

Supplementary Material

Theorem 1. Given any constants $\delta > 0$ and $M < \infty$, there exist a time instant $t_0 < \infty$ and a resolution parameter $n_0 < \infty$ such that $\forall t > t_0$ and $\forall n > n_0$:

$$\Pr \{G_i(t) > M\} > 1 - \delta, i \in N_r.$$

Proof: Theorem 1 is equivalent to

$$\Pr \{G_i(t) \leq M\} \leq \delta, i \in N_r. \quad (1)$$

The events $\{G_i(t) = k\}$ and $\{G_i(t) = j\}$ are mutually exclusive when $j \neq k$. So (1) is equivalent to

$$\sum_{k=1}^M \Pr \{G_i(t) = k\} \leq \delta \quad (2)$$

where

$$\Pr \{G_i(t) = k\} = C(t, k) (\Pr \{a_i \text{ is chosen}\})^k (\Pr \{a_i \text{ is not chosen}\})^{t-k}. \quad (3)$$

A threshold of resolution parameter $n(i)$ is given for each a_i , by which $p_i(t) > 0$ if $t \leq t(i)$. $t(i)$ is a threshold of time. $r(t) = |\{a_i | p_i(t) \neq 0\}|$, where $|\cdot|$ denotes the cardinality of a set. When LA has not converged, $r(t) \geq 2$.

First, for any iteration of DEP_{RI} ,

$$\Pr \{a_i \text{ is chosen}\} \leq 1. \quad (4)$$

Then, for action a_i , $t \leq t(i)$. If $n = n(i)$ and a_i is punished until $t(i)$, $p_i(t(i)) = \left(p_i(0) - \sum_{j=1}^{t(i)} \frac{1}{r(t)n(i)}\right)$. Therefore, for all $n > n(i)$ and $t < t(i)$,

$$\begin{aligned} p_i(t) &\geq \left(p_i(0) - \sum_{j=1}^{t(i)} \frac{1}{r(t)n(i)}\right) \\ &= \left(p_i(0) - \frac{t(i)}{r(t)n(i)}\right) \\ &\geq \left(p_i(0) - \frac{t(i)}{2n(i)}\right), i \in N_r. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

The second line of (5) is equal to the first line's right part because $\sum_{j=1}^{t(i)} \frac{1}{r(t)n(i)} = \frac{t(i)}{r(t)n(i)}$. It is greater than the item in the third line because $r(t) \geq 2$ when LA has not converged.

To make $p_i(0) - \frac{t(i)}{2n(i)} > 0$, $n(i)$ can be set as

$$n(i) = r \cdot t(i). \quad (6)$$

Then, at time $t \leq t(i)$, we have

$$\Pr\{a_i \text{ is not chosen}\} \leq 1 - \frac{1}{2r} < 1. \quad (7)$$

Then, according to (3),(4) and (7), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\{G_i(t) < M\} &= \sum_{k=1}^M \Pr\{G_i(t) = k\} \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^M C(t, k) (1)^k \left(1 - p_i(0) + \frac{t(i)}{2n(i)}\right)^{t-k} \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^M C(t, k) (1)^k \left(1 - \frac{1}{2r}\right)^{t-k}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

To prove the sum of M terms less than δ , we just need to make each element less than δ/M . It suffices to prove that M times the k' th term is less than δ . It can be observed that $C(t, k') \leq t^{k'}$. Let $\psi = 1 - \frac{1}{2r}$. So we have to prove that:

$$\Pr\{G_i(t) < M\} \leq Mt^{k'}\psi^{t-k'} \leq \delta. \quad (9)$$

By using l'Hopital's rule k' times, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} Mt^{k'}\psi^{t-k'} &= M \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{t^{k'}}{(1/\psi)^{t-k'}} \\ &= M \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{k'!}{(\ln(1/\psi))^{k'} (1/\psi)^{t-k'}} \\ &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Thus, for any given constants $\delta > 0$ and $M < \infty$, there exists a threshold $t(i)$ such that for all $t > t(i)$ and $n > n(i) = r \cdot t(i)$, (9) is satisfied. Since, we can repeat this argument for all the actions. t_0 and n_0 are defined as follows:

$$t_0 = \max_{i \in N_r} \{t(i)\}, \quad (11)$$

$$n_0 = \max_{i \in N_r} \{n(i)\} = \max_{i \in N_r} \{r \cdot t(i)\}. \quad (12)$$

Therefore, for all i , it is true that for all $t > t_0$ and $n > n_0$, $\Pr\{G_i(t) > M\} > 1 - \delta$, which completes the proof. \blacksquare

Theorem 2. Given any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, there exists $t_0 < \infty$, such that $\Pr\{\bar{C}(t_0)\} = 1$, where $\bar{C}(t_0)$

is defined as follows:

$$q_j(t) = \Pr \left\{ \left| \tilde{d}_j(t) - d_j \right| < \frac{w}{2} \right\}, \quad (13)$$

$$q(t) = \Pr \left\{ \left| \tilde{d}_j(t) - d_j \right| < \frac{w}{2}, \forall j \in N_r \right\} = \prod_{j \in N_r} q_j(t), \quad (14)$$

$$C(t) = \{q(t) > 1 - \delta\}, \quad \delta \in (0, 1), \quad (15)$$

$$\overline{C}(t_0) = \left\{ \bigcap_{t > t_0} \{q(t) > 1 - \delta\} \right\}, \quad \delta \in (0, 1) \quad (16)$$

where w is the minimum difference between the reward probabilities of any two actions.

Proof: Theorem 2 is equivalent to

$$\Pr \left\{ \left| \tilde{d}_i(t) - d_i \right| < \frac{w}{2}, \forall i \in N_r, \forall t > t_0 \right\} > 1 - \delta. \quad (17)$$

By the weak law of large numbers, for a given $\delta > 0$, $\exists M_i < \infty$, such that if a_i is chosen at least M_i times:

$$\Pr \left\{ \left| \tilde{d}_i(t) - d_i \right| < \frac{w}{2}, \forall t > t_0 \right\} > 1 - \delta. \quad (18)$$

Let $M = \max_{1 \leq i \leq r} \{M_i\}$. According to Theorem 1, there exist a time instant $t_0 < \infty$ and a resolution parameter $n_0 < \infty$ such that $\forall t > t_0$ and $\forall n > n_0$:

$$\Pr \{G_i(t) > M\} > 1 - \delta, i \in N_r.$$

Thus, if all actions are chosen at least M times, then each of the $\tilde{d}_i(t)$ will be in an $w/2$ neighborhood of d_i with a probability greater than $1 - \delta$, which completes the proof. ■

Theorem 3. $p_m(t)_{t > t_0} = \sum_{i \in \tilde{X}(t)} p_i(t)$ is submartingale under DEP_{RI} .

Proof: First,

$$E[p_m(t)] \leq 1 < \infty. \quad (19)$$

Then, according to the updating rule of DEP_{RI} , we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
& E[p_m(t+1) | Q(t)] \\
& \geq \sum_{j \in N_r} p_j(t) (d_j(s(t)(p_m(t) + c_t \Delta) \\
& \quad + o(t)(p_m(t) + f_t \Delta) \\
& \quad + (1 - s(t) - o(t)) \left(p_m(t) + \frac{c_t}{\hat{r}} (\hat{r} - e_t) \Delta - e_t \Delta \right)) \\
& \quad + (1 - d_j) p_m(t)) \\
& \geq \sum_{j \in N_r} p_j(t) (d_j(s(t)(p_m(t) + c_t \Delta) \\
& \quad + (1 - s(t)) \left(p_m(t) + \min\{f_t, \frac{c_t \hat{r} - c_t e_t - \hat{r} e_t}{\hat{r}}\} \Delta \right) \\
& \quad + (1 - d_j) p_m(t)) \\
& = p_m(t) + \sum_{j \in N_r} p_j(t) d_j \\
& \quad \left(s(t) (c_t - \min\{f_t, \frac{c_t \hat{r} - c_t e_t - \hat{r} e_t}{\hat{r}}\}) \Delta \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \min\{f_t, \frac{c_t \hat{r} - c_t e_t - \hat{r} e_t}{\hat{r}}\} \Delta \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

where $c_t = 1, 2, \dots, r - \hat{r}$, $f_t \in [-\frac{\hat{r}-1}{\hat{r}^2 \Delta}, \frac{\hat{r}-1}{\hat{r}^2 \Delta}]$ and $e_t = 1, 2, \dots, \hat{r}$. $s(t)$ is the probability that all actions in \hat{A} are in the currently estimated arbitrary action subset $\tilde{A}(t)$ at time t and we can see that:

$$\begin{aligned}
s(t) &= \Pr\{a_i \in \tilde{A}(t), \forall a_i \in \hat{A}\} \\
&\geq \prod_{j \in \tilde{X}(t)} q_j(t)
\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

and $o(t)$ is the probability that actions in $\tilde{A}(t)$ have changed after being updated at time t and $\exists a_i \in \hat{A}$ is not in $\tilde{A}(t)$ after the change.

We denote $g_t = \frac{c_t \hat{r} - c_t e_t - \hat{r} e_t}{\hat{r}}$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& E[p_m(t+1) | Q(t)] - p_m(t) \\
& \geq \sum_{j \in N_r} p_j(t) d_j (s(t) (c_t - \min\{f_t, g_t\}) \Delta + \min\{f_t, g_t\} \Delta).
\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

Given that $p_j(t) > 0$ and $d_j > 0$, we denote

$$Z_t = \frac{\min\{f_t, g_t\}}{\min\{f_t, g_t\} - c_t}$$

and

$$\max \{Z_t\} = \begin{cases} \frac{\hat{r}}{\hat{r}+1}, \Delta \leq \frac{\hat{r}-1}{\hat{r}^3} \\ \frac{\hat{r}-1}{\hat{r}^2 \Delta + \hat{r} - 1}, \Delta > \frac{\hat{r}-1}{\hat{r}^3} \end{cases}.$$

Let $1-\delta = \max\{Z_t\}$. According to Theorem 2, there exists t_0 such that $\forall t > t_0$, $\prod_{j \in \tilde{X}(t)} q_j(t) \geq \max\{Z_t\}$. Thus,

$$E[p_m(t+1) | Q(t)] - p_m(t) \geq 0. \quad (23)$$

$p_m(t)_{t>t_0}$ is a submartingale, which completes the proof. \blacksquare

Based on the Martingale convergence theory and Theorem 3, we have Corollary 1.

Corollary 1. Under DEP_{RI} ,

$$p_m(\infty) = 0 \text{ or } 1.$$

Theorem 4. In all stationary environments, DEP_{RI} is ϵ -optimal, i.e., given any $1-\delta \geq \max\{Z_t\}$, there exists $t_0 < \infty$ and $n_0 < \infty$, such that $\forall t > t_0$ and $\forall n > n_0$, $\Pr\{p_m(\infty) = 1\} \rightarrow 1$.

Proof: We need to prove that

$$\Gamma_m(P) = \Pr\{p_m(\infty) = 1 | P(0) = P\} \rightarrow 1. \quad (24)$$

Define $\Phi_m(P) = e^{-x_m p_m}$, where x_m is a positive constant. An operator U is defined as

$$U(\Phi_m(P)) = E[\Phi_m(P(t+1)) | P(t) = P]. \quad (25)$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & U(\Phi_m(P)) - \Phi_m(P) \\ &= E[\Phi_m(P(t+1)) | P(t) = P] - \Phi_m(P) \\ &\leq \sum_{j \in N_r} p_j(t) (d_j(s(t) e^{-x_m(p_m(t)+c_t \Delta)} \\ &\quad + o(t) e^{-x_m(p_m(t)+f_t \Delta)} \\ &\quad + (1-s(t)-o(t)) e^{-x_m(p_m(t)+g_t \Delta)}) \\ &\quad + (1-d_j) e^{-x_m p_m(t)}) - \sum_{j \in N_r} p_j(t) e^{-x_m p_m(t)} \\ &= \sum_{j \in N_r} p_j(t) d_j e^{-x_m p_m(t)} (s(t) (e^{-x_m c_t \Delta} - e^{-x_m g_t \Delta}) \\ &\quad + o(t) (e^{-x_m f_t \Delta} - e^{-x_m g_t \Delta}) + (e^{-x_m g_t \Delta} - 1)). \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

$U(\Phi_m(P)) - \Phi_m(P) \leq 0$ is equivalent to the following formula:

$$\begin{aligned} & s(t) (e^{-x_m c_t \Delta} - e^{-x_m g_t \Delta}) + o(t) (e^{-x_m f_t \Delta} - e^{-x_m g_t \Delta}) \\ & + (e^{-x_m g_t \Delta} - 1) \leq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

If $b > 0$ and $x \rightarrow 0$, $b^x \doteq 1 + (\ln b)x + \frac{(\ln b)^2}{2}x^2$. So let $b = e^{-x_m}$, as $\Delta \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & s(t) \left((\ln b)(c_t - g_t)\Delta + \frac{(\ln b)^2}{2}(c_t^2 - g_t^2)\Delta^2 \right) \\ & + o(t) \left((\ln b)(f_t - g_t)\Delta + \frac{(\ln b)^2}{2}(f_t^2 - g_t^2)\Delta^2 \right) \\ & + (\ln b)g_t\Delta + \frac{(\ln b)^2}{2}g_t^2\Delta^2 \leq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Replacing b with e^{-x_m} , then

$$x_m(x_m - \frac{2(s(t)(c_t - g_t) + o(t)(f_t - g_t) + g(t))}{\Delta(s(t)(c_t^2 - g_t^2) + o(t)(f_t^2 - g_t^2) + g_t^2)}) \leq 0. \quad (29)$$

Thus,

$$0 < x_m \leq \frac{2(s(t)(c_t - g_t) + o(t)(f_t - g_t) + g(t))}{\Delta(s(t)(c_t^2 - g_t^2) + o(t)(f_t^2 - g_t^2) + g_t^2)}. \quad (30)$$

Denote $x_{m_0} = \frac{2(s(t)(c_t - g_t) + o(t)(f_t - g_t) + g(t))}{\Delta(s(t)(c_t^2 - g_t^2) + o(t)(f_t^2 - g_t^2) + g_t^2)}$, when $\Delta \rightarrow 0$, $x_{m_0} \rightarrow \infty$ as $s(t) > \max\{Z_t\}$. Thus, $\Phi_m(P)$ is superregular.

Denote $\phi_m(P) = \frac{1 - e^{-x_m p_m(t)}}{1 - e^{-x_m}}$. Obviously, $0 \leq \phi_m(P) \leq 1$. According to (30), $\phi_m(P)$ is a subregular.

Therefore,

$$\Gamma_m(P) \geq \phi_m(P) = \frac{1 - e^{-x_m p_m(t)}}{1 - e^{-x_m}}. \quad (31)$$

As $x_{m_0} \rightarrow \infty$, $\Gamma_m(P) \rightarrow 1$, implying that DEP_{RI} is ϵ -optimality. ■