This document is the omitted appendices of the paper "Lowcomplexity AoI-optimal status update control with partial battery state information in energy harvesting IoT networks" (by Hao Wu, Shengtian Yang, and Jun Chen) submitted to ISIT 2025.

Some Notes on the Submitted Conference Paper

The following notes will be incorporated into the revised version if accepted.

- Since the system is request-driven, we assume that η > λ. As for the case η ≤ λ, additional mechanisms may be implemented to simulate user requests, thereby preventing energy overflow and ensuring that the excess energy is utilized effectively.
- The time complexity in the eBSI case refers to that of a general value iteration algorithm on the corresponding MDP model, which is $O(\overline{B}^2 \overline{\Delta}^2)$ (see, e.g., [13, Sec. III.B]).
- In practice, the block length n is set to be \overline{B}/λ for estimating the post-update value function.
- The set of allowable actions for a state $z = (\hat{b}, \check{e})$ should be $Q_z := \mathbb{Z}_{[\langle \lfloor \hat{b} + \check{e} - n\eta \rfloor \rangle_{0,\overline{B}-1}, \langle \lfloor \hat{b} + \check{e} \rfloor \rangle_{\leq \overline{B}-1}]}$, where $\langle x \rangle_{a,b}$ clips the number x by the interval [a, b]. Correspondingly, $N_{su} = \xi \langle \hat{b} + \check{e} - q \rangle_{\leq n\eta}$ (defined after (20). This change does not affect the simulation results in the paper.
- The numbers e_i (i = -1, 0, 1) in Definition 2 are the three energy levels of the assumed three-point block-energy-arrival distribution, i.e., $n\lambda$ and $n\lambda \pm \sigma'$.
- There is a typo in (20), which should be.

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\hat{\eta}(n^2 + nN_{\rm su} - 2N_{\rm su}^2)}{2N_{\rm su}} + N_{\rm su}, & \frac{n}{N_{\rm su}} \leq \overline{\Delta}, \\ \frac{\hat{\eta}N_{\rm su}(\overline{\Delta}^2 + \overline{\Delta} - 2)}{2} \\ + \hat{\eta}(n\overline{\Delta} - N_{\rm su}\overline{\Delta}^2) + N_{\rm su}, & \frac{n}{N_{\rm su}} > \overline{\Delta}. \end{cases}$$

APPENDIX A

Proposition 2: Suppose that $\overline{B} = \infty$ and $O_t = (\tilde{B}_t, \Delta_t, \overline{\mathfrak{U}}_t) = o := (0, \delta, \overline{U}).$

(1) If $A_t = 0$ (no update), then $O_{t+1} = (0, \delta + 1, \overline{U})$ and $\mathbb{E}(B_{t+1}|O_{t+1} = (0, \delta + 1, \overline{U})) = \mathbb{E}(B_t|O_t = o, A_t = 0) + \lambda.$ (25)

(2) If $A_t = 1$ but $H_t = 0$ (update failure), then $O_{t+1} = (0, \delta + 1, \overline{U} \cup \{\delta\})$ and

$$\mathbb{E}(B_{t+1}|O_{t+1} = (0, \delta + 1, U \cup \{\delta\})) = \frac{(1-\xi)(\mathbb{E}(B_t|O_t = o, A_t = 1) - \theta_t)}{1-\theta_t\xi} + \lambda, \quad (26)$$

where $\theta_t := P\{B_t > 0 | O_t = o, A_t = 1\}.$

(3) If $A_t=1$ and $H_t=1$ (update success), then $O_{t+1}=(B_t-1,1,\emptyset)$ and

$$\mathbb{E}(B_{t+1}|O_{t+1} = (B_t - 1, 1, \emptyset)) = B_t - 1 + \lambda.$$
(27)

Sketch of Proof: The cases (1) and (3) are trivial. The case (2) can be proved by the following observations:

$$\begin{split} \mathbb{E}(B_{t+1}|O_t = o, B_t > 0, A_t = 1, H_t = 0) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(B_{t+1}|O_t = o, B_t > 0, A_t = 1) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(B_t - 1 + E_t|O_t = o, B_t > 0, A_t = 1) \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{E}(B_t|O_t = o, A_t = 1)}{\theta_t} - 1 + \lambda, \\ \mathbb{E}(B_{t+1}|O_t = o, B_t = 0, A_t = 1, H_t = 0) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(E_t|O_t = o, B_t = 0, A_t = 1) = \lambda, \\ P\{B_t > 0, H_t = 0|O_t = o, A_t = 1\} = \theta_t(1 - \xi), \\ P\{B_t = 0, H_t = 0|O_t = o, A_t = 1\} = 1 - \theta_t, \\ P\{H_t = 0|O_t = o, A_t = 1\} = 1 - \theta_t \xi. \end{split}$$

Remark 1: Due to the possible dependence of A_t on B_t , it is not easy to compute $\mathbb{E}(B_t|O_t = o, A_t = 0)$, $\mathbb{E}(B_t|O_t = o, A_t = 1)$, and θ_t accurately. In practice, we just use the following approximation:

$$\mathbb{E}(B_t|O_t = o, A_t = 0) \approx \mathbb{E}(B_t|O_t = o)$$
(28)

$$\mathbb{E}(B_t|O_t = o, A_t = 1) \approx \mathbb{E}(B_t|O_t = o)$$
⁽²⁹⁾

$$\theta_t \approx P\{B_t > 0 | O_t = o\}$$

$$\approx 1 - (1 - p_1)^{\mathbb{E}(B_t | O_t = o)/\lambda}, \quad (30)$$

where $p_1 := P\{E_1 > 0\}$. To make these approximations precise, we need to reduce the dependence of A_t on B_t . Therefore, we will minimize the use of battery level information in decisions when $\tilde{B}_t = 0$. By considering the equivalent time for energy harvesting, $\mathbb{E}(B_t|O_t)$ can be expressed as

$$D_t := \frac{\mathbb{E}(B_t | O_t)}{\lambda}.$$

We immediately obtain the concept of AoFBL.

APPENDIX B

Proof of Theorem 1: It is clear that the initial expected sensor battery level is approximately $b_0 = \langle \hat{b} + \lambda \delta \rangle_{\leq \overline{B}}$. Since $\overline{n} \leq b_0$, the (N-step) total value under Γ_1 can be estimated by

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \xi (1-\xi)^{i-1} \hat{V}(b_0, \delta, i) + (1-\xi)^{\bar{n}} W_N,$$

where $V(b_0, \delta, i)$ is the total value under Γ_1 given that the first successful update occurs at the *i*-th time slot with a request (Proposition 3), and W_N is the total value under Γ_1 given that the first \bar{n} updates all fail.

We denote by \hat{T}_i the (one-based) step index of the *i*-th time slot with a request, counted from the current time slot. In particular, $\hat{T}_1 = 1$. Then, W_N can be estimated by

$$W_N \approx \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \langle \delta + \hat{T}_i \rangle_{\leq \overline{\Delta}} + \tilde{V}_{N-\hat{T}_{\bar{n}}}(b_0 - \bar{n} + \lambda \hat{T}_{\bar{n}}, \delta + \hat{T}_{\bar{n}}, X)\right)$$
$$\approx \sum_{i=1}^{\bar{n}} \langle \delta + \mathbb{E}\hat{T}_i \rangle_{\leq \overline{\Delta}} + \tilde{V}_{N-\mathbb{E}\hat{T}_{\bar{n}}}(b_0 - \bar{n} + \lambda \mathbb{E}\hat{T}_{\bar{n}}, \delta + \mathbb{E}\hat{T}_{\bar{n}}, \mathbb{E}X)$$
$$\stackrel{(a)}{=} \sum_{i=1}^{\bar{n}} \langle \delta + \phi_0(i) \rangle_{\leq \overline{\Delta}}$$

$$+ \tilde{V}_{N-\phi_0(\bar{n})}(b_0 - \bar{n} + \lambda \phi_0(\bar{n}), \delta + \phi_0(\bar{n}), \mathbb{E}X) = \psi_1(\bar{n}) + \tilde{V}_{N-\phi_0(\bar{n})}(b_1, \psi_0(\delta, \bar{n}), \mathbb{E}X),$$
(31)

where $\tilde{V}_N(b, \delta, x)$ is the estimated total value under Γ_1 given that the first successful update occurs at the *x*-th step (Proposition 4), $X := Y - \hat{T}_{\bar{n}}$ with Y being the step index (counted from the current time slot) of the first successful update, and (a) follows from Lemma 1.

Next, we estimate $\mathbb{E}X$. After the update failure at step $\hat{T}_{\bar{n}}$ (the \bar{n} -th time slot with request), we still need $1/\xi$ updates on average for a successful update. Then, the expected value $x := \mathbb{E}X$ satisfies the following equation approximately:

$$\min\left\{b + \lambda x, 1 + \eta(x-1)\right\} \approx \frac{1}{\xi},$$

where b is the initial expected sensor battery level. Solving this equation, we obtain

$$x = \max\left\{\frac{1}{\xi\lambda} - \frac{b}{\lambda}, \frac{1}{\xi\eta} - \frac{1}{\eta} + 1\right\}.$$
 (32)
ed with (31) gives (9)

This combined with (31) gives (9).

Eq. (10) is an easy consequence of (9) because Γ_2 can be equivalently regarded as Γ_1 with one additional energy unit but failing at the first time slot with request. Note that a slight adjustment (see Eqs. (10), (13), and (14)) of the initial expected battery level b_0 is required to take into account the case where the harvested energy during the first $1/\eta$ time slots cannot be charged to the battery due to a close-to-capacity initial battery level.

Lemma 1: Let \hat{T}_i be the one-based step index of the *i*-th time slot with a request, counted from the current time slot. Then, $\mathbb{E}\hat{T}_i = \phi_0(i)$, where $\phi_0(i)$ is defined by (17).

Proof: Let $\Delta \hat{T}_i := \hat{T}_i - \hat{T}_{i-1}$ for $i \ge 2$. It is clear that $\mathbb{E}\Delta \hat{T}_i = 1/\eta$. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}\hat{T}_i = \mathbb{E}\left(\hat{T}_1 + \sum_{j=2}^i \Delta \hat{T}_i\right) = 1 + \frac{i-1}{\eta} = \phi_0(i).$$

APPENDIX C

Proposition 3 (The *i*-th-Request-Success Estimation): If $R_t = 1$, $\mathbb{E}B_t = b$ and $\Delta_t = \delta$, then for any $i \leq b$, the N-step total value under strategy Γ_1 given that the first successful update occurs at the *i*-th time slot with request can be estimated by

$$\hat{V}_N(b,\delta,i) \approx 1 + \psi_1(\delta,i-1)$$

 $+ (N - \phi_0(i))g^* + \tilde{h}(b - i + \lambda\phi_0(i) - \lambda),$ (33) where $\psi_1(\delta, i)$ and $\phi_0(i)$ are defined by (15) and (17), respectively.

Proof of Proposition 3: Since the first successful update occurs at the *i*-th time slot with request, the *N*-step total value under Γ_1 can be estimated by

$$\hat{V}_N(b,\delta,i) \approx \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \langle \delta + \hat{T}_j \rangle_{\leq \overline{\Delta}} + 1 + (N - \hat{T}_i)g^i + \tilde{h}(b - i + \lambda(\hat{T}_i - 1))\right)$$

$$\approx \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \langle \delta + \mathbb{E}\hat{T}_j \rangle_{\leq \overline{\Delta}} + 1 + (N - \mathbb{E}\hat{T}_i)g^* \\ + \tilde{h}(b - i + \lambda \mathbb{E}\hat{T}_i - \lambda) \\ \stackrel{\text{(a)}}{=} \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \langle \delta + \phi_0(j) \rangle_{\leq \overline{\Delta}} + 1 + (N - \phi_0(i))g^* \\ + \tilde{h}(b - i + \lambda \phi_0(i) - \lambda) \\ = 1 + \psi_1(\delta, i - 1) + (N - \phi_0(i))g^* \\ + \tilde{h}(b - i + \lambda \phi_0(i) - \lambda), \end{cases}$$

where \hat{T}_i denotes the (one-based) step index (counted from the current time slot) of the *i*-th time slot with a request, and (a) follows from Lemma 1.

APPENDIX D

Proposition 4 (The x-th-Step-Success Estimation): If $\mathbb{E}B_t = b$ and $\Delta_t = \delta$, then for any $x \ge 1$, the N-step total value under strategy Γ_1 given that the first successful update occurs at the x-th step can be estimated by:

$$V_N(b,\delta,x) \approx 1 + \eta \psi_2(\delta,x-1) + (N-x)g^* + \tilde{h}(\langle b - \phi_2(x) + \lambda x - \lambda \rangle_{\geq 0}), \quad (34)$$

where

$$\psi_2(\delta, x) := \psi_1(\delta, \lfloor x \rfloor) + (x - \lfloor x \rfloor) \langle \psi_0(\delta, \lceil x \rceil) \rangle_{\leq \overline{\Delta}}, \quad (35)$$

$$p_2(x) := 1 + \eta(x - 1).$$
 (36)

Proof of Proposition 4: We first suppose that x a positive integer. Since the first successful update occurs at the x-th step, the N-step total value under Γ_1 can be estimated by $\tilde{V}_N(b, \delta, i)$

$$\approx \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{x-1} R_j \langle \delta + j \rangle_{\leq \overline{\Delta}} + 1 + (N-x)g^* + \tilde{h}\left(\left\langle b - 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{x-1} R_j + \lambda(x-1) \right\rangle_{\geq 0}\right)\right]$$
$$\approx \eta \sum_{j=1}^{x-1} \langle \delta + j \rangle_{\leq \overline{\Delta}} + 1 + (N-x)g^* + \tilde{h}(\langle b - (1 + \eta(x-1)) + \lambda x - \lambda \rangle_{\geq 0})$$
$$= 1 + \eta \psi_1(\delta, x) + (N-x)g^* + \tilde{h}(\langle b - \phi_2(x) + \lambda x - \lambda \rangle_{\geq 0}).$$

where $\phi_2(x)$ is defined by (36).

As for a general number $x \ge 1$, we consider an interpolation of the above estimation:

$$\begin{split} &(1-t)V_N(b,\delta,\lfloor x\rfloor) + tV_N(b,\delta,\lceil x\rceil),\\ \text{where }t=x-\lfloor x\rfloor. \text{ Therefore, we have}\\ &\tilde{V}_N(b,\delta,x)\approx 1+\eta\psi_2(x-1,\delta)+(N-x)g^*\\ &+(1-t)\tilde{h}(\langle b-\phi_1(\lfloor x\rfloor)+\lambda x\rangle_{\geq 0})\\ &+t\tilde{h}(\langle b-\phi_1(\lceil x\rceil)+\lambda x\rangle_{\geq 0})\\ &\approx 1+\eta\psi_2(x-1,\delta)+(N-x)g^*\\ &+\tilde{h}(\langle b-\phi_1(x)+\lambda x\rangle_{\geq 0}),\\ \text{where }\psi_2(b,\delta) \text{ is defined by (35).} \end{split}$$

APPENDIX E

Derivation of Equation (20): Let $N_{\rm u} := \langle \hat{b} + \check{e} - q \rangle_{\leq n\eta}$ be the number of updates in a block (of *n* time slots), or equivalently, the $N_{\rm u}$ units of energy consumed within the block. Let $N_{\rm r}$ be the number of requests in the block. It is clear that $N_{\rm u} \leq \mathbb{E}N_{\rm r} = n\eta$. Let $N_{\rm su}$ be the number of successful updates in the block. It is clear that $\mathbb{E}N_{\rm su} = \xi N_{\rm u}$. To simplify the complexity of estimation, we assume that $P\{N_{\rm su} > N_{\rm r}\} \approx 0$.

Given N_r and N_{su} , the block can be divided into N_{su} segments, each ending with a successful update. Let $L^{N_{su}} := (L_i)_{i=1}^{N_{su}}$ be the lengths of the segments in the block. Then, the total on-demand AoCSI over the block given $(N_r, N_{su}, L^{N_{su}})$ is

$$\tilde{c}(N_{\mathrm{r}}, N_{\mathrm{su}}, L^{N_{\mathrm{su}}}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\mathrm{su}}} \tilde{c}(N_{\mathrm{r}}, N_{\mathrm{su}}, L_{i}).$$

where $\tilde{c}(N_{\rm r}, N_{\rm su}, L_i)$ is the total on-demand AoCSI over the *i*-th segment given $(N_{\rm r}, N_{\rm su}, L_i)$.

Next, we focus on the total on-demand AoCSI over a segment. Noting that the total requests in time slots with no successful update is $N_{\rm r} - N_{\rm su}$, we have

$$P\{R_{i} = 1\} \approx \begin{cases} \frac{\binom{n - N_{su} - 1}{N_{r} - N_{su} - 1}}{\binom{n - N_{su}}{N_{r} - N_{su}}}, & N_{su} < N_{r}, \\ 0, & N_{su} = N_{r}, \\ 0, & N_{su} = N_{r}, \end{cases}$$
$$= \hat{\eta} := \frac{N_{r} - N_{su}}{n - N_{su}}$$

for any time slot i with no successful update. Therefore, for any $\ell \geq 1$,

$$\begin{split} \tilde{c}(N_{\rm r},N_{\rm su},\ell) &= \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\ell-1}R_i\langle i+1\rangle_{\leq\overline{\Delta}}+1\right) \\ &= 1+\hat{\eta}\sum_{i=1}^{\ell-1}\langle i+1\rangle_{\leq\overline{\Delta}} \\ &= 1-\hat{\eta}+\hat{\eta}\sum_{i=1}^{\ell}\langle i\rangle_{\leq\overline{\Delta}} \\ &= 1-\hat{\eta}+\hat{\eta}\sum_{i=1}^{\ell}\sum_{j=1}^{i}1\{j\leq\overline{\Delta}\} \\ &= 1-\hat{\eta}+\hat{\eta}\sum_{j=1}^{\ell}1\{j\leq\overline{\Delta}\}\sum_{i=j}^{\ell}1 \\ &= 1-\hat{\eta}+\hat{\eta}\sum_{j=1}^{\ell}(\ell-j+1) \\ &= 1-\hat{\eta}+\hat{\eta}\langle\ell\rangle_{\leq\overline{\Delta}}\frac{2\ell-\langle\ell\rangle_{\leq\overline{\Delta}}+1}{2} \\ &= 1+\hat{\eta}\frac{\langle\ell\rangle_{\leq\overline{\Delta}}(2\ell-\langle\ell\rangle_{\leq\overline{\Delta}}+1)-2}{2} \\ &= 1+\hat{\eta}\left[\ell\langle\ell\rangle_{\leq\overline{\Delta}}-\frac{\langle\ell\rangle_{\leq\overline{\Delta}}(\langle\ell\rangle_{<\overline{\Delta}}-1)}{2}-1\right] \end{split}$$

Note that $\tilde{c}(N_{\rm r}, N_{\rm su}, \ell)$ is a convex function of ℓ for $\ell \in [0, \overline{\Delta}]$ and fixed $(N_{\rm r}, N_{\rm su})$. Therefore, the optimal total on-demand AoCSI over the whole block given $(N_{\rm r}, N_{\rm su})$ can be estimated by the approximate lower bound

 $\tilde{c}($

$$\begin{split} N_{\rm r}, N_{\rm su}) &= \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\rm su}} \tilde{c}(N_{\rm r}, N_{\rm su}, L_i) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\gtrsim} N_{\rm su} \tilde{c}\left(N_{\rm r}, N_{\rm su}, \frac{n}{N_{\rm su}}\right) \\ &= \begin{cases} N_{\rm su} + \frac{\hat{\eta}(n^2 + nN_{\rm su} - 2N_{\rm su}^2)}{2N_{\rm su}}, & \frac{n}{N_{\rm su}} \leq \overline{\Delta}, \\ N_{\rm su} + n\hat{\eta}\overline{\Delta} \\ - \frac{\hat{\eta}N_{\rm su}(\overline{\Delta}^2 - \overline{\Delta} + 2)}{2}, & \frac{n}{N_{\rm su}} > \overline{\Delta}, \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{\hat{\eta}(n^2 + nN_{\rm su} - 2N_{\rm su}^2)}{2N_{\rm su}} + N_{\rm su}, & \frac{n}{N_{\rm su}} \leq \overline{\Delta}, \\ \frac{\hat{\eta}N_{\rm su}(\overline{\Delta}^2 + \overline{\Delta} - 2)}{2} \\ + \hat{\eta}(n\overline{\Delta} - N_{\rm su}\overline{\Delta}^2) + N_{\rm su}, & \frac{n}{N_{\rm su}} > \overline{\Delta}, \end{cases} \end{split}$$

where (a) follows from Jensen's inequality. Replacing N_r and N_{su} with $\mathbb{E}N_r = n\eta$ and $\mathbb{E}N_{su} = \xi N_u$, respectively, we obtain the estimation (20).

APPENDIX F

Proof of the Lower Bound Θ in Definition 3: Suppose that $\overline{\Delta} = \infty$. Suppose that the number of successful updates over the first *n* time slots is $N_{\rm su}(n)$. The first *n* time slots can be divided into $N_{\rm su}(n) + 1$ segments. Except the last segment (which may degenerates to an empty segment), each segment ends with a successful update. In the sequel, we will write $N_{\rm su}$ in place of $N_{\rm su}(n)$ for simplicity.

The total on-demand AoCSI over an ℓ -length segment with distinct AoCSIs can be bounded below by

$$\sum_{i=1}^{Y} i = \frac{Y+Y^2}{2}$$

regardless of the initial AoCSI of the segment, where $1 \le Y \le \ell$ is the number of requests within the segment. Then, the expected total on-demand AoCSI over the first *n* time slots is bounded below by

$$\mathbb{E}\sum_{i=1}^{N_{\rm su}+1} \frac{Y_i + Y_i^2}{2} \ge \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{N_{\rm su}+1} Y_i + \frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N_{\rm su}+1} Y_i\right)^2}{N_{\rm su}+1}\right] = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}\left(N_{\rm r} + \frac{N_{\rm r}^2}{N_{\rm su}+1}\right),$$

where Y_i is the request number of the *i*-th segment, and N_r is the total request number during the first *n* time slots.

On the other hand, we have

1

$$\mathbb{E}(N_{\rm su}|N_{\rm r}) = \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} H_t \middle| N_{\rm r}\right)$$
$$= \xi \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_t 1\{B_t \ge 1\} \middle| N_{\rm r}\right)$$

$$\leq \xi \mathbb{E} \left(B_1 + \sum_{t=1}^n E_t \middle| N_r \right)$$

$$\leq \xi (\overline{B} + n\lambda). \tag{37}$$

Therefore, the average on-demand AoCSI over the first \boldsymbol{n} time slots is bounded below by

$$\frac{1}{2n}\mathbb{E}\left(N_{\rm r} + \frac{N_{\rm r}^2}{N_{\rm su} + 1}\right) = \frac{1}{2n}\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left(N_{\rm r} + \frac{N_{\rm r}^2}{N_{\rm su} + 1}\Big|N_{\rm r}\right)\right]$$

$$\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \frac{1}{2n}\mathbb{E}\left(N_{\rm r} + \frac{N_{\rm r}^2}{\mathbb{E}(N_{\rm su}|N_{\rm r}) + 1}\right)$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} \frac{1}{2n}\mathbb{E}\left[N_{\rm r} + \frac{N_{\rm r}^2}{\xi(\overline{B} + n\lambda) + 1}\right]$$

$$\stackrel{(c)}{\geq} \frac{1}{2n}\left[\mathbb{E}N_{\rm r} + \frac{(\mathbb{E}N_{\rm r})^2}{\xi(\overline{B} + n\lambda) + 1}\right]$$

$$= \frac{\eta}{2} + \frac{n\eta^2}{2\xi(\overline{B} + n\lambda) + 2}.$$

where (a) follows from Jensen's inequality for conditional expectation, (b) from (37), and (c) from Jensen's inequality. Letting $n \to \infty$, we obtain the lower bound Θ defined by (24).



Fig. 3. The additive gaps of the CN, OFT, and eBSI-Opt policies for $\eta = 0.7$, $\xi = 1$, and 0-1 Bernoulli distributions with $\lambda \in \{0.1, 0.12, \dots, 0.3\}$.



Fig. 4. The additive gaps of the CN, OFT, and eBSI-Opt policies for $\eta = 0.7$, $\xi = 0.4$, and 0-1 Bernoulli distributions with $\lambda \in \{0.1, 0.12, \dots, 0.3\}$.