

# Relative Error Streaming Quantiles\*

Graham Cormode<sup>†</sup>  
University of Warwick

Zohar Karnin  
Amazon

Edo Liberty  
HyperCube

Justin Thaler<sup>‡</sup>  
Georgetown University

Pavel Vesely<sup>†</sup>  
University of Warwick

## Abstract

Approximating ranks, quantiles, and distributions over streaming data is a central task in data analysis and monitoring. Given a stream of  $n$  items from a data universe  $\mathcal{U}$  (equipped with a total order), the task is to compute a sketch (data structure) of size  $\text{poly}(\log(n), 1/\varepsilon)$ . Given the sketch and a query item  $y \in \mathcal{U}$ , one should be able to approximate its rank in the stream, i.e., the number of stream elements smaller than  $y$ .

Most works to date focused on additive  $\varepsilon n$  error approximation, culminating in the KLL sketch that achieved optimal asymptotic behavior. This paper investigates *multiplicative*  $(1 \pm \varepsilon)$ -error approximations to the rank. The motivation stems from practical demand to understand the tails of distributions, and hence for sketches to be more accurate near extreme values.

The most space-efficient algorithms that can be derived from prior work store either  $O(\log(\varepsilon^2 n)/\varepsilon^2)$  or  $O(\log^3(\varepsilon n)/\varepsilon)$  universe items. This paper presents a sketch of size  $O(\log^{1.5}(\varepsilon n)/\varepsilon)$  (ignoring  $\text{poly}(\log \log n, \log(1/\varepsilon))$  factors) that achieves a  $1 \pm \varepsilon$  multiplicative error guarantee, without prior knowledge of the stream length or dependence on the size of the data universe. This is within a  $O(\sqrt{\log(\varepsilon n)})$  factor of optimal.

---

\*This manuscript is not in its final form. The research is performed in close collaboration with DataSketches <https://datasketches.apache.org/>, the Apache open source project for streaming data analytics. It is made available in preliminary form to inform the open source and science community of ongoing progress.

<sup>†</sup>Supported by European Research Council grant ERC-2014-CoG 647557.

<sup>‡</sup>Supported by NSF SPX award CCF-1918989, and NSF CAREER award CCF-1845125.

# 1 Introduction

Understanding the distribution of data is a fundamental task in data monitoring and analysis. The problem of streaming quantile approximation captures this task in the context of massive or distributed datasets.

The problem is as follows. Let  $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$  be a stream of items, all drawn from a data universe  $\mathcal{U}$  equipped with a total order. For any  $y \in \mathcal{U}$ , let  $R(y; X) = |\{x_i \mid x_i \leq y\}|$  be the rank of  $y$  in the stream. When  $X$  is clear from the context, we write  $R(y)$ . The objective is to process the stream while storing a small number of items, and then use those to approximate  $R(y)$  for any  $y \in \mathcal{U}$ . A guarantee for an approximation  $\hat{R}(y)$  is said to be additive if  $|\hat{R}(y) - R(y)| \leq \varepsilon n$ , and multiplicative or relative if  $|\hat{R}(y) - R(y)| \leq \varepsilon R(y)$ .

A long line of work has focused on achieving additive error guarantees [2, 3, 8, 9, 12, 13, 17, 18]. However, additive error is not appropriate for many applications. Indeed, often the primary purpose of computing quantiles is to understand the tails of the data distribution. When  $R(y) \ll n$ , a multiplicative guarantee is much more accurate and thus harder to obtain. As pointed out by Cormode et al. [4], a solution to this problem would also yield high accuracy when  $n - R(y) \ll n$ , by running the same algorithm with the reversed total ordering on the universe (simply negating the comparator).

A quintessential application that demands relative error is monitoring network latencies. In practice, one often tracks response time percentiles 50, 90, 99, and 99.9. This is because latencies are heavily long-tailed. For example, Masson et al. [15] report that for web response times, the 98.5th percentile can be as small as 2 seconds while the 99.5th percentile can be as large as 20 seconds. These unusually long response times affect network dynamics [4] and are problematic for users. Hence, highly accurate rank approximations are required for items  $y$  whose rank is very large ( $n - R(y) \ll n$ ); this is precisely the requirement captured by the multiplicative error guarantee.

Achieving multiplicative guarantees is known to be *strictly* harder than additive ones. A uniform sample of  $O(\log(1/\varepsilon)/\varepsilon^2)$  stream items already gives a sketch for additive error (albeit a large one), and there are additive error algorithms that store just  $\Theta(1/\varepsilon)$  items for constant failure probability [12]. For multiplicative error, no sampling of  $o(n)$  items suffices, and any algorithm achieving multiplicative error must store  $\Omega(\log(\varepsilon n)/\varepsilon)$  items (see, for example, [4, Theorem 2]).<sup>1</sup>

The best-known algorithms achieving multiplicative error guarantees are as follows. Zhang et al. [22] give a randomized algorithm storing  $O(\log(\varepsilon^2 n)/\varepsilon^2)$  universe items. This is essentially a  $\log(n)/\varepsilon$  factor away from the aforementioned lower bound. There is also an algorithm of Cormode et al. [5] that stores  $O(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \cdot \log(\varepsilon n) \cdot \log|\mathcal{U}|)$  items. However, this algorithm requires prior knowledge of the data universe  $\mathcal{U}$  (since it builds a binary tree over  $\mathcal{U}$ ), and is inapplicable when  $\mathcal{U}$  is huge or even unbounded (e.g., if the data can take arbitrary real values). Finally, Zhang and Wang [21] give a deterministic algorithm requiring  $O(\log^3(\varepsilon n)/\varepsilon)$  space. Very recent work of Cormode and Vesely [6] proves an  $\Omega(\log^2(\varepsilon n)/\varepsilon)$  lower bound for deterministic comparison-based algorithms, which is within a  $\log(\varepsilon n)$  factor of the Zhang and Wang’s upper bound.

In this work, we give a randomized algorithm that maintains the optimal linear dependence on  $1/\varepsilon$  achieved by Zhang and Wang, with a significantly improved dependence on the stream length. Our bound is strictly better than any deterministic algorithm [6] and within an  $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{\log(\varepsilon n)})$  factor of the known lower bound for randomized algorithms achieving multiplicative error.<sup>2</sup>

**Theorem 1** (Single-Quantile Approximation). *For  $\varepsilon < 1/\sqrt{\log_2(\varepsilon n)}$ , there is a randomized, one-pass streaming algorithm that computes a sketch consisting of*

$$O\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \cdot \log^{1.5}(\varepsilon n) \cdot \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)} \cdot \sqrt{\log(\log(\varepsilon n)/\delta)}\right)$$

*universe items, and from which an estimate  $\hat{R}(y)$  of  $R(y)$  can be derived for every  $y \in \mathcal{U}$ . For any fixed  $y \in \mathcal{U}$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , the returned estimate satisfies the multiplicative error guarantee  $|\hat{R}(y) - R(y)| \leq \varepsilon R(y)$ .*

<sup>1</sup>Even non-comparison-based algorithms must produce sketches consisting of at least  $\Omega(\varepsilon^{-1} \cdot \log(\varepsilon n) \cdot \log(\varepsilon|\mathcal{U}|))$  bits. This assertion appears not to have been explicitly stated in the literature; we prove it in Appendix A.

<sup>2</sup>Here, the  $\tilde{O}$  notation hides factors polynomial in  $\log \log n$ ,  $\log(1/\varepsilon)$ , and  $\log(1/\delta)$ .

We remark that we prove Theorem 1 assuming that an upper bound on the stream length is known in advance. The space usage of the algorithm grows polynomially with the logarithm of this upper bound, so if this upper bound is at most  $n^c$  for some constant  $c > 0$ , then the space usage of the algorithm will remain as stated in Theorem 1, with only the hidden constant factor changing. In Section 5, we explain how to mitigate this assumption at the cost of an  $O(\log \log(\varepsilon n))$  factor increase in space usage. Our mitigation technique does require knowing an upper bound of  $\log \log(\varepsilon n)$ , in order to appropriately set the failure probability of the resulting algorithm. However, for all practical values of  $n$  and  $\varepsilon$ ,  $\log \log(\varepsilon n)$  is at most 6, and hence can be treated as constant.

As a straightforward corollary of Theorem 1, we obtain a space-efficient algorithm whose estimates are simultaneously accurate for *all*  $y \in \mathcal{U}$  with high probability.

**Corollary 2** (All-Quantiles Approximation). *The error bound from Theorem 1 can be made to hold for all  $y \in \mathcal{U}$  simultaneously with probability  $1 - \delta$  while storing  $O\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \cdot \log^{1.5}(\varepsilon n) \cdot \log(\log(\varepsilon n)/(\varepsilon \delta))\right)$  stream items.*

*Proof.* The sketch in this paper maintains a weighted coresets for its rank estimates. It is therefore monotone in the sense that for  $y_1 \leq y_2$ , it yields rank estimates  $\hat{R}(y_1) \leq \hat{R}(y_2)$ . It follows that, if  $R(y_2)(1 - \varepsilon/3) \leq R(y_1) \leq R(y_2) \leq R(y_1)(1 + \varepsilon/3)$  and both  $y_1$  and  $y_2$  suffer at most a multiplicative error of  $1 \pm \varepsilon/3$ , then all the values  $y \in [y_1, y_2]$  suffer a multiplicative error of at most  $1 \pm \varepsilon$ . Indeed:

$$R(y) \leq R(y_2) \leq R(y_1)(1 + \varepsilon/3) \leq \hat{R}(y_1)(1 + \varepsilon/3)^2 \leq \hat{R}(y)(1 + \varepsilon/3)^2 \leq \hat{R}(y)/(1 - \varepsilon), \text{ and}$$

$$R(y) \geq R(y_1) \geq R(y_2)(1 - \varepsilon/3) \geq \hat{R}(y_2)(1 - \varepsilon/3)^2 \geq \hat{R}(y)(1 - \varepsilon/3)^2 \geq \hat{R}(y)/(1 + \varepsilon).$$

The space cost claimed in the Corollary is achieved by applying Theorem 1 with error parameter  $\varepsilon/3$  and with failure probability set to  $\delta' = \delta / \log_{1+\varepsilon/3}(n) = \Theta(\delta \cdot (\varepsilon / \log(n)))$ . By a union bound, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , the resulting sketch satisfies the  $(1 \pm \varepsilon/3)$ -multiplicative error guarantee on all  $\log_{1+\varepsilon/3}(n)$  stream items of rank  $\lceil (1 + \varepsilon/3)^i \rceil$  for  $i = 0, 1, \dots, \log_{1+\varepsilon/3}(n)$ . In this event, the previous paragraph implies that the  $(1 \pm \varepsilon)$ -multiplicative guarantee holds for all  $y \in \mathcal{U}$ .  $\square$

**Remark.** The issue of mergeability (the ability to merge sketches of different streams to get an accurate sketch for the concatenation of the streams) is significant both in theory [1] and in practice [19]. We are confident that our algorithm is fully mergeable via direct application of techniques of Karnin et al. [12], who gave mergeable additive error quantiles sketches and whose techniques we build upon. We leave formally verifying issues regarding mergeability to future work.

## 1.1 Prior Work

Some prior works on streaming quantiles consider queries to be *ranks*  $r \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , and the algorithm must identify a  $y \in \mathcal{U}$  such that  $R(y)$  is close to  $r$ . In comparison, we consider queries to be universe items  $y \in \mathcal{U}$  and the algorithm must yield an accurate estimate for  $R(y)$ . Unless specified otherwise, algorithms described in this section directly solve both formulations. The algorithm that we present operates in the comparison model, in which the only operation permitted on stream items is order comparison.

Below we recap prior work. Algorithms are randomized unless stated otherwise. For simplicity, randomized algorithms are assumed to have constant failure probability. All reported space costs refer to the number of universe items stored.

**Additive Error.** Manku, Rajagopalan and Lindsay [13, 14] built on the work of Munro and Paterson [16] and gave a deterministic solution that stores at most  $O((1/\varepsilon) \log^2(n\varepsilon))$  items, assuming the knowledge of  $n$ . Greenwald and Khanna [10] created an intricate deterministic algorithm that stores  $O((1/\varepsilon) \log(n\varepsilon))$  items. This is the best known deterministic algorithm for this problem, with a matching lower bound for comparison-based algorithms [6]. Agarwal, Cormode, Huang, Phillips, Wei, and Yi [1] provided a mergeable sketch of size  $O((1/\varepsilon) \log^{3/2}(1/\varepsilon))$ . This paper contains many ideas and observations that were used in

later work. Felber and Ostrovsky [8] managed to reduce the space complexity to  $O((1/\varepsilon)\log(1/\varepsilon))$  items by combining sampling with the Greenwald-Khanna sketches in non-trivial ways. Finally, Karnin, Lang, and Liberty [12] resolved the problem and provided an  $O(1/\varepsilon)$  solution, and a matching lower bound for comparison-based randomized algorithms.

**Multiplicative Error and Biased Quantiles.** A large number of works sought to provide more accurate quantile estimates for low or high ranks. Only a handful offer solutions to the relative error quantiles problem (also sometimes called the biased quantiles problem) considered in this work. Specifically, Gupta and Zane [11] gave a solution that stores  $O(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^3}\log^2(\varepsilon n))$  items, and use this to approximately count the number of inversions in a list; their algorithm requires prior knowledge of the stream length  $n$ . As previously mentioned, Zhang et al. [22] gave a solution storing  $O(\log(\varepsilon^2 n)/\varepsilon^2)$  universe items. Cormode et al. [5] gave a deterministic solution storing  $O(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\cdot\log(\varepsilon n)\cdot\log|\mathcal{U}|)$  items, which requires prior knowledge of the data universe  $\mathcal{U}$ . Their algorithm is inspired by the work of Shrivastava et al. [20] in the additive error setting. It is also only one-way mergeable (see [1, Section 3]). Zhang and Wang [21] gave a deterministic algorithm storing  $O(\log^3(\varepsilon n)/\varepsilon)$  items. Cormode and Vesely [6] very recently showed that, amongst deterministic comparison-based algorithms, this is within a  $\log(\varepsilon n)$  factor of optimal, i.e., a space lower bound of  $\Omega(\log^2(\varepsilon n)/\varepsilon)$  items applies to any deterministic comparison-based algorithm.

Other works that do not solve the relative error quantiles problem are as follows. Manku, Rajagopalan, and Lindsay [14] give an algorithm that, for a specified number  $\phi \in [0, 1]$ , stores  $O(\log(1/\delta)/\varepsilon)$  items and can return an item  $y$  with  $R(y)/n \in [(1 - \varepsilon)\phi, (1 + \varepsilon)\phi]$  (their algorithm requires prior knowledge of  $n$ ). Cormode et al. [4] gave a deterministic algorithm that is meant to achieve error properties “in between” additive and relative error guarantees. That is, their algorithm aims to provide multiplicative guarantees only up to some minimum rank  $k$ ; for items of rank below  $k$ , their solution only provides additive guarantees. Their algorithm does not solve the relative error quantiles problem: [22] observed that for adversarial item ordering, the algorithm of [4] requires linear space to achieve relative error for all ranks. Dunning and Ertl [7] describe a heuristic algorithm called t-digest that is intended to achieve relative error, but provide no formal accuracy analysis.

Most recently, Masson, Rim, and Lee [15] introduced a new notion of error for quantile sketches (they refer to their notion as “relative error”, but it is very different from the notion considered in this work). They require that for a query percentile  $\phi \in [0, 1]$ , if  $y$  denotes the item in the data stream satisfying  $R(y) = \phi n$ , then the algorithm should return an item  $\hat{y} \in \mathcal{U}$  such that  $|y - \hat{y}| \leq \varepsilon \cdot |y|$ . This definition only makes sense for data universes with a notion of magnitude and distance (e.g., numerical data), and the definition is not invariant to natural data transformations, such as incrementing every data item  $y$  by a large constant. In contrast, the standard notion of relative error considered in this work does not refer to the data items themselves, only to their ranks.

## 1.2 Paper Outline

Sections 2-4 describe and analyze the algorithm assuming that (an upper bound on) the stream length  $n$  is known in advance. Section 5 explains how to modify the algorithm to work even when  $n$  is not known in advance. Section 6 describes open directions.

# 2 Description of the Algorithm

## 2.1 The Relative-Compactor Object

The crux of our algorithm is a building block that we call the relative-compactor. Roughly speaking, this object processes a stream of  $n$  items and outputs a stream of at most  $n/2$  items (each “up-weighted” by a factor of 2), meant to “approximate” the input stream. It does so by maintaining a buffer of limited capacity.

Our complete sketch (described in Section 2.2 below) is composed of a sequence of relative-compactors, where the input of the  $h + 1$ ’th relative-compactor is the output of the  $h$ ’th. With (approximately)  $\log(\varepsilon n)$

such relative-compactors,  $n$  being the length of the input stream, the output of the last relative-compactor is of size  $O(1/\varepsilon)$ , and hence can be stored in memory.

**Compaction Operations.** The basic subroutine used by our relative-compactor is a compaction operation. The input to a compaction operation is a list  $X$  of  $2m$  items  $x_1 \leq x_2 \leq \dots \leq x_{2m}$ , and the output is a sequence  $Z$  of  $m$  items. This output is chosen to be one of the following two sequences, uniformly at random: Either  $Z = \{x_{2i-1}\}_{i=1}^m$  or  $Z = \{x_{2i}\}_{i=1}^m$ . That is, either the even or odd indexed items in the sorted order.

Consider an item  $y \in \mathcal{U}$ . The following is a trivial observation regarding the error of the rank estimate of  $y$  with respect to the input  $X$  of a compaction operation when using  $Z$ . We wish to view the output  $Z$  of a compaction operation (with all items up-weighted by a factor of 2) as an approximation to the input  $X$ ; for any  $y$ , its weighted rank in  $Z$  should be close to its rank in  $X$ . Observation 3 below states that this approximation incurs *zero error* on items that have an even rank in  $X$ . Moreover, for items  $y$  that have an odd rank in  $X$ , the error for  $y \in \mathcal{U}$  introduced by the compaction operation is  $+1$  or  $-1$  with equal probability.

**Observation 3.** *A universe item  $y \in \mathcal{U}$  is said to be even (odd) w.r.t a compaction operation if  $R(y; X)$  is even (odd), where  $X$  is the input sequence to the operation. If  $y$  is even w.r.t the compaction, then  $2R(y; Z) - R(y; X) = 0$ . Otherwise  $R(y; X) - 2R(y; Z)$  is a variable taking a value from  $\{-1, 1\}$  uniformly at random.*

The observation that items of even rank (and in particular items of rank zero) suffer no error from a compaction operation plays an especially important role in the error analysis of our full sketch.

### Full Description of the Relative-Compactor

**Object.** The complete description of the relative-compactor object is given in Algorithm 1. The high-level idea is as follows. The relative-compactor maintains a buffer of size  $B = \Theta(k \log(n/(k\delta)))$  where  $k$  is an integer parameter controlling the error,  $n$  is the upper bound on the stream length, and  $1 - \delta$  is the success probability. The incoming items are stored in the buffer until it is full. At this point, we perform a compaction operation, as described above. The input to the compaction operation is not all items in the buffer, but rather the largest  $B - S$  items in the buffer. The parameter  $S$  is chosen at random via an exponential distribution (Line 5 of Algorithm 1), subject to the constraint that  $S \geq B/2$ . That is, the number of compacted items  $B - S$  is at most  $B/2$ . These  $B - S$  items are then removed from the buffer, and the output of the compaction operation is sent to the output stream of the buffer. This intuitively lets low ranked items stay in the buffer longer than high ranked ones. Indeed, by design the lowest-ranked half of items in the buffer are *never* removed. We show later that this facilitates the multiplicative error guarantee.

## 2.2 The Full Sketch

Following prior work [1, 12, 13], the full sketch uses a sequence of relative-compactors. At the very start of the stream, it consists of a single relative-compactor and opens a new one once items are fed to the output stream of the first relative-compactor (i.e., after the first compaction operation, which occurs on the first




Figure 1: Illustration of the execution of a relative-compactor when inserting a new item  $x_t$  into a buffer that is full at time  $t$ . See Lines 5-9 of Algorithm 1.

---

**Algorithm 1** Relative-Compactor

---

**Require:** Parameters  $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$ ,  $1 > \delta > 0$ , and an input stream of items  $x_1, x_2, \dots$

```
1: Initialize an empty buffer  $\mathcal{B}$  of size  $B = 32k \ln((n/k) \ln(1/\delta)/\delta)$ 
2: for  $t = 1 \dots$  do
3:   // Remove items from the buffer when needed (i.e., compact the buffer when full)
4:   if  $\mathcal{B}$  is full: then
5:     Pick odd index  $S \in [B/2, B]$  with  $\Pr[S = s] \propto \exp(-(B - s)/k)$ 
6:     Pivot  $\mathcal{B}$  such that the largest  $B - S$  items occupy the last  $B - S$  slots
7:     Sort the last  $B - S$  slots in non-descending order
8:     Output either even or odd (equally likely) indexed items in the range  $\mathcal{B}[S : B]$ 
9:     Mark slots  $\mathcal{B}[S : B]$  in the buffer as clear (available for re-insertion of items)
10:  // Insert the new stream item into the buffer
11:  Store  $x_t$  to the next available slot in the buffer  $\mathcal{B}$ .
```

---

stream update during which the buffer is full). In general, when there are  $h$  relative-compactors, the first time the  $h$ 'th buffer performs a compaction operation (feeding items into its output stream for the first time), we open a new relative-compactor at level  $h + 1$  and feed it these items. Algorithm 2 describes the logic of this sketch. To answer rank queries, we use the items in the buffers of the different relative-compactors as a weighted coreset. That is, the union of these items is a weighted set  $\mathcal{C}$  of items, where the weight of items in relative-compactor  $h$  is  $2^h$  ( $h$  starts from 0), and the approximate rank of  $y$  is the sum of weights of items in  $\mathcal{C}$  smaller than or equal to  $y$ .

The construction of layered exponentially weighted compactors and the subsequent rank estimation is identical to that explained in prior works [1, 12, 13], i.e., our essential departure from prior work is in the definition of the compaction operation, not in how compactors are strung together to form a complete sketch.

---

**Algorithm 2** KLL-relative

---

**Require:** Parameters  $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$ ,  $1 > \delta > 0$ , and an input stream of items  $x_1, x_2, \dots$  **return** a sketch answering rank queries

```
1: Set  $H = 0$ , initialize relative-compactor with index  $h = 0$ 
2: for  $t = 1 \dots$  do
3:   INSERT( $x_t, 0$ )
4: function INSERT( $x, h$ )
5:   if  $H < h$ , set  $H = h$  and initialize relative-compactor indexed by  $h$ , with parameters  $k, \delta$ .
6:   Insert item  $x$  into relative-compactor  $h$ 
7:   for  $z$  in output stream of relative-compactor  $h$  do
8:     INSERT( $z, h + 1$ )
9: function ESTIMATE-RANK( $y$ )
10:  Set  $\hat{R}(y) = 0$ 
11:  for index  $h = 0$  to  $H$  do
12:    for each item  $y' \leq y$  stored by the relative-compactor with index  $h$  do
13:      Increment  $\hat{R}(y)$  by  $2^h$ 
return  $\hat{R}(y)$ 
```

---

## 2.3 Informal Outline of the Analysis

Recall that in the full sketch we maintain a sequence of relative-compactors, indexed by  $h$ . The relative-compactor of level  $h$  feeds its output as the input to relative-compactor  $h + 1$  (see Algorithm 2). The items processed by relative-compactor  $h$  each represent  $2^h$  items in the original stream.

To analyze the error of the full sketch, we focus on the error of an arbitrary item  $y \in \mathcal{U}$ . For clarity in this informal overview, we consider the failure probability  $\delta$  to be constant. Recall that in our algorithm, all buffers have size  $B = \Theta(k \log(n/k))$ ; we ultimately will set  $k = \Theta(\varepsilon^{-1}/\sqrt{\log(\varepsilon n)})$ , in which case  $B = O(\varepsilon^{-1}\sqrt{\log(\varepsilon n)})$ . By design, no relative-compactor ever compactifies the lowest-ranked  $B/2$  items that it stores.

Let  $R(y)$  be the rank of item  $y$  in the input stream, and  $\text{Err}(y)$  the error of the estimated rank for  $y$ . Our analysis of  $\text{Err}(y)$  relies on just two properties.

1. The level- $\ell$  compactor only does at most roughly  $R(y)/(k2^\ell)$  compactifications that might affect the error of  $y$ .

Roughly speaking, this holds by the following reasoning. First, we show that as we move up one level at a time,  $y$ 's rank with respect to the input stream fed to that level falls by about half (this is formally established in Lemma 12). This is the source of the  $2^\ell$  factor in the denominator. Second, we show that each compaction operation that affects  $y$  also kicks out  $\Omega(k)$  items smaller than  $y$  from the buffer in expectation (Lemma 6 and Theorem 8). This is the source of the  $k$  factor in the denominator.

2. Let  $H_y$  be the smallest positive integer such that  $2^{H_y} \gtrsim 8R(y)/B$  (8 could be any large-enough constant so that the analysis below will hold). Then no compactifications occurring at levels above  $H_y$  affect  $y$ , because  $y$ 's rank relative to the input stream of any such buffer is less than  $B/2$ .

Again, this holds because as we move up one level at a time,  $y$ 's rank with respect to each level falls by about half (see Lemma 12).

Together, this means that the variance of the estimate for  $y$  is at most:

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^{H_y} (R(y)/(k2^\ell)) \cdot 2^{2\ell} = \sum_{\ell=1}^{H_y} (R(y)/k) \cdot 2^\ell. \quad (1)$$

In the LHS above,  $R(y)/(k2^\ell)$  bounds the number of relevant compaction operations at layer  $\ell$  (this exploits Property 1 above), and  $2^{2\ell}$  is the variance contributed by each relevant compaction operation at layer  $\ell$  (because items processed by relative-compactor  $h$  each represent  $2^h$  items in the original stream).

The RHS of Equation (1) is dominated by the term for  $\ell = H_y$ , and the term for that value of  $\ell$  is at most<sup>3</sup>

$$(R(y)/k) \cdot 2^{H_y} \leq \Theta((R(y)/k) \cdot (R(y)/B)) = \Theta(R(y)^2/(kB)) = \Theta(R(y)^2 \log(\varepsilon n)/B^2). \quad (2)$$

The first inequality in Equation (2) exploits Property 2 above, while the last equality exploits the fact that  $B = O(k \cdot \log(\varepsilon n))$ . We obtain the desired accuracy guarantees so long as this variance is at most  $\varepsilon^2 R(y)^2$ , as this will imply that the standard deviation is at most  $\varepsilon R(y)$ . This hoped-for variance bound holds so long as  $B \geq \varepsilon^{-1} \cdot \sqrt{\log(\varepsilon n)}$ , or equivalently  $k \geq \varepsilon^{-1}/\sqrt{\log(\varepsilon n)}$ .

## 2.4 Roadmap for the Formal Analysis

Section 3 establishes the necessary properties of a single relative-compactor (Algorithm 1), namely that, roughly speaking, each compaction operation that affects a designated item  $y$  also kicks out  $\Omega(k)$  items smaller than  $y$  from the buffer. Section 4 then analyzes the full sketch (Algorithm 2), completing the proof of our main theorem.

<sup>3</sup>In the derivations within Equation (2), there are a couple of important subtleties. The first is that when we replace  $2^{H_y}$  with  $\Theta(R(y)/B)$ , that substitution only is valid if  $R(y)/B \geq \Omega(1)$ . But we may assume this inequality holds wlog. This is because we can assume wlog that  $R(y) \geq B/2$ , as otherwise the algorithm will make 0 error on  $y$  by virtue of storing the lowest-ranked  $B/2$  items deterministically. The second subtlety is that the algorithm is only well-defined if  $k \geq 2$ , so when we replace  $k$  with  $\Theta(B/\log(\varepsilon n))$ , that is only a valid substitution if  $B \geq \Omega(\log(\varepsilon n))$ , which based on the final setting of  $k$  requires the assumption that  $\varepsilon^{-1} > \sqrt{\log(\varepsilon n)}$ .

### 3 Analysis of the Relative-Compactor

To analyze our algorithm, we keep track of the error associated with an arbitrary fixed item  $y$ . Throughout this section, we restrict our attention to any single relative-compactor (Algorithm 1) maintained by our sketching algorithm (Algorithm 2), and we use “time  $t$ ” to refer to the  $t$ 'th insertion operation to this particular relative-compactor.

We analyze the error introduced by the relative-compactor for an item  $y$ . Specifically, at time  $t$ , let  $X_t = \{x_1, \dots, x_t\}$  be the input stream to the relative-compactor,  $Z_t$  be the output stream, and  $B_t$  be the items in the buffer. The error for the relative-compactor at time  $t$  with respect to item  $y$  is defined as

$$\text{Err}_t(y) = R(y; X_t) - 2R(y; Z_t) - R(y; B_t). \quad (3)$$

Conceptually,  $\text{Err}_t(y)$  tracks the difference between  $y$ 's rank in the input stream  $X_t$  at time  $t$  versus its rank as estimated by the combination of the output stream and the remaining items in the buffer at time  $t$  (output items are upweighted by a factor of 2 while items remaining in the buffer are not). The overall error of the relative-compactor is  $\text{Err}_n(y)$ , where  $n$  is the length of its input stream. To bound  $\text{Err}_n(y)$ , we keep track of the error associated with  $y$  over time, and define the increment (or decrement) of it as

$$\Delta_t(y) = \text{Err}_t(y) - \text{Err}_{t-1}(y),$$

where  $\text{Err}_0(y) = 0$ .

First, let us consider what happens in a time step  $t$  where a compaction operation occurs (Lines 5-9 of Algorithm 1). Let  $B_t$  denote the buffer maintained by the relative-compactor at the start of the compaction operation, and recall that  $B$  denotes the buffer's capacity. Recall from Observation 3 that if  $y$  is even with respect to the compaction, then  $y$  suffers no error, meaning that  $\Delta_t(y) = 0$ . Otherwise,  $\Delta_t(y)$  is uniform in  $\{-1, 1\}$ . At a given time  $t$ , let  $s_y^t$  be the number of items  $x$  in the buffer  $B_t$  such that  $x \leq y$ .

**Observation 4.** *Let  $S_t$  be the  $S$  variable drawn at time  $t$  (see Line 5 of Algorithm 1). If  $S_t > s_y^t$  then  $\Delta_t(y) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $S_t > s_y^t$ ,  $y$  has even rank with respect to the input to the compaction operation, since its rank with respect to the compacted items is zero. The claim immediately follows from Observation 3.  $\square$

The following lemma will be useful for analyzing how many elements smaller than  $y$  are evicted from the relative-compactor in any particular compaction operation.

**Lemma 5.** *Let  $Z$  denote the random variable taking values in  $[k] = \{1, \dots, k\}$ , with  $\Pr[Z = i] \propto \exp(-i/k)$ . Assuming  $k \geq 8$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[Z] > k/4$ .*

*Proof.* Clearly:

$$\mathbb{E}[Z] \geq \frac{\sum_{m=1}^k m \cdot \exp(-m/k)}{\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \exp(-m/k)} \stackrel{(i)}{\geq} \frac{3k^2 \cdot (1 - 2/k)}{4ek} > k/4.$$

In deriving Inequality (i), we use the inequalities

$$\left( \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \exp(-1/k)^m \right)^{-1} = 1 - \exp(-1/k) \geq 1/k - 2/k^2,$$

and

$$\sum_{m=1}^k m \exp(-m/k) \geq \sum_{m=k/2}^k m \exp(-1) = 3k^2/(4e).$$

$\square$



Recall that  $k$  denotes the parameter in Algorithm 1 controlling the size of the buffer of each relative-compactor. The following lemma states that, with high probability, there can be at most  $O(R(y)/k)$  times  $t$  with  $\Delta_t(y) \neq 0$  and  $s_y^t$  reasonably large. At a high level, the proof applies the following reasoning. We show that if  $s_y^t \geq k$  and  $\Delta_t(y) \neq 0$ , then Lemma 5 implies that  $\Omega(k)$  items smaller than or equal to  $y$  were processed by the compaction operation (at least in expectation). Since there are only  $R(y)$  elements of the input that are smaller than or equal to  $y$ , this intuitively limits the number of such compaction operations to  $O(R(y)/k)$ .

**Lemma 6.** *Let  $\delta > 0$ . With probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , there are at most  $8R(y)/k$  distinct time points  $t$  in which both  $s_y^t \geq B/2 + 4k \ln(1/\delta)$  and  $\Delta_t(y) \neq 0$ .*

*Proof.* Denote by  $T$  the set of time points  $t$  in which both  $s_y^t \geq B/2 + 4k \ln(1/\delta)$  and  $S_t \leq s_y^t$ . For each such  $t$ , consider the random variable  $z'_t = s_y^t - S_t$ . Recall that this quantity is the number of items smaller than or equal to  $y$  that are processed by the compaction operation at time  $t$ . We can draw two conclusions about  $z'_t$  with certainty. First, since  $S_t \leq s_y^t$ , we know that

$$z'_t \geq 0. \quad (4)$$

Second,

$$\sum_{t \in T} z'_t \leq R(y). \quad (5)$$

This is because each compaction operation ejects a distinct set of stream updates (each smaller than or equal to  $y$ ) from the relative-compactor, and at most  $R(y)$  such stream updates ever appear in the input stream for this relative-compactor.

Let  $Z$  denote the random variable taking values in  $[k] = \{1, \dots, k\}$ , with  $\Pr[Z = i] \propto \exp(-i/k)$ . Clearly, for integers  $i \in [0, s_y^t - B/2]$ ,

$$\Pr[S_t = s_y^t - i | S_t \leq s_y^t] \propto \exp(-i/k),$$

and this holds even when further conditioning on the variables  $z'_{t'}$  for all  $t' < t$ .

Hence, since  $s_y^t \geq B/2 + 4k \ln(1/\delta) \geq B/2 + k$ ,  $z'_t$  stochastically dominates  $Z$ . That is, for every value  $i$ , and for every possible sequence of values  $(Z'_1, \dots, Z'_{t-1})$  that the random variables  $z'_1, \dots, z'_{t-1}$  may take,

$$\Pr[z'_t \leq i | S_t \leq s_y^t \text{ and } z'_j = Z'_j \text{ for all } j \leq t-1] \leq \Pr[Z \leq i]. \quad (6)$$

In other words, the CDF of  $Z$  lower bounds the CDF of  $z'_t$ .

Let  $T_0 = 8R(y)/k$ , and let us now consider the event in which  $|T| > T_0$ . If this event occurs, let  $T'$  denote the first  $T_0$  timesteps in  $T$ . Equation (5) implies that

$$\Pr[|T| > T_0] \leq \Pr \left[ \sum_{t \in T'} z'_t \leq R(y) \right]. \quad (7)$$

Since each  $z'_t$  stochastically dominates  $Z$  as per Equation (6), we have

$$\Pr \left[ \sum_{t \in T'} z'_t \leq R(y) \right] \leq \Pr \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{T_0} Z_i \leq R(y) \right], \quad (8)$$

with the different  $Z_i$ 's being i.i.d according to the exponential distribution of  $Z$ , as defined above.

By Lemma 5, each variable  $Z_i$  has the property that  $0 \leq Z_i \leq k$ , and  $\mathbb{E}[Z_i] \geq k/4$ . We will assume w.l.o.g that  $\mathbb{E}[Z_i] = k/4$ ; this clearly maximizes the probability that we wish to upper-bound. Thus  $|Z_i - \mathbb{E}[Z_i]| \leq (3/4)k$ . The variance of such a random variable is maximized by having  $Z_i$  only have support  $\{0, k\}$ , with  $Z_i$  taking value 0 with probability 3/4 and taking value  $k$  with probability 1/4. This implies that

$\text{Var}[Z_i] \leq \mathbb{E}[Z_i^2] - \mathbb{E}[Z_i]^2 = 1/4 \cdot k^2 - (k/4)^2 = (1/4 - 1/16) \cdot k^2 = (3/16) \cdot k^2$ . We apply Bernstein's inequality:

$$\Pr \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{T_0} Z_i \leq R(y) \right] \leq \exp \left( - \frac{R(y)^2/2}{(3/16) \cdot T_0 k^2 + (1/3)(3/4)k \cdot R(y)} \right) \leq \exp(-T_0/28).$$

Combining the above and Inequalities (7) and (8), we conclude that

$$\Pr [|T| > T_0] \leq \exp(-T_0/28) \leq \exp(-R(y)/(4k)).$$

If  $R(y)/(4k) < \ln(1/\delta)$ , we can never have  $s_y^t \geq 4k \ln(1/\delta)$ , and hence  $|T| = 0$  in this case. Otherwise, we get

$$\Pr [|T| \geq T_0] \leq \exp(-R(y)/(4k)) \leq \delta$$

as required.  $\square$

The above lemma resulted in the required bound for time steps where  $s_y^t$  is large. When  $s_y^t$  is small, we take advantage of the size of the buffer.

**Lemma 7.** *Assuming  $\delta < 1/3$ ,*

$$\Pr [\exists t \in [n], S_t \leq B/2 + 4k \ln(1/\delta)] \leq 2\delta.$$

*Proof.* We have that:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr [S_t \leq (B/2) + 4k \ln(1/\delta)] &\leq \frac{\sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor 4k \ln(1/\delta) \rfloor} \exp(-(B/2 - i)/k)}{\sum_{i=0}^{B/2} \exp(-(B/2 - i)/k)} = \frac{\sum_{i=0}^{4k \ln(1/\delta)} \exp(i/k)}{\sum_{i=0}^{B/2} \exp(i/k)} \\ &\leq \frac{4k \ln(1/\delta)(1/\delta)^4}{(B/4) \cdot \exp(8 \ln((n/k) \ln(1/\delta)/\delta))} \leq 2\delta^4 / (n/k)^8 \leq \delta k / (8n). \end{aligned}$$

The proof of Lemma 6 (applied to an item  $y$  with  $R(y) = n$ ) shows that with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , the total number of compactions performed by the relative compactor while processing an input stream of length  $n$  is at most  $8n/k$ . It follows that

$$\Pr [\exists t \in [n], S_t \leq (B/2) + 4k \ln(1/\delta)] \leq 2\delta.$$

$\square$

Our main analytic result regarding relative-compactors is an immediate corollary of Lemmas 6 and 7:

**Theorem 8.** *Let  $\delta < 1/3$ . For any fixed item  $y \in \mathcal{U}$ , and any fixed relative-compactor fed an input stream of length  $n$ , with probability at least  $1 - 3\delta$  over the randomness of the choice of  $S_t$ , the following holds:*

$$\sum_{t=1}^n |\Delta_t(y)| \leq 8R(y)/k.$$

*In particular,  $\text{Err}_n(y) \leq 8R(y)/k$ .*

## 4 Analysis of the Full Sketch

Let  $R_h(y)$  be the rank of  $y$  in the input stream to layer  $h$ . Abusing notation, we denote by  $\text{Err}_h(y)$  the error for item  $y$  at the end of the stream when comparing the input stream to the compactor of level  $h$  and its output stream and buffer. That is, letting  $B_h$  be the items in the buffer of relative-compactor  $h$  after Algorithm 2 has processed the input stream,

$$\text{Err}_h(y) = R_h(y) - 2R_{h+1}(y) - R(y; B_h). \quad (9)$$

**Observation 9.** Let  $H$  denote the number of relative-compactors ever created by the full algorithm (Algorithm 2). Then  $H \leq \lceil \log_2(n/B) \rceil$ .

*Proof.* The stream output by level  $h$  is at most half the length of that in its input. It follows that the relative-compactor of level  $H = \lceil \log_2(n/B) \rceil$  will not observe more than  $B$  items, meaning the entire input to the level- $H$  relative-compactor will be stored in the memory buffer. This means that an  $H+1$  relative-compactor will never be constructed.  $\square$

In what follows, we assume that for all relative-compactors, the randomness of choosing  $S_t$  is fixed in a way that provides the guarantees of Lemma 7 and Theorem 8 for *all*  $H$  relative-compactors opened by the full algorithm. By a union bound, this occurs w.p. at least  $1 - 2H/\delta$ . That is, the remainder of the analysis will condition on the following two events,  $E_1$  and  $E_2$ , occurring:

- $E_1$  is the event that every time a compaction operation occurs in any relative-compactor, the number  $S$  of items that are not compacted (see Line 5 of Algorithm 1) is at least  $B/2 + 4k \ln(1/\delta)$ .
- $E_2$  is the event that the error guarantee of Theorem 8, i.e., that  $\sum_{t=1}^n |\Delta_{h,t}(y)| \leq 8R_h(y)/k$ , holds for the relative compactor on each level  $h$ . Here,  $\Delta_{h,t}(y)$  is the error variable at time  $t$  on level  $h$ .

We now provide bounds on the rank of  $y$  on each level, starting with a simple one that will be useful for bounding the maximum level  $h$  with  $R_h(y) > 0$ .

**Observation 10.** For any  $h \geq 0$ , it holds that  $R_{h+1}(y) \leq \max\{0, R_h(y) - B/2\}$ .

*Proof.* Since the minimum  $B/2$  items in the input stream to relative compactor  $h$  are stored in the buffer  $B_h$  and never given to the output stream of relative-compactor  $h$ , it follows immediately that  $R_{h+1}(y) \leq \max\{0, R_h(y) - B/2\}$ .  $\square$

More crucially, we prove that  $R_h(y)$  roughly halves with every level, up to a certain crucial level  $H(y)$ . This is easy to see in expectation and an application of the following Chernoff bound shows that it is true with high probability up a certain level. To define this level, let  $H(y)$  be the minimal  $h$  for which  $2^{2^{-h}}R(y) \leq B/2$ .

**Fact 11** (Multiplicative Chernoff bound). Let  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  be independent binary random variables and let  $X = \sum_i X_i$ . Then, for any  $\gamma \geq 1$  and any  $\mu \geq \mathbb{E}[X]$ , it holds that  $\Pr[X > (1 + \gamma) \cdot \mu] \leq \exp(-\frac{1}{3} \cdot \gamma \cdot \mu)$ .

**Lemma 12.** Assume that  $\delta \leq 1/2$  and  $B \geq 24 \log(1/\delta)$ . With probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for any  $h < H(y)$  it holds that  $R_h(y) \leq 2^{-h+1}R(y)$ .

*Proof.* We show by induction that  $\mathbb{E}[R_h(y)] = 2^{-h}R(y)$  and that  $R_h(y) \leq 2^{-h+1}R(y)$  with sufficiently high probability.

The base case is implied by  $R_0(y) = R(y)$ , so consider  $h \geq 1$ . Observe that any compaction operation at level  $h-1$  that involves  $a$  items smaller than  $y$  inserts  $\frac{1}{2}a$  such items to the input stream at level  $h$  in expectation (no matter whether  $a$  is odd or even). Thus,  $\mathbb{E}[R_h(y)] = \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}[R_{h-1}(y)] = 2^{-h}R(y)$ , where the second equality holds by the induction hypothesis.

Next, we apply the Multiplicative Chernoff bound. Note that the random variable  $R_h(y)$  equals a fixed amount (if we fix random bits used on levels below  $h-1$ ) plus a sum of binary random variables. Namely, each compaction on level  $h-1$  involving  $a$  items smaller than  $y$  promotes  $\lfloor \frac{1}{2}a \rfloor$  such items to level  $h$  and if  $a$  is odd, then with probability 0.5 additional one such item. Since the expectation of the sum of these binary variables (equal to their number) is at most  $\mathbb{E}[R_h(y)] = 2^{-h}R(y)$ , we use Fact 11 with  $\gamma = 1$  and

$\mu = 2^{-h}R(y)$  to show

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr[R_h(y) > 2 \cdot 2^{-h}R(y)] &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{3} \cdot 2^{-h}R(y)\right) \\
&= \exp\left(-\frac{1}{24} \cdot 2^{3-H(y)} \cdot 2^{H(y)-h} \cdot R(y)\right) \\
&\leq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{24} \cdot 2^{H(y)-h} \cdot B\right) \\
&\leq \exp\left(-2^{H(y)-h} \cdot \log(1/\delta)\right) = \delta^{2^{H(y)-h}} \leq \delta \cdot 2^{-H(y)+h},
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is by the definition of  $H(y)$ , which implies  $B \leq 2^{3-H(y)}R(y)$ , the third inequality is by  $B \geq 24\log(1/\delta)$ , and the last inequality uses  $\delta \leq 1/2$  and  $2^{H(y)-h} \geq H(y) - h + 1$  as  $h < H(y)$ . This concludes the induction proof.

Finally, to show the lemma, we take the union bound over  $h = 1, \dots, H(y) - 1$  to get that with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , we have  $R_h(y) \leq 2 \cdot 2^{-h}R(y)$  for all such levels  $h$ .  $\square$

Note that the assumption in Lemma 12 that  $B \geq 24\log(1/\delta)$  is always satisfied by our definition of  $B = 32k \ln((n/k) \ln(1/\delta)/\delta)$  (Line 1 of Algorithm 1).

**Lemma 13.** *Conditioned on the bounds in Lemma 12, it holds that  $R_{H(y)}(y) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* According to Lemma 12 and the definition of  $H(y)$  as the minimal  $h$  for which  $2^{2-h}R(y) \leq B/2$ ,

$$R_{H(y)-1}(y) \leq 2^{2-H(y)}R(y) \leq \frac{1}{2}B.$$

Invoking Observation 10, we conclude that  $R_{H(y)}(y) \leq \max\{0, R_{H(y)-1}(y) - B/2\} = 0$ .  $\square$

We are now ready to bound the overall error of the sketch, i.e.,  $|\hat{R}(y) - R(y)|$  where  $\hat{R}(y)$  is the estimated rank of  $y$ . It is easy to see that this error for item  $y$ , denoted by  $\text{Err}(y)$ , can be written as

$$\text{Err}(y) = \sum_{h=0}^H 2^h \text{Err}_h(y),$$

where  $H$  is the top relative-compactor that never produces any output. To bound this error we refine the guarantee of Theorem 8. Notice that for any particular relative-compactor, the bound  $\sum_{t=1}^n |\Delta_{h,t}(y)|$  referred to in Theorem 8 applied to a layer  $h$  is a potentially crude upper bound on  $\text{Err}_h(y) = \sum_{t=1}^n \Delta_{h,t}(y)$ : each term  $\Delta_{h,t}(y)$  is positive or negative with equal probability, so the terms are likely to involve a large amount of cancellation.

**Observation 14.** *Conditioned on events  $E_1$  and  $E_2$  occurring, for any relative-compactor  $h$ ,  $\text{Err}_h(y)$  is a sum of at most  $8R_h(y)/k$  random variables, i.i.d. uniform in  $\{-1, 1\}$ . In particular,  $\text{Err}_h(y)$  is a zero-mean sub-gaussian random variable with  $\text{Var}[\text{Err}_h(y)] \leq 8R_h(y)/k$ .*

According to Observation 14,  $\text{Err}(y)$  is a sum of zero-mean sub-gaussian random variables, and as such is itself a zero-mean sub-gaussian random variable. We make use of this fact below in order to provide a high probability bound of the error by bounding its variance.

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1. Theorem 15 below provides a more detailed version of its statement, including specifying the constants hidden by the  $O(\cdot)$  notation. Theorem 1 is a direct consequence of Theorem 15 with  $k$  set to  $\max\{\varepsilon^{-1}/\sqrt{\log(\varepsilon n)}, 2\}$ .

**Theorem 15.** *Let  $k, \delta$  be the parameters fed into Algorithm 2 and assume that  $k \geq 8\log_2(n/B)$ . Let  $\varepsilon = 32\sqrt{\log(1/\delta)/(kB)}$ . For any fixed item  $y$  we have that*

$$\Pr[|\text{Err}(y)| \geq \varepsilon R(y)] < \log_2(n/B) \cdot 2\delta + 3\delta$$

*The overall memory used by the algorithm is  $O(k \log(n/(k\delta)) \log(n/k))$ .*

*Proof.* We assume that for all relative-compactors, the randomness of choosing  $S_t$  is fixed in a way that provides the guarantees of Lemma 7 and Theorem 8. This occurs w.p. at least  $1 - 2H\delta \geq 1 - 2\log_2(n/B)\delta$  by Observation 9.

Let us first bound the variance of  $\text{Err}_h(y)$ . If  $R_h(y) = 0$ , then Observation 3 implies that  $\text{Err}_h(y) = 0$ , and hence that  $\text{Var}[\text{Err}_h(y)] = 0$ . Recall that  $H(y)$  denotes the minimal  $h$  such that  $2^{2-h}R(y) \leq B/2$ , which for  $h = H(y) - 1$  in particular implies  $2^{3-H(y)}R(y) \geq B/2$ , or equivalently  $2^{H(y)} \leq 2^4 \cdot R(y)/B$ . Then Lemma 13 implies that for any  $h \geq H(y)$ , we have  $\text{Var}[\text{Err}_h(y)] = 0$ .

For  $h < H(y)$ , by Observation 14 we have  $\text{Var}[\text{Err}_h(y)] \leq 8R_h(y)/k$ . Hence:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}[\text{Err}(y)] &= \sum_{h=0}^{H(y)-1} 2^{2h} \text{Var}[\text{Err}_h(y)] \\ &\leq \sum_{h=0}^{H(y)-1} 2^{2h} \cdot 8R_h(y)/k \\ &\leq \sum_{h=0}^{H(y)-1} 2^{h+1} \cdot 8R(y)/k \leq 2^{H(y)+4} \cdot R(y)/k \leq 2^8 \cdot R(y)^2/(kB). \end{aligned}$$

The penultimate inequality is due to Lemma 12. The last inequality is due to the definition of  $H(y)$ . We now apply the standard tail-bound for sub-gaussian variables<sup>4</sup> and obtain

$$\Pr[|\text{Err}(y)| \geq \varepsilon R(y)] < 2 \exp(-\varepsilon^2 R(y)^2 / (2 \cdot 2^8 \cdot R(y)^2 / (kB))) = 2 \exp(-\varepsilon^2 kB / 2^9) \leq 2\delta.$$

This concludes the calculation of the failure probability.

The claim regarding the memory usage is immediate given Observation 9. Each relative-compactor requires  $O(k \log(n/(k\delta)))$  memory and there are at most  $\log_2(n/B) < \log_2(n/k)$  such relative-compactors.  $\square$

## 5 Handling Unknown Stream Lengths

The algorithm and analysis of Section 2.2 proved Theorem 1 assuming that (an upper bound) on  $n$  is known, where  $n$  is the true stream length. The space usage of the algorithm grows polynomially with the logarithm of this upper bound, so if this upper bound is at most  $n^c$  for some constant  $c > 0$ , then the space usage of the algorithm will remain as stated in Theorem 1, with only the hidden constant factor changing.

In the case that such a polynomial upper bound on  $n$  is not known, we may start with an initial estimate  $N$  of  $n$ . As soon as the stream length hits this estimate, the algorithm “closes out” the current data structure and continues to store it in “read only” mode, while initializing a new summary based on the estimated stream length of  $N^2$ . This process occurs at most  $\log \log(\varepsilon n)$  many times, before the guess is at least the true stream length  $n$ . At the end of the stream, the rank of any item  $y$  is estimated by summing the estimates returned by each of the at most  $\log \log(\varepsilon n)$  summaries stored by the algorithm.

Let  $\sigma_i$  denote the substream processed by the summary with the  $i$ th guess for the stream length for  $i = 1, \dots, t$  with  $t \leq \log \log(\varepsilon n)$ . Let  $\sigma' \circ \sigma''$  denote the concatenation of two streams  $\sigma'$  and  $\sigma''$ . Then the complete stream processed by the algorithm is  $\sigma = \sigma_1 \circ \sigma_2 \circ \dots \circ \sigma_t$ . Clearly  $R_\sigma(x) = \sum_{i=1}^t R_{\sigma_i}(y)$ . Hence, if the summaries for each sub-stream  $\sigma_i$  achieve relative error  $\varepsilon$  for  $y$  with respect to  $\sigma_i$  for all  $i$ , then the sum of the estimates for  $y$  achieves relative error  $\varepsilon$  for the complete stream  $\sigma$ .

To ensure that with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , all at most  $\log \log(\varepsilon n)$  instantiations of the algorithm achieve relative error  $\varepsilon$  for  $y$ , we need to set the failure probability for each instantiation to  $\delta / \log \log(\varepsilon n)$ . This does require knowing an upper bound of  $\log \log(\varepsilon n)$ . However, for all practical values of  $n$  and  $\varepsilon$ ,  $\log \log(\varepsilon n)$  is at most 6, and hence can be treated as constant.

<sup>4</sup>See for example Lemma 1.3 of [https://ocw.mit.edu/courses/mathematics/18-s997-high-dimensional-statistics-spring-2015/lecture-notes/MIT18\\_S997S15\\_CourseNotes.pdf](https://ocw.mit.edu/courses/mathematics/18-s997-high-dimensional-statistics-spring-2015/lecture-notes/MIT18_S997S15_CourseNotes.pdf).

## 6 Discussion and Open Problems

For constant failure probability  $\delta$ , we have shown a  $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-1} \log^{1.5}(\varepsilon n))$  space upper bound for relative error quantile approximation over data streams, where the  $\tilde{O}$  notation hides a  $\log \log n$  factor, and the bound holds for  $\varepsilon < 1/\log(\varepsilon n)$ . Our algorithm is provably more space-efficient than any deterministic comparison-based algorithm, and is within a  $O(\sqrt{\log(\varepsilon n)})$  factor of the known lower bound for comparison-based randomized algorithms. The main remaining question is to close this  $O(\sqrt{\log(\varepsilon n)})$ -factor gap. It is possible that some progress can be made in this direction by using buffers of varying sizes at different levels of the data structure, similar to the techniques by which Karnin, Lang, and Liberty [12] achieved optimal space complexity in the additive error setting.

## References

- [1] Pankaj K Agarwal, Graham Cormode, Zengfeng Huang, Jeff M Phillips, Zhewei Wei, and Ke Yi. Mergeable summaries. *ACM Transactions on Database Systems (TODS)*, 38(4):26, 2013.
- [2] Rakesh Agrawal and Arun Swami. A one-pass space-efficient algorithm for finding quantiles. In *Proc. 7th Intl. Conf. Management of Data (COMAD-95), Pune, India*, 1995.
- [3] Arvind Arasu and Gurmeet Singh Manku. Approximate counts and quantiles over sliding windows. In *Proceedings of the twenty-third ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGART symposium on Principles of database systems*, pages 286–296. ACM, 2004.
- [4] Graham Cormode, Flip Korn, S. Muthukrishnan, S. Muthukrishnan, and Divesh Srivastava. Effective computation of biased quantiles over data streams. In *Proceedings of the 21st International Conference on Data Engineering, ICDE '05*, pages 20–31, Washington, DC, USA, 2005. IEEE Computer Society.
- [5] Graham Cormode, Flip Korn, S Muthukrishnan, and Divesh Srivastava. Space-and time-efficient deterministic algorithms for biased quantiles over data streams. In *Proceedings of the twenty-fifth ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGART symposium on Principles of database systems*, pages 263–272. ACM, 2006.
- [6] Graham Cormode and Pavel Veselý. Tight lower bound for comparison-based quantile summaries. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.03838*, 2019.
- [7] Ted Dunning and Otmar Ertl. Computing extremely accurate quantiles using t-digests. *CoRR*, abs/1902.04023, 2019.
- [8] David Felber and Rafail Ostrovsky. A randomized online quantile summary in  $O(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon})$  words. In *LIPICs-Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics*, volume 40. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2015.
- [9] Sumit Ganguly. A nearly optimal and deterministic summary structure for update data streams. *arXiv preprint cs/0701020*, 2007.
- [10] Michael Greenwald and Sanjeev Khanna. Space-efficient online computation of quantile summaries. In *ACM SIGMOD Record*, volume 30, pages 58–66. ACM, 2001.
- [11] Anupam Gupta and Francis X. Zane. Counting inversions in lists. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA '03*, pages 253–254, Philadelphia, PA, USA, 2003. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.
- [12] Zohar Karnin, Kevin Lang, and Edo Liberty. Optimal quantile approximation in streams. In *Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), 2016 IEEE 57th Annual Symposium on*, pages 71–78. IEEE, 2016.

- [13] Gurmeet Singh Manku, Sridhar Rajagopalan, and Bruce G Lindsay. Approximate medians and other quantiles in one pass and with limited memory. In *ACM SIGMOD Record*, volume 27, pages 426–435. ACM, 1998.
- [14] Gurmeet Singh Manku, Sridhar Rajagopalan, and Bruce G Lindsay. Random sampling techniques for space efficient online computation of order statistics of large datasets. In *ACM SIGMOD Record*, volume 28, pages 251–262. ACM, 1999.
- [15] Charles Masson, Jee E. Rim, and Homin K. Lee. Ddsketch: A fast and fully-mergeable quantile sketch with relative-error guarantees. *PVLDB*, 12(12):2195–2205, 2019.
- [16] J Ian Munro and Mike S Paterson. Selection and sorting with limited storage. *Theoretical computer science*, 12(3):315–323, 1980.
- [17] Ira Pohl. *A minimum storage algorithm for computing the median*. IBM TJ Watson Research Center, 1969.
- [18] Viswanath Poosala, Venkatesh Ganti, and Yannis E. Ioannidis. Approximate query answering using histograms. *IEEE Data Eng. Bull.*, 22(4):5–14, 1999.
- [19] Lee Rhodes, Kevin Lang, Alexander Saidakov, Edo Liberty, and Justin Thaler. Datasketches: A library of stochastic streaming algorithms. Open source software: <https://datasketches.github.io/>, 2013.
- [20] Nisheeth Shrivastava, Chiranjeeb Buragohain, Divyakant Agrawal, and Subhash Suri. Medians and beyond: new aggregation techniques for sensor networks. In *Proceedings of the 2nd international conference on Embedded networked sensor systems*, pages 239–249. ACM, 2004.
- [21] Qi Zhang and Wei Wang. An efficient algorithm for approximate biased quantile computation in data streams. In *Proceedings of the sixteenth ACM conference on Conference on information and knowledge management*, pages 1023–1026, 2007.
- [22] Ying Zhang, Xuemin Lin, Jian Xu, Flip Korn, and Wei Wang. Space-efficient relative error order sketch over data streams. In *22nd International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE'06)*, pages 51–51. IEEE, 2006.

## A A Lower Bound for Non-Comparison Based Algorithms

Cormode and Veselý [6, Theorem 16] proved an  $\Omega(\varepsilon^{-1} \cdot \log^2(\varepsilon n))$  lower bound on the number of items stored by any deterministic comparison-based streaming algorithm for the relative-error quantiles problem. Below, we extend the lower bound even to offline, non-comparison-based randomized algorithms, but at the (necessary) cost of losing a  $\log(\varepsilon n)$  factor in the resulting space bound.

**Theorem 16.** *For any randomized algorithm that processes a data stream of items from universe  $\mathcal{U}$  of size  $|\mathcal{U}| \geq \Omega(\varepsilon^{-1} \cdot \log(\varepsilon n))$  and outputs a sketch that solves the all-quantiles approximation problem for multiplicative error  $\varepsilon$  with probability at least  $2/3$  requires the sketch to have size  $\Omega(\varepsilon^{-1} \cdot \log(\varepsilon n) \cdot \log(\varepsilon|\mathcal{U}|))$  bits of space.*

*Proof.* We show that any multiplicative-error sketch for all-quantiles approximation can be used to losslessly encode an arbitrary subset  $S$  of the data universe  $\mathcal{U}$  of size  $|S| \geq \Omega(\varepsilon^{-1} \log(\varepsilon n))$ . This requires  $\log \binom{|\mathcal{U}|}{|S|} = \Theta(\log((|\mathcal{U}|/|S|)^{|S|})) = \Theta(|S| \log(\varepsilon|\mathcal{U}|))$  bits of space. The theorem follows.

Let  $\ell = 1/(8\varepsilon)$  and  $k = \log_2(\varepsilon n)$  and let  $S$  be a subset of  $\mathcal{U}$  of size  $s := \ell \cdot k$ . We will construct a stream  $\sigma$  of length less than  $\ell \cdot 2^k \leq n$  such that solving the all-quantiles approximation problem for  $\sigma$  enables reconstruction of  $S$ . To this end, let  $\{y_1, \dots, y_s\}$  denote the elements of  $S$  in increasing order. Consider the stream  $\sigma$  where items  $y_1, \dots, y_\ell$  each appear once, items  $y_{\ell+1}, \dots, y_{2\ell}$  appear twice, and in general items

$y_{i\ell+1}, \dots, y_{(i+1)\ell}$  appear  $2^i$  times, for  $i = 0, \dots, k-1$ . Let us refer to all universe items in the interval  $[y_{i\ell+1}, y_{(i+1)\ell}]$  as “Phase  $i$ ” items.

The construction of  $\sigma$  means that the error in the estimated rank of any Phase  $i$  item is at most  $2^{i+1}/8 < 2^{i-1}$ . This means that for any phase  $i \geq 1$  and integer  $j \in [1, \ell]$ , one can identify item  $y_{i\ell+j}$  by finding the smallest universe item whose estimated rank is strictly greater than  $(2^i - 1) \cdot \ell + 2^i \cdot j - 2^{i-1}$ . Here,  $(2^i - 1) \cdot \ell$  is the number of stream updates corresponding to items in Phases  $0, \dots, i-1$ , while  $2^{i-1}$  is an upper bound on the error of the estimated rank of any Phase  $i$  item. Hence, from any sketch solving the all-quantiles approximation problem for  $\sigma$  one can obtain the subset  $S$ , which concludes the lower bound.  $\square$

Theorem 16 is tight up to constant factors, as an optimal summary consisting of  $O(\varepsilon^{-1} \cdot \log(\varepsilon n))$  items can be constructed offline. For  $\ell = \varepsilon^{-1}$ , this summary stores all items of rank  $1, \dots, 2\ell$  appearing in the stream and assigns them weight one, stores every other item of rank between  $2\ell + 1$  and  $4\ell$  and assigns them weight 2, stores every fourth item of rank between  $4\ell + 1$  and  $8\ell$  and assigns them weight 4, and so forth. This yields a weighted coresets  $S$  for the relative-error quantiles approximation, consisting of  $|S| = \Theta(\ell \cdot \log(\varepsilon n))$  many items. Such a set  $S$  can be represented with  $\log \binom{|\mathcal{U}|}{|S|} = \Theta(\varepsilon^{-1} \cdot \log(\varepsilon n) \cdot \log(\varepsilon |\mathcal{U}|))$  many bits.