

On the dependence structure and quality of scrambled (t, m, s) -nets

Jaspar Wiart¹, Christiane Lemieux^{*2}, and Gracia Y. Dong²

¹Johann Radon Institute for Computational and Applied Mathematics (RICAM)
Austrian Academy of Sciences

Altenbergerstr. 69

4040 Linz, Austria

jaspar.wiart@ricam.oeaw.ac.at

²Department of Statistics and Actuarial Science

University of Waterloo,

200 University Avenue West

Ontario, Canada, N2L 3G1

email: clemieux@uwaterloo.ca, gracia.dong@uwaterloo.ca

Abstract

In this paper we develop a framework to study the dependence structure of scrambled point sets, with a focus on scrambled digital (t, m, s) -nets. Our main result shows that, if for all $(k_1, \dots, k_s) \in \mathbb{N}^s$ the total number of distinct pairs from a given point set that come from the same elementary (k_1, \dots, k_s) -interval is less than what is expected with random sampling, then after scrambling the point set will be negative lower/upper orthant dependent (NLOD/NUOD). Using this we obtain that a scrambled digital (t, m, s) -net is NLOD/NUOD if and only if $t = 0$ and that the first n points of a scrambled $(0, s)$ -sequence are always NLOD/NUOD. Finally, we explore the possibility of using our framework to differentiate the quality of point sets that have the same value for the parameter t but show obvious differences.

Keywords: Negative dependence; scrambled nets; variance; quasi-Monte Carlo.

1 Introduction

Quasi-Monte Carlo methods rely on low-discrepancy point sets and sequences to construct estimates for multi-dimensional integrals over the unit hypercube. In this context, the notion of discrepancy refers to the distance between the uniform distribution and the empirical distribution induced by a point set. This measure of non-uniformity is particularly suitable for deterministic point sets, for which a number of results exist that provide asymptotic results on the discrepancy of various constructions, including digital (t, m, s) -nets [1, 2].

In recent years, the use of randomized quasi-Monte Carlo methods has gained in popularity. By introducing randomness in a low-discrepancy point set, one gains not only access to probabilistic error estimates, but also in some cases to an improvement in the uniformity of the point set. In particular, the scrambled digital nets introduced by Owen in 1995 [3] have been used in different applications in practice. A number of results studying the variance of the corresponding estimators have been proved: see, for example, [4, 5]. For smooth enough functions, results in [6] show a much better convergence rate for the variance of these scrambled net estimators than the Monte Carlo equivalent. Other results give bounds holding for all square-integrable functions, where

*Corresponding author

the scrambled net variance is shown to be no larger than a constant (larger than one, and possibly quite large depending on the net) times the Monte Carlo variance [7, 8].

In [9], a new approach to study scrambled $(0, m, s)$ -nets was introduced. It is based on the concept of negative lower/upper orthant dependence, and how it can be used to study the covariance term that differentiates the variance of Monte Carlo sampling-based estimators from that of scrambled $(0, m, s)$ -nets. To study this covariance term, a new representation result was used. It is based on multivariate integration by parts, which allows to decompose the covariance term in a part that assesses the underlying point set—via its dependence structure—and a part that depends on the function. It is worth noting that a larger class of functions than those of bounded variation in the sense of Hardy and Krause [2] can be studied via this decomposition. In the same paper, it was proved that two-dimensional scrambled $(0, m, 2)$ -nets have a variance no larger than a Monte Carlo estimator for functions that are monotone in each variable. This result was obtained by first establishing that scrambled $(0, m, 2)$ -nets are negatively lower orthant dependent.

In this paper, we examine the randomized quasi-Monte Carlo sampling scheme \tilde{P}_n obtained by scrambling a deterministic point set $P_n \subseteq [0, 1]^s$. This class of sampling schemes includes scrambled digital (t, m, s) -nets in base b . We propose to measure the quality of these sampling schemes using values that we denote by $C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n)$, $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^s$, which arise in our study of the dependence structure of \tilde{P}_n . These quantities are related to how many distinct pairs of points lie in the same elementary \mathbf{k} -interval. They also play a key role in analyzing whether or not \tilde{P}_n is negative lower orthant dependent (NLOD) and negative upper orthant dependent (NUOD). Indeed, we show these properties hold if and only if $C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n) \leq 1$ for all $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^s$, a condition we refer to as being *completely quasi-equidistributed in base b* . In turn, this framework allows us to show that a scrambled digital (t, m, s) -net in base b is NLOD/NUOD if and only if $t = 0$, for any dimension $s \geq 1$, thus generalizing the result from [9]. We also show that the first n points of a $(0, s)$ -sequence in base b form a completely quasi-equidistributed point set (in base b).

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we review some background information on scrambled nets and dependence concepts, and prove a few key properties of scrambled nets that are relevant when studying their dependence structure. In Section 3 we obtain formulas for the joint probability density function (pdf) of pairs of distinct points in a scrambled point set. In Section 4 we show that a scrambled point set \tilde{P}_n is NLOD/NUOD if and only if the underlying point set P_n is completely quasi-equidistributed, a concept also defined in that section. In Section 5 we illustrate with a few examples the insight revealed by the $C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n)$ values when comparing the quality of different point sets with the same value of the quality parameter t . Concluding comments and ideas for future work are presented in Section 6.

2 Preliminaries

To ease the presentation, this section is divided into three subsections.

2.1 Background on scrambled nets

We start by recalling key properties of scrambled nets.

A *digital net in base b* (for b prime) [1, 2] is a point set $P_n = \{\mathbf{V}_1, \dots, \mathbf{V}_n\} \subseteq [0, 1]^s$ with $n = b^m$ that is constructed via s generating matrices C_1, \dots, C_s of size $m \times m$ with entries in \mathbb{F}_b , in the following way: for $0 \leq i < b^m$ we write $i = \sum_{r=0}^{m-1} i_r b^r$, then the point $\mathbf{V}_i = (V_{i,1}, \dots, V_{i,s})$ is obtained as $V_{i,\ell} = \sum_{r=1}^m V_{i,\ell,r} b^{-r}$, and $V_{i,\ell,r} = \sum_{p=1}^m C_{\ell,r,p} i_{p-1}$, where $C_{\ell,r,p}$ is the element on the r th row and p th column of C_ℓ .

To assess the uniformity of the net, the concept of (k_1, \dots, k_s) -equidistribution is used. More precisely, we say that P_n with $n = b^m$ is (k_1, \dots, k_s) -equidistributed in base b if every *elementary (k_1, \dots, k_s) -interval* of the form

$$I_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{a}) = \prod_{\ell=1}^s \left[\frac{a_\ell}{b^{k_\ell}}, \frac{a_\ell + 1}{b^{k_\ell}} \right) \quad (1)$$

for $0 \leq a_\ell < b^{k_\ell}$ contains exactly $b^{m-k_1-\dots-k_s}$ points from P_n , assuming $m \geq k_1 + \dots + k_s$. We say that a digital net in base b has a *quality parameter* t if P_n is (k_1, \dots, k_s) -equidistributed for all s -dimensional vectors of non-negative integers $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_s)$ such that $k_1 + \dots + k_s \leq m - t$. We then refer to P_n as a digital (t, m, s) -net in base b . So the lower is t , the more uniform P_n is [2]. The construction proposed by Faure in [10] provides digital $(0, m, s)$ -nets in prime bases $b \geq s$. The widely used Sobol' sequences [11] provide digital (t, m, s) -nets in base 2 with $t = 0$ when $s = 2$ and $t > 0$ otherwise. Information on newer constructions can be found in [1, 12]. Note that a (t, m, s) -net in base b is a point set P_n with $n = b^m$ points such that the above equidistribution properties holds, but the point set may not necessarily have been constructed using generating matrices, i.e., using the digital method.

In this paper we are interested in randomized point sets $\tilde{P}_n = \{\mathbf{U}_1, \dots, \mathbf{U}_n\}$ that are obtained by applying a *scrambling transformation* in base b to a deterministic point set $P_n = \{\mathbf{V}_1, \dots, \mathbf{V}_n\}$. We can think of a scrambling transformation as a function $\mathcal{S} : [0, 1]^s \times \Omega \rightarrow [0, 1]^s$ which applies a given random vector ω from a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P})$ to the base b digits $V_{i,\ell,r}$ of each point \mathbf{V}_i to get $\mathbf{U}_i = \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{V}_i, \omega)$.

Generally speaking, the goal of a scrambling transformation is to create a randomized version of a point set P_n that preserves the desirable properties of P_n but allows for error estimation. It also usually refers to a process that either randomizes the generating matrices of the digital net, or applies random permutations to the base b digits $V_{i,\ell,r}$ forming the points \mathbf{V}_i . For instance, one way to scramble a digital net P_n is to multiply from the left each generating matrix C_ℓ by a randomly chosen non-singular lower triangular (NLT) matrix S_ℓ (i.e., with entries on the diagonal uniformly chosen in $\{1, \dots, b-1\}$, and entries below the diagonal uniformly chosen in $\{0, \dots, b-1\}$, with the other entries set to 0), and then add a digital shift in base b [13]. In this case, the random vector ω would correspond to the entries in $S_\ell, \ell = 1, \dots, s$ and the digital shift.

In this paper, we assume the scrambling transformation \mathcal{S} is such that the following two properties hold [4, 13] and refer to such \mathcal{S} as a *base b -digital scramble*. We also denote the obtained point set by ${}_b\tilde{P}_n$.

Let $U_{i,\ell} = \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} U_{i,\ell,r} b^{-r}$, that is, $U_{i,\ell,r}$ represents the r th digit in the base b expansion of the ℓ th coordinate of the i th point \mathbf{U}_i . Then we must have:

1. Each $\mathbf{U}_i \sim U([0, 1]^s)$;
2. For two distinct points $\mathbf{U}_i = \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{V}_i, \omega), \mathbf{U}_j = \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{V}_j, \omega)$ and for each coordinate $\ell = 1, \dots, s$, if the two deterministic points $V_{i,\ell}, V_{j,\ell}$ have the same first r digits in base b and differ on the $(r+1)$ th digit, then (i) the scrambled points $(U_{i,\ell}, U_{j,\ell})$ also have the same first r digits in base b , and the pair $(U_{i,\ell,r+1}, U_{j,\ell,r+1})$ is uniformly distributed over $\{(k_1, k_2), 0 \leq k_1 \neq k_2 < b\}$; (ii) the pairs $(U_{i,\ell,v}, U_{j,\ell,v})$ for $v > r+1$ are independent and uniformly distributed over $\{(k_1, k_2), 0 \leq k_1, k_2 < b\}$.

Note that in the description of the above two properties, a base b -digital scramble does not require $n = b^m$, and the base b of the scrambling does not need to match the base in which a net has been constructed.

The scrambling method described above—using NLT matrices S_ℓ —can be shown to satisfy these two properties [13], as well as the nested scrambling method proposed by Owen in [3]. We refer the reader to [4] for further information on scrambling methods for digital nets. For the remainder of this paper, whenever we refer to a *scrambled (t, m, s) -net in base b* we are assuming it has been scrambled using a base b -digital scramble.

2.2 Dependence concepts

Next, we introduce dependence concepts from [9] that will be used throughout this paper.

Consider a sampling scheme $\tilde{P}_n = \{\mathbf{U}_1, \dots, \mathbf{U}_n\}$ designed to construct an unbiased estimator of the form

$$\hat{\mu}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(\mathbf{U}_i)$$

for

$$I(f) = \int_{[0,1]^s} f(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x},$$

where we assume each \mathbf{U}_i is uniformly distributed over $[0, 1]^s$ with a possible dependence structure between the \mathbf{U}_i 's. To assess this dependence, a key quantity of interest is

$$H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}; \tilde{P}_n) := \frac{2}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j>i} P(\mathbf{U}_i \leq \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{U}_j \leq \mathbf{y}). \quad (2)$$

We can think of $H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}; \tilde{P}_n)$ as the joint distribution of a pair of (distinct) points $(\mathbf{U}_I, \mathbf{U}_J)$ randomly chosen in \tilde{P}_n . (Here, we use capital letters for the indices I and J to make it clear the points are randomly selected.)

Intuitively speaking, having negative dependence across the points of a sampling scheme \tilde{P}_n is a desirable property because it implies the points are less likely to be clustered together, as they instead tend to repel each other, thus ensuring the sampling space is well covered by the points in \tilde{P}_n .

In this paper, negative dependence is assessed using the following concepts from [14]: we say that a vector $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_r)$ of random variables is NLOD if

$$P(X_1 \leq x_1, \dots, X_r \leq x_r) \leq \prod_{\ell=1}^r P(X_\ell \leq x_\ell),$$

and it is NUOD if

$$P(X_1 \geq x_1, \dots, X_r \geq x_r) \leq \prod_{\ell=1}^r P(X_\ell \geq x_\ell).$$

Note that when the dimension $r = 2$, the NLOD and NUOD properties are equivalent but it is not necessarily the case when $r \geq 3$.

If $H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}; \tilde{P}_n) \leq \prod_{\ell=1}^s x_\ell y_\ell$ for all $0 \leq x_\ell, y_\ell \leq 1$, $\ell = 1, \dots, s$, then we say \tilde{P}_n is an *NLOD sampling scheme*.

We are also interested in the quantity

$$T(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}; \tilde{P}_n) := \frac{2}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j>i} P(\mathbf{U}_i \geq \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{U}_j \geq \mathbf{y}), \quad (3)$$

and say that \tilde{P}_n is an *NUOD sampling scheme* if $T(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}; \tilde{P}_n) \geq \prod_{\ell=1}^s (1-x_\ell)(1-y_\ell)$ for all $0 \leq x_\ell, y_\ell \leq 1$, $\ell = 1, \dots, s$.

In [9], the quantity $T(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}; \tilde{P}_n)$ arises in the analysis of $\text{Cov}(f(\mathbf{U}_I), f(\mathbf{U}_J))$, the covariance term that differentiates the variance of $\hat{\mu}_n$ —when \tilde{P}_n is a dependent sampling scheme—from that of a Monte Carlo estimator with the same number of points n . More precisely, $\text{Cov}(f(\mathbf{U}_I), f(\mathbf{U}_J))$ is such that

$$\text{Var}(\hat{\mu}_n) = \frac{\sigma^2}{n} + \frac{n-1}{n} \text{Cov}(f(\mathbf{U}_I), f(\mathbf{U}_J)),$$

where $\sigma^2 = \text{Var}(f(\mathbf{U}))$. In the present work, rather than using the expression developed in [9] to write this covariance in terms of the survival function $T(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}; \tilde{P}_n)$, we instead work with the direct representation

$$\sigma_{I,J} := \text{Cov}(f(\mathbf{U}_I), f(\mathbf{U}_J)) = \int_{[0,1]^{2s}} f(\mathbf{x})f(\mathbf{y})\psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})d\mathbf{x}d\mathbf{y} - \int_{[0,1]^{2s}} f(\mathbf{x})f(\mathbf{y})d\mathbf{x}d\mathbf{y}. \quad (4)$$

where $\psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is the joint pdf of $(\mathbf{U}_I, \mathbf{U}_J)$ evaluated at (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) . (We set $\psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = 0$ if one of the coordinates of \mathbf{x} or \mathbf{y} is equal to 1.) In particular, this means we can also write

$$H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}; \tilde{P}_n) = \int_{R(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})} \psi(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})d\mathbf{u}d\mathbf{v},$$

where $R(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \{(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \in [0, 1]^{2s} : u_j < x_j, v_j < y_j, j = 1, \dots, s\}$.

The joint pdf $\psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ corresponding to a base b -digitally scrambled point set is the topic of Section 3. The rest of this section develops tools to analyze this joint pdf.

Remark 2.1. In the previous two equations we used different letters within the integrals. This is to emphasize the function of interest. In the first of the two equations we were interested in $f(\mathbf{x})$, $f(\mathbf{y})$, and $\psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$, while in the second we were interested in $H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}; \tilde{P}_n)$.

2.3 Tools to analyze the joint pdf $\psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$

Definition 2.2. For $x, y \in [0, 1)$, let $\gamma_b(x, y)$ be the exact number of initial digits shared by x and y in their (finite) base b expansion, i.e. the smallest number i such that

$$\lfloor b^i x \rfloor = \lfloor b^i y \rfloor \quad \text{but} \quad \lfloor b^{i+1} x \rfloor \neq \lfloor b^{i+1} y \rfloor.$$

For $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in [0, 1)^s$, we define

$$\gamma_b^s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = (\gamma_b(x_1, y_1), \dots, \gamma_b(x_s, y_s)) \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_b(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{j=1}^s \gamma_b(x_j, y_j).$$

Given $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^s$, we say that $\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{i}$ if $k_j \leq i_j$ for all $j = 1, \dots, s$. (Note that in this paper, we assume that \mathbb{N} includes 0.) To simplify notation, whenever we use i or k in the same formula as \mathbf{i} or \mathbf{k} , they will denote the sum of the coordinates: $i = i_1 + \dots + i_s$ and $k = k_1 + \dots + k_s$. For each $\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{i} \in (\mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\})^s$ we define $C_{\mathbf{k}}^s, D_{\mathbf{i}}^s \subseteq [0, 1)^{2s}$ to be the subsets

$$C_{\mathbf{k}}^s = \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in [0, 1)^{2s} : \mathbf{k} \leq \gamma_b^s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\} \quad \text{and} \\ D_{\mathbf{i}}^s = \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in [0, 1)^{2s} : \gamma_b^s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{i}\}.$$

Note that if $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in D_{\mathbf{i}}^s$ for finite \mathbf{i} , we must have $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{y}$. In the special case $s = 1$ we denote these sets by C_k and D_i respectively. It is clear that $C_{\mathbf{k}}^s = \cup_{\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{i}} D_{\mathbf{i}}^s$ and that the $D_{\mathbf{i}}^s$'s partition $[0, 1)^{2s}$. One can easily verify that

$$C_k = \bigcup_{a=0}^{b^k-1} \left[\frac{a}{b^k}, \frac{a+1}{b^k} \right)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad C_{\mathbf{k}}^s = \prod_{j=1}^s C_{k_j}$$

from which it follows that $\text{Vol}(C_k) = b^{-k}$ and $\text{Vol}(C_{\mathbf{k}}^s) = b^{-k}$. Finally, since $D_{\mathbf{i}} = C_{\mathbf{i}} \setminus C_{\mathbf{i}+1}$ and because $D_{\mathbf{i}}^s = \prod_{j=1}^s D_{i_j}$ we have

$$\text{Vol}(D_{\mathbf{i}}^s) = \frac{(b-1)^s}{b^{s+i}}$$

because $\text{Vol}(D_i) = (b-1)/b^{i+1}$.

Remark 2.3. The newly introduced notation $\gamma_b^s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ and $D_{\mathbf{i}}^s$ give us a succinct way of describing the two properties of a base b -digital scramble mentioned in Section 2.1. Indeed, these properties are equivalent to having that for any two scrambled points $\mathbf{U}_j, \mathbf{U}_l$ obtained from a base b -digital scrambling of $\mathbf{V}_j, \mathbf{V}_l$, we have that $(\mathbf{U}_j, \mathbf{U}_l) \sim U(D_{\mathbf{i}}^s)$, where $\mathbf{i} = \gamma_b^s(\mathbf{V}_j, \mathbf{V}_l)$. In turn, this implies that the joint pdf of a scrambled digital net in base b is constant on each $D_{\mathbf{i}}^s$ (and is zero on those $D_{\mathbf{i}}^s$ for which $i = \infty$). This latter property will be used in the analysis that follows and in the proof of Theorem 3.6.

To prove the NLOD property one must show that

$$\int_{R(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})} \psi(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) d\mathbf{u} d\mathbf{v} \leq \mathbf{x}\mathbf{y} = \prod_{j=1}^s x_j y_j$$

holds for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in [0, 1]^{2s}$. This integral may be written as

$$\int_{R(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})} \psi(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) d\mathbf{u} d\mathbf{v} = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}^s} V_i^s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \psi_i,$$

where

$$V_i^s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \int_{R(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})} 1_{D_i^s}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) d\mathbf{u} d\mathbf{v} = \text{Vol}(R(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \cap D_i^s)$$

and ψ_i is the value of ψ on D_i^s . As before, in the special case $s = 1$ we use the notation $V_i(x, y)$ or simply V_i when x and y are fixed. We will use the fact that

$$V_i^s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \int_{D_{i_1}^s} \dots \int_{D_{i_s}^s} \prod_{j=1}^s 1_{R(x_j, y_j)}(u_j, v_j) du_s dv_s \dots du_1 dv_1 = \prod_{j=1}^s V_{i_j}(x_j, y_j)$$

together with the following lemma (stating a result that appears in the proof of [9, Proposition 7]) to simplify the calculation of $V_i^s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $V_i = V_i(x, y)$ where $x, y \in [0, 1]$ and $i \geq 0$. Then we have*

$$V_i = \begin{cases} \frac{b-1}{b} \frac{\min(x, y)}{b^i} & \text{if } \gamma_b(x, y) < i, \\ xy - k_i(x + y - k_i - b^{-i}) - \frac{\min(x, y)}{b^{i+1}} & \text{if } \gamma_b(x, y) = i, \\ k_{i+1}(x + y - k_{i+1} - b^{-i-1}) - k_i(x + y - k_i - b^{-i}) & \text{if } \gamma_b(x, y) > i, \end{cases}$$

where $k_i = \lfloor b^i \min(x, y) \rfloor b^{-i}$.

We handle the special case where at least one of x or y equals 1 in the following lemma.

Lemma 2.5. *For any $x \in [0, 1]$ and $i \geq 0$, we have $V_i(x, 1) = V_i(1, x) = xV_i(1, 1)$, where $V_i(1, 1) = \text{Vol}(D_i) = (b-1)/b^{i+1}$.*

Proof. First, it is clear from the definition of $V_i(1, 1)$ that it equals $\text{Vol}(D_i)$. Next, for $u \in [0, 1]$ we define

$$D_i(u) = \{y \in [0, 1] : \gamma_b(u, y) = i\}.$$

Elements of $D_i(u)$ have the same first i digits as u , differ on the $(i+1)$ st digit, with the remaining digits being free. Hence the length of $D_i(u)$ is $(b-1)/b^{i+1}$. Next, we evaluate

$$V_i(x, 1) = \int_{R(x, 1)} 1_{D_i}(u, v) du dv = \int_0^x \int_0^1 1_{D_i}(u, v) du dv = \int_0^x \int_0^1 1_{D_i(u)}(v) dv du = \int_0^x \frac{b-1}{b^{i+1}} du = x \frac{b-1}{b^{i+1}}.$$

Clearly, a similar argument can be made to compute $V_i(1, x)$. □

We only need the above formulas to prove the following technical lemma, which gives us a critical relation between V_i and V_{i+1} . While its proof (found in the appendix) is rather tedious, it is not hard, we simply use the above formula and carefully work through the cases.

Lemma 2.6. *Let $x, y \in [0, 1]$ be given and $V_i = V_i(x, y)$ be defined as above. Then we have $bV_i - V_{i-1} \geq 0$ for all $i \geq 1$.*

3 The joint pdf of scrambled point sets

We first introduce some notation that will be helpful for important counting arguments that are needed to derive the joint pdf of scrambled point sets.

Definition 3.1. Let $P_n = \{\mathbf{U}_1, \dots, \mathbf{U}_n\}$ be a point set in $[0, 1]^s$ and $b \geq 2$ be an integer.

1. Let $m_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n, \mathbf{U}_l)$ be the number of points $\mathbf{U}_j \in P_n$ with $j \neq l$ satisfying $\gamma_b^s(\mathbf{U}_l, \mathbf{U}_j) \geq \mathbf{k}$. If these numbers are the same for all \mathbf{U}_l then we write $m_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n, \mathbf{U}_l) = m_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n)$.
2. Let $M_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n)$ be the number of ordered pairs of distinct points $(\mathbf{U}_l, \mathbf{U}_j)$ in P_n such that $\gamma_b^s(\mathbf{U}_l, \mathbf{U}_j) \geq \mathbf{k}$.
3. Let $n_b(\mathbf{i}; P_n, \mathbf{U}_l)$ be the number of points $\mathbf{U}_j \in P_n$ satisfying $\gamma_b^s(\mathbf{U}_l, \mathbf{U}_j) = \mathbf{i}$. If these numbers are the same for all \mathbf{U}_l we write $n_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n, \mathbf{U}_l) = n_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n)$.
4. Let $N_b(\mathbf{i}; P_n)$ be the number of ordered pairs $(\mathbf{U}_l, \mathbf{U}_j)$ in P_n such that $\gamma_b^s(\mathbf{U}_l, \mathbf{U}_j) = \mathbf{i}$.
5. In the special case where P_n is a digital (t, m, s) -net (deterministic or scrambled), we let $r(\mathbf{k})$ be the rank of the matrix formed by the first k_j rows of the generating matrices C_j , $j = 1, \dots, s$. (If $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{0}$ then we set $r(\mathbf{k}) = 0$.)

Remark 3.2. A few observations are in order:

1. The integer b used in the above definitions does not need to be equal to the base used to construct the point set P_n .
2. The quantity $m_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n, \mathbf{U}_l)$ is also equal to the number of points in P_n (other than \mathbf{U}_l) that are in the same \mathbf{k} -elementary interval as \mathbf{U}_l . Similarly, $M_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n)$ is the number of ordered pairs of distinct points from P_n that lie in the same \mathbf{k} -elementary intervals.
3. The quantity $N_b(\mathbf{i}; P_n)$ corresponds to the number of (ordered) pairs of distinct points that are in $D_{\mathbf{i}}^s$.
4. Clearly we have that

$$M_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n) = \sum_{l=1}^n m_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n, \mathbf{U}_l) \text{ and } N_b(\mathbf{i}; P_n) = \sum_{l=1}^n n_b(\mathbf{i}; P_n, \mathbf{U}_l).$$

5. As can be inferred from Remark 2.3, if $(\mathbf{U}_j, \mathbf{U}_l)$ are the two points obtained after applying a base b -digital scramble to $(\mathbf{V}_j, \mathbf{V}_l)$, then $\gamma_b^s(\mathbf{V}_j, \mathbf{V}_l) = \gamma_b^s(\mathbf{U}_j, \mathbf{U}_l)$. Since all the counting numbers introduced in Definition 3.1 are entirely determined by the function $\gamma_b^s(\cdot, \cdot)$, it means these numbers are the same for P_n and ${}_b\tilde{P}_n$.

In what follows we will make use of the following relations between the above quantities.

Proposition 3.3. *We have that*

$$n_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n, \mathbf{U}_l) = \sum_{\mathbf{e} \in \{0,1\}^s} (-1)^e m_b(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{e}; P_n, \mathbf{U}_l) \text{ and}$$

$$N_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n, \mathbf{U}_l) = \sum_{\mathbf{e} \in \{0,1\}^s} (-1)^e M_b(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{e}; P_n, \mathbf{U}_l).$$

Proof. Fix $\mathbf{U}_l \in P_n$ and for each $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^s$ let $I_{\mathbf{k}}^l$ denote the elementary \mathbf{k} -interval that contains \mathbf{U}_l . Since a point $\mathbf{U}_j \in P_n \cap I_{\mathbf{k}}^l$ satisfies $\gamma_b^s(\mathbf{U}_l, \mathbf{U}_j) = \mathbf{k}$ if and only if \mathbf{U}_j is not in any $I_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{e}}^l$, where $\mathbf{e} \in \{0, 1\}^s$ with $e = 1$, it holds that $n_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n, \mathbf{U}_l)$ counts the number of points from P_n that are in the set

$$I_{\mathbf{k}}^l \setminus \left(\bigcup_{\mathbf{e} \in \{0,1\}^s, k=e} I_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{e}}^l \right).$$

Note that \mathbf{U}_l is not in the above set. To apply the Principle of Inclusion-Exclusion, we observe that the intersection of any r distinct elementary intervals in the above union is an elementary interval of the form $I_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{e}}^l$,

where $\mathbf{e} \in \{0, 1\}^s$ with $e = r$, and that $m_b(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{e}; P_n, \mathbf{U}_l) + 1$ counts the number of points in $I_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{e}}^l$. Thus by the Principle of Inclusion-Exclusion we have

$$\begin{aligned} n_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n, \mathbf{U}_l) &= \sum_{r=0}^s \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{e} \in \{0,1\}^s \\ e=r}} (-1)^r (m_b(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{e}; \tilde{P}_n, \mathbf{U}_l) + 1) \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{e} \in \{0,1\}^s} (-1)^e (m_b(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{e}; P_n, \mathbf{U}_l) + 1) = \sum_{\mathbf{e} \in \{0,1\}^s} (-1)^e m_b(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{e}; P_n, \mathbf{U}_l), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the fact that $\sum_{\mathbf{e} \in \{0,1\}^s} (-1)^e = 0$. The expression for $N_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n)$ follows from Remark 3.2.4. \square

The next result provides expressions for the counting numbers $m_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n)$ and $n_b(\mathbf{i}; P_n)$ in the special case of scrambled digital (t, m, s) -nets and scrambled nets with $t = 0$.

Lemma 3.4. *Let ${}_b\tilde{P}_n$ be a scrambled digital (t, m, s) -net in base b . Then*

$$\begin{aligned} (i) \quad & m_b(\mathbf{k}; {}_b\tilde{P}_n) = b^{m-r(\mathbf{k})} - 1 \\ (ii) \quad & n_b(\mathbf{i}; {}_b\tilde{P}_n) = \sum_{\mathbf{e} \in \{0,1\}^s} (-1)^e b^{m-r(\mathbf{i}+\mathbf{e})} \text{ and} \\ (iii) \quad & N_b(\mathbf{i}; {}_b\tilde{P}_n) = b^m n_b(\mathbf{i}; {}_b\tilde{P}_n). \end{aligned}$$

For scrambled $(0, m, s)$ -nets in base b , we have

$$\begin{aligned} (iv) \quad & m_b(\mathbf{k}; {}_b\tilde{P}_n) = \max(b^{m-k} - 1, 0) \text{ and} \\ (v) \quad & n_b(\mathbf{i}; {}_b\tilde{P}_n) = \sum_{k=0}^s (-1)^k \binom{s}{k} \max(b^{m-i-k}, 1). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Consider the partition of $[0, 1]^s$ into elementary \mathbf{k} -intervals of the form $I_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{a})$ with $0 \leq a_j < b^{k_j}$, $j = 1, \dots, s$ (defined in (1)) and let \mathbf{a}_ℓ denote the k -dimensional integer vector corresponding to the elementary interval $I_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{a}_\ell)$ (which we denote $I_{\mathbf{k}}^\ell$ for short) from this partition in which \mathbf{U}_ℓ lies. Next, we observe that from the properties of the scrambling described in Section 2.1, there exists a bijection $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{k}} : \mathbb{F}_b^k \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_b^k$ such that if the deterministic point $\mathbf{V}_\ell \in I_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{a})$ then its scrambled version $\mathbf{U}_\ell \in I_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{a})) = I_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{a}')$ for some $0 \leq \mathbf{a}' < b^{\mathbf{k}}$. Indeed, $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{k}}$ is injective because if $\mathbf{V}_\ell \in I_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{a})$ and $\mathbf{V}_j \in I_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{a}')$ with $\mathbf{a} \neq \mathbf{a}'$, then \mathbf{U}_ℓ and \mathbf{U}_j cannot be in the same elementary intervals (otherwise Property 2 of the scrambling would not hold); it is surjective because for each $\mathbf{a}' \in \mathbb{F}_b^k$ there has to be an $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{F}_b^k$ such that $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{a}) = \mathbf{a}'$ otherwise Property 1 (uniformity) of the scrambling would not hold. Furthermore, this \mathbf{a} is well defined since if $\mathbf{U}_\ell, \mathbf{U}_j \in I_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{a}')$ then $\mathbf{V}_\ell, \mathbf{V}_j \in I_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{a})$. Then let $T_{\mathbf{k}}$ be the linear transformation from \mathbb{F}_b^m to \mathbb{F}_b^k determined by the k rows formed by the first k_j rows of C_j , for $j = 1, \dots, s$. Given that \mathbf{U}_ℓ lies in $I_{\mathbf{k}}^\ell$, it means \mathbf{a}_ℓ is in the image of $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{k}} \circ T_{\mathbf{k}}$. The dimension of the null space of $T_{\mathbf{k}}$ is $m - r(\mathbf{k})$, while the null space of $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{k}}$ has dimension 0. Thus the number of points in $I_{\mathbf{k}}^\ell$ (including \mathbf{U}_ℓ) is given by $b^{m-r(\mathbf{k})}$, which corresponds to $m_b(\mathbf{k}; {}_b\tilde{P}_n) + 1$. This shows (i).

To obtain (ii) we use Proposition 3.3, whose proof shows that

$$n_b(\mathbf{i}; {}_b\tilde{P}_n) = \sum_{\mathbf{e} \in \{0,1\}^s} (-1)^e (m_b(\mathbf{i} + \mathbf{e}; {}_b\tilde{P}_n, \mathbf{U}_l) + 1) = \sum_{\mathbf{e} \in \{0,1\}^s} (-1)^e m_b(\mathbf{i} + \mathbf{e}; {}_b\tilde{P}_n, \mathbf{U}_l).$$

To obtain (iii) we use Remark 3.2 (item 4).

For a general scrambled $(0, m, s)$ -net in base b (not necessarily constructed using the digital method), by definition we have $m_b(\mathbf{k}; {}_b\tilde{P}_n) = b^{m-k} - 1$ for $k \leq m$ and is 0 otherwise. This gives (iv). To get (v), we use the fact that there are exactly $\binom{s}{r}$ vectors $\mathbf{k} \in \{0, 1\}^s$ with $k = r$, together with the expression for $m_b(\mathbf{k}; {}_b\tilde{P}_n, \mathbf{U}_l)$, to

get

$$n_b(\mathbf{i}; {}_b\tilde{P}_n) = \sum_{r=0}^s \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{k} \in \{0,1\}^s \\ k=r}} (-1)^k \max(b^{m-i-k}, 1) = \sum_{k=0}^s (-1)^k \binom{s}{k} \max(b^{m-i-k}, 1). \quad \square$$

Remark 3.5. In the remainder of this paper, we assume we are working with point sets P_n such that the j th coordinate of the points are all distinct, for $j = 1, \dots, s$. Equivalently, this means we assume every pair of distinct points has a bounded number of common digits, i.e., we assume $\gamma_b(\mathbf{V}_i, \mathbf{V}_j) < \infty$ for all $i \neq j$. The properties of a base b -digital scramble imply that we also have $\gamma_b(\mathbf{U}_i, \mathbf{U}_j) < \infty$ for ${}_b\tilde{P}_n = \{\mathbf{U}_1, \dots, \mathbf{U}_n\}$, and that the j th coordinate of the points from ${}_b\tilde{P}_n$ are all distinct, for $j = 1, \dots, s$. Doing so avoids the case where we have two points with equal coordinates in one or more dimension, which would in turn lead to a joint pdf with non-zero value on the diagonal of the unit hypercube, i.e., on D_i^s with $i = \infty$.

Theorem 3.6. *Let ${}_b\tilde{P}_n = \{\mathbf{U}_1, \dots, \mathbf{U}_n\}$ be a point set obtained by applying a base b -digital scramble to $P_n = \{\mathbf{V}_1, \dots, \mathbf{V}_n\}$. Assume ${}_b\tilde{P}_n$ is such that the j th coordinate of the points are all distinct, for each $j = 1, \dots, s$. Then the joint pdf $\psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ of two distinct points $(\mathbf{U}_I, \mathbf{U}_J)$ randomly chosen from ${}_b\tilde{P}_n$ is given by*

$$\psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \begin{cases} \frac{N_b(\mathbf{i}; P_n)}{n(n-1)} \frac{b^{s+i}}{(b-1)^s} & \text{if } i < \infty, \\ 0 & \text{if } i = \infty, \end{cases}$$

where $\mathbf{i} = \gamma_b^s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ and $i = \gamma_b(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$.

In the special case where ${}_b\tilde{P}_n$ is a scrambled (t, m, s) -net in base b , the joint pdf becomes

$$\psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \begin{cases} \frac{n_b(\mathbf{i}; P_n)}{(b^m-1)} \frac{b^{s+i}}{(b-1)^s} & \text{if } i < \infty, \\ 0 & \text{if } i = \infty. \end{cases}$$

Proof. As explained in Remark 2.3, from the properties of a base b -digital scramble we have that $\psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is constant on D_i^s . The value ψ_i of $\psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ on D_i^s ($i \neq \infty$) can be found by observing that the integral of $\psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ over D_i^s is equal to the probability that a random pair of distinct points from ${}_b\tilde{P}_n$ lie in D_i^s , i.e.,

$$\frac{N_b(\mathbf{i}; {}_b\tilde{P}_n)}{n(n-1)} = \int_{D_i^s} \psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) d\mathbf{x}d\mathbf{y}. \quad (5)$$

Since the RHS is also equal to $\psi_i \text{Vol}(D_i^s) = \psi_i \frac{(b-1)^s}{b^{s+i}}$, we then simply solve for ψ_i using (5).

For a scrambled (t, m, s) -net in base b , from Lemma 3.4 we get $N_b(\mathbf{i}; {}_b\tilde{P}_n) = b^m n_b(\mathbf{i}; P_n)$.

When $i = \infty$, based on the assumption we made in Remark 3.5, there cannot be two distinct points in D_i so the joint pdf must be 0 in this case.

Finally, based on Remark 3.2(v) we have that $N_b(\mathbf{i}; {}_b\tilde{P}_n) = N_b(\mathbf{i}; P_n)$ and $n_b(\mathbf{i}; {}_b\tilde{P}_n) = n_b(\mathbf{i}; P_n)$. □

Remark 3.7. A few observations are in order:

1. The joint pdf is a simple function because the assumption discussed in Remark 3.5 implies that if i is large enough, then $N_b(\mathbf{i}; P_n)$ becomes 0 and thus $\psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = 0$.
2. We can see from Lemma 3.4 and Theorem 3.6 that the joint pdf of a scrambled $(0, m, s)$ -net depends only on the sum $\sum_{j=1}^s \gamma_b(x_j, y_j)$ and not on the vector $\gamma_b^s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$, since in that case $n_b(\mathbf{i}; P_n)$ depends only on i .
3. Using Lemma 2.4 and its preceding discussion along with the formulas in this section, one can compute $H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}; {}_b\tilde{P}_n)$ exactly.

4 Dependence structure of scrambled point sets

By the end of this section we will have shown that the only scrambled digital (t, m, s) -nets that are NLOD/NUOD are those for which $t = 0$. We have seen that the joint pdf of such nets is a function that is constant on D_i^s when $i \in \mathbb{N}^s$ and is otherwise zero. In this section we will develop an inequality of the form

$$G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := \int_{R(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})} \psi(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) d\mathbf{u}d\mathbf{v} \leq C_b \int_{R(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})} d\mathbf{u}d\mathbf{v} = C_b \mathbf{x}\mathbf{y} = C_b \prod_{j=1}^s x_j y_j \quad (6)$$

that holds for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in [0, 1]^s$, and will provide an exact expression for the minimum constant C_b satisfying this inequality. This expression will be written in terms of the $C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n)$ values mentioned in the introduction, which play a key role in the analysis of the dependence structure of ${}_b\tilde{P}_n$, and that we now define.

4.1 The $C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n)$ values

Definition 4.1. Let P_n be a point set in $[0, 1]^s$ and $b \geq 2$ be an integer. Let $C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n)$ be defined as

$$C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n) = \frac{b^k M_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n)}{n(n-1)}.$$

It is easy to see that $C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n) = 1$ when $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{0}$. We also have the following result:

Lemma 4.2. *If P_n is a digital (t, m, s) -net in base b whose one-dimensional projections are $(0, m, 1)$ -nets, then*

$$C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n) = \frac{b^k (b^{m-r(\mathbf{k})} - 1)}{b^m - 1}.$$

If P_n is a $(0, m, s)$ -net in base b , then

$$C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n) = \frac{b^k (\max(b^{m-k} - 1, 0))}{b^m - 1}.$$

Proof. From the definition of $M_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n)$, for (t, m, s) -nets in base b we have that $M_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n) = b^m m_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n)$, and from Lemma 3.4, for digital nets we have that $m(\mathbf{k}; \tilde{P}_n) = b^{m-r(\mathbf{k})} - 1$, from which we obtain the desired formula. For a $(0, m, s)$ -net in base b , we have $M_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n) = b^m (\max(b^{m-k}, 1) - 1)$, which after simplification yields $C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n) = b^k (\max(b^{m-k}, 1) - 1) / (b^m - 1)$ for $k \leq m$. \square

As mentioned above, the values $C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n)$ play a key role in our analysis of the joint pdf of scrambled point sets. They also have a connection with the concept of \mathbf{k} -equidistribution, in that the equality $C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n) = b^k (b^{m-k} - 1) / (b^m - 1)$ holds if and only if P_n is \mathbf{k} -equidistributed. However, the value $C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n)$ can be computed for any point set P_n and base $b \geq 2$, and leads us to the introduction of the following new concept.

Definition 4.3. Let P_n be a point set in $[0, 1]^s$ and $b \geq 2$ be a base. Let $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_s) \in \mathbb{N}^s$. Then we say P_n is \mathbf{k} -quasi-equidistributed in base b if $C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n) \leq 1$. If $C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n) \leq 1$ for all $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^s$ then we say P_n is completely quasi-equidistributed (c.q.e) in base b .

Note that there are only finitely many values of $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^s$ for which we need to compute $C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n)$ in order to verify if P_n is c.q.e. Indeed, the condition that the j th coordinate of the points are all distinct for $j = 1, \dots, s$ ensures there exists an M such that any \mathbf{k} -interval with $k > M$ has at most one point in it, which means $M_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n) = C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n) = 0$ for these \mathbf{k} 's.

It is clear that a $(0, m, s)$ -net in base b is c.q.e (in base b), since by definition it is \mathbf{k} -equidistributed for all \mathbf{k} such that $k \leq m$. Other examples of point sets P_n that are c.q.e. are given in the next proposition.

Proposition 4.4. *The first n points of a $(0, s)$ -sequence in base b is a c.q.e. point set in base b .*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^s$ with $k \leq \log(n)/\log(b)$ and write $n = jb^k + r$ with $0 \leq r < b^k$. From the properties of a (t, s) -sequence [1, 2], each point set of the form $P_{\ell, v} = \{\mathbf{V}_{(\ell-1)b^v+1}, \dots, \mathbf{V}_{\ell b^v}\}$ for $\ell \geq 1$ and $v \geq 1$ is a (t, v, s) -net in base b . Hence, we can split the first n points of a $(0, s)$ -sequence into j $(0, k, s)$ -nets and an additional point set with r points. Each of the j $(0, k, s)$ -nets contributes exactly one point to each \mathbf{k} -elementary interval. The last r points occupy exactly r of the b^k \mathbf{k} -elementary intervals, as otherwise $P_{j+1, k}$ would not be a $(0, k, s)$ -net. Therefore r \mathbf{k} -elementary intervals have $j + 1$ points and $b^k - r$ have j points. Hence

$$M_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n) = rj(j + 1) + (b^k - r)j(j - 1)$$

and therefore

$$C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n) = \frac{b^k}{n(n-1)} (rj(j + 1) + (b^k - r)j(j - 1)) = \frac{b^k}{n(n-1)} (j(n - b^k + r)).$$

Since $jb^k \leq n$ and $n - b^k + r \leq n - 1$, we have that $C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n) \leq 1$. If $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^s$ is such that $k > \log(n)/\log(b)$, then n of the b^k \mathbf{k} -elementary intervals have one point and $b^k - n$ have 0 points. Hence $M_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n)$ and therefore $C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n)$ are both 0 in that case. \square

Remark 4.5. The proof of Proposition 4.4 establishes that when P_n is given by the first n points of a $(0, s)$ -sequence in base b , then for any $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^s$, the number of points in two different \mathbf{k} -elementary intervals in base b differ by at most one.

We can also show that the $C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n)$ values contain more information than the parameter t of a digital (t, m, s) -net, as demonstrated in the following proposition.

Proposition 4.6. *Let P_n be a digital (t, m, s) -net in base b such that the j th coordinates of the net form a $(0, m, 1)$ -net in base b for each $j = 1, \dots, s$. Then we have that*

$$t = m - \max\{k : C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n) \leq 1, \mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^s, k \leq m\}.$$

Proof. It is sufficient to show that P_n is \mathbf{k} -equidistributed if and only if $C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n) \leq 1$. The “only if” statement is true because if P_n is \mathbf{k} -equidistributed, then using Lemma 3.4, we have that $M_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n) = b^m(b^{m-k} - 1)$ and therefore

$$C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n) = \frac{b^k b^m (b^{m-k} - 1)}{n(n-1)} = \frac{b^k (b^{m-k} - 1)}{b^m - 1} \leq 1.$$

To prove the “if” statement, assume that P_n is not \mathbf{k} -equidistributed for some \mathbf{k} such that $k \leq m$. Then it means the rank $r = r(\mathbf{k})$ is such that $r < k$, and that $M_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n) = b^m(b^{m-r} - 1)$. Hence

$$C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n) = \frac{b^k (b^m (b^{m-r} - 1))}{n(n-1)} = \frac{b^k (b^{m-r} - 1)}{b^m - 1} = \frac{b^{m+k-r} - b^k}{b^m - 1}.$$

Now, by assumption $k - r \geq 1$, therefore

$$C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n) \geq \frac{b^{m+1} - b^k}{b^m - 1}.$$

Hence to prove that $C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n) > 1$ it is sufficient to show that

$$\frac{b^{m+1} - b^k}{b^m - 1} > 1 \Leftrightarrow b^{m+1} - b^m > b^k - 1 \Leftrightarrow b^m(b - 1) > b^k - 1$$

and since $b \geq 2$ and $k \leq m$, we have that $b^m(b - 1) \geq b^m > b^k - 1$. \square

4.2 A functional analysis approach

In order to establish the inequality (6) set out at the beginning of this section, we apply tools from functional analysis. In order to do so, we first associate the joint pdf ψ with the vector $\psi = (\psi_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^s} \in \ell^\infty(\mathbb{N}^s)$ where ψ_i is the value assumed by ψ on D_i^s . This *value vector* induces a continuous linear functional $\widehat{\psi} : \ell^1(\mathbb{N}^s) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ via the formula

$$\widehat{\psi}(\eta) := \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}^s} \eta_i \psi_i, \quad (7)$$

where $\eta = (\eta_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^s} \in \ell^1(\mathbb{N}^s)$. Next, for each $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in [0, 1]^s$ we define

$$V^s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := (V_i^s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}))_{i \in \mathbb{N}^s} \in \ell^1(\mathbb{N}^s)$$

to be the *volume vector* of the region $R(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$, and observe that

$$\|V^s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\|_1 = \text{Vol}(R(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})) = \mathbf{xy}.$$

With this notation $G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \widehat{\psi}(V^s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}))$. As usual, in the special case $s = 1$ we drop the exponent and write

$$V(x, y) := (V_i(x, y))_{i=0}^\infty \in \ell^1(\mathbb{N}).$$

By letting

$$\mathcal{C}^s := \left\{ \frac{V^s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{\mathbf{xy}} : \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in [0, 1]^s \right\} \subseteq \ell^1(\mathbb{N}^s)$$

be the set of normalized volume vectors and denoting the norm of $\widehat{\psi}$ over \mathcal{C}^s by

$$\|\widehat{\psi}\|_{\mathcal{C}^s} := \sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{C}^s} \widehat{\psi}(\eta)$$

we get

$$G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \widehat{\psi}(V^s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})) \leq \mathbf{xy} \|\widehat{\psi}\|_{\mathcal{C}^s},$$

which holds for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in [0, 1]^s$. Thus, in the language of functional analysis our goal is to estimate $\|\widehat{\psi}\|_{\mathcal{C}^s}$, which we will do by way of a convexity argument.

Definition 4.7. We have the two following definitions.

1. For each $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^s$ we define $S^{\mathbf{k}} : \ell^1(\mathbb{N}^s) \rightarrow \ell^1(\mathbb{N}^s)$ to be the shift operator that acts on the standard Schauder basis $\{e_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}^s}$ according to the rule $S^{\mathbf{k}}e_i = e_{i+\mathbf{k}}$.
2. Given $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_s) \in \mathbb{N}^s$ and $\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^s$ we define

$$b^{-\mathbf{k}}\mathbf{x} := (b^{-k_1}x_1, \dots, b^{-k_s}x_s).$$

Lemma 4.8. Let $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in [0, 1]^s$ and $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^s$. Then

$$S^{\mathbf{k}}V^s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = b^{2\mathbf{k}}V^s(b^{-\mathbf{k}}\mathbf{x}, b^{-\mathbf{k}}\mathbf{y}).$$

In particular $S^{\mathbf{k}}\mathcal{C}^s \subseteq \mathcal{C}^s$.

Proof. We start by observing $\gamma_b(b^{-k}u, b^{-k}v) = \gamma_b(u, v) + k$, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $u, v \in [0, 1)$. From this it follows that given $x, y \in [0, 1]$, the region $R(b^{-k}x, b^{-k}y) \cap D_{i+\mathbf{k}}$ can be obtained by scaling the region $R(x, y) \cap D_i$ by a factor of b^{-k} in each coordinate, indeed

$$R(b^{-k}x, b^{-k}y) \cap D_{i+\mathbf{k}} = \{(b^{-k}u, b^{-k}v) : (u, v) \in R(x, y) \cap D_i\}.$$

Since no pair $(u, v) \in R(b^{-k}x, b^{-k}y)$ can have less than k initial common digits, we can write

$$b^{2k}V_i(b^{-k}x, b^{-k}y) = \begin{cases} V_{i-k}(x, y) & \text{if } k \leq i, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} S^k V^s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) &= \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{N}^s} V_{\mathbf{i}}^s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) e_{\mathbf{i}+k} = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{N}^s} V_{\mathbf{i}-\mathbf{k}}^s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) e_{\mathbf{i}} \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{N}^s} \left(\prod_{j=1}^s V_{i_j-k_j}(x_j, y_j) \right) e_{\mathbf{i}} \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{N}^s} \left(\prod_{j=1}^s b^{2k_j} V_{i_j}(b^{-k_j}x_j, b^{-k_j}y_j) \right) e_{\mathbf{i}} \\ &= b^{2k} \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{N}^s} V_{\mathbf{i}}(b^{-k}\mathbf{x}, b^{-k}\mathbf{y}) e_{\mathbf{i}} = b^{2k} V^s(b^{-k}\mathbf{x}, b^{-k}\mathbf{y}). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Definition 4.9. Let $\xi \in \ell^1(\mathbb{N})$ and $\xi^s \in \ell^1(\mathbb{N}^s)$ be defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \xi &:= V(1, 1) = (\text{Vol}(D_i))_{i=0}^{\infty} = \left(\frac{b-1}{b^{i+1}}\right)_{i=0}^{\infty} \text{ and} \\ \xi^s &:= V^s(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}) = (\text{Vol}(D_{\mathbf{i}}^s))_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{N}^s} = \left(\frac{(b-1)^s}{b^{s+i}}\right)_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{N}^s}. \end{aligned}$$

By applying the shift operators S^k to these vectors, we generate Schauder bases

$$\{S^k \xi : k \in \mathbb{N}\} \text{ and } \{S^k \xi^s : \mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^s\}.$$

This means that every element of $\ell^1(\mathbb{N}^s)$ can be written uniquely as $\sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^s} t_{\mathbf{k}} S^k \xi^s$, where $t_{\mathbf{k}} \in \mathbb{C}$. By Lemma 4.8 we see that if $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_s)$, then

$$S^k \xi^s = b^{2k} V^s(b^{-k}\mathbf{1}, b^{-k}\mathbf{1}) \in \mathcal{C}^s.$$

The next two lemmas show, in particular, that the elements $\eta \in \mathcal{C}^s$ are convex combinations of $\{S^k \xi^s : \mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^s\}$, i.e.

$$\eta = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^s} t_{\mathbf{k}} S^k \xi^s \text{ where } t_{\mathbf{k}} \geq 0 \text{ and } \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^s} t_{\mathbf{k}} = 1.$$

As usual the general case follows from the one-dimensional case.

Remark 4.10. The reason why there is no mention of convexity in the next two lemmas is that to do so would mean having to deal with $V(x, y)/xy$ and $V^s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})/\mathbf{x}\mathbf{y}$ instead of $V(x, y)$ and $V^s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$.

Lemma 4.11. For all $x, y \in [0, 1]$ there exists a sequence $t_k \geq 0$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, such that

$$V(x, y) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} t_k S^k \xi.$$

Proof. Because $\{S^k \xi : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a Schauder basis, we can write $V(x, y) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} t_k S^k \xi$ for some scalars t_k . To prove that $t_k \geq 0$ we will find an explicit formula for t_k . To that end, we define the sequence $\eta_n \in \ell^1(\mathbb{N})$ by

$$\eta_n = V(x, y) - \sum_{k=0}^n t_k S^k \xi = \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} t_k S^k \xi,$$

which satisfies $t_n = \eta_{n-1, n}/\xi_0$ for $n \geq 1$, and claim that

$$\eta_{n, i} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i \leq n, \\ V_i - b^{n-i} V_n & \text{if } i > n, \end{cases}$$

where $V(x, y) = (V_0, V_1, \dots)$ and $\eta_n = (\eta_{n,0}, \eta_{n,1}, \dots)$ for $n \geq 0$.

Proceeding by induction, we observe that $t_0 = V_0/\xi_0$ and $\xi_i/\xi_j = b^{j-i}$ to get

$$\eta_0 = (0, V_1 - b^{-1}V_0, \dots, V_i - b^{-i}V_0, \dots).$$

Next, we assume that the coordinates of η_{n-1} satisfy the formula and note that $\eta_n = \eta_{n-1} - t_n S^n \xi$ for $n \geq 1$. It is easy to see that $\eta_{n,i} = 0$ when $i \leq n$, and for $i > n$ we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_{n,i} &= \eta_{n-1,i} - (\eta_{n-1,n}/\xi_0)\xi_{i-n} \\ &= V_i - b^{n-1-i}V_{n-1} - (V_n - b^{-1}V_{n-1})\xi_{i-n}/\xi_0 \\ &= V_i - b^{n-1-i}V_{n-1} - b^{n-i}V_n + b^{n-i-1}V_{n-1} \\ &= V_i - b^{n-i}V_n, \end{aligned}$$

which proves the claim. Finally, for $k \geq 1$

$$t_k = \frac{bV_k - V_{k-1}}{b-1} \geq 0$$

by Lemma 2.6. □

Lemma 4.12. *For all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in [0, 1]^s$ there exist scalars $t_{\mathbf{k}} \geq 0$, $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^s$, such that*

$$V^s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^s} t_{\mathbf{k}} S^{\mathbf{k}} \xi^s \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^s} t_{\mathbf{k}} = \mathbf{x}\mathbf{y}.$$

Proof. In this proof we identify elements $(\eta_i)_{i=0}^\infty \in \ell^1(\mathbb{N})$ and $(\eta_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^s} \in \ell^1(\mathbb{N}^s)$ with the power series

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \eta_i z^i \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}^s} \eta_i \mathbf{z}^i$$

where $\mathbf{z} = \prod_{j=1}^s z_j^{i_j}$. In particular, we define

$$\begin{aligned} f_j(z) &= \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} V_i(x_j, y_j) z^i, & f^s(z) &= \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}^s} V_i^s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \mathbf{z}^i, \\ g(z) &= \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} V_i(1, 1) z^i, & g^s(z) &= \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}^s} V_i^s(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}) \mathbf{z}^i, \end{aligned}$$

and we observe that $S^k \xi$ and $S^{\mathbf{k}} \xi^s$ correspond with $z^k g(z)$ and $\mathbf{z}^{\mathbf{k}} g^s(\mathbf{z})$ respectively. With this notation, the conclusion of Lemma 4.11 becomes $f_j(z) = g(z) h_j(z)$, where $h_j(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} t_{j,k} z^k$ and $t_{j,k} \geq 0$. Since $f^s(\mathbf{z}) = \prod_{j=1}^s f_j(z_j)$ and $g^s(\mathbf{z}) = \prod_{j=1}^s g(z_j)$, we have

$$f^s(\mathbf{z}) = \prod_{j=1}^s g(z_j) h_j(z_j) = g^s(\mathbf{z}) h^s(\mathbf{z}),$$

where $h^s(\mathbf{z}) = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^s} t_{\mathbf{k}} \mathbf{z}^{\mathbf{k}}$ is the product of the $h_j(z_j)$'s. Finally, evaluating $f^s(\mathbf{z})$ and $g^s(\mathbf{z})$ at $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{1}$ yields

$$f^s(\mathbf{1}) = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}^s} V_i^s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \|V^s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\|_1 = \mathbf{x}\mathbf{y}$$

and $g^s(\mathbf{1}) = \mathbf{1}$, thus

$$\sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^s} t_{\mathbf{k}} = g^s(\mathbf{1}) h^s(\mathbf{1}) = f^s(\mathbf{1}) = \mathbf{x}\mathbf{y}. \quad \square$$

Remark 4.13. The convexity property in the previous lemma directly implies that $\|\widehat{\zeta}\|_{C^s} = \sup |\widehat{\zeta}(S^{\mathbf{k}}\xi^s)|$ for all $\zeta \in \ell^\infty(\mathbb{N}^s)$.

We are now ready to bring back the $C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n)$ values and explain the relation between these values and the joint pdf associated with ${}_b\tilde{P}_n$.

Lemma 4.14. *Let P_n be a point set in $[0, 1]^s$ such that the j th coordinate of the points are all distinct, for each $j = 1, \dots, s$. Let ${}_b\tilde{P}_n$ be the sampling scheme obtained by applying a base b -digital scramble to P_n . If $\psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ denotes the joint pdf of two distinct points randomly chosen from ${}_b\tilde{P}_n$ and $\widehat{\psi}(\cdot)$ is the linear functional defined in (7), then*

$$\widehat{\psi}(S^{\mathbf{k}}\xi^s) = C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n).$$

Proof. From Theorem 3.6, for each $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^s$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\psi}(S^{\mathbf{k}}\xi^s) &= \widehat{\psi}\left(\sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{N}^s} \frac{(b-1)^s}{b^{s+i}} e_{\mathbf{i}+\mathbf{k}}\right) = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{N}^s} \psi_{\mathbf{i}+\mathbf{k}} \frac{(b-1)^s}{b^{s+i}} \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{N}^s} \frac{N_b(\mathbf{i} + \mathbf{k}; {}_b\tilde{P}_n)}{n(n-1)} \frac{b^{s+i+\mathbf{k}}}{(b-1)^s} \frac{(b-1)^s}{b^{s+i}} = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{N}^s: \mathbf{i} \geq \mathbf{k}} \frac{b^{\mathbf{k}} N_b(\mathbf{i}; {}_b\tilde{P}_n)}{n(n-1)} \\ &= \frac{b^{\mathbf{k}} M_b(\mathbf{k}; {}_b\tilde{P}_n)}{n(n-1)} = \frac{b^{\mathbf{k}} M_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n)}{n(n-1)} \quad (\text{from Remark 3.2(v)}). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 4.15. *Let P_n be a deterministic point set and $b \geq 2$ be an integer. Assume P_n is such that the j th coordinate of the points are all distinct for $j = 1, \dots, s$. Let ${}_b\tilde{P}_n$ be the sampling scheme obtained by applying a base b -digital scramble to P_n and let $\psi(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ be the joint pdf of two distinct points randomly chosen from ${}_b\tilde{P}_n$. Then for $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in [0, 1]^s$, there exists scalars $t_{\mathbf{k}} \geq 0$ with $\sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^s} t_{\mathbf{k}} = \mathbf{x}\mathbf{y}$ such that*

$$\int_{R(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})} \psi(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) d\mathbf{u} d\mathbf{v} = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^s} t_{\mathbf{k}} C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n)$$

In particular,

$$\int_{R(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})} \psi(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) d\mathbf{u} d\mathbf{v} \leq \mathbf{x}\mathbf{y} \max_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^s} C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n).$$

Proof. By Lemma 4.12, given $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in [0, 1]^s$ there exists scalars $t_{\mathbf{k}} \geq 0$ with $\sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^s} t_{\mathbf{k}} = \mathbf{x}\mathbf{y}$ such that $V^s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^s} t_{\mathbf{k}} S^{\mathbf{k}}\xi^s$. Now

$$\int_{R(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})} \psi(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) d\mathbf{u} d\mathbf{v} = \widehat{\psi}(V^s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})) = \widehat{\psi}\left(\sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^s} t_{\mathbf{k}} S^{\mathbf{k}}\xi^s\right) = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^s} t_{\mathbf{k}} \widehat{\psi}(S^{\mathbf{k}}\xi^s) = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^s} t_{\mathbf{k}} C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n)$$

where the last equality follows from Lemma 4.14. The inequality in the result is obtained by using the fact that $\sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^s} t_{\mathbf{k}} = \mathbf{x}\mathbf{y}$ and recalling that only a finite number of vectors \mathbf{k} are such that $C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n) > 0$ because of our assumption on P_n having distinct coordinates, as discussed after Definition 4.3. \square

Remark 4.16. From Theorem 4.15 and as discussed when presenting Eq. (6) at the beginning of this section, it is clear that the quantity $C_b = \max_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^s} C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n)$ plays an important role in determining whether or not ${}_b\tilde{P}_n$ is NL0D. This will be clarified in Theorem 4.19.

We note that two nets with the same value of t , m , and s may have different values for the $C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n)$ values. A natural question is then: ‘‘What characteristics of P_n can be measured by the $C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n)$ values while not being captured by the parameter t ?’’ The next result provides some answers by showing that the values $C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n)$ can be used to differentiate two point sets with respect to their propensity for negative dependence. More precisely, it shows that the $C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n)$ values are able to capture the difference between the two nets in their ability to keep the integral of the joint pdf small. The parameter t fails to capture this difference because it aggregates too much information regarding the equidistribution properties of P_n .

Corollary 4.17. *Let P_n and P'_n be deterministic point sets such that the j th coordinate of the points are all distinct, for each $j = 1, \dots, s$. Let ${}_b\tilde{P}_n$ and ${}_b\tilde{P}'_n$ be the sampling schemes obtained by applying a base b -digital scramble to P_n and P'_n , respectively. Let $\psi(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ and $\psi'(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ be the joint pdf of two distinct points randomly chosen from ${}_b\tilde{P}_n$ and ${}_b\tilde{P}'_n$, respectively. Then the following are equivalent:*

1. For all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in [0, 1]^s$,

$$\int_{R(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})} \psi(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) d\mathbf{u} d\mathbf{v} \leq \int_{R(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})} \psi'(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) d\mathbf{u} d\mathbf{v}$$

2. $C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n) \leq C_b(\mathbf{k}; P'_n)$ for all $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^s$.

Proof. The fact that (2) \Rightarrow (1) is easily established using Theorem 4.15. If (1) holds, then from Theorem 4.15 and using the fact that the values $t_{\mathbf{k}} \geq 0$ only depend on \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} (not on the point set), it should be clear that (2) must hold: for additional details, we refer the reader to the proof of Theorem 4.19, which uses a similar argument for the “only if” part. \square

We need one more technical lemma before we proceed to the next result. This technical lemma will help us show that for base b digitally scrambled point sets, the NLOD and NUOD properties are equivalent.

Lemma 4.18. *Let $P_n = \{\mathbf{V}_1, \dots, \mathbf{V}_n\}$ be a point set such that the j th coordinate of the points are all distinct, for all $j = 1, \dots, s$. Let ${}_b\tilde{P}_n$ be the sampling scheme obtained by applying a base b -digital scramble to P_n . Let $\psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ be the joint pdf of two distinct points randomly chosen from ${}_b\tilde{P}_n$. Let $\mathbf{e}_j \in \mathbb{R}^s$ be the vector that is 1 in the j th coordinate and 0 elsewhere, for some $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$. Then for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in [0, 1]^s$ we have*

$$\int_{R(\mathbf{e}_j - \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{e}_j - \mathbf{y})} \psi(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) d\mathbf{u} d\mathbf{v} = \int_{R(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})} \psi(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) d\mathbf{u} d\mathbf{v}$$

Proof. The set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ containing all numbers with finite base b expansion is $\{ab^{-k} : a \in \mathbb{Z}, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$, a set of Lebesgue measure 0. If $x, y \in [0, 1] \setminus A$ have base b expansions $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} x_i b^{-i}$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} y_i b^{-i}$, respectively, then the base b expansions of $1 - x$ and $1 - y$ are

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{(b-1) - x_i}{b^i} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{(b-1) - y_i}{b^i}$$

respectively. It follows that $\gamma_b(x, y) = \gamma_b(1 - x, 1 - y)$ almost everywhere and that D_i is, up to a set of measure 0, invariant under the transformation $(x, y) \rightarrow (1 - x, 1 - y)$. This means that D_i^s is also invariant, up to a set of measure 0, under the transformation $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \rightarrow (\mathbf{e}_j - \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{e}_j - \mathbf{y})$. Because $\psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is constant on each D_i^s , $\psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \psi(\mathbf{e}_j - \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{e}_j - \mathbf{y})$ except on a set of measure 0. The result then follows from integration by substitution. \square

Theorem 4.19. *Let P_n be a deterministic point set and $b \geq 2$ be an integer. Assume P_n is such that the j th coordinate of the points are all distinct. Let ${}_b\tilde{P}_n$ be the sampling scheme obtained by applying a base b -digital scramble to P_n . Then ${}_b\tilde{P}_n$ is NLOD/NUOD if and only if P_n is c.q.e.*

Proof. First, by applying Lemma 4.18 successively to $\mathbf{e}_j, j = 1, \dots, s$, we see that the NLOD and NUOD properties are equivalent. So we proceed to show that ${}_b\tilde{P}_n$ is NLOD if and only if P_n is c.q.e.

For the “if” part, from Theorem 4.15, we need to show that

$$\sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^s} t_{\mathbf{k}} C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n) \leq 1 \tag{8}$$

for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in [0, 1]^s$, recalling that the $t_{\mathbf{k}}$'s are such that $\sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^s} t_{\mathbf{k}} = \mathbf{x}\mathbf{y}$. Clearly, if $C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n) \leq 1$ for all $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^s$ then (8) holds.

For the “only if” part: assume there exists a $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^s$ for which $C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n) > 1$. Then let $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y} = (b^{-k_1}, \dots, b^{-k_s})$. Then

$$\int_{R(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})} \psi(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) d\mathbf{u} d\mathbf{v} = \frac{1}{b^{2k}} \widehat{\psi}(S^{\mathbf{k}} \xi^s) = \frac{1}{b^{2k}} C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n) > \frac{1}{b^{2k}} = \text{Vol}(R(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})),$$

where the first and second equality come from Lemma 4.8 and Lemma 4.14, respectively. Hence ${}_b\tilde{P}_n$ is not NLOD. \square

We are now ready to present the main result of this paper.

Theorem 4.20. *Let ${}_b\tilde{P}_n = \{\mathbf{U}_1, \dots, \mathbf{U}_n\}$ be a scrambled digital (t, m, s) -net in base b whose one-dimensional projections are scrambled $(0, m, 1)$ -nets. Then ${}_b\tilde{P}_n$ is an NUOD/NLOD sampling scheme if and only if $t = 0$.*

Proof. As mentioned in the proof of Theorem 4.19, Lemma 4.18 can be used to show that the NLOD and NUOD properties are equivalent for a base b -digitally scrambled point set.

Next, using Theorem 4.19, it is sufficient to prove that P_n is c.q.e. in base b if and only if $t = 0$. In turn, to prove the latter we use Proposition 4.6, which establishes that if $t = 0$, then $C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n) \leq 1$ when $k \leq m$; if $k > m$, then $M_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n) = 0$ by Lemma 3.4 so that $C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n) = 0$ as well. Proposition 4.6 also establishes that if $t > 0$, then there exists a \mathbf{k} with $k \leq m$ such that $C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n) > 1$, and therefore P_n is not c.q.e. \square

The next result follows directly from applying Proposition 4.4 and Theorem 4.19. The assumption that the j th coordinate of the points of P_n are distinct follows from the fact that any one-dimensional projection of the first b^ℓ points of a $(0, s)$ -sequence is a $(0, \ell, 1)$ -net, so we do not need to include this as part of our assumptions.

Theorem 4.21. *Let P_n be the first n points of a $(0, s)$ -sequence in base b and let ${}_b\tilde{P}_n$ be the point set obtained after applying a base b -digital scramble to P_n . Then ${}_b\tilde{P}_n$ is NLOD/NUOD.*

5 Using dependence measures to assess the quality of point sets

In this section, we briefly outline a few of the many ways in which the framework described in the preceding sections can be used to assess the quality of point sets. In particular, we highlight the potential of the quantities $C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n)$ defined in Section 4 to provide a much more flexible and informative way of assessing the quality of any point set. These quantities also contain information on more traditional concepts such as equidistribution in base b and the t parameter, as demonstrated in Proposition 4.6.

We start by showing two different two-dimensional projections of a net in base 2 that are of bad quality both visually and in terms of their t parameter. Both projections have $n = 1024$ points and are based on a Sobol’ sequence with direction numbers all set to 1. The one on the top row of Figure 1 is obtained by taking the projection of that sequence over coordinates (27,28) and the one on the bottom row is obtained by taking the projection over coordinates (22,23).

Table 1 gives the value of $\beta_{b,k} = \sup_{\mathbf{k}: |\mathbf{k}|=k} C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n)$ for $k \geq 1$, for $b = 2$. It also gives the maximum value $C_b = \sup_{k \geq 1} \beta_{b,k}$, again for $b = 2$.

First, from Proposition 4.6 we have that $t = m - \max\{k : \beta_{b,k} \leq 1, 1 \leq k \leq m\}$. Hence from Table 1 we see that in both cases, $t = 9$. However, the $\beta_{b,k}$ values of the first point set are always at least as large as those for the second point set. In consistence with this observation, visually one observes in Figure 1 that while both point sets have large regions with no points, the design in the first point set (top left) appears to be worse than for the second one (bottom left), as we see larger contiguous empty boxes and the points are packed into a smaller region along the diagonal.

The plots in the centre of Figure 1 show the point sets after being scrambled in base 2, using the nested scrambling method of Owen [3]. Visually, we see that scrambling does not fix the issues of the deterministic point sets on the left. This is consistent with the fact that scrambling does not change the $C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n)$ values, so if they are large

Figure 1: Two different $(t, m, 2)$ -nets in base 2 with $m = 10$; the middle column shows the point sets after scrambling in base 2; the right column shows the point sets after scrambling in base 53.




Table 1: Values of $\beta_{b,k}$ and C_b for $b = 2$ for nets from left column of Figure 1.

k	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1st pt set (top)	0.9990	1.9980	1.9941	3.9883	3.9726	3.9413	3.8788
2nd pt set (bottom)	0.9990	1.9980	1.9941	1.9863	1.9707	1.9394	1.8768
k	8	9	10	11	12	13	C_b
1st pt set	3.7537	3.5034	3.0029	6.0059	4.0039	8.0078	8.0078
2nd pt set	1.7517	3.5034	3.0029	6.0059	4.0039	8.0078	8.0078

in a given base, scrambling in that base will not address the lack of equidistribution. However when measuring $C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n)$ in a base other than that used to construct P_n , if we find they are small (close to 1), it suggests that scrambling in that base could improve the equidistribution. To illustrate this, we performed a base 53 digital scramble of the two point sets, with the resulting point sets shown on the right column of Figure 1. Visually, both point sets appear much better equidistributed after this base 53 scrambling. Note that in this case there is no parameter t that can be computed to assess the quality of ${}_{53}\tilde{P}_n$ as $n = 1024$ is not a power of b . But the $C_{53}(\mathbf{k}; P_n)$ values can be computed and are shown in Table 2. They respectively yield a supremum C_{53} of 2.9282 and 0.9498 for the two point sets. Hence the second scrambled point set is c.q.e. in base 53. Even for the first point set, C_{53} is much smaller than C_2 . This experiment shows that scrambling base 2 point sets in a larger base can be used to fix bad projections that are not repaired by the base 2 scrambling.


Next, we consider $(0, s)$ -sequences in a prime base b , such as those proposed by Faure [10]. Since these sequences

Table 2: Values of $\beta_{b,k}$ and C_b for $b = 53$ for nets from left column of Figure 1

k	1	2	C_b
1st pt set	0.9498	2.9282	2.9282
2nd pt set	0.9498	0.7455	0.9498

require $b \geq s$, in large dimensions we must work with large bases. Hence it is typical to use a number of points n that is not a power of b . For this reason, we want to make sure the construction used is such that the first n points are uniformly distributed, for any value of n . As discussed in, e.g., [15], when working with the original Faure sequences, there can be some unwanted behavior for smaller values of n , i.e., smaller than b^d where d is the dimension of the space (or projection) considered. It is possible to construct $(0, s)$ -sequences with better properties (often referred to as generalized Faure sequences), but it can be challenging to quantify what we mean by “better” since $t = 0$ by definition for all these sequences, and we also know from Proposition 4.4 that their first n points form point sets that are all c.q.e. in base b . This is where our values $C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n)$ can help. Figure 2 shows different point sets obtained from $(0, 2)$ -sequences in base 53.

Figure 2: 1024 first points of $(0, 2)$ -sequences taken from 49th and 50th coordinate of the following construction: original Faure sequence (top left); generalized Faure (GFaure) sequence obtained by randomly choosing nonsingular lower triangular matrices and multiplying them with original Faure sequence matrices (bottom left); the middle column shows the point sets after a nested scrambling in base 53; the right column shows the point sets after a nested scrambling in base 2.



Since the point sets in the left column both come from the first $n = 1024$ points of a $(0, 2)$ -sequence in base 53, they have the same values of $C_{53}(\mathbf{k}; P_n)$, namely $\beta_{53,k} = 0.94975$ for $k = 1$ and is 0 otherwise. We can interpret this as follows: both point sets should have similarly good uniformity properties after being scrambled in base 53. This is confirmed by the two figures in the middle column being very similar although the base 53 digital scrambling was applied to point sets (left side) that appear very different, the top one having much less desirable uniformity than the bottom one. In other words, since both point sets in the middle column appear very uniform we can conclude (as expected from $\beta_{53,k}$) that both point sets are nicely distributed with respect to base 53.

In order to detect the difference between the two point sets in the left column, we compute the $C_2(\mathbf{k}; P_n)$ values for both. The motivation for doing this as follows: as seen in the right column of Figure 2 and the middle column of Figure 1, a base 2 digital scrambling does not address issues in a badly designed point set. This means scrambling in base 2 can only produce a uniform point set if the point set being scrambled is already uniform with respect to that base, and not only with respect to base 53. This is precisely what the $C_2(\mathbf{k}; P_n)$ can detect.

Since the $C_2(\mathbf{k}; P_n)$ values capture the dependence structure of the base 2 scrambling of P_n and we see that the two point sets look very different from each other after scrambling in base 2 (right column), those values should detect the difference between the point sets on the left. In other words, since the upper right point set is not uniform even though a base 2 scrambling has been applied, the upper left point set is not uniformly distributed with respect to base 2, thus the $C_2(\mathbf{k}; P_n)$ values for this point set should capture this. Similarly, since the lower

right point set looks uniform, the lower left point set is not only uniformly distributed with respect to base 53 but also with respect to base 2. Table 3 shows the $C_2(\mathbf{k}, P_n)$ values of both point sets on the left. We see that the $C_2(\mathbf{k}; P_n)$ do indeed detect the difference we see visually in the point sets, with the top one giving $C_2 = 16.8289$ and the bottom one giving $C_2 = 1.0753$.

Table 3: Values of $\beta_{b,k}$ and C_b for $b = 2$ for point sets in left column of Figure 2

k	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Faure (top left)	1.0001	1.0975	1.4429	1.8507	2.0287	2.2466	2.3306	2.5191	3.8270
GFaure (bottom left)	0.9991	0.9976	0.9939	0.9887	0.9791	0.9554	0.9135	0.8436	0.7840
k	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	C_b	
Faure (top left)	5.8905	7.9062	11.1830	13.2786	16.8289	15.6403	16.8289		
GFaure (bottom left)	0.9717	1.0753	0.7820	0.4536	0.4692	0.6882	0.6256	1.0753	

6 Conclusion

In this paper we have introduced the concept of quasi-equidistribution along with values $C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n)$ that play a key role in analyzing the dependence structure of scrambled point sets. We have proved that scrambled digital $(0, m, s)$ -nets have the property of being NUOD and NLOD and that any scrambled net with $t > 0$ does not have this property. The tools we have developed to get these results will allow us to explore different paths to generalize these results. In particular, we would like to explore a generalized concept of dependence that considers sets other than the rectangular boxes anchored at the origin or at the opposite corner $(1, \dots, 1)$ that are used to define the NLOD/NUOD concepts. We also plan to explore how the representation for the covariance term $\text{Cov}(f(\mathbf{U}), f(\mathbf{V}))$ as an integral of the joint pdf associated with a scrambled point set can be exploited to estimate the variance of estimators based on these point sets without having to make use of repeated randomizations. Finally, we want to explore how the $C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n)$ values can be used to construct new quality measures for digital nets. For instance, we could combine them into a weighted measure, or summarize them differently than in Section 5, e.g., by grouping them according to which coordinates of \mathbf{k} are non-zero. In turn, such measures could be used to design new constructions. We believe the $C_b(\mathbf{k}; P_n)$ values could also help assess the propensity of scrambled nets to provide estimators with lower variance than the Monte Carlo method based on their negative dependence structure.

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to acknowledge the support of the Natural Science and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) of Canada for its financial support via grant # 238959. The first author is also partially supported by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF): Project F5506-N26, which is part of the Special Research Program ‘‘Quasi-Monte Carlo Methods: Theory and Applications’’.

References

- [1] J. Dick, F. Pillichshammer, Digital Nets and Sequences: Discrepancy Theory and Quasi-Monte Carlo Integration, Cambridge University Press, UK, 2010.
- [2] H. Niederreiter, Random Number Generation and Quasi-Monte Carlo Methods, Vol. 63 of SIAM CBMS-NSF Regional Conference Series in Applied Mathematics, SIAM, Philadelphia, 1992.
- [3] A. B. Owen, Randomly permuted (t, m, s) -nets and (t, s) -sequences, in: H. Niederreiter, P. J.-S. Shiue (Eds.), Monte Carlo and Quasi-Monte Carlo Methods in Scientific Computing, Vol. 106 of Lecture Notes in Statistics, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995, pp. 299–317.

- [4] A. B. Owen, Variance and discrepancy with alternative scramblings, *ACM Transactions on Modeling and Computer Simulation* 13 (2003) 363–378.
- [5] M. Gerber, On integration methods based on scrambled nets of arbitrary size, *Journal of Complexity* 31 (2015) 798–816.
- [6] A. B. Owen, Scrambled net variance for integrals of smooth functions, *Annals of Statistics* 25 (4) (1997) 1541–1562.
- [7] A. B. Owen, Monte Carlo variance of scrambled equidistribution quadrature, *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis* 34 (5) (1997) 1884–1910.
- [8] A. B. Owen, Scrambling Sobol and Niederreiter-Xing points, *Journal of Complexity* 14 (1998) 466–489.
- [9] C. Lemieux, Negative dependence, scrambled nets, and variance bounds, *Mathematics of Operations Research* 43 (2017) 228–251.
- [10] H. Faure, Discr pance des suites associ es   un syst me de num ration (en dimension s), *Acta Arithmetica* 41 (1982) 337–351.
- [11] I. M. Sobol', On the distribution of points in a cube and the approximate evaluation of integrals, *USSR Comp. Math. Math. Phys.* 7 (1967) 86–112.
- [12] J. Dick, F. Y. Kuo, I. H. Sloan, High-dimensional integration: the quasi-Monte Carlo way, *Acta Numerica* 22 (2013) 133–288.
- [13] J. Matous k, On the L_2 -discrepancy for anchored boxes, *Journal of Complexity* 14 (1998) 527–556.
- [14] R. Nelsen, *An Introduction to Copulas*, 2nd Edition, Springer Series in Statistics, Springer, 2006.
- [15] C. Lemieux, *Monte Carlo and Quasi-Monte Carlo Sampling*, Springer Series in Statistics, Springer, New York, 2009.

Appendix

Proof of Lemma 2.6. When either x or y is 1, from Lemma 2.5 we have that $V_i = x(b-1)/b^{i+1}$ and thus $bV_i - V_{i-1} = 0$ in this case. So for the remainder of the proof, we assume $x, y \in [0, 1)$. Let

$$x = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{x_k}{b^k}, \quad \text{and} \quad y = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{y_k}{b^k}$$

be the base b digital expansion of x and y chosen so that only finitely many digits are non-zero. Recall that $k_i = \lfloor b^i \min(x, y) \rfloor b^{-i}$ for $i \geq 0$. When $\gamma_b(x, y) \geq 1$, then for $i \in \{1, \dots, \gamma_b(x, y)\}$ we have

$$k_i = \sum_{k=1}^i \frac{x_k}{b^k} = \sum_{k=1}^i \frac{y_k}{b^k},$$

and $k_0 = 0$. We also define $r_x^i = x - k_i$, and $r_y^i = y - k_i$ for $i \geq 0$. Without loss of generality we assume $x \leq y$. There are four cases.

Case 1: ($\gamma_b(x, y) < i - 1$)

In this case

$$bV_i - V_{i-1} = b \frac{x}{b^i} - \frac{x}{b^{i-1}} = 0.$$

Case 2: ($\gamma_b(x, y) = i - 1$)

In this case, $bV_i - V_{i-1}$ becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{x}{b^{i-1}} - xy + k_{i-1} \left(x + y - k_{i-1} - \frac{1}{b^{i-1}} \right) = \\ & = \frac{k_{i-1} + r_x^{i-1}}{b^{i-1}} - (k_{i-1} + r_x^{i-1})(k_{i-1} + r_y^{i-1}) + k_{i-1} \left(k_{i-1} + r_x^{i-1} + r_y^{i-1} - \frac{1}{b^{i-1}} \right) \\ & = \frac{k_{i-1} + r_x^{i-1}}{b^{i-1}} - r_x^{i-1} r_y^{i-1} - \frac{k_{i-1}}{b^{i-1}} \geq \frac{k_{i-1} + r_x^{i-1}}{b^{i-1}} - \frac{r_x^{i-1}}{b^{i-1}} - \frac{k_{i-1}}{b^{i-1}} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

because $r_y^{i-1} \leq 1/b^{i-1}$.

Case 3: ($\gamma_b(x, y) = i$)

We use the calculation in Case 2 and the identities $r_x^{i-1} = x_i/b^i + r_x^i$ and $r_y^{i-1} = x_i/b^i + r_y^i$ to simplify $bV_i - V_{i-1}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& b\left(xy - \frac{x}{b^{i+1}} - k_i\left(x + y - k_i - \frac{1}{b^i}\right)\right) \\
& - \left(k_i\left(x + y - k_i - \frac{1}{b^i}\right) - k_{i-1}\left(x + y - k_{i-1} - \frac{1}{b^{i-1}}\right)\right) \\
& = (b+1)\left(xy - \frac{x}{b^i} - k_i\left(x + y - k_i - \frac{1}{b^i}\right)\right) \\
& - \left(xy - \frac{x}{b^{i-1}} - k_{i-1}\left(x + y - k_{i-1} - \frac{1}{b^{i-1}}\right)\right) \\
& = (b+1)\left(r_x^i r_y^i - \frac{r_x^i}{b^i}\right) - \left(r_x^{i-1} r_y^{i-1} - \frac{r_x^{i-1}}{b^{i-1}}\right) \\
& = b r_x^i r_y^i - \frac{r_x^i}{b^i} - \frac{x_i^2}{b^{2i}} - \frac{x_i(r_x^i + r_y^i)}{b^i} + \frac{x_i}{b^{2i-1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Multiply by b^i to get

$$b^{i+1} r_x^i r_y^i - r_x^i - \frac{x_i^2}{b^i} - x_i r_x^i - x_i r_y^i + \frac{x_i}{b^{i-1}}$$

which will be shown to be non-negative. Note that by assumption $x < y$ and since their base b expansions differ for the first time at the $(i+1)$ th digit we always have $x_{i+1} < y_{i+1}$.

Case 3a: ($x_i \leq x_{i+1} < y_{i+1}$)

The assumption implies $0 \leq b^{i+1} r_x^i - x_i$ and $(x_i + 1)/b^{i+1} \leq r_y^i$. We estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
& (b^{i+1} r_x^i - x_i) r_y^i - r_x^i - \frac{x_i^2}{b^i} - x_i r_x^i + \frac{x_i}{b^{i-1}} \\
& \geq (b^{i+1} r_x^i - x_i) \frac{x_i + 1}{b^{i+1}} - r_x^i - \frac{x_i^2}{b^i} - x_i r_x^i + \frac{x_i}{b^{i-1}} \\
& = \frac{x_i}{b^{i+1}} (b^2 - (b+1)x_i - 1) \geq \frac{x_i}{b^{i+1}} (b^2 - (b+1)(b-1) - 1) = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Case 3b: ($x_{i+1} < x_i < y_{i+1}$)

The assumption implies $r_x^i \leq x_i/b^{i+1}$ and $(b^{i+1} r_y^i - x_i - 1) \leq 0$. We estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{x_i}{b^{i-1}} - \frac{x_i^2}{b^i} - x_i r_y^i + (b^{i+1} r_y^i - x_i - 1) r_x^i \\
& \geq \frac{x_i}{b^{i-1}} - \frac{x_i^2}{b^i} - x_i r_y^i + (b^{i+1} r_y^i - x_i - 1) \frac{x_i}{b^{i+1}} \\
& = \frac{x_i}{b^{i+1}} (b^2 - (b+1)x_i - 1) \geq \frac{x_i}{b^{i+1}} (b^2 - (b+1)(b-1) - 1) = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Case 3c: ($x_{i+1} < y_{i+1} \leq x_i$)

The assumption implies $0 \leq (b^{i+1} r_y^i - x_i - 1)$. We estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
& b^{i+1} r_x^i r_y^i - r_x^i - \frac{x_i^2}{b^i} - x_i r_x^i - x_i r_y^i + \frac{x_i}{b^{i-1}} = \\
& = \frac{x_i}{b^{i-1}} - \frac{x_i^2}{b^i} - x_i r_y^i + (b^{i+1} r_y^i - x_i - 1) r_x^i \\
& \geq \frac{x_i}{b^{i-1}} - \frac{x_i^2}{b^i} - x_i r_y^i \geq x_i \left(\frac{1}{b^{i-1}} - \frac{b-1}{b^i} - \frac{1}{b^i} \right) = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Case 4: ($\gamma_b(x, y) > i$)

In this case we need to show that

$$bk_{i+1}(x+y-k_{i+1}-1/b^{i+1}) - (b+1)k_i(x+y-k_i-1/b^i) + k_{i-1}(x+y-k_{i-1}-1/b^{i-1}) \quad (9)$$

is greater than or equal to zero. Using the identities $k_{i+1} = k_{i-1} + x_i/b^i + x_{i+1}/b^{i+1}$, $k_i = k_{i-1} + x_i/b^i$, $x = k_{i-1} + x_i/b^i + x_{i+1}/b^{i+1} + r_x^{i+1}$, and $y = k_{i-1} + x_i/b^i + x_{i+1}/b^{i+1} + r_y^{i+1}$ write

$$\begin{aligned} & k_{i+1}\left(x+y-k_{i+1}-\frac{1}{b^{i+1}}\right) = \\ & = \left(k_{i-1} + \frac{x_i}{b^i} + \frac{x_{i+1}}{b^{i+1}}\right)\left(k_{i-1} + \frac{x_i}{b^i} + \frac{x_{i+1}}{b^{i+1}} + r_x^{i+1} + r_y^{i+1} - \frac{1}{b^{i+1}}\right) \\ & = k_{i-1}^2 + \frac{x_i^2}{b^{2i}} + \frac{x_{i+1}^2}{b^{2i+2}} + \frac{2k_{i-1}x_i}{b^i} + \frac{2k_{i-1}x_{i+1}}{b^{i+1}} + \frac{2x_ix_{i+1}}{b^{2i+1}} + k_{i-1}(r_x^{i+1} + r_y^{i+1}) \\ & + \frac{x_i(r_x^{i+1} + r_y^{i+1})}{b^i} + \frac{x_{i+1}(r_x^{i+1} + r_y^{i+1})}{b^{i+1}} - \frac{k_{i-1}}{b^{i+1}} - \frac{x_i}{b^{2i+1}} - \frac{x_{i+1}}{b^{2i+2}}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & k_i\left(x+y-k_i-\frac{1}{b^i}\right) = \\ & = \left(k_{i-1} + \frac{x_i}{b^i}\right)\left(k_{i-1} + \frac{x_i}{b^i} + \frac{2x_{i+1}}{b^{i+1}} + r_x^{i+1} + r_y^{i+1} - \frac{1}{b^i}\right) \\ & = k_{i-1}^2 + \frac{x_i^2}{b^{2i}} + \frac{2k_{i-1}x_i}{b^i} + \frac{2k_{i-1}x_{i+1}}{b^{i+1}} + \frac{2x_ix_{i+1}}{b^{2i+1}} \\ & + k_{i-1}(r_x^{i+1} + r_y^{i+1}) + \frac{x_i(r_x^{i+1} + r_y^{i+1})}{b^i} - \frac{k_{i-1}}{b^i} - \frac{x_i}{b^{2i}}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & k_{i-1}\left(x+y-k_{i-1}-\frac{1}{b^{i-1}}\right) = \\ & = k_{i-1}\left(k_{i-1} + \frac{2x_i}{b^i} + \frac{2x_{i+1}}{b^{i+1}} + r_x^{i+1} + r_y^{i+1} - \frac{1}{b^{i-1}}\right) \\ & = k_{i-1}^2 + \frac{2k_{i-1}x_i}{b^i} + \frac{2k_{i-1}x_{i+1}}{b^{i+1}} + k_{i-1}(r_x^{i+1} + r_y^{i+1}) - \frac{k_{i-1}}{b^{i-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Now substituting into (9) and simplifying we get

$$\begin{aligned} & bV_{i+1} - V_i = 0\left(k_{i-1}^2 + \frac{2k_{i-1}x_i}{b^i} + \frac{2k_{i-1}x_{i+1}}{b^{i+1}} + k_{i-1}(r_x^{i+1} + r_y^{i+1})\right) \\ & - \left(\frac{x_i^2}{b^{2i}} + \frac{2x_ix_{i+1}}{b^{2i+1}} + \frac{x_i(r_x^{i+1} + r_y^{i+1})}{b^i}\right) + b\left(\frac{x_{i+1}^2}{b^{2i+2}} + \frac{x_{i+1}(r_x^{i+1} + r_y^{i+1})}{b^{i+1}}\right) \\ & - k_{i-1}\left(\frac{b}{b^{i+1}} - \frac{b+1}{b^i} + \frac{1}{b^{i-1}}\right) - x_i\left(\frac{b}{b^{2i+1}} - \frac{b+1}{b^{2i}}\right) - \frac{bx_{i+1}}{b^{2i+2}} \\ & = \frac{x_{i+1}^2}{b^{2i+1}} + \frac{x_i}{b^{2i-1}} - \frac{x_i^2}{b^{2i}} - \frac{2x_ix_{i+1}}{b^{2i+1}} - \frac{x_{i+1}}{b^{2i+1}} + \frac{(x_{i+1}-x_i)(r_x^{i+1} + r_y^{i+1})}{b^i}. \end{aligned}$$

By multiplying the above by b^{2i+1} we see that to finish the proof we need to show that

$$x_{i+1}^2 + b^2x_i - bx_i^2 - 2x_ix_{i+1} - x_{i+1} + b^{i+1}(x_{i+1}-x_i)(r_x^{i+1} + r_y^{i+1})$$

is non-negative.

Case 4a: ($x_i < x_{i+1}$)

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
& x_{i+1}^2 + b^2x_i - bx_i^2 - 2x_ix_{i+1} - x_{i+1} + b^{i+1}(x_{i+1} - x_i)(r_x^{i+1} + r_y^{i+1}) \\
& \geq x_{i+1}^2 + b^2x_i - bx_i^2 - 2x_ix_{i+1} - x_{i+1} \\
& \geq x_{i+1}^2 + bx_i(x_{i+1} + 1) - bx_ix_{i+1} - 2x_ix_{i+1} - x_{i+1} \\
& = x_{i+1}^2 + bx_i - 2x_ix_{i+1} - x_{i+1} \\
& \geq x_{i+1}^2 + (x_{i+1} + 1)x_i - 2x_ix_{i+1} - x_{i+1} \\
& \geq x_{i+1}^2 - x_ix_{i+1} - x_{i+1} + x_i \\
& \geq x_{i+1}(x_{i+1} - x_i - 1) \\
& \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Case 4b: $(x_{i+1} \leq x_i)$

Since $r_x^{i+1}, r_y^{i+1} \leq 1/b^{i+1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& x_{i+1}^2 + b^2x_i - bx_i^2 - 2x_ix_{i+1} - x_{i+1} + b^{i+1}(x_{i+1} - x_i)(r_x^{i+1} + r_y^{i+1}) \\
& \geq x_{i+1}^2 + b^2x_i - bx_i^2 - 2x_ix_{i+1} + x_{i+1} - 2x_i \\
& = (x_{i+1} - x_i)^2 + b^2x_i - (b+1)x_i^2 - 2x_i + x_{i+1} \\
& \geq (x_{i+1} - x_i)^2 + x_i(b^2 - (b+1)(b-1) - 2) + x_{i+1} \\
& = (x_{i+1} - x_i)^2 + x_{i+1} - x_i \\
& = (x_{i+1} - x_i)(x_{i+1} - x_i + 1) \\
& = (x_i - x_{i+1})(x_i - x_{i+1} - 1) \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

□