

Provably Efficient Exploration in Reward Machines with Low Regret

Hippolyte Bourel*, Anders Jonsson†, Odalric-Ambrym Maillard‡
Chenxiao Ma§ and Mohammad Sadegh Talebi¶

December 30, 2024

Abstract

We study reinforcement learning (RL) for decision processes with non-Markovian reward, in which high-level knowledge of the task in the form of reward machines is available to the learner. We consider probabilistic reward machines with initially unknown dynamics, and investigate RL under the average-reward criterion, where the learning performance is assessed through the notion of regret. Our main algorithmic contribution is a model-based RL algorithm for decision processes involving probabilistic reward machines that is capable of exploiting the structure induced by such machines. We further derive high-probability and non-asymptotic bounds on its regret and demonstrate the gain in terms of regret over existing algorithms that could be applied, but obliviously to the structure. We also present a regret lower bound for the studied setting. To the best of our knowledge, the proposed algorithm constitutes the first attempt to tailor and analyze regret specifically for RL with probabilistic reward machines.

1 Introduction

Most state-of-the-art reinforcement learning (RL) algorithms assume that the underlying decision process has Markovian reward and dynamics, i.e. that future observations depend only on the current state-action of the system. In this case, the Markov Decision Process (MDP) is a suitable mathematical model to represent the task to be solved (Puterman, 2014). However, there are many application scenarios with non-Markovian reward and/or dynamics (Bacchus et al., 1996; Brafman and De Giacomo, 2019; Littman et al., 2017) that are more appropriately modeled as *Non-Markovian Decision Processes (NMDPs)*.

NMDPs capture environments in which optimal action depends on events that occurred in the past, implying that the learning agent has to remember parts of the history. For example, a robot may receive a reward for delivering an item only if the item was requested previously, and a self-driving car is more likely to skid and lose control if it rained previously. Consider a mobile robot that has to track an object which is no longer in the robot’s field of view. By remembering where the object was last seen, the robot has a better chance of discovering the object again. An even more precise estimation is given by the sequence of last observations (which also capture direction of movement). This can be formalized by defining high-level events that correspond to past observations.

In general, the future observations of an NMDP can depend on an infinite history or trace, preventing efficient learning. Consequently, recent research has focused on tractable sub-classes of NMDPs. A tractable and recently introduced sub-class is Regular Decision Processes (RDPs) (Brafman and De Giacomo, 2019, 2024), where the reward function and next state distribution is determined by conditions over the history that fall within the class of the regular languages. Another popular formalism enjoying tractability is the *Reward Machine (RM)* (Toro Icarte et al., 2018, 2022), which is a Deterministic Finite-State Automaton (DFA) providing a compact representation of history that compresses the entire sequence of past events into

*Department of Computer Science, University of Copenhagen

†Department of Information and Communication Technologies, Universitat Pompeu Fabra

‡University of Lille, Inria, CNRS, Centrale Lille

§Department of Computer Science, University of Copenhagen

¶Department of Computer Science, University of Copenhagen. Corresponding author (email: sadegh.talebi@di.ku.dk).

a single state, which can be combined with the current observation to determine the best action. Hence, the current state of the reward machine is sufficient to fully specify the reward function. Nevertheless, high-level deterministic transitions often fall short of representing real-world cases. Keys may need to be turned several times to open a door; swiping a card may require multiple tries to succeed. To remedy such limitations, Dohmen et al. (2022) introduced the notion of probabilistic RMs, which we adopt in this paper.

In this paper, we investigate RL in Markov decision processes with reward machines (MDPRMs) under the average-reward criterion, where the agent performance is measured through the notion of regret with respect to an oracle aware of the transition dynamics and associated reward functions. The goal of the agent is to minimize its regret, which entails balancing exploration and exploitation. We focus on setting where dynamics of both observations and RM states are *unknown*, while states are observable. For a given MDPRM, it is possible to formulate an *equivalent cross-product* MDP (adhering to the Markov property) as discussed in the literature (Toro Icarte et al., 2018) and apply provably efficient off-the-shelf algorithms *obliviously* to the structure induced by the MDPRM. However, this would lead to large regret, both empirically and theoretically, as the associated cross-product MDP usually has a large state-space. Therefore, sample-efficient learning of near-optimal policies entails exploiting the intrinsic structure of MDPRMs in an efficient manner.

1.1 Contributions

We make the following contributions. We formalize regret minimization in MDPRMs with probabilistic machines under the average-reward criterion, and establish a first, to the best of our knowledge, regret lower bound for MDPRMs. We introduce a provably efficient algorithm called UCRL-PRM, which implements the principle of *optimism in the face of uncertainty* through a model-based approach, whose design is inspired by the celebrated UCRL2 algorithm (Jaksch et al., 2010), which guarantees a near-optimal regret bounds in the class of communicating MDPs without any prior knowledge on the MDP. UCRL-PRM uses high-probability and *time-uniform* confidence sets for unknown parameters of the underlying MDPRM and performs policy optimization over the correspondingly defined set of plausible MDPRMs. However, UCRL-PRM is carefully tailored to leverage the structure in MDPRMs, which is a key departure from UCRL2-style algorithms for MDPs. Specifically, we derive two variants of UCRL-PRM that mainly differ in the choice of confidence sets used: UCRL-PRM-L1, which uses L_1 -type confidence sets, and UCRL-PRM-B relying on Bernstein concentration. As a result, they attain different regret bounds.

More precisely, we show that UCRL-PRM-L1 achieves a high-probability regret growing as $\tilde{O}(D^\times \sqrt{(Q^2 E + O^2 A)T})$ in an MDPRM M after T steps of interaction, with O and A being the respective size of observation and action spaces, Q denoting the number of states of the RM, and E denoting the maximum number of relevant labels at any RM state.¹ Finally, D^\times denotes the diameter of the cross-product MDP associated to M . In the case of UCRL-PRM-B, we derive a regret bound informally growing as $\tilde{O}(D^\times \sqrt{(OAK + QEK')T})$, where K and K' are the respective support size of the next-state of observations and RM states. These bounds improve over the regret bounds of baselines that scale as $\tilde{O}(D^\times QO\sqrt{AT})$ and $\tilde{O}(D^\times \sqrt{QOAK''T})$ (for some $K'' \geq \max\{K, K'\}$).²

In addition, we establish refined regret bounds for UCRL-PRM in the case of deterministic machines. Specifically, we show that in an MDPRM M with deterministic RM, UCRL-PRM-L1 (resp. UCRL-PRM-B) achieves a regret growing as $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{c_M OAT})$ (resp. $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{c'_M OAT})$), where c_M and c'_M are problem-dependent quantities defined in terms of a novel notion of connectivity in MDPRMs, which we call the *RM-restricted diameter*. This notion is a problem-dependent refinement of the diameter D^\times of the cross-product MDP associated to M . The RM-restricted diameter of M reflects the connectivity in M *jointly* determined by the dynamics and the sparsity structure of the RM, and we believe it could be of interest in other settings of reward machines. The RM-restricted diameter is *always* smaller than D^\times , and in some MDPRM instances, it is proportional to D^\times/Q .

Although the design and analysis of UCRL-PRM build on UCRL2 and its variants, we stress that there are some non-trivial components. First, directly using the policy optimization procedure of UCRL2-style algorithms would require solving a bilinear program, which is NP-hard in general. To circumvent this issue, we perform policy optimization over a surrogate set of candidate MDPRMs, which entails solving a linear

¹The notation $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ hides poly-logarithmic terms in T and numerical constants.

²For further details, we refer to Section 4.

program. Second, the analysis of UCRL-PRM tackle the structural properties of MDPRMs, which in turn leads to making appear the RM-restricted diameters in the regret bound.

This paper builds upon our previous work (Bourel et al., 2023), where we originally investigated RL in average-reward MDPRMs in the regret setting. It restricted attention to the case of deterministic RMs, and proposed and analyzed UCRL-RM. We extend the setting of (Bourel et al., 2023) to the case of MDPRMs with probabilistic RMs by presenting UCRL-PRM and analyzing its high-probability regret. In terms of algorithmic novelty, the present work crucially relies on carefully chosen surrogate set of MDPRMs to perform policy computation. Further, the regret analysis of UCRL-PRM renders more challenging than deterministic RMs. To the best of our knowledge, the present paper and its preceding work (Bourel et al., 2023) are the first studying regret minimization in average-reward MDPRMs, and the proposed algorithms constitute the first attempt to tailor and analyze regret specifically for MDPRMs or MDPs with associated DFAs.

1.2 Related Work

In the case of Markovian rewards and dynamics, there is a rich literature on average-reward RL, presenting several algorithms with theoretical regret guarantees. While there is an abundance of work on the tabular case (i.e., without structural assumptions), there is a well-growing line of work on structured RL. For the former category we mention (Burnetas and Katehakis, 1997; Jaksch et al., 2010; Fruit et al., 2018a; Talebi and Maillard, 2018; Wei et al., 2020; Bourel et al., 2020; Zhang and Ji, 2019; Pesquerel and Maillard, 2022; Saber et al., 2023)), whereas some the latter one include (Wei et al., 2021; Ok et al., 2018; Talebi et al., 2021; Lakshmanan et al., 2015). In the absence of structure assumptions, as established by Jaksch et al. (2010), no algorithm can have a regret lower than $\Omega(\sqrt{DSAT})$ in a communicating MDP with S states, A actions, diameter D , and after T steps of interactions. The best available regret bounds for communicating MDPs, achievable by computationally implementable algorithms, grow as $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{DSAKT} \log(T))$ (Fruit et al., 2020) or as $\mathcal{O}(D\sqrt{KSAT} \log(T))$ (Fruit et al., 2018a), where K denotes the maximal number of next-states under any state-action pair in the MDP. Recently, Boone and Zhang (2024) present an algorithm achieving a regret of $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{DSAT} \log(T))$, albeit with an additive term scaling as $S^{5/2}T^{9/20}$ making the bound less interesting.

The progress in the domain of non-Markov RL has been substantially slower than the Markovian counterpart due to challenges posed by history dependence. A generic NMDP, with rewards and transition function arbitrarily depending on the history, is not PAC learnable. Nevertheless, there is already a broad literature in various sub-classes of NDMPs that admit some form of tractability, making learning a possibility. A line of such work tackle the problem of state-representation, where the agent must select a representation of the environment (i.e., a mapping from histories to a discrete state-space) from an input set (Lattimore et al., 2013; Maillard et al., 2013; Sunehag and Hutter, 2015). Although these algorithms could be applied to RMs, they do not exploit the particular structure of the underlying RMs, and hence the resulting theoretical bounds may grow prohibitively large. As a result, state representation learning algorithms render impractical for learning RMs.

RDPs (Brafman and De Giacomo, 2024) constitute another tractable class of NMDPs, which can be modeled via some unobservable DFA. More precisely, the automaton state of an RDP may be viewed as a hidden information state (Subramanian et al., 2022), and as shown by Brafman and De Giacomo (2024), any RDP is also a Partially-Observable Markov Decision Process (POMDP) (Kaelbling et al., 1998), whose hidden dynamics evolve according to its finite-state automaton. As a result, RMs may fall into the class of RDPs; however, they are simpler to learn because of full observability. RL in RDPs is a recent under-taking and remains mostly unexplored. The S3M algorithm of Abadi and Brafman (2020) integrates RL with the logical formulas of RDPs, but does not admit polynomial sample complexity in the PAC setting. Ronca and De Giacomo (2021) present the first online RL algorithm for RDPs whose PAC sample complexity grows polynomially in terms of the underlying parameters, though the sample complexity bound is prohibitively large in the relevant parameter. Recently, Cipollone et al. (2024) introduced RegORL, a provably efficient algorithm for offline RL in RDPs with near-optimal sample complexity. Nevertheless, none of these work could be used to control exploration in RMs with provable regret guarantees.

Research on reward machines is relatively recent, but has grown quickly in popularity and already attracted many researchers to the field. Initial research focused on proving convergence guarantees for RL algorithms specifically devised for RMs (Toro Icarte et al., 2018, 2022). There is also a rich literature on RL

with temporal specifications expressed in Linear Temporal Logic (LTL) (Camacho et al., 2019; Kazemi et al., 2022). Because of the equivalence between LTL and Büchi automata, LTL specifications are often translated to DFAs similar to RMs, and sometimes combined with hierarchical RL (den Hengst et al., 2022). More recently, many researchers have investigated how to learn RMs or similar DFAs from experience in the form of traces (Abate et al., 2022; De Giacomo et al., 2020; Furelos-Blanco et al., 2021; Gaon and Brafman, 2020; Toro Icarte et al., 2019; Verginis et al., 2022; Xu et al., 2020), and extensions to stochastic and probabilistic RMs in which either the rewards or the transitions are non-deterministic exist (Corazza et al., 2022; Dohmen et al., 2022). Another recent extension is to learn entire hierarchies of RMs (Furelos-Blanco et al., 2023). RMs have also been used in combination with multiagent RL (Dann et al., 2022; Neary et al., 2021). Among the fast growing literature on RMs literature, little attention is paid to regret minimization. This paper builds on our previous work (Bourel et al., 2023), which is the first, to our knowledge, studying average-reward RL in the regret setting in RMs with deterministic dynamics. We are not aware of any other work involving RMs that report regret bounds in the average-reward setting. The only available work in the episodic setting is due to Lin and Zhang (2024), who study regret in episodic RL in probabilistic RMs but assuming known RM dynamics. Hence, the machinery used (Lin and Zhang, 2024) does not apply to our case.

1.3 Organization

The remaining of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the notion of MDPRM under the average-reward criterion and formulate the corresponding regret minimization problem. We present two variants of the UCRL-PRM algorithm in Section 3, and report high-probability and finite-time bounds on their regret in Section 4. A regret lower bound for MDPRMs with deterministic machines is derived in Section 5. Finally, Section 6 concludes the paper and provides some future research directions. Proofs as well as some algorithmic details are presented in the appendix.

2 Problem Formulation

2.1 MDPRMs: Average-Reward Markov Decision Processes with Reward Machines

We begin with introducing some necessary background on labeled Markov decision processes and reward machines. We introduce notations that will be used throughout. Given a set A , Δ_A denotes the simplex of probability distributions over A . A^* denotes (possibly empty) sequences of elements from A , and A^+ denotes non-empty sequences. \mathbb{I}_A denotes the indicator function of event A .

2.1.1 Labeled Markov Decision Processes

A *labeled average-reward MDP* is a tuple $M = (\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{A}, P, \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{AP}, L)$, where \mathcal{O} is a finite set of (observation) states with cardinality O , \mathcal{A} is a finite set of actions available at each state with cardinality A , $P : \mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \Delta_{\mathcal{O}}$ is the transition function such that $P(o'|o, a)$ denotes the probability of transiting to state $o' \in \mathcal{O}$, when executing action $a \in \mathcal{A}$ in state $o \in \mathcal{O}$. $\mathbf{R} : (\mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{A})^+ \rightarrow \Delta_{[0,1]}$ denotes a history-dependent reward function such that for every history $h \in (\mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{A})^* \times \mathcal{O}$ and action $a \in \mathcal{A}$, $\mathbf{R}(h, a)$ defines a reward distribution.³ Further, \mathbf{AP} denotes a set of atomic propositions and $L : \mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow 2^{\mathbf{AP}}$ denotes a labeling function assigning a subset of \mathbf{AP} to each (o, a) .⁴ These labels describe high-level events associated to the various (o, a) pairs that can be detected from the environment, and they prove instrumental in defining the history-dependent reward function \mathbf{R} .

The notion of M above coincides with the conventional notion of average-reward MDPs except that (i) it assumes a *non-Markovian* reward function and (ii) it is equipped with a labeling mechanism (defined via L and \mathbf{AP}). The interaction between the agent and the environment M proceeds as follows. At each time step $t \in \mathbb{N}$, the agent is in state $o_t \in \mathcal{O}$ and chooses an action $a_t \in \mathcal{A}$ based on $h_t := (o_1, a_1, \dots, o_{t-1}, a_{t-1}, o_t)$. Upon executing a_t in o_t , M generates a next-state $o_{t+1} \sim P(\cdot | o_t, a_t)$ and assigns a label $\sigma_t = L(o_t, a_t)$. Then, the agent receives a reward $r_t \sim \mathbf{R}(h_t, a_t)$. Then, the state transits to o_{t+1} and a new decision step begins. As in MDPs, after T steps of interactions, the agent's cumulative reward is $\sum_{t=1}^T r_t$.

³This can be straightforwardly extended to σ -sub-Gaussian reward distributions with unbounded supports.

⁴A more complex labeling function of the form $L : \mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{O} \rightarrow 2^{\mathbf{AP}}$ could be considered.




Figure 1: Interaction with an MDPRM

2.1.2 (Probabilistic) Reward Machines

We restrict attention to a class of non-Markovian reward functions that are encoded by RMs (Toro Icarte et al., 2022; Dohmen et al., 2022), whose definitions are inspired by conventional DFAs. In this work, we consider probabilistic RMs (Dohmen et al., 2022). A probabilistic RM is a tuple $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{Q}, 2^{\mathcal{AP}}, \tau, \nu)$, where \mathcal{Q} is a finite set of states and $2^{\mathcal{AP}}$ is an input alphabet. $\tau : \mathcal{Q} \times 2^{\mathcal{AP}} \rightarrow \Delta_{\mathcal{Q}}$ denotes a transition function such that $\tau(q'|q, \sigma)$ denotes the probability that \mathcal{R} transits to $q' \in \mathcal{Q}$ when an input σ is received in state q , with the convention that $\tau(q, \emptyset) = q$. Finally, $\nu : \mathcal{Q} \times 2^{\mathcal{AP}} \rightarrow \Delta_{[0,1]}$ denotes the output function of \mathcal{R} , which returns a distribution over $[0, 1]$ for any (q, σ) .⁵ Let \mathcal{E}_q be the set of relevant labels at $q \in \mathcal{Q}$ and E_q be its cardinality. Further, define $E := \max_q E_q$. Note the labeling function is not necessarily one-to-one; i.e., there might exist two or more observation-action pairs generating the same label.

In the case of deterministic transition function $\tau : \mathcal{Q} \times 2^{\mathcal{AP}} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$, \mathcal{R} coincides with the conventional notion of RM considered in Toro Icarte et al. (2022). In this paper, we use RM to refer to both deterministic and probabilistic machines. In words, the RM \mathcal{R} converts a (sequentially received) sequence of labels to a sequence of Markovian reward distributions such that the output reward function at time t is $\nu(q_t, \sigma_t)$, and it thus only depends on the current state q_t and current label σ_t . Conditioned on (q_t, σ_t) , the reward distribution at time t is independent of earlier labels and RM states $(q_1, \sigma_1, \dots, q_{t-1}, \sigma_{t-1})$. Thus, RMs provide a compact representation for a class of non-Markovian rewards that can depend on the entire history.

2.1.3 Average-Reward MDPs with RMs

Restricting the generic history-dependent reward function \mathbf{R} to RMs leads to decision processes that are often termed MDPRMs. Formally, an average-reward MDPRM is a tuple $M = (\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{A}, P, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{AP}, L)$, where $\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{A}, P, \mathcal{AP}$, and L are defined as in (labeled) average-reward MDPs, and where \mathcal{R} is an RM, which generates reward functions. The agent's interaction with an MDPRM M proceeds as follows. At each time $t \in \mathbb{N}$, the agent observes both $o_t \in \mathcal{O}$ and $q_t \in \mathcal{Q}$, and chooses an action $a_t \in \mathcal{A}$ based on o_t and q_t as well as (potentially) her past decisions and observations. The environment reveals an event $\sigma_t = L(o_t, a_t)$. The RM \mathcal{R} , being in state q_t , receives σ_t and outputs a reward distribution $\nu(q_t, \sigma_t) \in \Delta_{[0,1]}$. Then, the agent receives a reward $r_t \sim \nu(q_t, \sigma_t)$ (at the end of the current time step). Then, the environment and RM states transit to their next states $o_{t+1} \sim P(\cdot | o_t, a_t)$ and $q_{t+1} \sim \tau(\cdot | q_t, \sigma_t)$, and a new step begins. This is summarized in Figure 1.

Figure 2 illustrates an example MDPRM, which we shall call *laundry gridworld*. In this example, the task consists in transferring soiled garments from a basket B , situated in the upper hall, to a washing machine W , located in the lower hall. An access card must be collected from location C to use laundry machine W . Upon completion of the assigned task and return of the card and basket to their original locations, the agent will receive a reward. However, if the agent operates the machine without clothes of laundry, a penalty will be imposed. The environment is illustrated in Figure 2(a). Figure 2(b) depicts the corresponding RM, where the green arrows indicate the available pathways for obtaining the reward, while the red one corresponds to the misoperation. In particular, in contrast to the high probability of 0.95 associated with operating the machine W with a card, the agent can only directly operate it with a probability of (w.p.) 0.01. Observation

⁵This is very similar to the standard definition of RM by Toro Icarte et al. (2022), though in our case the set of terminal states is empty.

dynamics are defined similarly to a classical gridworld. Specifically, in each state, the agent has the four cardinal actions, corresponding to movement in the up, down, right, and left directions, but with uncertain transitions. A specific action moves the agent in the intended direction with a probability of 0.7, while it may result in a movement to each perpendicular direction w.p. 0.15. In addition, the walls will be treated as reflectors, thereby keeping the agent in a same state. We remark that the current MDP observation (i.e., location) is not sufficient to predict what to do next, and therefore has to be combined with the current RM state.

As Figure 2(b) depicts, there exist two distinct but equally desirable ways to enter the lower hall. The agent may either collect the card prior to bringing the basket or vice versa, depending on the route taken, which is indicated by the arrival to q_4 from q_1 via q_2 or q_3 , respectively. Likewise, RM states may not define the optimal solution *per se*, so a combination with MDP states is expected. As for the suboptimal cases, holding a card increases the probability of operating the machine, but not having a basket results in penalties, represented by the transitions from q_3 to q_1 via q_5 . This also applies to the bare-handed agent, denoted by the transitions between q_1 and q_7 . However, her chance of using the machine is slimmer, given that there is no card in her hand. As with the bare-handed agent, the agent with only one basket can also be trapped when she focuses on turning on the machine. This is captured by the transition from q_2 to q_8 .




Figure 2: An example environment with one RM.

Despite the intricate dynamics manifesting even within a toy model, for a given MDPRM, one can derive an equivalent tabular MDP (i.e., with a Markovian reward function) defined over state-space $\mathcal{S} := \mathcal{Q} \times \mathcal{O}$. As a result, this associated MDP, which we shall denote by M^\times , is often called the *cross-product MDP* associated to M . The following lemma characterizes M^\times . Variants of this result appeared in, e.g., (Toro Icarte et al., 2022; Dohmen et al., 2022); the following version slightly extends it to hold for reward distributions.

Lemma 1 *Let $M = (\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{A}, P, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{AP}, L)$ be a finite MDPRM. Then, an associated cross-product MDP to M is $M^\times = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, P^\times, R^\times)$, with $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{Q} \times \mathcal{O}$, where for $s = (q, o)$, $s' = (q', o') \in \mathcal{S}$, and $a \in \mathcal{A}$,*

$$P^\times(s'|s, a) = P(o'|o, a)\tau(q'|q, L(o, a)), \quad R^\times(s, a) = \nu(q, L(o, a)). \quad (1)$$

2.2 Regret Minimization in MDPRMs

We are now ready to formalize RL in MDPRMs in the regret minimization setting, which is the main focus of this paper. As in tabular RL, it involves an agent who is seeking to maximize its cumulative reward, and its performance is measured in terms of regret with respect to an oracle algorithm who knows and always applies a gain-optimal policy. To formally define regret, we introduce some necessary concepts. A stationary deterministic policy in an MDPRM M is a mapping $\pi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ prescribing an action $\pi(q, o) \in \mathcal{A}$ for all $(q, o) \in \mathcal{S}$. Let Π be the set of all such policies in M . The long-term average-reward (or gain) of policy

$\pi \in \Pi$, when starting in (q, o) , is defined as:

$$g^\pi(q, o) = \liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[\sum_{t=1}^T r_t \mid q_1 = q, o_1 = o \right]$$

where $r_t \sim \mathbf{r}_t = \nu(q_t, L(o_t, \pi(q_t, o_t)))$ for all t . Here the expectation is taken with respect to randomness in r_t and over all possible histories h_t (which implicitly depend on generated labels too). Let $g^*(s) = \max_{\pi} g^\pi(s)$ denote the optimal gain over all (possibly history dependent) policies, where s denotes the starting state. Any policy achieving g^* is an optimal policy. Following the same arguments as in tabular MDPs together with the equivalence between M and its M^\times (Lemma 1), it is guaranteed that there exists at least one optimal policy in Π . We restrict attention to the class of MDPRMs, whose associated cross-product MDPs are communicating,⁶ for which the optimal gain is independent of the starting state (Puterman, 2014).

We assume that agent observes both the RM state q_t and observation state o_t at each time step t , but is unaware of their underlying transition functions (i.e., P and τ). The agent interacts with M for T steps according to the protocol specified earlier. We define the regret of an agent (or learning algorithm) \mathbb{A} as

$$\mathfrak{R}(\mathbb{A}, T) := Tg^* - \sum_{t=1}^T r_t.$$

Alternatively, the agent’s objective is to minimize regret, which entails balancing exploration and exploitation. We stress that regret $\mathfrak{R}(\mathbb{A}, T)$ compares the T -step reward collected by \mathbb{A} against an oracle that uses the *same reward machine* \mathcal{R} as the agent.

3 Learning Algorithms for MDPRMs

In this section, we present algorithms for learning in MDPRMs that fall into the category of model-based algorithms. In general, the equivalence between MDPRM M and its associated cross-product MDP M^\times implies that one could apply any off-the-shelf algorithm to M^\times , as it perfectly adheres to the Markovian property. This implies that provably efficient algorithms designed for average-reward MDPs such as UCRL2 (Jaksch et al., 2010) and its variants (e.g., (Fruit et al., 2020, 2018b; Bourel et al., 2020)) could be directly applied to M^\times while guaranteeing sublinear regret performance. However, this may lead to inefficient exploration, and thus large regret, since these generic algorithms are oblivious to the special structure of M^\times . Nevertheless, characterization of M^\times can indeed be used as a proxy to develop learning algorithms for MDPRM.

To simplify exposition, we assume that the reward distributions ν of the RM are known. This assumption can be easily relaxed at the expense of a slightly increased regret. We discuss in Appendix C how to tailor the algorithms to the case of unknown rewards.

3.1 Confidence Sets

We begin with introducing empirical estimates and confidence sets used by the algorithms. We first present confidence sets for observation dynamics P and RM dynamics τ , and then show how they yield confidence sets for the transition and reward functions of the cross-product MDP M^\times .

3.1.1 Confidence Sets for Observation Dynamics P

Formally, under a given algorithm and for any $o, o' \in \mathcal{O}$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}$, let $N_t(o, a, o')$ denote the number of times a visit to (o, a) was followed by a visit to o' , up to time t : $N_t(o, a, o') := \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{(o_i, a_i, o'_{i+1}) = (o, a, o')\}}$. Further, $N_t(o, a) := \max\{1, \sum_{o'} N_t(o, a, o')\}$. Using the observations collected up to $t \geq 1$, we define the empirical estimate $\hat{P}_t(o' | o, a) = \frac{N_t(o, a, o')}{N_t(o, a)}$ for $P(o' | o, a)$. We consider two confidence sets for P . The

⁶We recall that a tabular MDP is communicating if it is possible to reach any state from any other state under some stationary deterministic policy (Puterman, 2014). Alternatively, an MDP is communicating if and only if its diameter is finite (Jaksch et al., 2010).

first one uses a *time-uniform* variant of Weissman's concentration inequality (Weissman et al., 2003) and is defined as follows (Maillard, 2019; Asadi et al., 2019):

$$C_{t,\delta}^1(o, a) = \left\{ P' \in \Delta_{\mathcal{O}} : \|\widehat{P}_t(\cdot|o, a) - P'\|_1 \leq \beta_{N_t(o,a)}(\delta) \right\}$$

and $C_{t,\delta}^1 = \cap_{o,a} C_{t,\delta}^1(o, a)$, where for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\beta_n(\delta) := \sqrt{\frac{2}{n} \left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right) \log \left(\sqrt{n+1} \frac{2^{\mathcal{O}} - 2}{\delta}\right)}$. By construction, Lemma 12 guarantees that uniformly for all t , $P \in C_{t,2\delta/OA}^1$, with probability at least $1 - \delta/2$, that is, $\mathbb{P}(\exists t \in \mathbb{N} : P \notin C_{t,\delta/2OA}^1) \leq \delta/2$.

The second confidence set is based on Bernstein's inequality combined with a peeling technique (Maillard, 2019), and is defined as follows:

$$C_{t,\delta}^2(o, a, o') = \left\{ u \in [0, 1] : |\widehat{P}_t(o'|o, a) - u| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2u(1-u)}{N_t(o, a)} \beta'_{N_t(o,a)}(\delta)} + \frac{\beta'_{N_t(o,a)}(\delta)}{3N_t(o, a)} \right\},$$

and $C_{t,\delta}^2 = \cap_{o,a,o'} C_{t,\delta}^2(o, a, o')$, where for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$, $\beta'_n(\delta) := \eta \log \left(\frac{\log(n+1) \log(n\eta)}{\delta \log^2(\eta)} \right)$, where $\eta > 1$ is an arbitrary choice. (We set $\eta = 1.12$, as suggested by Maillard (2019), to get a small bound.) Further, let $u_{o,a,o'} := u_{o,a,o'}(t, \delta)$ be any solution to

$$|\widehat{P}_t(o'|o, a) - u| = \sqrt{\frac{2u(1-u)}{N_t(o, a)} \beta'_{N_t(o,a)}(\delta)} + \frac{\beta'_{N_t(o,a)}(\delta)}{3N_t(o, a)}, \quad u \in [0, 1],$$

which can be found via, e.g., bisection. By construction, $C_{t,\delta/4O^2A}^2$ traps P with high probability, uniformly for all t : $\mathbb{P}(\exists t \in \mathbb{N} : P \notin C_{t,\delta/4O^2A}^2) \leq \delta/2$; see Lemma 13.

3.1.2 Confidence Sets for RM State Dynamics τ

Formally, under a given algorithm and for any $q, q' \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_q$, let $N_t(q, \sigma, q')$ denote the number of times a visit to (q, σ) was followed by a visit to q' , up to time t : $N_t(q, \sigma, q') := \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{(q_i, \sigma_i, q_{i+1}) = (q, \sigma, q')\}}$. Further, $N_t(q, \sigma) := \max\{1, \sum_{o'} N_t(q, \sigma, o')\}$. Using the observations collected up to $t \geq 1$, we define the empirical estimate $\widehat{\tau}_t(q'|q, \sigma) = \frac{N_t(q, \sigma, q')}{N_t(q, \sigma)}$ for $\tau(q'|q, \sigma)$.

Similarly to the case of P , we consider two confidence sets for τ . The first one is built using time-uniform Weissman's concentration inequality:

$$D_{t,\delta}^1(q, \sigma) = \left\{ \tau' \in \Delta_{\mathcal{Q}} : \|\widehat{\tau}_t(\cdot|q, \sigma) - \tau'\|_1 \leq \beta''_{N_t(q,\sigma)}(\delta) \right\}$$

and $D_{t,\delta}^1 = \cap_{q,\sigma} D_{t,\delta}^1(q, \sigma)$, where for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\beta''_n(\delta) := \sqrt{\frac{2}{n} \left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right) \log \left(\sqrt{n+1} \frac{2^{\mathcal{Q}} - 2}{\delta}\right)}$. It follows by construction that $\mathbb{P}(\exists t \in \mathbb{N} : \tau \notin D_{t,\delta/2QE}^1) \leq \delta/2$; see Lemma 12.

The second confidence set is based on Bernstein's inequality (combined with a peeling technique) and is defined as follows:

$$D_{t,\delta}^2(q, \sigma, q') = \left\{ \lambda \in [0, 1] : |\widehat{\tau}_t(q'|q, \sigma) - \lambda| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2\lambda(1-\lambda)}{N_t(q, \sigma)} \beta'_{N_t(q,\sigma)}(\delta)} + \frac{\beta'_{N_t(q,\sigma)}(\delta)}{3N_t(q, \sigma)} \right\},$$

and $D_{t,\delta}^2 = \cap_{q,\sigma,q'} D_{t,\delta}^2(q, \sigma, q')$. Further, let $\lambda_{q,\sigma,q'} := \lambda_{q,\sigma,q'}(t, \delta)$ be any solution to

$$|\widehat{\tau}_t(q'|q, \sigma) - \lambda| = \sqrt{\frac{2\lambda(1-\lambda)}{N_t(q, \sigma)} \beta'_{N_t(q,\sigma)}(\delta)} + \frac{\beta'_{N_t(q,\sigma)}(\delta)}{3N_t(q, \sigma)}, \quad \lambda \in [0, 1].$$

Lemma 13 ensures that $\mathbb{P}(\exists t \in \mathbb{N} : \tau \notin D_{t,\delta/4Q^2E}^2) \leq \delta/2$.

3.1.3 Set of Plausible Models

Either choice of confidence sets introduced above, (C^1, D^1) or (C^2, D^2) , yields a set of MDPs that are plausible with the collected data up to any time step. More formally, consider a time step $t \geq 1$ and a confidence parameter $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Given a set D , let \mathcal{R}_D be the set of RMs defined using transition functions collected in D , i.e., $\mathcal{R}_D := \{R' = (\mathcal{Q}, 2^{\text{AP}}, \tau', \nu) : \tau' \in D\}$. Equipped with this, we build the set of MDPs

$$\mathcal{M}_{t,\delta} := \left\{ M' = (\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{A}, P', \mathcal{R}', \text{AP}, L) : P' \in C, \mathcal{R}' \in \mathcal{R}_D \right\},$$

where $(C, D) = (C_{t,\delta/2\mathcal{O}A}^1, D_{t,\delta/2\mathcal{Q}E}^1)$ or $(C, D) = (C_{t,\delta/4\mathcal{O}^2A}^2, D_{t,\delta/4\mathcal{Q}^2E}^2)$. Let $\mathcal{M}_{t,\delta}^1$ and $\mathcal{M}_{t,\delta}^2$ denote the respective set of MDPs. This construction ensures that the true MDP M belongs to both $\mathcal{M}_{t,\delta}^1$ and $\mathcal{M}_{t,\delta}^2$ with high probability, uniformly for all t , as formalized in the following lemma:

Lemma 2 For any $\delta \in (0, 1)$: (i) $\mathbb{P}(\exists t \in \mathbb{N} : M \notin \mathcal{M}_{t,\delta}^1) \leq \delta$ and (ii) $\mathbb{P}(\exists t \in \mathbb{N} : M \notin \mathcal{M}_{t,\delta}^2) \leq \delta$.

Lemma 2 relies on the equivalence between any candidate MDP $M' \in \mathcal{M}_{t,\delta}$ and its associated cross-product MDP $M'^{\times} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, P'^{\times}, R^{\times})$, where P'^{\times} and R^{\times} are defined similarly to (1). Let $\mathcal{M}^{\times,1}$ and $\mathcal{M}^{\times,2}$ be the respective set of cross-product MDPs associated to \mathcal{M}^1 and \mathcal{M}^2 .

The special structure of MDPs in $\mathcal{M}^{\times,1}$ and $\mathcal{M}^{\times,2}$ may pose some technical challenge since computing an optimal policy over such bounded-parameter MDPs would involve solving bilinear optimizations, which are NP-hard. To accommodate this situation, we introduce proper surrogate sets for $\mathcal{M}^{\times,1}$ and $\mathcal{M}^{\times,2}$.

Let $\bar{\nu}$ denote the mean of the reward function $\nu(q, \sigma)$ and let us assume that it is known to the agent. (We relax this assumption in Appendix C.) Consider the empirical estimate \hat{P}^{\times} defined as follows: For all $s = (q, o)$, $s' = (q', o')$, and a , $\hat{P}_t^{\times}(s'|s, a) = \hat{P}_t(o'|o, a)\hat{\tau}_t(q'|q, \sigma)$, with $\sigma = L(o, a)$. Consider the following sets of MDPs:

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{t,\delta}^{\times,1} &= \left\{ (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, P'^{\times}, R^{\times}) : P'^{\times} \in \mathcal{P}_{t,\delta}^1 \right\}, \quad \text{with} \\ \mathcal{P}_{t,\delta}^1 &:= \bigcap_{s,a} \left\{ p \in \Delta_{\mathcal{S}} : \|p - \hat{P}_t^{\times}(\cdot|s, a)\|_1 \leq \beta_{N_t(o,a)}\left(\frac{\delta}{2\mathcal{O}A}\right) + \beta''_{N_t(q,\sigma)}\left(\frac{\delta}{2\mathcal{Q}E}\right) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

Further,

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{t,\delta}^{\times,2} = \left\{ (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, P'^{\times}, R^{\times}) : P'^{\times} \in \mathcal{P}_{t,\delta}^2 \right\},$$

where $\mathcal{P}_{t,\delta}^2 = \bigcap_{s,a,s'} \{z \in [0, 1] : |z - \hat{P}_t^{\times}(s'|s, a)| \leq f\}$, with

$$\begin{aligned} f &:= \hat{\tau}_t(q'|q, \sigma) \sqrt{\frac{2u_{o,a,o'}(1-u_{o,a,o'})}{N_t(o,a)} \beta'_{N_t(o,a)}\left(\frac{\delta}{4\mathcal{O}^2A}\right) + \frac{\hat{\tau}_t(q'|q, \sigma)}{3N_t(o,a)} \beta'_{N_t(o,a)}\left(\frac{\delta}{4\mathcal{O}^2A}\right)} \\ &\quad + u_{o,a,o'} \sqrt{\frac{2\lambda_{q,\sigma,q'}(1-\lambda_{q,\sigma,q'})}{N_t(q,\sigma)} \beta'_{N_t(q,\sigma)}\left(\frac{\delta}{4\mathcal{Q}^2E}\right) + \frac{u_{o,a,o'}}{3N_t(q,\sigma)} \beta'_{N_t(q,\sigma)}\left(\frac{\delta}{4\mathcal{Q}^2E}\right)} \end{aligned}$$

We have:

Lemma 3 For all $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and all t , $\mathcal{M}_{t,\delta}^{\times,1} \subseteq \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{t,\delta}^{\times,1}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{t,\delta}^{\times,2} \subseteq \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{t,\delta}^{\times,2}$.

Lemma 3 implies that $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{t,\delta}^{\times,1}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{t,\delta}^{\times,2}$ may be used as surrogate for $\mathcal{M}_{t,\delta}^{\times,1}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{t,\delta}^{\times,2}$, respectively. In view of Lemma 2, both sets trap the true M^{\times} with high probability.

3.2 From Confidence Sets to Algorithms: UCRL-PRM-L1 and UCRL-PRM-B

Equipped with the confidence sets presented above, we are ready to present an algorithm, called UCRL-PRM, for learning in MDPs. We consider two variants of UCRL-PRM depending on which confidence set is used: The variant using (C^1, D^1) , called UCRL-PRM-L1, can be seen as an extension of UCRL2 (Jaksch

et al., 2010) to MDPs. Whereas the one built using (C^2, D^2) , which we call UCRL-PRM-B, extends UCRL2-style algorithms with Bernstein’s confidence sets (in, e.g., (Bourel et al., 2020; Fruit et al., 2020, 2018b)) to MDPs. The two algorithms hinge on the same design principle, and hence the same skeleton, but they differ in the choice of the confidence sets as well as their internal procedure of policy computation. As a result, they achieve different regret bounds. In the sequel, we shall use UCRL-PRM to refer to both variants, but will make specific pointers to each when necessary.

UCRL-PRM implements a form of the *optimism in the face of uncertainty* principle, but in an efficient manner, for MDPs. Similarly to many model-based approaches developed based on this principle, it proceeds in internal episodes (indexed by $k \in \mathbb{N}$) of varying lengths, where within each episode the policy is kept unchanged. Specifically, letting t_k denote the first step of episode k , UCRL-PRM considers a set of plausible MDPs and seeks a policy $\pi_k : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ that has the largest gain over all possible deterministic policies among all such candidate MDPs. Practically, as in UCRL2, it suffices to find a $\frac{1}{\sqrt{t_k}}$ -optimal solution to the following optimization problem: $\max_{M' \in \mathcal{M}_{t_k, \delta}, \pi \in \Pi_{M'}} g^\pi(M')$, where $g^\pi(M')$ denotes the gain of policy π in MDP M' .

In order to solve the optimization problem above, we will be working in the space of cross-product MDPs that correspond to candidate MDPs. However, as noted earlier, rather than considering the sets $\mathcal{M}_{t_k, \delta}^{\times, 1}$ or $\mathcal{M}_{t_k, \delta}^{\times, 2}$, we will consider their surrogate sets $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{t_k, \delta}^{\times, 1}$ (for UCRL-PRM-L1) or $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{t_k, \delta}^{\times, 2}$ (for UCRL-PRM-B). Specifically, to determine the policy π_k to be used in episode k , we will solve

$$\max_{M' \in \mathcal{X}, \pi \in \Pi_{M'}} g^\pi(M'), \quad \text{with } \mathcal{X} \in \left\{ \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{t_k, \delta}^{\times, 1}, \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{t_k, \delta}^{\times, 2} \right\}.$$

In view of Lemma 3, optimism is guaranteed despite use of $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}^{\times, 1}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}^{\times, 2}$ in lieu of $\mathcal{M}^{\times, 1}$ and $\mathcal{M}^{\times, 2}$. This problem can be solved efficiently using a variant of the EVI algorithm of Jaksch et al. (2010). More precisely, EVI here takes the following form:

$$u^{(i+1)}(s) = \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left(R^\times(s, a) + \max_{P' \times (\cdot | s, a) \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{s'} P'^{\times}(s' | s, a) u^{(i)}(s') \right), \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{Q} \times \mathcal{O}, \quad (2)$$

starting from an arbitrary choice of $u^{(0)}$. The pseudo-code of EVI is provided in Algorithm 2. The inner maximization in (2) can be solved exactly, but using different procedures depending on whether $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{t_k, \delta}^{\times, 1}$ or $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{t_k, \delta}^{\times, 2}$ is used. Note that we have $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_{t, \delta}^1$ for UCRL-PRM-L1, and $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_{t, \delta}^2$ for UCRL-PRM-B. We provide these details in Appendix C.

EVI returns a policy π_k , which is guaranteed to be $\frac{1}{\sqrt{t_k}}$ -optimal. UCRL-PRM commits to π_k for $t \geq t_k$ until the number of observations on some pair (o, a) or (q, σ) is doubled.⁷ More precisely, the sequence $(t_k)_{k \geq 1}$ satisfies: $t_1 = 1$, and for $k \geq 1$,

$$t_k = \min \left\{ t > t_{k-1} : \max_{o, a} \frac{\sum_{t'=t_{k-1}}^t \mathbb{I}_{\{(o_{t'}, a_{t'})=(o, a)\}}}{N_{t_{k-1}}(o, a)} \geq 1 \text{ or } \max_{q, \sigma \in \mathcal{E}_q} \frac{\sum_{t'=t_{k-1}}^t \mathbb{I}_{\{(q_{t'}, \sigma_{t'})=(q, \sigma)\}}}{N_{t_{k-1}}(q, \sigma)} \geq 1 \right\}.$$

The pseudo-code of UCRL-PRM is presented in Algorithm 1. We recover UCRL-PRM-L1 (resp. UCRL-PRM-B) if $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{t, \delta}^{\times, 1}$ (resp. $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{t, \delta}^{\times, 2}$) is used.

4 Theoretical Regret Guarantees

In this section, we present finite-time regret bounds for the two variants of UCRL-PRM that hold with high probability. We present regret bounds for both probabilistic and deterministic RMs. First, we introduce a notion of diameter that renders relevant for RMs.

⁷This is inspired by the stopping criterion in UCRL2 (Jaksch et al., 2010).

Algorithm 1 UCRL-PRM

Require: $\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{A}, \delta$

Initialize: For all (o, a, o') , set $N_0(o, a) = 0$, $N_0(o, a, o') = 0$ and $n_0(o, a) = 0$. For all $q, q' \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_q$, set $N_0(q, \sigma) = 0$, $N_0(q, \sigma, q') = 0$ and $n_0(q, \sigma) = 0$. Set $t_0 = 0$, $t = 1$, $k = 1$, and observe the initial state $s_1 = (q_1, o_1)$

for episodes $k \geq 1$ **do**

 Set $t_k = t$

 Set $N_{t_k}(o, a) = N_{t_k-1}(o, a) + n_k(o, a)$ for all (o, a) and $N_{t_k}(q, \sigma) = N_{t_k-1}(q, \sigma) + n_k(q, \sigma)$ all $q \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_q$

 Set $n_k(o, a) = 0$ for all (o, a) and $n_k(q, \sigma) = 0$ for all $q \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_q$

 Compute empirical estimates $\hat{P}_{t_k}(\cdot|o, a)$ for all (o, a) and $\hat{\tau}_t(\cdot|q, \sigma)$ for all $q \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_q$

 Compute $\pi_k = \text{EVI}(\mathcal{P}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{t_k}})$.

 (Set $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_{t, \delta}^1$ for UCRL-PRM-L1, and $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_{t, \delta}^2$ for UCRL-PRM-B.)

while $n_k(o_t, \pi_k(q_t, o_t)) < \max\{1, N_{t_k}(o_t, \pi_k(q_t, o_t))\}$ and $n_k(q_t, L(o_t, \pi_k(q_t, o_t))) < \max\{1, N_{t_k}(q_t, L(o_t, \pi_k(q_t, o_t)))\}$ **do**

 Play action $a_t = \pi_k(q_t, o_t)$

 Collect label $\sigma_t = L(o_t, a_t)$

 Receive next observation $o_{t+1} \sim P(\cdot|o_t, a_t)$ and next state $q_{t+1} \sim \tau(\cdot|q_t, \sigma_t)$

 Receive reward $r_t \sim \nu(q_t, \sigma_t)$

 Set $N_{t+1}(o_t, a_t, o_{t+1}) = N_t(o_t, a_t, o_{t+1}) + 1$ and $N_{t+1}(q_t, \sigma_t, q_{t+1}) = N_t(q_t, \sigma_t, q_{t+1}) + 1$

 Set $n_k(o_t, a_t) = n_k(o_t, a_t) + 1$ and $n_k(q_t, \sigma_t) = n_k(q_t, \sigma_t) + 1$

 Set $t = t + 1$

end while

end for

Algorithm 2 EVI(\mathcal{P}, ε)

Initialize: $u^{(0)} \equiv 0$, $u^{(-1)} \equiv -\infty$, $i = 0$

while $\max_{s \in \mathcal{S}}(u^{(i)} - u^{(i-1)})(s) - \min_{s \in \mathcal{S}}(u^{(i)} - u^{(i-1)})(s) > \varepsilon$ **do**

 Get \tilde{P}^\times using MAXP-L1 (Algorithm S1, for UCRL-PRM-L1) or MAXP-B (Algorithm S2, for UCRL-PRM-B)

 For all $s \in \mathcal{Q} \times \mathcal{O}$, update:

$$u^{(i+1)}(s) = \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left(R^\times(s, a) + \sum_{s'} \tilde{P}^\times(s'|s, a) u^{(i)}(s') \right)$$

 Set $i = i + 1$

end while

Output:

$$\pi(s) = \arg \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left(R^\times(s, a) + \sum_{s'} \tilde{P}^\times(s'|s, a) u^{(i)}(s') \right), \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{Q} \times \mathcal{O}$$




Figure 3: An example where RM-restricted diameter $D_s \lesssim D^\times / Q$. The labeled MDP in left, and the RM in right.

4.1 RM-Restricted Diameter

As in tabular MDPs, regret performance of an RL algorithm in average-reward MDPRMs would depend on some measure of connectivity. Specifically, for MDPRMs with communicating cross-product MDPs, diameter notions render most relevant. We distinguish between two notions of diameter for MDPRMs. The first one, denoted by D^\times , is defined as the diameter of the cross-product MDP associated to the considered MDPRM, coinciding with the classical definition of diameter, which we recall below for completeness:

Definition 1 (Jaksch et al. (2010)) The diameter D^\times of an MDP M^\times is defined as

$$D^\times = \max_{s \neq s'} \min_{\pi} \mathbb{E}[T^\pi(s, s')],$$

where $T^\pi(s, s')$ is the number of steps it takes to reach $s' \in \mathcal{S}$ starting from $s \in \mathcal{S}$ and following policy $\pi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$.

The second one is a novel notion, which we shall call *RM-restricted diameter*, and is tailored to the structure of MDPRMs. To formalize it, let us introduce for $s = (q, o) \in \mathcal{S}$,

$$\mathcal{B}_s := \bigcup_a \left\{ q' \in \mathcal{Q} : \tau(q'|q, L(o, a)) > 0 \right\}.$$

Intuitively, for a given $s = (q, o)$, $\mathcal{B}_s \subseteq \mathcal{Q}$ collects all possible next-states of the RM that can be reached from q via the *detectable labels* in o . In the worst-case, one has $\mathcal{B}_s = \mathcal{Q}$ for some state s . However, many high-level tasks in practice often admit RMs with sparse structures, where \mathcal{B}_s may be a small subset of \mathcal{Q} (cardinality-wise). Equipped with this, we define the *RM-restricted diameter* for state $s = (q, o) \in \mathcal{S}$:

Definition 2 (RM-Restricted Diameter) Consider state $s = (q, o) \in \mathcal{S}$. For $s_1, s_2 \in \mathcal{B}_s \times \mathcal{O}$ with $s_1 \neq s_2$, let $T^\pi(s_1, s_2)$ denote the number of steps it takes to reach s_2 starting from s_1 and following policy $\pi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$. The RM-restricted diameter of MDPRM M for state s is defined as

$$D_s := \max_{s_1, s_2 \in \mathcal{B}_s \times \mathcal{O}} \min_{\pi} \mathbb{E}[T^\pi(s_1, s_2)].$$

It is evident that $D_s \leq D^\times$ for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$, in view of $\mathcal{B}_s \subseteq \mathcal{Q}$. Further, if $\mathcal{B}_s = \mathcal{Q}$ for some state s , then the RM-restricted diameter for s coincides with D^\times . Since \mathcal{B}_s might be a proper (and possibly small) subset of \mathcal{Q} , D_s is a problem-dependent refinement of D^\times . It is worth noting that a small \mathcal{B}_s does not necessarily imply that $D_s \ll D^\times$ as D_s is determined by both \mathcal{B}_s and the transition function P^\times of M^\times . Interestingly, however, there exist cases where $D_s \lesssim D^\times / Q$, as we illustrate next.

Consider the MDPRM shown in Figure 3, where there are two observation states o_0 and o_1 , with identical transition probabilities parameterized by $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$. In o_0 , there is one action, but no event. In o_1 , there are two actions: a_0 resulting in detecting σ_A , and a_1 that leads to σ_B . The underlying (deterministic)

RM has Q states arranged in a cycle, such that σ_A and σ_B yield transitions in the clockwise and counter-clockwise directions, respectively. It holds that for all $q \in \mathcal{Q}$, $D_{o_1, q} = \frac{2}{\delta} + 1 + \frac{\delta}{1-\delta}$ and $D_{o_0, q} = \frac{1}{\delta}$, whereas $D^\times = \frac{\lfloor Q/2 \rfloor}{\delta} + 1 + \frac{\delta}{1-\delta}$. Thus, while D^\times grows as $\frac{Q}{\delta}$, D_s for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$ will be $\frac{1}{\delta}$. In summary, $D_s \lesssim D^\times / Q$.

4.2 Regret Bounds

4.2.1 Probabilistic Reward Machines

First, we present regret bounds for UCRL-PRM in the case of MDPs with probabilistic RMs.

The following theorem provides a regret bound for UCRL-PRM-L1, which is constructed using (C^1, D^1) :

Theorem 1 *Under UCRL-PRM-L1, with probability higher than $1 - 3\delta$ and uniformly over all $T \geq 2$,*

$$\mathfrak{R}(T) \lesssim D^\times \sqrt{OAT(O + \log(T/\delta))} + D^\times \sqrt{\sum_{q \in \mathcal{Q}} E_q T(Q + \log(T/\delta))} + D^\times (OA + QE) \log(T)$$

To present a regret bound for UCRL-PRM-B (constructed using (C^2, D^2)), we introduce some necessary notations. For $(o, a) \in \mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{A}$, we let $K_{o,a}$ be the number of possible next observations in \mathcal{O} under (o, a) , that is, $K_{o,a} := |\{o' \in \mathcal{O} : P(o'|o, a) > 0\}|$. Similarly, for $q \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_q$, we let $K_{q,\sigma}$ be the number of possible next RM-states in \mathcal{Q} under (q, σ) , that is, $K_{q,\sigma} := |\{q' \in \mathcal{Q} : \tau(q'|q, \sigma) > 0\}|$.

Theorem 2 *Under UCRL-PRM-B, uniformly over all $T \geq 2$, with probability higher than $1 - 3\delta$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{R}(T) \lesssim & D^\times \sqrt{\sum_{o,a} K_{o,a} T \log(\log(T)/\delta)} + D^\times \sqrt{\sum_{q,\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_q} K_{q,\sigma} T \log(\log(T)/\delta)} \\ & + D^\times Q^2 O^2 AE \log(T) \log(\log(T)). \end{aligned}$$

4.2.2 Deterministic Reward Machines

Now we restrict attention to the special class of deterministic RMs and present improved regret bounds. In the case of deterministic RMs, it is evident that there will be no need to maintain a confidence set for τ . Further, it will no longer be necessary to use a surrogate set of models. Hence, the variants of UCRL-PRM reduce to their respective form of UCRL-RM, which were initially presented in our previous work (Bourel et al., 2023). We will refer to this special case of UCRL-PRM as UCRL-RM, to comply with the terminology used in (Bourel et al., 2023).

Theorem 3 *Given an MDPRM M , let $\mathbf{c}_M = \sum_{o \in \mathcal{O}} \max_{q \in \mathcal{Q}} D_{q,o}^2$. Uniformly over all $T \geq 2$, with probability higher than $1 - 3\delta$, the regret under UCRL-RM-L1 in M satisfies*

$$\mathfrak{R}(T) \lesssim \sqrt{\mathbf{c}_M AT(O + \log(T/\delta))} + D^\times \sqrt{T \log(T/\delta)}.$$

Theorem 4 *Given an MDPRM M , let $\mathbf{c}'_M = \sum_{o \in \mathcal{O}, a \in \mathcal{A}} K_{o,a} \max_{q \in \mathcal{Q}} D_{q,o}^2$. Uniformly over all $T \geq 2$, with probability higher than $1 - 3\delta$, the regret under UCRL-RM-B in M satisfies*

$$\mathfrak{R}(T) \lesssim \sqrt{\mathbf{c}'_M T \log(\log(T)/\delta)} + D^\times \sqrt{T \log(\log(T)/\delta)}.$$

Here, \mathbf{c}_M and \mathbf{c}'_M are problem-dependent quantities that reflect the contribution of various states to the regret, weighted by their associated RM-restricted diameter. In the worst-case, $\mathbf{c}_M \leq OD^{\times 2}$ and $\mathbf{c}'_M = D^{\times 2} \sum_{o,a} K_{o,a}$. But in view of the example earlier, there are problem instances in which $\mathbf{c}_M \lesssim OD^{\times 2}/Q^2$ and $\mathbf{c}'_M \lesssim D^{\times 2}/Q^2 \sum_{o,a} K_{o,a}$. Therefore, these quantities could adapt to the sparsity structure of the underlying MDPRM. In contrast, the reported regret bounds for the case of probabilistic RMs would scale with the diameter D^\times of the cross-product MDP, which is structure-oblivious and (potentially much) larger. It is an interesting direction to derive similar regret bounds for probabilistic RMs.

4.3 Discussion

Any algorithm available for tabular RL could be directly applied to M^\times , obviously to the structure induced by the RM. In particular, UCRL2 (Jaksch et al., 2010) attains a regret of scaling as $D^\times OQ\sqrt{AT\log T}$, although its regret with improved confidence sets used here would grow as $D^\times\sqrt{AOQT(OQ + \log T)}$.

Further, UCRL2-B achieves a regret of $O(D^\times\sqrt{T\log(\log(T))\sum_{o,a}K_{q,o,a}})$.⁸

It would render natural to compare UCRL-PRM-L1 with UCRL2, and UCRL-PRM-B with UCRL2-B, in terms of regret dependency on problem parameters O, Q , and A . Under UCRL-PRM-L1, the regret order is $\sqrt{(OA + \sum_q E_q)T\log(T)}$ for large time horizon T (relative to O and Q), whereas it is $\sqrt{(O^2A + Q\sum_q E_q)T}$ for moderate T . In contrast, for UCRL2 it scales as $OQ\sqrt{AT\log(T)}$. It is clear that a dependency on QO is improved to one of the form $Q + O$, especially when $E_q \ll Q$ and $A \ll O$, which reasonably hold in practical situations. A similar remark holds when comparing to the improved regret of UCRL2. In the case of UCRL-PRM-B compared with UCRL2-B, a dependency on the (cumulative) support size of P^\times is traded with $K_{o,a} + K_{q,\sigma}$, that is, the support sizes of P and τ . The quantities $K_{o,a}$ and $K_{q,\sigma}$ are more capable of representing the sparsity of MDPRM than the support size of P^\times .

In the case of deterministic RMs, UCRL-RM-L1 improves over UCRL2 by a multiplicative factor of Q . However, in some specific instances, we have $D_s \lesssim D^\times/Q$ for all s , so that $c_M \sim O(D^\times/Q)^2$ for such M . On such MDPRMs, for moderate T , we obtain an improvement in the regret bound by a multiplicative factor of at least Q , but in some examples this can be as large as Q^2 . For large horizons (relative to O), the respective gains over UCRL2 are \sqrt{Q} and $Q^{3/2}$.

In view of $D_s \leq D^\times$, $c'_M \leq D^{\times 2}\sum_{o,a}K_{o,a}$. Hence, the regret of UCRL-RM-B, in the worst case grows as $D^\times\sqrt{\sum_{o,a}K_{o,a}T}$. However, in some specific instances, we have $D_s \lesssim D^\times/Q$ for all s , thus yielding $c'_M \lesssim (D^\times/Q)^2\sum_{o,a}K_{o,a}$. On such MDPRMs, its regret is of order $\frac{D^\times}{Q}\sqrt{\sum_{o,a}K_{o,a}T}$. In summary, UCRL-RM-B improves UCRL2-B in regret by a factor of, at least, \sqrt{Q} . Moreover, in instances where $D_s \lesssim D^\times/Q$, the improvement could be as large as a factor of $Q^{3/2}$.

5 Regret Lower Bound

In this section, we present a regret lower bound for the class of MDPRMs under the communicating assumption on the associated cross-product MDP. For communicating tabular MDPs with S states, A actions, and diameter D , a regret lower bound of $\Omega(\sqrt{DSAT})$ is presented by Jaksch et al. (2010), which relies on a carefully constructed family of worst-case MDPs. *However, this does not translate to a lower bound of $\Omega(\sqrt{D^\times QOAT})$ for the cross-product M^\times associated to a given MDPRM M .* This is due to the fact that the transition function of the aforementioned worst-case MDPs does not satisfy (1). In other words, *there exist no MDPRMs* for which those worst-case MDPs become their associated cross-product MDPs. In the following theorem, we present a regret lower bound that holds for any MDPRM M with a communicating cross-product M^\times .

Theorem 5 *For any $O \geq 3$, $A \geq 2$, $Q \geq 2$, and $D^\times \geq Q(6 + 2\log_A(O))$, $T \geq D^\times OA$ and $E \geq 4$, there exists a family of MDPRMs with deterministic RMs comprising O observations states, A actions, Q RM states, and diameter D^\times of the associated M^\times , in which the regret of any algorithm \mathbb{A} satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathfrak{R}(\mathbb{A}, T)] \geq c_0\sqrt{D^\times OAT},$$

where $c_0 > 0$ is a universal constant.

This theorem asserts a *worst-case* regret lower bound growing as $\Omega(\sqrt{D^\times OAT})$ and is provided in Appendix F. To establish this result, we carefully construct an instance of MDPRM. In order to make it a worst-case instance, both P and \mathcal{R} have to be chosen in a way to challenge exploration. To this end, we

⁸A factor of $\sqrt{D^\times/\log(T)}$ can be shaved off the regret of UCRL2-B as reported by Fruit et al. (2020), and the same improvement may carry over to UCRL-PRM-B. We exclude comparisons to EBF introduced by Zhang and Ji (2019) growing as $O(\sqrt{D^\times QOAT\log(T)})$, as it does not admit an efficient implementation.

construct an RM with a non-trivial structure, whereas for P , we take inspiration from the worst-case MDPs presented by Jaksch et al. (2010), so that on the resulting MDPRM, the regret of any algorithm grows as $\Omega(\sqrt{D \times OAT})$ even when the RM and associated rewards are known to the learner.

We remark that in the construction of the worst-case MDPRM, we use a deterministic RM \mathcal{R} . Nevertheless, the lower bound is likely loose for the case of probabilistic RMs. Deriving a worst-case MDPRM with a probabilistic RM is substantially more challenging and is an interesting direction for future research. We finally remark that the lower bound does not contradict our regret bounds; in particular, in the case of deterministic machines, the worst-case instances considered in Theorem 5 satisfy $\max_q D_{q,o} \simeq D^\times$.

6 Conclusion

We studied reinforcement learning in average-reward Markov decision processes with probabilistic reward machines (MDPRMs), in the regret minimization setting. We assumed that the reward machine is unknown but its state is observable. We introduced two algorithms tailored to leverage the structure of MDPRMs, and analyzed their regret. Both algorithms significantly outperform existing baselines in terms of theoretical regret guarantees. We also derived a regret lower bound for MDPRMs with deterministic machines that relies on a novel construction of worst-case MDPRMs. An interesting future work direction is to devise efficient algorithms for MDPRMs when the state of the RM is not observed. Another interesting direction is to improve our lower bound for the class of probabilistic machines.

Acknowledgment

Hippolyte Bourel is supported by the Independent Research Fund Denmark, grant number 1026-00397B. Anders Jonsson is partially supported by the Spanish grant PID2019-108141GB-I00 and the European project TAILOR (H2020, GA 952215). Odalric-Ambrym Maillard is supported by the French Ministry of Higher Education and Research, Inria, Scool, the Hauts-de-France region, the MEL and the I-Site ULNE regarding project R-PILOTE-19-004-APPRENF. Mohammad Sadegh Talebi is partially supported by the Independent Research Fund Denmark, grant number 1026-00397B.

References

- Martin L Puterman. *Markov decision processes: Discrete stochastic dynamic programming*. John Wiley & Sons, 2014.
- Fahiem Bacchus, Craig Boutilier, and Adam Grove. Rewarding behaviors. In *National Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 1996.
- Ronen I Brafman and Giuseppe De Giacomo. Regular decision processes: A model for non-Markovian domains. In *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2019.
- Michael L Littman, Ufuk Topcu, Jie Fu, Charles Isbell, Min Wen, and James MacGlashan. Environment-independent task specifications via GLTL. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.04341*, 2017.
- Ronen I Brafman and Giuseppe De Giacomo. Regular decision processes. *Artificial Intelligence*, 331: 104113, 2024.
- Rodrigo Toro Icarte, Toryn Klassen, Richard Valenzano, and Sheila McIlraith. Using reward machines for high-level task specification and decomposition in reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2018.
- Rodrigo Toro Icarte, Toryn Q Klassen, Richard Valenzano, and Sheila A McIlraith. Reward machines: Exploiting reward function structure in reinforcement learning. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 73:173–208, 2022.

- Taylor Dohmen, Noah Topper, George Atia, Andre Beckus, Ashutosh Trivedi, and Alvaro Velasquez. Inferring probabilistic reward machines from non-Markovian reward signals for reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Automated Planning and Scheduling*, 2022.
- Thomas Jaksch, Ronald Ortner, and Peter Auer. Near-optimal regret bounds for reinforcement learning. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11:1563–1600, 2010.
- Hippolyte Bourel, Anders Jonsson, Odalric-Ambrym Maillard, and Mohammad Sadegh Talebi. Exploration in reward machines with low regret. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 4114–4146. PMLR, 2023.
- Apostolos N Burnetas and Michael N Katehakis. Optimal adaptive policies for Markov decision processes. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 22(1):222–255, 1997.
- Ronan Fruit, Matteo Pirodda, and Alessandro Lazaric. Near optimal exploration-exploitation in non-communicating Markov decision processes. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 31*, 2018a.
- Mohammad Sadegh Talebi and Odalric-Ambrym Maillard. Variance-aware regret bounds for undiscounted reinforcement learning in MDPs. In *International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory*, 2018.
- Chen-Yu Wei, Mehdi Jafarnia Jahromi, Haipeng Luo, Hiteshi Sharma, and Rahul Jain. Model-free reinforcement learning in infinite-horizon average-reward Markov decision processes. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2020.
- Hippolyte Bourel, Odalric-Ambrym Maillard, and Mohammad Sadegh Talebi. Tightening exploration in upper confidence reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2020.
- Zihan Zhang and Xiangyang Ji. Regret minimization for reinforcement learning by evaluating the optimal bias function. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32*, pages 2823–2832, 2019.
- Fabien Pesquerel and Odalric-Ambrym Maillard. IMED-RL: Regret optimal learning of ergodic Markov decision processes. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35*, 2022.
- Hassan Saber, Fabien Pesquerel, Odalric-Ambrym Maillard, and Mohammad Sadegh Talebi. Logarithmic regret in communicating MDPs: Leveraging known dynamics with bandits. In *Asian Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1167–1182. PMLR, 2023.
- Chen-Yu Wei, Mehdi Jafarnia Jahromi, Haipeng Luo, and Rahul Jain. Learning infinite-horizon average-reward mdps with linear function approximation. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 3007–3015. PMLR, 2021.
- Jungseul Ok, Alexandre Proutiere, and Damianos Tranos. Exploration in structured reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 31, 2018.
- Mohammad Sadegh Talebi, Anders Jonsson, and Odalric Maillard. Improved exploration in factored average-reward MDPs. In *International conference on artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 3988–3996. PMLR, 2021.
- Kailasam Lakshmanan, Ronald Ortner, and Daniil Ryabko. Improved regret bounds for undiscounted continuous reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 524–532, 2015.
- Ronan Fruit, Matteo Pirodda, and Alessandro Lazaric. Improved analysis of UCRL2 with empirical Bernstein inequality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.05456*, 2020.
- Victor Boone and Zihan Zhang. Achieving tractable minimax optimal regret in average reward MDPs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.01234*, 2024.
- Tor Lattimore, Marcus Hutter, and Peter Sunehag. The sample-complexity of general reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2013.

- Odalric-Ambrym Maillard, Phuong Nguyen, Ronald Ortner, and Daniil Ryabko. Optimal regret bounds for selecting the state representation in reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2013.
- Peter Sunehag and Marcus Hutter. Rationality, optimism and guarantees in general reinforcement learning. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 16:1345–1390, 2015.
- Jayakumar Subramanian, Amit Sinha, Raihan Seraj, and Aditya Mahajan. Approximate information state for approximate planning and reinforcement learning in partially observed systems. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(12):1–83, 2022.
- Leslie Pack Kaelbling, Michael L Littman, and Anthony R Cassandra. Planning and acting in partially observable stochastic domains. *Artificial Intelligence*, 101(1-2):99–134, 1998.
- Eden Abadi and Ronen I Brafman. Learning and solving regular decision processes. In *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2020.
- Alessandro Ronca and Giuseppe De Giacomo. Efficient PAC reinforcement learning in regular decision processes. In *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2021.
- Roberto Cipollone, Anders Jonsson, Alessandro Ronca, and Mohammad Sadegh Talebi. Provably efficient offline reinforcement learning in regular decision processes. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- Alberto Camacho, Rodrigo Toro Icarte, Toryn Q Klassen, Richard Anthony Valenzano, and Sheila A McIlraith. LTL and beyond: Formal languages for reward function specification in reinforcement learning. In *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2019.
- Milad Kazemi, Mateo Perez, Fabio Somenzi, Sadegh Soudjani, Ashutosh Trivedi, and Alvaro Velasquez. Translating omega-regular specifications to average objectives for model-free reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems*, 2022.
- Floris den Hengst, Vincent Francois-Lavet, Mark Hoogendoorn, and Frank van Harmelen. Reinforcement learning with option machines. In *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2022.
- Alessandro Abate, Yousif Almula, James Fox, David Hyland, and Michael Wooldridge. Learning task automata for reinforcement learning using hidden Markov models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.11838*, 2022.
- Giuseppe De Giacomo, Marco Favorito, Luca Iocchi, and Fabio Patrizi. Imitation learning over heterogeneous agents with restraining bolts. In *International Conference on Automated Planning and Scheduling*, 2020.
- Daniel Furelos-Blanco, Mark Law, Anders Jonsson, Krysia Broda, and Alessandra Russo. Induction and exploitation of subgoal automata for reinforcement learning. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 70:1031–1116, 2021.
- Maor Gaon and Ronen Brafman. Reinforcement learning with non-Markovian rewards. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2020.
- Rodrigo Toro Icarte, Ethan Waldie, Toryn Klassen, Rick Valenzano, Margarita Castro, and Sheila McIlraith. Learning reward machines for partially observable reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- Christos Verginis, Cevahir Koprulu, Sandeep Chinchali, and Ufuk Topcu. Joint learning of reward machines and policies in environments with partially known semantics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.11833*, 2022.
- Zhe Xu, Ivan Gavran, Yousef Ahmad, Rupak Majumdar, Daniel Neider, Ufuk Topcu, and Bo Wu. Joint inference of reward machines and policies for reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Automated Planning and Scheduling*, 2020.

- Jan Corazza, Ivan Gavran, and Daniel Neider. Reinforcement learning with stochastic reward machines. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2022.
- Daniel Furelos-Blanco, Mark Law, Anders Jonsson, Kryisia Broda, and Alessandra Russo. Hierarchies of reward machines. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 10494–10541. PMLR, 2023.
- Michael Dann, Yuan Yao, Natasha Alechina, Brian Logan, and John Thangarajah. Multi-agent intention progression with reward machines. In *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2022.
- Cyrus Neary, Zhe Xu, Bo Wu, and Ufuk Topcu. Reward machines for cooperative multi-agent reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and MultiAgent Systems*, 2021.
- Xiaofeng Lin and Xuezhou Zhang. Efficient reinforcement learning in probabilistic reward machines. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.10381*, 2024.
- Ronan Fruit, Matteo Pirota, Alessandro Lazaric, and Ronald Ortner. Efficient bias-span-constrained exploration-exploitation in reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2018b.
- Tsachy Weissman, Erik Ordentlich, Gadiel Seroussi, Sergio Verdu, and Marcelo J Weinberger. Inequalities for the L1 deviation of the empirical distribution. *Hewlett-Packard Labs, Technical Report*, 2003.
- Odalric-Ambrym Maillard. Mathematics of statistical sequential decision making. *Habilitation à Diriger des Recherches*, 2019.
- Mahsa Asadi, Mohammad Sadegh Talebi, Hippolyte Bourel, and Odalric-Ambrym Maillard. Model-based reinforcement learning exploiting state-action equivalence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.04077*, 2019.
- Christoph Dann and Emma Brunskill. Sample complexity of episodic fixed-horizon reinforcement learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2015.
- Tor Lattimore and Csaba Szepesvári. *Bandit algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- Christoph Dann, Tor Lattimore, and Emma Brunskill. Unifying PAC and regret: Uniform PAC bounds for episodic reinforcement learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30*, 2017.

A Proof of Lemma 1

Proof. Let $M = (\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{A}, P, \mathcal{R}, \mathbf{AP}, L)$ and $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{Q} \times \mathcal{O}$. For any $t \in \mathbb{N}$, let $h_t := (s_1, a_1, \dots, s_{t-1}, a_{t-1}, s_t)$, where $s_{t'} := (q_{t'}, o_{t'})$. We show that for any $h \in (\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A})^{t-1} \times \mathcal{S}$, $s' = (q', o') \in \mathcal{S}$, $a \in \mathcal{A}$, and $B \subseteq [0, 1]$:

$$\mathbb{P}(s_{t+1} = s' | h_t = h, a_t = a) = P(o' | o, a) \tau(q' | q, L(o, a)), \quad \mathbb{P}(r_t \in B | h_t = h, a_t = a) = \nu(q, L(o, a))(B),$$

thus implying that the state and reward dynamics are fully determined by (s_t, a_t) . For any $(q', o') \in \mathcal{S}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(s_{t+1} = (q', o') | h_t = h, a_t = a) &= \mathbb{P}(o_{t+1} = o' | h_t = h, a_t = a) \mathbb{P}(q_{t+1} = q' | h_t = h, o_{t+1} = o', a_t = a) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(o_{t+1} = o' | o_t = o, a_t = a) \mathbb{P}(q_{t+1} = q' | s_t = (q, o), o_{t+1} = o', a_t = a) \\ &= P(o' | o, a) \tau(q' | q, L(o, a)), \end{aligned}$$

where the second line follows from the fact that observation dynamics are Markovian and from the definition of RMs.

Moreover, for any set $B \subseteq [0, 1]$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(r_t \in B | h_t = h, a_t = a) = \mathbb{P}(r_t \in B | s_t = (q, o), o_{t+1} = o', a_t = a) = \nu(q, L(o, a))(B),$$

thus verifying the two claims, and the lemma follows. \square

B Properties of the Set of Models

B.1 Proof of Lemma 3

Proof. Consider $\mathcal{M}_{t,\delta}^1$. Its corresponding set of cross-product MDPs, $\mathcal{M}_{t,\delta}^{\times,1}$, collects all MDPs $M' = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, P'^{\times}, R^{\times})$ such that for all $s, s' \in \mathcal{S}$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}$, $P'^{\times}(s'|s, a) = P'(o'|o, a)\tau'(q'|q, \sigma)$ such that $P' \in C_{t,\delta}^1$ and $\tau' \in D_{t,\delta}^1$. Now, if $M' \in \mathcal{M}_{t,\delta}^{\times,1}$, then it holds for any (s, a) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|P'^{\times}(\cdot|s, a) - \widehat{P}_t^{\times}(\cdot|s, a)\|_1 &\leq \|P'(\cdot|o, a) - \widehat{P}_t(\cdot|o, a)\|_1 + \|\tau'(\cdot|q, \sigma) - \widehat{\tau}_t(\cdot|q, \sigma)\|_1 \\ &\leq \beta_{N_t(o,a)}\left(\frac{\delta}{2OA}\right) + \beta''_{N_t(q,\sigma)}\left(\frac{\delta}{2QE}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from the identity that for probability vectors a, b, c , and d , $\sum_i |a_i b_i - c_i d_i| \leq \sum_i |a_i - c_i| + \sum_i |b_i - d_i|$, and where the last inequality follows from the fact that $P' \in C_{t,\delta}^1$ and $\tau' \in D_{t,\delta}^1$. Thus, $\mathcal{M}_{t,\delta}^{\times,1} \subseteq \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{t,\delta}^{\times,1}$.

The second statement can be proven using a very similar argument; its proof is thus omitted. \square

B.2 Proof of Lemma 2

Proof. Recall that $\mathcal{M}_{t,\delta}^{\times,1}$ (resp. $\mathcal{M}_{t,\delta}^{\times,2}$) denote the set of cross-products MDPs associated to MDPRMs in $\mathcal{M}_{t,\delta}^1$ (resp. $\mathcal{M}_{t,\delta}^2$). To prove the lemma, we show that M^{\times} belongs to the corresponding induced set of cross-product MDPs with high probability.

Part (i). Note that $\mathcal{M}_{t,\delta}^{\times,1}$ collects all MDPs $M' = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, P'^{\times}, R^{\times})$ such that for all $s, s' \in \mathcal{S}$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}$, $P'^{\times}(s'|s, a) = P'(o'|o, a)\tau'(q'|q, \sigma)$ such that $P' \in C_{t,\delta}^1$ and $\tau' \in D_{t,\delta}^1$. It is evident that $M \notin \mathcal{M}_{t,\delta}^{\times,1}$ if and only if $M^{\times} \notin \mathcal{M}_{t,\delta}^{\times,1}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\exists t \in \mathbb{N}, M \notin \mathcal{M}_{t,\delta}^1) &= \mathbb{P}(\exists t \in \mathbb{N}, M^{\times} \notin \mathcal{M}_{t,\delta}^{\times,1}) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(\exists t \in \mathbb{N}, \exists P \notin C_{t,\delta/2OA}^1 \quad \text{or} \quad \exists \tau \notin D_{t,\delta/2QE}^1) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\exists t \in \mathbb{N}, \exists(o, a) \in \mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{A}, P(\cdot|o, a) \notin C_{t,\delta/2OA}^1(o, a)) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}(\exists t \in \mathbb{N}, \exists q \in \mathcal{Q}, \sigma \in \mathcal{E}_q, \tau(\cdot|q, \sigma) \notin D_{t,\delta/2QE}^1(q, \sigma)) \\ &\leq \sum_{o \in \mathcal{O}, a \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbb{P}(\exists t \in \mathbb{N}, P(\cdot|o, a) \notin C_{t,\delta/2OA}^1(o, a)) \\ &\quad + \sum_{q \in \mathcal{Q}, \sigma \in \mathcal{E}} \mathbb{P}(\exists t \in \mathbb{N}, \tau(\cdot|q, \sigma) \notin D_{t,\delta/2QE}^1(q, \sigma)) \\ &\leq \delta, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Lemma 12.

Part (ii). The proof follows similar lines as in that of Part (i). We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\exists t \in \mathbb{N}, M \notin \mathcal{M}_{t,\delta}^2) &= \mathbb{P}(\exists t \in \mathbb{N}, M^\times \notin \mathcal{M}_{t,\delta}^{\times,2}) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}(\exists t \in \mathbb{N}, \exists P \notin C_{t,\delta/4O^2A}^2 \quad \text{or} \quad \exists \tau \notin D_{t,\delta/4Q^2E}^1) \\
&= \mathbb{P}(\exists t \in \mathbb{N}, \exists (o, a, o') \in \mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{O}, P(o'|o, a) \notin C_{t,\delta/4O^2A}^2(o, a, o')) \\
&\quad + \mathbb{P}(\exists t \in \mathbb{N}, \exists q, q' \in \mathcal{Q}, \sigma \in \mathcal{E}_q, \tau(q'|q, \sigma) \notin D_{t,\delta/4Q^2E}^1(q, \sigma, q')) \\
&\leq \sum_{o, o' \in \mathcal{O}, a \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbb{P}(\exists t \in \mathbb{N}, P(o'|o, a) \notin C_{t,\delta/4O^2A}^2(o, a, o')) \\
&\quad + \sum_{q, q' \in \mathcal{Q}, \sigma \in \mathcal{E}_q} \mathbb{P}(\exists t \in \mathbb{N}, \tau(q'|q, \sigma) \notin D_{t,\delta/4Q^2E}^1(q, \sigma, q')) \\
&\leq \delta,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality uses Lemma 13. □

C Further Algorithmic Details

C.1 Extended Value Iteration for MDPRMs

EVI relies on solving the following maximization problem in each round, and for any $s \in \mathcal{Q} \times \mathcal{O}$:

$$\max_{P^\times(\cdot|s,a) \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{s'} P^\times(s'|s, a) u(s') \quad (3)$$

where u is the value function at the current iteration of EVI, and where $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_{t,\delta}^1$ for UCRL-PRM-L1, and $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_{t,\delta}^2$ for UCRL-PRM-B. Algorithm 3 finds a solution to problem (3) for UCRL-PRM-L1, whereas Algorithm 4 does so for UCRL-PRM-B. Algorithm 3 is quite similar to the one used in UCRL2 (Jaksch et al., 2010), whereas Algorithm 4 is used in UCRL2B and similar (e.g., in (Dann and Brunskill, 2015)).

Algorithm 3 MAXP-L1

For all $s' \in \mathcal{Q} \times \mathcal{O}$, set $p(s') = \widehat{P}^\times(s'|s, a)$
 $s_{\max} = \arg \max_{s' \in \mathcal{Q} \times \mathcal{O}} u(s')$
 $p(s_{\max}) = \max \left\{ 1, p(s_{\max}) + \frac{1}{2} \left(\beta_{N_t(o,a)} \left(\frac{\delta}{2OA} \right) + \beta''_{N_t(q,\sigma)} \left(\frac{\delta}{2Q\Sigma} \right) \right) \right\}$
 $\mathcal{L} = \text{argsort}_{s'} u(s')$
 $\ell = 0$
while $\sum_{o' \in \mathcal{O}} p(s') > 1$ **do**
 $p(\mathcal{L}_\ell) = \max \left\{ 0, p(\mathcal{L}_\ell) + 1 - \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{Q} \times \mathcal{O}} p(s') \right\}$
 Set $\ell = \ell + 1$
end while
Output: $\widetilde{P}^\times(\cdot|s, a) = p$

C.2 Unknown Mean Rewards

Now we discuss the case of unknown mean rewards, i.e., when the agent has no prior knowledge about \bar{v} . To accommodate this situation, the agent maintains confidence sets for the various mean rewards as follows. For $q \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_q$, define

$$C_{t,\delta}^{\text{reward}}(q, \sigma) = \left\{ \lambda \in [0, 1] : |\widehat{v}_t(q, \sigma) - \lambda| \leq \beta'''_{N_t(q,\sigma)}(\delta) \right\}, \quad C_{t,\delta}^{\text{reward}} = \bigcap_{q,\sigma} C_{t,\delta}^{\text{reward}}(q, \sigma),$$

Algorithm 4 MAXP-B

For all $s' \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{O}$, set $p(s') = \min \{P' \in C_{t,\delta}^2\}$

$\mathcal{L} = \text{argsort}_{s'} u(s')$

$\ell = QO - 1$

while $\sum_{s' \in \mathcal{Q} \times \mathcal{O}} p(s') < 1$ **do**

 Set

$$p(\mathcal{L}_\ell) = \min \left\{ \max \left\{ z \in \tilde{D}_{t,\delta}(s, a, \mathcal{L}_\ell) \right\}, 1 - \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{O}} p(s') \right\}$$

$\ell = \ell - 1$

end while

Output: $\tilde{P}^\times(\cdot|s, a) = p$

where $\hat{\nu}_t(q, \sigma)$ denotes the empirical mean reward built using $N_t(q, \sigma)$ observations collected from the reward distribution $\nu(q, \sigma)$. Here, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\beta_n(\delta) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2n} \left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right) \log(\sqrt{n+1}/\delta)}$. Then, it suffices to replace $\bar{\nu}$ with its upper confidence set, that is, to replace $\bar{\nu}(q, \sigma)$, in problem (3), with $\hat{\nu}_t(q, \sigma) + \beta_{N_t(q, \sigma)}''' \left(\frac{\delta}{Q\Sigma}\right)$. Further, the parameter δ in other confidence sets must be rescaled accordingly to account for C^{reward} . Overall, this modification would increase the regret bound by an additive term that is independent of any diameter-like quantity (i.e., D^\times or $D_{q,o}$). The regret bound will depend on $\sqrt{\log Q}$, which will however be dominated by other $\sqrt{\log T}$ terms.

D Regret Analysis of UCRL-PRM

In this section, we provide regret analyses of the two variants of UCRL-PRM.

D.1 Proof of Theorem 1

As in most regret analyses for model-based algorithms that work based on the optimism principle, the proof builds on the regret analysis by Jaksch et al. (2010), but it includes novel steps due to the structure of MDPRMs.

Let $\delta \in (0, 1)$. We closely follow the notations used by Jaksch et al. (2010). To simplify notations, we define the short-hand $J_k := J_{t_k}$ for various random variables that are fixed within a given episode k and omit their dependence on δ (for example $\mathcal{M}_k := \mathcal{M}_{t_k, \delta}$). We let $m(T)$ denote the number of episodes initiated by the algorithm up to time T .

Observe that $\mathbb{E}[r_t | s_t, a_t] = \bar{\nu}(q_t, L(o_t, a_t))$. Hence, by applying Corollary S1 in the online companion, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{R}(T) &= \sum_{t=1}^T g^* - \sum_{t=1}^T r_t \\ &\leq \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{o, q, a} (g^* - \bar{\nu}(q, L(o, a))) \mathbb{I}_{\{(q_t, o_t, a_t) = (q, o, a)\}} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}(T+1) \log(\sqrt{T+1}/\delta)} \\ &= \sum_{o, q, a} (g^* - \bar{\nu}(q, L(o, a))) N_{m(T)}(q, o, a) + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}(T+1) \log(\sqrt{T+1}/\delta)}, \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

For $s = (q, o)$, define $\mu(s, a) := \bar{\nu}(q, L(o, a))$. Hence, the first term in the previous inequality reads

$$\sum_{s, a} (g^* - \mu(s, a)) N_{m(T)}(s, a) = \sum_{k=1}^{m(T)} \sum_{s, a} \underbrace{\sum_{t=t_k}^{t_{k+1}-1} \mathbb{I}_{\{s_t=s, a_t=a\}}}_{:=n_k(s, a)} (g^* - \mu(s, a)) = \sum_{k=1}^{m(T)} \sum_{s, a} n_k(s, a) (g^* - \mu(s, a)).$$

Introducing $\Delta_k := \sum_{s,a} n_k(s,a)(g^* - \mu(s,a))$ for $1 \leq k \leq m(T)$, we get

$$\mathfrak{R}(T) \leq \sum_{k=1}^{m(T)} \Delta_k + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}(T+1) \log(\sqrt{T+1}/\delta)}, \quad \text{with probability at least } 1 - \delta.$$

A given episode k is called *good* if $M \in \mathcal{M}_k$, and *bad* otherwise.

D.1.1 Control of the regret due to bad episodes

As a consequence of Lemma 2 and Lemma 3, the set $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_k^{\times,1}$ contains the cross-product MDP M^\times associated to the true MDPRM M with probability higher than $1 - \delta$ uniformly for all T , and for all episodes $k = 1, \dots, m(T)$. As a consequence, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{m(T)} \Delta_k \mathbb{I}_{\{M^\times \notin \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_k^{\times,1}\}} = 0.$$

D.1.2 Control of the regret due to good episodes

To upper bound regret in good episodes, we closely follow (Jaksch et al., 2010) and decompose the regret to control the transition and reward functions. Consider a good episode k . Let $\widetilde{M}_k = (\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{A}, \widetilde{P}_k, \widetilde{R}_k, \mathbf{AP}, L)$ denote the chosen optimistic MDPRM at episode k . Since $M^\times \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_k^{\times,1}$, we have $g_k := g^{\pi_k}(\widetilde{M}_k) \geq g^* - \frac{1}{\sqrt{t_k}}$. Hence, the regret accumulated in episode k satisfies:

$$\Delta_k \leq \sum_{s,a} n_k(s,a)(g_k - \mu(s,a)) + \sum_{s,a} \frac{n_k(s,a)}{\sqrt{t_k}}. \quad (4)$$

As a result of (Puterman, 2014, Theorem 8.5.6), when the convergence criterion of EVI holds at iterate i , we have

$$|u_k^{(i+1)}(s) - u_k^{(i)}(s) - g_k| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{t_k}}, \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{Q} \times \mathcal{O}. \quad (5)$$

By the design of EVI, note that for all $s \in \mathcal{Q} \times \mathcal{O}$,

$$u_k^{(i+1)}(s) = \mu(s, \pi_k(s)) + \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{Q} \times \mathcal{O}} \widetilde{P}_k(o'|o, \pi_k(s)) \widetilde{\tau}(q'|q, \sigma_k(s)) u_k^{(i)}(s'),$$

with $\sigma_k(s) := L(o, \pi_k(s))$, and where we recall that \widetilde{P}_k and $\widetilde{\tau}_k$ are the transition probability distribution and RM state distribution of the optimistic MDPRM \widetilde{M}_k in $s = (q, o)$, respectively. Then, (5) gives, for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$,

$$\left| g_k - \mu(s, \pi_k(s)) - \left(\sum_{s'} \widetilde{P}_k(o'|o, \pi_k(s)) \widetilde{\tau}_k(q'|q, \sigma_k(s)) u_k^{(i)}(s') - u_k^{(i)}(s) \right) \right| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{t_k}}.$$

Defining $\mathbf{g}_k = g_k \mathbf{1}$, $\boldsymbol{\mu}_k := (\mu(s, \pi_k(s)))_s$, $\widetilde{\mathbf{P}}_k^\times := (\widetilde{P}_k(o'|o, \pi_k(s)) \widetilde{\tau}_k(q'|q, \sigma_k(s)))_{s,s'}$, and $\mathbf{n}_k := (n_k(s, \pi_k(s)))_s$, we can rewrite the above inequality as:

$$\left| \mathbf{g}_k - \boldsymbol{\mu}_k - (\widetilde{\mathbf{P}}_k^\times - \mathbf{I}) u_k^{(i)} \right| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{t_k}} \mathbf{1}.$$

Also, we can rewrite (4) as

$$\Delta_k \leq \sum_{s,a} n_k(s,a)(g_k - \mu(s,a)) + \sum_{s,a} \frac{n_k(s,a)}{\sqrt{t_k}} \leq \mathbf{n}_k (\widetilde{\mathbf{P}}_k^\times - \mathbf{I}) u_k^{(i)} + 2 \sum_{s,a} \frac{n_k(s,a)}{\sqrt{N_k(o,a)}}, \quad (6)$$

where in the inequality we used that $t_k \geq \max_{o,a} N_k(o, a)$ so that

$$\sum_{s,a} \frac{n_k(s, a)}{\sqrt{t_k}} \leq \sum_{o,a} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N_k(o, a)}} \sum_q n_k(q, o, a) = \sum_{o,a} \frac{n_k(o, a)}{\sqrt{N_k(o, a)}}.$$

Let us define, for all $s \in \mathcal{Q} \times \mathcal{O}$,

$$w_k(s) := u_k^{(i)}(s) - \frac{1}{2} \left(\min_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} u_k^{(i)}(s') + \max_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} u_k^{(i)}(s') \right).$$

In view of the fact that $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_k^\times$ is row-stochastic (i.e., its rows sum to one), we obtain

$$\Delta_k \leq \mathbf{n}_k(\mathbf{P}_k^\times - \mathbf{I})w_k + \mathbf{n}_k(\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_k^\times - \mathbf{P}_k^\times)w_k + 2 \sum_{o,a} \frac{n_k(o, a)}{\sqrt{N_k(o, a)}}. \quad (7)$$

The following lemmas control the first and second terms in the right-hand side of (7):

Lemma 4 *For any good episode k , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{n}_k(\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_k^\times - \mathbf{P}_k^\times)w_k &\leq 2D^\times \sqrt{\log(2OA\sqrt{T}/\delta)} + O \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{o \in \mathcal{O}} \frac{n_k(o, a)}{\sqrt{N_k(o, a)}} \\ &\quad + 2D^\times \sqrt{\log(2 \sum_q E_q \sqrt{T}/\delta)} + Q \sum_{q \in \mathcal{Q}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_q} \frac{n_k(q, \sigma)}{\sqrt{N_k(q, \sigma)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 5 *Uniformly over all $T \geq 1$, with probability exceeding $1 - \delta$, we have*

$$\sum_{k=1}^{m(T)} \mathbf{n}_k(\mathbf{P}_k^\times - \mathbf{I})w_k \mathbb{I}_{\{M^\times \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_k^{\times,1}\}} \leq D^\times \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}(T+1) \log(\sqrt{T+1}/\delta)} + D^\times OA \log_2\left(\frac{8T}{OA}\right) + D^\times QE \log_2\left(\frac{8T}{QE}\right).$$

Using the bounds in Lemma 4) and Lemma 5 and summing over all good episodes, for the regret built during the good episodes we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^{m(T)} \Delta_k \mathbb{I}_{\{M^\times \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_k^{\times,1}\}} &\leq 2(D^\times + 2) \sqrt{\log(2OA\sqrt{T}/\delta)} + O \sum_{k=1}^{m(T)} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{o \in \mathcal{O}} \frac{n_k(o, a)}{\sqrt{N_k(o, a)}} \\ &\quad + 2D^\times \sqrt{\log(2QE\sqrt{T}/\delta)} + Q \sum_{k=1}^{m(T)} \sum_{q \in \mathcal{Q}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_q} \frac{n_k(q, \sigma)}{\sqrt{N_k(q, \sigma)}} \\ &\quad + D^\times \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}(T+1) \log(\sqrt{T+1}/\delta)} + D^\times (OA + QE) \log(T), \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

with probability exceeding $1 - \delta$.

D.1.3 The Final Bound

To derive the final bound, we simply bound the right-hand side of (8) as follows. Applying Lemma 8 and using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality:

$$\sum_{k=1}^{m(T)} \sum_{o,a} \frac{n_k(o, a)}{\sqrt{N_k(o, a)}} \leq 3 \sum_{o,a} \sqrt{N_T(o, a)} \leq 3 \sqrt{\sum_{o,a} N_T(o, a)} = 3\sqrt{OAT},$$

where, with a slight abuse of notation, we used $N_T(o, a)$ to denote the number of visits to (o, a) after T rounds. Similarly, we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^{m(T)} \sum_{q, \sigma \in \mathcal{E}_q} \frac{n_k(q, \sigma)}{\sqrt{N_k(q, \sigma)}} \leq 3 \sum_{q, \sigma \in \mathcal{E}_q} \sqrt{N_T(q, \sigma)} \leq 3 \sqrt{\sum_q E_q \sum_{q, \sigma \in \mathcal{E}_q} N_T(q, \sigma)} = 3 \sqrt{\sum_q E_q T}.$$

Combining these with (8), we have that with probability at least $1 - 4\delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{R}(T) &\leq 6D^\times \sqrt{\log(2OA\sqrt{T}/\delta)} + O\sqrt{OAT} + 6D^\times \sqrt{\log(2QE\sqrt{T}/\delta)} + Q\sqrt{\sum_q E_q T} \\ &\quad + (D^\times + 1)\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}(T+1)\log(\sqrt{T+1}/\delta)} + D^\times(OA + QE)\log(T), \end{aligned}$$

thus proving the theorem. \square

D.2 Proof of Theorem 2

Proof. Let $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Following the same steps as in the proof of Theorem 1, we have

$$\mathfrak{R}(T) \leq \sum_{k=1}^{m(T)} \Delta_k + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}(T+1)\log(\sqrt{T+1}/\delta)},$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$, where Δ_k is defined similarly to the proof of Theorem 1.

As a consequence of Lemma 2 and Lemma 3, the set $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_k^{\times,2}$ contains the cross-product MDP M^\times associated to the true MDP M with probability higher than $1 - \delta$ uniformly for all T , and for all episodes $k = 1, \dots, m(T)$. As a consequence, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{m(T)} \Delta_k \mathbb{I}_{\{M^\times \notin \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_k^{\times,2}\}} = 0.$$

Let us now focus on good episodes, i.e., episodes k where $M \in \mathcal{M}_k$. Similarly to the proof of Theorem 1, we have:

$$\Delta_k \leq \sum_{s,a} n_k(s,a)(g_k - \mu(s,a)) + \sum_{s,a} \frac{n_k(s,a)}{\sqrt{t_k}} \leq \mathbf{n}_k(\mathbf{P}_k^\times - \mathbf{I})w_k + \mathbf{n}_k(\widetilde{\mathbf{P}}_k^\times - \mathbf{P}_k^\times)w_k + 2 \sum_{o,a} \frac{n_k(o,a)}{\sqrt{N_k(o,a)}},$$

where w_k is defined in the proof of Theorem 1. The first term above is controlled via Lemma 5. To bound the second term, we use the following lemma:

Lemma 6 *For any good episode k , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{n}_k(\widetilde{\mathbf{P}}_k^\times - \mathbf{P}_k^\times)w_k &\leq \frac{D^\times}{2} \left(\sum_{o,a} n_k(o,a) \sqrt{\frac{2K_{o,a}\ell}{N_k(o,a)}} + \sum_{q,\sigma} n_k(q,\sigma) \sqrt{\frac{2K_{q,\sigma}\ell}{N_k(q,\sigma)}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 4O\ell \sum_{o,a} \frac{n_k(o,a)}{N_k(o,a)} + 4QO\ell \sum_{q,\sigma} \frac{n_k(q,\sigma)}{N_k(q,\sigma)} + O\ell\sqrt{8Q} \sum_{q,o,a} \frac{n_k(q,o,a)}{N_k(q,o,a)} + 6OQ\ell^{3/2} \sum_{o,a} \frac{n_k(o,a)}{N_k(o,a)^{3/2}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

with $\ell = \mathcal{O}(\log(\log(T)/\delta) + \log(OQA))$.

Applying Lemmas 6 and 5, and using similar algebraic manipulations as in the proof of Theorem 1 yield the desired bound:

$$\mathfrak{R}(T) \leq 3D^\times \sqrt{\sum_{o,a} K_{o,a} T \ell} + 3D^\times \sqrt{\sum_{q,\sigma} K_{q,\sigma} T \ell} + (D^\times + 1)\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}(T+1)\log(\sqrt{T+1}/\delta)} + c\log(T)\ell,$$

with $c = D^\times(OA + QE + 4O^2A + 4OQ^2E + QO^2A + Q^2O^2A)$. \square

D.3 Technical Lemmas

D.3.1 Proof of Lemma 4

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{n}_k(\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_k^\times - \mathbf{P}_k^\times)w_k &= \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} n_k(s, \pi_k(s)) \left(\tilde{P}_k^\times(s'|s, \pi_k(s)) - P^\times(s'|s, \pi_k(s)) \right) w_k(s') \\
&\leq \|w_k\|_\infty \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} n_k(s, \pi_k(s)) \left\| \tilde{P}_k^\times(\cdot|s, \pi_k(s)) - P^\times(\cdot|s, \pi_k(s)) \right\|_1 \\
&\leq D^\times \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} n_k(s, \pi_k(s)) \left\| \tilde{P}_k^\times(\cdot|s, \pi_k(s)) - P^\times(\cdot|s, \pi_k(s)) \right\|_1 \\
&\leq 2D^\times \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} n_k(s, \pi_k(s)) \left(\beta_{N_k(o, \pi_k(s))} + \beta''_{N_k(q, \sigma_k(s))} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that $\|w_k\|_\infty \leq D^\times/2$, as established by Jaksch et al. (2010) for communicating MDPs.

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} n_k(s, \pi_k(s)) \beta_{N_k(o, \pi_k(s))} &\leq \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{q \in \mathcal{Q}} \sum_{o \in \mathcal{O}} n_k(q, o, a) \beta_{N_k(o, a)} \\
&\leq \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{o \in \mathcal{O}} \beta_{N_k(o, a)} \sum_{q \in \mathcal{Q}} n_k(q, o, a) \\
&= \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{o \in \mathcal{O}} n_k(o, a) \beta_{N_k(o, a)} \\
&\leq 2\sqrt{\log(2OA\sqrt{T}/\delta)} + O \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{o \in \mathcal{O}} \frac{n_k(o, a)}{\sqrt{N_k(o, a)}},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the definition of $\beta_{N_k(o, a)}$ together with $1 \leq N_k(o, a) \leq T$.

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} n_k(s, \pi_k(s)) \beta''_{N_k(q, \sigma_k(s))} &\leq \sum_{q \in \mathcal{Q}} \sum_{o \in \mathcal{O}} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} n_k(q, o, a) \beta''_{N_k(q, L(o, a))} \\
&\leq \sum_{q \in \mathcal{Q}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_q} n_k(q, \sigma) \beta''_{N_k(q, \sigma)} \\
&\leq 2\sqrt{\log(2QE\sqrt{T}/\delta)} + Q \sum_{q \in \mathcal{Q}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_q} \frac{n_k(q, \sigma)}{\sqrt{N_k(q, \sigma)}},
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality uses the observation that a visit to (o, a) implies collecting σ . Further, the last inequality follows from the definition of $\beta''_{N_k(q, \sigma)}$ together with $1 \leq N_k(q, \sigma) \leq T$. Putting together proves the lemma. \square

D.3.2 Proof of Lemma 5

Proof. Similarly to the proof of Theorem 2 in (Jaksch et al., 2010), we define a martingale difference sequence $(Z_t)_{t \geq 1}$ with

$$Z_t := (P_k^\times(\cdot|s_t, a_t) - \mathbf{e}_{s_{t+1}})w_{k(t)} \mathbb{I}_{\{M \in \mathcal{M}_{k(t)}\}},$$

for all t , where $k(t)$ denotes the episode containing time step t . For any good episode k , we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{n}_k(\mathbf{P}_k^\times - \mathbf{I})w_k &= \sum_{t=t_k}^{t_{k+1}-1} (P_k^\times(\cdot|s_t, a_t) - \mathbf{e}_{s_t})w_k = \sum_{t=t_k}^{t_{k+1}-1} \left(P_k^\times(\cdot|s_t, a_t) - \mathbf{e}_{s_{t+1}} + \mathbf{e}_{s_{t+1}} - \mathbf{e}_{s_t} \right) w_k \\
&= \sum_{t=t_k}^{t_{k+1}-1} Z_t + w_k(s_{t_{k+1}}) - w_k(s_{t_k}) \leq \sum_{t=t_k}^{t_{k+1}-1} Z_t + D^\times,
\end{aligned}$$

where \mathbf{e}_i denotes a vector with the i -th element being 1 and the others being zero. Hence, $\sum_{k=1}^{m(T)} n_k(\mathbf{P}_k^\times - \mathbf{I})w_k \leq \sum_{t=1}^T Z_t + m(T)D^\times$. As established in (Jaksch et al., 2010), $|Z_t| \leq \|P_k^\times(\cdot|s_t, a_t) - \mathbf{e}_{s_{t+1}}\|_1 \|w_k(t)\|_\infty \leq D^\times$ and $\mathbb{E}[Z_t|s_1, a_1, \dots, s_t, a_t] = 0$, so that $(Z_t)_{t \geq 1}$ is martingale difference sequence. Therefore, by Corollary S1, we get:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\forall T : \sum_{t=1}^T Z_t \leq D^\times \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}(T+1) \log(\sqrt{T+1}/\delta)}\right) \geq 1 - \delta.$$

Putting together with the bound on $m(T)$ in Lemma 9 concludes the proof. \square

D.3.3 Proof of Lemma 6

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{n}_k(\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_k^\times - \mathbf{P}_k^\times)w_k &= \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} n_k(s, \pi_k(s)) \left(\tilde{P}_k^\times(s'|s, \pi_k(s)) - P^\times(s'|s, \pi_k(s)) \right) w_k(s') \\ &\leq \frac{D^\times}{2} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} n_k(s, \pi_k(s)) \left| \tilde{P}_k^\times(s'|s, \pi_k(s)) - P^\times(s'|s, \pi_k(s)) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Fix $s = (q, o)$. In view of the definition of \mathcal{P}^2 , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \left| \tilde{P}_k^\times(s'|s, \pi_k(s)) - P^\times(s'|s, \pi_k(s)) \right| &\leq \sum_{q', \sigma'} \hat{\tau}_t(q'|q, \sigma) \sqrt{\frac{2u_{o,a,o'}(1-u_{o,a,o'})}{N_k(o,a)}} \ell \\ &\quad + \sum_{q', \sigma'} u_{o,a,o'} \sqrt{\frac{2\lambda_{q,\sigma,q'}(1-\lambda_{q,\sigma,q'})}{N_k(q,\sigma)}} \ell \\ &\quad + \sum_{q', \sigma'} \left(\frac{\hat{\tau}_t(q'|q, \sigma) \ell}{3N_k(o,a)} + \frac{u_{o,a,o'} \ell}{3N_k(q,\sigma)} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

with $\sigma = L(o, a)$. Note that $\beta'_{N_k} = \mathcal{O}(\log(\log(T)/\delta))$. We use the short-hand ℓ to upper bound both $\beta'_{N_k(o,a)} \left(\frac{\delta}{4O^2A} \right)$ and $\beta'_{N_k(q,\sigma)} \left(\frac{\delta}{4Q^2E} \right)$.

To upper bound the first term in the right-hand side of (9), first observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{o'} \sqrt{u_{o,a,o'}(1-u_{o,a,o'})} &\leq \sum_{o'} \sqrt{\hat{P}_k(o'|o, a)(1-\hat{P}_k(o'|o, a))} + \sum_{o'} 3\sqrt{\frac{\ell}{N_k(o,a)}} \\ &\leq \sum_{o'} \sqrt{\hat{P}_k(o'|o, a)(1-\hat{P}_k(o'|o, a))} + 3O\sqrt{\frac{\ell}{N_k(o,a)}} \\ &\leq \sqrt{K_{o,a} - 1} + 3O\sqrt{\frac{\ell}{N_k(o,a)}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is due to Lemma 7, whereas the last uses the fact that for a distribution $p \in \Delta_{\mathcal{O}}$ with K non-zero elements, we have

$$\sum_{o \in \mathcal{O}} \sqrt{p(o)(1-p(o))} = \sum_{o:p(o)>0} \sqrt{p(o)(1-p(o))} \sqrt{\sum_{o:p(o)>0} p(o) \sum_{o:p(o)>0} (1-p(o))} = \sqrt{K-1}.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{q', \sigma'} \hat{\tau}_t(q'|q, \sigma) \sqrt{\frac{2u_{o,a,o'}(1-u_{o,a,o'})}{N_k(o,a)}} \ell &= \sum_{o'} \sqrt{\frac{2u_{o,a,o'}(1-u_{o,a,o'})}{N_k(o,a)}} \ell \sum_{q'} \hat{\tau}_t(q'|q, \sigma) \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{2K_{o,a}\ell}{N_k(o,a)}} + \frac{3O\ell}{N_k(o,a)}. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

We use a similar technique to bound the second term in (9):

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{q', o'} u_{o, a, o'} \sqrt{\frac{2\lambda_{q, \sigma, q'}(1 - \lambda_{q, \sigma, q'})}{N_k(q, \sigma)}} \ell &\leq \left(\sqrt{\frac{K_{q, \sigma} \ell}{N_k(q, \sigma)}} + \frac{3Q\ell}{N_k(q, \sigma)} \right) \sum_{o'} u_{o, a, o'} \\
&\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \left(\sqrt{\frac{2K_{q, \sigma} \ell}{N_k(q, \sigma)}} + \frac{3Q\ell}{N_k(q, \sigma)} \right) \left(1 + 2O\sqrt{\frac{\ell}{N_k(o, a)}} \right) \\
&\leq \sqrt{\frac{K_{q, \sigma} \ell}{N_k(q, \sigma)}} + \frac{3Q\ell}{N_k(q, \sigma)} + O\ell \sqrt{\frac{8Q}{N_k(o, a)N_k(q, \sigma)}} + \sqrt{\frac{\ell}{N_k(o, a)}} \frac{6OQ\ell}{N_k(q, \sigma)} \\
&\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \sqrt{\frac{2K_{q, \sigma} \ell}{N_k(q, \sigma)}} + \frac{3Q\ell}{N_k(q, \sigma)} + \frac{O\ell\sqrt{8Q}}{N_k(q, o, a)} + \frac{6OQ\ell^{3/2}}{N_k(o, a)^{3/2}}, \tag{11}
\end{aligned}$$

where (i) follows from the following inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{o'} u_{o, a, o'} &\leq \sum_{o'} \hat{P}_k(o'|o, a) + \sum_{o'} \sqrt{\frac{2u_{o, a, o'}(1 - u_{o, a, o'})}{N_k(o, a)}} \ell + \sum_{o'} \frac{\ell}{3N_k(o, a)} \\
&\leq 1 + O\sqrt{\frac{\ell}{2N_k(o, a)}} + \frac{O\ell}{3N_k(o, a)} \leq 1 + 2O\sqrt{\frac{\ell}{N_k(o, a)}},
\end{aligned}$$

and where (ii) uses that $N_k(q, \sigma) \geq N_k(q, o, o)$ and $N_k(o, a) \geq N_k(q, o, o)$.

Finally, the last term in (9) is bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{q', o'} \left(\frac{\hat{\tau}_t(q'|q, \sigma)\ell}{3N_k(o, a)} + \frac{u_{o, a, o'}\ell}{3N_k(q, \sigma)} \right) &\leq \frac{\ell}{3N_k(o, a)} \sum_{o', q'} \hat{\tau}_t(q'|q, \sigma) + \frac{\ell}{3N_k(q, \sigma)} \sum_{q', o'} u_{o, a, o'} \\
&\leq \frac{O\ell}{3N_k(o, a)} + \frac{QO\ell}{3N_k(q, \sigma)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Putting this together with (10) and (11) gives the desired bound:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{n}_k(\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_k^\times - \mathbf{P}_k^\times)w_k &\leq \frac{D^\times}{2} \sum_{q, o, a} n_k(q, o, a) \left(\sqrt{\frac{2K_{o, a} \ell}{N_k(o, a)}} \ell + \frac{3O\ell}{N_k(o, a)} + \frac{O\ell}{3N_k(o, a)} + \frac{QO\ell}{3N_k(q, \sigma)} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \sqrt{\frac{2K_{q, \sigma} \ell}{N_k(q, \sigma)}} \ell + \frac{3Q\ell}{N_k(q, \sigma)} + \frac{O\ell\sqrt{8Q}}{N_k(q, o, a)} + \frac{6OQ\ell^{3/2}}{N_k(o, a)^{3/2}} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{D^\times}{2} \left(\sum_{o, a} n_k(o, a) \sqrt{\frac{2K_{o, a} \ell}{N_k(o, a)}} + \sum_{q, \sigma} n_k(q, \sigma) \sqrt{\frac{2K_{q, \sigma} \ell}{N_k(q, \sigma)}} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 4O\ell \sum_{o, a} \frac{n_k(o, a)}{N_k(o, a)} + 4QO\ell \sum_{q, \sigma} \frac{n_k(q, \sigma)}{N_k(q, \sigma)} + O\ell\sqrt{8Q} \sum_{q, o, a} \frac{n_k(q, o, a)}{N_k(q, o, a)} + 6OQ\ell^{3/2} \sum_{o, a} \frac{n_k(o, a)}{N_k(o, a)^{3/2}} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

□

D.3.4 Auxiliary Lemmas

Lemma 7 ((Bourel et al., 2020, Lemma 11)) *Consider x and y satisfying $|x - y| \leq \sqrt{2y(1 - y)}\zeta + \zeta/3$. Then, $\sqrt{y(1 - y)} \leq \sqrt{x(1 - x)} + 2.4\sqrt{\zeta}$.*

Lemma 8 ((Jaksch et al., 2010, Lemma 19), (Talebi and Maillard, 2018, Lemma 24)) *Consider $(z_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ with $0 \leq z_k \leq Z_{k-1} := \max\{1, \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} z_i\}$. Then: (i) $\sum_{k=1}^n \frac{z_k}{\sqrt{Z_{k-1}}} \leq (\sqrt{2}+1)\sqrt{Z_n}$ and (ii) $\sum_{k=1}^n \frac{z_k}{Z_{k-1}} \leq 2 \log(Z_n) + 1$.*

The following lemma is a straightforward extension of (Jaksch et al., 2010, Proposition 18):

Lemma 9 *The number $m(T)$ of episodes up to time $T \geq OA$ satisfies $m(T) \leq OA \log_2 \left(\frac{8T}{OA} \right) + QE \log_2 \left(\frac{8T}{QE} \right)$.*

E Regret Analysis of Deterministic RMs

E.1 Proof of Theorem 3

Proof. We can use similar lines as in the proof of Theorem 1, with slight modifications to account for the fact that τ is a deterministic function, and is hence assumed known. In doing so, we obtain the following bound on the regret built during a good episode k :

$$\Delta_k \leq \mathbf{n}_k(\mathbf{P}_k^\times - \mathbf{I})w_k + \mathbf{n}_k(\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_k^\times - \mathbf{P}_k^\times)w_k + 2 \sum_{o,a} \frac{n_k(o,a)}{\sqrt{N_k(o,a)}}, \quad (12)$$

with w_k defined as follows:

$$w_k(s) := u_k^{(i)}(s) - \frac{1}{2} \left(\min_{s' \in \mathcal{B}_s \times \mathcal{O}} u_k^{(i)}(s') + \max_{s' \in \mathcal{B}_s \times \mathcal{O}} u_k^{(i)}(s') \right), \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}.$$

In the case of deterministic RM, we upper bound $\mathbf{n}_k(\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_k^\times - \mathbf{P}_k^\times)w_k$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{n}_k(\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_k^\times - \mathbf{P}_k^\times)w_k &= \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} n_k(s, \pi_k(s)) \left(\tilde{P}_k^\times(s'|s, \pi_k(s)) - P^\times(s'|s, \pi_k(s)) \right) w_k(s') \\ &= \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} n_k(s, \pi_k(s)) \sum_{o' \in \mathcal{O}} \sum_{q' \in \mathcal{Q}} \left(\tilde{P}_k(o'|o, \pi_k(s)) - P(o'|o, \pi_k(s)) \right) \mathbb{I}_{\{q' = \tau(q, L(o, \pi_k(s)))\}} w_k(q', o') \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} n_k(s, \pi_k(s)) \sum_{o' \in \mathcal{O}} \left| \tilde{P}_k(o'|o, \pi_k(s)) - P(o'|o, \pi_k(s)) \right| \\ &\quad \times \max_{s' \in \mathcal{B}_{q,o} \times \mathcal{O}} |w_k(q', o')| \underbrace{\sum_{q' \in \mathcal{Q}} \mathbb{I}_{\{q' = \tau(q, L(o, \pi_k(s)))\}}}_{=1} \\ &\leq \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} n_k(s, \pi_k(s)) \left\| (\tilde{P}_k - P)(\cdot | o, \pi_k(s)) \right\|_1 \cdot \max_{s' \in \mathcal{B}_{q,o} \times \mathcal{O}} |w_k(q', o')| \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \sum_{o \in \mathcal{O}} \sum_{q \in \mathcal{Q}} n_k(q, o, \pi_k(q, o)) \beta_{N_k(o, \pi_k(q, o))} \left(\frac{\delta}{OA} \right) \cdot D_{q,o} \\ &\leq \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{o \in \mathcal{O}} \sum_{q \in \mathcal{Q}} n_k(q, o, a) \cdot \beta_{N_k(o, a)} \left(\frac{\delta}{OA} \right) \cdot D_{q,o} \\ &\leq \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{o \in \mathcal{O}} \beta_{N_k(o, a)} \left(\frac{\delta}{OA} \right) \cdot \max_{q \in \mathcal{Q}} D_{q,o} \sum_{q \in \mathcal{Q}} n_k(q, o, a) \\ &\leq \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{o \in \mathcal{O}} \beta_{N_k(o, a)} \left(\frac{\delta}{OA} \right) \cdot \max_{q \in \mathcal{Q}} D_{q,o} \cdot n_k(o, a), \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where in (i) we used the definition of \mathcal{B}_s , and where (ii) follows from Lemma 10, which is stated and proven at the end of this subsection. Now, combining (13) with (12), summing over all good episodes, and applying

Lemma 5, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=1}^{m(T)} \Delta_k \mathbb{I}_{\{M^\times \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_k^{\times,1}\}} &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{m(T)} \mathbf{n}_k(\mathbf{P}_k^\times - \mathbf{I})w_k \mathbb{I}_{\{M^\times \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_k^{\times,1}\}} + \sum_{k=1}^{m(T)} \mathbf{n}_k(\widetilde{\mathbf{P}}_k^\times - \mathbf{P}_k^\times)w_k \mathbb{I}_{\{M^\times \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_k^{\times,1}\}} \\
&+ 2 \sum_{k=1}^{m(T)} \sum_{o,a} \frac{n_k(o,a)}{\sqrt{N_k(o,a)}} \\
&\leq 2\sqrt{O + \log(OA\sqrt{T+1}/\delta)} \sum_{k=1}^{m(T)} \sum_{o,a} \left(\max_{q \in \mathcal{Q}} D_{q,o} + 2 \right) \frac{n_k(o,a)}{\sqrt{N_k(o,a)}} \\
&+ D^\times \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}(T+1) \log(\sqrt{T+1}/\delta)} + D^\times OA \log(T),
\end{aligned}$$

holding with probability at least $1 - \delta$. Applying Lemma 8 and using Cauchy-Schwarz yield:

$$\sum_{k=1}^{m(T)} \sum_{o,a} \max_{q \in \mathcal{Q}} D_{q,o} \frac{n_k(o,a)}{\sqrt{N_k(o,a)}} \leq 3 \sum_{o,a} \max_{q \in \mathcal{Q}} D_{q,o} \sqrt{N_T(o,a)} \leq 3 \sqrt{\sum_{o,a} \max_{q \in \mathcal{Q}} D_{q,o}^2 \cdot \sum_{o,a} N_T(o,a)} = 3\sqrt{\mathbf{c}_M AT},$$

where, with a slight abuse of notation, we used $N_T(o,a)$ to denote the number of visits to (o,a) after T rounds. The rest of the proof follows algebraic manipulations similar to those in the proof of Theorem 1. \square

Lemma 10 For all $(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$, we have:

$$\max_{s' \in \mathcal{B}_s \times \mathcal{O}} |w_k(s')| \leq \frac{D_s}{2}, \quad \|w_k\|_\infty \leq \frac{D^\times}{2}.$$

Proof (of Lemma 10) The proof is quite similar to the one of Lemma 8 in (Bourel et al., 2020). We first show that for all $s_1, s_2 \in \mathcal{B}_s \times \mathcal{O}$, we have $u_k^{(i)}(s_1) - u_k^{(i)}(s_2) \leq D_s$, which further implies

$$\max_{x \in \mathcal{B}_s \times \mathcal{O}} |w_k(x)| \leq \frac{D_s}{2}.$$

To prove this, recall that similarly to (Jaksch et al., 2010), we can combine all cross-product MDPs in $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_k^{\times,1}$ to form a single MDP $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_k^\times$ with continuous action space \mathcal{A}' . In this extended MDP, in any $s = (q,o) \in \mathcal{S}$, and for each $a \in \mathcal{A}$, there is an action in \mathcal{A}' with mean $\mu(s,a)$ and transition probability $\widetilde{P}_k^\times(\cdot|s,a)$ (of the associated M^\times) belonging to the maintained confidence sets. Similarly to (Jaksch et al., 2010), we note that $u_k^{(i)}(s)$ amounts to the total expected i -step reward of an optimal non-stationary i -step policy starting in state s on the MDP $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_k^\times$ with the extended action set. The RM-restricted diameter of state s of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_k^\times$ is at most D_s , since by assumption k is a good episode and hence $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_k^{\times,1}$ contains the M^\times associated to the true MDPRM M , and therefore, the actions of the true MDPRM are contained in the continuous action set of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_k^\times$. Now, if there were states $s_1, s_2 \in \mathcal{B}_s \times \mathcal{O}$ with $u_k^{(i)}(s_1) - u_k^{(i)}(s_2) > D_s$, then an improved value for $u_k^{(i)}(s_1)$ could be achieved by the following non-stationary policy: First follow a policy that moves from s_1 to s_2 most quickly, which takes at most D_s steps on average. Then follow the optimal i -step policy for s_2 . We thus have $u_k^{(i)}(s_1) \geq u_k^{(i)}(s_2) - D_s$, since at most D_s of the i rewards of the policy for s_2 are missed. This is a contradiction, and so the claim follows. The second bound directly follows from the same arguments as in (Jaksch et al., 2010). \square

E.2 Proof of Theorem 4

Proof. We can use similar lines as in the proof of Theorem 2, with slight modifications to account for the fact that τ is a deterministic function, and is hence assumed known. In doing so, we obtain the following bound on the regret built during a good episode k :

$$\Delta_k \leq \mathbf{n}_k(\mathbf{P}_k^\times - \mathbf{I})w_k + \mathbf{n}_k(\widetilde{\mathbf{P}}_k^\times - \mathbf{P}_k^\times)w_k + 2 \sum_{o,a} \frac{n_k(o,a)}{\sqrt{N_k(o,a)}},$$

with w_k defined as follows:

$$w_k(s) := u_k^{(i)}(s) - \frac{1}{2} \left(\min_{s' \in \mathcal{B}_s \times \mathcal{O}} u_k^{(i)}(s') + \max_{s' \in \mathcal{B}_s \times \mathcal{O}} u_k^{(i)}(s') \right), \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}.$$

Here, we upper bound $\mathbf{n}_k(\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_k^\times - \mathbf{P}_k^\times)w_k$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{n}_k(\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_k^\times - \mathbf{P}_k^\times)w_k &= \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} n_k(s, \pi_k(s)) \left(\tilde{P}_k^\times(s'|s, \pi_k(s)) - P^\times(s'|s, \pi_k(s)) \right) w_k(s') \\ &= \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} n_k(s, \pi_k(s)) \sum_{o' \in \mathcal{O}} \sum_{q' \in \mathcal{Q}} \left(\tilde{P}_k(o'|o, \pi_k(s)) - P(o'|o, \pi_k(s)) \right) \mathbb{I}_{\{q'=\tau(q, L(o, \pi_k(s)))\}} w_k(q', o') \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} n_k(s, \pi_k(s)) \sum_{o' \in \mathcal{O}} \left| \tilde{P}_k(o'|o, \pi_k(s)) - P(o'|o, \pi_k(s)) \right| \\ &\quad \times \max_{s' \in \mathcal{B}_{q, o'} \times \mathcal{O}} |w_k(q', o')| \underbrace{\sum_{q' \in \mathcal{Q}} \mathbb{I}_{\{q'=\tau(q, L(o, \pi_k(s)))\}}}_{=1} \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \sum_{o \in \mathcal{O}} \sum_{q \in \mathcal{Q}} n_k(q, o, \pi_k(q, o)) D_{q, o} \sum_{o' \in \mathcal{O}} \left| \tilde{P}_k(o'|o, \pi_k(s)) - P(o'|o, \pi_k(s)) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{o \in \mathcal{O}} \sum_{q \in \mathcal{Q}} n_k(q, o, a) D_{q, o} \sum_{o' \in \mathcal{O}} \left| \tilde{P}_k(o'|o, a) - P(o'|o, a) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{o \in \mathcal{O}} \max_q D_{q, o} \sum_{o' \in \mathcal{O}} \left| \tilde{P}_k(o'|o, a) - P(o'|o, a) \right| \sum_{q \in \mathcal{Q}} n_k(q, o, a), \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where in (i) we used the definition of \mathcal{B}_s , and where (ii) follows from Lemma 10. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{o' \in \mathcal{O}} \left| \tilde{P}_k(o'|o, a) - P(o'|o, a) \right| &\leq \sum_{o' \in \mathcal{O}} \left| \tilde{P}_k(o'|o, a) - \hat{P}_k(o'|o, a) \right| + \sum_{o' \in \mathcal{O}} \left| \hat{P}_k(o'|o, a) - P(o'|o, a) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{o' \in \mathcal{O}} \sqrt{\frac{2\tilde{P}_k(o'|o, a)(1 - \tilde{P}_k(o'|o, a))}{N_k(o, a)}} \beta'_{N_k(o, a)} \left(\frac{\delta}{2O^2A} \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{o' \in \mathcal{O}} \sqrt{\frac{2P(o'|o, a)(1 - P(o'|o, a))}{N_k(o, a)}} \beta'_{N_k(o, a)} \left(\frac{\delta}{2O^2A} \right) + \frac{2}{3N_k(o, a)} \beta'_{N_k(o, a)} \left(\frac{\delta}{2O^2A} \right) \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \sqrt{\beta'_T \left(\frac{\delta}{2O^2A} \right)} \sum_{o' \in \mathcal{O}} \sqrt{\frac{2\hat{P}_k(o'|o, a)(1 - \hat{P}_k(o'|o, a))}{N_k(o, a)}} \\ &\quad + \sqrt{\beta'_T \left(\frac{\delta}{2O^2A} \right)} \sum_{o' \in \mathcal{O}} \sqrt{\frac{2P(o'|o, a)(1 - P(o'|o, a))}{N_k(o, a)}} + \frac{4}{N_k(o, a)} \beta'_T \left(\frac{\delta}{2O^2A} \right) \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \sqrt{8\beta'_T \left(\frac{\delta}{2O^2A} \right)} \frac{K_{o, a}}{N_k(o, a)} + \frac{4\beta'_T \left(\frac{\delta}{2O^2A} \right)}{N_k(o, a)}, \end{aligned}$$

where (i) follows from Lemma 7, and where (ii) uses the fact that for a distribution $p \in \Delta_{\mathcal{O}}$ with K non-zero elements, $\sum_{o \in \mathcal{O}} \sqrt{p(o)(1 - p(o))} \leq \sqrt{K - 1}$ —see Proof of Theorem 2 for details. Hence,

$$\mathbf{n}_k(\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_k^\times - \mathbf{P}_k^\times)w_k = \sqrt{8\beta'_T \left(\frac{\delta}{2O^2A} \right)} \sum_{o, a} n_k(o, a) \sqrt{\frac{K_{o, a}}{N_k(o, a)}} \max_q D_{q, o} + 4D^\times \beta'_T \left(\frac{\delta}{2O^2A} \right) \sum_{o, a} \frac{n_k(o, a)}{N_k(o, a)}.$$

The rest of the proof follows along the lines of the proof of Theorems 3 and 2. \square

F Regret Lower Bound

In this section, we prove Theorem 5. Our proof uses the machinery of establishing a minimax regret lower bound in Jaksch et al. (2010) for tabular MDPs. (We also refer to (Lattimore and Szepesvári, 2020, Chapter 38.7).) This machinery for tabular MDPs consists in crafting a worst-case MDP and showing that the regret under any algorithm on the MDP is lower bounded. We take a similar approach here but stress that constructing a worst-case MDPRM entails constructing a worst-case reward machine and a labeled MDP simultaneously. In terms of notations and presentation, we closely follow (Lattimore and Szepesvári, 2020, Chapter 38.7).




Figure 4: Construction of the underlying labeled MDP for the LB with $A = 2$ and $O = 8$, based on the worst-case MDP in (Lattimore and Szepesvári, 2020, Chapter 38.7).




Figure 5: Construction of the underlying RM for the lower bound with a double-cyclic a ‘good’ cycle giving rewards and ‘bad’ cycle of similar length giving no reward.

Proof (of Theorem 5). To prove the theorem, we construct a worst-case MDPRM, which can be seen as an MDPRM that models a bandit problem with approximately OA arms, such that obtaining the reward requires to pick the ‘good arm’ Q times. Figures 5 and 4 show the construction, given O and A : We build a tree of minimum depth with at most A children for each node using exactly $O - 2$ observations. The root of the tree is denoted o_0 and transitions within the tree are deterministic. So, in a node of the tree the agent can simply select the child to transition to. Let L be the number of leaves, and let us index observations as

o_1, o_2, \dots, o_L . The last two observations are o_A and o_B where events are given as detailed later. Then, for each $i \in [L]$ the agent can choose any action $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and transitions to either o_A or o_B according to:

$$P(o_A|o_i, a) = \frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon(a, i) \quad \text{and} \quad P(o_B|o_i, a) = \frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon(a, i),$$

where $\varepsilon(a, i) = 0$ for all (a, i) pairs except for one particular pair, for which $\varepsilon(a, i) = \Delta > 0$. (Δ will be chosen later in the proof.) The transition probabilities at o_A and o_B under any $a \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfy:

$$P(o|o, a) = 1 - \delta, \quad P(o_0|o, a) = \delta, \quad o \in \{o_A, o_B\}.$$

Let us choose $\delta = \frac{6Q}{D^\times}$. Note that by the assumptions of the theorem, $\delta \in (0, 1]$. Furthermore, this choice ensures that the diameter of the cross-product MDP associate to the described MDPRM is at most D^\times , regardless of the value of Δ . Also, for the diameter of the labeled MDP, D , we will have $D = \frac{4}{\delta}$.

The labeling function is defined as follows. Since we assume $\Sigma \geq 4$, we can consider three events $\sigma_A, \sigma_B, \sigma_{A \cap B}$ and define labeling function as follows: For all action $a \in \mathcal{A}$,

$$L(o_A, a, o_0) = \sigma_A, \quad L(o_A, a, o_A) = \sigma_{A \cap B}, \quad L(o_B, a, o_0) = \sigma_B, \quad L(o_B, a, o_B) = \sigma_{A \cap B}.$$

To build the RM, we let $N = \lceil (Q-1)/2 \rceil$ and $N' = \lfloor (Q-1)/2 \rfloor$ so that $N + N' = Q - 1$. The idea is to arrange the Q many nodes of the RM into 2 cycles of lengths N and N' ; see Figure 4. To this effect, we let q_0 be the origin. Then, the set $\{q_i\}_{i=0}^N$ of RM states defines the ‘good’ cycle, whereas the set $\{q'_j\}_{j=1}^{N'} \cup \{q_0\}$ define the ‘bad’ cycle. Then, we build the RM transition function τ and reward function ν , for all $i \in [N]$ and all $j \in [N']$:

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(q_0, \sigma_A) &= q_1, & \nu(q_0, \sigma_A) &= 1, \\ \tau(q_0, \sigma_B) &= q'_1, & \nu(q_0, \sigma_B) &= 0, \\ \tau(q_i, \sigma_A) &= q_{i+1}, & \nu(q_i, \sigma_A) &= 1, \\ \tau(q_i, \sigma_B) &= q_{i+1}, & \nu(q_i, \sigma_B) &= 1, \\ \tau(q_i, \sigma_{A \cap B}) &= q_i, & \nu(q_i, \sigma_{A \cap B}) &= 1, \\ \tau(q_N, \sigma_A) &= q_0, & \nu(q_N, \sigma_A) &= 1, \\ \tau(q_N, \sigma_B) &= q_0, & \nu(q_N, \sigma_B) &= 1, \\ \tau(q_N, \sigma_{A \cap B}) &= q_N, & \nu(q_N, \sigma_{A \cap B}) &= 1, \\ \tau(q'_j, \sigma_A) &= q'_{j+1}, & \nu(q'_j, \sigma_A) &= 0, \\ \tau(q'_j, \sigma_B) &= q'_{j+1}, & \nu(q'_j, \sigma_B) &= 0, \\ \tau(q'_{N'}, \sigma_A) &= q_0, & \nu(q'_{N'}, \sigma_A) &= 0, \\ \tau(q'_{N'}, \sigma_B) &= q_0, & \nu(q'_{N'}, \sigma_B) &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where all non-specified transitions imply no change of state, and where all non-specified rewards are zero. This means that in q_0 , the agent needs to realize the event σ_A to initiate a rotation of the ‘good’ cycle, where in all states the agent will get a reward when staying in either o_A or o_B and progresses one step forward in the cycle when leaving one of both RM-states. On the other hand, if the agent is in q_0 , she receives the event σ_B and then initiates a rotation of the ‘bad’ cycle, without any reward but similar length and transitions as for the ‘good’ cycle.

In summary, each time the agent arrives in $s_0 = (o_0, q_0)$, she selects which leaf to visit and then chooses an action from that leaf. This corresponds to choosing one of $k = LA = \Omega(OA)$ meta actions. The optimal policy is to select the meta action with the largest probability of transitioning to the observation o_A . The choice of δ ensures that the agent expects to stay at state o_A or o_B for approximately D rounds. Since all choices are equivalent when $q \neq q_0$, the agent expects to make about $\frac{2T}{DQ}$ decisions and the rewards are roughly in $[0, \frac{DQ}{8}]$, or $3DQ = 2D^\times$, so we should expect the regret to be $\Omega(D^\times \sqrt{kT/D^\times}) = \Omega(\sqrt{TD^\times OA})$.

Characterization of the MDPRM. Using the introduced notations, we introduce: $\mathcal{L} := \{(q_0, o, a) : a \in \mathcal{A} \text{ and } o \text{ is a leaf of the tree}\}$ and $\mathcal{L}^M := \{(o, a) : a \in \mathcal{A} \text{ and } o \text{ is a leaf of the tree}\}$. By definition, both have k elements. Then, let M_0 be the MDPRM with $\varepsilon(o, a) = 0$ for all pairs in \mathcal{L}^M . Then let M_j be the MDPRM with $\varepsilon(o, a) = \Delta$ for the j -th observation-action pair in the set \mathcal{L}^M . Similarly to (Lattimore and Szepesvári, 2020), we define the stopping time T_{stop} as the first time when the number of visits of (q_0, s_0) is at least $T/D^\times - 1$, or T if the state (q_0, s_0) is not visited enough:

$$T_{\text{stop}} = \min \left\{ T, \min \left\{ t : \sum_{t'=1}^t \mathbb{1}_{\{s_{t'}=(q_0, o_0)\}} \geq \frac{T}{D^\times} - 1 \right\} \right\}.$$

Also, let T_j be the number of visits to the j -th triplet of \mathcal{L} until T_{stop} and $T_{\text{tot}} = \sum_{j=1}^k T_j$. We also let $P_j, 0 \leq j \leq k$ denote the probability distribution of T_1, \dots, T_k induced by the interaction of π and M_j and let $\mathbb{E}_j[\cdot]$ be the expectation with respect to P_j .

Now, we study the characteristics of the MDPRM. In doing so, we first build upon (Lattimore and Szepesvári, 2020, Claim 38.9) that establishes that the diameter of the underlying MDP of M_j , denoted by $D(M_j)$, is bounded by D for all $j \in [k]$. Then, we have for $D^\times(M_j)$ cross-product diameter of the MDPRM M_j :

$$D^\times(M_j) \leq DN + DN \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} + DN' \leq \frac{3}{2}QD = D^\times.$$

The first inequality can be interpreted as the fact that the cross-product diameter is smaller than completing the 2 loops of the RM plus accounting the probability to have a transition to the “wrong” loop when in q_0 . The rest follows by construction and we note that we can ignore Δ due to the fact that it can only reduce the diameters.

Following the same arguments as in Claim 38.10 of (Lattimore and Szepesvári, 2020), there exist universal constants $0 < c_1 < c_2 < \infty$ such that $D^\times \mathbb{E}_0[T_{\text{tot}}]/T \in [c_1, c_2]$. By construction, we have

$$\frac{D^\times \mathbb{E}_0[T_{\text{tot}}]}{T} \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[T_{\text{tot}}]}{OA} \leq \frac{T}{DN'OA} \leq c_2, \quad \frac{D^\times \mathbb{E}[T_{\text{tot}}]}{T} \geq \frac{\mathbb{E}_0[T_{\text{tot}}]}{OA} \geq \frac{T}{DNOA} \geq c_1.$$

Finally, we write $\mathbb{E}[\mathfrak{R}_j(T)]$ the expected regret of policy π in the MDPRM M_j over T steps and prove that there exists a universal constant $c_3 > 0$ such that:

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathfrak{R}_j(T)] \geq c_3 \Delta D^\times \mathbb{E}[T_{\text{tot}} - T_j].$$

To prove this result, we first write the definition of the expected regret:

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathfrak{R}_j(T)] = \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_j^*[r_t] - \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_j[r_t],$$

where \mathbb{E}_j^* is the expectation in MDPRM M_j when following the optimal policy, which means always choosing the j -th element of \mathcal{L} when in (q_0, o_0) . Now, we can decompose the cumulative reward by “episodes”, where a new episode starts whenever reaching (q_0, o_0) . By construction and using our knowledge of the optimal policy, this yields:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathfrak{R}_j(T)] &\geq \mathbb{E}_j[T_{\text{tot}}] \left(\frac{1}{2} + \Delta \right) \frac{DN}{4} - \mathbb{E}[T_{\text{tot}} - T_j] \frac{DN}{8} - \mathbb{E}_j[T_j] \left(\frac{1}{2} + \Delta \right) \frac{DN}{4} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_j[T_{\text{tot}} - T_j] \Delta \frac{DN}{4}, \end{aligned}$$

or by definition of D and N there exists a universal constant $c_3 > 0$ such that $c_3 D^\times \geq \frac{DN}{4}$, which allows us to conclude.

The Final Lower Bound. Let $D(P, Q)$ denote the Kullback-Leibler divergence between two probability distributions P and Q . Similarly to (Lattimore and Szepesvári, 2020, Chapter 38.7) and (Jaksch et al., 2010) (as well as lower bound proofs for bandit problems), we have $D(P_0, P_j) = \mathbb{E}_0[T_j]d(1/2, 1/2 + \Delta)$, where $d(p, q)$ is the relative entropy between Bernoulli distributions with respective means p and q . Now the conclusion of the proof is exactly the same as for MDPs (Jaksch et al., 2010): We assume that the chosen Δ will satisfy $\Delta \leq 1/4$, then using the entropy inequalities from (Lattimore and Szepesvári, 2020, Equation 14.16), we have:

$$D(P_0, P_j) \leq 4\Delta^2 \mathbb{E}_0[T_j].$$

Then following the same steps as in (Lattimore and Szepesvári, 2020, Chapter 38.7) and using Pinsker's inequality, and using the fact that $0 \leq T_{\text{tot}} - T_j \leq T_{\text{tot}} \leq T/D^\times$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_j[T_{\text{tot}} - T_j] \geq \mathbb{E}[T_{\text{tot}} - T_j] - \frac{T}{D^\times} \sqrt{\frac{D(P_0, P_j)}{2}} \geq \mathbb{E}_0[T_{\text{tot}} - T_j] - \frac{T\Delta}{D^\times} \sqrt{2\mathbb{E}_0[T_j]}.$$

Summing over j and applying Cauchy-Schwarz give us

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbb{E}_j[T_{\text{tot}} - T_j] &\geq \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbb{E}_0[T_{\text{tot}} - T_j] - \frac{T\Delta}{D^\times} \sum_{j=1}^k \sqrt{2\mathbb{E}_0[T_j]} \\ &\geq (k-1)\mathbb{E}_0[T_{\text{tot}}] - \frac{T\Delta}{D^\times} \sqrt{2k\mathbb{E}_0[T_{\text{tot}}]} \\ &\geq \frac{c_1 T(k-1)}{D^\times} - \frac{T\Delta}{D^\times} \sqrt{\frac{2c_2 T k}{D^\times}}. \end{aligned}$$

Now choosing $\Delta = \frac{c_1(k-1)}{2} \sqrt{\frac{D^\times}{2c_2 T k}}$ yields

$$\sum_{j=1}^k \mathbb{E}_j[T_{\text{tot}} - T_j] \geq \frac{c_1 T(k-1)}{2kD^\times}.$$

This implies that there exists j such that $\mathbb{E}_j[T_{\text{tot}} - T_j] \geq \frac{c_1 T(k-1)}{2kD^\times}$, which leads to the final result using the previous lower bound on the regret

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathfrak{R}_j(T)] \geq c_3 D^\times \Delta \mathbb{E}_j[T_{\text{tot}} - T_j] \geq \frac{c_1^2 c_3 T(k-1)^2}{4k} \sqrt{\frac{D^\times}{2c_2 T k}} = c_0 \sqrt{D^\times OAT},$$

with $c_0 > 0$ being a universal constant. \square

G Useful Concentration Inequalities

In this subsection, we collect a few useful concentration inequalities. They can be found in, e.g., (Maillard, 2019; Lattimore and Szepesvári, 2020; Dann et al., 2017; Bourel et al., 2020). We begin with the following definition:

Definition 3 A sequence $(Y_t)_t$ has conditionally σ -sub-Gaussian noise if

$$\forall t, \forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \log \mathbb{E}[\exp(\lambda(Y_t - \mathbb{E}[Y_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]))] | \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \leq \frac{\lambda^2 \sigma^2}{2},$$

where \mathcal{F}_{t-1} denotes the σ -algebra generated by Y_1, \dots, Y_{t-1} .

Lemma 11 (Time-Uniform Laplace Concentration for Sub-Gaussian Distributions) Let Y_1, \dots, Y_n be a sequence of n i.i.d. real-valued random variables with mean μ , such that $Y_n - \mu$ is σ -sub-Gaussian. Let $\hat{\mu}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=1}^n Y_s$ be the empirical mean estimate. Then, for all $\delta \in (0, 1)$, it holds

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\exists n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad |\hat{\mu}_n - \mu| \geq \sigma \sqrt{\frac{2}{n} \left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right) \ln(\sqrt{n+1}/\delta)}\right) \leq \delta.$$

The ‘‘Laplace’’ method refers to using the Laplace method of integration for optimization. We recall that random variables bounded in $[0, 1]$ are $\frac{1}{2}$ -sub-Gaussian. The following corollary is an immediate consequence of Lemma 11:

Corollary 1 (Time-Uniform Azuma-Hoeffding Concentration using Laplace) *Let $(X_t)_{t \geq 1}$ be a martingale difference sequence such that for all t , $X_t \in [a, b]$ almost surely for some $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, for all $\delta \in (0, 1)$, it holds*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\exists T \in \mathbb{N} : \sum_{t=1}^T X_t \geq (b-a)\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}(T+1)\log(\sqrt{T+1}/\delta)}\right) \leq \delta.$$

Lemma 11 can be used to provide a time-uniform variant of Weissman’s concentration inequality (Weissman et al., 2003) using the method of mixture (a.k.a. the Laplace method):

Lemma 12 (Time-Uniform L1-Deviation Bound for Categorical Distributions Using Laplace) *Consider a finite alphabet \mathcal{X} and let P be a probability distribution over \mathcal{X} . Let $(X_t)_{t \geq 1}$ be a sequence of i.i.d. random variables distributed according to P , and let $\hat{P}_n(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i=x\}}$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Then, for all $\delta \in (0, 1)$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\exists n \in \mathbb{N} : \|P - \hat{P}_n\|_1 \geq \sqrt{\frac{2}{n}\left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right)\log\left(\sqrt{n+1}\frac{2^{|\mathcal{X}|-2}}{\delta}\right)}\right) \leq \delta.$$

The following lemma provides a time-uniform Bernstein-type concentration inequality for bounded random variables:

Lemma 13 (Time-Uniform Bernstein for Bounded Random Variables Using Peeling) *Let $Z = (Z_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of random variables generated by a predictable process, and $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_t$ be its natural filtration. Assume for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$, $|Z_t| \leq b$ and $\mathbb{E}[Z_t^2 | \mathcal{F}_{s-1}] \leq v$ for some positive numbers v and b . Let n be an integer-valued (and possibly unbounded) random variable that is \mathcal{F} -measurable. Then, for all $\delta \in (0, 1)$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\exists n \in \mathbb{N}, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n Z_t \geq \sqrt{\frac{2\ell_n(\delta)v}{n}} + \frac{\ell_n(\delta)b}{3n}\right) &\leq \delta, \\ \mathbb{P}\left(\exists n \in \mathbb{N}, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n Z_t \leq -\sqrt{\frac{2\ell_n(\delta)v}{n}} - \frac{\ell_n(\delta)b}{3n}\right) &\leq \delta, \end{aligned}$$

where $\ell_n(\delta) := \eta \log\left(\frac{\log(n)\log(\eta n)}{\delta \log^2(\eta)}\right)$, with $\eta > 1$ being an arbitrary parameter.

Lemma 13 is derived from Lemma 2.4 in (Maillard, 2019). We note that any $\eta > 1$ is valid here, but numerically optimizing the bound shows that $\eta = 1.12$ seems to be a good choice and yields a small bound. For example, when $(X_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. Bernoulli random variables with mean μ , we have, for all $\delta \in (0, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\exists n \in \mathbb{N}, \mu - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n X_t \geq \sqrt{\frac{2\ell_n(\delta)\mu(1-\mu)}{n}} + \frac{\ell_n(\delta)}{3n}\right) &\leq \delta, \\ \mathbb{P}\left(\exists n \in \mathbb{N}, \mu - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n X_t \leq -\sqrt{\frac{2\ell_n(\delta)\mu(1-\mu)}{n}} - \frac{\ell_n(\delta)}{3n}\right) &\leq \delta, \end{aligned}$$