

Policy Zooming: Adaptive Discretization-based Infinite-Horizon Average-Reward Reinforcement Learning

Avik Kar¹ Rahul Singh¹

¹Electrical Communication Engineering
Indian Institute of Science
Bengaluru, Karnataka 560012
{avikkar, rahulsingh}@iisc.ac.in

Abstract

We study infinite-horizon average-reward reinforcement learning (RL) for Lipschitz MDPs and develop an algorithm *PZRL* that discretizes the state-action space adaptively and zooms in to the promising regions, i.e., those which seem to yield high average rewards, of the “policy space”. We show that the regret of *PZRL* can be bounded as $\tilde{O}(T^{1-d_{\text{eff}}^{-1}})$, where $d_{\text{eff.}} = 2d_S + d_z^\Phi + 2$, d_S is the dimension of the state space, and d_z^Φ is the zooming dimension. d_z^Φ is a problem-dependent quantity that depends not only on the underlying MDP but also the class of policies Φ used by the agent, which allows us to conclude that if the agent apriori knows that optimal policy belongs to a low-complexity class (that has a small d_z^Φ), then its regret will be small. We note that the preexisting notions of zooming dimension are adept at handling only the episodic RL case since zooming dimension approaches covering dimension of the state-action space as $T \rightarrow \infty$, and hence do not yield any possible adaptivity gains. The current work shows how to capture adaptivity gains for infinite-horizon average-reward RL in terms of d_z^Φ . Several experiments are conducted to evaluate the performance of *PZRL*. *PZRL* outperforms other state-of-the-art algorithms; this clearly demonstrates the gains arising due to adaptivity.

1 Introduction

Reinforcement Learning (RL) (Sutton and Barto 2018) is a popular framework in which an agent repeatedly interacts with an unknown environment modeled by a Markov decision process (MDP) (Puterman 2014) and the goal is to choose actions sequentially in order to maximize the cumulative rewards earned by the agent. We study infinite-horizon average reward MDPs in continuous state and action spaces endowed with a metric, in which the transition kernel and reward functions are Lipschitz (Assumption 1). The class of Lipschitz MDPs covers a broad class of problems, such as the class of linear MDPs (Jin et al. 2020), RKHS MDPs (Chowdhury and Gopalan 2019), linear mixture models, RKHS approximation, and the nonlinear function approximation framework considered in (Osband and Van Roy 2014) and (Kakade et al. 2020). See (Maran et al. 2024a,b) for more details. We note that even though discrete and linear MDPs have been extensively studied in the literature, they might not be suitable for many real-world applications since it is becoming increasingly common to deploy RL and control algorithms in

systems that are non-linear and continuous (Nair et al. 2023; Kumar et al. 2021).

Throughout, we use d_S, d_A to denote dimensions of the state-space and the action-space respectively, and $d := d_S + d_A$. Note that for continuous spaces, the learning regret could grow linearly with time horizon T unless the problem has some structure (Kleinberg, Slivkins, and Upfal 2008). For Lipschitz MDPs in episodic setup, the regret scales as $\tilde{O}(K^{1-d_{\text{eff}}^{-1}})$ ¹, where K is the number of episodes, $d_{\text{eff.}}$ is the effective dimension associated with the *underlying MDP* and the *algorithm*. For example, a vanilla approach that uses *fixed discretization* has $d_{\text{eff.}} = d + 2$ (Song and Sun 2019). On the other hand, one can use structure of the MDP in order to reduce $d_{\text{eff.}}$. As an example, prior works on Lipschitz MDPs such as Sinclair, Banerjee, and Yu (2019); Cao and Krishnamurthy (2020) reduce effective dimension to $d_z + 2$, where d_z is the zooming dimension. Let N_γ be the γ -covering number of the set of state-action pairs (s, a) that have suboptimality gap in $[\gamma, 2\gamma)$, where sub-optimality is the gap between the Q -value and the value function evaluated at s . Zooming dimension d_z is the minimum value of $d' > 0$ such that N_γ scales as $\gamma^{-d'}$ for all $\gamma > 0$.

They use RL algorithms based on the principle of optimism in the face of uncertainty (OFU) (Lattimore and Szepesvári 2020) *only* on certain discretized MDPs that are composed of the centers of “active-cells.” These active cells, and their diameters are adjusted dynamically, which yields an intelligent exploration strategy that bypasses the need to learn the MDP on those regions of the state-action space that are irrelevant for obtaining optimal performance. The resulting algorithm relies upon (i) adaptive discretization and (ii) “zooming” behavior to reduce $d_{\text{eff.}}$.

We show that the existing definitions of zooming dimension are inappropriate for average reward RL tasks in that $d_z \rightarrow d$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$, which one would obtain via fixed discretization. We develop tools and algorithms that are appropriate for applying the zooming and adaptive discretization idea to this setup and obtain $d_{\text{eff.}} = 2d_S + d_z^\Phi + 2$, where d_z^Φ is the appropriately defined zooming dimension for average reward RL tasks in which the agent employs policies from a set Φ . Thus, we refine the notion of d_z to allow it to also depend upon the class of policies that the agent uses. Hence,

¹ \tilde{O} suppresses poly-logarithmic dependence in K or T .

if the optimal policy belongs to a “simple class,” then this would further lower the zooming dimension. We now describe the idea of adaptive discretization and zooming for the simpler problem of Lipschitz MABs developed in (Slivkins et al. 2019).

Lipschitz MABs: The Zooming Algorithm. One maintains a set of “active arms,” and at each time t plays an arm only from the current set of active arms. Include a new arm in the active set *only* when one cannot obtain a good estimate of its reward from the estimates of nearby active arms². This gives rise to “confidence balls” around each active arm with radius equal to the confidence radius associated with the estimate of the corresponding arm, and the reward estimates of arms lying within this ball are set equal to that of the representative active arm. In order to balance the exploration-exploitation trade-off, choose an action from the active set that has the highest upper confidence bound (UCB) index, where the index is a weighted sum of the empirical estimate of the arm’s mean reward and its confidence radius. Since the regret of the vanilla UCB algorithm for a fixed arm set increases with the number of arms, it is desirable to keep the number of active arms minimal. Hence, a new arm is “activated,” i.e., is included in the discretized action space, only when it is no longer covered by some ball. Since the radius of a confidence ball decreases only when the number of plays of that arm increases, an arm that is close to an active arm gets activated only when this active arm has been played sufficiently many times. Thus, this algorithm has a “zooming” behavior, i.e., it zooms in only those regions that seem promising, i.e., have a high value of UCB index. This algorithm has $d_{\text{eff.}} = d_z + 2$.

1.1 Challenges

A naive approach aimed towards designing an efficient RL algorithm for infinite-horizon average reward and obtaining a small $d_{\text{eff.}}$ would be to partition the total horizon T into episodes of constant duration, whose length is chosen to be $H = T^\beta, \beta \in (0, 1)$, and then rely upon the analysis that was done for episodic Lipschitz MDPs. There are several shortcomings with this approach. Firstly, the proofs in the episodic case crucially rely on showing that the episodic value function is also Lipschitz, with a Lipschitz constant equal to $L_r \sum_{h=1}^H L_p^h$ where L_r and L_p are Lipschitz constants corresponding to the reward function and transition probability kernel, respectively (Domingues et al. 2021). This Lipschitz constant appears as a pre-factor in the regret bounds. Since $H \rightarrow \infty$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$, these regret bounds become vacuous. Secondly, the zooming dimension is defined in terms of γ -covering number of sets consisting of state-action pairs whose *episodic* Q -values are within $\approx H\gamma$ of the optimal value. Since such sets reduce to $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ as $H \rightarrow \infty$, the zooming dimension proposed in (Cao and Krishnamurthy 2020; Sinclair, Banerjee, and Yu 2023) converges to d as $T \rightarrow \infty$. This takes back the gain obtained due to adaptive

²More specifically, an arm at a distance of r units from an arm a that has reward estimate $\hat{\mu}_a$, will have mean reward lying in the interval $[\hat{\mu}_a - Lr, \hat{\mu}_a + Lr]$, where L is the Lipschitz constant of the reward function.

discretization. See Appendix I for more details.

We now discuss some key technical difficulties that we overcome. For MABs, the zooming algorithm plays only from amongst the active arms since the UCB index of an active arm turns out to be an optimistic estimate of the mean reward of each arm lying inside its confidence ball. However, designing the confidence radius, and proving that this property holds in the case of policies is much more complex since the indices of various policies are interrelated with each other because all the policies interact with the same underlying MDP. Consequently, while employing the zooming idea to the RL setup, the complexity of the underlying environment must be reflected in the regret bound. Another issue that arises is regarding the choice of norm that should be used while measuring the distance between two policies (note that since the policy space is not finite-dimensional, all norms are not equivalent).

1.2 Contributions

1. We consider infinite-horizon average reward Lipschitz MDPs on continuous state and action spaces in which the agent can use policies only from set Φ comprising of stationary policies. We design an algorithm *PZRL* that combines policy-based zooming with UCB.
2. We show that the existing notions of zooming dimension are inadequate for average reward setup; we provide a new definition of zooming dimension d_z^Φ that is appropriate for this setup, and is based on the covering of the policy space Φ . We show that if Φ is a subset of the class of Lipschitz policies, the regret of *PZRL* w.r.t. Φ can be bounded as $\tilde{O}(T^{1-d_{\text{eff.}}^{-1}})$, where $d_{\text{eff.}} = 2d_S + d_z^\Phi + 2$. We note that d_z^Φ is a problem-specific quantity, i.e., it depends upon the underlying MDP as well as Φ . The complexity of the learning problem, and hence the quantity d_z^Φ and regret, vary with Φ . When the set of policies Φ is parameterized by a finite-dimensional parameter set $W \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_w}$, we have $d_z \leq d_w$ under a mild condition.
3. Along the way, we develop novel sensitivity results for general state-space Markov processes (Meyn and Tweedie 2012) that are of independent interest. More specifically, we show that for a Lipschitz MDP, the average reward of two stationary deterministic policies differs at most by a constant times the distance between these policies (2). Our sensitivity result significantly improves the existing results (Mitrophanov 2005; Mouhoubi 2021) and allows us to define the zooming dimension in terms of the covering of the policy space w.r.t. a weighted metric (2) instead of the L_∞ metric.
4. Simulation experiments verify the gains of using adaptive discretization techniques as against popular fixed discretization-based algorithms.

1.3 Past Works

Episodic RL: Regret for finite MDPs scales as $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{T})$ times a prefactor that increases with the cardinality of the state-action spaces (Simchowitz and Jamieson 2019; Zanette and Brunskill 2019), and hence learning becomes prohibitive for high dimensions. In order to achieve efficient learning in high

dimensional MDPs, it is either assumed that the problem has some structure, or one resorts to value/model function approximation. In linear mixture MDPs (Ayoub et al. 2020; Zhou, Gu, and Szepesvari 2021), one assumes that the transition kernel is a linear combination of d_m known transition kernels, and can show that the regret scales as $\tilde{O}(d_m \sqrt{H^3 K})$, where H is the duration of a single episode in the episodic RL setup. Also see Jin et al. (2020); Zanette et al. (2020). If the MDP belongs to an RKHS (Chowdhury and Gopalan 2019), then the regret of UCB and Thompson Sampling is bounded as $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{K})$; but the pre-factor could potentially be large when the RKHS is “broad” (e.g., Matern kernels). Several works use non-linear function approximation (Osband and Van Roy 2014; Jin, Liu, and Miryoosefi 2021) techniques. For MDPs in which the episodic value function is Lipschitz, and noise is sub-Gaussian, Osband and Van Roy (2014) obtains $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{d_E d_F H K})$ regret, where d_E, d_F are the eluder dimension and log-covering number of the function class, respectively, and could be huge. When the value function belongs to a known function class which is closed under the application of the Bellman operator (Wang, Salakhutdinov, and Yang 2020; Jin, Liu, and Miryoosefi 2021), the best-known regret upper bound is $\tilde{O}(H \sqrt{d_E d_F K})$ (Agarwal, Jin, and Zhang 2023).

Lipschitz MDPs on Metric Spaces: Domingues et al. (2021) obtain $\tilde{O}(H^3 K^{1-(2d+1)^{-1}})$ regret by applying smoothing kernels. Cao and Krishnamurthy (2020) shows provable gains arising due to adaptive discretization and zooming and obtains $\tilde{O}(H^{2.5+(2d_z+4)^{-1}} K^{1-(2d+1)^{-1}})$ regret, where d_z is the zooming dimension defined specifically for episodic RL. Sinclair, Banerjee, and Yu (2023) proposes a model-based algorithm with adaptive discretization that has a regret upper bound of $\tilde{O}(L_v H^{\frac{3}{2}} K^{1-(d_z+d_S)^{-1}})$, where L_v is the Lipschitz constant for the value function. We note that as compared with the works on general function approximation, regret bounds obtained in works on Lipschitz MDPs have a worse growth rate as a function of time horizon. However, this is expected since Lipschitz MDPs are a more general class of MDPs, and have a regret lower bound of $\Omega(K^{1-(d_z+2)^{-1}})$ (Sinclair, Banerjee, and Yu 2023).

Non-episodic RL: For finite MDPs (Jaksch, Ortner, and Auer 2010; Tossou, Basu, and Dimitrakakis 2019) the minimax regret of state-of-the-art algorithms scales at most as $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{D S A T})$ where D is the diameter of the MDP. However, algorithms for continuous MDPs are a *less explored* but important topic that is pursued in *this work*. For linear mixture MDPs on finite spaces (Wu, Zhou, and Gu 2022), regret is upper bounded as $\tilde{O}(d \sqrt{D T})$, where d is the number of component transition kernels, and D is the diameter. (Wei et al. 2021) works with a known feature map, assumes that the relative value function is a linear function of the features, and obtains a $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{T})$ regret. He, Zhong, and Yang (2023) studies model approximation as well as value function approximation using general function classes and obtains $\tilde{O}(\text{poly}(d_E, B) \sqrt{d_F T})$ regret, where B is the span of the relative value function. Ortner and Ryabko (2012) obtains

a $\tilde{O}(T^{\frac{2d+\alpha}{2d+2\alpha}})$ regret for α -Hölder continuous and infinitely often smoothly differentiable transition kernels. To the best of our knowledge, currently, no existing work has developed low-regret algorithms for non-episodic RL for general space Lipschitz MDPs.

2 Problem Setup

Notation. The set of natural numbers is denoted by \mathbb{N} , the set of positive integers by \mathbb{Z}_+ . For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we let $[n] := \{0, 1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Let \mathcal{F} be a σ -algebra and $\mu : \mathcal{F} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be a measure, then we let $\|\mu\|_{TV}$ denote its total variation norm (Folland 2013), i.e., $\|\mu\|_{TV} := \sup \{|\mu(B)| : B \in \mathcal{F}\}$.

Let $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, p, r)$ be an MDP, where the state-space \mathcal{S} and action-space \mathcal{A} are compact sets of dimension d_S and d_A , respectively. The spaces \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A} are endowed with metrics ρ_S and ρ_A , respectively. The space $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ is endowed with a metric ρ that is sub-additive, i.e., we have, $\rho((s, a), (s', a')) \leq \rho_S(s, s') + \rho_A(a, a')$, for all $(s, a), (s', a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$. We let \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{A} be endowed with Borel σ -algebra \mathcal{B}_S and \mathcal{B}_A , respectively. To simplify exposition, we assume that $\mathcal{S} = [0, 1]^{d_S}$ and $\mathcal{A} = [0, 1]^{d_A}$ without loss of generality. The state and action taken at time t are denoted by s_t, a_t , respectively. The transition kernel is $p : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}_S \rightarrow [0, 1]$, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{P}(s_{t+1} \in B | s_t = s, a_t = a) = p(s, a, B), \text{ a.s.}, \quad (1)$$

for all $(s, a, B) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}_S$, $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, and is not known by the agent. The reward function $r : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a measurable map, and the reward earned by the agent at time t is equal to $r(s_t, a_t)$. A stationary deterministic policy is a measurable map $\phi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ that implements the action $\phi(s)$ when the system state is s . Let Φ_{SD} be the set of all such policies. If ν is a non-negative, finite measure on \mathcal{B}_S , then the metric $\|\cdot\|_{\rho_A, \nu}$ on Φ_{SD} is given by

$$\|\phi_1 - \phi_2\|_{\rho_A, \nu} := \int_{\mathcal{S}} \rho_A(\phi_1(s), \phi_2(s)) d\nu(s), \quad (2)$$

where $\phi_1, \phi_2 \in \Phi_{SD}$. Two policies $\phi_1, \phi_2 \in \Phi_{SD}$ are equivalent if $\|\phi_1 - \phi_2\|_{\rho_A, \nu} = 0$. Note that if ν is taken to be the Lebesgue measure, and ρ_A to be the L_1 metric on \mathbb{R}^{d_A} , then the metric $\|\cdot\|_{\rho_A, \nu}$ reduces to the L_1 metric on Φ_{SD} . The infinite horizon average reward for the MDP \mathcal{M} under a policy ϕ is denoted by $J(\phi, p)$, and the optimal average reward attainable with Φ is denoted by $J_{\Phi}^*(p)$, i.e. $J_{\Phi}^*(p) = \sup_{\phi \in \Phi} J(\phi, p)$. Denote $J_{\Phi_{SD}}^*(p)$ by $J^*(p)$. We let $\Delta_{\Phi}(\phi) := J_{\Phi}^*(p) - J(\phi, p)$ be the suboptimality gap of policy ϕ w.r.t. Φ . A policy ϕ is called γ -optimal w.r.t. Φ if $\Delta_{\Phi}(\phi) \leq \gamma$, and γ -suboptimal w.r.t. Φ if $\Delta_{\Phi}(\phi) > \gamma$. The regret of a learning algorithm ψ w.r.t. a class of *comparator* policies Φ until T is defined as (Rakhlin and Sridharan 2014),

$$\mathcal{R}_{\Phi}(T; \psi) := T \sup_{\phi \in \Phi} J(\phi, p) - \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} r(s_t, a_t). \quad (3)$$

Note that if Φ contains an optimal policy then $\mathcal{R}_{\Phi}(T; \psi) := T J^*(p) - \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} r(s_t, a_t)$ is the usual regret. An MDP is Lipschitz if it satisfies the following properties.

Assumption 1 (Lipschitz continuity). (i) The reward function r is L_r -Lipschitz, i.e., $\forall s, s' \in \mathcal{S}, a, a' \in \mathcal{A}$,

$$|r(s, a) - r(s', a')| \leq L_r \rho((s, a), (s', a')).$$

(ii) The transition kernel p is L_p -Lipschitz, i.e., $\forall s, s' \in \mathcal{S}, a, a' \in \mathcal{A}$,

$$\|p(s, a, \cdot) - p(s', a', \cdot)\|_{TV} \leq L_p \rho((s, a), (s', a')).$$

While studying infinite-horizon average reward MDPs, some sort of ergodicity assumption is required.

Assumption 2 (Ergodicity). For each $s, s' \in \mathcal{S}$ and $a, a' \in \mathcal{A}$, we have $\|p(s, a, \cdot) - p(s', a', \cdot)\|_{TV} \leq 2\alpha$, where $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.

We note that even when the kernel p is known, Assumption 2 is the weakest known sufficient condition that ensures a computationally efficient way to obtain an optimal policy (Arapostathis et al. 1993). In Appendix B we derive some interesting properties for MDPs which satisfy Assumptions 1 and 2, which are then used while designing algorithms. Next, we show that the average reward function $J(\cdot, p) : \Phi_{SD} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Lipschitz function of policies w.r.t. $\|\cdot\|_{\rho_{\mathcal{A}, \nu}}$.

Theorem 1. Assume that p satisfies the following property: there is a probability measure ν and a constant $\kappa \in (0, \infty)$ such that for each policy $\phi \in \Phi_{SD}$, we have $\mu_{\phi, p}^{(\infty)}(\zeta) \leq \kappa \cdot \nu(\zeta)$, $\forall \zeta \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}}$. Then, the infinite horizon average reward is $\kappa \left(L_r + \frac{L_p}{2(1-\alpha)} \right)$ -Lipschitz w.r.t. the metric $\|\cdot\|_{\rho_{\mathcal{A}, \nu}}$, i.e., for every $\phi_1, \phi_2 \in \Phi_{SD}$,

$$|J(\phi_1, p) - J(\phi_2, p)| \leq \kappa \left(L_r + \frac{L_p/2}{1-\alpha} \right) \|\phi_1 - \phi_2\|_{\rho_{\mathcal{A}, \nu}}.$$

Its proof is provided in Appendix C. We next define the zooming dimension d_z^Φ .

Zooming dimension. Given a class of stationary deterministic policies Φ , we use Φ_γ to denote the set of policies from Φ whose sub-optimality gap belongs to $[\gamma, 2\gamma]$, i.e., $\Phi_\gamma := \{\phi \in \Phi \mid \Delta_\Phi(\phi) \in (\gamma, 2\gamma]\}$. We define the zooming dimension given the policy space Φ as

$$d_z^\Phi := \inf \left\{ d' > 0 \mid \mathcal{N}_{\gamma'}(\Phi_\gamma) \leq c_z \gamma^{-d'}, \forall \gamma \geq 0 \right\}, \quad (4)$$

where $\mathcal{N}_{\gamma'}(\Phi)$ denotes the γ' -covering number³ of Φ w.r.t. metric $\|\cdot\|_{\rho_{\mathcal{A}, \nu}}$, c_z is a problem-dependent constant, $\gamma' = \gamma/(C_1 C_3)$, C_1 is as defined in (49) and C_3 is as introduced in Lemma 16.

Policies parameterized by finitely many parameters: An important special case of the general setup is when Φ consists of policies parameterized by finite-dimensional parameters. Let $W \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_w}$ be a bounded set, and for $w \in W$ let $\phi(\cdot; w) : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ be the policy parameterized by w . Assume $\|w - w'\|_2 \leq L_W \|\phi(\cdot; w) - \phi(\cdot; w')\|_{\rho_{\mathcal{A}, \nu}}$ for all $w, w' \in W$, where ν is a measure that satisfies Assumption 3. It is shown in Appendix H that d_z^Φ can be upper-bounded by d_W .

³ γ -covering number of a set is the cardinality of the smallest set of balls of radius γ that covers the set (Shalev-Shwartz and Ben-David 2014).

3 Adaptive Discretization and Active Policies

In this section, we discuss two key features of the proposed algorithms: adaptive discretization of the state-action space, and active policies. We decompose the state-action space into ‘‘cells’’ to enable discretization.

Definition 1 (Cells). A cell is a dyadic cube with vertices from the set $\{2^{-\ell}(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_d) : v_j \in [2^\ell], j = 1, 2, \dots, d\}$ with sides of length $2^{-\ell}$, where $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. The quantity ℓ is called the level of the cell. We also denote the collection of cells of level ℓ by $\mathcal{P}^{(\ell)}$. For a cell ζ , we let $\ell(\zeta)$ denote its level.

For $Z \subseteq \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$, $\text{diam}(Z) := \sup_{z_1, z_2 \in Z} \rho(z_1, z_2)$. For a cell $\zeta \subseteq \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$, its \mathcal{S} -projection is called an \mathcal{S} -cell and is defined as, $\pi_{\mathcal{S}}(\zeta) := \{s \in \mathcal{S} \mid (s, a) \in \zeta \text{ for some } a \in \mathcal{A}\}$. Similarly, the \mathcal{A} -projection of ζ , $\pi_{\mathcal{A}}(\zeta)$ can be defined. For a cell/ \mathcal{S} -cell ζ , we let $q(\zeta)$ be a point from ζ that is its unique representative point. q^{-1} maps a representative point to the cell that this point is representing, i.e., $q^{-1}(z) = \zeta$ such that $q(\zeta) = z$. Denote the set of the representative points of the \mathcal{S} -cells of level ℓ by $S^{(\ell)}$. We define the level ℓ discretization of the MDP transition kernel p as follows,

$$\bar{p}(s, a, s'; \ell) := p(s, a, q^{-1}(s')), \quad (5)$$

for all $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$, $s' \in S^{(\ell)}$, and define the continuous extension of $\bar{p}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot; \ell)$ as,

$$p(s, a, B; \ell) := \sum_{s' \in S^{(\ell)}} \frac{\lambda(B \cap q^{-1}(s'))}{\lambda(q^{-1}(s'))} \bar{p}(s, a, s'; \ell), \quad (6)$$

for all $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$, $B \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}}$, where λ denotes the Lebesgue measure (Resnick 2019). Next, we introduce the partition tree of cells that enables adaptive discretization.

Definition 2 (Partition tree). A partition tree of depth ℓ is a tree in which (i) Each node is a cell. (ii) Each node at a depth $\ell' \leq \ell$ of the tree is a cell of level ℓ' . (iii) If ζ' is the parent node of ζ , then $\zeta \subset \zeta'$. ζ is called child cell of ζ' and ζ' is called the parent cell of ζ . (iv) The set of all ancestor nodes of cell ζ is called ancestors of ζ .

Define the L -neighborhood of a cell, ζ as $\zeta_L := \{(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \mid \exists (s', a') \in \zeta \text{ s.t. } \rho((s, a), (s', a')) \leq L \text{diam}(\zeta)\}$. The set of active cells at time t is given as follows.

Definition 3 (Activation rule). For a cell ζ denote,

$$N_{\max}(\zeta) := \frac{c_1 2^{d_S+2} \log\left(\frac{T}{\delta}\right)}{\text{diam}(\zeta)^{d_S+2}}, \text{ and} \quad (7)$$

$$N_{\min}(\zeta) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \zeta = \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \\ \frac{c_1 \log\left(\frac{T}{\delta}\right)}{\text{diam}(\zeta)^{d_S+2}}, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

where $c_1 > 0$ is a constant that is discussed in the proof of Lemma 7 and $\delta \in (0, 1)$ is the confidence parameter. The number of visits to ζ is denoted $N_t(\zeta)$ and is defined iteratively as follows by starting with level $\ell = 0$.

1. $N_t(\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}) := t$.
2. Any cell ζ is said to be active if $N_{\min}(\zeta) < N_t(\zeta) \leq N_{\max}(\zeta)$.

3. $N_t(\zeta)$ is defined for all other cells as the number of times ζ or any of its ancestors has been visited while being active until time t , i.e., $N_t(\zeta) := \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \mathbb{I}_{\{(s_i, a_i) \in \zeta_{i_L}\}}$, where ζ_i is the cell that was active at time i and $\zeta \subseteq \zeta_i$.

Denote the set of active cells at time t by \mathcal{P}_t and also denote $Z_t := \{q(\zeta) : \zeta \in \mathcal{P}_t\}$. Note that for each t , \mathcal{P}_t is a partition of the state-action space. For any $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$, and time t , $q_t^{-1}(s, a)$ denote the active cell that contains (s, a) . The adaptively discretized state-action space plays a crucial role in the computation of confidence diameters and UCB indices of policies. Let us now define the confidence diameter of a policy $\phi \in \Phi_{SD}$ at time t as follows, $\text{diam}_t(\phi) := \int_{\mathcal{S}} \mu_{p, \phi}^{(\infty)}(s) \text{diam}(q_t^{-1}(s, \phi(s))) ds$. *PZRL* maintains a set of active policies A_t , such that $\cup_{\phi \in A_t} B_t(\phi)$ covers the entire policy set Φ where

$$B_t(\phi) := \left\{ \phi' \in \Phi : \|\phi' - \phi\|_{\rho_{\mathcal{A}, \nu}} \leq \text{diam}_t(\phi) \right\}.$$

4 Algorithm

We propose an algorithm *PZRL* that combines policy-based zooming with the OFU. It maintains a set of active policies, computes their UCB indices and then plays an active policy with the highest UCB index in the current episode. Its zooming component zooms in and activates only those policies from Φ for which it is not possible to generate a good estimate of its performance using the performance of nearby active policies. We begin by describing how to estimate the transition kernel and the confidence ball associated with this estimate. We then provide an iterative algorithm that takes these estimates as input and yields the UCB indices for policies that are active during the current episode.

Estimating the Transition Kernel. Define the following discretized transition kernel in which the next state assumes discrete values from the set $\mathcal{S}^{(\ell_t(s, a))}$,

$$\bar{p}_t(s, a, s') := \bar{p}(s, a, s'; \ell_t(s, a)), \quad (9)$$

where $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$, the next state $s' \in \mathcal{S}^{(\ell_t(s, a))}$, and $\ell_t(s, a)$ denotes the level of the cell $q_t^{-1}(s, a)$. Let p_t denote the continuous extension (6) of \bar{p}_t . Let $N_t(\zeta, \xi) := \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \mathbb{I}_{\{(s_i, a_i, s_{i+1}) \in \zeta_{i_L} \times \xi\}}$, be the number of transitions until t from the cell ζ to the \mathcal{S} -cell ξ . Discretized transition kernel $\bar{p}_t(s, a, \cdot) : \mathcal{S}^{(\ell_t(s, a))} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ at time t is estimated as follows,

$$\hat{p}_t(s, a, s') := \frac{N_t(q_t^{-1}(s, a)_L, q^{-1}(s'))}{1 \vee N_t(q_t^{-1}(s, a)_L)}, \quad (10)$$

$(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$, $s' \in \mathcal{S}^{(\ell_t(s, a))}$ and its continuous extension is defined as,

$$\hat{p}_t(s, a, B) := \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}^{(\ell_t(s, a))}} \frac{\lambda(B \cap q^{-1}(s'))}{\lambda(q^{-1}(s'))} \hat{p}_t(s, a, s'), \quad (11)$$

for all $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$, $B \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}}$. Note that if (s, a) and (s', a') belong to the same active cell, then $\hat{p}_t(s, a) = \hat{p}_t(s', a')$. Also, $\hat{p}_t(s, a) = \hat{p}_t(s', a')$ when (s, a) and (s', a') belong

to the same active cell. For a cell ζ , the confidence radius associated with the estimate $\hat{p}_t(q(\zeta), \cdot)$ is defined as follows,

$$\eta_t(\zeta) := 3 \left(c_1 \log(T\delta^{-1}) / N_t(\zeta) \right)^{\frac{1}{d_{\mathcal{S}+2}}} + (3(1+L)L_p + C_v) \text{diam}(\zeta), \quad (12)$$

where $c_1 > 0$ and $C_v > 0$ are constants that are discussed in Lemma 7 and Assumption 4, respectively. Note that if $\zeta \in \mathcal{P}_t$, then it follows from the rule used for activating a new cell (Definition 3) that $\text{diam}(\zeta) \geq (c_1 \log(T\delta^{-1}) / N_t(\zeta))^{\frac{1}{d_{\mathcal{S}+2}}}$, which when combined with (12) yields,

$$\eta_t(\zeta) \leq C_\eta \text{diam}(\zeta), \quad (13)$$

where $C_\eta := 3(1 + (1+L)L_p) + C_v$. We define a set of transition probability kernels associated with \hat{p}_t as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_t := \{ \theta \in \Theta \mid & \|\theta(z, \cdot) - \hat{p}_t(z, \cdot)\|_1 \leq \eta_t(q_t^{-1}(z)) \text{ for} \\ & \text{every } z \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}, \|\theta(z, \cdot) - \theta(z', \cdot)\|_1 \leq 2\alpha \\ & \text{for every } z, z' \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \}, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where η_t is as in (12) and Θ is the set of all possible transition kernels for MDPs with state space \mathcal{S} and action space \mathcal{A} . Lemma 7 shows that $p \in \mathcal{C}_t$ for all $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$ with high probability.

Computing UCB Indices of Active Policies. To obtain the UCB index of a policy $\phi \in \Phi_{SD}$, we perform the following iterations,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{V}_0^{\phi, k}(s) &= 0, \\ \bar{V}_{i+1}^{\phi, k}(s) &= r(s, \phi(s)) + \max_{\theta \in \mathcal{C}_{\tau_k}} \int_{\mathcal{S}} \theta(s, \phi(s), s') \bar{V}_i^{\phi, k}(s') ds' \\ &+ C_L \text{diam}(q_{\tau_k}^{-1}(s, \phi(s))), \quad s \in \mathcal{S}, i \in \mathbb{Z}_+, \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where $C_L := \kappa_2 \left(L_r + \frac{L_p}{2(1-\alpha)} \right)$, then the normalized iterates converge to its UCB index, i.e.,

$$\bar{J}_k(\phi) := \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{i} \bar{V}_i^{\phi, k}(s). \quad (16)$$

$\bar{V}_i^{\phi, k}$ can be thought of as the value iterates for an extended MDP (Jaksch, Ortner, and Auer 2010) where the transition kernels belong to \mathcal{C}_{τ_k} are actions. Note that for each possible θ , the Markov chain obtained when ϕ is applied, is geometrically ergodic. This ensures the existence of $\bar{J}_k(\phi)$, and additionally from Lemma 4 we have that $sp(\bar{V}_i^{\phi, k})$ is finite. Hence, the choice of the initial state $s \in \mathcal{S}$ is irrelevant for the computation of $\bar{J}_k(\phi)$.

PZRL (Algorithm 1) plays policies from a predefined set of policies Φ . As discussed earlier, it maintains a set of active policies $A_t \subseteq \Phi$, and during the k -th episode plays a policy from the set $\arg \max_{\phi \in A_{\tau_k}} \bar{J}_k(\phi)$, where ties are broken according to a rule that has been chosen at time $t = 0$. When a policy is played during an episode, then its confidence ball shrinks. In the event $\cup_{\phi \in A_t} B_t(\phi)$ does not cover Φ anymore, it will activate some policies in order to ensure that the new set of confidence balls covers Φ . Iterations (15) are not computationally feasible since $\bar{V}_i^{\phi, k}$ must be computed over the

Algorithm 1 Policy Zooming for RL (PZRL)

Input Horizon T , Constant C_L , confidence parameter δ , ergodicity coefficient α and policy class Φ
Initialize $h = 0, k = 0, \mathcal{P}_0 = \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}, A_0 = \{\}$.
 $\tilde{\epsilon} = T^{-(2d_S+d+2)^{-1}}, t^*(\tilde{\epsilon}) = \lceil \log(\frac{2}{\tilde{\epsilon}^{d_S+1}}) / \log(\frac{1}{\alpha}) \rceil$.
for $t = 0$ to $T - 1$ **do**
 Update the set of active policies $A_t \subset \Phi$
 if $h \geq H_k$ **then**
 $k \leftarrow k + 1, h \leftarrow 0, \tau_k = t$
 $\mathcal{P}_{\tau_k} = \text{Update partition}(\mathcal{P}_{\tau_{k-1}}, \{s_t, a_t\}_{t=0}^{\tau_k-1})$ (4)
 Compute $\bar{J}_k(\phi)$ (16) for every $\phi \in A_t$.
 Choose $\phi_k \in \arg \max_{\phi \in A_{\tau_k}} \bar{J}_k(\phi)$.
 $H_k = \frac{16t^*(\tilde{\epsilon})(4D)^{2(d_S+1)}}{L \text{diam}_{\tau_k}(\phi_k)^{2(d_S+1)}} (c_2 \log(\frac{T}{\epsilon\delta}) + 1)^4$
 end if
 $h \leftarrow h + 1$
 Play $a_t = \phi_k(s_t)$, observe s_{t+1} and receive $r(s_t, a_t)$.
end for

entire state-space. Next, we propose a heuristic algorithm that has a significantly lesser computational complexity since it operates on a discretized MDP.

4.1 Heuristic for Computing UCB Indices of Active Policies

Our heuristic is based upon the popular Extended Value Iteration (EVI) of (Jaksch, Ortner, and Auer 2010) that is used by the UCRL2 algorithm designed for discrete MDPs. Our heuristic employs a slightly modified version of EVI on a certain discretized MDP, in which the state-action pairs (s, a) correspond to the representative state-action pairs of cells which are currently active, and the next possible state values belong to the set $S^{(\ell_t(s,a))}$. Let $\bar{\Theta}_t$ be the set of all such possible discrete transition kernels. Let $\hat{p}_t^{(d)} \in \bar{\Theta}_t$ denote the estimate of the discretized transition kernel,

$$\hat{p}_t^{(d)}(s, a, s') := \frac{N_t(q_t^{-1}(s, a), q^{-1}(s'))}{1 \vee N_t(q_t^{-1}(s, a))}, \quad (17)$$

where $(s, a) \in Z_t, s' \in S^{(\ell_t(s,a))}$. Define a set of discretized transition probability kernels with a discretized support at time $\tau_k, \bar{\mathcal{C}}_t := \{\theta \in \bar{\Theta}_t : \|\theta(s, a, \cdot) - \hat{p}_t(s, a, \cdot)\|_1 \leq \eta_t(q^{-1}(s, a)) \text{ for every } (s, a) \in Z_t\}$. From the proof of Lemma 7, it follows that $\hat{p}_t^{(d)} \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}_t \forall t \in [T]$ with a high probability. Let \mathcal{P} be a valid active partition. Define the set of relevant cells for each $s \in \mathcal{S}$ given \mathcal{P} as $Rel(s; \mathcal{P}) := \{\zeta \in \mathcal{P} : \exists a \in \mathcal{A} \text{ such that } (s, a) \in \zeta\}$. We denote $Rel(s; \mathcal{P}_t)$ by $Rel_t(s)$. Denote \mathcal{P}^S the least cardinality partition of \mathcal{S} such that no cells in $\{\pi_S(\zeta) | \zeta \in \mathcal{P}\}$ is a proper subset of any of the elements of \mathcal{P}^S . We say a policy $\phi \in \Phi_{SD}$ compatible with \mathcal{P}_t if for each $\xi \in \mathcal{P}_t^S$ and for all $s \in \xi, \phi(s) = q(\pi_{\mathcal{A}}(\zeta))$ for some $\zeta \in Rel_t(s)$.

At the beginning of k -th episode, Extended Value Iteration with Bias (EVI-B) (Algorithm 3, Appendix G) returns

$${}^4L \text{diam}_{\tau_k}(\phi) = \kappa_1 \int_{\mathcal{S}} \text{diam}(q_{\tau_k}^{-1}(s, \phi(s))) \nu(s) ds.$$

a policy that maximizes a certain index among all policies compatible with the discretization \mathcal{P}_t . This index is similar to what was defined in (16), the only difference being that the reward functions, plausible MDPs, and policies are discretized, and an additional term proportional to the radius of the cell is added to compensate for the “discretization error.” Since the policy returned by EVI-B might not be in Φ , we project this policy back onto the set Φ ,

$$\phi_k \in \arg \min_{\phi' \in \Phi} \|\phi' - \phi_{k, \text{EVI-B}}\|_{\rho_{\mathcal{A}}, \lambda}, \quad (18)$$

where λ denotes the Lebesgue measure and $\phi_{k, \text{EVI-B}}$ is the policy returned by EVI-B, and then play ϕ_k during \mathcal{E}_k . We provide the pseudocode of the heuristic algorithm and discuss the convergence and computational complexity of EVI-B algorithm in Appendix G.

5 Regret Analysis

In this section, we present our main result Theorem 2 that yields an upper bound on the regret of PZRL. We will need the following two assumptions.

Assumption 3 (Bound of Stationary Distributions). *There is a probability measure ν , and constants $0 < \kappa_1 \leq \kappa_2$ such that for every policy $\phi \in \Phi$, and for every $\zeta \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}}$, we have,*

$$\kappa_1 \cdot \nu(\zeta) \leq \mu_{\phi, p}^{(\infty)}(\zeta) \leq \kappa_2 \cdot \nu(\zeta). \quad (19)$$

Assumption 4 (Diminishing discretization error). *There exists a positive constant C_v such that for each $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, we have*

$$\|p(s, a, \cdot; \ell) - p(s, a, \cdot)\|_{TV} \leq C_v D 2^{-\ell}.$$

Remark. (A note on assumptions) We note that similar or stronger assumptions are made in the literature. Ormoneit and Glynn (2002) considers average reward RL on continuous state space and proves that the proposed adaptive policy converges to an optimal policy. It assumes that the transition kernel of the underlying MDP has a strictly positive Radon-Nikodym derivative, which resonates with Assumption 3. Recently, Wang, Blanchet, and Glynn (2023) derive optimal sample complexity for average reward RL under an assumption that the m -step transition kernel is bounded below by a known measure, which is also similar to Assumption 3. In yet another work, Wei et al. (2021) bounds the regret for average reward RL algorithm that in which MDPs employ linear function approximation. They assume that under every policy, the integral of cross-product of the feature vectors w.r.t. the stationary measure has all the eigenvalues bounded away from zero. This assumption ensures that upon playing any policy, the confidence ball shrinks in each direction, which has a similar effect as Assumption 3. We note that Assumption 4 is not restrictive since the continuity of transition kernels w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure is enough to satisfy it.

We use Φ_{Lip} to denote the class of Lipschitz policies. Note that it is a broad class, for example it contains the set of continuous policies.

Theorem 2. *Let $\Phi \subseteq \Phi_{Lip}$. If MDP \mathcal{M} satisfies Assumptions 1- 4, then under the PZRL algorithm, with a probability at least $1 - \delta$ the regret $\mathcal{R}_{\Phi}(T; \text{PZRL})$ is upper-bounded as $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(T^{1-d_{\text{eff}}^{-1}})$ where $d_{\text{eff}} = 2d_S + d_z^{\Phi} + 2$.*

The detailed proof is delegated to the Appendix F. Here, we provide a *proof sketch*:

Regret decomposition: We decompose the regret as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(T; \text{PZRL}) &= \sum_{k=1}^{K(T)} \sum_{t=\tau_k}^{\tau_{k+1}-1} J_{\Phi}^*(p) - r(s_t, a_t) \\ &= \underbrace{\sum_{k=1}^{K(T)} H_k \Delta_{\Phi}(\phi_k)}_{(a)} + \underbrace{\sum_{k=1}^{K(T)} \sum_{t=\tau_k}^{\tau_{k+1}-1} J(\phi_k, p) - r(s_t, \phi_k(s_t))}_{(b)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $K(T)$ denotes total number of episodes till time T , H_k denote the duration of the k -th episode and $r^\phi: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ such that $r^\phi(s) = r(s, \phi(s)) \forall s \in \mathcal{S}$. We bound the terms (a) and (b) separately.

Bounding (a): This term is further decomposed into the sum of the regrets arising due to playing policies from the sets Φ_γ , where γ assumes the values 2^{-i} , $i = 1, 2, \dots, \lceil \log(1/\epsilon) \rceil$, and $\epsilon = T^{-d_{\text{eff}}^{-1}}$. Cumulative regret arising from playing policies not in the set $\cup_{i=1}^{\lceil \log(1/\epsilon) \rceil} \Phi_{2^{-i}}$ is bounded by ϵT . The regret arising due to playing policies from Φ_γ is bounded in the following three steps:

(1) First, we derive a condition under which a γ -suboptimal policy is no longer played.

(2) Then, we deduce an upper bound of the number of plays of a policy ϕ in terms of its suboptimality gap by concluding that the condition stated in (1) holds when ϕ has been played sufficiently many times.

(3) Then we establish an upper bound on the number of policies that are activated by *PZRL* from Φ_γ .

The product of two upper bounds mentioned in (2) and (3), multiplied by 2γ , is the regret arising from playing policies from Φ_γ . We then add these regret terms with $\gamma = 2^{-i}$ for $i = 1$ to $\lceil \log(1/\epsilon) \rceil$ along with ϵT .

Bounding (b): Upper bound on the term (b) relies on the geometric ergodicity property (Meyn and Tweedie 2012) of \mathcal{M} , that has been shown in Proposition 3. Proposition 17 shows that we must pay a constant penalty in regret each time we change policy, which is $\mathcal{O}(K(T))$. Then we show that the number of episodes in *PZRL* is bounded above by $\mathcal{O}\left(T^{d_z^\Phi / (2d_S + d_z^\Phi + 2)}\right)$, so is the term (b).

We obtain the desired regret bound after summing the upper bounds on (a) and (b). \square

Remark. For the class of parametric policies discussed in Section 2, if we further assume that this class is a subset of Φ_{Lip} , we conclude that $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(T^{1-d_{\text{eff}}^{-1}})$ is a high probability bound on regret, where $d_{\text{eff}} = 2d_S + d_W + 2$.

6 Simulations

We compare the empirical performance of the heuristic algorithm (Algorithm 2, Appendix G) with that of UCRL2 (Jaksch, Ortner, and Auer 2010), TSDE (Ouyang et al. 2017) and a Q-learning based algorithm for average-reward RL, RVI-Q (Qian et al. 2019, Section E.1). Since these competitor policies are designed for finite state-action

spaces, we apply them on a uniform discretization of $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$. Simulation experiments are conducted on the following systems:

Truncated LQR System: The state of the system evolves as $s_{t+1} = -4 \vee (4 \wedge A s_t + B a_t + w_t)$, where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d_S \times d_S}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{d_S \times d_{\mathcal{A}}}$ and w_t is i.i.d. Gaussian noise. The reward at time t is $-s_t^\top P s_t - a_t^\top Q a_t$. The system parameters are set as follows:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} -0.2 & -0.07 \\ 0.6 & 0.07 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} 0.07 & 0.09 \\ -0.03 & -0.1 \end{bmatrix},$$

$P = 0.4 I_2$, $Q = 0.6 I_2$ and mean and standard deviation of w_t are 0 and 0.05, respectively⁵. We consider $\mathcal{A} = [-1, 1]^{d_{\mathcal{A}}}$.

Continuous RiverSwim: We modify the RiverSwim MDP (Strehl and Littman 2008) to obtain its continuous version. The state, that is the location of the agent in the river evolves upon moving towards a direction as follows:

$$s_{t+1} = \begin{cases} (0 \vee (s_t - \frac{1}{2}(1 + \frac{w_t}{2}))) \wedge 6 & \text{w.p. } \frac{2(1-a_t)}{5} \\ s_t & \text{w.p. } 0.2 \\ (0 \vee (s_t + \frac{1}{2}(1 + \frac{w_t}{2}))) \wedge 6 & \text{w.p. } \frac{2(1+a_t)}{5}, \end{cases}$$

where w_t is a 0-mean i.i.d. Gaussian random sequence. Here, $\mathcal{S} = [0, 6]$ and $\mathcal{A} = [0, 1]$. The reward function is given by $r(s, a) = 0.005(((s-6)/6)^4 + ((a-1)/2)^4) + 0.5((s/6)^4 + ((a+1)/2)^4)$.

We plot the cumulative rewards averaged over 50 runs for both the environments in Figure 1. See Appendix K for additional experimental results.




Figure 1: Cumulative Reward Plots.

7 Conclusion

The central idea of zooming-based algorithms is to capitalize on the adaptive nature of the algorithm. We identify an important problem encountered while employing adaptive discretization and zooming to infinite horizon average reward RL setup. To rectify this, we define the zooming dimension for this setup in terms of coverings of the policy space, and moreover also allow it to depend upon the class of policies Φ used by the agent. We propose a zooming-based algorithm *PZRL*, and prove that it exhibits adaptivity gains. We show that when $\Phi \subseteq \Phi_{\text{Lip}}$, then its Φ regret can be bounded as $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(T^{1-d_{\text{eff}}^{-1}})$ where $d_{\text{eff}} = 2d_S + d_z^\Phi + 2$. Though current work focused only on the class of Lipschitz policies, it is interesting to derive regret bounds for more general policy classes. Simulation results confirm our theoretical findings.

⁵ I_n denotes identity matrix of size $n \times n$.

References

- Abbasi-Yadkori, Y.; Pál, D.; and Szepesvári, C. 2011. Improved algorithms for linear stochastic bandits. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 24: 2312–2320.
- Agarwal, A.; Jin, Y.; and Zhang, T. 2023. VOQL: Towards Optimal Regret in Model-free RL with Nonlinear Function Approximation. In *The Thirty Sixth Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, 987–1063. PMLR.
- Arapostathis, A.; Borkar, V. S.; Fernández-Gaucherand, E.; Ghosh, M. K.; and Marcus, S. I. 1993. Discrete-time controlled Markov processes with average cost criterion: a survey. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 31(2): 282–344.
- Ayoub, A.; Jia, Z.; Szepesvári, C.; Wang, M.; and Yang, L. 2020. Model-based reinforcement learning with value-targeted regression. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 463–474. PMLR.
- Cao, T.; and Krishnamurthy, A. 2020. Provably adaptive reinforcement learning in metric spaces. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33: 9736–9744.
- Chowdhury, S. R.; and Gopalan, A. 2019. Online learning in kernelized markov decision processes. In *The 22nd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 3197–3205. PMLR.
- Domingues, O. D.; Menard, P.; Pirotta, M.; Kaufmann, E.; and Valko, M. 2021. Kernel-Based Reinforcement Learning: A Finite-Time Analysis. In Meila, M.; and Zhang, T., eds., *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, 2783–2792. PMLR.
- Folland, G. B. 2013. *Real analysis: modern techniques and their applications*. John Wiley & Sons.
- He, J.; Zhong, H.; and Yang, Z. 2023. Sample-efficient Learning of Infinite-horizon Average-reward MDPs with General Function Approximation. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Hernández-Lerma, O. 2012. *Adaptive Markov control processes*, volume 79. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Hernández-Lerma, O.; and Lasserre, J. B. 2012. *Further topics on discrete-time Markov control processes*, volume 42. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Jaksch, T.; Ortner, R.; and Auer, P. 2010. Near-optimal regret bounds for reinforcement learning. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11(Apr): 1563–1600.
- Jin, C.; Liu, Q.; and Miryoosefi, S. 2021. Bellman eluder dimension: New rich classes of rl problems, and sample-efficient algorithms. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34: 13406–13418.
- Jin, C.; Yang, Z.; Wang, Z.; and Jordan, M. I. 2020. Provably efficient reinforcement learning with linear function approximation. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, 2137–2143. PMLR.
- Kakade, S.; Krishnamurthy, A.; Lowrey, K.; Ohnishi, M.; and Sun, W. 2020. Information theoretic regret bounds for online nonlinear control. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33: 15312–15325.
- Kleinberg, R.; Slivkins, A.; and Upfal, E. 2008. Multi-armed bandits in metric spaces. In *Proceedings of the fortieth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, 681–690.
- Kumar, A.; Fu, Z.; Pathak, D.; and Malik, J. 2021. Rma: Rapid motor adaptation for legged robots. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.04034*.
- Lattimore, T.; and Szepesvári, C. 2020. *Bandit algorithms*. Cambridge University Press.
- Maran, D.; Metelli, A. M.; Papini, M.; and Restell, M. 2024a. No-Regret Reinforcement Learning in Smooth MDPs. *The Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Maran, D.; Metelli, A. M.; Papini, M.; and Restelli, M. 2024b. Projection by Convolution: Optimal Sample Complexity for Reinforcement Learning in Continuous-Space MDPs. *The 37th Annual Conference on Learning Theory*.
- Mete, A.; Singh, R.; Liu, X.; and Kumar, P. 2021. Reward biased maximum likelihood estimation for reinforcement learning. In *Learning for Dynamics and Control*, 815–827. PMLR.
- Meyn, S. P.; and Tweedie, R. L. 2012. *Markov chains and stochastic stability*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Mitrophanov, A. Y. 2005. Sensitivity and convergence of uniformly ergodic Markov chains. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 42(4): 1003–1014.
- Mouhoubi, Z. 2021. Perturbation and stability bounds for ergodic general state Markov chains with respect to various norms. *Le Matematiche*, 76(1): 243–276.
- Nair, S.; Rajeswaran, A.; Kumar, V.; Finn, C.; and Gupta, A. 2023. R3m: A universal visual representation for robot manipulation. *Conference on Robot Learning*.
- Ormoneit, D.; and Glynn, P. 2002. Kernel-based reinforcement learning in average-cost problems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 47(10): 1624–1636.
- Ortner, R.; and Ryabko, D. 2012. Online regret bounds for undiscounted continuous reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 25.
- Osband, I.; and Van Roy, B. 2014. Model-based reinforcement learning and the eluder dimension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1406.1853*.
- Ouyang, Y.; Gagrani, M.; Nayyar, A.; and Jain, R. 2017. Learning unknown Markov decision processes: A thompson sampling approach. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 1333–1342.
- Puterman, M. L. 2014. *Markov decision processes: discrete stochastic dynamic programming*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Qian, J.; Fruit, R.; Pirotta, M.; and Lazaric, A. 2019. Exploration bonus for regret minimization in discrete and continuous average reward mdps. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32.
- Raginsky, M.; Sason, I.; et al. 2013. Concentration of measure inequalities in information theory, communications, and coding. *Foundations and Trends® in Communications and Information Theory*, 10(1-2): 1–246.
- Rakhlin, A.; and Sridharan, K. 2014. Lecture notes for STAT928: Statistical Learning and Sequential Prediction. www.mit.edu/~rakhlin/courses/stat928/stat928_notes.pdf.

- Resnick, S. 2019. *A Probability Path*. Springer.
- Shalev-Shwartz, S.; and Ben-David, S. 2014. *Understanding machine learning: From theory to algorithms*. Cambridge university press.
- Simchowitz, M.; and Jamieson, K. G. 2019. Non-asymptotic gap-dependent regret bounds for tabular mdps. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32.
- Sinclair, S. R.; Banerjee, S.; and Yu, C. L. 2019. Adaptive discretization for episodic reinforcement learning in metric spaces. *Proceedings of the ACM on Measurement and Analysis of Computing Systems*, 3(3): 1–44.
- Sinclair, S. R.; Banerjee, S.; and Yu, C. L. 2023. Adaptive discretization in online reinforcement learning. *Operations Research*, 71(5): 1636–1652.
- Slivkins, A.; et al. 2019. Introduction to multi-armed bandits. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 12(1-2): 1–286.
- Song, Z.; and Sun, W. 2019. Efficient model-free reinforcement learning in metric spaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.00475*.
- Strehl, A. L.; and Littman, M. L. 2008. An analysis of model-based interval estimation for Markov decision processes. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 74(8): 1309–1331.
- Sutton, R. S.; and Barto, A. G. 2018. *Reinforcement learning: An introduction*. MIT press.
- Tossou, A.; Basu, D.; and Dimitrakakis, C. 2019. Near-optimal optimistic reinforcement learning using empirical Bernstein inequalities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.12425*.
- Van Der Vaart, A. W.; Wellner, J. A.; van der Vaart, A. W.; and Wellner, J. A. 1996. *Weak convergence*. Springer.
- Wang, R.; Salakhutdinov, R. R.; and Yang, L. 2020. Reinforcement learning with general value function approximation: Provably efficient approach via bounded eluder dimension. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33: 6123–6135.
- Wang, S.; Blanchet, J.; and Glynn, P. 2023. Optimal Sample Complexity for Average Reward Markov Decision Processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.08833*.
- Wei, C.-Y.; Jahromi, M. J.; Luo, H.; and Jain, R. 2021. Learning infinite-horizon average-reward mdps with linear function approximation. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 3007–3015. PMLR.
- Wu, Y.; Zhou, D.; and Gu, Q. 2022. Nearly minimax optimal regret for learning infinite-horizon average-reward mdps with linear function approximation. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 3883–3913. PMLR.
- Zanette, A.; and Brunskill, E. 2019. Tighter problem-dependent regret bounds in reinforcement learning without domain knowledge using value function bounds. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 7304–7312. PMLR.
- Zanette, A.; Lazaric, A.; Kochenderfer, M.; and Brunskill, E. 2020. Learning near optimal policies with low inherent Bellman error. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 10978–10989. PMLR.
- Zhou, D.; Gu, Q.; and Szepesvari, C. 2021. Nearly minimax optimal reinforcement learning for linear mixture Markov decision processes. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, 4532–4576. PMLR.

A Organization of the Appendix

The appendices are organized as follows. Some properties of continuous state-action MDPs that satisfy Assumption 2 are proved in Appendix B. Appendix C contains proof of a novel sensitivity result for continuous state-action Markov chains, along with its application to MDPs. Appendix D and Appendix E contain preliminary results that are required for deriving the regret upperbound of Theorem 2 and Appendix F contains proof of the same. The pseudocode of the proposed heuristic algorithm, EVI-B algorithm are in Appenix G. Also, the pseudocode of the subroutine for updating the partition of the state-action space, which is called by both *PZRL* and *PZRL*-heuristic at the beginning of every episode, can be found in Appendix G. The proofs of convergence of the EVI-B algorithm and the optimism property of the index of the returned policy by EVI-B are shown in the same section. Appendix H derives an upper bound on the zooming dimension when Φ is a set of policies of finite-dimensional parameterization. As a result, we have low regret when the comparator policy class can be represented in a lower dimensional space. Regret analysis for average reward RL of a naive modification of the episodic, zooming-based RL algorithm (Cao and Krishnamurthy 2020) is presented in Appendix I. Some known results that are used in this paper are placed in Appendix J. Additional experimental results and the details of the experiments are reported in Appendix K.

B General Results for MDPs

In this section, we derive some important properties for MDPs satisfying Assumption 2. We note that these results are applied either to the original MDP, or its discretization while deriving the regret upper bounds. Consider the controlled Markov process (CMP) $\{s_t\}$ described by the transition kernel p , which evolves under the application of a stationary policy ϕ . The following result can be found in (Arapostathis et al. 1993; Hernández-Lerma 2012). We provide its proof here for the sake of completeness.

Proposition 3. *Let $P : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a transition kernel that satisfies Assumption 2, i.e.,*

$$\|P(s, a, \cdot) - P(s', a', \cdot)\|_{TV} \leq 2\alpha, \quad (20)$$

where $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Then, under the application of each stationary deterministic policy $\phi : \mathcal{S} \mapsto \mathcal{A}$, the controlled Markov process $\{s_t\}$ has a unique invariant distribution, denoted by $\mu_{\phi, P}^{(\infty)}$. Moreover $\{s_t\}$ is geometrically ergodic, i.e., for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$ the following holds,

$$\left\| \mu_{\phi, P, s}^{(t)} - \mu_{\phi, P}^{(\infty)} \right\|_{TV} \leq 2\alpha^t, \quad t \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (21)$$

where $\mu_{\phi, P, s}^{(t)}$ denotes the probability distribution of s_t when $s_0 = s$.

Proof. Consider the CMP that is described by the transition kernel P and evolves under the application of policy ϕ , and consider two copies of that CMP with different initial state distributions, $\mu_1^{(0)}$ and $\mu_2^{(0)}$. Denote the distributions of s_t in

the corresponding processes by $\mu_1^{(t)}$ and $\mu_2^{(t)}$, respectively. We show the following:

$$\left\| \mu_1^{(t)} - \mu_2^{(t)} \right\|_{TV} \leq \alpha^t \left\| \mu_1^{(0)} - \mu_2^{(0)} \right\|_{TV}, \quad t \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (22)$$

Note that,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \mu_1^{(1)} - \mu_2^{(1)} \right\|_{TV} \\ &= 2 \sup_{A \subseteq \mathcal{S}} \left\{ (\mu_1^{(1)} - \mu_2^{(1)})(A) \right\} \\ &= 2 \sup_{A \subseteq \mathcal{S}} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{S}} P(s, \phi(s), A) (\mu_1^{(0)} - \mu_2^{(0)})(s) ds \right\} \\ &\leq \sup_{\substack{A \subseteq \mathcal{S} \\ s, s' \in \mathcal{S}}} \{ P(s, \phi(s), A) - P(s', \phi(s'), A) \} \left\| \mu_1^{(0)} - \mu_2^{(0)} \right\|_{TV} \\ &\leq \alpha \left\| \mu_1^{(0)} - \mu_2^{(0)} \right\|_{TV}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from the definition of the total variation norm, while the third and the fourth step follow from Lemma 26 and from Assumption 2, respectively. Applying the same argument recursively, we obtain (22). To see the existence of an invariant distribution, consider $\mu_2^{(0)} = \mu_1^{(s)}$, $s \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that for all $n, s \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\left\| \mu_1^{(t)} - \mu_1^{(t+s)} \right\|_{TV} \leq 2\alpha^t.$$

Hence, $\{\mu_1^{(t)}\}_t$ is a Cauchy sequence in the space of probability measures on \mathcal{S} and attains a limit by the completeness of the space of probability measures. To see the uniqueness of the invariant distribution, assume that $\mu_i^{(\infty)}$, $i = 1, 2$, are two invariant distributions of the CMP. Let the initial distributions of the two processes be $\mu_1^{(\infty)}$ and $\mu_2^{(\infty)}$. Then, by the definition of invariant distribution, the distributions of the states in these two processes at time t must be $\mu_1^{(\infty)}$ and $\mu_2^{(\infty)}$, respectively, for every $t \in \mathbb{N}$. But, from (22), for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mu_1^{(t)} - \mu_2^{(t)} \right\|_{TV} &= \left\| \mu_1^{(\infty)} - \mu_2^{(\infty)} \right\|_{TV} \\ &\leq \alpha^t \left\| \mu_1^{(\infty)} - \mu_2^{(\infty)} \right\|. \end{aligned}$$

Taking limit $t \rightarrow \infty$, we have that $\mu_1^{(\infty)} = \mu_2^{(\infty)}$. Hence, the uniqueness of the invariant distribution of the CMP is established. To show the last part of the claim, we take $\mu_1^{(0)} = \mu_{\phi, P}^{(\infty)}$ and $\mu_2^{(0)} = \delta_s$. Then, (21) follows from (22). This completes the proof. \square

Proposition 3 implies that under any $\phi \in \Phi_{SD}$, the controlled Markov process $\{s_t\}$ has a unique invariant distribution and is geometrically ergodic, i.e., (21) holds. The Q-iteration for \mathcal{M} (Sutton and Barto 2018) is defined as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} Q_0(s, a) &= 0, \\ Q_{i+1}(s, a) &= r(s, a) + \int_{\mathcal{S}} ds' p(s, a, s') V_i(s'), \quad (23) \end{aligned}$$

for all $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, where,

$$V_i(s) := \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q_i(s, a), \text{ for every } s \in \mathcal{S}, i \in \mathbb{Z}_+. \quad (24)$$

For a policy $\phi \in \Phi_{SD}$, the policy evaluation algorithm (Hernández-Lerma and Lasserre 2012) performs the following iterations,

$$V_0^\phi(s) = 0, \\ V_{i+1}^\phi(s) = r(s, \phi(s)) + \int_{\mathcal{S}} ds' p(s, \phi(s), s') V_i^\phi(s'), \quad (25)$$

for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. One can show that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{i} V_i(s) = J^*(p)$, and $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{i} V_i^\phi(s) = J(\phi, p)$ for every $s \in \mathcal{S}$ (Puterman 2014, Chapter 8). We now show another interesting property of \mathcal{M} that holds under Assumption 2.

Lemma 4. *If the MDP \mathcal{M} satisfies Assumption 2, then for each $\phi \in \Phi_{SD}$ we have*

$$sp(V_i) \leq \frac{1}{1-\alpha}, \text{ and } sp(V_i^\phi) \leq \frac{1}{1-\alpha}, \quad (26)$$

and for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. We will only prove the result for V_i since the proof for V_i^ϕ is similar. Consider $i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Let \bar{s} be a maximizer of the function $V_{i+1}(\cdot)$, and similarly let \underline{s} be a minimizer of $V_{i+1}(\cdot)$. Also, let \bar{a} be an optimal action in state \bar{s} that maximizes $Q_{i+1}(\bar{s}, a)$, i.e.,

$$V_{i+1}(\bar{s}) = r(\bar{s}, \bar{a}) + \int_{\mathcal{S}} p(\bar{s}, \bar{a}, s') V_i(s') ds'. \quad (27)$$

Similarly, let \underline{a} be an action that maximizes $Q_{i+1}(\underline{s}, a)$, i.e.,

$$V_{i+1}(\underline{s}) = r(\underline{s}, \underline{a}) + \int_{\mathcal{S}} p(\underline{s}, \underline{a}, s') V_i(s') ds'. \quad (28)$$

$sp(V_{i+1})$ can be upper-bounded iteratively as follows,

$$sp(V_{i+1}) = (r(\bar{s}, \bar{a}) - r(\underline{s}, \underline{a})) \\ + \int_{\mathcal{S}} (p(\bar{s}, \bar{a}, s') - p(\underline{s}, \underline{a}, s')) V_i(s') ds' \\ \leq 1 + \alpha sp(V_i), \quad (29)$$

where the inequality is obtained using Assumption 2, Lemma 26, and $|r(s, a)| \leq 1$. The claim then follows from the fact that $V_0 = 0$, and by applying (29) iteratively. \square

The same conclusion holds for the discretized MDP that has ergodicity property with ergodicity coefficient α .

C Lipschitz Continuity of Average Rewards

In this section, we will prove Theorem 1. Before doing that, we shall derive a novel sensitivity result for MDPs that satisfy Assumption 1 and 2.

Proposition 5. *Let ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 be two stationary deterministic policies and $P : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a transition kernel that satisfies Assumption 1(ii) and Assumption 2. Then,*

$$\left\| \mu_{\phi_1, P}^{(\infty)} - \mu_{\phi_2, P}^{(\infty)} \right\|_{TV} \leq \frac{L_p}{1-\alpha} \|\phi_1 - \phi_2\|_{\rho_{\mathcal{A}, \mu_{\phi_1, P}^{(\infty)}}}.$$

Proof. We introduce a few shorthand notations to simplify the presentation. Denote $\mu_{\phi_i, P}^{(t)}$ by μ_i^t , $\mu_{\phi_i, P}^{(\infty)}$ by μ_i for $i = 1, 2$. Let P_i denote the Markov transition kernel induced by policy ϕ_i , $i = 1, 2$. Denote $\Delta P := P_1 - P_2$ and $\delta^t := \mu_1^t - \mu_2^t$. If μ represents the distribution of states at time t and P is the transition probability kernel of the CMP, then $\int P d\mu$ is the distribution of states at time $t+1$. We have the following,

$$\delta^t = \int P_1 d\mu_1^{t-1} - \int P_2 d\mu_2^{t-1} \\ = \int \Delta P d\mu_1^{t-1} + \int P_2 d\delta^{t-1} \\ = \int \Delta P d\mu_1^{t-1} + \int P_2 d \left(\int \Delta P d\mu_1^{t-2} \right) \\ + \int P_2 d \left(\int P_2 d\delta^{t-2} \right) \\ = \int \Delta P d\mu_1^{t-1} + \int P_2 d \left(\int \Delta P d\mu_1^{t-2} \right) \\ + \int P_2 d \left(\int P_2 d \left(\int \Delta P d\mu_1^{t-3} \right) \right) \\ + \int P_2 d \left(\int P_2 d \left(\int P_2 d\delta^{t-3} \right) \right). \quad (30)$$

Note that if the difference between the distributions of states at time $t-3$ is δ^{t-3} , then the last term is the difference between distributions of states at time t of two CMPs whose evolutions are governed by transition kernel P . Hence, we write

$$\int P_2 d \left(\int P_2 d \left(\int P_2 d\delta^{t-3} \right) \right) \\ = P(x_t | x_{t-3} \sim \mu_1^{t-3}) - P(x_t | x_{t-3} \sim \mu_2^{t-3}). \quad (31)$$

Letting $t \rightarrow \infty$ in (30) and unrolling the terms up to m terms we have,

$$\mu_1 - \mu_2 \\ = \int \Delta P d\mu_1 + \int P_2 d \left(\int \Delta P d\mu_1 \right) \\ + \int P_2 d \left(\int P_2 d \left(\int \Delta P d\mu_1 \right) \right) + \dots \\ + (P(x_t | x_{t-m} \sim \mu_1) - P(x_t | x_{t-m} \sim \mu_2)). \quad (32)$$

Now, taking $m \rightarrow \infty$, due to geometric ergodicity, we have

$$\mu_1 - \mu_2 = \int \Delta P d\mu_1 + \int P_2 d \left(\int \Delta P d\mu_1 \right) \\ + \int P_2 d \left(\int P_2 d \left(\int \Delta P d\mu_1 \right) \right) + \dots \quad (33)$$

Note that $\int \Delta P d\mu_1$ is the difference between two probability measures, $\int P_1 d\mu_1$ and $\int P_2 d\mu_1$. Taking total variation norm on measures of both sides of (33), invoking triangle

inequality and from the proof of Proposition 3, we have that,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_{TV} \\
& \leq \left\| \int \Delta P d\mu_1 \right\|_{TV} + \alpha \left\| \int \Delta P d\mu_1 \right\|_{TV} \\
& \quad + \alpha^2 \left\| \int \Delta P d\mu_1 \right\|_{TV} + \dots \\
& = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \left\| \int \Delta P d\mu_1 \right\|_{TV} \\
& = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \sup_{A \subseteq S} \left\{ \int \Delta P(s, A) d\mu_1(s) \right\} \\
& \leq \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \int \sup_{A \subseteq S} \{ \Delta P(s, A) \} d\mu_1(s) \\
& = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \int \|\Delta P\|_{TV} d\mu_1. \tag{34}
\end{aligned}$$

Now, let us write (34) using the regular notation, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \mu_{\phi_1, P}^{(\infty)} - \mu_{\phi_2, P}^{(\infty)} \right\|_{TV} \\
& \leq \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \int \|P(s, \phi_1(s), \cdot) - P(s, \phi_2(s), \cdot)\|_{TV} d\mu_1(s) \\
& \leq \frac{L_p}{1-\alpha} \int \rho_{\mathcal{A}}(\phi_1(s), \phi_2(s)) d\mu_1(s) \\
& = \frac{L_p}{1-\alpha} \|\phi_1 - \phi_2\|_{\rho_{\mathcal{A}, \mu_{\phi_1, P}^{(\infty)}}},
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from Assumption 1(ii). This concludes the proof of the claim. \square

C.1 Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. For $\phi \in \Phi_{SD}$ we have,

$$J(\phi, p) = \int_S r(s, \phi(s)) d\mu_{\phi, p}^{(\infty)}(s).$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
& |J(\phi_1, p) - J(\phi_2, p)| \\
& = \left| \int_S r(s, \phi_1(s)) d\mu_{\phi_1, p}^{(\infty)}(s) - \int_S r(s, \phi_2(s)) d\mu_{\phi_2, p}^{(\infty)}(s) \right| \\
& \leq \left| \int_S r(s, \phi_1(s)) d\left(\mu_{\phi_1, p}^{(\infty)} - \mu_{\phi_2, p}^{(\infty)}\right)(s) \right| \\
& \quad + \left| \int_S (r(s, \phi_1(s)) - r(s, \phi_2(s))) d\mu_{\phi_2, p}^{(\infty)}(s) \right| \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2} sp(r) \left\| \mu_{\phi_1, p}^{(\infty)} - \mu_{\phi_2, p}^{(\infty)} \right\|_{TV} + L_r \|\phi_1 - \phi_2\|_{\rho_{\mathcal{A}, \mu_{\phi_2, p}^{(\infty)}}} \\
& \leq \left(L_r + \frac{L_p}{2(1-\alpha)} \right) \|\phi_1 - \phi_2\|_{\rho_{\mathcal{A}, \mu_{\phi_2, p}^{(\infty)}}} \\
& \leq \kappa \left(L_r + \frac{L_p}{2(1-\alpha)} \right) \|\phi_1 - \phi_2\|_{\rho_{\mathcal{A}, \nu}},
\end{aligned}$$

where the third step follows from Lemma 26, Assumption 1(i) and (2). The fourth step follows from Proposition 5 and the fifth step follows from the condition that $\mu_{\phi, p}^{(\infty)}(\zeta) \leq \kappa \cdot \nu(\zeta)$, $\forall \zeta \in \mathcal{B}_S$. This concludes the proof. \square

D Auxiliary Results

The diameter of level ℓ cells is equal to $D 2^{-\ell}$, where $D > 0$.

Lemma 6. Consider the cell activation rule described in Definition 3. For all $t \in [T-1]$ and $\zeta \in \mathcal{P}_t$, let t_i denote the time instance when ζ or any of its ancestor was visited by the algorithm for the i -th time⁶. Then

$$\frac{1}{N_t(\zeta)} \sum_{i=1}^{N_t(\zeta)} \text{diam}(\zeta_{t_i}) \leq 3 \text{diam}(\zeta).$$

Proof. By the activation rule (3), a cell ζ' is played at most $N_{\max}(\zeta') - N_{\min}(\zeta') = \tilde{c}_1 2^{\ell(\zeta')(d_S+2)} + \tilde{c}_1 (2^{d_S+2} - 1)^{-1} \mathbb{I}_{\{\zeta'=S \times \mathcal{A}\}}$ times while being active, where $\tilde{c}_1 = c_1 (2^{d_S+2} - 1) D^{-(d_S+2)} \log\left(\frac{T}{\delta}\right)$. We can write,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{N_t(\zeta)} \sum_{i=0}^{N_t(\zeta)} \text{diam}(\zeta_{t_i}) \\
& = \frac{1}{N_t(\zeta)} \sum_{i=0}^{N_{\min}(\zeta)} \text{diam}(\zeta_{t_i}) + \frac{1}{N_t(\zeta)} \sum_{i=N_{\min}(\zeta)+1}^{N_t(\zeta)} \text{diam}(\zeta_{t_i}) \\
& = \frac{c_1 D^{-(d_S+1)} \log\left(\frac{T}{\delta}\right)}{N_t(\zeta)} + \frac{\tilde{c}_1 D^{\ell(\zeta)-1}}{N_t(\zeta)} \sum_{\ell=0}^{d_S+1} 2^{\ell(d_S+1)} \\
& \quad + \frac{N_t(\zeta) - N_{\min}(\zeta) - 1}{N_t(\zeta)} \text{diam}(\zeta) \\
& < \frac{c_1 D^{-(d_S+1)} \log\left(\frac{T}{\delta}\right)}{N_t(\zeta)} + \frac{3c_1 D^{-(d_S+1)} \log\left(\frac{T}{\delta}\right)}{N_t(\zeta)} \\
& \quad \times \left(2^{\ell(\zeta)(d_S+1)} - 1\right) + \frac{N_t(\zeta) - N_{\min}(\zeta) - 1}{N_t(\zeta)} \text{diam}(\zeta) \\
& < \frac{3N_{\min}(\zeta)}{N_t(\zeta)} \text{diam}(\zeta) + \frac{N_t(\zeta) - N_{\min}(\zeta) - 1}{N_t(\zeta)} \text{diam}(\zeta) \\
& = \frac{(N_t(\zeta) + 2N_{\min}(\zeta) - 1) \text{diam}(\zeta)}{N_t(\zeta)} \\
& \leq 3 \text{diam}(\zeta),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last step is due to the fact that $N_{\min}(\zeta) \leq N_t(\zeta)$. \square

D.1 Concentration Inequality

Recall confidence ball \mathcal{C}_t from (14). Consider the following event,

$$\mathcal{G}_1 := \cap_{t=0}^{T-1} \{p \in \mathcal{C}_t\}. \tag{35}$$

We show that \mathcal{G}_1 holds with a high probability.

Lemma 7. $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G}_1) \geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{2}$, where \mathcal{G}_1 is as in (35).

Proof. Fix t , consider a cell ζ that is active at time t , and a point $z \in \zeta$. Let the level of cell ζ be ℓ . We want to get a high probability upperbound on $\|\hat{p}_t(z, \cdot) - \bar{p}_t(z, \cdot)\|_1$. Note that both $\hat{p}_t(z, \cdot)$ and $\bar{p}_t(z, \cdot)$ have support $S^{(\ell)}$, and $|S^{(\ell)}| = 2^{\ell d_S} = D^{d_S} \text{diam}(\zeta)^{-d_S}$.

⁶We are suppressing its dependence upon ζ .

We have,

$$\|\hat{p}_t(z, \cdot) - \bar{p}_t(z, \cdot)\|_1 = 2 \max_{A \subseteq S^{(\ell)}} \sum_{\tilde{s} \in A} \hat{p}_t(z, \tilde{s}) - \bar{p}_t(z, \tilde{s}).$$

Let $S_+^{(\ell)}$ denote the collection of points of $S^{(\ell)}$ such that for each $\tilde{s} \in S_+^{(\ell)}$, we have $\hat{p}_t(z, \tilde{s}) - \bar{p}_t(z, \tilde{s}) > 0$. Note that if $A \subseteq S_+^{(\ell)}$, then $S^{(\ell)} \setminus A \not\subseteq S_+^{(\ell)}$. Hence the number of subsets of $S_+^{(\ell)}$ is at most $2^{|S^{(\ell)}|-1}$. Also, we have the following,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\|\hat{p}_t(z, \cdot) - \bar{p}_t(z, \cdot)\|_1 \geq \iota \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{\tilde{\xi} \subset S_+^{(\ell)}} \sum_{\tilde{s} \in \tilde{\xi}} \hat{p}_t(z, \tilde{s}) - \bar{p}_t(z, \tilde{s}) \geq \frac{\iota}{2} \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcup_{\tilde{\xi} \subset S_+^{(\ell)}} \left\{ \sum_{\tilde{s} \in \tilde{\xi}} \hat{p}_t(z, \tilde{s}) - \bar{p}_t(z, \tilde{s}) \geq \frac{\iota}{2} \right\} \right). \quad (36) \end{aligned}$$

If $\mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{\tilde{s} \in \tilde{\xi}} \hat{p}_t(z, \tilde{s}) - \bar{p}_t(z, \tilde{s}) \geq \frac{\iota}{2} \right) \leq b_\iota, \forall \tilde{\xi} \subset S_+^{(\ell)}$, then by an application of union bound we obtain that the following must hold,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\|\hat{p}_t(z, \cdot) - \bar{p}_t(z, \cdot)\|_1 \geq \iota \right) \leq 2^{|S^{(\ell)}|-1} b_\iota. \quad (37)$$

Consider a fixed $\xi \subset \mathcal{S}$. Define the following random processes,

$$v_i(z) := \mathbb{I}_{\{(s_i, a_i) \in \zeta_i^{L_0}\}}, \quad (38)$$

$$v_i(z, \xi) := \mathbb{I}_{\{(s_i, a_i, s_{i+1}) \in \zeta_i^{L_0} \times \xi\}}, \quad (39)$$

$$w_i(z, \xi) := v_i(z, \xi) - p(s_i, a_i, \xi) v_i(z), \quad (40)$$

where $i \in [T-1]$. Let $\tilde{\xi} \subset S_+^{(\ell)}$ and $\xi = \bigcup_{\tilde{s} \in \tilde{\xi}} q^{-1}(\tilde{s})$. Then we have,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\tilde{s} \in \tilde{\xi}} \hat{p}_t(z, \tilde{s}) - \bar{p}_t(z, \tilde{s}) \\ &= \frac{N_t(\zeta, \xi)}{N_t(\zeta)} - p(z, \xi) \\ &= \frac{N_t(\zeta, \xi) - p(z, \xi) N_t(\zeta)}{N_t(\zeta)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{N_t(\zeta)} \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} w_i(z, \xi) + \frac{(1+L)L_p}{2N_t(\zeta)} \sum_{i=0}^{N_t(\zeta)} \text{diam}(\zeta_{t_i}) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{N_t(\zeta)} \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} w_i(z, \xi) + 1.5(1+L)L_p \text{diam}(\zeta), \quad (41) \end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows from Lemma 6. Note that $\{w_i(z, \zeta)\}_{i \in [T-1]}$ is martingale difference sequence w.r.t. $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i \in [T-1]}$. Moreover, $|w_i(z, \zeta)| \leq 1$. Hence from Lemma 21 we have,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left\{ \frac{\sum_{i=0}^{t-1} w_i(z, \xi)}{N_t(\zeta)} \geq \sqrt{\frac{2}{N_t(\zeta)} \log \left(\frac{2}{\delta} \right)} \right\} \right) \leq \frac{\delta}{2},$$

which when combined with (41) yields,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\|\hat{p}_t(z, \tilde{\xi}) - \bar{p}_t(z, \tilde{\xi})\|_1 \geq \sqrt{\frac{2}{N_t(\zeta)} \log \left(\frac{2^{|S^{(\ell)}|} T \mathcal{N}_1}{\delta} \right)} \right. \\ & \left. + 1.5(1+L)L_p \text{diam}(\zeta) \right) \leq \frac{\delta}{2^{|S^{(\ell)}|} T \mathcal{N}_1}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{N}_1 \approx T^{\frac{d}{d_S+2}}$ is the total number of cells that the algorithm can possibly activate under all possible sample paths. Upon using (37) in the above, we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\|\hat{p}_t(z, \cdot) - \bar{p}_t(z, \cdot)\|_1 \geq \right. \\ & \left. \sqrt{\frac{8D^{d_S} \text{diam}(\zeta)^{-d_S}}{N_t(\zeta)} \log \left(\frac{2T \mathcal{N}_1}{\delta} \right)} \right. \\ & \left. + 3(1+L)L_p \text{diam}(\zeta) \right) \leq \frac{\delta}{2T \mathcal{N}_1}. \end{aligned}$$

Upon taking union bound over all the cells that could possibly be activated in all possible sample paths at some t , the above inequality yields that with a probability at least $1 - \frac{\delta}{2}$, the following holds,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{p}_t(z, \cdot) - \bar{p}_t(z, \cdot)\|_1 &\leq 3 \left(\frac{c_1 \log \left(\frac{T}{\delta} \right)}{N_t(\zeta)} \right)^{\frac{1}{d_S+2}} \\ &+ 3(1+L)L_p \text{diam}(\zeta), \quad (42) \end{aligned}$$

for every $z \in \zeta, \zeta \in \mathcal{P}_t$, and $t \in [T-1]$, where c_1 be a constant such that $D^{d_S} \log \left(\frac{2T \mathcal{N}_1}{\delta} \right) = c_1 \log \left(\frac{T}{\delta} \right)$. Recall that \hat{p}_t and p_t are the continuous extension of \hat{p}_t and \bar{p}_t , respectively, and hence,

$$\|\hat{p}_t(z, \cdot) - p_t(z, \cdot)\|_{TV} = \|\hat{p}_t(z, \cdot) - \bar{p}_t(z, \cdot)\|_1.$$

Invoking the above relation and Assumption 4 in (42), we have that with a probability at least $1 - \frac{\delta}{2}$, the following holds,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{p}_t(z, \cdot) - p_t(z, \cdot)\|_{TV} &\leq 3 \left(\frac{c_1 \log \left(\frac{T}{\delta} \right)}{N_t(\zeta)} \right)^{\frac{1}{d_S+2}} \\ &+ 3(1+L)L_p \text{diam}(\zeta), \quad (43) \end{aligned}$$

for every $z \in \zeta, \zeta \in \mathcal{P}_t$, and $t \in [T-1]$. By Assumption 4, we have

$$\|p(z, \cdot) - p_t(z, \cdot)\|_{TV} \leq C_v \text{diam}(\zeta). \quad (44)$$

The proof is then completed by combining (43) and (44). \square

D.2 Properties of Indices of the Policies

We will now show that on the set \mathcal{G}_1 , the index (16) of a policy ϕ is an optimistic estimate (Jaksch, Ortner, and Auer 2010; Mete et al. 2021) of $J(\phi', p)$ when ϕ' is sufficiently close to ϕ . Recall that the confidence diameter of a policy $\phi \in \Phi_{SD}$ in episode k is given by,

$$\text{diam}_{\tau_k}(\phi) = \int_{\mathcal{S}} \mu_{p, \phi}^{(\infty)}(s) \text{diam}(q_{\tau_k}^{-1}(s, \phi(s))) ds. \quad (45)$$

Let us introduce two quantities that are the lower bound and upper bound of $\text{diam}_{\tau_k}(\phi)$, respectively.

$$\begin{aligned} L \text{diam}_{\tau_k}(\phi) &:= \kappa_1 \int_{\mathcal{S}} \nu(s) \text{diam}(q_{\tau_k}^{-1}(s, \phi(s))) ds, \text{ and} \\ H \text{diam}_{\tau_k}(\phi) &:= \kappa_2 \int_{\mathcal{S}} \nu(s) \text{diam}(q_{\tau_k}^{-1}(s, \phi(s))) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\kappa_2 L \text{diam}_{\tau_k}(\phi) = \kappa_1 H \text{diam}_{\tau_k}(\phi). \quad (46)$$

Lemma 8 (Optimism). *Fix an episode k and a policy $\phi \in \Phi_{SD}$. On the set \mathcal{G}_1 , we have*

$$J(\phi', p) \leq \bar{J}_k(\phi) \quad (47)$$

for every ϕ' with $\|\phi - \phi'\|_{\rho, \mathcal{A}, \nu} \leq \text{diam}_{\tau_k}(\phi)$.

Proof. Note that on the set \mathcal{G}_1 , we have $p \in \mathcal{C}_{\tau_k}$, and hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{J}_k(\phi) &\geq \int_{\mathcal{S}} (r(s, \phi(s)) + C_L \text{diam}(q_{\tau_k}^{-1}(s, \phi(s)))) \mu_{\phi, p}^{(\infty)}(s) ds \\ &= J(\phi, p) + C_L \text{diam}_{\tau_k}(\phi), \end{aligned}$$

where $C_L := \kappa_2 \left(L_r + \frac{L_p}{2(1-\alpha)} \right)$. The proof then follows from Theorem 1 and Assumption 3. \square

The next lemma provides an upper bound of the index of a policy in terms of its infinite horizon average reward and confidence diameter.

Lemma 9. *Consider an episode $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and a policy $\phi \in \Phi_{SD}$. We have,*

$$\bar{J}_k(\phi) \leq J(\phi, p) + C_1 \text{diam}_{\tau_k}(\phi), \quad (48)$$

where

$$C_1 := C_L + \frac{C_\eta(1 + C_L)}{2(1 - \alpha)}. \quad (49)$$

Recall $C_L = \kappa_2 \left(L_r + \frac{L_p}{2(1-\alpha)} \right)$ and $C_\eta = 3(1 + (1 + L)L_p) + C_\nu$.

Proof. We begin by noting that from the argument used in the proof of Lemma 4, it follows that $sp\left(\bar{V}_i^{\phi, k}\right) \leq \frac{1+C_L}{1-\alpha}$. Now, for $i \in \mathbb{N}$ we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{V}_{i+1}^{\phi, k}(s) &= r(s, \phi(s)) + \int_{\mathcal{S}} \theta_i(s, \phi(s), s') \bar{V}_i^{\phi, k}(s') ds' \\ &\quad + C_L \text{diam}(q_{\tau_k}^{-1}(s, \phi(s))) \\ &\leq r(s, \phi(s)) + \int_{\mathcal{S}} p(s, \phi(s), s') \bar{V}_i^{\phi, k}(s') ds' \\ &\quad + C_L \text{diam}(q_{\tau_k}^{-1}(s, \phi(s))) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \|\theta(s, \phi(s), \cdot) - p(s, \phi(s), \cdot)\|_{TV} sp\left(\bar{V}_i^{\phi, k}\right) \\ &\leq r(s, \phi(s)) + \int_{\mathcal{S}} p(s, \phi(s), s') \bar{V}_i^{\phi, k}(s') ds' \\ &\quad + \left(C_L + \frac{C_\eta(1 + C_L)}{2(1 - \alpha)} \right) \text{diam}(q_{\tau_k}^{-1}(s, \phi(s))), \end{aligned}$$

where θ_i is the maximizer of the r.h.s. of (15). The first inequality above follows from Lemma 26, while the second inequality follows from the definition of \mathcal{C}_{τ_k} , (13) and by the fact that $sp\left(\bar{V}_i^{\phi, k}\right) \leq \frac{1+C_L}{1-\alpha}$. Notice that $\bar{V}_i^{\phi, k}$'s are the value iterates of the policy evaluation algorithm for policy ϕ , where the reward function is altered from $r(s, \phi(s))$ to $r(s, \phi(s)) + C_1 \text{diam}(q_{\tau_k}^{-1}(s, \phi(s)))$, and the transition probability kernel is unchanged. Hence, we can write,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{J}_k(\phi) &\leq \int_{\mathcal{S}} (r(s, \phi(s)) + C_1 \text{diam}_{\tau_k}(q_{\tau_k}^{-1}(s, \phi(s)))) \mu_{\phi, p}^{(\infty)}(s) ds \\ &= J(\phi, p) + C_1 \text{diam}_{\tau_k}(\phi). \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof of the claim. \square

E Guarantee on the Number of Visits to Cells

Recall that $\mu_{\phi, p, s}^{(t)}$ denotes the distribution of s_t when policy ϕ is applied to the MDP that has kernel p and the initial state is s , and $\mu_{\phi, p}^{(\infty)}$ denotes the unique invariant distribution of the Markov chain induced by the policy ϕ on the MDP with transition kernel p . Consider a cell ζ for which the diameter is greater than ϵ , and $\mu_{\phi, p}^{(\infty)}(\pi_{\mathcal{S}}(\zeta)) \geq \epsilon^{d_S+1}$ for all stationary deterministic policies ϕ , where $\epsilon > 0$. Using Proposition 3, we get that for all $\phi \in \Phi_{SD}$ and for every initial state $s \in \mathcal{S}$,

$$\mu_{\phi, p, s}^{(t)}(\pi_{\mathcal{S}}(\zeta)) \geq \mu_{\phi, p}^{(\infty)}(\pi_{\mathcal{S}}(\zeta)) - \alpha^t.$$

Since $\mu_{\phi, p}^{(\infty)}(\pi_{\mathcal{S}}(\zeta)) \geq \epsilon^{d_S+1}$, we have

$$\mu_{\phi, p, s}^{(t)}(\pi_{\mathcal{S}}(\zeta)) \geq \frac{1}{2} \mu_{\phi, p}^{(\infty)}(\pi_{\mathcal{S}}(\zeta)), \quad \forall t \geq t^*(\epsilon), \quad (50)$$

where,

$$t^*(\epsilon) := \left\lceil \frac{\log\left(\frac{2}{\epsilon^{d_S+1}}\right)}{\log\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right)} \right\rceil. \quad (51)$$

Lemma 10. *Consider a cell ζ that has a diameter greater than ϵ , and also $\mu_{\phi, p}^{(\infty)}(\pi_{\mathcal{S}}(\zeta)) \geq \epsilon^{d_S+1}$. Consider a sample path for which we have $\phi_k \in \phi^{\mathcal{S}}$. Let $n_k(\zeta)$ be the number of visits to ζ_L in the k -th episode, and H_k be the duration of the k -th episode. Then, with a probability at least $1 - \frac{\delta}{2}$, we have*

$$n_k(\zeta) \geq \frac{H_k \mu_{\phi, p}^{(\infty)}(\pi_{\mathcal{S}}(\zeta))}{2t^*(\epsilon)} - \sqrt{\frac{H_k}{t^*(\epsilon)} \log\left(\frac{4T}{t^*(\epsilon)\delta}\right)} - 1.$$

Proof. Within this proof we denote $\pi_{\mathcal{S}}(\zeta)$ by $\zeta_{\mathcal{S}}$ and let $m := \lfloor H_k/t^*(\epsilon) \rfloor$ and $t_i := \tau_k + i t^*(\epsilon)$. Let $i^* \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ be such that $t_{i^*} \leq T < t_{i^*+1}$. Define the martingale difference sequence $\{b_i\}_i$ w.r.t. the filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_{t_i}\}_i$,

$$b_i := \mathbb{I}_{\{s_{t_i} \in \zeta_{\mathcal{S}}\}} - \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{I}_{\{s_{t_i} \in \zeta_{\mathcal{S}}\}} \mid \mathcal{F}_{t_{i-1}}\right], \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, i^*.$$

Also, define

$$f_i := \mathbb{I}_{\{(i-1)t^*(\epsilon) \leq H_k\}}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, i^*,$$

and note that it is $\{\mathcal{F}_{t_i}\}_i$ -predictable sequence. It can be shown that b_i 's are conditionally $\frac{1}{2}$ sub-Gaussian, i.e., $\mathbb{E}[\exp(\beta b_i) \mid \mathcal{F}_{t_{i-1}}] \leq \exp(\beta^2/8)$ (Raginsky, Sason et al. 2013). Also, note that $\{f_i\}_i$ is a $\{0, 1\}$ -valued, $\{\mathcal{F}_{t_i}\}$ -predictable stochastic process. Hence, we can use Corollary 24 in order to obtain,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m+1} \mathbb{I}_{\{s_{t_i} \in \zeta_S\}} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{m+1} \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{I}_{\{s_{t_i} \in \zeta_S\}} \mid \mathcal{F}_{t_{i-1}}\right] - \sqrt{\frac{m+2}{2} \log\left(\frac{2(m+2)}{\delta}\right)}\right) \leq \frac{\delta}{2}. \quad (52)$$

From (50), (51) we have that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{I}_{\{s_{t_{i-1}} \in \zeta_S\}} \mid \mathcal{F}_{t_{i-1}}\right] \geq \frac{1}{2} \mu_{\phi,p}^{(\infty)}(\zeta_S). \quad (53)$$

Also, observe that $m+1 > \frac{H_k}{t^*(\epsilon)}$ and $m \leq \frac{H_k}{t^*(\epsilon)}$. Since under *PZRL* algorithm we have $H_k \geq 2t^*(\epsilon)$, we get $m+2 \leq 2m$. Upon using (53) and $m+2 \leq 2m$ in (52), we obtain,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{I}_{\{s_{t_i} \in \zeta_S\}} \leq \frac{H_k \mu_{\phi,p}^{(\infty)}(\zeta_S)}{2t^*(\epsilon)} - \sqrt{\frac{H_k}{t^*(\epsilon)} \log\left(\frac{4H_k}{t^*(\epsilon)\delta}\right)} - 1\right) \leq \frac{\delta}{2}.$$

The claim then follows since $H_k \leq T$, and $\sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{I}_{\{s_{t_i} \in \zeta_S\}} \leq n_k(\zeta)$. \square

Corollary 11. For $\epsilon > 0$ define the event,

$$\mathcal{G}_{2,\epsilon} := \left\{ n_k(\zeta) \geq \frac{H_k \mu_{\phi,p}^{(\infty)}(\zeta_S)}{2t^*(\epsilon)} - \sqrt{\frac{c_2 H_k}{t^*(\epsilon)} \log\left(\frac{T}{\delta\epsilon}\right)} - 1, \forall (k, \zeta) \text{ s.t. } \text{diam}(\zeta) \geq \epsilon, \phi_k \in \Phi^\zeta \right\},$$

where $t^*(\epsilon) = \left\lceil \frac{\log\left(\frac{2}{\epsilon^d \delta^d}\right)}{\log\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right)} \right\rceil$. We have, $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G}_{2,\epsilon}) \geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{2}$.

Proof. A simple calculation shows that the number of cells that have diameter greater than ϵ , is less than $D^d \epsilon^{-d}$. The proof then follows from Lemma 10 by taking a union bound over all cells with diameter greater than ϵ , and over all the episodes, and choosing c_2 that satisfies

$$\log\left(\frac{8T^2 D^d}{t^*(\epsilon) \delta \epsilon^d}\right) \geq c_2 \log\left(\frac{T}{\epsilon \delta}\right). \quad \square$$

Lemma 12. Let ζ be a cell and $\phi \in \Phi_{SD}$ be a policy such that $\forall s \in \zeta_S, (s, \phi(s)) \in \zeta_L$ and $\mu_{\phi,p}^{(\infty)}(\zeta_S) \geq \epsilon^{d_S+1}$. Let ϕ be the policy that is played in the k -th episode by *PZRL*. Then, on the set $\mathcal{G}_{2,\epsilon}$, we have $n_k(\zeta) \geq \frac{H_k \mu_{\phi,p}^{(\infty)}(\zeta_S)}{4t^*(\epsilon)}$.

Proof. An application of Lemma 25 and the fact that $H_k \geq \frac{16t^*(\epsilon)}{\mu_{\phi,p}^{(\infty)}(\zeta_S)^2} (c_2 \log\left(\frac{T}{\epsilon \delta}\right) + 1)$ yields

$$\frac{H_k \mu_{\phi,p}^{(\infty)}(\zeta_S)}{2t^*(\epsilon)} - \sqrt{\frac{c_2 H_k}{t^*(\epsilon)} \log\left(\frac{T}{\epsilon \delta}\right)} - 1 \geq \frac{H_k \mu_{\phi,p}^{(\infty)}(\zeta_S)}{4t^*(\epsilon)}.$$

On the set $\mathcal{G}_{2,\epsilon}$, this implies that $n_k(\zeta) \geq \frac{H_k \mu_{\phi,p}^{(\infty)}(\zeta_S)}{4t^*(\epsilon)}$. \square

Define,

$$H(\beta) := \frac{16t^*(\epsilon)(4D)^{2(d_S+1)}}{\beta^{2(d_S+1)}} \left(c_2 \log\left(\frac{T}{\epsilon \delta}\right) + 1 \right).$$

Note that for *PZRL* we have that the duration of its episodes satisfy

$$H_k \geq H(\text{diam}_{\tau_k}(\phi_k)). \quad (54)$$

Let K_β be the smallest integer that satisfies

$$KH(\beta) \geq c_1 t^*(\epsilon) 2^{5d_S+12} D^{d_S} \log\left(\frac{T}{\delta}\right) \beta^{-2(d_S+1)}.$$

Lemma 13. Let us fix a policy $\phi \in \Phi_{SD}$ and let $\beta = \text{diam}_{\tau_k}(\phi)/2$. If *PZRL* plays ϕ for more than K_β episodes following time τ_k , then on the set $\mathcal{G}_{2,\epsilon}$, the diameter of ϕ will be less than β .

Proof. Let $\beta/2D \in (2^{-\ell_\beta}, 2^{-\ell_\beta+1}]$ where $\ell_\beta \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\mathcal{P}_\beta(\phi)$ be a collection of cells such that $\zeta \in \mathcal{P}_\beta(\phi)$ if for all $s, (s, \phi(s)) \in \zeta_L, \ell(\zeta) \leq \ell_\beta - 1$ and $\mu_{\phi,p}^{(\infty)}(\pi_S(\zeta)) \geq 2^{-\ell_\beta d_S - (\ell_\beta - \ell(\zeta))}$. Let K_β be the number of episodes that ϕ is played before the k' -th episode from k -th episode onwards. We shall show that every cell in $\mathcal{P}_\beta(\phi)$ is deactivated before the k' -th episode starts, and this will result in $\text{diam}_{\tau_{k'}}(\phi) \leq \beta$. To see the latter, note that if every cell from $\mathcal{P}_\beta(\phi)$ is deactivated, then each cell in the active partition through which ϕ passes either (i) has diameter $\leq D 2^{-\ell_\beta}$, or (ii) has diameter $D 2^{-\ell}$, $\ell < \ell_\beta$ and $\mu_{\phi,p}^{(\infty)}(\pi_S(\zeta)) < 2^{-\ell_\beta d_S - (\ell_\beta - \ell)}$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{P}_{\tau_{k'}}^S} \mu_{\phi,p}^{(\infty)}(\xi) \max_{\substack{\zeta \in \mathcal{P}_{\tau_{k'}}^S: \forall s \in \xi \\ (s, \phi(s)) \in \zeta_L}} \text{diam}(\zeta) \\ &= \mu_{\phi,p}^{(\infty)}(S) D 2^{-\ell_\beta} \\ &\quad + \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{P}_{\tau_{k'}}^S: \ell(\xi) < \ell_\beta} \mu_{\phi,p}^{(\infty)}(\xi) \max_{\substack{\zeta \in \mathcal{P}_{\tau_{k'}}^S: \forall s \in \xi \\ (s, \phi(s)) \in \zeta_L}} \text{diam}(\zeta) \\ &\leq \mu_{\phi,p}^{(\infty)}(S) D 2^{-\ell_\beta} + D \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{P}_{\tau_{k'}}^S: \ell(\xi) < \ell_\beta} 2^{-\ell_\beta(d_S+1)} \\ &\leq \left(\mu_{\phi,p}^{(\infty)}(S) + \lambda(\mathcal{S} \setminus S) \right) D 2^{-\ell_\beta} \\ &\leq \beta, \end{aligned}$$

where $S := \cup_{\xi \in \mathcal{P}_{\tau_k}^S: \ell(\xi) \geq \ell_\beta} \xi$, λ denotes the Lebesgue measure on \mathcal{S} , and $\mathcal{P}_{\tau_k}^S$ denotes the partition of \mathcal{S} with the least possible cardinality, that satisfies the following property: no cells in $\{\pi_S(\zeta) \mid \zeta \in \mathcal{P}_{\tau_k}\}$ is a proper subset of any of the

elements of $\mathcal{P}_{\tau_k}^S$. Now, it remains to show that the following holds: before ϕ is played in the k' -th episode, every cell in $\mathcal{P}_\beta(\phi)$ is deactivated. This is done next. Recall that a cell ζ is deactivated if it is played $c_1(2/D)^{d_S+2} \log\left(\frac{T}{\delta}\right) 2^{\ell(\zeta)(d_S+2)}$ times (3). From Lemma 12, it follows that any cell $\zeta \in \mathcal{P}_\beta(\phi)$ gets deactivated on $\mathcal{G}_{2,\epsilon}$ once ϕ has been played in K episodes of length H if we have,

$$\frac{KH}{4t^*(\epsilon)} 2^{-\ell_\beta(d_S+1)+\ell(\zeta)} \geq c_1 \log\left(\frac{T}{\delta}\right) \frac{2^{(\ell(\zeta)+1)(d_S+2)}}{D^{d_S+2}},$$

where $H \geq H(\beta)$. After performing algebraic manipulations, we obtain that every cell $\mathcal{P}_\beta(\phi)$ would be deactivated once ϕ has been played K_β number of episodes. This concludes the proof of the lemma. \square

F Regret Analysis

Regret decomposition: Recall the decomposition of regret (3) of learning algorithm ψ w.r.t. Φ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_\Phi(T; \psi) &= \sum_{k=1}^{K(T)} \sum_{t=\tau_k}^{\tau_{k+1}-1} J_\Phi^*(p) - r(s_t, a_t) \\ &= \underbrace{\sum_{k=1}^{K(T)} H_k \Delta_\Phi(\phi_k)}_{(a)} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\sum_{k=1}^{K(T)} H_k J(\phi_k, p) - \sum_{t=\tau_k}^{\tau_{k+1}-1} r(s_t, \phi_k(s_t))}_{(b)}. \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

The term (a) captures the regret arising due to the gap between the optimal value of the average reward and the average reward of the policies $\{\phi_k\}$ that are actually played in different episodes, while (b) captures the sub-optimality arising since the distribution of the induced Markov chain does not reach the stationary distribution in finite time. (a) and (b) are bounded separately.

Bounding (a): The regret (a) can be further decomposed into the sum of the regrets arising due to playing policies from the sets Φ_γ , where γ assumes the values 2^{-i} , $i = 1, 2, \dots, \lceil \log(1/\epsilon) \rceil$ and the regret arising from all ϵ -optimal policies. To bound the regret arising due to policies from Φ_γ , we count the number of times policies from Φ_γ are played and then multiply it by 2γ . We then add these regret terms from $i = 1$ to $\lceil \log(1/\epsilon) \rceil$. Note that the regret arising from all ϵ -optimal policies is bounded above by ϵT .

The regret arising due to playing policies from the sets Φ_γ is bounded as follows. Lemma 14 derives a condition under which a γ -suboptimal policy is no longer played. Its proof relies crucially on the properties of the index of policies that are derived in Section D.2. Lemma 15 gives an upper-bound of the number of plays of a policy ϕ by *PZRL* from Lemma 13 and Lemma 14. Next, Lemma 16 establishes an upper bound on the number of policies activated from Φ_γ . The product of these two upper bounds, multiplied by 2γ , is the regret arising from playing policies from Φ_γ .

Lemma 14. *On the set \mathcal{G}_1 , any policy $\phi \in \Phi$ will not be played by *PZRL* from episode k onwards if $\text{diam}_{\tau_k}(\phi) \leq \Delta_\Phi(\phi)/C_1$.*

Proof. Recall that the confidence balls around the active policies cover the policy space Φ at every time t . Hence, there exist a policy $\tilde{\phi} \in A_{\tau_k}$ such that $\phi^* \in B_{\tau_k}(\tilde{\phi})$ at the beginning of episode k . Then, Lemma 8 implies that on the set \mathcal{G}_1 , $\bar{J}_k(\tilde{\phi}) \geq J_\Phi^*(p)$. Hence, if the index of an active policy reduces below $J_\Phi^*(p)$, definitely the algorithm will play some other policy. From Lemma 9, we can write that on the set \mathcal{G}_1 , ϕ will never be played if

$$J(\phi, p) + C_1 \text{diam}_{\tau_k}(\phi) \leq J_\Phi^*(p),$$

or, $\text{diam}_{\tau_k}(\phi) \leq \Delta_\Phi(\phi)/C_1$. This completes the proof. \square

Next, we will produce an upper bound on the number of plays of $[\gamma, 2\gamma]$ -policies, which will help us in deriving an upper bound on the regret arising from playing these policies.

Lemma 15. *Define,*

$$\begin{aligned} N_{\max}(\phi) &:= 16C_e t^*(\epsilon) \left(\frac{8DC_1\kappa_2}{\kappa_1}\right)^{2(d_S+1)} \log_2\left(\frac{1}{\Delta_\Phi(\phi)}\right) \\ &\quad \times \left(c_2 \log\left(\frac{T}{\epsilon\delta}\right) + 1\right) \Delta_\Phi(\phi)^{-2(d_S+1)}. \end{aligned}$$

*On the set $\mathcal{G}_1 \cup \mathcal{G}_{2,\epsilon}$, an active policy ϕ is played no more than $N_{\max}(\phi)$ times by *PZRL*.*

Proof. The algorithm *PZRL* sets the length of episode k as

$$\frac{16t^*(\epsilon)(4D)^{2(d_S+1)}}{\beta^{2(d_S+1)}} \left(c_2 \log\left(\frac{T}{\epsilon\delta}\right) + 1\right)$$

when ${}^L\text{diam}_{\tau_k}(\phi) = 2\beta$ and $\phi_k = \phi$. From Lemma 13, it is evident that on the set $\mathcal{G}_1 \cap \mathcal{G}_{2,\epsilon}$, if *PZRL* plays ϕ a constant number of episodes from episode k onwards until the starting of some episode k' then ${}^L\text{diam}_{\tau_{k'}}(\phi) < \beta$. Hence, on the set $\mathcal{G}_1 \cap \mathcal{G}_{2,\epsilon}$, a policy ϕ is played by *PZRL* at most $C_e \log_2\left(\frac{1}{\Delta_\Phi(\phi)}\right)$ episodes, where C_e is a positive constant. Now, let k be the last episode where ϕ is played by *PZRL. Then, from Lemma 14 we have,*

$$\text{diam}_{\tau_k}(\phi) \geq \Delta_\Phi(\phi)/C_1,$$

which implies that

$${}^H\text{diam}_{\tau_k}(\phi) \geq \Delta_\Phi(\phi)/C_1.$$

From the relation between ${}^H\text{diam}_{\tau_k}(\phi)$ and ${}^L\text{diam}_{\tau_k}(\phi)$ shown in (46), we have that

$${}^L\text{diam}_{\tau_k}(\phi) \geq \Delta_\Phi(\phi)/(C_1\kappa_2/\kappa_1).$$

Hence, the duration of the last episode for ϕ , which is also the longest episode where ϕ is played, is bounded above by

$$\begin{aligned} 16t^*(\epsilon) \left(\frac{8DC_1\kappa_2}{\kappa_1}\right)^{2(d_S+1)} &\left(c_2 \log\left(\frac{T}{\epsilon\delta}\right) + 1\right) \\ &\times \Delta_\Phi(\phi)^{-2(d_S+1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, on the set $\mathcal{G}_1 \cap \mathcal{G}_{2,\epsilon}$, the policy ϕ can not be played more than

$$16t^*(\epsilon) \left(\frac{8DC_1\kappa_2}{\kappa_1} \right)^{2(d_S+1)} \left(c_2 \log \left(\frac{T}{\epsilon\delta} \right) + 1 \right) \\ \times \Delta_\Phi(\phi)^{-2(d_S+1)} \times C_e \log_2 \left(\frac{1}{\Delta_\Phi(\phi)} \right)$$

times. This concludes the proof of the claim. \square

Lemma 16. *On the set $\mathcal{G}_1 \cap \mathcal{G}_{2,\epsilon}$, PZRL (1) would not activate policies more than $C_\Phi \gamma^{-d_z^\Phi}$ policies from Φ_γ .*

Proof. Let k be the last episode where a policy $\phi \in \Phi_\gamma$ is played. As seen in the proof of the previous lemma, $\text{diam}_{\tau_k}(\phi) \geq \Delta_\Phi(\phi)/C_1$ and the duration of the k -th episode is $\mathcal{O}(\Delta_\Phi(\phi)^{-2(d_S+1)})$. Since it takes $\mathcal{O}(\beta^{-(d_S+2)})$ number of visits to a cell of diameter β , and there are $\mathcal{O}(\beta^{-d_S})$ number of cells of diameter β , \exists a constant C_3 such that $\text{diam}_{\tau_{k+1}}(\phi) \geq \Delta_\Phi(\phi)/(C_1 C_3)$. Now, consider the set of policies Φ_γ . By the argument above, any two active policies in Φ_γ must be at least $\gamma/(C_1 C_3)$ distance apart. Hence, it follows from the definition of the zooming dimension (4), that the number of active policies in Φ_γ is at most $\mathcal{O}(\gamma^{-d_z^\Phi})$. \square

We are now in a position to derive bounds on the term (a) in (55). Denote the regret due to playing policies from Φ_γ by \mathcal{R}_γ . As discussed before Lemma 14,

$$\mathcal{R}_\gamma \leq N_{\max}^\gamma \times C_\Phi \gamma^{-d_z^\Phi} \times 2\gamma \\ = \tilde{C} \gamma^{-(2d_S+d_z^\Phi+1)}, \quad (56)$$

where,

$$N_{\max}^\gamma := 16C_e t^*(\epsilon) \left(\frac{8DC_1\kappa_2}{\kappa_1} \right)^{2(d_S+1)} \log_2 \left(\frac{1}{\Delta_\Phi(\phi)} \right) \\ \times \left(c_2 \log \left(\frac{T}{\epsilon\delta} \right) + 1 \right) \gamma^{-2(d_S+1)},$$

and \tilde{C} is polylogarithmic in T , $\frac{1}{\epsilon}$, $\frac{1}{\delta}$ and $\frac{1}{\gamma}$. In the subsequent steps for derivation of the regret upper bound, we continue to use \tilde{C} in order to denote constants that are multiple of these original constants. As has been discussed earlier, we will derive an upper bound on (a) as follows,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K(T)} H_k \Delta_\Phi(\phi_k) \leq \sum_{\gamma: \gamma=2^{-i} > \epsilon} \mathcal{R}_\gamma + \epsilon T \\ \leq \tilde{C} \sum_{\gamma: \gamma=2^{-i} > \epsilon} \gamma^{-(2d_S+d_z^\Phi+1)} + \epsilon T \\ \leq \tilde{C} \epsilon^{-(2d_S+d_z^\Phi+1)} + \epsilon T, \quad (57)$$

where the second step follows from (56).

Bounding (b): We will now provide an upper bound on the term (b) of (55). This proof will rely on the geometric ergodicity (Meyn and Tweedie 2012) of the underlying

MDP \mathcal{M} , that has been shown in Proposition 3. For a stationary policy ϕ and kernel p , let $\mu_{\phi,p,s}^{(t)}$ be the distribution of the Markov chain at time t induced by applying ϕ on p when the start state $s_0 = s$. Similarly, let $\mu_{\phi,p,s}^{(\infty)}$ be the corresponding stationary distribution.

Proposition 17. *On the set $\mathcal{G}_1 \cap \mathcal{G}_{2,\epsilon}$, the term (b) in (55) can be bounded as follows,*

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K(T)} H_k J(\phi_k, p) - \sum_{t=\tau_k}^{\tau_{k+1}-1} r(s_t, \phi_k(s_t)) \leq \frac{2K(T)}{1-\alpha}, \quad (58)$$

where α is as in Assumption 2.

Proof. Recall from the proof of Lemma 15 that on the set $\mathcal{G}_1 \cap \mathcal{G}_{2,\epsilon}$, a policy ϕ is played by PZRL at most $C_e \log_2 \left(\frac{1}{\Delta_\Phi(\phi)} \right)$ where C_e is a positive real constant. We derive an upper bound on the absolute value of each term in the summation, which is l.h.s. of (58). We have,

$$\left| H_k J(\phi_k, p) - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=\tau_k}^{\tau_{k+1}-1} r(s_t, \phi_k(s_t)) \right] \right| \\ \leq \sum_{h=0}^{H_k-1} \left| \int_{\mathcal{S}} \left(\mu_{\phi_k,p}^{(\infty)}(s) - \mu_{\phi_k,p,s_0}^{(h)}(s) \right) r(s, \phi_k(s)) \right| \\ \leq 2 \sum_{h=0}^{H_k-1} \alpha^h \\ \leq 2 \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} \alpha^h \\ \leq \frac{2}{1-\alpha}, \quad (59)$$

where the second inequality follows from Proposition 3 and Lemma 26. Note that the number of activations of cells will be the highest if every part of the state-action space is visited uniformly, as larger cells need to be visited a lesser number of times to be activated. The proof then follows by summing (59) over $k \in [K(T)]$. \square

Upon combining the upper bounds on all the terms of the regret decomposition, we obtain the following upper bound on the regret.

F.1 Proof of Theorem 2

Proof. We first produce an upper bound on the total number of episodes. It is easy to see that the number of episodes of length greater than $T^{\frac{2d_S+2}{2d_S+d_z^\Phi+2}}$ is at most $T^{\frac{d_z^\Phi}{2d_S+d_z^\Phi+2}}$. Now let us bound the number of episodes of length less than $T^{\frac{2d_S+2}{2d_S+d_z^\Phi+2}}$. If the length of episode k is less than $T^{\frac{2d_S+2}{2d_S+d_z^\Phi+2}}$, it means

$$\text{diam}_{\tau_k}(\phi)^{-2(d_S+2)} \leq \text{const} \cdot T^{\frac{2d_S+2}{2d_S+d_z^\Phi+2}},$$

or

$$\text{diam}_{\tau_k}(\phi) \geq \text{const} \cdot T^{-\frac{1}{2d_S+d_z^\Phi+2}}.$$

Hence, there could be at most $\mathcal{O}\left(T^{\frac{d_\Phi}{2d_S+d_z^\Phi+2}}\right)$ such policies activated by the algorithm, and policy will be played in $\mathcal{O}\left(\log_2\left(T^{\frac{1}{2d_S+d_z^\Phi+2}}\right)\right)$ episodes of length less than $T^{\frac{2d_S+2}{2d_S+d_z^\Phi+2}}$. Hence,

$$K(T) \leq C_1^K T^{\frac{d_\Phi}{2d_S+d_z^\Phi+2}} + C_2^K \log_2(T) T^{\frac{d_\Phi}{2d_S+d_z^\Phi+2}}.$$

Now, summing all the upper bounds of regret components from (57) and (58), taking $\epsilon = T^{-\frac{1}{2d_S+d_z^\Phi+2}}$ and replacing $K(T)$ by its upper-bound, we get that on the set $\mathcal{G}_1 \cap \mathcal{G}_{2,\epsilon}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(T; \text{PZRL}) &\leq \tilde{C}\epsilon^{-(2d_S+d_z^\Phi+1)} + \frac{2K(T)}{1-\alpha} + \epsilon T \\ &= \tilde{O}\left(T^{\frac{2d_S+d_z^\Phi+1}{2d_S+d_z^\Phi+2}}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

Thus, we have the desired regret upper bound that holds with a high probability. \square

G Some Details and Properties of the Algorithms

G.1 Auxiliary Algorithms

We firstly present the proposed heuristic algorithm *PZRL*-heuristic (2), and then present the *EVI-B* algorithm that is used by *PZRL*-heuristic and the algorithm for updating the adaptive discretization that is used by both *PZRL* (1) and *PZRL*-heuristic (2).

Algorithm 2 *PZRL*-heuristic

Input Horizon T , Lipschitz constants L_r , ergodicity coefficient α , confidence parameter δ
 $h = 0, k = 0, \mathcal{P}_0 = \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$
for $t = 0$ to $T - 1$ **do**
 if $h \geq \sqrt{T}$ **or** $\exists \zeta \in \mathcal{P}_{\tau_k}$ s.t. $N_t(\zeta) = N_{\max}(\zeta)$ **then**
 $k \leftarrow k + 1, h \leftarrow 0, \tau_k = t$
 $\mathcal{P}_{\tau_k} = \text{Update partition}(\mathcal{P}_{\tau_{k-1}}, \{s_t, a_t\}_{t=0}^{\tau_k-1})$ (4)
 Compute $\hat{p}_{\tau_k}^{(d)}$ as in (17)
 $\phi_{k,\text{EVI-B}} = \text{EVI-B}(\mathcal{P}_{\tau_k}, \bar{\mathcal{C}}_{\tau_k}, 1/\sqrt{t})$ (3)
 Compute ϕ_k from $\phi_{k,\text{EVI-B}}$ (18)
 end if
 $h \leftarrow h + 1$
 Play $a_t = \phi_k(s_t)$ and observe s_{t+1} and $r(s_t, a_t)$
end for

Algorithm 3 *EVI-B*

Input Partition of $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$, \mathcal{P} ; Set of transition probability kernels \mathcal{C} ; Error tolerance tol .
 $i = 0, \bar{Q}_0(\zeta) = 0 \forall \zeta \in \mathcal{P}, \bar{V}_0(s) = 0 \forall s \in \mathcal{S}$.
repeat
 $\bar{Q}_{i+1}(\zeta) = r(q(\zeta)) + \max_{\theta \in \mathcal{C}} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}(\ell(\zeta))} \theta(q(\zeta), s) \bar{V}_i(s')$
 $+ L_r \text{diam}(\zeta), \forall \zeta \in \mathcal{P}$,
 where $\bar{V}_i(s) = \max_{\zeta \in \text{Rel}(s; \mathcal{P})} \bar{Q}_i(\zeta)$
 $i \leftarrow i + 1$
until $\max(\bar{Q}_{i+1} - \bar{Q}_i) - \min(\bar{Q}_{i+1} - \bar{Q}_i) < tol$
return $\phi_{\text{EVI-B}}$ where $\phi_{\text{EVI-B}}(s) = q\left(\arg \max_{\zeta \in \text{Rel}(s; \mathcal{P})} \bar{Q}_i(\zeta)\right)$

Algorithm 4 Update partition

Input $\mathcal{P}_{\tau_{k-1}}, \{s_t, a_t\}_{t=0}^{\tau_k-1}$.
Initialize $\mathcal{P}_{\tau_k} = \mathcal{P}_{\tau_{k-1}}, \ell = -1$.
while True **do**
 $\ell \leftarrow \ell + 1$
 if $\{\zeta \mid \ell(\zeta) \geq \ell, \zeta \in \mathcal{P}_{\tau_k}\}$ is empty **then**
 Break
 end if
 for $\zeta \in \{\zeta \mid \ell(\zeta) = \ell, \zeta \in \mathcal{P}_{\tau_k}\}$ **do**
 if $N_{\tau_k}(\zeta) \geq N_{\max}(\zeta)$ **then**
 $\mathcal{P}_{\tau_k} = \mathcal{P}_{\tau_k} \cup \mathcal{C}(\zeta) \setminus \{\zeta\}$
 end if
 end for
end while
Return \mathcal{P}_{τ_k}

G.2 Properties of the *EVI-B*

It follows from the discussion in Jaksch, Ortner, and Auer (2010, Section 3.1.2) that each step of *EVI-B* requires at most $\mathcal{O}(\sum_{\zeta \in \mathcal{P}} |\mathcal{S}(\ell(\zeta))|)$ steps. The next proposition shows that the optimal decisions of *EVI-B* iterates converge.

Proposition 18. *There exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for iteration steps $i > N$ a transition kernel from $\theta^{(k)} \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}_{\tau_k}$ and a map $\varphi^{(k)} : \mathcal{P}_{\tau_k}^{\mathcal{S}} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_{\tau_k}$ with $\varphi^{(k)}(\xi) \in \text{Rel}_{\tau_k}(s) \forall s \in \xi, \xi \in \mathcal{P}_{\tau_k}^{\mathcal{S}}$ maximized the r.h.s. of the *EVI-B* (3), i.e., for every $i > N$,*

$$\begin{aligned} (\varphi^{(k)}(\xi), \theta) &\in \arg \max_{\substack{\zeta \in \text{Rel}_{\tau_k}(q(\xi)), \\ \theta \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}_{\tau_k}}} \left\{ r(q(\zeta)) \right. \\ &\left. + \max_{\theta \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}_{\tau_k}} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}_{\tau_k}} \theta(q(\zeta), s) \bar{V}_i(s) + L_r \text{diam}(\zeta) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

Thus, for the *EVI-B* (3), the optimal decisions converge.

Proof. Consider the i -th step of EVI-B,

$$\begin{aligned} & (\varphi_i(\xi), \theta_i) \in \arg \max_{\substack{\zeta \in \text{Rel}_{\tau_k}(q(\xi)), \\ \theta \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}_{\tau_k}}} \left\{ r(q(\zeta)) \right. \\ & \left. + \max_{\theta \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}_{\tau_k}} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}_{\tau_k}} \theta(q(\zeta), s) \bar{V}_i(s) + L_r \text{diam}(\zeta) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $s^* := \arg \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}_{\tau_k}} \bar{V}_i(s)$ is in the above set and $\theta_i(q(\zeta), s^*) \geq \min \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{2} \eta_{\tau_k}(\zeta) \right\}$ for all $\zeta \in \mathcal{P}_{\tau_k}$. Consider the stochastic matrix Θ such that $\Theta_{s, s'} = \theta_i(q(\varphi_i(q^{-1}(s)), s'), s')$. It is evident that the associated Markov chain is aperiodic. The proof then follows from Puterman (2014, Theorem 9.4.4). \square

We will now show that the EVI-B iterates (3) are optimistic estimates (Jaksch, Ortner, and Auer 2010; Mete et al. 2021) of the true Q-function on the set \mathcal{G}_1 , i.e. $\bar{Q}_i(\zeta) \geq Q_i(s, a)$, $\zeta \in \mathcal{P}_{\tau_k}$, $(s, a) \in \zeta$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$.

Lemma 19 (Optimism). *Consider the EVI-B (3). On the set \mathcal{G}_1 , we have, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$*

$$\bar{Q}_i(\zeta) \geq Q_i(z), \quad \forall \zeta \in \mathcal{P}_{\tau_k}, z \in \zeta, \quad (62)$$

$$\bar{V}_i(s) \geq V_i(s), \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}. \quad (63)$$

where Q_i and V_i are as defined in (23) and (24) respectively.

Proof. We prove this using induction. The base cases (for $i = 0$) hold trivially. Next, assume that the following hold for all $j \in [i]$, where $i \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\bar{Q}_j(\zeta) \geq Q_j(z), \quad \forall \zeta \in \mathcal{P}_{\tau_k}, z \in \zeta, \quad (64)$$

$$\bar{V}_j(s) \geq V_j(s), \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}. \quad (65)$$

Consider a cell $\zeta \in \mathcal{P}_{\tau_k}$, and a $z \in \zeta$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{Q}_{i+1}(\zeta) &= r(q(\zeta)) + \max_{\theta \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}_{\tau_k}} \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}_{\tau_k}} \theta(q(\zeta), s') \bar{V}_i(s') \\ &\quad + L_r \text{diam}(\zeta) \\ &\geq r(z) + \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}_{\tau_k}} p(z, q^{-1}(s')) \bar{V}_i(s') \\ &\quad - |r(z) - r(q(\zeta))| + L_r \text{diam}(\zeta) \\ &\geq r(z) + \int_{\mathcal{S}} ds' p(z, s') V_i(s') \\ &\quad - L_r \text{diam}(\zeta) + L_r \text{diam}(\zeta) \\ &= Q_{i+1}(z), \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from the definition of $\bar{\mathcal{C}}_{\tau_k}$ (14), \mathcal{G}_1 (35), the second inequality follows from (65), and from Assumption (1). Hence, we have shown that (62) holds for step $i + 1$. We will now show that (65) holds for $i + 1$. Fix $s \in \mathcal{S}$. Since we have shown above that $\bar{Q}_{i+1}(\zeta) \geq Q_{i+1}(s, a)$ for all $(s, a) \in \zeta$, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{V}_{i+1}(s) &= \max_{\zeta \in \text{Rel}_{\tau_k}(s)} \bar{Q}_{i+1}(\zeta) \\ &\geq \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q_{i+1}(s, a) \\ &\geq V_{i+1}(s). \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. \square

H Parameterized Policy Spaces

In this section, we derive an upper bound on the zooming dimension d_z^Φ when Φ is the class of parameterized policies with a parameter set $W \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_w}$.

Lemma 20. *Consider a class of policy, parameterized by a bounded set of parameters $W \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_w}$ that satisfies,*

$$\|w - w'\|_2 \leq L_W \|\phi(\cdot; w) - \phi(\cdot; w')\|_{\rho_{\mathcal{A}, \nu}} \quad \forall w, w' \in W, \quad (66)$$

where ν is a measure that satisfies Assumption 3. Then, $d_z^\Phi \leq d_w$.

Proof. Fix $w \in W$, and consider the γ -radius ball around $\phi(\cdot; w)$, $B_\gamma(\phi(\cdot; w))$. From (66), we note that all the parameters corresponding to policies in $B_\gamma(\phi(\cdot; w))$ are in $B_{\gamma/L_W}(w)$. Hence, the γ -covering number of Φ_γ , $\mathcal{N}_\gamma(\Phi_\gamma) \leq \mathcal{N}_{\gamma/L_W}(W_\gamma)$ where W_γ is the set of parameters corresponding to policies in Φ_γ . This completes the proof. \square

I Infinite Horizon Regret Analysis of Episodic RL Algorithms

Cao and Krishnamurthy (2020) designs zooming-based algorithms for episodic RL, in which each episode lasts for a fixed number of steps, and the state is reset at the beginning of a new episode. We slightly modify their algorithm by letting the episode duration be a function of T and denote this algorithm by ψ_{CK} , where the subscript is initials of last names of the authors of (Cao and Krishnamurthy 2020). In this section, we will bound the cumulative regret,

$$\mathcal{R}(\psi_{CK}; T) := T J^*(p) - \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} r(s_t, a_t)$$

when it is deployed on non-episodic RL tasks.

Cao and Krishnamurthy (2020) considers an episodic RL framework. Let H be the duration of each episode, and K be the total number of episodes. $V_1^*(s)$ is the optimal value of the corresponding episodic MDP, when the system starts in state s at the beginning of the episode. Following Cao and Krishnamurthy (2020), the regret of a learning algorithm ψ in episodic setup is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{R}_e(\psi; K) = \sum_{k=1}^K \left(V_1^*(s_1^k) - \sum_{h=1}^H r(s_h^k, a_h^k) \right),$$

where s_h^k and a_h^k denote the state and the action, respectively, at timestep h of episode k , and sub-script e stands for episodic. Cao and Krishnamurthy (2020) shows that with a high probability, the regret of ψ_{CK} can be bounded as follows,

$$\mathcal{R}_e(\psi_{CK}; K) \leq CH^{\frac{5}{2} + \frac{1}{2d_z + 4}} K^{\frac{d_z + 1}{d_z + 2}},$$

where d_z is the zooming dimension for episodic RL, as defined by Cao and Krishnamurthy (2020), and C is a term that is polylogarithmic in K . We note that the definition of zooming dimension in (Cao and Krishnamurthy 2020) differs

from our definition. Cao and Krishnamurthy (2020) defines d_z as follows. Let

$$\mathcal{P}_{h,\gamma}^{Q^*} := \{(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} : V_h^*(s) - Q_h^*(s, a) \leq 2(H + 1 + L_V)\gamma\}, \quad (67)$$

be the γ -near-optimal set, where V_h^* and Q_h^* be the optimal value function and the optimal action-value function, respectively, of stage h and L_V be the Lipschitz constant for the value function. Then, the zooming dimension is defined as follows:

$$d_z := \inf \left\{ d' > 0 : \mathcal{N}_\gamma(\mathcal{P}_{h,\gamma}^{Q^*}) \leq c_z \gamma^{-d'} \right\}.$$

Consider an algorithm that plays a single stationary policy in episodes of constant duration. To analyze its non-episodic regret, we add to the bound on its episodic regret, a term associated with regret arising due to ‘‘policy switches’’ from one episode to another. Under Assumption 2, we have shown in Proposition 17 that the regret component due to changing policies is bounded above by $\frac{2K}{1-\alpha}$. Hence the non-episodic regret of ψ_{CK} is bounded as,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(\psi_{CK}; T) &\leq CH^{\frac{5}{2} + \frac{1}{2d_z+4}} K^{\frac{d_z+1}{d_z+2}} + \frac{2K}{1-\alpha} \\ &= CH^{\frac{3(d_z+3)}{2(d_z+2)}} T^{\frac{d_z+1}{d_z+2}} + \frac{2T}{H(1-\alpha)}. \end{aligned}$$

Upon letting $H = T^{\frac{2}{5d_z+13}}$, we obtain,

$$\mathcal{R}(\psi_{CK}; T) \leq \mathcal{O} \left(T^{\frac{5d_z+11}{5d_z+13}} \right).$$

This bound has a worse dependence upon d_z than our bound, which is $T^{\frac{2d_S+d_z+1}{2d_S+d_z+2}}$. Moreover, the zooming dimension for episodic RL defined by (Cao and Krishnamurthy 2020) converges to d as $H \rightarrow \infty$. To see this, fix a h , so that the remaining stages are equal to $H - h$. Now, the set $\mathcal{P}_{h,\gamma}^{Q^*}$ corresponding to a fixed $\gamma > 0$ is as in (67). It is evident that for values of H sufficiently large, we have that each (s, a) belongs to the set $\mathcal{P}_{h,\gamma}^{Q^*}$. This shows that d_z converges to d as $H \rightarrow \infty$. Since $H = T^{\frac{2}{5d_z+13}}$, we have,

$$\mathcal{R}(\psi_{CK}; T) \leq \mathcal{O} \left(T^{\frac{5d+11}{5d+13}} \right).$$

Sinclair, Banerjee, and Yu (2023) studies zooming-based algorithms for episodic RL. A similar analysis shows that their definition of zooming dimension also converges to d as $H \rightarrow \infty$.

J Useful Results

J.1 Concentration Inequalities

Lemma 21 (Azuma-Hoeffding inequality). *Let X_1, X_2, \dots be a martingale difference sequence with $|X_i| \leq c, \forall i$. Then for all $\epsilon > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \geq \epsilon \right\} \leq e^{-\frac{\epsilon^2}{2nc^2}}. \quad (68)$$

The following inequality is Proposition A.6.6 of (Van Der Vaart et al. 1996).

Lemma 22 (Bretagnolle-Huber-Carol inequality). *If the random vector (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n) is multinomially distributed with parameters N and (p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n) , then for $\epsilon > 0$*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |X_i - Np_i| \geq 2\sqrt{N}\epsilon \right) \leq 2^n e^{-2\epsilon^2}. \quad (69)$$

Alternatively, for $\delta > 0$

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \left| \frac{X_i}{N} - p_i \right| < \sqrt{\frac{2n}{N} \log \left(\frac{2}{\delta \frac{1}{n}} \right)} \right) \geq 1 - \delta. \quad (70)$$

The following is essentially Theorem 1 of (Abbasi-Yadkori, Pál, and Szepesvári 2011).

Theorem 23 (Self-Normalized Tail Inequality for Vector-Valued Martingales). *Let $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ be a filtration. Let $\{\eta_t\}_{t=1}^\infty$ be a real-valued stochastic process such that η_t is \mathcal{F}_t measurable and η_t is conditionally R sub-Gaussian for some $R > 0$, i.e.,*

$$\mathbb{E} [\exp(\lambda \eta_t) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \leq \exp(\lambda^2 R^2 / 2), \forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Let $\{X_t\}_{t=1}^\infty$ be an \mathbb{R}^d valued stochastic process such that X_t is \mathcal{F}_{t-1} measurable. Assume that V is a $d \times d$ positive definite matrix. For $t \geq 0$ define

$$\bar{V}_t := V + \sum_{s=1}^t X_s X_s^\top,$$

and

$$S_t := \sum_{s=1}^t \eta_s X_s.$$

Then, for any $\delta > 0$, with a probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\|S_t\|_{\bar{V}_t^{-1}}^2 \leq 2R^2 \log \left(\frac{\det(\bar{V}_t)^{1/2} \det(V)^{-1/2}}{\delta} \right).$$

Corollary 24 (Self-Normalized Tail Inequality for Martingales). *Let $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=0}^\infty$ be a filtration. Let $\{\eta_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ be a $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=0}^\infty$ measurable stochastic process and η_t is conditionally R sub-Gaussian for some $R > 0$. Let $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ be a $\{0, 1\}$ -valued \mathcal{F}_{i-1} measurable stochastic process.*

Then, for any $\delta > 0$, with a probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $k \geq 0$,

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^k \eta_i X_i \right| \leq R \sqrt{2 \left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^k X_i \right) \log \left(\frac{1 + \sum_{i=1}^k X_i}{\delta} \right)}.$$

Proof. Upon taking $V = 1$, we have that $\bar{V}_t = 1 + \sum_{s=1}^t X_s$. The claim follows from Theorem 23. \square

J.2 Other Useful Results

Lemma 25. Consider the following function $f(x)$ such that $0 < a_0 \leq \frac{a_1}{4}$,

$$f(x) = a_0 x - \sqrt{a_1 x} - 1.$$

Then for all $x \geq 1.5 \frac{a_1}{a_0}$, $f(x) \geq 0$.

Proof. See that $f(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \geq \left(\frac{\sqrt{a_1} + \sqrt{a_1 + 4a_0}}{2a_0}\right)^2$. Since $a_1 \leq 4a_0$, we have that for all $x \geq 1.5 \frac{a_1}{a_0}$ $f(x) \geq 0$. \square

Lemma 26. Let μ_1 and μ_2 be two probability measures on Z and let v be an \mathbb{R} -valued bounded function on Z . Then, the following holds.

$$\left| \int_Z (\mu_1 - \mu_2)(z)v(z)dz \right| \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_{TV} \text{sp}(v).$$

Proof. Denote $\lambda(\cdot) := \mu_1(\cdot) - \mu_2(\cdot)$. Now let $Z_+, Z_- \subset Z$ be such that $\lambda(B) \geq 0$ for every $B \subseteq Z_+$ and $\lambda(B) < 0$ for every $B \subseteq Z_-$. We have that

$$\lambda(Z) = \lambda(Z_+) + \lambda(Z_-) = 0. \quad (71)$$

Also,

$$\lambda(Z_+) - \lambda(Z_-) = \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_{TV}. \quad (72)$$

Combining the above two, we get that

$$\lambda(Z_+) = \frac{1}{2} \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_{TV}. \quad (73)$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_Z \lambda(z)v(z)dz \right| &= \left| \int_{Z_+} \lambda(z)v(z)dz + \int_{Z_-} \lambda(z)v(z)dz \right| \\ &\leq \left| \lambda(Z_+) \sup_{z \in Z} v(z) + \lambda(Z_-) \inf_{z \in Z} v(z) \right| \\ &= \left| \lambda(Z_+) \sup_{z \in Z} v(z) - \lambda(Z_+) \inf_{z \in Z} v(z) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \lambda(Z_+) \inf_{z \in Z} v(z) + \lambda(Z_-) \inf_{z \in Z} v(z) \right| \\ &= \lambda(Z_+) \left(\sup_{z \in Z} v(z) - \inf_{z \in Z} v(z) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_{TV} \text{sp}(v). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have proven the lemma. \square

K Simulation Experiments

In this section, we provide the details of the simulation environments corresponding to the experiments we have conducted and the additional results that are not reported in the main paper. The environments used are the following.

I Truncated linear quadratic regulator (LQR): The state of an LQR system evolves as follows:

$$s_{t+1} = As_t + Ba_t + w_t,$$

where A, B are matrices of appropriate dimensions, and w_t is i.i.d. Gaussian noise. The reward at time t is $-s_t^\top P s_t - a_t^\top Q a_t$. Since our algorithm is for systems with compact state-action spaces, we clip the elements of the state vectors at \bar{s} and \underline{s} from above and below, respectively, and restrict the action space to be $[-1, 1]^{d_A}$. Hence, the state evolves as

$$s_{t+1} = \bar{s} \vee (\underline{s} \wedge As_t + Ba_t + w_t).$$

We have used the following two sets of system parameters:

(a) Truncated LQR-1:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} -0.2 & -0.07 \\ 0.6 & 0.07 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} 0.07 & 0.09 \\ -0.03 & -0.1 \end{bmatrix},$$

$P = 0.4 I_2$, $Q = 0.6 I_2$ and mean and standard deviation of w_t are 0 and 0.05, respectively. We consider $\bar{s} = -\underline{s} = 4$.

(b) Truncated LQR-2:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} -0.2 & -0.07 \\ 0.6 & 0.07 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} 0.1 & -0.01 & 0.12 & 0.08 \\ 0.02 & -0.1 & 0.3 & 0.001 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Values of $P, Q, \bar{s}, \underline{s}$ and mean and standard deviation of w_t are the same as Truncated LQR-1.

II Continuous RiverSwim: This environment models an agent who is swimming in a river (Strehl and Littman 2008). Though the original MDP is discrete, we modify it slightly to obtain a continuous version. The state denotes the location of the agent in the river in a single dimension, and the action captures the movement of the agent. The state and action spaces are $[0, 6]$ and $[0, 1]$, respectively. The state of the evolves as follows:

$$s_{t+1} = \begin{cases} (0 \vee (s_t - \frac{1}{2}(1 + \frac{w_t}{2}))) \wedge 6 & \text{w.p. } \frac{2(1-at)}{5} \\ s_t & \text{w.p. } 0.2 \\ (0 \vee (s_t + \frac{1}{2}(1 + \frac{w_t}{2}))) \wedge 6 & \text{w.p. } \frac{2(1+at)}{5}, \end{cases}$$

where w_t is a 0-mean i.i.d. Gaussian random sequence. The reward function is given by $r(s, a) = 0.005(((s - 6)/6)^4 + ((a - 1)/2)^4) + 0.5((s/6)^4 + ((a + 1)/2)^4)$.

III Randomly generated continuous MDPs: We define a family of randomly generated continuous MDPs with state space $[0, 1]^2$ and action space $[0, 1]$. Let us denote the i -th component of the state vector s_t by $s_{t,i}$ and the beta distribution with parameter α and β by $Beta(\alpha, \beta)$. The family of MDPs is described as follows: For every $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $s_{t+1,i} \sim Beta(\alpha, \beta)$ where $\alpha = \lceil \vartheta_1 s_{t,1}(1 - s_{t,2}) / |a_t - s_{t,1}| \vee 0.1 \rceil$, and $\beta = \lceil \vartheta_2 s_{t,2}(1 - s_{t,1}) / |a_t - s_{t,2}| \vee 0.1 \rceil$. The reward function is $r(s, a) = \exp(-\vartheta_3 \|s - v_s\|_2 - \vartheta_4 \|a - v_a\|_2)$. Different values of $\vartheta \in \mathbb{R}^4$, $v_s \in [0, 1]^2$ and $v_a \in [0, 1]$ yield different MDPs. For our experiment, we set v_s and v_a to be $[0.5, 0.5]$ and 0.4 , respectively. We sample ϑ_1, ϑ_2 uniformly from $\mathbb{N} \cap [80, 120]$ and ϑ_3, ϑ_4 uniformly from $[2, 6]$.

IV Non-linear System: We consider a non-linear system where the state evolves as

$$s_{t+1} = \bar{s} \vee (\underline{s} \wedge Af(s_t) + Bg(a_t) + w_t),$$

where f and g are non-linear functions, A, B are matrices of appropriate dimensions, and w_t is noise sequence. The reward function is a function of the state and the actions. We have set the matrices A, B, P, Q, \bar{s} and \underline{s} the same as that of Truncated LQR-1. We set


$$f(s)(i) = 0.5s(i) + 0.5s(i)^2, \text{ for } i \in \{1, 2\} \text{ and}$$

$$g(a) = a^2,$$


where $v(i)$ denotes the i -th element of vector v . Similar to the LQR system, we consider the action space to be $[-1, 1]^{d_A}$.

estimate of it) in an easy way. So, we plot the cumulative reward instead of the regret. The plots of the cumulative reward corresponding to Truncated LQR-1 and Continuous RiverSwim environments are reported in the main paper (Figure 1). The cumulative reward plots for the other three systems are reported in Figure 2. Each of the plots is the average of cumulative rewards over 50 runs, and in particular, for Randomly generated continuous MDPs, the cumulative reward plot is the average of cumulative regret of 50 different systems that are randomly generated. Note that for PZRL-heuristic, we start from a uniform discretization that is more coarse than the discretization grid used by the fixed discretization-based comparator algorithms.


Computing resources: We have conducted experiments on a 11-th Gen Intel Core-i7, 2.5GHz CPU processor with 16GB RAM using Python-3 and PyTorch library.



(a) Truncated LQR-2



(b) Randomly generated Continuous MDPs



(c) Non-linear System

Figure 2: Cumulative Reward Plots.

Results: Apart from the Continuous RiverSwim environment, it is difficult to find the optimal reward (or an