

The Complexity of the Simplex Method

John Fearnley and Rahul Savani

University of Liverpool

Abstract. The simplex method is a well-studied and widely-used pivoting method for solving linear programs. When Dantzig originally formulated the simplex method, he gave a natural pivot rule that pivots into the basis a variable with the most violated reduced cost. In their seminal work, Klee and Minty showed that this pivot rule takes exponential time in the worst case. We prove two main results on the simplex method. Firstly, we show that it is PSPACE-complete to find the solution that is computed by the simplex method using Dantzig’s pivot rule. Secondly, we prove that deciding whether Dantzig’s rule ever chooses a specific variable to enter the basis is PSPACE-complete. We use the known connection between Markov decision processes (MDPs) and linear programming, and an equivalence between Dantzig’s pivot rule and a natural variant of policy iteration for average-reward MDPs. We construct MDPs and show PSPACE-completeness results for single-switch policy iteration, which in turn imply our main results for the simplex method.

1 Introduction

Linear programming is a fundamental technique in computer science, and the simplex method is a widely used technique for solving linear programs. The simplex method requires a *pivot rule* that determines which variable is pivoted into the basis in each step. Dantzig’s original formulation of the simplex method used a particularly natural pivot rule: in each step, the non-basic variable with the most negative reduced cost is chosen to enter the basis [5]. We will call this *Dantzig’s pivot rule*. Klee and Minty have shown that Dantzig’s pivot rule takes exponential time in the worst case [17].

The simplex method is a member of a of much wider class of *local search* algorithms. The complexity class PLS, which was introduced by Johnson, Papadimitriou, and Yannakakis, captures problems where a locally optimal solution can be found by a local search algorithm [16]. PLS has matured into a robust class, and there is now a wide range of problems that are known to be PLS-complete [15, 19]. It is widely believed that PLS-complete problems do not admit polynomial-time algorithms.

To show that a problem lies in PLS, we must provide three polynomial-time functions: a function A that produces a candidate solution, a function B that assigns an value to each candidate solution, and a function C that for each candidate solution, either produces a neighbouring candidate solution with higher value, or reports that no such candidate solution exists. Thus, each PLS problem comes equipped with a *natural algorithm* that executes A to find an initial candidate solution, and then iterates C until a local optimum is found. For some problems in PLS, it is known that it is PSPACE-complete to find the solution that is computed by the natural algorithm [22, 25]. So far, this is only known to hold for problems that are *tight PLS-complete* (see, e.g., [28]), which is a stronger form of PLS-completeness, or for problems that are suspected to be tight PLS-complete, such as the local max-cut problem on graphs of degree four [20].

Obviously, since linear programming is in P, it cannot be PLS-complete unless PLS=P. Despite this fact, in the first main theorem of this paper, we show that it is PSPACE-complete to compute the solution found by the simplex method equipped with Dantzig’s pivot rule. Given a linear program \mathcal{L} , an initial basic feasible solution b , and a variable v , the problem DANTZIGLPSOL(\mathcal{L}, b, v) asks the following question: if Dantzig’s pivot rule is started at basis b , and finds an optimal solution

s of \mathcal{L} , is variable v in the basis of s ? We show the following theorem, which holds regardless of the degeneracy resolution rule¹ used by Dantzig’s pivot rule.

Theorem 1. *DANTZIGLPSOL is PSPACE-complete.*

We can also understand Theorem 1 in the context of the complexity class PPAD. Linear programming is in the intersection of PLS and PPAD. The Lemke-Howson algorithm is a complementary pivoting algorithm that finds an equilibrium of a bimatrix game, and it was the inspiration for the complexity class PPAD [21]. In fact, a variant of the simplex method can be seen as a special case of Lemke’s algorithm for linear complementarity problems, which is closely related to the Lemke-Howson algorithm. The canonical PPAD-complete problem is *end of the line* which asks: given a succinct encoding of an exponentially-large graph, where every vertex has in-degree and out-degree at most 1, and an initial vertex v with in-degree 0, find another vertex $u \neq v$ that either has in-degree or out-degree 0.

A natural algorithm for a PPAD problem simply follows the line that starts at v until it finds a vertex with out-degree 0. The *other end of the line* problem asks us to find this vertex, and it is known to be PSPACE-complete [21]. This fact has been used to show that is PSPACE-complete to find any of the equilibria of a bimatrix game that can be computed by the Lemke-Howson algorithm [13], even though the problem of finding a Nash equilibrium of a bimatrix game is only PPAD-complete [4]. In Theorem 1, we show an even bigger gap between the complexity of finding any solution and a specific one, namely, we show that it is PSPACE-complete to compute the solution found by Dantzig’s pivot rule, even though the problem of finding a solution of a linear program is in P.

A potential criticism of Theorem 1 is that it requires that the linear program has more than one optimal solution. It is possible that one could turn a linear program with multiple solutions into one with a unique solution using perturbations. If \mathcal{L} is a linear program with a unique solution, then problem $\text{DANTZIGLPSOL}(\mathcal{L}, b, v)$ is trivially in P. However, the fact that Dantzig’s pivot rule can solve PSPACE-complete problems does not depend on a linear program with multiple solutions, as we show in our second main theorem. Given a linear program \mathcal{L} , a variable v , and a initial basic feasible solution b in which v is not basic, the problem $\text{BASISENTRY}(\mathcal{L}, b, v)$ asks the following question: if Dantzig’s pivot rule is started at b , will it ever choose variable v to enter the basis? The following theorem states our second main result, which holds regardless of the degeneracy resolution rule used by Dantzig’s pivot rule.

Theorem 2. *BASISENTRY is PSPACE-complete.*

Theorem 2 continues a line of work that was recently initiated by Disser and Skutella [6]. They defined an algorithm to be *NP-mighty* if it implicitly solves every problem in NP, and they showed that the (network) simplex algorithm with Dantzig’s pivot rule is NP-mighty. Using this terminology, Theorem 2 shows that Dantzig’s pivot rule is in fact PSPACE-mighty. This is also related to the interesting recent work of Adler, Papadimitriou, and Rubinstein [2], which explicitly conjectures that Theorem 2 may be true, but states that it is a challenging open problem.

Given its good performance in practice, we find it interesting that the simplex method can actually solve PSPACE-hard problems. As alluded to by Disser and Skutella, it seems somewhat counter-intuitive that, while an exponential-time worst-case example for an algorithm is often considered to show that the algorithm is “stupid”, a PSPACE-hardness results suggests it is in some sense “clever”.

¹ Degeneracy resolution is used to break ties when there is more than one possible entering and/or leaving variable, e.g., when there are two variables with the most negative reduced cost.

Techniques. In order to prove Theorems 1 and 2, we make use of a known connection between the simplex method for linear programming and *policy iteration* algorithms for Markov decision processes (MDPs), which are discrete-time stochastic control processes [24]. The problem of finding an optimal policy in an MDP can be solved in polynomial time by a reduction to linear programming. However, policy iteration is a local search technique that is often used as an alternative. Policy iteration starts at an arbitrary policy. In each policy it assigns each action an *appeal*, and if an action has positive appeal, then switching this action creates a strictly better policy. Thus, policy iteration proceeds by repeatedly switching a subset of switchable actions, until it finds a policy with no switchable actions. The resulting policy is guaranteed to be optimal.

We use the following connection: If a policy iteration algorithm for an MDP makes only a single switch in each iteration, then it corresponds directly to the simplex method for the corresponding linear program. In particular, Dantzig’s pivot rule corresponds to the natural switching rule for policy iteration that always switches the action with highest appeal. We call this *Dantzig’s rule*. This connection is well known, and has been applied in other contexts. Friedmann, Hansen, and Zwick used this connection in the expected total-reward setting, to show sub-exponential lower bounds for some randomized pivot rules [12]. Post and Ye have shown that Dantzig’s pivot rule is strongly polynomial for *deterministic discounted* MDPs [23], while Hansen, Kaplan, and Zwick went on to prove various further bounds for this setting [14].

We define two problems for Dantzig’s rule. Let \mathcal{M} be an MDP, σ be a starting policy, and a be an action. The problem $\text{DANTZIGMDPSOL}(\mathcal{M}, \sigma, a)$ asks: if σ^* is the optimal policy that is found when Dantzig’s rule is started at σ , does σ^* use action a ? The problem $\text{ACTIONSWITCH}(\mathcal{M}, \sigma, a)$ asks: if Dantzig’s rule is started at some policy σ that does not use a , will it ever switch action a ? We prove the following two theorems:

Theorem 3. DANTZIGMDPSOL is *PSPACE-complete*.

Theorem 4. ACTIONSWITCH is *PSPACE-complete*.

Policy iteration is a well-studied and frequently-used method. Thus, these theorems are of interest in their own right. Additionally, given the connections we show between policy iteration for our construction and Dantzig’s pivot rule on a certain linear program, these two theorems immediately imply that DANTZIGLPSOL and BASISENTRY are *PSPACE-complete* (Theorems 1 and 2, respectively). The majority of the paper is dedicated to proving Theorem 4; we then add one extra gadget to prove Theorem 3.

Our *PSPACE-completeness* results are shown by reductions from two slightly different *circuit iteration* problems. For example, the *PSPACE-completeness* result for DANTZIGLPSOL is a reduction from CIRCUITVALUE , which asks: given a function $F : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^n$ implemented by a boolean circuit C , an input bit-string B , and an integer z , is the z -th bit of $F^{2^n}(B)$ a 0?

We build an MDP that forces Dantzig’s rule to compute $F^i(B)$ for all $i \leq 2^n$. Melekopoglou and Condon have shown an exponential-time lower bound for Dantzig’s rule [18]. As a base for our construction, we use a *clock*, which is a modification of Condon and Melekopoglou’s construction. We show how a boolean circuit can be implemented by a system of gadgets. Our construction contains two full copies of a circuit for F . Both circuits have input bits and output bits. For both circuits, the output bits of that circuit are connected to the input bits of the other circuit. The circuits take turns in computing F : the first circuit computes F using the values stored in its input bits; once that computation is complete, the second circuit copies the resulting output into its input bits. Each time the clock ticks, the two circuits swap roles, so the second circuit computes and the first circuit copies. The clock ticks $2^n - 1$ times, so in the end we will have computed $F^{2^n}(B)$, and this can be used to show *PSPACE-completeness* of ACTIONSWITCH and DANTZIGLPSOL .

Related work. There has been a recent explosion of interest in the complexity of pivot rules for the simplex method, and of switching rules for policy iteration. The original spark for this line of work was a result of Friedmann, which showed an exponential lower bound for the *all-switches* variant of strategy improvement for two-player *parity games* [8, 9]. Fearnley then showed that the second player in Friedmann’s construction can be simulated by a probabilistic action, and used this to show an exponential lower bound for the all-switches variant of policy iteration of average-reward MDPs [7]. Friedmann, Hansen, and Zwick then showed a sub-exponential lower bound for the *random facet* strategy improvement algorithm for parity games [11], and then utilised Fearnley’s construction to extend the bound to the random facet pivot rule for the simplex method [12]. Friedmann also gave a sub-exponential lower bound for Zadeh’s pivot rule for the simplex method [10].

It is generally accepted that the simplex algorithm performs well in practice. Our strong worst-case negative result should be understood in the context of a long line of work that has attempted to explain the good behaviour of the simplex algorithm. This started with probabilistic analyses of the expected running time of variants of the simplex method by Adler and Megiddo [1], Borgwardt [3], and Smale [26]. Later, in seminal work, Spielman and Teng [27] defined the concept of smoothed analysis and showed that the simplex algorithm has smoothed polynomial complexity.

Roadmap. In Section 2 we formalize policy iteration for MDPs and explain the connection with the simplex method for linear programming. In Section 3 we define the PSPACE-complete circuit iteration problems, which are the starting point for our reductions. In Section 4 we define our construction and give a high-level overview of how it works. Finally, in Section 5 we give an overview of the proof of correctness of our construction for our main two theorems about MDPs, which directly imply our two main theorems for the simplex method. The full proof is unfortunately long and technical and is contained in its entirety in Appendices A to R.

2 Preliminaries

Markov decision processes. A Markov decision process (MDP) is defined by a tuple $\mathcal{M} = (S, (A_s)_{s \in S}, p, r)$, where S gives the set of states in the MDP. For each state $s \in S$, the set A_s gives the actions available at s . We also define $A = \bigcup_s A_s$ to be the set of all actions in \mathcal{M} . For each action $a \in A_s$, the function $p(s', a)$ gives the probability of moving from s to s' when using action a . Obviously, we must have $\sum_{s' \in S} p(s', a) = 1$, for every action $a \in A$. Finally, for each action $a \in A$, the function $r(a)$ gives a rational *reward* that is obtained when using action a .

A *deterministic memoryless policy* is a function $\sigma : S \rightarrow A$, which for each state s selects some action from A_s . All of the policies that we consider in this paper will be deterministic and memoryless, so we will henceforth refer to deterministic memoryless policies as *policies*. We define Σ to be the set of all deterministic memoryless policies. We say that an action a is *deterministic* if there exists an s' such that $p(s', a) = 1$. If a is a deterministic action at some state s , and s' is the state such that $p(s', a) = 1$, then we use the shorthand $\sigma(s) = s'$ to denote that policy σ selects action a at state s .

In this paper, we use the *expected average reward* optimality criterion. It has been shown that maximizing expected average reward is equivalent to solving the following system of *optimality equations* [24]. For each state $s \in S$ we have a *gain equation*:

$$G(s) = \max_{a \in A_s} \left(\sum_{s' \in S} p(s, a) \cdot G(s') \right). \quad (1)$$

Secondly, for each state s we have a *bias equation*. If $M_s = \{a \in A_s : G(s) = \sum_{s' \in S} p(s'|s, a) \cdot G(s')\}$ is the set of actions that satisfy the gain equation at the state s , then the bias equation for s is:

$$B(s) = \max_{a \in M_s} \left(r(a) - G(s) + \sum_{s' \in S} p(s', a) \cdot B(s') \right) \quad (2)$$

It has been shown that these equations have a unique solution, and that for each state s , the value of $G(s)$ is the largest expected average reward that can be obtained from s [24].

Policy iteration. Policy iteration is an algorithm for finding solutions to the optimality equations. For each policy $\sigma \in \Sigma$, we define the following system of linear equations:

$$\begin{aligned} G^\sigma(s) &= \sum_{s' \in S} p(s', \sigma(s)) \cdot G^\sigma(s) \\ B^\sigma(s) &= r(\sigma(s)) - G^\sigma(s) + \sum_{s' \in S} p(s, \sigma(s)) \cdot B^\sigma(s') \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

In a solution of this system, $G^\sigma(s)$ gives the expected average reward for obtained by following σ . We say that an action $a \in A_s$ is *switchable* in σ if either $\sum_{s' \in S} p(s', a) \cdot G^\sigma(s') > G^\sigma(s)$ or if $\sum_{s' \in S} p(s', a) \cdot G^\sigma(s') = G^\sigma(s)$ and $r(a) - G^\sigma(s) + \sum_{s' \in S} p(s', a) > B^\sigma(s)$. Switching an action a at a state s in a policy σ creates a new policy σ' such that $\sigma'(s) = a$, and $\sigma'(s') = \sigma(s')$ for all states $s' \neq s$.

We define an ordering over policies using gain and bias. If $\sigma, \sigma' \in \Sigma$, then we say that $\sigma \prec \sigma'$ if and only if one of the two following conditions hold:

- $G^{\sigma'}(s) \geq G^\sigma(s)$ for every state s , and there exists a state s' for which $G^{\sigma'}(s') > G^\sigma(s')$.
- $G^{\sigma'}(s) = G^\sigma(s)$ and $B^{\sigma'}(s) \geq B^\sigma(s)$ for every state s , and there exists a state s' for which $B^{\sigma'}(s') > B^\sigma(s')$.

The following theorem states that when we switch a switchable action, then we obtain a better policy in this ordering.

Theorem 5 ([24]). *If σ is a policy and σ' is a policy that is obtained by switching a switchable action in σ then we have $\sigma \prec \sigma'$.*

Policy iteration starts at an arbitrary policy σ . In each iteration, it switches a switchable action in σ to create σ' , which is then considered in the next iteration. Since there are finitely many policies in Σ , Theorem 5, implies that we must eventually arrive at a policy σ^* with no switchable actions. By definition, a policy with no switchable actions is a solution to Equations (1) and (2), so σ^* is an optimal policy, and the algorithm terminates.

Simplification. The construction that we give in this paper has a special structure, which will allow us to simplify policy iteration. Specifically, our construction ensures that under an optimal policy σ^* , we have $G^{\sigma^*} = 0$ for every state s . Moreover, we will start policy iteration from a policy σ with $G^\sigma(s) = 0$ for every state s . So, by Theorem 5, we have that $G^{\sigma'}(s) = 0$ for every policy σ' considered during policy iteration. If we substitute 0 into the gain equation, then we obtain the following simplification of Equation (2), which we will refer to as the *value equation*:

$$\text{Val}(s) = \max_{a \in A_s} \left(r(a) + \sum_{s' \in S} p(s', a) \cdot \text{Val}(s') \right) \quad (4)$$

Additionally, Equation (3) simplifies to:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(s) = r(\sigma(s)) + \sum_{s' \in S} p(s', \sigma(s)) \cdot \text{Val}^\sigma(s') \quad (5)$$

The definition of a switchable action is also simplified. For each policy $\sigma \in \Sigma$, each state s , and each action $a \in A_s$ we define:

$$\text{Appeal}^\sigma(a) = \left(r(a) + \sum_{s' \in S} p(s', a) \cdot \text{Val}^\sigma(s') \right) - \text{Val}^\sigma(s) \quad (6)$$

Thus, a is switchable in σ if and only if $\text{Appeal}^\sigma(a) > 0$. This is the formulation that we will use during our proofs.

We remark that these equations essentially define the *expected total reward* optimality criterion [24]. However, the detour through expected average reward was necessary, because our construction does not fall into one of the classes of MDPs for which total-reward policy iteration is known to work. In particular, in our construction, there exist policies that obtain negative infinite expected total reward, which precludes direct application of total-reward policy iteration. As we have seen, we can get around this restriction by forcing average-reward policy iteration to start at a policy with average reward 0.

Dantzig's rule. Recall that policy iteration specifies that some switchable action should be switched in each iteration. However, if there is more than one switchable action, it does not specify *which* switchable action should be chosen. This decision is delegated to a *switching rule*. In this paper, we concentrate on one particular switching rule, which we call *Dantzig's switching rule*.

Dantzig's switching rule always selects an action with maximal appeal. More formally, if σ is a policy that has at least one switchable action, then Dantzig's rule selects some action a that satisfies:

$$\text{Appeal}^\sigma(a) = \max\{\text{Appeal}^\sigma(a') : a' \in A \text{ and } \text{Appeal}^\sigma(a') > 0\}, \quad (7)$$

If more than one action a satisfies this equation, then Dantzig's switching rule selects one arbitrarily, and our PSPACE-completeness results will hold no matter how ties are broken. We will refer to the policy iteration algorithm that always follows Dantzig's switching rule as *Dantzig's rule*.

We are interested in two slightly different problems regarding Dantzig's rule. Let \mathcal{M} be an MDP, let σ be an initial policy, and let a be an action. The first problem is $\text{ACTIONSWITCH}(\mathcal{M}, \sigma, a)$, which requires us to answer the following question: When Dantzig's rule is started at policy σ , will it ever switch to a policy σ' with $\sigma'(s) = a$, for some state s ? The second problem is $\text{DANTZIGMDPSOL}(\mathcal{M}, \sigma, a)$, which requires us to answer the following question: Suppose that Dantzig's rule is started at σ , and that it finds an optimal policy σ^* . Does there exist a state s such that $\sigma^*(s) = a$? Note that this second problem is non-trivial, because although Equations (1) and (2) have a unique solution, there can be multiple optimal policies that satisfy these equations.

The connection with linear programming. There is a strong connection between policy iteration for Markov decision processes, and the simplex method for linear programming. In particular, for a number of classes of MDPs there is a well-known reduction to linear programming, which essentially encodes the optimality equations in Equations (1) and (2) as a linear program [24] and implies a correspondence between single-switch policy iteration and the simplex method applied to the dual linear program. Technically, our construction is a multi-chain average-reward MDP. This class does have a linear programming formulation, but it is the most complex case, and that

formulation is more complex than we need. In particular, the correspondence between the simplex method and policy iteration is less clear. We use special properties of our construction to define simpler primal-dual pair of linear programs using (4). We provide a full exposition of this correspondence and its correctness in Appendix C. In particular, we show that for our construction, Dantzig’s pivot rule corresponds to Dantzig’s switching rule.

Note that, when Dantzig’s pivot rule is applied in linear programming, a *degeneracy resolution* rule is required to prevent the algorithm from cycling. This rule picks the entering variable and leaving variable in the case of ties. In our formulation, the leaving variable is always unique. The entering variable is determined according to Equation (7). Since our PSPACE-completeness results for MDPs hold no matter how ties are broken in Equation (7), our PSPACE-completeness results for Dantzig’s pivot rule will also hold, no matter which degeneracy resolution rule is used.

As we mentioned in the introduction, the connection between policy iteration and the simplex method has been exploited in previous related work. However, we have been unable to find an explicit formalisation of this connection for the case of expected average reward. So in Appendix C we provide our own formalisation, and we show that Dantzig’s switching rule for an average-reward MDP corresponds to applying Dantzig’s pivot rule to the standard resulting linear program. Consequently, if we can show that ACTIONSWITCH and DANTZIGMDPSOL are PSPACE-complete problems, then we will have proved Theorems 1 and 2.

Appeal reduction gadget We now describe a gadget that will be used frequently in our construction, which we call the *appeal reduction gadget*. Similar gadgets were used by Melekopoglou and Condon to show an exponential-time lower bound for Dantzig’s rule [18], and by Fearnley to show an exponential-time lower bound against the all-switches rule [7].




Fig. 1. The appeal reduction gadget with reward r and probability p . The top diagram shows our shorthand, while the bottom diagram shows the gadget.

The gadget is shown in Figure 1. Throughout the paper, we will use the following diagramming notation for MDPs. States are represented as boxes, and the name of the state is displayed in the center of the box. Deterministic actions are represented as arrows that are annotated by rewards. Probabilistic actions are represented as arrows that split. For these actions, the reward is displayed before the split, while the transition probabilities are displayed after the split.

The lower half of Figure 1 diagram shows the gadget itself, and the upper half shows our diagramming notation for the gadget: whenever we use this shorthand in our of our diagrams, we intend it to be replaced with the gadget in the bottom half of Figure 1. The parameters for the gadget are two states s and t , two rewards r_d and r_f , and a probability p . In order to simplify

notation, if σ is a policy such that $\sigma(s)$ chooses the action towards s' , then in future we will simply $\sigma(s) = t$. This is because, when we use the shorthand notation, the state s' does not appear in our diagrams. The following lemma, which is proved in Appendix B, shows the two key properties of the gadget.

Lemma 6. *Let σ be a policy, and let a be the action between s and s' .*

- *If $\sigma(s) = a$, then we have $\text{Val}^\sigma(s) = \text{Val}^\sigma(t) + r_f + \frac{r_d}{p}$.*
- *If $\sigma(s) \neq a$, and if $\text{Val}^\sigma(t) = \text{Val}^\sigma(s) + b$, for some constant b , then we have $\text{Appeal}^\sigma(a) = p \cdot (b + r_f) + r_d$.*

The first claim of Lemma 6 describes the outcome when a policy uses the appeal reduction gadget. In particular if $r_d = 0$, which will frequently be the case in our construction, then the appeal reduction gadget acts like an action from s to t with reward r_f . The second claim describes what happens when a policy does not use the appeal reduction gadget. In this case, the appeal of moving to t is scaled down by the probability p . This property allows us to control when an action is switched by Dantzig's rule, which will be crucial for our construction.

3 Circuit Iteration Problems

In order to prove PSPACE-completeness of ACTIONSWITCH and DANTZIGMDPSOL, we will provide a reduction from two *circuit iteration* problems, which we define in this section.

3.1 Circuits

Let C be a boolean circuit with n input bits and n output bits. We represent C as an list of gates indexed 1 through $n + k$. The indices 1 through n represent the n *input bits*. Then, for each $i > n$, we have:

- If gate i is an OR gate, then we define $I_1(i)$ and $I_2(i)$ to give the indices of its two inputs.
- If gate i is a NOT gate, then we define $I(i)$ to give the index of its input.

The gates $(n + k) - n + 1 = k + 1$ through $k + n$ correspond to the n *output bits* of the circuit, respectively. For the sake of convenience, we also define, for each input bit i , we define $I(i) = k + i$, which indicates that input bit i should copy from output bit $I(i)$. Moreover, we assume that the gate ordering is topological. That is, for each OR gate i we assume that $i > I_1(i)$ and $i > I_2(i)$, and we assume that for each NOT gate i we have $i > I(i)$.

For each gate i , let $d(i)$ denote the *depth* of gate i , which is the length of the longest path from i to an input bit. Observe that we can increase the depth of a gate by inserting dummy OR gates: given a gate i , we can add an OR gate j with $I_1(j) = i$ and $I_2(j) = i$, so that $d(j) = i + 1$. We use this fact in order to make the following assumptions about our circuits:

- For each OR gate i , we have $d(I_1(i)) = d(I_2(i))$.
- For each NOT gate i , we have $d(i) \geq 2$.
- There is a constant j such that, for every output bit $i \in \{k + 1, k + n\}$, we have $d(i) = j$.

From now on, we assume that all circuits that we consider satisfy these properties. Note that, since all outputs gates have the same depth, we can define $d(C) = d(k + 1)$, which is the depth of all the output bits of the circuit.

Given an input $B \in \{0, 1\}^n$, the truth values of each of the gates in C are fixed. We define $C(B, i) = 1$ if gate i is true for input B , and $C(B, i) = 0$ if gate i is false for input B .

Given a circuit C' , we define the *negated form* of C' to be a transformation of C' in which each output bit is negated. More formally, we transform C' into a circuit C using the following operation: for each output bit $n + i$ in C' , we add a NOT gate $n + k + i$ with $I(n + k + i) = n + i$. In other words, we have that the i -th bit of $F(B)$ is 1 if and only if the $C(B, i) = 0$.

3.2 Circuit iteration problems

A *circuit iteration* instance is a triple (F, B, z) , where:

- $F : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^n$ is a function represented as a boolean circuit C ,
- $B \in \{0, 1\}^n$ is an initial bit-string, and
- z is an integer such that $1 \leq z \leq n$.

We use standard notation for function iteration: given a bit-string $B \in \{0, 1\}^n$, we recursively define $F^1(B) = F(B)$, and $F^i(B) = F(F^{i-1}(B))$ for all $i > 1$. We define two different circuit iteration problems, which correspond to the two different theorems that we prove for Dantzig's rule. Both are decision problems that take as input a circuit iteration instance (F, B, z) .

- **BITSWITCH** (F, B, z) : if the z -th bit of B is 1, then decide whether there exists an even $i \leq 2^n$ such that the z -th bit of $F^i(B)$ is 0.
- **CIRCUITVALUE** (F, B, z) : decide whether the z -th bit of $F^{2^n}(B)$ is 0.

The requirement for i to be even in **BITSWITCH** is a technical requirement that is necessary in order to make our reduction work. The fact that both of these problems are PSPACE-complete should not be too surprising, because we can use the circuit F to simulate a single step of a space-bounded Turing machine, so when F is iterated, it simulates the space-bounded Turing machine. The following lemma is shown in Appendix E.

Lemma 7. *Both **BITSWITCH** and **CIRCUITVALUE** are PSPACE-complete.*

4 Overview

Let (F, B, z) be a circuit iteration instance, where F is an n -bit function, and where C' is the circuit that implements F . Let C be the negated form of C' . Our goal is to reduce the problem **BITSWITCH** to the problem **ACTIONSWITCH**. To do so, we construct an MDP, which will be called $\text{Constr}(C)$.

The core part of the construction is the *clock*. For this, we use a modified version of the exponential-time examples of Melekopoglou and Condon [18]. The clock has two output states c_0 and c_1 , and the difference in value between these two states is what drives our construction. In particular, the clock alternates between two output *phases*: if we fix $T = 3^{d(C)+6}$ then:

- In phase 0 we have $\text{Val}^\sigma(c_1) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_0) + T$.
- In phase 1 we have $\text{Val}^\sigma(c_0) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_1) + T$.

The clock alternates between phase 0 and phase 1. The clock goes through exactly 2^n many phases, and therefore alternates between phase 0 and phase 1 exactly $2^n - 1$ many times.

Our goal is to compute one iteration of F in each clock phase. We will maintain two copies of the circuit C , which will be numbered 0 and 1. At the start of the computation, circuit 0 will hold the initial bit-string B in its input bits. In phase 0, circuit 0 will compute $F(B)$, and then circuit 1 will copy $F(B)$ into its input bits. When we change to phase 1, circuit 1 will compute $F(F(B))$, and

then circuit 0 will copy $F(F(B))$ into its input bits. This pattern is then repeated until 2^n phases have been encountered, and therefore when the clock terminates we will have computed F^{2^n} , as required.

Each copy of the circuit is built from gadgets. We will design gadgets to model the input bits, OR gates, and NOT gates. In particular, for each gate i in the circuit, and for each $j \in \{0, 1\}$, we will have a state σ_i^j , which represents the output of the gate i in copy j of the circuit. The value of this state will indicate whether the gate is true or false, in a way that we now formally define.

Let $j \in \{0, 1\}$. Recall that in phase j , circuit j will compute the function F , and circuit $1 - j$ will copy the output of circuit j . Firstly, for each k with $0 \leq k \leq d(C)$, we define the following constants:

$$b_k = 3^{d(C)-j+2}, \quad L_k = \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} b_m, \quad H_k = \sum_{m=0}^k b_m.$$

The constant H_k gives a *high* value, and will be used by gates of depth k to indicate that they are true. The constant L_k gives a *low* value, and will be used by gates of depth k to indicate that they are false. Note that $H_k = L_k + b_k$ and that $H_k = L_{k+1}$ for all k . Moreover, note that $H_{d(C)} \leq 2 \cdot 3^{d(C)+2}$ and that $H_{d(C)} < \frac{T}{2}$.

We use these constants to define the truth value of our gates. Let σ be a policy in phase j . Recall that in phase j , we have $\text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + T$. The truth values in circuit j will be given relative to the value of c_j . More precisely, we have:

- Gate i is false in σ in phase j if $\text{Val}^\sigma(\sigma_i^j) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + L_{d(i)}$.
- Gate i is true in σ in phase j if $\text{Val}^\sigma(\sigma_i^j) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + H_{d(i)}$.

Note, in particular, that these values depend on the depth of the gate.

In the rest of this section, we define each component of the construction, and we give high level descriptions of how each component operates. We will give a full description of $\text{Constr}(C)$ in terms of diagrams, and a full formal description of the $\text{Constr}(C)$ can be found in Appendix A. A formal proof that our construction works will be presented in Section 5.

4.1 The clock




Fig. 2. The clock construction.

Figure 2 shows the clock. For each i with $1 \leq i \leq n$, the probability α_i is defined to be:

$$\alpha_i = \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{4i}\right) \cdot T^{-1} \cdot 2^{-(f(i)-1)}, \quad (8)$$

We have used special notation to simplify this diagram. The circle states have a single outgoing action a . Each circle state has two outgoing arrows, which are each both have a 0.5 probability of being taken when a is used. That is, if s is a circle state, and t and u are the two states with incoming arrows from s , then we have $p(t, a) = 0.5$ and $p(u, a) = 0.5$. Also, to save space, we only display the probability parameter for the appeal reduction gadgets. This is because the r_d and r_f parameters are both 0 in all of the appeal reduction gadgets in the clock.

The clock is an adaptation of the exponential-time lower bound of Melekopoglou and Condon [18], but with several modifications. Firstly, they consider minimising the reachability probability of state 0, whereas we consider maximizing the expected total reward. In their original construction, the action at state 0 went to n with probability 0.5, and to si with probability 0.5. We have replaced this with a deterministic action from 0 to si .

Note that the two states c_0 and c_1 are the two clock states that we described earlier. In the initial policy for the clock, all states select the action going right. In the optimal policy, all states select the action going right, except state 1, which selects its downward action. However, to move from the initial to final policy, Dantzig's rule makes an exponential number of switches. In each step, the probability of reaching si' increases, and this is what allows us to generate an exponential sequence of clock phases.

One final thing to note about the clock is that the state si has a self-loop with reward 0. We call this the *sink*. In the optimal policy for our construction, for every state s , the probability of eventually moving from s to si is 1. This property will also hold for the initial policy. This is what allows us to guarantee that the expected average-reward is always 0.

4.2 Input bits

For every input bit i , and every $j \in \{0, 1\}$, our construction will contain a copy of the gadget shown in Figure 3. The probabilities shown in Figure 3 are defined as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} p_3 &= \frac{3.1}{\frac{3T}{2} + H_0}. & p_4 &= \frac{3.4}{\frac{3T}{2} + H_0 - \frac{H_{d(C)} + L_{d(C)}}{2}}. \\ p_5 &= \frac{1.6}{\frac{T}{2} + \frac{H_{d(C)} + L_{d(C)}}{2} - H_0} & p_6 &= \frac{3.2}{\frac{3T}{2} + L_0 - H_{d(C)}}. \\ p_7 &= \frac{0.8}{\frac{T}{2} + H_{d(C)} - L_0}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that since all of these probabilities contain at least $\frac{T}{2}$ in the denominator, they must all be strictly less than 1.

The input bit gadget has two distinct modes: in phase j the input bits of circuit j must output the values that they are holding, and once the output bits of circuit j have been computed, the input bits of circuit $1 - j$ must copy these outputs. Correspondingly, our input bits can either be in *output mode*, or in *copy mode*.

In phase j , we say that input bit i in circuit j is in output mode in a policy σ if $\sigma(l_i^j) = c_j$ and $\sigma(r_i^j) = c_j$. In this case we have:

- If $\sigma(o_i^j) = l_i^j$, then $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^j) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + H_0$, so input bit i is true in σ .
- If $\sigma(o_i^j) = r_i^j$, then $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^j) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + L_0$, so input bit i is false in σ .

Thus, when gadget i is in output mode, it always outputs either true or false, and the choice made at o_i^j determines which is the case.




Fig. 3. The gadget for input bit i in circuit j .

In phase j , we say that input bit i in circuit $1-j$ is in copy mode in a policy σ if $\sigma(l_i^{1-j}) = c_j$, $\sigma(r_i^{1-j}) = o_{I(i)}^{1-j}$, and $\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) = l_i^{1-j}$. Note that the two clock states in Figure 3 are indexed by j , so when we have $\sigma(l_i^{1-j}) = c_j$, we have that l_i^{1-j} is taking the *left* action shown in Figure 3. If all gates in circuit j have been evaluated, then since we have assumed that all outputs gates of C have the same depth, there are two possible values that $\sigma_{I(i)}^j$ can take:

- If $\text{Val}^\sigma(\sigma_{I(i)}^j) = L_d(C)$, then the appeal of switching o_i^{1-j} to r_i^{1-j} is $L_d(C) - \frac{H_d(C)+L_d(C)}{2} < 0$.
- If $\text{Val}^\sigma(\sigma_{I(i)}^j) = H_d(C)$, then the appeal of switching o_i^{1-j} to r_i^{1-j} is $H_d(C) - \frac{H_d(C)+L_d(C)}{2} > 0$.

So, o_i^{1-j} can switch to r_i^{1-j} if and only if the i -th output bit of C is 1. Recall that when circuit $1-j$ is in output mode, we have that o_i^{1-j} outputs true if and only if $\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) = l_i^{1-j}$. This is the reason why we needed C to be in negated form, because this means that o_i^{1-j} will be switched to r_i^{1-j} if and only if the i -th output bit of F is 0. Thus, the output of circuit j will be correctly copied into the input bits of circuit $1-j$.

Finally, we describe how the gadget transitions between the phases. When we move from phase j to phase $1-j$, the roles of the two circuits are switched. Thus, the input bits of circuit j must be switched from output mode to copy mode, and the input bits of circuit $1-j$ must be switched from copy mode to output mode. To do this, we must ensure that, for every input bit i , the states l_i^j , r_i^j , l_i^{1-j} , and r_i^{1-j} , are all switched before phase $1-j$ begins. Moreover, we must switch o_i^j to l_i^j , so that it is ready to copy in the next phase.

The probabilities used in the appeal reduction gadgets are specifically chosen for this task. As our proof will show, none of these states will be switched before the output of circuit j is copied into the input of circuit $1-j$, and once the copy has taken place, the probabilities ensure that they switch in a specific order. In particular, o_i^{1-j} must *not* be switched during this process, because doing so would destroy the input value that we will use during phase $1-j$.

4.3 Or gates

For every OR gate i and every $j \in \{0, 1\}$, our construction will include a copy of the gadget shown in Figure 4. As the circuit is computing in phase j we will have that x_i^j takes the action towards c_j .




Fig. 4. The gadget for an OR gate i in circuit j .

The probabilities on the appeal reduction gadgets at x_i^j ensure that x_i^j only switches to c_{1-j} after the output of the circuit j has been copied to circuit $1-j$.

The purpose of the state v_i^j is to select the maximum of the two inputs to gate i . It should be fairly clear that if exactly one of the two input gates is true, then v_i^j will switch towards that input. If both input gates have the same truth value, then it is irrelevant which action v_i^j chooses.

The state o_i^j ensures that the gate outputs the correct value. To see this, suppose that σ is a policy with $\sigma(o_i^j) = v_i^j$.

- If at least one of the input gates is true, then we will have $\text{Val}^\sigma(v_i^j) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + H_{d(i)-1}$. In this case we have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^j) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + H_{d(i)-1} + b_{d(i)} = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + H_{d(i)}.$$

Thus, if one of the two input gates is true, the output of gate i will be true.

- If both input gates are false, then we will have $\text{Val}^\sigma(v_i^j) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + L_{d(i)-1}$. In this case we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^j) &= \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + L_{d(i)-1} + b_{d(i)} \\ &< \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + L_{d(i)}. \end{aligned}$$

So, since x_i^j takes the action towards c_j , we have that switching o_i^j to x_i^j has appeal $L_{d(i)} - (L_{d(i)-1} + b_{d(i)}) < 0$. Therefore o_i^j will be switched to x_i^j , and we will have $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^j) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + L_{d(i)}$, as required.

4.4 Not gates

For each NOT gate i , and each $j \in \{0, 1\}$, our construction will include one copy of the gadget shown in Figure 5. The probabilities used in Figure 5 are defined as follows.

$$p_1 = \frac{3.5 + \frac{1}{2d(i)}}{H_{d(i)}} \qquad p_2 = \frac{0.95}{2T - H_{d(i)-1}}$$




Fig. 5. A gadget for a NOT gate i in circuit j .

Since $H_{d(i)} > 4$ we must have that $p_1 < 1$, and we must have $p_2 < 1$ because $2T - H_{d(i)-1} > 0.95$.

The state a_i^j has a very important role in this gadget. At the start of phase j we have that a_i^j takes the action to c_j . In this configuration, since by assumption all NOT gates have depth greater than 2, we have that if σ is a policy with $\sigma(\sigma_i^j) = \sigma_{I(i)}^j$, then the appeal of switching σ_i^j to $\sigma_{I(i)}^j$ is at least:

$$(\text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + L_{d(i)-1}) - (\text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + b_{d(i)}) > 0,$$

whenever $d(i) \geq 2$. This has the effect of ensuring that σ_i^j is switched to $\sigma_{I(i)}^j$ before a_i^j is switched.

We now describe what happens after a_i^j is switched to c_{1-j} . Let σ be a policy in which $\sigma(a_i^j) = c_{1-j}$ and $\sigma(\sigma_i^j) = \sigma_{I(i)}^j$. Let us consider the two possible outputs for gate $I(i)$.

- If gate $I(i)$ is false, then we have $\text{Val}^\sigma(\sigma_i^j) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + L_{d(i)-1}$. Therefore, we can apply Lemma 6 to argue that the appeal of switching σ_i^j to a_i^j is:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{b_{d(i)}} \cdot (H_{d(i)-1} - L_{d(i)-1}) + 1 &= \frac{1}{b_{d(i)}} \cdot b_{d(i)-1} + 1 \\ &= \frac{1}{3^{d(C)-d(i)+2}} \cdot 3^{d(C)-d(i)+3} + 1 \\ &= 4. \end{aligned}$$

So, σ_i^j will be switched to a_i^j . If σ' is this new policy, then we will have:

$$\text{Val}^{\sigma'}(\sigma_i^j) = \text{Val}^{\sigma'}(c_j) + H_{d(i)-1} + b_{d(i)} = \text{Val}^{\sigma'}(c_j) + H_{d(i)}.$$

This is the correct output value for gate i in the case where gate $I(i)$ is false.

- If gate $I(i)$ is true, then we have $\text{Val}^\sigma(\sigma_i^j) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + H_{d(i)-1}$. Again we can apply Lemma 6 to argue that the appeal of switching σ_i^j to a_i^j is:

$$\frac{1}{b_{d(i)}} \cdot (H_{d(i)-1} - H_{d(i)-1}) + 1 = 1.$$

Note that the action is now less appealing than in the previous case. This is the fundamental property that our construction exploits. We will ensure that when Dantzig's rule computes the output of the circuit j , and copies it into circuit $1-j$, it always switches an action with appeal

strictly greater than 1. Thus, while the circuit is computing, an action with appeal 1 will not be switched. So σ_i^j will not be switched away from $\sigma_{I(i)}^j$, and we have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(\sigma_i^j) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + H_{d(i)-1} = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + L_{d(i)}.$$

This is the correct output for NOT gate i when gate $I(i)$ is true.

Note that in our description so far, σ_i^j has played the role of “activating” the gadget: the gadget will not compute the not of its input until σ_i^j switches to c_{1-j} . It is for this reason that the appeal of switching σ_i^j to c_{1-j} has been very carefully chosen. Let σ be a policy with $\sigma(\sigma_i^j) = c_{1-j}$. Recall that in phase j we have $\text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + T$. Therefore, we can apply Lemma 6 to show that the appeal of switching σ_i^j to c_{1-j} is:

$$p_1 \cdot (T - T + H_{d(i)-1}) = 3.5 + \frac{1}{2d(i)}$$

This is a crucial property, because Dantzig’s rule will always switch the action with highest appeal. Therefore, NOT gates with depth k will be considered by Dantzig’s rule before NOT gates with depth $k + 1$. This will allow us to show that Dantzig’s rule computes the outputs of NOT gates in order of depth, which is needed in our proof of correctness.

5 The proof

In this section, we prove that ACTIONSWITCH is PSPACE-complete, by reducing from BITSWITCH. To this end, the circuit iteration instance (F, B^I, z) , where $n = |B^I|$ is the bit-length of F and B^I . This instance will be fixed throughout this section. We also fix C to be the negated form of the circuit implementing F . We start by proving properties of the gadgets used in $\text{Constr}(C)$.

The following lemma is shown in Appendix J. We will use this lemma to show that, in our initial policy for $\text{Constr}(C)$, every state has expected average-reward 0, and in an optimal policy for $\text{Constr}(C)$, every state has expected average-reward 0. As we explained in Section 2, this justifies the use of expected total-reward notation.

Lemma 8. *We have:*

- If σ is a policy with $\sigma(l_i^0) = \sigma(r_i^0) = c_j$ for every input bit i , then $G^\sigma(s) = 0$ for every state s .
- Let σ^* be an optimal policy in $\text{Constr}(C)$. We have $G^{\sigma^*}(s) = 0$ for every state s .

5.1 The clock

We prove that the clock generates a sequence of 2^n different phases. Note that since the clock has no actions to other gadgets, we can treat it separately from the rest of the construction. We say that σ is an initial policy for the clock if $\sigma(i) = i - 1$ for all states i with $1 \leq i \leq n$. The following lemma is shown in Appendix D.

Lemma 9. *Let σ_0 be an initial policy for the clock. Dantzig’s rule goes through an exponential sequence of policies $\langle \sigma_0, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{2^n-1} \rangle$ with the following properties:*

- If j is even, then $\text{Val}^{\sigma_j}(c_1) = \text{Val}^{\sigma_j}(c_0) + T$.
- If j is odd, then $\text{Val}^{\sigma_j}(c_0) = \text{Val}^{\sigma_j}(c_1) + T$.
- Dantzig’s rule always switches an action with appeal in the range $[0.25, 0.5]$.

Lemma 9 shows the clock will go through an exponential sequence of phases. Moreover, it shows that the appeal of advancing the clock always lies in the range $[0.25, 0.5]$. Thus, if σ is a policy in phase j , and if Dantzig's rule switches from σ to σ' by switching an action with appeal strictly greater than 0.5, then σ' will also be in phase j . We will use this fact frequently throughout the rest of the proof.

Note that the first phase of the clock is phase 0, so at the start of our construction we must load B^I into the input bits of circuit 0. Moreover, the final phase of the clock is phase 1, so at the end of our construction circuit 0 will copy $F^{2^n}(B^I)$ from the outputs of circuit 1.

5.2 Computing the circuit outputs

Coherent policies. In this section, we show that our circuit gadgets will correctly compute the function F . That is, if we are in phase j , and if the input bits of circuit j are currently holding a bit-string B , then Dantzig's rule will eventually switch to a policy in which the outputs of circuit j give $F(B)$.

Recall that during phase j the input bits in circuit j are in output mode, and the input bits in circuit $1 - j$ are in copy mode. Also recall that, in order for OR gate i in circuit j to function correctly, we must have that x_i^j takes the action to c_j . We formalise these conditions, along with some other technical conditions for circuit $1 - j$, by defining *coherent* policies. We say that a policy σ is *coherent* in phase j if the following conditions hold for every gate i :

- If i is an input bit then:
 - We have $\sigma(l_i^j) = c_j$ and $\sigma(r_i^j) = c_j$.
 - We have $\sigma(l_i^{1-j}) = c_j$ and $\sigma(r_i^{1-j}) = o_{1(i)}^j$.
- If i is an OR gate then we have $\sigma(x_i^j) = c_j$ and we have $\sigma(x_i^{1-j}) = c_j$.
- If i is a NOT gate then we have $\sigma(a_i^{1-j}) = c_j$.

The following Lemma, which is proved in Appendix K, will be crucial for our proof.

Lemma 10. *Suppose that we are in phase j , and let σ be a coherent policy. The following states have no actions with appeal strictly greater than 3.5:*

- $l_i^j, r_i^j, o_i^j, l_i^{1-j}, r_i^{1-j}$, and o_i^{1-j} for every input bit i .
- x_i^j and x_i^{1-j} for every OR gate i .
- a_i^{1-j} for every NOT gate i .

Intuitively, Lemma 10 states that if σ is a coherent policy, and if Dantzig's rule moves to a policy σ' by switching an action with appeal at least 3.5, then σ' is also coherent. As we will show, when the construction evaluates the gates in circuit j , and copies the output into the input bits of circuit $1 - j$, it always switches an action with appeal at least 3.5. Therefore, as this is done, the policy is always coherent.

Circuit computation. Our goal is to show that circuit j correctly computes the function F . In order to do this, we use the following definition of correctness. Suppose that we are in phase j , let σ be a policy, and let $B \in \{0, 1\}^k$ be an input bit-string for C . We say that a gate i is *B-correct* in σ if one of the following conditions holds:

- If $C(B, i) = 1$, then we have $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^j) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + H_i$.
- If $C(B, i) = 0$, then we have $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^j) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + L_i$.

We also use the following definition of a *final* gate. Suppose that we are in phase j , and let σ be a coherent policy. We say that a state s is final if, for every action $a \in A_s$, we have $\text{Appeal}^\sigma(a) \leq 3.5$. Using this notion, we give an inductive definition of finality for gates. We say that a gate i is *final* in σ if all gates i' with $d(i') < d(i)$ are final, and one of the following conditions is satisfied:

- i is an OR gate, and σ_i^j , v_i^j , and x_i^j are final.
- i is a NOT gate, and both σ_i^j and a_i^j are final.
- i is an input bit, and σ_i^j , l_i^j and r_i^j are final.

Lemma 11. *Suppose that we are in phase j , and let σ be a coherent policy. Suppose further that Dantzig's rule moves from σ to a policy σ' by switching an action with appeal at least 3.5. If gate i is final in σ , then it is also final in σ' .*

Our proof of correctness will be by induction over the depth of the gates. Lemma 11 is critical for making this induction work, because once we have shown that all gates with depth k are correct and final, we can then guarantee that these gates will not change their value while we consider the gates with depth $k + 1$.

We use the following definition as the base case of our induction. Let $B \in \{0, 1\}^k$ be an input bit-string for C . We say that a policy σ is an *initial policy* for B in phase j if the following conditions are satisfied.

- σ is coherent.
- For every input bit i :
 - If the i -th bit of B is 1, then we have $\sigma(\sigma_i^j) = l_i^j$.
 - If the i -th bit of B is 0, then we have $\sigma(\sigma_i^j) = r_i^j$.
 - We have $\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) = l_i^j$.
- For every NOT gate i , we have $\sigma(a_i^j) = c_j$.

Note that these conditions ensure that all input bits are B -correct in an initial policy for B . Moreover, if σ is an initial policy for B , then since σ is required to be coherent, we can apply Lemma 53 to argue that all input bits are final in σ . This is used as the base case for the following inductive lemma, which is proved in Appendix G.

Lemma 12. *Suppose that we are in phase j , let $B \in \{0, 1\}^n$ be an input bit-string for C , and let $k > 0$. Suppose that the following three assumptions are met:*

- Dantzig's rule was started at σ , which is an initial policy for B .
- Dantzig's rule has only ever switched actions with appeal greater than or equal to $3.5 + \frac{1}{2 \cdot k}$.
- Dantzig's rule has arrived at σ' in which all gates with depth at most k are final and B -correct.

When Dantzig's rule is applied to σ' , it will move to a policy σ'' in which all gates with depth at most $k + 1$ are final and B -correct. Moreover, Dantzig's rule will only switch actions with appeal greater than or equal to $3.5 + \frac{1}{2 \cdot (k+1)}$ while moving from σ' to σ'' .

Applying Lemma 12 inductively allows us to conclude that, if σ is an initial policy for some bit-string B , then when Dantzig's rule is applied to σ , we will eventually move to a policy σ' in which all output gates in circuit j are final and B -correct. In the next lemma, which is proved in Appendix H, we show that the input bits of circuit $1 - j$ copy the output bits of circuit j .

Lemma 13. *Suppose that we are in phase j , let $B \in \{0,1\}^n$ be an input bit-string for C , and let σ be an initial policy for B . While making only switches with appeal strictly greater than 3.5, Dantzig's rule will eventually switch to a policy σ' in which, for every input bit i , we have:*

- *If the i -th bit of $F(B)$ is 0, then we have $\sigma'(o_i^{1-j}) = r_i^{1-j}$.*
- *If the i -th bit of $F(B)$ is 1, then we have that $\sigma'(o_i^{1-j}) = l_i^{1-j}$, and moreover, o_i^{1-j} is never switched away from l_i^{1-j} at any policy between σ and σ' .*

To sum up the results in this section, we introduce the following definition. We say that σ is a *final policy* for B if the following conditions are satisfied:

- σ satisfies the conditions of initial policy for B .
- For every gate i we have that i is final and B -correct in σ .
- For every input bit i we have:
 - If $C(B, I(i)) = 0$, then $\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) = l_i^j$.
 - If $C(B, I(i)) = 1$, then $\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) = r_i^j$.

Lemmas 12 and 13 combine to prove the following lemma.

Lemma 14. *Suppose that we are in phase j , let B be an input bit-string, and let σ be an initial policy for B . When Dantzig's rule is applied to σ , it will make a sequence of switches that each have appeal at least 3.5, and it will arrive at a policy σ' that is a final policy for B .*

5.3 Phase transition

Let B be a bit-string. The results from the previous section imply that, starting from an initial policy for B in phase j , then Dantzig's rule will eventually move to a final policy for B in phase j . Once this has occurred, the construction transitions into phase $1-j$, so that the computation can be continued. In this section, we prove that this will occur.

The goal is to show that, if σ is a final policy for some bit-string B in phase j , then Dantzig's rule will move to an initial policy for $F(B)$ in phase $1-j$. To do this, several events must occur. The input bits in circuit j must be switched to copy mode, and the input bits in circuit $1-j$ must be switched to output mode. Moreover, the states x_i^j in the OR gates, and the states a_i^j in the NOT gates must be switched from c_j to c_{1-j} .

The following lemma, which is proved in Appendix L, describes how Dantzig's rule achieves these tasks. In particular, the order of these tasks is controlled by the probabilities that we have chosen for the appeal reduction gadgets in our construction. One crucial point to note here is that at no point are the states o_i^{1-j} switched for the input bits i , so the information that was copied into these states remains intact.

Lemma 15. *Suppose that we are in phase j , let B be an input bit-string for C , and let σ_f be a final policy for B . When Dantzig's rule is applied to σ_f , the following sequence of events takes place.*

1. *For every input bit i , the state l_i^{1-j} is switched to c_{1-j} .*
2. *For every input bit i , the state r_i^{1-j} is switched to c_{1-j} .*
3. *For every input bit i , the state l_i^j is switched to c_{1-j} .*
4. *For every input bit i , if σ_i^j takes the action towards r_i^j , then it is switched to l_i^j .*
5. *For every input bit i , the state r_i^j is switched to $o_{I(i)}^{1-j}$.*

6. For every NOT gate i , the state a_i^{1-j} is switched to c_{1-j} .
7. For every OR gate i , the states x_i^j and x_i^{1-j} are both switched to c_{1-j} .
8. An action in the clock is switched, and we move to phase $1 - j$.

At the end of this sequence, we will have arrived a coherent phase $1 - j$ policy σ_n , that is an initial policy for $F(B)$ in phase $1 - j$.

5.4 ActionSwitch is PSPACE-complete

Finally, we can provide a proof for Theorem 4. Recall that our circuit iteration instance is (F, B^I, z) . We reduce this to $\text{ACTION SWITCH}(\text{Constr}(C), \sigma_{\text{init}}, a)$, where:

- σ_{init} is an initial policy for the clock, and an initial policy for B^I in phase 0.
- a is the action from o_z^0 to r_z^0 .

Note that σ_{init} satisfies the condition of Lemma 8. Furthermore, recall that $\text{BIT SWITCH}(F, B^I, z)$ only requires us to decide something in the case where the z -th bit of B^I is 1. Thus, we have that σ_{init} does not use action a , and therefore we have a valid instance of ACTION SWITCH .

By Lemmas 9, 13 and 15, we know that when Dantzig’s rule is applied to σ_{init} , it will simulate 2^n iterations of $F(B^I)$. Note that circuit 0 outputs $F^i(B^I)$ for every odd i , and circuit 1 outputs $F^i(B^I)$ for every even i . Thus, for each even i , circuit 1 computes $F^i(B^I)$, and circuit 0 copies this value into its input bits. So, by Lemma 13, the state o_z^0 switches to r_z^0 only in the case where the z -th output bit of circuit 1 is a 1, which corresponds to the z -th output bit of $F^i(B^I)$ being a 0, for some even $i \leq 2^n$. Therefore, we have that $\text{ACTION SWITCH}(\text{Constr}(C), \sigma_{\text{init}}, a)$ is a “yes” instance if and only if $\text{BIT SWITCH}(F, B^I, z)$ is a “yes” instance, and we have completed the proof of Theorem 4, which then directly implies Theorem 2.

5.5 DantzigMdpSol is PSPACE-complete

In this section, we give an overview of the proof of for Theorem 3. A formal proof of this theorem can be found in Appendix R. In order to show that DANTZIGMDPSOL is PSPACE-complete, we make a slight modification to $\text{Constr}(C)$, which we now describe. Let S be the set of states of $\text{Constr}(C)$, and let σ be an optimal policy for $\text{Constr}(C)$. We define $W = \max\{\text{Val}^\sigma(s) : s \in S\}$ to be the largest possible value of a state in $\text{Constr}(C)$. We modify $\text{Constr}(C)$ by adding an extra gadget, and extra actions at the states l_z^0 and r_z^0 , as shown in Figure 6, and described formally in Appendix A.1. We call this modified construction $\text{Constr}(C, z)$.

Recall that si is the sink state in the clock. This gadget adds two new states: b_1 and b_2 . In the initial policy, b_2 will select the action that goes directly to si , thus there will be no incentive for l_z^0 or r_z^0 to switch to b_2 . Note that the appeal of switching b_2 to b_1 is 0.2, and that this is smaller than the appeal of advancing the clock given in Lemma 9. Thus, the construction will proceed as normal until the clock has gone through all 2^n phase switches, and it will be switched immediately after the final phase of the construction. Note that at this point, since 2^n is even, we will have that the choice made at o_z^0 will hold the z -th bit of $F^{2^n}(B^I)$.

When b_2 switches to b_1 , the value of b_2 will rise to $2 \cdot W$. Since the value of l_z^0 and r_z^0 can be at most W , we have that the appeal of switching l_z^0 and r_z^0 to b_2 is at least W . Thus, Dantzig’s rule will immediately switch both of these states to b_2 , and it can never switch them away from b_2 . The key point here is that once l_z^0 and r_z^0 have both been switched to b_2 , the state o_z^0 is now indifferent between its two actions. So no matter what choice is made at o_z^0 , policy iteration can not now switch o_z^0 . So, even though policy iteration may continue to switch actions elsewhere in




Fig. 6. The extra gadget needed in $\text{Constr}(C, z)$.

the construction, the information stored in o_z^0 cannot be destroyed. Thus, when policy iteration terminates, the choice made at o_z^0 will determine the z -th bit of F^{2^n} . For this reason, we have that DANTZIGMDPSOL is PSPACE-complete, and therefore we have shown both Theorem 3 and Theorem 1.

References

1. I. Adler and N. Megiddo. A simplex algorithm whose average number of steps is bounded between two quadratic functions of the smaller dimension. *J. ACM*, 32(4):871–895, Oct. 1985.
2. I. Adler, C. Papadimitriou, and A. Rubinstein. On simplex pivoting rules and complexity theory. In *Proc. of IPCO*, 2014. To appear. Available at arXiv:1404.3320.
3. K. H. Borgwardt. *A Probabilistic Analysis of the Simplex Method*. Springer-Verlag New York, Inc., New York, NY, USA, 1986.
4. X. Chen, X. Deng, and S.-H. Teng. Settling the complexity of computing two-player Nash equilibria. *J. ACM*, 56(3):14:1–14:57, May 2009.
5. G. B. Dantzig. *Linear programming and extensions*. Princeton University Press, 1965.
6. Y. Disser and M. Skutella. In defense of the simplex algorithm’s worst-case behavior. *CoRR*, abs/1311.5935, 2013.
7. J. Fearnley. Exponential lower bounds for policy iteration. In *Proc. of ICALP*, pages 551–562, 2010.
8. O. Friedmann. An exponential lower bound for the parity game strategy improvement algorithm as we know it. In *Proc. of LICS*, pages 145–156, 2009.
9. O. Friedmann. An exponential lower bound for the latest deterministic strategy iteration algorithms. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 7(3), 2011.
10. O. Friedmann. A subexponential lower bound for Zadeh’s pivoting rule for solving linear programs and games. In *Proc. of IPCO*, pages 192–206, 2011.
11. O. Friedmann, T. D. Hansen, and U. Zwick. A subexponential lower bound for the random facet algorithm for parity games. In *Proc. of SODA*, pages 202–216, 2011.
12. O. Friedmann, T. D. Hansen, and U. Zwick. Subexponential lower bounds for randomized pivoting rules for the simplex algorithm. In *Proc. of STOC*, pages 283–292, 2011.
13. P. W. Goldberg, C. H. Papadimitriou, and R. Savani. The complexity of the homotopy method, equilibrium selection, and Lemke-Howson solutions. *ACM Trans. Economics and Comput.*, 1(2):9, 2013. Preliminary version: *FOCS 2011*.

14. T. D. Hansen, H. Kaplan, and U. Zwick. Dantzig’s pivoting rule for shortest paths, deterministic MDPs, and minimum cost to time ratio cycles. In *Proc. of SODA*, pages 847–860, 2014.
15. D. S. Johnson. The NP-completeness column: Finding needles in haystacks. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 3(2), May 2007.
16. D. S. Johnson, C. H. Papadimitriou, and M. Yannakakis. How easy is local search? *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 37(1):79–100, 1988.
17. V. Klee and G. Minty. How good is the simplex algorithm? In *Inequalities, III*, pages 159–175, 1972.
18. M. Melekopoglou and A. Condon. On the complexity of the policy improvement algorithm for Markov decision processes. *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, 6(2):188–192, 1994.
19. B. Monien, D. Dumrauf, and T. Tscheuschner. Local search: Simple, successful, but sometimes sluggish. In *Proc. of ICALP*, pages 1–17, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2010. Springer-Verlag.
20. B. Monien and T. Tscheuschner. On the power of nodes of degree four in the local max-cut problem. In *Proc. of CIAC*, pages 264–275, 2010.
21. C. H. Papadimitriou. On the complexity of the parity argument and other inefficient proofs of existence. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 48(3):498–532, 1994.
22. C. H. Papadimitriou, A. A. Schäffer, and M. Yannakakis. On the complexity of local search. In *Proc. of STOC*, pages 438–445, 1990.
23. I. Post and Y. Ye. The simplex method is strongly polynomial for deterministic Markov decision processes. In *Proc. of SODA*, pages 1465–1473, 2013.
24. M. L. Puterman. *Markov Decision Processes: Discrete Stochastic Dynamic Programming*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, NY, USA, 1st edition, 1994.
25. A. A. Schäffer and M. Yannakakis. Simple local search problems that are hard to solve. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 20(1):56–87, 1991.
26. S. Smale. On the average number of steps of the simplex method of linear programming. *Mathematical Programming*, 27(3):241–262, 1983.
27. D. A. Spielman and S.-H. Teng. Smoothed analysis of algorithms: Why the simplex algorithm usually takes polynomial time. *J. ACM*, 51(3):385–463, May 2004.
28. M. Yannakakis. Computational complexity. In E. Aarts and J. Lenstra, editors, *Local Search in Combinatorial Optimization*. John Wiley, 1997.

A A formal definition of the construction

Let C be a boolean circuit. In this section, we give a formal definition of $\text{Constr}(C) = (S, (A_s)_{s \in S}, p, r)$.

Before we begin, let us describe some shorthand notation. When we say that state s has a deterministic action to state t with reward q , we mean that A_s contains an action a with $r(a) = q$, and $p(t, a) = 1$. We also give some notation for the appeal reduction gadget. Let s and t be two states. We will use $\text{GADGET}(s, t, r_d, p, r_f)$ to specify the following:

- A new state (s, t) is added to S .
- An action $a_{(s,t)}$ is added to A_s with $r(a_{(s,t)}) = r_d$ where:
 - $p((s, t), a_{(s,t)}) = p$.
 - $p(s, a_{(s,t)}) = 1 - p$.
- An action a_t is added to $A_{(s,t)}$ with $r(a_t) = r_f$ and $p(t, a_t) = 1$.

The clock. The clock consists of the following states:

- A state si . This state has a deterministic action to si with reward 0.
- A state si' . This state has a deterministic action to si with reward $T \cdot 2^{n+1}$.
- A state 0. This state has a deterministic action to si with reward 0.
- A state $1'$. This state has a single action a with $r(a) = 0$, and $p(si, a) = 0.5$, and $p(si', a) = 0.5$.
- A state 1. The actions at 1 are $\text{GADGET}(1, 0, 0, \alpha_1, 0)$ and $\text{GADGET}(1, 1', 0, \alpha_1, 0)$.
- For each integer i with $2 \leq i \leq n$, we have:
 - A state i' . This state has a single action a with $r(a) = 0$, and $p((i-1)', 0.5)$ and $p(i-2, 0.5)$.
 - A state i . The actions at i are $\text{GADGET}(i, i-1, 0, \alpha_i, 0)$ and $\text{GADGET}(i, i', 0, \alpha_i, 0)$.
- A state c_0 with a deterministic action to n with reward 0.
- A state c_1 . This state has a single action a with $r(a) = 0$, and $p(n-1, a) = 0.5$ and $p(n', a) = 0.5$.

Input bits. For each input bit i in circuit C , and each $j \in \{0, 1\}$, the construction contains the following states:

- A state l_i^j . The actions at l_i^j are $\text{GADGET}(l_i^j, c_{1-j}, 0, p_5, -\frac{T}{2} + \frac{H_{d(C)} + L_{d(C)}}{2})$ and $\text{GADGET}(l_i^j, c_j, 0, p_4, H_0)$.
- A state r_i^j . The actions at r_i^j are $\text{GADGET}(r_i^j, c_j, 0, p_6, L_0)$ and $\text{GADGET}(r_i^j, o_{1(i)}^{1-j}, 0, p_7, -\frac{T}{2})$.
- A state σ_i^j . This state has a deterministic action to r_i^j with reward 0, and it also has $\text{GADGET}(\sigma_i^j, l_i^j, 0, p_3, 0)$.

OR gates For each OR gate i in circuit C , and each $j \in \{0, 1\}$, the construction contains the following states:

- A state x_i^j . The actions at this state are $\text{GADGET}(x_i^j, c_j, 0, \frac{0.9}{T}, 0)$ and $\text{GADGET}(x_i^j, c_{1-j}, 0, \frac{0.9}{T}, 0)$.
- A state v_i^j . This state has a deterministic action to $\sigma_{1(i)}^j$ with reward 0, and a deterministic action to $\sigma_{12(i)}^j$ with reward 0.
- A state σ_i^j . This state has a deterministic action to x_i^j with reward $L_{d(i)}$, and a deterministic action to v_i^j with reward $b_{d(i)}$.

Not gates For each NOT gate i in circuit C , and each $j \in \{0, 1\}$, the construction contains the following states:

- A state a_i^j . The actions at this state are $\text{GADGET}(a_i^j, c_j, 0, p_2, 0)$ and $\text{GADGET}(a_i^j, c_{1-j}, 0, p_1, -T + H_{d(i)-1})$.
- A state σ_i^j . This state has a deterministic action to $\sigma_{1(i)}^j$ with reward 0, and it also has an action $\text{GADGET}(\sigma_i^j, a_i^j, 1, \frac{1}{b_{d(i)}}, 0)$.

A.1 Modifications for Theorem 3

In order to prove Theorem 3, we have to add an extra gadget to the construction. In this section, we formally define $\text{Constr}(C, z) = (S, (A_s)_{s \in S}, p, r)$. Firstly, $\text{Constr}(C, z)$ contains every state and every action from $\text{Constr}(C)$. It also contains the following states:

- A state b_1 . This state has a deterministic action to si with reward $2 \cdot W$.
- A state b_2 . This state has a deterministic action to si with reward 0, and it has an action $\text{GADGET}(b_2, b_1, 0, \frac{0.2}{2 \cdot W}, 0)$.
- An extra deterministic action is added from l_z^0 to b_2 with reward 0.
- An extra deterministic action is added from r_z^0 to b_2 with reward 0.

B Proof of Lemma 6

Proof. We begin by showing the first property. In this case we have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(s') = \text{Val}^\sigma(t) + r_f.$$

Therefore, since $\sigma(s) = a$, we have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(s) = p \cdot (\text{Val}^\sigma(t) + r_f) + (1 - p) \cdot \text{Val}^\sigma(s) + r_d.$$

Solving this equation for $\text{Val}^\sigma(s)$ yields:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(s) = \text{Val}^\sigma(t) + r_f + \frac{r_d}{p}.$$

This completes the proof of the first property.

We now turn our attention to the second property. In this case we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Appeal}^\sigma(a) &= p \cdot (\text{Val}^\sigma(t) + r_f) + (1 - p) \cdot \text{Val}^\sigma(s) + r_d - \text{Val}^\sigma(s) \\ &= p \cdot (\text{Val}^\sigma(t) - \text{Val}^\sigma(s) + r_f) + r_d \\ &= p \cdot (\text{Val}^\sigma(s) + b - \text{Val}^\sigma(s) + r_f) + r_d \\ &= p \cdot (b + r_f) + r_d. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the second property. □

C Equivalence of Dantzig's pivot and switching rules

Even though our construction is technically a multi-chain MDP with the average reward criterion, we do not require the fully general linear programming formulation for this setting (for that see Section 9.3 (pg. 462) of [24]). We utilize the special features of our construction, such the fact that, for every policy considered during policy iteration, the only recurrent state is si , and the fact that the initial policy and all optimal policies have 0 expected average reward, in order to define a simpler linear program and an initial basic feasible solution with the property that policy iteration with Dantzig's switching rule will perform identically to the simplex method with Dantzig's pivot rule applied to the linear program. Let $\bar{S} = S \setminus \{si\}$, let $n = |\bar{S}|$, and let $m = |A|$. For convenience, we pick an ordering of all actions and associate them with $[m]$.

We first construct our linear programs. We start by writing down Equation (4) as an LP, which we will call the *dual*. We then take the dual of this LP, to create an LP which we call the *primal*. We will execute the simplex method on the primal LP.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{PRIMAL (P):} \quad & \text{maximize} && \sum_{s \in \bar{S}} \sum_{a \in A_s} r(a) \cdot x_a \\ & \text{subject to} && \sum_{a \in A_j} x_a - \sum_{s \in \bar{S}} \sum_{a \in A_s} p(s, a) \cdot x_a = \frac{1}{n} \quad \forall j \in \bar{S} \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

$$x_a \geq 0 \quad \forall a \in A \quad (10)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{DUAL (D):} \quad & \text{minimize} && \sum_{j \in \bar{S}} \frac{1}{n} \cdot v_j \\ & \text{subject to} && v_s - \sum_{j \in \bar{S}} p(j, a) \cdot v_j \geq r(a) \quad \forall s \in \bar{S}, a \in A_s \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Parts of the following exposition on Linear Programming are closely based on [14], which deals with the LP formulation of discounted deterministic MDPs. We assume that (P) and (D) are written down in the following standard forms, respectively:

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{x} & \min \quad & \mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{y} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b} & \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{c} \\ & \mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0}. \end{aligned}$$

The constraint matrix \mathbf{A} is an $m \times n$ matrix. Let $B \subset [m]$ with $|B| = n$. We let $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{A}_B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be the $n \times n$ matrix obtained by selecting the columns of \mathbf{A} whose indices belong to B . If the columns of \mathbf{B} are linearly independent, then B is a *basis* and \mathbf{B} is a *basis matrix*. Then there is a unique vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ for which $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$ and $\mathbf{x}_i = 0$ for $i \notin B$. If we let $N = [m] \setminus B$, then

$$x_B := \mathbf{B}^{-1}\mathbf{b} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{x}_N := \mathbf{0}.$$

The vector \mathbf{x} is the *basic solution* corresponding to B . If $\mathbf{x}_B \geq \mathbf{0}$, then \mathbf{x} is said to be a *basic feasible solution* (BFS). A BFS is a vertex of the polyhedron corresponding to (P). The variables in $\{x_i \mid i \in B\}$ are referred to as *basic* variables, while the variables in $\{x_i \mid i \in N\}$ are referred to as *non-basic* variables. Each basis B also defines a solution to the dual as follows:

$$\mathbf{y} = ((\mathbf{A}_B)^{-1})^\top \mathbf{c}_B. \quad (12)$$

This dual solution is feasible if and only if the primal solution is optimal. The objective function can also be expressed as $\mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{c}_B^\top \mathbf{x}_B + \bar{\mathbf{c}}\mathbf{x}$, where

$$\bar{\mathbf{c}} = \mathbf{c} - (\mathbf{c}_B^\top \mathbf{B}^{-1} \mathbf{A})^\top = \mathbf{c} - \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{y}. \quad (13)$$

The vector $\bar{\mathbf{c}} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is referred to as the vector of *reduced costs*. Note that $\bar{\mathbf{c}}_B = \mathbf{0}$, i.e., the reduced costs of the basic variables are all 0. Since (P) is written as a maximization problem, our reduced costs are positive and Dantzig's pivot rule will choose the variable with the largest reduced cost to enter the basis, and if $\bar{\mathbf{c}} \leq \mathbf{0}$, then \mathbf{x} is an *optimal* solution.

Next, we show how to derive an initial basic feasible solution for (P) from an initial policy for our MDP construction.

Lemma 16. *Let σ_{init} be the initial policy for $\text{Constr}(C)$, as defined on page 19. Let $\mathbf{M} \cdot \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$ be the linear system obtained from (9) by setting $x_a = 0$ for all $s \in \bar{S}$ and $a \in A$ for which $\sigma(s) \neq a$. The matrix \mathbf{M} is upper triangular with non-zero entries on the diagonal, and is thus non-singular.*

Proof. Firstly, we show that the matrix is upper triangular. This follows from the fact that, in σ_{init} , there cannot be a pair of states s and s' , with $s' \neq s$ such that:

- The probability of moving from s to s' under σ_{init} is strictly greater than 0.
- The probability of moving from s' to s under σ_{init} is strictly greater than 0.

This property essentially says that there are no cycles of length greater than one in σ_{init} . Note that, there are cycles of length 1, but that all of these cycles arise due to an appeal reduction gadget.

There clearly cannot be a cycle with length greater than 1 in the clock, because apart from the cycles of length 1 in the appeal reduction gadgets, there are no other cycles in the clock. It can be verified that the only possible way to create a cycle with length greater than 1 in the circuits is to choose the action from r_i^0 to $o_{I(i)}^1$ and the action from $r_{i'}^0$ to $o_{I(i)}^0$ for some pair of input bits i and i' . But this is impossible for σ_{init} , because by definition we have $\sigma_{\text{init}}(l_i^0) = \sigma_{\text{init}}(r_i^0) = c_0$. So, \mathbf{M} must be upper triangular.

Next we must argue that the diagonal elements of \mathbf{M} are non-zero. Note that the diagonal elements of \mathbf{M} are zero if and only if there is a state s such that $p(s, \sigma_{\text{init}}(s)) = 1$. But no action in $\text{Constr}(C)$ has this property, because in every appeal reduction gadget, we have $p > 0$. Therefore, every diagonal element of \mathbf{M} is non-zero, and thus we have shown that \mathbf{M} is invertible. \square

Now we prove that there is a one-to-one correspondence between the basic feasible solutions encountered by Dantzig's pivot rule and the (deterministic) policies encountered by Dantzig's switching rule. To do this we use the following correspondence between policies and bases.

Definition 17. *For a (deterministic) policy σ , we define a corresponding basis $B(\sigma)$ as follows:*

$$B(\sigma) := \{ a \mid \exists s \in S \text{ s.t. } \sigma(s) = a \}.$$

Lemma 18. *The vector $\mathbf{x}_{B(\sigma_{\text{init}})}$ is basic feasible solution of the primal (P).*

Proof. By Lemma 16, the columns of \mathbf{A}_B are linearly independent. \square

We now show that, starting from $\mathbf{x}_{B(\sigma_{\text{init}})}$ every basic feasible solution encountered by Dantzig's rule will correspond to a basis $B(\sigma)$ for some deterministic policy σ .

Lemma 19. *Starting from $\mathbf{x}_{B(\sigma_{\text{init}})}$, Dantzig's pivot rule (with any type of degeneracy resolution) will go through a finite sequence of basic feasible solutions corresponding to the bases:*

$$B(\sigma_{\text{init}=0}), B(\sigma_1), B(\sigma_2), \dots, B(\sigma_l).$$

for some sequence $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots$ of distinct (deterministic) policies.

Proof. We prove the claim by induction. The base case is Lemma 18. Suppose that, as inductive hypothesis, that the k -th basis is $B(\sigma_k)$ for some deterministic policy σ_k . We need to show that the $(k+1)$ -th basis corresponds to $B(\sigma_{k+1})$ for some policy σ_{k+1} . In the pivot operation that produces basis $k+1$ from k , one non-basic variable becomes basic, say x_a for some $a \in A_s$ and $s \in S$. To prove the claim we require that the basic variable that leaves the basis is the unique one in $B(\sigma_k)$ that corresponds to another action at $s \in S$. Towards a contradiction, suppose this is not the case. Then, a basic variable, say $x_{a'}$ for some action $a' \in A_{s'}$ for some state $s' \neq s$ leaves the

basis. However, in that case there is no way to satisfy the constraint in (9) that corresponds to s' , since now all x_i for $i \in A_{s'}$ will be zero, the left-hand side of this constraint will be non-positive, while the right-hand side is positive. This contradicts the fact that the $(k+1)$ -th basis corresponds to a basic feasible solution. \square

Finally, we show that the reduced costs of a basic feasible solution that corresponds to a basis $B(\sigma)$ for some (deterministic) policy σ are the appeals used for Dantzig's switching rule.

Lemma 20. *Let σ be a (deterministic) policy and let $B(\sigma)$ be the resulting basis for (P) . For every action a in $B(\sigma)$, the corresponding reduced cost, defined by (13), is $\text{Appeal}^\sigma(a)$, as defined in (6).*

Proof. According to (12), the basis $B(\sigma)$ defines a dual solution that satisfies (5), thus $\mathbf{y} = \text{Val}^\sigma$. By definition, the reduced costs that correspond to $B(\sigma)$ equal $\mathbf{c} - \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{y}$. Thus, for each action $a \in B(\sigma)$, the reduced cost is:

$$r(a) - v_s + \sum_{j \in \bar{S}} p(j, a) \cdot v_j.$$

In other words, the reduced costs of every action $a \in B(\sigma)$ equals $\text{Appeal}^\sigma(a)$, as required. \square

Thus, when we apply Dantzig's pivot rule to (P) starting from $x_{B(\sigma_{\text{init}})}$ for some initial policy σ_{init} , we exactly simulate Dantzig's switching rule for policy iteration starting from σ_{init} .

D Proof of Lemma 9

We start by defining a reflected binary Gray code, which is a well-known construction that arises, for example, in the Klee-Minty examples that first showed that the simplex algorithm could be exponential in the worst case.

Notation. Throughout this proof, we use the following notation.

- n represents a fixed positive integer.
- ITER , short for iterations, denotes the set $\{0, 1, \dots, 2^n - 1\}$.
- $\text{BIT}(x, i)$ denotes the i -th bit of $x \in \text{ITER}$, which corresponds to 2^{i-1} for $i = 1, \dots, n$, i.e., when we talk about the i -th bit we count from right to left.
- $\text{SHIFT}(x, i)$ denotes $\lfloor x/2^i \rfloor$, that is, a shift to the right (and truncation) by i bits.
- $x \oplus y$ denotes the bit-wise exclusive or (XOR) of integers x and y .
- For $i \in [n]$, we define $f(i) := n - i + 1$. Note that f is an involution.
- We often consider $j + 2^i$. Note that for $k \leq i$ we have $\text{BIT}(j, k) = \text{BIT}(j + 2^i, k)$, i.e., only bits $\text{BIT}(j + 2^i, k)$ for $k > i$ differ from $\text{BIT}(j, k)$. In the following, during intermediate calculations, $j + 2^i$ may be larger than $2^n - 1$, but whenever this occurs a SHIFT operation ensures that no non-zero bits in positions greater than n are ever “ignored” when we consider only n bits in the end.

Definition 21 (Reflected Binary Gray Code). *We define $g : \text{ITER} \mapsto \{0, 1\}^n$ according to the following bit-wise definition. For $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $j \in \text{ITER}$:*

$$\text{BIT}(g(j), i) = \text{BIT}(j \oplus \text{SHIFT}(j, 1), f(i)). \quad (14)$$

Equivalently,

$$\text{BIT}(g(j), i) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{iff } \text{BIT}(j, f(i)) \neq \text{BIT}(j, f(i) + 1), \\ 0 & \text{iff } \text{BIT}(j, f(i)) = \text{BIT}(j, f(i) + 1). \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

We define the sequence $G := (g(0), g(1), \dots, g(2^n - 1))$.

G contains all possible bit-strings of length n exactly once, with

$$\begin{aligned} g(0) &= 0^n \\ g(1) &= 10^{n-1} \\ g(2^n - 1) &= 0^{n-1}1. \end{aligned}$$

$g(i + 1)$ is obtained from $g(i)$ by flipping a single bit, as described in following lemma.

Lemma 22. For $j \in \text{ITER}$, bit-string $g(j + 1)$ is obtained from $g(j)$ by flipping bit $f(\text{LSZ}(j))$, where

$$\text{LSZ}(j) := \min\{k \in [n] \mid \text{BIT}(j, k) = 0\}$$

is the position of the least significant zero bit of j .

Proof. For $i > \text{LSZ}(j)$, we have $\text{BIT}(j, i) = \text{BIT}(j + 1, i)$, and thus $\text{BIT}(g(j), f(i)) = \text{BIT}(g(j + 1), f(i))$. For $i = 1, \dots, \text{LSZ}(j) - 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{BIT}(j, i) &= \text{BIT}(j, i + 1) = 1 \neq \text{BIT}(j, \text{LSZ}(j)), \quad \text{and} \\ \text{BIT}(j + 1, i) &= \text{BIT}(j + 1, i + 1) = 0 \neq \text{BIT}(j + 1, \text{LSZ}(j)). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have for $i = 1, \dots, \text{LSZ}(j) - 1$:

$$\text{BIT}(g(j), f(i)) = \text{BIT}(g(j), f(i + 1)) = 0.$$

And, since we have:

$$\text{BIT}(j, \text{LSZ}(j)) = \text{BIT}(j + 1, \text{LSZ}(j)) \text{ and } \text{BIT}(j, \text{LSZ}(j) + 1) \neq \text{BIT}(j + 1, \text{LSZ}(j) + 1),$$

we have shown that

$$\text{BIT}(g(j), f(\text{LSZ}(j))) \neq \text{BIT}(g(j + 1), f(\text{LSZ}(j))),$$

which completes the proof. \square

The sequence G corresponds to the sequence of policies that Dantzig's rule will generate, where the bit-strings $g(j)$ are interpreted as policies according to the following definition.

Definition 23. For $j \in \text{ITER}$ and $i \in [n]$, the bit-string $g(j)$ corresponds to the policy $\sigma^{g(j)}$ as follows.

$$\sigma^{g(j)}(i) = \begin{cases} i - 1 & \text{if } \text{BIT}(g(j), i) = 1 \\ i' & \text{if } \text{BIT}(g(j), i) = 0. \end{cases}$$

For brevity, we often use $g(j)$ to mean the policy $\sigma^{g(j)}$. In the initial policy $g(1) = 0^n$, all states $n, n - 1, \dots, 1$ point right. We will show that:

- $g(j)$ contains a switchable state if and only if there exists an i with $\text{BIT}(j, i) = 0$ (Corollary 32). This implies that the final policy is $g(2^n - 1) = 0^{n-1}1$, where all states point to the right, except 1, which points down.

- Lemma 22 shows that $g(j+1)$ is obtained from $g(j)$ by flipping the bit in position $f(\text{LSZ}(j))$ of $g(j)$.
- Lemma 34 shows that at $g(j)$, Dantzig's rule flips $f(\text{LSZ}(j))$ and thus moves to $g(j+1)$.

This implies that there are $2^n - 1$ iterations in total. The main result of this section is Lemma 36, which characterizes the values of c_0 and c_1 at different iterations and bounds the appeal of actions within the clock.

In the clock, since all rewards are 0 except for the reward for the unique action at si' , which goes from si' to si , the value of state is the probability of reaching si' multiplied by that reward, $T \cdot 2^{n+1}$. Consequently, for brevity we work with the following scaled values to avoid the repetition of T throughout our calculations.

Definition 24. For a policy $\sigma^{g(j)}$, and for all $i \in [n]$, we define:

$$\overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{g(j)}}(i) := T^{-1} \cdot \text{Val}^{\sigma^{g(j)}}(i). \quad (16)$$

Lemma 25. For every $j \in \text{ITER}$, and the resulting policy $\sigma^{g(j)}$, we have:

$$\overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{g(j)}}(0) = 0 \quad (17)$$

$$\overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{g(j)}}(1') = 2^n \quad (18)$$

$$\overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{g(j)}}(2') = \frac{1}{2} \overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{g(j)}}(0) + \frac{1}{2} \overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{g(j)}}(1') = 2^{n-1} \quad (19)$$

$$\overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{g(j)}}(i') = \frac{1}{2} \overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{g(j)}}((i-1)') + \frac{1}{2} \overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{g(j)}}(i-2) \quad \text{for } i \geq 1 \quad (20)$$

$$\overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{g(j)}}(i) = \begin{cases} \overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{g(j)}}(i-1) & \text{if } \text{BIT}(g(j), i) = 0, \\ \overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{g(j)}}(i') & \text{if } \text{BIT}(g(j), i) = 1. \end{cases} \quad \text{for } i \geq 1. \quad (21)$$

Proof. These follow by the definition of $\overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{g(j)}}$ and $g(j)$. \square

The following three lemmas are easy technical lemmas that are used only in the proof of Lemma 29.

Lemma 26. The following holds for all $j \in \text{ITER}$ and $a \in [n]$:

$$\text{SHIFT}(j, a+1) + \text{SHIFT}(j+2^a, a+1) = \text{SHIFT}(j, a).$$

Proof. We consider two cases. First, suppose that $\text{BIT}(j, a+1) = 0$. Then, $j+2^a$ differs from j only in bit $a+1$, and so

$$\text{SHIFT}(j+2^a, a+1) = \text{SHIFT}(j, a+1).$$

Then we have $2 \cdot \text{SHIFT}(j, a+1) = \text{SHIFT}(j, a)$ as required, which holds because $\text{BIT}(j, a+1) = 0$. Second, suppose that $\text{BIT}(j, a+1) = 1$. Then,

$$\text{SHIFT}(j+2^a, a+1) = \text{SHIFT}(j, a+1) + 1.$$

Then we have $2 \cdot \text{SHIFT}(j, a+1) + 1 = \text{SHIFT}(j, a)$ as required, which holds because $\text{BIT}(j, a+1) = 1$. \square

Lemma 27. If $\text{BIT}(j, a) = \text{BIT}(j, a+1)$ the following holds:

$$\text{SHIFT}(j+2^{a-1}, a) = 2 \cdot \text{SHIFT}(j+2^a, a+1). \quad (22)$$

Proof. Since $\text{BIT}(j, a) = \text{BIT}(j, a + 1)$, then we have for all $k > a + 1$ that

$$\text{BIT}(j + 2^{a-1}, k) = \text{BIT}(j + 2^a, k),$$

and $\text{BIT}(j + 2^{a-1}, a + 1) = 0$. The claim follows. \square

Lemma 28. *If $\text{BIT}(j, a) \neq \text{BIT}(j, a + 1)$ the following holds:*

$$1 + 2 \cdot \text{SHIFT}(j, a + 1) = \text{SHIFT}(j + 2^{a-1}, a). \quad (23)$$

Proof. We consider two cases. First, suppose that $\text{BIT}(j, a) = 0$. Then, because $\text{BIT}(j, a + 1) = 1$ by assumption, we have that

$$1 + 2 \cdot \text{SHIFT}(j, a + 1) = \text{SHIFT}(j, a).$$

Moreover, then, since $\text{BIT}(j, a) = 0$, the bits $j + 2^{a-1}$ and j differ only in position a , so $\text{SHIFT}(j + 2^{a-1}, a) = \text{SHIFT}(j, a)$, as required. Second, suppose that $\text{BIT}(j, a) = 1$. Then, because $\text{BIT}(j, a + 1) = 0$, we have that

$$1 + 2 \cdot \text{SHIFT}(j, a + 1) = \text{SHIFT}(j, a) + 1.$$

Moreover, then, since $\text{BIT}(j, a) = 1$, the bits of $j + 2^{a-1}$ and j differ only in positions a and $a + 1$, which are both flipped. In particular, $\text{BIT}(j + 2^{a-1}, a + 1) = 1$, so $\text{SHIFT}(j + 2^{a-1}, a) = \text{SHIFT}(j, a) + 1$, as required. \square

Lemma 29. *Let $i \in [n]$ and $j \in \text{ITER}$. Let:*

$$X(j, i) = 2^{f(i)} + \text{SHIFT}(j, f(i) + 1) \cdot 2^{f(i)+1}, \quad (24)$$

$$Y(j, i) = \text{SHIFT}(j + 2^{f(i)-1}, f(i)) \cdot 2^{f(i)}. \quad (25)$$

We have

$$\overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{\text{g}(j)}}(i') = X(j, i), \quad (26)$$

$$\overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{\text{g}(j)}}(c_1) = X(j, n + 1) = 1 + 2 \cdot \text{SHIFT}(j, 1), \quad (27)$$

$$\overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{\text{g}(j)}}(i) = Y(j, i). \quad (28)$$

Proof. We prove the claim by induction on i .

Base case: For the base cases, we show that (26) holds for $i = 1, 2$, and that (28) holds for $i = 1$.

According to (18) and (19) in Lemma 25, for all $j \in \text{ITER}$ we have $\overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{\text{g}(j)}}(1') = 2^n$ and $\overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{\text{g}(j)}}(2') = 2^{n-1}$. This agrees with (26), since for $i = 1, 2$, we have $\text{SHIFT}(j, f(i) + 1) = 0$, and thus $X(j, i) = 2^{f(i)}$, as required. According to Definition 21 we have:

$$\text{BIT}(g(j), 1) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } j < 2^{n-1}, \\ 1 & \text{if } j \geq 2^{n-1}. \end{cases}$$

Note that $f(1) = n$. If $j < 2^{n-1}$, then $\text{BIT}(g(j), 1) = 0$ and state 1 points to state 0, so $\overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{\text{g}(j)}}(i) = 0$, which agrees with (28), since $\text{SHIFT}(j + 2^{n-1}, n) = 0$. If $2^{n-1} \leq j \leq 2^n - 1$, then $\text{BIT}(g(j), 1) = 1$ and state 1 points to state $1'$, so $\overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{\text{g}(j)}}(i) = 2^n$, which agrees with (28), since $\text{SHIFT}(j + 2^{n-1}, n) = 1$.

Induction: We now prove that (26) holds for $i > 2$. As induction hypothesis we assume that (26) and (28) hold for all $k < i$. By (20), we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{\text{g}(j)}}(i') &= \frac{1}{2} \overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{\text{g}(j)}}((i-1)') + \frac{1}{2} \overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{\text{g}(j)}}(i-2) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} X(j, i-1) + \frac{1}{2} Y(j, i-2) && \text{By the inductive hypothesis.} \\
&= 2^{f(i)} + (\text{SHIFT}(j, f(i) + 2) + \text{SHIFT}(j + 2^{f(i)+1}, f(i) + 2)) \cdot 2^{f(i)+1} \\
&= 2^{f(i)} + \text{SHIFT}(j, f(i) + 1) \cdot 2^{f(i)+1} && \text{By Lemma 26 with } a = f(i) + 1. \\
&= X(j, i). && \text{As required.}
\end{aligned}$$

This proves (26), and using exactly the same reasoning, this shows (27) too:

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{\text{g}(j)}}(c_1) &= \frac{1}{2} \overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{\text{g}(j)}}(n') + \frac{1}{2} \overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{\text{g}(j)}}(n-1) \\
&= 1 + 2 \cdot (\text{SHIFT}(j, 2) + \text{SHIFT}(j + 2, 2)) \\
&= 1 + 2 \cdot \text{SHIFT}(j, 1). && \text{By Lemma 26 with } a = 1.
\end{aligned}$$

We now prove that (28) holds for $i > 1$. We consider two cases:

1. $\text{BIT}(g(j), i) = 0$. Then by (21) we have that $\overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{\text{g}(j)}}(i) = \overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{\text{g}(j)}}(i-1)$, and we need to show that $Y(j, i) = Y(j, i-1) = \overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{\text{g}(j)}}(i-1)$, where the second equality holds by the inductive hypothesis. By (25), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
Y(j, i-1) &= \text{SHIFT}(j + 2^{f(i-1)-1}, f(i-1)) \cdot 2^{f(i-1)} \\
&= \text{SHIFT}(j + 2^{f(i)}, f(i) + 1) \cdot 2^{f(i)+1} \\
&= (2 \cdot \text{SHIFT}(j + 2^{f(i)}, f(i) + 1)) \cdot 2^{f(i)} \\
&= \text{SHIFT}(j + 2^{f(i)-1}, f(i)) \cdot 2^{f(i)} && \text{By Lemma 27 with } a = f(i). \\
&= Y(j, i).
\end{aligned}$$

2. $\text{BIT}(g(j), i) = 1$. Therefore, according to (21), we have $\overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{\text{g}(j)}}(i) = \overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{\text{g}(j)}}(i')$, and we need to show that $Y(j, i) = X(j, i)$, since we have just proved that $\overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{\text{g}(j)}}(i') = X(j, i)$. Since $\text{BIT}(g(j), i) = 1$, we have $\text{BIT}(j, f(i)) \neq \text{BIT}(j, f(i) + 1)$ by Definition 21 and we can apply Lemma 28 in the following. We have:

$$X(j, i) = 2^{f(i)} + \text{SHIFT}(j, f(i) + 1) \cdot 2^{f(i)+1} \quad (29)$$

$$= (1 + 2 \cdot \text{SHIFT}(j, f(i) + 1)) \cdot 2^{f(i)} \quad (30)$$

$$= \text{SHIFT}(j + 2^{f(i)-1}, f(i)) \cdot 2^{f(i)} \quad \text{By Lemma 28 with } a = f(i). \quad (31)$$

$$= Y(j, i). \quad (32)$$

This completes the induction and proof. \square

Next we show, a number of lemmas that we will use to show that Dantzig's rule follows the sequence G , as defined in Definition 21.

Lemma 30. *For $j \in \text{ITER} \setminus \{2^n - 1\}$, state i is switchable with appeal $(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{4i})$ if $\text{BIT}(j, f(i)) = 0$.*

Proof. Suppose that $\text{BIT}(j, f(i)) = 0$. We consider two cases. First, suppose that $\text{BIT}(g(j), i) = 0$. Then, (21) implies that we have:

$$\text{BIT}(j, f(i)) = \text{BIT}(j, f(i) + 1) = 0.$$

Then, according to (26) and (28), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{g(j)}}(i-1) &= \text{SHIFT}(j + 2^{f(i-1)-1}, f(i-1)) \cdot 2^{f(i-1)} \\ &= \text{SHIFT}(j + 2^{f(i)}, f(i) + 1) \cdot 2^{f(i)+1} \\ &= \text{SHIFT}(j, f(i) + 1) \cdot 2^{f(i)+1} && \text{Since } \text{BIT}(j, f(i) + 1) = 0. \\ &< 2^{f(i)} + \text{SHIFT}(j, f(i) + 1) \cdot 2^{f(i)+1} \\ &= \overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{g(j)}}(i'). \end{aligned}$$

Thus i is switchable, and the appeal is

$$\alpha_i \cdot T \cdot (\overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{g(j)}}(i') - \overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{g(j)}}(i-1)) = \alpha_i \cdot T \cdot 2^{f(i)} = \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{4i}\right),$$

Second, suppose that $\text{BIT}(g(j), i) = 1$. Then, (21) implies that $\text{BIT}(j, f(i)) \neq \text{BIT}(j, f(i) + 1)$. Thus, we have:

$$\text{BIT}(j, f(i)) = 0, \quad \text{BIT}(j, f(i) + 1) = 1.$$

Then, according to (26) and (28), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{g(j)}}(i') &= 2^{f(i)} + \text{SHIFT}(j, f(i) + 1) \cdot 2^{f(i)+1} \\ &< \text{SHIFT}(j + 2^{f(i)}, f(i) + 1) \cdot 2^{f(i)+1} && \text{Since } \text{BIT}(j, f(i) + 1) = 1. \\ &= \overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{g(j)}}(i-1) \end{aligned}$$

Thus i is switchable, and by Lemma 6, the appeal is

$$\alpha_i \cdot T \cdot (\overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{g(j)}}(i-1) - \overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{g(j)}}(i')) = \alpha_i \cdot T \cdot 2^{f(i)-1} = \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{4i}\right),$$

as claimed. This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 31. For $j \in \text{ITER} \setminus \{2^n - 1\}$, state i is not switchable under $g(j)$ if $\text{BIT}(j, f(i)) = 1$.

Proof. Suppose that $\text{BIT}(j, f(i)) = 1$. We consider two cases. First, suppose that $\text{BIT}(g(j), i) = 0$. Then, (21) implies that we have:

$$\text{BIT}(j, f(i)) = \text{BIT}(j, f(i) + 1) = 1.$$

Then, according to (26) and (28), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{g(j)}}(i-1) &= \text{SHIFT}(j + 2^{f(i-1)-1}, f(i-1)) \cdot 2^{f(i-1)} \\ &= \text{SHIFT}(j + 2^{f(i)}, f(i) + 1) \cdot 2^{f(i)+1} \\ &> (1 + \text{SHIFT}(j, f(i) + 1)) \cdot 2^{f(i)+1} && \text{Since } \text{BIT}(j, f(i) + 1) = 1. \\ &> 2^{f(i)} + \text{SHIFT}(j, f(i) + 1) \cdot 2^{f(i)+1} \\ &= \overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{g(j)}}(i'). \end{aligned}$$

Thus i is not switchable.

Second, suppose that $\text{BIT}(g(j), i) = 1$. Then, (21) implies that $\text{BIT}(j, f(i)) \neq \text{BIT}(j, f(i) + 1)$. Thus, we have:

$$\text{BIT}(j, f(i)) = 1, \quad \text{BIT}(j, f(i) + 1) = 0.$$

Then, according to (26) and (28), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{g(j)}}(i') &= 2^{f(i)} + \text{SHIFT}(j, f(i) + 1) \cdot 2^{f(i)+1} \\ &> \text{SHIFT}(j, f(i) + 1) \cdot 2^{f(i)+1} \\ &= \text{SHIFT}(j + 2^{f(i)}, f(i) + 1) \cdot 2^{f(i)+1} \quad \text{Since } \text{BIT}(j, f(i) + 1) = 0. \\ &= \overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{g(j)}}(i - 1) \end{aligned}$$

Thus i is not switchable. This completes the proof. \square

Corollary 32. *For $j \in \text{ITER} \setminus \{2^n - 1\}$, state i is switchable if and only if $\text{BIT}(j, f(i)) = 0$, and if i is switchable, then the appeal of the switch is $(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{4i})$.*

Proof. This follows immediately from Lemmas 30 and 31. \square

Lemma 33. *Dantzig's rule will always switch the switchable state with highest index, i.e.,*

$$\max_{i \in [n]} \{i \mid i \text{ is switchable}\}.$$

Proof. According to Lemma 32, for $i \in [n]$, if i is switchable, the appeal of the other action at i is $(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{4i})$, which is an increasing function of i . This proves the claim. \square

Corollary 34. *For $j \in \text{ITER} \setminus \{2^n - 1\}$, and $i \in [n]$, let $k = f(\text{LSZ}(j))$, which is well-defined since the binary representation of j contains at least one zero bit. Dantzig's rule will switch action k at $g(j)$.*

Proof. Because $\text{BIT}(j, \text{LSZ}(j)) = 0$ and all less significant bits in j are 1, according to Corollary 32, state k is switchable, and all states $i > k$ are not switchable under $g(j)$. Thus, the claim follows from Lemma 33. \square

Now, we can prove that Dantzig's rule will progress the clock through the sequence G .

Lemma 35. *Dantzig's rule, started from $g(0) = 0^n$ will progress the clock through the sequence G , taking $2^n - 1$ iterations, and finishing at $g(2^n - 1) = 0^{n-1}1$.*

Proof. By Corollary 32, for all $j \in \text{ITER} \setminus \{2^n - 1\}$, there exists a switchable state under $g(j)$, and thus since the first n bits of $2^n - 1$ are all 1, Dantzig's rule will terminate at $g(2^n - 1) = 0^{n-1}1$. Lemma 22 shows that $g(j + 1)$ is obtained from $g(j)$ by flipping the bit in position $f(\text{LSZ}(j))$ of $g(j)$. Lemma 34 shows that at $g(j)$, Dantzig's rule flips $f(\text{LSZ}(j))$ and thus moves to $g(j + 1)$. This implies that Dantzig's rule takes $2^n - 1$ iterations in total to find the optimal policy of the clock. \square

Lemma 36. *For all $j \in \text{ITER}$ we have:*

$$\text{Val}^{\sigma^{g(j)}}(c_0) = \text{Val}^{\sigma^{g(j)}}(c_1) + T \quad \text{for even } j \tag{33}$$

$$\text{Val}^{\sigma^{g(j)}}(c_1) = \text{Val}^{\sigma^{g(j)}}(c_0) + T \quad \text{for odd } j, \tag{34}$$

and the appeal of the switched action (and thus all actions) is in the range $[0.25, 0.5]$.

Proof. According to Corollary 35, Dantzig's rule will go through the sequence of policies G . According to Lemma 29, for $j \in \text{ITER}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{(j)}}(c_0) &= \overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{(j)}}(n) \\
&= \text{SHIFT}(j + 2^{f(n)-1}, f(n)) \cdot 2^{f(n)-1} \\
&= 2 \cdot \text{SHIFT}(j + 1, 1) \\
&= \begin{cases} j & \text{for even } j \\ j + 1 & \text{for odd } j. \end{cases} \\
\overline{\text{Val}}^{\sigma^{(j)}}(c_1) &= 1 + 2 \cdot \text{SHIFT}(j, 1) \\
&= \begin{cases} j + 1 & \text{for even } j \\ j & \text{for odd } j. \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

This shows (33) and (34). The appeal of switchable actions is always given by $(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{4i})$ for some $i \in [n]$, which is in $[0.25, 0.5]$ as required. \square

Lemmas 35 and 36 combine to complete the proof of Lemma 9.

E Proof of Lemma 7

Proof. We will use the same reduction in order to show that both of the problems are PSPACE-complete. We reduce from the halting problem of a deterministic Turing machine with polynomial tape length. More formally, let \mathcal{T} be a deterministic Turing machine with set of states Q , and a binary tape alphabet, let $I \in \{0, 1\}^k$ be an initial input tape of length k , and let $n \in \text{poly}(k)$ be a bound on the amount of space used by \mathcal{T} while processing I . Clearly, the halting problem for \mathcal{T} is PSPACE-complete.

We construct a circuit iteration instance as follows. Firstly, we modify \mathcal{T} so that, when it accepts, it writes a 0 to tape cell $n + 1$ and then halts. Let \mathcal{T}' be this new Turing machine, and let Q' be the set of states used by \mathcal{T}' . We will construct a function $F : \{0, 1\}^{n'} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{n'}$ where $n' = (n + 1) + \log n + \log |Q'|$. We allocate bits 1 through n' in the following way:

- The first $n + 1$ bits are used to hold the contents of the tape.
- The next $\log n$ bits are used to hold the position of the tape head.
- The final $\log |Q'|$ bits are used to hold the current state of the Turing machine

That is, each bit-string $B \in \{0, 1\}^{n'}$ holds all of the information about the configuration of \mathcal{T}' during its computation. For each bit-string $B \in \{0, 1\}^{n'}$, we define $F(B)$ to be next configuration of \mathcal{T}' after one transition has been made. This can clearly be computed in polynomial time, and therefore can be represented as a binary circuit that has size polynomial in $|\mathcal{T}'|$.

Let $B^I \in \{0, 1\}^{n'}$ be defined such that:

- The first k bits of B^I are I .
- The next $n - k$ bits of B^I are 0.
- The $n + 1$ th bit of B^I is a 1.
- The next $\log n$ bits correspond to the initial tape head position of \mathcal{T}' .
- The final $\log |Q|$ bits correspond to the initial state of \mathcal{T}' .

Under these definitions, B^I corresponds to the initial configuration of \mathcal{T} on input I .

Our circuit iteration instance is $(F, B^I, n+1)$. Note that, since \mathcal{T}' uses at most $n+1$ cells on its tape, we must have that if \mathcal{T}' halts on I , then it does so in at most 2^{n+1} transitions. Moreover, we have $2^{n'} > 2^{n+1}$. Moreover, since the machine writes a 0 to tape cell $n+1$ if and only if it halts, this proves that $\text{CIRCUITVALUE}(F, B^I, n+1)$ is PSPACE-complete.

For the problem BITSWITCH , observe that the $n+1$ th bit of B^I is 1, and that \mathcal{T}' only writes a 0 to tape cell $n+1$ in the case where it accepts I . Our goal is to show that there is an even $i \leq 2^{n'}$ such that the $(n+1)$ -th bit of $F^i(B^I)$ is a 0 if and only if \mathcal{T}' accepts I . So, let t be the number of steps that \mathcal{T}' takes before it terminates. If t is even, then we are done. Otherwise, note that $t \leq 2^{n+1} < 2^{n'}$, so $t+1$ is an even number with $t+1 \leq 2^{n'}$ such that $F^{t+1}(B^I)$ is a 0. Therefore, we have shown that the problem $\text{BITSWITCH}(F, B^I, n+1)$ is PSPACE-complete. \square

F Proof of Lemma 11

Proof. We will provide three different proofs for three distinct cases. Firstly, suppose that i is an input bit. Note that the appeals given in Lemma 53 imply that one cannot move from a coherent policy to a non coherent policy by switching an action with appeal strictly greater than 3.5. Therefore we must have that σ' is also a coherent policy. So, we can apply Lemma 53 to argue that σ_i^j , l_i^j and r_i^j are final in σ' .

Now suppose that i is an OR gate. Note that, by definition, all gates i' with $d(i') < d(i)$ are also final. Therefore, the action switched by Dantzig's rule cannot be contained in a gadget belonging to a gate i' with $d(i') < d(i)$. Moreover, by Lemma 9, the action switched by Dantzig's rule cannot be contained in the clock. Therefore, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Val}^\sigma(\sigma_{I_1(i)}^j) &= \text{Val}^{\sigma'}(\sigma_{I_1(i)}^j) \\ \text{Val}^\sigma(\sigma_{I_2(i)}^j) &= \text{Val}^{\sigma'}(\sigma_{I_2(i)}^j) \\ \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) &= \text{Val}^{\sigma'}(c_j).\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, since gate i is final we must have $\sigma(v_i^j) = \sigma'(v_i^j)$, $\sigma(x_i^j) = \sigma'(x_i^j)$, and $\sigma(\sigma_i^j) = \sigma'(\sigma_i^j)$. Therefore, for every action $a \in A_{\sigma_i^j} \cup A_{v_i^j} \cup A_{x_i^j}$, we have $\text{Appeal}^\sigma(a) = \text{Appeal}^{\sigma'}(a)$. Thus, gate i is final in σ' .

Finally, suppose that i is a NOT gate. This case is very similar to the OR gate case. In particular, we can use the same argument to prove that:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Val}^\sigma(\sigma_{I(i)}^j) &= \text{Val}^{\sigma'}(\sigma_{I(i)}^j) \\ \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) &= \text{Val}^{\sigma'}(c_j).\end{aligned}$$

Since i is final, we must have $\sigma(\sigma_i^j) = \sigma'(\sigma_i^j)$ and $\sigma(a_i^j) = \sigma'(a_i^j)$. Therefore, for every action $a \in A_{\sigma_i^j} \cup A_{a_i^j}$, we have $\text{Appeal}^\sigma(a) = \text{Appeal}^{\sigma'}(a)$. Thus, gate i is final in σ' . \square

G Proof of Lemma 12

Before we proceed to prove Lemma 12, we first prove some basic properties about our gate gadgets.

Let us explain some terminology that will be used throughout this section. Suppose that we are in a policy σ_0 , and let a be an action with appeal x . Throughout this proof we will use the phrase ‘‘Dantzig's rule will eventually switch action a with appeal x ,’’ to imply that Dantzig's rule will move through a sequence of policies $\sigma_0, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m$ where:

- Action a has appeal x in σ_{m-1} , and is switched to produce σ_m .
- For every $j < m - 1$, we have that the action switched by Dantzig's rule in σ_j has appeal at least x .

Note that if $x > 3.5$, then due to Lemma 11, every gate i that is final in σ_0 is also final in σ_m . We need this notation because there are very often ties for the highest appeal action: for example, if two OR gates have the same depth, and the same action needs to be switched in both of them, then both actions will have the same appeal, and we do not care which one is switched first. This notation allows us to say that both will be switched, without caring about the order in which they are switched. Moreover, OR states in gates with depth strictly greater than $k + 1$ may also switch while we are processing the gates with depth k . Since these are irrelevant for the depth k proof, this notation allows us to ignore these switches.

G.1 Or gates

We begin with the OR gate gadget. Let i be an OR gate. The following lemma describes the conditions under which v_i^j wants to switch. Specifically, it shows that if both $I_1(i)$ and $I_2(i)$ are B -correct and final, and if v_i^j does not currently select the maximum of the two, then switching v_i^j must have high appeal.

Lemma 37. *Suppose that we are in phase j , let σ be a coherent policy, and let i be an OR gate. Suppose that $\sigma(v_i^j) = \sigma_{I_m(i)}^j$ for $m \in \{1, 2\}$, and let \bar{m} be the other input. If $\text{Val}^\sigma(\sigma_{I_m(i)}^j) = L_{d(i)-1}$, and $\text{Val}^\sigma(\sigma_{I_{\bar{m}}(i)}^j) = H_{d(i)-1}$ then the appeal of switching v_i^j to $\sigma_{I_{\bar{m}}(i)}^j$ is at least 27.*

Proof. We have that the appeal of switching v_i^j to $\sigma_{I_{\bar{m}}(i)}^j$ is:

$$H_{d(i)-1} - L_{d(i)-1} = b_{d(i)-1}.$$

Recall that b_k decreases as k increases, therefore we have $b_{d(i)-1} \geq b_{d(c)-1} = 3^3 = 27$. □

The following lemma describes the conditions under which σ_i^j wants to switch. Specifically, if at least one of the two inputs to the gate is 1, then σ_i^j can switch to v_i^j with high appeal. On the other hand, if both inputs are 0, then σ_i^j can switch to x_i^j with high appeal.

Lemma 38. *Suppose that we are in phase j , let σ be a coherent policy, and let i be an OR gate.*

1. *If $\text{Val}^\sigma(v_i^j) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + H_{d(i)-1}$ then:*
 - (a) *If $\sigma(\sigma_i^j) = x_i^j$ then the appeal of switching σ_i^j to v_i^j is at least 9.*
 - (b) *If $\sigma(\sigma_i^j) = v_i^j$ then the appeal of switching σ_i^j to x_i^j is strictly less than 0.*
2. *If $\text{Val}^\sigma(v_i^j) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + L_{d(i)-1}$ then:*
 - (a) *If $\sigma(\sigma_i^j) = x_i^j$ then the appeal of switching σ_i^j to v_i^j is strictly less than 0.*
 - (b) *If $\sigma(\sigma_i^j) = v_i^j$ then the appeal of switching σ_i^j to x_i^j is at least 18.*

Proof. For case 1, if $\sigma(\sigma_i^j) = x_i^j$, then the appeal of switching σ_i^j to v_i^j is $H_{d(i)-1} + b_{d(i)} - L_{d(i)} = b_{d(i)}$. Recall that b_k decreases as k increases, thus we have that $b_{d(i)} \geq b_{d(c)} = 9$. On the other hand, if $\sigma(\sigma_i^j) = v_i^j$, then by the converse of the previous argument, we have that the appeal of switching σ_i^j to v_i^j is $L_{d(i)} - H_{d(i)-1} - b_{d(i)} = b_{d(i)} < 0$, since $b_{d(i)}$ is always positive.

For case 2, if $\sigma(o_i^j) = x_i^j$, then the appeal of switching o_i^j to v_i^j is

$$\begin{aligned} L_{d(i)-1} + b_{d(i)} - L_{d(i)} &= b_{d(i)} - b_{d(i)-1} \\ &= 3^{d(C)-d(i)+2} - 3^{d(C)-d(i)+3} \\ &< 0. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, if $\sigma(o_i^j) = v_i^j$, then the appeal of switching o_i^j to x_i^j is:

$$\begin{aligned} L_{d(i)} - L_{d(i)-1} - b_{d(i)} &= b_{d(i)-1} - b_{d(i)} \\ &= 3^{d(C)-d(i)+3} - 3^{d(C)-d(i)+2} \\ &\geq 3^{d(C)-d(C)+3} - 3^{d(C)-d(C)+2} \\ &= 18. \end{aligned}$$

□

In our final lemma concerning OR gates, we show that the gate always outputs the correct value. Taking into account Lemmas 37 and 38, we can see that there are only two cases to consider:

- If both inputs are 0 then o_i^j takes the action to x_i^j .
- If at least one input is 1, then o_i^j takes the action towards v_i^j , and v_i^j takes the action towards the input bit that is 1.

The following lemma shows that in either case, the value of o_i^j is B -correct.

Lemma 39. *Suppose that we are in phase j , let σ be a coherent policy, and let i be an OR gate.*

1. *If $\text{Val}^\sigma(v_i^j) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + H_{d(i)-1}$ and $\sigma(o_i^j) = v_i^j$, then $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^j) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + H_{d(i)}$.*
2. *If $\sigma(o_i^j) = x_i^j$, then $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^j) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + L_{d(i)}$*

Proof. The first part follows from the fact that $H_{d(i)-1} + b_{d(i)} = H_{d(i)}$. The second part follows from the reward of $L_{d(i)}$ on the action between o_i^j and x_i^j . □

G.2 Not gates

We now consider the NOT gate gadgets. Let i be a NOT gate. There are two modes of operation of the NOT gate depending upon the action chosen at a_i^j . In the following lemma, we describe the behaviour of the NOT gate in the case where a_i^j chooses the action towards c_j . Specifically, we show that if $I(i)$ is final and B -correct, then the action from o_i^j to $o_{I(i)}^j$ has high appeal. Moreover, we give a precise value for the appeal of switching a_i^j to c_{1-j} .

Lemma 40. *Suppose that we are in phase j , let σ be a j coherent policy, and let i be a NOT gate. If $\sigma(a_i^j) = c_j$ then:*

1. *The appeal of switching a_i^j to c_{1-j} is $3.5 + \frac{1}{2d(i)}$.*
2. *If $\sigma(o_i^j) = a_i^j$ and $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_{I(i)}^j) \geq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + L_{d(i)-1}$, then the appeal of switching o_i^j to $o_{I(i)}^j$ is at least 8.*
3. *If $\sigma(o_i^j) = o_{I(i)}^j$ and $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_{I(i)}^j) \geq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + L_{d(i)-1}$, then the appeal of switching o_i^j to a_i^j is strictly less than 0.*

Proof. We begin with the first claim. Since $\text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + T$, we can apply Lemma 6 to argue that the appeal of switching a_i^j to c_{1-j} is:

$$p_1 \cdot H_{d(i)-1} = 3.5 + \frac{1}{2d(i)}.$$

For the second claim, observe that $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^j) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + b_{d(i)}$. Recall that, by assumption, for every NOT gate i , we have $d(i) \geq 2$. Note also that L_k increases as k increases. Therefore, we have $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_{I(i)}^j) \geq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + L_1$. Hence, the appeal of switching o_i^j to $o_{I(i)}^j$ is at least:

$$\begin{aligned} L_1 - b_{d(i)} &\geq L_1 - b_2 \\ &= 3^{d(C)+2} - 3^{d(C)} \\ &\geq 3^2 - 3^0 \\ &= 8. \end{aligned}$$

For the third claim, we can apply Lemma 6 to argue that the appeal of switching o_i^j to a_i^j is:

$$\frac{1}{b_{d(i)}} \cdot (1 - L_{d(i)-1}) \leq \frac{1}{b_{d(i)}} \cdot (1 - L_1) < 0.$$

□

In the next lemma, we describe the behaviour of the NOT gate when a_i^j chooses the action towards c_{1-j} . In particular, we show that if $I(i)$ is final and B -correct, then the appeal of switching o_i^j to a_i^j is 1 in the case where $C(B, I(i))$ is 1, and 4 in the case where $C(B, I(i))$ is 0. This is the critical property that we need: while it is processing the circuit, Dantzig's rule will only switch actions with appeal greater than 3.5, so it will switch in the case where $C(B, I(i)) = 0$, and it will not switch when $C(B, I(i)) = 1$.

Lemma 41. *Suppose that we are in phase j , let σ be a coherent policy, and let i be a NOT gate. If $\sigma(a_i^j) = c_{1-j}$ then:*

1. *The appeal of switching a_i^j to c_j is strictly less than 0.*
2. *If $\sigma(o_i^j) = o_{I(i)}^j$ then:*
 - (a) *If $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_{I(i)}^j) = L_{d(i)-1}$, then the appeal of switching o_i^j to a_i^j is 4.*
 - (b) *If $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_{I(i)}^j) = H_{d(i)-1}$, then the appeal of switching o_i^j to a_i^j is 1.*
3. *If $\sigma(o_i^j) = a_i^j$, and if $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_{I(i)}^j) \leq H_{d(i)-1}$, then the appeal of switching o_i^j to $o_{I(i)}^j$ is strictly less than 0.*

Proof. We begin with the first claim. Since we are in phase j , we have $\text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + T$. Thus, we can apply Lemma 6 to argue that the appeal of switching a_i^j to c_j is:

$$p_2 \cdot (0 - H_{d(i)}) < 0.$$

We now consider the second claim. First suppose that $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_{I(i)}^j) = L_{d(i)-1}$. Then, by Lemma 6 we have that the appeal of switching σ_i^j to a_i^j is:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{b_{d(i)}} \cdot (H_{d(i)-1} - L_{d(i)-1}) + 1 \\ &= \frac{1}{b_{d(i)}} \cdot b_{d(i)-1} + 1 \\ &= \frac{1}{3^{d(C)-d(i)+2}} \cdot 3^{d(C)-d(i)+3} + 1 \\ &= 4. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, if $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_{I(i)}^j) = H_{d(i)-1}$, then the appeal of switching σ_i^j to a_i^j is:

$$\frac{1}{b_{d(i)}} \cdot (H_{d(i)-1} - H_{d(i)-1}) + 1 = 1.$$

Thus, we have shown both parts of the second claim.

Finally, we consider the third claim of this lemma. By Lemma 6 we have that the appeal of switching σ_i^j to $\sigma_{I(i)}^j$ is at most:

$$H_{d(i)-1} - (H_{d(i)-1} + b_{d(i)}) < 0.$$

□

Finally, we show that the value of σ_i^j is B -correct, once the necessary actions have been switched.

Lemma 42. *Suppose that we are in phase j , and let σ be a coherent policy. We have:*

- If $\sigma(o_i^j) = \sigma_{I(i)}^j$ and $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_{I(i)}^j) = H_{d(i)-1}$, then $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^j) = L_{d(i)}$.
- If $\sigma(o_i^j) = a_i^j$, then $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^j) = H_{d(i)}$.

Proof. In the case where $\sigma(o_i^j) = \sigma_{I(i)}^j$ the claim follows easily:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^j) = \text{Val}^\sigma(o_{I(i)}^j) = H_{d(i)-1} = L_{d(i)}.$$

For the case where $\sigma(o_i^j) = a_i^j$, we can apply Lemma 6 to obtain:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^j) = H_{d(i)-1} + b_{d(i)} = H_{d(i)}.$$

□

G.3 The proof

We can now present the proof of Lemma 12.

Proof. Let i be a gate with depth $k+1$. Since $k > 0$, we have that i cannot be an input bit, so we have two cases to consider. Firstly, suppose that i is an OR gate. The following sequence of events occurs:

- Firstly, if $\text{Val}^{\sigma'}(\sigma_{I_1(i)}^j) \neq \text{Val}^{\sigma'}(\sigma_{I_2(i)}^j)$, and if $\text{Val}^{\sigma'}(v_i^j) \neq \text{Val}^{\sigma'}(c_j) + H_{d(i)-1}$, then by Lemma 37 Dantzig's rule will eventually switch v_i^j with appeal at least 27. Once this has occurred Lemma 37 implies that v_i^j is final.
- At this point, if σ_i^j does not give the correct output, then by Lemma 38 Dantzig's rule will eventually switch σ_i^j with appeal 9. Once this has occurred, Lemma 38 implies that σ_i^j is final.
- Once the above two steps have occurred, Lemma 39 implies that gate i is B -correct.

Thus, Dantzig's rule will eventually arrive at a policy σ'' in which gate i is both final and B -correct, while switching only actions of appeal strictly greater than 9.

We now prove the case for when i is a NOT gate. Recall that, by assumption, as Dantzig's rule moved from σ to σ' it only switched actions with appeal at least $3.5 + \frac{1}{2 \cdot d(i-1)} > 3.5 + \frac{1}{2 \cdot d(i)}$. Therefore, by Lemma 53 we must still have $\sigma'(a_i^j) = c_j$. So, the following sequence of events occurs:

- Firstly, by Lemma 40, we have that if $\sigma(\sigma_i^j) \neq \sigma_{I(i)}^j$, then Dantzig's rule will eventually switch σ_i^j to $\sigma_{I(i)}^j$ with appeal at least 8.
- Then, by Lemma 40, we have that Dantzig's rule will eventually switch a_i^j to c_{1-j} with appeal $3.5 + \frac{1}{2 \cdot d(i)}$.
- There are now two cases:
 - If $\text{Val}^\sigma(\sigma_{I(i)}^j) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + L_{d(i)-1}$, then by Lemma 41 we have that Dantzig's rule will eventually switch σ_i^j to a_i^j with appeal 4. Once this has occurred, Lemma 41 implies that gate i is final, and Lemma 42 implies that gate i is B -correct.
 - If $\text{Val}^\sigma(\sigma_{I(i)}^j) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + H_{d(i)-1}$, then nothing further is switched in gate i , because Lemma 41 implies that gate i is final, and Lemma 42 implies that gate i is B -correct.

Thus, Dantzig's rule will eventually arrive at a policy σ'' in which gate i is both final and B -correct, while switching only actions of appeal strictly greater than $3.5 + \frac{1}{2 \cdot d(i)}$.

Since the argument made above holds for every gate i with depth $k+1$, we have that Dantzig's rule will eventually move to a policy σ''' in which all gates with depth $k+1$ are both final and B -correct, while switching only actions of appeal strictly greater than $3.5 + \frac{1}{2 \cdot (k+1)}$. \square

H Proof of Lemma 13

Before we begin, we give two lemmas about the behaviour of the input bit gadgets.

H.1 Input bits

Recall that, in an initial policy σ for B , we have that $\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) = l_i^{1-j}$. Our goal is to show that o_i^{1-j} switches to r_i^{1-j} only in the case where $C(B, I(i)) = 1$. The following lemma characterises the conditions under which o_i^{1-j} wants to switch to r_i^{1-j} .

Lemma 43. *Suppose that we are in phase J , and let σ be a policy with $\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) = l_i^{1-j}$, $\sigma(l_i^{1-j}) = c_j$, $\sigma(r_i^{1-j}) = \sigma_{I(i)}^j$ for some input bit i . We have:*

- If $\text{Val}^\sigma(\sigma_{I(i)}^j) \leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + L_{d(C)}$, then the appeal of switching o_i^{1-j} to r_i^{1-j} is strictly less than 0.
- If $\text{Val}^\sigma(\sigma_{I(i)}^j) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + H_{d(C)}$, then the appeal of switching o_i^{1-j} to r_i^{1-j} is 4.5.

Proof. We have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) = -\frac{T}{2} + \frac{H_{d(C)} + L_{d(C)}}{2}.$$

On the other hand, we have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(r_i^{1-j}) = -\frac{T}{2} + \text{Val}^\sigma(o_{1(i)}^j).$$

So, first suppose that $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_{1(i)}^j) \leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + L_{d(C)}$. In this case, the appeal of switching o_i^{1-j} to r_i^{1-j} can be at most:

$$\begin{aligned} L_{d(C)} - \frac{H_{d(C)} + L_{d(C)}}{2} &\leq L_{d(C)} - \frac{L_{d(C)} + L_{d(C)}}{2} \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Now suppose that we have $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_{1(i)}^j) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + H_{d(C)}$. In this case, the appeal of switching o_i^{1-j} to r_i^{1-j} is:

$$\begin{aligned} H_{d(C)} - \frac{H_{d(C)} + L_{d(C)}}{2} &= \frac{H_{d(C)} - L_{d(C)}}{2} \\ &= \frac{b_{d(C)}}{2} \\ &= \frac{3^2}{2} \\ &= 4.5 \end{aligned}$$

□

We also need the fact that, if o_i^{1-j} switches to r_i^{1-j} , then it cannot be switched back to l_i^{1-j} . The following lemma proves this.

Lemma 44. *Suppose that we are in phase j , and let σ be a policy with $\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) = r_i^{1-j}$, $\sigma(l_i^{1-j}) = c_j$, and $\sigma(r_i^{1-j}) = o_{1(i)}^j$ for some input bit i . If $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_{1(i)}^j) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + H_{d(C)}$, then the appeal of switching o_i^{1-j} to l_i^{1-j} is strictly less than 0.*

Proof. We have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) - \frac{T}{2} + \frac{H_{d(C)} + L_{d(C)}}{2}.$$

On the other hand, by assumption we have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(r_i^{1-j}) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) - \frac{T}{2} + H_{d(C)}.$$

Therefore, by Lemma 6, the appeal of switching o_i^{1-j} to l_i^{1-j} is at most:

$$\begin{aligned} p_3 \cdot \left(\frac{H_{d(C)} + L_{d(C)}}{2} - H_{d(C)} \right) &\leq p_3 \cdot \left(\frac{H_{d(C)} + H_{d(C)}}{2} - H_{d(C)} \right) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

H.2 The proof

We can now give the proof of Lemma 13.

Proof. By Lemma 12, we have that Dantzig's rule will eventually switch to a policy σ'' in which, for every input bit i , we have that gate $I(i)$ is final and B -correct.

Recall that circuit C is the negated form of the circuit implementing F . Thus, for each input bit i , we have that $C(B, I(i)) = 1$ if and only if the i -th bit of $F(B)$ is 0.

Now we can apply Lemmas 43 and 44. Let i be an input bit. We consider two cases:

- Firstly, if $C(B, I(i)) = 1$, then we must have $\text{Val}^{\sigma''}(o_{I(i)}) = \text{Val}^{\sigma''}(c_j) + H_{d(C)}$. So, if $\sigma''(o_i^{1-j}) = l_i^{1-j}$, we can apply Lemma 43 implies that Dantzig's rule will eventually switch o_i^{1-j} to r_i^{1-j} with appeal 4.5. Once we have $\sigma(o_i^{1-j})$ we can apply Lemma 44 to argue that o_i^{1-j} will not be switched away from r_i^{1-j} .
- Secondly, if $C(B, I(i)) = 0$, then we must have $\text{Val}^{\sigma''}(o_{I(i)}) = \text{Val}^{\sigma''}(c_j) + L_{d(C)}$. Note that $\text{Val}^{\sigma''}(c_j) = \text{Val}^{\sigma}(c_j)$, and therefore, since policy iteration can never decrease the value of a state, we must have $\text{Val}^{\sigma'''}(o_{I(i)}) \leq \text{Val}^{\sigma'''}(c_j) + L_{d(C)}$ for all policies σ''' that Dantzig's rule passed through as it moved from σ to σ'' . Thus, we can apply Lemma 43 to argue that Dantzig's rule cannot have ever switched o_i^{1-j} to r_i^{1-j} . \square

I Upper and lower bounds on circuit values

In this section, we show several preliminary results concerning upper and lower bounds of the values in our circuit gadgets. These will be used frequently in subsequent proofs.

The following lemma gives upper bounds on the value of the gates, based on the value of the input bits.

Lemma 45. *Suppose that we are in phase j . Let σ be a policy, and let $l \in \{0, 1\}$. Furthermore, suppose that σ satisfies the following properties:*

- For every OR gate i' , we have $\sigma(x_{i'}^j) = c_j$ and we have $\sigma(x_{i'}^{1-j}) = c_j$.
- For every NOT gate i , we have $\sigma(a_i^{1-j}) = c_j$.

If, for every input bit i' , we have $\text{Val}^{\sigma}(o_{i'}^l) \leq \text{Val}^{\sigma}(c_j) + B + H_0$, for some non-negative constant B , then for all gates i we have $\text{Val}^{\sigma}(o_i^l) \leq \text{Val}^{\sigma}(c_j) + B + H_{d(i)}$.

Proof. We will prove this claim by induction over depth. For input bits, which are the gates with depth 0, the claim holds by assumption.

We prove two versions of the inductive step. First, suppose that the claim has been shown for all gates with depth k , and let i be an OR gate with depth $k+1$. If $\sigma(o_i^l) = x_i^l$ then by our assumptions on σ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Val}^{\sigma}(o_i^l) &= \text{Val}^{\sigma}(c_j) + L_{k+1} \\ &\leq \text{Val}^{\sigma}(c_j) + H_{k+1} \\ &\leq \text{Val}^{\sigma}(c_j) + B + H_{k+1}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, if $\sigma(o_i^l) = c_j$ then by the inductive hypothesis we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Val}^{\sigma}(o_i^l) &\leq \text{Val}^{\sigma}(c_j) + B + H_k + b_{k+1} \\ &= \text{Val}^{\sigma}(c_j) + B + H_{k+1}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the OR gate case of the inductive step.

For the second version of the inductive step, suppose that the claim has been shown for all gates with depth k , and let i be a NOT gate with depth $k + 1$. Note that since we are in phase j , no matter which action is chosen by a_i^j , we must have $\text{Val}^\sigma(a_i^j) \leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + H_k$. On the other hand, since by assumption we have $\sigma(a_i^{1-j}) = c_j$, we have $\text{Val}^\sigma(a_i^{1-j}) \leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j)$. Therefore, if $\sigma(o_i^l) = a_i^l$, then by Lemma 6, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^l) &\leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + H_k + b_{k+1} \\ &= \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + H_{k+1} \\ &\leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + B + H_{k+1}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, if $\sigma(o_i^l) = o_{I(i)}^l$, then by the inductive hypothesis we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^l) &\leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + B + H_k \\ &< \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + B + H_{k+1}. \end{aligned}$$

□

We now prove an upper bound for the gates in circuit j , for a certain class of policies.

Lemma 46. *Suppose that we are in phase j , and let σ be a policy where:*

- *For every input bit i' we have $\sigma(l_{i'}^j) = \sigma(r_{i'}^j) = c_j$.*
- *For every OR gate i' , we have $\sigma(x_{i'}^j) = c_j$.*
- *For every NOT gate i' , we have $\sigma(a_{i'}^{1-j}) = c_j$.*

For every gate i we have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^j) \leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + H_{d(i)}.$$

Proof. Due to our assumptions about σ , we have $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^j) \leq H_0$ for every input bit i . Thus, we can apply Lemma 45 with $B = 0$ in order to prove this claim. □

The following lemma gives an upper bound for the gates in circuit $1 - j$ in coherent policies.

Lemma 47. *Suppose that we are in phase j , and let σ be a coherent policy. For every gate i , we have $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) \leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + H_{d(i)}$.*

Proof. Let i be an input bit. If $\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) = l_i^{1-j}$ we have

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) \leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) - \frac{T}{2} + \frac{H_{d(C)} + L_{d(C)}}{2} < \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j).$$

On the other hand, if $\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) = r_i^{1-j}$, then we can apply Lemma 46 to argue that:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(o_{I(i)}^j) \leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + H_{d(C)}.$$

Thus, we have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) \leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + H_{d(C)} - \frac{T}{2} < \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j).$$

Therefore, we have $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) \leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j)$, and we can again apply Lemma 45 with $B = 0$ to prove this lemma. □

We now prove lower bounds for the gates in circuit j in policies where $\sigma(l_i^j) = c_j$ and $\sigma(r_i^j) = c_j$.

Lemma 48. *Suppose that we are in phase j , and let σ be a policy with $\sigma(l_i^j) = c_j$ and $\sigma(r_i^j) = c_j$ for every input bit i . For every gate i we have $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^j) \geq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j)$.*

Proof. We will proceed via induction over gate depth. For the base case, we consider the input bits, which are the gates with depth 0. For these gates, we can use the assumption that $\sigma(l_i^j) = \sigma(r_i^j) = c_j$ to argue that either $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^j) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + L_0$ or $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^j) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + H_0$ must hold. Therefore in either case the lemma holds.

We prove two versions of the inductive step. First, suppose that the claim has been shown for all gates with depth k , and let i be an OR gate with depth $k + 1$. If $\sigma(o_i^j) = x_j^j$ then no matter which action is chosen at x_i^j , we have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^j) \geq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + L_{k+1} \geq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j).$$

On the other hand, if $\sigma(o_i^j) = c_j$ then by the inductive hypothesis we have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^j) \geq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + b_{k+1} \geq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j).$$

For the second version of the inductive step, suppose that the claim has been shown for all gates with depth k , and let i be a NOT gate with depth $k + 1$. Note that since we are in phase j , no matter which action is chosen by a_i^j , we must have $\text{Val}^\sigma(a_i^j) \geq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j)$. Therefore, if $\sigma(o_i^j) = a_i^j$, then by Lemma 6, we have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^j) \geq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + b_{k+1} \geq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j).$$

On the other hand, if $\sigma(o_i^j) = o_{l(i)}^j$, then by the inductive hypothesis we have $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^j) \geq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j)$. This completes the proof of Lemma 48. \square

The following lemma shows upper bound on the value of the gates in circuit $1 - j$ in the case where $\sigma(l_i^{1-j}) \neq c_j$ or $\sigma(r_i^{1-j}) \neq c_j$.

Lemma 49. *Suppose that we are in phase j , and let σ be a policy with*

- *For every input bit i' we have $\sigma(l_{i'}^j) = \sigma(r_{i'}^j) = c_j$.*
- *For every OR gate i' , we have $\sigma(x_{i'}^j) = c_j$ and we have $\sigma(x_{i'}^{1-j}) = c_j$.*
- *For every NOT gate i' , we have $\sigma(a_{i'}^{1-j}) = c_j$.*

For every gate i we have

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) \leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) + H_{d(i)}.$$

Proof. Let i be an input bit. First observe that if $\sigma(l_i^{1-j}) = c_j$, then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Val}^\sigma(l_i^{1-j}) &= \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) - \frac{T}{2} + \frac{H_{d(C)} + L_{d(C)}}{2} \\ &\leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, if we have $\sigma(l_i^{1-j}) = c_{1-j}$, then we have

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(l_i^{1-j}) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + H_0.$$

Thus, in either case, we have $\text{Val}^\sigma(l_i^{1-j}) \leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) + H_0$. So, if $\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) = l_i^j$ then we have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) \leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) + H_0.$$

On the other hand, if $\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) = r_i^{1-j}$, then we again have two cases to consider. Firstly, if $\sigma(r^{1-j}) = c_{1-j}$, then we have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) + L_0 < \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) + H_0.$$

If $\sigma(r^{1-j}) = o_{I(i)}^j$, then by Lemma 46 we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) &\leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + H_{d(C)} - \frac{T}{2} \\ &\leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) \\ &\leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) \\ &\leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) + H_0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, in either case, we can apply Lemma 45 with $B = 0$ to complete the proof of this lemma. \square

The following lemma is a version of Lemma 45 that has no preconditions on the choice made at x_i^j or a_i^j .

Lemma 50. *Suppose that we are in phase j . Let σ be a policy, and let $l \in \{0, 1\}$. Furthermore, suppose that for every input bit i' , we have $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_{i'}^l) \leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) + B + H_0$, for some non-negative constant B . For all gates i we have $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^l) \leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) + B + H_{d(i)}$.*

Proof. We will prove this claim by induction over depth. For input bits, which are the gates with depth 0, the claim holds by assumption.

We prove two versions of the inductive step. First, suppose that the claim has been shown for all gates with depth k , and let i be an OR gate with depth $k + 1$. If $\sigma(o_i^l) = x_i^l$ then, no matter which action is chosen at x_i^l , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^l) &\leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) + L_{k+1} \\ &\leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) + H_{k+1} \\ &\leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) + B + H_{k+1}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, if $\sigma(o_i^l) = c_j$ then by the inductive hypothesis we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^l) &\leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) + B + H_k + b_{k+1} \\ &= \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) + B + H_{k+1}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the OR gate case of the inductive step.

For the second version of the inductive step, suppose that the claim has been shown for all gates with depth k , and let i be a NOT gate with depth $k + 1$. Note that since we are in phase j , no matter which action is chosen by a_i^l , we must have $\text{Val}^\sigma(a_i^l) \leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) + H_k$. Therefore, if $\sigma(o_i^l) = a_i^l$, then by Lemma 6, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^l) &\leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) + H_k + b_{k+1} \\ &= \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) + H_{k+1} \\ &\leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) + B + H_{k+1}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, if $\sigma(o_i^l) = o_{I(i)}^l$, then by the inductive hypothesis we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^l) &\leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) + B + H_k \\ &< \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) + B + H_{k+1}.\end{aligned}$$

□

The following lemma gives an upper bound on the gate values for the case where, for every input bit i , we have that both l_i^{1-j} and r_i^{1-j} have switched to c_{1-j} .

Lemma 51. *Suppose that we are in phase j , and let σ be a policy with $\sigma(l_{i'}^{1-j}) = \sigma(r_{i'}^{1-j}) = c_{1-j}$ for every input bit i' . For every gate i , we have:*

- $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^j) \leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) + H_{d(i)}$, and
- $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) \leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) + H_{d(i)}$.

Proof. We start with the circuit $1-j$. Since by assumption we have $\sigma(l_{i'}^{1-j}) = \sigma(r_{i'}^{1-j}) = c_{1-j}$, for every input bit i' , we must have $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_{i'}^{1-j}) \leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) + H_0$ for every input bit i' . Therefore, we can apply Lemma 45 with $B = 0$ to prove the second claim of this lemma.

Now consider the circuit j . For every input bit i' , we can apply the second part of this lemma to prove that $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_{I(i')}^{1-j}) \leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) + H_{d(C)}$. Therefore, no matter what choices σ makes at $l_{i'}^j$ or $r_{i'}^j$, we have $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_{i'}^j) \leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) + H_0$. Thus, we can apply Lemma 45 with $B = 0$ to prove the first claim of this lemma. □

Finally, we show a lower bound on the gate values with a different set of assumptions to the ones used in Lemma 48.

Lemma 52. *Suppose that we are in phase j , and let σ such that, for every gate i' we have:*

- If i' is an input bits, then we have $\sigma(l_{i'}^{1-j}) = \sigma(r_{i'}^{1-j}) = c_{1-j}$.
- If i' is an OR gate, then we have $\sigma(x_{i'}^{1-j}) = c_{1-j}$.
- If i' is a NOT gate, then we have $\sigma(a_{i'}^{1-j}) = c_{1-j}$.

For every gate i , we have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) \geq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}).$$

Proof. We will prove this claim by induction over depths. For the gates i with depth 0, which are the input bits, the claim holds trivially, because we have $\sigma(l_i^{1-j}) = \sigma(r_i^{1-j}) = c_{1-j}$.

We will prove two versions of the inductive step. For the first version, assume that the claim holds for all gates with depth at most k , and let i be an OR gate with depth $k+1$. If $\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) = x_i^{1-j}$, then since $\sigma(x_i^{1-j}) = c_{1-j}$, we clearly have $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) \geq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j})$. On the other hand, if $\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) = v_i^{1-j}$, then we can apply the inductive hypothesis to argue that $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) \geq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j})$.

For the second version of the inductive step, suppose that the claim holds for all gates with depth at most k , and let i be a NOT gate with depth $k+1$. If $\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) = a_i^{1-j}$, then since $\sigma(a_i^{1-j}) = c_{1-j}$, we have $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) \geq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j})$. On the other hand, if $\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) = o_{I(i)}^{1-j}$, then we can invoke the inductive hypothesis in order to argue that $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) \geq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j})$. □

J Proof of Lemma 8

Proof. We begin by proving the first claim. It is not difficult to verify that for every state s , if we follow σ from s , then will eventually arrive at the state si . The only action available at si is a self-loop with reward 0, so this implies that the expected average-reward of all state s under σ must be 0. Therefore, we have $G^\sigma(s) = 0$ for every state s .

We now prove the second claim. The fact that there exists a policy σ with $G^\sigma(s) = 0$ for every state s follows from the first part of this lemma. We now prove that we cannot have $G^\sigma(s) > 0$, for any policy σ or state s . This holds because the only way of avoiding reaching si is to take the transition between r_i^j and $o_{I(i)}^{1-j}$ infinitely often, for some state i . But this action has reward $-\frac{T}{2}$, and by Lemma 45, the maximum possible reward that can be obtained on a path from $o_{I(i)}^{1-j}$ to r_i^j is $2 \cdot H_{d(C)}$. Since $2 \cdot H_{d(C)} - \frac{T}{2} < 0$, we have that any such loop has a negative average reward. Therefore, the optimal policy σ^* must satisfy $G^{\sigma^*}(s) = 0$ for every state s . \square

K Proof of Lemma 10

In order to prove Lemma 10, we will give explicit upper bounds on every state. The following lemma states these upper bounds, and the rest of this section will be dedicated to proving that they are correct. The proofs in this section will make use of the upper and lower bounds shown in Appendix I.

Lemma 53. *Suppose that we are in phase j , and let σ be a coherent policy. For every input bit i we have:*

1. *The appeal of switching l_i^j to c_{1-j} is 1.6.*
2. *The appeal of switching r_i^j to $o_{I(i)}$ is strictly less than 0.*
3. *The appeal of switching l_i^{1-j} to c_{1-j} is 3.4.*
4. *The appeal of switching r_i^{1-j} to c_{1-j} is at most 3.3.*
5. *If $\sigma(o_i^j) = l_i^j$, then the appeal of switching o_i^j to r_i^j is strictly less than 0.*
6. *If $\sigma(o_i^j) = r_i^j$, then the appeal of switching o_i^j to l_i^j is strictly less than 0.06.*

For every other gate i we have:

1. *If i is an OR gate, then the appeal of switching x_i^j to c_{1-j} is 0.9, and the appeal of switching x_i^{1-j} to c_{1-j} is 0.9*
2. *If i is a NOT gate, then the appeal of switching a_i^{1-j} to c_{1-j} is 0.95.*

The following lemma proves the first claim of Lemma 53.

Lemma 54. *Suppose that we are in phase j , and let σ be a policy with $\sigma(l_i^j) = c_j$. For every input bit i , the appeal of switching l_i^j to c_{1-j} is 1.6.*

Proof. Since we are in phase j , we must have that:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + T.$$

Moreover, we have that:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(l_i^j) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + H_0.$$

Thus, by Lemma 6, we have that the appeal of switching l_i^j to c_{1-j} is:

$$p_5 \cdot \left(T - \frac{T}{2} + \frac{H_{d(C)} + L_{d(C)}}{2} - H_0 \right) = 1.6.$$

\square

The next lemma proves the second claim of Lemma 53.

Lemma 55. *Suppose that we are in phase j , and let σ be a coherent policy. The action between r_i^j and $o_{I(i)}^{1-j}$ is not switchable.*

Proof. Since σ is coherent, we have $\text{Val}^\sigma(r_i^j) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + L_0$. On the other hand, by Lemma 47 we have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(o_{I(i)}^{1-j}) \leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + H_{d(C)}.$$

Thus, by Lemma 6 the appeal of switching r_i^j to $o_{I(i)}^{1-j}$ is:

$$\begin{aligned} p_7 \cdot \left(-\frac{T}{2} + H_{d(C)} - L_0\right) &\leq p_7 \cdot \left(-\frac{3^{d(C)+6}}{2} + 2 \cdot 3^{d(C)+2}\right) \\ &< 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

The next lemma proves the third claim of Lemma 53.

Lemma 56. *Suppose that we are in phase j , and let σ be a policy with $\sigma(l_i^{1-j}) = c_j$ for some input bit i . The appeal of switching l_i^{1-j} to c_{1-j} is 3.4.*

Proof. By Lemma 6, we have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(l_i^{1-j}) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) - \frac{T}{2} + \frac{H_{d(C)} + L_{d(C)}}{2}.$$

Moreover, since we are in phase j , we have that $\text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + T$. Thus, by Lemma 6 we have that the appeal of switching l_i^{1-j} to c_{1-j} is:

$$p_4 \cdot \left(T + H_0 + \frac{T}{2} - \frac{H_{d(C)} + L_{d(C)}}{2}\right) = 3.4.$$

□

The next lemma proves the fourth claim of Lemma 53

Lemma 57. *Suppose that we are in phase j and let σ be a policy with $\sigma(l_{i'}^j) = c_j$ and $\sigma(r_{i'}^j) = c_j$ for every input bit i' . For every input bit i , the appeal of switching r_i^{1-j} to c_{1-j} is at most 3.3.*

Proof. Since we are in phase j , we have $\text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + T$. By Lemma 48, we have $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_{I(i)}^j) \geq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j)$. Therefore, we can apply Lemma 6 to argue that the appeal of switching

r_i^{1-j} to $o_{I(i)}^j$ is at most:

$$\begin{aligned}
p_6 \cdot (T + L_0 + \frac{T}{2}) &= 3.2 \cdot \frac{\frac{3T}{2} + L_0}{\frac{3T}{2} + L_0 - H_{d(C)}} \\
&= 3.2 + \frac{3.2 \cdot H_{d(C)}}{\frac{3T}{2} + L_0 - H_{d(C)}} \\
&\leq 3.2 + \frac{3.2 \cdot H_{d(C)}}{\frac{3T}{2} - H_{d(C)}} \\
&\leq 3.2 + \frac{3.2 \cdot 2 \cdot 3^{d(C)+2}}{\frac{3}{2} \cdot 3^{d(C)+6} - 2 \cdot 3^{d(C)+2}} \\
&= 3.2 + \frac{3.2 \cdot 2 \cdot 3^{d(C)+2}}{1.5 \cdot 3^4 \cdot 3^{d(C)+2} - 2 \cdot 3^{d(C)+2}} \\
&= 3.2 + \frac{3.2 \cdot 2 \cdot 3^{d(C)+2}}{119.5 \cdot 3^{d(C)+2}} \\
&\leq 3.2 + 0.1.
\end{aligned}$$

□

The next lemma proves the fifth claim of Lemma 53.

Lemma 58. *Suppose that we are in phase j , and let σ be a policy with $\sigma(l_i^j) = \sigma(r_i^j) = c_j$ and with $\sigma(o_i^j) = l_i^j$ for some input bit i . The appeal of switching o_i^j to r_i^j is strictly less than 0.*

Proof. We have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^j) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + H_0.$$

On the other hand, we have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(r_i^j) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + L_0.$$

Thus, the appeal of switching o_i^j to r_i^j is $L_0 - H_0 < 0$. □

The next lemma proves the sixth claim of Lemma 53.

Lemma 59. *Suppose that we are in phase j , and let σ be a policy with $\sigma(l_i^j) = \sigma(r_i^j) = c_j$ and with $\sigma(o_i^j) = r_i^j$ for some input bit i . The appeal of switching o_i^j to l_i^j is strictly less than 0.06.*

Proof. We have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^j) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + L_0.$$

On the other hand, we have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(l_i^j) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + H_0.$$

Thus, we can apply Lemma 6 to argue that the appeal of switching o_i^j to l_i^j is:

$$\begin{aligned}
p_3 \cdot (H_0 - L_0) &= \frac{3.1 \cdot (H_0 - L_0)}{\frac{3T}{2} + H_0} \\
&\leq \frac{3.1 \cdot H_0}{\frac{3T}{2}} \\
&\leq \frac{3.1 \cdot 2 \cdot 3^{d(C)+2}}{\frac{3}{2} \cdot 3^{d(C)+6}} \\
&= \frac{3.1 \cdot 2}{121.5} \\
&< 0.06.
\end{aligned}$$

The next lemma proves the seventh claim of Lemma 53.

Lemma 60. *Suppose that we are in phase j , let $m \in \{0, 1\}$, and let σ be a policy with $\sigma(x_i^m) = c_j$ for some OR gate i . The appeal of switching x_i^m to c_{1-j} is 0.9.*

Proof. We have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(x_i^m) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j).$$

Thus, we can apply Lemma 6 to argue that the appeal of switching x_i^m to c_{1-j} is:

$$\frac{0.9}{T} \cdot T = 0.9.$$

□

The next lemma proves the eight claim of Lemma 53.

Lemma 61. *Suppose that we are in phase j , and let σ be a policy with $\sigma(a_i^{1-j}) = c_j$ for some NOT gate i . The appeal of switching a_i^{1-j} to c_{1-j} is 0.95.*

Proof. We have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(a_i^{1-j}) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) - T + H_{d(i)-1}.$$

On the other hand, we have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + T.$$

Thus, we can apply Lemma 6 to argue that the appeal of switching a_i^{1-j} to c_{1-j} is:

$$p_2 \cdot (2T - H_{d(i)-1}) = 0.95.$$

□

L Proof of Lemma 15

Our goal is to show that, when Dantzig's rule is applied to σ , the sequence of events specified in Lemma 15 will occur. To do this, we split events specified in Lemma 15 into four different *stages* as follows:

- Stage 1 encompasses the following event:
 1. For every input bit i , the state l_i^{1-j} is switched to c_{1-j} .

- Stage 2 encompasses the following event:
 2. For every input bit i , the state r_i^{1-j} is switched to c_{1-j} .
- Stage 3 encompasses the following events:
 3. For every input bit i , the state l_i^j is switched to c_{1-j} .
 4. For every input bit i , if σ_i^j takes the action towards r_i^j , then it is switched to l_i^j .
- Stage 4 encompasses the following events:
 5. For every input bit i , the state r_i^j is switched to $o_{I(i)}^{1-j}$.
 6. For every NOT gate i , the state a_i^{1-j} is switched to c_{1-j} .
 7. For every OR gate i , the states x_i^j and x_i^{1-j} are both switched to c_{1-j} .

For each stage, we will give a single lemma that specifies the upper and lower bounds on appeals that are necessary in order to show that a given action is switched. Since the proofs of these lemmas are lengthy, we defer each of them to their own appendix.

L.1 Stage 1

We say that σ is a *stage 1 transition policy* for phase j if, for every gate i , the following conditions are satisfied:

- If i is an input bit then:
 - We have $\sigma(l_i^j) = c_j$ and $\sigma(r_i^j) = c_j$.
 - We have $\sigma(r_i^{1-j}) = o_{I(i)}^j$.
- If i is an OR gate then we have $\sigma(x_i^j) = c_j$ and $\sigma(x_i^{1-j}) = c_j$.
- If i is a NOT gate then we have $\sigma(a_i^{1-j}) = c_j$.

Note that we do not place restrictions on the choice made at l_i^{1-j} for any input bit i , because these are the states that will be switched during stage 1. Moreover, note that every final policy for B satisfies the requirements of a stage 1 transition policy.

The following lemma is proved in Appendix N.

Lemma 62. *Suppose that we are in phase j , and let σ be a stage 1 transition policy. For every input bit i we have:*

1. *The appeal of switching l_i^j to c_{1-j} is 1.6.*
2. *The appeal of switching r_i^j to $o_{I(i)}$ is at most 0.8.*
3. (a) *If $\sigma(l_i^{1-j}) = c_j$, then the appeal of switching l_i^{1-j} to c_{1-j} is at least 3.4.*
 (b) *If $\sigma(l_i^{1-j}) = c_{1-j}$, then the appeal of switching l_i^{1-j} to c_j is strictly less than 0.*
4. *The appeal of switching r_i^{1-j} to c_{1-j} is at least 3.2, and at most 3.3.*
5. *If $\sigma(o_i^j) = l_i^j$, then the appeal of switching o_i^j to r_i^j is strictly less than 0*
6. *If $\sigma(o_i^j) = r_i^j$, then the appeal of switching o_i^j to l_i^j is strictly less than 0.06.*
7. *If $\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) = l_i^{1-j}$, and $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_{I(i)}^j) \leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + L_{d(C)}$ then the appeal of switching o_i^{1-j} to r_i^{1-j} is strictly less than 0.*
8. *If $\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) = r_i^{1-j}$, then the appeal of switching o_i^{1-j} to l_i^{1-j} is at most 3.1.*

For every other gate i we have:

9. *If i is an OR gate, then the appeal of switching x_i^j to c_{1-j} is 0.9, and the appeal of switching x_i^{1-j} to c_{1-j} is 0.9*
10. *If i is a NOT gate, then the appeal of switching a_i^{1-j} to c_{1-j} is 0.95.*

Firstly we argue that, for every input bit i , the state o_i^{1-j} cannot be switched during stage 1. If $\sigma_f(o_i^{1-j}) = r_i^{1-j}$, then this follows immediately from part 8 of Lemma 62. On the other hand, if $\sigma_f(o_i^{1-j}) = l_i^{1-j}$, then we must show that the precondition on part 7 of Lemma 62 will always be satisfied. We do so in the following lemma.

Lemma 63. *Suppose that we are in phase j , and let σ be a phase 1 transition policy in which all gates i are final and correct. Suppose that policy iteration switches, for some input bit i' , the state $l_{i'}^{1-j}$ to c_{1-j} . Let σ' be the resulting policy. We have that all gates i are final and correct in σ' .*

Proof. In every stage 1 transition policy, we have $\sigma(l_i^j) = \sigma(r_i^j) = c_j$, for every input bit i . Thus, every state s in the gadgets representing circuit j , it is impossible to move from s to $l_{i'}^{1-j}$. Thus, $\text{Val}^\sigma(s) = \text{Val}^{\sigma'}(s)$. So, for every state s in the gadgets representing circuit j , if s has no outgoing actions to circuit $1-j$, then s must be correct and final in σ' .

To complete the proof, we observe that the only states in circuit j that have an action to a state in circuit $1-j$ are the states r_i^j where i is an input bit, but part 2 of Lemma 62 proves that these are final and correct in σ' . \square

Lemma 63 implies that, if $\text{Val}^{\sigma_f}(o_{I(i)}^j) \leq \text{Val}^{\sigma_f}(c_j) + L_{d(C)}$, for some input bit i , then we will continue to have $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_{I(i)}^j) \leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + L_{d(C)}$ for every policy σ that is encountered during stage 1. Note that $\sigma_f(o_i^{1-j}) = l_i^{1-j}$ for an input bit i if and only if $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_{I(i)}^j) \leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + L_{d(C)}$, so we have shown that $o_{I(i)}^{1-j}$ cannot be switched during stage 1.

We now show that, for every input bit i , the Dantzig's rule will switch state l_i^{1-j} to c_{1-j} . Note that we cannot switch away from a stage 1 transition policy without switching some state that appears in Lemma 62. However, Lemma 62 shows that switching l_i^{1-j} to c_{1-j} has appeal at least 3.4, whereas all other actions considered in Lemma 62 have appeal strictly less than 3.4. Thus, starting at the policy σ_f , Dantzig's rule will eventually switch to a policy σ_1 in which, for every input bit i , we have $\sigma_1(l_i^{1-j}) = c_{1-j}$. The policy σ_1 will be the first policy considered in stage 2.

M Stage 2

We say that σ is a *stage 2 transition policy* for phase j if, for every gate i , the following conditions are satisfied.

- If i is an input bit then:
 - We have $\sigma(l_i^j) = c_j$ and $\sigma(r_i^j) = c_j$.
 - We have $\sigma(l_i^{1-j}) = c_{1-j}$.
- If i is an OR gate then we have $\sigma(x_i^j) = c_j$ and $\sigma(x_i^{1-j}) = c_j$.
- If i is a NOT gate then we have $\sigma(a_i^{1-j}) = c_j$.

Note that we do not place any restrictions on the choice made at r_i^{1-j} for any input bit i , because these states will be switched during stage 2. Also note that the policy σ_1 satisfies the requirements of a stage 2 transition policy.

The following lemma is proved in Appendix O

Lemma 64. *Suppose that we are in phase j , and let σ be a stage 2 transition policy. For every input bit i we have:*

1. *The appeal of switching l_i^j to c_{1-j} is 1.6.*

2. The appeal of switching r_i^j to $o_{I(i)}$ is at most 0.8.
3. The appeal of switching l_i^{1-j} to c_j is strictly less than 0.
4. (a) If $\sigma(r_i^{1-j}) = o_{I(i)}^j$, then the appeal of switching r_i^{1-j} to c_{1-j} is at least 3.2.
(b) If $\sigma(r_i^{1-j}) = c_{1-j}$, then the appeal of switching r_i^{1-j} to $o_{I(i)}^j$ is strictly less than 0.
5. If $\sigma(o_i^j) = l_i^j$, then the appeal of switching o_i^j to r_i^j is strictly less than 0.
6. If $\sigma(o_i^j) = r_i^j$, then the appeal of switching o_i^j to l_i^j is strictly less than 0.06.
7. If $\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) = l_i^{1-j}$, then the appeal of switching o_i^{1-j} to r_i^{1-j} is strictly less than 0.
8. If $\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) = r_i^{1-j}$, then the appeal of switching o_i^{1-j} to l_i^{1-j} is at most 3.1.

For every other gate i we have:

9. If i is an OR gate, then the appeal of switching x_i^j to c_{1-j} is 0.9, and the appeal of switching x_i^{1-j} to c_{1-j} is 0.9.
10. If i is a NOT gate, then the appeal of switching a_i^{1-j} to c_{1-j} is 0.95.

We can now argue that, starting at the policy σ_1 , Dantzig's rule will switch, for every input bit i , the state r_i^{1-j} to c_{1-j} . This is because we cannot switch away from a stage 2 transition policy without switching a state that appears in Lemma 64. However, Lemma 64 shows that switching r_i^{1-j} to c_{1-j} has appeal at least 3.2, whereas all other actions considered by Lemma 64 have appeal strictly less than 3.2. Thus, when applied to the policy σ_1 , Dantzig's rule will eventually switch to a policy σ_2 in which, for every input bit i , we have $\sigma(r_i^{1-j}) = c_{1-j}$. The policy σ_2 will be the first policy considered in stage 3.

M.1 Stage 3

We say that σ is a *stage 3 transition policy* for phase j if, for every gate i , the following conditions are satisfied.

- If i is an input bit then:
 - We have $\sigma(r_i^j) = c_j$.
 - We have $\sigma(l_i^{1-j}) = c_{1-j}$.
 - We have $\sigma(r_i^{1-j}) = c_{1-j}$.
- If i is an OR gate then we have $\sigma(x_i^j) = c_j$ and $\sigma(x_i^{1-j}) = c_j$.
- If i is a NOT gate then we have $\sigma(a_i^{1-j}) = c_j$.

Note that we do not place any restrictions on the choice made at l_i^j for any input bit i , because these are the states that will be switched during stage 3. Note also that σ_2 satisfies the requirements of a stage 3 transition policy.

The following lemma is proved in Appendix P.

Lemma 65. *Suppose that we are in phase j , and let σ be a stage 3 transition policy. For every input bit i we have:*

1. (a) If $\sigma(l_i^j) = c_j$, then the appeal of switching l_i^j to c_{1-j} is 1.6.
(b) If $\sigma(l_i^j) = c_{1-j}$, then the appeal of switching l_i^j to c_j is strictly less than 0.
2. The appeal of switching r_i^j to $o_{I(i)}$ is at most 0.8.
3. The appeal of switching l_i^{1-j} to c_j is strictly less than 0.
4. The appeal of switching r_i^{1-j} to $o_{I(i)}^j$ is strictly less than 0.
5. If $\sigma(o_i^j) = l_i^j$, then the appeal of switching o_i^j to r_i^j is strictly less than 0.

6. If $\sigma(o_i^j) = r_i^j$, then
 - (a) If $\sigma(l_i^j) = c_j$, then the appeal of switching o_i^j to l_i^j is strictly less than 0.06.
 - (b) If $\sigma(l_i^j) = c_{1-j}$, then the appeal of switching o_i^j to l_i^j lies in the range $[1.01, 1.1]$.
7. If $\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) = l_i^{1-j}$, then the appeal of switching o_i^{1-j} to r_i^{1-j} is strictly less than 0.
8. If $\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) = r_i^{1-j}$, then the appeal of switching o_i^{1-j} to l_i^{1-j} is strictly less than 0.06.

For every other gate i we have:

9. If i is an OR gate, then the appeal of switching x_i^j to c_{1-j} is 0.9, and the appeal of switching x_i^{1-j} to c_{1-j} is 0.9.
10. If i is a NOT gate, then the appeal of switching a_i^{1-j} to c_{1-j} is 0.95.

We can now argue that, when applied to the policy σ_2 , Dantzig's rule will execute the following two events from Lemma 15:

3. For every input bit i , the state l_i^j is switched to c_{1-j} .
4. For every input bit i , if o_i^j takes the action towards r_i^j , then it is switched to l_i^j .

We first show that event 3 occurs. This follows from the fact that, in order to switch away from a stage 3 transition policy, we must switch some action mentioned in Lemma 65. However, Lemma 65 shows that switching l_i^j to c_{1-j} has appeal 1.6, whereas all other actions mentioned in Lemma 65 have appeal strictly less than 1.6. Therefore, when it is applied to σ_2 , Dantzig's rule will eventually switch to a policy σ'_2 in which $\sigma'_2(l_i^j) = c_{1-j}$ for every input bit i .

We can now prove that event 4 occurs when Dantzig's rule is applied to σ'_2 . This follows from the same line of reasoning: once l_i^j has been switched to c_{1-j} for all input bits i , Lemma 65 states that the appeal of switching o_i^j to l_i^j is at least 1.01. Moreover, all other actions mentioned in Lemma 65 have appeal strictly less than 1.01. Thus, Dantzig's rule will eventually switch to a policy σ_3 in which, for every input bit i , we have $\sigma_3(l_i^j) = c_{1-j}$ and $\sigma_3(o_i^j) = l_i^j$. The policy σ_3 will be the first policy considered during stage 4.

M.2 Stage 4

We say that σ is a *stage 4 transition policy* for phase j if, for every gate i , the following conditions are satisfied.

- If i is an input bit then:
 - We have $\sigma(l_i^j) = c_{1-j}$.
 - We have $\sigma(l_i^{1-j}) = c_{1-j}$.
 - We have $\sigma(r_i^{1-j}) = c_{1-j}$.
 - We have $\sigma(o_i^j) = l_i^j$.

Note that we do not place any restrictions on the choice made at the states r_i^j for any input bit i , x_i^j for any OR gate i , or a_i^j for any NOT gate i , because these are the states that will be switched during stage 4. Note also that the policy σ_3 satisfied the conditions of a stage 4 transition policy.

The following lemma is proved in Appendix Q.

Lemma 66. *Suppose that we are in phase j , and let σ be a stage 4 transition policy. For every input bit i we have:*

1. The appeal of switching l_i^j to c_j is strictly less than 0.
2. (a) If $\sigma(r_i^j) = c_j$, then the appeal of switching r_i^j to $o_{1(i)}^j$ is at most 0.8.

- (b) If $\sigma(r_i^j) = c_j$ and if, for every OR gate i' we have $\sigma(x_{i'}^{1-j}) = c_{1-j}$ and for every NOT gate i' we have $\sigma(a_{i'}^{1-j}) = c_{1-j}$, then the appeal of switching r_i^j to $o_{I(i)}^{1-j}$ is at least 0.76.
- (c) If $\sigma(r_i^j) = o_{I(i)}^{1-j}$, and if, for every OR gate i' we have $\sigma(x_{i'}^{1-j}) = c_{1-j}$ and for every NOT gate i' we have $\sigma(a_{i'}^{1-j}) = c_{1-j}$, then the appeal of switching r_i^j to c_j is strictly less than 0.
- 3. The appeal of switching l_i^{1-j} to c_j is strictly less than 0.
- 4. The appeal of switching r_i^{1-j} to $o_{I(i)}^j$ is strictly less than 0.
- 5. The appeal of switching o_i^j to r_i^j is strictly less than 0
- 6. If $\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) = l_i^{1-j}$, then the appeal of switching o_i^{1-j} to r_i^{1-j} is strictly less than 0.
- 7. If $\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) = r_i^{1-j}$, then the appeal of switching o_i^{1-j} to l_i^{1-j} is strictly less than 0.06.

For every other gate i we have:

- 9. If i is an OR gate then for all $l \in \{0, 1\}$:
 - (a) If $\sigma(x_i^l) = c_j$, then the appeal of switching x_i^l to c_{1-j} is 0.9.
 - (b) If $\sigma(x_i^l) = c_{1-j}$, then the appeal of switching x_i^l to c_j is strictly less than 0.
- 10. If i is a NOT gate then:
 - (a) If $\sigma(a_i^{1-j}) = c_j$, then the appeal of switching a_i^{1-j} to c_{1-j} is 0.95.
 - (b) If $\sigma(a_i^{1-j}) = c_{1-j}$, then the appeal of switching a_i^{1-j} to c_j is strictly less than 0.

We can now show that, when Dantzig's rule is applied to σ_3 , the following events from Lemma 15 will occur.

- 5. For every input bit i , the state r_i^j is switched to $o_{I(i)}^{1-j}$.
- 6. For every NOT gate i , the state a_i^{1-j} is switched to c_{1-j} .
- 7. For every OR gate i , the states x_i^j and x_i^{1-j} are both switched to c_{1-j} .

We begin by showing that event 5 will occur. This follows from the fact that, in order to switch away from a stage 4 transition policy, one of the actions mentioned in Lemma 66 must be switched. However, Lemma 66 shows that the appeal of switching r_i^j to $o_{I(i)}^{1-j}$ is at least 0.76, whereas all other actions mentioned in Lemma 66 have appeal strictly less than 0.76. Thus, Dantzig's rule will switch from σ_3 to a policy σ'_3 with $\sigma'_3(r_i^j) = o_{I(i)}^{1-j}$ for every input bit i .

Events 6 and 7 follow using the same line of reasoning. After event 5 has occurred Lemma 66 shows that, for every NOT gate i , switching a_i^{1-j} to c_{1-j} has appeal 0.95, whereas all other actions have appeal strictly less than 0.95. Similarly, once event 6 has occurred, Lemma 66 shows that, for every OR gate i , switching x_i^j and x_i^{1-j} to c_{1-j} has appeal 0.9, whereas all other actions have appeal strictly less than 0.9. Thus Dantzig's rule will eventually switch to a policy σ_4 in which events 5, 6, and 7 have taken place.

M.3 Completing the proof

Note that σ_4 is still a stage 4 transition policy. Note that, for the policy σ_4 , all appeals mentioned in are strictly less than 0.06. On the other hand Lemma 9 implies that the appeal of advancing the clock is at least 0.25. Therefore, when Dantzig's rule is applied to σ_4 , it will proceed to advance the clock, and move into phase $1 - j$.

Let σ_n be the first policy after the clock is advanced. To complete the proof of Lemma 15, we must argue that σ_n is coherent for phase $1 - j$, and that it is an initial policy for $F(B)$. To do so, we must check the following conditions.

- Firstly, we must show that σ_n is coherent for phase $1 - j$. This follows from events in stages 1 through 4, which explicitly show that σ_n satisfies the conditions of a coherent policy in phase $1 - j$.
- Secondly, in order to show that σ_n is an initial policy for $F(B)$, we must show that for every input bit i , we have $\sigma_n(o_i^{1-j}) = l_i^j$ if and only if $C(B, I(i)) = 1$. Note that, by Lemma 13, this property holds for the policy σ_f . Moreover, we have shown that o_i^{1-j} cannot have been switched at any point during stages 1 through 4. Therefore, this property must hold for σ_n .
- Thirdly, we must show that $\sigma_n(o_i^j) = l_i^j$. To do so, we recall that o_i^j was switched to l_i^j during stage 3, and was not switched during stage 4.
- Finally, we must show that for every NOT gate i we have $\sigma(a_i^{1-j}) = c_{1-j}$. Recall that this was ensured during stage 4.

So, σ_n is coherent for phase $1 - j$, and an initial policy for $F(B)$ in phase $1 - j$. This completes the proof.

N Proof of Lemma 62

A number of the claims in this lemma follow from lemma that we have shown previously. In particular:

- The first part of this lemma follows from Lemma 54.
- The fifth claim of the lemma follows from Lemma 58.
- The sixth claim of this lemma follows from Lemma 59.
- The ninth part of this lemma follows from Lemma 60.
- The tenth claim of this lemma follows from Lemma 61.

We now proceed to prove the other claims. The following lemma proves second claim of Lemma 62.

Lemma 67. *Suppose that we are in phase j , and let σ be a policy with $\sigma(l_{i'}^j) = \sigma(r_{i'}^j) = c_j$ for every input bit i' . For every input bit i , the appeal of switching r_i^j to $o_{I(i)}^{1-j}$ is at most 0.8.*

Proof. We have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(r_i^j) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + L_0.$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 49, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) &\leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) + H_{d(C)} \\ &= \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + T + H_{d(C)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we can apply Lemma 6 to argue that the appeal of switching r_i^j to $o_{I(i)}^{1-j}$ is at most:

$$p_7 \cdot \left(\frac{T}{2} + H_{d(C)} - L_0 \right) = 0.8.$$

□

Part 3a of Lemma 62 is proved in Lemma 56. The following lemma proves part 3b of Lemma 62.

Lemma 68. *Suppose that we are in phase j , and let σ be a policy, and let i be an input bit. If $\sigma(l_i^{1-j}) = c_{1-j}$, then the appeal of switching l_i^{1-j} to c_j is strictly less than 0.*

Proof. In this case we have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(l_i^{1-j}) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + T + H_0.$$

Thus, by Lemma 6, we have that the appeal of switching l_i^{1-j} to c_j is:

$$p_5 \cdot \left(-\frac{T}{2} + \frac{H_{d(C)} + L_{d(C)}}{2} - T - H_0\right) < 0.$$

□

The upper bound in the fourth claim of Lemma 62 follows from Lemma 57. The following lemma proves the lower bound in the fourth claim of Lemma 62.

Lemma 69. *Suppose that we are in phase j , and let σ be a policy with $\sigma(l_{i'}^j) = \sigma(r_{i'}^j) = c_j$ for every input bit i' . If $\sigma(r_i^{1-j}) = o_{1(i)}^j$, for some input bit i , then the appeal of switching r^{1-j} to c_{1-j} is at least 3.2.*

Proof. We can apply Lemma 46 to obtain:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(r_i^{1-j}) \leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + H_{d(C)} - \frac{T}{2}.$$

On the other hand, we have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + T.$$

Thus, we can apply Lemma 6 to argue that the appeal of switching r^{1-j} to c_{1-j} is at least:

$$p_6 \cdot \left(\frac{3T}{2} + L_0 - H_{d(C)}\right) = 3.2$$

□

The following lemma proves the seventh claim of Lemma 62.

Lemma 70. *Suppose that we are in phase j , and let σ be a policy with $\sigma(r_i^{1-j}) = o_{1(i)}^j$ and $\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) = l_i^{1-j}$. If $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_{1(i)}^j) \leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + L_{d(C)}$ then the appeal of switching o_i^{1-j} to r_i^{1-j} is strictly less than 0.*

Proof. If $\sigma(l_i^{1-j}) = c_j$, then we have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(o^{1-j}) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) - \frac{T}{2} + \frac{H_{d(C)} + L_{d(C)}}{2}.$$

On the other hand, if $\sigma(l_i^{1-j}) = c_{1-j}$, then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Val}^\sigma(o^{1-j}) &= \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + T + H_0. \\ &\geq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) - \frac{T}{2} + \frac{H_{d(C)} + L_{d(C)}}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, in both cases, we have $\text{Val}^\sigma(o^{1-j}) \geq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) - \frac{T}{2} + \frac{H_{d(C)} + L_{d(C)}}{2}$.

Since $\sigma(r_i^{1-j}) = o_{1(i)}^j$, we have by assumption that:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(r_i^{1-j}) \leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + L_{d(C)} - \frac{T}{2}.$$

Thus, the appeal of switching o_i^{1-j} to r_i^{1-j} is at most:

$$\begin{aligned} L_{d(C)} - \frac{H_{d(C)} + L_{d(C)}}{2} &\leq L_{d(C)} - \frac{L_{d(C)} + L_{d(C)}}{2} \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

The following lemma proves the eight claim of Lemma 62. Note that the first precondition of this lemma is satisfied by Lemma 48, and the second precondition is satisfied no matter which action is chosen at l_i^{1-j} .

Lemma 71. *Suppose that we are in phase j , and let σ be a policy. If we have both:*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Val}^\sigma(r_i^{1-j}) &\geq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) - \frac{T}{2} \\ \text{Val}^\sigma(l_i^{1-j}) &\leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) + H_0 \end{aligned}$$

for some input bit i , then the appeal of switching o_i^{1-j} to l_i^{1-j} is at most 3.1.

Proof. We can use our two assumptions, along with Lemma 6 to argue that the appeal of switching o_i^j to r_i^j is at most:

$$p_3 \cdot \left(\frac{3T}{2} + H_0 \right) = 3.1.$$

□

O Proof of Lemma 64

Most of the claims made in this lemma follow from lemmas that we have shown previously. In particular, we have:

- The first part of this lemma follows from Lemma 54.
- The second part of this lemma follows from Lemma 67.
- The third part of this lemma follows from Lemma 68.
- Part 4a of this lemma follows from Lemma 69.
- The fifth claim of the lemma follows from Lemma 58.
- The sixth claim of this lemma follows from Lemma 59.
- The eight part of this lemma follows from Lemma 60.
- The tenth claim of this lemma follows from Lemma 61.

We now proceed to prove the rest of the claims. The next lemma shows part 4b of Lemma 64. Observe that Lemma 46 proves that the precondition of this lemma holds in a stage 2 transition policy.

Lemma 72. *Suppose that we are in phase j , let i be an input bit, and let σ be a policy with $\sigma(r_i^{1-j}) = c_{1-j}$ and $\text{Val}^\sigma(o_{1(i)}^j) \leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) + H_{d(C)}$. The appeal of switching r_i^{1-j} to $o_{1(i)}^j$ is strictly less than 0.*

Proof. We have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(r_i^{1-j}) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) + L_0.$$

On the other hand, we have by assumption:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(o_{I(i)}^j) \leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) + H_{d(C)}.$$

Thus, we can apply Lemma 6 to argue that the appeal of switching r_i^{1-j} to $o_{I(i)}^j$ is at most:

$$p_7 \cdot (H_{d(C)} - \frac{T}{2} - L_0) < 0.$$

□

The following lemma shows part 7 of Lemma 64. Observe that Lemma 46 proves that the precondition on the value of r_i^{1-j} holds, even if the action to $o_{I(i)}^j$ is chosen at r_i^{1-j} .

Lemma 73. *Suppose that we are in phase j , let i be an input, and let σ be a policy with $\sigma(l_i^{1-j}) = c_{1-j}$ and $\text{Val}^\sigma(r_i^{1-j}) \leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) + L_0$. If $\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) = l_i^{1-j}$, then the appeal of switching o_i^{1-j} to r_i^{1-j} is strictly less than 0.*

Proof. We have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) + H_0.$$

By assumption, we have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(r_i^{1-j}) \leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) + L_0$$

Thus, the appeal of switching o_i^{1-j} to r_i^{1-j} is at most $L_0 - H_0 < 0$. □

Part 8 of this lemma follows from Lemma 71. Note that the precondition on the value of r_i^{1-j} is satisfied by Lemma 46 in the case where $\sigma(r_i^{1-j}) = o_{I(i)}^{1-j}$, and the precondition is obviously satisfied when $\sigma(r_i^{1-j}) = c_{1-j}$. The precondition on the value of l_i^{1-j} is satisfied because $\sigma(l_i^{1-j}) = c_{1-j}$ for all stage 2 transition policies.

P Proof of Lemma 65

A few of the claims made in this lemma follow from results that we have already shown. In particular:

- Part three of Lemma 65 follows from Lemma 68.
- The ninth part of this lemma follows from Lemma 60.
- The tenth claim of this lemma follows from Lemma 61.

We now proceed to prove the remaining claims. Part 1a of this lemma follows from Lemma 54. In the following lemma, we show part 1b of Lemma 65.

Lemma 74. *Suppose that we are in phase j , and let σ be a policy with $\sigma(l_i^j) = c_{1-j}$. The appeal of switching l_i^j to c_j is strictly less than 0.*

Proof. We have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(l_i^j) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) - \frac{T}{2} + \frac{H_{d(C)} + L_{d(C)}}{2}.$$

On the other hand, we have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) - T.$$

Thus, we can apply Lemma 6 to argue that the appeal of switching l_i^j to c_j is:

$$p_5 \cdot \left(\frac{T}{2} + H_0 - \frac{H_{d(C)} + L_{d(C)}}{2} \right) < 0.$$

□

The following lemma shows part 2 of Lemma 65

Lemma 75. *Suppose that we are in phase j , and let σ be a policy with $\sigma(l_{i'}^{1-j}) = \sigma(r_{i'}^{1-j}) = c_{1-j}$ for every input bit i' . For each input bit i , if $\sigma(r_i^j) = c_j$, then the appeal of switching r_i^j to $o_{I(i)}^{1-j}$ is at most 0.8.*

Proof. We have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(r_i^j) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + L_0.$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 51, we have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(o_{I(i)}^{1-j}) \leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) + H_{d(C)}.$$

Thus, we can apply Lemma 6 to argue that the appeal of switching r_i^j to $o_{I(i)}^{1-j}$ is at most:

$$p_7 \cdot \left(\frac{T}{2} + H_{d(C)} - L_0 \right) = 0.8.$$

Part four of Lemma 65 follows from Lemma 72. Note that the precondition on the value of $o_{I(i)}^{1-j}$ is satisfied due to Lemma 51.

We now consider part 5 of Lemma 65. If $\sigma(l_i^j) = c_j$ for input bit i , then our upper bound follows from Lemma 58. The following lemma proves part 5 of Lemma 65 for the case where $\sigma(l_i^j) = c_{1-j}$.

Lemma 76. *Suppose that we are in phase j , and let σ be a policy with $\sigma(l_i^j) = c_{1-j}$ and $\sigma(r_i^j) = c_j$ and $\sigma(o_i^j) = l_i^j$ for some input bit i . The appeal of switching o_i^j to r_i^j is strictly less than 0.*

Proof. We have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^j) &= \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) - \frac{T}{2} + \frac{H_{d(C)} + L_{d(C)}}{2} \\ &= \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + \frac{T}{2} + \frac{H_{d(C)} + L_{d(C)}}{2} \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(r_i^j) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + L_0$$

Thus, the appeal of switching o_i^j to r_i^j is:

$$L_0 - \left(\frac{T}{2} + \frac{H_{d(C)} + L_{d(C)}}{2} \right) < 0.$$

Part 6a of Lemma 65 follows from Lemma 59. The following lemma proves part 6b of Lemma 65.

Lemma 77. *Suppose that we are in phase j , and let σ be a policy with $\sigma(r_i^j) = c_j$, $\sigma(l_i^j) = c_{1-j}$, and $\sigma(o_i^j) = r_i^j$ for some input bit i . The appeal of switching o_i^j to l_i^j lies in the range $[1.01, 1.1]$.*

Proof. We have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^j) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + L_0.$$

On the other hand, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Val}^\sigma(l_i^j) &= \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) - \frac{T}{2} + \frac{H_{d(C)} + L_{d(C)}}{2}. \\ &= \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + \frac{T}{2} + \frac{H_{d(C)} + L_{d(C)}}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we can apply Lemma 6 to argue that the appeal of switching o_i^j to l_i^j is:

$$\begin{aligned} & p_3 \cdot \left(\frac{T}{2} + \frac{H_{d(C)} + L_{d(C)}}{2} - L_0 \right) \\ &= p_3 \cdot \left(\frac{T}{2} + \frac{H_{d(C)} + L_{d(C)}}{2} \right) \quad [L_0 = 0] \\ &= \frac{3.1 \cdot \left(\frac{T}{2} + \frac{H_{d(C)} + L_{d(C)}}{2} \right)}{\frac{3T}{2} + H_0}. \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

For our lower bound, note that Equation (35) is greater than:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{3.1 \cdot \frac{T}{2}}{\frac{3T}{2} + H_0} \\ &= \frac{3.1 \cdot \frac{1}{2} \cdot 3^{d(C)+6}}{\frac{3}{2} \cdot 3^{d(C)+6} + 3^{d(C)+2}} \\ &= \frac{3.1 \cdot \frac{1}{2} \cdot 3^4}{\frac{3}{2} \cdot 3^4 + 1} \\ &= \frac{125.55}{122.5} \\ &> 1.01 \end{aligned}$$

For our upper bound, note that Equation (35) is less than:

$$\begin{aligned} &= \frac{3.1 \cdot \left(\frac{T}{2} + 2 \cdot 3^{d(C)+2} \right)}{\frac{3T}{2} + H_0} \\ &= \frac{3.1 \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2} \cdot 3^{d(C)+6} + 2 \cdot 3^{d(C)+2} \right)}{\frac{3}{2} \cdot 3^{d(C)+6} + 3^{d(C)+2}} \\ &= \frac{3.1 \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2} \cdot 3^4 + 2 \right)}{\frac{3}{2} \cdot 3^4 + 1} \\ &= \frac{128.65}{122.5} \\ &\leq 1.1 \end{aligned}$$

□

The following Lemma proves part 7 of Lemma 65.

Lemma 78. *Suppose that we are in phase j , and let σ be a policy with $\sigma(l_i^{1-j}) = \sigma(r_i^{1-j}) = c_{1-j}$ and with $\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) = l_i^{1-j}$ for some input bit i . The appeal of switching o_i^{1-j} to r_i^{1-j} is strictly less than 0.*

Proof. We have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) + H_0.$$

On the other hand, we have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(r_i^{1-j}) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) + L_0.$$

Thus, the appeal of switching o_i^{1-j} to r_i^{1-j} is $L_0 - H_0 < 0$. \square

The following Lemma proves Part 8 of Lemma 65.

Lemma 79. *Suppose that we are in phase j , and let σ be a policy with $\sigma(l_{i'}^{1-j}) = \sigma(r_{i'}^{1-j}) = c_{1-j}$ for every input bit i' . If $\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) = r_i^{1-j}$ for some input bit i , then the appeal of switching o_i^{1-j} to r_i^{1-j} is strictly less than 0.06.*

Proof. We have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^{1-j}) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) + L_0.$$

On the other hand, we have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(l_i^{1-j}) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) + H_0.$$

Thus we can apply Lemma 6 to argue that the appeal of switching o_i^{1-j} to r_i^{1-j} is at most:

$$\begin{aligned} & p_3 \cdot (H_0 - L_0) \\ &= \frac{3.1 \cdot (H_0 - L_0)}{\frac{3T}{2} + H_0} \\ &\leq \frac{3.1 \cdot H_0}{\frac{3T}{2}} \\ &\leq \frac{3.1 \cdot 2 \cdot 3^{d(C)+2}}{\frac{3}{2} \cdot 3^{d(C)+6}} \\ &= \frac{3.1 \cdot 2}{121.5} \\ &< 0.06. \end{aligned}$$

Q Proof of Lemma 66

A number of the claims made in this lemma follow from results that we have already shown. In particular, we have:

- Part 1 of Lemma 66 follows from Lemma 74.
- Part 3 of Lemma 66 follows from Lemma 68.
- Part 6 of Lemma 66 follows from Lemma 78.
- Part 7 of Lemma 66 follows from Lemma 79.

Part 2a of Lemma 66 follows from Lemma 75. The following lemma proves part 2b of Lemma 66.

Lemma 80. *Suppose that we are in phase j , and let σ be a policy with $\sigma(r_i^j) = c_j$ for some gate i , and for every gate i' :*

- If i' is an OR gate then we have $\sigma(x_{i'}^{1-j}) = c_{1-j}$.
- If i' is a NOT gate then we have $\sigma(a_{i'}^{1-j}) = c_{1-j}$.

The appeal of switching r_i^j to $o_{I(i)}$ is at least 0.76.

Proof. We have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(r_i^j) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + L_0.$$

On the other hand, we can apply Lemma 52 to argue that:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(o_{I(i)}^{1-j}) \geq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j})$$

Thus, we can apply Lemma 6 to argue that the appeal of switching r_i^j to $o_{I(i)}$ is at least:

$$\begin{aligned}
& p_7 \cdot \left(T - \frac{T}{2} + L_0\right) \\
&= \frac{0.8(\frac{T}{2} + L_0)}{\frac{T}{2} + H_{d(C)} - L_0} \\
&= \frac{0.8(\frac{T}{2})}{\frac{T}{2} + H_{d(C)}} \quad [L_0 = 0] \\
&\leq \frac{\frac{0.8}{2} \cdot 3^{d(C)+6}}{\frac{1}{2} \cdot 3^{d(C)+6} + 2 \cdot 3^{d(C)+2}} \\
&= \frac{\frac{0.8}{2} \cdot 3^4}{\frac{1}{2} \cdot 3^4 + 2} \\
&= 0.8 \cdot \frac{40.5}{42.5} \\
&> 0.76.
\end{aligned}$$

The following Lemma proves part 2c of Lemma 66.

Lemma 81. Suppose that we are in phase j , and let σ be a policy with $\sigma(r_i^j) = o_{I(i)}^{1-j}$ for some gate i , and for every gate i' :

- If i' is an OR gate then we have $\sigma(x_{i'}^{1-j}) = c_{1-j}$.
- If i' is a NOT gate then we have $\sigma(a_{i'}^{1-j}) = c_{1-j}$.

The appeal of switching r_i^j to c_j is strictly less than 0.

Proof. We can apply Lemma 52 to argue that

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(r_i^j) \geq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) - \frac{T}{2} = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + \frac{T}{2}.$$

Thus, we can apply Lemma 6 to argue that the appeal of switching r_i^j to c_j is at most:

$$p_6 \cdot \left(-\frac{T}{2} + L_0\right) < 0.$$

□

Part 4 of Lemma 66 follows from Lemma 72. Note that the precondition on the value of $\sigma_{1(i)}^j$ is satisfied due to Lemma 51.

In the following lemma, we show part 5 of Lemma 66.

Lemma 82. *Suppose that we are in phase j , and let σ be a policy with $\sigma(l_{i'}^{1-j}) = \sigma(r_{i'}^{1-j}) = c_{1-j}$ for every input bit i' . If $\sigma(l_i^j) = c_{1-j}$ and $\sigma(o_i^j) = l_i^j$ for some input bit i , then the appeal of switching σ_i^j to l_i^j is strictly less than 0.*

Proof. We have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(o_i^j) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) + H_0.$$

If $\sigma(r_i^j) = c_j$, then we have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(r_i^j) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + L_0 < \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}).$$

On the other hand, if $\sigma(r_i^j) = o_{1(i)}^{1-j}$, then we can apply Lemma 51 to argue that:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(r_i^j) \leq \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) + H_{d(c)} - \frac{T}{2} < \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}).$$

Thus, in either case, we have $\text{Val}^\sigma(r_i^j) < \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j)$. So, the appeal of switching σ_i^j to l_i^j is $0 - H_0 < 0$. \square

Part 9a of Lemma 66 follows from Lemma 60. In the following Lemma, we show part 9b of Lemma 66.

Lemma 83. *Suppose that we are in phase j , and let σ be a policy with $\sigma x_i^l = c_{1-j}$ for some OR gate i and some $l \in \{0, 1\}$. The appeal of switching x_i^l to c_j is strictly less than 0.*

Proof. We have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(x_i^l) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_j) + T.$$

So, by Lemma 6, the appeal of switching x_i^l to c_j is:

$$\frac{0.8}{T} \cdot -T < 0.$$

\square

Part 10a of Lemma 66 follows from Lemma 61. In the following lemma, we show part 10b of Lemma 66.

Lemma 84. *Suppose that we are in phase j , and let σ be a policy with $\sigma(a_i^{1-j}) = c_{1-j}$ for some NOT gate i . The appeal of switching a_i^{1-j} to c_j is strictly less than 0.*

Proof. We have:

$$\text{Val}^\sigma(a_i^{1-j}) = \text{Val}^\sigma(c_{1-j}).$$

Thus, we can apply Lemma 6 to argue that the appeal of switching a_i^{1-j} to c_j is:

$$p_1 \cdot (-2T + H_{d(i)-1}) < 0.$$

\square

R Proof of Theorem 3

Proof. Let σ'_{init} be a policy that agrees with σ_{init} for every state in $\text{Constr}(C)$, and that also has $\sigma'_{\text{init}}(b_1) = si$. This will be the starting policy for $\text{Constr}_2(C)$.

We first show that b_2 cannot be switched until after clock phase 2^n . This holds because, by Lemma 6, the appeal of switching b_2 to b_1 is 0.2, but in the proof of Theorem 4 all actions switched before the end of phase 2^n have appeal strictly greater than 0.2. Note that, in the initial policy for the construction σ'_{init} , we have $\text{Val}^{\sigma'_{\text{init}}}(l_i^0) \geq 0$ and $\text{Val}^{\sigma'_{\text{init}}}(r_i^0) \geq 0$ for all input bits i , and all $j \in \{0, 1\}$. Thus, for all policies σ with $\sigma(b_2) = si$, we have that the appeal of switching either l_i^0 or r_i^0 to b_2 is less than or equal to 0. These facts combine to show that policy iteration on $\text{Constr}_2(C)$ will proceed in the same way as policy iteration on $\text{Constr}(C)$ until after the 2^n -th clock phase. In particular, policy iteration will pass through to the end of stage 4 phase transition at the end of the 2^n -th clock phase.

Note that at the end of stage 4 of the phase transition, we have that the choice made at o_z^0 determines the z -th bit of $F^{2^n}(B^I)$. Once we arrive at the end of stage 4, we can then apply Lemma 66 to argue that Dantzig's rule will switch b_2 to b_1 , before it switches o_z^0 . This is because all relevant appeals mentioned in Lemma 66 are strictly less than 0.2, and because there are no switchable actions in the clock. Once b_2 has switched to b_1 , Dantzig's rule will immediately switch l_z^0 and r_z^0 to b_1 . This holds by construction, because the value of l_z^0 and r_z^0 can be at most W , and since the value of b_1 is now $2 \cdot W$, the appeal of switching these actions must be at least W .

Let σ be a policy in which $\sigma(b_2) = b_1$ and $\sigma(l_z^0) = \sigma(r_z^0) = b_1$. Let a be the action not chosen by σ at o_z^0 . By construction, we have that $\text{Appeal}(a) = 0$. Thus, policy iteration can never switch a . Therefore, once l_z^0 and r_z^0 have been switched to b_2 , the policy at o_z^0 will not be changed, even if policy iteration makes switches elsewhere in the construction. So, in the optimal policy we will have that the strategy decision made at o_z^0 will determine the z -th bit of $F^{2^n}(B^I)$. \square