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#### Abstract

We study risk-sensitive multi-agent reinforcement learning under general-sum Markov games, where agents optimize the entropic risk measure of rewards with possibly diverse risk preferences. We show that using the regret naively adapted from existing literature as a performance metric could induce policies with equilibrium bias that favor the most risk-sensitive agents and overlook the other agents. To address such deficiency of the naive regret, we propose a novel notion of regret, which we call risk-balanced regret, and show through a lower bound that it overcomes the issue of equilibrium bias. Furthermore, we develop a self-play algorithm for learning Nash, correlated, and coarse correlated equilibria in risk-sensitive Markov games. We prove that the proposed algorithm attains near-optimal regret guarantees with respect to the risk-balanced regret.


## 1 Introduction

Recent advancement in reinforcement learning research has witnessed much development on multiagent reinforcement learning (MARL). However, most of the works focus on risk-neutral agents, which may not be suitable for modeling the real world. For example, in investment activities, different investors have different risk preferences depending on their roles in the market. Some act as speculators and are risk-seeking, while others are bound by regulatory constraints and are thus risk-averse. Another example is multi-player online role-playing games, where each of the players can be considered an agent. Whereas some (risk-seeking) players enjoy exploring uncharted regions in the game, others (risk-averse players) prefer to playing in areas that are well explored and come with less uncertainty. It is not hard to see that in the above examples, modeling each agent as uniformly risk-neutral is inappropriate. This naturally calls for a more sophisticated modeling framework that takes into account of heterogeneous risk preferences of agents.

In this paper, we study the problem of risk-sensitive MARL under the setting of general-sum Markov games (MGs), a more realistic multi-agent model in which the agents may take different risk preferences. To that end, we consider $M \geq 1$ agents who maximize the entropic risk measure of rewards, informally defined as

$$
V_{m}:=\frac{1}{\beta_{m}} \log \mathbb{E}\left[e^{\beta_{m} R_{m}}\right], \quad \forall m \in[M],
$$

where $\beta_{m}$ represents the risk parameter of agent $m$ and $R_{m}$ is the corresponding reward. For each agent $m, \beta_{m}>0$ means that the agent prefers more risk (or risk seeking) and $\beta_{m}<0$ indicates that the agent favors less risk (or risk averse); when $\beta_{m} \rightarrow 0$, the agent tends to be risk-neutral

[^0]and maximizes the expected reward $\mathbb{E}\left[R_{m}\right]$. We aim to learn equilibria of the underlying MG in an online fashion, without access to knowledge or simulator of the unknown transition kernels.

In the online setting, a standard metric for quantifying the performance of an algorithm is regret, which computes the cumulative difference between the best possible utility and the utility attained by the algorithm. Unfortunately, the formulation of regret naively adapted from the risk-neutral setting fails to represent a suitable performance metric under the risk-sensitive setting: we show that the naive regret is dominated by the sub-optimality of the most risk-sensitive agents, demonstrated through a lower bound. Such deficiency may lead to algorithms that appear nearly optimal but generate policies that suffer equilibrium bias, by which the most risk-sensitive agents are falsely favored against the remaining agents, and exponential sub-optimality is incurred for all agents except for the most risk-sensitive ones.

To address the issue of equilibrium bias, we propose a novel definition of regret tailored to the risk-sensitive setting, which we name as risk-balanced regret. The risk-balanced regret takes into account of possibly diverse risk sensitivity of all agents and treats all agent in a symmetric way despite their different risk preferences. We prove a lower bound based on this new notion of regret, which suggests that it addresses the problem of equilibrium bias suffered by the naive regret. In addition, we propose a novel self-play algorithm that learns Nash, correlated, and coarse correlated equilibria of the general-sum MG involving multiple risk-sensitive agents, based on value iteration and optimistic exploration. We prove that the proposed algorithm achieves a nearly optimal upper bound for the risk-balanced regret. To the best of our knowledge, this work provides the first finite-sample guarantees in risk-sensitive MARL based on the entropic risk measure.

In summary, our work presents the following theoretical contributions.

- We consider risk-sensitive MARL under general-sum MGs where each agent may have heterogeneous risk preferences. We identify the pitfall of a regret metric naively adapted from the risk-neutral setting: it induces policies that incur equilibrium bias by improperly biasing towards agents with the largest risk sensitivity among the agent population.
- We propose a novel notion of regret (risk-balanced regret) for quantifying the performance of online learning algorithms for risk-sensitive agents, which accounts for the risk sensitivity of each agent and overcomes the issue of equilibrium bias.
- We develop a novel self-play algorithm for learning Nash, correlated, and coarse correlated equilibria, and we prove that the proposed algorithm achieves a nearly optimal rate w.r.t. the risk-balanced regret compared to the lower bound.


## 2 Related Work

MARL (Littman, 1994) has been a central topic in the literature of reinforcement learning, with an extensive line of work devoted to studying risk-neutral settings and finite-sample guarantees. For example, theoretical studies have investigated two-player zero-sum MGs and a number of nearoptimal self-play algorithms (Bai and Jin, 2020; Bai et al., 2020; Xie et al., 2020); a nearly minimax optimal regret has also become available for two-player zero-sum MGs under a linear kernel setup (Chen et al., 2021). Further, zero- and general-sum MGs are studied by Liu et al. (2020) and Zhang et al. (2020) with nearly optimal sample complexity bounds, while Dubey and Pentland (2021) considers multi-agent cooperative games with communication budget. The work of Tian et al. (2020) develops an algorithm for multi-player general-sum MGs that is agnostic of other agents'
actions.
Risk-sensitive MARL (especially based on the entropic risk measure) has also been investigated in a thread of literature. The paper Klompstra (2000) characterizes Nash equilibria of risksensitive two-player general-sum control games, a special case of general-sum MGs. The works of Basu and Ghosh (2012, 2014); Bäuerle and Rieder (2017) prove the existence of equilibria for discounted risk-sensitive two-player zero-sum games, and Cavazos-Cadena and Hernández-Hernández (2019) establishes the convergence of risk-sensitive value functions for zero-sum finite games. Moreover, the work Huang et al. (2019) considers non-cooperative muti-agent games with risk-averse agents and proposes an algorithm with almost-sure convergence results. The author of Wei (2019) proves the existence of Nash equilibria for risk-sensitive multi-agent general-sum games. Our work differs from these works, which mostly focus on asymptotic results, as we provide finite-sample guarantees for risk-sensitive MARL.

## 3 Preliminaries

In this section, we introduce the setup of general-sum MG with multiple agents under entropic risk measure, starting with notations.

### 3.1 Notation

We denote $[n]:=1,2, \ldots, n$ for any positive integer $n$. For any functions $f$ and $g$ defined on $\mathbb{X}$, we let $f \leq g$ denote $f(x) \leq g(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{X}$ and $f \geq g$ to be defined similarly. For any functions $f$ and $g$ defined on $\mathbb{X} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_{+}, f(n) \lesssim g(n)$ denotes $f(n) \leq C \cdot g(n)$ for every $n \in \mathbb{X}$ with some universal constant $C>0$ and $f(n) \gtrsim g(n)$ is defined similarly. The notation $f(n) \asymp g(n)$ means that we have $f(n) \lesssim g(n)$ as well as $f(n) \gtrsim g(n)$. We let $\log (\cdot)$ denote natural logarithm with base $e$ unless specified otherwise. The expression polylog $\left(v_{1}, \ldots, v_{n}\right)$ is defined as $c_{0} \prod_{i \in[n]} \log \left(v_{i}\right)^{c_{i}}$ for some universal constants $\left\{c_{i}\right\}_{i \geq 0}$ and variables $\left\{v_{i}\right\}_{i \in[n]}$. We also define poly $\left(v_{1}, \ldots, v_{n}\right):=c_{0} \prod_{i \in[n]} v_{i}^{c_{i}}$. Furthermore, we use $\widetilde{O}(\cdot)$ to denote $O(\cdot \operatorname{polylog}(\cdot))$; we define $\widetilde{\Omega}(\cdot)$ and $\widetilde{\omega}(\cdot)$ similarly.

### 3.2 Problem Setup

We consider a risk-sensitive general-sum MG with $M$ agents in the tabular setting, which can be represented as $\operatorname{MG}\left(H, K, \mathcal{S},\left\{\mathcal{A}_{m}\right\}_{m=1}^{M}, \mathcal{P},\left\{r_{m}\right\}_{m=1}^{M},\left\{\beta_{m}\right\}_{m=1}^{M}\right)$. Here, $H$ denotes the horizon (or the number of steps in each episode), $\mathcal{S}$ denotes the state space of size $S:=|\mathcal{S}|$. For each agent $m \in[M], \mathcal{A}_{m}$ denotes the action space available to the agent with size $A_{m}:=\left|\mathcal{A}_{m}\right|$, and for the convenience of notation, we further define $\mathcal{A}:=\prod_{m \in[M]} \mathcal{A}_{m}$ to be the action space of all $M$ agents, with cardinality $A:=\prod_{m \in[M]} A_{m}$. In particluar, we use $a_{h, m}$ to denote the action that agent $m$ takes at step $h$ and $a_{h}:=\left(a_{h, 1}, \ldots, a_{h, M}\right)$ to denote the actions of all $M$ agents at step $h$. Each agent has reward functions $r_{m}:=\left\{r_{h, m}\right\}_{h=1}^{H}$, where $r_{h, m}: \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}_{m} \rightarrow[0,1]$ is the reward function at each step $h$. In the risk-sensitive setting, each agent $m$ takes a risk parameter $\beta_{m} \neq 0$ representing its risk preference; the agent is risk-seeking if $\beta_{m}>0$ and risk-averse if $\beta_{m}<0$. We specify the way $\left\{\beta_{m}\right\}$ are involved in the agents' objectives in the next section. The transition kernels $\mathcal{P}=\left\{\mathcal{P}_{h}\right\}_{h=1}^{H}$ provide the transition probability of the underlying MG, i.e., the game transitions to $s^{\prime} \in \mathcal{S}$ with probability $\mathcal{P}_{h}\left(s^{\prime} \mid s, a\right)$ at step $h$ given the current state-action pair $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$. The total number of episodes is represented by $K$. In each episode $k$, we assume that the game begins at a fixed initial state $s_{1}^{k}=s_{1}$.
In this paper, we study the self-play setting, and we outline the interaction protocol between the
learning algorithm and agents in Algorithm 1. On the agent side, at each step $h \in[H]$ of an episode $k \in[K]$, each agent $m$ observes the current state $s_{h}$ and chooses an action $a_{h, m}$ simultaneously with other agents. Then it receives its reward $r_{h, m}\left(s_{h}, a_{h}\right)$ and the game state transitions to the next state $s_{h+1} \sim \mathcal{P}_{h}\left(\cdot \mid s_{h}, a_{h}\right)$. An episode ends after the game reaches step $H+1$. We remark that the learning algorithm does not have access to either the transition kernel or reward functions.

```
Algorithm 1 Interaction protocol of self-play
    for each episode \(k\) do
        for each step \(h\) do
            The learning algorithm computes policies for each agent
            Each agent plays action from the policies prescribed by the learning algorithm
            Each agent receives the next state and its reward (but not reward function)
            Information obtained by each agent is sent to the learning algorithm
        end for
    end for
```


### 3.3 Policy and Value Functions

For each agent $m \in[M]$, we define $\pi_{h, m}: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \Delta_{\mathcal{A}_{m}}$ as its policy at step $h$ that maps from each state to a distribution on the action space $\mathcal{A}_{m}$. We denote $\pi_{h}$ as the joint policy for all $M$ agents, where $\pi_{h}: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \Delta_{\mathcal{A}}$ maps from each state to a distribution on the joint action space $\mathcal{A}$ at each step $h$. When the decomposition $\pi_{h}:=\prod_{m=1}^{M} \pi_{h, m}$ exists, we say that $\pi_{h}$ is a product policy.
Given any policy $\pi=\left\{\pi_{h}\right\}$ and risk parameters $\left\{\beta_{m}\right\}$ of the $M$ agents, we define the value function $V_{h, m}^{\pi}$ for agent $m$ at step $h$ as the expected cumulative reward under the entropic risk measure for each state $s \in \mathcal{S}$, i.e.,

$$
V_{h, m}^{\pi}(s):=\frac{1}{\beta_{m}} \log \left\{\mathbb{E}_{\pi}\left[e^{\beta_{m} \sum_{i=h}^{H} r_{i, m}\left(s_{i}, a_{i}\right)} \mid s_{h}=s\right]\right\},
$$

and the corresponding action-value function can be similarly defined for all state-action pairs $(s, a) \in$ $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$, i.e.,

$$
Q_{h, m}^{\pi}(s, a):=\frac{1}{\beta_{m}} \log \left\{\mathbb{E}_{\pi}\left[e^{\beta_{m} \sum_{i=h}^{H} r_{i, m}\left(s_{i}, \pi_{i}\left(s_{i}\right)\right)} \mid s_{h}=s, a_{h}=a\right]\right\} .
$$

We remark that $\beta_{m}>0$ represents a risk-seeking agent and $\beta_{m}<0$ represents a risk-averse agent; the agent tends to be risk-neutral as $\beta_{m} \rightarrow 0$.

### 3.4 Equilibrium

We aim to learn a policy for all agents through $K$ episodes of interactions with the environment, so as to reach certain equilibria for the given general-sum MGs. In this paper, we consider three types of equilibria: Nash equilibrium (NE), correlated equilibrium (CE), and coarse correlated equilibrium (CCE). Before we provide their definitions, we first set some additional notations. For any policy $\pi$, we denote $\pi_{-m}$ to be the joint policy of all agents except agent $m$. We say that $\pi_{m}^{*}\left(\pi_{-m}\right)$ is a best response policy for agent $m$ given $\pi_{-m}$, if it holds that $V_{h, m}^{\pi_{m}^{*}\left(\pi_{-m}\right), \pi_{-m}}(s)=\sup _{\nu} V_{h, m}^{\nu, \pi_{-m}}(s)$ for all $(h, s) \in[H] \times \mathcal{S}$. We denote the value function under the best response of agent $m$ as $V_{h, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}}:=V_{h, m}^{\pi_{m}^{*}\left(\pi_{-m}\right), \pi_{-m}}$ for short. The action-value function for the best response $Q_{h, m}^{\pi_{m}^{*}\left(\pi_{-m}\right), \pi_{-m}}$ as well as its shorthand $Q_{h, m}^{*, \pi-m}$ is similarly defined for all agents $m \in[M]$.

An equilibrium implies that altering the policy of any single agent alone cannot improve its utility. We say that a product policy $\pi$ is a NE if the maximum payoff difference over all agents is zero, i.e., $\max _{m \in[M]}\left(V_{1, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}}-V_{1, m}^{\pi}\right)\left(s_{1}\right)=0$. Moreover, we say that a joint policy $\pi$ (not necessarily a product policy) is a CCE if $\max _{m \in[M]}\left(V_{1, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}}-V_{1, m}^{\pi}\right)\left(s_{1}\right)=0$. With regard to CE, we define strategy modification $\psi_{m}:=\left\{\psi_{h, s, m}\right\}_{(h, s) \in[H] \times s}$, where $\psi_{h, s, m}$ maps from $\mathcal{A}_{m}$ to itself for each agent $m \in[M]$, state $s \in \mathcal{S}$, and step $h \in[H]$. Let $\Psi_{m}$ denote the set of all possible strategy modifications $\psi_{m}$ available to agent $m$. When we apply a strategy modification $\psi_{m} \in \Psi_{m}$ to a policy $\pi$, if $\left(a_{h, 1}, \ldots, a_{h, M}\right)$ is the $\pi$-induced actions for all agents $m \in[M]$ given state $s$ and step $h$, then the modified policy $\psi_{m} \diamond \pi$ plays the modified joint action $\left(a_{h, 1}, \ldots, a_{h, m-1}, \psi_{h, s, m}\left(a_{h, m}\right), a_{h, m+1}, \ldots, a_{h, M}\right)$. Given the definition of strategy modification, we say that a joint policy $\pi$ is a CE if it satisfies that $\max _{m \in[M]} \max _{\psi \in \Psi_{m}}\left(V_{1, m}^{\psi \diamond \pi}-V_{1, m}^{\pi}\right)\left(s_{1}\right)=0$, which means that the best strategy modification for any single agent cannot improve its utility. We remark that the concepts of NE, CE and CCE are closely related. Indeed, it can be shown that CCE is a sub-class of CE, which is in turn a sub-class of NE (Nisan et al., 2007). Since NE always exists, CE and CCE always exist as well.

## 4 Regret and Equilibrium Bias

Before diving into our algorithm and regret analysis, we first discuss some of the pitfalls of standard regrets as a natural generalization of their risk-neutral counterparts, i.e., $\overline{\operatorname{Regret}}_{\mathrm{NE}}(K)$, $\overline{\text { Regret }}_{\mathrm{CCE}}(K)$, and $\overline{\text { Regret }}_{\mathrm{CE}}(K)$.

### 4.1 A Naive Definition of Regret and Its Pitfalls

In existing literature, most research has focused on risk-neutral MARL, where algorithm performance is measured by regret:

$$
\operatorname{RN-Regret}_{\mathrm{NE}}(K):=\sum_{k \in[K]} \max _{m \in[M]}\left(\widetilde{V}_{1, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}}-\tilde{V}_{1, m}^{\pi^{k}}\right)\left(s_{1}\right),
$$

In the above, $\tilde{V}_{h, m}^{\pi}(s):=\mathbb{E}_{\pi}\left[\sum_{i=h}^{H} r_{i, m}\left(s_{i}, \pi_{i}\left(s_{i}\right)\right) \mid s_{h}=s\right]$ is the risk-neutral value function. A natural extension of this regret to the risk-sensitive setting would be to replace the risk-neutral value functions by their risk-sensitive counterparts, as in

$$
\begin{equation*}
\overline{\operatorname{Regret}}_{\mathrm{NE}}(K):=\sum_{k \in[K]} \max _{m \in[M]}\left(V_{1, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}}-V_{1, m}^{\pi^{k}}\right)\left(s_{1}\right) . \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Similar definitions can be made for CE and CCE. It can be seen that the definition in (4.1) generalizes the regret for risk-sensitive RL studied in the single-agent setting (Fei and Xu, 2022a; Fei et al., $2021,2020)$ to the multi-agent setting.

Unfortunately, the naive regret definition in (4.1) has its shortcomings. Before we discuss them in details, we introduce some notations. Let $m_{*}:=\arg \max _{m \in[M]}\left|\beta_{m}\right|$ denote the index of the agent that is the most risk-sensitive among all $[M]$ agents, and if necessary, we may break the tie in an arbitrary way. We also set $\beta_{*}:=\beta_{m_{*}}$ to be the risk parameter of agent $m_{*}$. For notational convenience, we define a risk-dependent factor $\Phi_{u}(\beta)$ for any $\beta \neq 0$ and $u>0$ as

$$
\Phi_{u}(\beta):=\frac{1}{|\beta| u}\left(e^{|\beta| u}-1\right)
$$

Note that $\Phi_{u}(\beta)$ is an even function in $\beta$ and increases exponentially in $|\beta|$ and $u$. To showcase the deficiency of the naive definition of regret in (4.1), we start by presenting a lower bound for the regret in the following theorem.

Theorem 4.1. For $H \geq 8, K \geq \max \left\{16 e^{\left|\beta_{*}\right|(H-1)}, 16 H\right\}$, and $\log \log K \gtrsim\left|\beta_{*}\right|(H-1)$, there exists an $M G$ such that any algorithm obeys

$$
\mathbb{E}\left[\overline{\operatorname{Regret}}_{\mathrm{NE}}(K)\right]=\Phi_{H}\left(\beta_{*}\right) \cdot \widetilde{\Omega}\left(\sqrt{K H^{2}}\right) .
$$

The same bound holds for $\mathbb{E}\left[\overline{\operatorname{Regret}}_{\mathrm{CE}}(K)\right]$ and $\mathbb{E}\left[\overline{\operatorname{Regret}}_{\mathrm{CCE}}(K)\right]$.
The proof is provided in Appendix A. Theorem 4.1 generalizes the lower bound of the single-agent setting (Fei et al., 2020, Theorem 3) to the multi-agent setting . We note that the lower bound in Theorem 4.1 depends on the largest risk parameter $\beta_{*}$ (in absolute value) among all agents through the exponential factor $\Phi_{H}\left(\beta_{*}\right)$. This yields undesirable implications both in theory and practice.

Theoretical pitfalls. The naive regret defined in (4.1) may induce equilibrium bias, by which some learned policies only account for the most risk-sensitive agents while overlooking the remaining agents. To see this, let us consider the following instance of MG. Assume $\mathcal{S}=\{s\}, \mathcal{A}_{m}=\{g, b\}$ for each $m \in[M]$ and $\left\{\beta_{m}\right\}$ are such that their absolute values are increasing in $m$ (so that $\left.\beta_{*}=\beta_{M}\right)$. We denote by $a_{-m}$ a joint action of all agents except agent $m$. For each $m$, we assume $r_{h, m}\left(s,\left(g, a_{-m}\right)\right)=\Phi_{H}\left(\beta_{*}\right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}}$ and $r_{h, m}\left(s,\left(b, a_{-m}\right)\right)=0$ for all possible $a_{-m}$, and we consider $K \geq \Phi_{H}^{2}\left(\beta_{*}\right)$. In particular, for each agent, its reward functions only depend on its own action (and independent of actions of all the other agents). Under this setting, the MARL problem can be decomposed into $M$ single-agent ones, and an NE corresponds to each agent executing its own optimal policy in the respective single-agent problem. Now suppose an algorithm generates $\left\{\bar{\pi}^{k}\right\}$ that incurs $\overline{\operatorname{Regret}}_{\mathrm{NE}}(K)=\Phi_{H}\left(\beta_{*}\right) \sqrt{K H^{2}}$ (e.g. by taking $\bar{\pi}_{h, m}^{k}(s)=b$ for $m \in[M-1]$ and $\left.\bar{\pi}_{h, M}^{k}(s)=g\right)$. It can be seen that the attained naive regret matches the lower bound in Theorem 4.1 and the algorithm appears nearly optimal. However, existing results in Fei et al. (2021) show that an exponentially smaller regret, i.e. on the order of or smaller than $\Phi_{H}\left(\beta_{m}\right) \sqrt{K H^{2}}$ (since $\Phi_{H}(\beta)$ increases exponentially in $|\beta|$ ), can be achieved by applying a single-agent algorithm to each agent individually. Therefore, under the naive regret, the policies $\left\{\bar{\pi}^{k}\right\}$ only perform nearly optimally for the agent with the largest risk sensitivity while being exponentially sub-optimal for all the other agents.

Practical pitfalls. While the concept of equilibrium bias has been primarily explored in theoretical contexts, its real-world implications are far-reaching and often detrimental. In the realm of investment, this bias could disproportionately favor the most risk-seeking or risk-averse investors, potentially leading to adverse impacts and instability in economic activities. Similarly, in the world of multiplayer online games, such a bias tends to favor a select few of the most aggressive or passive players, thereby creating an imbalanced gaming environment and diminishing the experience for other participants.

Given the significant shortcomings of equilibrium bias, as highlighted by the naive regret formulation (4.1), there emerges a compelling need for an alternative performance metric in risk-sensitive MARL that can more effectively address these issues.

### 4.2 Risk-Balanced Regret

The above discussion motivates us to propose a new notion of regret, which we call risk-balanced regret. We provide its definition below.
Definition 4.2. For product policies $\left\{\pi^{k}\right\}_{k=1}^{K}$, we define the risk-balanced regret with respect to NE as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Regret}_{\mathrm{NE}}(K)=\sum_{k \in[K]} \max _{m \in[M]} \frac{\left(V_{1, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}}-V_{1, m}^{\pi^{k}}\right)\left(s_{1}\right)}{\Phi_{H}\left(\beta_{m}\right)} \tag{4.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Moreover, for joint policies $\left\{\pi^{k}\right\}_{k=1}^{K}$, we define the risk-balanced regret with respect to CE as

$$
\operatorname{Regret}_{\mathrm{CE}}(K):=\sum_{k \in[K]} \max _{m \in[M]} \max _{\psi \in \Psi m} \frac{\left(V_{1, m}^{\psi \diamond \pi^{k}}-V_{1, m}^{\pi^{k}}\right)\left(s_{1}\right)}{\Phi_{H}\left(\beta_{m}\right)},
$$

and with respect to CCE as

$$
\operatorname{Regret}_{\mathrm{CCE}}(K):=\sum_{k \in[K]} \max _{m \in[M]} \frac{\left(V_{1, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}}-V_{1, m}^{\pi^{k}}\right)\left(s_{1}\right)}{\Phi_{H}\left(\beta_{m}\right)} .
$$

It is important to note that while the regret definitions for NE and CCE bear similarities, the definition for CCE is more inclusive, applying to all joint policies without the necessity of them being product policies, as is mandated in the NE definition. The term $\operatorname{Regret}_{\mathrm{NE}}(K)$ can be interpreted as a normalization of the regret concept within the single-agent learning paradigm. Here, the risk-balanced factors $\Phi_{H}\left(\beta_{m}\right)$ play a pivotal role, symmetrically moderating the sub-optimality experienced by each agent in a dynamic manner, reflective of their respective risk sensitivities. In conjunction with these concepts, we also introduce a spectrum of notions pertaining to approximate equilibria, each intricately connected to the framework of risk-balanced regret.

Definition 4.3. We say a product policy $\pi$ is $(\beta, \varepsilon)$-approximate NE if

$$
\max _{m \in[M]} \frac{\left(V_{1, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}}-V_{1, m}^{\pi}\right)\left(s_{1}\right)}{\Phi_{H}\left(\beta_{m}\right)} \leq \varepsilon
$$

In addition, we say a joint policy $\pi$ is $(\beta, \varepsilon)$-approximate CE if

$$
\max _{m \in[M]} \max _{\psi \in \Psi_{m}} \frac{\left(V_{1, m}^{\psi \diamond \pi}-V_{1, m}^{\pi}\right)\left(s_{1}\right)}{\Phi_{H}\left(\beta_{m}\right)} \leq \varepsilon
$$

and $(\beta, \varepsilon)$-approximate CCE if

$$
\max _{m \in[M]} \frac{\left(V_{1, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}}-V_{1, m}^{\pi}\right)\left(s_{1}\right)}{\Phi_{H}\left(\beta_{m}\right)} \leq \varepsilon .
$$

Furthermore, a simple relationship between $\operatorname{Regret}_{\mathrm{NE}}(K)$ and $\overline{\operatorname{Regret}}_{\mathrm{NE}}(K)$ may be observed, as in

$$
\operatorname{Regret}_{\mathrm{NE}}(K)=\sum_{k \in[K]} \max _{m \in[M]} \frac{\left(V_{1, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}}-V_{1, m}^{\pi^{k}}\right)\left(s_{1}\right)}{\Phi_{H}\left(\beta_{m}\right)}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \geq \sum_{k \in[K]} \max _{m \in[M]} \frac{\left(V_{1, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}}-V_{1, m}^{\pi^{k}}\right)\left(s_{1}\right)}{\max _{\ell \in[M]} \Phi_{H}\left(\beta_{\ell}\right)} \\
& =\frac{1}{\Phi_{H}\left(\beta_{*}\right)} \sum_{k \in[K]} \max _{m \in[M]}\left(V_{1, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}}-V_{1, m}^{\pi^{k}}\right)\left(s_{1}\right) \\
& =\frac{1}{\Phi_{H}\left(\beta_{*}\right)} \overline{\operatorname{Regret}}_{\mathrm{NE}}(K), \tag{4.3}
\end{align*}
$$

where the inequality holds since $\Phi_{H}(\beta)$ is increasing in $|\beta|$. It is not hard to see that similar equations to (4.3) can be derived for $\operatorname{Regret}_{\mathrm{CE}}(K)$ and $\operatorname{Regret}_{\mathrm{CCE}}(K)$. In view of (4.3), we have that the risk-balanced regret (4.2) is more general than the naive regret (4.1) in the sense that, for any algorithm, attaining an upper bound on $\operatorname{Regret}_{\mathrm{NE}}(K)$ implies that it also attains an upper bound on $\overline{\operatorname{Regret}}_{\mathrm{NE}}(K)$. Specifically, if $\operatorname{Regret}_{\mathrm{NE}}(K) \leq U$ for some $U \geq 0$, then we have $\overline{\operatorname{Regret}}_{\mathrm{NE}}(K) \leq$ $\Phi_{H}\left(\beta_{*}\right) \operatorname{Regret}_{\mathrm{NE}}(K) \leq \Phi_{H}\left(\beta_{*}\right) U$, thanks to (4.3).

Combined with Theorem 4.1, the inequality (4.3) directly leads to the following lower bound for risk-balanced regret.

Theorem 4.4. Under the same setting as Theorem 4.1, any algorithm obeys the lower bound

$$
\mathbb{E}\left[\operatorname{Regret}_{\mathrm{NE}}(K)\right]=\widetilde{\Omega}\left(\sqrt{K H^{2}}\right) .
$$

The same result holds for $\mathbb{E}\left[\operatorname{Regret}_{\mathrm{CE}}(K)\right]$ and $\mathbb{E}\left[\operatorname{Regret}_{\mathrm{CCE}}(K)\right]$.
We remark that the results of Theorem 4.4 coincide with those of Theorem 4.1 for $M=1$ or when all agents take the same risk parameter.

Given Theorem 4.4, let us discuss how the risk-balanced regret in Definition 4.2 overcomes the issue of equilibrium bias suffered by the naive regret. We observe that a nearly optimal algorithm under the risk-balanced regret has to learn a policy for each agent such that the (un-normalized) regret of agent $m$ is upper bounded by a quantity proportional to risk-balanced factor $\Phi_{H}\left(\beta_{m}\right)$. To see this, we let $\operatorname{Regret}_{m, \mathrm{NE}}(K):=\sum_{k \in[K]} \frac{\left(V_{1, m}^{*, \pi_{-}^{k}}-V_{\left.\pi_{, m}^{k}\right)\left(s_{1}\right)}\right.}{\Phi_{H}\left(\beta_{m}\right)}$ be the (normalized) regret incurred by agent $m$ alone. In order to match with a lower bound (e.g., the single-agent version of Theorem 4.4), an algorithm must achieve the near-optimal regret bound $\operatorname{Regret}_{m, \mathrm{NE}}(K)=\widetilde{O}(\sqrt{K \cdot \operatorname{poly}(H)})$ for each individual agent $m \in[M]$; otherwise, if for some agent $m^{\prime}$ the algorithm incurs $\operatorname{Regret}_{m^{\prime}, \mathrm{NE}}(K)=$ $\widetilde{\omega}(\sqrt{K \cdot \operatorname{poly}(H)})$, then we would have $\operatorname{Regret}_{\mathrm{NE}}(K) \geq \operatorname{Regret}_{m^{\prime}, \mathrm{NE}}(K)=\widetilde{\omega}(\sqrt{K \cdot \operatorname{poly}(H)})$, which is sub-optimal compared to the lower bound in Theorem 4.4 and results in a contradiction to our assumption that the algorithm is nearly optimal.

In the remaining paper, we present an algorithm and proves that it nearly attains the lower bound of Theorem 4.4.

## 5 Algorithm

In this section, we introduce the Multi-Agent Risk-Sensitive Value Iteration algorithm, abbreviated as MARS-VI, presented in Algorithm 2. This algorithm is designed to estimate NE, CE, and CCE within the context of multi-agent general-sum MGs, specifically tailored to the entropic risk measure.

```
Algorithm 2 Multi-Agent Risk-Sensitive Value Iteration (MARS-VI)
Input: number of episodes \(K\)
Output: \(\widehat{\pi}\)
    Set \(\Delta_{V} \leftarrow H\), and initialize \(\left\{N_{h}(s, a)\right\}_{h \in[H]}\) and \(\left\{N_{h}(s, a, \cdot)\right\}_{h \in[H]}\) as zero functions
    for episode \(k=1,2, \ldots, K\) do
        \(\forall m \in[M]: \quad \bar{V}_{H+1, m}(\cdot) \leftarrow 0, \underline{V}_{H+1, m}(\cdot) \leftarrow 0\)
        for step \(h=H, H-1, \ldots, 1\) do
            \(\forall m \in[M]: \quad \bar{q}_{h, m}(\cdot, \cdot) \leftarrow e^{\beta_{m}(H-h+1)}, \quad \underline{q}_{h, m}(\cdot, \cdot) \leftarrow 1\)
            for \((m, s, a) \in[M] \times \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}\) such that \(N_{h}(s, a) \geq 1\) do
                    \(\bar{Q}_{h, m}(s, a), \underline{Q}_{h, m}(s, a) \leftarrow\) Q-Update ()
                end for
                \(\pi_{h}(\cdot \mid s) \leftarrow\) EquilSolver \(\left(\left\{(-1)^{\mathbb{I}\left(\beta_{m}<0\right)} e^{\beta_{m} \bar{Q}_{h, m}(s, \cdot)}\right\}_{m \in[M]}\right)\)
                for \((m, s) \in[M] \times \mathcal{S}\) do
                    \(\bar{V}_{h, m}(s) \leftarrow \frac{1}{\beta_{m}} \log \left\{\sum_{a} \pi_{h}(a \mid s) e^{\beta_{m} \bar{Q}_{h, m}(s, a)}\right\}\)
                    \(\underline{V}_{h, m}(s) \leftarrow \frac{1}{\beta_{m}} \log \left\{\sum_{a} \pi_{h}(a \mid s) e^{\beta_{m} \underline{Q}_{h, m}(s, a)}\right\}\)
                end for
        end for
        if \(\max _{m \in[M]}\left(\bar{V}_{1, m}-\underline{V}_{1, m}\right)\left(s_{1}\right) \leq \Delta_{V}\) then
            \(\Delta_{V} \leftarrow\left(\bar{V}_{1, m}-\underline{V}_{1, m}\right)\left(s_{1}\right), \quad \hat{\pi} \leftarrow \pi\)
        end if
        Receive \(s_{1}\)
        for step \(h=1,2, \ldots, H\) do
            Take actions \(a_{h} \sim \pi_{h}\left(\cdot \mid s_{h}\right)\) and observe \(r_{h}\left(s_{h}, a_{h}\right)\) and \(s_{h+1}\)
            \(N_{h}\left(s_{h}, a_{h}\right) \leftarrow N_{h}\left(s_{h}, a_{h}\right)+1\)
            \(N_{h}\left(s_{h}, a_{h}, s_{h+1}\right) \leftarrow N_{h}\left(s_{h}, a_{h}, s_{h+1}\right)+1\)
            \(\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{h}\left(\cdot \mid s_{h}, a_{h}\right) \leftarrow \frac{N_{h}\left(s_{h}, a_{h} \cdot\right)}{N_{h}\left(s_{h}, a_{h}\right)}\)
        end for
    end for
```

Within each episode $k$, we update the upper and lower confidence bounds $\bar{Q}_{h, m}$ and $\underline{Q}_{h, m}$ of the action-value function using the estimated transition kernel based on samples collected from the past $k-1$ episodes. We present the detailed updates of the confidence bounds in Algorithm 3. For each agent $m$, step $h$, and state-action pair $(s, a)$, we compute $\bar{q}_{h, m}(s, a)$ and $\underline{q}_{h, m}(s, a)$ as estimates of the exponential action-value functions $\mathbb{E}_{s^{\prime}}\left[e^{\beta_{m}\left[r_{h, m}(s, a)+\bar{V}_{h+1, m}\left(s^{\prime}\right)\right]}\right]$ and $\mathbb{E}_{s^{\prime}}\left[e^{\beta_{m}\left[r_{h, m}(s, a)+\underline{V}_{h+1, m}\left(s^{\prime}\right)\right]}\right]$, respectively. We then transform $\bar{q}_{h, m}$ and $\underline{q}_{h, m}$ in Lines 2 and 3 of Algorithm 3 into estimates $\bar{Q}_{h, m}$ and $\underline{Q}_{h, m}$, respectively, by incorporating a bonus term $\gamma_{h, m}$ and applying proper truncation:

$$
\begin{gather*}
\bar{Q}_{h, m}(s, a) \leftarrow \begin{cases}\frac{1}{\beta_{m}} \log \left\{\min \left\{\bar{q}_{h, m}(s, a)+\gamma_{h, m}(s, a), e^{\beta_{m}(H-h+1)}\right\}\right\} & \text { if } \beta_{m}>0 ; \\
\frac{1}{\beta_{m}} \log \left\{\max \left\{\bar{q}_{h, m}(s, a)-\gamma_{h, m}(s, a), e^{\beta_{m}(H-h+1)}\right\}\right\} & \text { if } \beta_{m}<0,\end{cases}  \tag{5.1}\\
\underline{Q}_{h, m}(s, a) \leftarrow \begin{cases}\frac{1}{\beta_{m}} \log \left\{\max \left\{\underline{q}_{h, m}(s, a)-\gamma_{h, m}(s, a), 1\right\}\right\} & \text { if } \beta_{m}>0 ; \\
\frac{1}{\beta_{m}} \log \left\{\min \left\{\underline{q}_{h, m}(s, a)+\gamma_{h, m}(s, a), 1\right\}\right\} & \text { if } \beta_{m}<0 .\end{cases} \tag{5.2}
\end{gather*}
$$

The bonus term $\gamma_{h, m}$ facilitates Risk-Sensitive Optimism in the Face of Uncertainty (Fei et al., 2020) by augmenting $\bar{q}_{h, m}$ and $\underline{q}_{h, m}$. Notice that the way $\gamma_{h, m}$ joins the formulae depends on the sign of $\beta_{m}$ for each agent $m$. For the upper bound $\bar{Q}_{h, m}$, we add bonus for $\beta_{m}>0$ and subtract

```
Algorithm 3 Q-Update
Input: All necessary variables from Algorithm 2
    1: \(\gamma_{h, m}(s, a) \leftarrow C\left|e^{\beta_{m}(H-h+1)}-1\right| \sqrt{\frac{S \iota}{N_{h}(s, a)}}\) for some universal constant \(C>0\)
    2: \(\bar{q}_{h, m}(s, a) \leftarrow e^{\beta_{m} r_{h, m}(s, a)}\left[\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{h} e^{\left.\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{h+1, m}\right](s, a)}\right.\)
    3: \(\underline{q}_{h, m}(s, a) \leftarrow e^{\beta_{m} r_{h, m}(s, a)}\left[\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{h} e^{\left.\beta_{m} \underline{V}_{h+1, m}\right](s, a)}\right.\)
    4: Update \(\bar{Q}_{h, m}(s, a)\) following (5.1)
    5: Update \(\underline{Q}_{h, m}(s, a)\) following (5.2)
    6: Return \(\bar{Q}_{h, m}(s, a)\) and \(\underline{Q}_{h, m}(s, a)\)
```

it for $\beta_{m}<0$, whereas in the lower bound $\underline{Q}_{h, m}$, we subtract bonus for $\beta_{m}>0$ while adding it for $\beta_{m}<0$. This is because the exponential function $z \mapsto e^{\beta z}$ is an increasing function when $\beta>0$ and decreasing function when $\beta<0$; so are $\bar{q}_{h, m}$ and $\underline{q}_{h, m}$ given their construction. Subtracting bonus, i.e., $\bar{q}_{h, m}(s, a)-\gamma_{h, m}(s, a)$, under $\beta<0$ yields a smaller estimation of the exponential value function, and this implies a larger upper confidence bound $\bar{Q}_{h, m}$ of the action-value function. A similar argument holds for $\underline{Q}_{h, m}$. Another feature of Algorithm 2 is the difference in thresholding applied to $\bar{Q}_{h, m}$ and $\underline{Q}_{h, m}$. This is due to the fact that $\bar{q}_{h, m}$ and $\underline{q}_{h, m}$ are designed to estimate the upper and lower exponential value functions, whose upper and lower bounds are $e^{\beta(H-h+1)}$ and 1 respectively.

In Line 9 of Algorithm 2, we update the policy by solving a one-step multi-agent game via the oracle subroutine EquilSolver, which can be instantiated by existing solvers for NE, CE and CCE, respectively (Berg and Sandholm, 2017). Here, we assume that EquilSolver maximizes the utility of all agents. We therefore use the signed exponential value estimates $\left\{(-1)^{\mathbb{I}\left(\beta_{m}<0\right)} e^{\beta_{m} \bar{Q}_{h, m}(s, \cdot)}\right\}$ as input to the solver; it can be seen that for $\beta_{m}<0$, maximizing with respect to $-e^{\beta_{m} \bar{Q}_{h, m}(s,)}$ amounts to maximizing with respect to $\bar{Q}_{h, m}(s, \cdot)$. We also note that existing solvers for CCE and CE based on linear programming have polynomial time complexity, while those for NE are PPAD-hard (Daskalakis, 2013).

## 6 Main Results

In this section we present our main theoretical results, which comprise of upper bounds on the risk-balanced regret attained by Algorithm 2 and its induced sample complexity.

Theorem 6.1. For any $\delta \in(0,1]$, with probability $1-\delta$, Algorithm 2 attains the following regret upper bound when EquilSolver is instantiated as a NE solver:

$$
\operatorname{Regret}_{\mathrm{NE}}(K)=\widetilde{O}\left(\sqrt{K H^{4} S^{2} A}\right) .
$$

The same result holds for $\operatorname{Regret}_{\mathrm{CE}}(K)$ and $\operatorname{Regret}_{\mathrm{CCE}}(K)$ when EquilSolver is instantiated as a $C E$ and CCE solver, respectively. Moreover, with probability at least $\frac{2}{3}, \widehat{\pi}$ output by Algorithm 2 is a $(\beta, \varepsilon)$-approximate $N E, C E$ or $C C E$ if $K=\widetilde{\Omega}\left(H^{4} S^{2} A / \varepsilon^{2}\right)$.

The proof is provided in Appendix B. We make the following remarks for Theorem 6.1.

Comparison with the lower bound. In view of Theorem 4.4, we see that the above regret upper bound is nearly optimal up to a logarithmic factor in $K$ and polynomial factors of $H, S$
and $A$. Note that although agents may take different risk parameters $\left\{\beta_{m}\right\}$, the upper bound in Theorem 6.1 is not influenced by the difference among $\left\{\beta_{m}\right\}$ as they have been "normalized out" through the risk-balanced factor $\left\{\Phi_{H}\left(\beta_{m}\right)\right\}$ in the definition of regret.

Comparison with existing results. Our results can also be connected back to some of the existing works, showing that our bounds generalize theirs:

- When $\beta_{m} \rightarrow 0$ for all $m \in[M]$, our Theorem 6.1 recovers the upper bound for MGs with risk-neutral agents (Liu et al., 2020, Theorem 16), since $\lim _{b \rightarrow 0} \Phi_{H}(b)=1$ and $\operatorname{Regret}_{\mathrm{NE}}(K)$ tends to RN-Regret ${ }_{\mathrm{NE}}(K)$
- When $M=1$, the multi-agent setting reduces to the single-agent setting, and Theorem 6.1 implies that an agent with risk parameter $\beta$ incurs the normalized regret (by $\Phi_{H}(\beta)$ ) of order $\widetilde{O}\left(\sqrt{K H^{4} S^{2} A}\right)$, recovering the bound presented in Fei et al. (2021, Theorem 1) up to logarithmic factors.

Technical highlights. The proof crucially relies on controlling the differences between upper and lower confidence bounds $\left\{\bar{V}_{h, m}^{k}\right\}$ and $\left\{\underline{V}_{h, m}^{k}\right\}$. In particular, we show that the quantities $\left\{\frac{e^{\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{h, m}^{k}-e^{\beta_{m} 亡_{h, m}^{k}}}}{\rho_{h, m}}\right\}$ (where $\rho_{h, m}$ is a quantity that depends on $h, m$ ) is upper bounded by a carefully constructed sequence $\left\{U_{h}^{k}\right\}$, such that $U_{1}^{k}\left(s_{1}^{k}\right) \geq \frac{\left(V_{1, m}^{\left.*, m_{-m}^{k}-V_{1, m}^{k}\right)\left(s_{1}^{k}\right)}\right.}{\Phi_{H}\left(\beta_{m}\right)}$ for all $m \in[M]$. We then analyze the evolution of the sequence $\left\{U_{h}^{k}\right\}$, which yields the upper bound of regret. Perhaps interestingly, the normalization sequence $\left\{\rho_{h, m}\right\}$ evolves in different ways for risk-seeking and riskaverse agents, thus revealing the inherent asymmetry between the two types of agents. Such finding helps highlight, in a quantitative way, the role of the risk-balanced factors $\left\{\Phi_{H}\left(\beta_{m}\right)\right\}$ in symmetrizing the sub-optimality of each agent in computation of regret. We believe that this finding could be of independent interest for further research in risk-sensitive multi-agent games.

## 7 Conclusion

In this paper, we study the problem of risk-sensitive MARL under the setting of general-sum MG, where agents optimize the entropic risk measure of rewards and possibly take different risk preferences. We demonstrate that a naive definition of regret adapted from risk-neutral MARL suffers equilibrium bias by inducing policies that favor the most risk-sensitive agents without taking into account of the other agents in the same game. Motivated by such deficiency of the naive regret, we propose a novel notion of regret, named as risk-balanced regret. We derive a lower bound w.r.t risk-balanced regret, from which we show that the proposed regret overcomes the issue of equilibrium bias. In addition, we propose a self-play MARL algorithm based on value iteration for learning NE, CE and CCE of the general-sum MG, and we provide a nearly optimal upper bound for the proposed algorithm w.r.t. the risk-balanced regret. The bound is shown to generalize existing results derived under risk-neutral or single-agent settings.
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## A Proof of Theorem 4.1

We provide a regret lower bound that any algorithm has to incur, and this is achieved through considering a hard instance of the $K$-episode and $H$-step MGs. Let $m_{*}$ be the index of the most risk-sensitive agent, i.e., $m_{*}:=\arg \max _{m \in[M]}\left|\beta_{m}\right|$ with ties broken arbitrarily. We assume that the transition kernel of the MG depends only on the action of $m_{*}$, and it then reduces to an Markov decision process (MDP) with respect to $m_{*}$. To further simplify the MG and remove the effect of all agents other than $m_{*}$ on $\overline{\operatorname{Regret}}_{\mathrm{NE}}(K)$, we define reward functions such that all agents except $m_{*}$ receive a constant reward no matter which action they take. More specifically, the MG has three states: an initial state $s_{0}$ that serves as a dummy state, an absorbing state $s_{1}$ in which the agent $m_{*}$ keeps getting positive rewards, and an absorbing state $s_{2}$ where the agent $m_{*}$ gets no reward at all. There are also two actions $a_{1}, a_{2}$ available to all agents at every state, i.e., $r_{h, m_{*}}\left(s_{0}, a\right)=0$, $r_{h, m_{*}}\left(s_{1}, a\right)=1$, and $r_{h, m_{*}}\left(s_{2}, a\right)=0$ for the most risk-sensitive agent $m_{*}$, and $r_{h, m}\left(s_{0}, a\right)=0$, $r_{h, m}\left(s_{1}, a\right)=1$, and $r_{h, m}\left(s_{2}, a\right)=1$ for all other agents $m \neq m_{*}$ and all $a \in\left\{a_{1}, a_{2}\right\}$. In other words, the rewards for all agents except agent $m_{*}$ are always the same and contains no stochasticity. The transition kernel is simple as it only depends on the action of agent $m_{*}$ at the initial state $s_{0}$. Especially, we let the state transitions from $s_{0}$ to $s_{1}$ if agent $m_{*}$ takes $a_{1}$ and to $s_{2}$ if it takes $a_{2}$.

Recall that the regret is defined as the sum of the regrets on the worst performing agent at each episode, and all agents except $m_{*}$ incur no regret under the MG we defined. Thus, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\overline{\operatorname{Regret}}_{\mathrm{NE}}(K) & =\sum_{k \in[K]} \max _{m \in[M]}\left(V_{1, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}}-V_{1, m}^{\pi^{k}}\right)\left(s_{1}\right) \\
& =\sum_{k \in[K]}\left(V_{1, m_{*}}^{*, \pi_{-}^{k}}-V_{1, m_{*}}^{\pi^{k}}\right)\left(s_{1}\right) \\
& =\sum_{k \in[K]}\left(V_{1, m_{*}}^{*}-V_{1, m_{*}}^{\pi_{m_{*}}^{k}}\right)\left(s_{1}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Then $\overline{\text { Regret }}_{\mathrm{NE}}(K)$ equals to the regret of the most risk-sensitive agent $m_{*}$, and the MG is reduced to an MDP with respect to $m_{*}$, where $V_{1, m_{*}}^{*}$ denotes the optimal value function of $m_{*}$ and $V_{1, m_{*}}^{\pi_{m_{*}}^{k}}$ denotes the value function of $m_{*}$ under policy $\pi^{k}$. To simplify the notation, we will denote them as $V_{1}^{*}$ and $V_{1}^{\pi^{k}}$ without explicitly referring the agent $m_{*}$. The NE in this case corresponds to agent $m_{*}$ playing the optimal action with respect to its own MDP and all the other agents playing arbitrary policy. Therefore, we drop the subscript of NE and use $\overline{\operatorname{Regret}}(K)$ to simplify notation. Notice that such MG is equivalent to a $K$-episode and $H$-step MDP of $m_{*}$, which is further equivalent to a $K$-round bandit of $m_{*}$ due to the nature of absorbing states $s_{1}$ and $s_{2}$.

In particular, we construct two bandit problems with two arms for the agent $m_{*}$. The idea is to construct two bandits, each with a pair of hard-to-distinguish arms. The first bandit machine has the following two arms: the first arm has reward $H-1$ with probability $p_{1}$ and reward 0 with probability $1-p_{1}$ if $\beta_{*}>0$ (reward $H-1$ with probability $1-p_{1}$ and reward 0 with probability $p_{1}$ if $\beta_{*}<0$ ); the second arm has reward $H-1$ with probability $p_{2}$ and reward 0 with probability $1-p_{2}$ if $\beta_{*}>0$ (and reward $H-1$ with probability $1-p_{2}$ and reward 0 with probability $p_{2}$ if $\left.\beta_{*}<0\right)$. The second bandit machine also has two arms: the first arm has reward $H-1$ with probability $q_{1}$ and reward 0 with probability $1-q_{1}$ if $\beta_{*}>0$ (reward $H-1$ with probability $1-q_{1}$ and reward 0 with probability $q_{1}$ if $\beta_{*}<0$ ); the second arm has reward $H-1$ with probability $q_{2}$ and reward 0 with probability $1-q_{2}$ if $\beta_{*}>0$ (and reward $H-1$ with probability $1-q_{2}$ and
reward 0 with probability $q_{2}$ if $\beta_{*}<0$ ). To see the correspondence between the MDP of $m_{*}$ and the bandit problem, agent $m_{*}$ taking action $a_{1}$ is equivalent to pressing the first arm of the bandit machine; similarly, taking action $a_{2}$ is equivalent to pressing the second arm.
With proper setup of $p_{1}, p_{2}$ and $q_{1}, q_{2}$, we are able to show that no policy $\pi$ can do well on both of the bandit problems. We denote the regret of $\pi$ on the first bandit to be $\overline{\operatorname{Regret}}_{1}(K)$ and that on the second bandit to be $\overline{\operatorname{Regret}}_{2}(K)$. The worst regret between the two can be lower bounded through

$$
\max \left\{\overline{\operatorname{Regret}}_{1}(K)+\overline{\operatorname{Regret}}_{2}(K)\right\} \geq \frac{1}{2} \overline{\operatorname{Regret}}_{1}(K)+\frac{1}{2} \overline{\operatorname{Regret}}_{2}(K) .
$$

Following Lemma A. 1 with proper choice on $p_{1}, p_{2}$ and $q_{1}, q_{2}$, we conclude that the lower bound of $\overline{\operatorname{Regret}}(K)$ on the bandit with the worst regret

$$
\begin{aligned}
\overline{\operatorname{Regret}}(K) & \gtrsim \frac{1}{2}\left[\overline{\operatorname{Regret}}_{1}(K)+\overline{\operatorname{Regret}}_{2}(K)\right] \\
& \gtrsim \frac{e^{\left|\beta_{*}\right|(H-1)}-1}{\left|\beta_{*}\right|} \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} K e^{-\left|\beta_{*}\right|(H-1)}} \\
& \stackrel{(i)}{\gtrsim} \frac{e^{\left|\beta_{*}\right|(H-1)}-1}{\left|\beta_{*}\right|} \sqrt{\frac{K}{\log K}} \\
& \stackrel{(i i)}{\gtrsim} \frac{e^{\left|\beta_{*}\right| H}-1}{\left|\beta_{*}\right|} \sqrt{\frac{K}{(\log K)^{3}}} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Here $(i)$ is due to $\log \log K \gtrsim\left|\beta_{*}\right|(H-1)$ and $(i i)$ is due to $e^{\left|\beta_{*}\right|(H-1)}-1 \geq\left(1-\frac{1}{H}\right) e^{-\left|\beta_{*}\right|}\left(e^{\left|\beta_{*}\right| H}-1\right)$ and $\log \log K \gtrsim\left|\beta_{*}\right|$. More specifically, notice that we have a decomposition

$$
e^{\left|\beta_{*}\right|}\left(e^{\left|\beta_{*}\right|(H-1)}-1\right)=\left(e^{\left|\beta_{*}\right| H}-1\right)-\left(e^{\left|\beta_{*}\right|}-1\right)
$$

and it holds that $\left(e^{\left|\beta_{*}\right| H}-1\right) /\left(e^{\left|\beta_{*}\right|}-1\right) \geq \lim _{x \rightarrow 1_{+}} \frac{x^{H}-1}{x-1}=H$ for any $\beta_{*} \neq 0$ due to the convexity of the function $x^{H}$. It then follows that

$$
e^{\left|\beta_{*}\right|}\left(e^{\left|\beta_{*}\right|(H-1)}-1\right) \geq\left(1-\frac{1}{H}\right)\left(e^{\left|\beta_{*}\right| H}-1\right) .
$$

Lemma A.1. We assume the bandit machines in Theorem 4.1. For any corresponding MG with $H \geq 8$ and $K \geq \max \left\{16 e^{\left|\beta_{*}\right|(H-1)}, 16 H\right\}$, there exists a set of $p_{1}, p_{2}$ and $q_{1}, q_{2}$, such that the regret of any policy obeys

$$
\overline{\operatorname{Regret}}_{1}(K)+\overline{\operatorname{Regret}}_{2}(K) \gtrsim \frac{e^{\left|\beta_{*}\right|(H-1)}-1}{\left|\beta_{*}\right|} \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} K e^{-\left|\beta_{*}\right|(H-1)}} .
$$

Proof. The proof follows a similar argument in Fei et al. (2020) and Fei and Xu (2022b), and we supply a complete proof here that adapts to the alternative conditions of the lemma. For the bandit machines defined in Theorem 4.1, if we let $p_{2}=e^{-\left|\beta_{*}\right|(H-1)}$ and

$$
p_{1}=q_{1}=\left\{\begin{array}{ll}
p_{2}+\bar{p}, & \beta_{*}>0 ; \\
p_{2}-\bar{p}, & \beta_{*}<0 ;
\end{array} \quad q_{2}= \begin{cases}p_{2}+2 \bar{p}, & \beta_{*}>0 ; \\
p_{2}-2 \bar{p}, & \beta_{*}<0,\end{cases}\right.
$$

then it holds that $p_{1}, p_{2}, q_{1}, q_{2} \leq \frac{1}{2}$ for any $\bar{p} \leq \frac{1}{4} e^{-\left|\beta_{*}\right|(H-1)}$ if $\left|\beta_{*}\right|(H-1) \geq \log 4$ and $H \geq 2$. If we let $p_{2}=\frac{1}{H}$ and

$$
p_{1}=q_{1}=\left\{\begin{array}{ll}
p_{2}+\bar{p}, & \beta_{*}>0 ; \\
p_{2}-\bar{p}, & \beta_{*}<0 ;
\end{array} \quad q_{2}= \begin{cases}p_{2}+2 \bar{p}, & \beta_{*}>0 \\
p_{2}-2 \bar{p}, & \beta_{*}<0\end{cases}\right.
$$

then it holds that $p_{1}, p_{2}, q_{1}, q_{2} \leq \frac{1}{2}$ for any $\bar{p} \leq \frac{1}{4 H}$ if $\left|\beta_{*}\right|(H-1) \leq \log H$ and $H>8$. The following argument holds for both scenarios.

Recall that in the $K$-round bandit problem, any policy $\pi^{k}$ can only pick one of the two arms that are corresponding to action $a_{1}$ and $a_{2}$. Let us define $r_{a}$ to be the reward from taking action $a \in\left\{a_{1}, a_{2}\right\}$. Without loss of generality, we look at the first bandit machine and assume that the action $a_{1}$ corresponds to the optimal arm and $a_{2}$ corresponds to the sub-optimal arm. The regret can be written as

$$
\begin{aligned}
\overline{\operatorname{Regret}}_{1}(K) & =\sum_{k \in[K]} \frac{1}{\left|\beta_{*}\right|}\left|\log \mathbb{E}_{p} e^{\beta_{*} r_{a_{1}}}-\log \left(\mathbb{P}_{p}\left[a^{k}=a_{1}\right] \mathbb{E}_{p} e^{\beta_{*} r_{a_{1}}}+\mathbb{P}_{p}\left[a^{k}=a_{2}\right] \mathbb{E}_{p} e^{\beta_{*} r_{a_{2}}}\right)\right| \\
& =\sum_{k \in[K]} \frac{1}{\left|\beta_{*}\right|}\left|\log \frac{\mathbb{P}_{p}\left[a^{k}=a_{1}\right] \mathbb{E}_{p} e^{\beta_{*} r_{a_{1}}}+\mathbb{P}_{p}\left[a^{k}=a_{2}\right] \mathbb{E}_{p} e^{\beta_{*} r_{a_{2}}}}{\mathbb{E}_{p} e^{\beta_{*} r_{a_{1}}}}\right|,
\end{aligned}
$$

where the probability $\mathbb{P}_{p}$ is with respect to both the policy $\pi$ and the success probability of the arms. Notice that $\mathbb{E}_{p} e^{\beta_{*} r_{a_{1}}} \geq \mathbb{E}_{p} e^{\beta_{*} r_{a_{2}}}$ for $\beta_{*}>0$, and it follows that

$$
\left|\log \frac{\mathbb{P}_{p}\left[a^{k}=a_{1}\right] \mathbb{E}_{p} e^{\beta_{*} r_{a_{1}}}+\mathbb{P}_{p}\left[a^{k}=a_{2}\right] \mathbb{E}_{p} e^{\beta_{*} r_{a_{2}}}}{\mathbb{E}_{p} e^{\beta_{*} r_{a_{1}}}}\right| \geq \log \left(\frac{\left|\mathbb{E}_{p} e^{\beta_{*} r_{a_{2}}}-\mathbb{E}_{p} e^{\beta_{*} r_{a_{1}}}\right|}{\mathbb{E}_{p} e^{\beta_{*} r_{a_{1}}}} \mathbb{P}_{p}\left[a^{k}=a_{2}\right]+1\right) .
$$

Therefore, under either setup of $p_{1}$ and $p_{2}$, we have

$$
\overline{\operatorname{Regret}}_{1}(K) \geq \frac{1}{2\left|\beta_{*}\right|} \frac{\mid \mathbb{E}_{p} e^{\beta_{*} r_{a_{2}}}-\mathbb{E}_{p} e^{\beta_{*} r_{a_{1}}}}{\mathbb{E}_{p} e^{\beta_{*} r_{a_{1}}}} \sum_{k \in[K]} \mathbb{P}_{p}\left[a^{k}=a_{2}\right],
$$

where the inequality follows from $\log (1+x) \geq x / 2$ for $x \in[0,1]$ and the assumption that $\bar{p} \leq \frac{1}{4} p_{2}$. Swap the order of $a_{1}$ and $a_{2}$, we similarly get a lower bound for either pair of $q_{1}$ and $q_{2}$ that

$$
\overline{\operatorname{Regret}}_{2}(K) \geq \frac{1}{2\left|\beta_{*}\right|} \frac{\left|\mathbb{E}_{q} e^{\beta_{*} r_{a_{1}}}-\mathbb{E}_{q} e^{\beta_{*} r_{a_{2}}}\right|}{\mathbb{E}_{q} e^{\beta_{*} r_{a_{2}}}} \sum_{k \in[K]} \mathbb{P}_{q}\left[a^{k}=a_{1}\right] .
$$

In particular, for the first bandit machine we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\left|\mathbb{E}_{p} e^{\beta_{*} r_{a_{2}}}-\mathbb{E}_{p} e^{\beta_{*} r_{a_{1}}}\right|}{\mathbb{E}_{p} e^{\beta_{*} r_{a_{1}}}} & =\frac{\left|\left(\mathbb{P}_{p}\left[a_{1}\right]-\mathbb{P}_{p}\left[a_{2}\right]\right) e^{\beta_{*}(H-1)}-\left(\mathbb{P}_{p}\left[a_{1}\right]-\mathbb{P}_{p}\left[a_{2}\right]\right)\right|}{\mathbb{P}_{p}\left[a_{1}\right] e^{\beta_{*}(H-1)}+\left(1-\mathbb{P}_{p}\left[a_{1}\right]\right)} \\
& =\frac{\left|\bar{p}\left(e^{\beta_{*}(H-1)}-1\right)\right|}{\mathbb{P}_{p}\left[a_{1}\right] e^{\beta_{*}(H-1)}+\left(1-\mathbb{P}_{p}\left[a_{1}\right]\right)} \\
& \geq \frac{\bar{p}}{4}\left(e^{\beta_{*} \mid(H-1)}-1\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

where the inequality holds for both pairs of $p_{1}$ and $p_{2}$. Similarly, we have

$$
\frac{\left|\mathbb{E}_{q} e^{\beta_{*} r_{a_{1}}}-\mathbb{E}_{q} e^{\beta_{*} r_{a_{2}}}\right|}{\mathbb{E}_{q} e^{\beta_{*} r_{a_{2}}}} \geq \frac{\bar{p}}{4}\left(e^{\left|\beta_{*}\right|(H-1)}-1\right)
$$

for both pairs of $q_{1}$ and $q_{2}$. Hence, we can combine both lower bounds on $\overline{\operatorname{Regret}}_{1}(K)$ and $\overline{\operatorname{Regret}}_{2}(K)$ :

$$
\overline{\operatorname{Regret}}_{1}(K)+\overline{\operatorname{Regret}}_{2}(K) \geq \frac{\bar{p}}{4\left|\beta_{*}\right|}\left(e^{\left|\beta_{*}\right|(H-1)}-1\right) \cdot \sum_{k \in[K]}\left(\mathbb{P}_{p}\left[a^{k}=a_{2}\right]+\mathbb{P}_{q}\left[a^{k}=a_{1}\right]\right) .
$$

It is note-worthy here that $a_{2}$ is sub-optimal for the first bandit and $a_{1}$ is sub-optimal for the second bandit. Notice that for any policy $\pi$ applied to both bandit machines, we have

$$
\sum_{k \in[K]}\left(\mathbb{P}_{p}\left[a^{k}=a_{2}\right]+\mathbb{P}_{q}\left[a^{k}=a_{1}\right]\right)=\mathbb{E}_{p}\left[\sum_{k \in[K]} \mathbb{I}\left\{a^{k}=a_{2}\right\}\right]+\mathbb{E}_{q}\left[\sum_{k \in[K]} \mathbb{I}\left\{a^{k}=a_{1}\right\}\right],
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{p}\left[\sum_{k \in[K]} \mathbb{I}\left\{a^{k}=a_{2}\right\}\right] \geq \frac{K}{2} \mathbb{P}_{p}\left[\sum_{k \in[K]} \mathbb{I}\left\{a^{k}=a_{2}\right\}>\frac{K}{2}\right], \\
& \mathbb{E}_{q}\left[\sum_{k \in[K]} \mathbb{I}\left\{a^{k}=a_{1}\right\}\right] \geq \frac{K}{2} \mathbb{P}_{q}\left[\sum_{k \in[K]} \mathbb{I}\left\{a^{k}=a_{1}\right\}>\frac{K}{2}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

due to a simple lower bound on the cases where the sub-optimal arm is selected more than half of the time. We denote the shorthand $p_{\beta_{*}}:=p_{2}$ if $\beta_{*}>0$ and $p_{\beta_{*}}:=1-p_{2}$ if $\beta_{*}<0 ; q_{\beta_{*}}:=p_{2}$ if $\beta_{*}>0$ and $q_{\beta_{*}}:=1-p_{2}$ if $\beta_{*}<0$. A lower bound on the sum of the paired probabilities is given by

$$
\begin{gathered}
\mathbb{P}_{p}\left[\sum_{k \in[K]} \mathbb{I}\left\{a^{k}=a_{1}\right\} \leq \frac{K}{2}\right]+\mathbb{P}_{q}\left[\sum_{k \in[K]} \mathbb{I}\left\{a^{k}=a_{1}\right\}>\frac{K}{2}\right] \\
\geq \frac{1}{2} \exp \left(-\operatorname{KL}\left(\operatorname{Ber}\left(p_{\beta_{*}}\right) \| \operatorname{Ber}\left(q_{\beta_{*}}\right)\right) K\right),
\end{gathered}
$$

where it follows from Lattimore and Szepesvári (2020, Theorem 14.2) that

$$
\mathbb{P}_{p}\left[\sum_{k \in[K]} \mathbb{I}\left\{a^{k}=a_{1}\right\} \leq \frac{K}{2}\right]+\mathbb{P}_{q}\left[\sum_{k \in[K]} \mathbb{I}\left\{a^{k}=a_{1}\right\}>\frac{K}{2}\right] \geq \frac{1}{2} \exp \left(-\mathrm{KL}\left(\mathbb{P}_{p} \| \mathbb{P}_{q}\right)\right)
$$

and Lattimore and Szepesvári (2020, Lemma 15.1) that

$$
\operatorname{KL}\left(\mathbb{P}_{p} \| \mathbb{P}_{q}\right)=\operatorname{KL}\left(\operatorname{Ber}\left(p_{\beta_{*}}\right) \| \operatorname{Ber}\left(q_{\beta_{*}}\right)\right) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{p}\left[\sum_{k \in[K]} \mathbb{I}\left\{a^{k}=a_{2}\right\}\right] .
$$

Following the definition of Kullback-Leibler (kl) divergence and some simple calculations, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{KL}\left(\operatorname{Ber}\left(p_{\beta_{*}}\right) \| \operatorname{Ber}\left(q_{\beta_{*}}\right)\right) & \leq \frac{\left(q_{\beta_{*}}-p_{\beta_{*}}\right)^{2}}{q_{\beta_{*}}\left(1-q_{\beta_{*}}\right)} \\
& \leq \frac{8 \bar{p}^{2}}{p_{2}\left(1-p_{2}\right)}
\end{aligned}
$$

where the first inequality follows from $\log (1+x) \leq x$ on $\mathbb{R}$ and the second inequality follows from the definition of the bandit such that $\left|p_{2}-q_{2}\right|=2 \bar{p}$ and $p_{2} \leq q_{2} \leq \frac{1}{2}$ for $\beta_{*}>0$ and $\frac{1}{2} p_{2} \leq q_{2} \leq p_{2} \leq \frac{1}{2}$ for $\beta_{*}<0$. Consequently, we have

$$
\sum_{k \in[K]}\left(\mathbb{P}_{p}\left[a^{k}=a_{2}\right]+\mathbb{P}_{q}\left[a^{k}=a_{1}\right]\right) \geq \frac{K}{4} \exp \left(-\frac{8 K \bar{p}^{2}}{p_{2}\left(1-p_{2}\right)}\right) .
$$

Finally, we combine the lower bounds on $\overline{\operatorname{Regret}}_{1}(K)$ and $\overline{\operatorname{Regret}}_{2}(K)$ together to get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\overline{\operatorname{Regret}}_{1}(K)+\overline{\operatorname{Regret}}_{2}(K) & \geq \frac{K \bar{p}}{32\left|\beta_{*}\right|}\left(e^{\left|\beta_{*}\right|(H-1)}-1\right) \exp \left(-\frac{8 K \bar{p}^{2}}{p_{2}\left(1-p_{2}\right)}\right) \\
& \gtrsim \frac{e^{\left|\beta_{*}\right|(H-1)}-1}{\left|\beta_{*}\right|} \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} K e^{-\left|\beta_{*}\right|(H-1)}},
\end{aligned}
$$

where the second inequality follows from taking $\bar{p}=\sqrt{\left(p_{2}\left(1-p_{2}\right)\right) / K}$ for $K \geq 16 / p_{2}$ such that $\bar{p} \leq \frac{1}{4} p_{2}$.

## B Proof of Theorem 6.1

We focus on the proof for the case of NE; the proofs for CE and CCE follow the same reasoning, with the differences presented in Appendix B.4. For any state $s \in \mathcal{S}$, policy $\pi$ and function $Q^{\prime}: \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we denote $\left[\mathcal{G}_{\pi} Q^{\prime}\right](s):=\mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi}\left[Q^{\prime}(s, a)\right]$.

## B. 1 Some Useful Lemmas

Let us first present a uniform concentration result.
Lemma B.1. For $G>0$, consider the function class

$$
\mathcal{W}=\left\{e^{\beta g} \mid g: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow[0, G]\right\} .
$$

For any $\delta \in(0,1]$, and for all $(k, h, s, a) \in[K] \times[H] \times \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ with $N_{h}^{k}(s, a) \geq 1$, there exists a universal constant $c>0$ such that, with probability at least $1-\delta$,

$$
\left|\left[\left(\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{h}^{k}-\mathcal{P}_{h}\right) e^{\beta g}\right](s, a)\right| \leq c\left|e^{\beta G}-1\right| \sqrt{\frac{S \log (H S A K / \delta)}{N_{h}^{k}(s, a)}}
$$

Proof. Define $\mathcal{C}_{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{W})$ to be an $\varepsilon$-covering of $\mathcal{G}$ with respect to the $\ell_{\infty}$ norm for any $\varepsilon>0$. Mathematically, this means that for any $W \in \mathcal{W}$, there exists $W^{\prime} \in \mathcal{C}_{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{W})$ such that $\sup _{s \in \mathcal{S}}\left|W(s)-W^{\prime}(s)\right| \leq \varepsilon$. It is not hard to verify that $\left|\mathcal{C}_{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{W})\right| \leq\left(3\left|e^{\beta G}-1\right| / \varepsilon\right)^{S}$. Now fix a $(k, h, s, a) \in[K] \times[H] \times \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$, and define

$$
\left.\varphi_{h}^{k, W}(s, a):=\frac{1}{N_{h}^{k}(s, a)} \sum_{\tau \in[k-1]} \mathbb{I}\left\{\left(s_{h}^{\tau}, a_{h}^{\tau}\right)=(s, a)\right\} \cdot W\left(s_{h+1}^{\tau}\right)-\left(\mathcal{P}_{h} W\right)(s, a)\right] .
$$

By Hoeffding's inequality and a union bound over both $W \in \mathcal{W}$ and $N_{h}^{k} \in[K]$, with probability at least $1-\delta /(H S A)$, we have

$$
\left|\sup _{W^{\prime} \in \mathcal{C}_{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{W})} \varphi_{h}^{k, W^{\prime}}(s, a)\right| \leq\left|e^{\beta G}-1\right| \sqrt{\frac{S \log \left(3\left|e^{\beta G}-1\right| / \varepsilon\right)+\log (H S A K / \delta)}{N_{h}^{k}(s, a)}} .
$$

Set $\varepsilon=3 \delta\left|e^{\beta G}-1\right| / \sqrt{H S A K}$ and the above equation yields

$$
\left|\sup _{W^{\prime} \in \mathcal{C}_{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{W})} \varphi_{h}^{k, W^{\prime}}(s, a)\right| \leq c_{0}\left|e^{\beta G}-1\right| \sqrt{\frac{S \log (H S A K / \delta)}{N_{h}^{k}(s, a)}}
$$

On the other hand, for any $W \in \mathcal{W}$, there exists $W^{\prime} \in \mathcal{C}_{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{W})$ and a universal constant $c^{\prime}>0$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|\varphi_{h}^{k, W}(s, a)-\varphi_{h}^{k, W^{\prime}}(s, a)\right| & \leq 2 \varepsilon \\
& \leq 6 \delta\left|e^{\beta G}-1\right| \sqrt{\frac{1}{H S A K}} \\
& \leq c^{\prime}\left|e^{\beta G}-1\right| \sqrt{\frac{S \log (H S A K / \delta)}{N_{h}^{k}(s, a)}}
\end{aligned}
$$

We combine the previous displays and take a union bound over $(h, s, a) \in[H] \times \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ to conclude the proof.

We have the following lemma that bounds the sample exponential value functions.
Lemma B.2. For any $\delta \in(0,1]$ and $(k, h, m, s, a)$, the following statements hold with probability at least $1-\delta$. If $\beta_{m}>0$, then we have

$$
\begin{gathered}
e^{\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{h, m}^{k}(s)} \geq e^{\beta_{m} V_{h, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}}(s)}, \quad e^{\beta_{m} \underline{V}_{h, m}^{k}(s)} \leq e^{\beta_{m} V_{h, m}^{V^{k}}(s)}, \\
e^{\beta_{m} \bar{Q}_{h, m}^{k}(s, a)} \geq e^{\beta_{m} Q_{h, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}(s, a)},} \quad e^{\beta_{m} \underline{Q}_{h, m}^{k}(s, a)} \leq e^{\beta_{m} Q_{h, m}^{k}(s, a)},
\end{gathered}
$$

and if $\beta_{m}<0$, we have

$$
\begin{gathered}
e^{\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{h, m}^{k}(s)} \leq e^{\beta_{m} V_{h, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}}(s)}, \quad e^{\beta_{m} \underline{V}_{h, m}^{k}(s)} \geq e^{\beta_{m} V_{h, m}^{\pi^{k}}(s)}, \\
e^{\beta_{m} \bar{Q}_{h, m}^{k}(s, a)} \leq e^{\beta_{m} Q_{h, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}}(s, a)}, \quad e^{\beta_{m} \underline{Q}_{h, m}^{k}(s, a)} \geq e^{\beta_{m} Q_{h, m}^{k}(s, a)},
\end{gathered}
$$

Proof. Let us fix a tuple $(k, h, m, s, a)$ and $\delta \in(0,1]$. We focus on the inequalities $e^{\beta_{m} \bar{Q}_{h, m}^{k}(s, a)} \geq$ $e^{\beta_{m} Q_{h, m}^{*, k_{-m}^{k}}(s, a)}$ and $e^{\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{h, m}^{k}(s)} \geq e^{\beta_{m} V_{h, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}}(s)}$ with $\beta_{m}>0$; the other inequalities can be established in similar ways.
From the update procedure of the algorithm and the Bellman equation, we have the recursion

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left(e^{\beta_{m} \bar{Q}_{h, m}^{k}}-e^{\beta_{m} Q_{h, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}}}\right)(s, a) \\
& =e^{\beta_{m} r_{h, m}(s, a)}\left[\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{h}^{k} e^{\left.\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{h+1, m}^{k}\right](s, a)+\gamma_{h, m}^{k}(s, a)-e^{\beta_{m} r_{h, m}(s, a)}\left[\mathcal{P}_{h} e^{\beta_{m} V_{h+1, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}}}\right](s, a)}\right. \\
& =e^{\beta_{m} r_{h, m}(s, a)}\left[\widehat { \mathcal { P } } _ { h } ^ { k } \left(e^{\left.\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{h+1, m}^{k}-e^{\left.\beta_{m} V_{h+1, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}}\right)}\right](s, a)+\gamma_{h, m}^{k}(s, a), ~\left({ }^{k}\right)}\right.\right. \\
& +\left[\left(\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{h}^{k}-\mathcal{P}_{h}\right) e^{\beta_{m}\left[r_{h, m}(s, a)+V_{h+1, m}^{\left.*, \pi_{m}^{k}\right]}\right]}\right](s, a) \tag{B.1}
\end{align*}
$$

Note that by Lemma B. 1 we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\gamma_{h, m}^{k}(s, a) \leq\left[\left(\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{h}^{k}-\mathcal{P}_{h}\right) e^{\beta_{m}\left[r_{h, m}(s, a)+V_{h+1, m}^{\left.*, \pi_{-m}^{k}\right]}\right](s, a) \leq \gamma_{h, m}^{k}(s, a) . . .}\right. \tag{B.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

The remaining proof proceeds by induction. We first check the base case: by definition, $\bar{V}_{H+1, m}^{k}=$
 $h \in[H-1]$. Then by (B.1) and (B.2), we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
e^{\beta_{m} \bar{Q}_{h, m}^{k}(s, a)} \geq e^{\beta_{m} Q_{h, m}^{*, k_{-m}^{k}}(s, a)} . \tag{B.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

By the construction of Algorithm 2 and the definition of best response, we have
and

$$
e^{\beta_{m} V_{h, m}^{* * \pi_{-m}^{k}}(s)}=\max _{\nu}\left[\mathcal{G}_{\nu \times \pi_{h,-m}^{k}} e^{\left.\beta_{m} Q_{h, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}}\right](s) .}\right.
$$

It follows from (B.3) that

$$
e^{\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{h, m}^{k}(s)} \geq e^{\beta_{m} V_{h, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}}(s)}
$$

This completes the induction.
The next lemma bounds the difference of $Q$-functions by the bonus and the difference of $V$ functions.

Lemma B.3. For any $\delta \in(0,1]$ and $(k, h, m, s, a)$, the following statements hold with probability at least $1-\delta$. If $\beta_{m}>0$,

$$
\left(e^{\beta_{m} \bar{Q}_{h, m}^{k}}-e^{\beta_{m} \underline{\underline{Q}}_{h, m}^{k}}\right)(s, a) \leq e^{\beta_{m} r_{h, m}(s, a)}\left[\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{h}^{k}\left(e^{\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{h+1, m}^{k}}-e^{\beta_{m}{\underline{V_{h}^{k}}}_{k}^{k}}\right)\right](s, a)+2 \gamma_{h, m}^{k}(s, a)
$$

and if $\beta_{m}<0$,

$$
\left(e^{\beta_{m} \underline{Q}_{h, m}^{k}}-e^{\beta_{m} \bar{Q}_{h, m}^{k}}\right)(s, a) \leq e^{\beta_{m} r_{h, m}(s, a)}\left[\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{h}^{k}\left(e^{\beta_{m} \underline{V}_{h+1, m}^{k}}-e^{\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{h+1, m}^{k}}\right)\right](s, a)+2 \gamma_{h, m}^{k}(s, a) .
$$

Proof. For $\beta_{m}>0$, the update procedure of Algorithm 2 implies that for all $(k, h, m, s, a)$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
e^{\beta_{m} \bar{Q}_{h, m}^{k}(s, a)} & \leq e^{\beta_{m} r_{h, m}(s, a)}\left[\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{h}^{k} e^{\left.\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{h+1, m}^{k}\right](s, a)+\gamma_{h, m}^{k}(s, a),}\right. \\
e^{\beta_{m}} \underline{Q}_{h, m}^{k}(s, a) & \geq e^{\beta_{m} r_{h, m}(s, a)}\left[\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{h}^{k}\right.
\end{aligned} e^{\left.\beta_{m} \underline{V}_{h+1, m}^{k}\right](s, a)-\gamma_{h, m}^{k}(s, a) .} .
$$

Combining the above displayed equations yields the result. The proof for the case of $\beta_{m}<0$ holds similarly.

Let

$$
\begin{equation*}
W_{h}^{k}(s, a):=\min \left\{1,\left[\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{h}^{k} U_{h+1}^{k}\right](s, a)+2 z_{h}^{k}(s, a)\right\} \tag{B.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where we set

$$
\begin{equation*}
z_{h}^{k}(s, a):=\max \left\{\max _{m \in[M]: \beta_{m}>0} \frac{\gamma_{h, m}^{k}(s, a)}{e^{\beta_{m}(H-h+1)}-e^{-\beta_{m}(h-1)}}, \max _{m \in[M]: \beta_{m}<0} \frac{\gamma_{h, m}^{k}(s, a)}{1-e^{\beta_{m} H}}\right\} \tag{B.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

We let

$$
U_{H+1}^{k}(s):=0
$$

and for $h \in[H]$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
U_{h}^{k}(s):=\left(\mathcal{G}_{\pi_{h}^{k}} W_{h}^{k}\right)(s) \tag{B.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

The next lemma controls $\left\{U_{h}^{k}\right\}$ through upper and lower bounds.
Lemma B.4. For all $(k, h, s) \in[K] \times[H] \times \mathcal{S}$, we have $U_{h}^{k}(s) \leq 1$,

$$
U_{h}^{k}(s) \geq \max _{m \in[M]: \beta_{m}>0} \frac{\left(e^{\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{h, m}^{k}}-e^{\beta_{m} \underline{V}_{h, m}^{k}}\right)(s)}{e^{\beta_{m}(H-h+1)}-e^{-\beta_{m}(h-1)}} \geq 0,
$$

and

$$
U_{h}^{k}(s) \geq \max _{m \in[M]: \beta_{m}<0} \frac{\left(e^{\beta_{m} \underline{V}_{h, m}^{k}}-e^{\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{h, m}^{k}}\right)(s)}{1-e^{\beta_{m} H}} \geq 0
$$

Proof. Let us write $[M]=\mathcal{M}^{+} \cup \mathcal{M}^{-}$where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{M}^{+}:=\left\{m \in[M]: \beta_{m}>0\right\} \\
& \mathcal{M}^{-}:=\left\{m \in[M]: \beta_{m}<0\right\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Case I. We first prove the lemma w.r.t. $\mathcal{M}^{+}$. We first verify the base case. Since $U_{H+1}^{k}=\bar{V}_{H+1, m}^{k}=$ $\underline{V}_{H+1, m}^{k}=0$, we have

$$
1 \geq U_{H+1}^{k}(s)=0=\max _{m \in \mathcal{M}^{+}} \frac{\left(e^{\left.\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{H+1, m}^{k}-e^{\beta_{m} \underline{V}_{H+1, m}^{k}}\right)(s)}\right.}{1-e^{-\beta_{m} H}} .
$$

Now assume that our claim holds for $U_{h+1}^{k}$ for some $h \in[H-1]$. We can deduce

$$
\begin{align*}
{\left[\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{h}^{k} U_{h+1}^{k}\right](s, a) } & \geq\left[\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{h}^{k} \max _{m \in \mathcal{M}^{+}} \frac{e^{\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{h+1, m}^{k}}-e^{\beta_{m} \underline{V}_{h+1, m}^{k}}}{e^{\beta_{m}(H-h)}-e^{-\beta_{m} h}}\right](s, a) \\
& =\left[\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{h}^{k} \max _{m \in \mathcal{M}^{+}} \frac{e^{\beta_{m}}\left(e^{\beta_{m}} \bar{V}_{h+1, m}^{k}-e^{\left.\beta_{m} \underline{V}_{h+1, m}^{k}\right)}\right.}{e^{\beta_{m}}\left(e^{\beta_{m}(H-h)}-e^{-\beta_{m} h}\right)}\right](s, a) \\
& =\left[\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{h}^{k} \max _{m \in \mathcal{M}^{+}} \frac{e^{\beta_{m}}\left(e^{\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{h+1, m}^{k}}-e^{\beta_{m} \underline{V}_{h+1, m}^{k}}\right)}{e^{\beta_{m}(H-h+1)}-e^{-\beta_{m}(h-1)}}\right](s, a) \\
& \geq \max _{m \in \mathcal{M}^{+}}\left[\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{h}^{k} \frac{e^{\beta_{m}}\left(e^{\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{h+1, m}^{k}}-e^{\left.\beta_{m} \underline{V}_{h+1, m}^{k}\right)}\right.}{e^{\beta_{m}(H-h+1)}-e^{-\beta_{m}(h-1)}}\right](s, a) \tag{B.7}
\end{align*}
$$

We claim that

$$
\begin{equation*}
W_{h}^{k} \geq \max _{m \in \mathcal{M}^{+}}\left[\frac{\left(e^{\left.\beta_{m} \bar{Q}_{h, m}^{k}-e^{\beta_{m}} \underline{Q}_{h, m}^{k}\right)(s, a)}\right.}{e^{\beta_{m}(H-h+1)}-e^{-\beta_{m}(h-1)}}\right] \tag{B.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $\left[\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{h}^{k} U_{h+1}^{k}\right](s, a)+2 z_{h}^{k}(s, a) \geq 1$, then (B.4) implies $W_{h}^{k}=1$ and (B.8) is verified; otherwise, we have

$$
\left.\begin{array}{rl}
W_{h}^{k} & \stackrel{(i)}{=}\left[\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{h}^{k} U_{h+1}^{k}\right](s, a)+2 z_{h}^{k}(s, a) \\
\quad \stackrel{(i i)}{\geq} \max _{m \in \mathcal{M}^{+}}\left[\widehat { \mathcal { P } } _ { h } ^ { k } e ^ { \beta _ { m } } \left(e^{\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{h+1, m}^{k}}-e^{\left.\beta_{m} \underline{V}_{h+1, m}^{k}\right)}\right.\right. \\
e^{\beta_{m}(H-h+1)}-e^{-\beta_{m}(h-1)}
\end{array}(s, a)+2 \max _{m \in \mathcal{M}^{+}} \frac{\gamma_{h, m}^{k}(s, a)}{e^{\beta_{m}(H-h+1)}-e^{-\beta_{m}(h-1)}}\right] \quad \begin{aligned}
& \quad \max _{m \in \mathcal{M}^{+}}\left[\frac{e^{\beta_{m}}\left[\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{h}^{k}\left(e^{\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{h+1, m}^{k}}-e^{\left.\beta_{m} \underline{V}_{h+1, m}^{k}\right)}\right](s, a)+2 \gamma_{h, m}^{k}(s, a)\right.}{e^{\beta_{m}(H-h+1)}-e^{-\beta_{m}(h-1)}}\right] \\
& \quad \geq \max _{m \in \mathcal{M}^{+}}\left[\frac{\left(e^{\beta_{m}} \bar{Q}_{h, m}^{k}-e^{\left.\beta_{m} \underline{Q}_{h, m}^{k}\right)(s, a)}\right.}{e^{\beta_{m}(H-h+1)}-e^{-\beta_{m}(h-1)}}\right],
\end{aligned}
$$

where step ( $i$ ) holds by (B.4); step (ii) holds by (B.7); the last step follows from Lemma B. 3 as well as the facts that $e^{\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{h+1, m}^{k}} \geq e^{\beta_{m} \underline{V}_{h+1, m}^{k}}$ (implied by Lemma B.2) and that $e^{\beta_{m}} \geq e^{\beta_{m} r_{h, m}(s, a)}$ (since $r_{h, m}(s, a) \in[0,1]$ ). Hence, (B.8) is verified. Since (B.4) implies $W_{h}^{k} \leq 1$, from (B.6) we have $U_{h}^{k}(s) \leq 1$; on the other hand,

$$
\begin{align*}
& U_{h}^{k}(s) \stackrel{(i)}{=}\left[\mathcal{G}_{\pi_{h}^{k}} W_{h}^{k}\right](s) \\
& \stackrel{(i i)}{\geq}\left[\mathcal{G}_{\pi_{h}^{k}} \max _{m \in \mathcal{M}^{+}}\left[\frac{e^{\beta_{m} \bar{Q}_{h, m}^{k}-e^{\beta_{m}} \underline{Q}_{h, m}^{k}}}{e^{\beta_{m}(H-h+1)}-e^{-\beta_{m}(h-1)}}\right]\right]  \tag{s}\\
& \geq \max _{m \in \mathcal{M}^{+}}\left[\mathcal{G}_{\pi_{h}^{k}} \frac{\left.e^{\beta_{m} \bar{Q}_{h, m}^{k}-e^{\beta_{m}} \underline{Q}_{h, m}^{k}}\right]}{} \quad\right.  \tag{s}\\
& \quad=\max _{m \in \mathcal{M}^{+}} \frac{\left(e^{\beta_{m}} \overline{\bar{V}}_{h, m}^{k}-e^{\left.\beta_{m} \underline{V}_{h, m}^{k}\right)(s)}\right.}{e^{\beta_{m}(H-h+1)}-e^{-\beta_{m}(h-1)}} \geq 0,
\end{align*}
$$

where step (i) holds by (B.6); step (ii) holds by (B.8); the last step follows from the update procedure of Algorithm 2. The induction is completed.

Case II. We prove the lemma w.r.t. $\mathcal{M}^{-}$. We first verify the base case. Since $\bar{V}_{H+1, m}^{k}=\underline{V}_{H+1, m}^{k}=$ 0 , we have

$$
1 \geq U_{H+1}^{k}(s)=\max _{m \in \mathcal{M}^{-}} \frac{\left(e^{\beta_{m} V_{h, m}^{k}}-e^{\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{n, m}^{k}}\right)(s)}{1-e^{\beta_{m} H}}=0 .
$$

Assume that our claim holds for $U_{h+1}^{k}$. We can deduce

$$
\begin{aligned}
{\left[\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{h}^{k} U_{h+1}^{k}\right](s, a) } & \geq\left[\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{h}^{k} \max _{m \in \mathcal{M}^{-}} \frac{e^{\beta_{m} V_{h+1, m}^{k}}-e^{\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{h+1, m}^{k}}}{1-e^{\beta_{m} H}}\right](s, a) \\
& \geq \max _{m \in \mathcal{M}^{-}}\left[\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{h}^{k} \frac{e^{\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{h+1, m}^{k}}-e^{\beta_{m} \underline{V}_{h+1, m}^{k}}}{1-e^{\beta_{m} H}}\right](s, a) .
\end{aligned}
$$

We claim that

$$
\begin{equation*}
W_{h}^{k} \geq \max _{m \in \mathcal{M}^{-}}\left[\frac{\left(e^{\beta_{m} \underline{Q}_{h, m}^{k}}-e^{\beta_{m} \bar{Q}_{h, m}^{k}}\right)(s, a)}{1-e^{\beta_{m} H}}\right] \tag{B.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $\left[\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{h}^{k} U_{h+1}^{k}\right](s, a)+2 z_{h}^{k}(s, a) \geq 1$, then (B.4) implies $W_{h}^{k}=1$ and (B.9) is verified; otherwise,

$$
\begin{aligned}
W_{h}^{k} & =\left[\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{h}^{k} U_{h+1}^{k}\right](s, a)+2 z_{h}^{k}(s, a) \\
& \stackrel{(i)}{\geq} \max _{m \in \mathcal{M}^{-}}\left[\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{h}^{k}\left(\frac{e^{\beta_{m} \underline{V}_{h+1, m}^{k}}-e^{\beta_{m}} \bar{V}_{h+1, m}^{k}}{1-e^{\beta_{m} H}}\right)\right](s, a)+2 \max _{m \in \mathcal{M}^{-}} \frac{\gamma_{h, m}^{k}(s, a)}{1-e^{\beta_{m} H}} \\
& \geq \max _{m \in \mathcal{M}^{-}}\left[\frac{\left[\widehat { \mathcal { P } } _ { h } ^ { k } \left(e^{\left.\left.\beta_{m} \underline{V}_{h+1, m}^{k}-e^{\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{h+1, m}^{k}}\right)\right](s, a)}\right.\right.}{1-e^{\beta_{m} H}}+2 \frac{\gamma_{h, m}^{k}(s, a)}{1-e^{\beta_{m} H}}\right] \\
& \geq \max _{m \in \mathcal{M}^{-}}\left[\frac{\left(e^{\left.\beta_{m} \underline{Q}_{h, m}^{k}-e^{\beta_{m}} \bar{Q}_{h, m}^{k}\right)(s, a)}\right.}{1-e^{\beta_{m} H}}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

where step (i) holds by the induction hypothesis on $U_{h+1}^{k}$ and (B.5), and the last step follows from Lemma B.3. This verifies our claim for $W_{h}^{k}$. We also have

$$
\begin{align*}
U_{h}^{k}(s) & =\left[\mathcal{G}_{\pi_{h}^{k}} W_{h}^{k}\right](s) \\
& \geq\left[\mathcal{G}_{\pi_{h}^{k}} \max _{m \in \mathcal{M}^{-}}\left[\frac{e^{\beta_{m} \underline{Q}_{h, m}^{k}-e^{\beta_{m}} \bar{Q}_{h, m}^{k}}}{1-e^{\beta_{m} H}}\right]\right](s  \tag{s}\\
& \geq \max _{m \in \mathcal{M}^{-}} \mathcal{G}_{\pi_{h}^{k}}\left[\frac{e^{\beta_{m} \underline{Q}_{h, m}^{k}-e^{\beta_{m}} \bar{Q}_{h, m}^{k}}}{1-e^{\beta_{m} H}}\right](s) \\
& =\max _{m \in \mathcal{M}^{-}} \frac{\left(e^{\beta_{m} V_{h, m}^{k}}-e^{\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{h, m}^{k}}\right)(s)}{1-e^{\beta_{m} H}},
\end{align*}
$$

where the first step holds by (B.6). The induction is completed.

## B. 2 Controlling $U_{1}^{k}$

Let us define

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{h}^{k} & :=U_{h}^{k}\left(s_{h}^{k}\right) \\
\zeta_{h}^{k} & :=\left(\mathcal{G}_{\pi^{k}} W_{h}^{k}\right)\left(s_{h}^{k}\right)-W_{h}^{k}\left(s_{h}^{k}, a_{h}^{k}\right), \\
\bar{p}_{h}^{k} & :=\left(\mathcal{P}_{h} U_{h+1}^{k}\right)\left(s_{h}^{k}, a_{h}^{k}\right)-U_{h+1}^{k}\left(s_{h+1}^{k}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

We have

$$
\begin{aligned}
U_{h}^{k}\left(s_{h}^{k}\right) & =\left(\mathcal{G}_{\pi^{k}} W_{h}^{k}\right)\left(s_{h}^{k}\right) \\
& =\zeta_{h}^{k}+W_{h}^{k}\left(s_{h}^{k}, a_{h}^{k}\right) \\
& \stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \zeta_{h}^{k}+2 z_{h}^{k}+\left(\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{h}^{k} U_{h+1}^{k}\right)\left(s_{h}^{k}, a_{h}^{k}\right) \\
& =\zeta_{h}^{k}+2 z_{h}^{k}+\left[\left(\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{h}^{k}-\mathcal{P}_{h}\right) U_{h+1}^{k}\right]\left(s_{h}^{k}, a_{h}^{k}\right)+\left[\mathcal{P}_{h} U_{h+1}^{k}\right]\left(s_{h}^{k}, a_{h}^{k}\right) \\
& \stackrel{(i i)}{\leq} \zeta_{h}^{k}+3 z_{h}^{k}+\left[\mathcal{P}_{h} U_{h+1}^{k}\right]\left(s_{h}^{k}, a_{h}^{k}\right) \\
& =\zeta_{h}^{k}+3 z_{h}^{k}+\bar{p}_{h}^{k}+U_{h+1}^{k}\left(s_{h+1}^{k}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

where step ( $i$ ) holds by (B.4) and step (ii) follows from Lemma B.1. Recursing and summing over $k \in[K]$ gives

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{k \in[K]} U_{1}^{k}\left(s_{1}^{k}\right) \leq \sum_{k \in[K]} \sum_{h \in[H]}\left(\zeta_{h}^{k}+3 z_{h}^{k}+\bar{p}_{h}^{k}\right) . \tag{B.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note that $\left\{\zeta_{h}^{k}\right\}$ and $\left\{\bar{p}_{h}^{k}\right\}$ are martingale difference sequences. Also, by (B.4) and Lemma B.4, we have that $\left|\zeta_{h}^{k}\right|,\left|\bar{p}_{h}^{k}\right| \leq 1$ for $(k, h) \in[K] \times[H]$. Therefore, the Azuma-Hoeffding inequality implies that with probability at least $1-\delta$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|\sum_{k \in[K]} \sum_{h \in[H]} \zeta_{h}^{k}\right| & \leq \sqrt{2 H K \log (1 / \delta)}, \\
\left|\sum_{k \in[K]} \sum_{h \in[H]} \bar{p}_{h}^{k}\right| & \leq \sqrt{2 H K \log (1 / \delta)}
\end{aligned}
$$

On the other hand, recalling $z_{h}^{k}$ defined in (B.5) and the construction of $\gamma_{h, m}^{k}$ in Algorithm 2, we have

$$
z_{h}^{k} \leq \sqrt{\frac{S \iota}{N_{h}^{k-1}\left(s_{h}^{k}, a_{h}^{k}\right)}}
$$

This implies

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k \in[K]} \sum_{h \in[H]} z_{h}^{k} & \leq \sum_{h \in[H]} \sum_{k \in[K]} \sqrt{\frac{S \iota}{\min \left\{1, N_{h}^{k-1}\left(s_{h}^{k}, a_{h}^{k}\right)\right\}}} \\
& \stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \sum_{h \in[H]} \sqrt{K \sum_{k \in[K]} \frac{S \iota}{\min \left\{1, N_{h}^{k-1}\left(s_{h}^{k}, a_{h}^{k}\right)\right\}}} \\
& \stackrel{(i i)}{\leq} \sum_{h \in[H]} \sqrt{S K \iota} \sum_{(s, a) \in S \times \mathcal{A}} \sum_{k \in[K]} \frac{1}{\min \left\{1, N_{h}^{k-1}(s, a)\right\}} \\
& \stackrel{(i i i)}{\leq} \sum_{h \in[H]} \sqrt{S K \iota \cdot S A(1+\log K)} \\
& =2 \sqrt{H^{2} S^{2} A K \iota^{2}},
\end{aligned}
$$

where step ( $i$ ) follows from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, step (ii) holds by the pigeonhole principle, and step (iii) holds by the fact that $\sum_{k \in[K]} \frac{1}{k} \leq \log K$. Combining the above results with (B.10), we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{k \in[K]} U_{1}^{k}\left(s_{1}^{k}\right) \lesssim \sqrt{H K \iota}+\sqrt{H^{2} S^{2} A K \iota^{2}} \lesssim \sqrt{H^{2} S^{2} A K \iota^{2}} . \tag{B.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

## B. 3 Putting All Together

By Lemma B. 4 , note that for $\beta_{m}>0$,

$$
U_{1}^{k}(s) \geq \frac{\left(e^{\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{1, m}^{k}}-e^{\beta_{m} \underline{V}_{1, m}^{k}}\right)(s)}{e^{\beta_{m} H}-1}
$$

and for $\beta_{m}<0$,

$$
U_{1}^{k}(s) \geq \frac{\left(e^{\beta_{m} V_{1, m}^{k}}-e^{\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{1, m}^{k}}\right)(s)}{1-e^{\beta_{m} H}}
$$

which together imply

$$
\begin{equation*}
U_{1}^{k}(s) \geq \max _{m \in[M]} \frac{\left(e^{\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{1, m}^{k}}-e^{\beta_{m} V_{1, m}^{k}}\right)(s)}{e^{\beta_{m} H}-1} . \tag{B.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note that on the event of Lemma B.2, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\left(e^{\left.\beta_{m} V_{1, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}}-e^{\beta_{m} V_{1, m}^{\pi_{2}^{k}}}\right)\left(s_{1}^{k}\right)}\right.}{e^{\beta_{m} H}-1} \leq \frac{\left(e^{\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{1, m}^{k}}-e^{\beta_{m} V_{1, m}^{k}}\right)\left(s_{1}^{k}\right)}{e^{\beta_{m} H}-1}, \tag{B.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the above two quantities are non-negative since for $\beta_{m}>0$, we have

$$
e^{\beta_{m} V_{1, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}}}-e^{\beta_{m} V_{1, m}^{\pi^{k}}} \geq 0, \quad e^{\beta_{m} H}-1>0,
$$

and for $\beta_{m}<0$, we have

$$
e^{\beta_{m} V_{1, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}}}-e^{\beta_{m} V_{1, m}^{\pi^{k}}} \leq 0, \quad e^{\beta_{m} H}-1<0 .
$$

We now connect the above results with the regret of (4.2). For each $m \in[M]$, it is clear that $V_{1, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}} \geq V_{1, m}^{\pi^{k}}$ by definition. If $\beta_{m}>0$, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{\left(V_{1, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}}-V_{1, m}^{\pi^{k}}\right)\left(s_{1}^{k}\right)}{\Phi_{H}\left(\beta_{m}\right)} & =\frac{H}{e^{\beta_{m} H}-1}\left[\operatorname { l o g } \left(e^{\left.\left.\beta_{m} V_{1, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}\left(s_{1}^{k}\right)}\right)-\log \left(e^{\left.\beta_{m} V_{1, m}^{\pi^{k}\left(s_{1}^{k}\right)}\right)}\right)\right]} \begin{array}{rl} 
& \stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \frac{H}{e^{\beta_{m} H}-1}\left(e^{\left.\beta_{m} V_{1, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}\left(s_{1}^{k}\right)}-e^{\beta_{m} V_{1, m}^{k}\left(s_{1}^{k}\right)}\right)}\right. \\
& \stackrel{(i i)}{\leq} \frac{H}{e^{\beta_{m} H}-1}\left(e^{\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{1, m}^{k}\left(s_{1}^{k}\right)}-e^{\beta_{m} V_{1, m}^{k}\left(s_{1}^{k}\right)}\right) \\
& \leq H \cdot U_{1}^{k}\left(s_{1}^{k}\right),
\end{array},\right.\right.
\end{align*}
$$

where step ( $i$ ) holds since $f(x)=\log x$ is 1-Lipschitz for $x \geq 1$, step (ii) holds on the event of Lemma B.2, and the last step holds by (B.12). If $\beta_{m}<0$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\left(V_{1, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}}-V_{1, m}^{\pi^{k}}\right)\left(s_{1}^{k}\right)}{\Phi_{H}\left(\beta_{m}\right)} & =\frac{H}{e^{-\beta_{m} H}-1}\left[\log \left(e^{\beta_{m} V_{1, m}^{\pi^{k}}\left(s_{1}^{k}\right)}\right)-\log \left(e^{\beta_{m} V_{1, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}}\left(s_{1}^{k}\right)}\right)\right] \\
& \stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \frac{H e^{-\beta_{m} H}}{e^{-\beta_{m} H}-1}\left(e^{\left.\beta_{m} V_{1, m}^{\pi_{2}^{k}\left(s_{1}^{k}\right)}-e^{\beta_{m} V_{1, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}}\left(s_{1}^{k}\right)}\right)}\right. \\
& =\frac{H}{1-e^{\beta_{m} H}}\left(e^{\left.\beta_{m} V_{1, m}^{\pi^{k}\left(s_{1}^{k}\right)}-e^{\left.\beta_{m} V_{1, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}\left(s_{1}^{k}\right)}\right)}\right)}\right. \\
& \stackrel{(i i)}{\leq} \frac{H}{1-e^{\beta_{m} H}}\left(e^{\beta_{m} V_{1, m}^{k}\left(s_{1}^{k}\right)}-e^{\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{1, m}^{k}\left(s_{1}^{k}\right)}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& =\frac{H}{e^{\beta_{m} H}-1}\left(e^{\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{1, m}^{k}\left(s_{1}^{k}\right)}-e^{\beta_{m} V_{1, m}^{k}\left(s_{1}^{k}\right)}\right) \\
& \leq H \cdot U_{1}^{k}\left(s_{1}^{k}\right) \tag{B.15}
\end{align*}
$$

where step ( $i$ ) holds since $f(x)=\log x$ is $\left(e^{-\beta_{m} H}\right)$-Lipschitz for $x \in\left[e^{\beta_{m} H}, 1\right]$, step (ii) holds on the event of Lemma B.2, and the last step holds by (B.12). The proof for the regret upper bound is completed by applying (B.11) to (B.14) and (B.15) combined.

Finally, a sample complexity guarantee can be derived based on the regret bound, following an argument similar to that presented in Jin et al. (2018). In particular, we have

$$
\operatorname{Regret}_{\mathrm{NE}}(K)=\sum_{k \in[K]} \max _{m \in[M]} \frac{\left(V_{1, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}}-V_{1, m}^{\pi_{m}^{k}}\right)\left(s_{1}\right)}{\Phi_{H}\left(\beta_{m}\right)} \lesssim \sqrt{H^{4} S^{2} A K \iota^{2}}
$$

and a random policy $\pi^{\ddagger}$ defined as a uniform sample from $\left\{\pi^{k}\right\}_{k=1}^{K}$ enjoys

$$
\max _{m \in[M]} \frac{\left(V_{1, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{\ddagger}}-V_{1, m}^{\pi^{\ddagger}}\right)\left(s_{1}\right)}{\Phi_{H}\left(\beta_{m}\right)} \lesssim \sqrt{3 H^{4} S^{2} A \iota^{2} / K}
$$

with probability at least $\frac{2}{3}$. It follows that Algorithm 2 finds $\varepsilon$-optimal policy with $K=\widetilde{O}\left(H^{4} S^{2} A / \varepsilon^{2}\right)$ episodes.

## B. 4 Proofs for CCE and CE

We supply the proofs of upper and lower bounds of exponential value functions involved in Algorithm 2 for CCE and CE in this section, which complement the analogous results on NE in Lemma B.2. The regret upper bounds for CCE and CE then follow from substituting Lemma B. 2 with Lemmas B. 5 and B.6, respectively, and replacing the exponential value function $e^{\beta_{m} V_{h, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}}(s)}$ under the optimal response with $e^{\beta_{m} \max _{\psi \in \Psi_{m}} V_{h, m}^{\psi\left(\pi^{k}\right)}(s)}$ for CE.

Lemma B. 5 (Upper and Lower Bounds for CCE). For any $\delta \in(0,1]$ and $(k, h, m, s, a)$, the following statements hold with probability at least $1-\delta$ for any policy $\pi^{k}$. If $\beta_{m}>0$, we have

$$
\begin{array}{cc}
e^{\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{h, m}^{k}(s)} \geq e^{\beta_{m} V_{h, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}(s)},} & e^{\beta_{m} V_{h, m}^{\pi^{k}}(s)} \geq e^{\beta_{m} \underline{V}_{h, m}^{k}(s)}, \\
e^{\beta_{m} \bar{Q}_{h, m}^{k}(s, a)} \geq e^{\beta_{m} Q_{h, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}(s, a)},} & e^{\beta_{m} Q_{h, m}^{\pi_{h}^{k}(s, a)} \geq e^{\beta_{m} \underline{Q}_{h, m}^{k}(s, a)} ;}
\end{array}
$$

and if $\beta_{m}<0$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& e^{\beta_{m} V_{h, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}(s)}} \geq e^{\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{h, m}^{k}(s)}, e^{\beta_{m} \underline{V}_{h, m}^{k}(s)} \geq e^{\beta_{m} V_{h, m}^{\pi^{k}}(s)} \\
& e^{\beta_{m} Q_{h, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}(s, a)} \geq e^{\beta_{m} \bar{Q}_{h, m}^{k}(s, a)},} \quad e^{\beta_{m} \underline{Q}_{h, m}^{k}(s, a)} \geq e^{\beta_{m} Q_{h, m}^{k}(s, a)} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. We prove this result through induction. We only show the argument for the case of $\beta_{m}>0$, and we can multiply -1 to the argument below for $\beta_{m}<0$. For any $\delta \in(0,1]$, fixed tuple $(k, h, m, s, a)$, and $\beta_{m}>0$, if we assume that the value functions at the next step satisfies $e^{\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{h+1, m}^{k}(s)}-e^{\beta_{m} V_{h+1, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}(s)}} \geq 0$, then we have

$$
e^{\beta_{m} \bar{Q}_{h, m}^{k}(s)}-e^{\beta_{m} Q_{h, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}(s)}}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =\left(e ^ { \beta _ { m } r _ { h , m } ( s , a ) } \left[\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{h}^{k} e^{\left.\left.\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{h+1, m}^{k}\right](s, a)-e^{\beta_{m} r_{h, m}(s, a)}\left[\mathcal{P}_{h} e^{\beta_{m} V_{h+1, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}}}\right](s, a)\right)+\gamma_{h, m}^{k}(s, a), ~\left({ }^{k}\right)}\right.\right. \\
& =e^{\beta_{m} r_{h, m}(s, a)}\left[\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{h}^{k}\left(e^{\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{h+1, m}^{k}}-e^{\left.\beta_{m} V_{h+1, m}^{*, \pi_{m}^{k}}\right)}\right)\right](s, a) \\
& +\left[\left(\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{h}^{k}-\mathcal{P}_{h}\right) e^{\beta_{m}\left(r_{h, m}(s, a)+V_{h+1, m}^{\left.*, \pi_{-m}^{k}\right)}\right](s, a)+\gamma_{h, m}^{k}(s, a), ~\left({ }^{k}\right)}\right. \\
& \geq 0,
\end{aligned}
$$

where the first component is non-negative due to induction assumption, the sum of the second and the third component is also non-negative due to Lemma B.1. Notice that $\bar{V}_{H+1, m}^{k}(s)=V_{H+1, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}}(s)=$
 we have

$$
e^{\beta_{m} \bar{Q}_{h, m}^{k}(s, a)} \geq e^{\beta_{m} Q_{h, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}(s, a)}}
$$

for all agents, state-action pairs, and $h \in[H]$.
Further, given the assumption $e^{\beta_{m} \bar{Q}_{h, m}^{k}(s, a)}-e^{\beta_{m} Q_{h, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}}(s, a)} \geq 0$ for any fixed tuple $(k, h, m, s, a)$, it follows that

$$
e^{\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{h, m}^{k}(s)}-e^{\beta_{m} V_{h, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}}(s)}=\left[\mathcal{G}_{\pi_{h}^{k}} e^{\left.\beta_{m} \bar{Q}_{h, m}^{k}\right](s)-e^{\beta_{m} V_{h, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}(s)}} \geq 0, ., 0, ~}\right.
$$

where by the definition of CCE equilibrium that
for any $\beta_{m}>0$ and

$$
\left[\mathcal{G}_{\pi_{h}^{k}} e^{\beta_{m} \bar{Q}_{h, m}^{k}}\right](s)=\min _{\nu}\left[\mathcal{G}_{\nu \times \pi_{h,-m}^{k}} e^{\left.\beta_{m} \bar{Q}_{h, m}^{k}\right](s) \leq e^{\beta_{m} V_{h, m}^{*, \pi_{-m}^{k}}(s)}, ~}\right.
$$

for any $\beta_{m}<0$.
Recursion proofs for $(-1)^{\mathbb{I}\left\{\beta_{m}<0\right\}} \cdot\left(e^{\beta_{m} V_{h, m}^{\pi_{m}^{k}}(s)}-e^{\beta_{m} \underline{V}_{h, m}^{k}(s)}\right) \geq 0$ and $(-1)^{\mathbb{I}\left\{\beta_{m}<0\right\}} \cdot\left(e^{\beta_{m} Q_{h, m}^{\pi_{n}^{k}}(s, a)}-\right.$ $\left.e^{\beta_{m} \underline{\underline{Q}}_{h, m}^{k}(s, a)}\right) \geq 0$ follow the same reasoning.

Lemma B. 6 (Upper and Lower Bounds for CE). For any $\delta \in(0,1]$ and $(k, h, m, s, a)$, the following statements hold with probability at least $1-\delta$ for any CE policy $\pi^{k}$. If $\beta_{m}>0$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
e^{\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{h, m}^{k}(s)} \geq e^{\beta_{m} \max _{\psi \in \Psi_{m}} V_{h, m}^{\psi\left(\pi^{k}\right)}(s)}, & e^{\beta_{m} V_{h, m}^{\pi^{k}}(s)} \geq e^{\beta_{m} \underline{V}_{h, m}^{k}(s)}, \\
e^{\beta_{m} \bar{Q}_{h, m}^{k}(s, a)} \geq e^{\beta_{m} \max _{\psi \in \Psi_{m}} Q_{h, m}^{\psi\left(\pi^{k}\right)}(s, a)}, & e^{\beta_{m} Q_{h, m}^{\pi^{k}(s, a)} \geq e^{\beta_{m} \underline{Q}_{h, m}^{k}(s, a)}} ;
\end{aligned}
$$

if $\beta_{m}<0$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& e^{\beta_{m} \max _{\psi \in \Psi_{m}} V_{h, m}^{\psi\left(\pi^{k}\right)}(s)} \geq e^{\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{h, m}^{k}(s)}, \quad e^{\beta_{m} \underline{V}_{h, m}^{k}(s)} \geq e^{\beta_{m} V_{h, m}^{\pi^{k}}(s)}, \\
& e^{\beta_{m} \max _{\psi \in \Psi_{m}} Q_{h, m}^{\psi\left(\pi^{k}\right)}(s, a)} \geq e^{\beta_{m} \bar{Q}_{h, m}^{k}(s, a)}, \quad e^{\beta_{m} \underline{Q}_{h, m}^{k}(s, a)} \geq e^{\beta_{m} Q_{h, m}^{k}(s, a)} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. We prove this result with induction. We only show the argument for the case of $\beta_{m}>0$, and for $\beta_{m}<0$ we can multiply -1 to the argument below. For any $\delta \in(0,1]$, fixed tuple $(k, h, m, s, a)$, and $\beta_{m}>0$, if $e^{\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{h+1, m}^{k}(s)}-e^{\beta_{m} \max _{\psi \in \Psi_{m}} V_{h+1, m}^{\psi\left(\pi^{k}\right)}(s)} \geq 0$, then we have

$$
\geq 0,
$$

where the first component is non-negative due to induction assumption, the sum of the second and the third component is also non-negative due to Lemma B.1. Notice that $\bar{V}_{H+1, m}^{k}(s)=V_{H+1, m}^{\psi\left(\pi^{k}\right)}(s)=$ 0 for all state $s \in \mathcal{S}$, and $e^{\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{H+1, m}^{k}(s)}-e^{\left.\beta_{m} \max _{\psi \in \Psi m} V_{H+1, m}^{\psi(s)} \geq 0 \text { holds for step } H+1 \text {. Consequently, }, \text {, }{ }^{k}\right)} \geq$ we have

$$
e^{\beta_{m} \bar{Q}_{h, m}^{k}(s, a)} \geq e^{\beta_{m} \max _{\psi \in \Psi_{m}} Q_{h, m}^{\psi\left(\pi^{k}\right)}(s, a)}
$$

for all agents, state-action pairs, and $h \in[H]$.
Further, given the assumption $e^{\beta_{m} \bar{Q}_{h, m}^{k}(s, a)}-e^{\beta_{m} \max _{\psi \in \Psi_{m}} Q_{h, m}^{\psi\left(\pi^{k}\right)}(s, a)} \geq 0$ for any fixed tuple ( $k, h, m, s, a$ ), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& e^{\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{h, m}^{k}(s)}-e^{\beta_{m} \max _{\psi \in \Psi_{m}} V_{h+1, m}^{\psi\left(\pi_{m}^{k}\right)}(s)}=\left[\mathcal{G}_{h}^{k} e^{\left.\beta_{m} \bar{Q}_{h, m}^{k}\right](s)-e^{\beta_{m} \max _{\psi \in \Psi_{m}} V_{h+1, m}^{\psi\left(\pi^{k}\right)}(s)}} \mathbf{}\right. \\
& \geq 0,
\end{aligned}
$$

where by the definition of CE that

$$
\left[\mathcal{G}_{\pi_{h}^{k}} e^{\left.\beta_{m} \bar{Q}_{h, m}^{k}\right](s)}=\max _{\psi}\left[\mathcal{G}_{\psi\left(\pi_{h}^{k}\right)} e^{\left.\beta_{m} \bar{Q}_{h, m}^{k}\right](s) \geq e^{\beta_{m} \max _{\psi \in \Psi_{m}} V_{h+1, m}^{\psi\left(k^{k}\right)}(s)}, ~}\right.\right.
$$

for any $\beta_{m}>0$ and

$$
\left[\mathcal{G}_{\pi_{h}^{k}} e^{\left.\beta_{m} \bar{Q}_{h, m}^{k}\right](s)}=\min _{\psi}\left[\mathcal{G}_{\psi\left(\pi_{h}^{k}\right)} e^{\left.\beta_{m} \bar{Q}_{h, m}^{k}\right](s) \leq e^{\beta_{m} \max _{\psi \in \Psi m} V_{h+1, m}^{\psi\left(\pi^{k}\right)}(s)}, ~}\right.\right.
$$

for any $\beta_{m}<0$. Recall that $e^{\beta_{m} \max _{\psi \in \Psi_{m}} V_{h+1, m}^{\psi\left(\pi^{k}\right)}(s)}=\max _{\psi}\left[\mathcal{G}_{\psi\left(\pi_{h}^{k}\right)} e^{\beta_{m} \max _{\psi^{\prime}} Q_{h, m}^{\psi^{\prime}\left(\pi_{h}^{k}\right)}}\right](s)$ for $\beta_{m}>0$ and $e^{\beta_{m} \max _{\psi \in \Psi} \Psi_{m}} V_{h+1, m}^{\psi\left(\pi^{k}\right)}(s)=\min _{\psi}\left[\mathcal{G}_{\psi\left(\pi_{h}^{k}\right)} e^{\beta_{m} \max _{\psi^{\prime}} Q_{h, m}^{\psi^{\prime}\left(\pi_{h}^{k}\right)}}\right](s)$ for $\beta_{m}<0$.
The recursion arguments for the other two inequalities follow the same reasoning.
Future directions and broad impact. With the recent developments in variance-aware learning, an exciting avenue for future exploration is examining how noise-adaptive algorithms (Xu et al., 2023a) can enhance risk-sensitive reinforcement learning (RL). There is also significant potential in developing efficient algorithms for risk-sensitive RL in varied contexts, such as matching and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& e^{\beta_{m} \bar{Q}_{h, m}^{k}(s, a)}-e^{\beta_{m} \max _{\psi \in \Psi m} Q_{h, m}^{\psi\left(\pi^{k}\right)}(s, a)}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =e^{\beta_{m} r_{h, m}(s, a)}\left[\widehat { \mathcal { P } } _ { h } ^ { k } \left(e^{\beta_{m} \bar{V}_{h+1, m}^{k}}-e^{\left.\left.\beta_{m} \max _{\psi \in \Psi_{m}} V_{h+1, m}^{\psi\left(\pi^{k}\right)}\right)\right](s, a)}\right.\right. \\
& +\left[\left(\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{h}^{k}-\mathcal{P}_{h}\right) e^{\beta_{m}\left(r_{h, m}(s, a)+\max _{\psi \in \Psi_{m}} V_{h+1, m}^{\psi\left(\pi^{k}\right)}\right)}\right](s, a)+\gamma_{h, m}^{k}(s, a)
\end{aligned}
$$

finding competitive equilibrium in macroeconomics (Min et al., 2022; Xu et al., 2023b). Furthermore, given the close connection between risk-sensitive RL and human learning behaviors, it would be fascinating to investigate its integration with fields like meta-learning and bio-inspired learning, as discussed in studies by Xu et al. (2021) and Song et al. (2021). Additionally, a critical area for future research lies in exploring the role of risk sensitivity in augmenting unsupervised learning algorithms, a concept touched upon by Ling et al. (2019).
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