

# Reinforcement Learning

## Assignment 1 (Theoretical Questions)

### Group Members

Matheus da Silva Araujo – ID!!!  
Miguel Ángel Carrillo – ID!!!

January 26, 2026

### Problem Statement

*Application of the Lai–Robbins bound. The asymptotic lower bound on the total regret  $L_T$  for any consistent bandit algorithm is given by the Lai–Robbins bound:*

$$\liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}[L_T]}{\ln T} \geq \sum_{a: \Delta_a > 0} \frac{\Delta_a}{D_{\text{KL}}(P_a \| P_*)},$$

where  $D_{\text{KL}}$  is the Kullback–Leibler divergence between the distribution of a suboptimal arm  $a$  ( $P_a$ ) and the optimal arm ( $P_*$ ), and  $\Delta_a$  is the gap in expected reward between the optimal arm and arm  $a$ .

### Question 1

Derive the explicit formula for the KL-divergence between two Bernoulli distributions with parameters  $p$  and  $q$ :

$$D_{\text{KL}}(\text{Ber}(p) \| \text{Ber}(q)).$$

#### Derivation:

General expression for KL-divergence between distributions  $r(x)$  and  $s(x)$  with discrete random variables:

$$D_{\text{KL}}(r(x) \| s(x)) = \sum_{x \in X} r(x) \log \left( \frac{r(x)}{s(x)} \right) \quad (1)$$

Expression for a Bernoulli distribution with parameter  $p$ :

$$P(X = x) = \begin{cases} 1 - p, & \text{if } X = 0 \\ p, & \text{if } X = 1 \end{cases}$$

Combining both expressions:

$$\begin{aligned}
D_{\text{KL}}(\text{Ber}(p) \parallel \text{Ber}(q)) &= \sum_{x \in X = \{0,1\}} P(X = x) \log \left( \frac{P(X = x)}{Q(X = x)} \right) \\
&= P(X = 0) \log \left( \frac{P(X = 0)}{Q(X = 0)} \right) + P(X = 1) \log \left( \frac{P(X = 1)}{Q(X = 1)} \right) \\
&= (1 - p) \log \left( \frac{1 - p}{1 - q} \right) + p \log \left( \frac{p}{q} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

## Final Answer

$$D_{\text{KL}}(\text{Ber}(p) \parallel \text{Ber}(q)) = (1 - p) \log \left( \frac{1 - p}{1 - q} \right) + p \log \left( \frac{p}{q} \right).$$

## Question 2

*Same question for two Gaussian distributions sharing the same variance.*

### Derivation:

General expression for Gaussian distribution with variance  $\sigma^2$  and mean  $\mu$ :

$$\mathcal{N}(x, \mu, \sigma) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \exp \left( -\frac{(x - \mu)^2}{2\sigma^2} \right)$$

Assuming without loss of generality that the two Gaussian distributions have different means,  $P(X, \mu_1, \sigma), Q(X, \mu_2, \sigma)$ .

General expression for KL-divergence between distributions  $R(x)$  and  $S(x)$  with continuous random variables:

$$D_{\text{KL}}(R(x) \parallel S(x)) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} R(x) \log \left( \frac{R(x)}{S(x)} \right) dx = \mathbb{E}_{X \sim R} \left[ \log \left( \frac{R(X)}{S(X)} \right) \right] \quad (2)$$

,

where  $\mathbb{E}$  is the expected value.

Analyzing the log-term isolated first:

$$\begin{aligned}
\log \frac{P(x)}{Q(x)} &= \log P(x) - \log Q(x) \\
&= \log \left[ \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma^2} \right) \exp \left( -\frac{(x - \mu_1)^2}{2\sigma^2} \right) \right] - \log \left[ \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma^2} \right) \exp \left( -\frac{(x - \mu_2)^2}{2\sigma^2} \right) \right] \\
&= \left( \log \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma^2} \right) + \log \left( \exp \left( -\frac{(x - \mu_1)^2}{2\sigma^2} \right) \right) \right) - \left( \log \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma^2} \right) + \log \left( \exp \left( -\frac{(x - \mu_2)^2}{2\sigma^2} \right) \right) \right) \\
&= \left( \log \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma^2} \right) - \frac{(x - \mu_1)^2}{2\sigma^2} \right) - \left( \log \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma^2} \right) - \frac{(x - \mu_2)^2}{2\sigma^2} \right) \\
&= \frac{(x - \mu_2)^2 - (x - \mu_1)^2}{2\sigma^2} \\
\rightarrow \log \frac{P(x)}{Q(x)} &= \frac{(x - \mu_2)^2 - (x - \mu_1)^2}{2\sigma^2} \quad (3)
\end{aligned}$$

Analyzing the numerator of Equation 3:

$$\begin{aligned}
(x - \mu_2)^2 - (x - \mu_1)^2 &= (x^2 - 2x\mu_2 + \mu_2^2) - (x^2 - 2x\mu_1 + \mu_1^2) \\
&= 2x(\mu_1 - \mu_2) + \mu_2^2 - \mu_1^2 \\
&= 2x(\mu_1 - \mu_2) + (\mu_2 - \mu_1)(\mu_2 + \mu_1) \\
&= (\mu_1 - \mu_2)(2x - \mu_2 - \mu_1) \\
\rightarrow (x - \mu_2)^2 - (x - \mu_1)^2 &= (\mu_1 - \mu_2)(2x - \mu_2 - \mu_1)
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Substituting Equations 4 into the numerator of 3:

$$\log \frac{P(x)}{Q(x)} = \frac{(\mu_1 - \mu_2)(2x - \mu_1 - \mu_2)}{2\sigma^2} \tag{5}$$

Then, from the expected value definition of KL-divergence and Equation 5, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
D_{\text{KL}}(P(x) \| Q(x)) &= \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P} \left[ \log \left( \frac{P(X)}{Q(X)} \right) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P} \left[ \frac{(\mu_1 - \mu_2)(2X - \mu_1 - \mu_2)}{2\sigma^2} \right] \\
&= \frac{(\mu_1 - \mu_2)}{2\sigma^2} \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P} [2X - \mu_1 - \mu_2].
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Finally, from the linearity of expectation ( $\mathbb{E}[aX + b] = a\mathbb{E}[X] + b$ ) and the information that  $P(X)$  is a Gaussian distribution (implying that  $\mathbb{E}_{X \sim P} = \mu_1$ ), applied to Equation 6:

$$\begin{aligned}
D_{\text{KL}}(P(x) \| Q(x)) &= \frac{(\mu_1 - \mu_2)}{2\sigma^2} \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P} [(2X - \mu_1 - \mu_2)] \\
&= \frac{(\mu_1 - \mu_2)}{2\sigma^2} (2\mu_1 - \mu_1 - \mu_2) \\
&= \frac{(\mu_1 - \mu_2)}{2\sigma^2} (\mu_1 - \mu_2) \\
&= \frac{(\mu_1 - \mu_2)^2}{2\sigma^2}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\rightarrow D_{\text{KL}}(P(X, \mu_1, \sigma)(X) \| Q(X, \mu_2, \sigma)(X)) &= \\
&\frac{(\mu_1 - \mu_2)^2}{2\sigma^2}
\end{aligned}$$

### Final Answer

$$D_{\text{KL}}(P(X, \mu_1, \sigma)(X) \| Q(X, \mu_2, \sigma)(X)) = \frac{(\mu_1 - \mu_2)^2}{2\sigma^2} \tag{7}$$

## Question 3

Show that for the Bernoulli bandit, it is "easier" (i.e., theoretically implies lower regret) to distinguish an arm with mean  $p = 0.9$  from an optimal arm with  $p_* = 0.99$  than it is to distinguish an arm with  $p = 0.55$  from an optimal arm with  $p_* = 0.64$ , even though the difference in means is identical ( $\Delta = 0.09$ ) in both cases. What about the Gaussian case?

### Answer

#### Bernoulli case:

From Question 1 final answer:

$$D_{\text{KL}}(\text{Ber}(p) \parallel \text{Ber}(q)) = (1-p) \log \left( \frac{1-p}{1-q} \right) + p \log \left( \frac{p}{q} \right).$$

For  $p = 0.9, p_* = 0.99$  using the distributions  $P_a, P_*$ :

$$D_{\text{KL}}(P_a(p) \parallel P_*(p_*)) = D_{\text{KL}}(P_a(0.9) \parallel P_*(0.99)) = (1-p) \log \left( \frac{1-p}{1-p_*} \right) + p \log \left( \frac{p}{p_*} \right) \approx 0.1445$$

By applying the previous value and  $\Delta_a = 0.09$  in the Lai-Robbins bound, it is obtained

$$\frac{\Delta_a}{D_{\text{KL}}(P_a \parallel P_*)} \approx \frac{0.09}{0.1445} \approx 0.623 \quad (8)$$

Likewise, for  $p = 0.55, p_* = 0.64$  using the distributions  $P_a, P_*$ :

$$D_{\text{KL}}(P_a(p) \parallel P_*(p_*)) = D_{\text{KL}}(P_a(0.55) \parallel P_*(0.64)) = (1-p) \log \left( \frac{1-p}{1-p_*} \right) + p \log \left( \frac{p}{p_*} \right) \approx 0.0171$$

Again, by applying the previous value and  $\Delta_a = 0.09$  in the Lai-Robbins bound, it is obtained

$$\frac{\Delta_a}{D_{\text{KL}}(P_a \parallel P_*)} \approx \frac{0.09}{0.0171} \approx 5.26 \quad (9)$$

Comparing Equations 8 and 9, the conclusion is that the theoretical lower bound for the regret is smaller in the first case ( $p = 0.9, p_* = 0.99$ ) than in the second case ( $p = 0.55, p_* = 0.64$ ), which means that the first case is "easier".

#### Gaussian case:

From Question 2 final answer:

$$D_{\text{KL}}(P(X, \mu_1, \sigma)(X) \parallel Q(X, \mu_2, \sigma)(X)) = \frac{(\mu_1 - \mu_2)^2}{2\sigma^2} \quad (10)$$

For  $p = \mu_1 = 0.9, p_* = \mu_2 = 0.99$  using the Gaussian distributions  $P_a, P_*$ :

$$D_{\text{KL}}(P_a(p, \sigma) \parallel P_*(p_*, \sigma)) = \frac{(\mu_1 - \mu_2)^2}{2\sigma^2} = \frac{(0.9 - 0.99)^2}{2\sigma^2} = \frac{0.09^2}{2\sigma^2}$$

For  $p = \mu_1 = 0.55, p_* = \mu_2 = 0.64$  using the Gaussian distributions  $P_a, P_*$ :

$$D_{\text{KL}}(\text{P}_a(p, \sigma) \| \text{P}_*(p_*, \sigma)) = \frac{(\mu_1 - \mu_2)^2}{2\sigma^2} = \frac{(0.55 - 0.64)^2}{2\sigma^2} = \frac{0.09^2}{2\sigma^2}$$

Since the gaps are the same and the KL-divergence is the same in both cases, this means that one does not have a theoretically lower bound than the other, meaning that one is not easier than the other.

**Conclusion:** the theoretical lower bound depends only on the gap and, as such, both cases have the same theoretical lower bound and are equally "easy".

## Proof of simplified Lai-Robbins bound

Consider two Bernoulli arms:

- Arm 1 has a known success probability  $p_1 = 0.5$ .
- Arm 2 has an unknown success probability  $p_2 = 0.5 + \Delta$ .

You want to determine if Arm 2 is better than Arm 1 with high confidence. You collect  $n$  samples from Arm 2 and compute the empirical mean  $\hat{p}_n$ . You decide Arm 2 is "Better" if  $\hat{p}_n > 0.5$ .

## 1 Question 4

Suppose the truth is that Arm 2 is actually worse ( $\Delta < 0$ ). Use Hoeffding's inequality to find an upper bound on the probability that you incorrectly classify it as "Better" (i.e.,  $P(\hat{p}_n > 0.5)$ ) after  $n$  samples.

Hoeffding's Inequality states that for independent identically distributed random variables  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  with expected value  $\mu$ :

$$P(\bar{X}_n - \mu \geq t) \leq \exp(-2nt^2)$$

Let  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  be the  $n$  samples from Arm 2, where each  $X_i \sim \text{Ber}(p_2)$  with  $p_2 = 0.5 + \Delta$  and  $\Delta < 0$ .

The empirical mean is:

$$\hat{p}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$$

Since it is a Bernoulli distribution, the expected value  $\mu = p_2$ .

The question asks to bound the expression

$$P(\hat{p}_n > 0.5) = P(\hat{p}_n - p_2 > 0.5 - p_2)$$

Note that  $p_2 = 0.5 + \Delta \rightarrow 0.5 - p_2 = -\Delta$

Combining the last two expressions, the required expression is equivalent to bound

$$P(\hat{p}_n - p_2 > -\Delta)$$

Note that  $\Delta < 0 \rightarrow -\Delta > 0$ , which is a deviation above the mean of the distribution.

Finally, set  $t = -\Delta$  (which is positive because  $\Delta < 0$ ) in the Hoeffding's Inequality to obtain:

$$P(\hat{p}_n > 0.5) = P(\hat{p}_n - p_2 > -\Delta) \leq \exp(-2n\Delta^2)$$

This is an upper bound on the probability required in the question.

### Final Answer

$$P(\hat{p}_n > 0.5) \leq \exp(-2n\Delta^2)$$

## Question 5

Set this error probability to be at most  $\delta$  (e.g.,  $\delta = 1/T$ ). Rearrange your bounds to show that the number of samples  $n$  required to avoid this error must be at least:

$$n \geq \frac{\ln(1/\delta)}{2\Delta^2}.$$

In Question 4 final answer it was obtained:

$$P(\hat{p}_n > 0.5) \leq \exp(-2n\Delta^2)$$

The question asks that the probability of misclassification to be at most  $\delta$  i.e.,

$$P(\hat{p}_n > 0.5) \leq \delta$$

Using this upper bound:

$$\begin{aligned} P(\hat{p}_n > 0.5) &\leq \exp(-2n\Delta^2) \leq \delta \\ \implies -2n\Delta^2 &\leq \ln(\delta) \\ \implies 2n\Delta^2 &\geq \ln(1/\delta) \\ \implies n &\geq \frac{\ln(1/\delta)}{2\Delta^2}. \end{aligned}$$

### Final Answer

$$n \geq \frac{\ln(1/\delta)}{2\Delta^2}$$

## Question 6

For small gaps,  $D_{\text{KL}} \approx 2\Delta^2$ . Substitute  $D_{\text{KL}}$  into the inequality above. Explain how this explains the Lai–Robbins term

$$\frac{\ln T}{D_{\text{KL}}}.$$

From Question 4, it was determined that the number of samples needed is:

$$n \geq \frac{\ln(1/\delta)}{2\Delta^2}$$

Using the approximation for small gaps specified in the problem statement  $D_{KL} \approx 2\Delta^2$  and substituting into the previous bound:

$$n \geq \frac{\ln(1/\delta)}{D_{KL}}$$

Setting  $\delta = 1/T$  (the probability of error tolerated over  $T$  rounds):

$$n \geq \frac{\ln(T)}{D_{KL}}$$

This shows that, in order to distinguish a suboptimal Bernoulli arm from the optimal arm with error probability at most  $1/T$ , the suboptimal arm must be sampled at least on the order of

$$\frac{\ln T}{D_{KL}(P_a \| P_*)}$$

times. Since each such sample incurs regret  $\Delta$ , this directly explains the Lai–Robbins bound term

$$\frac{\Delta \ln T}{D_{KL}(P_a \| P_*)}.$$