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Abstract

The Central Limit Theorem states that a standard Gaussian random variable can be simulated within any level of approximation error (measured by the Kolmogorov-Smirnov distance) from an i.i.d. real-valued random vector \( X^n \sim P_X^n \) by the normalized sum \( \frac{1}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(X)}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (X_i - E[X]) \) (as \( n \to \infty \)). Moreover given the mean \( E[X] \) and variance \( \text{Var}(X) \), this linear function does not depend on the distribution \( P_X \). Such simulation problems (in which the simulation mapping is independent or almost independent of \( P_X \), or equivalently \( P_X \) is unknown a priori) are referred to as being universal. In this paper, we consider both universal and non-universal simulations of random variables with an arbitrary target distribution \( Q_Y \) by general mappings, not limited to linear ones. We derive the fastest convergence rate of the approximation errors for such problems. Interestingly, we show that for discontinuous or absolutely continuous \( P_X \), the approximation error for the universal simulation is almost as small as that for the non-universal one; and moreover, for both universal and non-universal simulations, the approximation errors by general mappings are strictly smaller than those by linear mappings. Specifically, for both universal and non-universal simulations, if the seed distribution \( P_X \) is discontinuous, then the approximation error decays at least exponentially fast with rate \( H_\infty(P_X):=−\log \max_x P_X(x) \) as the dimension \( n \) of \( X^n \) goes to infinity; if \( P_X \) is absolutely continuous, then only one-dimensional \( X \) is sufficient to simulate \( Y \) exactly or arbitrarily well. For continuous but not absolutely continuous \( P_X \), using a non-universal simulator, one-dimensional \( X \) is still sufficient to simulate \( Y \) exactly, however using a universal simulator, we only show that the approximation error decays sup-exponentially fast. Furthermore, we also generalize these results to simulation from Markov processes, and simulation of random elements (or general random variables). For the former case, the approximation error for the universal simulation also decays at least exponentially fast; and for the latter case, using a universal simulator, an absolutely continuous random element respect to some continuous distribution (which is known a prior) is also sufficient to simulate another arbitrary random element arbitrarily well.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Central Limit Theorem (CLT) states that for a sequence of i.i.d. real-valued random variables \( X^n \sim P_X^n \), the normalized sum \( \frac{1}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(X)}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (X_i - E[X]) \) converges in distribution to a standard Gaussian random variable \( Y \) by the normalized sum so that the approximation error asymptotically vanishes under the Kolmogorov–Smirnov distance. Moreover, from the Berry-Esseen theorem [1, Sec. XVI.5], the approximation error vanishes in a rate of \( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \). Note that here, the distribution \( P_X \) of \( X \) is arbitrary, and given the mean and variance, the linear function is independent of \( P_X \). Hence such a linear function can be considered as a universal linear function. The corresponding simulation problem can be considered as being universal. In this paper, we consider general universal simulation problems, in which general simulation functions, not limited to linear ones, are allowed. We are interested in the following question: What is the optimal convergence rate for such universal simulation problems? To know how important the knowledge of the distribution \( P_X \) is in a simulation, we are also interested in the optimal convergence rate for non-universal simulation problems (in which \( P_X \) is known). Is the optimal convergence rate for universal simulation as fast as, or strictly slower than, that for non-universal simulation?

The CLT is about universal simulation of a continuous random variable (more specifically, a Gaussian random variable). In addition to simulation of continuous random variables, there are a large number of works that consider universal simulation of a sequence of discrete (or atomic) random variables from another sequence of discrete

---

1We say a mapping is general if it is either linear or non-linear.
random variables. In 1951, von Neumann [2] described a procedure for exactly generating a sequence of independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) unbiased random coins from a sequence of i.i.d. biased random coins with an unknown distribution. To obtain unbiased outputs, two pairs of bits (0, 1) and (1, 0) (which have the same empirical distribution) are mapped to 0 and 1, respectively, and (0, 0) and (1, 1) are discarded. Elias [3] and Blum [4] considered a more general situation in which the process of the repeated coin tosses is subject to an unknown Markov process, instead of a traditional i.i.d. process, and then studied the efficiency of such a procedure measured according to the expected number of output coins per input coin. Knuth and Yao [5], Roche [6], Abrahams [7], and Han and Hoshi [8] considered another general simulation problem in which an arbitrary target distribution is generated by using an unbiased or biased M-coin (i.e., an M-sided coin) but with a known distribution. They showed that the minimum expected number of coin tosses required to generate the target distribution can be expressed in terms of the ratio of the entropy of the target distribution to that of the seed distribution. In all of the works above [2]–[8], simulators are defined as functions that map a variable-length input sequence to a fixed-length output sequence. Hence, to produce an output symbol, arbitrarily long delay or waiting time may be required.

To reduce delay, a direction of generalizing the random number generation problem is to require that an output must be generated for every k bits input from a unbiased or biased coin, for any fixed k, but at the same time, relax the requirement of exact generation to that of approximate generation. That is, we may require only that the target distribution should be generated approximately within a nonzero but arbitrarily small tolerance in terms of some suitable distance measures such as the total variation distance or divergences. Such a problem in the asymptotic context with known seed and target distributions has been formulated and studied by Han and Verdú [9]; its inverse problem has been investigated by Vembu and Verdú [10]; and a general version of these problems —– generating an i.i.d. sequence from another i.i.d. sequence with arbitrary known seed and target distributions —– has been studied in [11]–[13].

All of the works above only considered simulating a sequence of discrete random variables from another sequence of discrete random variables. In contrast, in this paper we consider approximately generating an arbitrary random variable (or a random element) from a sequence of random variables (or another random element) with arbitrary but unknown seed distribution.

A. Problem Formulation

Before formulating our problem, we first introduce two statistical distances. For an arbitrary measurable space \((\Omega, \mathcal{B}_\Omega)\), we use \(\mathcal{P}(\Omega, \mathcal{B}_\Omega)\) to denote the set of all the possible probability measures (a.k.a. distributions) defined on \((\Omega, \mathcal{B}_\Omega)\). Given an arbitrary measurable space \((\Omega, \mathcal{B}_\Omega)\), the total variation (TV) distance between two probability measures \(P, Q \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega, \mathcal{B}_\Omega)\) is defined as

\[
|P - Q|_{TV} = \sup_{A \in \mathcal{B}_\Omega} |P(A) - Q(A)|.
\] (1)

The Kolmogorov–Smirnov (KS) distance between two probability measures \(P, Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}})\) is defined as

\[
|P - Q|_{KS} = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |F(x) - G(x)|,
\] (2)

where \(F\) and \(G\) respectively denote the CDFs of \(P\) and \(Q\). For \(P, Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}})\), we have

\[
0 \leq |P - Q|_{KS} \leq |P - Q|_{TV},
\] (3)

since \(|P - Q|_{KS} = \sup_{A \in T} |P(A) - Q(A)|\) with \(T := \{(-\infty, y] : y \in \mathbb{R}\} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}\). Furthermore, both \(|P - Q|_{KS}\) and \(|P - Q|_{TV}\) are metrics, and hence \(|P - Q|_{KS} = 0 \iff P = Q \ a.e.\) (almost everywhere) and \(|P - Q|_{TV} = 0 \iff P = Q\ a.e.\).

Based on these two distances, we next formulate our problem. In this paper, we consider the following problem: When we use an \(n\)-dimensional real-valued random vector \(X^n\) with distribution \(f_{X^n}\) to generate a real-valued random variable \(Y\) by a function \(y = f(x^n)\) so that its distribution is approximately \(Q_Y\), what is the fastest convergence speed of the approximation error over all functions \(f\) as \(n\) tends to infinity? Here the approximation error is measured by the TV distance or the KS distance. We term the Borel space \((\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}^n})\) of \(X^n\) as the seed space, and the Borel space \((\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}})\) of \(Q_Y\) as the target space,
Definition 1. Given the seed Borel space \((\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{B}_\mathbb{R}^n)\) and the target Borel space \((\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}_\mathbb{R})\), a simulator is a measurable function \(f: \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}\).

Given a random vector \(X^n \sim P_{X^n}\) and a target distribution \(Q_Y\), we want to find an optimal simulator \(Y = f(X^n)\) that minimizes the TV distance or the KS distance between the output distribution \(P_Y := P_{X^n} \circ f^{-1}\) (the distribution of the output random variable \(Y\)) and the target distribution \(Q_Y\). For such a simulation problem, we consider two different scenarios where \(P_{X^n}\) is respectively known and unknown a priori.

As illustrated in Fig. 1 (a), if the seed distribution \(P_{X^n}\) is unknown, but the class \(\mathcal{P}_{X^n} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{B}_\mathbb{R}^n)\) that \(P_{X^n}\) belongs to is known, we term such simulation problems as (universal) \((P_{X^n}, Q_Y)\)-simulation problems. Hence, the simulator \(f: \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}\) in the universal simulation problem may depend on everything including \(Q_X\) and \(P_{X^n}\), but except for \(P_{X^n}\). That is, it is independent of \(P_{X^n}\) given \(P_{X^n}\). Next we give a mathematical formulation for the universal simulation problem, which avoids ambiguous languages, like “\(P_{X^n}\) is unknown”.

Definition 2. A function \(g: \mathcal{P}_{X^n} \mapsto \mathbb{R}\) is called TV-achievable (resp. KS-achievable) for the universal \((P_{X^n}, Q_Y)\)-simulation, if there exists a sequence of simulators \(\{f_{n,k}\}_{k=1}^{\infty}\) such that

\[
\limsup_{k \to \infty} \|P_{Y_{n,k}} - Q_Y\|_{\theta} \leq g(P_{X^n})
\]

for all \(P_{X^n} \in \mathcal{P}_{X^n}\), where \(P_{Y_{n,k}} := P_{X^n} \circ f_{n,k}^{-1}\) and \(\theta = \text{TV}\) (resp. \(\theta = \text{KS}\)).

Definition 3. The set of TV-achievable (resp. KS-achievable) functions for the universal \((P_{X^n}, Q_Y)\)-simulation is defined as

\[
\mathcal{E}_\theta(P_{X^n}, Q_Y) := \{g: \mathcal{P}_{X^n} \mapsto \mathbb{R} : g \text{ is } \theta\text{-achievable}\}
\]

where \(\theta = \text{TV}\) (resp. \(\theta = \text{KS}\)).

According to Lebesgue’s decomposition theorem [14], the distributions of real-valued random variables can be partitioned into three classes\(^2\): discontinuous distributions (including discrete distributions and mixtures of discrete and continuous distributions), absolutely continuous distributions, and continuous but not absolutely continuous distributions.

\(^2\)We say a distribution (or a probability measure) \(P\) is discrete (or atomic) if it is purely atomic; continuous if it does not have any atoms; discontinuous if it has at least one atom; absolutely continuous if it is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure, i.e., having a probability density function; and singular continuous if it is continuous, and meanwhile, singular with respect to Lebesgue measure.
distributions (including singular continuous distributions and mixtures of singular continuous and absolutely continuous distributions). The sets of these distributions are respectively denoted as $P_{\text{ac}}, P_{\text{uc}},$ and $P_{\text{uc}} \setminus P_{\text{ac}},$ where $P_{\text{ac}} = P(\mathbb{R}, B_{\mathbb{R}}) \setminus P_{\text{uc}}.$

For the i.i.d. case, we define $P_{X}^{(n)} := \{ P_{X} : P_{X} \in P_{X} \}.$ In this paper, we want to characterize $E_{\theta}(P_{X}^{(n)}, Q_{Y})$ with $P_{X}$ respectively set to $P_{\text{ac}}, P_{\text{uc}},$ or $P_{\text{uc}} \setminus P_{\text{ac}}.$ Note that $E_{\theta}(P_{X}^{(n)}, Q_{Y})$ is an upper set. For brevity, for such sets and a function $g : P_{X} \mapsto \mathbb{R},$ we denote $E_{\theta}(P_{X}^{(n)}, Q_{Y}) \geq g$ if there exists a $g_{f} \in E_{\theta}(P_{X}^{(n)}, Q_{Y})$ such that $g_{f}(P_{X}) \leq g(P_{X}), \forall P_{X} \in P_{X};$ and $E_{\theta}(P_{X}^{(n)}, Q_{Y}) \geq g$ if $g_{f}(P_{X}) \geq g(P_{X}), \forall P_{X} \in P_{X}$ for all $g_{f} \in E_{\theta}(P_{X}^{(n)}, Q_{Y}).$ In addition, $E_{\theta}(P_{X}^{(n)}, Q_{Y}) \triangleright g$ if and only if $E_{\theta}(P_{X}^{(n)}, Q_{Y}) \geq g$ and $E_{\theta}(P_{X}^{(n)}, Q_{Y}) \geq g.$ In general, there does not necessarily exist $g$ such that $E_{\theta}(P_{X}^{(n)}, Q_{Y}) \triangleright g.$ However, if it exists, then $g(P_{X}) = \inf_{g_{f} \in E_{\theta}(P_{X}^{(n)}, Q_{Y})} g_{f}(P_{X})$ for $P_{X} \in P_{X}.$

Similarly, we write $E_{\theta}(P_{X}^{(n)}, Q_{Y}) \preceq g_{n}$ if there exists a $g_{f}^{n} \in E_{\theta}(P_{X}^{(n)}, Q_{Y})$ such that $g_{f}^{n}(P_{X}) \preceq g_{n}(P_{X}), \forall P_{X} \in P_{X};$ and $E_{\theta}(P_{X}^{(n)}, Q_{Y}) \preceq g$ if $g_{f}^{n}(P_{X}) \preceq g_{n}(P_{X}), \forall P_{X} \in P_{X}$ for all $g_{f}^{n} \in E_{\theta}(P_{X}^{(n)}, Q_{Y}).$ In addition, $E_{\theta}(P_{X}^{(n)}, Q_{Y}) \preceq g_{n}$ if and only if $E_{\theta}(P_{X}^{(n)}, Q_{Y}) \preceq g_{n}$ and $E_{\theta}(P_{X}^{(n)}, Q_{Y}) \preceq g.$ Furthermore, $E_{\theta}(P_{X}^{(n)}, Q_{Y}) \asymp e^{-\Omega(g_{n})}$ (resp. $E_{\theta}(P_{X}^{(n)}, Q_{Y}) \asymp e^{-\omega(g_{n})}$) if there exists a $g_{f}^{n} \in E_{\theta}(P_{X}^{(n)}, Q_{Y})$ such that $g_{f}^{n}(P_{X}) = e^{-\Omega(g_{n}(P_{X}))}$ (resp. $g_{f}^{n}(P_{X}) = e^{-\omega(g_{n}(P_{X}))}$) for all $P_{X} \in P_{X}.$

Conversely, as illustrated in Fig. 1 (b), if $P_{X}^{n}$ is known, we term such problems as (non-universal) $(P_{X}^{n}, Q_{Y})$-simulation problems. The simulator $f : \mathbb{R}^{n} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ in the non-universal simulation problem may depend on all of $P_{X}^{n}, Q_{X},$ etc.

**Definition 4.** The optimal $TV$-achievable (resp. KS-achievable) approximation error for the non-universal $(P_{X}^{n}, Q_{Y})$-simulation is defined as

$$E_{\theta}(P_{X}^{n}, Q_{Y}) := \inf_{f_{n}, P_{Y}^{n} \mapsto \mathbb{R}} |P_{Y}^{n} - Q_{Y}|_{\theta},$$

where $P_{Y} := P_{X} \circ f_{n}^{-1}$ and $\theta = TV$ (resp. $\theta = KS$).

The non-universal $(P_{X}^{n}, Q_{Y})$-simulation problem can be seen as a special universal $(P_{X}^{n}, Q_{Y})$-simulation problem with $P_{X}^{n}$ set to $\{ P_{X}^{n} \}.$ Hence $E_{\theta}(\{ P_{X}^{n} \}, Q_{Y}) \asymp E_{\theta}(P_{X}^{n}, Q_{Y}).$ On the other hand, by definitions, the set $E_{\theta}(P_{X}^{n}, Q_{Y})$ for the universal $(P_{X}^{n}, Q_{Y})$-simulation with $\theta \in \{ KS, TV \}$ must satisfy $E_{\theta}(P_{X}^{n}, Q_{Y}) \geq E_{\theta}(P_{X}^{n}, Q_{Y}).$ That is, the approximation errors for non-universal simulation problems are not larger than those for universal simulation problems.

In general, simulating a continuous random variable is more difficult than simulating a discontinuous one, as stated in the following lemma. Hence in this paper, sometimes we only provide upper bounds on the approximation errors for simulating continuous random variables. It should be understood that those upper bounds are also upper bounds for simulating any other random variables (e.g., discrete random variables). Furthermore, to make our results easier to follow, we summarize them in Fig. 2.

**Lemma 1.** Assume $Q_{Y}$ and $Q_{Z}$ are two distributions defined on $(\mathbb{R}, B_{\mathbb{R}}),$ and moreover, $Q_{Y}$ is continuous. Then the approximation errors for non-universal and universal simulations satisfy

$$E_{\theta}(P_{X}^{n}, Q_{Z}) \leq E_{\theta}(P_{X}^{n}, Q_{Y}),$$

$$E_{\theta}(P_{X}^{n}, Q_{Z}) \geq E_{\theta}(P_{X}^{n}, Q_{Y}),$$

for any $P_{X}^{n}$ and $P_{X}^{n},$ where $\theta \in \{ KS, TV \}.$

---

3Throughout this paper, for two positive sequences $f(n), g(n),$ we write $f(n) \leq g(n)$ or $g(n) \geq f(n)$ if $\limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{f(n)}{g(n)} \leq 0.$ In addition, $f(n) \equiv g(n)$ if and only if $f(n) \leq g(n)$ and $f(n) \geq g(n).$

4For two positive sequences $f(n), g(n),$ we write $f(n) = \Omega(g(n))$ (resp. $f(n) = \omega(g(n))$) if $\liminf_{n \to \infty} \frac{f(n)}{g(n)} > 0$ (resp. $\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{f(n)}{g(n)} = \infty$).
### Simulating a Random Variable from a Stationary Memoryless Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$(P_X, Q_Y)$</th>
<th>Non-universal Simulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(continuous, arbitrary)</td>
<td>$E_\theta(P_X, Q_Y) = 0$ for $\theta \in {\text{KS}, \text{TV}}$ (Prop. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(discontinuous, arbitrary)</td>
<td>$E_{KS}(P^n_X, Q_Y) \leq \frac{1}{2} (\max_x P_X(x))^m$ (Cor. 1 &amp; Lem. 1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Special Case 1:** (discontinuous, continuous)

$E_{KS}(P^n_X, Q_Y) = \frac{1}{2} (\max_x P_X(x))^m$ (Cor. 1)

**Special Case 2:** (discrete with finite alphabet, discrete with finite alphabet)

$E_{KS}(P^n_X, Q_Y) \leq (\min_x P_X(x))^n$ (Prop. 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$(P_X, Q_Y)$</th>
<th>Universal Simulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(absolutely continuous, arbitrary)</td>
<td>$E_\theta(P_X, Q_Y) = 0$ for $\theta \in {\text{KS}, \text{TV}}$ (Thm. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(discontinuous, arbitrary)</td>
<td>$E_{KS}(P^{(n)}_X, Q_Y) \leq (\max_x P_X(x))^n$ (Cor. 2 &amp; Lem. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Case:</strong> (discontinuous, continuous)</td>
<td>$E_{KS}(P^{(n)}_X, Q_Y) \sim (\max_x P_X(x))^n$ (Cor. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(continuous but not absolutely continuous, arbitrary)</td>
<td>$E_{KS}(P^{(n)}_X, Q_Y) \sim e^{-\omega(n)}$ (Cor. 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Case:</strong> $(P_X$ is Hölder continuous with exponent $\alpha$ where $0 &lt; \alpha \leq 1$, arbitrary)</td>
<td>$E_{KS}(P^{(n)}_X, Q_Y) \sim e^{-\alpha n \log n}$ (Cor. 3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Simulating a Random Variable from a Markov Process with Order $k$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$(P_X^n, Q_Y)$</th>
<th>Non-universal Simulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a Markov chain of order $k$ with finite state space $X$ and initial state $x_{-k+1}$, arbitrary)</td>
<td>$E_{KS}(P_X^n, Q_Y) \leq e^{-nH_\infty(x_{-k+1}, P_{X_{k+1}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Special Case:** (a Markov chain of order $k$ with finite state space $X$ and initial state $x_{-k+1}$, continuous)

$E_{KS}(P_X^n, Q_Y) \sim e^{-nH_\infty(x_{-k+1}, P_{X_{k+1}|X_k})}$ (Cor. 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$(P_X^n, Q_Y)$</th>
<th>Universal Simulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a Markov chain of order $k$ with finite state space $X$ and initial state $x_{0_{k+1}}$, arbitrary)</td>
<td>$E_{KS}(P^{(n)}<em>{X</em>{k+1}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Special Case:** (a Markov chain of order $k$ with finite state space $X$ and initial state $x_{0_{k+1}}$, continuous)

$E_{KS}(P^{(n)}_{X_{k+1}|X_k}, Q_Y) \sim e^{-nH_\infty(x_{0_{k+1}}, P_{X_{k+1}|X_k})}$ (Thm. 3)

### Simulating a Random Element from another Random Element

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$(P_X, Q_Y)$</th>
<th>Non-universal Simulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(continuous, arbitrary)</td>
<td>$E_{TV}(P_X, Q_Y) = 0$ (Thm. 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Case:</strong> (continuous random variable, arbitrary random vector)</td>
<td>$E_\theta(P_X, Q_Y) = 0$ for $\theta \in {\text{KS, TV}}$ (Cor. 5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$(P_X, Q_Y)$</th>
<th>Universal Simulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(absolutely continuous respect to a continuous distribution, arbitrary)</td>
<td>$E_{TV}(P_X, Q_Y) \sim 0$ (Thm. 5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Special Case:** (absolutely continuous random variable, arbitrary random vector)

$E_\theta(P_X, Q_Y) \sim 0$ for $\theta \in \{\text{KS, TV}\}$ (Cor. 6)

Fig. 2: Summary of our results. Here $P_X$ and $Q_Y$ denote the classes that $P_X$ and $Q_Y$ respectively belong to.
Proof: Proposition 1 (which is given in the next section) states that there exists a non-decreasing mapping
$z = g(y) : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ such that $Z = g(Y) \sim Q_Z$ where $Y \sim Q_Y$. Observe that for any $P_Z$,
\[
|P_Z - Q_Z|_{KS} = \sup_{A \in I} |P_Z(A) - Q_Z(A)| \tag{9}
\]
\[
= \sup_{A \in I} \left| P_Y(g^{-1}(A)) - Q_Y(g^{-1}(A)) \right| \tag{10}
\]
\[
\leq \sup_{B \in I} |P_Y(B) - Q_Y(B)| \tag{11}
\]
\[
= |P_Y - Q_Y|_{KS}, \tag{12}
\]
where $I := \{(-\infty, y) : y \in \mathbb{R}\}$. Hence (7) and (8) hold for $\theta = KS$. By similar steps but with $I$ replaced by $B_{\mathbb{R}}$, we can easily obtain that (7) and (8) also hold for $\theta = TV$. □

II. NON-UNIVERSAL SIMULATION FROM A STATIONARY MEMORYLESS PROCESS

In this section, we consider non-universal simulation of a real-valued random variable. If the seed distribution
$P_X$ is continuous and the target distribution $Q_Y$ is arbitrary, then we can simulate a random variable $Y$ that exactly (a.e.) follows the distribution $Q_Y$. The proof of Proposition 1 is provided in Appendix A.

**Proposition 1.** For a continuous distribution $P_X$ and an arbitrary distribution $Q_Y$, using the inverse transform sampling function $y = G_Y^{-1}(F_X(x))$, we obtain $P_Y = Q_Y$ a.e., where $G_Y^{-1}(t) := \min \{y : G_Y(y) \geq t\}$ denotes the quantile function (generalized inverse distribution function) of $G_Y$. That is, $E_\theta(P_X, Q_Y) = 0$ for $\theta \in \{KS, TV\}$.

Next we consider the case $P_X$ is discontinuous. For this case, exact simulation cannot be obtained.

**Proposition 2.** Assume $P_X$ is discontinuous and $Q_Y$ is continuous. Then for the non-universal $(P_X, Q_Y)$-simulation problem,\[^6\] $E_{KS}(P_X, Q_Y) = \frac{1}{2} \max_x P_X(x)$.

Proof: Denote $A$ as the set of discontinuity points of $F_X$. Then for each $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus A$, map $x$ to $G_Y^{-1}(F_X(x))$. For each $x \in A$, map $x$ to $G_Y^{-1}(\lim_{\hat{x} \uparrow x} F_X(\hat{x})) + \frac{1}{2} P_X(x)$. For such mapping, we have $|P_Y - Q_Y|_{KS} = \frac{1}{2} \max_x P_X(x)$. Furthermore, the converse is obvious.

Applying Proposition 2 to the vector case, we get the following corollary.

**Corollary 1.** Assume $P_X$ is discontinuous and $Q_Y$ is continuous. Then for the non-universal $(P_X^n, Q_Y)$-simulation problem, $E_{KS}(P_X^n, Q_Y) = \frac{1}{2} (\max_x P_X(x))^n$.

The result above shows that if the seed and target distributions are respectively discontinuous and continuous, then the optimal approximation error vanishes exponentially fast. We next show that if the seed and target distributions are both discrete, the optimal approximation error vanishes faster. The proof of Proposition 3 is provided in Appendix B.

**Proposition 3.** Assume both $P_X$ and $Q_Y$ are discrete with finite alphabets $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ respectively. Then for the non-universal $(P_X^n, Q_Y)$-simulation problem, $E_{KS}(P_X^n, Q_Y) \leq (\min_x P_X(x))^n$.

Remark 1. More specifically, we can prove that for $n \geq |\mathcal{Y}| \max_{1 \leq i \leq |\mathcal{X}| - 1} \frac{P_X(x_i)}{P_X(x_{i+1})}$,
\[
E_{KS}(P_X^n, Q_Y) \leq \frac{1}{2} P_X(x_{|\mathcal{X}| - 1}) \left( P_X(x_{|\mathcal{X}|}) \right)^{n-1}, \tag{13}
\]
where $x_1, x_2, ..., x_{|\mathcal{X}|}$ is a resulting sequence after sorting the elements in $\mathcal{X}$ such that $P_X(x_1) \geq P_X(x_2) \geq ... \geq P_X(x_{|\mathcal{X}|})$.

III. UNIVERSAL SIMULATION FROM A STATIONARY MEMORYLESS PROCESS

In this section, we consider universal simulation of a real-valued random variable. For universal simulation, we divide the seed distributions into three kinds: absolutely continuous, discontinuous, as well as continuous but not absolutely continuous distributions.

[^6]: Here the minimum exists since CDFs are right-continuous.

[^6]: For simplicity, we denote $P_X \{x\}$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$ as $P_X(x)$. Hence for a discrete random variable $X$, $P_X(x)$ is the probability mass function of $X$.  

6
A. Absolutely continuous seed distributions

We first consider absolutely continuous seed distribution, and show an impossibility result for this case.

**Proposition 4.** There is no simulator (measurable function) \( Y = f(X) : (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}_\mathbb{R}) \mapsto (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}_\mathbb{R}) \) such that \( P_Y = Q_Y \) a.e. for any absolutely continuous \( P_X \).

**Proof:** Suppose that there exists a measurable function \( f : (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}_\mathbb{R}) \mapsto (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}_\mathbb{R}) \) such that \( P_Y = Q_Y \) a.e. for any absolutely continuous \( P_X \).

Case 1: Suppose that there exists a set \( A \in \mathcal{B}_\mathbb{R} \) such that \( f^{-1}(A) \) has positive Lebesgue measure. Then \( P_Y(A) = P_X(f^{-1}(A)) \). For two absolutely continuous measures \( P_X \) and \( \tilde{P}_X \) such that \( P_X(f^{-1}(A)) \neq \tilde{P}_X(f^{-1}(A)) \), then \( P_Y(A) \neq \tilde{P}_Y(A) \), where \( \tilde{P}_Y \) is the distribution induced by \( \tilde{P}_X \) through the mapping \( f \). This implies that \( P_Y(A) \neq Q_Y(A) \) or \( \tilde{P}_Y(A) \neq Q_Y(A) \). This contradicts with the assumption that \( P_Y = Q_Y \) a.e. for any absolutely continuous \( P_X \).

Case 2: Suppose that \( f^{-1}(A) \) has zero Lebesgue measure for all \( A \in \mathcal{B}_\mathbb{R} \). Then for any absolutely continuous \( P_X \), we have \( P_Y(A) = P_X(f^{-1}(A)) = 0 \) for all \( A \in \mathcal{B}_\mathbb{R} \). However for any measure \( Q_Y \), there exists an \( A \in \mathcal{B}_\mathbb{R} \) such that \( Q_Y(A) > 0 \). This contradicts with the assumption that \( P_Y = Q_Y \) a.e.

Combining the two cases above, we have Proposition 4. \( \blacksquare \)

The theorem above implies that for any simulator \( f : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R} \), we always have \( |P_Y - Q_Y|_{TV} > 0 \) for some absolutely continuous \( P_X \). However, we can prove that there exists a sequence of simulators that make the TV-approximation error \( |P_Y - Q_Y|_{TV} \) arbitrarily close to zero for any absolutely continuous \( P_X \).

**Theorem 1.** Assume \( \mathcal{P}_X = \mathcal{P}_{ac} \) and \( Q_Y \) is arbitrary. Then for the universal \( (\mathcal{P}_X, Q_Y) \)-simulation problem, \( \mathcal{E}_\theta(\mathcal{P}_X, Q_Y) = 0 \) for \( \theta \in \{KS, TV\} \).

This result is rather surprising and counter-intuitive. If \( f \) is a differentiable bijective function, then the input distribution is determined by \( f \) and the output distribution, since \( p_X(x) = p_Y(f(x))f'(x) \), where \( p_X \) and \( p_Y \) are respectively the PDFs (Radon–Nikodym derivatives respect to the Lebesgue measure) of \( P_X \) and \( P_Y \). Hence given \( f \) and the output distribution, the input distribution is unique. However, in our case, we consider a sequence of non-bijective mappings \( f_n \). Hence given \( f_n \) and the output distribution, the input distribution is not unique. The essence of our proof of this theorem is that any PDF \( p_X \) can be approximated within any level of approximation error by a sequence of step functions, and on the other hand, such step functions can be used to simulate any distribution in a universal way. Hence \( P_X \) can be used to simulate any distribution within any level of approximation error.

**Proof:** We first restrict our attention to the case that \( Q_Y \) is absolutely continuous. Let \( p_X, p_Y, \) and \( q_Y \) be the PDFs of \( P_X, P_Y, \) and \( Q_Y \) respectively.

**Universal Mapping:** Partition the real line into intervals with the same length \( \Delta \), i.e., \( \bigcup_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} (i\Delta, (i + 1)\Delta] \). We first simulate a uniform distribution on \( [a, b] \) by mapping each interval \( (i\Delta, (i + 1)\Delta] \) into \( [a, b] \) using the linear function \( x \mapsto a + \frac{b-a}{\Delta}(x-i\Delta) \). We then transform the output distribution to the target distribution \( Q_Y \), by using function \( x \mapsto G_Y^{-1} \left( \frac{x-a}{b-a} \right), \) where \( G_Y^{-1}(t) := \min \{ y : G_Y(y) \geq t \} \). Therefore, each \( x \in (i\Delta, (i + 1)\Delta] \) is mapped to \( G_Y^{-1} \left( \frac{x-a}{b-a} \right), \Delta(x-i\Delta) \). Hence the final mapping is

\[
 f(x) := \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} G_Y^{-1} \left( \frac{x-a}{b-a} \right) 1 \{ x \in (i\Delta, (i + 1)\Delta] \},
\]

which is shown in Fig. 3.

The conditional PDF induced by this cascaded mapping is

\[
 p_{\Delta}(y|x) = \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta \left( y - G_Y^{-1} \left( \frac{x-a}{b-a} \right) \right) 1 \{ x \in (i\Delta, (i + 1)\Delta] \}.
\]

Then the PDF of the output of this mapping is

\[
 p_{\Delta}(y) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} p(x)p_{\Delta}(y|x)dx.
\]

\footnote{All integrals in this paper refer to the Lebesgue-integral.}
Fig. 3: Illustration of the universal mapping.

Since \( \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{b}^{a} |\delta(y - G_Y^{-1}\left(\frac{x-a}{b-a}\right))| \, dx \, dy = b - a \) is finite, by Lemma 3 with \( f(x) \leftarrow p(x) \) and \( g(x, y) \leftarrow \delta(y - G_Y^{-1}\left(\frac{x-a}{b-a}\right)) \), we have

\[
\lim_{\Delta \to 0} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left| p_\Delta(y) - \frac{1}{b-a} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} p(x) \, dx \int_{a}^{b} \delta(y - G_Y^{-1}\left(\frac{x-a}{b-a}\right)) \, dx \right| \, dy = 0. \tag{17}
\]

On the other hand,

\[
\frac{1}{b-a} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} p(x) \, dx \int_{a}^{b} \delta(y - G_Y^{-1}\left(\frac{x-a}{b-a}\right)) \, dx
= \frac{1}{b-a} \int_{a}^{b} \delta(y - G_Y^{-1}\left(\frac{x-a}{b-a}\right)) \, dx
= \int_{0}^{1} \delta(y - G_Y^{-1}(t)) \, dt
= q_Y(y). \tag{19}
\]

Therefore,

\[
\lim_{\Delta \to 0} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |p_\Delta(y) - q_Y(y)| \, dy = 0. \tag{21}
\]

If \( Q_Y \) is not absolutely continuous, we can first simulate an absolutely continuous random variable \( Z \) with distribution \( Q_Z \) and then use it to simulate \( Y \sim Q_Y \). As stated in Lemma 1, this will result in a smaller TV-approximation error for \((P_X, Q_Y)\)-simulation problem than that for \((P_X, Q_Z)\)-simulation problem. Hence the TV-approximation error for this case also approaches to zero as \( \Delta \to 0 \).

For the universal mapping proposed in the proof of Theorem 1, the induced approximation error \( |P_\Delta - Q_Y|_{TV} \) depends on the interval length \( \Delta \), and converges to zero as \( \Delta \to 0 \). We next investigate how fast the approximation error converges to zero as \( \Delta \to 0 \).

**Proposition 5** (Convergence Rate as \( \Delta \to 0 \)). Assume \( P_X \) is an absolutely continuous distribution with an a.e. continuously differentiable PDF \( p_X \) such that \( |p_X(x)| \) is bounded, and \( Q_Y \) is an arbitrary distribution. Then the TV-approximation error induced by the universal mapping \( x \mapsto \sum_{i=\infty}^{\infty} G_Y^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{\Delta}(x-i\Delta)\right) 1 \{ x \in (i\Delta,(i+1)\Delta]\} \) satisfies \( \limsup_{\Delta \to 0} \frac{1}{\Delta} |P_\Delta - Q_Y|_{TV} \leq \int |p_X'(x)| \, dx \), where \( P_\Delta \) denotes the distribution of the output \( Y \).
By Taylor’s theorem, we have

\[ p_{\Delta} = p_X(x) = p_X(x) + p'_X(x,\Delta)(x-x_i) \text{ for some } x_i, \Delta \in (i\Delta, (i+1)\Delta]. \]

Therefore, from Remark 4, we have

\[
\frac{1}{\Delta} |P_\Delta - Q_Y|_{TV} \leq \frac{1}{\Delta} \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{i\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} \left| p_X(x) - \frac{1}{\Delta} \int_{i\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} p_X(x) dx \right| dx 
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{\Delta} \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{i\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} |p_X(x_i) + p'_X(x_i,\Delta)(x-x_i) - p_X(x_i)| dx 
\]

\[
\leq \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} |p'_X(x_i,\Delta)|. 
\]

Since \( |p'_X(x)| \) is continuous a.e. and bounded, \( |p'_X(x)| \) is Riemann-integrable on every interval \([a, b]\) with \( a < b \). Then

\[
\limsup_{\Delta \to 0} \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} |p'_X(x_i,\Delta)| \Delta = \text{Riemann-} \int |p'_X(x)| dx, 
\]

where Riemann-\( \int \) denotes the Riemann-integral. Furthermore, for any non-negative Riemann-integrable function, its Riemann-integral and Lebesgue-integral are the same. That is

\[
\text{Riemann-} \int |p'_X(x)| dx = \int |p'_X(x)| dx. 
\]

Therefore, \( \limsup_{\Delta \to 0} \frac{1}{\Delta} |P_\Delta - Q_Y|_{TV} \leq \int |p'_X(x)| dx. \) \hfill \qed

Proposition 5 implies that if the total variation \( \int |p'_X(x)| dx \) of \( p_X \) is finite, then the approximation error \( |P_\Delta - Q_Y|_{TV} \) converges to zero at least linearly fast as \( \Delta \to 0 \). If \( \int |p'_X(x)| dx \) is infinity, then it is not easy to obtain a general bound \( |P_\Delta - Q_Y|_{TV} \). However, for some special cases, e.g., \( p_X = -\log x, x \in (0, 1] \) or \( p_X = (1-r)x^{-r}, x \in (0, 1], r \in (0, 1) \), we provide upper bounds as follows.

**Example 1** (Convergence Rate as \( \Delta \to 0 \) for \( \int |p'_X(x)| dx = \infty \)). \[15\] For the PDF \( p_X(x) = -\log x, x \in (0, 1] \), \( |P_\Delta - Q_Y|_{TV} \leq \frac{2}{\Delta} \ln 2 + \frac{1}{\Delta}. \) For the PDF \( p_X(x) = (1-r)x^{-r}, x \in (0, 1], r \in (0, 1) \), \( |P_\Delta - Q_Y|_{TV} \leq C\Delta^{-r} \) for some constant \( C \).

Universal simulations in Theorem 1 for the uniform distribution on \([0, 1]\) for different \( P_X \) are illustrated in Fig. 4. For Gaussian and exponential distributions, the total variations of their PDFs are finite. Hence the approximation errors for these two distributions decay linearly in \( \Delta \). For logarithmic and polynomial-like distributions, the total variations of their PDFs are infinite. As stated in Proposition 1, the approximation errors for these two distributions decay respectively in order of \( \Delta \ln \frac{1}{\Delta} \) and \( \Delta^{1-r} \).

**B. Discontinuous seed distributions**

Next we consider the case \( P_X \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{dc} \). Assume \( \{\Delta_n\} \) is a sequence of non-increasing positive numbers. Assume \( \{P_{X_n}\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \) is a sequence of distribution sets such that for every \( P_{X_n} \in \mathcal{P}_{X_n} \), its CDF \( F_{X_n} \) satisfies

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \sup_{x_1:F_{X_n}(x_1+\Delta_n) > F_{X_n}(x_1)} \sup_{x \in (x_1,x_1+\Delta_n]} |F_{X_n}(x_1+x) - F_{X_n}(x_1) - \frac{x}{\Delta_n}| = 0. 
\]

We obtain a discontinuous version of Theorem 1. The proof of Proposition 6 is provided in Appendix C.

**Proposition 6.** There exists a sequence of universal mappings \( Y_n = f_n(X_n) \) (which are dependent on \( \{\Delta_n\} \)) such that \( \lim_{n \to \infty} |P_{Y_n} - Q_Y|_{KS} = 0 \). That is, \( \lim_{n \to \infty} \mathcal{E}_{KS}(P_{X_n}, Q_Y) = 0 \).

The proposition above implies that if the seed random variable \( X_n \) gets more and more smooth as \( n \to \infty \) in the sense that it can be approximated by a linear function for every small interval \((x_1,x_1+\Delta_n]\) as (27), then we can find a sequence of universal mappings that achieve vanishing KS-approximation error. Here is a simple example.
Given a Borel subset $X$, it is uniformly distributed over the type class $|P^*_X|$. It has been shown that same type $T$ is denoted by $\{x^*\}$, where the indicator function $1\{A\}$ equals 1 if the clause $A$ is true and 0 otherwise. For a type $T_X$, the type class (set of sequences having the same type $T_X$) is denoted by $T_X$. The set of types of sequences in $X^n$ is denoted as $\mathcal{P}_n(X) := \{T_{x^n} : x^n \in X^n\}$. It has been shown that $|\mathcal{P}_n(X)| \leq (n+1)^{|X|}$ in [16].

For any i.i.d. $X^n$, all sequences in a type class have a equal probability. That is, under the condition $X^n \in T_{X^n}$, it is uniformly distributed over the type class $T_{X^n}$, regardless of $P_X$. Now we construct a mapping $f$ that maps the uniform random vector on $T_{X^n}$ to a random variable such that $\sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} |F_Y(y|T_X) - G_Y(y)|$ is minimized. Here $F_Y(y|T_X)$ denotes the CDF of the output random variable for the type $T_X$. Since the probability values of uniform random vectors are all equal to $|T_{X^n}|^{-1}$, $\sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} |F_Y(y|T_X) - G_Y(y)| = \frac{1}{2} |T_{X^n}|^{-1}$. Therefore, the output distribution induced by $f$ is

$$F_Y(y) = \sum_{T_X} \sum_{x^n \in T_{X^n}} P^n_X(x^n) 1\{f(x^n) \leq y\}$$

(28)

$$= \sum_{T_X} P^n_X(T_{X^n}) \sum_{x^n \in T_{X^n}} \frac{P^n_X(x^n)}{|T_{X^n}|} 1\{f(x^n) \leq y\}$$

(29)

$$= \sum_{T_X} P^n_X(T_{X^n}) \sum_{x^n \in T_{X^n}} \frac{1}{|T_{X^n}|} 1\{f(x^n) \leq y\}$$

(30)

$$= \sum_{T_X} P^n_X(T_{X^n}) F_Y(y|T_X)$$

(31)
\[
\begin{align*}
&= \sum_{T_x} P_X^k(T_{T_x}) \left( G_Y(y) + \left[ -\frac{1}{2} |T_{T_x}|^{-1}, \frac{1}{2} |T_{T_x}|^{-1} \right] \right) \\
&= G_Y(y) + \sum_{T_x} P_X^k(T_{T_x}) \left[ -\frac{1}{2} |T_{T_x}|^{-1}, \frac{1}{2} |T_{T_x}|^{-1} \right].
\end{align*}
\]

Using this equation we obtain
\[
|F_Y(y) - G_Y(y)| \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{T_x} P_X^k(T_{T_x}) |T_{T_x}|^{-1}
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{T_x} e^n \sum_{x} T_X(x) \log P_X(x)
\]
\[
\leq \frac{1}{2} (n+1)|X| \max_{x} e^n \sum_{x} T_X(x) \log P_X(x)
\]
\[
\leq \frac{1}{2} e^n (\log \max_{x} P_X(x) + |X| \log (n+1))
\]
\[
= e^n \log \max_{x} P_X(x)
\]
\[
= \left( \max_{x} P_X(x) \right)^n
\]

We next consider the case in which \(X\) is countably infinite. For brevity, we assume \(X = \mathbb{Z}\). We partition \(\mathbb{Z}\) into \(2k + 1\) intervals\(^8\) \(U_k = [-\infty, -k], U_{k-1} = (-k, -k+1], \ldots, U_{k-1} = (-k, k-1), U_k = [k, \infty]\). Denote 
\[
Z_k = f_{1,k}(X) \in \mathbb{Z} := [-k : k]
\]
as the index that \(X \in U_{Z_k}\). Hence \(P_{Z_k}\) is defined on the finite set \(\mathbb{Z}\). Now we use \(Z_k\) to simulate \(Y \sim Q_Y\). By the derivation above, we have that there exists a universal mapping \(Y_k = f_{2,k}(Z_k) : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}\) such that \(|P_{Y_k} - Q_Y|_{KS} \leq (\max_{x} P_{Z_k}(x))^{n}\). Furthermore, as \(k \rightarrow \infty\), \(\max_{x} P_{Z_k}(z) \rightarrow \max_x P_X(x)\). Therefore, the universal mappings \(f_{2,k} \circ f_{1,k}, k \in \mathbb{Z}\) satisfy \(\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |P_{Y_k} - Q_Y|_{KS} \leq (\max_{x} P_X(x))^{n}\).

The converse part follows from Theorem 3, since even non-universal simulation cannot make the approximation error decay faster than \((\max_{x} P_X(x))^{n}\), hence universal simulation cannot as well.

Now we consider a discontinuous \(P_X\). We partition the real line into intervals \(U_k := ((k-1)\Delta, k\Delta], k \in \mathbb{Z}\) with \(\Delta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\). Denote \(Z_k = f_{1,k}(X) \in \mathbb{Z}\) as the index that \(X \in U_{Z_k}\). Hence \(P_{Z_k}\) is defined on the finite set \(\mathbb{Z}\). Now we use \(Z_k\) to simulate \(Y \sim Q_Y\). By Theorem 2, we have that there exists a universal mapping \(Y_k = f_{2,k}(Z_k) : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}\) such that \(|P_{Y_k} - Q_Y|_{KS} \leq (\max_{x} P_{Z_k}(z))^{n}\). Furthermore, as \(k \rightarrow \infty\), we have \(\max_{x} P_{Z_k}(z) \rightarrow \max_{x} P_X(x)\). Therefore, the universal mappings \(f_{2,k} \circ f_{1,k}, k \in \mathbb{Z}\) satisfy \(\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |P_{Y_k} - Q_Y|_{KS} \leq (\max_{x} P_X(x))^{n}\). Therefore, we have the following result.

**Corollary 2.** Assume \(P_X = P_{de}\) and \(Q_Y\) is continuous. Then for the universal \((P_X^{(n)}, Q_Y)\)-simulation problem, \(\mathcal{E}_{KS}(P_X^{(n)}, Q_Y) \approx (\max_{x} P_X(x))^{n}\).

**C. Continuous but not absolutely continuous seed distributions**

Next we consider continuous but not absolutely continuous \(P_X\). For this case, we have \(\max_{x} P_X(x) = 0\). Hence the approximation error decays sup-exponentially fast. To provide a better bound, we assume \(F_X\) is H"older continuous with exponent \(\alpha\), where \(0 < \alpha \leq 1\). That is, \(L = \sup_{x \neq x'} |F_X(x) - F_X(x')| (x \rightarrow x')\) is finite. Consider the following mapping. We partition the real line into \(2k + 2\) intervals \(U_{-k} := (-\infty, -k\Delta], U_{-(k-1)} := (-k\Delta, -(k-1)\Delta], \ldots, U_{k} := ((k-1)\Delta, k\Delta], U_{k+1} := (k\Delta, \infty]\). Denote \(Z = f_1(X) \in \mathbb{Z} := [-k : k + 1]\) as the index that \(X \in U_{Z}\). Now we use \(Z\) to simulate \(Y \sim Q_Y\). By the derivation till (37), we have that there exists a universal mapping \(Y = f_2(Z) : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}\) such that \(|P_{Y_n} - Q_Y|_{KS} \leq \frac{1}{2} e^{n(\log \max_{x} P_{Z}(z) + (2k+2)|\log n|)}\). Set \(\Delta = \frac{\log n}{n}\). Then \(\Delta \rightarrow 0\) and \(\Delta = \sqrt{\log n}\) to \(\rightarrow \infty\). Since \(F_X\) is H"older continuous with exponent \(\alpha\), we have \(\max_{x} P_{Z}(z) \leq \max_{x} \{F_X(x + \Delta) - F_X(x)\} \leq L\Delta^{\alpha}\). Hence the universal mapping \(Y_n = f_2 \circ f_1(X^n)\) satisfies \(|P_{Y_n} - Q_Y|_{KS} = e^{-\alpha \Omega(n \log n)}\). Therefore, we have the following result.

\(^8\)Sometimes, we use \([a : b]\) to denote \(Z \cap [a, b]\).
Corollary 3. Assume $\mathcal{P}_X = \mathcal{P}_Y |_{a,c}$ and $Q_Y$ is arbitrary. Then for the universal $(\mathcal{P}_X^{(n)}, Q_Y)$-simulation problem, $E_{KS}(\mathcal{P}_X^{(n)}, Q_Y) \gg e^{-\omega(n)}$. That is, there exists a sequence of simulators such that $|P_{Y(n)} - Q_Y|_{KS}$ decays super-exponentially fast as $n \to \infty$ for any $P_X$. Moreover, if $P_X = \{P_X : F_X$ is Hölder continuous with exponent $\alpha\}$ with $0 < \alpha \leq 1$, then $E_{KS}(\mathcal{P}_X^{(n)}, Q_Y) \ll e^{-\alpha O(n \log n)}$.

IV. SIMULATING A RANDOM VARIABLE FROM A MARKOV PROCESS

In the preceding sections, we consider simulation of a random variable from a stationary memoryless process. Next we extend Theorem 2 to Markov processes of order $k \geq 1$.

Definition 5. Given a Markov chain $X = \{X_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ of order $k \geq 1$ with finite state space $\mathcal{X} = \{1, 2, ..., |\mathcal{X}|\}$, initial state $x_{-k+1}^0 := (x_{-k+1}, x_{-k+2}, ..., x_0)$, and transition probability $P_{X_{k+1}|X^k}$, the min-entropy ($\infty$-order Rényi entropy) rate of $X$ is defined as

$$H_\infty(X) = - \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \max_{x^n} \log P(x^n).$$

(40)

Since the distribution of $X^n$ is determined by the initial state $x_{-k+1}^0$ and transition probability $P_{X_{k+1}|X^k}$, hence $H_\infty(X)$ is also denoted as $H_\infty(x_{-k+1}^0, P_{X_{k+1}|X^k})$.

Given a state space $\mathcal{X}$ of any Markov chain $\{X_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ of order $k = 1$ with transition probability $P_{X_{k+1}|X^k}$, a loop is a sequence of distinct states of the chain $(i_1, i_2, ..., i_l)$ with $l \geq 1$ such that $P_{x_i, x_{i+1}} > 0$ for $s = 1, 2, ..., l$ where $i_{l+1} = i_1$. (If $P_{i,i} > 0$, then $(i)$ is a loop.) The set of all loops of length $l$ is denoted by $\mathcal{C}(P)$.

Let $P$ be the transition matrix of an ergodic Markov chain of order $k = 1$ on a finite alphabet $\mathcal{X}$. The min-entropy rate of this Markov chain is given by [17]

$$H_\infty(P) = \min_{1 \leq l \leq |\mathcal{X}|} \min_{1 \leq s \leq |\mathcal{X}|} \frac{1}{l} \sum_{i=1}^{l} \log \frac{1}{P_{x_i|X_i}}.$$

(41)

where the inner minimum is taken over all loops $(i_1, i_2, ..., i_l) \in \mathcal{C}(P)$, and $P_{X_{i+1}|X_i}(j|i) := \log \frac{1}{P_{ij}}$.

A. Non-universal Simulation from a Markov Process

As a direct consequence of Proposition 1, we can obtain the approximation error for non-universal simulation from a Markov process.

Corollary 4. Assume $X = \{X_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a Markov chain of order $k$ with finite state space $\mathcal{X}$, initial state $x_{-k+1}^0$, and transition probability $P_{X_{k+1}|X^k}$, and $Q_Y$ is a continuous distribution. Then for the non-universal $(\mathcal{P}_X^n, Q_Y)$-simulation problem, $E_{KS}(\mathcal{P}_X^n, Q_Y) \leq e^{-n H_{\infty}(x_{-k+1}^0, P_{X_{k+1}|X^k})}$.

B. Universal Simulation from a Markov Process

Given a finite state space $\mathcal{X}$, a order $k \geq 1$, and an initial state $x_{-k+1}^0$, we denote the set of all possible distributions of Markov chains with these parameters as $\mathcal{P}_X^{(n)}$, and transition probability $P_{X_{k+1}|X^k}$. Then for the universal $(\mathcal{P}_X^{(n)}, Q_Y)$-simulation problem, we have $E_{KS}(\mathcal{P}_X^{(n)}, Q_Y) \leq e^{-n H_{\infty}(x_{-k+1}^0, P_{X_{k+1}|X^k})}$.

The existence of the limit is guaranteed by Fekete’s subadditive lemma.

10Here the definition of $\approx$ is analogous to that for stationary memoryless processes.
V. SIMULATING A RANDOM ELEMENT FROM ANOTHER RANDOM ELEMENT

A. Non-universal Simulation

Next we show that an arbitrary continuous random element (or general random variable) is sufficient to simulate another arbitrary random element. Here random elements is a generalization of random variable, which may be defined on any non-empty Borel set in a separable metric space.

Theorem 4. Assume $P_X$ and $Q_Y$ are two distributions respectively defined on any non-empty Borel sets $(X, B_X)$ and $(Y, B_Y)$ in two separable metric spaces. If $P_X$ is continuous, then there exists a measurable mapping $Y = f(X)$ such that $P_Y = Q_Y$ a.e. That is, $\mathcal{E}_{TV}(P_X, Q_Y) = 0$.

Proof: For any two separable metric spaces which are Borel subsets of their completions, they are Borel-isomorphic if and only if they have the same cardinality, which moreover is either finite, countable, or $\aleph$ (the cardinal of the continuum, that is, of $[0,1]$) [14]. Hence for any measurable space $(X, B_X)$, we can always find a Borel subset $(\mathcal{W}, B_{\mathcal{W}})$ of $([0,1], B_{[0,1]})$ such that $(X, B_X)$ and $(\mathcal{W}, B_{\mathcal{W}})$ are Borel-isomorphic. Suppose $\varphi$ is a Borel isomorphism from $(X, B_X)$ to $(\mathcal{W}, B_{\mathcal{W}})$. Denote $P_W$ as the distribution of $W := g(X)$ with $X \sim P_X$. Since $P_X$ is continuous (or atomless), $P_W$ must be continuous as well. This is because $P_X(\varphi^{-1}(w)) = P_W(w) > 0$ for some $w \in [0,1]$. This contradicts with the continuity of $P_X$. Hence $P_W$ is continuous. Furthermore, the existence of the Borel isomorphism can be shown by [18, Theorem 9.2.2] as well.

Similarly, for any measurable space $(Y, B_Y)$, we can always find a Borel subset $(\mathcal{Z}, B_Z)$ of $(\mathbb{R}, B_{\mathbb{R}})$ such that $(Y, B_Y)$ and $(\mathcal{Z}, B_Z)$ are Borel-isomorphic. Suppose $\psi$ is a Borel isomorphism from $(Y, B_Y)$ to $(\mathcal{Z}, B_Z)$. Denote $Q_Z$ as the distribution of $Z := \psi(Y)$ with $Y \sim Q_Y$.

By Proposition 1, we know that there exists a measurable mapping $\eta$ such that $Z := \eta(W) \sim Q_Z$ with $W \sim P_W$. Now consider the mapping $Y = \psi^{-1} \circ \eta \circ \varphi(X)$. Obviously, $Y = \psi^{-1}(Z) \sim Q_Y$.

Note that random vectors defined on $(\mathbb{R}^n, B_{\mathbb{R}^n}), n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ are special cases of such random elements. Hence we have the following corollary.

Corollary 5. For a continuous $P_X$ defined on $(\mathbb{R}, B_{\mathbb{R}})$ and an arbitrary $Q_{Y^n}$ defined on $(\mathbb{R}^n, B_{\mathbb{R}^n}), n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, there exists a measurable mapping $Y^n = f(X) : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $P_{Y^n} = Q_{Y^n}$ a.e.

B. Universal Simulation

Now we generalize Theorem 1 to simulating random elements.

Theorem 5. Assume $R_X$ and $Q_Y$ are two distributions respectively defined on any non-empty Borel sets $(X, B_X)$ and $(Y, B_Y)$ in two separable metric spaces, and moreover, $R_X$ is continuous. $\mathcal{P}(R_X)$ denotes the set of all absolutely continuous distributions (defined on $(X, B_X)$) respect to $R_X$. Then for the universal $(\mathcal{P}(R_X), Q_Y)$-simulation problem, $\mathcal{E}_{TV}(\mathcal{P}(R_X), Q_Y) > 0$.

Proof: Since $R_X$ is continuous, as shown in the proof of Theorem 4, there exists a Borel isomorphism $\varphi$ from $(X, B_X)$ to a Borel subset $(\mathcal{W}, B_{\mathcal{W}})$ of $([0,1], B_{[0,1]})$ such that the output distribution $R_X \circ \varphi^{-1}$ is continuous. Denote $R_Z$ as the uniform distribution (which is also the Lebesgue measure) on $([0,1], B_{[0,1]})$. Then by Proposition 1, we know that there exists a measurable mapping $\eta : (W, B_{\mathcal{W}}) \mapsto ([0,1], B_{[0,1]})$ such that

$$R_X \circ \varphi^{-1} \circ \eta^{-1} = R_Z \text{ a.e.} \quad (42)$$

Hence a random element $\tilde{X} \sim R_X$ is mapped to a uniform random variable $\tilde{Z} \sim R_Z$ through the mapping $\tilde{Z} = \eta \circ \varphi(\tilde{X})$. We define $P_{\tilde{Z}} := P_X \circ \varphi^{-1} \circ \eta^{-1}$, which denotes the distribution of $\tilde{Z} = \eta \circ \varphi(X)$ where $X \sim P_X$.

Since $P_X$ is absolutely continuous respect to $R_X$, we have that $P_{\tilde{Z}}$ is absolutely continuous respect to $R_Z$ (or the Lebesgue measure). This is because on one hand, by (42), we have $R_X(\varphi^{-1} \circ \eta^{-1}(A)) = 0$ for any $A$ such that $R_Z(A) = 0$; on the other hand, $P_X$ is absolutely continuous respect to $R_X$, hence $P_X(\varphi^{-1} \circ \eta^{-1}(A)) = 0$, i.e., $P_{\tilde{Z}}(A) = 0$.

Since $P_{\tilde{Z}}$ is absolutely continuous, by Theorem 1, we know there exists a sequence of universal mappings $\tau_k : ([0,1], B_{[0,1]}) \mapsto ([0,1], B_{[0,1]})$ such that the resulting approximation error $\lim_{k \to \infty} |P_{\tilde{Z}} \circ \tau_k^{-1} - R_Z|_{TV} = 0$. Observe that $P_{\tilde{Z}} = P_X \circ \varphi^{-1} \circ \eta^{-1}$ and $\eta, \varphi$ (only depend on $R_X$) are independent of $P_X$. Hence the universal mappings $\tau_k \circ \eta \circ \varphi$ satisfy

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} |P_X \circ \varphi^{-1} \circ \eta^{-1} \circ \tau_k^{-1} - R_Z|_{TV} = 0. \quad (43)$$
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Since $R_Z$ is continuous, by Theorem 4, we know that there exists a measurable mapping $\kappa : ([0, 1], B_{[0, 1]}) \mapsto (Y, B_Y)$ such that $R_Z \circ \kappa^{-1} = Q_Y, a.e.$.

Now we consider the universal mappings $Y = \kappa \circ \tau_k \circ \eta \circ \varphi(X)$. We have

\[ |P_X \circ \varphi^{-1} \circ \eta^{-1} \circ \tau_k^{-1} \circ \kappa^{-1} - Q_Y|_{TV} = \sup_{A \in B_Y} |P_X \circ \varphi^{-1} \circ \eta^{-1} \circ \tau_k^{-1} \circ \kappa^{-1}(A) - Q_Y(A)| \]

\[ = \sup_{A \in B_Y} |P_X \circ \varphi^{-1} \circ \eta^{-1} \circ \tau_k^{-1}(\kappa^{-1}(A)) - R_Z(\kappa^{-1}(A))| \]

\[ \leq \sup_{B \in B_{[0, 1]}} |P_X \circ \varphi^{-1} \circ \eta^{-1} \circ \tau_k^{-1}(B) - R_Z(B)| \]

\[ = |P_X \circ \varphi^{-1} \circ \eta^{-1} \circ \tau_k^{-1} - R_Z|_{TV}. \]

Combining this with (43) gives us

\[ \lim_{k \to \infty} |P_X \circ \varphi^{-1} \circ \eta^{-1} \circ \tau_k^{-1} \circ \kappa^{-1} - Q_Y|_{TV} = 0. \] (48)

Note that random vectors defined on $(\mathbb{R}^n, B_{\mathbb{R}^n})$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ are special cases of such random elements. Furthermore, for any absolutely continuous (respect to the Lebesgue measure) $P_{X^n}$ defined on $(\mathbb{R}^n, B_{\mathbb{R}^n})$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, it must be absolutely continuous respect to the $n$-dimensional standard Gaussian distribution (since its PDF is positive for every point in $\mathbb{R}^n$). Hence we have the following corollary.

**Corollary 6.** For the set $\mathcal{P}_{ac}$ of absolutely continuous distributions on $(\mathbb{R}, B_{\mathbb{R}})$ and an arbitrary $Q_{Y^n}$ on $(\mathbb{R}^n, B_{\mathbb{R}^n})$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, the approximation errors for the universal $(\mathcal{P}_{ac} : Q_{Y^n})$-simulation problem satisfies $\mathcal{E}_\theta(\mathcal{P}_{ac}, Q_{Y^n}) \preceq 0$ for $\theta \in \{\text{KS, TV}\}$.

**VI. Concluding Remarks**

In this paper, motivated by the CLT and other universal simulation problems in the literature, we consider both universal and non-universal simulations of random variables with an arbitrary target distribution $Q_Y$ by general mappings. We investigate the fastest convergence rate of the approximation error for such a problem. One of our interesting results is that under universal simulation, an absolutely continuous random element (or a general random variable, including random vectors) respect to some continuous distribution is sufficient to simulate another random element arbitrarily well. This requirement is a little stronger than that for non-universal simulation, since under non-universal simulation, a continuous random element is sufficient to exactly simulate another random element. Another interesting result is that when we use a stationary memoryless process or a Markov process to simulate a random variable by a universal mapping, the approximation error decays at least exponentially fast with rate $R_\infty(P_X) := -\log \max_y P_X(x)$ as the dimension $n$ of $X^n$ goes to infinity. Furthermore, as a byproduct, we also obtain a property on uncorrelation between a squeezed periodic function and any other integrable function. We think this topic is of independent interest, and expect it to be further applied in other problems in the future.

**APPENDIX A**

**PROOF OF PROPOSITION 1**

\[ F_Y(y) = \mathbb{P}\{G_Y^{-1}(F_X(X)) \leq y\} \]

\[ = \mathbb{P}\{\min\{y : G_Y(y) \geq F_X(X)\} \leq y\} \]

\[ = \mathbb{P}\{F_X(X) \leq G_Y(y)\} \]

\[ = P_X\{x : F_X(x) \leq G_Y(y)\} \]

Denote $x_0 := \sup\{x : F_X(x) \leq G_Y(y)\}$. Hence for any $\epsilon > 0$, we have $F_X(x_0 - \epsilon) \leq G_Y(y) < F_X(x_0 + \epsilon)$. Since $F_X$ is continuous, letting $\epsilon \to 0$, we have $F_X(x_0) = G_Y(y)$.

Furthermore, by the definition of $x_0$, we have $P_X\{x : x < x_0\} \leq P_X\{x : F_X(x) \leq G_Y(y)\} \leq P_X\{x : x \leq x_0\}$, i.e., $\lim_{x \to x_0} F_X(x) \leq P_X\{x : F_X(x) \leq G_Y(y)\} \leq F_X(x_0)$. Since $F_X$ is continuous, $P_X\{x : F_X(x) \leq G_Y(y)\} = F_X(x_0)$. Therefore, $F_Y(y) = P_X\{x : F_X(x) \leq G_Y(y)\} = G_Y(y)$.
APPENDIX B

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3

Sort the sequences in $X^n$ as $x_1^n, x_2^n, ... , x_{|X|^n}$ such that $P^n_X(x_1^n) \geq P^n_X(x_2^n) \geq ... \geq P^n_X(x_{|X|^n})$. Map $x_i^n$ to $y_1 := \arg \max_{y \in Y} Q_Y(y)$; map $x_2^n$ to $y_2 := \arg \max_{y \in Y} \{ Q_Y(y) - P^n_X(x_1^n) \} \{ y = y_1 \}$; ... map $x_i^n$ to $y_i := \arg \max_{y \in Y} \{ Q_Y(y) - \sum_{j=1}^{|X|^n-|Y|-1} P^n_Y(x_j^n) \} \{ y = y_i \}$. Map the remaining $|Y| + 1$ sequences $x_j^n, |X|^n - |Y| \leq j \leq |X|^n$ to sequences in $Y$ in a similar way as in the proof of Proposition 2, such that

$\sup_{y \in Y} \left| \sum_{y' \in Y} \sum_{i=1}^j P^n_Y(x_i^n) \{ y' = y_i \} - G_Y(y) \right|$ is minimized for $|X|^n - |Y| \leq j \leq |X|^n$.

For this mapping, observe that for any $1 \leq j \leq |X|^n$,

$$ \max_{y \in Y} \left\{ Q_Y(y) - \sum_{i=1}^j P^n_X(x_i^n) 1 \{ y = y_i \} \right\} \geq \frac{\sum_{y \in Y} \left\{ Q_Y(y) - \sum_{i=1}^j P^n_X(x_i^n) 1 \{ y = y_i \} \right\}}{|Y|} \geq 1 - \sum_{i=1}^j P^n_Y(x_i^n) Y \frac{\sum_{i=1}^j P^n_X(x_i^n)}{|Y|}. $$

This implies that if $P^n_X(x_{j+1}^n) \leq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{|X|^n} P^n_X(x_i^n)}{|Y|}$, then $\sum_{i=1}^{j+1} P^n_X(x_i^n) 1 \{ y_{j+1} = y_i \} \leq Q_Y(y_{j+1})$. Therefore, the following claim holds.

**Claim 1.** If $P^n_X(x_{j+1}^n) \leq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{|X|^n} P^n_X(x_i^n)}{|Y|}$, holds for $1 \leq j \leq m$ for some integer $m$, then $\sum_{i=1}^{m+1} P^n_X(x_i^n) 1 \{ y = y_i \} \leq Q_Y(y)$ for all $y \in Y$.

Next we prove the following claim.

**Claim 2.** $P^n_X(x_{j+1}^n) \leq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{|X|^n} P^n_X(x_i^n)}{|Y|}$ holds for $1 \leq j \leq |X|^n - |Y| - 2$ and for $n \geq |Y| \max_{1 \leq i \leq |X|^n-1} \frac{P_X(x_i)}{P_X(x_{i+1})}$.

We split the proof into two cases.

- **Case 1** ($1 \leq j \leq |X|^n - n - 2$): For $1 \leq j \leq |X|^n - n - 2$, denote $n$ as the smallest integer such that $k \geq j + 2$ and $T_k^n \neq T_{n+1}^n$. Then we have

$$ P^n_X(x_{j+1}^n) \leq P^n_X(x_k^n) \max_{1 \leq i \leq |X|^n-1} \frac{P_X(x_i)}{P_X(x_{i+1})}. $$

This is because if $x_k^n$ and $x_{j+1}^n$ are different in only one component, say the $i$th component $x_{k,i}$ and $x_{j+1,i}$, then by the generation process of $x_1^n, x_2^n, ... , x_{|X|^n}$, we have $P^n_X(x_{k,i}) \geq P^n_X(x_{j+1,i})$. Hence

$$ P^n_X(x_{j+1}^n) = P^n_X(x_k^n) \frac{P_X(x_{j+1,i})}{P_X(x_{k,i})} \leq P^n_X(x_k^n) \max_{1 \leq i \leq |X|-1} \frac{P_X(x_i)}{P_X(x_{i+1})}. $$

If $x_k^n$ and $x_{j+1}^n$ are different in more than one components, then by the generation process of $x_1^n, x_2^n, ... , x_{|X|^n}$, we have $P^n_X(x_{j+1}^n) \geq P^n_X(x_k^n) \geq P^n_X(x_k^n)$ for any sequence $x_k^n$ such that $x_k^n$ are different from $x_{j+1}^n$ in only one component. Hence by the same argument above, we obtain

$$ P^n_X(x_{j+1}^n) \leq P^n_X(x_k^n) \max_{1 \leq i \leq |X|-1} \frac{P_X(x_i)}{P_X(x_{i+1})} \leq P^n_X(x_k^n) \max_{1 \leq i \leq |X|-1} \frac{P_X(x_i)}{P_X(x_{i+1})}. $$

**Case 2** ($n \geq |Y| \max_{1 \leq i \leq |X|^n-1} \frac{P_X(x_i)}{P_X(x_{i+1})}$): for $n \geq |Y| \max_{1 \leq i \leq |X|-1} \frac{P_X(x_i)}{P_X(x_{i+1})}$, we have $P^n_X(x_{j+1}^n) \leq P^n_X(x_k^n)$ for any sequence $x_k^n$. Hence

$$ P^n_X(x_{j+1}^n) \leq P^n_X(x_k^n) \frac{P_X(x_{j+1,i})}{P_X(x_{k,i})} \leq P^n_X(x_k^n) \max_{1 \leq i \leq |X|-1} \frac{P_X(x_i)}{P_X(x_{i+1})}. $$

This completes the proof of Claim 2.
Therefore, (56) holds. Next, we prove (56) implies Claim 2.

\[
\frac{P^n(x^n)}{\sum_{i=j}^{\max(n-1)} P^n(x_i^n)} \leq \frac{P^n(x^n)}{\sum_{i=k}^{\max(n-1)} P^n(x_i^n)} \leq \frac{\max_{1 \leq i \leq |X|} P^n(x_i^n)}{n P^n(x^n)}
\]

(59)

\[
\frac{\max_{1 \leq i \leq |X|} P^n(x_i^n)}{n P^n(x^n)} \leq \frac{P^n(x^n)}{\sum_{i=k}^{\max(n-1)} P^n(x_i^n)} \leq \frac{\max_{1 \leq i \leq |X|} P^n(x_i^n)}{n P^n(x^n)}
\]

(60)

According to the definition of \( x^n \), we have \( T_{T_{n-k}} \subseteq \{ x^n_{k+1}, \ldots, x^n_{|X|} \} \). Furthermore, each type class has at least \( n \) elements, hence \( |T_{T_{n-k}}| \geq n \). Therefore,

\[
\frac{P^n(x^n_{k+1})}{\sum_{i=k+1}^{\max(n-1)} P^n(x_i^n)} \leq \frac{P^n(x^n_{k+1})}{\sum_{i=k}^{\max(n-1)} P^n(x_i^n)} \leq \frac{\max_{1 \leq i \leq |X|} P^n(x_i^n)}{n P^n(x^n)}
\]

(62)

For \( n \geq |\mathcal{Y}| \max_{1 \leq i \leq |X|} P^n(x_i^n) \), we have (62) \( \leq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{Y}|} \). Therefore, \( P^n(x^n_{j+1}) \leq \frac{\sum|x_i^n| P^n(x_i^n)}{n|\mathcal{Y}|} \).

- **Case 2** (\( |\mathcal{Y}| - n - 1 \leq j \leq |\mathcal{Y}| - 1 \)): For \( |\mathcal{X}| - n - 1 \leq j \leq |\mathcal{Y}| - 1 \), we know \( x^n_{j+1}, \ldots, x^n_{|X|} \) belong to a same type class, \( P(x^n_{j+1}) \) \( \ldots \) \( P(x^n_{|X|}) = (P(x(x_i^n)))^{n-1} P(x(x_{|X|}-1)), \) and \( P(x^n_{|X|}) = (P(x(x_i^n)))^{n-1} \). Hence we have \( \frac{P^n(x^n_{j+1})}{\sum_{i=j}^{\max(n-1)} P^n(x_i^n)} \leq \frac{P^n(x^n_{j+1})}{|\mathcal{Y}| P^n(x^n_{j+1})} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{Y}|} \).

Combining the two cases above, we have Claim 2. By Claim 1, we further have \( \sum_{i=1}^{m+1} P^n(x^n_i) 1 \{ y = y_i \} \leq Q_Y(y) \) for all \( y \in \mathcal{Y} \) with \( m = |\mathcal{X}| - |\mathcal{Y}| - 2 \).

Since the remaining \( |\mathcal{Y}| + 1 \) sequences are mapped to sequences in \( \mathcal{Y} \) in a similar way as in the proof of Proposition 2, similar to Proposition 2, here we can show that the output measure \( Y \) induced by the mapping satisfies \( |P_Y - Q_Y|_{\text{KS}} \leq \frac{1}{2} P(x(x_{|X|}-1)) (P(x(x_{|X|})))^{n-1} \).

**APPENDIX C**

**PROOF OF PROPOSITION 6**

**Universal Mapping**: For \( X_n \), partition the real line into intervals with the same length \( \Delta_n \), i.e., \( \bigcup_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} (i \Delta_n, (i + 1) \Delta_n] \). We first simulate a uniform distribution on \( [a, b] \) by mapping each interval \( (i \Delta_n, (i + 1) \Delta_n] \) into \( [a, b] \) using the linear function \( x \mapsto a + \frac{b-a}{\Delta_n} (x - i \Delta_n) \). That is, the function used here is

\[
f_1(x) := \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \left( a + \frac{b-a}{\Delta_n} (x - i \Delta_n) \right) 1 \{ x \in (i \Delta_n, (i + 1) \Delta_n] \}.
\]

(63)

We then transform the output distribution to the target distribution \( Q_Y \), by using function \( x \mapsto G_Y^{-1} \left( \frac{x-a}{b-a} \right) \). Therefore, each \( x \in (i \Delta_n, (i + 1) \Delta_n] \) is mapped to \( G_Y^{-1} \left( \frac{x-a}{b-a} \right) \). Hence the final mapping is

\[
f(x) := \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} G_Y^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{\Delta_n} (x - i \Delta_n) \right) 1 \{ x \in (i \Delta_n, (i + 1) \Delta_n] \}.
\]

(64)
For such a universal simulator, we have

\[ |P_{Y_n} - Q_Y|_{KS} \leq |P_{Y_n} - \text{Unif}([a, b])|_{KS} \]

\[ = \sup_{z \in [a, b]} \left| \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} F_{X_n} \left( i\Delta_n + \Delta_n \frac{z-a}{b-a} \right) - F_{X_n} \left( i\Delta_n \right)^b \right| \]

\[ = \sup_{z \in [0, \Delta_n]} \left| \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} F_{X_n} \left( i\Delta_n + x \right) - F_{X_n} \left( i\Delta_n \right) \right| - \frac{x}{\Delta_n} \]

\[ = \sup_{x \in [0, \Delta_n]} \left| \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} F_{X_n} \left( (i+1)\Delta_n \right) - F_{X_n} \left( i\Delta_n \right) \right| \sup_{x \in [0, \Delta_n]} \left| \frac{F_{X_n} \left( (i+1)\Delta_n \right) - F_{X_n} \left( i\Delta_n \right)}{\Delta_n} \right| \]

\[ \leq \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} |F_{X_n} \left( (i+1)\Delta_n \right) - F_{X_n} \left( i\Delta_n \right)| \sup_{x \in [0, \Delta_n]} \left| \frac{F_{X_n} \left( (i+1)\Delta_n \right) - F_{X_n} \left( i\Delta_n \right)}{\Delta_n} \right| \]

\[ \leq \sup_{x_1: F_{X_n}(x_1+\Delta_n) > F_{X_n}(x_1)} \sup_{x \in \{x_1, x_1+\Delta_n\}} \left| \frac{F_{X_n}(x_1 + \Delta_n) - F_{X_n}(x_1)}{\Delta_n} \right| \]

\[ \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty, \]

where (65) follows from Lemma 1.

**APPENDIX D**

**PROOF OF THEOREM 3**

We still use a type-based mapping scheme (similar to that used in the proof of Theorem 2) to prove Theorem 3.

Here we adopt the notation from [19]. Assume the Markov process \( X \) starts from the fixed initial state \( (x_{-k+1}, x_{-k+2}, \ldots, x_0) \).

The \( k \)-th order Markov type \( T_{x^n} \) of a sequence \( x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n \) is defined as the number of occurrences in \( x^n \) of each string \( s \in \mathcal{X}^{k+1} \). denoted \( n_{x^n}(s) \), namely

\[ n_{x^n}(s) = |\{i: 1 \leq i \leq n, (x_{i-k+1}, \ldots, x_{i-1}, x_i) = s\}| \]

where \( |\cdot| \) denotes cardinality. We use \( T_k \) to denote a \( k \)-th order Markov type of sequences in \( \mathcal{X}^n \). For a type \( T_k \), the \( k \)-th order Markov type class \( T_{k,n} \) is the set of all sequences \( x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n \) that have the same type \( T_k \). Obviously, all sequences in a type class have a equal probability, i.e., \( P(x^n) = P(\hat{x}^n) \) for all \( x^n, \hat{x}^n \in T_{k,n} \).

That is, under the condition \( \mathcal{X}^n \in T_{k,n} \), it is uniformly distributed over the type class \( T_{k,n} \), regardless of the distribution of the Markov process. Furthermore, the set of \( k \)-th order Markov types of sequences in \( \mathcal{X}^n \) is denoted as \( \mathcal{P}_{k,n} (\mathcal{X}) := \{ T_{x^n} : x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n \} \). It has been shown that \( |\mathcal{P}_{k,n} (\mathcal{X})| \leq (n+1)^{\mathcal{X}^{k+1}} \) in [19].

Now we construct a mapping \( f \) that maps the uniform random vector on \( T_{k,n} \) to a random variable such that \( \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} |F_Y(y|T_{k,n}) - G_Y(y)| \) is minimized. Here \( F_Y(y|T_{k,n}) \) denotes the CDF of the output random variable for the uniform random vector on \( T_{k,n} \). Since the probability values of uniform random vectors are all equal to \( |T_{k,n}|^{-1} \),

\[ \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} |F_Y(y|T_{k,n}) - G_Y(y)| = \frac{1}{2} |T_{k,n}|^{-1}. \]

Following the same steps as (28)-(39), we obtain

\[ |F_Y(y) - G_Y(y)| \leq \max_{x^n} P(x^n). \]

The converse part follows from Theorem 3, since even non-universal simulation cannot make the approximation error decay faster than \( \max_{x^n} P(x^n) \), hence universal simulation cannot as well.

**APPENDIX E**

**USEFUL LEMMAS: SQUEEZING PERIODIC FUNCTIONS**

For a function \( g : [a, b] \mapsto \mathbb{R} \) and a number \( \Delta > 0 \), we define a periodic function \( g_\Delta \) induced by \( g \) as

\[ g_\Delta(x) := \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} g \left( a + \frac{b-a}{\Delta} (x - i\Delta) \right) \chi \{ x \in (i\Delta, (i+1)\Delta] \}. \]
Now we squeeze this periodic function in $x$-axis by letting $\Delta \to 0$. It is easy to see that the limit $\lim_{\Delta \to 0} g \left( a + \frac{b-a}{\Delta} (x - i\Delta) \right)$ of function $g$ does not exist. However, the integral $\lim_{\Delta \to 0} \int f(x) g(x) \, dx$ for any integrable function $f$ exists. Moreover, this limit is equal to the product of the integral of $f(x)$ and the normalized integral of $g_{\Delta}(x)$ (or $g(x)$). That is, $f(x)$ and $g_{\Delta}(x)$ are asymptotically uncorrelated as $\Delta \to 0$.

Define

$$L_{\Delta} := \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) g_{\Delta}(x) \, dx$$

and

$$L' := \frac{1}{b-a} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) \, dx \int_{a}^{b} g(x') \, dx'.$$

**Lemma 2.** Assume $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ are arbitrary integrable functions, and $|g(x)|$ is bounded a.e. Then $f(x)$ and $g_{\Delta}(x)$ are asymptotically uncorrelated as $\Delta \to 0$. That is,

$$\lim_{\Delta \to 0} L_{\Delta} = L'.$$

**Remark 2.** More specifically, it holds that

$$|L_{\Delta} - L'| \leq \esssup_{x} |g(x)| \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{i\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} \left| f(x) - \frac{1}{\Delta} \int_{i\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} f(x) \, dx \right| \, dx.$$  \hspace{1cm} (77)

**Remark 3.** If $f(x)$ is bounded and continuous a.e. on an interval $[c, d]$ (i.e., Riemann-integrable), and $f(x) = 0$, $x \in [c, d]$, then the condition $\sup_{x} |g(x)|$ is finite can be relaxed to that $\int_{a}^{b} |g(x)| \, dx$ is finite. Furthermore, for this case, Lemma 2 also holds for $g(x) = g_1(x) + \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} c_i \delta(x-x_i)$ with $x_i \in [a, b]$ such that $\int_{a}^{b} |g_1(x)| \, dx + \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} c_i$ is finite, where $\delta(\cdot)$ denotes the Dirac delta function.

The proof of Lemma 2 is provided in Appendix F.

Now we generalize Lemma 2 by considering $g : [a, b] \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ to be a real multivariate function. For such $g$ and a number $\Delta > 0$, we define a periodic function $g_{\Delta}$ induced by $g$ as

$$g_{\Delta}(x, y) := \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} g \left( a + \frac{b-a}{\Delta} (x - i\Delta), y \right) 1 \{ x \in (i\Delta, (i+1)\Delta) \}. \hspace{1cm} (78)$$

Define

$$L_{\Delta}(y) := \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) g_{\Delta}(x, y) \, dx$$

and

$$L'(y) := \frac{1}{b-a} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) \, dx \int_{a}^{b} g(x', y) \, dx'.$$  \hspace{1cm} (80)

**Lemma 3.** Assume $f(x)$ and $g(x, y)$ are arbitrary integrable functions, and $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |g(x, y)| \, dy$ is bounded a.e. Then $f(x)$ and $g_{\Delta}(x, y)$ are asymptotically uncorrelated under the $L_1$-norm distance as $\Delta \to 0$. That is,

$$\lim_{\Delta \to 0} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |L_{\Delta}(y) - L'(y)| \, dy = 0.$$  \hspace{1cm} (81)

Furthermore, (81) also holds for $g(x, y) = g_1(x, y) + g_3(x) \delta(y-g_2(x))$ such that $g_2(x)$ is a differentiable a.e. function and $g_2'(x) \neq 0$ for almost every $x \in [a, b]$ and

$$\sup_{x} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |g(x, y)| \, dy = \sup_{x} \left\{ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |g_1(x, y)| \, dy + |g_3(x)| \right\}$$

is finite.
Remark 4. More specifically, it holds that

\[ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |L_\Delta(y) - L'(y)| \, dy \leq \text{ess sup}_{x} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |g(x, y)| \, dy \sum_{i=\infty}^{i=\infty} \int_{i}^{(i+1)\Delta} \left| f(x) - \frac{1}{\Delta} \int_{i\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} f(x) \, dx \right| \, dx. \tag{82} \]

If \( g(x, y) = g_1(x, y) + g_3(x)\delta(y - g_2(x)) \), then (82) still holds with \( \text{ess sup}_{x} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |g(x, y)| \, dy \) replaced by \( \text{ess sup}_{x} |g_3(x)| \).

Remark 5. If \( f(x) \) is bounded and continuous a.e. on an interval \([c, d]\), and \( f(x) = 0, x \in [c, d] \), then the condition \( \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |g(x, y)| \, dy \) is bounded a.e. can be relaxed to that \( \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{a}^{b} |g(x, y)| \, dx \, dy \) is finite. Furthermore, for this case, Lemma 3 also holds for \( g(x, y) = g_1(x, y) + g_3(x)\delta(y - g_2(x)) \) such that \( g_2(x) \) is a differentiable a.e. function and \( g_2'(x) \neq 0 \) for almost every \( x \in [a, b] \) and \( \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{a}^{b} |g(x, y)| \, dx \, dy = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{a}^{b} |g_1(x, y)| \, dx \, dy + \int_{a}^{b} |g_3(x)| \, dx \) is finite.

The proof of Lemma 3 is provided in Appendix G.

Furthermore, Lemmas 2 and 3 can be extended to multivarient function cases.

**APPENDIX F**

**PROOF OF LEMMA 2**

Define

\[ L_\Delta = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x)g_\Delta(x) \, dx \tag{83} \]

\[ = \sum_{i=\infty}^{i=\infty} \int_{i\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} f(x)g\left(a + \frac{b-a}{\Delta}(x - i\Delta)\right) \, dx \tag{84} \]

and

\[ \sum_{i=\infty}^{(i+1)\Delta} \left( \frac{1}{\Delta} \int_{i\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} f(x) \, dx \right) g\left(a + \frac{b-a}{\Delta}(x - i\Delta)\right) \, dx \]

\[ = \sum_{i=\infty}^{(i+1)\Delta} \left( \frac{1}{\Delta} \int_{i\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} f(x) \, dx \right) \int_{i\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} g\left(a + \frac{b-a}{\Delta}(x - i\Delta)\right) \, dx \tag{85} \]

\[ = \sum_{i=\infty}^{(i+1)\Delta} \left( \frac{1}{\Delta} \int_{i\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} f(x) \, dx \right) \frac{\Delta}{b-a} \int_{a}^{b} g(x') \, dx' \tag{86} \]

\[ = \frac{1}{b-a} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) \, dx \int_{a}^{b} g(x') \, dx' \tag{87} \]

\[ = L'. \tag{88} \]
Then we bound $|L_\Delta - L'|$ as follows.

$$
|L_\Delta - L'| = \left| \sum_{i=\infty}^{\infty} \int_{\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} f(x)g\left(a + \frac{b-a}{\Delta}(x-i\Delta)\right) dx 
- \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} \left(\frac{1}{\Delta} \int_{\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} f(x) dx\right) g\left(a + \frac{b-a}{\Delta}(x-i\Delta)\right) dx \right| 
$$

(89)

$$
= \left| \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} f(x) - \frac{1}{\Delta} \int_{\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} f(x) dx \right| g\left(a + \frac{b-a}{\Delta}(x-i\Delta)\right) dx 
$$

(90)

$$
\leq \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} \left| f(x) - \frac{1}{\Delta} \int_{\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} f(x) dx \right| g\left(a + \frac{b-a}{\Delta}(x-i\Delta)\right) dx 
$$

(91)

$$
\leq \text{ess sup}_{x} |g(x)| \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} \left| f(x) - \frac{1}{\Delta} \int_{\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} f(x) dx \right| dx 
$$

(92)

$$
= \text{ess sup}_{x} |g(x)| \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left| f(x) - \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\Delta} \int_{\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} f(x) dx1 \{x \in (i\Delta, (i+1)\Delta]\} \right| dx 
$$

(93)

$$
\to 0, \text{ as } \Delta \to 0, 
$$

(94)

where (94) follows since

$$
\lim_{\Delta \to 0} \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\Delta} \int_{\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} f(x) dx1 \{x_0 \in (i\Delta, (i+1)\Delta]\} 
$$

(95)

$$
= \lim_{\Delta \to 0} \frac{1}{\Delta} \int_{\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} f(x) dx1 \left\{x_0 \in \left(\left\lfloor \frac{x_0}{\Delta} \right\rfloor \Delta, \left\lfloor \frac{x_0}{\Delta} \right\rfloor \Delta + 1 \right)\} 
$$

(96)

where (96) follows by Lebesgue’s differentiation theorem [20, Thm. 7.7].

Therefore, from (94), $\lim_{\Delta \to 0} L_\Delta$ exists and equals $L'$.

**APPENDIX G**

**PROOF OF LEMMA 3**

Define

$$
L_\Delta(y) = \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} f(x)g\left(a + \frac{b-a}{\Delta}(x-i\Delta), y\right) dx 
$$

(97)

and

$$
\sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} \left(\frac{1}{\Delta} \int_{\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} f(x) dx\right) g\left(a + \frac{b-a}{\Delta}(x-i\Delta), y\right) dx 
$$

(98)

$$
= \frac{1}{b-a} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) dx \int_{a}^{b} g(x', y) dx' 
$$

(99)

$$
= L'(y), 
$$
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where (98) follows by steps similar to (85)-(88). Then we bound \( \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |L_\Delta(y) - L'(y)| \, dy \) as follows.

\[
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} L_\Delta(y) - L'(y) \, dy \\
= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left( \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{i\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} f(x) g \left( a + \frac{b - a}{\Delta} (x - i\Delta), y \right) \, dx \right) \, dy \\
= \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{i\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} \left( \frac{1}{\Delta} \int_{i\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} f(x) \, dx \right) g \left( a + \frac{b - a}{\Delta} (x - i\Delta), y \right) \, dx \, dy \\
\leq \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{i\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} \left( f(x) - \frac{1}{\Delta} \int_{i\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} f(x) \, dx \right) \left( g \left( a + \frac{b - a}{\Delta} (x - i\Delta), y \right) \right) \, dx \, dy \\
\leq \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{i\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} \left( f(x) - \frac{1}{\Delta} \int_{i\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} f(x) \, dx \right) \left( |g_1(x,y)| + |g_3(x)| \delta(y - g_2(x)) \right) \, dx \, dy
\]

(100)

(101)

(102)

(103)

(104)

where (104) follows from the same reason as (94). Therefore,

\[
\lim_{\Delta \to 0} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |L_\Delta(y) - L'(y)| \, dy = 0.
\]

(105)

If \( g(x,y) = g_1(x,y) + g_3(x) \delta(y - g_2(x)) \) such that \( g_2(x) \) is a differentiable function and only has simple roots, then (97), (98), and (101) still hold.

\[
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |L_\Delta(y) - L'(y)| \, dy \\
\leq \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{i\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} \left( f(x) - \frac{1}{\Delta} \int_{i\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} f(x) \, dx \right) \left( |g_1(x,y)| + |g_3(x)| \delta(y - g_2(x)) \right) \, dx \, dy
\]

(106)

(107)

Since \( \sup_x \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} g_1(x,y) \, dy \) is finite, as shown above, \( \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{i\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} \left( f(x) - \frac{1}{\Delta} \int_{i\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} f(x) \, dx \right) \left( |g_1(x,y)| + |g_3(x)| \delta(y - g_2(x)) \right) \, dx \, dy \to 0 \), as \( \Delta \to 0 \).

Partition the real line into several intervals \( U_0 := (-\infty, c_1), U_1 := [c_1, c_2), ..., U_{k-1} := [c_{k-1}, c_k), \) and \( U_k := [c_k, \infty) \) such that \( g_2(x) \) is monotonous on each interval. Denote \( g_{2,j}(x) := g_2(x), x \in U_j \). Denote \( x_j(y) \) as the root in \( U_j \) of \( g_2(x) = y \). Then \( x_j(y) = g_2^{-1}(y) \).

We have

\[
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{i\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} \left( f(x) - \frac{1}{\Delta} \int_{i\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} f(x) \, dx \right) g_3(x) \delta(y - g_2(x)) \, dx \, dy
\]

(108)

(109)

(110)
\[ = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{k} f(x_j(y)) - \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\Delta} \int_{i\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} f(x) dx 1\{x_j(y) \in (i\Delta, (i+1)\Delta]\} \left| \frac{g_3(x_j(y))}{g_2'(x_j(y))} \right| dy \]  
(111)

\[ = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \int_{U_j} \left| f(x_j(y)) - \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\Delta} \int_{i\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} f(x) dx 1\{x \in (i\Delta, (i+1)\Delta]\} \right| g_3(x) \right| dx \]  
(112)

\[ = \int \left| f(x) - \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\Delta} \int_{i\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} f(x) dx 1\{x \in (i\Delta, (i+1)\Delta]\} \right| g_3(x) \right| dx \]  
(113)

\[ \leq \text{ess sup}_{x} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left| f(x) - \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\Delta} \int_{i\Delta}^{(i+1)\Delta} f(x) dx 1\{x \in (i\Delta, (i+1)\Delta]\} \right| dx \]  
(114)

\[ \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } \Delta \rightarrow 0. \]  
(115)
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