
ADAPTIVE GENERALIZED NEYMAN ALLOCATION: LOCAL ASYMPTOTIC MINIMAX OPTIMAL BEST ARM IDENTIFICATION

A PREPRINT

Masahiro Kato

Data Analytics Department, Mizuho-DL Financial Technology, Co., Ltd.
masahiro-kato@fintec.co.jp

May 30, 2024

ABSTRACT

This study investigates a local asymptotic minimax optimal strategy for fixed-budget best arm identification (BAI). We propose the Adaptive Generalized Neyman Allocation (AGNA) strategy and show that its worst-case upper bound of the probability of misidentifying the best arm aligns with the worst-case lower bound under the small-gap regime, where the gap between the expected outcomes of the best and suboptimal arms is small. Our strategy corresponds to a generalization of the Neyman allocation for two-armed bandits (Neyman, 1934; Kaufmann et al., 2016) and a refinement of existing strategies such as the ones proposed by Glynn & Juneja (2004) and Shin et al. (2018). Compared to Komiyama et al. (2022), which proposes a minimax rate-optimal strategy, our proposed strategy has a tighter upper bound that exactly matches the lower bound, including the constant terms, by restricting the class of distributions to the class of small-gap distributions. Our result contributes to the longstanding open issue about the existence of asymptotically optimal strategies in fixed-budget BAI, by presenting the local asymptotic minimax optimal strategy.

1 Introduction

This study considers the problem of fixed-budget best arm identification (BAI). We present an asymptotically optimal strategy in the sense that the upper bound aligns with the lower bound under the worst-case distribution when the budget approaches infinity and the gap between the expected outcomes of the best and suboptimal arms approaches zero.

Problem setting. In our problem, we consider a decision-maker who conducts an adaptive experiment with a fixed budget (sample size) T and a fixed set of arms $[K] := \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$. Each arm $a \in [K]$ has a potential random outcome $Y_a \in \mathcal{Y} \subset \mathbb{R}$, where \mathcal{Y} is an outcome space (Neyman, 1923; Rubin, 1974). Let P be a joint distribution of K -potential outcomes (Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_K) , and P_a be the marginal distribution of Y_a under P for each $a \in [K]$. Let \mathbb{P}_P and \mathbb{E}_P be the probability and expectation under P , respectively. Under P , let $a^*(P) := \arg \max_{a \in [K]} \mu_a(P)$ be the best arm, where $\mu_a(P) := \mathbb{E}_P[Y_a]$ is the expected value of Y_a . Let P^* be the distribution that generates data during an adaptive experiment, called the true distribution.

In each round $t \in [T] := \{1, 2, \dots, T\}$,

1. Potential outcomes $(Y_{1,t}, Y_{2,t}, \dots, Y_{K,t})$ are generated from P^* ;
2. The decision-maker draws arm $A_t \in [K]$ based on past observations $\{(Y_s, A_s)\}_{s=1}^{t-1}$;
3. The decision-maker observes the corresponding outcome Y_t linked to the allocated arm A_t as $Y_t = \sum_{a \in [K]} \mathbb{1}[A_t = a] Y_{a,t}$.

At the end of the experiment, the decision-maker estimates $a^*(P^*)$, denoted by $\hat{a}_T \in [K]$. The decision-maker's goal is to identify the arm with the highest expected outcome, minimizing the probability of misidentification $\mathbb{P}_{P^*}(\hat{a}_T \neq a^*(P^*))$ at the end of the experiment.

We define a strategy of a decision-maker as a pair of $((A_t)_{t \in [T]}, \hat{a}_T)$, where $(A_t)_{t \in [T]}$ is the allocation rule, and \hat{a}_T is the recommendation rule. Formally, with the sigma-algebras $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma(A_1, Y_1, \dots, A_t, Y_t)$, a strategy is a pair $((A_t)_{t \in [T]}, \hat{a}_T)$, where

- $(A_t)_{t \in [T]}$ is an allocation rule, which is \mathcal{F}_{t-1} -measurable and allocates an arm $A_t \in [K]$ in each round t using observations up to round $t - 1$.
- \hat{a}_T is a recommendation rule, which is an \mathcal{F}_T -measurable estimator of the best arm a^* using observations up to round T .

We denote a strategy by π . We also denote A_t and \hat{a}_T by A_t^π and \hat{a}_T^π when we emphasize that A_t and \hat{a}_T depend on π .

For this problem, we aim to derive a lower bound for the probability of misidentification $\mathbb{P}_{P^*}(\hat{a}_T \neq a^*(P^*))$ and develop a strategy whose probability of misidentification aligns with the lower bound.

Background and related work. To evaluate the exponential convergence of $\mathbb{P}_{P^*}(\hat{a}_T^\pi \neq a^*(P^*))$ under a designed strategy π , we employ the following measure, called the *complexity*:

$$-\frac{1}{T} \log \mathbb{P}_{P^*}(\hat{a}_T^\pi \neq a^*(P^*)). \quad (1)$$

The complexity $-\frac{1}{T} \log \mathbb{P}_{P^*}(\hat{a}_T^\pi \neq a^*(P^*))$ has widely been employed in the literature on large-deviation evaluation of hypothesis testing (Bahadur, 1960; van der Vaart, 1998), ordinal optimization (Glynn & Juneja, 2004), and BAI (Kaufmann et al., 2016).

When we know the distributional information completely, we can compute the optimal strategies based on the large-deviation principle (Gärtner, 1977; Ellis, 1984). When Y_a follows a Gaussian distribution for all $a \in [K]$, Chen et al. (2000) develops an asymptotically large-deviation optimal strategy for any Gaussian distribution. For more general distributions, Glynn & Juneja (2004) develops optimal strategies. Shin et al. (2018) refines their strategies.

However, assuming that the distributional information is completely known is too strong. This assumption implies that we know various information, such as the mean, variance, and best arm, in advance of an experiment. Our interest rather lies in designing experiments without assuming such knowledge. In BAI, various strategies have been proposed for that task (Bubeck et al., 2009; Karnin et al., 2013), but it is still under investigation what strategy is optimal in some sense (Ariu et al., 2021; Qin, 2022; Komiyama et al., 2022; Degenne, 2023; Wang et al., 2024).

To discuss optimal experiments, existing studies discuss lower bounds for the complexity (1) and then explore a strategy whose probability of misidentification aligns with the lower bound. Kaufmann et al. (2016) develops a general tool for developing lower bounds in BAI that holds based on the change-of-measure arguments (Lai & Robbins, 1985), without proposing strategies whose probability of misidentification aligns with the lower bound. Moreover, they also do not propose a specific lower bound for fixed-budget BAI. Using the arguments in Kaufmann et al. (2016), Garivier & Kaufmann (2016) conjectures a lower bound in their conclusion section, but Kaufmann (2020) points out that there exists the *reverse KL problem*, which implies that the conjectured lower bound in Garivier & Kaufmann (2016) may not work.

The existence of optimal strategies has long been an open issue (Kaufmann, 2020), where an ‘‘optimal’’ strategy implies that its upper bound aligns with the lower bound developed by Kaufmann et al. (2016). This problem is addressed by Ariu et al. (2021), a comment paper for Kasy & Sautmann (2021). Based on the arguments about Kasy & Sautmann (2021), Ariu et al. (2021) shows that there exists a distribution under which we can construct a lower bound that is larger than the lower bound in Kaufmann et al. (2016); that is, we cannot design a strategy whose probability of misidentification aligns with the lower bound in Kaufmann et al. (2016) for *any* distribution in a given class of distributions. This result is further refined and confirmed by Degenne (2023).

Motivated by these impossibility results, Komiyama et al. (2022) and Komiyama et al. (2023) develop minimax and Bayes optimal strategies. However, their strategies still have gaps between their lower and upper bounds. There are various other studies that attempt to address the open issue (Barrier et al., 2023; Atsidakou et al., 2023; Nguyen et al., 2024; Kato, 2024b; Wang et al., 2024).

To the best of our knowledge, there is no lower and upper bound (strategy) that strictly match including the constant terms. Note that in BAI with fixed confidence, such optimal strategies have been proposed (Garivier & Kaufmann, 2016). In Bayesian BAI, the asymptotically optimal strategies have been proposed in the sense of the posterior convergence rate, which does not imply the asymptotic optimality in fixed-budget BAI (Kasy & Sautmann, 2021; Ariu et al., 2021).

Contribution. We propose an *asymptotically optimal strategy whose probability of misidentification aligns with a lower bound under the worst-case distribution and the small-gap regime*, where the gaps between the expected

outcomes of the best and suboptimal arms are small. We refer to this optimality as the *local (asymptotic) minimax optimality*.

This study establishes the worst-case lower bound under the small-gap regime, which is characterized by the variances of the outcome Y_a . Then, motivated by the lower bound, we develop the Adaptive Generalized Neyman allocation (AGNA) strategy. We prove that its probability of misidentification aligns with our developed lower bound in the worst case under the small-gap regime.

We refer to our proposed strategy as the AGNA strategy since it is a generalization of the Neyman allocation strategy that is proven to be optimal in two-armed (Gaussian) bandits (Neyman, 1934; Glynn & Juneja, 2004; Hahn et al., 2011; Kaufmann et al., 2016; Kato et al., 2020). The extension of the Neyman allocation to multi-armed cases is also a longstanding open issue. In this study, we address this issue by showing a natural extension of the Neyman allocation.

Our result does not contradict those in Ariu et al. (2021) and Degenne (2023), which find that there exists a distribution under which we cannot design a strategy whose probability of misidentification aligns with the lower bound in Kaufmann et al. (2016). For their claim, we point out that (i) given a restricted class of distributions, (ii) for the worst-case distribution in the class, (iii) we can design a strategy whose upper bound aligns with the lower bound. The restricted class is characterized by the small-gap regime.

To the best of our knowledge, asymptotically optimal strategies whose upper bound exactly aligns with the lower bound have not been previously proposed in fixed-budget BAI. Furthermore, our argument is not restricted to a certain distribution and can be widely used because we approximate the lower and upper bounds by Gaussian ones under the small-gap regime.

In summary, our contributions are as follows:

1. A tight worst-case lower bound for multi-armed bandits (Theorem 2.3).
2. The AGNA strategy (Algorithm 1).
3. The upper bound of the AGNA strategy, which aligns with the lower bound under the small-gap regime (Theorem 4.1).
4. Applicability for various distributions.

When estimating the mean outcome, we employ the Adaptive Augmented Inverse Probability Weighting (A2IPW) estimator from Kato et al. (2020) and Cook et al. (2023), which has been utilized in existing studies in various fields (van der Laan, 2008). Our argument about the lower bound is inspired by the arguments in Kato (2024b), Komiyama et al. (2022), and Degenne (2023). The upper bound under the small-gap regime is derived using the results in Kato (2024a).

Organization. In Section 2, we develop the worst-case lower bound under the small-gap regime. Then, we develop the AGNA strategy in Section 3. In Section 4, we derive an upper bound of the AGNA strategy and show the local asymptotic minimax optimality by proving that the lower and upper bounds match as the budget approaches infinity and the gap approaches zero.

2 Worst-case Lower Bound

This section provides a lower bound for the probability of misidentification. We focus on the worst-case lower bound under the small-gap regime. Lower bounds also provide intuition about the sampling rule as well as the theoretical performance limit.

First, we define a class of distributions, for which show lower and upper bounds for the worst-case distribution.

Definition 2.1 (Mean-parameterized distributions with finite variances). *Let $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a compact parameter space, and let \mathcal{Y} be the support of Y_a for all $a \in [K]$. Let $\sigma_a : \Theta \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ be a variance function that is continuous with respect to $\theta \in \Theta$. Let P_{a, μ_a} be a distribution of Y_a parameterized by $\mu_a \in \Theta$. We define bandit models $(\mathcal{P}_a)_{a \in [K]}$ as*

$$\mathcal{P}_a := \mathcal{P}_a(\sigma_a(\cdot), \Theta, \mathcal{Y}) := \left\{ P_{a, \mu_a} : \mu_a \in \Theta, (1), (2), \text{ and } (3) \right\}, \quad (2)$$

where (1), (2), and (3) are defined as follows:

- (1) A distribution $P_{\mu_a, a}$ has a probability mass function or probability density function, denoted by $f_a(y \mid \mu_a)$. Additionally, $f_a(y \mid \mu_a) > 0$ holds for all $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $\mu_a \in \Theta$.
- (2) The variance of Y_a under P_{a, μ_a} is $\sigma_a^2(\mu_a)$. For each $\mu_a \in \Theta$ and each $a \in [K]$, the Fisher information $I_a(\mu_a) > 0$ of P_{a, μ_a} exists and is equal to the inverse of the variance $1/\sigma_a^2(\mu_a)$.

(3) Let $\ell_a(\mu_a) = \ell_a(\mu_a | y) = \log f(y | \mu_a)$ be the likelihood function of $P_{\mu_a, a}$, and $\dot{\ell}_a$, $\ddot{\ell}_a$, and $\dddot{\ell}_a$ be the first, second, and third derivatives of ℓ_a . The likelihood functions $\{\ell_a(\mu_a)\}_{a \in [K]}$ are three times differentiable and satisfy the following:

- (a) $\mathbb{E}_{P_{\mu_a, a}} [\dot{\ell}_a(\mu_a)] = 0$;
- (b) $\mathbb{E}_{P_{\mu_a, a}} [\ddot{\ell}_a(\mu_a)] = -I_a(\mu_a) = 1/\sigma_a^2(\mu_a)$;
- (c) For each $\mu_a \in \Theta$, there exist a neighborhood $U(\theta)$ and a function $u(y | \mu_a) \geq 0$, and the following holds:
 - i. $|\dot{\ell}_a(\tau)| \leq u(y | \theta)$ for $U(\mu_a)$;
 - ii. $\mathbb{E}_{P_{\mu_a, a}} [u(Y | \mu_a)] < \infty$.

Let P_μ be a joint distribution of $(Y_a)_{a \in [K]}$, under which the marginal distribution of Y_a is given as $P_{a, \mu_a} \in \mathcal{P}_a$ for all $a \in [K]$. We define the following class of distributions for $(Y_a)_{a \in [K]}$:

$$\bar{\mathcal{P}}(b, \theta, \bar{\Delta}) := \left\{ P_\nu : \forall a \in [K] \quad P_{a, \nu_a} \in \mathcal{P}_a, \nu_b = \theta, \forall a \in [K] \setminus \{b\} \quad 0 < \theta - \nu_a \leq \bar{\Delta} \right\}.$$

We also define $\bar{\mathcal{P}}(\bar{\Delta}) := \{P \in \cup_{b \in [K]} \bar{\mathcal{P}}(b, \theta, \bar{\Delta}) : \theta \in \Theta\}$.

For example, Gaussian distributions with fixed variances and Bernoulli distributions belong to this class. In Gaussian distributions, the variances are usually defined to be independent of μ_a . In Bernoulli distributions, the variances are $\mu_a(1 - \mu_a)$.

Next, we define a class of strategies and later show the asymptotic optimality for a strategy belonging to this class. This study focuses on consistent strategies that recommend the best arm with probability one as $T \rightarrow \infty$ (Kaufmann et al., 2016).

Definition 2.2 (Consistent strategy). *We say that a strategy π is consistent if $\mathbb{P}_{P^*}(\hat{a}_T^\pi = a^*(P^*)) \rightarrow 1$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$ for any true distribution P^* such that $a^*(P^*)$ is unique. We denote the class of all possible consistent strategies by Π^{const} .*

Then, we derive a lower bound that any consistent strategy satisfies given the mean-parameterized distributions. To derive a tight lower bound, we employ the change-of-measure argument (Le Cam, 1972, 1986; Lehmann & Casella, 1998; van der Vaart, 1991, 1998; Lai & Robbins, 1985). Using the change-of-measure argument, Kaufmann et al. (2016) developed a general framework for discussing lower bounds. In their results, lower bounds are characterized by the Kullback–Leibler (KL) divergence $\text{KL}(P, Q)$ between two distributions P and Q . We are usually interested in the KL divergence between P^* and a hypothesis Q . This lower bound also provides intuition about the sampling rule as well as the theoretical performance limit.

If the distribution P^* of the data-generating process is known, we can compute the KL divergence exactly, allowing us to design an asymptotically optimal strategy based on the KL divergence, as shown by Glynn & Juneja (2004). However, P^* is usually unknown (if P^* were known, we would know which arm is the best arm in advance of an experiment). In BAI, our interest lies in designing better strategies without knowing P^* in advance.

To reflect the fact that P^* is unknown in evaluation, we employ the statistical decision-making framework pioneered by Wald (1945). Among several criteria, such as Bayesian evaluation (Komiyama et al., 2023), we focus on the worst-case or minimax analysis. We evaluate the worst-case probability of misidentification defined as

$$\lim_{\bar{\Delta} \rightarrow 0} \inf_{P \in \cup_{b \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}} \bar{\mathcal{P}}(b, \theta^*, \bar{\Delta})} \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{\bar{\Delta}^2 T} \log \mathbb{P}_P(\hat{a}_T^\pi \neq a^*(P)).$$

This worst-case complexity evaluates the probability of misidentification under the worst-case scenario where the best arm is not $a^*(P^*)$ and the gaps are small. The infimum $\inf_{P \in \cup_{b \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}} \bar{\mathcal{P}}(b, \theta^*, \bar{\Delta})}$ represents the worst case concerning the best arm. Specifically, the true best arm is $a^*(P^*)$ under P^* , and we ensure robustness against all cases where the best arm is not $a^*(P^*)$, thus guaranteeing robustness against the misidentification of $a^*(P^*)$ during an experiment. The small-gap regime $\bar{\Delta} \rightarrow 0$ also indicates the worst case concerning the gaps.

For the worst-case complexity, the following theorem provides the worst-case lower bound. The proof is shown in Appendix A.

Theorem 2.3 (Worst-case lower bound). *For each $P^* \in \bar{\mathcal{P}}(\bar{\Delta})$, any consistent strategy $\pi \in \Pi^{\text{const}}$ (Definition 2.2) satisfies*

$$\lim_{\bar{\Delta} \rightarrow 0} \inf_{P \in \cup_{b \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}} \bar{\mathcal{P}}(b, \theta^*, \bar{\Delta})} \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{\bar{\Delta}^2 T} \log \mathbb{P}_P(\hat{a}_T^\pi \neq a^*(P)) \leq V^*(P^*),$$

where $\theta^* = \mu_{a^*(P^*)}(P^*)$, and

$$V^*(P^*) := \frac{1}{2 \left(\sigma_{a^*(P^*)}(\theta^*) + \sqrt{\sum_{a \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}} \sigma_a^2(\theta^*)} \right)^2}.$$

Our lower bound depends on the expected outcome of the best arm $\theta^* = \max_{b \in [K]} \mu_b(P^*)$ and variances $(\sigma_a^2(\theta^*))_{a \in [K]}$, while taking the worst case.

While several existing studies, such as Carpentier & Locatelli (2016), Komiyama et al. (2022), Yang & Tan (2022), and Degenne (2023), have introduced the minimax evaluation framework, there is a constant gap between the lower and upper bounds, and only the *leading factors* in lower and upper bounds match. We conjecture that this is due to the estimation error of P^* affecting the evaluation. To address this issue, we consider a restricted class of P , characterized by the small gap; that is, $\mu_{a^*(P^*)} - \mu_a$ is sufficiently small for all $a \in [K]$. Under this regime, we can obtain matching lower and upper bounds, as shown in Section 4.2. We refer to this as local minimax optimality.

3 The AGNA Strategy

Based on the lower bounds, we design the AGNA strategy, which consists of the sampling rule using the generalized Neyman allocation and the recommendation rule using the *Adaptive Augmented Inverse Probability Weighting* (A2IPW) estimator. Our strategy depends on hyperparameters \bar{C}_μ and \bar{C}_{σ^2} , which are introduced for technical purposes to bound the estimators and any large positive value can be used. The pseudo-code is shown in Algorithm 1.

3.1 Sampling Rule

Let $(\sigma_a^2)_{a \in [K]}$ be the variances of the true distribution P^* .

First, we define a target allocation ratio, which is used to determine our allocation rule, as follows:

$$\mathbf{w}^{\text{AGNA}} := \arg \max_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \min_{a \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}} \frac{1}{\sigma_{a^*(P^*)}^2/w_{a^*(P^*)} + \sigma_a^2/w_a},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} w_{a^*(P^*)}^{\text{AGNA}} &= \frac{\sigma_{a^*(P^*)}}{\sigma_{a^*(P^*)} + \sqrt{\sum_{c \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}} \sigma_c^2}}, \\ w_a^{\text{AGNA}} &= \frac{\sigma_a^2 / \sqrt{\sum_{c \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}} \sigma_c^2}}{\sigma_{a^*(P^*)} + \sqrt{\sum_{c \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}} \sigma_c^2}} = \frac{(1 - w_{a^*(P^*)}^{\text{AGNA}}) \sigma_a^2}{\sum_{c \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}} \sigma_c^2} \quad \forall a \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

This target allocation ratio is given from the proof of the lower bound in Theorem 2.3. We conjecture that a strategy using the ratio (3) is optimal and design a strategy using it. We confirm that such a strategy is actually optimal by checking the matching of the lower and upper bounds.

During our experiment, we estimate \mathbf{w}^{AGNA} using observed data. Since \mathbf{w}^{AGNA} only depends on the variances, we can implement such an algorithm by sequentially estimating the variance.

By using the target allocation ratio, we define our sampling rule. Our sampling rule is characterized by a sequence $\{\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t^{\text{AGNA}}\}_{t=1}^T$, where $\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t^{\text{AGNA}} = (\hat{w}_{a,t}^{\text{AGNA}})_{a \in [K]} \in \Delta^K$. The first K rounds are initialization phases. In each round $t = 1, \dots, K$, we set $\hat{w}_{1,t}^{\text{AGNA}} = \dots = \hat{w}_{K,t}^{\text{AGNA}} = 1/K$ and sample $A_t = t$. Next, in each round $t = K + 1, K + 2, \dots, T$, we estimate σ_a^2 by using the past observations up to $(t - 1)$ -th round \mathcal{F}_{t-1} . By using the estimate $\hat{\sigma}_{a,t}^2$, we obtain $\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t^{\text{AGNA}}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{w}_{\hat{a}_t,t}^{\text{AGNA}} &= \frac{\hat{\sigma}_{\hat{a}_t,t}}{\hat{\sigma}_{\hat{a}_t,t} + \sqrt{\sum_{c \in [K] \setminus \{\hat{a}_t\}} \hat{\sigma}_{c,t}^2}}, \\ \hat{w}_{a,t}^{\text{AGNA}} &= \frac{\hat{\sigma}_{a,t}^2 / \sqrt{\sum_{c \in [K] \setminus \{\hat{a}_t\}} \hat{\sigma}_{c,t}^2}}{\hat{\sigma}_{\hat{a}_t,t} + \sqrt{\sum_{c \in [K] \setminus \{\hat{a}_t\}} \hat{\sigma}_{c,t}^2}} = \frac{(1 - \hat{w}_{\hat{a}_t,t}^{\text{AGNA}}) \hat{\sigma}_{a,t}^2}{\sum_{c \in [K] \setminus \{\hat{a}_t\}} \hat{\sigma}_{c,t}^2} \quad \forall a \in [K] \setminus \{\hat{a}_t\}, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Algorithm 1 AGNA Strategy**Parameter:** Positive constants \overline{C}_μ and \overline{C}_{σ^2} .**Initialization:**For each $t = 1, 2, \dots, K$, draw $A_t = t$. For $a \in [K]$, set $\widehat{w}_{a,t} = 1/K$.**for** $t = 3$ to T **do**Estimate w^{AGNA} following (4).Draw $A_t = a$ with probability $\widehat{w}_{a,t}$.Observe $Y_t = \sum_{a \in [K]} \mathbb{1}[A_t = a] Y_{a,t}$.**end for**Construct $\widehat{\mu}_{a,T}^{\text{A2IPW}}$ for $a \in [K]$, following (5).Recommend \widehat{a}_T following (6).

where $\widehat{a}_t = \arg \max_{a \in [K]} \widehat{\mu}_{a,t}$ and $\widehat{\mu}_{a,t} = \frac{1}{\sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \mathbb{1}[A_s = a]} \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \mathbb{1}[A_s = a] Y_{a,s}$. Then, we sample arm a with probability $\widehat{w}_{a,t}^{\text{AGNA}}$.

In this study, we define the estimator $\widehat{\sigma}_{a,t}^2$ as $\widehat{\sigma}_{a,t}^2 := \text{thre}(\widehat{\sigma}_{a,t}^2, 1/\overline{C}_{\sigma^2}, \overline{C}_{\sigma^2})$, where $\widehat{\sigma}_{a,t}^2 := \widehat{v}_{a,t} - \widehat{\mu}_{a,t}^2$, and $\widehat{v}_{a,t} = \frac{1}{\sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \mathbb{1}[A_s = a]} \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \mathbb{1}[A_s = a] Y_{a,s}^2$.

3.2 Recommendation Rule

At the end of the experiment, we estimate the expected outcome μ_a for each $a \in [K]$ and recommend arm with the highest estimated expected outcome. We follow the recommendation rule that employs an A2IPW estimator, proposed in Kato et al. (2020) and Kato (2024a).

With a truncated version of the estimated expected reward $\widehat{\mu}_{a,t} := \text{thre}(\widehat{\mu}_{a,t}, -\overline{C}_\mu, \overline{C}_\mu)$, we define the A2IPW estimator of μ_a for each $a \in [K]$ as

$$\widehat{\mu}_{a,T}^{\text{A2IPW}} := \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left\{ \frac{\mathbb{1}[A_t = a] (Y_{a,t} - \widehat{\mu}_{a,t})}{\widehat{w}_{a,t}^{\text{AGNA}}} + \widehat{\mu}_{a,t} \right\}. \quad (5)$$

At the end of the experiment (after the round $t = T$), we recommend \widehat{a}_T as

$$\widehat{a}_T^{\text{AGNA}} := \arg \max_{a \in [K]} \widehat{\mu}_{a,T}^{\text{A2IPW}} \quad (6)$$

The A2IPW estimator consists of a martingale difference sequence (MDS), which allows us to apply various tools for asymptotic analysis and simplify the analysis. Using the property of an MDS, for the A2IPW estimator, Kato et al. (2020) shows an asymptotic normality with the central limit theorem, and Kato (2024a) develops a large-deviation bound. While we conjecture that a naive sample mean also has the same asymptotic theoretical property, it is not easy to show, as well as Hirano et al. (2003).

4 Worst-Case Upper Bound and Local Asymptotic Minimax Optimality

This section provides an upper bound of the probability of misidentification of the AGNA strategy.

4.1 Worst-Case Upper Bound

For a compact parameter space $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}$, let us define

$$\underline{\mathcal{P}}(b, \theta, \underline{\Delta}) := \left\{ P_\nu : \forall a \in [K] \quad P_{a,\nu_a} \in \mathcal{P}_a, \nu_b = \theta, \forall a \in [K] \setminus \{b\} \quad \underline{\Delta} \leq \theta - \nu_a \right\}$$

We also define $\underline{\mathcal{P}}(\underline{\Delta}) := \{P \in \cup_{b \in [K]} \underline{\mathcal{P}}(b, \theta, \underline{\Delta}) : \theta \in \Theta\}$.

Then, we show the following upper bound. Our proof is based on Kato (2024a). For completeness, we show the proof in Appendix B.

Theorem 4.1 (Upper bound of the AGNA strategy). *Suppose that $\mu_a \in (-\bar{C}_\mu, \bar{C}_\mu)$ and $\sigma_a(\mu_a) \in (1/\bar{C}_{\sigma^2}, \bar{C}_{\sigma^2})$ hold for all $a \in [K]$ and all $\mu_a \in \Theta$. Then, for each $P^* \in \underline{\mathcal{P}}(\underline{\Delta})$, the AGNA strategy satisfies*

$$\lim_{\underline{\Delta} \rightarrow 0} \min_{P \in \cup_{b \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}} \underline{\mathcal{P}}(b, \theta^*, \underline{\Delta})} \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{\underline{\Delta}^2 T} \log \mathbb{P}_P(\hat{a}_T^{\text{AGNA}} \neq a^*(P)) \geq V^*(P^*).$$

Here, \bar{C}_μ and \bar{C}_{σ^2} are used for technical purpose, and we can set sufficiently large values for them.

4.2 Local Minimax Optimality

This section proves the local minimax optimality of our proposed AGNA strategy. Let us define

$$\mathcal{P}(b, \theta, \underline{\Delta}, \bar{\Delta}) := \left\{ P_\nu : \forall a \in [K] \quad P_{a, \nu_a} \in \mathcal{P}_a, \nu_b = \theta, \forall a \in [K] \setminus \{b\} \quad \underline{\Delta} \leq \theta - \nu_a \leq \bar{\Delta} \right\}.$$

We also define $\mathcal{P}(\underline{\Delta}, \bar{\Delta}) := \{P \in \cup_{b \in [K]} \mathcal{P}(b, \theta, \underline{\Delta}, \bar{\Delta}) : \theta \in \Theta\}$. Then, the following lemma holds from Theorems 2.3 and 4.1.

Lemma 4.2 (Lower and upper bound). *For each $P^* \in \mathcal{P}(\underline{\Delta}, \bar{\Delta})$, any consistent strategy $\pi \in \Pi^{\text{const}}$ (Definition 2.2) satisfies*

$$\lim_{\underline{\Delta}, \bar{\Delta} \rightarrow 0} \inf_{P \in \cup_{b \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}} \bar{\mathcal{P}}(b, \theta^*, \underline{\Delta}, \bar{\Delta})} \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{\bar{\Delta}^2 T} \log \mathbb{P}_P(\hat{a}_T^\pi \neq a^*(P)) \leq V^*(P^*),$$

where $\theta^* := \mu_{a^*(P^*)}(P^*)$. Additionally, if $\mu_a \in (-\bar{C}_\mu, \bar{C}_\mu)$ and $\sigma_a \in (1/\bar{C}_{\sigma^2}, \bar{C}_{\sigma^2})$ hold for all $a \in [K]$, then the AGNA strategy satisfies

$$\lim_{\underline{\Delta}, \bar{\Delta} \rightarrow 0} \min_{P \in \cup_{b \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}} \mathcal{P}(b, \theta^*, \underline{\Delta}, \bar{\Delta})} \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{\underline{\Delta}^2 T} \log \mathbb{P}_P(\hat{a}_T^{\text{AGNA}} \neq a^*(P)) \geq V^*(P^*).$$

Then, the following result shows that the probability of misidentification of our proposed AGNA strategy aligns with our derived lower bound under the worst case and the small-gap regime; that is, our proposed strategy is local asymptotic minimax optimal. We illustrate the concept of the local asymptotic minimax optimal in Figure 1.

Theorem 4.3 (Local asymptotic minimax optimality). *For each $P^* \in \mathcal{P}(\underline{\Delta}, \bar{\Delta})$, it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\pi \in \Pi^{\text{const}}} \lim_{\underline{\Delta}, \bar{\Delta} \rightarrow 0} \inf_{P \in \cup_{b \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}} \bar{\mathcal{P}}(b, \theta^*, \underline{\Delta}, \bar{\Delta})} \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{\bar{\Delta}^2 T} \log \mathbb{P}_P(\hat{a}_T^\pi \neq a^*(P)) \\ & \leq V^*(P^*) \leq \lim_{\underline{\Delta}, \bar{\Delta} \rightarrow 0} \inf_{P \in \cup_{b \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}} \mathcal{P}(b, \theta^*, \underline{\Delta}, \bar{\Delta})} \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{\underline{\Delta}^2 T} \log \mathbb{P}_P(\hat{a}_T^{\text{AGNA}} \neq a^*(P)). \end{aligned}$$

Note that the upper and lower bounds are flipped due to the property of $\log(x)$. This theorem is a direct consequence of Lemma 4.2.

In two-armed Bernoulli bandits, we draw each arm with the ratio $w_1^{\text{AGNA}} = w_2^{\text{AGNA}} = \frac{1}{2}$ (uniform allocation) because the variances become the same under the small-gap regime. This result is compatible with those in Kaufmann et al. (2016) and Wang et al. (2024). In contrast, in multi-armed Bernoulli bandits with $K \geq 3$, the ratio becomes $w_{a^*(P^*)}^{\text{AGNA}} = \frac{1}{1+\sqrt{K}}$ and $w_a^{\text{AGNA}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}(1+\sqrt{K})}$ for all $a \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}$. To the best of our knowledge, this ratio has not been proven to be optimal in the literature of BAI.

5 Simulation Studies

In this section, we investigate the empirical performance of our proposed AGNA strategy. We compare AGNA with the Uniform-EBA strategy (Uniform, Bubeck et al., 2011), which allocates arms with the AGNA given known variances (GNA); an equal allocation ratio ($1/K$); the successive rejects strategy (SR, Audibert et al., 2010); the large-deviation optimal (GJ) strategy proposed by Glynn & Juneja (2004); and the successive halving (Karnin et al., 2013) using the variances (SHVar, Lalitha et al., 2023).




Figure 1: Illustration of the local asymptotic minimax optimality.




Figure 2: The results with $\bar{\sigma} = 5$. The left and right columns are the results with the first and second cases, respectively. We conduct 250 independent trials and report the empirical probability of misidentification at $T \in \{100, 200, 300, \dots, 49900, 50000\}$.




Figure 3: The results with $\bar{\sigma} = 10$. The left and right columns are the results with the first and second cases, respectively. We conduct 250 independent trials and report the empirical probability of misidentification at $T \in \{100, 200, 300, \dots, 49900, 50000\}$.

The GJ strategy is an oracle strategy that is proven to be asymptotically optimal in cases where we have full knowledge of the distributions, including mean parameters and the identity of the best arm. Note that this strategy is practically infeasible. The GNA strategy does not estimate variances but directly allocates arms according to the ratio w^{AGNA} using known variances.

Let $K \in \{3, 5\}$. The best arm is arm 1 with $\mu_1 = \mu_1(P^*) = 1$. We consider two cases. In the first case, we set $\mu_a = \mu_a(P^*) = 0.95$ for all $a \in [K] \setminus \{1\}$. In the second case, we set $\mu_2 = \mu_2(P^*) = 0.95$ and choose $\mu_a = \mu_a(P^*)$ from a uniform distribution with support $[0.90, 0.95]$ for all $a \in [K] \setminus \{1, 2\}$.

The variances are given as a permutation of the set $\{\bar{\sigma}, \underline{\sigma}, \sigma_{(3)}, \dots, \sigma_{(K)}\}$, where $\bar{\sigma}$ is chosen from $\{5, 10\}$, $\underline{\sigma} = 0.1$, and $\sigma_{(3)}$ is chosen from a uniform distribution with support $[\underline{\sigma}, \bar{\sigma}]$.

We continue the strategies until $T = 50000$. We conduct 100 independent trials for each setting. For each $T \in \{100, 200, 300, \dots, 49900, 50000\}$, we compute the empirical probability of misidentification. We plot the empirical probability of misidentification \hat{p} in Figures 3–2. Note that the variance of the empirical probability of misidentification \hat{p} is $\hat{p}(1 - \hat{p})$. Thus, \hat{p} provides sufficient information about its distribution, so we do not show other graphs such as box plots and confidence intervals.

According to our results and existing studies, we theoretically expect the highest performance from the GJ strategy, followed by the GNA strategy in large samples. Our AGNA strategy follows these, with the other strategies trailing.

Our empirical results align with theoretical expectations. Interestingly, the AGNA strategy often outperforms the GJ strategy. In finite samples, we observe cases where the SR and Uniform strategies outperform the GJ and AGNA strategies. However, in large samples, the GJ and AGNA strategies tend to outperform them. This result implies that our proposed strategies are asymptotically optimal but can be suboptimal in finite samples.

In future work, it would be interesting to investigate the finite sample properties of the AGNA strategy and finite sample optimal strategies. Kato et al. (2020) explore the finite sample properties of the A2IPW strategy, which has been refined by Cook et al. (2023), using the concentration inequalities proposed by Balsubramani & Ramdas (2016) and Howard et al. (2021). In the study of finite sample optimal strategies, the lower bound by Carpentier & Locatelli (2016) is insightful, as it has already been used in existing studies (Yang & Tan, 2022; Ariu et al., 2021; Degenne, 2023).

6 Conclusion

This study developed the AGNA strategy for the fixed-budget BAI problem. We show that its upper bound on the probability of misidentification aligns with the worst-case lower bound. This result provides a solution to the longstanding open problem regarding the existence of optimal strategies in fixed-budget BAI. Ariu et al. (2021) and Degenne (2023) identified distributions under which another lower bound, larger than the lower bound of Kaufmann et al. (2016), can be constructed. In contrast, by restricting the class of distributions to the small-gap regime, we eliminated such instances and developed a local asymptotic minimax optimal strategy.

References

- Kaito Ariu, Masahiro Kato, Junpei Komiyama, Kenichiro McAlinn, and Chao Qin. Policy choice and best arm identification: Asymptotic analysis of exploration sampling, 2021. arXiv:2109.08229.
- Alexia Atsidakou, Sumeet Katariya, Sujay Sanghavi, and Branislav Kveton. Bayesian fixed-budget best-arm identification, 2023. arXiv:2211.08572.
- Jean-Yves Audibert, Sébastien Bubeck, and Remi Munos. Best arm identification in multi-armed bandits. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pp. 41–53, 2010.
- R. R. Bahadur. Stochastic Comparison of Tests. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 31(2):276 – 295, 1960.
- Akshay Balsubramani and Aaditya Ramdas. Sequential nonparametric testing with the law of the iterated logarithm. In Alexander T. Ihler and Dominik Janzing (eds.), *Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, 2016.
- Antoine Barrier, Aurélien Garivier, and Gilles Stoltz. On best-arm identification with a fixed budget in non-parametric multi-armed bandits. In *International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory (AISTATS)*, 2023.
- Sébastien Bubeck, Rémi Munos, and Gilles Stoltz. Pure exploration in multi-armed bandits problems. In *Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pp. 23–37. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2009.
- Sébastien Bubeck, Rémi Munos, and Gilles Stoltz. Pure exploration in finitely-armed and continuous-armed bandits. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 2011.
- Ovidiu Calin and Constantin Udriște. *Geometric Modeling in Probability and Statistics*. Mathematics and Statistics. Springer International Publishing, 2014.
- Alexandra Carpentier and Andrea Locatelli. Tight (lower) bounds for the fixed budget best arm identification bandit problem. In *COLT*, 2016.
- Chun-Hung Chen, Jianwu Lin, Enver Yücesan, and Stephen E. Chick. Simulation budget allocation for further enhancing the efficiency of ordinal optimization. *Discrete Event Dynamic Systems*, 10(3):251–270, 2000.
- Thomas Cook, Alan Mishler, and Aaditya Ramdas. Semiparametric efficient inference in adaptive experiments. In *NeurIPS 2023 Workshop on Adaptive Experimental Design and Active Learning in the Real World*, 2023. arXiv:2311.18274.
- Rémy Degenne. On the existence of a complexity in fixed budget bandit identification. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 195, pp. 1131–1154. PMLR, 2023.
- Hanna Döring, Sabine Jansen, and Kristina Schubert. The method of cumulants for the normal approximation. *Probability Surveys*, 19(none):185 – 270, 2022.
- John Duchi. Lecture notes on statistics and information theory, 2023. URL <https://web.stanford.edu/class/stats311/lecture-notes.pdf>.
- Richard S. Ellis. Large Deviations for a General Class of Random Vectors. *The Annals of Probability*, 12(1):1 – 12, 1984.
- Aurélien Garivier and Emilie Kaufmann. Optimal best arm identification with fixed confidence. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, 2016.
- Jürgen Gärtner. On large deviations from the invariant measure. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 22(1):24–39, 1977.

- Peter Glynn and Sandeep Juneja. A large deviations perspective on ordinal optimization. In *Proceedings of the 2004 Winter Simulation Conference*, volume 1. IEEE, 2004.
- Jinyong Hahn, Keisuke Hirano, and Dean Karlan. Adaptive experimental design using the propensity score. *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, 2011.
- Keisuke Hirano, Guido Imbens, and Geert Ridder. Efficient estimation of average treatment effects using the estimated propensity score. *Econometrica*, 2003.
- Steven R. Howard, Aaditya Ramdas, Jon D. McAuliffe, and Jasjeet S. Sekhon. Time-uniform, nonparametric, nonasymptotic confidence sequences. *Annals of Statistics*, 2021.
- Zohar Karnin, Tomer Koren, and Oren Somekh. Almost optimal exploration in multi-armed bandits. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2013.
- Maximilian Kasy and Anja Sautmann. Adaptive treatment assignment in experiments for policy choice. *Econometrica*, 89(1):113–132, 2021.
- Masahiro Kato. Locally optimal fixed-budget best arm identification in two-armed gaussian bandits with unknown variances, 2024a. arXiv:2312.12741.
- Masahiro Kato. Worst-case optimal multi-armed gaussian best arm identification with a fixed budget, 2024b. arXiv:2310.19788.
- Masahiro Kato, Takuya Ishihara, Junya Honda, and Yusuke Narita. Efficient adaptive experimental design for average treatment effect estimation, 2020. arXiv:2002.05308.
- Emilie Kaufmann. *Contributions to the Optimal Solution of Several Bandits Problems*. Habilitation à Diriger des Recherches, Université de Lille, 2020. URL https://emiliekaufmann.github.io/HDR_EmilieKaufmann.pdf.
- Emilie Kaufmann, Olivier Cappé, and Aurélien Garivier. On the complexity of best-arm identification in multi-armed bandit models. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17(1):1–42, 2016.
- Junpei Komiyama, Taira Tsuchiya, and Junya Honda. Minimax optimal algorithms for fixed-budget best arm identification. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022.
- Junpei Komiyama, Kaito Ariu, Masahiro Kato, and Chao Qin. Rate-optimal bayesian simple regret in best arm identification. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 2023.
- T.L Lai and Herbert Robbins. Asymptotically efficient adaptive allocation rules. *Advances in Applied Mathematics*, 1985.
- Anusha Lalitha, Kousha Kalantari, Yifei Ma, Anoop Deoras, and Branislav Kveton. Fixed-budget best-arm identification with heterogeneous reward variances. In *Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, 2023.
- L Le Cam. Limits of experiments. In *Theory of Statistics*, pp. 245–282. University of California Press, 1972.
- Lucien Le Cam. *Asymptotic Methods in Statistical Decision Theory (Springer Series in Statistics)*. Springer, 1986.
- Erich L. Lehmann and George Casella. *Theory of Point Estimation*. Springer-Verlag, 1998.
- Jerzy Neyman. Sur les applications de la theorie des probabilites aux experiences agricoles: Essai des principes. *Statistical Science*, 5:463–472, 1923.
- Jerzy Neyman. On the two different aspects of the representative method: the method of stratified sampling and the method of purposive selection. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 97:123–150, 1934.
- Nicolas Nguyen, Imad Aouali, András György, and Claire Vernade. Prior-dependent allocations for bayesian fixed-budget best-arm identification in structured bandits, 2024. arXiv:2402.05878.
- Chao Qin. Open problem: Optimal best arm identification with fixed-budget. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, 2022.
- Donald B. Rubin. Estimating causal effects of treatments in randomized and nonrandomized studies. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1974.
- Dongwook Shin, Mark Broadie, and Assaf Zeevi. Tractable sampling strategies for ordinal optimization. *Operations Research*, 66(6):1693–1712, 2018.
- Mark J. van der Laan. The construction and analysis of adaptive group sequential designs, 2008. URL <https://biostats.bepress.com/ucbbiostat/paper232>.
- A.W. van der Vaart. An asymptotic representation theorem. *International Statistical Review / Revue Internationale de Statistique*, 59(1):97–121, 1991.

- A.W. van der Vaart. *Asymptotic Statistics*. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- A. Wald. Sequential tests of statistical hypotheses. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 16(2):117–186, 1945.
- Po-An Wang, Kaito Ariu, and Alexandre Proutiere. On uniformly optimal algorithms for best arm identification in two-armed bandits with fixed budget. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2024.
- Junwen Yang and Vincent Tan. Minimax optimal fixed-budget best arm identification in linear bandits. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022.

A Proof of Theorem 2.3

This section provides the proof for Theorem 2.3. Our proof is inspired by Kaufmann et al. (2016), Garivier & Kaufmann (2016), and Kato (2024b).

A.1 Transportation Lemma

Let us denote the number of drawn arms by

$$N_a(T) = \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{1}[A_t = a].$$

First, we introduce the *transportation* lemma, shown by Kaufmann et al. (2016).

Proposition A.1 (Transportation lemma. From Lemma 1 in Kaufmann et al. (2016)). *Let P and Q be two bandit models with K arms such that for all a , the distributions P_a and Q_a of Y_a are mutually absolutely continuous. Then, we have*

$$\sum_{a=1}^K \mathbb{E}_P[N_a(T)] \text{KL}(P_a, Q_a) \geq \sup_{\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{F}_T} d(\mathbb{P}_P(\mathcal{E}), \mathbb{P}_Q(\mathcal{E})),$$

where $d(x, y) := x \log(x/y) + (1-x) \log((1-x)/(1-y))$ is the binary relative entropy, with the convention that $d(0, 0) = d(1, 1) = 0$.

Here, Q corresponds to an alternative hypothesis that is used for deriving lower bounds and not an actual distribution.

A.2 KL Divergence and Fisher Information

We recap the following well-known relationship that holds between the KL divergence and the Fisher information. This result is a consequence of the Taylor expansion.

Proposition A.2 (Proposition 15.3.2. in Duchi (2023) and Theorem 4.4.4 in Calin & Udriște (2014)). *For $P_{\mu_a, a}$ and $Q_{\nu_a, a}$ of $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}$, we have*

$$\lim_{\nu_a \rightarrow \mu_a} \frac{1}{(\mu_a - \nu_a)^2} \text{kl}(\mu_a, \nu_a) = \frac{1}{2} I(\mu_a) \quad (7)$$

A.3 Proof of Theorem 2.3

By using Propositions A.1 and A.2, we prove Theorem 2.3 below.

Proof of Theorem 2.3. Let $P_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = P^*$; that is, $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_a)_{a \in [K]}$ be the true mean outcomes of Y_a under P^* .

From Proposition A.1 1, any consistent strategy $\pi \in \Pi^{\text{const}}$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{P_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \in \cup_{b \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}} \mathcal{P}(b, \theta^*, \bar{\Delta})} \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{T} \log \mathbb{P}_{P_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}}(\hat{a}_T^\pi \neq a^*(P_{\boldsymbol{\nu}})) \\ & \leq \inf_{P_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \in \cup_{b \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}} \mathcal{P}(b, \theta^*, \bar{\Delta})} \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{a \in [K]} \kappa_{a, T}^\pi(P_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) \text{KL}(P_{a, \mu_a}, Q_{a, \nu_a}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\kappa_{a, T}^\pi(P_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) := \frac{1}{T} \mathbb{E}_{P_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}} [N_a]$. Here, we used the proof of Theorem 12 in Kaufmann et al. (2016).

From Proposition A.2, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\Xi_a(\varepsilon)$ such that for all $-\Xi_a(\varepsilon) < \xi_a := -\mu_a + \nu_a < \Xi_a(\varepsilon)$, the following holds:

$$\text{kl}(\mu_a, \mu_a + \xi_a) \leq \frac{\xi_a^2}{2} I(\mu_a) + \varepsilon \xi_a^2 = \frac{\xi_a^2}{2\sigma_a(\mu_a)} + \varepsilon \xi_a^2, \quad (8)$$

where we used $I(\mu_a) = \sigma_a^2(\mu_a)$.

Then, we have

$$\inf_{P_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \in \cup_{b \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}} \mathcal{P}(b, \theta^*, \bar{\Delta})} \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{T} \log \mathbb{P}_{P_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}}(\hat{a}_T^\pi \neq a^*(P_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}))$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\leq \inf_{\substack{(\nu_a) \in \mathbb{R}^K: \\ \arg \max_{a \in [K]} \nu_a \neq a^*(P^*)}} \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{a \in [K]} \left\{ \kappa_{a,T}^\pi(P_\mu) \frac{(\mu_a - \nu_a)^2}{2\sigma_a^2(\mu_a)} + \varepsilon (\mu_a - \nu_a)^2 \right\} \\
 &\leq \sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \inf_{\substack{(\nu_a) \in \mathbb{R}^K: \\ \arg \max_{a \in [K]} \nu_a \neq a^*(P^*)}} \sum_{a \in [K]} \left\{ w_a \frac{(\mu_a - \nu_a)^2}{2\sigma_a^2(\mu_a)} + \varepsilon (\mu_a - \nu_a)^2 \right\},
 \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{W} := \{\mathbf{w} \in [0, 1]^K : \sum_{a \in [K]} w_a = 1\}$.

We compute the RHS as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\inf_{\substack{(\nu_a) \in \mathbb{R}^K: \\ \arg \max_{a \in [K]} \nu_a \neq a^*(P^*)}} \sum_{a \in [K]} w_a \frac{(\mu_a - \nu_a)^2}{2\sigma_a^2(\mu_a)} \\
 &= \min_{a \in [K] \setminus \{a^*\}} \inf_{\substack{(\nu_a) \in \mathbb{R}^K: \\ \nu_a > \nu_{a^*(P^*)}}} \sum_{a \in [K]} w_a \frac{(\mu_a - \nu_a)^2}{2\sigma_a^2(\mu_a)} \\
 &= \min_{a \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}} \inf_{\substack{(\nu_{a^*(P^*)}, \nu_a) \in \mathbb{R}^2: \\ \nu_a > \nu_{a^*(P^*)}}} \left\{ w_{a^*(P^*)} \frac{(\nu_{a^*(P^*)} - \mu_{a^*(P^*)})^2}{2\sigma_{a^*(P^*)}^2(\mu_{a^*(P^*)})} + w_a \frac{(\nu_a - \mu_a)^2}{2\sigma_a^2(\mu_a)} \right\} \\
 &= \min_{a \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}} \min_{\nu \in [\mu_a, \mu_{a^*(P^*)}]} \left\{ w_{a^*(P^*)} \frac{(\nu - \mu_{a^*(P^*)})^2}{2\sigma_{a^*(P^*)}^2(\mu_{a^*(P^*)})} + w_a \frac{(\nu - \mu_a)^2}{2\sigma_a^2(\mu_a)} \right\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Then, by solving the optimization problem, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\min_{a \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}} \min_{\nu \in [\mu_a, \mu_{a^*(P^*)}]} \left\{ w_{a^*(P^*)} \frac{(\nu - \mu_{a^*(P^*)})^2}{2\sigma_{a^*(P^*)}^2(\mu_{a^*(P^*)})} + w_a \frac{(\nu - \mu_a)^2}{2\sigma_a^2(\mu_a)} \right\} \\
 &= \min_{a \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}} \frac{(\theta^* - \mu_a)^2}{2 \left(\frac{\sigma_{a^*(P^*)}^2(\mu_{a^*(P^*)})}{w_{a^*(P^*)}} + \frac{\sigma_a^2(\mu_a)}{w_a} \right)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\lim_{\Delta \rightarrow 0} \inf_{P_\nu \in \cup_{b \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}} \mathcal{P}(b, \theta^*, \Delta)} \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{\Delta^2 T} \log \mathbb{P}_{P_\mu}(\hat{a}_T^\pi \neq a^*(P_\mu)) \\
 &\leq \sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \min_{a \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}} \frac{(\theta^* - \mu_a)^2}{2 \left(\frac{\sigma_{a^*(P^*)}^2(\mu_{a^*(P^*)})}{w_{a^*(P^*)}} + \frac{\sigma_a^2(\mu_a)}{w_a} \right)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Lastly, we solve

$$\max_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \min_{a \neq b} \frac{1}{2 \left(\frac{\sigma_{a^*(P^*)}^2(\mu_{a^*(P^*)})}{w_{a^*(P^*)}} + \frac{\sigma_a^2(\mu_a)}{w_a} \right)}.$$

For simplicity, we denote $(\sigma_a^2(\mu_a))_{a \in [K]}$ by $(\sigma_a^2)_{a \in [K]}$.

We solve the optimization problem by solving the following non-linear programming:

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\max_{R > 0, \mathbf{w} = \{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_K\} \in (0, 1)^K} R \\
 \text{s.t. } &R \left(\frac{\sigma_{a^*(P^*)}^2}{w_{a^*(P^*)}} + \frac{\sigma_a^2}{w_a} \right) \zeta - 1 \leq 0 \quad \forall a \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}, \\
 &\sum_{a \in [K]} w_a - 1 = 0,
 \end{aligned}$$

$$w_a > 0 \quad \forall a \in [K].$$

Let $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = \{\lambda_a\}_{a \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}} \in [-\infty, 0]^{K-1}$ and $\gamma \geq 0$ be Lagrangian multipliers. Then, we define the following Lagrangian function:

$$L(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \gamma; R, \mathbf{w}) = R + \sum_{a \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}} \lambda_a \left(R \left(\frac{\sigma_{a^*(P^*)}^2}{w_{a^*(P^*)}} + \frac{\sigma_a^2}{w_a} \right) - 1 \right) - \gamma \left(\sum_{a \in [K]} w_a - 1 \right).$$

Note that the objective (R) and constraints ($R \left(\frac{\sigma_{a^*(P^*)}^2}{w_{a^*(P^*)}} + \frac{\sigma_a^2}{w_a} \right) - 1 \leq 0$ and $\sum_{a \in [K]} w_a - 1 = 0$) are differentiable convex functions for R and \mathbf{w} .

Here, the global optimizer R^\dagger and $\mathbf{w}^\dagger = \{w_a^\dagger\} \in (0, 1)^K$ satisfies the following KKT conditions:

$$1 + \sum_{a \in [K] \setminus \{b\}} \lambda_a^\dagger \left(\frac{\sigma_{a^*(P^*)}^2}{w_{a^*(P^*)}^\dagger} + \frac{\sigma_a^2}{w_a^\dagger} \right) = 0 \quad (9)$$

$$-2 \sum_{a \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}} \lambda_a^\dagger R^\dagger \frac{\sigma_{a^*(P^*)}^2}{(w_{a^*(P^*)}^\dagger)^2} = \gamma^\dagger \quad (10)$$

$$-2\lambda_a^\dagger R^\dagger \frac{\sigma_a^2}{(w_a^\dagger)^2} = \gamma^\dagger \quad \forall a \in [K] \setminus \{b\} \quad (11)$$

$$\lambda_a^\dagger \left(R^\dagger \left(\frac{\sigma_{a^*(P^*)}^2}{w_{a^*(P^*)}^\dagger} + \frac{\sigma_a^2}{w_a^\dagger} \right) - 1 \right) = 0 \quad \forall a \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\} \quad (12)$$

$$\gamma^\dagger \left(\sum_{c \in [K]} w_c^\dagger - 1 \right) = 0$$

$$\lambda_a^\dagger \leq 0 \quad \forall a \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}.$$

Here, (9) implies that there exists $a \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}$ such that $\lambda_a^\dagger < 0$ holds. This is because if $\lambda_a^\dagger = 0$ for all $a \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}$, $1 + 0 = 1 \neq 0$.

With $\lambda_a^\dagger < 0$, since $-\lambda_a^\dagger R^\dagger \frac{\sigma_{a^*(P^*)}^2}{(w_{a^*(P^*)}^\dagger)^2} > 0$ for all $a \in [K]$, it follows that $\gamma^\dagger > 0$. This also implies that $\sum_{c \in [K]} w_c^\dagger - 1 = 0$.

Then, (12) implies that

$$R^\dagger \left(\frac{\sigma_{a^*(P^*)}^2}{w_{a^*(P^*)}^\dagger} + \frac{\sigma_a^2}{w_a^\dagger} \right) = 1 \quad \forall a \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\frac{\sigma_a^2}{w_a^\dagger} = \frac{\sigma_c^2}{w_c^\dagger} \quad \forall a, c \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}. \quad (13)$$

Let $\frac{\sigma_a^2}{w_a^\dagger} = \frac{\sigma_c^2}{w_c^\dagger} = \frac{1}{R^\dagger} - \frac{\sigma_{a^*(P^*)}^2}{w_{a^*(P^*)}^\dagger} = U$. From (13) and (9),

$$\sum_{c \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}} \lambda_c^\dagger = -\frac{1}{\frac{\sigma_{a^*(P^*)}^2}{w_{a^*(P^*)}^\dagger} + U} \quad (14)$$

From (10) and (11), we have

$$\frac{\sigma_{a^*(P^*)}^2}{(w_{a^*(P^*)}^\dagger)^2} \sum_{c \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}} \lambda_c^\dagger = \lambda_a^\dagger \frac{\sigma_a^2}{(w_a^\dagger)^2} \quad \forall a \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}. \quad (15)$$

From (14) and (15), we have

$$-\frac{\sigma_{a^*(P^*)}^2}{(w_{a^*(P^*)}^\dagger)^2} = \lambda_a^\dagger \frac{\sigma_a^2}{(w_a^\dagger)^2} \left(\frac{\sigma_{a^*(P^*)}^2}{w_{a^*(P^*)}^\dagger} + U \right) \quad \forall a \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}. \quad (16)$$

From (9) and (16), we have

$$w_{a^*(P^*)}^\dagger = \sqrt{\sigma_{a^*(P^*)}^2 \sum_{a \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}} \frac{(w_a^\dagger)^2}{\sigma_a^2}}.$$

In summary, the KKT conditions are given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} w_{a^*(P^*)}^\dagger &= \sqrt{\sigma_{a^*(P^*)}^2 \sum_{a \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}} \frac{(w_a^\dagger)^2}{\sigma_a^2}} \\ \frac{\sigma_{a^*(P^*)}^2}{(w_{a^*(P^*)}^\dagger)^2} &= -\lambda_a^\dagger \frac{\sigma_a^2}{(w_a^\dagger)^2} \left(\left(\frac{\sigma_{a^*(P^*)}^2}{w_{a^*(P^*)}^\dagger} + \frac{\sigma_a^2}{w_a^\dagger} \right) \right) \quad \forall a \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\} \\ -\lambda_a^\dagger \frac{\sigma_a^2}{(w_a^\dagger)^2} &= \tilde{\gamma}^\dagger \quad \forall a \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\} \\ \frac{\sigma_a^2}{w_a^\dagger} &= \frac{1}{R^\dagger} - \frac{\sigma_{a^*(P^*)}^2}{w_{a^*(P^*)}^\dagger} \quad \forall a \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\} \\ \sum_{a \in [K]} w_a^\dagger &= 1 \\ \lambda_a^\dagger &\leq 0 \quad \forall a \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\gamma}^\dagger = \gamma^\dagger / 2R^\dagger$.

From $w_b^\dagger = \sqrt{\sigma_b^2 \sum_{a \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}} \frac{(w_a^\dagger)^2}{\sigma_a^2}}$ and $-\lambda_a^\dagger \frac{\sigma_a^2}{(w_a^\dagger)^2} = \tilde{\gamma}^\dagger$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} w_{a^*(P^*)}^\dagger &= \sigma_{a^*(P^*)} \sqrt{\sum_{a \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}} -\lambda_a^\dagger / \sqrt{\tilde{\gamma}^\dagger}} \\ w_a^\dagger &= \sqrt{-\lambda_a^\dagger / \tilde{\gamma}^\dagger} \sigma_a. \end{aligned}$$

From $\sum_{a \in [K]} w_a^\dagger = 1$, we have

$$\sigma_b \sqrt{\sum_{a \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}} -\lambda_a^\dagger / \sqrt{\tilde{\gamma}^\dagger}} + \sum_{a \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}} \sqrt{-\lambda_a^\dagger / \tilde{\gamma}^\dagger} \sigma_a = 1.$$

Therefore, the following holds:

$$\sqrt{\tilde{\gamma}^\dagger} = \sigma_{a^*(P^*)} \sqrt{\sum_{a \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}} -\lambda_a^\dagger} + \sum_{a \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}} \sqrt{-\lambda_a^\dagger} \sigma_a.$$

Hence, the target drawing ratio is computed as

$$\begin{aligned} w_{a^*(P^*)}^\dagger &= \frac{\sigma_{a^*(P^*)} \sqrt{\sum_{a \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}} -\lambda_a^\dagger}}{\sigma_{a^*(P^*)} \sqrt{\sum_{a \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}} -\lambda_a^\dagger} + \sum_{a \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}} \sqrt{-\lambda_a^\dagger} \sigma_a} \\ w_a^\dagger &= \frac{\sqrt{-\lambda_a^\dagger} \sigma_a}{\sigma_{a^*(P^*)} \sqrt{\sum_{a \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}} -\lambda_a^\dagger} + \sum_{a \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}} \sqrt{-\lambda_a^\dagger} \sigma_a}, \end{aligned}$$

where from $\frac{\sigma_{a^*(P^*)}^2}{(w_{a^*(P^*)}^\dagger)^2} = -\lambda_a^\dagger \frac{\sigma_a^2}{(w_a^\dagger)^2} \left(\frac{\sigma_b^2}{w_b^\dagger} + \frac{\sigma_a^2}{w_a^\dagger} \right)$, $(\lambda_a^\dagger)_{a \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}}$ satisfies,

$$\frac{1}{\sum_{a \in [K] \setminus \{b\}} -\lambda_a^\dagger}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \left(\frac{\sigma_b}{\sqrt{\sum_{a \in [K] \setminus \{b\}} -\lambda_a^\dagger}} + \frac{\sigma_a}{\sqrt{-\lambda_a^\dagger}} \right) \left(\sigma_b \sqrt{\sum_{c \in [K] \setminus \{b\}} -\lambda^{c\dagger}} + \sum_{c \in [K] \setminus \{b\}} \sqrt{-\lambda^{c\dagger} \sigma_0^c} \right) \\
 &= \left(\sigma_b + \frac{\sigma_a}{\sqrt{-\lambda_a^\dagger}} \sqrt{\sum_{c \in [K] \setminus \{b\}} -\lambda^{c\dagger}} \right) \left(\sigma_b + \frac{\sum_{c \in [K] \setminus \{b\}} \sqrt{-\lambda^{c\dagger} \sigma_0^c}}{\sum_{c \in [K] \setminus \{b\}} -\lambda^{c\dagger}} \sqrt{\sum_{c \in [K] \setminus \{b\}} -\lambda^{c\dagger}} \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

Then, the following solutions satisfy the above KKT conditions:

$$\begin{aligned}
 R^\dagger \left(\sigma_b + \sqrt{\sum_{a \in [K] \setminus \{b\}} \sigma_a^2} \right)^2 &= 1 \\
 w_b^\dagger &= \frac{\sigma_b \sqrt{\sum_{a \in [K] \setminus \{b\}} \sigma_a^2}}{\sigma_b \sqrt{\sum_{a \in [K] \setminus \{b\}} \sigma_a^2} + \sum_{a \in [K] \setminus \{b\}} \sigma_a^2} \\
 w_a^\dagger &= \frac{\sigma_a^2}{\sigma_b \sqrt{\sum_{a \in [K] \setminus \{b\}} \sigma_a^2} + \sum_{a \in [K] \setminus \{b\}} \sigma_a^2} \\
 \lambda_a^\dagger &= -\sigma_a^2 \\
 \gamma^\dagger &= \left(\sigma_b \sqrt{\sum_{a \in [K] \setminus \{b\}} \sigma_a^2} + \sum_{a \in [K] \setminus \{b\}} \sigma_a^2 \right)^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we complete the proof. □

B Proof of Theorem 4.1

To show Theorem 4.1, we derive an upper bound of

$$\mathbb{P}_{P^*} \left(\widehat{\mu}_{a^*(P^*),T}^{\text{A2IPW}} \leq \widehat{\mu}_{b,T}^{\text{A2IPW}} \right)$$

for $b \in [K] \setminus \{a^*(P^*)\}$.

Lemma B.1 (From Theorem 4.1 in Kato (2024a)). *Under the same condition with Theorem 4.1, for each P^* and each $a \in [K]$, the AGNA strategy satisfies*

$$\lim_{\Delta \rightarrow 0} \liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{\underline{\Delta}^2 T} \log \mathbb{P}_{P^*} \left(\widehat{\mu}_{a^*(P^*),T}^{\text{A2IPW}} \leq \widehat{\mu}_{a,T}^{\text{A2IPW}} \right) \geq \frac{1}{2 \left(\frac{\sigma_{a^*(P^*)}^2}{w_{a^*(P^*)}^{\text{AGNA}}} + \frac{\sigma_a^2}{w_a^{\text{AGNA}}} \right)}.$$

For the completeness, we show the proof in Appendix C.

Then, we prove Theorem 4.1 in Kato (2024a) as follows:

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{\underline{\Delta}^2 T} \log \mathbb{P}_{P^*} \left(\widehat{a}_T^{\text{AGNA}} \neq a^*(P^*) \right) \\
 &\geq \liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{\underline{\Delta}^2 T} \log \sum_{a \neq a^*(P^*)} \mathbb{P}_{P^*} \left(\widehat{\mu}_{a^*(P^*),T}^{\text{A2IPW}} \leq \widehat{\mu}_{a,T}^{\text{A2IPW}} \right) \\
 &\geq \liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{\underline{\Delta}^2 T} \log \left\{ (K-1) \max_{a \neq a^*(P^*)} \mathbb{P}_{P^*} \left(\widehat{\mu}_{a^*(P^*),T}^{\text{A2IPW}} \leq \widehat{\mu}_{a,T}^{\text{A2IPW}} \right) \right\} \\
 &\geq \min_{a \neq a^*(P^*)} \frac{1}{2 \left(\frac{\sigma_{a^*(P^*)}^2}{w_{a^*(P^*)}^{\text{AGNA}}} + \frac{\sigma_a^2}{w_a^{\text{AGNA}}} \right)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

□

C Proof of Lemma B.1

Let $P_\mu = P^*$; that is, μ be the true mean outcomes of Y_a under P^* .

Let us define

$$\Psi_{a,t} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{V_a^*(P^*)}} \left(\frac{\mathbb{1}[A_t = a^*(P^*)](Y_{a^*(P^*),t} - \hat{\mu}_{a^*(P^*),t})}{\hat{w}_{a^*(P^*),t}^{\text{AGNA}}} - \frac{\mathbb{1}[A_t = a](Y_{a,t} - \hat{\mu}_{a,t})}{\hat{w}_{a,t}^{\text{AGNA}}} + \hat{\mu}_{a^*(P^*),t} - \hat{\mu}_{a,t} - \Delta_a(P^*) \right),$$

where $\Delta_a(P^*) := \mu_{a^*(P^*)} - \mu_a$, and

$$V_a^*(P^*) := \frac{\sigma_{a^*(P^*)}^2}{w_{a^*(P^*)}^{\text{AGNA}}} + \frac{\sigma_a^2}{w_a^{\text{AGNA}}}.$$

Then, we have

$$\hat{\mu}_{a^*(P^*),T}^{\text{A2IPW}} - \hat{\mu}_{a,T}^{\text{A2IPW}} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \Psi_{a,t}.$$

By using this result, we aim to derive the upper bound of

$$\mathbb{P}_{P^*} \left(\hat{\mu}_{a^*(P^*),T}^{\text{A2IPW}} \leq \hat{\mu}_{a,T}^{\text{A2IPW}} \right) = \mathbb{P}_{P^*} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \Psi_{a,t} \leq -\frac{T\Delta_a(P^*)}{\sqrt{V_a^*(P^*)}} \right).$$

Here, we show that $\{\Psi_{a,t}\}_{t \in [T]}$ is a martingale difference sequence (MDS). For each $t \in [T]$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{V_a^*(P^*)} \mathbb{E}_{P^*} [\Psi_{a,t} \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{P^*} \left[\frac{\mathbb{1}[A_t = a^*(P^*)](Y_{a^*(P^*),t} - \hat{\mu}_{a^*(P^*),t})}{\hat{w}_{a^*(P^*),t}} + \hat{\mu}_{a^*(P^*),t} \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right] \\ & \quad - \mathbb{E}_{P^*} \left[\frac{\mathbb{1}[A_t = a](Y_{a,t} - \hat{\mu}_{a,t})}{\hat{w}_{a,t}} + \hat{\mu}_{a,t} \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right] - \Delta \\ &= \frac{\hat{w}_{a^*(P^*),t}(\mu_{a^*(P^*)} - \hat{\mu}_{a^*(P^*),t})}{\hat{w}_{a^*(P^*),t}} + \hat{\mu}_{a^*(P^*),t} - \frac{\hat{w}_{a,t}(\mu_a - \hat{\mu}_{a,t})}{\hat{w}_{a,t}} + \hat{\mu}_{a,t} - \Delta \\ &= (\mu_{a^*(P^*)} - \mu_a) - (\mu_{a^*(P^*)} - \mu_a) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

This result implies that $\{\Psi_{a,t}\}_{t \in [T]}$ is an MDS.

First, because there exists a constant $C > 0$ independent of T such that $\hat{w}_{a,t} > C$ by construction, the following lemma holds.

Lemma C.1. For any $P^* \in \mathcal{P}^*$ and all $a \in [K]$, $\hat{\mu}_{a,t} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \mu_a$ and $\hat{\sigma}_a^2 \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \sigma_a^2$.

Furthermore, from $\hat{\sigma}_a^2 \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \sigma_a^2$ and continuous mapping theorem, for all $a \in [K]$, $\hat{w}_{a,t} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} w_{a,t}^{\text{AGNA}}$ holds.

Lemma C.2 (From Lemma 5.3 in Kato (2024a)). For any $\mu \in \Theta^K$, under $P^* = P_\mu$, we have $\mathbb{E}_{P^*} [\Psi_{a,t}^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] - 1 \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

This lemma immediately yields the following lemma.

Lemma C.3 (From Lemma 5.4 in Kato (2024a)). For any $\mu \in \Theta^K$, under $P^* = P_\mu$, it holds that

$$\mathbb{P}_{P^*} \left(\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T |\mathbb{E}_{P^*} [\Psi_{a,t}^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] - 1| = 0 \right) = 1$$

This result is a variant of the Cesàro lemma for a case with almost sure convergence.

From Definition 2.1, the following lemma holds:

Lemma C.4. For any $\mu \in \Theta^K$, under $P^* = P_{\mu}$, the first moment of $\Psi_{a,t}$ is zero, and the second moment of $\Psi_{a,t}$ exists.

By using these lemma, we prove Lemma B.1.

Proof of Lemma B.1. By applying the Chernoff bound, for any $v < 0$ and any $\lambda < 0$, it holds that

$$\mathbb{P}_{P^*} \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \Psi_{a,t} \leq v \right) \leq \mathbb{E}_{P^*} \left[\exp \left(\lambda \sum_{t=1}^T \Psi_{a,t} \right) \right] \exp(-T\lambda v).$$

From the Chernoff bound and a property of an MDS, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{P^*} \left[\exp \left(\lambda \sum_{t=1}^T \Psi_{a,t} \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{P^*} \left[\prod_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{P^*} [\exp(\lambda \Psi_{a,t}) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{P^*} \left[\exp \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \log \mathbb{E}_{P^*} [\exp(\lambda \Psi_{a,t}) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Then, from the Taylor expansion around $\lambda = 0$, we obtain the following (Section 1.2, Döring et al., 2022):

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \log \mathbb{E}_{P^*} [\exp(\lambda \Psi_{a,t}) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{P^*} [\Psi_{a,t}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]. \quad (17)$$

Here, we used Lemma C.4, which states that the conditional variance $\mathbb{E}_{P^*} [\Psi_{a,t}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]$ of $\Psi_{a,t}^2$ exists.

Let $v = \lambda = -\frac{\Delta}{\sqrt{V_a^*(P^*)}}$. Then, from the results in Steps 1 and 2, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $t(\epsilon) > 0$ such that for all $T > t(\epsilon)$ and for any $\epsilon' > 0$, there exists $\delta_T(\epsilon') > 0$ such that for all $0 < \underline{\Delta} < \delta_T(\epsilon')$ and for all $P^* \in \underline{\mathcal{P}}(\underline{\Delta})$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_{P^*} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \Psi_{a,t} \leq Tv \right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}_{P^*} \left[\exp \left(-\frac{T\lambda^2}{2} + \epsilon T\lambda^2 - \frac{\Delta^2}{2V_a^*(P^*)} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{P^*} [\Psi_{a,t}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] - T \right) \right) \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}_{P^*} \left[\exp \left(-\frac{T\lambda^2}{2} + \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{P^*} [\Psi_{a,t}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] - 1 \right) + \epsilon T\lambda^2 \right) \right] \\ & = \exp \left(-\frac{T\lambda^2}{2} + \epsilon T\lambda^2 \right) \mathbb{E}_{P^*} \left[\exp \left(\frac{\lambda^2}{2} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{P^*} [\Psi_{a,t}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] - 1 \right) \right) \right] \\ & = \exp \left(-\frac{T\lambda^2}{2} + \epsilon T\lambda^2 \right) \exp(\epsilon' T\lambda^2) \\ & = \exp \left(-\frac{T\lambda^2}{2} + (\epsilon + \epsilon') T\lambda^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by letting $\lambda = -\frac{\Delta}{\sqrt{V_a^*(P^*)_a(\theta^*)}}$, we have

$$\lim_{\underline{\Delta} \rightarrow 0} \min_{P^* \in \underline{\mathcal{P}}(\underline{\Delta})} \liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{\underline{\Delta}^2 T} \log \mathbb{P}_{P^*} \left(\hat{\mu}_{a^*(P^*),T}^{\text{A2IPW}} \leq \hat{\mu}_{a,T}^{\text{A2IPW}} \right) \geq \frac{1}{2V_a^*(P^*)}.$$

Thus, the proof is complete. □