} \right) \left\| \overline{V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}} - \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \overline{\rho^*} \right\|_\infty \mathbf{1} \\
&= \left( \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} e_s^\top Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^t Y_{\pi_\gamma^*} \right) \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \overline{\rho^*} + \left\| \overline{V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}} - \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \overline{\rho^*} \right\|_\infty \\
&\leq \left( \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} e_s^\top Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^t Y_{\pi_\gamma^*} \right) \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \overline{\rho^*} + \|h^*\|_{\text{span}} \\
&= \left( \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} e_s^\top Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^t Y_{\pi_\gamma^*} \right) \frac{1}{1-\gamma} X_{\pi_\gamma^*}^\infty \overline{\rho^*} + \|h^*\|_{\text{span}} \\
&= \left( \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} e_s^\top Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^t Y_{\pi_\gamma^*} X_{\pi_\gamma^*}^\infty \right) \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \overline{\rho^*} + \|h^*\|_{\text{span}} \\
&= e_s^\top Y_{\pi_\gamma^*}^\infty \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \overline{\rho^*} + \|h^*\|_{\text{span}} \\
&= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} e_s^\top P_{\pi_\gamma^*}^\infty \rho^* + \|h^*\|_{\text{span}} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \rho^*(s) + \|h^*\|_{\text{span}}
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that  $X_{\pi_\gamma^*}^\infty \overline{\rho^*} = \overline{\rho^*}$  and then that  $e_s^\top P_{\pi_\gamma^*}^\infty \rho^* \leq \rho^*(s)$ . This gives an upper bound of

$$V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*} \leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \rho^*(s) + \mathbf{B} + \|h^*\|_{\text{span}}.$$

Combining with the lower bound

$$V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}(s) \geq V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*} \geq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \rho^*(s) - \|h^*\|_{\text{span}},$$

we obtain that

$$\left\| V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*} - \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \rho^* \right\|_\infty \leq \mathbf{B} + \|h^*\|_{\text{span}}$$

which is the first bound in the lemma statement.

To obtain the second bound in the lemma statement, using the second bound from Lemma 20, we can

calculate for the second term in (13) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left( \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} e_s^\top Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^t Y_{\pi_\gamma^*} \right) \overline{V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}} &\leq \left( \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} e_s^\top Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^t Y_{\pi_\gamma^*} \right) \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \overline{\rho^{\pi_\gamma^*}} + \left( \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} e_s^\top Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^t Y_{\pi_\gamma^*} \right) \left\| \overline{V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}} - \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \overline{\rho^{\pi_\gamma^*}} \right\|_\infty \mathbf{1} \\
&= \left( \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} e_s^\top Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^t Y_{\pi_\gamma^*} \right) \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \overline{\rho^{\pi_\gamma^*}} + \left\| \overline{V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}} - \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \overline{\rho^{\pi_\gamma^*}} \right\|_\infty \\
&\leq \left( \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} e_s^\top Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^t Y_{\pi_\gamma^*} \right) \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \overline{\rho^{\pi_\gamma^*}} + 2 \|h^*\|_{\text{span}} \\
&= \left( \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} e_s^\top Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^t Y_{\pi_\gamma^*} \right) \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \overline{P_{\pi_\gamma^*}^\infty r_{\pi_\gamma^*}} + 2 \|h^*\|_{\text{span}} \\
&= \left( \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} e_s^\top Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^t Y_{\pi_\gamma^*} \right) \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \overline{X_{\pi_\gamma^*}^\infty r_{\pi_\gamma^*}} + 2 \|h^*\|_{\text{span}} \\
&= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} e_s^\top Y_{\pi_\gamma^*}^\infty \overline{r_{\pi_\gamma^*}} + 2 \|h^*\|_{\text{span}} \\
&= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} e_s^\top P_{\pi_\gamma^*}^\infty r_{\pi_\gamma^*} + 2 \|h^*\|_{\text{span}} \\
&= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \rho^{\pi_\gamma^*}(s) + 2 \|h^*\|_{\text{span}}
\end{aligned}$$

where in the second equality we used the fact that  $\left( \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} e_s^\top Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^t Y_{\pi_\gamma^*} \right)$  is a probability distribution, and in the final steps we used the decomposition of  $P_{\pi_\gamma^*}^\infty$  and the fact that  $\rho^{\pi_\gamma^*} = P_{\pi_\gamma^*}^\infty r_{\pi_\gamma^*}$ .

Therefore by combining these steps we obtain that

$$V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}(s) \leq \mathbf{B} + 2 \|h^*\|_{\text{span}} + \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \rho^{\pi_\gamma^*}(s).$$

Combining with the lower bound

$$V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}(s) \geq V_\gamma^{\pi^*}(s) \geq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \rho^{\pi^*}(s) - \|h^*\|_{\text{span}} \geq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \rho^{\pi_\gamma^*}(s) - \|h^*\|_{\text{span}},$$

we obtain the desired bound

$$\left| V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}(s) - \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \rho^{\pi_\gamma^*}(s) \right| \leq \mathbf{B} + 2 \|h^*\|_{\text{span}}.$$

□

**Lemma 22.** *If  $\pi$  satisfies  $V_\gamma^\pi \geq V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*} - \delta \mathbf{1}$ , then*

$$\left\| V_\gamma^\pi - \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \rho^\pi \right\|_\infty \leq 3\mathbf{B} + 2 \|h^*\|_{\text{span}} + \delta.$$

*Proof.* Similar to the proof of Lemmas 20 and 21, we will first establish a bound for the states which are recurrent under  $\pi$ . Specifically, we will first show that if  $s$  is recurrent under  $\pi$  we have

$$\left| V_\gamma^\pi(s) - \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \rho^\pi(s) \right| \leq 2\mathbf{B} + 2 \|h^*\|_{\text{span}} + \delta. \quad (14)$$

Letting  $s \in \mathcal{R}^\pi$ , following steps which are similar to the proof of the second part of Lemma 20, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
V_\gamma^\pi(s) - \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \rho^\pi(s) &= e_s^\top (I - P_\pi^\infty) V_\gamma^\pi \\
&= e_s^\top (I - P_\pi^\infty) \left( V_\gamma^\pi - \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \rho^* \right) \\
&= e_s^\top (I - P_\pi^\infty) \left( V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*} - \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \rho^* \right) + e_s^\top (I - P_\pi^\infty) (V_\gamma^\pi - V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*})
\end{aligned}$$

using the fact discussed in Lemma 20 that  $e_s^\top(I - P_\pi^\infty)\rho^* = 0$  since  $s$  is recurrent under  $\pi$ . Then by triangle inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|V_\gamma^\pi(s) - \frac{1}{1-\gamma}\rho^\pi(s)\right| &\leq \left|e_s^\top(I - P_\pi^\infty)(V_\gamma^{\pi^*} - \frac{1}{1-\gamma}\rho^*)\right| + \left|e_s^\top(I - P_\pi^\infty)(V_\gamma^\pi - V_\gamma^{\pi^*})\right| \\
&\leq \left\|V_\gamma^{\pi^*} - \frac{1}{1-\gamma}\rho^*\right\|_{\text{span}} + \left\|V_\gamma^\pi - V_\gamma^{\pi^*}\right\|_{\text{span}} \\
&\leq 2\left\|V_\gamma^{\pi^*} - \frac{1}{1-\gamma}\rho^*\right\|_\infty + \delta \\
&\leq 2\mathbf{B} + 2\|h^*\|_{\text{span}} + \delta,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the facts that  $\|\cdot\|_{\text{span}} \leq 2\|\cdot\|_\infty$  and that  $V_\gamma^{\pi^*} \geq V_\gamma^\pi \geq V_\gamma^{\pi^*} - \delta\mathbf{1}$ .

Having established (14), we now extend to transient states using arguments similar to those for the second bound of Lemma 21. Let  $s$  be transient under  $\pi$ . Then starting by using Lemma 18, we can calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
V_\gamma^\pi(s) &= e_s^\top(I - \gamma P_\pi)^{-1}r_\pi \\
&= \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t e_s^\top Z_\pi^t r_\pi + \gamma \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t e_s^\top Z_\pi^t Y_\pi (I - \gamma X_\pi)^{-1} \bar{r}_\pi \\
&= \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t e_s^\top Z_\pi^t r_\pi + \gamma \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t e_s^\top Z_\pi^t Y_\pi \bar{V}_\gamma^\pi \\
&\leq \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} e_s^\top Z_\pi^t r_\pi + \left(\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} e_s^\top Z_\pi^t Y_\pi\right) \bar{V}_\gamma^\pi \\
&\leq \left\|\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} e_s^\top Z_\pi^t\right\|_1 \|r_\pi\|_\infty + \left(\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} e_s^\top Z_\pi^t Y_\pi\right) \bar{V}_\gamma^\pi \\
&\leq \mathbf{B} + \left(\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} e_s^\top Z_\pi^t Y_\pi\right) \bar{V}_\gamma^\pi
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

using the bounded transient time assumption via Lemma 17 in the final step. Then we can calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} e_s^\top Z_\pi^t Y_\pi\right) \bar{V}_\gamma^\pi &\leq \left(\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} e_s^\top Z_\pi^t Y_\pi\right) \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \bar{\rho}^\pi + \left(\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} e_s^\top Z_\pi^t Y_\pi\right) \left\|\bar{V}_\gamma^\pi - \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \bar{\rho}^\pi\right\|_\infty \mathbf{1} \\
&= \left(\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} e_s^\top Z_\pi^t Y_\pi\right) \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \bar{\rho}^\pi + \left\|\bar{V}_\gamma^\pi - \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \bar{\rho}^\pi\right\|_\infty \\
&\leq \left(\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} e_s^\top Z_\pi^t Y_\pi\right) \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \bar{\rho}^\pi + 2\mathbf{B} + 2\|h^*\|_{\text{span}} + \delta \\
&= \left(\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} e_s^\top Z_\pi^t Y_\pi\right) \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \overline{P_\pi^\infty r_\pi} + 2\mathbf{B} + 2\|h^*\|_{\text{span}} + \delta \\
&= \left(\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} e_s^\top Z_\pi^t Y_\pi\right) \frac{1}{1-\gamma} X_\pi^\infty \bar{r}_\pi + 2\mathbf{B} + 2\|h^*\|_{\text{span}} + \delta \\
&= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} e_s^\top Y_\pi^\infty \bar{r}_\pi + 2\mathbf{B} + 2\|h^*\|_{\text{span}} + \delta \\
&= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} e_s^\top P_\pi^\infty r_\pi + 2\mathbf{B} + 2\|h^*\|_{\text{span}} + \delta \\
&= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \rho^\pi(s) + 2\mathbf{B} + 2\|h^*\|_{\text{span}} + \delta,
\end{aligned}$$

where in the first equality we used the fact that  $\left(\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} e_s^\top Z_\pi^t Y_\pi\right)$  is a probability distribution, in the second inequality we used the bound (14), and in the final steps we used the decomposition of  $P_\pi^\infty$  and the fact that  $\rho^\pi = P_\pi^\infty r_\pi$ .

Therefore by combining this last bound with the bound (15), we have

$$V_\gamma^\pi(s) \leq 3\mathbf{B} + 2\|h^*\|_{\text{span}} + \delta + \frac{1}{1-\gamma}\rho^\pi(s).$$

Combining with the lower bound

$$V_\gamma^\pi(s) \geq V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*} - \delta \geq V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}(s) - \delta \geq \frac{1}{1-\gamma}\rho^*(s) - \|h^*\|_{\text{span}} - \delta \geq \frac{1}{1-\gamma}\rho^\pi(s) - \|h^*\|_{\text{span}} - \delta,$$

we conclude that

$$\left|V_\gamma^\pi(s) - \frac{1}{1-\gamma}\rho^\pi(s)\right| \leq 3\mathbf{B} + 2\|h^*\|_{\text{span}} + \delta$$

as desired.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 5.* Suppose  $\pi$  is  $\varepsilon_\gamma$ -optimal for the discounted MDP  $(P, r, \gamma)$ . We can calculate that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{1-\gamma}\rho^\pi &\geq V_\gamma^\pi - (3\mathbf{B} + 2\|h^*\|_{\text{span}} + \varepsilon_\gamma) \\ &\geq V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*} - (3\mathbf{B} + 2\|h^*\|_{\text{span}} + 2\varepsilon_\gamma) \\ &\geq V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*} - (3\mathbf{B} + 2\|h^*\|_{\text{span}} + 2\varepsilon_\gamma) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{1-\gamma}\rho^* - (3\mathbf{B} + 3\|h^*\|_{\text{span}} + 2\varepsilon_\gamma), \end{aligned}$$

where in the first inequality we used Lemma 22, in the second inequality we used the fact that  $\pi$  is  $\varepsilon_\gamma$ -optimal, in the third inequality we used the optimality of  $\pi_\gamma^*$  for the discounted MDP, and in the final inequality we used Lemma 19. Therefore by multiplying both sides by  $1 - \gamma$ , we have that

$$\rho^\pi \geq \rho^* - \frac{\varepsilon}{\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H}}(3\mathbf{B} + 3\|h^*\|_{\text{span}} + 2\varepsilon_\gamma) \geq \rho^* - \left(3\varepsilon + 2\frac{\varepsilon_\gamma}{\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H}}\right)\varepsilon.$$

$\square$

## B.2 Proof of Theorem 6 (Discounted MDP Bounds)

In this section, we provide our main result on the sample complexity of general discounted MDPs.

Our proof relies on three lemmas that provide bounds on relevant variance parameters. The first lemma controls the variance for  $\pi_\gamma^*$  on recurrent states.

**Lemma 23.** *Letting  $\pi_\gamma^*$  be the optimal policy for the discounted MDP  $(P, r, \gamma)$ , if  $\gamma \geq 1 - \frac{1}{\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H}}$ , we have*

$$\max_{s \in \mathcal{R}^{\pi_\gamma^*}} \gamma \left| e_s^\top (I - \gamma P_{\pi_\gamma^*})^{-1} \sqrt{\mathbb{V}_{P_{\pi_\gamma^*}} [V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}]} \right| \leq \sqrt{\frac{32}{5} \frac{\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H}}{(1-\gamma)^2}}.$$

*Proof.* First, using the decomposition (11), we can calculate for any  $s \in \mathcal{R}^{\pi_\gamma^*}$  that

$$\begin{aligned} e_s^\top (I - \gamma P_{\pi_\gamma^*})^{-1} \sqrt{\mathbb{V}_{P_{\pi_\gamma^*}} [V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}]} &= \bar{e}_s^\top (I - \gamma X_{\pi_\gamma^*})^{-1} \sqrt{\mathbb{V}_{P_{\pi_\gamma^*}} [V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}]} \\ &= \bar{e}_s^\top (I - \gamma X_{\pi_\gamma^*})^{-1} \sqrt{\mathbb{V}_{X_{\pi_\gamma^*}} [V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}]}. \end{aligned}$$

Also due to the decomposition, notice that set  $\mathcal{R}^{\pi^*}$  is a closed set for the Markov chain with transition matrix  $P_{\pi^*}$ , and furthermore when restricting to the entries corresponding to this closed set we obtain the transition matrix  $X_{\pi^*}$ . Therefore we can apply Lemma 11 to this subchain to obtain that

$$\gamma \left\| (I - \gamma X_{\pi^*})^{-1} \sqrt{\mathbb{V}_{X_{\pi^*}} \left[ \overline{V_{\gamma}^{\pi^*}} \right]} \right\|_{\infty} \leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{1-\gamma}} \sqrt{\left\| \overline{\mathbb{V}_{\pi^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_t \right]} \right\|_{\infty}}.$$

Abbreviating  $L = \mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H}$ , we can also then apply Lemma 12 to bound

$$\left\| \overline{\mathbb{V}_{\pi^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_t \right]} \right\|_{\infty} \leq \frac{\left\| \overline{\mathbb{V}_{\pi^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{L-1} \gamma^t R_t + \gamma^L V_{\gamma}^{\pi^*}(S_L) \right]} \right\|_{\infty}}{1 - \gamma^{2L}}.$$

We can repeat a similar argument as within Lemma 14 to bound this term. Fixing an initial state  $s_0 \in \mathcal{R}^{\pi^*}$ , the key observation is that  $\rho^*$  is constant on the recurrent block of  $X_{\pi^*}$  containing  $s_0$ , and therefore any state trajectory  $S_0 = s_0, S_1, S_2, \dots$  under the transition matrix  $P_{\pi^*}$  will have  $\rho^*(S_L) = \rho^*(s_0)$ . Therefore for this fixed  $s_0$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}_{s_0}^{\pi^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{L-1} \gamma^t R_t + \gamma^L V_{\gamma}^{\pi^*}(S_L) \right] &= \mathbb{V}_{s_0}^{\pi^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{L-1} \gamma^t R_t + \gamma^L \left( V_{\gamma}^{\pi^*}(S_L) - \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \rho^*(s_0) \right) \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\pi^*} \left| \sum_{t=0}^{L-1} \gamma^t R_t + \gamma^L \left( V_{\gamma}^{\pi^*}(S_L) - \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \rho^*(s_0) \right) \right|^2 \\ &\leq 2\mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\pi^*} \left| \sum_{t=0}^{L-1} \gamma^t R_t \right|^2 + 2\mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\pi^*} \left| \gamma^L \left( V_{\gamma}^{\pi^*}(S_L) - \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \rho^*(s_0) \right) \right|^2 \\ &= 2\mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\pi^*} \left| \sum_{t=0}^{L-1} \gamma^t R_t \right|^2 + 2\mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\pi^*} \left| \gamma^L \left( V_{\gamma}^{\pi^*}(S_L) - \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \rho^*(S_L) \right) \right|^2 \\ &\leq 2L^2 + 2 \sup_{s \in \mathcal{R}^{\pi^*}} \left( V_{\gamma}^{\pi^*}(s) - \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \rho^*(s) \right)^2 \\ &\leq 2L^2 + 2\mathbf{H}^2 \\ &\leq 4L^2 \end{aligned}$$

where we used Lemma 20 in the penultimate inequality. Applying this argument to all  $s_0 \in \mathcal{R}^{\pi^*}$  we obtain

$$\left\| \overline{\mathbb{V}_{\pi^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{L-1} \gamma^t R_t + \gamma^L V_{\gamma}^{\pi^*}(S_L) \right]} \right\|_{\infty} \leq 4L^2.$$



Therefore by combining with our initial bounds we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{s \in \mathcal{R}^{\pi_\gamma^*}} \gamma \left| e_s^\top (I - \gamma P_{\pi_\gamma^*})^{-1} \sqrt{\mathbb{V}_{P_{\pi_\gamma^*}} [V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}]} \right| &\leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{1-\gamma}} \sqrt{\left\| \mathbb{V}^{\pi_\gamma^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_t \right] \right\|_\infty} \\
&\leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{1-\gamma}} \sqrt{\frac{\left\| \mathbb{V}^{\pi_\gamma^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{L-1} \gamma^t R_t + \gamma^L V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}(S_L) \right] \right\|_\infty}{1-\gamma^{2L}}} \\
&\leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{1-\gamma}} \sqrt{\frac{4L^2}{1-\gamma^{2L}}} \\
&\leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{1-\gamma}} \sqrt{\frac{16L^2}{5L(1-\gamma)}} \\
&\leq \sqrt{\frac{32}{5}} \frac{L}{(1-\gamma)^2},
\end{aligned}$$

where in the penultimate inequality we used Lemma 13 to bound  $\frac{1}{1-\gamma^{2L}} \leq \frac{5}{4(1-\gamma)L}$ .  $\square$

The next lemma controls the variance for  $\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*$  on recurrent states.

**Lemma 24.** *Letting  $\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*$  be the optimal policy for the discounted MDP  $(\hat{P}, \tilde{r}, \gamma)$ , if  $\gamma \geq 1 - \frac{1}{\text{B}+\text{H}}$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{s \in \mathcal{R}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*}} \gamma \left| e_s^\top (I - \gamma P_{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*})^{-1} \sqrt{\mathbb{V}_{P_{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*}} [V_{\gamma, \text{P}}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*}]} \right| \\
\leq \sqrt{29} \frac{\text{B} + \text{H}}{(1-\gamma)^2} + \sqrt{\frac{15}{\text{B} + \text{H}}} \frac{\left\| \hat{V}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*} - V_{\gamma, \text{P}}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*} \right\|_\infty + \left\| \hat{V}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^{\pi_\gamma^*} - V_{\gamma, \text{P}}^{\pi_\gamma^*} \right\|_\infty}{1-\gamma}.
\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Let  $L = \text{B} + \text{H}$ . By the same arguments as in the beginning of the proof of Lemma 23, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{s \in \mathcal{R}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*}} \gamma \left| e_s^\top (I - \gamma P_{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*})^{-1} \sqrt{\mathbb{V}_{P_{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*}} [V_{\gamma, \text{P}}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*}]} \right| &\leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{1-\gamma}} \sqrt{\left\| \mathbb{V}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \tilde{R}_t \right] \right\|_\infty} \\
&\leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{1-\gamma}} \sqrt{\frac{\left\| \mathbb{V}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{L-1} \gamma^t \tilde{R}_t + \gamma^L V_{\gamma, \text{P}}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*}(S_L) \right] \right\|_\infty}{1-\gamma^{2L}}}
\end{aligned}$$

so it again suffices to bound  $\mathbb{V}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{L-1} \gamma^t \tilde{R}_t + \gamma^L V_{\gamma, \text{P}}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*}(S_L) \right]$ . Fix  $s_0 \in \mathcal{R}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*}$ . Again, as observed in Lemma 23,  $\rho^*$  is constant on the recurrent block of  $X_{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*}$  containing  $s_0$ , so we will have  $\rho^*(S_L) = \rho^*(s_0)$

with probability one. Therefore (mostly following the steps of Lemma 15)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{V}_{s_0}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{L-1} \gamma^t \tilde{R}_t + \gamma^L V_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^*}(S_L) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{V}_{s_0}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{L-1} \gamma^t \tilde{R}_t + \gamma^L V_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^*}(S_L) - \gamma^L \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \rho^*(s_0) \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^*} \left( \sum_{t=0}^{L-1} \gamma^t \tilde{R}_t + \gamma^L V_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^*}(S_L) - \gamma^L \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \rho^*(s_0) \right)^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^*} \left( \sum_{t=0}^{L-1} \gamma^t \tilde{R}_t + \gamma^L \left( V_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^*}(S_L) - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*}(S_L) \right) + \gamma^L \left( V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*}(S_L) - \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \rho^*(S_L) \right) \right)^2 \\
&\leq 3 \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^*} \left( \sum_{t=0}^{L-1} \gamma^t \tilde{R}_t \right)^2 + 3\gamma^{2L} \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^*} \left( V_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^*}(S_L) - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*}(S_L) \right)^2 \\
&\quad + 3\gamma^{2L} \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^*} \left( V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*}(S_L) - \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \rho^*(S_L) \right)^2 \\
&\leq 3 \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^*} \left( \sum_{t=0}^{L-1} \gamma^t \tilde{R}_t \right)^2 + 6\gamma^{2L} \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^*} \left( V_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^*}(S_L) - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*}(S_L) \right)^2 + 6\gamma^{2L} \left\| V_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right\|_{\infty}^2 \\
&\quad + 3\gamma^{2L} \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^*} \left( V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*}(S_L) - \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \rho^*(S_L) \right)^2 \tag{16}
\end{aligned}$$

using the inequalities  $(a + b + c)^2 \leq 3a^2 + 3b^2 + 3c^2$  and  $(a + b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2$ . Now we bound each term of (16) analogously to the steps of Lemma 15. For the first term of (16),

$$3 \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^*} \left( \sum_{t=0}^{L-1} \gamma^t \tilde{R}_t \right)^2 \leq 3(L \|\tilde{r}\|_{\infty})^2 \leq 3L^2(\|r\|_{\infty} + \xi)^2 \leq 6L^2 \left( 1 + \left( \frac{(1-\gamma)\varepsilon}{6} \right)^2 \right) \leq 6L^2 \left( \frac{7}{6} \right)^2,$$

where we had  $\frac{(1-\gamma)\varepsilon}{6} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{6L} \leq \frac{1}{6}$  because  $\frac{1}{1-\gamma} \geq L$  and  $\varepsilon \leq L$ . For the second term of (16),

$$\begin{aligned}
6\gamma^{2L} \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^*} \left( V_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^*}(S_L) - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*}(S_L) \right)^2 &\leq 6 \left\| V_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right\|_{\infty}^2 \\
&\leq 6 \left( \left\| \hat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right\|_{\infty} + \left\| \hat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right\|_{\infty} \right)^2
\end{aligned}$$

where we used  $(a + b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2$  and the fact that  $\left\| V_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right\|_{\infty} \leq \left\| \hat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right\|_{\infty} + \left\| \hat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right\|_{\infty}$  which was shown in Lemma 15. For the third term of (16),

$$6\gamma^{2L} \left\| V_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right\|_{\infty}^2 \leq 6 \left\| V_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right\|_{\infty}^2 \leq 6 \left( \frac{\xi}{1-\gamma} \right)^2 = 6 \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{6} \right)^2 \leq \frac{L^2}{6}$$

where the fact that  $\left\| V_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right\|_{\infty} \leq \frac{\xi}{1-\gamma}$  is identical to the arguments used in the proof of Lemma 9, and the final inequality is due to the assumption that  $\varepsilon \leq L$ . For the fourth term of (16),

$$3\gamma^{2L} \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^*} \left( V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*}(S_L) - \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \rho^*(S_L) \right)^2 \leq 3 \left\| V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} - \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \rho^* \right\|_{\infty}^2 \leq 3L^2$$

using Lemma 21 for the second inequality. Using all these bounds in (16), we obtain

$$\mathbb{V}_{s_0}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{L-1} \gamma^t \tilde{R}_t + \gamma^L V_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^*}(S_L) \right] \leq \left( \frac{49}{6} + \frac{1}{6} + 3 \right) L^2 + 6 \left( \left\| \hat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right\|_{\infty} + \left\| \hat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbb{P}}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right\|_{\infty} \right)^2$$

and so (since this holds for arbitrary  $s_0 \in \mathcal{R}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*}$ ), we have

$$\overline{\mathbb{V}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{L-1} \gamma^t \tilde{R}_t + \gamma^L V_{\gamma, \text{P}}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*}(S_L) \right]} \leq \frac{68}{6} L^2 + 6 \left( \left\| \hat{V}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*} \right\|_{\infty} + \left\| \hat{V}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right\|_{\infty} \right)^2.$$

Therefore, combining with our initial arguments,

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{s \in \mathcal{R}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*}} \gamma \left| e_s^{\top} (I - \gamma P_{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*})^{-1} \sqrt{\mathbb{V}_{P_{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*}} \left[ V_{\gamma, \text{P}}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*} \right]} \right| & \\ & \leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{1-\gamma}} \sqrt{\frac{\left\| \mathbb{V}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{L-1} \gamma^t \tilde{R}_t + \gamma^L V_{\gamma, \text{P}}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*}(S_L) \right] \right\|_{\infty}}{1-\gamma^{2L}}} \\ & \leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{1-\gamma}} \frac{\sqrt{\frac{68}{6} L^2 + 6 \left( \left\| \hat{V}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*} \right\|_{\infty} + \left\| \hat{V}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right\|_{\infty} \right)^2}}{\sqrt{1-\gamma^{2L}}} \\ & \leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{1-\gamma}} \frac{\sqrt{\frac{68}{6} L^2} + \sqrt{6 \left( \left\| \hat{V}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*} \right\|_{\infty} + \left\| \hat{V}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right\|_{\infty} \right)^2}}{\sqrt{1-\gamma^{2L}}} \\ & \leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{1-\gamma}} \frac{\sqrt{\frac{68}{6} L^2} + \sqrt{6 \left( \left\| \hat{V}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*} \right\|_{\infty} + \left\| \hat{V}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right\|_{\infty} \right)^2}}{\sqrt{\frac{4}{5}(1-\gamma)L}} \\ & < \sqrt{\frac{29L}{(1-\gamma)^2}} + \sqrt{\frac{15}{L} \frac{\left\| \hat{V}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*} \right\|_{\infty} + \left\| \hat{V}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right\|_{\infty}}{1-\gamma}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used Lemma 13 to bound  $\frac{1}{1-\gamma^{2L}} \leq \frac{5}{4} \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)L}$ .  $\square$

The next lemma controls the variance on all states.

**Lemma 25.** *Under the settings of Lemmas 23 and 24, we have*

$$\gamma \left\| (I - \gamma P_{\pi_{\gamma}^*})^{-1} \sqrt{\mathbb{V}_{P_{\pi_{\gamma}^*}} \left[ V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right]} \right\|_{\infty} \leq 4 \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H}}{(1-\gamma)^2}}$$

and

$$\gamma \left\| (I - \gamma P_{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*})^{-1} \sqrt{\mathbb{V}_{P_{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*}} \left[ V_{\gamma, \text{P}}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*} \right]} \right\|_{\infty} \leq 8 \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H}}{(1-\gamma)^2}} + \sqrt{\frac{15}{\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H}} \frac{\left\| \hat{V}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^*} \right\|_{\infty} + \left\| \hat{V}_{\gamma, \text{P}}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right\|_{\infty}}{1-\gamma}}.$$

*Proof.* First we establish the first bound in the lemma statement. As we have already bounded the entries corresponding to the recurrent states of  $\pi_{\gamma}^*$  by Lemma 23, it remains to bound the transient states. Let  $s \in \mathcal{T}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*}$  be an arbitrary transient state. Using Lemma 18, we have

$$\begin{aligned} e_s^{\top} \gamma (I - \gamma P_{\pi_{\gamma}^*})^{-1} \sqrt{\mathbb{V}_{P_{\pi_{\gamma}^*}} \left[ V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right]} &= \gamma \underline{e}_s^{\top} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \gamma^k Z_{\pi_{\gamma}^*}^{k-1} Y_{\pi_{\gamma}^*} (I - \gamma X_{\pi_{\gamma}^*})^{-1} \sqrt{\mathbb{V}_{P_{\pi_{\gamma}^*}} \left[ V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right]} \\ &\quad + \gamma \underline{e}_s^{\top} \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t Z_{\pi_{\gamma}^*}^t \sqrt{\mathbb{V}_{P_{\pi_{\gamma}^*}} \left[ V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right]}. \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

Now we bound each of the terms in (17). For the first term, we can calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma \underline{e}_s^\top \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \gamma^k Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^{k-1} Y_{\pi_\gamma^*} (I - \gamma X_{\pi_\gamma^*})^{-1} \sqrt{\mathbb{V}_{P_{\pi_\gamma^*}} [V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}]} \\
\leq \gamma \underline{e}_s^\top \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^{k-1} Y_{\pi_\gamma^*} (I - \gamma X_{\pi_\gamma^*})^{-1} \sqrt{\mathbb{V}_{P_{\pi_\gamma^*}} [V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}]} \\
\leq \left\| \underline{e}_s^\top \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^{k-1} Y_{\pi_\gamma^*} \right\|_1 \gamma \left\| (I - \gamma X_{\pi_\gamma^*})^{-1} \sqrt{\mathbb{V}_{P_{\pi_\gamma^*}} [V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}]} \right\|_\infty \\
\leq \sqrt{\frac{32}{5} \frac{\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H}}{(1 - \gamma)^2}}
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that  $\underline{e}_s^\top \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^{k-1} Y_{\pi_\gamma^*}$  is a probability distribution and Lemma 23.

For the second term of (17), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma \underline{e}_s^\top \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^t \sqrt{\mathbb{V}_{P_{\pi_\gamma^*}} [V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}]} &= \gamma \left\| \underline{e}_s^\top \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^t \right\|_1 \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \frac{\gamma^t \underline{e}_s^\top Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^t}{\left\| \underline{e}_s^\top \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^t \right\|_1} \sqrt{\mathbb{V}_{P_{\pi_\gamma^*}} [V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}]} \\
&\leq \gamma \left\| \underline{e}_s^\top \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^t \right\|_1 \sqrt{\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \frac{\gamma^t \underline{e}_s^\top Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^t}{\left\| \underline{e}_s^\top \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^t \right\|_1} \mathbb{V}_{P_{\pi_\gamma^*}} [V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}]} \\
&= \sqrt{\left\| \underline{e}_s^\top \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^t \right\|_1} \sqrt{\gamma^2 \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \underline{e}_s^\top Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^t \mathbb{V}_{P_{\pi_\gamma^*}} [V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}]} \tag{18}
\end{aligned}$$

where we used Jensen's inequality since  $x \mapsto \sqrt{x}$  is concave and  $\frac{\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \underline{e}_s^\top Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^t}{\left\| \underline{e}_s^\top \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^t \right\|_1}$  is a probability distribution (all entries of this row vector are positive and they sum to 1 due to our normalization). Now we bound each factor in (18). Using Lemma 17, we have

$$\sqrt{\left\| \underline{e}_s^\top \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^t \right\|_1} \leq \sqrt{\left\| \underline{e}_s^\top \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^t \right\|_1} \leq \sqrt{\mathbf{B}}.$$

For the second factor in (18), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \underline{e}_s^\top Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^t \mathbb{V}_{P_{\pi_\gamma^*}} [V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}] &\leq \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \underline{e}_s^\top Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^t \mathbb{V}_{P_{\pi_\gamma^*}} [V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}] \\
&\quad + \underline{e}_s^\top \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \gamma^k Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^{k-1} Y_{\pi_\gamma^*} (I - \gamma X_{\pi_\gamma^*})^{-1} \mathbb{V}_{P_{\pi_\gamma^*}} [V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}] \\
&= \underline{e}_s^\top (I - \gamma P_{\pi_\gamma^*})^{-1} \mathbb{V}_{P_{\pi_\gamma^*}} [V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}]
\end{aligned}$$

where the equality step is due to Lemma 18. Now we can apply two steps which are used within Lemma 11 to obtain the desired bound on this term. Abbreviating  $v = \mathbb{V}_{P_{\pi_\gamma^*}} [V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}]$ , it is shown within Lemma 11 that

$$\gamma^2 \left\| (I - \gamma P_{\pi_\gamma^*})^{-1} v \right\|_\infty \leq 2\gamma^2 \left\| (I - \gamma^2 P_{\pi_\gamma^*})^{-1} v \right\|_\infty \leq 2 \left\| \mathbb{V}_{\pi_\gamma^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_t \right] \right\|_\infty \leq \frac{2}{(1 - \gamma)^2}$$

(where the final inequality is because the total discounted return is within  $[0, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}]$ ). Therefore we can bound the second factor in (18) as

$$\sqrt{\gamma^2 \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t e_s^\top Z_{\pi_\gamma^*}^t \mathbb{V}_{P_{\pi_\gamma^*}} [V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}]} \leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{(1-\gamma)^2}} = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{1-\gamma}.$$

Combining all of these bounds back into (17), we have

$$\begin{aligned} e_s^\top \gamma (I - \gamma P_{\pi_\gamma^*})^{-1} \sqrt{\mathbb{V}_{P_{\pi_\gamma^*}} [V_\gamma^{\pi_\gamma^*}]} &\leq \sqrt{\frac{32}{5} \frac{\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H}}{(1-\gamma)^2}} + \sqrt{\mathbf{B}} \frac{\sqrt{2}}{1-\gamma} \\ &< 4 \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H}}{(1-\gamma)^2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have established the first inequality from the lemma statement.

For the second inequality, the argument is entirely analogous, except that we use Lemma 24 instead of Lemma 23, and also in the MDP with the perturbed reward  $\tilde{r}$  we have the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mathbb{V}^{\pi_\gamma^*} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_t \right] \right\|_{\infty} &\leq \left( \frac{\|\tilde{r}\|_{\infty}}{1-\gamma} \right)^2 \leq \left( \frac{\|r\|_{\infty} + \xi}{1-\gamma} \right)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)^2} \left( 1 + \frac{(1-\gamma)\varepsilon}{6} \right)^2 \leq \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)^2} \left( \frac{7}{6} \right)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that  $\frac{(1-\gamma)\varepsilon}{6} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{6(\mathbf{B}+\mathbf{H})} \leq \frac{1}{6}$  because  $\frac{1}{1-\gamma} \geq \mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H}$  and  $\varepsilon \leq \mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H}$ . Thus we can obtain the bound

$$\begin{aligned} &\gamma \left\| (I - \gamma P_{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^*})^{-1} \sqrt{\mathbb{V}_{P_{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^*}} [V_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^*}]} \right\|_{\infty} \\ &\leq \sqrt{29 \frac{\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H}}{(1-\gamma)^2}} + \sqrt{\frac{15}{\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H}}} \frac{\|\hat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^*}\|_{\infty} + \|\hat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^{\pi_\gamma^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_\gamma^*}\|_{\infty}}{1-\gamma} \\ &\quad + \sqrt{\mathbf{B}} \frac{7\sqrt{2}}{6(1-\gamma)} \\ &\leq 8 \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H}}{(1-\gamma)^2}} + \sqrt{\frac{15}{\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H}}} \frac{\|\hat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\hat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^*}\|_{\infty} + \|\hat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^{\pi_\gamma^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_\gamma^*}\|_{\infty}}{1-\gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

We are now ready to prove Theorem 6 on the sample complexity of general discounted MDPs.

*Proof of Theorem 6.* To prove Theorem 6 we will combine our bounds of the variance parameters in Lemma 25 with Lemma 9. First, starting with (2) from Lemma 9 and combining with the first bound from Lemma 25, we have that there exist absolute constants  $c_1, c_2$  such that for any  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , if  $n \geq \frac{c_2}{1-\gamma} \log \left( \frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon} \right)$ ,

then with probability at least  $1 - \delta$

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\widehat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^{\pi_\gamma^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_\gamma^*}\|_\infty &\leq \gamma \sqrt{\frac{c_1 \log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{n}} \left\| (I - \gamma P_{\pi_\gamma^*})^{-1} \sqrt{\mathbb{V}_{P_{\pi_\gamma^*}} [V_{\gamma}^{\pi_\gamma^*}]} \right\|_\infty \\
&\quad + c_1 \gamma \frac{\log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{(1-\gamma)n} \|V_{\gamma}^{\pi_\gamma^*}\|_\infty + \frac{\varepsilon}{6} \\
&\leq \sqrt{\frac{c_1 \log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{n}} 4 \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H}}{(1-\gamma)^2}} + c_1 \gamma \frac{\log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{(1-\gamma)n} \|V_{\gamma}^{\pi_\gamma^*}\|_\infty + \frac{\varepsilon}{6} \\
&\leq \sqrt{\frac{c_1 \log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{n}} 4 \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H}}{(1-\gamma)^2}} + c_1 \frac{\log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{(1-\gamma)^2 n} + \frac{\varepsilon}{6} \\
&\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{6} + \frac{1}{16 \cdot 6^2} \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H}} + \frac{\varepsilon}{6} \\
&\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2},
\end{aligned}$$

where the penultimate inequality is under the assumption that  $n \geq 16 \cdot 6^2 c_1 \frac{\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H}}{\varepsilon^2 (1-\gamma)^2} \log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)$ , and the final inequality makes use of the fact that  $\varepsilon \leq \mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H}$ .

Next, still using Lemma 9, under the same event, we also have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\widehat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^*}\|_\infty \\
&\leq \gamma \sqrt{\frac{c_1 \log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{n}} \left\| (I - \gamma P_{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^*})^{-1} \sqrt{\mathbb{V}_{P_{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^*}} [V_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^*}]} \right\|_\infty \\
&\quad + c_1 \gamma \frac{\log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{(1-\gamma)n} \|V_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^*}\|_\infty + \frac{\varepsilon}{6} \\
&\leq \sqrt{\frac{c_1 \log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{n}} \left( 8 \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H}}{(1-\gamma)^2}} + \sqrt{\frac{15}{\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H}}} \frac{\|\widehat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^*}\|_\infty + \|\widehat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^{\pi_\gamma^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_\gamma^*}\|_\infty}{1-\gamma} \right) \\
&\quad + c_1 \gamma \frac{\log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{(1-\gamma)n} \|V_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^*}\|_\infty + \frac{\varepsilon}{6} \\
&\leq \sqrt{\frac{c_1 \log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{n}} \left( 8 \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H}}{(1-\gamma)^2}} + \sqrt{\frac{15}{\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H}}} \frac{\|\widehat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^*}\|_\infty + (\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H})/2}{1-\gamma} \right) \\
&\quad + c_1 \frac{\log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{(1-\gamma)n} \frac{7}{6} \frac{1}{1-\gamma} + \frac{\varepsilon}{6}
\end{aligned}$$

using the second inequality from Lemma 25 for the second inequality, and then we use the fact that  $\|V_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^*}\|_\infty \leq \frac{7}{6} \frac{1}{1-\gamma}$  which was argued in Lemma 25, as well as the fact from above that  $\|\widehat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^{\pi_\gamma^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_\gamma^*}\|_\infty \leq$

$\varepsilon/2 \leq (\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H})/2$ . After rearranging, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left( 1 - \sqrt{\frac{c_1 \log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{n}} \sqrt{\frac{15}{\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H}}} \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \right) \left\| \widehat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^*} \right\|_{\infty} \\
& \leq \sqrt{\frac{c_1 \log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{n}} \left( 8\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H}}{(1-\gamma)^2}} + \sqrt{\frac{15}{\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H}}} \frac{(\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H})/2}{1-\gamma} \right) + c_1 \frac{\log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{(1-\gamma)^2 n} \frac{7}{6} + \frac{\varepsilon}{6} \\
& \leq \sqrt{\frac{c_1 \log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{n}} 10\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H}}{(1-\gamma)^2}} + c_1 \frac{\log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{(1-\gamma)^2 n} \frac{7}{6} + \frac{\varepsilon}{6}.
\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

If  $n \geq 6^2 \cdot 10^2 c_1 \frac{\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H}}{\varepsilon^2 (1-\gamma)^2} \log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)$ , then the RHS of (19) is bounded by

$$\frac{\varepsilon}{6} + \frac{7}{6} \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H}} \frac{1}{6^2 \cdot 10^2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{6} \leq \left( \frac{1}{6} + \frac{1}{6^2 \cdot 10^2} + \frac{1}{6} \right) \varepsilon \leq 0.4\varepsilon$$

using the assumption that  $\varepsilon \leq \mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H}$ . Under the same condition on  $n$ , we also have that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left( 1 - \sqrt{\frac{c_1 \log\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon}\right)}{n}} \sqrt{\frac{15}{\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H}}} \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \right) \left\| \widehat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^*} \right\|_{\infty} \\
& \geq \left( 1 - \sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon^2}{(\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H})^2}} \sqrt{\frac{15}{6^2 \cdot 10^2}} \right) \left\| \widehat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^*} \right\|_{\infty} \\
& \geq \left( 1 - \sqrt{\frac{15}{6^2 \cdot 10^2}} \right) \left\| \widehat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^*} \right\|_{\infty} \\
& \geq 0.9 \left\| \widehat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^*} \right\|_{\infty}
\end{aligned}$$

where again we used the assumption that  $\varepsilon \leq \mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H}$ . Combining these two bounds with the inequality (19), we obtain that

$$0.9 \left\| \widehat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^*} \right\|_{\infty} \leq 0.4\varepsilon$$

which implies that

$$\left\| \widehat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^*} \right\|_{\infty} \leq \frac{0.4}{0.9} \varepsilon < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Since we have established that  $\left\| \widehat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right\|_{\infty} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$  and that  $\left\| \widehat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^*} \right\|_{\infty} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ , since also  $\widehat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^*} \geq \widehat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*}$ , we can conclude that

$$V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^*} \leq \left\| \widehat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\pi_{\gamma}^*} \right\|_{\infty} \mathbf{1} + \left\| \widehat{V}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^*} - V_{\gamma}^{\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^*} \right\|_{\infty} \mathbf{1} \leq \varepsilon \mathbf{1},$$

that is that  $\widehat{\pi}_{\gamma, \mathbf{P}}^*$  is  $\varepsilon$ -optimal.

Finally, we check that all of our conditions on  $n$  can be satisfied if

$$n \geq \max \left\{ 6^2 \cdot 10^2 c_1 \frac{\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H}}{\varepsilon^2 (1-\gamma)^2}, 6^2 \cdot 16 c_1 \frac{\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H}}{\varepsilon^2 (1-\gamma)^2}, \frac{c_2}{1-\gamma} \right\} \log \left( \frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon} \right),$$

and since  $\frac{1}{1-\gamma} \geq \mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H}$  and  $\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H} \geq \varepsilon$ , we have  $\frac{\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H}}{\varepsilon^2 (1-\gamma)^2} \geq \frac{(\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H})^2}{\varepsilon^2 (1-\gamma)^2} \geq \frac{1}{1-\gamma}$ , so the above is guaranteed if we set  $C_3 = \max\{6^2 \cdot 10^2 c_1, c_2\}$  and require  $n \geq C_3 \frac{\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{H}}{\varepsilon^2 (1-\gamma)^2} \log \left( \frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)\delta\varepsilon} \right)$ .  $\square$

### B.3 Proof of Theorem 7 (General Average-Reward MDP Bounds)

In this section, we prove our main result on the sample complexity of general average-reward MDPs.

*Proof of Theorem 7.* We can combine our bound for discounted MDPs, Theorem 6, with our reduction from average-reward MDPs to discounted MDPs, Theorem 5.

Using Theorem 6 with target accuracy  $B + H$  and discount factor  $\bar{\gamma} = 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{6(B+H)}$ , we obtain a  $(B + H)$ -optimal policy for the discounted MDP  $(P, r, \bar{\gamma})$  with probability at least  $1 - \delta$  as long as

$$\begin{aligned} n &\geq C_3 \frac{B + H}{(1 - \bar{\gamma})^2 (B + H)^2} \log \left( \frac{SA}{(1 - \bar{\gamma}) \delta \varepsilon} \right) \\ &= 6^2 C_3 \frac{B + H}{(B + H)^2} \frac{(B + H)^2}{\varepsilon^2} \log \left( \frac{6(B + H) SA}{\varepsilon \delta \varepsilon} \right) \end{aligned}$$

which is satisfied when  $n \geq C_4 \frac{B+H}{\varepsilon^2} \log \left( \frac{SA(B+H)}{\delta \varepsilon} \right)$  for sufficiently large  $C_4$ .

Applying Theorem 5 (with error parameter  $\frac{\varepsilon}{6}$ ), we obtain

$$\rho^* - \rho^{\hat{\pi}^*} \leq \left( 3 + 2 \frac{B + H}{B + H} \right) \frac{\varepsilon}{6} \leq \varepsilon$$

as desired.  $\square$

### B.4 Proof of Theorems 3 and 4 (Lower Bounds)

In this section, we prove our minimax lower bounds on the sample complexity of general average-reward MDPs (Theorem 3) and discounted MDPs (Theorem 4).

*Proof of Theorem 3.* First consider the MDP instances  $\mathcal{M}_{a^*}$  indexed by  $a^* \in \{1, \dots, A\}$  shown in Figure 2. In all instances, states 2, 3 and 4 are absorbing states, and state 1 is a transient state. State 1 has  $A$  actions and is the only state with multiple actions. At state 1, taking action  $a = 1$  will take the agent to state 4 deterministically; taking action 2 will take the agent back to state 1 with probability  $P(1|1, 2) = 1 - \frac{1}{T}$ , to state 2 with probability  $P(2|1, 2)$ , and to state 3 with probability  $P(3|1, 2) = 1 - P(1|1, 2) - P(2|1, 2)$ . The instances differ only in the values of  $P(2|1, a)$  and  $P(3|1, a)$ , which are shown in Figure 2 along with the reward  $R$  for each state-action pair.

For the MDP instance  $\mathcal{M}_1$ , the optimal policy is taking action  $a = 1$  at state 1, leading to an average reward of  $1/2$ ; taking any other action leads to a sub-optimal average reward of  $\frac{1-2\varepsilon}{2}$ . Similarly, for the instance  $\mathcal{M}_{a^*}$  with  $a^* \in \{2, \dots, A\}$ , the optimal action is  $a = a^*$  with average reward  $\frac{1+2\varepsilon}{2}$ , the action  $a = 1$  has average reward  $\frac{1}{2}$ , and all other actions have average reward  $\frac{1-2\varepsilon}{2}$ . By direct calculation, we find that the span of the optimal policy is  $\|h^*\|_{\text{span}} = 0$  in all instances. Moreover, by taking any action  $a \neq 1$ , the agent will stay in state 1 for  $B$  steps in expectation before transitioning to state 2 or 3, so the bounded transient time is satisfied with parameter  $B$ .

We next define  $(A - 1)S/4$  master MDPs  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{s^*, a^*}$  indexed by  $s^* \in \{1, \dots, S/4\}$  and  $a^* \in \{2, \dots, A\}$  as follows. Each master MDP  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{s^*, a^*}$  has  $S/4$  copies of sub-MDPs such that the  $s^*$ th sub-MDP is equal to  $\mathcal{M}_{a^*}$  and all other sub-MDPs are equal to  $\mathcal{M}_1$ . We rename the states so that the states of the  $s$ th sub-MDP has states  $4s + 1, 4s + 2, 4s + 3, 4s + 4$  corresponding to states 1, 2, 3, 4 of the instances shown in Figure 2. Note each of these master MDPs has  $S$  states and  $A$  actions, satisfies the bounded transient time property with parameter  $B$ , and has the span of the bias of its Blackwell optimal policy equal to 0. Note that for a given policy  $\pi$  to be  $\varepsilon/3$ -average optimal in master MDP  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{s^*, a^*}$ , it must take action  $a^*$  in state  $4s^* + 1$  with probability at least  $2/3$ , and it must take action 1 in states  $4s + 1$  for  $s \in \{1, \dots, S/4\} \setminus \{s^*\}$  with probability at least  $2/3$ .

Thus, for an algorithm Alg to output an  $\varepsilon/3$ -average optimal policy  $\pi$ , it must identify the master MDP instance  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{s^*, a^*}$  (equivalently, the values of  $s^*$  and  $a^*$ ), in the sense that there must be exactly one state  $4s + 1$  where an action  $a \neq 1$  is taken with probability  $\geq 2/3$ . Therefore it suffices to lower bound the failure probability of any algorithm Alg for this  $(A - 1)S/4$ -way testing problem. By construction, for any two






Figure 2: MDP Instances Used in the Proof of Lower Bound in Theorem 3

distinct index pairs  $(s_1^*, a_1^*)$  and  $(s_2^*, a_2^*)$ , the master MDPs  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{s_1^*, a_1^*}$  and  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{s_2^*, a_2^*}$  differ only in the state-action pairs  $(4s_1^*, a_1^*)$  and  $(4s_2^*, a_2^*)$ , and we have

$$P_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{s_1^*, a_1^*}}(\cdot | 4s_1^*, a_1^*) = \text{Cat}\left(1 - \frac{1}{B}, \frac{1-2\varepsilon}{2B}, \frac{1+2\varepsilon}{2B}\right) =: Q_1,$$

$$P_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{s_2^*, a_2^*}}(\cdot | 4s_1^*, a_1^*) = \text{Cat}\left(1 - \frac{1}{B}, \frac{1+2\varepsilon}{2B}, \frac{1-2\varepsilon}{2B}\right) =: Q_2,$$

where  $\text{Cat}(p_1, p_2, p_3)$  denotes the categorical distribution with event probabilities  $p_i$ 's (and vice versa for the distributions of the state action pair  $(4s_2^*, a_2^*)$ ).

Now we use Fano's method [Wainwright, 2019a] to lower bound this failure probability. Choose an index  $J$  uniformly at random from the set  $\mathcal{J} := \{1, \dots, S/4\} \times \{2, \dots, A\}$  and suppose that we draw  $n$  iid samples  $X = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$  from the master MDP  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_J$ ; note that under the generative model, each random variable  $X_i$  represents an  $(S \times A)$ -by- $S$  transition matrix with exactly one nonzero entry in each row. Letting  $I(J; X)$  denote the mutual information between  $J$  and  $X$ , Fano's inequality yields that the failure probability is lower bounded by

$$1 - \frac{I(J; X) + \log 2}{\log((A-1)S/4)}.$$

We can calculate using the fact that the  $P_i$ 's are i.i.d., the chain rule of mutual information, and the form of the construction that

$$\begin{aligned}
I(J; X) &= nI(J; X_1) \\
&\leq n \max_{\substack{(s_1^*, a_1^*), (s_2^*, a_2^*) \in \mathcal{J}: \\ (s_1^*, a_1^*) \neq (s_2^*, a_2^*)}} D_{\text{KL}} \left( P_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{s_1^*, a_1^*}} \mid P_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{s_2^*, a_2^*}} \right) \\
&= n(D_{\text{KL}}(Q_1 \mid Q_2) + D_{\text{KL}}(Q_2 \mid Q_1)).
\end{aligned}$$

By direct calculation, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
D_{\text{KL}}(Q_1 \mid Q_2) &= \frac{1-2\varepsilon}{2B} \log \frac{1-2\varepsilon}{1+2\varepsilon} + \frac{1+2\varepsilon}{2B} \log \frac{1+2\varepsilon}{1-2\varepsilon} \\
&\leq \frac{1-2\varepsilon}{2B} \cdot \frac{-4\varepsilon}{1+2\varepsilon} + \frac{1+2\varepsilon}{2B} \cdot \frac{4\varepsilon}{1-2\varepsilon} && \log(1+x) \leq x, \forall x > -1 \\
&= \frac{16\varepsilon^2}{B(1+2\varepsilon)(1-2\varepsilon)} \\
&\leq \frac{32\varepsilon^2}{B} && \varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{4}.
\end{aligned}$$

Also note that  $D_{\text{KL}}(Q_2 \mid Q_1) = D_{\text{KL}}(Q_1 \mid Q_2)$  in this case. Therefore the failure probability is at least

$$\begin{aligned}
1 - \frac{I(J; P^n) + \log 2}{\log((A-1)S/4)} &\geq 1 - \frac{n \frac{64\varepsilon^2}{B} + \log 2}{\log((A-1)S/4)} \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{n \frac{64\varepsilon^2}{B}}{\log((A-1)S/4)},
\end{aligned}$$

where in the second inequality we assumed  $A$  and  $S$  are at least a sufficiently large constant. For the above RHS to be smaller than  $1/4$ , we therefore require  $n \geq \Omega(\frac{B \log(SA)}{\varepsilon^2})$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 4.* The desired DMDP lower bound follows from combining our AMDP lower bound Theorem 3 with the Average-to-Discount Reduction Algorithm 3.  $\square$