Abstract

R (Version 3.5.1 patched) has two issues with its random sampling functionality. First, it uses a version of the Mersenne Twister known to have a seeding problem, which was corrected by the authors of the Mersenne Twister in 2002. Updated C source code is available at http://www.math.sci.hiroshima-u.ac.jp/~m-mat/MT/MT2002/CODES/mt19937ar.c. Second, R generates random integers between 1 and $m$ by multiplying random floats by $m$, taking the floor, and adding 1 to the result. Well-known quantization effects in this approach result in a non-uniform distribution on $\{1, \ldots, m\}$. The difference, which depends on $m$, can be substantial. Because the sample function in R relies on generating random integers, random sampling in R is biased. There is an easy fix: construct random integers directly from random bits, rather than multiplying a random float by $m$. That is the strategy taken in Python’s numpy.random.randint() function, and recommended by the authors of the Mersenne Twister algorithm, among others. Example source code in Python is available at https://github.com/statlab/cryptorandom/blob/master/cryptorandom/cryptorandom.py (see functions getrandbits() and randbelow_from_randbits()).
A textbook way to generate a random integer on \(\{1, \ldots, m\}\) is to start with 
\(X \sim U[0, 1)\) and define 
\[Y \equiv 1 + \lfloor mX \rfloor.\]
If \(X\) is truly uniform on \([0, 1)\), \(Y\) is then uniform on \(\{1, \ldots, m\}\). But if \(X\) has a discrete distribution derived by scaling a pseudorandom \(w\)-bit integer (typically \(w = 32\)) or floating-point number, the resulting distribution is, in general, not uniformly distributed on \(\{1, \ldots, m\}\) even if the underlying pseudorandom number generator (PRNG) is perfect. Theorem \(\square\) illustrates the problem.

**Theorem 1** \(\text{(Knuth [1997])}\). Suppose \(X\) is uniformly distributed on \(w\)-bit binary fractions, and let \(Y_m \equiv 1 + \lfloor mX \rfloor\). Let \(p_+(m) = \max_{1 \leq k \leq m} \Pr\{Y_m = k\}\) and \(p_-(m) = \min_{1 \leq k \leq m} \Pr\{Y_m = k\}\). There exists \(m < 2^w\) such that, to first order, \(p_+(m)/p_-(m) = 1 + m2^{-w+1}\).

A better way to generate random elements of \(\{1, \ldots, m\}\) is to use pseudorandom bits directly, avoiding floating-point representation, multiplication, and the floor operator. Integers between 0 and \(m-1\) can be represented with \(\mu(m) \equiv \lceil \log_2(m-1) \rceil\) bits. To generate a pseudorandom integer between 1 and \(m\), first generate \(\mu(m)\) pseudorandom bits (for instance, by taking the most significant \(\mu(m)\) bits from the PRNG output, if \(w \geq \mu(m)\), or by concatenating successive outputs of the PRNG and taking the first \(\mu(m)\) bits of the result, if \(w < \mu(m)\)). Cast the result as a binary integer \(M\). If \(M > m - 1\), discard it and draw another \(\mu(m)\) bits; otherwise, return \(M + 1\). Unless \(m = 2^{\mu(m)}\), this procedure is expected to discard some random draws—up to almost half the draws if \(m = 2^p + 1\) for some integer \(p\). But if the input bits are IID Bernoulli(1/2), the output will be uniformly distributed on \(\{1, \ldots, m\}\).

This is how the Python function `numpy.random.randint()` (Version 1.14) generates

\(^1\text{See Knuth [1997, p.114]. This is also the approach recommended by the authors of the Mersenne Twister. See }\text{http://www.math.sci.hiroshima-u.ac.jp/~m-mat/MT/efaq.html} \text{ last accessed 18 September 2018.}\)
pseudorandom integers\footnote{However, Python’s built-in \texttt{random.choice()} (Versions 2.7 through 3.6) does something else biased: it finds the closest integer to $mX$, where $X$ is a binary fraction between 0 and 1.}

The algorithm that R (Version 3.5.1 patched) \cite{Rcore2018} uses to generate random integers in \texttt{runif.index()} (in \texttt{RNG.c}) has the issue pointed out in Theorem \ref{thm:ran1} in a more complicated form, because R uses a pseudorandom float at an intermediate step, rather than multiplying a binary fraction by $m$. The way the float is constructed depends on $m$. Because \texttt{sample} relies on random integers, it inherits the problem.

When $m$ is small, R uses \texttt{unif.rand} to generate pseudorandom floating-point numbers $X$ on $[0, 1)$ starting from a 32-bit random integer generated from the (obsolete version of the) Mersenne Twister algorithm \cite{Matsumoto1998}. The range of \texttt{unif.rand} contains (at most) $2^{32}$ values, which are approximately equi-spaced (but for the vagaries of converting a binary number into a floating-point number \cite{Goldberg1991}, which R does using floating-point multiplication by $2.3283064365386963e-10$).

When $m > 2^{31}$, \texttt{runif.index()} calls \texttt{ru} instead of \texttt{unif.rand}. \footnote{A different function, \texttt{sample2}, is called when $m > 10^7$ and $k < m/2$. \texttt{sample2} uses the same method to generate pseudorandom integers.} \texttt{ru} combines two floating-point numbers, $R_1$ and $R_2$, each generated from a 32-bit integer, to produce the floating-point number $X$, as follows: the first float is multiplied by $U = 2^{25}$, added to the second float, and the result is divided by $U$:

$$X = \left\lfloor UR_1 \right\rfloor + \frac{R_2}{U}.$$

The relevant code is in \texttt{RNG.c}.

The cardinality of the range of \texttt{ru} is certainly not larger than $2^{64}$. The range of
ru is unevenly spaced on \([0, 1)\) because of how floating-point representation works. The inhomogeneity can make the probability that \(X \in [x, x + \delta) \subset [0, 1)\) vary widely with \(x\).

For the way \texttt{R\_unif\_index()} generates random integers, the non-uniformity of the probabilities of \(\{1, \ldots, m\}\) is largest when \(m\) is just below \(2^{31}\). The upper bound on the ratio of selection probabilities approaches 2 as \(m\) approaches \(2^{31}\), about 2 billion. For \(m\) close to 1 million, the upper bound is about 1.0004.

We recommend that the R developers replace the obsolete (1997) version of the Mersenne Twister code with the current (2002) version, and replace the algorithm in \texttt{R\_unif\_index()} with the algorithm based on generating a random bit string large enough to represent \(m\) and discarding integers that are larger than \(m\). The resulting code would be simpler and more accurate. Other routines that generate random integers using the multiply-and-floor method (\texttt{int} \texttt{unif\_rand()} \* \texttt{n}, for instance, \texttt{walker\_ProbSampleReplace()} in \texttt{random.c}, should also be updated to use an unbiased integer generator (e.g., to call the new version of \texttt{R\_unif\_index()}).
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