

Unichain and Aperiodicity are Sufficient for Asymptotic Optimality of Average-Reward Restless Bandits

Yige Hong

Computer Science Department, Carnegie Mellon University, yigeh@andrew.cmu.edu

Qiaomin Xie

Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering, University of Wisconsin–Madison, qiaomin.xie@wisc.edu

Yudong Chen

Department of Computer Sciences, University of Wisconsin–Madison, yudong.chen@wisc.edu

Weina Wang

Computer Science Department, Carnegie Mellon University, weinaw@cs.cmu.edu


Abstract. We consider the infinite-horizon, average-reward restless bandit problem in discrete time. We propose a new class of policies that are designed to drive a progressively larger subset of arms toward the optimal distribution. We show that our policies are asymptotically optimal with an $O(1/\sqrt{N})$ optimality gap for an N -armed problem, assuming only a unichain and aperiodicity assumption. Our approach departs from most existing work that focuses on index or priority policies, which rely on the Global Attractor Property (GAP) to guarantee convergence to the optimum, or a recently developed simulation-based policy, which requires a Synchronization Assumption (SA).

Key words: Restless bandits; Long-run average reward; Asymptotic optimality

1. Introduction A restless bandit (RB) problem [25] is a stochastic sequential decision-making problem that consists of multiple components. Each component is associated with a Markov decision process (MDP) with two actions: activating/pulling the arm, or idling the arm. The MDPs of different arms share the same parameters. At each time step, the decision maker, who has knowledge of the MDP parameters, observes the states of all arms and decides which arms to activate. This decision is subject to a *budget constraint*, which requires that a fixed number of arms is activated at every time step. The objective is to maximize the reward from all arms, where the reward from each arm is a function of its state and action. We illustrate the problem in Figure 1. The RB problem has a rich history and wide-reaching applications. We refer the readers to the recent survey paper [20] for a comprehensive overview of the literature.

Solving for an optimal policy for the RB problem is known to be PSPACE-hard [21]. However, it is possible to find *asymptotically optimal* policies in a computationally efficient manner in the regime where the number of arms, N , grows large. A policy is said to be asymptotically optimal if its *optimality gap* is *diminishing* as $N \rightarrow \infty$, where the optimality gap is the difference between the average reward per arm achieved by an optimal policy and that achieved by this policy. This large N regime, introduced in the seminal papers on the renowned Whittle index policy [24, 25], has recently regained significant attention. There has been a growing body of work that proposes new policies and provides refined analysis of their optimality gaps, not only in the infinite-horizon average-reward setting but also in the finite-horizon total-reward setting [3–5, 7, 11–13, 18, 27, 28] and the infinite-horizon discounted-reward setting [5, 13, 29]. We discuss related work in more detail in Section 2.

In this paper, we focus on the N -armed RB problem in the *infinite-horizon, average-reward* setting. Most existing policies for this setting, including the celebrated Whittle index policy [25] and the more general LP-Priority policies [23], rely on a global attractor property (GAP) [23, 24] or an even stronger property called the Uniform Global Attractor Property (UGAP) [10, 11] to achieve asymptotic optimality, in addition to the standard unichain and aperiodicity type of conditions. Roughly speaking, GAP requires the global convergence of the mean-field dynamics over time, where the mean-field dynamics characterizes the limit of the RB system as $N \rightarrow \infty$. GAP is a technical condition known to be difficult to verify for a given RB instance and policy, due to the non-linearity of the mean-field dynamics. Moreover, there are documented RB instances where the Whittle index and LP-Priority policies fail to satisfy GAP and are strictly asymptotically



suboptimal [9, 16]. In Section 8.2, we further examine several natural classes of randomly generated RB instances; we observe that when the transition kernels and the reward function are generated from some sparse distributions, the percentage of non-GAP instances could be as high as 20%.

The recent work [16] takes a first step towards relaxing the long-standing GAP assumption. This paper proposes a policy named Follow-The-Virtual-Advice (FTVA) for the discrete-time RB problem and a variant for the continuous-time setting. We focus on the discrete-time setting here. FTVA achieves asymptotic optimality without GAP, but rather under an alternative condition named Synchronization Assumption (SA). As argued in [16], SA is more intuitive and easier-to-verify than GAP. However, the reliance on SA is still unsatisfactory; in particular, there exist RB instances where SA is not satisfied and FTVA performs suboptimally. In Section 8.3 and Section A, we provide two counterexamples to SA, and discuss ways to construct more such examples.

The need for additional assumptions like GAP and SA reveals a fundamental gap in our understanding of the restless bandit problem. As such, the literature on RBs leaves open the following question: *Is it possible to efficiently find a policy that achieves asymptotic optimality in infinite-horizon, average-reward RBs under only unichain and aperiodicity type of conditions, without imposing any additional conditions?*

Our contributions

Answer to the question. In this paper, we focus on the discrete-time RB problem and give a definitive, affirmative answer to this long-standing question. We propose a novel class of policies named *focus-set policies*, and construct two concrete instances of focus-set policies that are asymptotically optimal with an $O(1/\sqrt{N})$ optimality gap under a weaker-than-standard aperiodic-unichain assumption (Assumption 1).

Policy design. Our proposed policies depart from the prevalent *priority-based* design of most existing policies. A priority-based policy specifies a fixed priority order over all the *states* of a single arm. At each time step, the policy pulls arms from states of higher priorities to those of lower priorities, until the budget constraint is met. In contrast, each of our proposed policies selects a subset of arms based on the *empirical distribution* of their states and lets the selected arms take their *ideal actions* as much as possible. These ideal actions are computed using the solution of a single-armed, budget-relaxed problem. The subset selection is constructed in a way such that most arms in the subset can take their ideal actions and the subset expands over time. Note that the FTVA policy in [16] also leverages the same single-armed problem to guide policy construction; however, it requires simulating additional virtual states, which our policies do not.

Proof techniques. We establish a meta-theorem that provides sufficient conditions for the asymptotic optimality of a focus-set policy. The proof of the meta-theorem highlights a class of bivariate Lyapunov functions we term *subset Lyapunov functions*, along with a global Lyapunov function constructed dynamically from one of the subset Lyapunov functions. Using these Lyapunov functions, we show that, under the stipulated sufficient conditions, the state-action distribution of arms in the selected subset converges to the optimal distribution, and the subset eventually expands to cover most arms. This meta-theorem allows us to prove the asymptotic optimality of the two proposed instances of the focus-set policies by verifying the stipulated sufficient conditions.

1.1. Paper organization The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we give a more detailed review of the literature. In Section 3, we set up the problem of average-reward restless bandits and introduce the single-armed problem. In Section 4, we present our main results, where we propose the focus-set policies, present two concrete instances of focus-set policies, namely, the set-expansion policy and the ID policy, and establish their $O(1/\sqrt{N})$ optimality. In Section 5, we present a meta-theorem that provides sufficient conditions for focus-set policies to achieve $O(1/\sqrt{N})$ optimality gaps. In Section 6 and Section 7, we use the meta-theorem to prove the asymptotic optimality of the set-expansion policy and the ID policy. In Section 8, we conduct experiments comparing the performances of our policies with existing policies, and investigate the commonness of the GAP and SA assumptions. We conclude the paper in Section 9.

2. Related work

Related work on conditions for asymptotic optimality. As briefly discussed in the introduction, a line of work on the infinite-horizon average-reward RB problems has been progressively weakening the conditions for achieving asymptotic optimality when the number of arms $N \rightarrow \infty$. Weber and Weiss [24] establishes asymptotic optimality of the Whittle index policy proposed by Whittle [25], under three assumptions — indexability, unichain, and the global attractor property (GAP). Later, Verloop [23] proposes a more general class of priority policies derived from an LP relaxation, referred to as “LP-Priority policies” in [11], which removes the reliance on indexability and only requires the unichain and GAP assumptions to achieve asymptotic optimality. Notably, the Whittle index policy is a special case of LP-Priority policies. Both [24] and [23] focus on the continuous-time RB problems. Recently, Hong et al. [16] proposes a policy named Follow-the-Virtual-Advice (FTVA) for discrete-time RBs, and the continuous-time variant of FTVA named FTVA-CT. FTVA and FTVA-CT do not assume GAP for achieving asymptotic optimality. In particular, FTVA requires the unichain condition and a new assumption called the Synchronization Assumption (SA) to be asymptotically optimal, whereas FTVA-CT only requires the unichain condition. In addition to proving asymptotic optimality, [16] also gives non-asymptotic bounds for the optimality gaps of FTVA and FTVA-CT, which are of the order $O(1/\sqrt{N})$. Note that although the unichain condition is assumed in all the above-mentioned papers, they are slightly different in details, and could potentially be weakened in different ways. See Section B for a detailed discussion on these distinctions.

In addition to the prior work reviewed above, there are two recent papers that appear a few months after the arXiv version of our paper [14, 26]. Both papers propose new discrete-time RB policies that are asymptotically optimal under weaker conditions than ours. In particular, their assumptions are implied by the single-armed MDP being weakly communicating and aperiodic, whereas ours is not. However, [14, 26] only provide asymptotic results and do not show the orders of the optimality gaps.

Related work on better optimality gap orders. Apart from weakening the condition for asymptotic optimality, there is also prior work aiming for achieving better optimality gap than $O(1/\sqrt{N})$: Gast et al. [10, 11] prove $O(\exp(-CN))$ optimality gap bounds for the Whittle index policy and LP-Priority policies for some $C > 0$, in both discrete-time or continuous-time settings. The exponential optimality gap mainly relies on an additional assumption named non-singularity or non-degeneracy, inspired by a recent paper [28] on finite-horizon RB problems to be discussed later in this section. Apart from non-singularity or non-degeneracy, other assumptions in [10, 11] are also slightly stronger than those in [23, 24] in several aspects: [10, 11] require the RB problem to be irreducible under every policy, instead of just being unichain; for discrete-time RBs, they also require the RB problem to be aperiodic under every policy; in addition, they need a stronger version of global attractor property than GAP, referred to as Uniform Global Attractor Property (UGAP), which is discussed in detail in Section 6.2.1 of [11].

Related work on finite-horizon or discounted-reward settings. Apart from the infinite-horizon average-reward setting, there is also a large body of work on other reward settings.

In the finite-horizon total-reward setting, there have been papers [3–5, 7, 11–13, 18, 27, 28] that readily achieve asymptotic optimality in the $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit without assumptions, with the main focus being on improving the orders of the optimality gaps. Specifically, the optimality gap has been improved from $o(1)$ in [18] to $O(\log N/\sqrt{N})$ in [4, 7, 27] and $O(1/\sqrt{N})$ in [3, 5, 13], without assumptions. Later, Zhang and

Frazier [28] propose a policy that achieves an $O(1/N)$ optimality gap under a mild assumption called non-degeneracy; Gast et al. [11, 12] further improve the optimality gap to $O(\exp(-CN))$ under the same non-degeneracy assumption. Although the above-mentioned papers on the finite-horizon total-reward setting are able to prove strong bounds of optimality gap in terms of the scaling of N under minimal conditions, most of them either do not consider the scaling of the time horizon T [3, 18], or have a super-linear dependency on the T (quadratic in [7, 13, 27], and $O(T \log T)$ in [4]). Consequently, most of the bounds in the finite horizon setting are incomparable to the bounds in the infinite-horizon average-reward setting — the latter is analogous to having a linear dependency on T . There are, however, two exceptions: Brown and Zhang [5] and Gast et al. [12] obtain bounds with linear dependencies on T , under additional assumptions similar to the Synchronization Assumption in [16]. Nevertheless, there is no direct way for applying the policies in [5, 12] to the infinite-horizon setting, since they both involve solving subproblems whose complexities depend on the time horizon.

The asymptotic optimality in the infinite-horizon discounted-reward setting has also been considered in the prior work [3, 5, 13, 29]. Similar to the finite-horizon setting, asymptotic optimality can be achieved without assumptions. In particular, an $O(N^{\log_2(\sqrt{\gamma})})$ optimality gap is obtained in [3] for a discount factor $\gamma \in (1/2, 1)$, and $O(1/\sqrt{N})$ optimality gaps are achieved in [5, 13, 29]. These results are incomparable to the asymptotic optimality results in the infinite-horizon average-reward setting due to their dependencies on γ . The $O(1/\sqrt{N})$ bounds in [5, 13, 29] scale at least quadratically with the effective horizon $1/(1-\gamma)$ rather than linearly. Meanwhile, the $O(N^{\log_2(\sqrt{\gamma})})$ bound in [3] has a coefficient that scales linearly with $1/(1-\gamma)$, but since $N^{\log_2(\sqrt{\gamma})}$ becomes constant in N after taking the limit of $\gamma \rightarrow 1$, this bound is not comparable to the asymptotic optimality results in the average-reward setting, where the bounds must be diminishing in N .

Generalizations of restless bandits. Some generalizations of the restless bandit problem have also been extensively studied in the literature. Those generalizations including having multiple actions, multiple constraints, state-dependent costs, heterogeneous arms, time-inhomogeneous rewards and transitions, etc. A lot of the papers mentioned above contain results for one or more such generalizations. While we believe it is possible to also generalize our results to some of these settings, we do not pursue this direction in this paper. We refer readers to recent papers such as [5] and [12] for a more detailed review of more general settings.

3. Problem setup In this section, we set up the average-reward restless bandits problem and its single-armed relaxation, and introduce the assumptions and notations used throughout the paper.

3.1. Restless bandit problem We consider the discrete-time, infinite-horizon restless bandit problem with the average-reward criterion. The RB problem consists of N homogeneous arms and is henceforth referred to as the N -armed problem. Each arm is associated with an MDP called the single-armed MDP, which is defined by the tuple $(\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{A}, P, r)$. Here \mathbb{S} is the state space, which is a finite set; $\mathbb{A} = \{0, 1\}$ is the action space, where the action 1 is interpreted as activating or pulling the arm; $P: \mathbb{S} \times \mathbb{A} \times \mathbb{S} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is the transition kernel, where $P(s, a, s')$ is the probability of transitioning to state s' in the next time step conditioned on taking action a at state s in the current step; $r: \mathbb{S} \times \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the reward function, where $r(s, a)$ is the expected reward for taking action a in state s . Let $r_{\max} = \max_{s \in \mathbb{S}, a \in \mathbb{A}} |r(s, a)|$. The RB problem has a *budget constraint*, which requires that exactly αN arms must be pulled at every time step for some given constant $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Here αN is assumed to be an integer for simplicity. We focus on the setting where all the model parameters, $\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{A}, P, r, \alpha$, are known.

We index the arms in an N -armed bandit by $[N]$, where $[n] \triangleq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. We refer to the index i of Arm i as its *ID*, to avoid confusion with the Whittle index or other index notions.

A policy π for the N -armed problem chooses in each time step the action for each of the N arms. We allow the policy to be randomized and choose actions based on the whole history.

Under a policy π , we use the *state vector* $\mathbf{S}_t^\pi \triangleq (S_t^\pi(i))_{i \in [N]} \in \mathbb{S}^N$ to represent the states of all arms, where $S_t^\pi(i) \in \mathbb{S}$ denotes the state of the i -th arm at time t . Similarly, the *action vector* is defined as $\mathbf{A}_t^\pi \triangleq (A_t^\pi(i))_{i \in [N]} \in \mathbb{A}^N$, where $A_t^\pi(i) \in \mathbb{A}$ denotes the action applied to the i -th arm at time t .

Let the *limsup average reward* be $R^+(\pi, \mathbf{S}_0) \triangleq \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in [N]} \mathbb{E} [r(S_t^\pi(i), A_t^\pi(i))]$ and let the *liminf average reward* be $R^-(\pi, \mathbf{S}_0) \triangleq \liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in [N]} \mathbb{E} [r(S_t^\pi(i), A_t^\pi(i))]$. When the

limsup and liminf average rewards coincide, the infinite-horizon average reward (also known as the long-run average reward) exists and is given by

$$R(\pi, \mathbf{S}_0) \triangleq \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in [N]} \mathbb{E} [r(S_t^\pi(i), A_t^\pi(i))].$$

Our goal is to solve the following optimization problem.

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{\text{policy } \pi}{\text{maximize}} && R^-(\pi, \mathbf{S}_0) && \text{(RB)} \\ & \text{subject to} && \sum_{i \in [N]} A_t^\pi(i) = \alpha N, \quad \forall t \geq 0. && \text{(1a)} \end{aligned}$$

Let $R^*(N, \mathbf{S}_0)$ be the optimal value of the problem, referred to as the *optimal reward*. Note that $R^*(N, \mathbf{S}_0) = \sup_{\pi'} R^-(\pi', \mathbf{S}_0) = \sup_{\pi'} R^+(\pi', \mathbf{S}_0)$ because (RB) is an MDP with finite state and action spaces [22, Theorem 9.1.6]. For any policy π , we define its optimality gap as $R^*(N, \mathbf{S}_0) - R^-(\pi, \mathbf{S}_0)$; we say the policy is *asymptotically optimal* if its optimality gap vanishes as $N \rightarrow \infty$, i.e., $R^*(N, \mathbf{S}_0) - R^-(\pi, \mathbf{S}_0) = o(1)$. This notion of asymptotic optimality is consistent with the literature; see, e.g., [23, Definition 4.11].

In later parts of the paper, we will focus on policies under which the long-run average reward $R(\pi, \mathbf{S}_0)$ exists. These policies include any stationary Markovian policies, under which \mathbf{S}_t is a finite-state Markov chain [22, Proposition 8.1.1]. More generally, with a similar argument, it is easy to show that $R(\pi, \mathbf{S}_0)$ is well-defined if π makes decisions based on augmented system states with a finite state space. Importantly, restricting to such policies is sufficient, because there always exists a stationary Markovian policy whose long-run average reward achieves the optimal reward, by standard results for the MDPs with finite state and action spaces [22, Theorem 9.1.8]. For simplicity, we will refer to $R(\pi, \mathbf{S}_0)$ as the objective function of (RB) and write the optimality gap as $R^*(N, \mathbf{S}_0) - R(\pi, \mathbf{S}_0)$.

3.2. Scaled state-count vector We introduce an alternative way, used extensively in the paper, for representing the information contained in the state vector \mathbf{S}_t^π . For each subset $D \subseteq [N]$, we define the *scaled state-count vector on D* as $X_t^\pi(D) = (X_t^\pi(D, s))_{s \in \mathbb{S}}$, where

$$X_t^\pi(D, s) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in D} \mathbb{1}\{S_t^\pi(i) = s\}.$$

Note that each entry of the vector $X_t^\pi(D)$ is the number of arms in D in a certain state, scaled by $1/N$. When $D = [N]$ is the set of all arms, we simply call $X_t^\pi([N])$ the *scaled state-count vector*.

Sometimes we view $X_t^\pi(D)$ as a vector-valued function of $D \subseteq [N]$. We refer to this function X_t as the *system state* at time t . The system state X_t^π contains the same information as the state vector \mathbf{S}_t^π does; in particular, from X_t^π one can deduce the state of each arm.

3.3. LP relaxation In this section, we discuss a linear programming (LP) relaxation of the N -armed problem (RB) which is crucial for the design and analysis of RB policies. This LP is defined as follows.

$$\underset{\{y(s, a)\}_{s \in \mathbb{S}, a \in \mathbb{A}}}{\text{maximize}} \quad \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}, a \in \mathbb{A}} r(s, a) y(s, a) \quad \text{(LP)}$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} y(s, 1) = \alpha, \quad \text{(2a)}$$

$$\sum_{s' \in \mathbb{S}, a \in \mathbb{A}} y(s', a) P(s', a, s) = \sum_{a \in \mathbb{A}} y(s, a), \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{S}, \quad \text{(2b)}$$

$$\sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}, a \in \mathbb{A}} y(s, a) = 1, \quad y(s, a) \geq 0, \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{S}, a \in \mathbb{A}. \quad \text{(2c)}$$

To see why (LP) is a relaxation of (RB), for any stationary Markovian policy π , consider

$$y^\pi(s, a) = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in [N]} \mathbb{1}\{S_t^\pi(i) = s, A_t^\pi(i) = a\} \right] \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{S}, a \in \mathbb{A}.$$

It is not hard to see that $R(\pi, \mathbf{S}_0) = \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}, a \in \mathbb{A}} r(s, a) y^\pi(s, a)$, and $(y^\pi(s, a))_{s \in \mathbb{S}, a \in \mathbb{A}}$ satisfies the constraints (2a)–(2c). Therefore, letting R^{rel} be the optimal value of (LP), it can be shown that $R^{\text{rel}} \geq R^*(N, \mathbf{S}_0)$ (See Section C for the detailed proof). This relation allows us to bound the optimality gap of any policy π using the inequality $R^*(N, \mathbf{S}_0) - R^-(\pi, \mathbf{S}_0) \leq R^{\text{rel}} - R^-(\pi, \mathbf{S}_0)$, following the approach adopted in prior work [10, 11, 16, 23, 24].

3.4. Optimal single-armed policy To understand how to achieve the average reward upper bound R^{rel} given by the LP relaxation (LP), it is helpful to view (LP) as solving for a certain stationary state-action probability, $y(s, a)$, in the single-armed MDP, $(\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{A}, P, r)$. Specifically, the objective of (LP) equals the expected reward under the stationary probability. The constraint in (2a) can be interpreted as a budget constraint, which requires the arm to be activated with α probability in the steady state. The constraint (2b) is the stationary equation. The constraint (2c) ensures that $(y(s, a))_{s \in \mathbb{S}, a \in \mathbb{A}}$ is a valid probability distribution.

From each stationary state-action probability $(y(s, a))_{s \in \mathbb{S}, a \in \mathbb{A}}$, one can construct a policy for the single-armed MDP, which we call a *single-armed policy*, that achieves the state-action probability in the steady state. In particular, let $\{y^*(s, a)\}_{s \in \mathbb{S}, a \in \mathbb{A}}$ be an optimal solution to (LP). We consider the following single-armed policy $\bar{\pi}^*$:

$$\bar{\pi}^*(a|s) = \begin{cases} y^*(s, a) / (y^*(s, 0) + y^*(s, 1)), & \text{if } y^*(s, 0) + y^*(s, 1) > 0, \\ 1/2, & \text{if } y^*(s, 0) + y^*(s, 1) = 0. \end{cases} \quad \text{for } s \in \mathbb{S}, a \in \mathbb{A}. \quad (3)$$

We call $\bar{\pi}^*$ the *optimal single-armed policy*. Let $P_{\bar{\pi}^*}$ be the transition matrix induced by $\bar{\pi}^*$ in the single-armed MDP. We make the following assumption throughout the paper:

ASSUMPTION 1 (Unichain and aperiodicity). *There exists an optimal solution $\{y^*(s, a)\}_{s \in \mathbb{S}, a \in \mathbb{A}}$ to (LP), such that the optimal single-armed policy $\bar{\pi}^*$ defined in (3) induces an aperiodic unichain (i.e., a Markov chain with a single recurrent class and a possibly empty set of transient states) with state space \mathbb{S} and transition matrix $P_{\bar{\pi}^*}$.*

With Assumption 1, the Markov chain induced by $\bar{\pi}^*$ converges to a unique stationary distribution, which we denote as $\mu^* = (\mu^*(s))_{s \in \mathbb{S}}$. From the definition of $\bar{\pi}^*$ in (3), it is easy to verify that $\mu^*(s) = y^*(s, 0) + y^*(s, 1)$; thus the steady-state state-action probability under $\bar{\pi}^*$ is $(y^*(s, a))_{s \in \mathbb{S}, a \in \mathbb{A}}$. Consequently, the long-run average reward of $\bar{\pi}^*$ equals the optimal value of (LP), R^{rel} ; the long-run average budget usage of $\bar{\pi}^*$ equals α .

In Section B, we discuss the generality of Assumption 1. In particular, we compare Assumption 1 with the assumptions in the literature; we also give an example to show that $R^{\text{rel}} - R^*(N, \mathbf{S}_0)$ can be non-diminishing as $N \rightarrow \infty$ when the single-armed MDP is periodic.

3.5. Additional notation For a subset $D \subseteq [N]$, we let $m(D) = |D|/N$ denote the fraction of arms contained in D . We introduce a convenient shorthand $[0, 1]_N = \{0, 1/N, 2/N, \dots, 1\}$. Then $m(D) \in [0, 1]_N$ for any $D \subseteq [N]$. Let $\Delta(\mathbb{S})$ denote the set of probability distributions on the state space \mathbb{S} . We treat each distribution $v \in \Delta(\mathbb{S})$ as a row vector. Recall that π denotes a policy for the N -armed problem. In later sections, when the context is clear, we drop the superscript π from the vectors \mathbf{S}_t^π , \mathbf{A}_t^π , and X_t^π . We use $a^+ \triangleq \max\{a, 0\}$ to denote the positive part of $a \in \mathbb{R}$.

4. Main results: policies and optimality guarantees In this section, we propose policies for the average-reward RB problems and bound their optimality gaps. In Section 4.1, we present an algorithmic idea based on the convergence of state distribution to μ^* under the optimal single-armed policy $\bar{\pi}^*$, and propose a novel class of policies named *focus-set policies*. Then in Section 4.2 and Section 4.3, we present two instances of focus-set policies, named the *set-expansion policy* and the *ID policy*, and state their optimality gap bounds. Finally, we discuss the relationships between our policies and the policies in the literature to explain why they rely on different assumptions.

Algorithm 1 Focus-set policy

Input: number of arms N , budget αN , the optimal single-armed policy $\bar{\pi}^*$, initial system state X_0 , initial state vector S_0 , initial focus set D_{-1}

- 1: **for** $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ **do**
- 2: Choose a *focus set* $D_t \subseteq [N]$ based on X_t and D_{t-1} ▷ Set update
- 3: Independently sample $\widehat{A}_t(i) \sim \bar{\pi}^*(\cdot | S_t(i))$ for $i \in [N]$ ▷ Action sampling
- 4: Pick $A_t(i)$ for $i \in D_t$ based on X_t and D_t to achieve ▷ Action rectification

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{\{A_t(i) : i \in D_t\}}{\text{maximize}} && \left| \left\{ i \in D_t : A_t(i) = \widehat{A}_t(i) \right\} \right| \\ & \text{subject to} && \alpha N - (N - |D_t|) \leq \sum_{i \in D_t} A_t(i) \leq \alpha N \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

- 5: Pick $A_t(i)$ for $i \in D_t^c$ based on X_t and D_t such that

$$\sum_{i \in [N]} A_t(i) = \alpha N \quad (5)$$

- 6: Apply $A_t(i)$ and observe $S_{t+1}(i)$ for each arm $i \in [N]$

4.1. Algorithmic idea and focus-set policies Consider the single-armed system and the optimal single-armed policy $\bar{\pi}^*$. Because $P_{\bar{\pi}^*}$ is an aperiodic unichain by Assumption 1, it follows that starting from any initial distribution in $\Delta(\mathbb{S})$, the state distribution of the Markov chain $P_{\bar{\pi}^*}$ converges to the steady-state distribution μ^* .

We observe the following simple fact based on the single-armed convergence under $\bar{\pi}^*$: an RB system would achieve the reward upper bound if all arms could follow the optimal single-armed policy $\bar{\pi}^*$. However, exactly achieving this goal is not possible due to the budget constraint. A natural way is to approach it gradually: let a subset of arms persistently follow $\bar{\pi}^*$ and wait for them to approach μ^* ; at this point, more arms can be included into the subset, as we explain later.

We capture this idea of letting a subset of arms follow $\bar{\pi}^*$ and then gradually expanding the subset in a class of policies named *focus-set policies*, the template of which is given in Algorithm 1. In particular, a focus-set policy first samples an *ideal action* $\widehat{A}_t(i)$ using $\bar{\pi}^*$ for each arm $i \in [N]$ based on its state $S_t(i)$ at time t (Line 3). The policy then selects a subset of arms D_t , referred to as the *focus-set*, and gives them precedence to set the actual action equal to the ideal action, i.e., $A_t(i) = \widehat{A}_t(i)$ (Line 4).

The performance benefit of a focus-set policy will not be realized until one specifies a proper rule to update the focus set D_t . In subsequent subsections, we propose two instances of focus-set policies with updating rules that lead to asymptotically optimal performance. In Section 5, we provide more general sufficient conditions for a focus-set policy to achieve asymptotic optimality.

4.2. Set-expansion policy In this section, we introduce an instance of the focus-set policies called the *set-expansion policy*. The set-expansion policy updates D_t based on a quantity referred to as the *slack*, which is defined for a subset $D \subseteq [N]$ based on the system state x as follows:

$$\delta(x, D) = \beta(1 - m(D)) - \frac{1}{2} \|x(D) - m(D)\mu^*\|_1, \quad (6)$$

where $\beta = \min(\alpha, 1 - \alpha)$ and recall that $m(D) = |D|/N$. The policy chooses D_t with the maximal cardinality such that $\delta(X_t, D_t) \geq 0$ and either $D_t \supseteq D_{t-1}$ (if $\delta(X_t, D_{t-1}) > 0$) or $D_t \subseteq D_{t-1}$ (if $\delta(X_t, D_{t-1}) \leq 0$) to maintain continuity. See Algorithm 2 for the full definition of the set-expansion policy.

Here we briefly explain the design of the set-expansion policy and why it works. The slack $\delta(x, D)$ is carefully constructed such that $\delta(X_t, D_t) \geq 0$ ensures that most arms in D_t can follow $\bar{\pi}^*$. Moreover, $P_{\bar{\pi}^*}$ is

Algorithm 2 Set-expansion policy


Input: number of arms N , budget αN , the optimal single-armed policy $\bar{\pi}^*$, initial system state X_0 , initial state vector S_0 , initial focus set $D_{-1} = \emptyset$

- 1: **for** $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ **do**
- 2: **if** $\delta(X_t, D_{t-1}) > 0$ **then** ▷ Set update
- 3: Let D_t be any set with the largest $m(D_t)$ such that $D_t \supseteq D_{t-1}$ and $\delta(X_t, D_t) \geq 0$
- 4: **else**
- 5: Let D_t be any set with the largest $m(D_t)$ such that $D_t \subseteq D_{t-1}$ and $\delta(X_t, D_t) \geq 0$

▷ *Lines below implement Lines 3–6 of Algorithm 1, with random tie-breaking for Lines 4–5*

- 6: Independently sample $\widehat{A}_t(i) \sim \bar{\pi}^*(\cdot | S_t(i))$ for $i \in [N]$ ▷ Action sampling
- 7: **if** $\sum_{i \in D_t} \widehat{A}_t(i) \geq \alpha N$ **then** ▷ Action rectification
- 8: Select αN arms in D_t with $\widehat{A}_t(i) = 1$ uniformly at random, and set $A_t(i) = 1$
- 9: For the rest of $i \in [N]$, set $A_t(i) = 0$
- 10: **else if** $\sum_{i \in D_t} \widehat{A}_t(i) \leq \alpha N - (N - |D_t|)$ **then**
- 11: Select $(1 - \alpha)N$ arms in D_t with $\widehat{A}_t(i) = 0$ uniformly at random, and set $A_t(i) = 0$
- 12: For the rest of $i \in [N]$, set $A_t(i) = 1$
- 13: **else**
- 14: Set $A_t(i) = \widehat{A}_t(i)$ for $i \in D_t$
- 15: Set $A_t(i) = \widehat{A}_t(i)$ for as many $i \notin D_t$ as possible; break ties uniformly at random
- 16: Apply $A_t(i)$ and observe $S_{t+1}(i)$ for each arm $i \in [N]$

FIGURE 2. Single-armed MDP of a simple RB example for illustrating the policies.




Note. The single-armed MDP of the RB problem has two states, $\{0, 1\}$, whose transition structure is illustrated above. One unit of reward is generated if and only if the state changes. The budget parameter α is 0.5. One can easily see that the optimal single-armed policy $\bar{\pi}^*$ activates the arm if and only if the arm is in state 1. The optimal stationary distribution is $\mu^* = (0.5, 0.5)$.

non-expansive under the L_1 norm, so $\delta(X_t, D_t) \geq 0$ often implies that $\delta(X_{t+1}, D_t) \geq 0$, preventing D_{t+1} from shrinking significantly. Consequently, each arm in the focus set is likely to remain in the focus set for a long time, where they persistently follow $\bar{\pi}^*$ and converge to the optimal stationary distribution μ^* . As soon as the scaled state-count vector on D_t , $X_t(D_t)$, is sufficiently close to $m(D_t)\mu^*$, the focus set expands. Therefore, in the long run, the arms in the focus set converges to μ^* , allowing the focus set to cover most of the arms.

Next, we use an example to provide some more concrete intuition. For illustration purposes, let us temporarily suppose that the L_1 norm between μ^* and any distribution on \mathbb{S} strictly decreases after right-multiplying $P_{\bar{\pi}^*}$.

Consider the RB problem defined by the two-state single-armed MDP in Figure 2. For any system state x and any subset of arms D , the scaled state-count vector on D , $x(D) = (X(D, 0), X(D, 1))$, can be represented by a point in the triangle $\{(a, b) : a \geq 0, b \geq 0, a + b \leq 1\}$, depicted in Figure 3a. The region where all arms in D can follow $\bar{\pi}^*$ is $[0, 0.5] \times [0, 0.5]$, marked in yellow. One can verify that the constraint $\delta(X_t, D_t) \geq 0$ exactly keeps $X_t(D_t)$ in the yellow region. In fact, $\delta(X_t, D_t)$ is proportional to the L_1 distance between $X_t(D_t)$ and the boundary of the yellow region, and is positive if $X_t(D_t)$ stays within the region. Consequently, under the set-expansion policy, in each time step, most of the arms in D_t follow $\bar{\pi}^*$, causing $X_{t+1}(D_t)$ to move closer to $m(D_t)\mu^*$ (the red line) than $X_t(D_t)$; when the set-expansion policy updates D_t to D_{t+1} , it maximizes $m(D_{t+1})$ under the constraint $\delta(X_{t+1}, D_{t+1}) \geq 0$ and $D_{t+1} \supseteq D_t$, so $X_{t+1}(D_{t+1})$ moves to the upper right of $X_{t+1}(D_t)$ but still stays in the yellow region. As this process repeats, the sequence

FIGURE 3. Intuitions of the set-expansion policy and the ID policy through the example in Figure 2.



Note. (a) Under the set-expansion policy, a typical trajectory is characterized by the blue dots connected by arrows, which alternates between $X_t(D_t)$ and $X_{t+1}(D_t)$. When $X_t(D_t)$ is in the yellow region, all arms in D_t can follow $\bar{\pi}^*$, causing $X_{t+1}(D_t)$ to move closer to $m(D_t)\mu^*$; when D_t expands to D_{t+1} , $X_{t+1}(D_{t+1})$ moves to the upper right of $X_{t+1}(D_t)$ while remaining in the yellow region. (b) Under the ID policy, for time step t , the system state is illustrated by the set $\{X_t([n]) : n \in [N]\}$, which shows up as a pink curve. The part of the pink curve in the yellow region moves towards the line $\{m\mu^* : m \in [0, 1]_N\}$ in the next time step, because it corresponds to the arms that follow $\bar{\pi}^*$. The ID policy can be analyzed in similar ways as the set-expansion policy if the focus set is chosen as $D_t = [Nm_d(X_t)]$, where $m_d(X_t)$ can roughly be seen as the largest $m \in [0, 1]_N$ such that $X_t([Nm])$ is in the yellow region.

$X_1(D_1), X_2(D_1), X_2(D_2), X_3(D_2), X_3(D_3) \dots$ converges in a zigzag fashion to a neighborhood of μ^* , as illustrated by the blue arrows in Figure 3a.

Based on the above intuition, we can formally prove that the set-expansion policy is asymptotically optimal, as stated in Theorem 1 below. The proof of Theorem 1 is provided in Section 6.

THEOREM 1 (Optimality gap of set-expansion policy). *Consider an N -armed restless bandit problem with the single-armed MDP $(\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{A}, P, r)$ and budget αN for $0 < \alpha < 1$. Assume that the optimal single-armed policy induces an aperiodic unichain (Assumption 1). Let π be the set-expansion policy (Algorithm 2). The optimality gap of π is bounded as*

$$R^*(N, \mathcal{S}_0) - R(\pi, \mathcal{S}_0) \leq \frac{C_{SE}}{\sqrt{N}}, \quad (7)$$

where C_{SE} is a constant depending on r_{\max} , $|\mathbb{S}|$, $\beta \triangleq \min\{\alpha, 1 - \alpha\}$, and $P_{\bar{\pi}^*}$; the explicit expression of C_{SE} is given in the proof.

Theorem 1 shows that under Assumption 1, the set-expansion policy is asymptotically optimal with an $O(1/\sqrt{N})$ optimality gap. The bound (7) holds for any finite N , and only depends on intuitive quantities, including the problem primitives and a quantity reflecting the mixing time of the transition matrix $P_{\bar{\pi}^*}$.

Finally, note that Lines 7–15 of Algorithm 2 is just one way to implement the action rectification step of the focus-set policy by breaking ties uniformly at random. The analysis of the set-expansion policy still goes through as long as the constraints in Lines 4–5 of Algorithm 1 are satisfied. In Section 8, we will also consider an alternative way for action rectification for the set-expansion policy, where we let arms outside the focus-sets follow the LP index policy [11], which sometimes leads to a better empirical performance.

4.3. ID policy Next, we introduce another instance of the focus-set policies, named the ID policy, whose pseudocode is given in Algorithm 3. The ID policy first samples an ideal action $\hat{A}_t(i)$ for each arm $i \in [N]$

Algorithm 3 ID policy

Input: number of arms N , budget αN , the optimal single-armed policy $\bar{\pi}^*$, initial system state X_0 , initial state vector S_0

- 1: **for** $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ **do**
- 2: Independently sample $\widehat{A}_t(i) \sim \bar{\pi}^*(\cdot | S_t(i))$ for $i \in [N]$ ▷ Action sampling
- 3: **if** $\sum_{i \in [N]} \widehat{A}_t(i) \geq \alpha N$ **then** ▷ Action rectification
- 4: $N_t^{\bar{\pi}^*} \leftarrow \max\{n \leq N : \sum_{i=1}^n \widehat{A}_t(i) \leq \alpha N\}$
- 5: $A_t(i) \leftarrow \widehat{A}_t(i)$ for $i \leq N_t^{\bar{\pi}^*}$, $A_t(i) \leftarrow 0$ for $i > N_t^{\bar{\pi}^*}$
- 6: **else**
- 7: $N_t^{\bar{\pi}^*} \leftarrow \max\{n \leq N : \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \widehat{A}_t(i)) \leq (1 - \alpha)N\}$
- 8: $A_t(i) \leftarrow \widehat{A}_t(i)$ for $i \leq N_t^{\bar{\pi}^*}$, $A_t(i) \leftarrow 1$ for $i > N_t^{\bar{\pi}^*}$
- 9: Apply $A_t(i)$ and observe $S_{t+1}(i)$ for each arm $i \in [N]$

using $\bar{\pi}^*$, and then goes through the arms $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ sequentially and assigns $A_t(i) = \widehat{A}_t(i)$ for as many arms as allowed by the budget constraint. The assignment continues until the remaining arms with larger IDs are forced to all take the same action (0 or 1).

By definition, the focus set of the ID policy could potentially be any subset of the form $[n]$; for analysis purposes, we will choose a suitable focus set for every time step so that the ID policy can be analyzed in similar ways as the set-expansion policy. Specifically, we will show that most of the arms in the focus set follow $\bar{\pi}^*$, and the focus set expands almost monotonically every time step until it contains most of the arms in the system. In Figure 3b, we illustrate the dynamics of X_t under the ID policy and the choice of the focus set.

The ID policy again has an $O(1/\sqrt{N})$ optimality gap, as stated in Theorem 2 below; the proof of Theorem 2 is provided in Section 7.

THEOREM 2 (Optimality gap of ID policy). *Consider an N -armed restless bandit problem with the single-armed MDP $(\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{A}, P, r)$ and budget αN for $0 < \alpha < 1$. Assume that the optimal single-armed policy induces an aperiodic unichain (Assumption 1). Let π be the ID policy (Algorithm 3). The optimality gap of π is bounded as*

$$R^*(N, S_0) - R(\pi, S_0) \leq \frac{C_{\text{ID}}}{\sqrt{N}}, \quad (8)$$

where C_{ID} is a constant depending on r_{\max} , $|\mathbb{S}|$, $\beta \triangleq \min\{\alpha, 1 - \alpha\}$, and $P_{\bar{\pi}^*}$; the explicit expression of C_{ID} is given in the proof.

REMARK 1 (COMPARISON BETWEEN THE ID POLICY AND THE SET-EXPANSION POLICY). The ID policy is simpler to implement and does not require an explicit calculation of the focus set. Moreover, in simulations, the ID policy often performs slightly better than the set-expansion policy. We also notice in simulations that a larger set of arms are able to persistently follow $\bar{\pi}^*$ under the ID policy than under the set-expansion policy (see Section G.4 for a closer investigation of this phenomenon). On the other hand, under the ID policy, the arms with higher IDs have less chance to follow $\bar{\pi}^*$, whereas the set-expansion policy is fairer by not differentiating arms based on IDs.

REMARK 2. Note that due to the homogeneity of the arms, it is actually sufficient to focus on the scaled state-count vector $X_t([N])$ as the overall state of the RB problem and design policies based on $X_t([N])$. In fact, most prior work on homogeneous RBs [10, 11, 23, 24] uses $X_t([N])$ rather than X_t as the state representation of the RB system. However, in our case, neither the set-expansion policy nor the ID policy are Markovian with respect to $X_t([N])$, which naturally leads to the following question: Does there exist a focus-set policy that makes $X_t([N])$ a Markov chain, and achieve the $O(1/\sqrt{N})$ optimality gap? In Section F, we construct another focus-set policy termed *set-optimization policy* that indeed satisfies these two requirements. The basic idea of the set-optimization policy is to update the focus set D_t by minimizing a Lyapunov function whose value is determined by $X_t(D_t)$.

4.4. Connection with existing policies As we intuitively explained in previous subsections, a focus-set policy achieves asymptotic optimality if most arms independently take actions according to the optimal single-armed policy $\bar{\pi}^*$ in the steady state. In this subsection, we consider two representative existing policies, the LP-Priority policies [11, 23] and the FTVA policy [16], and investigate *the number of arms that follow $\bar{\pi}^*$* under these policies. This unified view through the number of arms that follow $\bar{\pi}^*$ can help us develop a better understanding of the connection among these policies and of the roles of the assumptions made for proving asymptotic optimalities.

We first consider LP-Priority policies, which achieve asymptotic optimality under the GAP assumption [11, 23]. Recall that an LP-Priority policy assigns a priority order to each state, and prioritizes activating the arms in the high-priority states. The priority orders must be compatible with the optimal single-armed policy $\bar{\pi}^*$ in the following way. Assuming that $y^*(s, 1) + y^*(s, 0) > 0$ for all $s \in \mathbb{S}$, the state space can be partitioned into three subsets: $S^+ \triangleq \{s \in \mathbb{S} : \bar{\pi}^*(1|s) = 1\}$, $S^0 \triangleq \{s \in \mathbb{S} : 0 < \bar{\pi}^*(1|s) < 1\}$, and $S^- \triangleq \{s \in \mathbb{S} : \bar{\pi}^*(1|s) = 0\}$, where one can always find a $\bar{\pi}^*$ such that $|S^0| \leq 1$ and we let $S^0 = \{\tilde{s}\}$ if $|S^0| = 1$. The definition of an LP-Priority policy requires the priorities of the states in S^+ to be higher than those in S^0 , and further higher than those in S^- (Definition 4.4 of [23]).

Here is a heuristic way to see why GAP implies the asymptotic optimality of an LP-Priority policy: When GAP holds, the state-count vector of the system concentrates around μ^* in the steady state (see, e.g., Lemma 12 in [10]). The relation $\sum_{s \in S^+} \mu^*(s) + \sum_{s \in S^0} \mu^*(s) \bar{\pi}^*(1|s) = \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} y^*(s, 1) = \alpha$, along with the concentration of the state-count vector, suggests that, in an approximate sense, all arms in S^+ are activated, a fraction $\bar{\pi}^*(1|\tilde{s})$ of arms in S^0 are activated if $|S^0| = 1$, and all arms in S^- remain passive. Thus, in the steady state, for each state $s \in \mathbb{S}$, the fraction of active arms under an LP-Priority policy approximately coincides with the fraction of active arms if the actions were sampled by $\bar{\pi}^*$. Consequently, nearly all arms can be considered as following $\bar{\pi}^*$. On the other hand, when GAP fails, the scaled state-count vector may significantly deviate from μ^* , making it infeasible to activate a $\bar{\pi}^*(1|s)$ fraction of arms for each state $s \in \mathbb{S}$. In this case, only a limited subset of arms can be considered as following $\bar{\pi}^*$.

Next, we consider the FTVA policy proposed in [16], which achieves asymptotic optimality under the SA condition. FTVA is a simulation-based policy; it simulates a virtual N -armed system where each arm independently follows the single-armed optimal policy $\bar{\pi}^*$, without any budget constraints. FTVA then lets the real actions follow the virtual actions as much as possible, driving the real states of most arms to be equal to their virtual states. The virtual states are designed to follow the optimal distribution μ^* , so most arms can align their real actions with the virtual actions. Consequently, for most of the arms whose real and virtual states coincide (so-called “good arms”), their actions are generated from the distribution $A_t(i) \sim \bar{\pi}^*(\cdot|S_t(i))$ — that is, these arms follow $\bar{\pi}^*$. When SA holds, each arm can be proved to turn into a good arm after following the virtual actions for a certain period of time and remains good for a long time afterward. Therefore, in the steady state, most arms can follow $\bar{\pi}^*$ under FTVA if SA holds.

FTVA is similar to focus-set policies in the sense that it also maintains a set of arms that follow $\bar{\pi}^*$ persistently for a long time. However, for those “bad arms” whose virtual and real states are different, FTVA simply waits for them to turn “good” on their own, which is guaranteed to happen soon only when SA holds; in contrast, the set-expansion policy or the ID policy actively expands the focus set whenever the state distribution of the arms in the focus set is close to μ^* , which is guaranteed to happen soon if the optimal single-armed policy $\bar{\pi}^*$ induces an aperiodic unichain.

5. A meta-theorem for focus-set policies and the proof In this section, we establish a meta-theorem, Theorem 3, which provides sufficient conditions for a focus-set policy to have an $O(1/\sqrt{N})$ optimality gap. The meta-theorem and its conditions are stated in Section 5.1, followed by the proof in Section 5.2.

The meta-theorem contains the main technical novelty of our analysis. In the subsequent sections, we will simply verify that the set-expansion policy and the ID policy satisfy these conditions under the aperiodic unichain assumption, thereby proving the optimality gap bounds in Theorem 1 and Theorem 2.

5.1. Meta-theorem on $O(1/\sqrt{N})$ optimality gaps of focus-set policies We now state a set of conditions which, once satisfied by a focus-set policy, guarantees an $O(1/\sqrt{N})$ optimality gap.

To begin with, we define a class of functions called the *subset Lyapunov functions*, which are indexed by a collection of subsets $D \subseteq [N]$. The subset Lyapunov function indexed by D upper bounds the distance between $x(D)$ and $m(D)\mu^*$, and decreases geometrically if the arms in D follow the optimal single-armed policy $\bar{\pi}^*$ indefinitely. The formal definition is given below.

DEFINITION 1 (SUBSET LYAPUNOV FUNCTIONS). Let \mathcal{D} be a collection of subsets of $[N]$. Consider a class of functions $\{h(\cdot, D) : D \in \mathcal{D}\}$, where each $h(\cdot, D)$ maps a system state x to a real value that depends only on the states of the arms in D . This class of functions is referred to as the *subset Lyapunov functions* for the policy $\bar{\pi}^*$ if they satisfy the following conditions:

1. (Drift condition for a fixed D). There exist constants $\rho_2 \in (0, 1)$ and $K_{\text{drift}} > 0$ such that for any $D \in \mathcal{D}$ and any system state x ,

$$\mathbb{E}[h(X_1, D) \mid X_0 = x, A_0(i) \sim \bar{\pi}^*(\cdot \mid S_0(i)) \forall i \in D] \leq \rho_2 h(x, D) + \frac{K_{\text{drift}}}{\sqrt{N}}. \quad (9)$$

2. (Distance domination). There exists a constant $K_{\text{dist}} > 0$ such that for any $D \in \mathcal{D}$ and any system state x ,

$$h(x, D) \geq K_{\text{dist}} \|x(D) - m(D)\mu^*\|_1. \quad (10)$$

3. (Lipschitz continuity in D). There exists a constant $L_h > 0$ such that for any $D, D' \in \mathcal{D}$ with $D \subseteq D'$ and any system state x ,

$$|h(x, D') - h(x, D)| \leq L_h (m(D') - m(D)). \quad (11)$$

As an example, in Section 6, we will define a weighted L_2 norm, $\|v\|_W \triangleq \sqrt{v^T W v}$ for some weight matrix W . We will show that the class of functions $\{h_W(\cdot, D)\}_{D \subseteq [N]}$ with $h_W(x, D) = \|x(D) - m(D)\mu^*\|_W$ satisfies the definition of subset Lyapunov functions.

While the subset Lyapunov function $h(\cdot, D)$ is constructed to witness the convergence of $X_t(D)$ to $m(D)\mu^*$ for a *fixed* set D , in a focus-set policy, the set D_t is not fixed but rather is chosen dynamically. Below we introduce three conditions on D_t , which would allow us to use the subset Lyapunov functions to establish the asymptotic optimality of a focus-set policy.

Condition 1 requires that most arms in the focus set D_t conform to the actions sampled from $\bar{\pi}^*$.

Condition 1 (Majority conformity) Let $K_{\text{conf}} > 0$ be a constant. For any $t \geq 0$, there exists $D'_t \subseteq D_t$ such that for any $i \in D'_t$, the policy chooses $A_t(i) = \bar{A}_t(i)$, and

$$\mathbb{E}[m(D_t \setminus D'_t) \mid X_t, D_t] \leq \frac{K_{\text{conf}}}{\sqrt{N}} \quad a.s. \quad (12)$$

Condition 2 requires that D_t changes in a set-inclusive manner and does not shrink much in expectation.

Condition 2 (Almost non-shrinking) For any $t \geq 0$, either $D_{t+1} \supseteq D_t$ or $D_{t+1} \subseteq D_t$. Moreover, there exists a constant $K_{\text{mono}} > 0$ such that for any $t \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}[(m(D_t) - m(D_{t+1}))^+ \mid X_t, D_t] \leq \frac{K_{\text{mono}}}{\sqrt{N}} \quad a.s. \quad (13)$$

Condition 3 requires that $m(D_t)$, the fraction of arms covered by D_t , is sufficiently large with respect to a subset Lyapunov function on D_t .

Condition 3 (Sufficient coverage) There exist a class of subset Lyapunov functions $\{h(\cdot, D) : D \in \mathcal{D}\}$ and constants $L_{\text{cov}} > 0, K_{\text{cov}} > 0$ such that for any $t \geq 0$,

$$1 - m(D_t) \leq L_{\text{cov}} h(X_t, D_t) + \frac{K_{\text{cov}}}{\sqrt{N}} \quad a.s. \quad (14)$$

We remark that Conditions 1 and 2 are generally easier to satisfy when the focus set D_t is small, while Condition 3 requires D_t to be large.

We are now ready to state the meta-theorem, which establishes an $O(1/\sqrt{N})$ bound on the optimality gap of a focus-set policy that satisfies the above conditions.

THEOREM 3 (Meta-theorem on optimality gap of focus-set policies). *Consider an N -armed restless bandit problem with the single-armed MDP $(\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{A}, P, r)$ and budget αN for $0 < \alpha < 1$. Assume that the optimal single-armed policy induces an aperiodic unichain (Assumption 1). Let π be a focus-set policy given in Algorithm 1. If π satisfies Conditions 1, 2, and 3 for a class of subset Lyapunov functions $\{h(\cdot, D)\}_{D \in \mathcal{D}}$, then*

$$R^*(N, \mathbf{S}_0) - R(\pi, \mathbf{S}_0) \leq r_{\max} \left(\left(\frac{1}{K_{\text{dist}}} + \frac{2}{L_h} \right) \frac{K_1}{1 - \rho_1} + 2K_{\text{conf}} \right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}, \quad (15)$$

where $\rho_1 = 1 - \frac{1 - \rho_2}{1 + L_h L_{\text{cov}}}$ and $K_1 = K_{\text{drift}} + 2L_h K_{\text{conf}} + 2L_h K_{\text{mono}} + \frac{1 - \rho_2}{1 + L_h L_{\text{cov}}} K_{\text{cov}}$.

5.2. Proof of Theorem 3 We prove Theorem 3 in this section. To highlight the key ideas and for notational simplicity, we first present the proof under the assumption that the focus-set policy induces a Markov chain converging to a unique stationary distribution. The proof for the general case follows essentially the same line of argument and is given in Section D.

Under the above assumption, we use $\mathbf{S}_\infty, \widehat{\mathbf{A}}_\infty, \mathbf{A}_\infty, X_\infty, D_\infty$ to denote the random variables following the stationary distributions of $\mathbf{S}_t, \widehat{\mathbf{A}}_t, \mathbf{A}_t, X_t, D_t$, respectively. With this notation, the long-run average reward of the policy π is equal to $R(\pi, \mathbf{S}_0) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in [N]} \mathbb{E}[r(\mathbf{S}_\infty(i), \mathbf{A}_\infty(i))]$.

Proof of Theorem 3. Our proof is structured into two steps: understanding the optimality gap, and bounding the Lyapunov function.

Understanding the optimality gap. Recall that the optimality gap can be upper bounded as $R^*(N, \mathbf{S}_0) - R(\pi, \mathbf{S}_0) \leq R^{\text{rel}} - R(\pi, \mathbf{S}_0)$, where R^{rel} is the expected reward associated with the optimal steady-state state-action distribution $y^* = (y^*(s, a))_{s \in \mathbb{S}, a \in \mathbb{A}}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & R^*(N, \mathbf{S}_0) - R(\pi, \mathbf{S}_0) \\ & \leq R^{\text{rel}} - R(\pi, \mathbf{S}_0) \\ & = \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}, a \in \mathbb{A}} r(s, a) y^*(s, a) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in [N]} \mathbb{E} \left[r(\mathbf{S}_\infty(i), \mathbf{A}_\infty(i)) \right] \\ & \leq \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}, a \in \mathbb{A}} r(s, a) y^*(s, a) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in [N]} \mathbb{E} \left[r(\mathbf{S}_\infty(i), \widehat{\mathbf{A}}_\infty(i)) \right] + \frac{2r_{\max}}{N} \sum_{i \in [N]} \mathbb{P}(\widehat{\mathbf{A}}_\infty(i) \neq \mathbf{A}_\infty(i)) \\ & \leq \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}, a \in \mathbb{A}} r(s, a) \left(y^*(s, a) - \bar{\pi}^*(a|s) \mathbb{E}[X_\infty([N], s)] \right) + 2r_{\max} \mathbb{E}[1 - m(D'_\infty)] \\ & = \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}, a \in \mathbb{A}} r(s, a) \bar{\pi}^*(a|s) \left(\mu^*(s) - \mathbb{E}[X_\infty([N], s)] \right) + 2r_{\max} \mathbb{E}[1 - m(D'_\infty)] \\ & \leq r_{\max} \mathbb{E}[\|\mu^* - \mathbb{E}[X_\infty([N])]\|_1] + 2r_{\max} \mathbb{E}[1 - m(D_\infty)] + \frac{2r_{\max} K_{\text{conf}}}{\sqrt{N}}, \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where D'_∞ is the subset of D_∞ assumed in Condition 1, which satisfies $m(D'_\infty) \geq m(D_\infty) - K_{\text{conf}}/\sqrt{N}$. Therefore, to bound the optimality gap, it suffices to bound $\mathbb{E}[\|\mu^* - \mathbb{E}[X_\infty([N])]\|_1]$, which is the distributional distance, and $\mathbb{E}[1 - m(D_\infty)]$, which is the size of the complement of the focus set.

In this proof, we construct a Lyapunov function that can be viewed as an upper bound on a weighted sum of the two terms in (16). In particular, consider the following Lyapunov function

$$V(x, D) = h(x, D) + L_h(1 - m(D)). \quad (17)$$

Let us first see how the terms in (16) are upper bounded by $\mathbb{E}[V(X_\infty, D_\infty)]$. For the first term, it is easy to see that $K_{\text{dist}} \|\mu_1^* - X_\infty([N])\| \leq h(X_\infty, [N])$ by the distance domination property of h (cf. Equation (10)). Then by the Lipschitz continuity of h , we have $h(X_\infty, [N]) \leq h(X_\infty, D_\infty) + L_h(1 - m(D_\infty)) = V(X_\infty, D_\infty)$. Thus, $\mathbb{E}[\|\mu_1^* - \mathbb{E}[X_\infty([N])]\|_1] \leq \mathbb{E}[V(X_\infty, D_\infty)]/K_{\text{dist}}$. For the second term, clearly $\mathbb{E}[1 - m(D_\infty)] \leq \mathbb{E}[V(X_\infty, D_\infty)]/L_h$. Therefore, the upper bound in (16) can be further bounded as

$$R^*(N, \mathbf{S}_0) - R(\pi, \mathbf{S}_0) \leq r_{\max} \left(\frac{1}{K_{\text{dist}}} + \frac{2}{L_h} \right) \mathbb{E}[V(X_\infty, D_\infty)] + \frac{2r_{\max}K_{\text{conf}}}{\sqrt{N}}, \quad (18)$$

which makes it sufficient to bound $\mathbb{E}[V(X_\infty, D_\infty)]$.

Bounding the Lyapunov function. We establish an upper bound on $\mathbb{E}[V(X_\infty, D_\infty)]$ by proving the following drift condition: for any $t \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}[V(X_{t+1}, D_{t+1}) \mid X_t, D_t] \leq \rho_1 V(X_t, D_t) + \frac{K_1}{\sqrt{N}}, \quad (19)$$

for some constants $\rho_1 \in (0, 1)$ and $K_1 > 0$. To prove (19), observe that for any time step $t \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} V(X_{t+1}, D_{t+1}) &= h(X_{t+1}, D_{t+1}) + L_h(1 - m(D_{t+1})) \\ &\leq \left(h(X_{t+1}, D_t) + L_h |m(D_{t+1}) - m(D_t)| \right) + \left(L_h(1 - m(D_t)) + L_h(m(D_t) - m(D_{t+1})) \right) \\ &= h(X_{t+1}, D_t) + L_h(1 - m(D_t)) + 2L_h(m(D_t) - m(D_{t+1}))^+, \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where we have used the facts that $D_{t+1} \supseteq D_t$ or $D_{t+1} \subseteq D_t$ (Condition 2) and the Lipschitz continuity of $h(x, D)$ in D . Subtracting $V(X_t, D_t)$ and taking the expectations, we obtain the *key decomposition* below:

$$\mathbb{E}[V(X_{t+1}, D_{t+1}) \mid X_t, D_t] - V(X_t, D_t) \leq \mathbb{E}[h(X_{t+1}, D_t) \mid X_t, D_t] - h(X_t, D_t) \quad (21)$$

$$+ 2L_h \mathbb{E}[(m(D_t) - m(D_{t+1}))^+ \mid X_t, D_t]. \quad (22)$$

where the term in (21) represents the contribution of state transitions to the drift of $V(X_t, D_t)$, and the term in (22) represents the contribution of set updates.

We first upper bound the term $\mathbb{E}[h(X_{t+1}, D_t) \mid X_t, D_t] - h(X_t, D_t)$ in (21). Note that this bound would immediately follow from the drift condition of subset Lyapunov functions if all the arms in D_t were to follow the ideal actions. By the majority conformity property of the focus set D_t (Condition 1), there exists $D'_t \subseteq D_t$ such that for any $i \in D'_t$, the policy chooses $A_t(i) = \widehat{A}_t(i)$, and $\mathbb{E}[m(D_t \setminus D'_t) \mid X_t, D_t] = O(1/\sqrt{N})$. Let X'_{t+1} be a random element denoting the system state at time $t+1$ if $A_t(i) = \widehat{A}_t(i)$ for all $i \in [N]$. We couple X_{t+1} with X'_{t+1} such that they have the same states on the set D'_t , and thus $h(X_{t+1}, D'_t) = h(X'_{t+1}, D'_t)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[h(X_{t+1}, D_t) \mid X_t, D_t] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[h(X'_{t+1}, D_t) + (h(X_{t+1}, D_t) - h(X'_{t+1}, D_t)) \mid X_t, D_t] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[h(X'_{t+1}, D_t) + (h(X_{t+1}, D_t) - h(X_{t+1}, D'_t)) + (h(X'_{t+1}, D'_t) - h(X'_{t+1}, D_t)) \mid X_t, D_t] \\ &\leq \rho_2 h(X_t, D_t) + \frac{K_{\text{drift}}}{\sqrt{N}} + 2L_h \mathbb{E}[m(D_t \setminus D'_t) \mid X_t, D_t] \\ &\leq \rho_2 h(X_t, D_t) + \frac{K_{\text{drift}} + 2L_h K_{\text{conf}}}{\sqrt{N}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the drift condition and the Lipschitz continuity of h . It follows that

$$\mathbb{E}[h(X_{t+1}, D_t) | X_t, D_t] - h(X_t, D_t) \leq -(1 - \rho_2)h(X_t, D_t) + \frac{K_{\text{drift}} + 2L_h K_{\text{conf}}}{\sqrt{N}}. \quad (23)$$

Next, to bound the term in (22), we simply apply Condition 2:

$$2L_h \mathbb{E}[(m(D_t) - m(D_{t+1}))^+ | X_t, D_t] \leq \frac{2L_h K_{\text{mono}}}{\sqrt{N}}. \quad (24)$$

Combining the above bounds for (21) and (22), we get

$$\mathbb{E}[V(X_{t+1}, D_{t+1}) | X_t, D_t] - V(X_t, D_t) \leq -(1 - \rho_2)h(X_t, D_t) + \frac{K_{\text{drift}} + 2L_h K_{\text{conf}} + 2L_h K_{\text{mono}}}{\sqrt{N}}. \quad (25)$$

To get (19), it remains to upper bound the $-(1 - \rho_2)h(X_t, D_t)$ term. By the sufficient coverage condition (Condition 3), $1 - m(D_t) \leq L_{\text{cov}}h(X_t, D_t) + K_{\text{cov}}/\sqrt{N}$, so

$$V(X_t, D_t) = h(X_t, D_t) + L_h(1 - m(D_t)) \leq (1 + L_h L_{\text{cov}})h(X_t, D_t) + \frac{L_h K_{\text{cov}}}{\sqrt{N}}.$$

Upper bounding the $-(1 - \rho_2)h(X_t, D_t)$ term in (25) using the above inequality, we get

$$\mathbb{E}[V(X_{t+1}, D_{t+1}) | X_t, D_t] \leq \rho_1 V(X_t, D_t) + \frac{K_1}{\sqrt{N}},$$

where $\rho_1 = 1 - \frac{1 - \rho_2}{1 + L_h L_{\text{cov}}}$ and $K_1 = K_{\text{drift}} + 2L_h K_{\text{conf}} + 2L_h K_{\text{mono}} + \frac{1 - \rho_2}{1 + L_h L_{\text{cov}}} L_h K_{\text{cov}}$. This is the bound in (19) that we set out to prove.

Taking expectations on both sides of (19) letting $t \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[V(X_\infty, D_\infty)] \leq \rho_1 \mathbb{E}[V(X_\infty, D_\infty)] + \frac{K_1}{\sqrt{N}},$$

which implies that

$$\mathbb{E}[V(X_\infty, D_\infty)] \leq \frac{K_1}{(1 - \rho_1)\sqrt{N}}. \quad (26)$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 3. \square

REMARK 3. We conclude this section by a remark on our use of the *bivariate Lyapunov functions* $h(x, D)$ and $V(x, D) = h(x, D) + L_h(1 - m(D))$. By definition, the subset Lyapunov function $h(x, D)$ depends on the system state x only through $x(D)$. This means that for fixed D , the drifts of $h(x, D)$ and $V(x, D)$ only depend on the state transitions of the arms in D . When D is chosen appropriately, most arms in D can follow $\bar{\pi}^*$ under the budget constraint, thus inheriting the convergence and concentration properties of the aperiodic unichain induced by $\bar{\pi}^*$. Therefore, the auxiliary variable D provides the flexibility of focusing on a subset of arms so that the drift is easy to bound and expanding the subset gradually to the entire system.

For the ID policy, D_t is determined by the system state X_t , and hence $h(X_t, D_t)$ can be written as a function of X_t alone. Even in this case, using a bivariate h is beneficial, as it allows us to decouple the two variables—in particular, quantities like $h(X_{t+1}, D_t)$ play a prominent role in our proof of Theorem 3.

Our use of bivariate Lyapunov functions departs from most prior work on the RB problem [10, 11, 23–25], whose analysis is in terms of the full system state $X_t([N])$, under which the dynamics of arms in a subset is less visible. We expect that our approach is useful for a broader class of problems where the system state consists of multiple components, a subset of which have a more tractable dynamic at a given time. In this case, one may construct a Lyapunov function that can zoom into this more tractable subset and seek to gradually expand the subset based on the system state.

6. Proof of Theorem 1 (Optimality gap of set-expansion policy) In this section, we prove Theorem 1 using the framework established in Section 5. This section is organized as follows. In Section 6.1, we define the subset Lyapunov functions for the set-expansion policy. In Section 6.2, we present three lemmas verifying that the set-expansion policy satisfies Conditions 1, 2 and 3, and prove Theorem 1 by citing the meta-theorem Theorem 3. These three lemmas are subsequently proved in Sections 6.3, 6.4 and 6.5.

6.1. Subset Lyapunov functions To construct the subset Lyapunov functions, we consider the L_2 norm weighted by a carefully constructed matrix W defined below.

DEFINITION 2. Let W be an $|\mathbb{S}|$ -by- $|\mathbb{S}|$ matrix given by

$$W = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (P_{\bar{\pi}^*} - \Xi)^k (P_{\bar{\pi}^*}^\top - \Xi^\top)^k, \quad (27)$$

where Ξ is an $|\mathbb{S}|$ -by- $|\mathbb{S}|$ matrix with each row being μ^* . Let λ_W denote maximal eigenvalue of W .

In section E.1, we show that the matrix W is well-defined and positive definite, with eigenvalues in the range $[1, \lambda_W]$. Our next lemma shows that $P_{\bar{\pi}^*}$ is a pseudo-contraction under the W -weighted L_2 norm.

LEMMA 1 (Pseudo-contraction under W -weighted L_2 norm). *Suppose $P_{\bar{\pi}^*}$ is an aperiodic unichain on \mathbb{S} . Then for any distribution $v \in \Delta(\mathbb{S})$,*

$$\|vP_{\bar{\pi}^*} - \mu^*\|_W \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{2\lambda_W}\right) \|v - \mu^*\|_W, \quad (28)$$

where λ_W is the maximal eigenvalue of W for W defined in Definition 2, and $\|\cdot\|_W$ is the W -weighted L_2 norm, that is, $\|u\|_W = \sqrt{uWu^\top}$ for any row vector $u \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbb{S}|}$.

Now we are ready to define the subset Lyapunov functions. For any system state x and $D \subseteq [N]$, let

$$h_W(x, D) = \|x(D) - m(D)\mu^*\|_W, \quad (29)$$

which measures the distance between $x(D)$, the scaled state-count vector on D , and $m(D)\mu^*$, the correspondingly scaled optimal stationary distribution. Note that $h_W(x, D)$ depends only on the states of the arms in D , as required by the definition of subset Lyapunov functions. The next lemma, Lemma 2, shows that the class of functions $\{h_W(x, D)\}_{D \subseteq [N]}$ satisfies the definition of subset Lyapunov functions (Definition 1). The proof of Lemma 2 is provided in Section E.2.

LEMMA 2. *The class of functions $\{h_W(\cdot, D)\}_{D \subseteq [N]}$ defined in (29) satisfies that for any system state x and any pair of subsets $D, D' \subseteq [N]$ with $D \subseteq D'$,*

$$\mathbb{E}[h_W(X_1, D) \mid X_0 = x, A_0(i) \sim \bar{\pi}^*(\cdot | S_0(i)) \forall i \in D] \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{2\lambda_W}\right) h_W(x, D) + \frac{2\lambda_W^{1/2}}{\sqrt{N}} \quad (30)$$

$$h_W(x, D) \geq \frac{1}{|\mathbb{S}|^{1/2}} \|x(D) - m(D)\mu^*\|_1 \quad (31)$$

$$|h_W(x, D) - h_W(x, D')| \leq L_W(m(D') - m(D)), \quad (32)$$

where the Lipschitz constant $L_W = 2\lambda_W^{1/2}$. These inequalities imply the drift condition, distance dominance property, and Lipschitz continuity in Definition 1, respectively. Consequently, $\{h_W(x, D)\}_{D \subseteq [N]}$ is a class of subset Lyapunov functions for the single-armed policy $\bar{\pi}^*$.

6.2. Lemmas verifying Conditions 1, 2 and 3; Proof of Theorem 1 Next, we establish Lemmas 3, 4 and 5, which verify that the set-expansion policy in Algorithm 2 satisfies Conditions 1, 2 and 3, respectively. Then we apply Theorem 3 to prove Theorem 1.

LEMMA 3 (Set-expansion policy satisfies Condition 1). *Consider the set-expansion policy in Algorithm 2. For any $t \geq 0$, there exists a subset $D'_t \subseteq D_t$ such that for any $i \in D'_t$, the policy chooses $A_t(i) = \widehat{A}_t(i)$, and*

$$\mathbb{E}[m(D_t \setminus D'_t) \mid X_t, D_t] \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} + \frac{1}{N} \quad a.s. \quad (33)$$

LEMMA 4 (Set-expansion policy satisfies Condition 2). *Consider the set-expansion policy in Algorithm 2. For any $t \geq 0$,*

$$\mathbb{E}[(m(D_t) - m(D_{t+1}))^+ \mid X_t, D_t] \leq \frac{|\mathbb{S}|^{1/2} + 1}{\beta\sqrt{N}} + \frac{1 + (\beta + 1)|\mathbb{S}|}{\beta N} \quad a.s. \quad (34)$$

LEMMA 5 (Set-expansion policy satisfies Condition 3). *Consider the set-expansion policy in Algorithm 2. For any $t \geq 0$,*

$$1 - m(D_t) \leq \frac{|\mathbb{S}|^{1/2}}{\beta} h_W(X_t, D_t) + \frac{2}{\beta N} \quad a.s. \quad (35)$$

Proof of Theorem 1. By Lemmas 3, 4 and 5, the set-expansion policy satisfies Conditions 1, 2 and 3 with the subset Lyapunov functions $\{h_W(x, D)\}_{D \subseteq [N]}$. Applying Theorem 3 and substituting the constants, we get

$$R^{\text{rel}} - R(\pi, \mathbf{S}_0) \leq \frac{252r_{\max}\lambda_W^2|\mathbb{S}|^2}{\beta^2\sqrt{N}},$$

which implies the optimality gap bound in Theorem 1. Note that we relax all $1/N$ factors to $1/\sqrt{N}$ when deriving the bound. \square

6.3. Proof of Lemma 3

Proof of Lemma 3. Recall that the set-expansion policy matches as many actions $A_t(i)$ with the ideal actions $\widehat{A}_t(i)$ as possible for $i \in D_t$. Observe that to satisfy the budget constraint $\sum_{i \in [N]} A_t(i) = \alpha N$, a necessary and sufficient condition for $(A_t(i))_{i \in D_t}$ is that $\sum_{i \in D_t} A_t(i) \leq \alpha N$ and $\sum_{i \in D_t} (1 - A_t(i)) \leq (1 - \alpha)N$. Let $D'_t = \{i \in D_t : A_t(i) = \widehat{A}_t(i)\}$. Then

$$|D_t \setminus D'_t| = \left(\sum_{i \in D_t} \widehat{A}_t(i) - \alpha N \right)^+ + \left(\sum_{i \in D_t} (1 - \widehat{A}_t(i)) - (1 - \alpha)N \right)^+.$$

Therefore, if we can show that for any $t \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i \in D_t} \widehat{A}_t(i) - \alpha N \right)^+ + \left(\sum_{i \in D_t} (1 - \widehat{A}_t(i)) - (1 - \alpha)N \right)^+ \mid X_t, D_t \right] \leq \sqrt{N}, \quad (36)$$

we will have $\mathbb{E}[(m(D_t \setminus D'_t))^+] \leq 1/\sqrt{N}$, which will complete the proof. The remainder of the proof is dedicated to proving (36).

Observe that given X_t and D_t , $\widehat{A}_t(i)$'s are independent for $i \in D_t$. Consider the *scaled expected budget requirement* for arms in a set D , defined as

$$C_{\bar{\pi}^*}(x, D) \triangleq \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in D} \widehat{A}_t(i) \mid X_t = x \right] = \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} x(D, s) \bar{\pi}^*(1|s) = x(D) c_{\bar{\pi}^*}^\top, \quad (37)$$

where $c_{\bar{\pi}^*}$ is the row vector $(\bar{\pi}^*(1|s))_{s \in \mathbb{S}}$. Then $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{i \in D_t} \widehat{A}_t(i) | X_t, D_t] = NC_{\bar{\pi}^*}(X_t, D_t)$. By the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\sum_{i \in D_t} \widehat{A}_t(i) - NC_{\bar{\pi}^*}(X_t, D_t)\right| \middle| X_t, D_t\right] &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{i \in D_t} \widehat{A}_t(i) - NC_{\bar{\pi}^*}(X_t, D_t)\right)^2 \middle| X_t, D_t\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \left(\sum_{i \in D_t} \text{Var}[\widehat{A}_t(i) | X_t, D_t]\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \sqrt{N}. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

We next prove (36) utilizing the bound (38). Recall that D_t is chosen with $\delta(X_t, D_t) \geq 0$, i.e., $\|X_t(D_t) - m(D_t)\mu^*\|_1 / 2 \leq \beta(1 - m(D_t))$. Then $|C_{\bar{\pi}^*}(X_t, D_t) - \alpha m(D_t)|$ can be bounded as

$$|C_{\bar{\pi}^*}(X_t, D_t) - \alpha m(D_t)| = \left| \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} (X_t(D_t, s) - m(D_t)\mu^*(s))\bar{\pi}^*(1|s) \right| \quad (39)$$

$$\leq \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} (X_t(D_t, s) - m(D_t)\mu^*(s))^+ \quad (40)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \|X_t(D_t) - m(D_t)\mu^*\|_1 \quad (41)$$

$$\leq \beta(1 - m(D_t)), \quad (42)$$

where (39) is because of $\sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} \mu^*(s)\bar{\pi}^*(1|s) = \alpha$, and (40) uses the fact that $\sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} (X_t(D_t, s) - m(D_t)\mu^*(s))^+ = \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} (m(D_t)\mu^*(s) - X_t(D_t, s))^+$, which is true because $\sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} X_t(D_t, s) = \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} m(D_t)\mu^*(s) = m(D_t)$. Thus,

$$NC_{\bar{\pi}^*}(X_t, D_t) \leq \alpha|D_t| + \beta(N - |D_t|) \leq \alpha|D_t| + \alpha(N - |D_t|) = \alpha N,$$


and

$$NC_{\bar{\pi}^*}(X_t, D_t) \geq \alpha|D_t| - \beta(N - |D_t|) \geq \alpha|D_t| - (1 - \alpha)(N - |D_t|) = \alpha N - (N - |D_t|).$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{i \in D_t} \widehat{A}_t(i) - \alpha N\right)^+ + \left(\sum_{i \in D_t} (1 - \widehat{A}_t(i)) - (1 - \alpha)N\right)^+ \middle| X_t, D_t\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{i \in D_t} \widehat{A}_t(i) - \alpha N\right)^+ + (\alpha N - (N - |D_t|) - \sum_{i \in D_t} \widehat{A}_t(i))^+ \middle| X_t, D_t\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\sum_{i \in D_t} \widehat{A}_t(i) - NC_{\bar{\pi}^*}(X_t, D_t)\right| \middle| X_t, D_t\right] \\ &\leq \sqrt{N}, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of (36), thus concluding the proof of Lemma 3. \square



Note. Each point denotes $(m(D_t), h_1(X_t, D_t))$ or $(m(D_{t+1}), h_1(X_{t+1}, D_{t+1}))$ under the set-expansion policy, where $h_1(x, D)$ is a shorthand for $0.5\|x(D) - m(D)\mu^*\|_1$. By definition, the set-expansion policy tries to maximize $m(D_t)$ while keeping the point $(m(D_t), h_1(X_t, D_t))$ below the line $m \mapsto \beta(1-m)$ so that $\delta(X_t, D_t) = \beta(1-m(D_t)) - h_1(X_t, D_t) \geq 0$. The two subfigures illustrate two possible ways that $(m(D_t), h_1(X_t, D_t))$ can change based on the outcomes of the state transitions: In Figure 4a, $h_1(X_{t+1}, D_t)$ remains below $\beta(1-m(D_t))$, so D_{t+1} expands; in Figure 4b, $h_1(X_{t+1}, D_t)$ goes above $\beta(1-m(D_t))$, so D_{t+1} shrinks. In the latter case, one can find a subset $\bar{D} \subseteq D_t$ (corresponding to the triangular dot) that satisfies $h_1(X_{t+1}, \bar{D}) \leq \beta(1-m(D_t))$ by picking γ fraction of arms in each state from D_t , with $\gamma \approx 1 - |\delta(X_{t+1}, D_t)| / (\beta m(D_t))$. Because $\delta(X_{t+1}, D_t) = h_1(X_{t+1}, D_t) - \beta(1-m(D_t))$ is often small, γ is close to 1 and \bar{D} is not significantly smaller than D_t . Further, because $m(D_{t+1})$ is not smaller than $m(\bar{D})$, D_{t+1} does not shrink significantly from D_t either.

6.4. Proof of Lemma 4 In this subsection, we prove Lemma 4, which shows that the focus set D_t does not shrink much every time step. The intuition of the proof is given in Figure 4.

Proof of Lemma 4. Our proof consists of two steps. In Step 1, we focus on proving the following inequality for any time step t :

$$(m(D_t) - m(D_{t+1}))^+ \leq \frac{1}{\beta}(-\delta(X_{t+1}, D_t))^+ + \frac{K}{N}, \quad (43)$$

where $K = (1 + 1/\beta)|\mathbb{S}|$. In Step 2, we utilize (43) to bound $\mathbb{E}[(m(D_t) - m(D_{t+1}))^+ | X_t, D_t]$. We recall the definition of the slack $\delta(x, D)$ for a set $D \subseteq [N]$ at system state x below, which is heavily used in the proof:

$$\delta(x, D) = \beta(1 - m(D)) - \frac{1}{2} \|x(D) - m(D)\mu^*\|_1. \quad (44)$$

Step 1: Proving (43). The inequality (43) clearly holds when $D_{t+1} \supseteq D_t$. So it suffices to consider the case when $D_{t+1} \subsetneq D_t$. Recall that D_{t+1} is chosen to have the largest cardinality among all subsets $\bar{D} \subseteq D_t$ such that $\delta(X_{t+1}, \bar{D}) \geq 0$. Therefore, it suffices to construct a subset $\bar{D} \subseteq D_t$ such that

$$\delta(X_{t+1}, \bar{D}) \geq 0 \quad (45)$$

$$(m(D_t) - m(\bar{D}))^+ \leq \frac{1}{\beta}(-\delta(X_{t+1}, D_t))^+ + \frac{K}{N} \quad (46)$$

since $(m(D_t) - m(D_{t+1}))^+ \leq (m(D_t) - m(\bar{D}))^+ \leq (-\delta(X_{t+1}, D_t))^+ / \beta + K/N$, implying (43).

We construct the subset $\bar{D} \subseteq D_t$ that satisfies (45) and (46) by considering the two cases below, depending on the realization of X_{t+1} . The two cases correspond to Figures 4a and 4b, respectively.

- Case 1: $\delta(X_{t+1}, D_t) \geq 0$. In this case, we let $\bar{D} = D_t$.
- Case 2: $\delta(X_{t+1}, D_t) < 0$. If $|\delta(X_{t+1}, D_t)| / \beta + K/N \geq m(D_t)$, we let $\bar{D} = \emptyset$; otherwise, let

$$\gamma = 1 - \frac{1}{m(D_t)} \left(\frac{|\delta(X_{t+1}, D_t)|}{\beta} + \frac{K - |\mathbb{S}|}{N} \right), \quad (47)$$

which satisfies $0 < \gamma < 1$. We let \bar{D} be a subset of D_t such that

$$X_{t+1}(\bar{D}, s) = \frac{\lfloor \gamma X_{t+1}(D_t, s) N \rfloor}{N} \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{S}, \quad (48)$$

that is, for each state s , we take a γ fraction of arms with state s in D_t and put them into \bar{D} , modulo the integer effect. A pictorial illustration of γ is given in Figure 4b.

To show (45) and (46), observe that they are trivial in Case 1, as well as in Case 2 with $|\delta(X_{t+1}, D_t)| / \beta + K/N \geq m(D_t)$. Therefore, it remains to consider Case 2 with $|\delta(X_{t+1}, D_t)| / \beta + K/N < m(D_t)$.

We first show the lower bound of $\delta(X_{t+1}, \bar{D})$ in (45) for the \bar{D} defined above via (48). By the definition of \bar{D} , we have $m(\bar{D}) \leq \gamma m(D_t)$. Substituting the definitions of γ , K , and $\delta(X_{t+1}, D_t)$, we upper bound $m(\bar{D})$ as

$$\begin{aligned} m(\bar{D}) &\leq m(D_t) + \frac{1}{\beta} \delta(X_{t+1}, D_t) - \frac{|\mathbb{S}|}{\beta N} \\ &= 1 - \frac{1}{2\beta} \|X_{t+1}(D_t) - m(D_t)\mu^*\|_1 - \frac{|\mathbb{S}|}{\beta N}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we can lower bound $\delta(X_{t+1}, \bar{D})$ using the above upper bound of $m(\bar{D})$:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(X_{t+1}, \bar{D}) &= \beta(1 - m(\bar{D})) - \frac{1}{2} \|X_{t+1}(\bar{D}) - m(\bar{D})\mu^*\|_1 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \|X_{t+1}(D_t) - m(D_t)\mu^*\|_1 - \frac{1}{2} \|X_{t+1}(\bar{D}) - m(\bar{D})\mu^*\|_1 + \frac{|\mathbb{S}|}{N}. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

We further lower bound $\|X_{t+1}(D_t) - m(D_t)\mu^*\|_1 - \|X_{t+1}(\bar{D}) - m(\bar{D})\mu^*\|_1$ in (49) as

$$\begin{aligned} &\|X_{t+1}(D_t) - m(D_t)\mu^*\|_1 - \|X_{t+1}(\bar{D}) - m(\bar{D})\mu^*\|_1 \\ &\geq \gamma \|X_{t+1}(D_t) - m(D_t)\mu^*\|_1 - \|X_{t+1}(\bar{D}) - m(\bar{D})\mu^*\|_1 \\ &\geq -\|\gamma X_{t+1}(D_t) - \gamma m(D_t)\mu^* - X_{t+1}(\bar{D}) + m(\bar{D})\mu^*\|_1 \\ &\geq -\|\gamma X_{t+1}(D_t) - X_{t+1}(\bar{D})\|_1 - |\gamma m(D_t) - m(\bar{D})| \cdot \|\mu^*\|_1 \\ &\geq -\frac{2|\mathbb{S}|}{N}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is because $\gamma < 1$; the second and third inequalities are due to triangular inequality; the last inequality is by the definition of \bar{D} in (48). Therefore, $\delta(X_{t+1}, \bar{D}) \geq 0$.

Next, we show the lower bound of $m(\bar{D})$ in (46) for the subset \bar{D} defined via (48). By the definition of \bar{D} , we have $m(\bar{D}) \geq \gamma m(D) - |\mathbb{S}|/N$. Substituting the definition of γ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} m(\bar{D}) &\geq m(D_t) + \frac{1}{\beta} \delta(X_{t+1}, D_t) - \frac{K - |\mathbb{S}|}{N} - \frac{|\mathbb{S}|}{N} \\ &\geq m(D_t) + \frac{1}{\beta} \delta(X_{t+1}, D_t) - \frac{K}{N}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies (46). Therefore, we have proved the inequality (43) claimed at the beginning of this proof.

Step 2: Utilizing (43) to bound $\mathbb{E}[(m(D_t) - m(D_{t+1}))^+ | X_t, D_t]$. Taking expectations on the both sides of (43), we have

$$\mathbb{E}[(m(D_t) - m(D_{t+1}))^+ | X_t, D_t] \leq \frac{1}{\beta} \mathbb{E}[(-\delta(X_{t+1}, D_t))^+ | X_t, D_t] + \frac{K}{N}. \quad (50)$$

It remains to upper bound $\mathbb{E}[(-\delta(X_{t+1}, D_t))^+ | X_t, D_t]$. Let X'_{t+1} be a random element denoting the system state at time $t+1$ if we were able to set $A_t(i) = \widehat{A}_t(i)$ for all $i \in [N]$. We couple X'_{t+1} and X_{t+1} such that $X'_{t+1}(D'_t) = X_{t+1}(D'_t)$, where $D'_t \subseteq D_t$ is the subset given in Lemma 3 which satisfies $\widehat{A}_t(i) = A_t(i)$ for all $i \in D'_t$. With X'_{t+1} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[(-\delta(X_{t+1}, D_t))^+ | X_t, D_t] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}[(-\delta(X_{t+1}, D_t) + \delta(X'_{t+1}, D_t))^+ | X_t, D_t] + \mathbb{E}[(-\delta(X'_{t+1}, D_t))^+ | X_t, D_t]. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

We bound the two terms separately below.

To bound $\mathbb{E}[(-\delta(X_{t+1}, D_t) + \delta(X'_{t+1}, D_t))^+ | X_t, D_t]$, note that the coupling implies that

$$\begin{aligned} (-\delta(X_{t+1}, D_t) + \delta(X'_{t+1}, D_t))^+ &= \frac{1}{2} (\|X_{t+1}(D_t) - m(D_t)\mu^*\|_1 - \|X'_{t+1}(D_t) - m(D_t)\mu^*\|_1)^+ \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|X_{t+1}(D_t) - X'_{t+1}(D_t)\|_1 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|X_{t+1}(D_t \setminus D'_t)\|_1 + \frac{1}{2} \|X'_{t+1}(D_t \setminus D'_t)\|_1 \\ &\leq m(D_t \setminus D'_t), \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

where the last inequality uses the fact that $\|X_{t+1}(D_t \setminus D'_t)\|_1 = \|X'_{t+1}(D_t \setminus D'_t)\|_1 = m(D_t \setminus D'_t)$. Taking expectations and applying Lemma 3, we get

$$\mathbb{E}[(-\delta(X_{t+1}, D_t) + \delta(X'_{t+1}, D_t))^+ | X_t, D_t] \leq \mathbb{E}[m(D_t \setminus D'_t) | X_t, D_t] \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} + \frac{1}{N}. \quad (53)$$

To bound $\mathbb{E}[(-\delta(X'_{t+1}, D_t))^+ | X_t, D_t]$, by the definition of $\delta(X'_{t+1}, D_t)$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[(-\delta(X'_{t+1}, D_t))^+ | X_t, D_t] = \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{1}{2} \|X'_{t+1}(D_t) - m(D_t)\mu^*\|_1 - \beta(1 - m(D_t))\right)^+ | X_t, D_t\right] \quad (54)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[(\|X'_{t+1}(D_t) - m(D_t)\mu^*\|_1 - \|X_t(D_t) - m(D_t)\mu^*\|_1)^+ | X_t, D_t], \quad (55)$$

where (55) follows from $\delta(X_t, D_t) \geq 0$. Note that X'_{t+1} is the next-time-step system state of X_t if all arms follow $\bar{\pi}^*$. Because $P_{\bar{\pi}^*}$ is non-expansive under the L_1 norm, we prove in Lemma 13 of Section E.3 that

$$\mathbb{E}[(\|X'_{t+1}(D_t) - m(D_t)\mu^*\|_1 - \|X_t(D_t) - m(D_t)\mu^*\|_1)^+ | X_t, D_t] \leq \frac{2|S|^{1/2}}{\sqrt{N}}. \quad (56)$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[(-\delta(X'_{t+1}, D_t))^+ \mid X_t, D_t\right] \leq \frac{|\mathbb{S}|^{1/2}}{\sqrt{N}}. \quad (57)$$

Plugging (53) and (57) into (43), we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[(m(D_t) - m(D_{t+1}))^+ \mid X_t, D_t\right] \leq \frac{|\mathbb{S}|^{1/2} + 1}{\beta\sqrt{N}} + \frac{1 + (\beta + 1)|\mathbb{S}|}{\beta N},$$

which finishes the proof. \square

6.5. Proof of Lemma 5

Proof of Lemma 5. Recall that D_t is taken to be a maximal set such that $\delta(X_t, D_t) \geq 0$, where $\delta(x, D) = \beta(1 - m(D)) - \|x(D) - m(D)\mu^*\|_1/2$. We first prove that

$$\delta(X_t, D_t) \leq \frac{2}{N}.$$

Assume, for the sake of contradiction, that $\delta(X_t, D_t) > 2/N$. Then by the definition of $\delta(X_t, D_t)$, we know that $m(D_t) < 1$ and thus $D_t^c \neq \emptyset$. Picking an arbitrary $i \in D_t^c$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \delta(X_t, D_t \cup \{i\}) - \delta(X_t, D_t) \\ &= -\frac{\beta}{N} - \frac{1}{2} \|X_t(D_t \cup \{i\}) - m(D_t \cup \{i\})\mu^*\|_1 + \frac{1}{2} \|X_t(D_t) - m(D_t)\mu^*\|_1 \\ &\geq -\frac{\beta}{N} - \frac{1}{2} \|X_t(\{i\}) - m(\{i\})\mu^*\|_1 \\ &\geq -\frac{2}{N}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\delta(X_t, D_t \cup \{i\}) > 0$, which contradicts the maximality of D_t .

Since $\delta(X_t, D_t) \leq 2/N$, we have

$$1 - m(D_t) \leq \frac{1}{\beta} \|X_t(D_t) - m(D_t)\mu^*\|_1 + \frac{2}{\beta N} \leq \frac{|\mathbb{S}|^{1/2}}{\beta} h_W(X_t, D_t) + \frac{2}{\beta N},$$

where the second inequality is because of the distance dominance property of $h_W(x, D)$ in (31). \square


7. Proof of Theorem 2 (Optimality gap of ID policy) In this section, we prove Theorem 2 using the framework established in Section 5. This section is organized as follows. We first define the subset Lyapunov functions for the ID policy in Section 7.1. We then define the focus set for the ID policy in Section 7.2. In Section 7.3, we present three lemmas verifying that the ID policy satisfies Conditions 1, 2 and 3, respectively, and prove Theorem 2 by combining these three lemmas and citing the meta-theorem Theorem 3. In Sections 7.4, 7.5, and 7.6, we prove the three lemmas.

7.1. Subset Lyapunov functions To construct the subset Lyapunov functions for the ID policy, consider the following class of functions, $\{h_{\text{ID}}(x, [Nm])\}_{m \in [0, 1]_N}$: For any system state x and $m \in [0, 1]_N$, we let $h_{\text{ID}}(x, [Nm])$ to be a non-decreasing ‘‘envelop’’ of $h_W(x, [Nm])$, given by

$$h_{\text{ID}}(x, [Nm]) = \max_{\substack{m' \in [0, 1]_N \\ m' \leq m}} h_W(x, [Nm']). \quad (58)$$

In the rest of the paper, we write $h_W(x, m)$ and $h_{\text{ID}}(x, m)$ as shorthands for $h_W(x, [Nm])$ and $h_{\text{ID}}(x, [Nm])$. Note that $h_{\text{ID}}(x, m)$ depends only on the states of the arms in $[Nm]$, as required by the definition of subset Lyapunov functions. The lemma below verifies that $\{h_{\text{ID}}(x, m)\}_{m \in [0, 1]_N}$ satisfies Definition 1 and is proved in Section E.2.

FIGURE 5. Illustrations of the focus set and the proof of Lemma 7 for the ID policy.



Note. (a) Suppose the current system state is $X_t = x$. The function $h_{\text{ID}}(x, m)$, a shorthand for $h_{\text{ID}}(x, [Nm])$, is a subset Lyapunov function on the subset $[Nm]$. The set $[m_d(x)]$ is the focus set. (b) The three curves illustrated are central to the proof of Lemma 7, e.g., see the inequality (72). Take the bottom curve $m \mapsto \max_{m' \leq m} |C_{\bar{\pi}^*}(x, [Nm']) - \alpha m'|$ as the baseline. We show that the red curve based on the subset Lyapunov function $m \mapsto K_{c/h} h_{\text{ID}}(x, [Nm])$ is always above the bottom curve, and that the curve $m \mapsto \max_{m' \leq m} |\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in [Nm']} \hat{A}_t(i) - \alpha m'|$ deviates from the bottom curve by $O(1/\sqrt{N})$ in expectation. Since $N_t^{\bar{\pi}^*}/N$ is always to the right of the blue dot, we have $(Nm_d(X_t) - N_t^{\bar{\pi}^*})^+ = O(1/\sqrt{N})$ in expectation.

LEMMA 6. *The class of functions $\{h_{\text{ID}}(\cdot, m)\}_{m \in [0, 1]_N}$ defined in (58) satisfies that for any system state x and any $m, m' \in [0, 1]_N$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(h_{\text{ID}}(X_1, m) - \left(1 - \frac{1}{2\lambda_W}\right) h_{\text{ID}}(x, m) \right)^+ \middle| X_0 = x, A_0(i) \sim \bar{\pi}^*(\cdot | S_0(i)) \forall i \in [Nm] \right] \leq \frac{4\lambda_W^{1/2}}{\sqrt{N}}, \quad (59)$$

$$h_{\text{ID}}(x, m) \geq \frac{1}{|\mathbb{S}|^{1/2}} \|x([Nm]) - m\mu^*\|_1, \quad (60)$$

$$|h_{\text{ID}}(x, m) - h_{\text{ID}}(x, m')| \leq 2\lambda_W^{1/2} |m' - m|. \quad (61)$$

These inequalities imply the drift condition, distance dominance property, and Lipschitz continuity in Definition 1, respectively. Consequently, $\{h_{\text{ID}}(x, m)\}_{m \in [0, 1]_N}$ are subset Lyapunov functions for the single-armed policy $\bar{\pi}^$.*

We note that the inequality (59) is stronger than the drift condition required by the definition of feature Lyapunov functions. This stronger version is needed for later analysis.

7.2. Focus set The ID policy, as previously noted, does not explicitly specify the focus set within its algorithm. Nonetheless, for analysis purposes, we can introduce a set D_t at each time step t , effectively serving as the focus set for the ID policy. Specifically, let $D_t = [Nm_d(X_t)]$, where $m_d(\cdot)$ is a function that maps a system state to a number in $[0, 1]_N = \{1/n, \dots, 1\}$. This function $m_d(\cdot)$ is formally defined as follows:

$$m_d(x) = \max\{m \in [0, 1]_N : K_{c/h} h_{\text{ID}}(x, m) \leq \beta(1 - m)\}, \quad (62)$$

where $\beta \triangleq \min\{\alpha, 1 - \alpha\}$ and $K_{c/h}$ is a constant. More concretely, the constant $K_{c/h} = \|c_{\bar{\pi}^*}\|_{W^{-1}} = \sqrt{c_{\bar{\pi}^*} W^{-1} c_{\bar{\pi}^*}^\top}$, where $c_{\bar{\pi}^*}$ denotes the row vector $(\bar{\pi}^*(1|s))_{s \in \mathbb{S}}$ and W is the matrix defined in Definition 2.

The definition of $m_d(x)$ has a nice geometric representation, as shown in Figure 5a. For a system state x , note that $h_{\text{ID}}(x, [0]) = 0$ and recall that $h_{\text{ID}}(x, [Nm])$ is non-decreasing in m . Then $m_d(x)$ is the value of m at which the curve $m \mapsto K_{c/h} h_{\text{ID}}(x, [Nm])$ intersects with the line $m \mapsto \beta(1 - m)$, ignoring the integer effect.

REMARK 4. Here we comment on the different choices of subset Lyapunov functions in the analysis of the set-expansion policy and the ID policy. In the analysis of the set-expansion policy, $\{h_W(x, D)\}_{D \subseteq [N]}$ is constructed to satisfy Definition 1, allowing the application of the meta-theorem Theorem 3. In the analysis of the ID policy, $\{h_{\text{ID}}(x, m)\}_{m \in [0,1]_N}$ is constructed to satisfy Definition 1 and to be non-decreasing in m . This monotonicity of $h_{\text{ID}}(x, m)$ ensures that the focus set $D_t = \lfloor Nm_d(X_t) \rfloor$, defined via $h_{\text{ID}}(x, m)$, can be proved to satisfy the almost non-shrinking condition (Lemma 8).

7.3. Lemmas for verifying Conditions 1, 2 and 3; Proof of Theorem 2 Having defined the subset Lyapunov functions $\{h_{\text{ID}}(x, D)\}_{D \in \mathcal{D}}$ and the focus set $D_t = \lfloor Nm_d(X_t) \rfloor$, we proceed to establish Lemmas 7, 8 and 9, which verify that the ID policy satisfies Conditions 1, 2 and 3, respectively. Then we apply Theorem 3 to prove Theorem 2.

LEMMA 7 (ID policy satisfies Condition 1). *Consider the ID policy in Algorithm 3. For any $t \geq 0$, let $D'_t = \lfloor \min(N_t^{\bar{\pi}^*}, Nm_d(X_t)) \rfloor$, where recall that $N_t^{\bar{\pi}^*} \in [N]$ is defined in Algorithm 3 as the largest number such that for any $i \in [N_t^{\bar{\pi}^*}]$, $A_t(i) = \widehat{A}_t(i)$. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}[m(D_t \setminus D'_t) | X_t, D_t] = \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E}[(Nm_d(X_t) - N_t^{\bar{\pi}^*})^+ | X_t] \leq \frac{2}{\beta\sqrt{N}} + \frac{1}{N} \quad a.s. \quad (63)$$

LEMMA 8 (ID policy satisfies Condition 2). *Consider the ID policy in Algorithm 3. For any $t \geq 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(m(D_t) - m(D_{t+1}))^+ | X_t, D_t] &= \mathbb{E}[(m_d(X_t) - m_d(X_{t+1}))^+ | X_t] \\ &\leq \frac{4K_{c/h}\lambda_W^{1/2}(1+\beta)}{\beta^2\sqrt{N}} + \frac{2K_{c/h}\lambda_W^{1/2} + \beta}{\beta N} \quad a.s. \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

LEMMA 9 (ID policy satisfies Condition 3). *Consider the ID policy in Algorithm 3. For any $t \geq 0$,*

$$1 - m(D_t) \leq \frac{K_{c/h}}{\beta} h_{\text{ID}}(X_t, D_t) + \frac{2K_{c/h}\lambda_W^{1/2} + \beta}{\beta N} \quad a.s. \quad (65)$$

Proof of Theorem 2. By Lemma 7, 8 and 9, the ID policy satisfies Conditions 1, 2 and 3 with the subset Lyapunov functions $\{h_{\text{ID}}(x, D)\}_{D \in \mathcal{D}}$. Applying Theorem 3 and substituting the constants, we get

$$R^{\text{rel}} - R(\pi, S_0) \leq \frac{672r_{\max}\lambda_W^{5/2}|\mathbb{S}|^{3/2}}{\beta^3\sqrt{N}},$$

which implies the optimality gap bound in the theorem statement. Note that we bound $K_{c/h}$ by $|\mathbb{S}|^{1/2}$ and relax all $1/N$ factors to $1/\sqrt{N}$ when deriving this bound. \square

7.4. Proof of Lemma 7 Before delving into the proof, we first offer a high-level understanding of Lemma 7. Recall that $[N_t^{\bar{\pi}^*}]$ is defined to be the largest set of arms that always follow their ideal actions under the ID policy. Then Lemma 7 states that the focus set we define, $D_t = \lfloor Nm_d(X_t) \rfloor$, is close to $[N_t^{\bar{\pi}^*}]$, differing by only $O(\sqrt{N})$ elements. Note that whether a set of arms $[Nm]$ can follow their ideal actions or not is determined by the amount of budget required by them, i.e., the number of action 1's in their ideal actions. Our proof of Lemma 7 utilizes the relationship between the budget requirement by arms in $[Nm]$ and the distributional distance $\|x([Nm]) - m\mu^*\|_W$.

Proof of Lemma 7. Consider a time step $t \geq 0$ and condition on $X_t = x$. We first derive a property of $N_t^{\bar{\pi}^*}$ by relating whether the arms in a set $[n]$ can follow their ideal actions with the quantity $\sum_{i \in [n]} \widehat{A}_t(i)$, referred to as their budget requirement. For any $n \leq N$, the arms in $[n]$ can follow their ideal actions if and only if

$$\sum_{i \in [n]} \widehat{A}_t(i) \leq \alpha N, \quad (66)$$

$$\sum_{i \in [n]} (1 - \widehat{A}_t(i)) \leq (1 - \alpha)N. \quad (67)$$

Here (66) requires that the number of action 1's is within budget. For the condition (67), the easiest way to understand it is that it requires the number of action 0's to be within $(1 - \alpha)N$, where $(1 - \alpha)N$ can be interpreted as the ‘‘budget for idling actions’’. As a result, a sufficient condition for the arms in $[n]$ to follow their ideal actions is

$$\left| \sum_{i \in [n]} \widehat{A}_t(i) - \alpha n \right| \leq \beta(N - n), \quad (68)$$

where recall that $\beta = \min\{\alpha, 1 - \alpha\}$. In this proof, we use a further sufficient condition for the inequality (68) above, which is

$$\max_{n' \leq n} \left| \sum_{i \in [n']} \widehat{A}_t(i) - \alpha n' \right| \leq \beta(N - n). \quad (69)$$

Therefore, by the definition of $N_t^{\bar{\pi}^*}$,

$$\begin{aligned} N_t^{\bar{\pi}^*} &\geq \max \left\{ n \leq N : \max_{n' \leq n} \left| \sum_{i \in [n']} \widehat{A}_t(i) - \alpha n' \right| \leq \beta(N - n) \right\} \\ &= \max \left\{ Nm : m \in [0, 1]_N, \max_{\substack{m' \in [0, 1]_N \\ m' \leq m}} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in [Nm']} \widehat{A}_t(i) - \alpha m' \right| \leq \beta(1 - m) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

We next consider the quantity $\max_{m' \in [0, 1]_N, m' \leq m} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in [Nm']} \widehat{A}_t(i) - \alpha m' \right|$ and relate it to $h_{\text{ID}}(x, m)$ by relating $\left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in [Nm']} \widehat{A}_t(i) - \alpha m' \right|$ to $\|x([Nm']) - m' \mu^*\|_W$. Consider the scaled expected budget requirement for arms in a set D , defined as

$$C_{\bar{\pi}^*}(x, D) \triangleq \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in D} \widehat{A}_t(i) \middle| X_t = x \right] = \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} x(D, s) \bar{\pi}^*(1|s) = x(D) c_{\bar{\pi}^*}^\top, \quad (71)$$

where recall that $c_{\bar{\pi}^*}$ is the row vector $(\bar{\pi}^*(1|s))_{s \in \mathbb{S}}$. Then for any $m \in [0, 1]_N$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\max_{\substack{m' \in [0, 1]_N \\ m' \leq m}} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in [Nm']} \widehat{A}_t(i) - \alpha m' \right| \\ &\leq \max_{\substack{m' \in [0, 1]_N \\ m' \leq m}} \left(\left| C_{\bar{\pi}^*}(x, [Nm']) - \alpha m' \right| + \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in [Nm']} \widehat{A}_t(i) - C_{\bar{\pi}^*}(x, [Nm']) \right| \right) \\ &\leq \max_{\substack{m' \in [0, 1]_N \\ m' \leq m}} \left| C_{\bar{\pi}^*}(x, [Nm']) - \alpha m' \right| + \max_{m' \in [0, 1]_N} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in [Nm']} \widehat{A}_t(i) - C_{\bar{\pi}^*}(x, [Nm']) \right|, \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

where the second term can be viewed as a noise term, which will be bounded later. Consider the first term. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
|C_{\bar{\pi}^*}(x, [Nm']) - \alpha m'| &= (x([Nm']) - m' \mu^*) c_{\bar{\pi}^*}^\top \\
&= (x([Nm']) - m' \mu^*) W^{1/2} W^{-1/2} c_{\bar{\pi}^*}^\top \\
&\leq \|x([Nm']) - m' \mu^*\|_W \|c_{\bar{\pi}^*}\|_{W^{-1}} \\
&= K_{c/h} h_W(x, m').
\end{aligned}$$

$$\max_{\substack{m' \in [0,1]_N \\ m' \leq m}} |C_{\bar{\pi}^*}(x, [Nm']) - \alpha m'| \leq K_{c/h} \max_{\substack{m' \in [0,1]_N \\ m' \leq m}} h_W(x, m') = K_{c/h} h_{\text{ID}}(x, m).$$

As a result, for any $m \leq m_d(x)$, because $K_{c/h} h_{\text{ID}}(x, m) \leq K_{c/h} h_{\text{ID}}(x, m_d(x)) \leq \beta(1 - m_d(x))$,

$$\max_{\substack{m' \in [0,1]_N \\ m' \leq m}} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in [Nm']} \widehat{A}_t(i) - \alpha m' \right| \leq \beta(1 - m_d(x)) + \max_{m' \in [0,1]_N} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in [Nm']} \widehat{A}_t(i) - C_{\bar{\pi}^*}(x, [Nm']) \right|. \quad (73)$$

We now utilize the property of $N_t^{\bar{\pi}^*}$ in (70) and the upper bound in (73) to bound $(Nm_d(x) - N_t^{\bar{\pi}^*})^+$. Note that the upper bound in (73) does not depend on m . Now consider the property of $N_t^{\bar{\pi}^*}$ in (70). Then it is not hard to see that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\min \left\{ Nm_d(x), \left[N - \frac{N}{\beta} \left(\beta(1 - m_d(x)) + \max_{m' \in [0,1]_N} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in [Nm']} \widehat{A}_t(i) - C_{\bar{\pi}^*}(x, [Nm']) \right| \right) \right] \right\} \\
&\in \left\{ Nm : m \in [0,1]_N, \max_{\substack{m' \in [0,1]_N \\ m' \leq m}} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in [Nm']} \widehat{A}_t(i) - \alpha m' \right| \leq \beta(1 - m) \right\}. \quad (74)
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
N_t^{\bar{\pi}^*} &\geq \min \left\{ Nm_d(x), \left[N - \frac{N}{\beta} \left(\beta(1 - m_d(x)) + \max_{m' \in [0,1]_N} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in [Nm']} \widehat{A}_t(i) - C_{\bar{\pi}^*}(x, [Nm']) \right| \right) \right] \right\} \\
&\geq \min \left\{ Nm_d(x), N - \frac{N}{\beta} \left(\beta(1 - m_d(x)) + \max_{m' \in [0,1]_N} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in [Nm']} \widehat{A}_t(i) - C_{\bar{\pi}^*}(x, [Nm']) \right| \right) - 1 \right\} \\
&= \min \left\{ Nm_d(x), Nm_d(x) - 1 - \frac{1}{\beta} \max_{m' \in [0,1]_N} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in [Nm']} \widehat{A}_t(i) - C_{\bar{\pi}^*}(x, [Nm']) \right| \right\} \\
&= Nm_d(x) - 1 - \frac{1}{\beta} \max_{n' \leq N} \left| \sum_{i \in [n']} \widehat{A}_t(i) - N C_{\bar{\pi}^*}(x, [n']) \right|.
\end{aligned}$$

Rearranging the terms and taking expectation, we get

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(Nm_d(x) - N_t^{\bar{\pi}^*})^+ \mid X_t = x \right] \leq 1 + \frac{1}{\beta} \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{n' \leq N} \left| \sum_{i \in [n']} \widehat{A}_t(i) - N C_{\bar{\pi}^*}(x, [n']) \right| \mid X_t = x \right]. \quad (75)$$

Now it suffices to prove

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\max_{n \leq N} \left| \sum_{i \in [n]} \widehat{A}_t(i) - NC_{\bar{\pi}^*}(x, [n]) \right| \middle| X_t = x \right] \leq 2\sqrt{N}. \quad (76)$$

We prove this bound using Doob's maximum inequality for martingales [6]. Let $\xi(i) = \widehat{A}_t(i) - \mathbb{E}[\widehat{A}_t(i) | X_t = x]$ and recall that $C_{\bar{\pi}^*}(x, [n]) = \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{E}[\widehat{A}_t(i) | X_t = x]$. Then

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\max_{n \leq N} \left| \sum_{i \in [n]} \widehat{A}_t(i) - NC_{\bar{\pi}^*}(x, [n]) \right| \middle| X_t = x \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{n \leq N} \left| \sum_{i \in [n]} \xi(i) \right| \middle| X_t = x \right]. \quad (77)$$

We argue that $(\sum_{i \in [n]} \xi(i))_n$ is a martingale (conditioned on $X_t = x$):

- Independence: conditioned on $X_t = x$, the ideal actions $\widehat{A}_t(i)$'s are independently sampled, so $\xi(i)$'s are independent.
- Zero-mean: $\mathbb{E}[\xi(i) | X_t = x] = 0$.
- Bounded: $|\xi(i)| = |\widehat{A}_t(i) - \mathbb{E}[\widehat{A}_t(i) | X_t = x]| \leq 1$.

Then by Doob's L_2 maximum inequality [6],

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\max_{n \leq N} \left| \sum_{i \in [n]} \xi(i) \right|^2 \middle| X_t = x \right] \leq 4\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sum_{i \in [N]} \xi(i) \right|^2 \middle| X_t = x \right]. \quad (78)$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{n \leq N} \left| \sum_{i \in [n]} \xi(i) \right| \middle| X_t = x \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{n \leq N} \left| \sum_{i \in [n]} \xi(i) \right|^2 \middle| X_t = x \right]^{1/2} \\ &\leq \left(4\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sum_{i \in [N]} \xi(i) \right|^2 \middle| X_t = x \right] \right)^{1/2} \\ &= \left(4 \sum_{i \in [N]} \mathbb{E} \left[\xi(i)^2 \middle| X_t = x \right] \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq 2\sqrt{N}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

7.5. Proof of Lemma 8 Next, we prove that the focus set that we choose for the ID policy, $D_t = \lceil Nm_d(X_t) \rceil$, is almost non-shrinking. To provide some intuition, we consider Figure 5a and view $m_d(x)$ as the fraction of the curve $m \mapsto h_{\text{ID}}(X_t, m)$ below the line $m \mapsto \beta(1 - m)$. Observe that $m \mapsto h_{\text{ID}}(X_t, m)$ is non-decreasing with a bounded slope and the line $m \mapsto \beta(1 - m)$ is strictly decreasing. We show that the part of the curve $m \mapsto h_{\text{ID}}(X_t, m)$ below $m \mapsto \beta(1 - m)$ does not move upward significant every time step by bounding the difference $h_{\text{ID}}(X_{t+1}, m_d(X_t)) - h_{\text{ID}}(X_t, m_d(X_t))$, so $m_d(X_t)$ should be approximately non-decreasing.

Proof of Lemma 8. Observe that under the ID policy, we clearly have that $D_{t+1} \supseteq D_t$ or $D_{t+1} \subseteq D_t$ because both D_{t+1} and D_t are of the form $\lceil n \rceil$. Therefore, to show that the ID policy satisfies Condition 2, it suffices to bound $\mathbb{E}[(m(D_t) - m(D_{t+1}))^+ | X_t, D_t] = \mathbb{E}[(m_d(X_t) - m_d(X_{t+1}))^+ | X_t]$.

Fixing a time step $t \geq 0$, we first prove the following inequality, which will be used to establish an upper bound on $\mathbb{E}[(m_d(X_t) - m_d(X_{t+1}))^+ | X_t]$:

$$m_d(X_{t+1}) \geq m_d(X_t) - \frac{K_c/h}{\beta} (h_{\text{ID}}(X_{t+1}, m_d(X_t)) - h_{\text{ID}}(X_t, m_d(X_t)))^+ - \frac{1}{N}. \quad (79)$$

By the maximality of $m_d(X_{t+1})$, it suffices to show $K_{c/h}h_{\text{ID}}(X_{t+1}, \bar{m}) \leq \beta(1 - \bar{m})$ for any $\bar{m} \in [0, 1]_N$ with $\bar{m} \leq m_d(X_t) - \frac{K_{c/h}}{\beta}(h_{\text{ID}}(X_{t+1}, m_d(X_t)) - h_{\text{ID}}(X_t, m_d(X_t)))^+$. For any such \bar{m} ,

$$\begin{aligned} \beta(1 - \bar{m}) &\geq \beta(1 - m_d(X_t)) + K_{c/h}(h_{\text{ID}}(X_{t+1}, m_d(X_t)) - h_{\text{ID}}(X_t, m_d(X_t)))^+ \\ &\geq K_{c/h}h_{\text{ID}}(X_t, m_d(X_t)) + K_{c/h}(h_{\text{ID}}(X_{t+1}, m_d(X_t)) - h_{\text{ID}}(X_t, m_d(X_t)))^+ \\ &\geq K_{c/h}h_{\text{ID}}(X_{t+1}, m_d(X_t)) \\ &\geq K_{c/h}h_{\text{ID}}(X_{t+1}, \bar{m}), \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is because $K_{c/h}h_{\text{ID}}(X_t, m_d(X_t)) \leq \beta(1 - m_d(X_t))$, and the last inequality is because $h_{\text{ID}}(X_t, m)$ is non-decreasing in m and $\bar{m} \leq m_d(X_t)$. This proves (79).

The inequality (79) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[(m_d(X_t) - m_d(X_{t+1}))^+ | X_t] \\ &\leq \frac{K_{c/h}}{\beta} \mathbb{E}[(h_{\text{ID}}(X_{t+1}, m_d(X_t)) - h_{\text{ID}}(X_t, m_d(X_t)))^+ | X_t] + \frac{1}{N}. \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

We now upper bound $\mathbb{E}[(h_{\text{ID}}(X_{t+1}, m_d(X_t)) - h_{\text{ID}}(x, m_d(x)))^+ | X_t]$ by coupling X_{t+1} with a random element X'_{t+1} constructed below. Let X'_{t+1} be the random element denoting the system state at time step $t+1$ if we were able to set $A_t(i) = \widehat{A}_t(i)$ for all $i \in [N]$. By the drift property of the subset Lyapunov function $h_{\text{ID}}(\cdot, D)$ established as (59) in Lemma 6,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[(h_{\text{ID}}(X'_{t+1}, m_d(X_t)) - h_{\text{ID}}(X_t, m_d(X_t)))^+ | X_t] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[(h_{\text{ID}}(X'_{t+1}, m_d(X_t)) - (1 - \frac{1}{2\lambda_W})h_{\text{ID}}(X_t, m_d(X_t)))^+ | X_t] \leq \frac{4\lambda_W^{1/2}}{\sqrt{N}}. \end{aligned} \quad (81)$$

We couple X'_{t+1} and X_{t+1} such that $X'_{t+1}(\{i\}) = X_{t+1}(\{i\})$ for all $i \leq \min(Nm_d(X_t), N_t^{\bar{\pi}^*})$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[(h_{\text{ID}}(X_{t+1}, m_d(X_t)) - h_{\text{ID}}(X_t, m_d(X_t)))^+ - (h_{\text{ID}}(X'_{t+1}, m_d(X_t)) - h_{\text{ID}}(X_t, m_d(X_t)))^+ | X_t] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[(h_{\text{ID}}(X_{t+1}, m_d(X_t)) - h_{\text{ID}}(X'_{t+1}, m_d(X_t)))^+ | X_t] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\max_{m' \in [0, 1]_N, m' \leq m_d(X_t)} h_W(X_{t+1}, m') - \max_{m' \in [0, 1]_N, m' \leq m_d(X_t)} h_W(X'_{t+1}, m')\right)^+ | X_t\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\max_{m' \in [0, 1]_N, m' \leq m_d(X_t)} (h_W(X_{t+1}, m') - h_W(X'_{t+1}, m'))^+ | X_t\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\max_{m' \in [0, 1]_N, m' \leq m_d(X_t)} \|X_{t+1}([Nm']) - X'_{t+1}([Nm'])\|_W | X_t\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[\|X_{t+1}([Nm_d(X_t)] \setminus [N_t^{\bar{\pi}^*}])\|_W + \|X'_{t+1}([Nm_d(X_t)] \setminus [N_t^{\bar{\pi}^*}])\|_W | X_t] \\ &\leq \frac{2\lambda_W^{1/2}}{N} \mathbb{E}[(Nm_d(X_t) - N_t^{\bar{\pi}^*})^+ | X_t] \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

$$\leq \frac{4\lambda_W^{1/2}}{\beta\sqrt{N}} + \frac{2\lambda_W^{1/2}}{N}, \quad (83)$$

where (82) follows from the facts $\|v\|_W \leq \lambda_W^{1/2} \|v\|_1$ for any vector v and that $\|X_{t+1}(D)\|_1 = \|X'_{t+1}(D)\|_1 = m(D)$ for any $D \subseteq [N]$, and (83) applies the bound on $\mathbb{E}[(Nm_d(X_t) - N_t^{\bar{\pi}^*})^+ | X_t]$ in Lemma 7.

Combining (80), (81) and (83), we get

$$\mathbb{E}[(m_d(X_t) - m_d(X_{t+1}))^+ | X_t] \leq \frac{4K_{c/h}\lambda_W^{1/2}(1+\beta)}{\beta^2\sqrt{N}} + \frac{2K_{c/h}\lambda_W^{1/2} + \beta}{\beta N}. \quad \square$$

7.6. Proof of Lemma 9

Proof of Lemma 9. Lemma 9 almost follows directly from the definition $D_t = [Nm_d(X_t)]$ with

$$m_d(X_t) = \max\{m \in [0, 1]_N : K_{c/h}h_{\text{ID}}(X_t, m) \leq \beta(1 - m)\}. \quad (84)$$

We just need to handle the discretization effect where $m_d(X_t)$ is a multiple of $1/N$.

It suffices to focus on the case $m_d(X_t) < 1$. By (84),

$$K_{c/h}h_{\text{ID}}\left(X_t, m_d(X_t) + \frac{1}{N}\right) > \beta\left(1 - m_d(X_t) - \frac{1}{N}\right). \quad (85)$$

By the Lipschitz continuity of $h_{\text{ID}}(x, m)$ stated in (61),

$$K_{c/h}h_{\text{ID}}\left(X_t, m_d(X_t) + \frac{1}{N}\right) \leq K_{c/h}h_{\text{ID}}\left(X_t, m_d(X_t)\right) + \frac{2K_{c/h}\lambda_W^{1/2}}{N}. \quad (86)$$

Combining (85) with (86), we get

$$\beta(1 - m_d(X_t)) < K_{c/h}h_{\text{ID}}(x, m_d(X_t)) + \frac{2K_{c/h}\lambda_W^{1/2} + \beta}{N}. \quad \square$$


8. Experiments In our theoretical analysis, we have shown that our policies achieve asymptotic optimality assuming only the aperiodic unichain assumption, removing GAP or SA assumed in prior work. In this section, we compare the numerical performance of our policies with the policies in the prior work when the number of arms N is finite. These numerical results complement our theory, showing that our policies also empirically outperform previous policies on some RB problems that violate GAP or SA (Section 8.1 and 8.3) but still satisfy our Assumption 1. Moreover, such RB problems are not rare. For GAP, there exists some natural classes of randomly-generated RB instances, a decent fraction of which do not satisfy GAP under all LP-Priority policies (Section 8.2); for SA, we give two counterexamples for SA and discuss ways to construct more counterexamples in Section A. The code for all the experiments are available on Github [17].

8.1. Comparing policies on two non-GAP examples In this section, we consider two examples where two prevalent versions of LP-Priority policies, the Whittle index policy [25] and the LP index policy [11] (whose variants are also studied as primal-dual heuristics, Lagrange-based policies, or the Optimal Lagrangian Index Policy [2, 3, 15, 18]) are not asymptotically optimal, either because of the failure of GAP or because the policy itself is not well-defined. We will simulate the Whittle index policy and the LP-index policy on these two examples, where the Whittle index policy is implemented using the algorithm in [8]. Along with these two LP-Priority policies, we also evaluate the performance of the FTVA policy [16], the set-expansion policy (Section 4.2), and the ID policy (Section 4.3). Note that for the set-expansion policy, we will consider two versions of implementations that perform action rectification differently: the vanilla version performs action rectification in the uniformly random way as described in Algorithm 2; the ‘‘LP index version’’ of the set-expansion policy applies the LP index policy to the arms not in the focus set. See Section G.1 for implementation details of the set-expansion policy.


For all the simulations, we compare the *optimality ratios* of the policies, which are their average rewards normalized by the optimal value of the LP relaxation in (LP). The optimality ratio of an asymptotically optimal policy converges to 1 as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

The first non-GAP example is an RB problem defined by a single-armed MDP with three states and was obtained in a random search by [9]; it was also evaluated in Figure 1 of [16]; see Section G.2 for its detailed


FIGURE 6. Performance comparison on two examples where GAP fails to hold.



(a) Performance comparison on the three-state example.



(b) Performance comparison on the eight-state example.

FIGURE 7. Scatter plots illustrating the eigenvalues of about 10^4 random RB problems, whose transition probabilities and reward function follow the Dirichlet distribution with different parameters in each subplot.


Note. Each point in a scatter plot represents an RB problem, whose x -coordinate (or y -coordinate) represents the second largest modulus of eigenvalues of P_{π^*} (or spectral radius of Φ). Each RB problem has $|\mathcal{S}| = 10$. The points marked in red represent RB problems that violate GAP under all LP-Priority policies.

definition. Note that in this three-state example, there is only one LP-Priority policy, so the Whittle index policy and the LP index policy are identical. Our simulation is shown in Figure 6a: The Whittle index policy and the LP index policy are asymptotically suboptimal; FTVA outperforms the LP index policy and appears to be asymptotically optimal; the set-expansion policy and the ID policy are strictly better than FTVA; the LP-index version of set-expansion policy has the best performance among all these policies.

The second non-GAP example is defined by a single-armed MDP with eight states, and is adapted from Figure 2 of [16]; see Section G.2 for its detailed definition. A notable feature of this example is the existence of a local attractor, where the scaled state-count vector of the arms is attracted to a distribution other than the optimal stationary distribution, which is a mode of non-GAP-ness not observed in earlier literature. Our simulation result on this example is shown in Figure 6b: The Whittle index policy is not included since this example is non-indexable; the LP index policy has nearly zero reward; FTVA, the set-expansion policy, and the ID policy are asymptotically optimal, and the ID policy has the best performance among all these policies.

8.2. Commonness of non-GAP examples Although counterexamples to GAP are well-known to exist starting from [24], such examples are rare in previously known classes of RB problems. In particular, it has been found in [10] that when $|\mathcal{S}| = 3$, no more than 0.2% of the uniformly random examples are non-indexable or violate GAP for Whittle index policy; when $|\mathcal{S}|$ gets large, this fraction among the uniformly random examples further decreases and becomes less than $10^{-4}\%$ when $|\mathcal{S}| = 7$.

FIGURE 8. CDF of the suboptimality ratios of LP-Priority policies when $N = 500$, among 2049 non-GAP examples generated from Dirichlet(0.05).



Note. We regard the average reward of Whittle index policy as 0 if it is not well-defined.

In this section, we study some classes of RB problems that are more sparse than the RB problems following the uniform distribution. Specifically, we generate some random RBs with $|\mathbb{S}| = 10$, whose transition distribution $P(s, a, \cdot)$ for $s \in \mathbb{S}, a \in \mathbb{A}$ and reward function $r(\cdot, a)$ for $a \in \mathbb{A}$ follow the Dirichlet distribution, a natural distribution for generating points on the probability simplex.


To count the number of non-GAP examples, we focus on identifying the RB problems that are *locally unstable*, which implies the violation of GAP under all LP-Priority policies. The local instability of an RB problem is easy to certify: it happens when the spectral radius of a certain matrix Φ representing the local mean-field dynamics under the LP-Priority policies is larger than 1, given that the definition of Φ is unambiguous (See Section G.3 for details). Based on this fact, we make three scatter plots in Figure 7, each visualizing 10^4 independently generated RB problems following the Dirichlet distributions with different parameters. Each point in a scatter plot represents an RB problem, whose y -coordinate is the spectral radius of Φ , and whose x -coordinate represents the second-largest absolute value of $P_{\bar{\pi}^*}$'s eigenvalues.

From Figure 7a to Figure 7c, the parameter of the Dirichlet distribution decreases from 1 to 0.05, indicating the increased sparsity of the single-armed MDPs. In particular, in Figure 7a, because Dirichlet(1) is the uniform distribution on probability simplex, the fact that no RB examples are found to be locally unstable is consistent with the findings in [11]. In contrast, in Figure 7c, under Dirichlet(0.05) distribution, a significant proportion of the problem instances are locally unstable (marked in red); moreover, even if we focus on the examples whose x -coordinate is less than 0.95, that is, the examples whose $P_{\bar{\pi}^*}$ is aperiodic unichain with a decently large spectral gap, 1844 out of 9131 examples (about 20.2%) are locally unstable. Note that when generating the 10^4 random examples for the three scatter plots, the definition of Φ is ambiguous for a small number of examples, which we do not display in the figures; specifically, the actual number of examples displayed in Figure 7a, 7b, and 7c are 9776, 9918, and 9914, respectively.


The experiment in Figure 7 shows that for the RB problems whose single-armed MDPs are sparse, a significant fraction of them could be aperiodic unichain, but violate GAP for all LP-Priority policies.

LP-Priority policies on random non-GAP examples Violation of GAP invalidates the asymptotic optimality guarantee of an LP-Priority policy, but how suboptimal is an LP-Priority policy when GAP does not hold? In Figure 8, we plot some CDF curves representing the optimality ratios of the LP index policy, the Whittle index policy, and their maximal performances when $N = 500$, among 2034 locally unstable examples generated from the Dirichlet(0.05) distribution. Each policy is simulated for 2×10^4 time steps on every example. As we can see from Figure 8c, the average rewards under the LP index policy or the Whittle index policy are close to the LP upper bound in most non-GAP examples, which explains the good performance of LP-Priority policies observed in practice; on the other hand, there are about 6.7% of the examples where the average rewards of both policies are less than 90% of the LP upper bound. This experiment shows that it is not uncommon for LP-Priority policies to be substantially suboptimal when the single-armed MDPs of the RB problems are sparse. In these cases, relaxing the GAP condition could bring a practical benefit.

FIGURE 9. Performance comparison on two Dirichlet(0.05) examples where GAP fails to hold.




(a) First Dirichlet(0.05) example.




(b) Second Dirichlet(0.05) example.

FIGURE 10. Performance comparison of the policies on counterexamples to SA defined in Section A.



(a) RB problem defined in Figure 11.




(b) RB problem defined in Figure 12.

In Figure 9a and Figure 9b, we pick two non-GAP examples where both the Whittle index and LP index policies have optimality ratios of less than 90%, and compare the performance of different policies there. In both examples, FTVA, the two versions of set-expansion policy, and the ID policy outperform the LP-Priority policies, with clear and discernible differences.

8.3. Comparing policies on two non-SA examples In this section, we consider the same set of policies as in Section 8.1 and compare their performances on two examples that violate SA (Assumption 1 of [16]) but satisfy our aperiodic unichain assumption. We give one of the examples at the end of this subsection, and another one in Section A, where we also discuss ways to construct more counterexamples to SA. To give a high-level idea, each example that we construct requires each arm to strictly follow a particular policy so that it can reach and remain in the states with high rewards, which is hard to achieve by following some virtual actions that are not generated based on the true state of the arm.

The simulation results are shown in Figure 10. Note that FTVA is simulated for 1.6×10^5 time steps with five sample paths, whereas the other policies are simulated for 2×10^4 time steps with five sample paths. Despite the longer simulations, the performances of FTVA still exhibit significant variability with large confidence intervals. In both examples, FTVA perform worse than the other policies, especially in the RB problem considered in Figure 10b, whose single-armed MDP has a larger state space. In contrast, the ID policy and the two version of the set-expansion policy demonstrate solid performances, though not quite

FIGURE 11. A counterexample to the Synchronization Assumption in [16].



Note. Each cycle denotes a state, indexed by $0, 1, 2, \dots, 7$. Each arrow denotes a possible transition. The numbers labeled on the solid-line arrows denote actions. If an arm takes an action that is labeled on one of the outward solid-line arrows at its current state, it picks such an arrow labeled by the action uniformly at random and transitions to a nearby state along the arrow; otherwise, the arm jumps to state 0. The reward is 1 if an arm is in states $\{4, 5, 6, 7\}$ and takes the action on an outward solid-line arrow at its current state. Otherwise, the reward is zero. The budget parameter α is set to be 0.6.

reaching the performances of the LP index policy. The Whittle index policy is not well-defined on these two examples due to the multichain nature of the single-armed MDPs (see [8] for details).

Definition of one of the non-SA examples. Now we define the example considered in Figure 10a. The single-armed MDP of this example is defined using Figure 11. This figure consists of a set of cycles denoting states and a set of arrows in solid lines and dashed lines. The states are indexed by $0, 1, 2, \dots, 7$. Each solid arrow is labeled by an action, 0 or 1. In each time step, when the arm takes an action labeled on one of the outward solid-line arrows adjacent to its current state, the arm transitions to a random nearby state through one of such arrows; the arm takes an action that does not exist on any of the adjacent outward solid-line arrows, it jumps to state 0. For example, if the arm takes action 1 at state 7, it goes to state 6 with probability 1; if the arm takes action 0 at state 6, it goes to state 7 or 4, each with probability 0.5; if the arm takes action 0 at state 2, it jumps to state 0 with probability 1. For the reward functions, one unit of reward is generated if the arm is in states $\{4, 5, 6, 7\}$ and takes the action on an adjacent outward solid-line arrow; no reward is generated otherwise. We let $\alpha = 0.6$, that is, the arm is activated for 0.6 fraction of the time in the long run.

One can see that the optimal single-armed policy $\bar{\pi}^*$ defined in (3) takes each action with 0.5 probability at the states $\{0, 1, 2, 3\}$, and always takes the actions labeled on the solid-line arrows at the states $\{4, 5, 6, 7\}$. The policy $\bar{\pi}^*$ thus induces an aperiodic unichain with the recurrent class $\{4, 5, 6, 7\}$. The long-run average reward of $\bar{\pi}^*$ is 1.

On the other hand, we argue that SA is violated in this example. To see this, recall the leader-and-follower system in the SA (see Section 4.1 of [16]), which consists of two arms, the leader arm and the follower arm, whose states are denoted by \widehat{S}_t and \underline{S}_t ; the leader arm takes the action $\widehat{A}_t \sim \bar{\pi}^*(\cdot | \widehat{S}_t)$, and the follower arm takes the action same action, $A_t = \widehat{A}_t$. SA requires that the stopping time $\tau = \inf\{t: S_t = \widehat{S}_t\}$ has a finite expectation for any possible pair of initial states. However, in the above example, if we initialize the pair of states as $\widehat{S}_0 = 7$ and $S_0 = 0$, \widehat{S}_t will remain in states $\{4, 5, 6, 7\}$ under $\bar{\pi}^*$, and the action sequences applied by both arms will not contain more than two subsequent 1's. Consequently, S_t always falls back to the state 0 before reaching state 3, and the two arms never reach the same state, implying $\tau = \infty$.

9. Conclusion and discussions In this paper, we considered the infinite-horizon, average-reward restless bandit problem. We introduced a new class of policies that are asymptotically optimal with $O(1/\sqrt{N})$ optimality gaps, if the optimal single-armed policy induces an aperiodic unichain. Our paper is the first to show that asymptotic optimality can be achieved without any additional assumptions like GAP and SA.

Our policy design and analysis highlight the use of multiple, bivariate Lyapunov functions. This novel approach holds promises beyond restless bandits, showing potential for a broader class of large stochastic systems consisting of many coupled components. In such complex systems, it can be challenging to directly design a policy that steers the whole system towards optimality or to construct a Lyapunov function that certifies such convergence.

To complement our theory, we simulate our policies on examples where either GAP or SA fails, along with the policies from prior work. Our policies consistently demonstrate good performance, whereas the policies

from prior work may perform suboptimally in some examples. Additionally, we identify some natural classes of RB instances where GAP is violated with a considerable probability and discuss a method for constructing more counterexamples of SA.

Several directions are of interest for future research. The first direction is to generalize our results to restless bandit problems with heterogeneous arms and to the more general problem of weakly coupled MDPs. Another important direction for future research is achieving asymptotic optimality when the model parameters of the RB problem are unknown.

Acknowledgments


Y. Hong and W. Wang are supported in part by NSF grants ECCS-2145713, ECCS-2432545, and CCF-2403194; Qiaomin Xie is supported in part by NSF grants CNS-1955997 and EPCN-2339794; Yudong Chen is supported in part by NSF grant CCF-2233152.

References

- [1] Asmussen S, Glynn PW (2007) *Steady-State Simulation*, 96–125 (New York, NY: Springer New York).
- [2] Bertsimas D, Niño Mora J (2000) Restless bandits, linear programming relaxations, and a primal-dual index heuristic. *Oper. Res.* 48(1):80–90.
- [3] Brown DB, Smith JE (2020) Index policies and performance bounds for dynamic selection problems. *Manage. Sci.* 66(7):3029–3050.
- [4] Brown DB, Zhang J (2022) Dynamic programs with shared resources and signals: Dynamic fluid policies and asymptotic optimality. *Oper. Res.* 70(5):3015–3033.
- [5] Brown DB, Zhang J (2023) Fluid policies, reoptimization, and performance guarantees in dynamic resource allocation. *Oper. Res.* Ahead of Print, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/opre.2022.0601>.
- [6] Durrett R (2019) *Probability: Theory and Examples*. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics (Cambridge University Press), 5 edition.
- [7] D’Aeth JC, Ghosal S, Grimm F, Haw D, Koca E, Lau K, Liu H, Moret S, Rizmie D, Smith PC, Forchini G, Miraldo M, Wiesemann W (2023) Optimal hospital care scheduling during the sars-cov-2 pandemic. *Manage. Sci.* 69(10):5923–5947.
- [8] Gast N, Gaujal B, Khun K (2023) Testing indexability and computing whittle and gittins index in subcubic time. *Mathematical Methods of Operations Research* 97(3):391–436.
- [9] Gast N, Gaujal B, Yan C (2020) Exponential convergence rate for the asymptotic optimality of whittle index policy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.09064*.
- [10] Gast N, Gaujal B, Yan C (2023) Exponential asymptotic optimality of whittle index policy. *Queueing Syst.* 104(1):107–150.
- [11] Gast N, Gaujal B, Yan C (2023) Linear program-based policies for restless bandits: Necessary and sufficient conditions for (exponentially fast) asymptotic optimality. *Math. Oper. Res.*
- [12] Gast N, Gaujal B, Yan C (2024) Reoptimization nearly solves weakly coupled markov decision processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.01961*.
- [13] Ghosh A, Nagaraj D, Jain M, Tambe M (2023) Indexability is not enough for whittle: Improved, near-optimal algorithms for restless bandits. *Proc. Int. Conf. Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Syst.*, 1294–1302 (Richland, SC).
- [14] Goldsztajn D, Avrachenkov K (2024) Asymptotically optimal policies for weakly coupled markov decision processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.04751*.
- [15] Hawkins JT (2003) *A Lagrangian decomposition approach to weakly coupled dynamic optimization problems and its applications*. Ph.D. thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- [16] Hong Y, Xie Q, Chen Y, Wang W (2023) Restless bandits with average reward: Breaking the uniform global attractor assumption. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 36, 12810–12844.
- [17] Hong Y, Xie Q, Chen Y, Wang W (2024) Unichain and aperiodicity are sufficient for asymptotic optimality of average-reward restless bandits. GitHub repository, <https://github.com/YigeHong/rb-focus-set/>.

- [18] Hu W, Frazier P (2017) An asymptotically optimal index policy for finite-horizon restless bandits. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.00205* .
- [19] Mannor S, Tsitsiklis JN (2005) On the empirical state-action frequencies in markov decision processes under general policies. *Math. Oper. Res.* 30(3):545–561.
- [20] Niño-Mora J (2023) Markovian restless bandits and index policies: A review. *Mathematics* 11(7).
- [21] Papadimitriou CH, Tsitsiklis JN (1999) The complexity of optimal queuing network control. *Math. Oper. Res.* 24(2):293–305.
- [22] Puterman ML (2005) *Markov decision processes: Discrete stochastic dynamic programming* (John Wiley & Sons).
- [23] Verloop IM (2016) Asymptotically optimal priority policies for indexable and nonindexable restless bandits. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 26(4):1947–1995.
- [24] Weber RR, Weiss G (1990) On an index policy for restless bandits. *J. Appl. Probab.* 27(3):637–648.
- [25] Whittle P (1988) Restless bandits: activity allocation in a changing world. *J. Appl. Probab.* 25:287 – 298.
- [26] Yan C (2024) An optimal-control approach to infinite-horizon restless bandits: Achieving asymptotic optimality with minimal assumptions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.11913* .
- [27] Zayas-Cabán G, Jasin S, Wang G (2019) An asymptotically optimal heuristic for general nonstationary finite-horizon restless multi-armed, multi-action bandits. *Adv. Appl. Probab.* 51:745–772.
- [28] Zhang X, Frazier PI (2021) Restless bandits with many arms: Beating the central limit theorem. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.11911* .
- [29] Zhang X, Frazier PI (2022) Near-optimality for infinite-horizon restless bandits with many arms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.15853* .

FIGURE 12. Another counterexample to the Synchronization Assumption in [16].



Note. This figure can be interpreted in the way as Figure 11. The reward is 1 if the arms takes the required action in states $\{5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11\}$. The budget parameter α is set to be $1/2$.

Appendix A: Additional counterexamples for the Synchronization Assumption Recall that in Section 8.3, we have compared the performances of our policies and the policies from prior work on two examples where the Synchronization Assumption (SA), required by the FTVA policy in [16], does not hold. One of the examples has been defined in Figure 11.

In this section, we discuss how to generalize the graphical way of defining the example in Figure 11 to construct non-SA examples of arbitrary sizes. In particular, we use this method to define the example simulated in Figure 10b.

To specify the single-armed MDP for a non-SA example, we can first pick a set of transient states (like the states $\{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ in Figure 11), and a set of recurrent states (like the states $\{4, 5, 6, 7\}$ in Figure 11). Then we set a *required action* for each state, such that the arm goes to a next state if it follows the required action, and jumps back to a fixed transient state (we call it state 0) otherwise. The reward is positive if the arm follows the required action on the recurrent states, and is zero otherwise. The budget parameter α is chosen to be the long-run average fraction of activations if the arm always follows the required actions. To make the SA fail, we can specify the transition structure and the required actions such that from state 0, the arm can reach a recurrent state only after strictly following a *particular sequence of actions*, which should be different from all possible action sequences taken by the arms in the recurrent states. In this way, the leader arm \hat{S}_t keeps circulating among the recurrent states, so the action sequence of the leader arm cannot bring the follower arm from state 0 to a recurrent state.

Using the above method, we construct another example, whose single-armed MDP is illustrated in Figure 12, with budget $1/2$. One can verify that if the leader arm and the follower arm are initialized as $\hat{S}_0 = 5$ and $S_0 = 0$, the two arms never reach the same state. On the other hand, note that the optimal single-armed policy $\bar{\pi}^*$ defined by (3) induces an aperiodic unichain on this example, implying the compliance of Assumption 1.

Appendix B: Discussion of Assumption 1

B.1. Unichain conditions in prior work In this section, we discuss our version of the unichain condition stated in Assumption 1, which assumes that the optimal single-armed policy $\bar{\pi}^*$ induces a unichain. We compare it with other unichain-like assumptions in the literature.

The all-policy unichain condition commonly used in the average-reward MDP literature [22, Section 8.3] assumes that every stationary policy induces a unichain. Our single-policy unichain condition in Assumption 1 is weaker, because we only require a particular policy $\bar{\pi}^*$ to induce a unichain.

Another commonly used condition in the average-reward MDP literature is the weakly-communicating condition, which assumes that the state space can be partitioned into two sets: a closed set of states where every pair of states in the set can be reached from each other under some policy, and a possibly empty set of

states that are transient under every policy. The weakly-communicating condition, a weaker alternative to the all-policy unichain condition, ensures that an MDP has an initial-state-independent optimal average reward.

Our single-policy unichain condition in Assumption 1 and the weakly-communicating condition are not directly comparable. In particular,

- Our unichain condition does not imply the weakly-communicating condition because the transient states under $\bar{\pi}^*$ may not be transient under every policy.
- The weakly-communicating condition does not imply our unichain condition either. A counterexample is given in Example 3.1 of [19], as paraphrased below. Consider the following two-state MDP with the state space $\{0, 1\}$. The state of the MDP transitions to 0 (resp., 1) in the next time step with probability 1 after taking action 0 (resp., 1), regardless of the current state; the reward function is $r(1, 1) = r(0, 0) = 1$ and $r(1, 0) = r(0, 1) = 0$. This MDP is clearly communicating. However, if we consider the RB problem defined by this MDP with the budget parameter $\alpha = 1/2$, then the optimal solution to the LP relaxation (LP) is $y^*(1, 1) = y^*(0, 0) = 1/2$ and $y^*(1, 0) = y^*(0, 1) = 0$. The optimal single-armed policy is thus given by $\bar{\pi}^*(1|1) = \bar{\pi}^*(0|0) = 1$ and $\bar{\pi}^*(1|0) = \bar{\pi}^*(0|1) = 0$, which induces a Markov chain with no transitions between the two states, violating our unichain condition.

Now we review the unichain-like conditions considered in the RB literature. To the best of our knowledge, all prior work on average-reward RBs assumes the all-policy unichain assumption: In [23, 24], it is assumed that *the N -armed restless bandit system* is unichain under every policy; in [10, 11], it is further assumed that the N -armed restless bandit system is irreducible under every policy; in [16], the single-armed MDP is assumed to be unichain under every policy. All these assumptions are stronger than our unichain condition in Assumption 1. In particular, assuming the N -armed restless bandit system to be unichain under every policy implies that the single-armed MDP is unichain under every policy, because if a policy for the single-armed MDP induces more than one recurrent classes, one can construct a policy for the N -armed system that also induces more than one recurrent classes. Nevertheless, all these unichain-like conditions in prior work are mostly for simplifying the presentation and can often be relaxed: For example, [11] mentions that their analysis still goes through if they assume the N -armed system to be weakly communicating; [16] discusses in their appendices that the unichain condition can be dropped as long as the Synchronization Assumption holds, albeit at the cost of a slightly more complicated formulation of the single-armed problem.

B.2. Necessity of aperiodicity In this section, we provide an example showing that without aperiodicity, the gap between the optimal value of the N -armed RB problem, $R^*(N, S_0)$, and the optimal value of its single-armed relaxation, R^{rel} , can be non-diminishing as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

Consider a single-armed problem with two states, A and B . At each time step, the arm transitions to the other state with probability 1, regardless of the action applied. The reward function is given by $r(A, 0) = r(B, 1) = 1$ and $r(A, 1) = r(B, 0) = 0$. Let α be $\frac{1}{2}$ in the relaxed budget constraint, i.e., the arm is pulled half of the time in the long run. It is not hard to see that an optimal policy $\bar{\pi}^*$ of the single-armed problem is given by $\bar{\pi}^*(0|A) = \bar{\pi}^*(1|B) = 1$ and $\bar{\pi}^*(1|A) = \bar{\pi}^*(0|B) = 0$, and it achieves the optimal value $R^{\text{rel}} = 1$. Note that any policies in this single-armed problem induce a *periodic* unichain.

Now we consider the RB system consisting of N copies of the single-armed MDP defined above, with budget constraint $\alpha N = N/2$. Suppose all arms of the RB system are initialized in state A . Then at any time t , either all arms are in state A or all arms are in state B . In this case, all policies have the same outcome: when all arms are in state A , $N/2$ arms take action 0 and generate $N/2$; when all arms are in state B , $N/2$ arms take action 1 and generate $N/2$ reward. Therefore, under any policy, the long-run average reward per time step and arm is $1/2$, which has a non-diminishing gap with the upper bound $R^{\text{rel}} = 1$.

Appendix C: Proof of LP relaxation upper bound In this section, we prove a lemma to show that the linear program (LP) is a relaxation of the restless bandit problem (RB). Although the lemma has been proved and is used in all prior work on average-reward restless bandit [see, e.g. 23, Lemma 4.3], we prove it here for completeness.

For ease of reference, we first restate (LP) and (RB).

$$\begin{aligned} \text{maximize}_{\text{policy } \pi} \quad & R^-(\pi, \mathbf{S}_0) \triangleq \liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in [N]} \mathbb{E} [r(S_t^\pi(i), A_t^\pi(i))] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{RB})$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad \sum_{i \in [N]} A_t^\pi(i) = \alpha N, \quad \forall t \geq 0, \quad (1a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{maximize}_{\{y(s,a)\}_{s \in \mathbb{S}, a \in \mathbb{A}}} \quad & \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}, a \in \mathbb{A}} r(s, a) y(s, a) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{LP})$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} y(s, 1) = \alpha, \quad (2a)$$

$$\sum_{s' \in \mathbb{S}, a \in \mathbb{A}} y(s', a) P(s', a, s) = \sum_{a \in \mathbb{A}} y(s, a), \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{S}, \quad (2b)$$

$$\sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}, a \in \mathbb{A}} y(s, a) = 1, \quad y(s, a) \geq 0, \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{S}, a \in \mathbb{A}. \quad (2c)$$

Next, we show that the optimal value of (LP) upper bounds the optimal value of (RB).

LEMMA 10 (LP relaxation). *Let R^{rel} be the optimal value of the linear program (LP), and let $R^*(N, \mathbf{S}_0)$ be the optimal reward of the N -armed restless bandit problem (RB). Then we have*

$$R^{\text{rel}} \geq R^*(N, \mathbf{S}_0). \quad (87)$$

Proof of Lemma 10. For any stationary Markovian policy π , define

$$y^\pi(s, a) \triangleq \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in [N]} \mathbb{1}\{S_t^\pi(i) = s, A_t^\pi(i) = a\} \right] \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{S}, a \in \mathbb{A}.$$

We first show that $R(\pi, \mathbf{S}_0) = \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}, a \in \mathbb{A}} r(s, a) y^\pi(s, a)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}, a \in \mathbb{A}} r(s, a) y^\pi(s, a) &= \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}, a \in \mathbb{A}} r(s, a) \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in [N]} \mathbb{1}\{S_t^\pi(i) = s, A_t^\pi(i) = a\} \right] \\ &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sum_{i \in [N]} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}, a \in \mathbb{A}} r(s, a) \mathbb{1}\{S_t^\pi(i) = s, A_t^\pi(i) = a\} \right] \\ &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sum_{i \in [N]} \mathbb{E} [r(S_t^\pi(i), A_t^\pi(i))] \\ &= R(\pi, \mathbf{S}_0). \end{aligned}$$

Then we show that $(y^\pi(s, a))_{s \in \mathbb{S}, a \in \mathbb{A}}$ satisfies the constraints of (LP). We first consider the constraint (2a):

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} y^\pi(s, 1) &= \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in [N]} \mathbb{1}\{S_t^\pi(i) = s, A_t^\pi(i) = 1\} \right] \\
&= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sum_{i \in [N]} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} \mathbb{1}\{S_t^\pi(i) = s, A_t^\pi(i) = 1\} \right] \\
&= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \alpha N \\
&= \alpha.
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we look at the constraint (2b):

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{s' \in \mathbb{S}, a \in \mathbb{A}} y^\pi(s', a) P(s', a, s) &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sum_{i \in [N]} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}, a \in \mathbb{A}} P(s', a, s) \mathbb{P}(S_t^\pi(i) = s', A_t^\pi(i) = a) \\
&= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sum_{i \in [N]} \mathbb{P}(S_{t+1}^\pi(i) = s) \\
&= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i \in [N]} \mathbb{P}(S_t^\pi(i) = s) \\
&= \sum_{a \in \mathbb{A}} y^\pi(s, a).
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we consider the constraint (2c):

$$\sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}, a \in \mathbb{A}} y^\pi(s, a) = \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sum_{i \in [N]} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}, a \in \mathbb{A}} \mathbb{1}\{S_t^\pi(i) = s, A_t^\pi(i) = a\} \right] = 1,$$

and it is obvious that $\sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}, a \in \mathbb{A}} y^\pi(s, a) \geq 0$.

Combining the above argument, $(y^\pi(s, a))_{s \in \mathbb{S}, a \in \mathbb{A}}$ is a feasible solution to Equation (LP), so $R(\pi, \mathbf{S}_0) = \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}, a \in \mathbb{A}} r(s, a) y^\pi(s, a) \leq R^{\text{rel}}$.

By standard results for MDP with finite state and action spaces, there always exists a stationary Markovian policy whose long-run average reward achieves the optimal reward [22, Theorem 9.1.8]. Letting π be this optimal stationary Markovian policy, then $R^*(N, \mathbf{S}_0) = R(\pi, \mathbf{S}_0) \leq R^{\text{rel}}$. \square

Appendix D: Proof of Theorem 3 in general case Recall that in Section 5.1, we have proved Theorem 3 assuming that the focus-set policy induces a Markov chain that converges to a unique stationary distribution. Here we provide the general proof without this simplifying assumption.

Proof of Theorem 3 in the general case. Most steps in the general proof go through almost verbatim if we replace any steady-state expectations of the form $\mathbb{E}[f(S_\infty, A_\infty, X_\infty, D_\infty)]$ with the long-run averages of the form:

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E}[f(S_t, A_t, X_t, D_t)].$$

Note that the long-run averages of the above form always exist because (S_t, A_t, X_t, D_t) is a finite-state Markov chain and Proposition 8.1.1 in [22] can be applied with a trivial generalization of its proof, although the values of the long-run averages could depend on the initial states. With the steady-state expectations replaced by the long-run averages, we get the following analogs of (16) and (18):

$$R^*(N, S_0) - R(\pi, S_0) \leq r_{\max} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \left(\mathbb{E}[\|\mu^* - \mathbb{E}[X_t([N])]\|_1] + 2r_{\max} \mathbb{E}[1 - m(D_t)] \right) + \frac{2r_{\max} K_{\text{conf}}}{\sqrt{N}} \quad (88)$$

$$\leq r_{\max} \left(\frac{1}{K_{\text{dist}}} + \frac{2}{L_h} \right) \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E}[V(X_t, D_t)] + \frac{2r_{\max} K_{\text{conf}}}{\sqrt{N}}. \quad (89)$$

The only place that needs a different treatment in the general case is in the last few steps, after deriving the drift condition for each finite t :

$$\mathbb{E}[V(X_{t+1}, D_{t+1}) | X_t, D_t] \leq \rho_1 V(X_t, D_t) + \frac{K_1}{\sqrt{N}}. \quad (19 \text{ restated})$$

We take expectation on both sides of (19) to get the recursive inequality on $\mathbb{E}[V(X_t, D_t)]$:

$$\mathbb{E}[V(X_{t+1}, D_{t+1})] \leq \rho_1 \mathbb{E}[V(X_t, D_t)] + \frac{K_1}{\sqrt{N}}.$$

We expand the recursion to get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[V(X_t, D_t)] &\leq \rho_1^t \mathbb{E}[V(X_0, D_0)] + \frac{K_1}{(1 - \rho_1)\sqrt{N}} \\ \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E}[V(X_t, D_t)] &\leq \frac{1}{(1 - \rho_1)T} \mathbb{E}[V(X_0, D_0)] + \frac{K_1}{(1 - \rho_1)\sqrt{N}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the long-run average of $\mathbb{E}[V(X_t, D_t)]$ can be bounded as

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E}[V(X_t, D_t)] \leq \frac{K_1}{(1 - \rho_1)\sqrt{N}}. \quad (90)$$

Combining (90) with (89), we finish the proof.

Appendix E: Supplementary lemmas and proofs In this section, we provide lemmas and proofs that serve as preliminaries for analyzing our policies. In Section E.1, we show that the weight matrix W in Definition 2 is well-defined and prove Lemma 1, which claims that the state distribution of the Markov chain $P_{\bar{\pi}^*}$ converges to the steady-state distribution μ^* geometrically fast under the W -weighted L_2 norm. Then in Section E.2, we show that two classes of functions, $\{h_W(x, D)\}_{D \subseteq [N]}$ and $\{h_{\text{ID}}(\cdot, m)\}_{m \in [0, 1]_N}$, are subset Lyapunov functions. Finally, in Section E.3, we prove two lemmas about the L_1 norm that are used when analyzing the set-expansion policy.

E.1. Lemmas and proofs about matrix W and W -weighted L_2 norm For the ease of reference, we first restate the definition of Definition 2 below.

DEFINITION 2. Let W be an $|\mathbb{S}|$ -by- $|\mathbb{S}|$ matrix given by

$$W = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (P_{\bar{\pi}^*} - \Xi)^k (P_{\bar{\pi}^*}^\top - \Xi^\top)^k, \quad (27)$$

where Ξ is an $|\mathbb{S}|$ -by- $|\mathbb{S}|$ matrix with each row being μ^* . Let λ_W denote maximal eigenvalue of W .

The next lemma shows that the matrix W is well-defined and positive definite, with eigenvalues in the range $[1, \lambda_W]$.

LEMMA 11. *The matrix W given in Definition 2 is well-defined. Moreover, W is positive definite whose eigenvalues are lower bounded by 1.*

Proof of Lemma 11. Consider the sum of the spectral norm of all terms in the definition of W :

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \|(P_{\bar{\pi}^*} - \Xi)^k (P_{\bar{\pi}^*}^\top - \Xi^\top)^k\|_2.$$

Note that $(P_{\bar{\pi}^*} - \Xi)^k = P_{\bar{\pi}^*}^k - \Xi$. Because $\bar{\pi}^*$ induces an aperiodic unichain, $P_{\bar{\pi}^*}^k \rightarrow \Xi$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Consequently, there exist $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $\bar{\rho} < 1$ such that $\|(P_{\bar{\pi}^*} - \Xi)^{k_0}\|_2 = \bar{\rho}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \|(P_{\bar{\pi}^*} - \Xi)^k (P_{\bar{\pi}^*}^\top - \Xi^\top)^k\|_2 &= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=jk_0}^{(j+1)k_0-1} \|(P_{\bar{\pi}^*} - \Xi)^k (P_{\bar{\pi}^*}^\top - \Xi^\top)^k\|_2 \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{k_0-1} \|(P_{\bar{\pi}^*} - \Xi)^{jk_0} (P_{\bar{\pi}^*} - \Xi)^k (P_{\bar{\pi}^*}^\top - \Xi^\top)^k (P_{\bar{\pi}^*}^\top - \Xi^\top)^{jk_0}\|_2 \\ &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{k_0-1} \|(P_{\bar{\pi}^*} - \Xi)^{k_0}\|_2^j \|(P_{\bar{\pi}^*} - \Xi)^k (P_{\bar{\pi}^*}^\top - \Xi^\top)^k\|_2 \|(P_{\bar{\pi}^*}^\top - \Xi^\top)^{k_0}\|_2^j \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \bar{\rho}^{2j} \sum_{k=0}^{k_0-1} \|(P_{\bar{\pi}^*} - \Xi)^k (P_{\bar{\pi}^*}^\top - \Xi^\top)^k\|_2 \\ &= \frac{C_0}{1 - \bar{\rho}^2} < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where $C_0 = \sum_{k=0}^{k_0-1} \|(P_{\bar{\pi}^*} - \Xi)^k (P_{\bar{\pi}^*}^\top - \Xi^\top)^k\|_2$. Therefore, the infinite sum is absolutely convergent.

To show that W is positive definite, observe that each term in its definition, $(P_{\bar{\pi}^*} - \Xi)^k (P_{\bar{\pi}^*}^\top - \Xi^\top)^k$, is positive semi-definite; and its first term is the identity matrix. Therefore, for any row vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbb{S}|}$ such that $v \neq 0$, $vWv^\top \geq vv^\top$. Therefore, W is positive definite and its eigenvalues are lower bounded by 1. \square

Next, we restate and prove Lemma 1.

LEMMA 1 (Pseudo-contraction under W -weighted L_2 norm). *Suppose $P_{\bar{\pi}^*}$ is an aperiodic unichain on \mathbb{S} . Then for any distribution $v \in \Delta(\mathbb{S})$,*

$$\|vP_{\bar{\pi}^*} - \mu^*\|_W \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{2\lambda_W}\right) \|v - \mu^*\|_W, \quad (28)$$

where λ_W is the maximal eigenvalue of W for W defined in Definition 2, and $\|\cdot\|_W$ is the W -weighted L_2 norm, that is, $\|u\|_W = \sqrt{uWu^\top}$ for any row vector $u \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbb{S}|}$.

Proof of Lemma 1. We let λ_W be the largest eigenvalue of W . By the definition of W in Definition 2, the eigenvalues of W is in the range $[1, \lambda_W]$.

Next, we show (28). It is not hard to see from the definition that W satisfies

$$(P_{\bar{\pi}^*} - \Xi)W(P_{\bar{\pi}^*}^\top - \Xi^\top) - W + I = 0.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(v - \mu^*)P_{\bar{\pi}^*}\|_W - \|v - \mu^*\|_W \\ & \leq \frac{(v - \mu^*)P_{\bar{\pi}^*}WP_{\bar{\pi}^*}^\top(v - \mu^*)^\top - (v - \mu^*)W(v - \mu^*)^\top}{2\|v - \mu^*\|_W} \\ & = \frac{(v - \mu^*)(P_{\bar{\pi}^*} - \Xi)W(P_{\bar{\pi}^*} - \Xi)^\top(v - \mu^*)^\top - (v - \mu^*)W(v - \mu^*)^\top}{2\|v - \mu^*\|_W} \\ & = \frac{(v - \mu^*)(W - I)(v - \mu^*)^\top - (v - \mu^*)W(v - \mu^*)^\top}{2\|v - \mu^*\|_W} \\ & = -\frac{\|v - \mu^*\|_2^2}{2\|v - \mu^*\|_W}, \end{aligned} \tag{91}$$

where the inequality is due to the concavity of the function $x \mapsto \sqrt{x}$. To change the norm in the numerator of the RHS of (91) to W -weighted L_2 norm, we use the following observation: let λ_W be the maximal eigenvalue of W , then

$$\|v - \mu^*\|_W^2 = (v - \mu^*)W(v - \mu^*)^\top \leq \lambda_W \|v - \mu^*\|_2^2.$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$\|(v - \mu^*)P_{\bar{\pi}^*}\|_W - \|v - \mu^*\|_W \leq -\frac{1}{2\lambda_W} \|v - \mu^*\|_W,$$

Because $\mu^*P_{\bar{\pi}^*} = \mu^*$, after rearranging the terms, we finish the proof. \square

E.2. Lemmas and proofs about subset Lyapunov functions In this section, we consider two classes of functions, $\{h_W(x, D)\}_{D \subseteq [N]}$ and $\{h_D(x, m)\}_{m \in [0,1]^N}$, defined in Section 6.1 and Section 7.1 respectively. Then we prove Lemmas 2 and 6, which verify that these two classes of functions satisfy the definition of subset Lyapunov functions.

For any system state x and subset $D \subseteq [N]$, recall that for any system state x and $D \subseteq [N]$, $h_W(x, D)$ is defined as

$$h_W(x, D) = \|x(D) - m(D)\mu^*\|_W, \tag{29}$$

where W is the matrix defined in Definition 2; $\|u\|_W = \sqrt{uWu^\top}$ for any row vector u .

The lemma below shows that $\{h_W(x, D)\}_{D \subseteq [N]}$ are subset Lyapunov functions.

LEMMA 2. *The class of functions $\{h_W(\cdot, D)\}_{D \subseteq [N]}$ defined in (29) satisfies that for any system state x and any pair of subsets $D, D' \subseteq [N]$ with $D \subseteq D'$,*

$$\mathbb{E}[h_W(X_1, D) | X_0 = x, A_0(i) \sim \bar{\pi}^*(\cdot | S_0(i)) \forall i \in D] \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{2\lambda_W}\right) h_W(x, D) + \frac{2\lambda_W^{1/2}}{\sqrt{N}} \tag{30}$$

$$h_W(x, D) \geq \frac{1}{|\mathbb{S}|^{1/2}} \|x(D) - m(D)\mu^*\|_1 \tag{31}$$

$$|h_W(x, D) - h_W(x, D')| \leq L_W(m(D') - m(D)), \tag{32}$$

where the Lipschitz constant $L_W = 2\lambda_W^{1/2}$. These inequalities imply the drift condition, distance dominance property, and Lipschitz continuity in Definition 1, respectively. Consequently, $\{h_W(x, D)\}_{D \subseteq [N]}$ is a class of subset Lyapunov functions for the single-armed policy $\bar{\pi}^*$.

Proof of Lemma 2. We first prove (30). Let X'_1 be the system state after one step of transition if $A_0(i) \sim \bar{\pi}^*(\cdot | S_0(i))$ for any $i \in D$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & h_W(X'_1, D) - \left(1 - \frac{1}{2\lambda_W}\right) h_W(x, D) \\ &= \|X'_1(D) - m(D)\mu^*\|_W - \left(1 - \frac{1}{2\lambda_W}\right) \|x(D) - m(D)\mu^*\|_W \\ &\leq \|X'_1(D) - m(D)\mu^*\|_W - \|x(D)P_{\bar{\pi}^*} - m(D)\mu^*\|_W \\ &\leq \|X'_1(D) - x(D)P_{\bar{\pi}^*}\|_W. \end{aligned} \tag{92}$$

where the first inequality follows from applying Lemma 1 with $v = x(D)/m(D)$; the second inequality is due to the triangle inequality. For any $i \in D$, define the random vector $\xi(i) \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbb{S}|}$ as

$$\xi(i) = X'_1(\{i\}) - x(\{i\})P_{\bar{\pi}^*}.$$

We denote the s -th entry of the vector $\xi(i)$ as $\xi(i, s)$. We rewrite $\|X'_1(D) - x(D)P_{\bar{\pi}^*}\|_W$ as

$$\|X'_1(D) - x(D)P_{\bar{\pi}^*}\|_W = \left\| \sum_{i \in D} \xi(i) \right\|_W. \tag{93}$$

Observe that conditioned on $X_0 = x$, we have the following facts about $\xi(i)$'s

- $\xi(i)$'s are independent across $i \in D$;
- For each $i \in D$ and $s \in \mathbb{S}$, $\mathbb{E}[\xi(i, s) | X_0 = x] = 0$.

Conditioned on $X_0 = x$, we bound the expectation of $\|\sum_{i \in D} \xi(i)\|_W^2$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \sum_{i \in D} \xi(i) \right\|_W^2 \middle| X_0 = x \right] &\leq \lambda_W \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \sum_{i \in D} \xi(i) \right\|_2^2 \middle| X_0 = x \right] \\ &= \lambda_W \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} \left(\sum_{i \in D} \xi(i, s)^2 + 2 \sum_{0 \leq i < i' \leq Nm_d(x) - 1} \xi(i, s) \xi(i', s) \right) \middle| X_0 = x \right] \\ &= \lambda_W \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} \sum_{i \in D} \mathbb{E} \left[\xi(i, s)^2 \middle| X_0 = x \right] \\ &\leq \lambda_W \sum_{i \in D} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} |\xi(i, s)| \right)^2 \middle| X_0 = x \right] \\ &\leq \frac{4\lambda_W}{N}, \end{aligned} \tag{94}$$

where the first inequality uses from the fact that $\|v\|_W \leq \lambda_W^{1/2} \|v\|_2$ for any $v \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbb{S}|}$; the first equality is by the definition of $\|\cdot\|_2$ on $\mathbb{R}^{|\mathbb{S}|}$; the second equality is because $\xi(i, s)$'s are independent across $i \in D$ and have zero means; the last inequality uses the fact that $\sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} |\xi(i, s)| = \|\xi(i)\|_1 \leq \|X'_1(\{i\})\|_1 + \|x(\{i\})P_{\bar{\pi}^*}\|_1 = 2/N$. By the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, it follows from (94) that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \sum_{i \in D} \xi(i) \right\|_W \middle| X_0 = x \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \sum_{i \in D} \xi(i) \right\|_W^2 \middle| X_0 = x \right]^{1/2} \leq \frac{2\lambda_W^{1/2}}{\sqrt{N}}. \tag{95}$$

Therefore, by combining the above calculations, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[h_W(X'_1, D) - \left(1 - \frac{1}{2\lambda_W}\right) h_W(x, D) \mid X_0 = x \right] \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\|X'_1(D) - x(D)P_{\bar{\pi}^*}\|_W \mid X_0 = x \right] \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \sum_{i \in D} \xi(i) \right\|_W \mid X_0 = x \right] \\
& \leq \frac{2\lambda_W^{1/2}}{\sqrt{N}},
\end{aligned}$$

which implies (30).

Next, we show (31). Because the eigenvalues of W are at least 1, it holds that

$$h_W(x, D) = \|x(D) - m(D)\mu^*\|_W \geq \|x(D) - m(D)\mu^*\|_2 \geq \frac{1}{|\mathbb{S}|^{1/2}} \|x(D) - m(D)\mu^*\|_1.$$

Finally, we show (32). Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& |h_W(x, D) - h_W(x, D')| \\
& = \left| \|x(D) - m(D)\mu^*\|_W - \|x(D') - m(D')\mu^*\|_W \right| \\
& \leq \|x(D) - m(D)\mu^* - x(D') + m(D')\mu^*\|_W \\
& = \|x(D' \setminus D) - m(D' \setminus D)\mu^*\|_W \\
& \leq \|x(D' \setminus D)\|_W + m(D' \setminus D) \|\mu^*\|_W.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that for any $v \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbb{S}|}$, $\|v\|_W \leq \lambda_W^{1/2} \|v\|_2 \leq \lambda_W^{1/2} \|v\|_1$. Because $\|x(D' \setminus D)\|_1 = m(D') - m(D)$, and $\|\mu^*\|_1 = 1$, we have

$$\|x(D' \setminus D)\|_W + m(D' \setminus D) \|\mu^*\|_W \leq 2\lambda_W^{1/2} (m(D') - m(D)). \quad \square$$

Recall that for any system state x and $m \in [0, 1]_N$, $h_{\text{ID}}(x, m)$ is given by

$$h_{\text{ID}}(x, m) = \max_{\substack{m' \in [0, 1]_N \\ m' \leq m}} h_W(x, m'), \quad (58)$$

where $h_W(x, m') = \|x([Nm']) - m'\mu^*\|_W$. Next, we show Lemma 6, which implies that $\{h_{\text{ID}}(x, m)\}_{m \in [0, 1]_N}$ are also subset Lyapunov functions satisfying Definition 1.

LEMMA 6. *The class of functions $\{h_{\text{ID}}(\cdot, m)\}_{m \in [0, 1]_N}$ defined in (58) satisfies that for any system state x and any $m, m' \in [0, 1]_N$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(h_{\text{ID}}(X_1, m) - \left(1 - \frac{1}{2\lambda_W}\right) h_{\text{ID}}(x, m) \right)^+ \mid X_0 = x, A_0(i) \sim \bar{\pi}^*(\cdot | S_0(i)) \forall i \in [Nm] \right] \leq \frac{4\lambda_W^{1/2}}{\sqrt{N}}, \quad (59)$$

$$h_{\text{ID}}(x, m) \geq \frac{1}{|\mathbb{S}|^{1/2}} \|x([Nm]) - m\mu^*\|_1, \quad (60)$$

$$|h_{\text{ID}}(x, m) - h_{\text{ID}}(x, m')| \leq 2\lambda_W^{1/2} |m' - m|. \quad (61)$$

These inequalities imply the drift condition, distance dominance property, and Lipschitz continuity in Definition 1, respectively. Consequently, $\{h_{\text{ID}}(x, m)\}_{m \in [0,1]_N}$ are subset Lyapunov functions for the single-armed policy $\bar{\pi}^*$.

Proof. We first show (59). Let X'_1 be the system state after one step of transition if $A_0(i) \sim \bar{\pi}^*(\cdot | S_0(i))$ for all $i \in D$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & h_{\text{ID}}(X'_1, m) - h_{\text{ID}}(x, m) \\ &= \max_{m' \in [0,1]_N, m' \leq m} h_W(X'_1, m') - \max_{m' \in [0,1]_N, m' \leq m} h_W(x, m') \\ &\leq \max_{m' \in [0,1]_N, m' \leq m} (h_W(X'_1, m') - h_W(x, m')) \\ &\leq \max_{m' \in [0,1]_N, m' \leq m} \|X'_1([Nm']) - x([Nm'])P_{\bar{\pi}^*}\|_W, \end{aligned} \quad (96)$$

where the last inequality can be justified using the same argument as (92). Therefore,

$$\left(h_{\text{ID}}(X'_1, m) - \left(1 - \frac{1}{2\lambda_W}\right) h_{\text{ID}}(x, m) \right)^+ \leq \max_{m' \in [0,1]_N, m' \leq m} \|X'_1([Nm']) - x([Nm'])P_{\bar{\pi}^*}\|_W. \quad (97)$$

For any $i \in [Nm]$, we define the random vector $\xi(i) \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbb{S}|}$ as

$$\xi(i) = X'_1(\{i\}) - x(\{i\})P_{\bar{\pi}^*}.$$

We denote the s -th entry of the vector $\xi(i)$ as $\xi(i, s)$. We rewrite the term on the RHS of (97) as

$$\max_{m' \in [0,1]_N, m' \leq m} \|X'_1([Nm']) - x([Nm'])P_{\bar{\pi}^*}\|_W = \max_{n \in [Nm]} \left\| \sum_{i \in [n]} \xi(i) \right\|_W. \quad (98)$$

Therefore, to prove the bound in (59), it suffices to show that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\max_{n \in [Nm]} \left\| \sum_{i \in [n]} \xi(i) \right\|_W \mid X_0 = x \right] \leq \frac{4\lambda_W^{1/2}}{\sqrt{N}}. \quad (99)$$

Conditioned on $X_0 = x$, we argue that $\left\| \sum_{i \in [n]} \xi(i) \right\|_W$ is a submartingale in n so that we can invoke Doob's L_2 maximal inequality to bound the RHS of (98) (see, e.g., Theorem 4.4.4 of [6]). Observe that

- $\xi(i)$'s are independent across $i \in [Nm]$;
- For each $i \in [Nm]$ and $s \in \mathbb{S}$, $\mathbb{E}[\xi(i, s) | X_0 = x] = 0$.

Therefore, $\sum_{i \in [n]} \xi(i)$ is a martingale in n . Because $\|\cdot\|_W$ is a convex function, $\left\| \sum_{i \in [n]} \xi(i) \right\|_W$ is a submartingale in n . We apply Doob's L_2 maximal inequality to $\left\| \sum_{i \in [n]} \xi(i) \right\|_W$ to get

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\max_{n \in [Nm]} \left\| \sum_{i \in [n]} \xi(i) \right\|_W \right)^2 \mid X_0 = x \right] \leq 4 \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \sum_{i \in [Nm]} \xi(i) \right\|_W^2 \mid X_0 = x \right]. \quad (100)$$

Applying Holder's inequality to the LHS of (100), we get

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\max_{n \in [Nm]} \left\| \sum_{i \in [n]} \xi(i) \right\|_W \mid X_0 = x \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\max_{n \in [Nm]} \left\| \sum_{i \in [n]} \xi(i) \right\|_W \right)^2 \mid X_0 = x \right]^{1/2} \quad (101)$$

Using the same argument in (94) with $D = [Nm]$, we bound the RHS of (100) as

$$4\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\sum_{i \in [Nm]} \xi(i)\right\|_W^2 \middle| X_0 = x\right] \leq \frac{16\lambda_W}{N}. \quad (102)$$

Plugging (101) and (102) into two sides of (100), we get

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\max_{n \in [Nm]} \left\|\sum_{i \in [n]} \xi(i)\right\|_W \middle| X_0 = x\right] \leq \frac{4\lambda_W^{1/2}}{\sqrt{N}}, \quad (103)$$

which implies (59).

Next, we show (60). By the definition of $h_{\text{ID}}(x, m)$ and the fact that the eigenvalues of W are at least 1,

$$h_{\text{ID}}(x, m) \geq \|x([Nm]) - m\mu^*\|_W \geq \|x([Nm]) - m\mu^*\|_2 \geq \frac{1}{|\mathbb{S}|^{1/2}} \|x([Nm]) - m\mu^*\|_1.$$

Finally, we show (61). For simplicity, we omit $m \in [0, 1]_N$ in the subscripts. Consider any $m, m' \in [0, 1]_N$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $m \leq m'$. By definition, we rewrite $h_{\text{ID}}(x, m)$ and $h_{\text{ID}}(x, m')$ in the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\text{ID}}(x, m) &= \max\{h_{\text{ID}}(x, m), h_W(x, m)\} \\ h_{\text{ID}}(x, m') &= \max\{h_{\text{ID}}(x, m), \max_{m'' \in [m, m']} h_W(x, m'')\}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that for any $a, b, c \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $|\max\{a, b\} - \max\{a, c\}| \leq |b - c|$. Letting $a = h_{\text{ID}}(x, m)$, $b = h_W(x, m)$, and $c = \max_{m'' \in [m, m']} h_W(x, m'')$, we get

$$\left| h_{\text{ID}}(x, m) - h_{\text{ID}}(x, m') \right| \leq \left| \max_{m'' \in [m, m']} h_W(x, m'') - h_W(x, m) \right|. \quad (104)$$

We further bound the RHS of (104) as

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \max_{m'' \in [m, m']} h_W(x, m'') - h_W(x, m) \right| \\ &\leq \max_{m'' \in [m, m']} |h_W(x, m'') - h_W(x, m)| \\ &\leq \max_{m'' \in [m, m']} 2\lambda_W^{1/2} |m'' - m| \\ &= 2\lambda_W^{1/2} |m' - m|, \end{aligned} \quad (105)$$

where in the second inequality we used (32), the Lipschitz continuity of $h_W(x, D)$ in D that we have proved in Lemma 2. Combining (104) and (105), we have proved (61). \square

E.3. Lemmas and proofs about L_1 norm In this subsection, we prove two lemmas about the L_1 norm that are useful for the analysis of the set-expansion policy, considering that they select sets based on the slack $\delta(x, D)$ whose definition involves L_1 norm.

We first show that if the optimal single-armed policy $\bar{\pi}^*$ induces an aperiodic unichain, right-multiplying $P_{\bar{\pi}^*}$ is non-expansive under the L_1 norm.

LEMMA 12 (Non-expansiveness of $P_{\bar{\pi}^*}$ under L_1 norm). *Suppose $P_{\bar{\pi}^*}$ is an aperiodic unichain. For any distribution $v \in \Delta(\mathbb{S})$,*

$$\|(v - \mu^*)P_{\bar{\pi}^*}\|_1 \leq \|v - \mu^*\|_1. \quad (106)$$

Proof. For any $v \in \Delta(\mathbb{S})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(v - \mu^*)P_{\bar{\pi}^*}\|_1 &= \sum_{s' \in \mathbb{S}} \left| \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} (v(s) - \mu^*(s))P_{\bar{\pi}^*}(s, s') \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{s' \in \mathbb{S}} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} |v(s) - \mu^*(s)| P_{\bar{\pi}^*}(s, s') \\ &= \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} |v(s) - \mu^*(s)| \sum_{s' \in \mathbb{S}} P_{\bar{\pi}^*}(s, s') \\ &= \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} |v(s) - \mu^*(s)| \\ &= \|v - \mu^*\|_1. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Next, we show that if all arms in a subset D follow $\bar{\pi}^*$, the L_1 distance between the scaled state-count vector $X_t(D)$ and the scaled optimal steady-state distribution $m(D)\mu^*$ only increases by a small amount.

LEMMA 13. *For any system state x and any subset $D \subseteq [N]$,*

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\|X_1(D) - m(D)\mu^*\|_1 - \|x(D) - m(D)\mu^*\|_1 \right)^+ \mid X_0 = x, A_0(i) \sim \bar{\pi}^*(\cdot | S_0(i)) \forall i \in D \right] \\ &\leq \frac{2|\mathbb{S}|^{1/2}}{\sqrt{N}}. \end{aligned} \quad (107)$$

Proof. Let X'_1 be the system state after one step of transition if $A_0(i) \sim \bar{\pi}^*(\cdot | S_0(i))$ for any $i \in D$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\|X'_1(D) - m(D)\mu^*\|_1 - \|x(D) - m(D)\mu^*\|_1 \\ &\leq \|X'_1(D) - m(D)\mu^*\|_1 - \|x(D)P_{\bar{\pi}^*} - m(D)\mu^*\|_1 \\ &\leq \|X'_1(D) - x(D)P_{\bar{\pi}^*}\|_1, \end{aligned} \quad (108)$$

where the first inequality follows from applying Lemma 12 with $v = x(D)/m(D)$; the second inequality is due to the triangular inequality. Therefore,

$$\left(\|X'_1(D) - m(D)\mu^*\|_1 - \|x(D) - m(D)\mu^*\|_1 \right)^+ \leq \|X'_1(D) - x(D)P_{\bar{\pi}^*}\|_1. \quad (109)$$

For any $i \in [Nm_d(x)]$, define the random vector $\xi(i) \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbb{S}|}$ as

$$\xi(i) = X'_1(\{i\}) - x(\{i\})P_{\bar{\pi}^*}.$$

We denote the s -th entry of the vector $\xi(i)$ as $\xi(i, s)$. We rewrite $\|X'_1(D) - x(D)P_{\bar{\pi}^*}\|_1$ as

$$\|X'_1(D) - x(D)P_{\bar{\pi}^*}\|_1 = \left\| \sum_{i \in D} \xi(i) \right\|_1. \quad (110)$$

Observe that conditioned on $X_0 = x$, we have the following facts about $\xi(i)$'s

- $\xi(i)$'s are independent across $i \in D$;

- For each $i \in D$ and $s \in \mathbb{S}$, $\mathbb{E}[\xi(i, s) | X_0 = x] = 0$.

Conditioned on $X_0 = x$, we bound the expectation of $\|\sum_{i \in D} \xi(i)\|_1^2$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\sum_{i \in D} \xi(i)\right\|_1^2 \middle| X_0 = x\right] &\leq |\mathbb{S}| \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\sum_{i \in D} \xi(i)\right\|_2^2 \middle| X_0 = x\right] \\
&= |\mathbb{S}| \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} \left(\sum_{i \in D} \xi(i, s)^2 + 2 \sum_{0 \leq i < i' \leq Nm_d(x)-1} \xi(i, s) \xi(i', s)\right) \middle| X_0 = x\right] \\
&= |\mathbb{S}| \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} \sum_{i \in D} \mathbb{E}\left[\xi(i, s)^2 \middle| X_0 = x\right] \\
&\leq |\mathbb{S}| \sum_{i \in D} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} |\xi(i, s)|\right)^2 \middle| X_0 = x\right] \\
&\leq \frac{4|\mathbb{S}|}{N},
\end{aligned} \tag{111}$$

where the first inequality uses from the fact that $\|v\|_1 \leq |\mathbb{S}|^{1/2} \|v\|_2$ for any $v \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbb{S}|}$; the first equality is by the definition of $\|\cdot\|_2$ on $\mathbb{R}^{|\mathbb{S}|}$; the second equality is because $\xi(i, s)$'s are independent across $i \in D$ and have zero means; the last inequality uses the fact that $\sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} |\xi(i, s)| = \|\xi(i)\|_1 \leq \|X'_1(\{i\})\|_1 + \|x(\{i\})P_{\bar{\pi}^*}\|_1 = 2/N$. By the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, it follows from (111) that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\sum_{i \in D} \xi(i)\right\|_1 \middle| X_0 = x\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\sum_{i \in D} \xi(i)\right\|_1^2 \middle| X_0 = x\right]^{1/2} \leq \frac{2|\mathbb{S}|^{1/2}}{\sqrt{N}}. \tag{112}$$

Combining the above calculations, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\|X'_1(D) - m(D)\mu^*\|_1 - \|x(D) - m(D)\mu^*\|_1\right)^+ \middle| X_0 = x\right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\|X'_1(D) - x(D)P_{\bar{\pi}^*}\|_1 \middle| X_0 = x\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\sum_{i \in D} \xi(i)\right\|_1 \middle| X_0 = x\right] \\
&\leq \frac{2|\mathbb{S}|^{1/2}}{\sqrt{N}},
\end{aligned}$$

which implies (107). \square

Appendix F: Set-optimization policy In this section, we introduce an additional focus-set policy, referred to as the *set-optimization policy*, which also achieves an optimality gap of the order $O(1/\sqrt{N})$. Notably, the set-optimization policy is a Markovian policy based on the scaled state-count vector $X_t([N])$; i.e., under the set-optimization policy, the scaled state-count vector $X_t([N])$ is a Markov chain, a property that does not hold under the set-expansion policy (Algorithm 2) or the ID policy (Algorithm 3). Although the advantages of the set-optimization policy over the other two focus-set policies are not evident — particularly as it does not perform better in simulations — we include it here for its potential theoretical interests.

F.1. Definition and asymptotic optimality of set-optimization policy The set-optimization policy is similar to the set-expansion policy in that they both choose a focus set D_t in each time step and give priority to arms in D_t to follow their ideal actions. However, they differ in how D_t is chosen. In the set-optimization policy, D_t is updated by solving an optimization problem (113a)–(113b), where $h_W(x, D) =$

Algorithm 4 Set-optimization policy

Input: number of arms N , budget αN , the optimal single-armed policy $\bar{\pi}^*$, initial system state X_0 , initial state vector S_0

1: **for** $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ **do**

2: Let D_t be a maximal optimal solution to the problem below:

▷ Set update

$$D_t \leftarrow \arg \min_{D \subseteq [N]} h_W(X_t, D) + L_W(1 - m(D)) \quad (113a)$$

$$\text{subject to } \delta(X_t, D) \geq 0 \quad (113b)$$

3: Run the same action sampling and action rectification steps as in Lines 6–15 of Algorithm 2

4: Apply $A_t(i)$ and observe $S_{t+1}(i)$ for each arm $i \in [N]$

$\|X_t(D) - m(D)\mu^*\|_W$ is the subset Lyapunov function that we have used in Section 6, $L_W = 2\lambda_W^{1/2}$, and the slack $\delta(x, D) = \beta(1 - m(D)) - 0.5\|x(D) - m(D)\mu^*\|_1$ is the same notion as in Section 4.2. Importantly, D_t is chosen to be a *maximal* optimal solution in the sense that there is no other optimal solution D' that contains D_t . When there are multiple maximal optimal solutions, D_t is picked uniformly at random. The formal definition of the set-optimization policy is given in Algorithm 4.

We note that under the set-optimization policy, the number of arms corresponding to each state-action pair at time step t is determined by the state-count vector $X_t([N])$ rather than the full system state X_t , implying that $X_t([N])$ is a Markov chain. Although the subproblem in (113a)–(113b) requires evaluating $X_t(D)$ for a specific subset D , which seems to require full knowledge of the system state X_t , we observe that $h_W(X_t, D)$, $m(D)$, and $\delta(X_t, D)$ are determined solely by $X_t(D)$. Thus, solving the subproblem boils down to deciding $X_t(D_t)$, which only requires the knowledge of $X_t([N])$ rather than X_t .

Our next theorem, Theorem 4, shows that the set-optimization policy achieves an $O(1/\sqrt{N})$ optimality gap, just like the set-expansion policy and the ID policy.

THEOREM 4 (Optimality gap of set-optimization policy). *Consider an N -armed restless bandit problem with the single-armed MDP $(\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{A}, P, r)$ and budget αN for $0 < \alpha < 1$. Assume that the optimal single-armed policy induces an aperiodic unichain (Assumption 1). Let π be the set-optimization policy (Algorithm 4). The optimality gap of π is bounded as*

$$R^*(N, S_0) - R(\pi, S_0) \leq \frac{C_{SO}}{\sqrt{N}}, \quad (114)$$

where C_{SO} is a constant depending on r_{\max} , $|\mathbb{S}|$, $\beta \triangleq \min\{\alpha, 1 - \alpha\}$, and $P_{\bar{\pi}^*}$; the explicit expression of C_{SO} is given in the proof.

F.2. Proof of Theorem 4 (Optimality gap of set-optimization policy) We will spend the remainder of this appendix proving Theorem 4. Unlike the ID policy and the set-expansion policy, the set-optimization policy does not satisfy Condition 2, so Theorem 4 can not be proved as a direct corollary of Theorem 3. However, the proof of Theorem 4 follows a similar structure as the framework established in Section 5. Specifically, in Section F.2.1, we state and prove three lemmas; each lemma either verifies a condition or states a fact that modifies one of the three conditions in Section 5; in Section F.2.2, we prove Theorem 4 using similar ideas as Theorem 3, with the subset Lyapunov functions being $\{h_W(x, D)\}_{D \subseteq [N]}$.

F.2.1. Lemmas and proofs We first show that the set-optimization policy satisfies Condition 1.

LEMMA 14 (Set-optimization policy satisfies Condition 1). *Consider the set-optimization policy defined in Algorithm 4. For any time step $t \geq 0$, there exists a subset $D'_t \subseteq D_t$ such that for all $i \in D'_t$, the policy chooses $A_t(i) = \hat{A}_t(i)$, and*

$$\mathbb{E}[m(D_t \setminus D'_t) | X_t, D_t] \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} + \frac{1}{N} \quad a.s. \quad (115)$$

Proof of Lemma 14. The whole proof is verbatim to the proof of Lemma 3, considering that for both the set-optimization policy and the set-expansion policy, D_t satisfies $\delta(X_t, D_t) \geq 0$, and A_t is chosen such that the number of arms $i \in D_t$ with $A_t(i) = \widehat{A}_t(i)$ is maximized. \square

Although the set-optimization policy does not satisfy the almost non-shrinking condition (Condition 2), we show that for each time step t , there is another subset D_{t+1}^{SE} such that the pair of subsets $(D_t, D_{t+1}^{\text{SE}})$ satisfies Condition 2, and D_{t+1}^{SE} is feasible to the optimization subproblem (113a)–(113b) in the $(t+1)$ -th time step.

LEMMA 15. *Consider the set-optimization policy defined in Algorithm 4. For any $t \geq 0$, there exists a random subset $D_{t+1}^{\text{SE}} \subseteq [N]$ such that*

1. $\delta(X_{t+1}, D_{t+1}^{\text{SE}}) \geq 0$;
2. either $D_{t+1}^{\text{SE}} \supseteq D_t$ or $D_{t+1}^{\text{SE}} \subseteq D_t$;
3. $\mathbb{E}[(m(D_t) - m(D_{t+1}^{\text{SE}}))^+ | X_t, D_t] \leq \frac{|\mathbb{S}|^{1/2} + 1}{\beta\sqrt{N}} + \frac{1 + (\beta + 1)|\mathbb{S}|}{\beta N} \quad a.s.$ (116)

Proof of Lemma 15. We let the set D_{t+1}^{SE} be the next-time-step focus set if we apply the update rule of the set-expansion policy to (X_t, D_t) . By the definition of the set-expansion policy, we automatically get $\delta(X_{t+1}, D_{t+1}^{\text{SE}}) \geq 0$, and we also have $D_{t+1}^{\text{SE}} \supseteq D_t$ or $D_{t+1}^{\text{SE}} \subseteq D_t$.

To prove (116), note the following two facts from the choices of D_t and D_{t+1}^{SE} :

- The definition of the set-expansion policy implies that when $D_{t+1}^{\text{SE}} \subseteq D_t$, D_{t+1}^{SE} is chosen to be the subset with the largest number of arms among all sets \overline{D} such that $\delta(X_{t+1}, \overline{D}) \geq 0$.
- By Lemma 14, there exists a subset $D'_t \subseteq D_t$ such that for all $i \in D'_t$, the policy chooses $A_t(i) = \widehat{A}_t(i)$, and $\mathbb{E}[m(D_t \setminus D'_t) | X_t, D_t] = O(1/\sqrt{N})$.

With these two facts, the proof of (116) is verbatim to the proof of (34) in Lemma 4. \square

Finally, we show that the set-optimization policy satisfies Condition 3.

LEMMA 16 (Set-optimization policy satisfies Condition 3). *Consider the set-optimization policy defined in Algorithm 4. For any $t \geq 0$,*

$$1 - m(D_t) \leq \frac{|\mathbb{S}|^{1/2}}{\beta} h_W(X_t, D_t) + \frac{2}{\beta N} \quad a.s., \quad (117)$$

Proof of Lemma 16. Recall that D_t is chosen to be maximal among the optimal solutions of

$$\min_{D \subseteq [N]} h_W(X_t, D) + L_W(1 - m(D)) \quad (113a)$$

$$\text{subject to } \delta(X_t, D) \geq 0. \quad (113b)$$

Because $h_W(X_t, D)$ is L_W -Lipschitz continuous in D according to Lemma 2, the objective $h_W(X_t, D) + L_W(1 - m(D))$ is non-increasing as D expands. Consequently, there is no subset D' strictly containing D_t that satisfies $\delta(X_t, D') \geq 0$, because otherwise D' would be an optimal solution to (113a)–(113b) that strictly contains D_t , violating the maximality of D_t . Then we must have

$$\beta(1 - m(D_t)) - \frac{1}{2} \|X_t(D_t) - m(D_t)\mu^*\|_1 \leq \frac{2}{N},$$

because otherwise, $m(D_t) < 1$, we can pick any $i \notin D_t$ and show that $\delta(X_t, D_t \cup \{i\}) \geq 0$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - m(D_t) &\leq \frac{1}{\beta} \|X_t(D_t) - m(D_t)\mu^*\|_1 + \frac{2}{\beta N} \\ &\leq \frac{|\mathbb{S}|^{1/2}}{\beta} h_W(X_t, D_t) + \frac{2}{\beta N} \end{aligned} \quad (118)$$

where (118) is by the distance domination property of $h_W(x, D)$ established in Lemma 2. \square

F.2.2. Proof of Theorem 4 Here we prove Theorem 4, again assuming that the focus-set policy induces a Markov chain that converges to a unique stationary distribution. Similar to Theorem 3, the proof for the general case of Theorem 4 is essentially the same, so we skip it here.

Proof of Theorem 4. Following the same steps that derive (18) in Theorem 3, we get

$$R^*(N, \mathbf{S}_0) - R(\pi, \mathbf{S}_0) \leq r_{\max} \left(\frac{1}{K_{\text{dist}}} + \frac{2}{L_W} \right) \mathbb{E}[V(X_\infty, D_\infty)] + \frac{2r_{\max}K_{\text{conf}}}{\sqrt{N}}, \quad (119)$$

where

$$V(x, D) = h_W(x, D) + L_W(1 - m(D)).$$

Therefore, it suffices to bound $\mathbb{E}[V(X_\infty, D_\infty)]$.

We fix any $t \geq 0$. Recall that D_{t+1} is chosen to be the minimizer of $V(X_{t+1}, D)$ among sets D with $\delta(X_{t+1}, D) \geq 0$. Because D_{t+1}^{SE} defined in Lemma 15 satisfies $\delta(X_{t+1}, D_{t+1}^{\text{SE}}) \geq 0$, we must have

$$V(X_{t+1}, D_{t+1}) \leq V(X_{t+1}, D_{t+1}^{\text{SE}}). \quad (120)$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} V(X_{t+1}, D_{t+1}) &\leq V(X_{t+1}, D_{t+1}^{\text{SE}}) \\ &= h_W(X_{t+1}, D_{t+1}^{\text{SE}}) + L_W(1 - m(D_{t+1}^{\text{SE}})) \\ &\leq h_W(X_{t+1}, D_t) + L_W|m(D_{t+1}^{\text{SE}}) - m(D_t)| + L_W(1 - m(D_t)) + L_W(m(D_t) - m(D_{t+1}^{\text{SE}})) \\ &= h_W(X_{t+1}, D_t) + L_W(1 - m(D_t)) + 2L_W(m(D_t) - m(D_{t+1}^{\text{SE}}))^+, \end{aligned} \quad (121)$$

where the second inequality utilizes the fact that $D_{t+1}^{\text{SE}} \supseteq D_t$ or $D_{t+1}^{\text{SE}} \subseteq D_t$ established in Lemma 15, and the Lipschitz continuity of $h_W(x, D)$ with respect to D established in Lemma 2.

Therefore, subtracting $V(X_t, D_t)$ and taking the expectation in (121) conditioned on X_t , we have

$$\mathbb{E}[V(X_{t+1}, D_{t+1}) - V(X_t, D_t) \mid X_t] \leq \mathbb{E}[h_W(X_{t+1}, D_t) - h_W(X_t, D_t) \mid X_t] \quad (122)$$

$$+ 2L_W \mathbb{E}[(m(D_t) - m(D_{t+1}^{\text{SE}}))^+ \mid X_t]. \quad (123)$$

We will bound each of the terms in (122) and (123) separately.

To bound the term in (122), notice that by Lemma 14, there exists $D'_t \subseteq D_t$ such that for any $i \in D'_t$, the policy chooses $A_t(i) = \widehat{A}_t(i)$, and $\mathbb{E}[m(D_t \setminus D'_t) \mid X_t, D_t] = O(1/\sqrt{N})$. Let X'_{t+1} be the random element denoting the system state at time $t+1$ if $A_t(i) = \widehat{A}_t(i)$ for all $i \in [N]$. We can couple X_{t+1} with X'_{t+1} such that they have the same states on the set D'_t , and thus $h_W(X_{t+1}, D'_t) = h_W(X'_{t+1}, D'_t)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[h_W(X_{t+1}, D_t) \mid X_t] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[h_W(X'_{t+1}, D_t) \mid X_t] + \mathbb{E}[h_W(X_{t+1}, D_t) - h_W(X'_{t+1}, D_t) \mid X_t] \\ &\leq \rho_2 \mathbb{E}[h_W(X_t, D_t) \mid X_t] + \frac{K_{\text{drift}}}{\sqrt{N}} + \mathbb{E}[h_W(X_{t+1}, D_t) - h_W(X'_{t+1}, D_t) \mid X_t] \end{aligned} \quad (124)$$

$$\leq \rho_2 \mathbb{E}[h_W(X_t, D_t) \mid X_t] + \frac{K_{\text{drift}}}{\sqrt{N}} + 2L_W \mathbb{E}[m(D_t \setminus D'_t) \mid X_t] \quad (125)$$

$$\leq \rho_2 \mathbb{E}[h_W(X_t, D_t) \mid X_t] + \frac{K_{\text{drift}} + 2L_W K_{\text{conf}}}{\sqrt{N}}, \quad (126)$$

where $\rho_2 = 1 - 1/(2\lambda_W)$, $K_{\text{drift}} = 2\lambda_W^{1/2}$, $K_{\text{conf}} = 2$; the inequality in (124) follows from the drift condition of $h_W(x, D)$ established in Lemma 2; to get the inequality in (125), we use the argument that

$$\begin{aligned} h_W(X_{t+1}, D_t) - h_W(X'_{t+1}, D_t) &= h_W(X_{t+1}, D_t) - h_W(X_{t+1}, D'_t) + h_W(X'_{t+1}, D'_t) - h_W(X'_{t+1}, D_t) \\ &\leq 2L_W m(D_t \setminus D'_t); \end{aligned}$$

the inequality in (126) follows from the majority conformity of the set-optimization policy proved in Lemma 14. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}[h_W(X_{t+1}, D_t) | X_t] - h_W(X_t, D) \leq -(1 - \rho_2)\mathbb{E}[h_W(x, D_t) | X_t] + \frac{K_{\text{drift}} + 2L_W K_{\text{conf}}}{\sqrt{N}}.$$

To bound the term $2L_W \mathbb{E}[(m(D_t) - m(D_{t+1}^{\text{SE}}))^+ | X_t = x]$ in (123), we apply Lemma 15 to get

$$2L_W \mathbb{E}[(m(D_t) - m(D_{t+1}^{\text{SE}}))^+ | X_t] \leq \frac{2L_W K_{\text{mono}}}{\sqrt{N}},$$

where $K_{\text{mono}} = (2 + (\beta + 2)|\mathbb{S}|)/\beta$. Plugging the above bounds into (122) and (123), we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[V(X_{t+1}, D_{t+1}) - V(X_t, D_t) | X_t] \\ &\leq -(1 - \rho_2)\mathbb{E}[h_W(X_t, D_t) | X_t] + \frac{K_{\text{drift}} + 2L_W(K_{\text{conf}} + K_{\text{mono}})}{\sqrt{N}}. \end{aligned} \quad (127)$$

Note that by Lemma 16,

$$V(X_t, D_t) \leq \left(1 + L_W L_{\text{cov}}\right) h_W(X_t, D_t) + \frac{L_W K_{\text{cov}}}{\sqrt{N}}, \quad (128)$$

where $L_{\text{cov}} = |\mathbb{S}|^{1/2}/\beta$, $K_{\text{cov}} = 3/\beta$. Combining (128) with (127), we have proved that for any $t \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}[V(X_{t+1}, D_{t+1}) | X_t] \leq \rho_1 \mathbb{E}[V(X_t, D_t) | X_t] + \frac{K_1}{\sqrt{N}}, \quad (129)$$

where $\rho_1 = 1 - (1 - \rho_2)/(1 + L_W L_{\text{cov}})$ and $K_1 = K_{\text{drift}} + 2L_W(K_{\text{conf}} + K_{\text{mono}}) + (1 - \rho_2)L_W K_{\text{cov}}/(1 + L_W L_{\text{cov}})$.

Now, with (129), $\mathbb{E}[V(X_\infty, D_\infty)]$ can be bounded as follows: We take the expectations on both sides of (129) conditioned on X_t , and let $t \rightarrow \infty$ to get

$$\mathbb{E}[V(X_\infty, D_\infty)] \leq \rho_1 \mathbb{E}[V(X_\infty, D_\infty)] + \frac{K_1}{\sqrt{N}},$$

which implies that

$$\mathbb{E}[V(X_\infty, D_\infty)] \leq \frac{K_1}{(1 - \rho_1)\sqrt{N}}. \quad (130)$$

We combine (130) with the bound of $R^*(N, S_0) - R(\pi, S_0)$ in terms of $V(X_\infty, D_\infty)$ in (119), and substitute β , L_W , K_{drift} , K_{conf} , K_{mono} , L_{cov} , and K_{cov} with their values, which lead to the final bound

$$R^*(N, S_0) - R(\pi, S_0) \leq \frac{252r_{\max}\lambda_W^2|\mathbb{S}|^2}{\beta^2\sqrt{N}}. \quad (131)$$

We omit the detailed calculations that lead to (131). \square

Appendix G: Experiment details In this section, we provide details for the experiments in Section 8. In Section G.1, we discuss the implementation details of the set-expansion policy. Then in Section G.2, we provide additional details of some performance comparison experiments in Section 8, including the simulation settings and the definitions of the MDPs. Next, in Section G.3, we comment on the details of the experiments in Section 8.2 which investigate the probability that a random RB instance violates GAP. Finally, in Section G.4, we conduct an additional experiment illustrating a difference between the behaviors of the set-expansion policy and the ID policy.

G.1. Implementation details of set-expansion policy In this subsection, we discuss the implementation details of the set-expansion policy (Algorithm 2) that we use in our experiments. We first discuss the set-update step on Lines 2–5, where the focus set D_t is updated. Then we discuss the action rectification step on Lines 7–15 which determines the actions based on the focus set and the ideal actions.

Set-update step for set-expansion policy. Recall that $\delta(x, D)$ is given by $\delta(x, D) = \beta(1 - m(D)) - 0.5 \|x(D) - m(D)\mu^*\|_1$, and the set-expansion policy chooses D_t with the maximal cardinality such that

- $\delta(X_t, D_t) \geq 0$, and
- $D_t \supseteq D_{t-1}$ if $\delta(X_t, D_{t-1}) > 0$, or $D_t \subseteq D_{t-1}$ if $\delta(X_t, D_{t-1}) \leq 0$.

Due to the complexity of directly optimizing over the discrete variable D_t , we will first decide $X_t(D_t)$, and then find D_t based on $X_t(D_t)$. Specifically, when $\delta(X_t, D_{t-1}) \geq 0$, consider the following optimization problem, whose optimal solution (z^*, m^*) gives $(X_t(D_t), m(D_t))$, up to integer effects:

$$\text{maximize}_{z \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbb{S}|}} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} z(s) \quad (132a)$$

$$\text{subject to } X_t(D_{t-1}, s) \leq z(s) \leq X_t([N], s) \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{S} \quad (132b)$$

$$\sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} z(s) = m \quad (132c)$$

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} |z(s) - \mu^*(s)m| \leq \beta(1 - m). \quad (132d)$$

Here, the constraints (132b) and (132c) ensure that each feasible solution (z, m) corresponds to a $(X_t(D), m(D))$ for some $D \supseteq D_{t-1}$, up to integer effects; the constraint (132d) ensures that $\delta(X_t, D) \geq 0$. To solve the above optimization problem, we can equivalently convert it to the following LP:

$$\text{maximize}_{z, d \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbb{S}|}, m \in \mathbb{R}} m \quad (133a)$$

$$\text{subject to } X_t(D_{t-1}, s) \leq z(s) \leq X_t([N], s) \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{S} \quad (133b)$$

$$\sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} z(s) = m \quad (133c)$$

$$z(s) - \mu^*(s)m \leq d(s) \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{S} \quad (133d)$$

$$-z(s) + \mu^*(s)m \leq d(s) \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{S} \quad (133e)$$

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} d(s) \leq \beta(1 - m). \quad (133f)$$

Similarly, when $\delta(X_t, D_{t-1}) \leq 0$, we consider the optimization problem

$$\text{maximize}_{z \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbb{S}|}} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} z(s) \quad (134a)$$

$$\text{subject to } 0 \leq z(s) \leq X_t(D_{t-1}, s) \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{S} \quad (134b)$$

$$\sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} z(s) = m \quad (134c)$$

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} |z(s) - \mu^*(s)m| \leq \beta(1 - m), \quad (134d)$$

where the only change is (134b), which ensures that each feasible solution (z, m) corresponds to a $(X_t(D), m(D))$ for some $D \subseteq D_{t-1}$. This optimization problem is also equivalent to an LP given by

$$\text{maximize}_{z, d \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbb{S}|}, m \in \mathbb{R}} m \quad (135a)$$

$$\text{subject to } 0 \leq z(s) \leq X_t(D_{t-1}, s) \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{S} \quad (135b)$$

$$\sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} z(s) = m \quad (135c)$$

$$z(s) - \mu^*(s)m \leq d(s) \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{S} \quad (135d)$$

$$-z(s) + \mu^*(s)m \leq d(s) \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{S} \quad (135e)$$

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} d(s) \leq \beta(1 - m). \quad (135f)$$

Note that each of the two LPs has $2|\mathbb{S}| + 1$ variables and $4|\mathbb{S}| + 2$ constraints, so the complexities of solving them are polynomials in $|\mathbb{S}|$ and independent of N .

After obtaining the optimal solution (z^*, m^*) of either of the LPs above, we pick $\lfloor Nz^*(s) \rfloor$ arms in state s for each $s \in \mathbb{S}$ to form the subset D_t . Note that due to the rounding, the resulting D_t may not be the exact optimal solution that maximizes the cardinality as required by Lines 2–5 of Algorithm 2. In principle, one could take the more rigorous approach to impose the additional integer constraints $Nz^*(s) \in \mathbb{Z}$ for $s \in \mathbb{S}$ on each of the LPs. However, we do not impose the integer constraints when implementing the set-expansion policy in our experiments because the rounding causes at most $O(1/N)$ error in $m(D_t)$, which is negligible asymptotically. The good performances of our implementations of the set-expansion policy observed in the simulations also suggest that omitting the integer constraints is acceptable.

Action rectification step for set-expansion policy. For the vanilla version of the set-expansion policy, the action rectification step has been completely specified in Algorithm 2, where we prioritize the arms in D_t over those in D_t^c to follow the ideal actions, breaking ties uniformly at random.

For the version of the set-expansion policy that utilizes the LP index policy for tie-breaking, its pseudocode is given in Algorithm 5. To summarize the differences, if not all arm in D_t can follow the ideal actions, this version of the set-expansion policy breaks ties using LP indices instead of uniformly at random; if all arms in D_t can follow the ideal actions, this version of the set-expansion policy invokes the LP index policy to allocate the remaining budget to the arms not in D_t .

G.2. Additional details of the performance comparison experiments in Section 8 Next, we provide some additional details of the performance comparison experiments in Section 8. We first talk about the simulation settings and the computation of the confidence interval. Then we include the definitions of the two RB instances in Section 8.1.

Algorithm 5 Set-expansion policy (with LP index)

Input: number of arms N , budget αN , the optimal single-armed policy $\bar{\pi}^*$, initial system state X_0 , initial state vector S_0 , initial focus set $D_{-1} = \emptyset$

- 1: **for** $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ **do**
- 2: **if** $\delta(X_t, D_{t-1}) > 0$ **then** \triangleright Set update
- 3: Let D_t be any set with the largest $m(D_t)$ such that $D_t \supseteq D_{t-1}$ and $\delta(X_t, D_t) \geq 0$
- 4: **else**
- 5: Let D_t be any set with the largest $m(D_t)$ such that $D_t \subseteq D_{t-1}$ and $\delta(X_t, D_t) \geq 0$

\triangleright *Lines below implement Lines 3–6 of Algorithm 1*

- 6: Independently sample $\widehat{A}_t(i) \sim \bar{\pi}^*(\cdot | S_t(i))$ for $i \in [N]$ \triangleright Action sampling
- 7: **if** $\sum_{i \in D_t} \widehat{A}_t(i) \geq \alpha N$ **then** \triangleright Action rectification
- 8: Select αN arms in D_t with $\widehat{A}_t(i) = 1$ to set $A_t(i) = 1$; break ties favoring larger LP indices
- 9: For the rest of $i \in [N]$, set $A_t(i) = 0$
- 10: **else if** $\sum_{i \in D_t} \widehat{A}_t(i) \leq \alpha N - (N - |D_t|)$ **then**
- 11: Select $(1 - \alpha)N$ arms in D_t with $\widehat{A}_t(i) = 0$ to set $A_t(i) = 0$; break ties favoring smaller LP indices
- 12: For the rest of $i \in [N]$, set $A_t(i) = 1$
- 13: **else**
- 14: Set $A_t(i) = \widehat{A}_t(i)$ for $i \in D_t$
- 15: Apply the LP index policy to the arms in D_t^c with $(\alpha N - \sum_{i \in D_t} \widehat{A}_t(i))$ units of budget
- 16: Apply $A_t(i)$ and observe $S_{t+1}(i)$ for each arm $i \in [N]$

Simulation setting and output analysis. When simulating most of the RB problems and the policies, we run 5 independent replications for each N . The initial state of each arms in each replication is independently sampled from the uniform distribution over the state space. Each replication runs for 2×10^4 time steps. The exceptions are the simulations of the FTVA policy on the two non-SA examples in Figure 10, where we run the simulations for 1.6×10^5 time steps in each replication.

We compute the confidence interval of the average reward using the batch means method, a common method for computing the confidence intervals in steady-state simulations. Specifically, fixing the RB problem, the policy and the number of arms N , we divide the sample path of each replication into 4 intervals of equal lengths, and compute the sample mean of the rewards within each interval. As a result, we get 20 sample means out of the 5 replications. Then we further average the 20 sample means and use it as the estimation of the long-run average reward. The confidence interval for the estimate is calculated using the variance of the 20 sample means, under the assumption that each interval is sufficiently long for the system to mix to the steady state, resulting in the sample means being nearly independent [see, e.g., 1].

Definition of the example in Figure 6a. The RB instance in Figure 6a has been given in Example 2 in Appendix E.2 of [9] and Appendix G.1 of [16]. Nevertheless, we include it here for completeness. The single-armed MDP of this RB instance has three states, whose transition kernel is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
 P(\cdot, 0, \cdot) &= \begin{bmatrix} 0.02232142 & 0.10229283 & 0.87538575 \\ 0.03426605 & 0.17175704 & 0.79397691 \\ 0.52324756 & 0.45523298 & 0.02151947 \end{bmatrix}, \\
 P(\cdot, 1, \cdot) &= \begin{bmatrix} 0.14874601 & 0.30435809 & 0.54689589 \\ 0.56845754 & 0.41117331 & 0.02036915 \\ 0.25265570 & 0.27310439 & 0.4742399 \end{bmatrix},
 \end{aligned}$$

where the s -th row and s' -th column in each matrix above represents $P(s, 0, s')$ or $P(s, 1, s')$ for each pair of $s, s' \in \mathbb{S}$. The reward function of the single-armed MDP is given by

$$\begin{aligned} r(\cdot, 0) &= [0 \ 0 \ 0], \\ r(\cdot, 1) &= [0.37401552 \ 0.11740814 \ 0.07866135]. \end{aligned}$$

The budget parameter $\alpha = 0.4$ for this RB instance, that is, $0.4N$ arms are activated in each time step.

Definition of the example in Figure 6b. The RB instance in Figure 6b is a modification of the example provided in Section 3.3 of [16]. Specifically, let the single-armed MDP have the state space $\mathbb{S} = \{0, 1, \dots, 7\}$. Each state is associated with a *preferred action*, which is action 1 for states in $\{0, 1, 2, 3\}$, and action 0 for the other states. If an arm is in state s and takes the preferred action, it moves to state $(s + 1) \bmod 8$ with probability $p_{s,R}$, and stays in state s otherwise; if it does not take the preferred action, it moves to state $(s - 1)^+$ with probability $p_{s,L}$. Here, the subscript L (resp., R) represents “left” (resp., “right”), and we are imagining the states of the single-armed MDP being lined up in a row from state 0 to state 7; by taking the preferred actions, the arm moves to the right and loops back to the state 0 after passing through the state 7. The probabilities $p_{\cdot,R}$ and $p_{\cdot,L}$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} p_{\cdot,R} &= [0.1 \ 0.1 \ 0.1 \ 0.1 \ 0.1 \ 0.1 \ 0.1 \ 0.1], \\ p_{\cdot,L} &= [1.0 \ 1.0 \ 0.48 \ 0.47 \ 0.46 \ 0.45 \ 0.44 \ 0.43]. \end{aligned}$$

The reward function is given by $r(7, 0) = 0.1$, $r(0, 1) = 1/300$, and $r(s, a) = 0$ for all other $s \in \mathbb{S}, a \in \mathbb{A}$. The budget parameter $\alpha = 1/2$, so $N/2$ arms are activated in each time step.

Compared with the RB instance in Section 3.3. of [16], the only modification in this RB instance is changing $r(0, 1)$ from 0 to $1/300$. This small modification makes this instance non-indexable for the Whittle index policy, and keeps the performances of the other policies almost unchanged.

G.3. Generating and identifying non-GAP examples in Section 8.2 In this subsection, we first provide some details on generating random RB instances following the Dirichlet distribution in Section 8.2. Then we comment on how we identify the non-GAP instances through the notion of local instability.


Generating Dirichlet random examples. Each of the random RB example in Figure 7 is generated from the Dirichlet distribution in the following way: For each state-action pair (s, a) , we let $(P(s, a, s'))_{s' \in \mathbb{S}}$ be an independently-sampled random vector following the Dirichlet distribution; for each action a , we also let $(r(s, a))_{s \in \mathbb{S}}$ be an independent random vector following the same Dirichlet distribution; we sample the budget parameter α from the uniform distribution over the interval $[0.1, 0.9]$ and round it down to the nearest multiple of 0.01.

Identifying local instability. To identify a non-GAP example, we use the notation of *local instability*. To avoid ambiguity, we only consider local instability for the RB problems that satisfy the three conditions:

- The optimal solution (LP), y^* , is unique;
- There are no transient states for this y^* , that is, $y^*(s, 1) + y^*(s, 0) > 0$ for all $s \in \mathbb{S}$;
- The RB problem is non-degenerate, that is, there exists $\tilde{s} \in \mathbb{S}$ with $y^*(\tilde{s}, 1) > 0$ and $y^*(\tilde{s}, 0) > 0$.

Under these assumptions, the mean-field dynamics around μ^* is locally linear and is the same for all LP-priority policies. Specifically, we have

$$\mathbb{E} [X_{t+1}([N]) - \mu^* \mid X_t([N])] = (X_t([N]) - \mu^*)\Phi, \quad (136)$$

FIGURE 13. Illustration of the fractions of arms that persistently follow $\bar{\pi}^*$ for the two RB problems simulated in Section 8.1.

(a) The example in Figure 6a.

(b) The example in Figure 6b.

given that $X_t([N])$ is sufficiently close to μ^* , and an LP-Priority policy is used; the matrix Φ is defined as

$$\Phi \triangleq P_{\bar{\pi}^*} - \mathbf{1}^\top \mu^* - (c_{\bar{\pi}^*} - \alpha \mathbf{1})^\top (P_1(\tilde{s}) - P_0(\tilde{s})), \quad (137)$$

where $c_{\bar{\pi}^*} \triangleq (\bar{\pi}^*(1|s))_{s \in \mathbb{S}}$ and $P_a(\tilde{s}) \triangleq (P(\tilde{s}, a, s))_{s \in \mathbb{S}}$ are both row vectors; $\mathbf{1}$ is the all-one row vector. We refer the readers to Appendix B of [10] for a detailed derivation of the dynamics under LP-Priority policies.


In the context of our experiments, we say the RB problem is *locally unstable* if the matrix Φ defined in (137) is unstable, that is, its spectral radius is strictly larger than 1. The instability of Φ implies that the mean-field dynamics of the state-count vector under any LP-Priority policy drifts away from the optimal state distribution μ^* in a certain neighborhood of μ^* , which implies the violation of GAP.

G.4. Comparing set-expansion policy with ID policy In this subsection, we make an additional observation about different behaviors of the set-expansion policy and the ID policy: under the ID policy, a larger subset of arms can persistently follow the optimal single-armed policy $\bar{\pi}^*$ for a long period of time than under the set-expansion policy. Although this phenomenon does not necessarily imply that the ID policy performs better than the set-expansion policy, we include it here for its potential theoretical interests.


The observation comes from the following experiment. We run the ID policy and the set-expansion policy on each of the six RB problems simulated in Section 8 with $N = 500$. For each of the two policies, we first let them run 5000 time steps to mix to the steady state. Then for each of the next 1000 time step t , we plot the fraction of arms that whose actions agree with ideal actions in the time interval $[t, t + 199]$; these are the arms that will persistently follow $\bar{\pi}^*$ for 200 time steps starting from time t . We choose the look-ahead window to be 200 because it is large enough for an arm following $\bar{\pi}^*$ to converge to the stationary distribution: notice that by Lemma 1, the W -weighted L_2 distance between any distribution on \mathbb{S} and the optimal stationary distribution μ^* reduces by a ratio of at most $1 - 1/(2\lambda_W)$ every time step under $\bar{\pi}^*$, and $2\lambda_W$ ranges from 2.82 to 84.29 in each of the examples simulated in Section 8.

The simulation results are shown in Figures 13, 14, and 15. As we can see, the numbers of arms that can persistently follow $\bar{\pi}^*$ for 200 time steps under the ID policy are clearly larger than those under the set-expansion policy in all the examples.


Here is a plausible explanation for this phenomenon. Because the set-expansion policy randomly selects arms outside the focus set to follow $\bar{\pi}^*$, only those arms in the focus set could persistently follow $\bar{\pi}^*$. Moreover, the focus set of the set-expansion policy is determined according to the L_1 norm constraint, which is somewhat conservatively designed to facilitate the analysis. In contrast, the ID policy relies on a fixed set of IDs rather than the explicitly computed focus sets to decide the subset of arms that follow $\bar{\pi}^*$. As a result, some arms outside the focus set $[Nm_d(X_t)]$ that are considered in the analysis may also follow $\bar{\pi}^*$ for long periods of times under the ID policy. Consequently, more arms could follow $\bar{\pi}^*$ persistently under the ID policy than under the set-expansion policy.

FIGURE 14. Illustration of the fractions of arms that persistently follow $\bar{\pi}^*$ for the two RB problems simulated in Section 8.2.


(a) The example in Figure 9a.



(b) The example in Figure 9a.

FIGURE 15. Illustration of the fractions of arms that persistently follow $\bar{\pi}^*$ for the two RB problems simulated in Section 8.3.

(a) The example in Figure 10a.



(b) The example in Figure 10b.