arXiv:1912.02986v2 [cs.LG] 13 Jul 2020

How Does an Approximate Model Help in Reinforcement Learning?

Fei Feng*[1], Wotao Yin†[1], and Lin F. Yang‡[2]

[1]Department of Mathematics, UCLA
[2]Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, UCLA

Abstract

One of the key approaches to save samples in reinforcement learning (RL) is to use knowledge from an approximate model such as its simulator. However, *how much does an approximate model help to learn a near-optimal policy of the true unknown model*? Despite numerous empirical studies of transfer reinforcement learning, an answer to this question is still elusive. In this paper, we study the sample complexity of RL while an approximate model of the environment is provided. For an unknown Markov decision process (MDP), we show that the approximate model can effectively reduce the complexity by eliminating sub-optimal actions from the policy searching space. In particular, we provide an algorithm that uses $\widetilde{O}(N/(1-\gamma)^3/\varepsilon^2)$ samples in a generative model to learn an ε-optimal policy, where γ is the discount factor and N is the number of near-optimal actions in the approximate model. This can be much smaller than the learning-from-scratch complexity $\widetilde{\Theta}(SA/(1-\gamma)^3/\varepsilon^2)$, where S and A are the sizes of state and action spaces respectively. We also provide a lower bound showing that the above upper bound is nearly-tight if the value gap between near-optimal actions and sub-optimal actions in the approximate model is sufficiently large. Our results provide a very precise characterization of how an approximate model helps reinforcement learning when no additional assumption on the model is posed.

Keywords— Transfer Reinforcement Learning, Value Gap, Sample Complexity, TV-distance

1 Introduction

Reinforcement learning (RL) is the framework of learning to control an unknown system through trial and error. Recently, RL achieves phenomenal empirical successes, e.g, AlphaGo (Silver et al.,

*fei.feng@math.ucla.edu
†wotaoyin@math.ucla.edu
‡linyang@ee.ucla.edu, corresponding author.

2016) defeated the best human player in Go, and OpenAI used RL to precisely and robustly control a robotic arm (Andrychowicz et al., 2017). The RL framework is general enough such that it can capture a broad spectrum of topics, including health care, traffic control, and experimental design (Sutton et al., 1992; Esteva et al., 2019; Si and Wang, 2001; Wiering, 2000). However, *successful* applications of RL in these domains are still rare. The major obstacle that prevents RL being widely used is its high sample complexity: both the AlphaGo and OpenAI arm took nearly a thousand years of human-equivalent experiences to achieve good performances.

One way to reduce the number of training samples is to mimic how human beings learn – borrow knowledge from previous experiences. In robotics research, a robot may need to accomplish different tasks at different times. Instead of learning every task from scratch, a more ideal situation is that the robot can utilize the similarities between the underlying models of these tasks and adapt them to future new jobs quickly. Another example is that RL agents are often trained in simulators and then applied to the real world (Ng et al., 2006; Itsuki, 1995; Dosovitskiy et al., 2017). It is still desirable to have their performance improved after seeing samples collected from the real world. One might hope that agents from simulators (approximate models) can adapt to the real world (true model) faster than knowing nothing. Both examples lead to a natural question:

How does an approximate model help in RL?

This paper focuses on answering the above question. Suppose the true unknown model is a Markov Decision Process (MDP) $\mathcal{M}$ and the RL agent is provided with a prior model $\mathcal{M}_0$ with the same state and action spaces as $\mathcal{M}$ but different transition and reward functions. In particular, we have

$$\mathrm{dist}(\mathcal{M}_0, \mathcal{M}) \leq \beta,$$

where $\mathrm{dist}(\cdot,\cdot)$ is a statistical distance and β is a small scalar. We would like to study the sample complexity of learning a policy π for $\mathcal{M}$ such that its error[1] is at most ε.

In this paper, we consider one of the most natural choices for $\mathrm{dist}(\cdot,\cdot)$, the total-variation (TV) distance between the transition kernels of $\mathcal{M}_0$ and $\mathcal{M}$ (see the formal definition in Equation (2)). Under such a distance, we establish both upper and lower sample complexity bounds. Specifically, we utilize the fact that if two models are close under TV-distance, their optimal value functions are close under $\|\cdot\|_\infty$. Based on this, given the prior knowledge, for every state in $\mathcal{M}$ we can split its available actions into two sets: one contains all *potential-optimal* actions and the other contains all *sub-optimal* actions. An action is potential-optimal if it has a chance to be optimal in $\mathcal{M}$; otherwise, it is sub-optimal. We develop a transfer RL algorithm that first identifies potential-optimal actions using the prior knowledge, then focuses exploration only on them. To obtain an ε-optimal policy, our algorithm enjoys a sample bound $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}\big(\frac{\overline{N}}{(1-\gamma)^3\varepsilon^2}\log(1/\delta)\big)$, where $\overline{N}$ equals the total number of potential-optimal actions over all states. $\overline{N}$ depends on the distance parameter β, the accuracy requirement ε, and the optimal value function of $\mathcal{M}_0$. When $\overline{N}$ is smaller than the total number of state-action pairs in $\mathcal{M}$, transfer learning achieves a smaller sample complexity than learning-from-scratch.

To complement our result, we further develop a sample lower bound $\Omega\big(\frac{\underline{N}}{(1-\gamma)^3\varepsilon^2}\log(1/\delta)\big)$, where $\underline{N}$ characterizes the number of actions we must explore or we fail to learn a near-optimal policy with high probability for some $\mathcal{M} \in B_{\mathrm{TV}}(\mathcal{M}_0, \beta)$. Roughly speaking, the more near-optimal actions there are in $\mathcal{M}_0$, the more we shall consider and the larger $\underline{N}$ is. In particular, we have $\overline{N} \approx \underline{N}$ when there exists a large value gap in $\mathcal{M}_0$. The reader is referred to Section 5.2 for more discussion. This lower

[1]The error of a policy is the difference between the values of the policy and the optimal policy.

bound essentially shows that our lower upper bound is nearly tight. To achieve the lower bound, we leverage techniques for proving hardness in the bandit literature (e.g. Mannor and Tsitsiklis 2004) and reinforcement learning (e.g. Azar et al. 2013).

Our results do not rely on additional structure assumptions but only the intrinsic value property of MDPs. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first systematic theoretical answer to the aforementioned question in this setting.

1.1 Related Work

Transfer learning is an important strategy to reduce sample complexity in RL. There are many different learning regimes, e.g, multi-task RL (Wilson et al., 2007; Lazaric and Ghavamzadeh, 2010; Brunskill and Li, 2013; Ammar et al., 2014; Calandriello et al., 2014), lifelong RL (Tanaka and Yamamura, 1997; Brunskill and Li, 2014; Abel et al., 2018; Zhan et al., 2017), and meta-RL (Schweighofer and Doya, 2003; Al-Shedivat et al., 2018; Gupta et al., 2018; Sæmundsson et al., 2018; Rakelly et al., 2019). Please also see surveys in Taylor and Stone 2009; Lazaric 2012 and Yang et al. 2020.

In the above settings, often more than one prior model (task) is considered. These models are assumed to share structural similarity with the to-be-learned model, or they are all generated from a common distribution. For instance, in Brunskill and Li 2013, all models are assumed to be drawn from a finite set of MDPs; in Abel et al. 2018, all models share the same transition dynamics but reward functions change with a hidden distribution; in Modi et al. 2019 and Ayoub et al. 2020, every model's transition kernel and reward function lie in the linear span of several known base models.

In terms of how one approximate model can help, there are several theoretical works. In Jiang 2018, the authors use the number of incorrect state-action pairs to characterize the difference between two models, which is another interesting direction to look at besides the TV-distance as we adopt. However, the statistical distance from such a model to the true model can be arbitrarily large. As the authors show, even if the difference is only one state-action pair, the approximate model could still be information-theoretically useless. Additional conditions are needed to achieve positive transfer. In Mann and Choe 2012, the authors analyzed action-value transfer via inter-task mappings to guide exploration. They do not measure the difference between models but show that as long as the optimal action function of the source task is (almost) larger than that of the target task component-wisely, one can use the former as an initialization for value-based RL on the true model and achieve a smaller sample complexity compared compared with learning-from-scratch. Their working mechanism is similar to ours: eliminate sub-optimal state-action pairs from later exploration. The difference is we directly identify and remove sub-optimal actions and they achieve this implicitly through value functions. No lower bound is established there.

Compared with the aforementioned works, our results do not rely on additional assumptions and are more complete with both upper and lower bounds. In particular, our upper and lower bounds enjoy a unifying structure that is explicitly characterized by the value function, the TV-distance parameter, and the learning precision parameters.

Outline This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the necessary background and the formal setting. In Section 3, we formalize the problem and state the main results. In Section 4, we provide analysis to establish the main results. We have more graphical illustration in Section 5 and we conclude in Section 6.

2 Preliminary

Given an integer K, we use $[K]$ to represent the set $\{1, 2, \ldots, K\}$. We use $|\cdot|$ to denote the cardinality of a set. We denote by $\mathcal{O}, \Omega$ and Θ to denote leading orders in upper, lower, and minimax lower bounds, respectively; and we use $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}, \widetilde{\Omega}$ and $\widetilde{\Theta}$ to hide the polylog factors.

Markov Decision Process We consider an infinite-horizon discounted Markov Decision Process (MDP), $\mathcal{M} := (\mathcal{S}, \{\mathcal{A}^s\}_{s\in\mathcal{S}}, p, r, \gamma)$, where $\mathcal{S}$ is a finite state space, $\mathcal{A}^s$ is the set of available actions for state s, $p(s'|s,a)$ is the transition function, $r(s,a,s') \in [0,1]$ is the reward function, and $\gamma \in (0,1)$ is a discount factor. We denote by $\mathcal{S}'$ the set of states with more than one available action.

At step t, the controller observes a state s_t and selects an action $a_t \in \mathcal{A}^{s_t}$ according to a *policy* π, which maps a state to one of its available action. The environment then transitions to a new state s_{t+1} with probability $p(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t)$ and the controller receives an instant reward $r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1})$. Given a policy π, we define its value function as: $V^\pi(s) := \mathbb{E}^\pi\big[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) \mid s_0 = s\big]$, where the expectation is taken over the trajectory following π. The objective of RL is to learn a policy π^* that can maximize the value function, i.e., $\forall\, \pi, s \in \mathcal{S}:\ V^* := V^{\pi^*}(s) \geq V^\pi(s)$. A policy π is said to be *ε-optimal* if $V^\pi(s) \geq V^*(s) - \varepsilon$ for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$. The action-value function (or Q-function) of a policy π is defined as

$$Q^\pi(s,a) := \sum_{s'\in\mathcal{S}} p(s'|s,a) \cdot \big(r(s,a,s') + \gamma V^\pi(s')\big).$$

The optimal Q-function is denoted by $Q^* := Q^{\pi^*}$. By Bellman Optimality Equation, we have

$$V^*(s) = \max_{a\in\mathcal{A}^s} Q^*(s,a) = \max_{a\in\mathcal{A}^s} \sum_{s'\in\mathcal{S}} p(s'|s,a) \cdot \big(r(s,a,s') + \gamma V^*(s')\big).$$

Given an MDP $\mathcal{M}$ and a constant c, for each state s, we define the following set

$$\mathcal{A}^s_{\mathcal{M}}(c) := \begin{cases} \{a \mid V^*_{\mathcal{M}}(s) - Q^*_{\mathcal{M}}(s,a) < c\}, & c > 0; \\ \operatorname{argmax}_a Q^*_{\mathcal{M}}(s,a), & c \leq 0, \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

where $V^*_{\mathcal{M}}$ and $Q^*_{\mathcal{M}}$ denote the optimal value function and Q-function of $\mathcal{M}$, respectively. For any value of c, $\mathcal{A}^s_{\mathcal{M}}(c)$ is well-defined and always contains all optimal actions for state s in $\mathcal{M}$. If $C > c$, then $\mathcal{A}^s_{\mathcal{M}}(C) \supseteq \mathcal{A}^s_{\mathcal{M}}(c)$. If $c > 1/(1-\gamma)$, $\mathcal{A}^s_{\mathcal{M}}(c) = \mathcal{A}^s_{\mathcal{M}}$, i.e., all available actions for state s in $\mathcal{M}$.

TV-distance for MDPs Given $\mathcal{M}_0 := (\mathcal{S}, \{\mathcal{A}^s\}_{s\in\mathcal{S}}, p_0, r_0, \gamma)$ and $\mathcal{M} := (\mathcal{S}, \{\mathcal{A}^s\}_{s\in\mathcal{S}}, p, r, \gamma)$, we define

$$d_{\mathrm{TV}}(\mathcal{M}_0, \mathcal{M}) = \max\big\{ \max_{s\in\mathcal{S}, a\in\mathcal{A}^s} \|p_0(\cdot|s,a) - p(\cdot|s,a)\|_1,\ \|r_0 - r\|_\infty \big\}. \tag{2}$$

$d_{\mathrm{TV}}(\cdot,\cdot)$ is a metric between MDPs with the same state/action space and the discount factor. The name TV comes from that $\|p_0(\cdot|s,a) - p(\cdot|s,a)\|_1$ is equal to the *total variation* distance between distributions $p_0(\cdot|s,a)$ and $p(\cdot|s,a)$. We denote by $\mathcal{M} \in B_{\mathrm{TV}}(\mathcal{M}_0, \beta)$ if $d_{\mathrm{TV}}(\mathcal{M}_0, \mathcal{M}) \leq \beta$.

Generative Model Generative model is a special sample oracle. It allows any state-action pair (s,a) as input, where $s \in \mathcal{S}$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}^s$, and outputs $(s', r(s,a,s'))$ with probability $p(s'|s,a)$.

Algorithm 1 Transfer RL from an Approximate Model

1: **Input:** full knowledge of $\mathcal{M}_0$; a generative model of $\mathcal{M}$; a near-optimal RL algorithm $\mathscr{A}_{\text{opt}}$;
2: **Parameters:** $\overline{C} > 0$, $\varepsilon > 0$, $\delta \in (0, 1)$.
3: Apply any planning algorithm on $\mathcal{M}_0$ to get Q_0^*;
4: Construct $\mathcal{A}^s_{\mathcal{M}_0}(\overline{C})$ with Q_0^* (see Equation (1));
5: Form a new MDP $\mathcal{M}^c := (\mathcal{S}, \{\mathcal{A}^s_{\mathcal{M}_0}(\overline{C})\}_{s\in\mathcal{S}}, p^c, r^c, \gamma)$;
6: Apply $\mathscr{A}_{\text{opt}}$ to learn an $\varepsilon/2$-optimal policy π of $\mathcal{M}^c$ with probability at least $1-\delta$.
7: **Output:** π.

Near-Optimal RL Algorithm An RL algorithm is near-optimal if without any prior knowledge, it returns an ε-optimal policy for an MDP $\mathcal{M} := (\mathcal{S}, \{\mathcal{A}^s\}_{s\in\mathcal{S}}, p, r, \gamma)$ with probability at least $1-\delta$ using $\widetilde{O}\left(\frac{\sum_{s\in\mathcal{S}}|\mathcal{A}^s|}{(1-\gamma)^3\varepsilon^2}\log(1/\delta)\right)$ samples. Near-optimal RL algorithms often require a generative model. Examples can be found in Azar et al. 2013 and Sidford et al. 2018.

3 Main Results

We formalize our problem of knowledge transferring as below.

Problem 1. *Suppose the target unknown model is $\mathcal{M} := (\mathcal{S}, \{\mathcal{A}^s\}_{s\in\mathcal{S}}, p, r, \gamma)$ and an agent is provided with the full knowledge of an approximate model $\mathcal{M}_0 := (\mathcal{S}, \{\mathcal{A}^s\}_{s\in\mathcal{S}}, p_0, r_0, \gamma)$ satisfying $\mathcal{M} \in B_{\text{TV}}(\mathcal{M}_0, \beta)$, where $\beta > 0$ is a known constant. How many samples does it take to learn an ε-optimal policy for $\mathcal{M}$ with probability at least $1-\delta$?*

Without additional structure assumption, we answer Problem 1 by exploiting value functions. Our idea is based on the fact that if $d_{\text{TV}}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}_0) \le \beta$, then their optimal Q-functions are apart for at most $\beta/(1-\gamma)^2$ (see Lemma 1). Given full knowledge of $\mathcal{M}_0$, we can then obtain upper and lower bounds on every entry of the optimal Q-function of $\mathcal{M}$. The upper and lower bounds depict how optimal and sub-optimal an action could be at some state in $\mathcal{M}$. Based on this information, for every state we can split its available actions into two sets: one contains all *potential-optimal* actions and the other are all *sub-optimal* actions. An action is potential-optimal if it has a chance to be optimal in $\mathcal{M}$; otherwise, it is sub-optimal. For the learning stage, we remove all sub-optimal actions and apply an RL algorithm only on potential-optimal ones. A rigorous definition will be given in Section 4. This learning process is described in Algorithm 1.

In Algorithm 1, we first use a planning algorithm to get the optimal Q-function of $\mathcal{M}_0$, Q_0^*. Then, for each state $s \in \mathcal{S}$, we construct a set $\mathcal{A}^s_{\mathcal{M}_0}(\overline{C})$ (recall the definition in Equation (1)). Later we will show that $\mathcal{A}^s_{\mathcal{M}_0}(\overline{C})$ consists of all potential-optimal actions. By replacing the original action space $\{\mathcal{A}^s\}_{s\in\mathcal{S}}$ by $\{\mathcal{A}^s_{\mathcal{M}_0}(\overline{C})\}_{s\in\mathcal{S}}$, we form a new MDP $\mathcal{M}^c$ (Line 5), where $p^c(s'|s,a) = p(s'|s,a)$ and $r^c(s,a,s') = r(s,a,s)$ for every $s \in \mathcal{S}, a \in \mathcal{A}^s_{\mathcal{M}_0}(\overline{C})$ and $s' \in \mathcal{S}$. Note that $\mathcal{M}^c$ is simply $\mathcal{M}$ with a contracted action space. Finally, we apply a near-optimal RL algorithm to learn a policy of $\mathcal{M}^c$. In Theorem 1, we show that the output policy is ε-optimal for $\mathcal{M}$ with probability at least $1-\delta$ and the sample complexity therein is our upper bound result to Problem 1.

Theorem 1 (Main Result – Upper Bound). *Given $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\delta \in (0,1)$, with probability at least $1-\delta$, Algorithm 1 returns an ε-optimal policy for $\mathcal{M}$ using samples*

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(\frac{\sum_{s\in\mathcal{S}'} |\mathcal{A}^s_{\mathcal{M}_0}(\overline{C})|}{(1-\gamma)^3\varepsilon^2}\log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right),$$

where $\overline{C} := \min\{2/(1-\gamma), 2\beta/(1-\gamma)^2\} - \varepsilon(1-\gamma)/2$.

In Theorem 1, the complexity is summed over $\mathcal{S}'$ since no action exploration is needed for single-action states. Further, we have the lower bound result to Problem 1 in Theorem 2.

Theorem 2 (Main Result – Lower Bound). *Let $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ and $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$. The sample complexity for Problem 1 is*

$$\Omega\left(\frac{\sum_{s\in\mathcal{S}'} |\mathcal{A}^s_{\mathcal{M}_0}(\underline{C}_s)|}{(1-\gamma)^3\varepsilon^2}\log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right),$$

where $\varepsilon_0 = \frac{\beta\gamma \min_{s\in\mathcal{S}'} V^*(s)^2}{16}\min(\beta/2, \frac{1-\gamma}{3\gamma})$, $\delta_0 = 1/40$ *and*

$$\underline{C}_s = \begin{cases} V^*(s) - \frac{9}{12(1-\gamma)-64(1-\gamma)^2\varepsilon+4.5\beta\gamma}, & \text{if } \beta/2 + \frac{4\gamma-1}{3\gamma} \geq 1; \\ V^*(s) - \frac{V^*(s)^2}{V^*(s)+\beta\gamma V^*(s)^2+4\varepsilon(1+\gamma\beta V^*(s)/2)^2}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The lower bound shares a similar structure as the upper bound except that $\underline{C}_s \leq \overline{C}$. In Section 5.2, we have more discussion about $\underline{C}_s$ and $\overline{C}$. For each state $s \in \mathcal{S}'$, exploring the set of actions $\mathcal{A}^s_{\mathcal{M}_0}(\overline{C})$ is *sufficient* to obtain a near-optimal action in $\mathcal{M}$, likewise, exploring the actions in $\mathcal{A}^s_{\mathcal{M}_0}(\underline{C}_s)$ is *necessary* to find a near-optimal action in $\mathcal{M}$. Note that the sample complexity of learning-from-scratch is $\widetilde{\Theta}\left(\frac{\sum_{s\in\mathcal{S}'}|\mathcal{A}^s|}{\varepsilon^2(1-\gamma)^3}\log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right)$ (see Azar et al. 2013). For the upper bound, if $|\mathcal{A}^s_{\mathcal{M}_0}(\overline{C})| \ll |\mathcal{A}^s|$, knowledge transferring achieves a significantly smaller sample complexity than learning-from-scratch. The best case, as in Corollary 1, is when $|\mathcal{A}^s_{\mathcal{M}_0}(\overline{C})| = 1$, $\forall s \in \mathcal{S}$ and the policy is transferable. For the lower bound, if $|\mathcal{A}^s_{\mathcal{M}_0}(\underline{C}_s)|$ is close to $|\mathcal{A}^s|$, the prior knowledge does not offer much help. The worst case, as in Corollary 2, is when $|\mathcal{A}^s_{\mathcal{M}_0}(\underline{C}_s)| = |\mathcal{A}^s|$, then with or without the prior knowledge, it has the same order of complexity. In particular, if $|\mathcal{A}^s_{\mathcal{M}_0}(\overline{C})| \approx |\mathcal{A}^s_{\mathcal{M}_0}(\underline{C}_s)|$, the upper bound is tight up to a log factor.

Corollary 1 (The Best Scenario). *Suppose for every state $s \in \mathcal{S}'$, $|\operatorname{argmax}_a Q^*_{\mathcal{M}_0}(s,a)| = 1$ and*

$$\left|V^*_{\mathcal{M}}(s) - \max\left\{Q^*_{\mathcal{M}}(s,a) \mid Q^*_{\mathcal{M}}(s,a) < V^*_{\mathcal{M}}(s), a \in \mathcal{A}^s\right\}\right| \geq 2\beta/(1-\gamma)^2 - \varepsilon/(1-\gamma).$$

Then $|\mathcal{A}^s_{\mathcal{M}_0}(\overline{C})| = 1$, $\forall s \in \mathcal{S}$ and the optimal policy for $\mathcal{M}_0$ is also optimal for $\mathcal{M}$.

Corollary 2 (The Worst Scenario). *Let $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ and $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$, where ε_0 and δ_0 are as defined in Theorem 2. Suppose for every state $s \in \mathcal{S}'$, $\operatorname{argmax}_a Q^*_{\mathcal{M}_0}(s,a) = \mathcal{A}^s$. Then the sample complexity for Problem 1 has the same order as that of learning-from-scratch.*

4 Analysis

In this section, we prove the main results. We defer all proofs to Appendix A.

4.1 Proofs of the Upper Bound

We follow the notations used in Problem 1 and always use Q_0^* and Q^* for the optimal Q-functions of $\mathcal{M}_0$ and $\mathcal{M}$, respectively. Our first result is

Lemma 1. $\|Q_0^* - Q^*\|_\infty \le \min\{1/(1-\gamma), \beta/(1-\gamma)^2\}$.

As explained before, we use Lemma 1 to estimate Q^* and then identify potential-optimal actions. Next, we give a rigorous definition of these actions. Before that, we introduce the following lemma.

Lemma 2. *Given $\epsilon > 0$, for every state $s \in \mathcal{S}$, we denote by a^s an action in $\mathcal{A}^s$ such that $Q^*(s, a^s) \ge \max_a Q^*(s, a) - \epsilon(1-\gamma)$. Then $\pi(s) = a^s$ is an ϵ-optimal policy for $\mathcal{M}$.*

Therefore, to construct an ϵ-optimal policy, we only need to find actions satisfying the condition in Lemma 2. Instead of searching over the whole action space, we use Lemma 1 to shrink the searching range. Specifically, we have the next lemma.

Lemma 3. *Given $\beta > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$, let $C(\beta, \epsilon) := 2 \cdot \min\{1/(1-\gamma), \beta/(1-\gamma)^2\} - \epsilon(1-\gamma)$. For every state $s \in \mathcal{S}$, we can definitely find an action satisfying the condition in Lemma 2 from the set $\mathcal{A}^s_{\mathcal{M}_0}(C(\beta, \epsilon))$.*

Actions in the set $\mathcal{A}^s_{\mathcal{M}_0}(C(\beta, \epsilon))$ are the potential-optimal actions. Next, we form a new MDP $\mathcal{M}^c := (\mathcal{S}, \{\mathcal{A}^s_{\mathcal{M}_0}(C(\beta, \epsilon))\}_{s \in \mathcal{S}}, p^c, r^c, \gamma)$, where $p^c(s'|s, a) = p(s'|s, a)$ and $r^c(s, a, s') = r(s, a, s)$ for every $s \in \mathcal{S}, a \in \mathcal{A}^s_{\mathcal{M}_0}(\overline{C})$ and $s' \in \mathcal{S}$. By Lemma 3, an optimal policy of $\mathcal{M}^c$ is at least ϵ-optimal for $\mathcal{M}$. Then we use a near-optimal RL algorithm to learn an $\varepsilon/2$-optimal policy of $\mathcal{M}^c$. Thus, the output policy of Algorithm 1 is $\epsilon + \varepsilon/2$-optimal for $\mathcal{M}$. By the definition of an near-optimal RL algorithm and letting $\epsilon = \varepsilon/2$, we obtain Theorem 1.

4.2 Proofs of the Lower Bound

Next, we prove Theorem 2. We first give a definition about the correctness of RL algorithms.

Definition 1. *($(\mathcal{M}_0, \beta, \varepsilon, \delta)$-correctness) Given $\beta > 0$ and a prior model $\mathcal{M}_0$, we say that an RL algorithm $\mathscr{A}$ is $(\mathcal{M}_0, \beta, \varepsilon, \delta)$-correct if for every $\mathcal{M} \in B_{\mathrm{TV}}(\mathcal{M}_0, \beta)$, $\mathscr{A}$ can output an ε-optimal policy with probability at least $1 - \delta$.*

Next, we construct a class of hard MDPs. We will then select one model $\mathcal{M}_0$ from the class as prior and show that if an RL algorithm $\mathscr{A}$ learns with samples significantly fewer than the lower bound, there would always exist an MDP $\mathcal{M} \in B_{\mathrm{TV}}(\mathcal{M}_0, \beta)$ such that $\mathscr{A}$ cannot be $(\mathcal{M}_0, \beta, \varepsilon, \delta)$-correct.

Construction of the Hard Case We define a family of MDPs $\mathbb{M}$ with a structure as in Figure 1. The state space $\mathcal{S}$ consists of three disjoint subsets $\mathcal{X}$ (gray nodes), $\mathcal{Y}_1$ (green nodes), and $\mathcal{Y}_2$ (blue nodes). The set $\mathcal{X}$ includes K states $\{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_K\}$ and each of them has L available actions $\{a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_L\} =: \mathcal{A}$. States in $\mathcal{Y}_1$ and $\mathcal{Y}_2$ are all of single-action. For state $x \in \mathcal{X}$, by taking action $a \in \mathcal{A}$, it transitions to a state $y_1(x, a) \in \mathcal{Y}_1$ with probability 1. Note that such a mapping is one-to-one from $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A}$ to $\mathcal{Y}_1$. For state $y_1(x, a) \in \mathcal{Y}_1$, it transitions to itself with probability $p_{\mathcal{M}}(x, a) \in (0, 1)$ and to a corresponding state $y_2(y_1) \in \mathcal{Y}_2$ with probability $1 - p_{\mathcal{M}}(x, a)$. $p_{\mathcal{M}}(x, a)$ can be different for different models. All states in $\mathcal{Y}_2$ are absorbing. The reward function $R(s, a, s') = 1$ if $s' \in \mathcal{Y}_1$; otherwise 0.




Figure 1: The class of MDPs considered to prove the lower bound in Theorem 2.

$\mathbb{M}$ is a generalization of a multi-armed bandit problem used in Mannor and Tsitsiklis 2004 to prove a lower bound on bandit learning. A similar example is also shown in Azar et al. 2013. For an MDP $\mathcal{M} \in \mathbb{M}$, it is fully determined by the parameter set $\{p_{\mathcal{M}}(x_k, a_l), k \in [K], l \in [L]\}$. And its Q-function is $Q_{\mathcal{M}}(x, a) = 1/(1 - \gamma p_{\mathcal{M}}(x, a)), \forall\ (x, a) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A}$.

In the sequel, we restrict $\beta \in (0, 2)$ (by definition in Equation 2, $d_{\mathrm{TV}}(\cdot, \cdot) \leq 2$). Fixing β, we further restrict the discount factor $\gamma \in \big(\max\{0.4, 1 - 10\beta\}, 1\big)$.

Prior Model $\mathcal{M}_0$ and Hypotheses of $\mathcal{M}$ For $\mathcal{M}_0$, we simplify the notation $p_{\mathcal{M}_0}(x_k, a_l)$ as $p_0(x_k, a_l)$. Without loss of generality, we assume $1 > p_0(x_k, a_1) \geq p_0(x_k, a_2) \geq \cdots \geq p_0(x_k, a_L) \geq 0$, for every $x_k \in \mathcal{X}$. Thus, in $\mathcal{M}_0$, the Q-values from a_1 to a_L are monotonically non-increasing. Given β and γ, we require $p_0(x_k, a_1) \in \big(\frac{4\gamma-1}{3\gamma}, 1\big)$ for every $x_k \in \mathcal{X}$.

After selecting a prior model $\mathcal{M}_0$ satisfying the above conditions, we define $p_0^k := \max\{p_0(x_k, a_1) - \beta/2, \frac{4\gamma-1}{3\gamma}\}$ for every $k \in [K]$. Then let $\varepsilon_0 := \min_{k\in[K]} \big\{\beta\gamma(1-p_0^k)/(16(1-\gamma p_0^k)^2)\big\}$. Fixing $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$, we define two numbers α_1^k and $\alpha_2^k := 4(1 - \gamma p_0^k)^2\varepsilon/\gamma$ such that

$$\frac{1}{1 - \gamma(p_0^k + \alpha_1^k)} - \frac{1}{1 - \gamma p_0^k} = 2\varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{1 - \gamma(p_0^k + \alpha_2^k)} - \frac{1}{1 - \gamma(p_0^k + \alpha_1^k)} \geq 2\varepsilon. \tag{3}$$

Now, we are ready to define possibilities of $\mathcal{M}$. Given K integers $\{L_k \in [L]\}_{k\in[K]}$, let

$$\mathcal{M}_1 : \text{for every } k \in [K], \quad \begin{cases} p_{\mathcal{M}_1}(x_k, a_1) = p_0^k + \alpha_1^k, \\ p_{\mathcal{M}_1}(x_k, a_l) = p_0^k, & 2 \leq l \leq L_k, \\ p_{\mathcal{M}_1}(x_k, a_l) = p_0(x_k, a_l), & l > L_k; \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

$$\text{for every } k \in [K], 1 < l \leq L_k,\ \mathcal{M}_{k,l} : \begin{cases} p_{\mathcal{M}_{k,l}}(x_k, a_l) = p_0^k + \alpha_2^k \\ p_{\mathcal{M}_{k,l}}(x_{k'}, a_{l'}) = p_{\mathcal{M}_1}(x_{k'}, a_{l'}), \quad \forall\ (k', l') \neq (k, l). \end{cases}$$

Due to our specific selection of p_0^k, α_1^k and α_2^k, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 4. *Let* $L_k := \Big|\big\{l \in [L] \;\big|\; |\ p_0^k + \alpha_2^k - p_0(x_k, a_l)\ | \leq \beta/2\big\}\Big|$ *for every* $k \in [K]$. *All possibilities defined in* (4) *lie in* $B_{TV}(\mathcal{M}_0, \beta)$.

We refer to the models in Equation (4) as *hypotheses* of $\mathcal{M}$. There are in total $1 + \sum_{k\in[K]}(L_k - 1)$ of them. In $\mathcal{M}_1$, for every $x_k \in \mathcal{X}$, a_1 is the optimal action and a_2 to a_{L_k} are the second-best actions with a value only 2ε less than the optimal (Equation (3)). $\{\mathcal{M}_{k,l}\}$ are built on top of $\mathcal{M}_1$ by raising up the value of the action a_l at state x_k by at least 4ε (Equation (3)). Thus, in $\mathcal{M}_{k,l}$, the best action for x_k is a_l and the best action for $x_{k'}$ $(k' \neq k)$ is still a_1. See Figure 2 for illustration. Every hypothesis gives a probability measure over the same sample space. We denote by $\mathbb{E}_1$, $\mathbb{P}_1$ and $\mathbb{E}_{k,l}$,




Figure 2: The optimal Q-values of $\mathcal{M}_0$, $\mathcal{M}_1$, $\mathcal{M}_{k,2}$, and $\mathcal{M}_{k,3}$ at state x_k with 6 actions. The dashed lines indicate the values: $\frac{1}{1-\gamma p_0^k}$, $\frac{1}{1-\gamma(p_0^k+\alpha_1^k)}$, and $\frac{1}{1-\gamma(p_0^k+\alpha_2^k)}$, respectively. Actions above the grey line in $\mathcal{M}_0$ are in the set for the definition of L_k in Lemma 4. Note that for states $x_{k'}$ $(k' \neq k)$, $\mathcal{M}_{k,2}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{k,3}$ have the same shape as $\mathcal{M}_1$.

$\mathbb{P}_{k,l}$ the expectation and probability under hypothesis $\mathcal{M}_1$ and $\mathcal{M}_{k,l}$, respectively. These probability measures capture both randomness in the MDP and the randomization in an RL algorithm like its sampling strategy.

We fix $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ and $\delta \in (0, 1/40)$. Let $\mathscr{A}$ be an $(\mathcal{M}_0, \beta, \varepsilon, \delta)$-correct RL algorithm. We denote by $T_{k,l}$ the number of samples that algorithm $\mathscr{A}$ calls from the generative model with input state $y_1(x_k, a_l)$ till $\mathscr{A}$ stops (these sample calls are not necessarily consecutive). For every $k \in [K], 1 < l \leq L_k$, we define an event $E_{k,l} = \{\mathscr{A}$ outputs a policy π with $\pi(x_k) = a_1\}$. Then we have the following key lemma.

Lemma 5. *For any $k \in [K], 1 < l \leq L_k$, if $\mathbb{E}_1[T_{k,l}] < \frac{c_1}{(1-\gamma)^3\varepsilon^2} \log\left(\frac{1}{4\delta}\right)$, $\mathbb{P}_{k,l}(E_{k,l}) > \delta$, where $c_1 > 0$ is some large constant.*

Based on Lemma 5, we can prove Theorem 2. The main idea is that if $\mathscr{A}$ is $(\mathcal{M}_0, \beta, \varepsilon, \delta)$-correct, it should return a policy π such that $\pi(x_k) = a_l$ with probability $\geq 1 - \delta$ under hypothesis $\mathcal{M}_{k,l}$, i.e., $\mathbb{P}_{k,l}(E_{k,l}) < \delta$. By Lemma 5, this requires $\mathbb{E}_1[T_{k,l}] > t^*$ for all $k \in [K], 1 < l \leq L_k$. Thus, in total we need $\Omega\left(\frac{\sum_{k\in[K]} L_k}{(1-\gamma)^3\varepsilon^2} \log(1/\delta)\right)$ samples. Following the definition of L_k, we can get Theorem 2. More technical details can be found in Appendix A. Note that as any online algorithm can be realized in the generative model setting, the lower bound automatically adapts to the online setting.

5 Further Discussion

In this section, we explain our results in a graphical way. We depict parameter relations in 5.1, compare $\overline{C}$ and $\underline{C}_s$ in 5.2, illustrate when an approximate model does not help in 5.3.

5.1 Parameter Relations

In our hard case in Section 4.2, given $\beta \in (0, 2)$, we restrict $\gamma \in (\max\{0.4, 1 - 10\beta\}, 1)$ and then select p_0^k based on whether $p_0(x_k, a_1) \leq \beta/2 + \frac{4\gamma-1}{3\gamma}$. We depict the relation between these parameters in the left graph in Figure 3. One can see that when $\beta < 1$, with a small γ (below the blue line), we can find a $p_0(x_k, a_1)$ such that $p_0^k = p_0(x_k, a_1) - \beta/2$; otherwise, p_0^k will always be $\frac{4\gamma-1}{3\gamma}$. For the

lower bound, we require $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$. In the right graph of Figure 3, we plot ε_0 in terms of β and γ with $p_0^k = \frac{4\gamma-1}{3\gamma}$. We can see that for a fixed γ, $\varepsilon_0 \approx c\beta$ and the larger γ is, the larger c is.




Figure 3: Relations between parameters. The blue area represents $\gamma \in (\max\{0.4, 1 - 10\beta\}, 1)$.

5.2 $\overline{C}$ and $\underline{C}_s$

We plot the values of $\overline{C}$ and $\underline{C}_s$ in our hard case in Figure 4. We can see that $\underline{C}_s$ matches $\overline{C}$ up to a constant factor when β is away from 0. When β is small, the upper bound provides useful information on how much an approximate model can help. As β increases, the upper bound becomes trivial and the lower bound is informative on the limitation of an approximate model. This change is not surprising: the larger the distance between two models is, the less helpful an approximate model would be. The value of β when the upper bound reduces trivial also depends on γ: the greater γ is, the smaller this value is since the more sensitive the value function becomes in terms of the variation in transition. To have the upper bound meets the lower bound, we need $|\mathcal{A}^s_{\mathcal{M}_0}(\overline{C})| = |\mathcal{A}^s_{\mathcal{M}_0}(\underline{C}_s)|$, which is achievable if the value gap in $\mathcal{M}_0$ is big enough. We illustrate this situation in Figure 5.




Figure 4: $\overline{C}$ (solid lines) and $\underline{C}_s$ (dashed lines) in the hard case with $p_0^k = (4\gamma - 1)/(3\gamma)$.




Figure 5: The left two figures depict two types of $\mathcal{M}_0$. Actions with values above the yellow lines form $\mathcal{A}^s_{\mathcal{M}_0}(\underline{C}_s)$; actions with values above the blue lines form $\mathcal{A}^s_{\mathcal{M}_0}(\overline{C})$. In the left model, $\mathcal{A}^s_{\mathcal{M}_0}(\underline{C}_s) \subset \mathcal{A}^s_{\mathcal{M}_0}(\overline{C})$; In the right model, due to a large value gap, $\mathcal{A}^s_{\mathcal{M}_0}(\underline{C}_s) = \mathcal{A}^s_{\mathcal{M}_0}(\overline{C})$. The right figure is an empirical verification of the worst case.

5.3 Empirical Verification of the Worst Case

We further do a numerical demonstration to show when an approximate model does not help. We test on a sailing problem (Vanderbei, 1996). In Figure 5, we generate two MDPs $\mathcal{M}_0$ and $\mathcal{M}$ with $\mathcal{M} \in B_{\mathrm{TV}}(\mathcal{M}_0, 0.3)$. We compare the performances of two algorithms: 1. direct Q-learning (Watkins and Dayan, 1992) on $\mathcal{M}$ (blue line); 2. use the full knowledge of $\mathcal{M}_0$ to compute $Q^*_{\mathcal{M}_0}$, then use $Q^*_{\mathcal{M}_0}$ as an initialization for Q-learning on $\mathcal{M}$ (red line). One can observe a jump-start improvement. However, to reach higher rewards, it takes the same number of samples with or without the prior knowledge. This verifies our worst case result in Corollary 2: when the accuracy requirement is high, i.e., ε is small, the help of an approximate model can be very limited.

6 Conclusion and Future Work

In this paper, we provide sample complexity results of RL when a prior model that is close under TV-distance is provided. We show that the approximate model can help eliminate sub-optimal actions and reduce the sample complexity of learning a near-optimal policy for the true unknown model. We also show that the help can be rather limited if the value gap in the prior model is small and the precision requirement of the policy is high. For future work, we intend to exploit more structural information in transfer RL and consider other measures of closeness for MDPs.

References

Abel, D., Jinnai, Y., Guo, S. Y., Konidaris, G., and Littman, M. (2018). Policy and value transfer in lifelong reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 20–29.

Al-Shedivat, M., Bansal, T., Burda, Y., Sutskever, I., Mordatch, I., and Abbeel, P. (2018). Continuous adaptation via meta-learning in nonstationary and competitive environments. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Ammar, H. B., Eaton, E., Ruvolo, P., and Taylor, M. (2014). Online multi-task learning for policy gradient methods. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1206–1214.

Andrychowicz, M., Wolski, F., Ray, A., Schneider, J., Fong, R., Welinder, P., McGrew, B., Tobin, J., Pieter Abbeel, O., and Zaremba, W. (2017). Hindsight experience replay. In Guyon, I., Luxburg, U. V., Bengio, S., Wallach, H., Fergus, R., Vishwanathan, S., and Garnett, R., editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30*, pages 5048–5058. Curran Associates, Inc.

Ayoub, A., Jia, Z., Szepesvari, C., Wang, M., and Yang, L. F. (2020). Model-based reinforcement learning with value-targeted regression. In *Machine Learning: Proceedings of the Thirty-seventh International Conference (ICML'2020)*.

Azar, M. G., Munos, R., and Kappen, H. J. (2013). Minimax PAC bounds on the sample complexity of reinforcement learning with a generative model. *Machine learning*, 91(3):325–349.

Brunskill, E. and Li, L. (2013). Sample complexity of multi-task reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 122–131. AUAI Press.

Brunskill, E. and Li, L. (2014). PAC-inspired option discovery in lifelong reinforcement learning. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 316–324.

Calandriello, D., Lazaric, A., and Restelli, M. (2014). Sparse multi-task reinforcement learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 819–827.

Dosovitskiy, A., Ros, G., Codevilla, F., Lopez, A., and Koltun, V. (2017). CARLA: An open urban driving simulator. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pages 1–16.

Durrett, R. (2019). *Probability: Theory and examples*, volume 49. Cambridge university press.

Esteva, A., Robicquet, A., Ramsundar, B., Kuleshov, V., DePristo, M., Chou, K., Cui, C., Corrado, G., Thrun, S., and Dean, J. (2019). A guide to deep learning in healthcare. *Nature medicine*, 25(1):24–29.

Gupta, A., Mendonca, R., Liu, Y., Abbeel, P., and Levine, S. (2018). Meta-reinforcement learning of structured exploration strategies. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 5302–5311.

Itsuki, N. (1995). Soccer server: A simulator for RoboCup. In *JSAI AI-Symposium 95: Special Session on RoboCup*. Citeseer.

Jiang, N. (2018). PAC reinforcement learning with an imperfect model. In *Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.

Lazaric, A. (2012). Transfer in reinforcement learning: A framework and a survey. In *Reinforcement Learning*, pages 143–173. Springer.

Lazaric, A. and Ghavamzadeh, M. (2010). Bayesian Multi-Task Reinforcement Learning. In *ICML - 27th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 599–606, Haifa, Israel. Omnipress.

Mann, T. A. and Choe, Y. (2012). Directed exploration in reinforcement learning with transferred knowledge. In *Ewrl*, pages 59–76.

Mannor, S. and Tsitsiklis, J. N. (2004). The sample complexity of exploration in the multi-armed bandit problem. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 5(Jun):623–648.

Modi, A., Jiang, N., Tewari, A., and Singh, S. (2019). Sample complexity of reinforcement learning using linearly combined model ensembles. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.10597*.

Ng, A. Y., Coates, A., Diel, M., Ganapathi, V., Schulte, J., Tse, B., Berger, E., and Liang, E. (2006). Autonomous inverted helicopter flight via reinforcement learning. In *Experimental robotics IX*, pages 363–372. Springer.

Rakelly, K., Zhou, A., Finn, C., Levine, S., and Quillen, D. (2019). Efficient off-policy meta-reinforcement learning via probabilistic context variables. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5331–5340.

Sæmundsson, S., Hofmann, K., and Deisenroth, M. P. (2018). Meta reinforcement learning with latent variable gaussian processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.07551*.

Schweighofer, N. and Doya, K. (2003). Meta-learning in reinforcement learning. *Neural Networks*, 16(1):5–9.

Si, J. and Wang, Y.-T. (2001). Online learning control by association and reinforcement. *IEEE Transactions on Neural networks*, 12(2):264–276.

Sidford, A., Wang, M., Wu, X., Yang, L., and Ye, Y. (2018). Near-optimal time and sample complexities for solving Markov decision processes with a generative model. In Bengio, S., Wallach, H., Larochelle, H., Grauman, K., Cesa-Bianchi, N., and Garnett, R., editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 31*, pages 5186–5196. Curran Associates, Inc.

Silver, D., Huang, A., Maddison, C. J., Guez, A., Sifre, L., Van Den Driessche, G., Schrittwieser, J., Antonoglou, I., Panneershelvam, V., Lanctot, M., et al. (2016). Mastering the game of go with deep neural networks and tree search. *nature*, 529(7587):484.

Sutton, R. S., Barto, A. G., and Williams, R. J. (1992). Reinforcement learning is direct adaptive optimal control. *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, 12(2):19–22.

Tanaka, F. and Yamamura, M. (1997). An approach to lifelong reinforcement learning through multiple environments. In *6th European Workshop on Learning Robots*, pages 93–99.

Taylor, M. E. and Stone, P. (2009). Transfer learning for reinforcement learning domains: A survey. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 10(Jul):1633–1685.

Vanderbei, R. (1996). Sailing strategies, an application involving stochastics, optimization, and statistics.

Watkins, C. J. and Dayan, P. (1992). Q-learning. *Machine learning*, 8(3-4):279–292.

Wiering, M. (2000). Multi-agent reinforcement learning for traffic light control. In *Machine Learning: Proceedings of the Seventeenth International Conference (ICML'2000)*, pages 1151–1158.

Wilson, A., Fern, A., Ray, S., and Tadepalli, P. (2007). Multi-task reinforcement learning: A hierarchical Bayesian approach. In *Proceedings of the 24th international conference on Machine learning*, pages 1015–1022.

Yang, Q., Zhang, Y., Dai, W., and Pan, S. J. (2020). *Transfer learning*. Cambridge University Press.

Zhan, Y., Ammar, H. B., and Taylor, M. E. (2017). Scalable lifelong reinforcement learning. *Pattern Recognition*, 72:407–418.

A Proofs of the Main Results

A.1 Proofs of the Upper Bound

We first prove the upper bound result in Theorem 1.

Proof of Lemma 1. Since $R(s,a,s') \in [0,1]$, the bound $1/(1-\gamma)$ is a direct result. For any policy π, denote by Q_0^π and Q^π the action-value functions and V_0^π and V^π the state-value functions of running π in $\mathcal{M}_0$ and $\mathcal{M}$, respectively. Then, by definition, for every $(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|Q_0^\pi(s,a) - Q^\pi(s,a)\right| &= \left|r_0(s,a) + \gamma p_0(\cdot|s,a)^\top V_0^\pi - r(s,a) - \gamma p(\cdot|s,a)^\top V^\pi\right| \\
&\le \left|r_0(s,a) - r(s,a)\right| + \gamma\left|p_0(\cdot|s,a)^\top V_0^\pi - p(\cdot|s,a)^\top V_0^\pi\right| \\
&\quad + \gamma \cdot \left|p(\cdot|s,a)^\top V_0^\pi - p(\cdot|s,a)^\top V^\pi\right| \\
&\le \beta + \gamma \cdot \left\|p_0(\cdot|s,a) - p(\cdot|s,a)\right\|_1 \cdot \left\|V_0^\pi\right\|_\infty + \gamma \cdot \left\|V_0^\pi - V^\pi\right\|_\infty \\
&\le \beta + \gamma\beta/(1-\gamma) + \gamma\left\|Q_0^\pi - Q^\pi\right\|_\infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\left\|Q_0^\pi - Q^\pi\right\|_\infty \le \beta/(1-\gamma) + \gamma \cdot \left\|Q_0^\pi - Q^\pi\right\|_\infty$ and $\left\|Q_0^\pi - Q^\pi\right\|_\infty \le \beta/(1-\gamma)^2$. Denote by π_0^* an optimal policy of $\mathcal{M}_0$ and π^* an optimal policy of $\mathcal{M}$. Then

$$Q_0^{\pi^*} - Q^{\pi^*} \le Q_0^* - Q^* \le Q_0^{\pi_0^*} - Q^{\pi_0^*}.$$

Thus, $\left\|Q_0^* - Q^*\right\|_\infty \le \max\left\{\left\|Q_0^{\pi^*} - Q^{\pi^*}\right\|_\infty, \left\|Q_0^{\pi_0^*} - Q^{\pi_0^*}\right\|_\infty\right\} \le \min\left\{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}, \frac{\beta}{(1-\gamma)^2}\right\}$. ■

Proof of Lemma 2. Since $\pi(s) = a^s$ for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
V^*(s) - V^\pi(s) &= \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}^s} Q^*(s,a) - Q^\pi(s,a^s) \\
&= \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}^s} Q^*(s,a) - Q^*(s,a^s) + Q^*(s,a^s) - Q^\pi(s,a^s) \\
&\le \epsilon(1-\gamma) + \gamma \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} p(s'|s,a^s)(V^*(s') - V^\pi(s')) \\
&\le \epsilon(1-\gamma) + \gamma \cdot \epsilon(1-\gamma) + \cdots \le \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \epsilon(1-\gamma)\gamma^n = \epsilon,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last line is an induction step. Note that the above inequality holds for all states. Thus, π is an ϵ-optimal policy for $\mathcal{M}$. ■

Proof of Lemma 3. Following Lemma 2, for every state s we need to find an action $a^s \in \mathcal{A}^s$ such that

$$Q^*(s,a^s) \ge \max_a Q^*(s,a) - \epsilon(1-\gamma). \tag{5}$$

Denote by $c_0 := \min\{1/(1-\gamma), \beta/(1-\gamma)^2\}$. If

$$\max_{a \in \mathcal{A}^s} Q^*(s,a) - \epsilon(1-\gamma) \le \max_{a' \in \mathcal{A}^s} Q_0^*(s,a') - c_0,$$

then by Lemma 1, any optimal action for state s in $\mathcal{M}_0$ satisfies Equation (5). Since $\mathcal{A}^s_{\mathcal{M}_0}(C(\beta,\epsilon))$ contains all these optimal actions, it is a valid searching set. If

$$\max_{a\in\mathcal{A}^s} Q^*(s,a) - \epsilon(1-\gamma) > \max_{a'\in\mathcal{A}^s} Q_0^*(s,a') - c_0,$$

then denoting by a^* an action such that $Q^*(s,a^*) = \max_a Q^*(s,a)$, we have

$$Q_0^*(s,a^*) \geq Q^*(s,a^*) - c_0 > \max_{a'} Q_0^*(s,a') - 2c_0 + \epsilon(1-\gamma),$$

i.e., $a^* \in \mathcal{A}^s_{\mathcal{M}_0}(C(\beta,\epsilon))$. Combining the above results, there exists an $\epsilon(1-\gamma)$-optimal action for state s in $\mathcal{M}$ in the set $\mathcal{A}^s_{\mathcal{M}_0}(C(\beta,\epsilon))$. ■

Combining the above Lemmas, we can easily obtain Theorem 1.

A.2 Proofs of the Lower Bound

Next, we prove the lower bound result. We first introduce the following lemma.

Lemma 6. *Following the notation in Lemma 4, we have*

$$\left\{l \in [L] \;\middle|\; |\, p_0^k + \alpha_2^k - p_0(x_k,a_l)\,| \leq \beta/2\right\} = [L_k],\ \forall k \in [K].$$

Proof of Lemma 6. Since $p_0(x_k,a_1) \geq p_0(x_k,a_2) \geq \cdots \geq p_0(x_k,a_l)$, the set $\left\{l \in [L] \;\middle|\; |\, p_0^k + \alpha_2^k - p_0(x_k,a_l)\,| \leq \beta/2\right\}$ contains consecutive integers. Now we only need to show that $l=1$ is contained in the set. By definition of p_0^k, it holds that $p_0(x_k,a_1) - \beta/2 \leq p_0^k < p_0(x_k,a_1)$. When $\varepsilon \in (0,\varepsilon_0)$, we have $0 < \alpha_2^k < \beta/2$. Thus, $l=1$ is in the set. ■

Based on Lemma 6, we can prove Lemma 4.

Proof of Lemma 4. We first verify $\mathcal{M}_1 \in B_{\mathrm{TV}}(\mathcal{M}_0,\beta)$. When $\varepsilon \in (0,\varepsilon_0)$, by definition, we have $0 < \alpha_1^k < \alpha_2^k < \beta/2$ and $p_0(x_k,a_1) - \beta/2 \leq p_0^k < p_0(x_k,a_1)$. Then it holds that

$$p_0(x_k,a_1) - \beta/2 < p_0^k + \alpha_1^k < p_0(x_k,a_1) + \alpha_1^k < p_0(x_k,a_1) + \beta/2.$$

Thus, $|p_0^k + \alpha_1^k - p_0(x_k,a_1)| \leq \beta/2$. For $2 \leq l \leq L_k$, if $p_0(x_k,a_l) \geq p_0^k$, then $p_0(x_k,a_l) - p_0^k \leq p_0(x_k,a_1) - p_0^k \leq \beta/2$; otherwise, $p_0^k - p_0(x_k,a_l) \leq p_0^k + \alpha_2^k - p_0(x_k,a_l) \leq \beta/2$ (Lemma 6). Hence, $\mathcal{M}_1 \in B_{\mathrm{TV}}(\mathcal{M}_0,\beta)$. For each $\mathcal{M}_{k,l}$, the validity directly follows Lemma 6 and $\mathcal{M}_1 \in B_{\mathrm{TV}}(\mathcal{M}_0,\beta)$. ■

Now we prove Lemma 5. Before that, we need to give some definitions. Let

$$t^* = \frac{c_1}{(1-\gamma)^3\varepsilon^2}\log\left(\frac{1}{4\delta}\right),$$

where $c_1 > 0$ is to be determined later. We denote by $T_{k,l}$ the number of samples that algorithm $\mathscr{A}$ calls from the generative model with input state $y_1(x_k,a_l)$ till $\mathscr{A}$ stops (these sample calls are not necessarily consecutive). For every $k \in [K], 1 < l \leq L_k$, we define the following events:

$$A_{k,l} = \{T_{k,l} \leq 4t^*\}, \quad E_{k,l} = \{\mathscr{A} \text{ outputs a policy } \pi \text{ with } \pi(x_k) = a_1\},$$

$$C_{k,l} = \Big\{ \max_{1 \le T_{k,l} \le 4t^*} \left| p_0^k \cdot T_{k,l} - S_{k,l}(T_{k,l}) \right| \le \sqrt{16t^* \cdot p_0^k \cdot (1-p_0^k) \log(1/4\delta)} \Big\},$$

where $S_{k,l}(T_{k,l})$ is the sum of rewards (non-discounted) by calling the generative model $T_{k,l}$ times with input state $y_1(x_k, a_l)$. For these events, we have the following lemmas.

Lemma 7. *For any $k \in [K], 1 < l \le L_k$, if $\mathbb{E}_1[T_{k,l}] \le t^*$, $\mathbb{P}_1(A_{k,l}) > 3/4$.*

Proof.

$$t^* \ge \mathbb{E}_1[T_{k,l}] > 4t^* \mathbb{P}_1(T_{k,l} > 4t^*) = 4t^*(1 - \mathbb{P}_1(T_{k,l} \le 4t^*)).$$

Thus, $\mathbb{P}_1(A_{k,l}) > 3/4$. ■

Lemma 8. *For any $k \in [K], 1 < l \le L_k$, $\mathbb{P}_1(C_{k,l}) > 3/4$.*

Proof. Let $\epsilon := \sqrt{16t^* \cdot p_0^k \cdot (1-p_0^k) \log(1/4\delta)}$. When $1 < l \le L_k$, under hypothesis $\mathcal{M}_1$, $p_{\mathcal{M}_1}(x_k, a_l) = p_0^k$. By definition, the instant rewards from state $y_1(x_k, a_l)$ are i.i.d. Bernoulli(p_0^k) random variables and $p_0^k \cdot T_{k,l} - S_{k,l}(T_{k,l})$ is a martingale. Using Doob's inequality ((Durrett, 2019, Theorem 4.4.2)), we have the following bound:

$$\mathbb{P}_1\Big(\max_{1 \le T_{k,l} \le 4t^*} \left| p_0^k T_{k,l} - S_{k,l}(T_{k,l}) \right| \ge \sqrt{16t^* p_0^k (1-p_0^k) \log \frac{1}{4\delta}} \Big) \le \frac{\mathbb{E}_1\Big[\big(4t^* \cdot p_0^k - S_{k,l}(4t^*)\big)^2 \Big]}{16t^* \cdot p_0^k (1-p_0^k) \log(1/4\delta)}.$$

Since $\mathbb{E}_1[(4t^* \cdot p_0^k - S_{k,l}(4t^*))^2] = 4t^* p_0^k (1-p_0^k)$ and $\delta < 1/40$, we obtain that

$$\mathbb{P}_1(C_{k,l}) \ge 1 - 1/(4\log(1/4\delta)) > 3/4.$$

■

Since $\mathscr{A}$ is $(\mathcal{M}_0, \beta, \varepsilon, \delta)$-correct, it should return a policy π such that when $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_1$, $\pi(x_k) = a_1$ for every $k \in [K]$ with probability at least $1-\delta$, i.e. $\mathbb{P}_1\big(E_{k,l},\ \text{for all } k \in [K], 1 < l \le L_k \big) \ge 1 - \delta > 3/4$. We define the event $\mathcal{E}_{k,l} := A_{k,l} \cap E_{k,l} \cap C_{k,l}$. Combining the results above, it holds that

$$\mathbb{P}_1(\mathcal{E}_{k,l}) > 1 - 3/4 = 1/4, \quad \forall\ k \in [K],\ 1 < l \le L_k.$$

Based on the above results, we show the correctness of Lemma 5.

Proof of Lemma 5. Given $k \in [K]$ and $1 < l \le L_k$, we denote by W the length-$T_{k,l}$ random sequence of the instant rewards by calling the generative model $T_{k,l}$ times with the input state $y_1(x_k, a_l)$. If $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_1$, this is an i.i.d. Bernoulli(p_0^k) sequence; if $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_{k,l}$, this is an i.i.d Bernoulli($p_0^k + \alpha_2^k$) sequence. We define the likelihood function $L_{k,l}$ as

$$L_{k,l}(w) = \mathbb{P}_{k,l}(W = w)$$

for every possible realization w. We simplify the previous notation $S_{k,l}(T_{k,l})$ as $S_{k,l}$. Then we compute the following likelihood ratio

$$\frac{L_{k,l}(W)}{L_1(W)} = \frac{(p_0^k + \alpha_2^k)^{S_{k,l}} (1 - p_0^k - \alpha_2^k)^{T_{k,l} - S_{k,l}}}{(p_0^k)^{S_{k,l}} (1-p_0^k)^{T_{k,l} - S_{k,l}}} = \left(1 + \frac{\alpha_2^k}{p_0^k}\right)^{S_{k,l}} \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_2^k}{1-p_0^k}\right)^{T_{k,l} - S_{k,l}}$$

$$= \left(1 + \frac{\alpha_2^k}{p_0^k}\right)^{S_{k,l}} \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_2^k}{1-p_0^k}\right)^{S_{k,l}\frac{1-p_0^k}{p_0^k}} \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_2^k}{1-p_0^k}\right)^{T_{k,l}-S_{k,l}/p_0^k}.$$

Since $\gamma > 0.4$ and $p_0^k \geq \frac{4\gamma-1}{3\gamma}$, we have $p_0^k > 1/2$. By our choice of α_2^k and ε, it holds that $\alpha_2^k/(1-p_0^k) \leq \beta/4 \in (0, 1/2]$ and $\alpha_2^k/p_0^k \leq \beta(1-p_0^k)/(4p_0^k) \in (0, 1/2)$. With the fact that $\log(1-u) \geq -u - u^2$ for $u \in [0, 1/2]$ and $\exp(-u) \geq 1-u$ for $u \in [0, 1]$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\left(1 - \frac{\alpha_2^k}{1-p_0^k}\right)^{\frac{1-p_0^k}{p_0^k}} &\geq \exp\left(\frac{1-p_0^k}{p_0^k}\left(-\frac{\alpha_2^k}{1-p_0^k} - \left(\frac{\alpha_2^k}{1-p_0^k}\right)^2\right)\right) \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_2^k}{p_0^k}\right)\left(1 - \frac{(\alpha_2^k)^2}{p_0^k(1-p_0^k)}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{L_{k,l}(W)}{L_1(W)} &\geq \left(1 - \frac{(\alpha_2^k)^2}{(p_0^k)^2}\right)^{S_{k,l}} \left(1 - \frac{(\alpha_2^k)^2}{p_0^k \cdot (1-p_0^k)}\right)^{S_{k,l}} \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_2^k}{1-p_0^k}\right)^{T_{k,l}-S_{k,l}/p_0^k} \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{(\alpha_2^k)^2}{(p_0^k)^2}\right)^{T_{k,l}} \left(1 - \frac{(\alpha_2^k)^2}{p_0^k \cdot (1-p_0^k)}\right)^{T_{k,l}} \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_2^k}{1-p_0^k}\right)^{T_{k,l}-S_{k,l}/p_0^k}\end{aligned}$$

due to $S_{k,l} \leq T_{k,l}$. Next, we proceed on the event $\mathcal{E}_{k,l}$. By definition, if $\mathcal{E}_{k,l}$ occurs, $A_{k,l}$ also occurs. Using $\log(1-u) \geq -2u$ for $u \in [0, 1/2]$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\left(1 - \frac{(\alpha_2^k)^2}{(p_0^k)^2}\right)^{T_{k,l}} &\geq \left(1 - \frac{(\alpha_2^k)^2}{(p_0^k)^2}\right)^{4t^*} \geq \exp\left(-8t^* \frac{(\alpha_2^k)^2}{(p_0^k)^2}\right) \\ &= \exp\left(\frac{-8c_1 \log(1/4\delta)}{(1-\gamma)^3\varepsilon^2} \cdot \frac{16(1-\gamma p_0^k)^4\varepsilon^2}{\gamma^2(p_0^k)^2}\right) \\ &\geq \exp\Big(-128c_1 \log(1/4\delta) \frac{(1-\frac{4\gamma-1}{3})^4}{(1-\gamma)^3\gamma^2(\frac{4\gamma-1}{3\gamma})^2}\Big) \\ &= \exp\Big(-128c_1 \log(1/4\delta) \frac{256(1-\gamma)}{9(4\gamma-1)^2}\Big) \\ &\geq \exp\Big(-128c_1 \log(1/4\delta) \frac{256}{9 * 0.6}\Big) \geq (4\delta)^{6100c_1},\end{aligned}$$

where the second line follows $p_0^k \geq \frac{4\gamma-1}{3\gamma}$. Using $\log(1-u) \geq -2u$ for $u \in [0, 1/2]$, we also obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\left(1 - \frac{(\alpha_2^k)^2}{p_0^k \cdot (1-p_0^k)}\right)^{T_{k,l}} &\geq \left(1 - \frac{(\alpha_2^k)^2}{p_0^k \cdot (1-p_0^k)}\right)^{4t^*} \geq \exp\left(-8t^* \frac{(\alpha_2^k)^2}{p_0^k(1-p_0^k)}\right) \\ &= \exp\left(-8\frac{c_1}{(1-\gamma)^3\varepsilon^2} \log(1/4\delta) \frac{16(1-\gamma p_0^k)^4\varepsilon^2}{\gamma^2 p_0^k(1-p_0^k)}\right) \\ &\geq \exp\Big(-128c_1 \log(1/4\delta) \frac{(1-\frac{4\gamma-1}{3})^4}{(1-\gamma)^3\gamma^2(\frac{4\gamma-1}{3\gamma})\min\{\frac{1-\gamma}{3\gamma}, \beta/2\}}\Big)\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \exp\Big(- 128c_1 \log(1/4\delta) \frac{256}{27\gamma(4\gamma-1)} \cdot \frac{1-\gamma}{\min\{\frac{1-\gamma}{3\gamma}, \beta/2\}} \Big) \\
&\geq \exp\Big(- 128c_1 \log(1/4\delta) \frac{256 \cdot 20}{27\gamma(4\gamma-1)} \Big) \\
&\geq \exp\Big(- 128c_1 \log(1/4\delta) \frac{5120}{27 * 0.4 * 0.6} \Big) \geq (4\delta)^{102000c_1},
\end{aligned}
$$

where the third line follows $1 - p_0^k \geq \min\{1 - \frac{4\gamma-1}{3\gamma}, 1 - p_0(x_k, a_1) + \beta/2\} \geq \min\{\frac{1-\gamma}{3\gamma}, \beta/2\}$ and the fifth line is due to $\frac{1-\gamma}{\min\{\frac{1-\gamma}{3\gamma}, \beta/2\}} \leq \max\{3\gamma, 20\} = 20$ (since $\gamma > 1 - 2\beta$). Further, when $\mathcal{E}_{k,l}$ occurs, $A_{k,l}$ and $C_{k,l}$ both occur. Therefore, following similar steps, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(1 - \frac{\alpha_2^k}{1-p_0^k}\right)^{T_{k,l} - S_{k,l}/p_0^k} &\geq \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_2^k}{1-p_0^k}\right)^{\max_{1 \leq T_{k,l} \leq 4t^*} |T_{k,l} - S_{k,l}/p_0^k|} \\
&\geq \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_2^k}{1-p_0^k}\right)^{\sqrt{16t^* \frac{1-p_0^k}{p_0^k} \log(1/4\delta)}} \\
&\geq \exp\left(- \sqrt{64 \frac{(\alpha_2^k)^2}{p_0^k(1-p_0^k)} t^* \log(1/4\delta)} \right) \geq (4\delta)^{\sqrt{810000c_1}}.
\end{aligned}
$$

In total, we have $L_{k,l}(W)/L_1(W) \geq (4\delta)^{108100c_1 + \sqrt{810000c_1}}$. By taking c_1 small enough, e.g. $c_1 = 5e^{-7}$, we have $L_{k,l}(W)/L_1(W) > 4\delta$. By a change of measure,

$$
\mathbb{P}_{k,l}(E_{k,l}) \geq \mathbb{P}_{k,l}(\mathcal{E}_{k,l}) = \mathbb{E}_{k,l}[\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{k,l}}] = \mathbb{E}_1\left[\frac{L_{k,l}(W)}{L_1(W)} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{k,l}}\right] > 4\delta * 1/4 = \delta.
$$

■

Finally, we can show Theorem 2.

Proof of the Lower Bound in Theorem 2. Since $\mathscr{A}$ is $(\mathcal{M}^0, \beta, \varepsilon, \delta)$-correct, under hypothesis $\mathcal{M}_{k,l}$, $\mathscr{A}$ should produce a policy π such that $\pi(x_k) = a_l$ with probability $\geq 1 - \delta$. Thus, we should have $\mathbb{P}_{k,l}(E_{k,l}) < \delta$ for all $k \in [K], 1 < l \leq L_k$. From Lemma 5, it requires $\mathbb{E}_1[T_{k,l}] > t^*$ for all $k \in [K], 1 < l \leq L_k$. In total, we need $\Omega\left(\frac{\sum_{k \in [K]} L_k}{(1-\gamma)^3 \varepsilon^2} \log(1/\delta)\right)$ samples. By definition of L_k, for every $k \in [K]$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\{a_l, l \leq L_k\} &= \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}_0}^{x_k}\Big(\frac{1}{1 - \gamma p_0(x_k, a_1)} - \frac{1}{1 - \gamma(p_0^k + \alpha_2^k - \beta/2)}\Big) \\
&= \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}_0}^{x_k}\Big(V^*(x_k) - \frac{1}{1 - \gamma p_0^k - 4(1-\gamma p_0^k)^2 \varepsilon + \beta\gamma/2}\Big).
\end{aligned}
$$

If $p_0^k = \frac{4\gamma-1}{3\gamma}$, i.e. $p_0(x_k, a_1) - \beta/2 \leq \frac{4\gamma-1}{3\gamma}$, then

$$
L_k = \Big|\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}_0}^{x_k}\Big(V^*(x_k) - \frac{9}{12(1-\gamma) - 64(1-\gamma)^2\varepsilon + 4.5\beta\gamma}\Big)\Big|. \tag{6}
$$

If $p_0^k = p_0(x_k, a_1) - \beta/2$, i.e. $p_0(x_k, a_1) - \beta/2 > \frac{4\gamma-1}{3\gamma}$, then

$$L_k = \left|\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}_0}^{x_k}\left(V^*(x_k) - \frac{1}{1-\gamma p_0(x_k,a_1)+\gamma\beta-4\varepsilon(1-\gamma p_0(x_k,a_1)+\gamma\beta/2)^2}\right)\right| \tag{7}$$
$$= \left|\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}_0}^{x_k}\left(V^*(x_k) - \frac{V^*(x_k)^2}{V^*(x_k)+\gamma\beta(V^*(x_k))^2-4\varepsilon(1+\gamma\beta V^*(x_k)/2)^2}\right)\right|$$

Combining Equation (6) and (7), we have

$$\Omega\left(\frac{\sum_{k\in[K]} L_k}{(1-\gamma)^3\varepsilon^2}\log(1/\delta)\right) = \Omega\left(\frac{\sum_{s\in\mathcal{S}'}|\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}_0}^s(\underline{C}_s)|}{(1-\gamma)^3\varepsilon^2}\log(1/\delta)\right),$$

which concludes our proof of the lower bound result in Theorem 2. ■

In Corollary 2, we have the worst scenario, where $L_k = |\mathcal{A}|$. This is possible if there is no gap between the values in $\mathcal{M}_0$. Then, for any $c > 0$, $|\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}_0}^{x_k}(c)| = |\mathcal{A}|$.