

Exploiting Exogenous Structure for Sample-Efficient Reinforcement Learning

Jia Wan^{†*} Sean R. Sinclair[†] Devavrat Shah[†] Martin J. Wainwright[†]

Massachusetts Institute of Technology[†]
 Laboratory for Information and Decision Systems
 Statistics and Data Science Center

Abstract

We study a class of structured Markov Decision Processes (MDPs) known as Exo-MDPs, characterized by a partition of the state space into two components. The exogenous states evolve stochastically in a manner not affected by the agent’s actions, whereas the endogenous states are affected by the actions, and evolve in a deterministic and known way conditional on the exogenous states. Exo-MDPs are a natural model for various applications including inventory control, finance, power systems, ride sharing, among others. Despite seeming restrictive, this work establishes that any discrete MDP can be represented as an Exo-MDP. Further, Exo-MDPs induce a natural representation of the transition and reward dynamics as linear functions of the exogenous state distribution. This linear representation leads to near-optimal algorithms with regret guarantees scaling only with the (effective) size of the exogenous state space d , independent of the sizes of the endogenous state and action spaces. Specifically, when the exogenous state is fully observed, a simple plug-in approach achieves a regret upper bound of $\tilde{O}(H^{3/2}\sqrt{dK})$, where H denotes the horizon and K denotes the total number of episodes. When the exogenous state is unobserved, the linear representation leads to a regret upper bound of $\tilde{O}(H^{3/2}d\sqrt{K})$. We also establish a nearly matching regret lower bound of $\Omega(Hd\sqrt{K})$ for the no observation regime. We complement our theoretical findings with an experimental study on inventory control problems.

1 Introduction

Reinforcement learning (RL) provides a natural framework for sequential decision-making under uncertainty. The past few decades have witnessed tremendous empirical success from RL, notably in “data-rich” areas such as competitive game-playing [31], computational advertising [38], robotics [23], and human-guided training of large language models [26]. This success relies on the availability of massive datasets, either due to large amounts of pre-collected data or via access to simulators for generating data. In contrast, there are various other application domains that are notoriously “data-poor”, including finance [28], resource allocation [15], inventory control [24], supply chain management [29], as well as ridesharing systems [8]. The limited data arises from various causes, including the small quantity of pre-collected data, difficulty in collecting new data, and/or the lack of good simulators. In such data-limited settings—and in the absence of structure on the underlying Markov decision processes (MDPs)—information-theoretic lower bounds dictate that a good RL policy cannot be learned without large sample sizes. Therefore, it is essential to identify and exploit domain-specific structures so as to enable data efficient RL policy learning.

With this motivation in mind, we focus on a structured family of Markov decision processes known as Exo-MDPs (e.g., [10, 11, 27, 33, 13]). They are defined by a partition of state variables into exogenous versus endogenous states. More specifically, a state variable is said to be *exogenous* if it evolves in a way that is *not influenced* by the agent’s actions; otherwise the state is *endogenous*. All stochasticity in the system dynamics is captured via the exogenous states, while the endogenous state variables evolve according to a known deterministic function of the endogenous states, the agent’s action, as well as the exogenous

*Corresponding author, jiawan@mit.edu.

state variables. For example, in the classic inventory control (i.e., newsvendor) problem in supply chain, the external demand represents the exogenous state, the inventory in the system represents the endogenous state, the action corresponds to placing a new purchase order, and the inventory in the system evolves as a function of existing inventory, the exogenous demand, and the purchase orders placed; see Section 2.1 for details on this example. Similarly, the efficiency of a ridesharing system is tied to fluctuating demand levels exogenous to the system itself [13].

Exo-MDPs hold promise for designing data-efficient simulators and hence the identification of optimal RL policies, due to the fact that all randomness is captured through exogenous states that are not impacted by the actions or the endogenous states as well as known dynamics of the endogenous states. This insight has been exploited in some past work on ExoMDPs (e.g. [33, 25]). However, they crucially assume the exogenous variables are completely observed.

However, there are many real-world systems in which this assumption fails to hold. For example, inventory modeling in retail involves lost sales, where the true exogenous demand is unobserved due to stockouts [24]. Similarly, ridesharing systems exhibit demand shortfalls when drivers are unavailable, resulting in users leaving the platform [8]. With this motivation in place, this paper tackles the following question:

Challenge: *How to exploit Exo-MDP structure to learn policies in a sample-efficient manner with no (or partial) observation of exogenous states?*

1.1 Contributions

Let us briefly summarize the main contributions of this paper. Our first result is structural in nature: we show that for tabular MDPs, the Exo-MDP assumption is actually not limiting; any tabular MDP can be represented as an Exo-MDP. Moreover, any Exo-MDP can be viewed as an instance of a discrete linear mixture MDP. The arguments used to establish these relations reveal interesting structural properties of these classes, and also inform our subsequent study into the effective dimension of an Exo-MDP.

Second, we provide sample-efficient learning algorithms that exploit the Exo-MDP structure. We do so both in the *full observation regime* in which the exogenous states are observed, and the more challenging *no observation regime*, in which the exogenous states are entirely unobserved. When the exogenous states are fully observed, we analyze a plug-in approach and prove that it achieves a regret upper bound of $\tilde{O}(H^{3/2}\sqrt{dK})$ in terms of the horizon H , total number of episodes K , and dimension d of the exogenous state. On the other hand, for problems in which exogenous states are not unobserved, we first make use of the linear mixture representation of an Exo-MDP, thereby obtaining an algorithm with nearly-optimal regret upper bound of $\tilde{O}(H^{3/2}d\sqrt{K})$. We then introduce a notion of *effective dimension* r , and establish a sharper guarantee $\tilde{O}(H^{3/2}r\sqrt{K})$. The term r captures the effective dimension of the feature space, and can be computed a priori without any samples. We complement our upper bounds by proving a lower bound for the no observation regime which scales as $\Omega(Hd\sqrt{K})$, thereby matching our upper bound up to a factor of \sqrt{H} . We show that for a more general version of Exo-MDPs—in which the exogenous dynamics can differ from stage to stage—it is possible to achieve the stronger lower bound with the additional \sqrt{H} factor. Combined with our upper bound which also solves the more general case, this characterizes the minimax optimal rate for non-stationary Exo-MDPs up to polylogarithmic factors.

Finally, we complement our theoretical results with an experimental study applying our Exo-MDP algorithms to an inventory control problem with lost sales and positive lead time. Our results highlight the robustness of our algorithms, where despite being more general solvers, they achieve performances competitive with state-of-the-art algorithms tailored for inventory control.

Organization. The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. We present the Exo-MDP problem formulation in Section 2. In Section 3, we discuss and prove the structural equivalence of the classes of Exo-MDPs, discrete MDPs, and discrete linear mixture MDPs. In Section 4, we provide sample-efficient algorithms with theoretical guarantees for learning optimal policies in the Exo-MDPs. In Section 5, we provide a nearly matching lower bound for Exo-MDPs when no observation of the exogenous state is available, as well as a matching lower bound that establishes the minimax optimality of our proposed algorithm on non-stationary Exo-MDPs. In Section 6, we present our empirical results on the inventory control problem with lead time and lost sales.

1.2 Related work

We now discuss the lines of work closely related to our work and highlight our contributions to the literature. For more extensive references, see Sutton and Barto [35], Powell [27], Agarwal et al. [2] for RL, and Bubeck and Cesa-Bianchi [7], Slivkins [34] for multi-armed bandits.

MDPs with exogenous states. Exo-MDPs, the sub-class of MDPs we consider in this work, were described in Powell [27]. Since then there has been an evolving line of work on Exo-MDPs, e.g., [10, 11, 27, 24, 4, 33, 13]. Some researchers [10, 11] have studied the case when the rewards or transitions factorize so that the exogenous process can be filtered out. While doing so simplifies development, it can lead to sub-optimality, since policies agnostic to the exogenous states need not be optimal. Other work studies the use of hindsight optimization, showing that the regret for hindsight optimization policies can be bounded by the hindsight bias, a problem-dependent term [33, 13]. The overarching assumption in this literature is that the exogenous states are fully observed, which is impractical for many problems of interest. We extend the literature by presenting algorithms tailored for Exo-MDPs with unobserved exogenous states as well as refine the results on the fully observed case.

Linear mixture MDPs and other structured MDPs. As we will show in this paper, any Exo-MDP can be cast as a linear mixture MDP (and vice versa), and our analysis is first to establish the close connection of Exo-MDPs to linear mixture MDPs [18, 5, 39]. Closely related to our setting, Ayoub et al. [6] proved an $\Omega(H\sqrt{dK})$ lower bound on the regret for *stationary* linear mixture MDPs. Despite Exo-MDPs being a subclass of this problem class, we are able to prove a regret lower bound that is tighter by a factor of \sqrt{d} .

More generally in the literature, RL algorithms exploiting structural properties either make parametric or nonparametric assumptions on the underlying MDP. The most common non-parametric assumptions are that the Q function is Lipschitz continuous with respect to a given metric [30, 32]. While more general, the regret guarantees scale exponentially with the dimension. Parametric assumptions sacrifice generality on the space of MDPs for regret with polynomial dependence on the dimension. Here one assumes the principal has a known feature representation under which the underlying MDP is well-approximated by a fixed (typically linear) model. Recent years have seen tremendous activity on RL with linear function approximation. These works can be categorized depending on their assumptions on the underlying MDP, whether that be low Bellman rank [19, 9], linear MDPs [36, 21], low inherent Bellman error [37], or linear mixture MDPs [18, 5, 39].

Exo-MDPs in practice. We present experimental results on inventory control with lost sales, censored demand, and positive lead times. Tailored specifically to the inventory control setting, Agrawal and Jia [3] design an online learning algorithm to learn the optimal base-stock policy, a well-known heuristic policy that is optimal under restrictive settings. Our algorithms have the benefit of providing regret guarantees to the *true optimal* policy. Our empirical results show that our algorithms surpass the sub-optimality of this heuristic class and instead converge to the true optimal policy. Other authors [24, 4] studied specializations of Exo-MDPs to these inventory settings, along with associated regret analysis. Their analysis is predicated on observing an unbiased signal from which the true demand can be recovered; in sharp contrast, our algorithms apply even when the demand is fully unobserved. We lastly note that deep reinforcement learning algorithms have been applied in other applications (without exploiting their Exo-MDP structure) including ride-sharing systems [13], stochastic queueing networks [8], and jitter buffers [12]. Applications of our method can potentially improve sample efficiency in these applications by exploiting the exogenous structures.

1.3 Notation

For a positive integer n , we denote $[n] := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. For a finite set \mathcal{S} , let $|\mathcal{S}|$ denote its cardinality. We use calligraphic letters to denote sets, e.g., \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A} ; capital letters denote random variables, e.g., S, A, R ; lower case letters denote specific realization of random variables, e.g., s, a, r ; and for a distribution over a discrete set of elements, we use bolded lower case letters to denote the probability vector corresponding to the multinomial distribution, e.g., \mathbf{p}_x . We use lowercase letters with superscripts, e.g., $x^j \in \mathcal{X}$ to denote elements of a set \mathcal{X} indexed by j . For vector x , we use $[x]_j$ to denote its j -th entry. We use $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ to denote rates omitting absolute constants and polylogarithmic factors. Fixing an episode k , $h \in [H]$ denotes the h -th stage of the MDP. Lastly, we let $(x)^+ = \max\{x, 0\}$. See Appendix A for a table of notation.

2 Background and Problem Set-up

Throughout this paper, we consider stationary episodic tabular Markov decision processes (MDPs) with finite state and action spaces. We define any MDP with a tuple $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, H, s_1, \mathbb{P}, R)$, where \mathcal{S} is the set of states, \mathcal{A} is the set of actions, horizon H is the number of stages in each episode, s_1 is a fixed initial state, $\mathbb{P}(\cdot | s_h, a_h)$ gives the probability distribution over the next state s_{h+1} based on the state action pair s_h, a_h at stage h in an episode, and assume bounded stochastic reward $R : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ at each stage h . Without loss of generality, throughout this paper we assume a fixed starting state s_1 , see Appendix B.1 for discussion on this assumption.

2.1 Exo-MDP: Markov Decision Processes with Exogenous States

We now consider a specialized class of MDPs with exogenous states (Exo-MDPs), where the state space can be partitioned into two parts: the *endogenous states* \mathcal{S} , and the *exogenous states* \mathcal{X} [11, 33]. Both the endogenous and exogenous states affect the dynamics of the system, but the agent’s actions only influence the dynamics of the endogenous states, *not* the exogenous states. See Figure 1 for an illustration of the distinctions between a standard MDP and an Exo-MDP.




Figure 1. Directed graphical models showing an ordinary MDP (left), and an Exo-MDP (middle). In an ordinary MDP, the state space is fully endogenous, and the current state S_h and action A_h generate the next state S_{h+1} and reward R_h . In an Exo-MDP, the state vector is partitioned into two components: an endogenous component S_h and an exogenous component X_h . The exogenous state X_h at each stage is drawn i.i.d from \mathbb{P}_x independent of (S_h, A_h) . There are also known deterministic functions \mathbf{f} and \mathbf{g} such that $S_{h+1} = \mathbf{f}(S_h, A_h, X_h)$ and $R_h = \mathbf{g}(S_h, A_h, X_h)$. The right panel gives the structural equivalence relations between the class of Exo-MDPs, discrete MDPs and discrete linear mixture MDPs.

Definition 1. An Exo-MDP is represented by a tuple $\mathcal{M}[\mathbb{P}_x, \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}] = (\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A}, H, s_1, \mathbb{P}, R)$. In an Exo-MDP, the state vector at stage h takes the form (S_h, X_h) , where S_h and X_h are endogenous and exogenous, respectively. The exogenous state evolves in a stationary way independent of (S_h, A_h) , where each X_h is an i.i.d. sample from an unknown distribution \mathbb{P}_x . We fix indexings $\mathcal{X} = \{x^j\}_{j=1}^d$ and let \mathbf{p}_x denote the probability vector corresponding to \mathbb{P}_x , where $\mathbf{p}_x = (\mathbb{P}_x(X = x^1), \dots, \mathbb{P}_x(X = x^{|\mathcal{X}|})) \in [0, 1]^{|\mathcal{X}|}$. We denote $d = |\mathcal{X}|$ as the cardinality of the exogenous state space. As we will show later, one can view d as the effective dimension to summarize the Exo-MDP, leading to sample complexity results that only depend on d regardless of the sizes of the endogenous state and action spaces $|\mathcal{S}|, |\mathcal{A}|$.

Additionally, we assume that, conditional on the realization of X_1, \dots, X_H in an episode, the transition and reward are completely specified by known deterministic functions \mathbf{f} and \mathbf{g} . Specifically, the next state S_{h+1} given triple (S_h, A_h, X_h) follows

$$S_{h+1} = \mathbf{f}(S_h, A_h, X_h) \quad \text{where } \mathbf{f} : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}. \quad (1a)$$

Similarly, the reward R_h at stage h is given by

$$R_h = \mathbf{g}(S_h, A_h, X_h) \quad \text{where } \mathbf{g} : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, 1]. \quad (1b)$$

Therefore, an Exo-MDP is a special case of MDP where the only randomness lies in the exogenous variables X_h . Conditional on X_h , all state transition and reward dynamics are deterministically given by known functions \mathbf{f} and \mathbf{g} .

Example: inventory control. To put the Exo-MDP formulation in action, consider the following simple setting of inventory control. Suppose a retailer needs to order products to meet exogenous independent demand at each stage h over a finite horizon H . Given current on-hand inventory Inv_h , the retailer picks an amount O_h of products to order. The inventory level then transitions to $\text{Inv}_{h+1} = \mathbf{f}(\text{Inv}_h, O_h, X_h) = (\text{Inv}_h + O_h - X_h)^+$, where X_h denotes the exogenous demand drawn i.i.d. from \mathbb{P}_x . The cost $\mathbf{g}(\text{Inv}_h, O_h, X_h)$ (negative reward) consists of the holding cost for remaining products $c(\text{Inv}_h + O_h - X_h)^+$, plus the penalty for lost sales $p(X_h - \text{Inv}_h - O_h)^+$. This can be formulated as an Exo-MDP where d denotes the size of the support for the demand X_h and the state and action correspond to inventory Inv_h and orders O_h respectively. The true exogenous state X_h is unobserved, only the realized sales $\min\{\text{Inv}_h + O_h, X_h\}$.

2.2 Data Setting and Learning Objective in an Exo-MDP

Observation regimes on x . In this paper, we mainly study two observation regimes on the exogenous state x : (i) the *full observation regime* (Section 4.1), where the learning agent observes (S_h, A_h, R_h, X_h) at each stage; and (ii) the *no observation regime* (Section 4.2), where the learning agent observes (S_h, A_h, R_h) with no observation on X_h . We focus on these two extremes regarding observations on the exogenous state x , leaving as an open direction other (e.g., partial or censored) observation regimes which may lead to sample complexities interpolating between the two.

Policies. We consider (stochastic) policies $\pi_h : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{A})$, where $\Delta(\mathcal{A})$ denotes a distribution over the action space. Importantly, in the case of Exo-MDPs, the policy is *not* allowed to depend on the exogenous state X_h . An algorithm that decides the policy depends on the historical trajectory $\{S_{h,k}, A_{h,k}, R_{h,k}, X_{h,k}\}_{h \in [H], k \in [K]}$ for the full observation regime; and $\{S_{h,k}, A_{h,k}, R_{h,k}\}_{h \in [H], k \in [K]}$ for the no observation regime.

Online learning. We focus on the online learning setting for solving Exo-MDPs. At the start of the Exo-MDP, the learning agent is given $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{X}, H$ and functions \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g} , but does not know the vector \mathbf{p}_x . The agent interacts with the environment for K episodes. At the beginning of each episode $k \in [K]$, the agent fixes a policy π^k . At each stage $h \in [H]$, the agent observes state $S_{h,k}$ and picks action $A_{h,k} \sim \pi_h^k(\cdot | S_{h,k})$. The exogenous state $X_{h,k}$ is then sampled from \mathbb{P}_x , and the agent receives reward $R_{h,k} = R(S_{h,k}, A_{h,k}) = \mathbf{g}(S_{h,k}, A_{h,k}, X_{h,k})$, and transitions to the state $S_{h+1,k} = \mathbf{f}(S_{h,k}, A_{h,k}, X_{h,k})$. Under the full observation regime, the agent additionally observes $X_{h,k}$ at the end of the stage. This continues until the final transition to state $S_{H,k}$, at which point the agent chooses policy π^{k+1} for the next episode. We denote the value function $V^\pi : \mathcal{S} \times [H] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of a policy π under MDP \mathcal{M}^1 as $V_h^\pi(s, \mathcal{M}) := \mathbb{E}_{X_{\geq h}, \pi}[\sum_{\tau \geq h} R(S_\tau, A_\tau, X_\tau) | S_h = s]$, where $X_{\geq h}$ denotes vector (X_h, \dots, X_H) . Let $V_h^*(s, \mathcal{M})$ denote the optimal value function, i.e., $V_h^*(s, \mathcal{M}) = V_h^{\pi^*}(s, \mathcal{M})$ where $\pi^* = \arg \max_\pi V_h^\pi(s, \mathcal{M})$ is the optimal policy.

Performance metrics. In this paper, we focus on understanding the *policy optimization* problem in Exo-MDPs, that is, given a number of episodes K , we aim to find a policy π that achieves close-to-optimal episodic value with guaranteed error bound compared with the true optimal policy π^* . Specifically, we aim to design an algorithm that minimizes *regret*, which is the cumulative difference in total reward of the sequence of policies employed by the algorithm $(\pi^k)_{k \in [K]}$ to that of the optimal policy.

Definition 2. *The regret for an algorithm that deploys a sequence of policies $(\pi^k)_{k \in [K]}$ is defined as:*

$$\text{REGRET}(K) = \sum_{k=1}^K V_1^*(s_1) - V_1^{\pi^k}(s_1).$$

Another common metric is the value function estimation error, given by $V_1^*(s_1) - V_1^\pi(s_1)$, where π is the final policy after K episodes. The two different performance metrics, *regret* and *value function estimation error*, are closely connected. As studied by prior work such as Jin et al. [20], any algorithm achieving some regret upper bound readily converts to a final policy with value function estimation error that is $\frac{1}{K}$ times the regret upper bound. Given this conversion, all our regret upper bounds readily convert to guarantees on the value function estimation error with an added $\frac{1}{K}$ factor. See Lemma 3 in Appendix B.2.

¹We omit dependence on \mathcal{M} when it is clear from the context.

3 Structural Relations among MDPs

Exo-MDPs by definition are a subclass of MDPs where the transition and reward dynamics are characterized by the restricted forms of Eq. (1a) and Eq. (1b). However, it turns out that Exo-MDPs can represent any discrete MDP with the addition of an exogenous state space. Intuitively, we can *lift* the randomness from transition and reward dynamics as a $2|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|$ -dimensional exogenous state.

Lemma 1. *Let \mathcal{R} denote the range of the reward function R . For any discrete MDP $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, H, s_1, \mathbb{P}, R)$, there exists an exogenous state space $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{S}^{|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|} \times \mathcal{R}^{|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|}$ following distribution \mathbb{P}_x , and transition and reward functions \mathbf{f} and \mathbf{g} such that \mathcal{M} is equivalent to an Exo-MDP $\mathcal{M}'[\mathbb{P}_x, \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}] = (\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A}, H, s_1, \mathbb{P}, R)$.*

Proof. To show this, we recast the MDP \mathcal{M} as an Exo-MDP through a *lifting* argument. Let x be a random vector of dimension $2|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|$ with its components defined elementwise for each fixed state-action pair s, a as $x_{s,a}^{\mathbf{f}}, x_{s,a}^{\mathbf{g}}$, where $x_{s,a}^{\mathbf{f}} \in \mathcal{S}$ and $x_{s,a}^{\mathbf{g}} \in \text{Im}(R(s, a))$. We can then specify the transition and reward functions for any state-action pair s, a as $\mathbf{f}(s, a, x) := x_{s,a}^{\mathbf{f}}, \mathbf{g}(s, a, x) := x_{s,a}^{\mathbf{g}}$. Let the random variable $x_{s,a}^{\mathbf{f}}$ be distributed as $\mathbb{P}(\cdot | s, a)$, that is, let $\mathbf{f}(s, a, x)$ take the distribution of the next state conditional on current state-action pair (s, a) . Similarly, let the random variable $x_{s,a}^{\mathbf{g}}$ be distributed as $R(s, a)$, that is, $x_{s,a}^{\mathbf{g}}$ takes the distribution of the random reward given current state-action pair (s, a) . Then the MDP \mathcal{M} is equivalent to an Exo-MDP $\mathcal{M}' = (\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A}, H, s_1, \mathbb{P}, R)$ with deterministic transition and reward functions \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g} , where $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{S}^{|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|} \times \mathcal{R}^{|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|}$ with \mathcal{R} being the set of all possible rewards. \square

We next show that Exo-MDPs have a natural *linear representation* defined by \mathbf{f} and \mathbf{g} . This allows us to cast Exo-MDPs as a linear mixture MDP, a common subclass of MDPs from the literature in which both the transition probability and reward function are linear functions of a given feature mapping over state-action-state triples [39]. Formally,

Definition 3. *An MDP $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, H, s_1, \mathbb{P}, R)$ is called a linear mixture MDP if there exists vectors $\theta_p, \theta_r \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and known feature vectors $\phi_r(s, a), \phi_p(s' | s, a) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that the transition probability satisfies $\mathbb{P}(s' | s, a) = \phi_p(s' | s, a)^\top \theta_p$ and the expected reward satisfies $R(s, a) = \phi_r(s, a)^\top \theta_r$.*

Exo-MDPs are a special case of linear mixture MDPs, where the features are characterized by the given forms of \mathbf{f} and \mathbf{g} , and the probability vector \mathbf{p}_x serves as the coefficient on the d -dimensional simplex. This leads to the following lemma representing any Exo-MDP as a linear mixture MDP.

Lemma 2. *Any Exo-MDP $\mathcal{M}[\mathbb{P}_x, \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}] = (\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A}, H, s_1, \mathbb{P}, R)$ with a fixed indexing $\mathcal{X} = \{x^j\}_{j=1}^d$ is a linear mixture MDP $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, H, s_1, \mathbb{P}, R)$ with coefficients $\theta_p = \theta_r = \mathbf{p}_x = (\mathbb{P}_x(X = x^1), \dots, \mathbb{P}_x(X = x^d))$. For any $s \in \mathcal{S}, a \in \mathcal{A}$, the feature vectors are given by*

$$\phi_p(s' | s, a) = [\mathbf{1}_{s'=\mathbf{f}(s,a,x^1)}, \dots, \mathbf{1}_{s'=\mathbf{f}(s,a,x^d)}]^\top \quad \phi_r(s, a) = [\mathbf{g}(s, a, x^1), \dots, \mathbf{g}(s, a, x^d)]^\top$$

Proof. This follows by the observation that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(s' | s, a) &= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbf{1}_{s'=\mathbf{f}(s,a,x)} \mathbb{P}_x(x) = \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbf{1}_{s'=\mathbf{f}(s,a,x^i)} [\mathbf{p}_x]_i = \phi_p(s' | s, a)^\top \mathbf{p}_x \\ R(s, a) &= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbf{g}(s, a, x) \mathbb{P}_x(x) = \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbf{g}(s, a, x^i) [\mathbf{p}_x]_i = \phi_r(s, a)^\top \mathbf{p}_x. \end{aligned}$$

\square

Lemma 1 and Lemma 2 leads to the following interesting observation that Exo-MDPs, despite their structural assumptions, capture a rich class of MDPs as large as both the class of discrete MDPs and the class of discrete linear mixture MDPs. See the right panel of Fig. 1 for an illustration.

Theorem 1. *The classes of Exo-MDPs, discrete MDPs, and discrete linear mixture MDPs are equivalent.*

4 Sample-efficient Algorithms and Guarantees

We now turn to describing some sample-efficient algorithms for learning optimal policies in Exo-MDPs, along with theoretical bounds on their regret. Section 4.1 is devoted to the full observation regime, whereas Section 4.2 provides guarantees when no exogenous states are observed.

4.1 Plug-In Method for the Full Observation Regime

In the full observation regime, the agent observes the quadruple (S_h, A_h, R_h, X_h) at each stage $h \in [H]$. Recall that all randomness in an Exo-MDP lies in the exogenous component x , and the functions (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) are known. As a key consequence, estimating the probability vector $\mathbf{p}_x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is sufficient for estimating the Exo-MDP itself, from which we can compute an optimal policy estimate. These observations motivate a natural plug-in approach for the fully observed case, in which we perform the following three steps: (i) first compute an empirical estimate $\widehat{\mathbf{p}}_x$ using the observations of the exogenous variables; and (ii) use this estimated probability vector to form an estimate $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}$ of the Exo-MDP; and (iii) compute an optimal policy via standard dynamic programming.

More precisely, at the start of each episode $k = 2, 3, \dots, K$, the agent has access to $(k - 1)$ -trajectories of exogenous states, each of length H ; denote this data set by $\mathcal{D}_k = \{X_{h,k'}\}_{h \in [H], k' < k}$, and observe that it contains a total of $H(k - 1)$ samples. We use this data set to compute the empirical distribution

$$\widehat{\mathbf{p}}_x^k := \frac{1}{H(k-1)} \sum_{h \in [H], k' < k} \mathbf{1}_{X_{h,k'}=x} \quad \text{for } x \in \mathcal{X}, \quad (2)$$

and let $\widehat{\mathbf{p}}_x^1$ for $k = 1$ be the uniform distribution. At each episode $k \in [K]$, we construct the estimated MDP $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^k$ with transition dynamics $S_{h+1} = \mathbf{f}(S_h, A_h, X_h)$, and stochastic rewards $R_h = \mathbf{g}(S_h, A_h, X_h)$, where $X_h \sim \widehat{\mathbf{p}}_x^k$. Finally, we compute the optimal policy

$$\widehat{\pi}^k = \arg \max_{\pi \in \Pi} V_1^\pi(s, \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^k), \quad (3)$$

via standard dynamic programming, with computational complexity polynomial in $|\mathcal{S}|$ and $|\mathcal{A}|$. This procedure yields regret that grows with the exogenous dimension d , as opposed to the cardinalities $|\mathcal{S}|$ and $|\mathcal{A}|$ of the endogenous state and action spaces. We summarize as follows:

Theorem 2. *For any error tolerance $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and H -horizon Exo-MDP with exogenous dimension d , the plug-in method, when applied over K episodes, achieves regret at most*

$$\text{REGRET}(K) \leq 9H^{3/2} \sqrt{\{d + 2 \log(2K/\delta)\}K}, \quad (4)$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

Ignoring the error probability δ and logarithmic factors, we can summarize that the regret is at most $\text{REGRET}(K) \leq \widehat{O}(H^{3/2} \sqrt{dK})$.

Proof sketch. The proof of Theorem 2 follows three steps. First, we provide a bound on the estimation error of $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_x^k$ versus \mathbb{P}_x (or equivalently $\widehat{\mathbf{p}}_x$ versus \mathbf{p}_x) in ℓ_1 in terms of the number of samples used to generate the estimate, $H(k - 1)$. Second, we use the estimation errors to relate the true MDP \mathcal{M} to $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^k$. Lastly, we relate the optimal policy in $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^k$ to that of \mathcal{M} using the simulation lemma [22]. See Appendix C for the full proof.

4.2 Guarantees for the No Observation Regime

In practice, assuming full observations of the exogenous states may not be realistic. As one concrete example, in the inventory control problem, the true demand X_h is not directly observable. Instead, one can only infer a censored signal from the sales $\min(X_h, \text{Inv}_h + O_h)$. Accordingly, in this section, we address the challenge of designing algorithms when the exogenous states are unobserved. For ease of exposition, we present the case when the expected reward is known and focus on unknown transition dynamics.

In the full observation setting, the plug-in method hinges on the idea that estimating the probability vector \mathbf{p}_x is sufficient to estimate the full Exo-MDP. When x is not observed, it is no longer possible to estimate \mathbf{p}_x , but at the same time, it is not always necessary. For instance, in a trivial Exo-MDP with a single state and constant reward, any policy is optimal, and estimating \mathbf{p}_x confers no advantage.

How to capture the difficulty of learning optimal policies in an Exo-MDP? Enumerating the exogenous state space as $\mathcal{X} = \{x^1, \dots, x^d\}$, recall from Lemma 2 the feature vectors

$$\phi_p(s' | s, a) = [\mathbb{1}_{s'=\mathbf{f}(s,a,x^1)}, \dots, \mathbb{1}_{s'=\mathbf{f}(s,a,x^d)}] \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (5)$$

Using these feature vectors, we define the *full information matrix* $F \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}| \times d}$ with row $F_{(s',s,a),\cdot} := \phi_p(s' | s, a)$ for each triple $(s', s, a) \in |\mathcal{S}|^2|\mathcal{A}|$. The key complexity parameter in our analysis is the *rank* $r := \text{Rank}(F)$ of this full information matrix. Note that this rank can be computed *a priori*—that is, without collecting any data—based on the known sets $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}$ and functions \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g} . Note that r is upper bounded by

$$r := \text{Rank}(F) \leq \min\{d := |\mathcal{X}|, |\mathcal{S}|^2|\mathcal{A}|\}. \quad (6)$$

Both inequalities can be conservative, and of interest to us in this section is the fact that there exist many Exo-MDPs for which $r \ll d$. In Section 4.3 we illustrate this type of rank reduction in the context of a simple infection model.

Recall that the feature vectors (5) arose as part of establishing the connection between Exo-MDP and linear MDPs in Lemma 2. This connection is a key enabler: it allows us to leverage algorithms developed for linear mixture MDPs [5, 39]. While other connections are possible, here we adopt the UCRL-VTR⁺ algorithm [39] to our setting. See Appendix D for details of the algorithm². Our main result is to show that an algorithm that exploits the SVD of the full information matrix can achieve regret that scales with the rank r , as opposed to the ambient dimension d .

Theorem 3. *For any H -horizon Exo-MDP with effective dimension $\text{Rank}(F) = r$, applying a rank-reduced UCRL-VTR⁺ algorithm over K episodes yields a sequence of policies $\{\pi^k\}_{k=1}^K$ with regret at most*

$$\text{REGRET}(K) \leq \tilde{O}\left(\sqrt{r^2 H^2 + r H^3 \sqrt{KH}} + r^2 H^3 + r^3 H^2\right). \quad (7)$$

Note that when $r \geq H$ and $K \geq r^4 H + r^3 H^2$, we can restate the regret bound (7) more succinctly as $\text{REGRET}(K) \leq \tilde{O}(r H^{3/2} \sqrt{K})$. Thus, up to poly-logarithmic factors, it grows linearly in the rank r of the full information matrix F . When no rank reduction occurs (i.e., $r = d$), then we obtain a regret bound that scales linearly with the cardinality d of the exogenous state space at $\tilde{O}(H^{3/2} d \sqrt{K})$.

Proof. The row space of the information matrix F entirely captures all possible transition features $\{\phi_p(s' | s, a)\}_{s,s' \in \mathcal{S}, a \in \mathcal{A}}$ across all state-action-state triples in the Exo-MDP. So the feature space has a low-rank structure if and only if the row-space of F is low-rank. Let $F = U\Sigma V^\top$ be the r -dimensional singular value decomposition of F , so that $U \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}| \times r}$, $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$, and $V \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times r}$. Note that by construction, $\mathbb{P}(s' | s, a) = \phi_p(s' | s, a)\mathbf{p}_x = e_{s'|s,a} F \mathbf{p}_x$, where $e_{s'|s,a}$ is the unit vector with a one in the corresponding entry to (s', s, a) . By projecting the feature vector to the r -ranked row space of F , we can rewrite the transition probability as the inner product of the transformed r -dimensional feature and coefficients $\tilde{\phi}_p, \tilde{\theta}_p$ where $\mathbb{P}(s' | s, a) = e_{s'|s,a} F \mathbf{p}_x = (e_{s'|s,a} U \Sigma) (V^\top \mathbf{p}_x) = \tilde{\phi}_p(s' | s, a)^\top \tilde{\theta}_p$.

Running the UCRL-VTR⁺ algorithm on the linear mixture MDP with known feature $\tilde{\phi}_p(s' | s, a) = (e_{s'|s,a} U \Sigma)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^r$ and coefficient $\tilde{\theta}_p = V^\top \mathbf{p}_x$ gives the stated performance. \square

Note that the full information matrix F only depends on $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}$, all of which are known a priori to the agent, therefore requires no samples to compute. The singular decomposition of F can be computed in time polynomial in $|\mathcal{S}|, |\mathcal{A}|, d$.

Remark 1. *The rank reduction procedure we have described above generally holds for linear mixture MDPs with discrete state and action spaces. For any generic linear mixture MDP, we can similarly compute the full information matrix F by vertically stacking the known feature vectors over all state-action-state triples,*

²To the best of our knowledge, it has the best known guarantees.

and perform the same SVD decomposition to project the features to the row space of F . Essentially, if one believes the feature space is low-rank, then, at the cost of computing the rank of the full information matrix F as well as its SVD decomposition, one can reduce the regret by a linear factor of $\frac{d}{r}$, the ratio of rank reduction.

Remark 2. The idea of reducing Exo-MDP to linear mixture MDP applies to more general cases of \mathbb{P}_x . Under full observation assumption, simple modifications on the feature representation allows us to extend the i.i.d. setting to general dynamics for the exogenous states, including the Markov process, k -step Markov process, and Markov process affected by the agent's actions, all with efficient regret bounds.

Specifically, if the exogenous state follows a Markov process affected by the agent's actions. Augmenting the state as (s_{t+1}, x_t) , the transition probability can be written as

$$\Pr(s_{t+1}, x_t | s_t, x_{t-1}, a_t) = \phi_p^T(s_{t+1}, s_t, x_{t-1}, a_t) \theta_p$$

where the feature is given by

$$\phi_p(s_{t+1}, s_t, x_{t-1}, a_t) = [\mathbb{1}_{s_{t+1}=\mathbf{f}(s_t, a_t, x')} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{a_t=a} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{x_t=x'} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{x_{t-1}=x}]_{x, x' \in \mathcal{X}, a \in \mathcal{A}}.$$

The unknown coefficient is given by

$$\theta_p = [\Pr(x_{t+1} = x' | x_t = x, a_t = a)]_{x, x' \in \mathcal{X}, a \in \mathcal{A}}.$$

Applying the UCRL-VTR⁺ algorithm gives upper bound $\tilde{O}(d^2 |\mathcal{A}| H^{3/2} \sqrt{K})$.

If the exogenous state is Markov, we can write the transition probability as a d^2 -dimensional linear mixture representation

$$\Pr(s_{t+1}, x_t | s_t, x_{t-1}, a_t) = \phi_p^T(s_{t+1}, s_t, x_{t-1}, a_t) \theta_p.$$

The feature vector is given by

$$\phi_p(s_{t+1}, s_t, x_{t-1}, a_t) = [\mathbb{1}_{s_{t+1}=\mathbf{f}(s_t, a_t, x')} \mathbb{1}_{x_{t-1}=x} \mathbb{1}_{x_t=x'}]_{x, x' \in \mathcal{X}}.$$

The unknown coefficient is given by

$$\theta_p = [\Pr(x_t = x' | x_{t-1} = x)]_{x, x' \in \mathcal{X}}.$$

Again, applying the UCRL-VTR⁺ algorithm gives upper bound $\tilde{O}(d^2 H^{3/2} \sqrt{K})$.

Generally, if the dynamics of the exogenous state transition is a k -step Markov process, the transition probability is the inner product of a d^k -dimensional feature vector, with the k -step Markov probability as the coefficient. Applying the same reduction gives upper bound $\tilde{O}(d^{k+1} H^{3/2} \sqrt{K})$.

4.3 Example of Rank Reduction: Infection Model with Vaccines

We illustrate the possibility of rank reduction as discussed in Section 4.2 through a simple infection model.

Suppose a single individual is faced with an infectious disease over time, and at each stage, a central planner needs to decide whether to use a vaccine or not on them. We let $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{A} = \{0, 1\}$ where the state $s = 1$ implies the individual is infected, $s = 0$ that they are not infected (or recovered); an action of $a = 1$ means to vaccinate the individual, and $a = 0$ means to not vaccinate. Let P_0 be the probability an uninfected person is infected conditional on no vaccine at stage h , P_1 be the probability an uninfected person is infected conditional on the person being vaccinated at stage h , and P_2 be the probability of recovering from the disease at stage h , independent of vaccination status. The transition dynamics are represented by the state-transition matrix $P_{s_h \rightarrow s_{h+1}}(a)_{i,j} = \mathbb{P}(s_{h+1} = j | s_h = i, a_t = a)$ where

$$\begin{aligned} a = 0, \quad P_{s_h \rightarrow s_{h+1}}(a = 0) &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 - P_0 & P_0 \\ P_2 & 1 - P_2 \end{bmatrix}, \\ a = 1, \quad P_{s_h \rightarrow s_{h+1}}(a = 1) &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 - P_1 & P_1 \\ P_2 & 1 - P_2 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Reformulate as an Exo-MDP. Define the exogenous state space as $\mathcal{X} = \{0, 1\}^3$ such that $x = (x_0, x_1, x_2)^\top$ and $\mathbb{P}_x = P$ is characterized by $x_0 \sim \text{Bern}(P_0)$, $x_1 \sim \text{Bern}(P_1)$, and $x_2 \sim \text{Bern}(1 - P_2)$ independently. We can write the transition function $s_{h+1} = \mathbf{f}(s_h, a_h, x_h)$ as:

$$\mathbf{f}(s_h, a_h, x_h) = \begin{cases} x_0 & s_h = 0, a_h = 0 \\ x_1 & s_h = 0, a_h = 1 \\ x_2 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Rank of the Full Information Matrix F . We denote the exogenous distribution \mathbf{p}_x as

$$\mathbf{p}_x = [P_{(0,0,0)}, P_{(0,0,1)}, P_{(0,1,0)}, P_{(0,1,1)}, P_{(1,0,0)}, P_{(1,0,1)}, P_{(1,1,0)}, P_{(1,1,1)}]^T.$$

The full information matrix with rows indexed by $(s' | s, a)$ and columns indexed by $x \in \mathcal{X}$ is given by:

$$F = \begin{matrix} & \begin{matrix} (0,0,0) & (0,0,1) & (0,1,0) & (0,1,1) & (1,0,0) & (1,0,1) & (1,1,0) & (1,1,1) \end{matrix} \\ \begin{matrix} \phi_p(1 | 0,0) \\ \phi_p(0 | 0,0) \\ \phi_p(1 | 0,1) \\ \phi_p(0 | 0,1) \\ \phi_p(1 | 1,0) \\ \phi_p(0 | 1,0) \\ \phi_p(1 | 1,1) \\ \phi_p(0 | 1,1) \end{matrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \end{matrix}$$

By a simple rank calculation, we have that $r = \text{Rank}(F) = 4$ while $d = 8$. Intuitively, the rank reduction comes from the fact that the state transition dynamics only depend on \mathbf{p}_x through the marginal distribution of each of the three coordinates of x . Therefore, instead of estimating the eight-dimensional probability vector \mathbf{p}_x (which is also impossible to infer in this case), one only needs the three Bernoulli coefficients for the marginal distribution at each of the three coordinates of x , along with an extra rank coming from the simplex constraint. Even though the agent does not know anything about the structure of \mathbf{p}_x a priori, the full information matrix reveals that the dynamics of the Exo-MDP only depend on \mathbf{p}_x through the three marginal distributions.

5 Regret Lower Bound under the No Observation Regime

In this section, we present a regret lower bound of $\Omega(Hd\sqrt{K})$ for Exo-MDPs under the no observation regime. This almost matches our upper bound of $\tilde{O}(H^{3/2}d\sqrt{K})$ in Section 4.2, showing that the dependence on dimension d and number of episodes K is optimal, while the dependence on horizon H differs by a factor of \sqrt{H} . Following prior work, our lower bound is on expected regret, calculated over both the distribution \mathbb{P}_x and the chosen policy. We formally state our regret lower bound for Exo-MDPs below in Theorem 4.

Prior work such as Ayoub et al. [6] provides a lower bound of $\Omega(H\sqrt{dK})$ for *stationary* linear mixture MDPs, that is, the transition and reward dynamics are the same across each stage of an episode. Despite Exo-MDPs being a subclass of stationary linear mixture MDPs, our regret lower bound is tighter by a factor of \sqrt{d} . In Section 5.2, we provide a lower bound for Exo-MDPs when the dynamics of the exogenous state \mathbb{P}_x^h can differ across each stage of $\Omega(H^{3/2}d\sqrt{K})$. Since the upper bound in Section 4.2 of $\tilde{O}(H^{3/2}d\sqrt{K})$ applies to this more general setting, we achieve the minimax optimal rate for nonstationary Exo-MDPs up to polylogarithmic factors.

5.1 Regret Lower Bound for (Stationary) Exo-MDPs

We formally state the regret lower bound for Exo-MDPs as follows.

Theorem 4. *Assume $K \geq \frac{1}{10}d^2$, then for any Exo-MDP algorithm \mathcal{B} , there exists an Exo-MDP \mathcal{M} such that the expected regret of \mathcal{B} over K episodes on the Exo-MDP \mathcal{M} is lower bounded by $\gamma Hd\sqrt{K}$ for some universal constant γ .*

Proof sketch. Our lower bound construction builds upon the hardness of learning a single-horizon Exo-MDP, which we call an Exo-Bandit. Specifically, we construct an Exo-Bandit instance which reduces to learning a linear bandit on a hypercube action set that achieves a lower bound of $\Omega(d\sqrt{K})$. We then use this Exo-Bandit to construct a hard instance of Exo-MDP, denoted as \mathcal{M} . At stage $h = 1$, \mathcal{M} follows the same reward dynamics as the Exo-Bandit. For stages $h = 2, 3, \dots, H$, the specific forms of \mathbf{f} and \mathbf{g} force the reward from the first stage to repeat H times regardless of the actions or exogenous states, without revealing any additional information on \mathbb{P}_x . This directly leads to a lower bound of $\Omega(Hd\sqrt{K})$. We outline the hard instance of Exo-MDP, $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}[\mathbb{P}_x(\tilde{Z}), \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}] = (\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A}, H, s_1, \mathbb{P}, R)$ below, but see the full proof in Appendix E.1.

The state space of $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ is given by $\mathcal{S} = s_1 \cup \{(h, r) \mid h \in \{2, 3, \dots, H\}, r \in \{-1, 1\}\}$. That is, \mathcal{S} consists of s_1 , a single starting state, and each of the next $H - 1$ states are indexed by the stage $h \in [H]$ as well as a single number $r \in \{-1, 1\}$. The exogenous state space is given by $\mathcal{X} = [d] = \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$. The action set \mathcal{A} sits on a subset of the d -dimensional hypercube, where

$$\mathcal{A} = \{([Z]_1, -[Z]_1, [Z]_2, -[Z]_2, \dots, [Z]_{\frac{d}{2}}, -[Z]_{\frac{d}{2}}) \mid Z \in \{-1, 1\}^{d/2}\} \subset \{-1, 1\}^d.$$

Each action $a \in \mathcal{A}$ is completely characterized by a vector $Z \in \{-1, 1\}^{d/2}$ where

$$a(Z) = ([Z]_1, -[Z]_1, [Z]_2, -[Z]_2, \dots, [Z]_{\frac{d}{2}}, -[Z]_{\frac{d}{2}}).$$

The (unknown) distribution \mathbb{P}_x for the exogenous state X , parameterized by $\tilde{Z} \in \{-1, 1\}^{d/2}$ and constant $c = \frac{1}{10}\sqrt{\frac{2}{5K}}$, is given by

$$\mathbf{p}_x(\tilde{Z}) = (\mathbb{P}_x(1), \dots, \mathbb{P}_x(d)) = \left(\frac{1}{d} + c[\tilde{Z}]_1, \frac{1}{d} - c[\tilde{Z}]_1, \dots, \frac{1}{d} + c[\tilde{Z}]_{\frac{d}{2}}, \frac{1}{d} - c[\tilde{Z}]_{\frac{d}{2}}\right).$$

In other words, \mathbf{p}_x is almost a uniform distribution except each coordinate is perturbed from $\frac{1}{d}$ by a small constant c or $-c$ depending on the value of \tilde{Z} . Intuitively, the hardness comes from correctly guessing the coordinates of these perturbations by choosing action $a(Z)$ that matches \tilde{Z} closely.

The known state transition function is given by

$$s_{h+1} = \mathbf{f}(s_h, a_h, x_h) = \begin{cases} (h+1, r) & \text{if } s_h = (h, r), h = 2, 3, \dots, H-1 \\ (2, r = [a_1]_{x_1}) & \text{if } h = 1, s_h = s_1 \end{cases}$$

The action a_h has no effect on the state transition, except, in the first stage, action a_1 assigns value $r = [a_1]_{x_1}$ to the second coordinate of the state, which is then retained and shared across all stages afterwards. The known reward function is given by

$$R_h = \mathbf{g}(s_h, a_h, x_h) = \begin{cases} [a_1]_{x_1} & \text{if } h = 1, s_h = s_1 \\ r & \text{if } s_h = (h, r). \end{cases}$$

At stage $h = 1$, taking action a_1 incurs reward $[a_1]_{x_1}$, where $x_1 \sim \mathbb{P}_x$. For all $H - 1$ stages afterwards, the same reward at the first stage is repeated, leading to a total reward of $H \cdot [a_1]_{x_1}$.

5.2 Lower Bound and Minimax Optimality for Non-stationary Exo-MDPs

Recall that our upper bound through linear mixture MDP formulation in Section 4.2 is $\tilde{O}(dH^{3/2}\sqrt{K})$, which differs from our lower bound of $\Omega(Hd\sqrt{K})$ by a factor of \sqrt{H} omitting logarithmic dependencies. In this section, we show that, if we allow the exogenous state distribution \mathbb{P}_x to differ across all stages, then we can achieve a matching lower bound of $\Omega(H^{3/2}d\sqrt{K})$.

Note that our definition of Exo-MDP is *stationary*, that is, the dynamics of \mathbb{P}_x is the same across all stages $h = 1, \dots, H$. On the other hand, the UCRL-VTR⁺ algorithm applies to the more general problem of non-stationary linear mixture MDPs, where the transition and reward dynamics \mathbb{P}_h and R_h differ in each stage of the MDP. UCRL-VTR⁺ is therefore able to solve a more general version of an Exo-MDP, where the dynamics of \mathbb{P}_x^h can differ across each stage, which we call a *non-stationary Exo-MDP*, achieving an

Table 1. Total cost at the final episode $K = 1000$, $C_1^{\pi^K}$. \star indicates significant improvement and \circ significant decrease over ONLINE BASE-STOCK by Welch’s t -test with a p value of 0.05. In parenthesis we show the relative performance to the total cost of the optimal policy, $(C_1^{\pi^K} - C_1^*)/C_1^*$. See Table 3 for parameter specifications of the scenarios.

Algorithm	Scenario I	Scenario II
Optimal Policy (C_1^*)	25.0 (0%)	33.0 (0%)
Optimal Base-Stock Policy (C_1^{b*})	48.8 (95%)	33.0 (0%)
PLUG-IN	25.1* (0%)	33.6* (2%)
RANDOM	57.5 $^\circ$ (130%)	76.6 $^\circ$ (132%)
Q-LEARNING	39.7 (59%)	48.0 $^\circ$ (45%)
ONLINE BASE-STOCK	48.7 (95%)	40.6 (23%)
UCRL-VTR ⁺	25.2* (0%)	38.4 (16%)

identical regret performance to that established in Theorem 3 in the case with no rank reduction ($r = d$). We show how to construct a non-stationary Exo-MDP with a lower bound of $\Omega(H^{3/2}d\sqrt{K})$. This matches the upper bound up to polylogarithmic factors, implying that the UCRL-VTR⁺ algorithm is optimal for non-stationary Exo-MDPs.

We first define the notion of non-stationary Exo-MDPs.

Definition 4. An Exo-MDP $\mathcal{M}[\mathbb{P}_x, \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}]$ is said to be non-stationary if at each stage $h = 1, 2, \dots, H$, the exogenous state x_h is an independent sample from \mathbb{P}_x^h , where \mathbb{P}_x^h can be different for different stages h .

We formally state the regret lower bound for non-stationary Exo-MDPs as follows.

Theorem 5. Suppose $K \geq \frac{1}{10}d^2$, then for any Exo-MDP algorithm \mathcal{B} , there exists a non-stationary Exo-MDP \mathcal{M}_{ns} such that the expected regret of \mathcal{B} over K episodes on the non-stationary Exo-MDP is lower bounded by:

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{REGRET}(K)] \geq \gamma H^{3/2}d\sqrt{K} \quad \text{where } \gamma \text{ is a universal constant.}$$

Proof sketch. Intuitively, the construction of the non-stationary Exo-MDP proceeds in two parts, each lasting $\frac{H}{2}$ stages. The first $\frac{H}{2}$ stages entail no reward, but requires the agent to correctly guess the exogenous state distribution which is drawn uniformly from a collection of $\frac{H}{2}$ different unknown options. The second $\frac{H}{2}$ stages uses the same trick as the instance of Theorem 4 to repeat this reward $\frac{H}{2}$ times. The added factor of \sqrt{H} is due to the additional hardness of guessing $\frac{H}{2}$ exogenous state distributions instead of a single distribution. See Appendix E.2 for full details of the hard instance construction and the complete proof.

6 Simulations on Inventory Control

We compare the empirical performance of the PLUG-IN (Section 4.1) and UCRL-VTR⁺ (Section 4.2) algorithms on an extension to the inventory control example in Section 2. We show that under certain parameter settings, UCRL-VTR⁺ achieves comparable performance with state-of-the-art algorithms tailored for the inventory control problem. See Appendix F for further details on the experimental setup and simulation details, and https://github.com/jw3479/Exogenous_MDPs for the implementation.

6.1 Inventory Control with Lead Time.

In our experiments, we consider the online inventory control problem from Section 2 with the addition of a *lead time* L [14]. In particular, a retailer is faced with the task of making ordering decisions online over a fixed horizon of H stages. In the beginning of each stage h , the inventory manager observes the current inventory level Inv_h as well as the L previous unfulfilled orders in the pipeline, denoted as O_{h-L}, \dots, O_{h-1} . Here, $L \geq 1$ is the so-called *lead time*, or delay in the number of stages between placing an order and receiving




Figure 2. In Fig. 2a we plot the total cost function $C_1^b(s_1)$ as we vary the base-stock value b in Scenario II. The x -axis denotes the base-stock value $b \in [0, 10]$ and the y -axis C_1^b . In Figs. 2b and 2c on the x -axis we show the episode $k \in [1000]$ and on the y -axis the total cost C^{π^k} under the different algorithms. Fig. 2b shows results on Scenario I, and Fig. 2c results for Scenario II. The grey line corresponds to the performance (total cost) of the optimal base-stock policy, and the black line to the performance of the optimal policy. We note that under Scenario II there is no optimality gap.

it. We assume for ease of notation that we start at no on-hand inventory and no outstanding orders, that is, $\text{Inv}_1 = O_{1-L} = \dots = O_1 = O_0 = 0$. The dynamics model works as follows.

At the beginning of each stage h , the inventory manager observes the current inventory level Inv_h and previous orders O_{h-L}, \dots, O_{h-1} and picks an order O_h to arrive at stage $h+L$. Then, the order O_{h-L} that was made L time steps earlier arrives. Next, an unobserved demand $X_h \geq 0$ is generated from the unknown demand distribution \mathbb{P}_x , independent of the previous stages. The number of products sold is the minimum of on-hand inventory and demand, i.e. $\min\{\text{Inv}_h + O_{h-L}, X_h\}$. Note that the decision maker only observes the sales, and not the actual demand X_h .

As a function of the sales, the retailer pays a holding cost of $c(\text{Inv}_h + O_{h-L} - X_h)^+$ and a lost sales penalty of $p(X_h - \text{Inv}_h - O_{h-L})$, where c and p known constants. This leads to a total cost of

$$C_h = -R_h = c(\text{Inv}_h + O_{h-L} - X_h)^+ + p(X_h - \text{Inv}_h - O_{h-L}).$$

For notational convenience we assume c and p are normalized so that the cost is in $[0, 1]$. The on-hand inventory is then updated as $\text{Inv}_{h+1} = (\text{Inv}_h + O_{h-L} - X_h)^+$. The goal is to design ordering decision policy π to minimize total expected cost $C_1^\pi = \mathbb{E}_\pi[\sum_{h=1}^H C_h]$.

Exo-MDP Formulation. To formulate this problem as an Exo-MDP, let $d+1$ denote the size of the support of the independent demand distribution \mathbb{P}_x . We assume for convenience that the support is then $\{0, \dots, d\}$. The state space is $\mathcal{S} = [d]^{L+1}$, where each state

$$S_h = (\text{Inv}_h, O_{h-L}, \dots, O_{h-1}),$$

consists of the current inventory level Inv_h and previous L unfulfilled orders in the pipeline O_{h-L}, \dots, O_{h-1} . The exogenous state space is given by $\mathcal{X} = [d]$, where each X_h is given by the demand at time h . The action space is given by $\mathcal{A} = [d]$, where action $a_h = O_h$ denotes the order placed at time h . We can write the deterministic transition and reward dynamics as

$$S_{h+1} = \mathbf{f}(S_h, A_h, X_h) = ((\text{Inv}_h + O_{h-L} - X_h)^+, O_{h-L+1}, \dots, O_{h-1}, O_h), \quad (8)$$

$$R_h = \mathbf{g}(S_h, A_h, X_h) = c(\text{Inv}_h + O_{h-L} - X_h)^+ + p(X_h - (\text{Inv}_h + O_{h-L}))^+. \quad (9)$$

6.2 Regret Guarantee for UCRL-VTR⁺ and Plug-In on Inventory Control

We focus on the performances of UCRL-VTR⁺ and the PLUG-IN approach. For comparison purpose, we grant the PLUG-IN method additional access to past demand trajectories for comparison, even though the algorithms only observe the sales of $\min\{X_h, \text{Inv}_h + O_{h-L}\}$ under the problem setting.

Direct applications of Theorem 2 and Theorem 3 yield regret guarantees of $\tilde{O}(H^{3/2}\sqrt{dK})$ and $\tilde{O}(H^{3/2}d\sqrt{K})$ respectively, where d is the support of the demand distribution. We note that there is no additional rank reduction in this model ($r = d$). See Appendix F.1 for further details.

Corollary 6. *Consider a single product stochastic inventory control problem with lost sales and lead time $L \geq 0$, where the demand $X_h \in [d]$. Then for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the Plug-IN algorithm achieves $\text{REGRET}(K) \leq O\left(H^{3/2}\sqrt{\{d + \log(K/\delta)\}K}\right)$ for the full observation regime; and UCRL-VTR⁺ achieves $\text{REGRET}(K) \leq \tilde{O}(H^{3/2}dK)$ for the no observation regime.*

6.3 Baseline Algorithms

We compare the performance of our algorithms against standard Q-Learning [20] and a widely-used heuristic, *base-stock policies* [14]. These policies are defined relative to b , the so-called base-stock level. At each stage h , the policy orders an amount to ensure the total inventory position (including both on-hand inventory and outstanding orders) is at least b units. In Table 1 we use C_1^{b*} to denote the total cost of the best base-stock policy. To learn the optimal base-stock policy online, inspired by Agrawal and Jia [3] we include an online convex optimization algorithm over the base-stock level, which we denote as ONLINE BASE-STOCK. In Corollary 7 we show the approach yields a regret guarantee of $O(H\sqrt{K})$, where regret is defined relative to the optimal base-stock C_1^{b*} . At first glance this guarantee seems stronger (scaling independent of d). However, since base-stock policies are not optimal in general, even the optimal base-stock policy can lead to regret of $\Omega(K)$ relative to the total cost of the optimal policy.

Base-stock policies. The class of base-stock policies is a well-known heuristic for the inventory control problem with positive lead time and lost sales. Intuitively, these policies order a quantity that brings the sum of leftover inventory and outstanding order to some fixed value b , also referred to as the *base-stock level*. Formally, fixing the base-stock level b , the action at stage h is given by:

$$\pi_h^b(\text{Inv}_h, O_{h-L}, \dots, O_{h-1}) = O_h = \left(b - \text{Inv}_h - \sum_{i=1}^L O_{h-i} \right)^+. \quad (10)$$

In general, base-stock policies do not recover the optimal policy. However, prior work such as Huh et al. [16], Zipkin [40] shows that base-stock policy are optimal when either $L = 0$ or the lost-sales cost $p \rightarrow \infty$. See Goldberg et al. [14] for more discussion.

Online base-stock algorithm. Here we outline our baseline algorithm for learning the optimal base-stock policy. The total cost function (i.e., negative value) with respect to the base-stock level b , $-V_1^b = C_1^b = \mathbb{E}_{X_1, \dots, X_H, \pi_b}[\sum_{h=1}^H \mathcal{C}(S_h, A_h) \mid s_1 = (0, 0, \dots, 0)]$ is convex in b (see Appendix F.2, Lemma 9). Moreover, once the policy π^b is fixed, each H -stage evaluation of the policy in a given episode can be treated as a single sample for its expected H -stage total cost C_1^b . These observations lead to our baseline policy, the *online base-stock policy* that searches for the optimal base-stock level with stochastic online convex optimization with bandit feedback [1], which amounts to a finite horizon extension to the algorithm in Agrawal and Jia [3]. Online base-stock gives a regret guarantee of $O(H\sqrt{K})$ relative to the optimal base-stock policy [1]. See Appendix F.3 for the complete algorithm and regret analysis.

6.4 Simulation Results

In Table 1 and Fig. 2 we compare the performance of our algorithms to the online base stock algorithm and Q-Learning from Jin et al. [20]. For exposition purpose we present the total cost under two configurations of the inventory control problem, which we denote as Scenario I and Scenario II, detailed in Table 3. Notably, Scenario I is an instance where the optimal base-stock is sub-optimal due to positive lead time, and Scenario II is an instance when the optimal base-stock is indeed optimal.

Under Scenario I, we note a large optimality gap between the optimal (C_1^*) and best performing base-stock policy (C_1^{b*}). UCRL-VTR⁺ outperforms ONLINE BASE-STOCK since it surpasses the sub-optimality of the heuristic class of base-stock and instead converges to the true optimal policy. Moreover, UCRL-VTR⁺ and the PLUG-IN algorithm both converge quickly to the true optimal policy C_1^* . Under Scenario II, the best performing base-stock policy C_1^{b*} is the true optimal C_1^* . We again observe that UCRL-VTR⁺

achieves similar performance to ONLINE BASE-STOCK. This highlights the robustness of UCRL-VTR⁺ to different regimes, achieving convergence to the true optimal policy even in settings where optimal base-stock is sub-optimal, and additionally achieves similar statistical power as ONLINE BASE-STOCK.

7 Conclusion and Future Work

In this paper, we studied a special class of Markov decision processes called Markov decision processes with exogenous states (Exo-MDPs), which arise from real-world MDPs where some state variables are exogenous and outside of the control of the decision maker. We highlight that Exo-MDPs, despite their structural assumptions, represent a rich class of MDPs equivalent to both the class of discrete MDPs and discrete linear mixture MDPs. We provide algorithms under both the full observation and no observation regimes on the exogenous states, as well as nearly-matching lower bounds. Importantly, all our algorithms achieve regret bounds scaling only with the dimension of the exogenous state d regardless of the endogenous state and action spaces. One interesting open direction would be to investigate intermediate observation regimes with sample complexities interpolating between the full and no observation regimes. Another future direction is to study the upper bounds outside the high dimension ($d \geq H$) and large sample ($K \geq d^4H + d^3H^2$) regime required for the upper bounds.

Acknowledgments.

The authors would like to thank Nic Fishman and Yassir Jedra for insightful discussions about this work. This work was partially supported by MIT IBM project; MIT EECS Alumni Fellowship; and ONR grant N00014-21-1-2842 and NSF DMS-2311072.

References

- [1] Agarwal, A., Foster, D. P., Hsu, D. J., Kakade, S. M., and Rakhlin, A. (2011). Stochastic convex optimization with bandit feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 24.
- [2] Agarwal, A., Jiang, N., Kakade, S. M., and Sun, W. (2019). Reinforcement Learning: Theory and Algorithms. Technical report, University of Washington. Available from <https://rltheorybook.github.io>.
- [3] Agrawal, S. and Jia, R. (2022). Learning in structured mdps with convex cost functions: Improved regret bounds for inventory management. *Operations Research*, 70(3):1646–1664.
- [4] Alvo, M., Russo, D., and Kanoria, Y. (2023). Neural inventory control in networks via hindsight differentiable policy optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.11246*.
- [5] Ayoub, A., Jia, Z., Szepesvari, C., Wang, M., and Yang, L. (2020a). Model-based reinforcement learning with value-targeted regression. In III, H. D. and Singh, A., editors, *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 463–474. PMLR.
- [6] Ayoub, A., Jia, Z., Szepesvari, C., Wang, M., and Yang, L. (2020b). Model-based reinforcement learning with value-targeted regression. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 463–474. PMLR.
- [7] Bubeck, S. and Cesa-Bianchi, N. (2012). Regret analysis of stochastic and nonstochastic multi-armed bandit problems. *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, 5(1).
- [8] Dai, J. G. and Gluzman, M. (2021). Queueing network controls via deep reinforcement learning. *Stochastic Systems*.
- [9] Dann, C., Jiang, N., Krishnamurthy, A., Agarwal, A., Langford, J., and Schapire, R. E. (2018). On oracle-efficient pac rl with rich observations. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31.

- [10] Dietterich, T., Trimponias, G., and Chen, Z. (2018). Discovering and Removing Exogenous State Variables and Rewards for Reinforcement Learning. In *ICML*.
- [11] Efroni, Y., Foster, D. J., Misra, D., Krishnamurthy, A., and Langford, J. (2022). Sample-efficient reinforcement learning in the presence of exogenous information. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 5062–5127. PMLR.
- [12] Fang, J., Ellis, M., Li, B., Liu, S., Hosseinkashi, Y., Revow, M., Sadovnikov, A., Liu, Z., Cheng, P., Ashok, S., Zhao, D., Cutler, R., Lu, Y., and Gehrke, J. (2019). Reinforcement learning for bandwidth estimation and congestion control in real-time communications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.02222*.
- [13] Feng, J., Gluzman, M., and Dai, J. G. (2021). Scalable deep reinforcement learning for ride-hailing. In *2021 American Control Conference (ACC)*, pages 3743–3748. IEEE.
- [14] Goldberg, D. A., Reiman, M. I., and Wang, Q. (2021). A Survey of Recent Progress in the Asymptotic Analysis of Inventory Systems. *Production and Operations Management*, 30(6).
- [15] Hadary, O., Marshall, L., Menache, I., Pan, A., Greeff, E. E., Dion, D., Dorminey, S., Joshi, S., Chen, Y., Russinovich, M., et al. (2020). Protean: {VM} allocation service at scale. In *14th {USENIX} Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation ({OSDI} 20)*, pages 845–861.
- [16] Huh, W. T., Janakiraman, G., Muckstadt, J. A., and Rusmevichientong, P. (2009). Asymptotic optimality of order-up-to policies in lost sales inventory systems. *Management Science*, 55(3):404–420.
- [17] Janakiraman, G. and Roundy, R. O. (2004). Lost-sales problems with stochastic lead times: Convexity results for base-stock policies. *Operations Research*, 52(5):795–803.
- [18] Jia, Z., Yang, L., Szepesvari, C., and Wang, M. (2020). Model-based reinforcement learning with value-targeted regression. In Bayen, A. M., Jadbabaie, A., Pappas, G., Parrilo, P. A., Recht, B., Tomlin, C., and Zeilinger, M., editors, *Proceedings of the 2nd Conference on Learning for Dynamics and Control*, volume 120 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 666–686. PMLR.
- [19] Jiang, N., Krishnamurthy, A., Agarwal, A., Langford, J., and Schapire, R. E. (2017). Contextual decision processes with low Bellman rank are PAC-learnable. In Precup, D. and Teh, Y. W., editors, *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 70 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1704–1713. PMLR.
- [20] Jin, C., Allen-Zhu, Z., Bubeck, S., and Jordan, M. I. (2018). Is q-learning provably efficient? *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31.
- [21] Jin, C., Yang, Z., Wang, Z., and Jordan, M. I. (2020). Provably efficient reinforcement learning with linear function approximation. In Abernethy, J. and Agarwal, S., editors, *Proceedings of Thirty Third Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 125 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2137–2143. PMLR.
- [22] Kearns, M. and Singh, S. (2002). Near-optimal reinforcement learning in polynomial time. *Machine learning*, 49:209–232.
- [23] Kober, J., Bagnell, J. A., and Peters, J. (2013). Reinforcement learning in robotics: A survey. *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, 32(11):1238–1274.
- [24] Madeka, D., Torkkola, K., Eisenach, C., Luo, A., Foster, D. P., and Kakade, S. M. (2022). Deep inventory management. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.03137*.
- [25] Mao, H., Venkatakrisnan, S. B., Schwarzkopf, M., and Alizadeh, M. (2018). Variance reduction for reinforcement learning in input-driven environments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.02264*.
- [26] Ouyang, L., Wu, J., Jiang, X., Almeida, D., Wainwright, C. L., Mishkin, P., Zhang, C., Agarwal, S., Slama, K., Ray, A., et al. (2022). Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.02155>, 13:1.

- [27] Powell, W. (2022). *Reinforcement Learning and Stochastic Optimization: A Unified Framework for Sequential Decisions*. Wiley.
- [28] Rao, A. and Jelvis, T. (2022). *Foundations of reinforcement learning with applications in finance*. Chapman and Hall/CRC.
- [29] Rolf, B., Jackson, I., Müller, M., Lang, S., Reggelin, T., and Ivanov, D. (2023). A review on reinforcement learning algorithms and applications in supply chain management. *International Journal of Production Research*, 61(20):7151–7179.
- [30] Shah, D. and Xie, Q. (2018). Q-Learning with nearest neighbors. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 3111–3121.
- [31] Silver, D., Huang, A., Maddison, C. J., Guez, A., Sifre, L., Van Den Driessche, G., Schrittwieser, J., Antonoglou, I., Panneershelvam, V., Lanctot, M., et al. (2016). Mastering the game of go with deep neural networks and tree search. *nature*, 529(7587):484.
- [32] Sinclair, S. R., Banerjee, S., and Yu, C. L. (2023a). Adaptive discretization in online reinforcement learning. *Operations Research*, 71(5):1636–1652.
- [33] Sinclair, S. R., Frujeri, F. V., Cheng, C.-A., Marshall, L., Barbalho, H. D. O., Li, J., Neville, J., Menache, I., and Swaminathan, A. (2023b). Hindsight learning for mdps with exogenous inputs. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 31877–31914. PMLR.
- [34] Slivkins, A. (2019). Introduction to multi-armed bandits. *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, 12(1-2).
- [35] Sutton, R. S. and Barto, A. G. (2018). *Reinforcement learning: An introduction*. MIT press.
- [36] Yang, L. and Wang, M. (2019). Sample-optimal parametric q-learning using linearly additive features. In Chaudhuri, K. and Salakhutdinov, R., editors, *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 97 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 6995–7004. PMLR.
- [37] Zanette, A., Lazaric, A., Kochenderfer, M., and Brunskill, E. (2020). Learning near optimal policies with low inherent Bellman error. In III, H. D. and Singh, A., editors, *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 10978–10989. PMLR.
- [38] Zhao, X., Xia, L., Tang, J., and Yin, D. (2019). ” deep reinforcement learning for search, recommendation, and online advertising: a survey” by xiangyu zhao, long xia, jiliang tang, and dawei yin with martin vesely as coordinator. *ACM sigweb newsletter*, 2019(Spring):1–15.
- [39] Zhou, D., Gu, Q., and Szepesvari, C. (2021). Nearly minimax optimal reinforcement learning for linear mixture markov decision processes. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 4532–4576. PMLR.
- [40] Zipkin, P. (2008). Old and new methods for lost-sales inventory systems. *Operations research*, 56(5):1256–1263.

A Table of Notations

Symbol	Definition
<i>Problem setting specification</i>	
$\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, H, s_1, \mathbb{P}, R$	State space, action space, horizon, starting state, transition distribution, reward function
\mathcal{X}, d	Exogenous state space with $d = \mathcal{X} $
S_h, A_h, X_h	State, action, exogenous state at stage h
s_h, a_h, x_h	Realization of state, action, exogenous state at stage h
$\mathbb{P}_x, \mathbf{p}_x$	Marginal distribution of x and its vector representation
\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}	Known transition function and reward function
π	Stochastic policies $\pi_h : \mathcal{S} \times [H] \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{A})$
K	Number of episodes
π^k	Policy chosen by learning algorithm at start of episode k
$V_h^\pi(s, \mathcal{M})$	Value for policy π starting in state s at stage h in MDP \mathcal{M}
$x_{\geq h}$	The vector (x_h, \dots, x_H)
$\text{REGRET}(K)$	Cumulative loss for policies $\{\pi^k\}_{k \in [K]}$ relative to the optimal policy π^*
θ_p, θ_r	Unknown latent vectors for linear mixture MDP transition and reward
ϕ_p, ϕ_r	Known feature mappings $\phi_p(s, a)$ and $\phi_r(s' s, a)$ for linear mixture MDP
<i>Algorithm specification</i>	
\mathcal{D}_k	$H(k-1)$ observed samples of exogenous state at start of episode k
$\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_x^k$	Empirical distribution over \mathcal{D}_k
$\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^k$	Estimated MDP where \mathbb{P}_x is replaced with $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_x^k$
$\hat{\pi}^k$	Optimal policy in $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^k$
F	Full information matrix, where rows correspond to $\phi_p(s' s, a)$
r	Rank of F
<i>Inventory control specification</i>	
Inv_h	On-hand inventory at the start of stage h
X_h	Demand at stage h
O_h	Ordering decision at stage h
c, p	Holding cost and lost sales penalty
b, b^*	Base-stock parameter b and optimal base-stock value

Table 2: List of common notations.

B Omitted Discussion in Section 2

B.1 Remarks on Fixed Single Starting State

Note that we defined the MDP and Exo-MDP models with a fixed initial state. This simplifies the technical arguments in this paper but is not a restrictive assumption since we can capture MDPs and Exo-MDPs with random initial states by the following modification. Suppose the initial state is instead a random variable following distribution $s_1 \sim \mu$. Then we can add a *dummy* initial state s_0 with $R(s_0, a) = 0, \forall a \in \mathcal{A}$, $\mathbb{P}(s_1 | s_0, a) = \mu(s_1), \forall a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\mathbb{P}(s_0 | s, a) = 0, \forall (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$. In the case of MDPs, μ can be any distribution over \mathcal{S} . In the case of Exo-MDPs, μ can be any distribution captured by \mathbb{P}_x . Specifically, the probability vector $\mathbf{p}_\mu = (\mu(s_1 = s^1), \dots, \mu(s_1 = s^{|\mathcal{S}|})) \in [0, 1]^{|\mathcal{S}|}$ corresponding to the multinomial distribution μ , must be expressed as $\mathbf{p}_\mu = \mathbf{M}\mathbf{p}_x$ where $\mathbf{M} \in \{0, 1\}^{|\mathcal{S}| \times |\mathcal{X}|}$ is such that $\mathbf{M}^\top \mathbf{1}_{|\mathcal{S}|} = \mathbf{1}_{|\mathcal{X}|}$, where

$\mathbf{1}_{|\mathcal{S}|}$ and $\mathbf{1}_{|\mathcal{X}|}$ are the vectors of all 1's of dimensions $|\mathcal{S}|$ and $|\mathcal{X}|$. Note that this implicitly imposes that the support of μ is at most $|\mathcal{X}| = d$.

B.2 Regret to Value Function Estimation Error Conversion

The two different performance metrics, *regret* and *value function estimation error*, are closely connected [20]. Specifically, for any sequence of policies $\{\pi^k\}_{k=1}^K$, one can construct a policy π such that its value function estimation error is upper bounded by $\frac{1}{K}$ times the regret of the sequence of policies $\{\pi^k\}_{k=1}^K$.

Lemma 3. *Given an online algorithm generating a sequence of policies $\{\pi^k\}_{k=1}^K$, let policy $\hat{\pi}$ be a uniform draw from $\{\pi^k\}_{k=1}^K$. Suppose the algorithm achieves cumulative online regret $\text{REGRET}(K) \leq \rho(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, H)K^{1-\alpha}$, where ρ is some fixed function of $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, H$. Then $\hat{\pi}$ achieves value function estimation error:*

$$V_1^*(s_1) - V_1^{\hat{\pi}}(s_1) \leq \rho(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, H)K^{-\alpha}.$$

Proof. By definition of $\hat{\pi}$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} V_1^*(s_1) - V_1^{\hat{\pi}}(s_1) &= \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K V_1^*(s_1) - \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K V_1^{\pi^k}(s_1) = \frac{1}{K} \left[\sum_{k=1}^K (V_1^*(s_1) - V_1^{\pi^k}(s_1)) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{K} \text{REGRET}(K) \leq \frac{1}{K} \rho(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, H)K^{1-\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

□

C Proof of Theorem 2 in Section 4.1

Step 1: Bounding the ℓ_1 -estimation error $\|\hat{\mathbb{P}}_x^k - \mathbb{P}_x\|_1$. Recall that we set $d = |\mathcal{X}|$, and so for notational convenience we enumerate it via $\mathcal{X} = \{x^1, \dots, x^d\}$. We start off with a generic concentration argument, and then specialize it to $\hat{\mathbb{P}}_x^k$ for all $k \in [K]$.

Lemma 4. *For any value of $\delta \in (0, 1)$ suppose that $n \geq \max\{\frac{4d}{\epsilon^2}, \frac{8}{\delta^2} \log(\frac{2}{\delta})\}$. Let $\mathcal{D} = \{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$ contain n independent samples where each $X_i \sim \mathbb{P}_x$. Further denote $\hat{\mathbb{P}}_x$ as the empirical distribution of \mathcal{D} . Then with probability at least $1 - \delta$, $\|\mathbb{P}_x - \hat{\mathbb{P}}_x\|_1 \leq \epsilon$.*

Proof. We first bound the expected ℓ_1 distance between \mathbb{P}_x and $\hat{\mathbb{P}}_x$:

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbb{P}_x - \hat{\mathbb{P}}_x\|_1] = \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E}[|\mathbb{P}_x(x^i) - \hat{\mathbb{P}}_x(x^i)|] \leq \sum_{i=1}^d \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[(\mathbb{P}_x(x^i) - \hat{\mathbb{P}}_x(x^i))^2]},$$

where the last inequality is by Jensen's inequality. Moreover, for any $i \in [d]$, $n\hat{\mathbb{P}}_x(x^i) \sim \text{Bin}(n, \mathbb{P}_x(x^i))$, and therefore

$$\mathbb{E}[(\mathbb{P}_x(x^i) - \hat{\mathbb{P}}_x(x^i))^2] = \frac{1}{n^2} \text{VAR}[n\hat{\mathbb{P}}_x(x^i)] = \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{P}_x(x^i)(1 - \mathbb{P}_x(x^i)).$$

Hence,

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbb{P}_x - \hat{\mathbb{P}}_x\|_1] \leq \sum_{i=1}^d \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \mathbb{P}_x(x^i)(1 - \mathbb{P}_x(x^i))} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^d \sqrt{\mathbb{P}_x(x^i)} \leq \sqrt{\frac{d}{n}},$$

where the last inequality is by Cauchy Schwartz. Therefore, for $n \geq \frac{4d}{\epsilon^2}$, $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbb{P}_x - \hat{\mathbb{P}}_x\|_1] \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$.

We next convert this to a high probability guarantee with McDiarmid's inequality applied to a random variable $f(X_1, \dots, X_1) := \|\mathbb{P}_x - \hat{\mathbb{P}}_x\|_1$. Note that changing any single sample cannot change its value by more than $c = 2/n$ and so:

$$\Pr(|f(X_1, \dots, X_n) - \mathbb{E}[f(X_1, \dots, X_n)]| \geq \frac{\epsilon}{2}) \leq 2e^{-\frac{2(\epsilon/2)^2}{nc^2}} = 2e^{-\frac{n\epsilon^2}{8}}.$$

Therefore if $n \geq \frac{8}{\epsilon^2} \log(\frac{2}{\delta})$, then with probability $\geq 1 - \delta$,

$$|f(X_1, \dots, X_n) - \mathbb{E}[f(X_1, \dots, X_n)]| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

Combining with the previous bound, we have, if $n \geq \max\{\frac{4d}{\epsilon^2}, \frac{8}{\epsilon^2} \log(\frac{2}{\delta})\}$, then with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\|\mathbb{P}_x - \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_x\|_1 \leq |f(X_1, \dots, X_n) - \mathbb{E}[f(X_1, \dots, X_n)]| + \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbb{P}_x - \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_x\|_1] \leq \epsilon.$$

□

Solving the previous lemma in terms of ϵ and a union bound over $k \in [K]$ gives the following.

Lemma 5. *Let $\delta \in (0, 1)$ be arbitrary. Then with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for every $k = 2, \dots, K$ we have*

$$\|\mathbb{P}_x - \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_x^k\|_1 \leq \sqrt{\frac{4(d + 2 \log(\frac{2K}{\delta}))}{H(k-1)}}.$$

Step 2: Approximating the original Exo-MDP \mathcal{M} with $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^k$. Let $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A}, H, s_1, \mathbb{P}, R)$ be the original Exo-MDP. Given $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_x^k$ estimated with the trajectory up until episode k , we define the estimated MDP $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^k = (\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A}, H, s_1, \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_x^k, \widehat{R}^k)$ with transition dynamics $S_{h+1} = \mathbf{f}(S_h, A_h, X_h)$ where $X_h \sim \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_x^k$; and reward dynamics $\mathbf{g}(S_h, A_h, X_h)$ where $X_h \sim \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_x^k$. We then let $\widehat{\pi}^k = \arg \max_{\pi \in \Pi} V_1^\pi(s, \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^k)$. In order to translate the closeness of \mathbb{P}_x to $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_x^k$ to the difference in transition and reward function between the plug-in MDP $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^k$ and \mathcal{M} , we note that the upper bound on ℓ_1 -estimation error $\|\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_x^k - \mathbb{P}_x\|_1$ leads to the following Lipschitz bound on the estimation error of the transition and reward dynamics.

Lemma 6. *For all $k \in [K]$ and $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ we have:*

$$\|\mathbb{P}(\cdot | s, a) - \widehat{\mathbb{P}}^k(\cdot | s, a)\|_1 \leq \|\mathbb{P}_x(\cdot) - \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_x^k(\cdot)\|_1 \quad \text{and} \quad |\mathbb{E}[R(s, a)] - \mathbb{E}[\widehat{R}^k(s, a)]| \leq \|\mathbb{P}_x(\cdot) - \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_x^k(\cdot)\|_1.$$

Proof. The first inequality follows by directly applying the definition of transition $\mathbb{P}(\cdot | s, a)$ in terms of \mathbb{P}_x .

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbb{P}(\cdot | s, a) - \widehat{\mathbb{P}}^k(\cdot | s, a)\|_1 &= \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \left| \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbf{1}_{s'=f(s,a,x)} \mathbb{P}_x(x) - \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbf{1}_{s'=f(s,a,x)} \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_x^k(x) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbf{1}_{s'=f(s,a,x)} |\mathbb{P}_x(x) - \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_x^k(x)| \\ &= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \left(\sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbf{1}_{s'=f(s,a,x)} \right) \cdot |\mathbb{P}_x(x) - \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_x^k(x)| \\ &= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |\mathbb{P}_x(x) - \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_x^k(x)| = \|\mathbb{P}_x(\cdot) - \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_x^k(\cdot)\|_1. \end{aligned}$$

We use Hölder's inequality for the reward dynamics to have:

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}[R(s, a)] - \mathbb{E}[\widehat{R}^k(s, a)]| &= \left| \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} r(s, a, x) (\mathbb{P}_x(x) - \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_x^k(x)) \right| \\ &\leq \|r(s, a, \cdot)\|_\infty \cdot \|\mathbb{P}_x - \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_x^k\|_1 \leq \|\mathbb{P}_x - \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_x^k\|_1. \end{aligned}$$

□

Step 3: Bounding the value function difference of the optimal policy in $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^k$ to that of \mathcal{M} . Lastly, we adapt the simulation lemma in Kearns and Singh [22] for finite horizon MDPs to bound the value function difference between the true optimal policy π^* and the policy at the k -th episode given by the plug-in algorithm, $\widehat{\pi}^k$.

Lemma 7. (Simulation lemma for finite horizon MDPs) Let $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, H, s_1, \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{M}}, R_{\mathcal{M}})$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{M}} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, H, s_1, \mathbb{P}_{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}}, R_{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}})$ be two MDPs with the same state space, action space and horizon. Suppose that the transition and reward functions of these MDPs satisfy for all $s \in \mathcal{S}, a \in \mathcal{A}$:

$$\sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} |\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(s'|s, a) - \mathbb{P}_{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}}(s'|s, a)| \leq \epsilon_p \quad (11)$$

$$|R_{\mathcal{M}}(s, a) - R_{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}}(s, a)| \leq \epsilon_r. \quad (12)$$

Then for every policy π and $s \in \mathcal{S}$,

$$|V_1^\pi(s, \mathcal{M}) - V_1^\pi(s, \widehat{\mathcal{M}})| \leq H\epsilon_r + \frac{H(H-1)}{2}\epsilon_p.$$

With the previous lemmas in hand we provide a regret bound for this plug-in approach.

Proof of Theorem 2. This follows from for every $k \in [K]$:

$$\begin{aligned} V_1^{\pi^*}(s_1, \mathcal{M}) - V_1^{\widehat{\pi}^k}(s_1, \mathcal{M}) &= V_1^{\pi^*}(s_1, \mathcal{M}) - V_1^{\pi^*}(s_1, \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^k) + V_1^{\pi^*}(s_1, \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^k) - V_1^{\widehat{\pi}^k}(s_1, \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^k) \\ &\quad + V_1^{\widehat{\pi}^k}(s_1, \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^k) - V_1^{\widehat{\pi}^k}(s_1, \mathcal{M}) \\ &\leq |V_1^{\pi^*}(s_1, \mathcal{M}) - V_1^{\pi^*}(s_1, \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^k)| + |V_1^{\widehat{\pi}^k}(s_1, \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^k) - V_1^{\widehat{\pi}^k}(s_1, \mathcal{M})| \end{aligned}$$

where the second to last inequality is due to $\widehat{\pi}^k$ being the optimal policy in $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^k$.

We can then apply Lemma 7 to both terms and using that ϵ_r and ϵ_p are bounded by $\|\mathbb{P}_x - \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_x^k\|_1$ via Lemma 6:

$$\begin{aligned} V_1^*(s_1, \mathcal{M}) - V_1^{\widehat{\pi}^k}(s_1, \mathcal{M}) &\leq 2 \cdot (H\epsilon_r + \frac{H(H-1)}{2}\epsilon_p) \\ &\leq 2 \cdot (H \cdot \|\mathbb{P}_x(\cdot) - \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_x^k(\cdot)\|_1 + \frac{H(H-1)}{2} \cdot \|\mathbb{P}_x(\cdot) - \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_x^k(\cdot)\|_1) \\ &\leq 2H^2 \|\mathbb{P}_x(\cdot) - \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_x^k(\cdot)\|_1 \end{aligned}$$

After K episodes, let the resulting policy be $\widehat{\pi}^{K+1}$, then the value function estimation error is bounded by:

$$V_1^*(s_1, \mathcal{M}) - V_1^{\widehat{\pi}^{K+1}}(s_1, \mathcal{M}) \leq 2H^2 \sqrt{\frac{4(d + 2 \log(\frac{2K}{\delta}))}{HK}} = O(H^{3/2} \sqrt{\frac{d + \log(1/\delta)}{K}}).$$

Similarly in the regret guarantee we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{REGRET}(K) &= \sum_{k=1}^K V_1^*(s_1, M) - V_1^{\widehat{\pi}^k}(s_1, M) \\ &\leq V_1^*(s_1, M) - V_1^{\widehat{\pi}^1}(s_1, M) + \sum_{k=2}^K V_1^*(s_1, M) - V_1^{\widehat{\pi}^k}(s_1, M) \\ &\leq H + \sum_{k=2}^K 2H^2 \|\mathbb{P}_x(\cdot) - \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_x^k(\cdot)\|_1 \\ &\leq H + 2H^2 \sum_{k=2}^K \sqrt{\frac{4(d + 2 \log(2K/\delta))}{H(k-1)}} \\ &\leq H + 8H^{3/2} \sqrt{(d + 2 \log(2K/\delta))K} \\ &\leq 9H^{3/2} \sqrt{(d + 2 \log(2K/\delta))K}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the first inequality we used Lemma 5. □

D Complete Algorithm of UCRL-VTR⁺ [39] (Section 4.2)

Setting of non-stationary linear mixture MDPs. Zhou et al. [39] solves a more general class of linear mixture MDPs than we mentioned in Definition 3, called *non-stationary* episodic linear mixture MDP. Specifically, they solve MDPs of the following form: $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, H, \{r_h\}_{h=1}^H, \{\mathbb{P}_h\}_{h=1}^H)$ where there exists vectors $\theta_h \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\|\theta_h\|_2 \leq B$ and $0 \leq \sum_{j=1}^H r_h(s_h, a_h) \leq H$ such that $\mathbb{P}_h(s' | s, a) = \langle \phi(s' | s, a), \theta_h \rangle$ for any state-action-next-state triplet $(s, a, s') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{S}$ and stage h .

Proposition 1. (Theorem 5.3 of Zhou et al. [39]) Set $\lambda = 1/B^2$. For any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, with probability at least $1 - 5\delta$ by running the UCRL-VTR⁺ algorithm on a linear mixture MDP with known features $\phi_p(\cdot | \cdot, \cdot), \phi_r(\cdot, \cdot) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and unknown coefficients $\theta_p, \theta_r \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the regret is upper bounded by $\text{REGRET}(K) \leq \tilde{O}\left(\sqrt{d^2 H^2 + d H^3} \sqrt{K H} + d^2 H^3 + d^3 H^2\right)$.

Putting into the context of Exo-MDPs, we have $\theta_h = \mathbf{p}_x$ for all $h \in [H]$, and $B = 1$ given $\|\mathbf{p}_x\|_2 \leq \|\mathbf{p}_x\|_1 = 1$. Theorem 5.3 combined with the relaxation in Remark 5.5 of Zhou et al. [39] therefore directly leads to our regret upper bound of $\text{REGRET}(K) \leq \tilde{O}\left(\sqrt{d^2 H^2 + d H^3} \sqrt{K H} + d^2 H^3 + d^3 H^2\right)$.

Details of the UCRL-VTR⁺ algorithm. We specify the complete UCRL-VTR⁺ in Algorithm 1, with the following specifications of parameters.

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_V(s, a) &= \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \phi(s' | s, a) V(s') \\ [\mathbb{P}_h V](s, a) &= \mathbb{E}_{S' \sim \mathbb{P}_h(\cdot | s, a)} V(S') \\ [\mathbb{V}_h V](s, a) &= [\mathbb{P}_h V^2](s, a) - ([\mathbb{P}_h V](s, a))^2 \\ \hat{\beta}_k &= 8\sqrt{d \log(1 + k/\lambda) \log(4k^2 H/\delta)} + 4\sqrt{d} \log(4k^2 H/\delta) + \sqrt{\lambda} B \\ [\bar{\mathbb{V}}_{k,h} V_{k,h+1}](S_h^k, A_h^k) &= \left[\langle \phi_{V_{k,h+1}}(S_h^k, A_h^k), \tilde{\theta}_{k,h} \rangle \right]_{[0, H^2]} - \left[\langle \phi_{V_{k,h+1}}(S_h^k, A_h^k), \hat{\theta}_{k,h} \rangle \right]_{[0, H]}^2 \\ \text{where } [\cdot]_{[a,b]} &\text{ denotes clipping operator to interval } [a, b]. \\ E_{k,h} &= \min \left\{ H^2, 2H\check{\beta}_k \left\| \hat{\Sigma}_{k,h}^{-1/2} \phi_{V_{k,h+1}}(S_h^k, A_h^k) \right\|_2 \right\} + \min \left\{ H^2, \tilde{\beta}_k \left\| \hat{\Sigma}_{k,h}^{-1/2} \phi_{V_{k,h+1}}(S_h^k, A_h^k) \right\|_2 \right\} \\ \check{\beta}_k &= 8d\sqrt{\log(1 + k/\lambda) \log(4k^2 H/\delta)} + 4\sqrt{d} \log(4k^2 H/\delta) + \sqrt{\lambda} B \\ \tilde{\beta}_k &= 8\sqrt{dH^4 \log(1 + kH^4/(d\lambda)) \log(4k^2 H/\delta)} + 4H^2 \log(4k^2 H/\delta) + \sqrt{\lambda} B. \end{aligned}$$

E Proof of Lower Bounds in Section 5

E.1 Proof of Theorem 4

We present our lower bound constructions in two steps. We start by constructing an Exo-Bandit (an Exo-MDP with $H = 1$) achieving a lower bound of $\Omega(d\sqrt{K})$ on the expected regret. We then use the Exo-Bandit as a building block for an Exo-MDP with horizon H to get a lower bound of $\Omega(Hd\sqrt{K})$.

Step 1: the ‘‘Exo-Bandit’’ problem with lower bound $\Omega(d\sqrt{K})$. Our lower bound construction builds upon the hardness of learning a single-horizon Exo-MDP. We first show a specific construction with $H = 1$ which reduces to learning a linear bandit on a hypercube action set. We call this construction the ‘‘Exo-Bandit’’ problem $\mathcal{L}[\tilde{Z}^*]$ parameterized by a vector $\tilde{Z}^* \in \{-1, 1\}^{d/2}$.

Setup of the ‘‘Exo-Bandit’’ problem $\mathcal{L}[\tilde{Z}^*]$. Let d be given, and assume it is even for convenience. Without loss of generality, we can consider the exogenous state space as $\mathcal{X} = [d] = \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$. We define the linear bandit problem $\mathcal{L}[\tilde{Z}^*] = (\mathcal{A}, R)$ parameterized by a vector $\tilde{Z}^* \in \{-1, 1\}^{d/2}$ with action space \mathcal{A} and reward dynamics R as follows. Note that since the horizon $H = 1$, there is no notion of state and we omit it in the following definition.

Algorithm 1: UCRL-VTR⁺ for Episodic Linear Mixture MDPs

Input: Regularization parameter λ , an upper bound B of the ℓ_2 -norm of θ_h^*
For $h \in [H]$, set $\widehat{\Sigma}_{1,h}, \widetilde{\Sigma}_{1,h} \leftarrow \lambda I; \widehat{b}_{1,h}, \widetilde{b}_{1,h} \leftarrow 0; \widehat{\theta}_{1,h}, \widetilde{\theta}_{1,h} \leftarrow 0; V_{1,H+1}(\cdot) \leftarrow 0$.
for $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$ **do**
 for $h = H, H-1, \dots, 1$ **do**
 $Q_{k,h}(\cdot, \cdot) \leftarrow \min\{H, r_h(\cdot, \cdot) + \langle \widehat{\theta}_{k,h}, \phi_{V_{k,h+1}}(\cdot, \cdot) \rangle + \widehat{\beta}_k \|\widehat{\Sigma}_{k,h}^{-1/2} \phi_{V_{k,h+1}}(\cdot, \cdot)\|_2\}$.
 $\pi_h^k(\cdot) \leftarrow \arg \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q_{k,h}(\cdot, a)$
 $V_{k,h}(\cdot) \leftarrow \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q_{k,h}(\cdot, a)$
 for $h = 1, 2, \dots, H$ **do**
 Take action $A_h^k \leftarrow \pi_h^k(S_h^k)$, receive $S_{h+1}^k \sim \mathbb{P}_h(\cdot | S_h^k, A_h^k)$
 $\bar{\sigma}_{k,h} \leftarrow \sqrt{\max\{H^2/d, [\overline{V}_{k,h} V_{k,h+1}](S_h^k, A_h^k) + E_{k,h}\}}$
 $\widehat{\Sigma}_{k+1,h} \leftarrow \widehat{\Sigma}_{k,h} + \bar{\sigma}_{k,h}^{-2} \phi_{V_{k,h+1}}(S_h^k, A_h^k) \phi_{V_{k,h+1}}(S_h^k, A_h^k)^\top$
 $\widehat{b}_{k+1,h} \leftarrow \widehat{b}_{k,h} + \bar{\sigma}_{k,h}^{-2} \phi_{V_{k,h+1}}(S_h^k, A_h^k) V_{k,h+1}(S_{h+1}^k)$
 $\widetilde{\Sigma}_{k+1,h} \leftarrow \widetilde{\Sigma}_{k,h} + \phi_{V_{k,h+1}^2}(S_h^k, A_h^k) \phi_{V_{k,h+1}^2}(S_h^k, A_h^k)^\top$
 $\widetilde{b}_{k+1,h} \leftarrow \widetilde{b}_{k,h} + \phi_{V_{k,h+1}^2}(S_h^k, A_h^k) V_{k,h+1}^2(S_{h+1}^k)$
 $\widehat{\theta}_{k+1,h} \leftarrow \widehat{\Sigma}_{k+1,h}^{-1} \widehat{b}_{k+1,h}, \widetilde{\Sigma}_{k+1,h}^{-1} \widetilde{b}_{k+1,h}$

The action set \mathcal{A} sits on a subset of the d -dimensional hypercube,

$$\mathcal{A} = \{([Z]_1, -[Z]_1, [Z]_2, -[Z]_2, \dots, [Z]_{\frac{d}{2}}, -[Z]_{\frac{d}{2}}) \mid [Z]_i \in \{-1, 1\}\} \subset \{-1, 1\}^d.$$

Note that each action $a \in \mathcal{A}$ is completely characterized by a vector $Z \in \{-1, 1\}^{d/2}$ where

$$a(Z) = ([Z]_1, -[Z]_1, [Z]_2, -[Z]_2, \dots, [Z]_{\frac{d}{2}}, -[Z]_{\frac{d}{2}}).$$

The (unknown) distribution \mathbb{P}_x for the exogenous state x , parameterized by $\tilde{Z} \in \{-1, 1\}^{d/2}$, is given by

$$\mathbf{p}_x(\tilde{Z}) = (\mathbb{P}_x(1), \dots, \mathbb{P}_x(d)) = \left(\frac{1}{d} + c[\tilde{Z}]_1, \frac{1}{d} - c[\tilde{Z}]_1, \dots, \frac{1}{d} + c[\tilde{Z}]_{\frac{d}{2}}, \frac{1}{d} - c[\tilde{Z}]_{\frac{d}{2}} \mid [\tilde{Z}]_i \in \{-1, 1\} \right),$$

where constant $c = \frac{1}{10} \sqrt{\frac{2}{5K}}$. In other words, \mathbf{p}_x is almost a uniform distribution over $[d]$ except each coordinate is perturbed from $\frac{1}{d}$ by a small constant c or $-c$ depending on the value of $[\tilde{Z}]_i$. The reward function R is given by $R(a) = \mathbf{g}(a, x) = [a]_x$ for $x = 1, 2, \dots, d$, that is, $\mathbf{g}(a, x)$ takes value of the x -th coordinate of the action vector a . Equivalently, $R(a) = [a]_j$ with probability $[\mathbf{p}_x]_j$.

Regret lower bound for the Exo-Bandit problem. We now show that for any algorithm \mathcal{B} , there exists some hard instance $\mathcal{L}[\tilde{Z}^*]$ of the ‘‘Exo-Bandit’’ problem such that the expected regret over K time steps is lower bounded by $\Omega(d\sqrt{K})$.

Lemma 8. Assume $K \geq \frac{1}{10}d^2$, and let $c = \frac{1}{10} \sqrt{\frac{2}{5K}}$. For any bandit algorithm \mathcal{B} , there exists a linear bandit $\mathcal{L}[\tilde{Z}^*]$ parameterized by $\tilde{Z}^* \in \{-1, 1\}^{d/2}$ with corresponding exogenous state distribution $\mathbf{p}_x(\tilde{Z}^*) = (\frac{1}{d} + c[\tilde{Z}^*]_1, \frac{1}{d} - c[\tilde{Z}^*]_1, \dots, \frac{1}{d} + c[\tilde{Z}^*]_{\frac{d}{2}}, \frac{1}{d} - c[\tilde{Z}^*]_{\frac{d}{2}})$ such that the expected regret of \mathcal{B} over K time steps on the bandit is lower bounded by

$$\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathbf{p}_x(\tilde{Z}^*)}[\text{REGRET}(K)] \geq \gamma d\sqrt{K} \quad \text{where } \gamma \text{ is a universal constant.}$$

Proof. We first show that the Exo-Bandit is a linear bandit where the reward follows a shifted Bernoulli distribution, and the probability parameter is a linear function of a and \mathbb{P}_x . Specifically, for any time step, the reward for taking action $a = a(Z) \in \{-1, 1\}^d$ is given by $\mathbf{g}(a, x) = [a]_x$. So $R(a) \in \{-1, 1\}$, and the

probability of getting reward 1 is given by

$$\begin{aligned} p_1 &= \Pr[R(a(Z)) = 1] = \sum_{i=1}^{d/2} \frac{1}{d} + c \sum_{i=1}^{d/2} \mathbb{1}_{[Z]_i = \text{sign}([\tilde{Z}]_i)} - c \sum_{i=1}^{d/2} \mathbb{1}_{[Z]_i = -\text{sign}([\tilde{Z}]_i)} \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{cd}{2} \right) + 2c \langle Z, \tilde{Z} \rangle = \delta + 2c \langle Z, \tilde{Z} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

where $\delta := \frac{1}{2} - \frac{cd}{2}$.

We set $c = \frac{1}{10} \sqrt{\frac{2}{5K}}$, and suppose $K \geq \frac{1}{10} d^2$. Since the reward $R(a) \in \{-1, 1\}$, the reward distribution given action a follows a shifted Bernoulli distribution

$$R(a) \stackrel{\mathbf{d}}{=} -1 + 2\text{Bern}(p_1) \quad \text{where } \stackrel{\mathbf{d}}{=} \text{denotes equal in distribution.}$$

The problem now reduces to showing a lower bound of regret on linear bandits with hypercube action set and Bernoulli reward with linear mean payoff. To prove the regret lower bound for this linear bandit, we largely follow the arguments in Lemma C.8 of [39], with adaptations to our Exo-Bandit setting.

Let $a_k = a(Z_k) \in \mathcal{A}$ for $k \in [K]$ denote an action chosen at the k -th episode. Then for any $\mathbf{p}_x(\tilde{Z})$ and $\tilde{Z} \in \{-1, 1\}^{d/2}$, the expected regret $\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathbf{p}_x(\tilde{Z})}[\text{REGRET}(K)]$ by taking action sequence $a_1 = a(Z_1), \dots, a_K = a(Z_K)$ in Exo-Bandit $\mathcal{L}[\tilde{Z}]$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathbf{p}_x(\tilde{Z})}[\text{REGRET}(K)] &= \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathbf{p}_x(\tilde{Z})} \left[2c \left(\max_{Z \in \{-1, 1\}^{d/2}} \langle \tilde{Z}, Z \rangle - \langle \tilde{Z}_k, Z \rangle \right) \right] \\ &= 2c \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^{d/2} \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathbf{p}_x(\tilde{Z})} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\text{sign}[\tilde{Z}]_j \neq \text{sign}[Z_k]_j} \right] \\ &= 2c \sum_{j=1}^{d/2} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathbf{p}_x(\tilde{Z})} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\text{sign}[\tilde{Z}]_j \neq \text{sign}[Z_k]_j} \right] \end{aligned}$$

Let $N_j(\tilde{Z}) := \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{1}_{\text{sign}[\tilde{Z}]_j \neq \text{sign}[Z_k]_j}$, which denotes the number of mistakes made on the j -th coordinate of \tilde{Z} over K episodes. Let $\tilde{Z}^j \in \{-1, 1\}^{d/2}$ denote the vector which flips the sign of the j -th coordinate of vector \tilde{Z} . Note that $N_j(\tilde{Z}) + N_j(\tilde{Z}^j) = K$ for any $\tilde{Z} \in \{-1, 1\}^{d/2}$. Let $\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{Z}}$ be the distribution over R_1, \dots, R_K induced by executing a_1, \dots, a_K on bandit $\mathcal{L}[\tilde{Z}]$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} &2 \sum_{\tilde{Z} \in \{-1, 1\}^{d/2}} \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathbf{p}_x(\tilde{Z})}[\text{REGRET}(K)] \\ &= 2c \sum_{\tilde{Z} \in \{-1, 1\}^{d/2}} \sum_{j=1}^{d/2} \left(\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathbf{p}_x(\tilde{Z})}[N_j(\tilde{Z})] + \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathbf{p}_x(\tilde{Z}^j)}[N_j(\tilde{Z}^j)] \right) \\ &= 2c \sum_{\tilde{Z} \in \{-1, 1\}^{d/2}} \sum_{j=1}^{d/2} \left(K + \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathbf{p}_x(\tilde{Z})}[N_j(\tilde{Z})] - \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathbf{p}_x(\tilde{Z}^j)}[N_j(\tilde{Z}^j)] \right) \\ &\geq 2c \sum_{\tilde{Z} \in \{-1, 1\}^{d/2}} \sum_{j=1}^{d/2} \left(K - \sqrt{1/2} K \sqrt{KL(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{Z}}, \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{Z}^j})} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is by Pinsker inequality. We proceed to decompose $KL(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{Z}}, \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{Z}^j})$ by the chain rule

of relative entropy and upper bound it as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
KL(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{Z}}, \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{Z}^j}) &= \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathbf{p}_x(\tilde{Z})} [KL(\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{Z}}(R_k | R_{1:k-1}), \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{Z}^j}(R_k | R_{1:k-1}))] \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathbf{p}_x(\tilde{Z})} [KL(\text{Bern}(\delta + 2c\langle Z_k, \tilde{Z} \rangle), \text{Bern}(\delta + 2c\langle Z_k, \tilde{Z}^j \rangle))] \\
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathbf{p}_x(\tilde{Z})} \left[\frac{20(2c\langle Z_k, \tilde{Z} - \tilde{Z}^j \rangle)^2}{\delta + 2c\langle Z_k, \tilde{Z} \rangle} \right] \\
&\leq K \frac{20(2c)^2}{\frac{\delta}{2}} = \frac{160Kc^2}{\delta}.
\end{aligned}$$

The first inequality is due to the fact that $\delta + 2c\langle Z_k, \tilde{Z} \rangle \leq \delta + cd \leq \frac{3}{5}$, since for any two Bernoulli distributions $\text{Bern}(a)$ and $\text{Bern}(b)$, $KL(\text{Bern}(a), \text{Bern}(b)) \leq \frac{20(a-b)^2}{a}$ when $a, b \in (0, \frac{3}{5})$. The second inequality uses the following facts. For the numerator, because \tilde{Z} and \tilde{Z}^j differ only in the j -th coordinate, $|\langle Z_k, \tilde{Z} - \tilde{Z}^j \rangle| \leq 1$; for the denominator, $2c\langle Z_k, \tilde{Z} \rangle \geq -cd \geq -\frac{\delta}{2}$. These inequalities are satisfied by setting $c = \frac{1}{10}\sqrt{\frac{2}{5K}}$ and assuming $K \geq \frac{1}{10}d^2$. Then $cd \leq \frac{1}{5}$ and $\delta = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{cd}{2} \geq \frac{2}{5}$, so $c \leq \frac{1}{10}\sqrt{\frac{\delta}{K}}$ and $cd \leq \frac{\delta}{2}$.

Plugging this back in to the inequality above yields

$$\begin{aligned}
2 \sum_{\tilde{Z} \in \{-1, 1\}^{d/2}} \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathbf{p}_x(\tilde{Z})} [\text{REGRET}(K)] &\geq 2c \sum_{\tilde{Z}} \frac{d}{2} \left(K - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} K \sqrt{\frac{160Kc^2}{\delta}} \right) \\
&= cd \sum_{\tilde{Z}} \left(K - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} K \sqrt{\frac{160Kc^2}{\delta}} \right) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{10} \sqrt{\frac{2}{5K}} d \sum_{\tilde{Z}} \left(K - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} K \sqrt{\frac{160K}{\delta}} \frac{1}{10} \sqrt{\frac{\delta}{K}} \right) \\
&= \sum_{\tilde{Z}} \frac{1}{10} \sqrt{\frac{2K}{5}} d \left(1 - \frac{\sqrt{80}}{10} \right) \\
&\geq \sum_{\tilde{Z}} \frac{1}{200} d \sqrt{K},
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is due to $c \leq \frac{1}{10}\sqrt{\frac{\delta}{K}}$. Therefore, selecting \tilde{Z}^* maximizing the left hand side gives

$$\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathbf{p}_x(\tilde{Z}^*)} [\text{REGRET}(K)] \geq \frac{1}{400} d \sqrt{K}.$$

Since this holds for any sequence of actions $a(Z_1), \dots, a(Z_K)$, it follows for an arbitrary algorithm \mathcal{B} . \square

Step 2: an Exo-MDP instance with lower bound $\Omega(Hd\sqrt{K})$. We can now use the lower bound for the Exo-Bandit problem above to show that the hard instance $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}$ in Section 5.1 achieves a lower bound of $\Omega(Hd\sqrt{K})$.

Specifically, at stage $h = 1$, the dynamics of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}$ is the same as the Exo-Bandit problem in Appendix E.1, with the same action space \mathcal{A} parameterized by $Z \in \{-1, 1\}^{d/2}$ and exogenous state distribution $\mathbf{p}_x(\tilde{Z})$ parameterized by $\tilde{Z} \in \{-1, 1\}^{d/2}$. For stages $h = 2, 3, \dots, H$, the transition and reward functions under the Exo-MDP framework are designed such that the reward incurred at the first stage is repeated H times.

Proof of regret lower bound in Theorem 4. At stage $h = 1$, the hard instance \mathcal{M} acts exactly the same as an Exo-Bandit as in Appendix E.1, incurring reward r_1 . In stages $h = 2, 3, \dots, H$, the specific form of \mathbf{f} and \mathbf{g} forces the reward from the first stage to repeat H times regardless of the actions. In other words,

for each episode on the Exo-MDP \mathcal{M} , the reward over the whole episode, Hr_1 , is entirely determined by the action at the first stage. Because both \mathbf{f} and \mathbf{g} are independent of x_h, a_h for $h = 2, 3, \dots, H$, the only function of the last $H - 1$ stages is to repeat the reward without revealing any additional information on \mathbb{P}_x .

By Lemma 8, for any bandit algorithm, there exists parameter \tilde{Z}^* such that the expected regret is lower bounded by $\frac{1}{400}d\sqrt{K}$. Therefore, for any policy \mathcal{B} on the hard Exo-MDP \mathcal{M} , there exists parameter \tilde{Z}^* such that the expected regret is lower bounded by $\frac{1}{400}Hd\sqrt{K}$.

E.2 Proof of Theorem 5

Setup of the hard non-stationary Exo-MDP \mathcal{M}_{ns} . We follow the same basic construction as the hard Exo-MDP instance in Appendix E.1, but now allow the latent parameter Z for the exogenous state distribution to differ across each stage in $h = 1, 2, \dots, \frac{H}{2}$.

Formally, define the hard *non-stationary* Exo-MDP $\mathcal{M}_{ns}[\mathbb{P}_x^h(\tilde{Z}), \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}] = (\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A}, H + 1, s_1, \mathbb{P}_h, R_h)$.³

The state space is given by $\mathcal{S} = s_0 \cup \{(h, \text{ind}_x, r) \mid h = 0, 1, \dots, H, \text{ind}_x \in \{1, 2, \dots, \frac{H}{2}\}, r \in \{-1, 1, \emptyset\}\}$. That is, the state space \mathcal{S} consists of the set of tuples consisting of $h \in [H]$, an index ind_x as well as a binary code for reward $r \in \{-1, 1\}$; it also includes a dummy starting state s_0 .

The exogenous state space is given by $\mathcal{X} = [d] = \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$, assume $d > \frac{H}{2}$.

Action set $\mathcal{A} = \{([Z]_1, -[Z]_1, [Z]_2, -[Z]_2, \dots, [Z]_{\frac{d}{2}}, -[Z]_{\frac{d}{2}}) \mid [Z]_i \in \{-1, 1\}\}$.

For stages $h = 1, \dots, \frac{H}{2}$,

$$\mathbf{p}_x^h = (\mathbb{P}_x^h(1), \dots, \mathbb{P}_x^h(d)) = \left(\frac{1}{d} + c[\tilde{Z}]_1^h, \frac{1}{d} - c[\tilde{Z}]_1^h, \dots, \frac{1}{d} + c[\tilde{Z}]_{\frac{d}{2}}^h, \frac{1}{d} - c[\tilde{Z}]_{\frac{d}{2}}^h \mid \tilde{Z}^h \in \{-1, 1\}^{d/2}\right)$$

where constant $c = \frac{1}{10}\sqrt{\frac{2}{5K}}$.

The distributions \mathbb{P}_x^h for $h = \frac{H}{2} + 1, \dots, H$ can be any arbitrary distribution over \mathcal{X} , since x_h has no effect on transition or reward during those stages. Note that the dynamics of the Exo-MDP is completely determined by vectors $\tilde{Z}^1, \dots, \tilde{Z}^{H/2}$.

For stage $h = 0$, \mathbb{P}_x^0 is uniform over $\{1, 2, \dots, \frac{H}{2}\}$. Since $d > \frac{H}{2}$ this makes a valid distribution. Specifically,

$$\mathbb{P}_x^0(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{2}{H} & \text{if } x = 1, 2, \dots, \frac{H}{2} \\ 0 & \text{if } x = \frac{H}{2}, \dots, d. \end{cases}$$

The known state transition function is given by

$$s_{h+1} = \mathbf{f}(s_h, a_h, x_h) = \begin{cases} (0, \text{ind}_x, \emptyset) & \text{if } s_h = s_0, \text{ind}_x \sim \mathbb{P}_x^0 \\ (h + 1, \text{ind}_x, \emptyset) & \text{if } s_h = (h, \text{ind}_x, \emptyset), h + 1 \neq \text{ind}_x \\ (h + 1, \text{ind}_x, r = [a_h]_{x_h}) & \text{if } s_h = (h, \text{ind}_x, \emptyset), h + 1 = \text{ind}_x, a_h, x_h \sim \mathbb{P}_x^h \\ (h + 1, \text{ind}_x, r) & \text{if } s_h = (h, \text{ind}_x, r), r \in \{-1, 1\}. \end{cases}$$

The known reward function is given by

$$r_h = \mathbf{g}(s_h, a_h, x_h) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } h \leq \frac{H}{2} \\ r & \text{if } h > \frac{H}{2}, s_h = (h, \text{ind}_x, r). \end{cases}$$

Proof of Theorem 5. In each episode, the Exo-MDP proceeds in two stages, each lasting $\frac{H}{2}$ stages. The first $\frac{H}{2}$ stages entail no reward, but decides the reward r that the agent will receive in the later $\frac{H}{2}$ stages. The second $\frac{H}{2}$ stages repeats this reward $\frac{H}{2}$ times. Specifically, at stage $h = 0$, the Exo-MDP draws a sample of ind_x from a uniform distribution in $[\frac{H}{2}]$, which indexes the reward function that the agent receives. For stages $h = 1, 2, \dots, \frac{H}{2}$, the exogenous state follows distribution $x_h \sim \mathbb{P}_x^h$, and when the stage reaches the corresponding index ind_x , the third component of the state r is updated as $[a_h]_{x_h}$, that is, the action vector a_h indexed at $x_h \in [d]$. Given $\text{ind}_x \leq \frac{H}{2}$, after $\frac{H}{2}$ stages, r will take on some value in $\{-1, 1\}$. This will be

³Note that we use $H + 1$ as the horizon, and use H instead in the lower bound for notational convenience.

the reward the agent receives for stages $h = \frac{H}{2} + 1, \dots, H$. Note that the agent's action has no effect other than at the stage $h = \text{ind}_x$, when the reward r takes the value corresponding to the $[a_h]_{x_h}$.

By construction, the only components throughout an episode of length H that determine the final reward for the Exo-MDP is ind_x , which is sampled at stage $h = 0$, as well as the action $a \in \mathcal{A}$ taken at stage $h = \text{ind}_x$. Therefore the optimal policy π^* maps ind_x to the action a_h taken at $h = \text{ind}_x$. Moreover, the reward r is maximized when $a_h = \tilde{Z}^{\text{ind}_x}$ (which maximizes the probability that $r = 1$). Therefore, the optimal policy is to take action \tilde{Z}^{ind_x} at $h = \text{ind}_x$:

$$a_{\text{ind}_x}^* = \pi_{\text{ind}_x}^*(\text{ind}_x) = \tilde{Z}^{\text{ind}_x}.$$

Given at $h = 0$, ind_x is uniformly drawn from $\{1, 2, \dots, \frac{H}{2}\}$, in K episodes, any specific bandit $\mathcal{L}_{\text{ind}_x}$ is played $\frac{2K}{H}$ times in expectation. Therefore, by Lemma 8, the regret incurred on any specific bandit $\mathcal{L}_{\text{ind}_x}$ is given by

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{L}_{\text{ind}_x}}[\text{REGRET}(\frac{2K}{H})] \geq \frac{H}{2} \cdot \frac{d\sqrt{\frac{2K}{H}}}{400} = \frac{d\sqrt{2HK}}{800}.$$

The total regret over K episodes with starting state ranging across $\text{ind}_x = 1, 2, \dots, \frac{H}{2}$ is therefore

$$\sum_{\text{ind}_x=1}^{\frac{H}{2}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{L}_{\text{ind}_x}}[\text{REGRET}(\frac{2K}{H})] = \frac{H}{2} \cdot \frac{d\sqrt{2HK}}{800} = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{1600} H^{3/2} d\sqrt{K}.$$

F Case Study on Inventory Control in Section 6

F.1 Regret Guarantees for UCRL-VTR⁺ and Plug-In on Inventory Control

Proof of Corollary 6. Let F be the full information matrix of a single product stochastic inventory control problem with lead time $L > 0$ where the demand has support $[d]$. We simply show that $\text{Rank}(F) = d$.

Given the transition of the unfulfilled orders $(O_{h-L}, \dots, O_{h-1})$ is just a shift operation completely independent of X_h , we isolate the first component of the state, Inv_h . We fix $s = (\text{Inv}_h, O_{h-L}, \dots, O_{h-1}) = (0, 0, \dots, 0)$ and order $O_h = d$, then the information matrix restricted to state-action pair (s, a) , $F[s, a]$, at entry $\text{Inv}_{h+1} = i$, $X_h = j$ is given by

$$F[s, a]_{i,j} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = d - j \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Fix ordering $\mathcal{S} = \{\text{Inv}^0 = d, \text{Inv}^1 = d - 1, \dots, \text{Inv}^d = 0\}$, $\mathcal{X} = \{X^0 = 0, X^1 = 1, \dots, X^d = d\}$, then one can easily check that $F[s, a] = I_d$, that is, the $d \times d$ identity matrix. Therefore the full information matrix F obtained by vertically stacking all $F[s, a]_{s \in \mathcal{S}, a \in \mathcal{A}}$ also has rank d . Since the full information matrix is full-rank, $r = d$ and there is no further reduction using the method in Theorem 3. Nevertheless, using the results in Theorems 2 and 3 gives the regret guarantees scaling in terms of d , the support of the exogenous demand distribution.

F.2 Base-Stock Policies

Let $C_1^b(s_1) = -V_1^b(s_1)$ denote the H -stage total cost (negative value) function for the base-stock policy π_h^b starting from an initial state of no inventory, i.e., $s_1 = (\text{Inv}_1, O_{1-L}, \dots, O_0) = (0, 0, \dots, 0)$. Formally, we have:

$$C_1^b = \mathbb{E}_{X_1, \dots, X_H, \pi_b} \left[\sum_{h=1}^H \mathcal{C}(S_h, A_h) \mid s_1 = (0, 0, \dots, 0) \right], \quad (13)$$

where $S_h = (\text{Inv}_h, O_{h-1}, \dots, O_{h-L})$ and $A_h = O_h$. We start off by noting that by existing results, the total cost function C_1^b is convex in the base-stock level b .

Lemma 9 (Theorem 8 of Janakiraman and Roundy [17]). *For any distribution of the demand \mathbb{P}_x , the total cost function C_1^b for a base-stock policy π^b is convex in b .*

Algorithm 2: One-dimensional stochastic convex bandit algorithm from Agarwal et al. [1] applied to online inventory control

Input: Total number of episodes K
Output: Estimate of optimal base-stock level b
Set $l_1 := 0$ and $r_1 := Ld$. Let $\sigma = \frac{H}{2}$.
for epoch $\tau = 1, 2, \dots$ **do**
 for round $i = 1, 2, \dots$ **do**
 Let $\gamma_i := 2^{-i}$.
 For each $b \in \{b_l, b_c, b_r\}$, run the base-stock policy for $\frac{2 \log(K)}{\gamma_i^2}$ episodes.
 if $\max\{LB_{\gamma_i}(b_l), LB_{\gamma_i}(b_r)\} \geq \max\{UB_{\gamma_i}(b_l), UB_{\gamma_i}(b_r)\}$ **then**
 if $LB_{\gamma_i}(b_l) \geq LB_{\gamma_i}(b_r)$ **then**
 let $l_{\tau+1} := b_l$ and $r_{\tau+1} := r_\tau$.
 if $LB_{\gamma_i}(b_l) < LB_{\gamma_i}(b_r)$ **then**
 let $l_{\tau+1} := l_\tau$ and $r_{\tau+1} := b_r$.
 else if $\max\{LB_{\gamma_i}(b_l), LB_{\gamma_i}(b_r)\} \geq UB_{\gamma_i}(b_c) + \gamma_i$ **then**
 if $LB_{\gamma_i}(b_l) \geq LB_{\gamma_i}(b_r)$ **then**
 let $l_{\tau+1} := b_l$ and $r_{\tau+1} := r_\tau$.
 if $LB_{\gamma_i}(b_l) < LB_{\gamma_i}(b_r)$ **then**
 let $l_{\tau+1} := l_\tau$ and $r_{\tau+1} := b_r$.
 Continue to epoch $\tau + 1$.
return $(\pi^k)_{k \in [K]}$.

F.3 Online Base-Stock Algorithm

Since we know that C_1^b is convex in the base-stock level b , we can use existing work on establishing algorithms for stochastic online convex optimization with bandit feedback from Agarwal et al. [1]. This directly yields an algorithm for our scenario by using the following observation. Once the policy π^b is fixed, each H -stage evaluation of the policy in a given episode can be treated as a single sample for its expected H -stage total cost C_1^b .

Algorithm 1 in Agarwal et al. [2] (restated in Algorithm 2 specified for our context) is epoch based where the feasible region of optimal base-stock parameters $[0, U]$, where U corresponds to the maximum demand, is refined over time. In each epoch, the algorithm aims to discard a portion of the feasible region determined to contain provably suboptimal points. To do so, the algorithm estimates the performance of base-stock policies at three different points within the working feasible region. At the end of an epoch, the feasible region is reduced to a subset of the current region so long as one point obtains confidence estimates which are sufficiently estimated. In the algorithm we let $LB_{\gamma_i}(b)$ and $UB_{\gamma_i}(b)$ denote upper and lower confidence bound estimates on the performance of base-stock policy π^b , defined as $\hat{C}_1^b \pm \gamma_i$, where \hat{C}_1^b is the empirical average cost of base-stock policy b evaluated over $2 \log(K)/\gamma_i^2$ trajectories.

Corollary 7. Denote by b^* as the best performing base-stock policy, $b^* = \arg \min_b C_1^b$. Then applying Theorem 1 of Agarwal et al. [1] establishes that Algorithm 2 yields with probability at least $1 - 1/K$ that:

$$\sum_{k=1}^K C_1^{b^k}(s_1) - C_1^{b^*}(s_1) \leq 108H \sqrt{K \log(K)} \log_{4/3} \left(\frac{K}{8 \log(K)} \right) = \tilde{O}(H \sqrt{K}).$$

Note that the factor H arises since Agarwal et al. [1] assumes the costs are in $[0, 1]$ whereas $C_1^b \in [0, H]$. This also defines regret relative to the performance of the best performing base-stock policy. However, as we will see in Section 6 there are scenarios where this gap leads to $O(K)$ gap in total cost relative to the optimal policy.

Table 3: Configuration parameters for the inventory control scenarios in Fig. 2 and Table 1.

	Scenario I	Scenario II
Horizon (H)	25	20
Lead Time (L)	2	0
Holding Cost (c)	6	6
Lost Sales (p)	1	4
Demand Support (d)	8	10
Demand Distribution (\mathbb{P}_x)	Poisson($\lambda = 3$)	Poisson($\lambda = 7$)

F.4 Simulation Details

Computing infrastructure. The experiments were conducted on a server with an Intel Xeon 16 Core Processor and 128GB of RAM. No GPUs were needed for the experiments. Each simulation (evaluating all algorithms included in Figs. 2b and 2c) took approximately twenty hours.

Experiment setup. Each experiment was run with 100 iterations where the various plots and metrics were computed with respect to the mean of the various quantities. Hyperparameters for the confidence intervals (the constant scaling in front of the dominating terms) were tuned via grid search in 2^{-i} for $i \in \{-5, \dots, 5\}$.

Regret performance. To complement the results in Table 1, in Fig. 2 we plot the regret performance of the algorithms on the same scenarios.