

Can Large Language Models Play Games? A Case Study of A Self-Play Approach

Hongyi Guo* Zhihan Liu† Yufeng Zhang‡ Zhaoran Wang§

March 12, 2024

Abstract

Large Language Models (LLMs) harness extensive data from the Internet, storing a broad spectrum of prior knowledge. While LLMs have proven beneficial as decision-making aids, their reliability is hampered by limitations in reasoning, hallucination phenomenon, and so on. On the other hand, Monte-Carlo Tree Search (MCTS) is a heuristic search algorithm that provides reliable decision-making solutions, achieved through recursive rollouts and self-play. However, the effectiveness of MCTS relies heavily on heuristic pruning and external value functions, particularly in complex decision scenarios. This work introduces an innovative approach that bolsters LLMs with MCTS self-play to efficiently resolve deterministic turn-based zero-sum games (DTZG), such as chess and go, without the need for additional training. Specifically, we utilize LLMs as both action pruners and proxies for value functions without the need for additional training. We theoretically prove that the suboptimality of the estimated value in our proposed method scales with $\tilde{O}\left(\frac{|\tilde{\mathcal{A}}|}{\sqrt{N}} + \epsilon_{\text{pruner}} + \epsilon_{\text{critic}}\right)$, where N is the number of simulations, $|\tilde{\mathcal{A}}|$ is the cardinality of the pruned action space by LLM, and ϵ_{pruner} and ϵ_{critic} quantify the errors incurred by adopting LLMs as action space pruner and value function proxy, respectively. Our experiments in chess and go demonstrate the capability of our method to address challenges beyond the scope of MCTS and improve the performance of the directly application of LLMs.

*Northwestern University. hongyiguo2025@u.northwestern.edu.

†Northwestern University. zhihanliu2027@u.northwestern.edu.

‡ByteDance Inc. yufengzhang.ai@gmail.com.

§Northwestern University. zhaoranwang@gmail.com.

1 Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs) like GPT-4 (Achiam et al., 2023) have revolutionized the way we interact with artificial intelligence by utilizing massive datasets sourced from the internet. These models store a vast repository of knowledge covering a wide array of subjects, making them invaluable tools for aiding users in various decision-making scenarios. Unlike traditional algorithms, LLMs can process and interpret complex data, providing nuanced insights and solutions for decision making. Nonetheless, the reliability of LLMs is compromised by issues such as limited reasoning capacity (Huang and Chang, 2022; Berglund et al., 2023), tendency to produce incorrect or “hallucinated” information (Huang et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2023), etc. Consequently, the development of a dependable LLM-based agent remains a significant and ongoing challenge in the field. We consider turn-based zero-sum games as our testbed due to its inherent complexity which surpasses conventional single-LLM-agent testing environments such as Shridhar et al. (2020); Yao et al. (2023), and also because the evaluation in games is clear and straightforward.

Monte-Carlo Tree Search (MCTS) (Kocsis and Szepesvári, 2006; Coulom, 2006) is a pivotal decision-making algorithm commonly used in game theory and artificial intelligence. It is particularly noted for its application in board games like chess and Go. MCTS operates by systematically exploring potential moves in a game tree through recursive rolling out and self-play, employing a blend of deterministic and probabilistic methods. Despite its effectiveness, MCTS faces limitations due to its dependency on heuristic pruning strategies (Champanand, 2014; Schaeffer, 1989) and external value functions (Baier and Winands, 2012). These dependencies may restrict MCTS’s efficiency, particularly in intricate decision-making contexts.

In this study, we explore the integration of LLMs with MCTS self-play, utilizing LLMs to enhance the MCTS framework in two key ways. Firstly, LLMs serve as action pruners, accelerating the self-play process by reducing the number of possible rollouts. Secondly, they function as proxies for value functions, which becomes crucial in evaluating potential outcomes when the rollouts reach their maximum depth. This hybrid approach combines the advantages of both LLMs and MCTS. By incorporating LLMs, we significantly increase the efficiency of MCTS self-play, effectively reducing the width and depth of the search tree. Moreover, this method bolsters the performance of LLMs by leveraging MCTS’s strategic planning capabilities, which helps in selecting the most effective solution from the options proposed by the LLMs.

Recently, researchers at DeepMind trained a 270M parameter transformer model using supervised learning on a dataset comprising 10 million chess games annotated with a professional chess engine. The resulting Language Learning Model (LLM) achieved grandmaster-level performance without

employing any searching techniques (Ruoss et al., 2024). Our work diverges in an orthogonal direction. We aim to construct a decision-making agent using readily available LLM products such as `gpt-4` and `gpt-3.5-turbo-instruct` supplemented with searching methodologies to enhance performance. Our approach is applicable to a wide array of decision-making problems necessitating prior knowledge and seamlessly transfers to other tasks without the need for additional training efforts.

We conduct a detailed theoretical analysis of our algorithm, focusing on the suboptimality of the estimated value. The suboptimality is decomposed into two main components: the discrepancy between our value function and the optimal value function within the context of the pruned action space, and the gap between the optimal value function with respect to the pruned action space and the full action space. We prove that the suboptimality of the estimated value in our proposed method scales with $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(\frac{|\tilde{\mathcal{A}}|}{\sqrt{N}} + \epsilon_{\text{pruner}} + \epsilon_{\text{critic}}\right)$, where N is the number of simulations, $|\tilde{\mathcal{A}}|$ is the cardinality of the pruned action space by LLMs, and ϵ_{pruner} and ϵ_{critic} quantify the errors incurred by adopting LLMs as action space pruner and value function proxy, respectively. This formula highlights the impact of the number of simulations and using LLMs as pruner and critic on the precision of our value estimation.

Our experiments on this proposed method produce encouraging outcomes. We conduct experiments across three scenarios: (1) *Chess puzzle*: figuring out a mating sequence of varying lengths; (2) *MiniGo*: playing Go game on a reduced 5×5 board; (3) *Chess*: playing as the white player with the initiative in a standard chess game. In all three settings, our method outperforms the standalone use of LLMs and traditional MCTS self-play, showcasing a superior capability to tackle these challenges. These results indicate that the integration of LLMs with MCTS could mark a considerable advancement in artificial intelligence research, especially in fields that require strategic decision-making and game theory insights.

In summary, our contributions are threefold:

1. We provide a novel approach that synergizes LLM and MCTS self-play in turn-based zero-sum games. In this methodology, LLMs are utilized both as action pruners and value function proxies, enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of both LLMs and MCTS.
2. We give a theoretical analysis of our algorithm and provide a sublinear suboptimality rate guarantee up to errors incurred by pruning the action space via LLMs and using LLMs as critic.
3. We validate our approach through experiments in three different contexts: chess puzzles, MiniGo, and standard chess games. These experiments reveal that our method surpasses the

performance of both standalone LLMs and conventional MCTS in solving these problems, indicating its superior problem-solving capabilities.

2 Related Work

LLM Agent Recently, through the acquisition of vast amounts of web knowledge, large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated remarkable potential in achieving human-level intelligence. This has sparked an upsurge in studies investigating LLM-based autonomous agents. Recent work like ToT (Yao et al., 2023), RAP (Hao et al., 2023), and RAFA (Liu et al., 2023) aim to augment the reasoning capabilities of LLMs by utilizing tree-search algorithms to guide multi-step reasoning. TS-LLM (Feng et al., 2023b) illustrates how tree-search with a learned value function can guide LLMs’ decoding ability.

The LLM Agents for games are of our particular interest. Akata et al. (2023); Mao et al. (2023) evaluate how LLMs solve different game theory problems. ChessGPT (Feng et al., 2023a) collects large-scale game and language dataset related to chess. Leveraging the dataset, they develop a gpt models specifically for chess, integrating policy learning and language modeling. Recently, DeepMind trains a 270M parameter transformer model with supervised learning on a dataset of 10 million chess games annotated by Stockfish 16 engine. The trained LLM achieves grand-master level performance (Ruoss et al., 2024).

Monte-Carlo Tree Search (MCTS) Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS) is a decision-making algorithm that consists in searching combinatorial spaces represented by trees. MCTS has been originally proposed in the work by Kocsis and Szepesvári (2006) and Coulom (2006), as an algorithm for making computer players in Go. We survey the works related to action reduction and UCT (Upper Confidence Bounds for Tree) alternatives.

In the expansion phase, the MCTS algorithm adds new nodes into the tree for states resulting after performing an action in the game. For many problems, the number of possible actions can be too high. To address this problem, heuristic move pruning strategy can be applied to reduce the action space, such as alpha-beta pruning (Schaeffer, 1989) and its variants (Pearl, 1980; Kishimoto and Schaeffer, 2002). Another basic techniques of heuristic action reduction is Beam Search (Lowerre and Reddy, 1976). It determines the most promising states using an estimated heuristic. These states are then considered in a further expansion phase, whereas the other ones get permanently pruned. BMCTS (Baier and Winands, 2012) combines Beam Search with MCTS. Other variants can be found in Pepels and Winands (2012); Soemers et al. (2016); Zhou et al. (2018). Game specified

heuristic pruning is also common in the literature for Lords of War (Sephton et al., 2014), Starcraft (Churchill and Buro, 2013; Justesen et al., 2014), etc.

Following the insights from stochastic multi-arm bandit (MAB) literature (Agrawal, 1995; Auer et al., 2002), the Upper Confidence Bound for Trees (UCT) in prior works utilizes logarithmic bonus term for balancing exploration and exploitation within the tree-based search. In effect, such an approach assumes that the regret of the underlying recursively dependent non-stationary MABs concentrates around their mean exponentially in the number of steps, which is unlikely to hold as pointed out in (Audibert et al., 2009), even for stationary MABs. This gap is filled by (Shah et al., 2020) which establishes that the MCTS with appropriate polynomial rather than logarithmic bonus term in UCB provides an approximate value function for a given state with enough simulations. This coincides with the empirically successful AlphaGo (Silver et al., 2017) that also utilizes a polynomial form of UCB.

3 Preliminary

3.1 Deterministic Turn-based Zero-Sum Two-Player Game (DTZG).

We consider a deterministic turn-based zero-sum two-player game (DTZG), denoted as a tuple $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, R, \gamma)$, a tuple consist of state space \mathcal{S} , action space \mathcal{A} , reward function R , and a discount factor γ . We assume the action space is finite and consider the reward function to be stochastic for generality. Two players, a max player and a min player take turns to act. Without loss of generality, we assume the player who takes the initiative is the max player. We use a and b to denote the action of the max player and the min player, and denote their policy as $\mu : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$ and $\nu : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$, respectively, where $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ denote the set of distributions on any set \mathcal{X} . We define the state as the concatenation of the action sequence by both players from the beginning of the game such that

$$s_h = a_0 \circ b_0 \circ a_1 \circ b_1 \circ \dots \circ a_{h-1} \circ b_{h-1}. \quad (3.1)$$

Suppose the current state is s and it's the max player's turn. The max player takes an action $a \sim \mu(s)$ and receives a reward $R(s, a)$. By our notation in (3.1), the next state is the concatenation of the current state and the action made by the max player, i.e., $s' = s \circ a$. The min player then takes an action $b \sim \nu(s')$ and receives a reward $R(s', b)$. We denote by

$$r(s, a, b) = R(s, a) + R(s \circ a, b) \quad (3.2)$$

the total reward of the max player and the min player after they both take an action. Then, the goal of the max (min) player is to maximize (minimize) the following accumulated reward,

$$V^{\mu,\nu}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\mu,\nu} \left[\sum_{h=0}^{\infty} \gamma^h r(s_h, a_h, b_h) \mid s_0 = s \right], \quad (3.3)$$

where $\gamma \in [0, 1)$ is the discount factor.

The Nash equilibrium policy (μ^*, ν^*) in the DTZG satisfies $V^{\mu^*, \nu^*}(s) = \max_{\mu} \min_{\nu} V^{\mu, \nu}(s) = \min_{\mu} \max_{\nu} V^{\mu, \nu}(s)$. Since min max is a contraction operator and $\gamma \in [0, 1)$, we know there exists an optimal value function V^* for the following minimax optimal Bellman equation

$$V^*(s) = \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \min_{b \in \mathcal{A}} \left(\mathbb{E}[r(s, a, b)] + \gamma \cdot V^*(s \circ a \circ b) \right). \quad (3.4)$$

We introduce the concept of *half-step* to handle the status where the max player has made a move but the min player has not. For any step $h \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote

$$s_{h+1/2} = s_h \circ a_h, \quad a_{h+1/2} = b_h.$$

With the concept of half-step, we define $V_{1/2}^*$ by

$$V_{1/2}^*(s) = \min_{b \in \mathcal{A}} \left(\mathbb{E}[R(s, b)] + \gamma \cdot V^*(s \circ b) \right). \quad (3.5)$$

Combining (3.2), (3.4) and (3.5), we further define

$$V_0^*(s) := V^*(s) = \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left(\mathbb{E}[R(s, a)] + V_{1/2}^*(s \circ a) \right). \quad (3.6)$$

Hence, by (3.5) and (3.6), we show that any DTZG can be reduced to a composition of two single-agent MDPs, which enables us to design the corresponding Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS) algorithms for DTZG.

3.2 Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS)

Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS) is a heuristic search algorithm for decision processes. The aforementioned DTZG forms a game tree. MCTS expands the search tree based on random sampling in the game tree. The application of MCTS in games is based on self-play and rollouts. In each rollout, the game is played out to the end by selecting moves at random. The final game result of each rollout is then used to weight the nodes in the game tree so that better nodes are more likely

to be chosen in future rollouts. Each round of MCTS consists of four steps:

(1) *Selection*: Start from the root node and select successive child nodes until a leaf node is reached.

(2) *Expansion*: Unless the game is done, create child nodes and choose from one of them. Child nodes are valid moves from the game position.

(3) *Rollout*: Complete one random rollout from the child node by choosing random moves until the game is decided.

(4) *Back-propagation*: Use the result of the rollout to update information in the nodes on the path from s_0 to s_h .

The main difficulty in selecting child nodes is maintaining a balance between the exploitation of nodes with high value and the exploration of moves with few simulations. Following the insights from stochastic multi-arm bandit (MAB) literature, the Upper Confidence Bound for Trees (UCT) in prior works adds a logarithmic bonus term such as $c\sqrt{\frac{\log N(s)}{N(s,a)}}$ to the value term and selects the node with the highest value to expand. However, it’s established in [Shah et al. \(2020\)](#) that the MCTS with appropriate polynomial rather than logarithmic bonus term in UCB provides an approximate value function for a given state with enough simulations. This coincides with the empirically successful AlphaGo ([Silver et al., 2017](#)) that also utilizes a polynomial form of UCB.

4 Algorithm

Starting from the initial state s_0 , our algorithm evaluates the value of s_0 by executing N simulations using MCTS with self-play, wherein the LLM functions both as an action pruner and a proxy for the value function. This approach is detailed in Algorithm 1. The algorithm unfolds in two primary stages: the rollout phase, where simulations are conducted to explore possible outcomes, and the backward update phase, where the rewards gained are retroactively applied to update the values of preceding nodes in the search tree.

Rollout. The rollout phase (line 3-13) in our algorithm combines the *selection*, *expansion* and *rollout* steps that form the core of the traditional Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS) algorithm introduced in Section 3.2. In this phase, we operate under the assumption that the action space has been pruned by the LLM, resulting in a significantly reduced action set $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$, compared to the original action space \mathcal{A} . During any given step up to the search depth limit, the max player maximizing the outcome chooses the action that yields the highest UCB score. This score is calculated as the sum of the empirical mean of accumulated rewards and a polynomial UCB bonus similar to that in [Shah](#)

Algorithm 1 LLM Self-Play with MCTS

Require: The number of MCTS simulations N , the root node s_0 , search depth H , the UCB bonus function $B : [H] \times \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the pruned action space $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$, and the value function proxy $\hat{V} : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

```
1: Initialize  $N(s) = 0, \tilde{v}_h(s) = 0, \tilde{q}_h(s, a) = 0$ , for any  $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$  and  $h \in \{0, 1/2, 1, \dots, H\}$ .
2: for simulation  $n \leftarrow 1, \dots, N$  do
3:    $N(s_0) \leftarrow N(s_0) + 1$  /* Rollout */
4:   for  $h \leftarrow 0, 1, \dots, H - 1$  do
5:      $a_h \leftarrow \operatorname{argmax}_{a \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(s_h)} \frac{\tilde{q}_h(s_h, a)}{N(s_h \circ a)} + B_h(s_h, a)$  /* Max Player */
6:      $s_{h+1/2} \leftarrow s_h \circ a_h$ 
7:      $r_h \leftarrow R(s_h, a_h)$ 
8:      $N(s_h \circ a_h) \leftarrow N(s_h \circ a_h) + 1$ 
9:      $b_h \leftarrow \operatorname{argmin}_{b \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(s_h \circ a_h)} \frac{\tilde{q}_{h+1/2}(s_h \circ a_h, b)}{N(s_h \circ a_h \circ b)} - B_{h+1/2}(s_h \circ a_h, b)$  /* Min Player */
10:     $s_{h+1} \leftarrow s_h \circ a_h \circ b_h$ 
11:     $r_{h+1/2} \leftarrow R(s_h \circ a_h, b_h)$ 
12:     $N(s_h \circ a_h \circ b_h) \leftarrow N(s_h \circ a_h \circ b_h) + 1$ 
13:  end for
14:   $\tilde{v} \leftarrow \hat{V}(s_H)$  /* Backward Update */
15:  for  $h \leftarrow H - 1, H - 2, \dots, 0$  do
16:     $\tilde{q}_{h+1/2}(s_h \circ a_h, b_h) \leftarrow r_{h+1/2} + \tilde{v}_{h+1}(s_h \circ a_h \circ b_h)$  /* Min Player */
17:     $\tilde{v} \leftarrow r_{h+1/2} + \gamma \tilde{v}$ 
18:     $\tilde{v}_{h+1/2}(s_h \circ a_h) \leftarrow \tilde{v}_{h+1/2}(s_h \circ a_h) + \tilde{v}$ 
19:     $\tilde{q}_h(s_h, a_h) \leftarrow r_h + \tilde{v}_{h+1/2}(s_h \circ a_h)$  /* Max Player */
20:     $\tilde{v} \leftarrow r_h + \tilde{v}$ 
21:     $\tilde{v}_h(s_h) \leftarrow \tilde{v}_h(s_h) + \tilde{v}$ 
22:  end for
23: end for
Ensure:  $\tilde{V}(s_0) = \frac{\tilde{v}_0(s_0)}{N}$ 
```

et al. (2020) given by the following

$$B_h(s, a) = \beta_h \cdot \frac{N(s)^{\eta_1}}{N(s \circ a)^{\eta_2}}, \quad (4.1)$$

for any $(h, s, a) \in \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$. Here, the function $N(\cdot) : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ counts the number of times the corresponding node is visited in our simulation, β_h, η_1, η_2 are constant parameters, and we denote by $\mathcal{H} = \{0, 1/2, 1, \dots, H - 1/2\}$ the set of all step and half-step leading up to the leaf nodes. The rollout phase concludes once the simulation reaches the maximum depth H , at which point we proceed to update the value estimates based on the outcomes of the simulation.

Backward update. We conduct backward update (line 14-22) starting from the leaf node s_H . We use the input value function \widehat{V} as a proxy of the optimal value V^* to estimate $V^*(s_H)$. For any step or half-step $h \in \mathcal{H}$, we define $\widetilde{q}_h(s, a)$ as the sum of accumulated rewards received every time after taking action a at state s , and $\widetilde{v}_h(s)$ as the sum of accumulated rewards after visiting state s . We conduct the backward update following the minimax optimal bellman equation defined in (3.6) and (3.5). The difference between the update for the min player and the max player is the γ factor, which is only applied for the min player.

Finally, our algorithm outputs the average value collected at the root node s_0 .

5 Theory

For the sake of theoretical analysis, we assume the full action space \mathcal{A} and the pruned action space $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}$ are both independent of the state. For the simplicity of notation, we write $[N] = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ for any $N \in \mathbb{N}_+$.

The goal of our theory is to upper bound the suboptimality of our method, which is defined as the gap between our value estimate \widetilde{V} and the optimal value V^* defined in (3.4) such that

$$|\widetilde{V}(s_0) - V^*(s_0)| = o(1), \quad (5.1)$$

with the increasing number of simulation number N . It's noteworthy that deriving a policy from the value estimate is straightforward. For any state s , the action a that maximizes (minimizes) the value of the next state $\widetilde{V}(s \circ a)$ is the optimal action for the max (min) player with respect to the value function \widetilde{V} . In order to prove the above statement, we make the following assumption about the quality of the LLM-based value function proxy.

Assumption 5.1 (Quality of LLMs as critic). There exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that

$$\|\widehat{V} - V^*\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon_0, \quad (5.2)$$

Since our algorithm is built upon the pruned action space by LLMs, mirroring the definition of V^* in (3.4), we define the optimal value under such pruned action space as

$$\widetilde{V}^*(s) = \max_{a \in \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}} \min_{b \in \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}} \left(\mathbb{E}[r(s, a, b)] + \gamma \cdot \widetilde{V}^*(s \circ a \circ b) \right), \quad (5.3)$$

where $r(s, a, b)$ is the total reward of the max player and the min player after they both take an action as defined in (3.2) and $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}$ is the pruned action space. We decompose the suboptimality in (5.1) with the help of \widetilde{V}^* as follows,

$$|\widetilde{V}(s_0) - V^*(s_0)| = \underbrace{|\widetilde{V}(s_0) - \widetilde{V}^*(s_0)|}_{\epsilon_{\dagger}: \text{estimation error}} + \underbrace{|\widetilde{V}^*(s_0) - V^*(s_0)|}_{\epsilon_{\dagger}: \text{pruning error}}. \quad (5.4)$$

Here, the estimation error is the gap between the value estimated by our MCTS algorithm and the true optimal value function under the same pruned action space. The pruning error is the gap between optimal value function on the original action space and the pruned action space. To characterize the estimation error, we give the following theorem.

Theorem 5.2 (Estimation Error). Set $\eta_1 = 1/4$ and $\eta_2 = 1/2$ in Algorithm 1. For any $s_0 \in \mathcal{S}$, there exists constants $\{\beta_h\}_{h \in \mathcal{H}}$ such that

$$\epsilon_{\dagger} = |\widetilde{V}(s_0) - \widetilde{V}^*(s_0)| \leq \gamma^H \varepsilon_0 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{|\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}|}{\sqrt{N}}\right),$$

where γ is the discount factor, H is the search depth, N is the number of simulations in Algorithm 1, $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}$ is the pruned action space, $\varepsilon_0 = \|\widehat{V} - V^*\|_\infty$ is the estimation error of the value function proxy defined in Assumption (5.1).

Proof. See Appendix A for a detailed proof. □

The analysis of the estimation error follows a similar idea with the single-agent MCTS non-asymptotic analysis (Shah et al., 2020). We show that, the backward update in Algorithm 1 of the min player and the max player mirrors twice of value iteration, and thus is contractive. Then, we use induction to prove

To quantify the pruning error and give an error bound of order $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{N})$, we utilize the

LogSumExp (LSE) operator defined as follows

$$\text{LSE}(f, \mathcal{X}, \tau) = \frac{1}{\tau} \cdot \log \left(\frac{1}{|\mathcal{X}|} \cdot \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \exp(\tau \cdot f(x)) \right) \quad (5.5)$$

for any finite set \mathcal{X} , function $f : \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, and $\tau \geq 0$. This function well approximates the maximum item of X , as stated in the following lemma.

Lemma 5.3. For any finite set \mathcal{X} and $\tau > 0$, it holds that

$$\left| \text{LSE}(f, \mathcal{X}, \tau) - \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} f(x) \right| \leq \frac{\log |\mathcal{X}|}{\tau},$$

where the LogSumExp operator LSE is defined in (5.5).

Proof. See Appendix B.1 for a detailed proof. □

By Lemma 5.3, the LogSumExp operator coincides with the max operator when $\tau \rightarrow \infty$. For any $j \in \{0, 1/2\}$, we define $Q_j^*(s, a)$ as

$$Q_j^*(s, a) = \mathbb{E}[(-1)^{2j} \cdot R(s, a)] + (-\gamma)^{2j} \cdot V_j^*(s \circ a),$$

where V_0^* and $V_{1/2}^*$ are defined in (3.6) and (3.5), respectively.

Definition 5.4 (Quality of LLMs as pruner). For any $\tau \geq 0$, we define

$$\varepsilon_1(\tau) = \max_{j \in \{0, 1/2\}} \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \left| \text{LSE}(Q_j^*(s, \cdot), \mathcal{A}, \tau) - \text{LSE}(Q_j^*(s, \cdot), \tilde{\mathcal{A}}, \tau) \right|, \quad (5.6)$$

where \mathcal{A} and $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ denote the original and pruned action space, respectively.

Proposition 5.5. It holds for any $\tau > 0$ and $s \in \mathcal{S}$ that

$$\epsilon_{\ddagger} = |V^*(s) - \tilde{V}^*(s)| \leq \frac{2}{1-\gamma} \cdot \left(\varepsilon_1(\tau) + \frac{2 \log(|\mathcal{A}| |\tilde{\mathcal{A}}|)}{\tau} \right),$$

where $\varepsilon_1(\tau)$ is defined in Definition 5.4.

Proof. See Appendix B.2 for a detailed proof. □

Combining (5.4), Theorem 5.2 and Proposition 5.5 together, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 5.6. Under the same settings in Theorem 5.2, it holds that

$$|\tilde{V}(s_0) - V^*(s_0)| \leq \tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(\gamma^H \epsilon_0 + \frac{\epsilon_1(\sqrt{N})}{1-\gamma} + \frac{|\tilde{\mathcal{A}}|}{\sqrt{N}}\right),$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ hides constant factors and logarithms terms and $|\tilde{\mathcal{A}}|$ is the cardinality of the pruned action space.

We denote $\epsilon_{\text{critic}} = \gamma^H \epsilon_0$ and $\epsilon_{\text{pruner}} = \frac{\epsilon_1(\sqrt{N})}{1-\gamma}$. Corollary 5.6 reveals that the suboptimality of the value estimation in our Algorithm 1 vanishes at a sublinear rate with respect to the number of simulations N up to errors incurred from LLM as critic and action pruner. Thus, with a proper chosen simulation number, our algorithm well approximates the optimal value function. Notice that if the LLM does not prune the action space at all, the last error term in Corollary 5.6 becomes $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(\frac{|\mathcal{A}|}{\sqrt{N}}\right)$, which is much bigger since $|\mathcal{A}| \gg |\tilde{\mathcal{A}}|$.

6 Experiments




Figure 1: Algorithm illustration for chess. We assume black nodes corresponds to the state where the black player has just made a move, and vice versa for the white nodes.

We detail our experiments conducted across three different game scenarios. For each experiment, we configure the LLM as an action pruner, allowing it to suggest what it deems as the optimal action 20 times for each state, with a temperature setting of 0.7. We set $\eta_1 = \eta_2 = 1/2$ and $\beta_h = 1.25$ for any $h \in \mathcal{H}$ for the UCB bonus defined in (4.1). We begin by exploring two initial toy experiments: chess puzzles and MiniGo, where the LLM’s role is solely to act as an action pruner. Given the shorter game horizons in these scenarios, we directly use the game’s outcome as a proxy for the value function. Specifically, outcomes of winning, losing, and drawing are assigned rewards of 1, -1, and 0, respectively. Afterwards, we will present our main experiment conducted on full chess games, where we set a finite search depth and use a hybrid of rule-based and LLM-based value function proxy as illustrated in Figure 1.

6.1 Chess Puzzle

Our first experiment setting is chess checkmate puzzles. We collect chess puzzles from lichess¹. The puzzles have different themes describing the topic of the puzzle, such as winning the game with style, or carrying out special moves. We pick the puzzles with themes *mateInN*. The corresponding descriptions are shown in Table 1.

Theme	Description
<i>mateIn1</i>	Deliver checkmate in one move.
<i>mateIn2</i>	Deliver checkmate in two moves.
<i>mateIn3</i>	Deliver checkmate in three moves.
<i>mateIn4</i>	Deliver checkmate in four moves.
<i>mateIn5</i>	Figure out a long (≥ 5) mating sequence.

Table 1: Themes

Since both the white player and the black player are possible to be the puzzle solver, we name the role corresponding to the puzzle solver as the *agent*, and name the other one as the *opponent*. We define the “depth” of a puzzle as the number of moves needed to deliver checkmate. We denote the state corresponding to the starting point of the puzzle as s_0 . For a puzzle with depth H , we would know if the agent has solved the puzzle or not at step $s_{H-1} \circ a_{H-1} = s_0 \circ a_0 \circ a_{1/2} \circ \dots \circ a_{H-1}$. Without loss of generality, we assume the agent is the max player and the opponent is the min player. And the agent gets a reward of 1 if he delivers checkmate within required steps, and -1 otherwise.

Since puzzles with depth 1 and 2 are quite simple, we only consider puzzles with depth $d = 3, 4, \dots, 8$. We construct the evaluation dataset corresponding to each depth by taking one hundred

¹<https://database.lichess.org/#puzzles>

Puzzle Depth	Vanilla LLM	MCTS (50)	MCTS (10,000)	LLM + MCTS (50)
3	10%	1%	33%	74%
4	15%	1%	10%	67%
5	5%	0%	2%	19%
6	4%	0%	0%	24%
7	1%	0%	0%	37%
8	0%	0%	0%	43%

Table 2: Percentage of solved chess puzzles by different methods. The best performance is marked with a bold font.

puzzles with the highest rating judged by lichess users. We implement our Algorithm 1 with `gpt-3.5-turbo-instruct` for its lower cost. We compare our method with the following baseline methods:

Vanilla LLM: The vanilla LLM method uses majority voting to pick action out of its proposed candidates. We set the temperature to 0.7 and set the number of chat completion choices to 20. And we use majority voting to pick the most popular legal answer from the 20 answers by the LLM. We choose `gpt-3.5-turbo-instruct` to conduct our experiment to align with our proposed method.

MCTS (50) and MCTS (10,000): The vanilla MCTS method with 50 and 10,000 simulations. In this chess puzzle setting, the only difference between this baseline and our proposed algorithm is the number of simulations and the action space. The action space here is the full action space instead of the pruned action space by LLM.

The results are as shown in Table 2. By combining LLM and MCTS self-play, our method outperforms both LLM and MCTS baselines by a huge margin. Even with only 50 simulations, our method outperforms the MCTS baseline with 10,000 simulations.

6.2 MiniGo

We use 5×5 go board as another toy example. We adopt the ko rule which states that the stones on the board must never repeat a previous position of stones. We test our method and the baseline methods by letting them play as black with the initiative against a fixed opponent who adopts vanilla MCTS methods with 1,000 simulations and plays as white. Since the game on a 5×5 go board is still very short, we set the depth of the MCTS to a large number so that we directly use the game’s outcome as a proxy for the value function. The outcomes of winning, losing, and drawing are assigned rewards of 1, -1, and 0, respectively. Note that the first player always has an advantage in Go. We use the territory score as our metric, which is defined by the territory of the black player minus that of the white player. We repeat the battle for 20 times and report the average score.

The results are shown in Table 3. Our algorithm achieves the highest advantage against the fixed opponent.

LLM	LLM + MCTS (50)	MCTS (50)	MCTS (10,000)
-8.0	11.9	1.3	9.5

Table 3: The score of different methods playing MiniGo (5×5) against a vanilla MCTS baseline with 1,000 simulations.

6.3 Chess: Full Game

Our previous experiments on chess puzzles have shown the efficiency of LLM as MCTS pruner. In this part, we evaluate our method against the stockfish engine² in full games. In a full game scheme, the game tree would become deep. Thus, we set a fixed MCTS search depth of 10 and use a hybrid value function proxy composed of both a rule based centipawn evaluator and a LLM-based critic.

Rule-based critic: The rule-based critic we use calculates the piece values of the current board in centipawns. The centipawn is the unit of measure used in chess as measure of the advantage. The value of a pawn is 100 by default. We assign a value for each of piece in Table 4. Our critic evaluates the current board by subtracting the total value of the current player’s pieces by the total value of the opponent’s pieces and divide the result by 1,000. For example, if the black player has one more queen than the white player in the current board, the value evaluated by the critic for the black player is 0.9. We denote this rule-based critic as $V_{\text{rule}} : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Specifically, if the game is finished, we set this critic value as 10 for the winner or 0 if the game is a draw.

Piece	Pawn	Knight	Bishop	Rook	Queen
Value	100	325	325	500	900

Table 4: Centipawn value for each kind of piece.

LLM-based critic: The LLM-based critic evaluates the strategic position of the chess board such as piece coordination, pawn structure and attacking potential, focusing on positional advantage rather than the value of the pieces. It also uses centipawn as the unit of metric and we divide the result by 1,000 just like the rule-based critic. The prompt we use for LLM-based critic are shown in Figure 1. We denote the LLM-based critic as $V_{\text{LLM}} : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

We combine the rule-based critic and the LLM-based critic by adding them together, i.e. $\hat{V}(s) = V_{\text{rule}}(s) + V_{\text{LLM}}(s)$. In practice, we use `gpt-4` with a temperature of 0 as the backend of the

²<https://stockfishchess.org/>

LLM-based critic, and for consistency, we also use `gpt-4` as the backend of the actor. To evaluate the performance, we define a score function that maps “win”, “tie”, and “lose” to 1, 1/2, and 0, respectively. We evaluate our method, the standalone LLMs and conventional MCTS by playing against Stockfish engine with different engine levels. The results are shown in Table 5. For the MCTS baseline, we run it in two way, one with a search depth of 512 so that no critic is needed because the game is simulated to the end, and the other one with a search depth of 10 and is equipped with only the rule-based critic V_{rule} same with our proposed method. However, we find that both MCTS baseline approaches failed to achieve a win or draw against the stockfish engine.

Level	LLM + MCTS (50)	LLM	MCTS (100,000)
1	0.78	0.35	0
2	0.73	0.15	0
3	0.47	0.05	0

Table 5: The score of different methods playing chess against different levels of stockfish engine.

7 Conclusion

In this study, we harness the unique capabilities of Large Language Models (LLMs) as black-box oracles and Monte-Carlo Tree Search (MCTS) as planning oracles to develop a novel self-play algorithm tailored for deterministic turn-based zero-sum games. Our approach positions the LLM to fulfill dual roles: firstly, as an action pruner, narrowing the breadth of the MCTS search tree, and secondly, as a value function proxy, thereby shortening the depth required for the MCTS search tree. This dual functionality enhances the efficiency and effectiveness of both methodologies.

Our research is supported by both theoretical and empirical analyses. Theoretically, we demonstrate that the suboptimality of the estimated value in our method is proportional to $\mathcal{O}(\frac{|\tilde{\mathcal{A}}|}{\sqrt{N}})$ up to errors incurred by using LLM as critic and action pruner, where N is the number of simulations and $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ is the pruned action space. Empirically, through tests in chess and Go, we showcase our method’s ability to tackle complex problems beyond the reach of traditional MCTS, as well as to outperform the direct application of LLMs, highlighting its potential to advance the field of game theory and artificial intelligence.

References

- Achiam, J., Adler, S., Agarwal, S., Ahmad, L., Akkaya, I., Aleman, F. L., Almeida, D., Alentschmidt, J., Altman, S., Anadkat, S. et al. (2023). Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*.
- Agrawal, R. (1995). Sample mean based index policies by o (log n) regret for the multi-armed bandit problem. *Advances in applied probability*, **27** 1054–1078.
- Akata, E., Schulz, L., Coda-Forno, J., Oh, S. J., Bethge, M. and Schulz, E. (2023). Playing repeated games with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16867*.
- Audibert, J.-Y., Munos, R. and Szepesvári, C. (2009). Exploration–exploitation tradeoff using variance estimates in multi-armed bandits. *Theoretical Computer Science*, **410** 1876–1902.
- Auer, P., Cesa-Bianchi, N. and Fischer, P. (2002). Finite-time analysis of the multiarmed bandit problem. *Machine learning*, **47** 235–256.
- Azuma, K. (1967). Weighted sums of certain dependent random variables. *Tohoku Mathematical Journal, Second Series*, **19** 357–367.
- Baier, H. and Winands, M. H. (2012). Beam monte-carlo tree search. In *2012 IEEE Conference on Computational Intelligence and Games (CIG)*. IEEE.
- Berglund, L., Tong, M., Kaufmann, M., Balesni, M., Stickland, A. C., Korbak, T. and Evans, O. (2023). The reversal curse: Llms trained on " a is b " fail to learn " b is a ". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.12288*.
- Bertsekas, D. (2012). *Dynamic programming and optimal control: Volume I*, vol. 4. Athena scientific.
- Champanand, A. J. (2014). Monte-carlo tree search in total war: Rome ii’s campaign ai. *AIGameDev.com*: <http://aigamedev.com/open/coverage/mcts-rome-ii>, **4**.
- Churchill, D. and Buro, M. (2013). Portfolio greedy search and simulation for large-scale combat in starcraft. In *2013 IEEE Conference on Computational Intelligence in Games (CIG)*. IEEE.
- Coulom, R. (2006). Efficient selectivity and backup operators in monte-carlo tree search. In *International conference on computers and games*. Springer.
- Feng, X., Luo, Y., Wang, Z., Tang, H., Yang, M., Shao, K., Mguni, D., Du, Y. and Wang, J. (2023a). Chessgpt: Bridging policy learning and language modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.09200*.

- Feng, X., Wan, Z., Wen, M., Wen, Y., Zhang, W. and Wang, J. (2023b). Alphazero-like tree-search can guide large language model decoding and training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.17179*.
- Hao, S., Gu, Y., Ma, H., Hong, J. J., Wang, Z., Wang, D. Z. and Hu, Z. (2023). Reasoning with language model is planning with world model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14992*.
- Huang, J. and Chang, K. C.-C. (2022). Towards reasoning in large language models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10403*.
- Huang, L., Yu, W., Ma, W., Zhong, W., Feng, Z., Wang, H., Chen, Q., Peng, W., Feng, X., Qin, B. et al. (2023). A survey on hallucination in large language models: Principles, taxonomy, challenges, and open questions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.05232*.
- Justesen, N., Tillman, B., Togelius, J. and Risi, S. (2014). Script-and cluster-based uct for starcraft. In *2014 IEEE conference on computational intelligence and games*. IEEE.
- Kishimoto, A. and Schaeffer, J. (2002). Transposition table driven work scheduling in distributed game-tree search. In *Advances in Artificial Intelligence: 15th Conference of the Canadian Society for Computational Studies of Intelligence, AI 2002 Calgary, Canada, May 27–29, 2002 Proceedings 15*. Springer.
- Kocsis, L. and Szepesvári, C. (2006). Bandit based monte-carlo planning. In *European conference on machine learning*. Springer.
- Liu, Z., Hu, H., Zhang, S., Guo, H., Ke, S., Liu, B. and Wang, Z. (2023). Reason for future, act for now: A principled framework for autonomous llm agents with provable sample efficiency. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.17382*.
- Lowerre, B. and Reddy, R. (1976). The harpy speech recognition system: performance with large vocabularies. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, **60** S10–S11.
- Mao, S., Cai, Y., Xia, Y., Wu, W., Wang, X., Wang, F., Ge, T. and Wei, F. (2023). Alympics: Language agents meet game theory. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.03220*.
- Pearl, J. (1980). Scout: A simple game-searching algorithm with proven optimal properties. In *AAAI*.
- Pepels, T. and Winands, M. H. (2012). Enhancements for monte-carlo tree search in ms pac-man. In *2012 IEEE Conference on Computational Intelligence and Games (CIG)*. IEEE.

- Ruoss, A., Delétang, G., Medapati, S., Grau-Moya, J., Wenliang, L. K., Catt, E., Reid, J. and Genewein, T. (2024). Grandmaster-level chess without search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.04494*.
- Schaeffer, J. (1989). The history heuristic and alpha-beta search enhancements in practice. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, **11** 1203–1212.
- Sephton, N., Cowling, P. I., Powley, E. and Slaven, N. H. (2014). Heuristic move pruning in monte carlo tree search for the strategic card game lords of war. In *2014 IEEE conference on computational intelligence and games*. IEEE.
- Shah, D., Xie, Q. and Xu, Z. (2020). Non-asymptotic analysis of monte carlo tree search. In *Abstracts of the 2020 SIGMETRICS/Performance Joint International Conference on Measurement and Modeling of Computer Systems*.
- Shridhar, M., Yuan, X., Côté, M.-A., Bisk, Y., Trischler, A. and Hausknecht, M. (2020). Alfworld: Aligning text and embodied environments for interactive learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.03768*.
- Silver, D., Schrittwieser, J., Simonyan, K., Antonoglou, I., Huang, A., Guez, A., Hubert, T., Baker, L., Lai, M., Bolton, A. et al. (2017). Mastering the game of go without human knowledge. *nature*, **550** 354–359.
- Soemers, D. J., Sironi, C. F., Schuster, T. and Winands, M. H. (2016). Enhancements for real-time monte-carlo tree search in general video game playing. In *2016 IEEE Conference on Computational Intelligence and Games (CIG)*. IEEE.
- Yao, S., Yu, D., Zhao, J., Shafran, I., Griffiths, T. L., Cao, Y. and Narasimhan, K. (2023). Tree of thoughts: Deliberate problem solving with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10601*.
- Zhang, Y., Li, Y., Cui, L., Cai, D., Liu, L., Fu, T., Huang, X., Zhao, E., Zhang, Y., Chen, Y. et al. (2023). Siren’s song in the ai ocean: A survey on hallucination in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.01219*.
- Zhou, H., Gong, Y., Mugrai, L., Khalifa, A., Nealen, A. and Togelius, J. (2018). A hybrid search agent in pommerman. In *Proceedings of the 13th international conference on the foundations of digital games*.

A Value Estimation Error Analysis

Without loss of generality, we assume the root node correspond to the state where the max player is about to make a move. Thus, the leaf nodes correspond to the state where the min player is about to make a move. For any $h \in \{0, 1/2, \dots, H - 1/2, H\}$, denote by n_h the number of nodes at level h and denote by $s_h^{(1)}, s_h^{(2)}, \dots, s_h^{(n_h)} \in \mathcal{S}$ the nodes in at level h . We denote $K = |\tilde{\mathcal{A}}|$ the cardinality of the pruned action space and represent the pruned action space by $[K]$. We rewrite the bonus function as

$$B_h(s, a) = \beta_h^{1/\xi_h} \cdot \frac{N(s)^{\alpha_h/\xi_h}}{\sqrt{N(s \circ a)}}.$$

For any $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times [K]$, we denote by

$$\tilde{q}_{H-1/2}^*(s, a) = \mathbb{E}[R(s, a)] + \gamma \tilde{v}_H^*(s \circ a)$$

the estimated expected return for the min player at level $H - 1/2$ for taking action a at state s , where \tilde{v}_H^* is the input value function of Algorithm 1 as an estimation of the true value function V^* . Since the level $H - 1/2$ corresponds to the min player, we define

$$\tilde{v}_{H-1/2}^*(s) = \min_{a \in [K]} \tilde{q}_{H-1/2}^*(s, a).$$

Then, we define recursively

$$\tilde{q}_h^*(s, a) = \mathbb{E}[R(s, a)] + \tilde{v}_{h+1/2}^*(s \circ a), \quad \tilde{v}_h^*(s) = \max_{a \in [K]} \tilde{q}_h^*(s, a) \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$$\tilde{q}_{h+1/2}^*(s, a) = \mathbb{E}[R(s, a)] + \gamma \tilde{v}_{h+1}^*(s \circ a), \quad \tilde{v}_{h+1/2}^*(s) = \min_{a \in [K]} \tilde{q}_{h+1/2}^*(s, a) \quad (\text{A.2})$$

for any $h = H - 1, H - 2, \dots, 0$. Meanwhile, we denote by

$$\tilde{a}_h^*(s) \in \operatorname{argmax}_{a \in [K]} \tilde{q}_h^*(s, a), \quad \tilde{a}_{h+1/2}^*(s) \in \operatorname{argmin}_{a \in [K]} \tilde{q}_{h+1/2}^*(s, a)$$

the optimal action at state s according to the value function q , and by

$$\Delta_h(s) = \tilde{v}_h(s) - \max_{a \in [K], a \neq \tilde{a}_h^*(s)} \tilde{q}_h^*(s, a), \quad \Delta_{h+1/2}(s) = \tilde{v}_{h+1/2}^*(s) - \max_{a \in [K], a \neq \tilde{a}_{h+1/2}^*(s)} \tilde{q}_{h+1/2}^*(s, a) \quad (\text{A.3})$$

the gap between the optimal arm and the second optimal arm at state s . Furthermore, we define the empirical value functions of our Algorithm 1. For each level $h \in \{0, 1/2, 1, \dots, H - 1/2\}$, denote

by $\tilde{v}_h^{(n)}(s)$ the sum of discounted rewards collected at state s during $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ visits of it.

A.1 Non-stationary Multi-Arm Bandit

Consider non-stationary multi-arm bandit (MAB) problems. Let there be $K \geq 1$ arms or actions and let $X_{k,t}$ denote the random reward obtained by playing the arm $k \in [K]$ for the t -th time with $t \geq 1$. We assume that the optimal arm is unique. We denote by $\bar{X}_{k,n} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n X_{k,t}$ the empirical mean of the reward obtained by playing arm k for n times and denote by $\mu_{k,n} = \mathbb{E}[\bar{X}_{k,n}]$ the expectation of the empirical mean. We assume that the optimal arm is unique. We make the following assumptions about the reward $X_{k,t}$.

Assumption A.1. There exists an absolute constant R such that $X_{k,t} \in [-R, R]$ for any arm $k \in [K]$.

Assumption A.2. The reward sequence $\{X_{k,t} : t \geq 1\}$ is a non-stationary process such that

1. there exists μ_k for any $k \in [K]$ such that

$$\mu_k = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n X_{k,t} \right].$$

2. there exists $\beta \in (1, \infty)$ and $\xi \in (0, \infty)$ such that for any $z \in [1, \infty)$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{t=1}^n X_{k,t} - n\mu_k \geq \sqrt{n}z \right) \geq \frac{\beta}{z^\xi}, \quad \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{t=1}^n X_{k,t} - n\mu_k \leq -\sqrt{n}z \right) \geq \frac{\beta}{z^\xi}.$$

Assumption A.1 states that the reward is bounded for all arms. And Assumption A.2 establishes the convergence and concentration properties of the process. Those assumptions holds naturally for bounded and deterministic reward setting.

Consider the following variant of UCB algorithm applied to the above non-stationary MAB.

In Algorithm 2, $T_{k,t}$ is the number of times arm k has been played, up to (including) time t , $U_{k,s,t}$ is the upper confidence bound for arm k when it is played s times in total of t time steps, and $B_{t,s}$ is the bonus term, where β, ξ are constants defined in Assumption A.2 and $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$ is a tuning parameter that controls the exploration and exploitation trade-off. A tie is broken arbitrarily when selecting an arm in Line 4.

Denote by $\mu_{\max} = \max_{k \in [K]} \mu_k$ the optimal value with respect to the converged expectation, and by $k_{\max} \in \operatorname{argmax}_{k \in [K]} \mu_k$ the corresponding optimal arm. We assume the optimal arm is unique.

Algorithm 2 A variant of Upper Confidence Bound (UCB) algorithm (Max Player)

Require: A non-stationary MAB with K arms. Parameters α, β, ξ .

- 1: Initialize $T_{k,0} \leftarrow 0$ for any $k \in [K]$.
 - 2: **for** $t \leftarrow 0, 1, \dots$ **do**
 - 3: $U_{k,s,t} \leftarrow \sum_{\tau=1}^s X_{k,\tau} + B_{t,s}$, where $B_{t,s} = \frac{\beta^{1/\xi} \cdot t^{\alpha/\xi}}{\sqrt{s}}$, for any $s \in [t]$
 - 4: $k_t \leftarrow \operatorname{argmax}_{k \in [K]} U_{k,T_{k,t-1},t-1}$ /* Pull arm k_t and get reward $X_{k_t,T_{k_t,t-1}+1}$. */
 - 5: $T_{k_t,t} \leftarrow T_{k_t,t-1} + 1$
 - 6: $T_{k,t} \leftarrow T_{k,t-1}, \forall k \in [K] \setminus \{k_t\}$
 - 7: **end for**
-

Denote by $\Delta_{\max} = \min_{k \in [K], k \neq k_{\max}} |\mu_{\max} - \mu_k|$ the gap between the optimal arm and the second optimal arm, and define

$$\tau(t) = \lceil (2/\Delta_{\max} \cdot \beta^{1/\xi})^2 \cdot t^{2\alpha/\xi} \rceil. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Also, we denote by

$$\tau^* = \min\{t \in \mathbb{N}_+ : t \geq \tau(t) \text{ and } 2R\tau(t) \geq \sqrt{t} + 2R(4K - 3)\} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Denote by $\bar{X}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k \in [K]} \sum_{t \in [T_{k,n}]} X_{k,t}$ the empirical mean reward under the Algorithm 2. The following theorem establishes theoretical analysis for Algorithm 2.

Theorem A.3 (Theorem 3, Shah et al. (2020)). Under Assumptions A.1 and A.2, the following holds for Algorithm 2 with any $\alpha \in (2, \infty) \cap [\xi/4, \xi/2)$.

1. Let $\Delta_{\max} = \min_{k \in [K], k \neq k_{\max}} |\mu_{\max} - \mu_k|$. It then holds that

$$|\mathbb{E}[\bar{X}_n] - \mu_{\max}| \leq |\mu_{k_{\max},n} - \mu_{\max}| + \frac{2R(K-1) \cdot \left((2/\Delta_{\max} \cdot \beta^{1/\xi})^2 \cdot n^{2\alpha/\xi} + \frac{2}{\alpha-2} + 1 \right)}{n}. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

2. It holds for any $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and $z \in [1, \infty)$ that

$$\mathbb{P}(n\bar{X}_n - n\mu_{\max} \geq n^{2\alpha/\xi}z) \leq \frac{\beta'}{z^{\alpha-1}}, \quad \mathbb{P}(n\bar{X}_n - n\mu_{\max} \leq -n^{2\alpha/\xi}z) \leq \frac{\beta'}{z^{\alpha-1}}, \quad (\text{A.7})$$

where

$$\beta' = \max \left\{ 2R(\tau^* - 1)^{1-2\alpha/\xi}, 2(2RK(2/\Delta_{\max})^{1/\xi})^{\alpha-1} \cdot \max \left\{ \beta, \frac{2(K-1)}{(\alpha-1)(1+\tau(\tau^*))^{\alpha-1}} \right\} \right\}.$$

Here, Δ_{\max} is the gap between the optimal arm and the second optimal arm, τ and τ^* are given

by (A.4) and (A.5), respectively. Theorem A.3 provides both the convergence guarantee (A.6) and the concentration guarantee (A.7) of the UCB algorithm described in Algorithm 2.

Min player counterpart. We can construct a min player version of the non-stationary multi-arm bandit by adopting a negative bonus and choosing the arm with lowest UCB value. We include the algorithm here for completeness.

Algorithm 3 A variant of Upper Confidence Bound (UCB) algorithm (Min Player)

Require: A non-stationary MAB with K arms. Parameters α, β, ξ .

- 1: Initialize $T_{k,0} \leftarrow 0$ for any $k \in [K]$.
 - 2: **for** $t \leftarrow 0, 1, \dots$ **do**
 - 3: $U_{k,s,t} \leftarrow \sum_{\tau=1}^s X_{k,\tau} - B_{t,s}$, where $B_{t,s} = \frac{\beta^{1/\xi} \cdot t^{\alpha/\xi}}{\sqrt{s}}$, for any $s \in [t]$
 - 4: $k_t \leftarrow \operatorname{argmin}_{k \in [K]} U_{k,T_{k,t-1},t-1}$ /* Pull arm k_t and get reward $X_{k_t,T_{k,t-1}+1}$. */
 - 5: $T_{k_t,t} \leftarrow T_{k_t,t-1} + 1$
 - 6: $T_{k,t} \leftarrow T_{k,t-1}, \forall k \in [K] \setminus \{k_t\}$
 - 7: **end for**
-

Similarly, we define $\mu_{\min} = \min_{k \in [K]} \mu_k$, $k_{\min} = \operatorname{argmin}_{k \in [K]} \mu_k$, and $\Delta_{\min} = \min_{k \in [K], k \neq k_{\min}} |\mu_{\min} - \mu_k|$. Then, we mirror Theorem A.3 to give the following analysis for the min player.

Corollary A.4 (UCB Min Player). Under Assumptions A.1 and A.2, the following holds for Algorithm 3 with any $\alpha \in (2, \infty) \cap [\xi/4, \xi/2]$.

1. Let $\Delta_{\min} = \min_{k \in [K], k \neq k_{\min}} |\mu_{\min} - \mu_k|$. It then holds that

$$|\mathbb{E}[\bar{X}_n] - \mu_{\min}| \leq |\mu_{k_{\min},n} - \mu_{\min}| + \frac{2R(K-1) \cdot \left((2/\Delta_{\min} \cdot \beta^{1/\xi})^2 \cdot n^{2\alpha/\xi} + \frac{2}{\alpha-2} + 1 \right)}{n}. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

2. There exist constant $\beta' \in (1, \infty)$ depending on $R, K, \Delta_{\min}, \beta, \xi$ and α such that it holds for any $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and $z \in [1, \infty)$ that

$$\mathbb{P}(n\bar{X}_n - n\mu_{\min} \geq n^{2\alpha/\xi}z) \leq \frac{\beta'}{z^{\alpha-1}}, \quad \mathbb{P}(n\bar{X}_n - n\mu_{\min} \leq -n^{2\alpha/\xi}z) \leq \frac{\beta'}{z^{\alpha-1}}. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

A.2 Leaf Level

The leaf nodes at level H are children of nodes at level $H - 1/2$ in the MCTS tree. Without loss of generality, we assume the leaf nodes correspond to the state where the max player is about to make a move, the same as the root node s_0 . Therefore, the nodes at level $H - 1/2$ correspond to the min player. Consider node $i \in [n_{H-1/2}]$ at level $H - 1/2$, corresponding to state s_i . Each time the min player is at

this node, it takes an action $a_{H-1/2} \in [K]$ and reaches the node $s'_H = s_{H-1/2}^{(i)} \circ a_{H-1/2}$ at the leaf level H . Then, the reward collected for the node $s_{H-1/2}^{(i)}$ and action $a_{H-1/2}$ is $R(s_{H-1/2}^{(i)} \circ a_{H-1/2}) + \gamma \tilde{v}_H^*(s'_H)$, where $\tilde{v}_H^*(s'_H)$ is calculated by the input value function proxy for Algorithm 1. Thus, each time the node $s_{H-1/2}^{(i)}$ is visited, the reward is the summation of bounded independent and identical (for a given action) random variables and a deterministic evaluation. By Lemma C.2, there exists β_H such that the collected rewards at $s_{H-1/2}^{(i)}$ satisfy the concentration property (C.1) and the convergence property (C.2). This process mirrors the MAB problem we introduced in Section A.1. In order to apply Theorem A.3 or Corollary A.4, we denote by R_h^{\max} the maximum magnitude of the rewards collected by all the nodes in level $h \in \{0, 1/2, 1, \dots, H\}$ and we quantify it later in Lemma C.3. Then, we have the following lemma that establishes the convergence and concentration property of the nodes in level $H - 1/2$.

Lemma A.5 (Leaf). Consider a node corresponding to state $s_{H-1/2}^{(i)}$ at level $H - 1/2$ within the MCTS for $i \in [n_{H-1/2}]$. Let $\tilde{v}_{H-1/2}^{(n)}(s_{H-1/2}^{(i)})$ be the total discounted reward collected at $s_{H-1/2}^{(i)}$ during $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ visits of it, to one of its K leaf nodes under the UCB policy. Then, there exists appropriately large $\beta_{H-1/2} \in (0, \infty)$ such that the following holds for a given $\xi_{H-1/2} > 0$ and $\alpha_{H-1/2} > 2$.

1. It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{v}_{H-1/2}^{(n)}(s_{H-1/2}^{(i)}) \right] - n \cdot \tilde{v}_{H-1/2}^*(s_{H-1/2}^{(i)}) \right| \\ & \leq 2R_{H-1/2}^{\max}(K-1) \cdot \left(\left(\frac{2\beta_{H-1/2}^{1/\xi_{H-1/2}}}{\Delta_{H-1/2}(s_{H-1/2}^{(i)})} \right)^2 \cdot n^{\frac{2\alpha_{H-1/2}}{\xi_{H-1/2}}} + \frac{2}{\alpha_{H-1/2} - 2} + 1 \right). \end{aligned}$$

2. There exist $\beta' \in (1, \infty)$ such that it holds for any $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and $z \in [1, \infty)$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\tilde{v}_{H-1/2}^{(n)}(s_{H-1/2}^{(i)}) - n \cdot \tilde{v}_{H-1/2}^*(s_{H-1/2}^{(i)}) \geq n^{\frac{2\alpha_{H-1/2}}{\xi_{H-1/2}}} z \right) & \leq \frac{\beta'}{z^{\alpha_{H-1/2}-1}}, \\ \mathbb{P} \left(\tilde{v}_{H-1/2}^{(n)}(s_{H-1/2}^{(i)}) - n \cdot \tilde{v}_{H-1/2}^*(s_{H-1/2}^{(i)}) \leq -n^{\frac{2\alpha_{H-1/2}}{\xi_{H-1/2}}} z \right) & \leq \frac{\beta'}{z^{\alpha_{H-1/2}-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof follows directly from Corollary A.4. □

A.3 Recursion

Lemma A.5 suggests that the convergence assumption (A.6) and concentration assumption (A.7) of Theorem A.3 are satisfied by $\tilde{v}_{H-1/2}^{(n)}$ for each node at level $H - 1/2$ with $\alpha^{H-1/2}$ and $\xi^{(H-1/2)}$ defined in Theorem 5.2 and with appropriately defined large enough constant $\beta_{H-1/2}$. We claim that result

similar to Lemma A.5, but for node at level $H - 1$, continues to hold with parameters α_{H-1} and ξ_{H-1} as defined in Theorem 5.2 and with appropriately defined large enough constant β_{H-1} . And similar argument will continue to apply going from level h to $h - 1/2$ for all $h \in \{1/2, 1, \dots, H - 1, H - 1/2\}$. That is, we shall assume that the convergence and concentration assumptions of Theorem A.3 or Corollary A.4 hold for $\tilde{v}_h(\cdot)$, for all nodes at level h with parameters $\alpha^{(h)}$ and $\xi^{(h)}$ defined in Theorem 5.2 and with appropriately defined large enough constant β_h , and then argue that such holds for nodes at level $h - 1/2$ as well. Thus, we can prove the results for all $h \in \{1/2, 1, \dots, H - 1, H - 1/2\}$ by induction.

To that end, we first consider the nodes corresponding to the max player. For any $h \in [H - 1]$, consider a node corresponding to state $s_h^{(i)}$ at level h within the MCTS for $i \in [n_h]$. As part of the algorithm, whenever this node is visited, one of the K feasible action a is taken and the node $s_{h+1/2} = s_h^{(i)} \circ a$ at level $h + 1/2$ will be reached. This results in a reward $R(s_h^{(i)}, a) + \tilde{v}_h(s_{h+1/2})$ at node $s_h^{(i)}$ at level h . Since $R(s, a)$ is an independent, bounded valued random variable while $\tilde{v}_h(\cdot)$ is effectively collected by following a path all the way to the leaf level. Inductively, we assume that $\tilde{v}_{h+1/2}(\cdot)$ satisfies the convergence and concentration property for each node at level $h + 1/2$, with $\alpha_{h+1/2}$ and $\xi_{h+1/2}$ given by Theorem 5.2 and with appropriately defined large enough constant $\beta_{h+1/2}$. Therefore, by an application of Lemma C.2, it follows that this combined reward continues to satisfy the convergence (A.6) and concentration (A.7) properties. Thus, we invoke Theorem A.3 and conclude the follow lemma.

Lemma A.6 (Max player). Consider a node corresponding to state $s_h^{(i)}$ at level h in the MCTS tree for $i \in [n_h]$. Let $\tilde{v}_h^{(n)}(s_h^{(i)})$ be the sum discounted reward collected at $s_h^{(i)}$ during $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ visits. Then, the following holds for the choice of appropriately large $\beta_{h+1/2} > 0$, for a given $\xi_{h+1/2} > 0$ and $\alpha_{h+1/2} > 2$.

1. It holds that

$$\left| \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left[v_h^{(n)}(s_h^{(i)}) \right] - \tilde{v}_h^*(s_h^{(i)}) \right| \leq \frac{2R_h^{\max}(K - 1) \cdot \left(\left(\frac{2\beta_h^{1/\xi_h}}{\Delta_h(s_h^{(i)})} \right)^2 \cdot n \frac{2\alpha_h}{\xi_h} + \frac{2}{\alpha_h - 2} + 1 \right)}{n}.$$

2. There exist a large enough constant $\beta' \in (1, \infty)$ such that it holds for any $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and $z \in [1, \infty)$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(v_h^{(n)}(s_h^{(i)}) - n \cdot \tilde{v}_h^*(s_h^{(i)}) \geq n \frac{2\alpha_h}{\xi_h} z \right) &\leq \frac{\beta'}{z^{\alpha_h - 1}}, \\ \mathbb{P} \left(v_h^{(n)}(s_h^{(i)}) - n \cdot \tilde{v}_h^*(s_h^{(i)}) \leq -n \frac{2\alpha_h}{\xi_h} z \right) &\leq \frac{\beta'}{z^{\alpha_h - 1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we consider a node corresponding to state $s_{h-1/2}^{(i)}$ where the min player is about to make a move for any $h \in [H-1]$. Similarly, whenever this node is visited, one of the K feasible action a is taken and the node $s_h = s_{h-1/2}^{(i)} \circ a$ at level h will be reached. This results in a reward $R(s_{h-1/2}^{(i)}, a) + \gamma \tilde{v}_{h-1/2}(s_h)$ at node $s_{h-1/2}^{(i)}$ at level $h-1/2$. Here, the only difference is the γ factor, which does not effect our conclusion. By invoking Theorem A.3, we conclude the follow lemma.

Lemma A.7 (Min player). Consider a node corresponding to state $s_{h-1/2}^{(i)}$ at level $h-1/2$ in the MCTS tree for $i \in [n_{h-1/2}]$. Let $\tilde{v}_{h-1/2}^{(n)}(s_{h-1/2}^{(i)})$ be the sum discounted reward collected at $s_{h-1/2}^{(i)}$ during $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ visits. Then, the following holds for the choice of appropriately large $\beta_h > 0$, for a given $\xi_h > 0$ and $\alpha_h > 2$.

1. It holds that

$$\left| \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{v}_{h-1/2}^{(n)}(s_{h-1/2}^{(i)}) \right] - \tilde{v}_{h-1/2}^*(s_{h-1/2}^{(i)}) \right| \leq \frac{2R_{h-1/2}^{\max}(K-1) \cdot \left(\left(\frac{2\beta_{h-1/2}^{1/\xi_{h-1/2}}}{\Delta_{h-1/2}(s_{h-1/2}^{(i)})} \right)^2 \cdot n^{\frac{2\alpha_{h-1/2}}{\xi_{h-1/2}}} + \frac{2}{\alpha_{h-1/2}-2} + 1 \right)}{n}.$$

2. There exist a large enough constant $\beta' \in (1, \infty)$ such that it holds for any $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and $z \in [1, \infty)$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\tilde{v}_{h-1/2}^{(n)}(s_{h-1/2}^{(i)}) - n \cdot \tilde{v}_{h-1/2}^*(s_{h-1/2}^{(i)}) \geq n^{\frac{2\alpha_{h-1/2}}{\xi_{h-1/2}}} z \right) &\leq \frac{\beta'}{z^{\alpha_{h-1/2}-1}}, \\ \mathbb{P} \left(\tilde{v}_{h-1/2}^{(n)}(s_{h-1/2}^{(i)}) - n \cdot \tilde{v}_{h-1/2}^*(s_{h-1/2}^{(i)}) \leq -n^{\frac{2\alpha_{h-1/2}}{\xi_{h-1/2}}} z \right) &\leq \frac{\beta'}{z^{\alpha_{h-1/2}-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

A.4 Error Analysis for Value Function Iteration

We now move to the second part of the proof. The value function iteration improves the estimation of optimal value function by iterating Bellman equation. In effect, the MCTS tree is “unrolling” $2H$ steps of such an iteration. Specifically, let $V(\cdot)$ denote the value function before an iteration, and let $V'(\cdot)$ be the value function after iteration. By definition, it holds for any $s \in \mathcal{S}$,

$$V'(s) = \max_{a \in [K]} \left(\mathbb{E} [R(s, a)] + V(s \circ a) \right). \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Recall that value iteration is contractive with respect to $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ norm (Bertsekas, 2012). That is, for any $h \geq 0$,

$$\|V' - V^*\|_\infty \leq \gamma \cdot \|V - V^*\|_\infty. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

Since we can flipping the sign of $R(\cdot)$, $V(\cdot)$ and $V'(\cdot)$ without breaking the contractive nature, the following iteration is also contractive with respect to $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ norm,

$$V'(s) = \min_{a \in [K]} \left(\mathbb{E}[R(s, a)] + \gamma V(s \circ a) \right). \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Thus, (A.11) still applies to the iteration corresponding to (A.12). By drawing connection between (A.1) and (A.10) as well as (A.2) and (A.12), we conclude the following lemma.

Lemma A.8. The mean reward $\tilde{v}_0^*(s_0)$ collected under the MCTS policy at root node s_0 , starting with input value function proxy V is such that

$$|\tilde{v}_0^*(s_0) - V^*(s_0)| \leq \gamma^H \|V - V^*\|_\infty. \quad (\text{A.13})$$

A.5 Completing Proof of Theorem 5.2

In summary, using Lemma A.5 and A.6, we conclude that the recursive relationship going from level $h - 1/2$ to $h - 1$ and from level h to $h - 1/2$ holds for all $h \in [H]$ with level 0 being the root. We set $\alpha_h = \frac{\alpha_{h+1/2}}{4}$ and $\xi_h = \alpha_{h+1/2}$. At root $s^{(0)}$, the query state that is input to the MCTS policy, we have that after n total simulations of MCTS, the empirical average of the rewards over these n trial, $\frac{1}{n}v_0^{(n)}(s_0)$ is such that using the fact that

$$\left| \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[v_0^{(n)}(s_0)] - \tilde{v}_0^*(s_0) \right| = \mathcal{O}(n^{2\alpha_0/\xi_0 - 1}) = \mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{n}), \quad (\text{A.14})$$

where the last equality follows from $\alpha_0 = \xi_0/4$. By Lemma A.8, it holds that

$$|\tilde{v}_0(s_0) - V^*(s_0)| \leq \gamma^H \varepsilon_0, \quad (\text{A.15})$$

since $\varepsilon_0 = \|\widehat{V} - V^*\|_\infty$. Combining (A.14) and (A.15), it then holds that

$$\left| \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[v_0^{(n)}(s_0)] - V^*(s_0) \right| \leq \gamma^H \varepsilon_0 + \mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{n}). \quad (\text{A.16})$$

This concludes the proof of Theorem 5.2.

B Pruning Analysis

B.1 Proof of the property of LSE

Proof of Lemma 5.3. Denote by $x^* = \operatorname{argmax}_{x \in \mathcal{X}} f(x)$. For any $\tau \geq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{LSE}(f, \mathcal{X}, \tau) - \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} f(x) \\
 &= \frac{1}{\tau} \cdot \log \left(\frac{1}{|\mathcal{X}|} \cdot \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \exp(\tau \cdot f(x)) \right) - f(x^*) \\
 &\geq \frac{1}{\tau} \cdot \log \left(\frac{1}{|\mathcal{X}|} \cdot \exp(\tau \cdot f(x^*)) \right) - f(x^*) \\
 &= \frac{-\log |\mathcal{X}|}{\tau},
 \end{aligned} \tag{B.1}$$

where the first equality uses the definition of x^* and the first inequality uses the fact that $\exp(\tau \cdot f(x)) \geq 0$ for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\tau \geq 0$.

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} f(x) - \text{LSE}(f, \mathcal{X}, \tau) \\
 &= \frac{1}{\tau} \cdot \log \left(\frac{1}{|\mathcal{X}|} \cdot \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \exp(\tau \cdot f(x)) \right) - f(x^*) \\
 &\leq \frac{1}{\tau} \cdot \log \left(\exp(\tau \cdot f(x^*)) \right) - f(x^*) \\
 &= 0
 \end{aligned} \tag{B.2}$$

$$\tag{B.3}$$

where we use the definition of x^* and the fact that $\tau \geq 0$.

Hence, we combine (B.1) and (B.3) to have

$$|\text{LSE}(f, \mathcal{X}, \tau) - \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} f(x)| \leq \frac{\log |\mathcal{X}|}{\tau}, \tag{B.4}$$

for any $\tau \geq 0$. Thus, we finish the proof of Lemma 5.3. \square

B.2 Proof of the pruning error bound

Proof of Proposition 5.5. By the notion of half-horizon, we mirror (3.5) to define

$$\tilde{V}_{1/2}^*(s) = \min_{a \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}} \left(\mathbb{E}[R(s, a)] + \gamma \cdot \tilde{V}^*(s \circ a) \right). \tag{B.5}$$

Combining (5.3), (B.5), and the fact that $r(s, a, b) = R(s, a) + R(s \circ a, b)$, we have

$$\tilde{V}^*(s) = \max_{a \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}} \left(\mathbb{E}[R(s, a)] + \tilde{V}_{1/2}^*(s \circ a) \right). \quad (\text{B.6})$$

For the notational simplicity, we define $\hat{\epsilon}(\tau)$ as

$$\hat{\epsilon}(\tau) = \max_{j \in \{0, 1/2\}} \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \left| \left(\max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} - \max_{a \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}} \right) (Q_j^*(s, a)) \right|, \quad (\text{B.7})$$

where we define V_0^* as V^* , $\max_{x \in \mathcal{X}_1} f(x) - \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}_2} f(x)$ as $(\max_{x \in \mathcal{X}_1} - \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}_2})(f(x))$, and $Q_j^*(s, a)$ as

$$Q_j^*(s, a) = \mathbb{E}[(-1)^{2j} \cdot R(s, a)] + (-\gamma)^{2j} \cdot V_j^*(s \circ a) \quad (\text{B.8})$$

for any $j \in \{0, 1/2\}$.

By the definition of $\hat{\epsilon}(\tau)$ in (B.7), we use triangle inequality to have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\epsilon}(\tau) &\leq \max_{j \in \{0, 1/2\}} \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \left| \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q_j^*(s, a) - \text{LSE}(Q_j^*(s, \cdot), \mathcal{A}, \tau) \right| \\ &\quad + \max_{j \in \{0, 1/2\}} \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \left| \text{LSE}(Q_j^*(s, \cdot), \mathcal{A}, \tau) - \text{LSE}(Q_j^*(s, \cdot), \tilde{\mathcal{A}}, \tau) \right| \\ &\quad + \max_{j \in \{0, 1/2\}} \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \left| \max_{a \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}} Q_j^*(s, a) - \text{LSE}(Q_j^*(s, \cdot), \tilde{\mathcal{A}}, \tau) \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.9})$$

Invoking Lemma 5.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\max_{j \in \{0, 1/2\}} \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \left| \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q_j^*(s, a) - \text{LSE}(Q_j^*(s, \cdot), \mathcal{A}, \tau) \right| + \max_{j \in \{0, 1/2\}} \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \left| \max_{a \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}} Q_j^*(s, a) - \text{LSE}(Q_j^*(s, \cdot), \tilde{\mathcal{A}}, \tau) \right| \\ &\leq 2 \frac{\log(|\mathcal{A}| |\tilde{\mathcal{A}}|)}{\tau}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.10})$$

for any $\tau \geq 0$. Plugging (B.9) and (B.10) into (B.7), we bound $\hat{\epsilon}(\tau)$ as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\epsilon}(\tau) &\leq \frac{2 \log(|\mathcal{A}| |\tilde{\mathcal{A}}|)}{\tau} + \max_{j \in \{0, 1/2\}} \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \left| \text{LSE}(Q_j^*(s, \cdot), \mathcal{A}, \tau) - \text{LSE}(Q_j^*(s, \cdot), \tilde{\mathcal{A}}, \tau) \right| \\ &\leq \frac{2 \log(|\mathcal{A}| |\tilde{\mathcal{A}}|)}{\tau} + \epsilon(\tau) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.11})$$

for any $\tau \geq 0$. Here, the inequality uses the definition of $\epsilon(\tau)$ in Definition 5.4. By (3.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|V^*(s) - \tilde{V}^*(s)| &= \left| \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left(\mathbb{E}[R(s, a)] + V_{1/2}^*(s \circ a) \right) - \max_{a \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}} \left(\mathbb{E}[R(s, a)] + \tilde{V}_{1/2}^*(s \circ a) \right) \right| \\
&\leq \left| \max_{a \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}} \left(\mathbb{E}[R(s, a)] + V_{1/2}^*(s \circ a) \right) - \max_{a \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}} \left(\mathbb{E}[R(s, a)] + \tilde{V}_{1/2}^*(s \circ a) \right) \right| + \hat{\epsilon}(\tau) \\
&\leq \max_{a \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}} \left| \mathbb{E}[R(s, a)] + V_{1/2}^*(s \circ a) - \mathbb{E}[R(s, a)] - \tilde{V}_{1/2}^*(s \circ a) \right| + \hat{\epsilon}(\tau) \\
&\leq \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \left| V_{1/2}^*(s) - \tilde{V}_{1/2}^*(s) \right| + \hat{\epsilon}(\tau), \tag{B.12}
\end{aligned}$$

for any $\tau \geq 0$ and $s \in \mathcal{S}$. Here, the first inequality uses the definition of $\hat{\epsilon}(\tau)$ in Definition 5.4 and the triangle inequality, the second inequality uses the contraction property of max operator, and the last inequality uses the fact that $s \circ a \in \mathcal{S}$. Take the maximum for $s \in \mathcal{S}$ on the left-hand side of (B.12), we obtain

$$\max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} |V^*(s) - \tilde{V}^*(s)| \leq \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \left| V_{1/2}^*(s) - \tilde{V}_{1/2}^*(s) \right| + \hat{\epsilon}(\tau), \tag{B.13}$$

for any $\tau \geq 0$. Emulating the similar proof, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|V_{1/2}^*(s) - \tilde{V}_{1/2}^*(s)| &= \left| \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left(\mathbb{E}[R(s, a)] + \gamma \cdot V^*(s \circ a) \right) - \min_{a \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}} \left(\mathbb{E}[R(s, a)] + \gamma \cdot \tilde{V}^*(s \circ a) \right) \right| \\
&= \left| \max_{a \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}} \left(\mathbb{E}[-R(s, a)] - \gamma \cdot V^*(s \circ a) \right) - \max_{a \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}} \left(\mathbb{E}[-R(s, a)] - \gamma \cdot \tilde{V}^*(s \circ a) \right) \right| \\
&\leq \left| \max_{a \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}} \left(\mathbb{E}[-R(s, a)] - \gamma \cdot V^*(s \circ a) \right) - \max_{a \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}} \left(\mathbb{E}[-R(s, a)] - \gamma \cdot \tilde{V}^*(s \circ a) \right) \right| + \hat{\epsilon}(\tau) \\
&\leq \max_{a \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}} \left| \mathbb{E}[-R(s, a)] - \gamma \cdot V^*(s \circ a) + \mathbb{E}[R(s, a)] + \gamma \cdot \tilde{V}^*(s \circ a) \right| + \hat{\epsilon}(\tau) \\
&\leq \gamma \cdot \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \left| V^*(s) - \tilde{V}^*(s) \right| + \hat{\epsilon}(\tau), \tag{B.14}
\end{aligned}$$

for any $\tau \geq 0$ and $s \in \mathcal{S}$. Here, the first inequality uses the definition of $\hat{\epsilon}(\tau)$ in Definition 5.4 and the triangle inequality, the second inequality uses the contraction property of max operator, and the last inequality uses the fact that $s \circ a \in \mathcal{S}$. Take the maximum for $s \in \mathcal{S}$ on the left-hand side of (B.14), we obtain

$$\max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} |V_{1/2}^*(s) - \tilde{V}_{1/2}^*(s)| \leq \gamma \cdot \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \left| V_{1/2}^*(s) - \tilde{V}_{1/2}^*(s) \right| + \hat{\epsilon}(\tau), \tag{B.15}$$

for any $\tau \geq 0$. Combining (B.13) and (B.15), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} |V^*(s) - \tilde{V}^*(s)| &\leq \frac{2}{1-\gamma} \cdot \tilde{\epsilon}(\tau) \\ &\leq \frac{2}{1-\gamma} \cdot \left(\epsilon(\tau) + \frac{2 \log(|\mathcal{A}| |\tilde{\mathcal{A}}|)}{\tau} \right), \end{aligned}$$

for any $\tau \geq 0$. Here, the last inequality uses (B.11). Thus, we finish the proof of Proposition 5.5. \square

C Auxiliary Lemmas

Lemma C.1 (The Azuma-Hoeffding's Inequality (Azuma, 1967)). Let X_1, \dots, X_n be independent random variables such that $X_i \in [a_i, b_i]$ almost surely. It then holds for any $t > 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n X_i \right] \geq t \right) &\leq \exp \left(- \frac{2t^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (b_i - a_i)^2} \right), \\ \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n X_i \right] \leq -t \right) &\leq \exp \left(- \frac{2t^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (b_i - a_i)^2} \right), \end{aligned}$$

Lemma C.2. Consider random variables $X_i, Y_i \in \mathbb{R}$ for $i \in \mathbb{N}_+$ such that X_i 's are independent and identically distributed taking values in $[-B, B]$ for some $B > 0$ and X_i 's are independent of Y_i 's. Suppose there exists $\mu_Y \in \mathbb{R}$ such that it holds for any $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i \right] = \mu_Y,$$

and it holds for any $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and $z \in [1, \infty)$ that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i - n\mu_Y \geq n^\eta z \right) \leq \frac{\beta}{z^\xi}, \quad \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i - n\mu_Y \leq -n^\eta z \right) \leq \frac{\beta}{z^\xi},$$

where $\beta \in (1, \infty)$, $\xi \in (0, \infty)$, $\eta \in [1/2, 1)$ are constants. Let $Z_i = X_i + \rho Y_i$ for some $\rho > 0$, and let $\mu_X = \mathbb{E}[X_1]$ be the expectation of all X_i 's. Then, it holds for any $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \right] = \mu_X + \rho \mu_Y. \tag{C.1}$$

And it holds for any $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and $z \in [1, \infty)$ that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n Z_i - n(\mu_X + \rho\mu_Y) \geq n^\eta z\right) \leq \frac{\beta'}{z^\xi}, \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n Z_i - n(\mu_X + \rho\mu_Y) \leq -n^\eta z\right) \leq \frac{\beta'}{z^\xi}, \quad (\text{C.2})$$

where $\beta' = (4\xi B^2/e)^{\xi/2} + (2\rho)^\xi \beta$.

Proof. Following from Lemma C.1 and the fact that X_i 's are i.i.d. bounded random variables taking value in $[-B, B]$, it holds for any $t \geq 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i - n\mu_X \geq nt\right) &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{t^2 n}{2B^2}\right), \\ \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i - n\mu_X \leq -nt\right) &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{t^2 n}{2B^2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, it holds for a large enough constant β' that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n Z_i - n(\mu_X + \rho\mu_Y) \geq n^\eta z\right) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i - n\mu_X \geq \frac{n^\eta z}{2}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i - n\mu_Y \geq \frac{n^\eta z}{2\rho}\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{z^2 n^{2\eta-1}}{8B^2}\right) + \left(\frac{2\rho}{z}\right)^\xi \beta. \end{aligned}$$

To choose a proper value value β' , note that

$$z^\xi \exp\left(-\frac{z^2 n^{2\eta-1}}{8B^2}\right) \leq z^\xi \exp\left(-\frac{z^2}{8B^2}\right) \leq (4\xi B^2)^{\xi/2} \exp(-\xi/2),$$

where the first inequality follows from the fact that $n \in [1, \infty)$ and $\eta \in [1/2, 1)$, and the second inequality is obtained via treating the right-hand side as a function of z and finding the maximum of that function. Then, we conclude the proof of the first equation in (C.2) by setting

$$\beta' = (4\xi B^2/e)^{\xi/2} + (2\rho)^\xi \beta.$$

We can prove the second equation by the same reasoning. □

Lemma C.3 (Maximum magnitude). Denote by R_h^{\max} the maximum magnitude of the rewards

collected by all the nodes in level $h \in \{0, 1/2, 1, \dots, H\}$. It then holds for any $h \in [H - 1]$ that

$$R_{H-1/2}^{\max} = R^{\max} + \gamma(V^{\max} + \epsilon_0) \quad (\text{C.3})$$

$$R_h^{\max} = R^{\max} + R_{h+1/2}^{\max} \quad (\text{C.4})$$

$$R_{h-1/2}^{\max} = R^{\max} + \gamma R_h^{\max}. \quad (\text{C.5})$$

Proof. Since all the rewards are bounded by R^{\max} . Then it follows from the definition of V^* and $V_{1/2}^*$ in (3.5) and (3.6) that

$$\begin{aligned} V^*(\cdot) &\leq 2R^{\max} + \gamma \cdot (2R^{\max} + \gamma \cdot (2R^{\max} + \dots)) = 2R^{\max} \cdot \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \gamma^i \right) \leq \frac{2R^{\max}}{1-\gamma} = V^{\max}, \\ V_{1/2}^*(\cdot) &\leq R^{\max} + \gamma \cdot (2R^{\max} + \gamma \cdot (2R^{\max} + \dots)) \leq 2R^{\max} \cdot \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \gamma^i \right) \leq \frac{2R^{\max}}{1-\gamma} = V^{\max}. \end{aligned}$$

The rewards collected for the node s and action a at level $H - 1/2$ is $R(s, a) + \gamma \tilde{v}_H^*(s \circ a)$. Since the \tilde{v}_H^* is provided by the input value function proxy V of Algorithm 2 and $\|V - V^*\| \leq \epsilon_0$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} |R(s, a) + \gamma \tilde{v}_H^*(s \circ a)| &\leq |R(s, a)| + \gamma \cdot (|V^{\max}(s \circ a)| + |\tilde{v}_H^*(s \circ a) - V^{\max}(s \circ a)|) \\ &\leq R^{\max} + \gamma(V^{\max} + \epsilon_0). \end{aligned}$$

For any $h \in [H - 1]$, the rewards collected for the node s and action a at level h is

$$|R(s, a) + \tilde{v}_{h+1/2}^*(s \circ a)| \leq |R(s, a)| + |\tilde{v}_{h+1/2}^*(s \circ a)| \leq R^{\max} + R_{h+1/2}^{\max},$$

and for level $h - 1/2$,

$$|R(s, a) + \gamma \tilde{v}_h(s \circ a)| \leq |R(s, a)| + \gamma |\tilde{v}_h(s \circ a)| \leq R^{\max} + \gamma R_h^{\max},$$

which concludes the proof of Lemma C.3. □