

# Using Exponential Histograms to Approximate the Quantiles of Heavy- and Light-Tailed Data

Philip T. Labo\*

April 30, 2024

## Abstract

Exponential histograms, with bins of the form  $\{(\rho^{k-1}, \rho^k]\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ , for  $\rho > 1$ , straightforwardly summarize the quantiles of streaming data sets (Masson et al (2019)). While they guarantee the relative accuracy of their estimates, they appear to use only  $\log n$  values to summarize  $n$  inputs. We study four aspects of exponential histograms—size, accuracy, occupancy, and largest gap size—when inputs are i.i.d.  $\text{Exp}(\lambda)$  or i.i.d. Pareto  $(\nu, \beta)$ , taking  $\text{Exp}(\lambda)$  (or, Pareto  $(\nu, \beta)$ ) to represent all light- (or, heavy-) tailed distributions. We show that, in these settings, size grows like  $\log n$  and takes on a Gumbel distribution as  $n$  grows large. We bound the missing mass to the right of the histogram and the mass of its final bin and show that occupancy grows apace with size. Finally, we approximate the size of the largest number of consecutive, empty bins. Our study gives a deeper and broader view of this low-memory approach to quantile estimation.

## 1 Introduction

Modern organizations collect tons of data, and yet storage is expensive. A great deal of research has thus gone into the invention of techniques for distilling the data into summaries. The idea is to selectively throw away most of the data while keeping enough of it to accurately approximate the answers to future questions. (Cormode & Yi (2020) gives an overview.) Of the many possible questions and data types, we consider the approximation of numerical quantiles.<sup>1</sup>

Say we have multiple data centers, each summarizing the data it receives. The approach we discuss solves the following problem: 1. When a new numerical input value  $X_n$  reaches a data center, it should immediately incorporate it into its summary. 2. If we supply  $0 \leq q \leq 1$  to a data center, it should immediately respond with a provably-accurate approximation of the  $q^{\text{th}}$  quantile of  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$ . 3. If we supply the system a list of centers, it should quickly

\*Author contact: plabo@alumni.stanford.edu.

<sup>1</sup>This is a challenging task. Munro & Paterson (1980) shows that computing an inner order statistic in one pass requires  $\mathcal{O}(n)$  space.

build a summary of the data summarized by those centers. This summary must guarantee accurate quantile estimation for the data it summarizes; it need not summarize new data received by the data centers following its assembly.

An exponential histogram is a pair  $(\mathbf{B}, \rho)$ , where  $\rho > 1$  and

$$B_{n,k} := \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{\rho^{k-1} < X_i \leq \rho^k\}}, \text{ for } n \geq 1 \text{ and } k \in \mathbb{Z},$$

gives the number of data values  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$  that fall into bin  $k$ ,  $(\rho^{k-1}, \rho^k]$ .<sup>2</sup> In practical settings, one keeps a separate counter for  $n$ —and does not index by it. We assume that  $\Pr(X_i > 0) = 1$ . In settings with positive *and* negative  $X_i$ , two exponential histograms, and a counter if  $\Pr(X_i = 0) > 0$ , suffice. Note that: 1. Incorporating new data value  $X_n$  requires only  $B_{n,k} \leftarrow B_{n-1,k} + 1$ , for  $k = \lceil \log_\rho X_n \rceil$ . 2. See below. 3. Combining exponential histograms that use the same  $\rho$  requires only the summing of corresponding entries, the combined histogram retaining the accuracy of its progenitors.

In considering accuracy, let us assume for a moment that  $X_i \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} F$ . Then,

$$(B_{n,j})_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \sim \text{Multinomial} \left( n, (F(\rho^j) - F(\rho^{j-1}))_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \right), \quad (1)$$

so that, in particular,

$$\frac{B_{n,k}}{n} \sim \frac{\text{Binomial}(n, F(\rho^k) - F(\rho^{k-1}))}{n} \xrightarrow[\infty]{n} F(\rho^k) - F(\rho^{k-1}), \quad (2)$$

where convergence occurs with probability one by the strong law of large numbers. By the same reasoning, we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \bar{B}_{n,k} := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=-\infty}^k B_{n,j} \sim \frac{\text{Binomial}(n, F(\rho^k))}{n} \xrightarrow[\infty]{n} F(\rho^k). \quad (3)$$

That is to say, the accumulation of data leads to the accurate approximation of probabilities  $(F(\rho^j))_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ . Further, the expected error in approximations (2) and (3) is  $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{n})$ .

While statements (1) to (3) are true of any histogram (modulo replacing  $\rho^k$  with general  $c_k$ ), one might ask, what makes exponential histograms special? For one thing, their size: §2 shows that exponential histograms require only  $\log n$  space to store a sample of size  $n$  from the light-tailed  $\text{Exp}(\lambda)$  or the heavy-tailed Pareto  $(\nu, \beta)$ . For another, their accuracy: The literature on quantile estimation uses two measures of accuracy (*e.g.*, Greenwald & Khanna (2001); Cormode et al (2021)). For  $\hat{X}_q$  an estimate of the  $q^{\text{th}}$  quantile and  $X_{(1)} \leq X_{(2)} \leq \dots \leq X_{(n)}$  the order statistics of the  $X_i$ , *absolute* and *relative* accuracy guarantee that

$$\left| X_{(\lfloor 1+(n-1)q \rfloor)} - \hat{X}_q \right| \leq \epsilon n \text{ and} \quad (4)$$

$$\left| X_{(\lfloor 1+(n-1)q \rfloor)} - \hat{X}_q \right| \leq \epsilon X_{(\lfloor 1+(n-1)q \rfloor)}, \quad (5)$$

<sup>2</sup> $\mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{S}\}}$  equals one if statement  $\mathcal{S}$  is true; zero otherwise.

for  $0 < \epsilon < 1$ , *e.g.*,  $\epsilon = 0.01$ , and  $X_{(\lfloor 1+(n-1)q \rfloor)}$  the (lower)  $q^{\text{th}}$  quantile. Which is better? In many cases,  $X_{(\lfloor 1+(n-1)q \rfloor)} \ll n$  with high probability; *e.g.*, for  $X_i$  i.i.d.  $\text{Exp}(1)$ ,  $\mathbb{E}X_{(n)} \sim \log n$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . In others,  $X_{(\lfloor 1+(n-1)q \rfloor)} \gg n$  with high probability; *e.g.*, for  $X_i$  i.i.d.  $\text{Pareto}(1, 1)$ ,  $\mathbb{E}X_{(n)} = \infty$ . The distribution of the expected data plays a role in weighing (4) against (5); usually (5) wins.

Exponential histograms give quantile estimates satisfying relative accuracy guarantee (5) (Masson et al (2019)). To see this note that:

**Fact 1.1.** *If  $0 < a < b < \infty$ , then  $\arg \min_{\theta \in [a, b]} \max_{x \in [a, b]} \frac{|x - \theta|}{x} = \frac{2ab}{a+b}$ , which implies that  $\min_{\theta \in [a, b]} \max_{x \in [a, b]} \frac{|x - \theta|}{x} = \frac{b-a}{a+b}$ .*

*Proof.* This is Hartmann & Schlossnagle (2020) Proposition 3.16. For  $a \leq \theta \leq b$ ,

$$\max_{x \in [a, b]} \frac{|x - \theta|}{x} = \max \left\{ \frac{|a - \theta|}{a}, \frac{|b - \theta|}{b} \right\} = \max \left\{ \frac{\theta}{a} - 1, 1 - \frac{\theta}{b} \right\}$$

since  $1 - \theta/x$  grows in  $x$ . Because  $\theta/a - 1$  increases in  $\theta$  from 0 while  $1 - \theta/b$  decreases in  $\theta$  to 0, the above maxima is smallest when  $\theta/a - 1 = 1 - \theta/b$ ; *i.e.*, the minimizing  $\theta$  is  $2ab/(a+b)$ , which gives  $\min_{\theta \in [a, b]} \max_{x \in [a, b]} |x - \theta|/x = (b-a)/(a+b)$ .  $\square$

Applying Fact 1.1, we fix  $0 < \epsilon < 1$  and let  $\rho := (1+\epsilon)/(1-\epsilon)$ .<sup>3</sup> Then,  $\forall j \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,

$$\min_{\theta \in [\rho^{j-1}, \rho^j]} \max_{x \in [\rho^{j-1}, \rho^j]} \frac{|x - \theta|}{x} = \frac{\rho^j - \rho^{j-1}}{\rho^{j-1} + \rho^j} = \frac{\rho - 1}{\rho + 1} = \epsilon.$$

Furthermore, for  $0 \leq q \leq 1$ , find  $k_q \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $X_{(\lfloor 1+(n-1)q \rfloor)} \in (\rho^{k_q-1}, \rho^{k_q}]$ . Then,  $\hat{X}_q := \frac{2\rho^{k_q-1}\rho^{k_q}}{\rho^{k_q-1} + \rho^{k_q}} = \frac{2\rho^{k_q}}{\rho+1}$  approximates  $X_{(\lfloor 1+(n-1)q \rfloor)}$  and satisfies (5).

## 1.1 Heavy- and Light-Tailed Data Distributions

This paper studies how data of different distributions populate the bins of an exponential histogram. While we focus on the  $\text{Exp}(\lambda)$  and  $\text{Pareto}(\nu, \beta)$  settings, the implications of our analysis go beyond these constraints. For example, if  $X \sim \text{Pareto}(\nu, \beta)$ , then  $f_{X^{-1}}(x) = \beta\nu^\beta x^{\beta-1}$  on  $(0, 1/\nu)$ . Putting  $\nu = \beta = 1$  gives  $1/X \sim \text{Uniform}(0, 1)$ . Although we do not focus on  $\text{Uniform}(0, 1)$ , many of the results for  $\text{Uniform}(0, 1)$ , in particular size, match those for  $\text{Pareto}(1, 1)$ .

Following Foss et al (2013) we call a distribution:

$$\text{heavy-tailed} \iff \forall t > 0, \quad \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{tx} f(x) dx = \infty \quad (6)$$

$$\text{light-tailed} \iff \exists t > 0, \text{ such that } \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{tx} f(x) dx < \infty, \quad (7)$$

where we assume the existence of density function  $f$ . Put another way, we call  $X$  heavy-tailed (light-tailed) if its moment generating function  $\mathbb{E}e^{tX}$  is infinite for all  $t > 0$  (is finite for some  $t > 0$ ). We take exemplars  $\text{Exp}(\lambda)$  and  $\text{Pareto}(\nu, \beta)$

<sup>3</sup>In practice, one picks  $0 < \epsilon < 1$  first and then sets  $\rho := (1+\epsilon)/(1-\epsilon)$ . We use “ $\rho$ ” for ratio.

NAME	Exp ( $\lambda$ )	Pareto ( $\nu, \beta$ )	Gumbel ( $\mu, \sigma$ )
SUPPORT	$(0, \infty)$	$(\nu, \infty)$	$\mathbb{R}$
LOCATION	—	$\nu > 0$	$\mu \in \mathbb{R}$
RATE/SCALE	$\lambda > 0$	$\beta > 0$	$\sigma > 0$
$f_X(x)$	$\lambda e^{-\lambda x}$	$(\beta/x)(\nu/x)^\beta$	$\frac{1}{\sigma} e^{-\left(\frac{x-\mu}{\sigma} + e^{-\frac{x-\mu}{\sigma}}\right)}$
$F_X(x)$	$1 - e^{-\lambda x}$	$1 - (\nu/x)^\beta$	$e^{-e^{-(x-\mu)/\sigma}}$
$\mathbb{E}X$	$1/\lambda$	$\beta > 1: \frac{\nu\beta}{\beta-1}$	$\mu + \gamma\sigma$
$\text{Var}(X)$	$1/\lambda^2$	$\beta > 2: \frac{\nu^2\beta}{(\beta-1)^2(\beta-2)}$	$\frac{\pi^2\sigma^2}{6}$
$\text{Skew}(X)$	2	$\beta > 3: \frac{2(1+\beta)}{\beta-3} \sqrt{\frac{\beta-2}{\beta}}$	$12\sqrt{6}\zeta(3)/\pi^3$
$\mathbb{E}e^{tX}$	$t < \lambda: \frac{\lambda}{\lambda-t}$	$\infty$	$\Gamma(1 - \sigma t) e^{\mu t}$

Table 1: Probability distributions of interest. For  $X \sim \text{Pareto}(1, \beta)$ ,  $\mathbb{E}X = \infty$  when  $\beta \leq 1$ ,  $\text{Var}(X) = \infty$  when  $\beta \leq 2$ , and  $\text{Skew}(X) = \infty$  when  $\beta \leq 3$ . The  $\gamma$  and  $\zeta(3)$  in the Gumbel mean and skewness are Euler and Apéry’s constants.

to stand in for all light- and heavy-tailed distributions (Table 1). As Theorem 2.6 of Foss et al (2013) points out, a distribution  $F$  is heavy-tailed if and only if  $\limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} (1 - F(x))e^{tx} = \infty$ , for all  $t > 0$ ; *i.e.*, “heavy-tailed” is a tail property.

That said, from the histogram’s perspective, heavy-tailed Pareto(1, 1) looks exactly like compactly-supported Uniform(0, 1). In both settings  $F_{\text{Size}}^{-1}(q) \sim \log_\rho n - \log_\rho(-\log q)$  (see Theorem 2.5). Why is this? Two things: 1. Larger and larger bins to the right soften Pareto(1, 1)’s creation of extreme outliers. 2. The exponential histogram has countably many smaller and smaller bins to the left. With  $\mathbb{E}U_{(1)} = 1/(n+1) = 1 - \mathbb{E}U_{(n)}$ , we expect  $U_i$  i.i.d. Uniform(0, 1) to occupy bins  $\{-\lfloor \log_\rho(n+1) \rfloor, \dots, -1, 0\}$ . Exponential histograms are blessed with (cursed with) larger and larger (smaller and smaller) bins to the right (to the left).


As the above correctly suggests, the study of exponential histograms touches on extreme value theory (Resnick (1987); Haan & Ferreira (2006)). Standardized sizes of exponential histograms holding i.i.d. Exp( $\lambda$ ) or i.i.d. Pareto( $\nu, \beta$ ) data belong to the Gumbel domain of attraction (Propositions 2.3 and 2.7), whereas Exp( $\lambda$ ) and Pareto( $\nu, \beta$ ) themselves belong to the Gumbel and Fréchet domains of attraction (see page 83 of Durrett (2005)). The maxima of  $n$  i.i.d. Pareto( $\nu, \beta$ ) variables has a heavy tail, which the logarithm in the size attenuates. Finally,

**Fact 1.2.** *Fixing  $\mu, b \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\sigma, a > 0$ , we note that, if  $X \sim \text{Gumbel}(\mu, \sigma)$ , then  $aX + b \sim \text{Gumbel}(a\mu + b, a\sigma)$ .*


*Proof.* Fixing  $y \in \mathbb{R}$  and noting that  $X \sim \text{Gumbel}(\mu, \sigma)$ , we have

$$\Pr(aX + b \leq y) = \Pr\left(X \leq \frac{y-b}{a}\right) = \exp\left(-\exp\left(-\frac{y-(a\mu+b)}{a\sigma}\right)\right),$$

which implies that  $aX + b \sim \text{Gumbel}(a\mu + b, a\sigma)$ .  $\square$



(a) Exp (1) data with expected bin counts  $\mathbb{E}B_{1000,j} = 1000 \{e^{-\rho^{j-1}} - e^{-\rho^j}\}$ .



(b) Pareto (1, 1) data with expected bin counts  $\mathbb{E}B_{1000,j} = 1000 \{\rho^{-j+1} - \rho^{-j}\}$ .

Figure 1: Exponential histograms with  $\rho = \frac{1.01}{0.99} \approx 1.02$ . Panels on the left (on the right) show  $B_{1000,j}$  versus  $2^{\rho^j/(\rho+1)}$  (versus  $j$ ). Red curves give  $\mathbb{E}B_{1000,j}$ .

## 1.2 Our Contributions

Recent work on estimating quantiles on data streams includes Shrivastava et al (2004); Chambers et al (2006); Tibshirani (2008); Agarwal et al (2013); Karnin et al (2016); Masson et al (2019); Dunning & Ertl (2019); Cormode et al (2021). Agarwal et al (2013); Karnin et al (2016) develop *compactors* (sequences of

SYMBOL	DEFINITION	ADDITIONAL NOTES
$\gamma = 0.57721\dots$	$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\sum_{k=1}^n 1/k - \log n)$	Euler's constant
$\zeta(3) = 1.20205\dots$	$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 1/k^3$	Apéry's constant
$a_n \sim b_n$	$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n/b_n = 1$	Asymptotically equivalent
$\Gamma(x), x > 0$	$\int_0^{\infty} t^{x-1} \exp(-t) dt$	Gamma function
$B(x, y), x, y > 0$	$\int_0^1 t^{x-1} (1-t)^{y-1} dt = \frac{\Gamma(x)\Gamma(y)}{\Gamma(x+y)}$	Beta function
$\psi(x), x > 0$	$\frac{d}{dx} \log \Gamma(x) \sim \log x - \frac{1}{2x}$	Digamma function
$\psi_m(x), x > 0$	$\frac{d^m}{dx^m} \psi(x) = \frac{d^{m+1}}{dx^{m+1}} \log \Gamma(x)$	Polygamma function
$\text{Li}_2(x), x > 0$	$\int_1^x \frac{\log t}{1-t} dt$	Dilogarithm function
$\sinh^{-1}(x), x \in \mathbb{R}$	$\log(x + \sqrt{x^2 + 1})$	Inverse hyperbolic sine
$W_0(x), x \geq 0$	$w$ such that $we^w = x$	Lambert $W$ principal branch
$W_{-1}(x), x \in [-1/e, 0)$	$w$ such that $we^w = x$	Lambert $W$ $-1$ branch
$\mathcal{L}(X)$	The distribution of $X$	$\mathcal{L}$ stands for "law"
$X \sim F$	$\mathcal{L}(X) = F$	$X$ has distribution $F$
$X \dot{\sim} F$	$\mathcal{L}(X) \approx F$	Approximate distribution
$A \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} B$	$A$ and $B$ have same distribution	Equality in distribution
Skew( $X$ )	$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left\{ \frac{(X - \mathbb{E}X)}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(X)}} \right\}^3 \right]$	Skewness (asymmetry) of $X$
$A_n \implies B$	$\Pr(A_n \leq x) \rightarrow \Pr(B \leq x), \forall x$	Convergence in distribution

Table 2: Conventions. Our definition of convergence in distribution assumes continuous  $F(x) := \Pr(B \leq x)$ . When this does not hold, we have convergence in distribution if  $\Pr(A_n \leq x) \rightarrow \Pr(B \leq x)$  for all continuity points  $x$  of  $F(x)$ .

length- $2m$  buffers that, using coin flips, pass their even or odd order statistics to the next buffer) for absolute-error-guaranteed quantile estimation, as in (4). Cormode et al (2021) develop this further, presenting compactor-based sketches for relative-error-guaranteed quantile estimation, as in (5). While the Cormode et al (2021) approach requires space

$$\mathcal{O} \left( \frac{\log^{3/2}(\epsilon n)}{\epsilon} \sqrt{\log \left( \frac{\log(\epsilon n)}{\delta \epsilon} \right)} \right) \quad (8)$$

to summarize  $n$  data points, with error probability bounded by  $0 < \delta < 1$  and  $0 < \epsilon < 1$  as in (5), the exponential histogram-based approach of Masson et al (2019) has  $F_{\text{Size}}^{-1}(q) \sim \log_{\rho} n - \log_{\rho}(-\log q)$  under  $\text{Exp}(\lambda)$  or Pareto( $\nu, 1$ ) sampling (see Theorems 2.1 and 2.5) and is computationally-simpler, and therefore less error-prone. While Masson et al (2019) shows that exponential histograms give relatively accurate estimates (see Fact 1.1), their size result only apply in the light-tailed  $\text{Exp}(\lambda)$  setting—not in the heavy-tailed Pareto( $\nu, \beta$ ) setting.<sup>4</sup>

Exponential histograms are a simple, low-memory method for relative-error-guaranteed quantile estimation. We corroborate and extend Masson et al (2019). Each of sections 2–5 spends part of its time in the  $\text{Exp}(\lambda)$  setting and part of its

<sup>4</sup>Pareto( $\nu, \beta$ ), with  $\mathbb{E}e^{tX} = \infty$  for all  $t > 0$ , is not sub-exponential, *i.e.*, does not fulfill (7).

time in the Pareto  $(\nu, \beta)$  setting (Figure 1). Section 2 gives quantile functions for histogram size and shows that size is approximately Gumbel-distributed. Section 3 quantifies upper edge precision, a concern in industrial settings. Section 4 shows that the number of occupied bins grows apace with size, and section 5 shows that the length of the largest block of empty bins is a small fraction of the total number of empty bins. Table 2 presents notation, and section 6 concludes.

## 2 Size

When we write *size* or *histogram size*, we mean  $\lceil \log_\rho X_{(n)} \rceil - \lceil \log_\rho X_{(1)} \rceil + 1$

$$= \left| \left\{ \lceil \log_\rho X_{(1)} \rceil, \lceil \log_\rho X_{(1)} \rceil + 1, \dots, \lceil \log_\rho X_{(n)} \rceil \right\} \right|,$$

that is, the number of consecutive bins when we count from the one containing  $X_{(1)}$  to the one containing  $X_{(n)}$ . We assume that  $n \geq 2$ . For ease of computation we drop the ceiling functions and focus on

$$M_n := \frac{\log X_{(n)} - \log X_{(1)}}{\log \rho} + 1, \quad A_n := \frac{\log X_{(n)} - \log \nu}{\log \rho} + 1, \quad (9)$$

so that w.p.1  $\text{size} \in \{\lfloor M_n \rfloor, \lfloor M_n \rfloor + 1\}$ . As we study how size grows with  $n$ , we simply take size to be  $M_n$ . In the Pareto  $(\nu, \beta)$  setting, if one feels certain that  $X_{(1)}$  occupies the left-most bin, or, if one wishes to start counting from  $\lceil \log_\rho \nu \rceil$ , then  $A_n$  measures size. When using exponential histograms, one might wish to amortize memory allocation as in §17.1 of Cormen et al (2001).

### 2.1 The Exponential Setting

This section characterizes  $\mathcal{L}(M_n)$  when  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Exp}(\lambda)$ . Note that:

**Theorem 2.1.** *For  $n \geq 2$ ,  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Exp}(\lambda)$ , and  $M_n$  in (9), we have*

$$F_{M_n}(\mu) = (n-1) B\left(\frac{\rho^{\mu-1} + n - 1}{\rho^{\mu-1} - 1}, n-1\right) \quad (10)$$

$$f_{M_n}(\mu) = \frac{n\rho^{\mu-1} F_{M_n}(\mu) \log \rho}{(\rho^{\mu-1} - 1)^2} \left\{ \psi\left(\frac{n\rho^{\mu-1}}{\rho^{\mu-1} - 1}\right) - \psi\left(\frac{\rho^{\mu-1} + n - 1}{\rho^{\mu-1} - 1}\right) \right\} \quad (11)$$

$$F_{M_n}^{-1}(q) \sim \log_\rho \left( \frac{n \log(n-1) + \log(1/q)}{\log(1/q)} \right) + 1 \sim \log_\rho n - \log_\rho(-\log q), \quad (12)$$

for  $\mu > 1$  and  $0 < q < 1$ . The asymptotic results in (12) hold as either or both  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $q \rightarrow 1^-$ . The first asymptotic result in (12) also holds as  $q \rightarrow 0^+$  while  $n$  remains fixed.

*Proof.* The proof, which uses (2.3.3) of David & Nagaraja (2003), appears in Appendix A.  $\square$




Figure 2: The distribution of  $W_n$  under exponential sampling. The histogram shows  $10^5$  simulated values  $W_n = \log(X_{(n)}/X_{(1)}) = (M_n - 1) \log \rho$ , when  $n = 100$  and  $\lambda = 1$ .  $\mathcal{L}(W_n)$  and  $\mathcal{L}(M_n)$  do not depend on  $\lambda$ . The dashed curve gives (rescaled)  $f_{W_n}$  in (45). The curves on the right give  $F_{W_n}(\tilde{F}_{W_n}^{-1}(q))$  versus  $0 < q < 1$  and  $1 \leq \log_{10} n \leq 8$ , for  $\tilde{F}_{W_n}^{-1}$  the left-most approximation of  $F_{W_n}^{-1}$  on the right-hand side of (46). Theorem 2.1 shows that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_{W_n}(\tilde{F}_{W_n}^{-1}(q)) = q$ .

Figure 2 shows  $\mathcal{L}(W_n) = \mathcal{L}((M_n - 1) \log \rho)$  and  $F_{W_n}(\tilde{F}_{W_n}^{-1}(q))$ . Note:

1.  $\mathcal{L}(W_n)$  and  $\mathcal{L}(M_n)$  do not depend on  $\lambda$  (*cf.* Rényi (1953) for  $\mathcal{L}(X_{(i)})$ ).
2. For most values of  $n$  and  $q$ ,  $F_{W_n}(\tilde{F}_{W_n}^{-1}(q)) \leq q \implies \tilde{F}_{W_n}^{-1}(q) \leq F_{W_n}^{-1}(q)$ .
3.  $F_{M_n}^{-1}(q)$  grows like  $\log_\rho n$  plus the quantile function for Gumbel  $(0, 1/\log \rho)$ .

The following lemma gives wide bounds for  $\mathbb{E}M_n$  and  $\text{Var}(M_n)$ :

**Lemma 2.2.** For  $n \geq 2$ ,  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Exp}(\lambda)$ ,  $M_n$  in (9), and

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1 &:= \frac{n \log n}{n-1} \sim \log n \\ \lambda_2 &:= \frac{n \left\{ \log^2(n-1) + \frac{\pi^2}{3} + 2\text{Li}_2\left(\frac{n}{n-1}\right) \right\}}{n-1} \sim \log^2 n \\ \delta_1 &:= \frac{n(n-2) \left\{ \pi(\sqrt{2n-1}-1) - 2 \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{n-1}{\sqrt{2n-1}}\right) \right\}}{2\sqrt{(2n-1)(2n-3)}(n-1)} \sim \frac{\pi\sqrt{2n}}{4} \\ \delta_2 &:= \frac{4n(n-2) \left\{ \log\left(\frac{n-1}{4}\right) + 2 \sinh^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n-1}}\right) \right\}}{\sqrt{2n-3}(n-1)} \sim 2\sqrt{2n} \log n, \end{aligned}$$




Figure 3: The moments of  $W_n := \log(X_{(n)}/X_{(1)})$  under exponential sampling. Both axes use the log scale. The range formulae (in gray) come from Lemma 2.2. We truncate variance lower bounds at 1. Simulations (in black) use 1000 repetitions. The asymptotic formulae (in red) come from Proposition 2.3.

we have

$$\{\mathbb{E}M_n - 1\} \log \rho \in [\lambda_1, \lambda_1 + \delta_1] \tilde{\in} \left[ \log n, \frac{\pi\sqrt{2n}}{4} \right]$$

$$\text{Var}(M_n) \log^2 \rho \in \left[ \lambda_2 - (\lambda_1 + \delta_1)^2, \lambda_2 + \delta_2 - \lambda_1^2 \right] \tilde{\in} \left[ -\frac{\pi^2 n}{8}, 2\sqrt{2n} \log n \right],$$

where  $\tilde{\in}$  indicates asymptotic upper and lower bounds as  $n$  becomes large.

*Proof.* The proof, which uses bounds for the beta function provided by Cerone (2007), appears in Appendix A.  $\square$

The widths of the intervals for  $\mathbb{E}M_n$  and  $\text{Var}(M_n)$  in Lemma 2.2 grow large as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  (see Figure 3, which truncates variance lower bounds at one). That said, the following proposition provides excellent asymptotic approximations.

**Proposition 2.3.** For  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Exp}(\lambda)$  and  $M_n$  in (9), we have

$$Y_n := (M_n - 1) \log \rho - \log n - \log \log n \implies \text{Gumbel}(0, 1) \quad (13)$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , which implies that, for  $n$  large,

$$M_n \sim \text{Gumbel} \left( 1 + \frac{\log n + \log \log n}{\log \rho}, \frac{1}{\log \rho} \right) \quad (14)$$

$$\mathbb{E}M_n \sim 1 + \gamma + \frac{\log n + \log \log n}{\log \rho} \sim \frac{\log n}{\log \rho} \quad (15)$$

$$\text{Var}(M_n) \sim \frac{\pi^2}{6 \log^2 \rho}, \text{ and } \text{Skew}(M_n) \sim \frac{12\sqrt{6}\zeta(3)}{\pi^3}. \quad (16)$$

*Proof.* We start with (13). Fixing  $y \in \mathbb{R}$ , we have

$$\Pr(Y_n \leq y) = \Pr\left(M_n \leq 1 + \frac{y + \log n + \log \log n}{\log \rho}\right) \quad (17)$$

$$= (n-1) B\left(1 + \frac{n}{e^{y_n} \log n - 1}, n-1\right) \quad (18)$$

$$\sim \frac{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{n}{e^{y_n} \log n - 1}\right)}{(n-1) \frac{n}{e^{y_n} \log n - 1}} \rightarrow e^{-e^{-y}}, \quad (19)$$

where (18) uses (10) and (19) uses a well-known approximation of  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} B(c, x)$  and the continuity of  $\Gamma$  at 1. This, with Fact 1.2, proves (13) and (14). Results (15) and (16) use well-known properties of Gumbel  $(\mu, \sigma)$  (Table 1).  $\square$

**Remark 2.4.** One can repurpose the proof above to show that, for  $y \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(W_n - \log n \leq y) = 0$ , which implies that  $W_n - \log n \rightarrow \infty$  in probability, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . That is, convergence in distribution relies on the  $\log \log n$  term in the standardization of  $W_n = (M_n - 1) \log \rho$  (cf. (53)).

Proposition 2.3 shows that, while  $\mathbb{E}M_n$  grows like  $\log_\rho n$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\text{Var}(M_n)$  is asymptotically bounded (Figure 3, red and black curves). Past a certain point, as  $M_n$  grows, its variance does not. This is also a property of certain occupancy counts (see Theorems 4.1 and 4.2, which come from Karlin (1967) and Bogachev et al (2008)).

## 2.2 The Pareto Setting

We now characterize  $\mathcal{L}(M_n)$  when  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Pareto}(\nu, \beta)$ . Note that:

**Theorem 2.5.** For  $n \geq 2$ ,  $X_1, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Pareto}(\nu, \beta)$ , and  $M_n$  in (9), we have

$$F_{M_n}(\mu) = \left(1 - \rho^{-\beta(\mu-1)}\right)^{n-1} \quad (20)$$

$$f_{M_n}(\mu) = \beta(n-1) \left(1 - \rho^{-\beta(\mu-1)}\right)^{n-2} \rho^{-\beta(\mu-1)} \log \rho \quad (21)$$

$$F_{M_n}^{-1}(q) = 1 - \frac{1}{\beta \log \rho} \log\left(1 - q^{1/(n-1)}\right) \sim \frac{\log n - \log(-\log q)}{\beta \log \rho}, \quad (22)$$

for  $\mu > 1$  and  $0 < q < 1$ , where the asymptotic result holds as either or both  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $q \rightarrow 1^-$ .

*Proof.* The proof, which uses (2.3.3) of David & Nagaraja (2003), appears in Appendix A.  $\square$

The Pareto  $(\nu, \beta)$  setting—unlike the  $\text{Exp}(\lambda)$  setting (see Lemma 2.2 and Proposition 2.3)—permits direct computation of  $\mathbb{E}M_n$  and  $\text{Var}(M_n)$ .

**Proposition 2.6.** For  $X_1, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Pareto}(\nu, \beta)$  with  $n \geq 2$  and  $M_n$  in (9), we have  $\mathbb{E}e^{tM_n} = (n-1)e^t B(1-t/\beta \log \rho, n-1)$ , for  $t < \beta \log \rho$ , so that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}M_n &= 1 + \frac{\psi(n) + \gamma}{\beta \log \rho} \sim \frac{\log n}{\beta \log \rho} \\ \text{Var}(M_n) &= \frac{\frac{\pi^2}{6} - \psi_1(n)}{\beta^2 \log^2 \rho} \sim \frac{\pi^2}{6\beta^2 \log^2 \rho} \\ \text{Skew}(M_n) &= \frac{2\zeta(3) + \psi_2(n)}{[\frac{\pi^2}{6} - \psi_1(n)]^{3/2}} \sim \frac{12\sqrt{6}\zeta(3)}{\pi^3},\end{aligned}$$

where the asymptotic results hold as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

*Proof.* The proof, which uses Theorem 2.5, appears in Appendix A.  $\square$

Note that, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} F_{\text{Pareto}(\nu, \beta), M_n}^{-1}(q) \stackrel{\leq}{\sim} F_{\text{Exp}(\lambda), M_n}^{-1}(q) \\ \mathbb{E}_{\text{Pareto}(\nu, \beta)} M_n \stackrel{\leq}{\sim} \mathbb{E}_{\text{Exp}(\lambda)} M_n \\ \text{Var}_{\text{Pareto}(\nu, \beta)}(M_n) \stackrel{\leq}{\sim} \text{Var}_{\text{Exp}(\lambda)}(M_n) \end{array} \right\} \iff \beta \stackrel{\geq}{\sim} 1 \quad (23)$$

(Theorems 2.1 and 2.5; Propositions 2.3 and 2.6). If we dial up (down) the size of Pareto outliers, an exponential histogram of Pareto  $(\nu, \beta)$  data becomes larger (smaller) than one of Exp  $(\lambda)$  data, and size has a larger (smaller) variance. It seems strange to conclude that a histogram of Exp  $(\lambda)$  values is larger than a histogram of Pareto  $(\nu, \beta)$  values, but see our discussion of Uniform  $(0, 1)$  in §1.1. We turn to the asymptotic distribution of  $M_n$  under Pareto  $(\nu, \beta)$  sampling.

**Proposition 2.7.** For  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Pareto}(\nu, \beta)$  and  $M_n$  as in (9), we have  $(M_n - 1)(\beta \log \rho) - \log n \implies \text{Gumbel}(0, 1)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , which implies that, for  $n$  large,

$$M_n \sim \text{Gumbel}\left(1 + \frac{\log n}{\beta \log \rho}, \frac{1}{\beta \log \rho}\right),$$

so that  $\mathbb{E}M_n \sim \frac{\log n}{\beta \log \rho}$ ,  $\text{Var}(M_n) \sim \frac{\pi^2}{6\beta^2 \log^2 \rho}$ , and  $\text{Skew}(M_n) \sim \frac{12\sqrt{6}\zeta(3)}{\pi^3}$ .

*Proof.* Fixing  $y \in \mathbb{R}$  we note that

$$\Pr((M_n - 1)(\beta \log \rho) - \log n \leq y) = \Pr\left(M_n \leq 1 + \frac{y + \log n}{\beta \log \rho}\right) \quad (24)$$

$$= \left(1 - \frac{e^{-y}}{n}\right)^{n-1} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} e^{-e^{-y}}, \quad (25)$$

where (25) uses (20). This proves the first result. The second uses Fact 1.2.  $\square$

Comparing Propositions 2.3 and 2.7, we see that the Exp  $(\lambda)$  setting needs the  $\log \log n$  term to place  $M_n$  into the Gumbel domain of attraction while the Pareto  $(\nu, \beta)$  setting does not (see Remark 2.4). We finally consider  $\mathcal{L}(A_n)$ :

**Theorem 2.8.** For  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Pareto}(\nu, \beta)$  and  $A_n$  in (9), we have

$$F_{A_n}(a) = \left(1 - \rho^{-\beta(a-1)}\right)^n \quad (26)$$

$$f_{A_n}(a) = n\beta \left(1 - \rho^{-\beta(a-1)}\right)^{n-1} \rho^{-\beta(a-1)} \log \rho \quad (27)$$

$$F_{A_n}^{-1}(q) = 1 - \frac{\log(1 - q^{1/n})}{\beta \log \rho} \sim \frac{\log n - \log(-\log q)}{\beta \log \rho}, \quad (28)$$

for  $a > 1$ ,  $0 < q < 1$ , where the asymptotic result holds as either or both  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $q \rightarrow 1^-$ . This gives  $\mathbb{E}e^{tA_n} = ne^{tB}(1 - t/\beta \log \rho, n)$ , for  $t < \beta \log \rho$ , so that

$$\mathbb{E}A_n = 1 + \frac{\psi(n+1) + \gamma}{\beta \log \rho} \sim \frac{\log n}{\beta \log \rho} \quad (29)$$

$$\text{Var}(A_n) = \frac{\frac{\pi^2}{6} - \psi_1(n)}{\beta^2 \log^2 \rho} \sim \frac{\pi^2}{6\beta^2 \log^2 \rho} \quad (30)$$

$$\text{Skew}(A_n) = \frac{2\zeta(3) + \psi_2(n) + \frac{2}{n^3}}{\left[\frac{\pi^2}{6} - \psi_1(n)\right]^{3/2}} \sim \frac{12\sqrt{6}\zeta(3)}{\pi^3}. \quad (31)$$

Finally, we have  $(A_n - 1)\beta \log \rho - \log n \implies \text{Gumbel}(0, 1)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , which implies that, for  $n$  large,

$$A_n \sim \text{Gumbel}\left(1 + \frac{\log n}{\beta \log \rho}, \frac{1}{\beta \log \rho}\right), \quad (32)$$

so that  $\mathbb{E}A_n \sim \frac{\log n}{\beta \log \rho}$ ,  $\text{Var}(A_n) \sim \frac{\pi^2}{6\beta^2 \log^2 \rho}$ , and  $\text{Skew}(A_n) \sim \frac{12\sqrt{6}\zeta(3)}{\pi^3}$ .

*Proof.* See Theorem 2.5 and Propositions 2.6–2.7. Another approach to (32): the  $\log_\rho(X_i/\nu)$  are i.i.d.  $\text{Exp}(\beta \log \rho)$  and  $Z_{(n)} - \log n \implies \text{Gumbel}(0, 1)$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , for  $Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_n$  i.i.d.  $\text{Exp}(1)$  (see page 83 of Durrett (2005)).  $\square$


We note that  $F_{M_n}(\mu) = F_{A_{n-1}}(\mu)$  (see (20) and (26)): One loses a degree of freedom in approximating  $\nu$  with  $X_{(1)}$ . To summarize, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , the  $\text{Exp}(\lambda)$  and  $\text{Pareto}(\nu, \beta)$  settings give similar results, modulo  $1/\beta$  terms in  $\text{Pareto}(\nu, \beta)$  expressions, so that row-wise expressions below are asymptotically-equivalent:

$$\begin{array}{lll} F_{\text{Exp}(\lambda), M_n}^{-1}(q) & \beta F_{\text{Pareto}(\nu, \beta), M_n}^{-1}(q) & \log_\rho n - \log_\rho(-\log q) \\ \mathbb{E}_{\text{Exp}(\lambda)} M_n & \beta \mathbb{E}_{\text{Pareto}(\nu, \beta)} M_n & \log_\rho n \\ \text{Var}_{\text{Exp}(\lambda)}(M_n) & \beta^2 \text{Var}_{\text{Pareto}(\nu, \beta)}(M_n) & (\pi/\sqrt{6} \log \rho)^2. \end{array}$$


### 3 Accuracy

Section 1 presents two takes on accuracy: (3) gives  $n^{-1}\bar{B}_{n,k} \rightarrow F(\rho^k)$  w.p.1 as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  while (4) and following argue that

$$\left|X_{(\lfloor 1+(n-1)q \rfloor)} - \hat{X}_q\right| \leq \epsilon X_{(\lfloor 1+(n-1)q \rfloor)},$$



(a) DKW confidence bands for Exp(1) data.



(b) DKW confidence bands for Pareto(1,1) data.

Figure 4: DKW bands for Exp(1) and Pareto(1,1) data. Panels show: the CDF in red; the empirical CDF for  $n = 1000$  simulated data points in navy; the DKW confidence bands in gray; and inferred quantile intervals in green. The inferred intervals for  $q = 0.999$  continue to  $+\infty$ . We use  $\alpha = 0.05$  and  $\rho = \frac{1.01}{0.99}$ .

for  $\hat{X}_q$  the exponential histogram estimate and  $0 < \epsilon < 1$ . The former presents the proximity of an estimate and a population quantity; the latter presents the proximity of two estimates. We extend the former view of accuracy. In particular, we present well-known confidence bands for CDF  $F$  and suggest that these provide information about  $F^{-1}$  (see Figure 4). Noting that organizations are often interested in extreme quantiles, we also approximate the largest and second largest quantile one can estimate under Exp( $\lambda$ ) and Pareto( $\nu, \beta$ ) sampling.

For the empirical CDF  $\hat{F}_n(x) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{X_i \leq x\}}$  and  $\delta > 0$ , the Dvoretzky-Kiefer-Wolfowitz (DKW) inequality gives

$$\Pr \left( \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \hat{F}_n(x) - F(x) \right| > \delta \right) \leq 2e^{-2n\delta^2}$$

when  $X_1, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} F$  (Dvoretzky et al (1956); Massart (1990)). With  $\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}}$

inside  $\Pr(\cdot)$ , the DKW inequality gives  $1 - \alpha$  confidence bands for  $(F(x))_{x \in \mathbb{R}}$ , namely,  $\hat{F}_n(x) \pm \sqrt{\log(2/\alpha)/(2n)}$ , which become wider (more narrow) as  $\alpha \rightarrow 0^+$  (as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ). Observing that

$$\left\{ k \in \mathbb{Z} : \left| \frac{1}{n} \bar{B}_{n,k} - F(\rho^k) \right| > \delta \right\} \subset \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R} : \left| \hat{F}_n(x) - F(x) \right| > \delta \right\},$$

we have

$$\Pr \left( \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \bar{B}_{n,k} - F(\rho^k) \right| > \delta \right) \leq \Pr \left( \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \hat{F}_n(x) - F(x) \right| > \delta \right),$$

so that  $\frac{1}{n} \bar{B}_{n,k} \pm \sqrt{\log(2/\alpha)/(2n)}$  gives  $1 - \alpha$  confidence bands for  $(F(\rho^k))_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ .

Figure 4 shows 95% confidence bands for Exp(1) and Pareto(1, 1). Both circumscribe their CDF, an outcome one expects 9025 times out of 10,000. What do such bands tell us about  $F^{-1}$ ? While these are not confidence bands for  $F^{-1}$ , they are illustrative, *e.g.*, we expect an interval for  $F^{-1}(0.999)$  to look like  $(C, \infty)$ . With a DKW-type inequality for

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left| \hat{F}_n(x) - F(x) \right| dx = \int_0^1 \left| \hat{F}_n^{-1}(q) - F^{-1}(q) \right| dq$$

(something like Schmid & Tiede (1996); Johnson & Killeen (1983)) one could derive confidence bands for both  $(F(x))_{x \in \mathbb{R}}$  and  $(F^{-1}(q))_{q \in [0,1]}$ .<sup>5</sup>

### 3.1 The Exponential Setting

Organizations guard against extreme events, *e.g.*, high latency, high error rate, extreme heat, and excessive traffic. Say latency has an exponential distribution. We consider the following: If an organization uses an exponential histogram to store latency data, will it be able to accurately estimate extreme quantiles like  $F^{-1}(0.99999)$ ? The concern here is not accuracy per se, but estimability.

We bound both the expected mass to the right of the histogram and the expected mass in the right-most bin. That is, for final bin  $[J_n]$ , we bound

$$p_{\text{last}} := \Pr \left( \rho^{\lceil J_n \rceil - 1} < X \leq \rho^{\lceil J_n \rceil} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad p_{\text{tail}} := \Pr \left( X > \rho^{\lceil J_n \rceil} \right), \quad (33)$$

for  $X, X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Exp}(\lambda)$  and  $J_n := \log_{\rho} X_{(n)}$ .

**Theorem 3.1.** *For  $X, X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Exp}(\lambda)$ ,  $J_n := \log_{\rho} X_{(n)}$ , and  $p_{\text{last}}$  and  $p_{\text{tail}}$  in (33), we have*

$$p_{\text{last}} \leq nB(1 + 1/\rho, n) - nB(1 + \rho, n) \sim \frac{\Gamma(1 + 1/\rho)}{n^{1/\rho}} - \frac{\Gamma(1 + \rho)}{n^{\rho}} \quad (34)$$

$$\frac{\Gamma(1 + \rho)}{n^{\rho}} \sim nB(1 + \rho, n) \leq p_{\text{tail}} \leq \frac{1}{n+1} \sim \frac{1}{n}, \quad (35)$$

where the limits hold as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

<sup>5</sup>Rosenkrantz (2000); Aldor-Noiman et al (2013) give confidence bands for the quantile function in the i.i.d. normal setting. If we thought the data were normal, we could use these.

$\log_{10} n$	Exp( $\lambda$ )		Pareto( $\nu, 1$ )	
	$p_{\text{last}}$	$q_{\text{max}}$	$p_{\text{last}}$	$q_{\text{max}}$
1	$7.3 \times 10^{-3}$	0.9127160	$3.6 \times 10^{-3}$	0.9108911
2	$1.7 \times 10^{-3}$	0.9909028	$4.0 \times 10^{-4}$	0.9902951
3	$2.6 \times 10^{-4}$	0.9991236	$4.0 \times 10^{-5}$	0.9990208
4	$3.5 \times 10^{-5}$	0.9999163	$4.0 \times 10^{-6}$	0.9999020
5	$4.5 \times 10^{-6}$	0.9999920	$4.0 \times 10^{-7}$	0.9999902
6	$5.4 \times 10^{-7}$	0.9999992	$4.0 \times 10^{-8}$	0.9999990
7	$6.4 \times 10^{-8}$	0.9999999	$4.0 \times 10^{-9}$	0.9999999
8	$7.3 \times 10^{-9}$	1.0000000	$4.0 \times 10^{-10}$	1.0000000

Table 3: Rounded upper bounds for  $p_{\text{last}}$  and  $q_{\text{max}} := 1 - p_{\text{tail}}$  (see (33)) when  $\rho = \frac{1.01}{0.99} \approx 1.0202$ . See (34) and (35) for Exp( $\lambda$ ) and (36) for Pareto( $\nu, \beta$ ).

*Proof.* The proof appears in Appendix B.  $\square$

Table 3 bounds the expected mass of the last bin and the largest quantile we can hope to estimate under Exp( $\lambda$ ) sampling when  $\rho = \frac{1.01}{0.99}$  and  $1 \leq \log_{10} n \leq 8$ . We see that  $p_{\text{last}} \lesssim 1/n$  and  $q_{\text{max}} := 1 - p_{\text{tail}} \lesssim 1 - 1/n$ . For  $\rho$  fixed we have  $p_{\text{last}} = O(n^{-1/\rho})$  and  $p_{\text{tail}} = \mathcal{O}(1/n)$ .

### 3.2 The Pareto Setting

We turn to the setting in which  $X, X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Pareto}(\nu, \beta)$ .

**Theorem 3.2.** For  $X, X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Pareto}(\nu, \beta)$ ,  $J_n := \log_{\rho} X_{(n)}$ , and  $p_{\text{last}}$  and  $p_{\text{tail}}$  in (33), we have

$$p_{\text{last}} \leq \frac{\rho^{\beta} - 1/\rho^{\beta}}{n+1} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1/\rho^{\beta}}{n+1} \leq p_{\text{tail}} \leq \frac{1}{n+1}. \quad (36)$$

*Proof.* The proof, which uses Theorem 2.8, appears in Appendix B.  $\square$

Table 3 bounds  $p_{\text{last}}$  and  $q_{\text{max}}$  under Pareto( $\nu, 1$ ) sampling when  $\rho = \frac{1.01}{0.99}$  and  $1 \leq \log_{10} n \leq 8$ . In this setting  $p_{\text{last}} \lesssim 4/100n$  and we again have  $q_{\text{max}} \lesssim 1 - 1/n$ . The mass of the last bin increases as  $\beta$  or  $\rho$  increase, *i.e.*, as outliers become scarce or as bin sizes increase (so that  $\epsilon$  increases). For  $\beta$  and  $\rho$  fixed, both  $p_{\text{last}}$  and  $p_{\text{tail}}$  are  $\mathcal{O}(1/n)$ .

## 4 Occupancy

In this section and the next we adopt a new mental picture. Our histogram now becomes an infinite (or, in Exp( $\lambda$ )'s case, doubly-infinite) sequence of probability urns (or, buckets). Each value  $X_n \sim F$  becomes a ball thrown independently into an urn, the  $n$ th ball falling into urn  $k$  with probability

$$p_k := \Pr(\rho^{k-1} < X \leq \rho^k),$$

for  $X \sim F$ . While  $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} p_k = 1$ , we let  $Y_i := \lceil \log_\rho X_i \rceil$ , for  $i \geq 1$ , so that i.i.d.  $Y_i \sim (p_j)$  summarize the urn indices of the i.i.d.  $X_i \sim F$ . We say bin  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$  is occupied at time  $n \geq 1$  if  $B_{n,k} > 0$ .

Occupancy,

$$K_n := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbf{1}_{\{B_{n,j} > 0\}} = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{1}_{\{B_{n,j}=r\}} =: \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} K_{n,r}, \quad (37)$$

the number of occupied bins, is bounded above by size, *i.e.*,  $K_n \leq M_n$ .  $K_{n,r}$  gives the number of bins that summarize  $r$  of the  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$ . Our goal in studying occupancy (and gap sizes in §5) is to determine whether one wastes a significant amount of space by storing (an amortized superset of) the counts

$$\{B_{n,Y_{(1)}}, B_{n,Y_{(1)}+1}, \dots, B_{n,Y_{(n)}}\}. \quad (38)$$

We approximate the number of non-zero  $B_{n,k}$  in (38). This section and the next confirm that, for  $\text{Exp}(\lambda)$  and  $\text{Pareto}(\nu, \beta)$ , one does not waste significant space in storing the full list of counts in (38)—our hunch going into this analysis.

Occupancy in the presence of an infinite number of urns is an area of enduring concern in applied probability—work bookended by Karlin (1967)’s seminal insights and Gnedin et al (2007)’s excellent review. We review two, key results below, which sections 4.1 and 4.2 then apply. Regarding  $\mathbb{E}K_n$  we have:

**Theorem 4.1.** *For  $Y_i$  i.i.d. with support  $\mathbb{Z}_+ := \{1, 2, \dots\}$ , let  $p_k := \Pr(Y_1 = k)$  and assume that  $p_1 \geq p_2 \geq \dots$ . For  $x > 0$  let  $\alpha(x) := \max\{k \geq 1 : p_k \geq 1/x\}$ . If  $\alpha$  is slowly-varying (*i.e.*,  $\alpha(cx) \sim \alpha(x)$  for each fixed  $c > 0$ , as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ ), then  $\mathbb{E}K_n \sim \alpha(n)$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .*

*Proof.* Please see Theorem 1’ in section 2 of Karlin (1967). Put “ $\gamma = 0$ .”  $\square$

Decrouez et al (2018) gives finite- $n$  bounds for  $\mathbb{E}K_n$ . For  $\text{Var}(K_n)$  we have:

**Theorem 4.2.** *For  $Y_i$  i.i.d. with support  $\mathbb{Z}_+ := \{1, 2, \dots\}$ , let  $p_k := \Pr(Y_1 = k)$  and assume that  $p_1 \geq p_2 \geq \dots$ . Let  $v_n := \text{Var}(K_n)$ . Then,*

1.  $(v_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$  approaches a finite limit  $\iff \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{p_{j+k}}{p_j} = \frac{1}{2}$  for some  $k \geq 1$ , in which case  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} v_n = k$ ;
2.  $(v_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$  is bounded  $\iff \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{p_{j+k}}{p_j} \leq \frac{1}{2}$  for some  $k \geq 1$ . Then,

$$k_{\min} := \inf \left\{ k \geq 1 : \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{p_{j+k}}{p_j} \leq \frac{1}{2} \right\}$$

*provides an asymptotically sharp bound for  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} v_n$ .*

*Proof.* Please refer to Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 of Bogachev et al (2008).  $\square$

## 4.1 The Exponential Setting

In applying Theorems 4.1–4.2 to  $\text{Exp}(\lambda)$  data, we encounter the following mismatch: these theorems call for a singly-infinite sequence of urns with decreasing probabilities while  $\text{Exp}(\lambda)$  produces a doubly-infinite sequence of urns with increasing and then decreasing probabilities.<sup>6</sup> For  $X \sim \text{Exp}(\lambda)$ ,  $x > 0$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_{\lambda, \rho} := 1 + \log_{\rho} \left( \frac{\log \rho}{\lambda(\rho - 1)} \right) &= \arg \max_{-\infty < y < \infty} \Pr(\rho^{y-1} < X \leq \rho^y) & (39) \\ &= \arg \max_{-\infty < y < \infty} \{ \exp(-\lambda \rho^{y-1}) - \exp(-\lambda \rho^y) \}, & (40) \end{aligned}$$

we therefore split  $F(x) = \Pr(X \leq x)$  into two parts:

$$\begin{aligned} F(x) &= F_0(x) \Pr(X \leq \kappa_{\lambda, \rho}) + F_1(x) \Pr(X > \kappa_{\lambda, \rho}) \\ &= F_0(x) \left( 1 - \rho^{-\frac{\rho}{\rho-1}} \right) + F_1(x) \rho^{-\frac{\rho}{\rho-1}}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$F_0(x) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \leq 0 \\ \frac{1 - e^{-\lambda x}}{1 - \rho^{-\frac{\rho}{\rho-1}}} & \text{if } 0 < x < \frac{\rho \log \rho}{\lambda(\rho-1)} \\ 1 & \text{if } x \geq \frac{\rho \log \rho}{\lambda(\rho-1)} \end{cases} \quad (41)$$

$$F_1(x) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \leq \frac{\rho \log \rho}{\lambda(\rho-1)} \\ 1 - e^{-\lambda(x - \frac{\rho \log \rho}{\lambda(\rho-1)})} & \text{if } x > \frac{\rho \log \rho}{\lambda(\rho-1)}. \end{cases} \quad (42)$$

We analyze  $F_0$  and  $F_1$  separately and then stitch the results so-obtained back together. Regarding  $\mathbb{E}K_n$  we have:

**Proposition 4.3.** *Note that:*

1. If  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} F_0$  in (41), then, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,


$$\mathbb{E}K_n \sim \log_{\rho} \left( \frac{n \log \rho}{1 - \rho^{-\frac{\rho}{\rho-1}}} \right) + \frac{1}{\log \rho} W_0 \left( - \frac{\left( 1 - \rho^{-\frac{\rho}{\rho-1}} \right) \sqrt{\rho}}{(\rho - 1) n} \right) \sim \log_{\rho} n.$$

2. If  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} F_1$  in (42) and  $\eta_{\rho, n} := \log(n \log \rho) + \frac{\rho \log \rho}{\rho-1}$ , then, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,


$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}K_n &\sim \log_{\rho} \left( - \frac{\rho - 1}{\log \rho} W_{-1} \left( - \frac{\rho^{-\frac{\rho}{\rho-1}}}{n \log \rho} \right) \right) \\ &\leq \log_{\rho} \left( \frac{\rho - 1}{\log \rho} \left( \eta_{\rho, n} + \sqrt{2(\eta_{\rho, n} - 1)} \right) \right) \sim \log_{\rho} \log_{\rho} n. \end{aligned}$$

---

<sup>6</sup> $\Pr(\rho^{k-1} < X \leq \rho^k)$  is unimodal  $\iff -\log_{\rho} X \sim \text{Gumbel}(\log_{\rho} \lambda, \frac{1}{\log \rho})$ ,  $X \sim \text{Exp}(\lambda)$ .



(a) Occupancy counts and expected counts. Box plots show simulated  $K_n$  for  $10^3$  data sets with  $1 \leq \log_{10} n \leq 8$ . Red curves use the full approximations of  $\mathbb{E}K_n$  in Proposition 4.3. Blue curves use summary approximations  $\log_\rho n$  (outer panels) and  $\log_\rho \log_\rho n$  (central panel).



(b) The variance of occupancy counts. Green curves give the variances of box plots in Figure 5a. Gray lines give bounds  $(\lceil \log_\rho 2 \rceil, 1, \lfloor \log_\rho 2 \rfloor + 1) = (35, 1, 36)$  from Proposition 4.4.

Figure 5: Occupancy in the  $\text{Exp}(1)$  setting (Propositions 4.3–4.4). Left panels sample from  $F_0$  in (41) with  $\lambda = 1$ ; middle panels sample from  $F_1$  in (42) with  $\lambda = 1$ ; right panels sample from  $\text{Exp}(1)$ . Histograms use  $\rho = 1.01/0.99 \approx 1.02$ .

3. If  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Exp}(\lambda)$ , then

$$\mathbb{E}K_n \begin{cases} \approx \mathbb{E}_0 K_{n_0} + \mathbb{E}_1 K_{n_1} \\ \lesssim \log_\rho n \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty, \end{cases}$$

where “ $\mathbb{E}_b$ ” indicates expectation with respect to  $F_b$  in (41) or (42) and

$$n_0 := n \times \left(1 - \rho^{-\frac{\rho}{\rho-1}}\right) \text{ and } n_1 := n \times \rho^{-\frac{\rho}{\rho-1}}$$

give the expected numbers of values below and above cutoff  $\rho^{K, \lambda, \rho} = \frac{\rho \log \rho}{\lambda(\rho-1)}$ .

*Proof.* The proof, which uses Theorem 4.1, appears in Appendix C.  $\square$

Figure 5a shows good correspondence between our approximations of  $\mathbb{E}K_n$  and simulated occupancy counts, especially under  $F_0$  and  $F_1$ . Under  $F$ , approxi-

mations  $\mathbb{E}_0 K_{n_0} + \mathbb{E}_1 K_{n_1}$  and  $\log_\rho n$  under- and overshoot occupancy. Regarding  $\text{Var}(K_n)$  we have:

**Proposition 4.4.** *Letting  $\mathbb{Z}_+ := \{1, 2, \dots\}$ , we note that:*

1. *If  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} F_0$  in (41), then*

$$\begin{aligned} \log_\rho 2 \in \mathbb{Z}_+ &\implies \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(K_n) = \log_\rho 2 \\ \log_\rho 2 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Z}_+ &\implies \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(K_n) \leq \lceil \log_\rho 2 \rceil. \end{aligned}$$

2. *If  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} F_1$  in (42), then  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(K_n) \leq 1$ .*

3. *If  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Exp}(\lambda)$ , then, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,*

$$\text{Var}(K_n) \begin{cases} \approx \text{Var}_0(K_{n_0}) + \text{Var}_1(K_{n_1}) \\ \lesssim \log_\rho^2 n, \end{cases}$$

where  $\text{Var}_b(X) := \mathbb{E}_b[(X - \mathbb{E}_b X)^2]$  takes the variance using  $F_b$  in (41) or (42) and

$$n_0 := n \times \left(1 - \rho^{-\frac{\rho}{\rho-1}}\right) \text{ and } n_1 := n \times \rho^{-\frac{\rho}{\rho-1}}$$

give the expected numbers of values below and above cutoff  $\rho^{\kappa, \rho} = \frac{\rho \log \rho}{\lambda(\rho-1)}$ .

Note finally that  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \{\text{Var}_0(K_{n_0}) + \text{Var}_1(K_{n_1})\} \leq \lceil \log_\rho 2 \rceil + 1$ .

*Proof.* The proof, which uses Theorem 4.2, appears in Appendix C.  $\square$

Figure 5b compares our approximations of  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(K_n)$  with the variances of simulated occupancies. Simulations corroborate our analytic results for  $F_0$  and  $F_1$ ,  $\lceil \log_\rho 2 \rceil$  and 1. Simulations also show that our analytic result for  $\text{Exp}(\lambda)$ ,  $\log_\rho^2 n$ , is not tight. In fact,  $\lceil \log_\rho 2 \rceil + 1$ , the bound suggested by  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \{\text{Var}_0(K_{n_0}) + \text{Var}_1(K_{n_1})\}$ , works well. The variance result in Proposition 2.3 provides corroborating evidence.

Comparing Propositions 2.3 and 4.3 we see that both  $\mathbb{E}M_n$  and  $\mathbb{E}K_n$  are  $\sim \log_\rho n$ —an asymptotically insignificant number of bins are empty. That said, how many bins *are* empty? The following bounds the mean number as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .


**Theorem 4.5.** *Let  $\mathbb{E}_b$  represent expectation with respect to  $F_b$  in (41) or (42),  $p_0 := 1 - \rho^{-\frac{\rho}{\rho-1}}$ , and  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Then, for empty cell count  $E_n := M_n - K_n$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_0 M_n \lesssim \log_\rho \left( \frac{n \rho \log \rho}{(\rho-1)p_0} \right) + \frac{\gamma}{\log \rho} + 1 &\implies \mathbb{E}_0 E_n \lesssim \log_\rho \left( \frac{\rho}{\rho-1} \right) + \frac{\gamma}{\log \rho} + 1 \\ \mathbb{E}_1 M_n \lesssim \log_\rho \left( \frac{(\rho-1)(\gamma + \log n)}{\rho \log \rho} + 1 \right) + 1 &\implies \mathbb{E}_1 E_n \lesssim \log_\rho \left( \frac{3}{2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

*These results imply that  $\mathbb{E}E_n \lesssim \log_\rho \left( \frac{3\rho}{2(\rho-1)} \right) + \frac{\gamma}{\log \rho} + 1$  in the  $\text{Exp}(\lambda)$  setting.*

*Proof.* The proof, which uses Proposition 4.3, appears in Appendix C.  $\square$

Note in particular that, with  $\rho = \frac{1.01}{0.99}$ ,  $\mathbb{E}_0 E_n \lesssim 226$  and  $\mathbb{E}_1 E_n \lesssim 21$ . Under  $\text{Exp}(\lambda)$ , as the number of summarized values grows large, the expected number of empty bins is bounded above by 247 (see Figure 6). That said, bounds on the expected number of empty bins grow large as  $\rho \rightarrow 1^+$ .



(a) Under  $F_0$  in (41).

(b) Under  $F_1$  in (42).

Figure 6: The number of (empty) bins versus  $1 \leq \log_{10} n \leq 6$  under  $F_0$  and  $F_1$  in (41) and (42). We use  $\rho = \frac{1.01}{0.99}$ . See Theorem 4.5 for the asymptotic bounds.

## 4.2 The Pareto Setting

For  $X_i \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Pareto}(\nu, \beta)$ , we have bin indices  $Y_i \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Geometric}(1 - 1/\rho^\beta)$ , so that:

**Theorem 4.6.** For  $\mathbb{Z}_+ := \{1, 2, \dots\}$ ,  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Pareto}(\nu, \beta)$ , and empty bin count  $E_n := M_n - K_n$ , we note that:

1. When  $n \rightarrow \infty$ :

$$\mathbb{E}K_n \sim 1 + \frac{\log_\rho((1 - 1/\rho^\beta)n)}{\beta}, \quad \mathbb{E}E_n \sim \frac{1}{\beta} \left[ \log_\rho \left( \frac{1}{1 - 1/\rho^\beta} \right) + \frac{\gamma}{\log \rho} \right].$$

2. Letting  $\xi_{\beta, \rho} := \frac{1}{\beta} \log_\rho 2$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_{\beta, \rho} \in \mathbb{Z}_+ &\implies \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(K_n) = \xi_{\beta, \rho} \\ \xi_{\beta, \rho} \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}_+ &\implies \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(K_n) \leq \lceil \xi_{\beta, \rho} \rceil. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* The proof, which uses Theorems 4.1 and 4.2, appears in Appendix C.  $\square$

The results given above mirror those for  $\text{Exp}(\lambda)$ . 1. The number of empty bins is bounded as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  (cf. Theorem 4.5). We expect 225 empty bins when  $\beta = 1$  and  $\rho = \frac{1.01}{0.99}$ . 2. The expected number of empty bins is not bounded in  $\beta$  or  $\rho$ . If either or both of these become smaller (i.e., if we increase outlier magnitude or histogram accuracy), we increase the expected number of occupied and empty bins. 3. Finally,  $\text{Var}_{\text{Pareto}(\nu, \beta)}(K_n)$ ,  $\text{Var}_{\text{Pareto}(\nu, \beta)}(M_n)$  (Proposition 2.6), and it appears  $\text{Var}_{\text{Exp}(\lambda)}(K_n)$  (Figure 5b) plateau as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

## 5 Longest Gap

While occupancy grows apace with size under  $\text{Exp}(\lambda)$  and Pareto  $(\nu, \beta)$  sampling (§4), this section looks more closely at missingness. In particular we consider

$$L_n := \text{length of the longest gap in } \{Y_{(1)}, Y_{(1)} + 1, \dots, Y_{(n)}\},$$

where a *gap* is a contiguous sequence of empty bins. The largest gap eats up only a fraction of the empty bins, *e.g.*,  $5\mathbb{E}L_n \approx \mathbb{E}E_n$  in the  $\text{Exp}(\lambda)$  and Pareto  $(\nu, 1)$  settings when  $\rho = 1.01/0.99$  (§5.1–§5.2).

The excellent paper by Grübel & Hitczenko (2009) shows that the asymptotic fate of  $L_n$  depends on and implies properties for  $\{\Pr(Y_1 \geq k+1)/\Pr(Y_1 \geq k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ .

**Theorem 5.1.** *For  $k \geq 0$  and  $Y_1, Y_2, \dots$  i.i.d. with support  $\mathbb{N} := \{0, 1, \dots\}$ , let  $p_k := \Pr(Y_1 = k)$  and  $q_k := \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} p_j = \Pr(Y_1 \geq k)$ . Then,*

1.  $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{q_{k+1}}{q_k} < \infty \iff \Pr(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} L_n = 0) = 1;$
2.  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{q_{k+1}}{q_k} = 0 \iff \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(L_n = 0) = 1;$
3.  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{q_{k+1}}{q_k} = 1 \implies \Pr(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} L_n = \infty) = 1.$

*Proof.* Please refer to Theorems 1, 2, and 3 of Grübel & Hitczenko (2009).  $\square$

While Theorem 5.1 does not consider the setting  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} q_{k+1}/q_k = r \in (0, 1)$ , Theorem 5.2 (also from Grübel & Hitczenko (2009)) considers this setting's exemplar, the geometric distribution.

**Theorem 5.2.** *If  $Y_1, Y_2, \dots$  are i.i.d. with  $\Pr(Y_i = k) = (1-p)^k p$ , for  $0 < p < 1$  and  $k \geq 0$ , we have*

$$\Pr(\bar{V} \leq (l-1)\tau_p) \leq \Pr(L_n \leq l) \leq \Pr(\bar{V}_n \leq (l+1)\tau_p), \quad (43)$$

for  $n, l \geq 1$ , where  $\tau_p := -\log(1-p)$  and

$$\bar{V}_n := \max\{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_{n-1}\} \uparrow \max_{1 \leq i < \infty} V_i =: \bar{V},$$

for independent  $V_i \sim \text{Exp}(i)$ , so that, for  $v > 0$ ,  $\Pr(\bar{V}_n \leq v) = \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (1 - e^{-iv})$  and  $\Pr(\bar{V} \leq v) = \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} (1 - e^{-iv})$ . Further, there is a subsequence  $\{n_m\}_{m=1}^{\infty}$  such that  $\mathcal{L}(L_{n_m})$  approaches a non-degenerate distribution as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ .

*Proof.* Please refer to Theorem 5 of Grübel & Hitczenko (2009), which specifies a family of (subsequence, limiting distribution) pairs indexed by  $\eta \in [0, 1]$ .  $\square$

The upper and lower bounds for  $\{\Pr(L_n \leq l)\}_{n, l \geq 1}$  in (43) provide upper and lower bounds for  $\mathbb{E}L_n$  and  $\text{Var}(L_n)$ , which we summarize in the following lemma. Figure 7 compares the derived bounds with simulated data.




Figure 7: The largest gaps in Geometric ( $p$ ) samples. Each box plot summarizes  $10^3$  data sets of size  $n = 10^4$ . Lemma 5.3 bounds  $\mathbb{E}L_n$  and  $\text{Var}(L_n)$ . Red and blue curves give upper and lower bounds for  $\mathbb{E}L_n$ . The purple curve sums the upper bounds for  $\mathbb{E}L_n$  and  $\sqrt{\text{Var}(L_n)}$ . Axes use the log scale. Skewness at times places the median (bold horizontal line) below the lower bounds for  $\mathbb{E}L_n$ .

**Lemma 5.3.** For  $\{Y_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$  i.i.d. with  $\Pr(Y_i = k) = (1-p)^k p$ , for  $0 < p < 1$ , we note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}L_n &\in \left[ \frac{(1-p)^2}{p} - \frac{(1-p)^{2n}}{1-(1-p)^n}, \frac{1.5}{p} + 1 \right] \\ \mathbb{E}L_n^2 &\in \left[ \frac{2(1-p)^2}{p^2} - \frac{2(1-p)^{2n}}{(1-(1-p)^n)^2}, \frac{3.3}{p^2} + \frac{3}{2p} + 2 \right] \\ \text{Var}(L_n) &\in \left[ 0, \frac{3.3}{p^2} + \frac{3}{2p} + 2 - \left( \frac{(1-p)^2}{p} - \frac{(1-p)^{2n}}{1-(1-p)^n} \right)^2 \right], \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}L_n &\tilde{\in} \begin{cases} \left[ \frac{(1-p)^2}{p}, \frac{1.5}{p} + 1 \right], & \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty \\ \left[ \frac{n-1}{np}, \frac{1.5}{p} \right], & \text{as } p \rightarrow 0^+ \\ [0, 2.5], & \text{as } p \rightarrow 1^- \end{cases} \\ \mathbb{E}L_n^2 &\tilde{\in} \begin{cases} \left[ \frac{2(1-p)^2}{p^2}, \frac{3.3}{p^2} + \frac{3}{2p} + 2 \right], & \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty \\ \left[ \frac{2n^2(1-p)^2-2}{n^2p^2}, \frac{3.3}{p^2} \right], & \text{as } p \rightarrow 0^+ \\ [0, 6.8], & \text{as } p \rightarrow 1^- \end{cases} \\ \text{Var}(L_n) &\tilde{\in} \begin{cases} \left[ 0, \frac{2.3}{p^2} + \frac{5.5}{p} \right], & \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty \\ \left[ 0, \frac{2.3n^2+2n-1}{n^2p^2} \right], & \text{as } p \rightarrow 0^+ \\ [0, 6.8], & \text{as } p \rightarrow 1^- \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{\in}$  indicates asymptotic upper and lower bounds.

*Proof.* The proof, which uses Theorem 5.2, appears in Appendix D.  $\square$

## 5.1 The Exponential Setting

Our analysis here (as in §4.1) hinges on splitting the  $\text{Exp}(\lambda)$  CDF into two parts:  $F_0$  and  $F_1$  ((39)–(42)). Note that, under  $F_0$ , bin masses are nearly geometric.

**Conjecture 5.4.** *If  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} F_0$  in (41), then, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E}L_n \tilde{\in} \left[ \frac{1}{\rho(\rho-1)}, \frac{2.5\rho-1}{\rho-1} \right] \text{ and } \text{Var}(L_n) \tilde{\in} \left[ 0, \frac{\rho(7.8\rho-5.5)}{(\rho-1)^2} \right],$$

where  $\tilde{\in}$  indicates asymptotic upper and lower bounds.

*Proof.* The basic idea is that the independent  $Y_i$  are nearly Geometric  $(1 - 1/\rho)$ . If they were Geometric  $(1 - 1/\rho)$ , the result would follow (Lemma 5.3). To see that the  $Y_i$  are nearly Geometric  $(1 - 1/\rho)$ , we recall the proof of Proposition 4.4 part 1, which gives, for  $k \leq 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} p_k &:= \Pr(\rho^{\kappa_{\lambda, \rho} + k - 1} < X_1 \leq \rho^{\kappa_{\lambda, \rho} + k}) \\ &= \frac{\rho^{-\frac{\rho^k}{\rho-1}} - \rho^{-\frac{\rho^{k+1}}{\rho-1}}}{1 - \rho^{-\frac{\rho}{\rho-1}}} \sim \frac{\rho^{-\frac{\rho^{k+1/2}}{\rho-1}} \rho^k \log \rho}{1 - \rho^{-\frac{\rho}{\rho-1}}}, \end{aligned}$$

as  $k \rightarrow -\infty$ . This then implies that  $p_{k-1}/p_k \sim \rho^{-1 + \rho^{k-1/2}}$ , which approaches  $1/\rho$  (very quickly) as  $k \rightarrow -\infty$ .  $\square$

Do Theorem 5.2's conclusions apply more generally to  $q_k$  for which  $q_{k+1}/q_k \rightarrow r \in (0, 1)$ ? Perhaps (Grübel & Hitczenko (2009)). Simulations support Conjecture 5.4 and the weak dependence of Lemma 5.3's intervals on  $n$  (Figure 8). Turning to  $F_1$  we have:

**Proposition 5.5.** *If  $X_1, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} F_1$  in (42), then  $\Pr(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} L_n = 0) = 1$ .*

*Proof.* The proof, which uses Theorem 5.1, appears in Appendix D.  $\square$

In the  $\text{Exp}(\lambda)$  setting with  $\rho = \frac{1.01}{0.99}$  we expect a longest gap of length [48, 77] bins to the left of  $1.01/\lambda$ . The longest gap subsumes perhaps 20% of the empty bins (see §4.1), and its length has standard deviation  $\leq 79$  bins (Figure 8). We expect the longest gap to become longer and its length more variable as  $\rho$  (and  $\epsilon$ ) becomes smaller. On the other hand, the largest gap above  $1.01/\lambda$  has length zero and  $\mathbb{E}X_{(n)} \sim \frac{\gamma + \log n}{\lambda}$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  (see page 83 of Durrett (2005)).

## 5.2 The Pareto Setting

Recall that, in the Pareto  $(\nu, \beta)$  setting, the bin masses are geometric, yielding:

**Proposition 5.6.** *If  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Pareto}(\nu, \beta)$ , then*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}L_n \tilde{\in} & \begin{cases} \left[ \frac{1}{\rho^\beta(\rho^\beta-1)}, \frac{2.5\rho^\beta-1}{\rho^\beta-1} \right], & \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty \\ \left[ \frac{n-1}{n(\rho^\beta-1)}, \frac{1.5}{\rho^\beta-1} \right], & \text{as } \beta \rightarrow 0^+ \\ [0, 2.5], & \text{as } \beta \rightarrow \infty \end{cases} \\ \text{Var}(L_n) \tilde{\in} & \begin{cases} \left[ 0, \frac{\rho^\beta(7.8\rho^\beta-5.5)}{(\rho^\beta-1)^2} \right], & \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty \\ \left[ 0, \frac{2.3n^2+2n-1}{n^2(\rho^\beta-1)^2} \right], & \text{as } \beta \rightarrow 0^+ \\ [0, 6.8], & \text{as } \beta \rightarrow \infty \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$




Figure 8: Largest gap size when  $X_i \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} F_0$ . Box plots show  $10^3$  data sets of size  $1 \leq \log_{10} n \leq 7$ . Blue and red lines give the bounds for  $\mathbb{E}L_n$  in Conjecture 5.4. The purple line sums the upper bounds for  $\mathbb{E}L_n$  and  $\sqrt{\text{Var}(L_n)}$ . We use  $\rho = \frac{1.01}{0.99} \approx 1.02$ . Simulations bolster the veracity of our claim in Conjecture 5.4.

where  $\tilde{\epsilon}$  indicates asymptotic upper and lower bounds.

*Proof.* Apply Lemma 5.3 noting that  $Y_i \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Geometric}(1 - 1/\rho^\beta)$  (cf. (106)).  $\square$

In the Pareto  $(\nu, 1)$  setting with  $\rho = \frac{1.01}{0.99}$  and  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we expect a longest gap of length  $[48, 77]$  bins, subsuming perhaps 20% of the empty bins (see §4.2). The length of the longest gap has standard deviation  $\leq 79$  bins. The longest gap becomes longer and its length more variable as  $\rho$  or  $\beta$  become smaller, *i.e.*, as we increase histogram precision or outlier size.

## 6 Conclusions

Table 4 compares results for  $\text{Exp}(\lambda)$  and Pareto  $(\nu, \beta)$ . Having observed  $n$  data points, we expect we will be able to approximate something at least as large as the  $(1 - 1/n)$ th quantile of  $\text{Exp}(\lambda)$  or Pareto  $(\nu, \beta)$ . Note further that

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} F_{\text{Pareto}(\nu, \beta), \text{Size}}^{-1}(q) \\ \mathbb{E}_{\text{Pareto}(\nu, \beta)}[\text{Occupancy}] \\ \mathbb{E}_{\text{Pareto}(\nu, \beta)}[\text{Largest Gap}] \\ \text{Var}_{\text{Pareto}(\nu, \beta)}(\text{Largest Gap}) \end{array} \right\} \begin{array}{l} \geq \\ \geq \\ \geq \\ \geq \end{array} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} F_{\text{Exp}(\lambda), \text{Size}}^{-1}(q) \\ \mathbb{E}_{\text{Exp}(\lambda)}[\text{Occupancy}] \\ \mathbb{E}_{\text{Exp}(\lambda)}[\text{Largest Gap}] \\ \text{Var}_{\text{Exp}(\lambda)}(\text{Largest Gap}) \end{array} \right\} \iff \beta \geq 1$$

The above pairs of values differ only with respect to the Pareto  $\beta$  parameter. For results that differ beyond setting  $\beta = 1$ :

	Exp ( $\lambda$ )	Pareto ( $\nu, \beta$ )
$F_{\text{Size}}^{-1}(q)$	$\log_{\rho} n - \log_{\rho}(-\log q)$	$\beta^{-1}(\log_{\rho} n - \log_{\rho}(-\log q))$
$\mathcal{L}(\text{Size})$	Gumbel $\left(1 + \frac{\log n + \log \log n}{\log \rho}, \frac{1}{\log \rho}\right)$	Gumbel $\left(1 + \frac{\log n}{\beta \log \rho}, \frac{1}{\beta \log \rho}\right)$
Pr (Largest Bin)	$e^{1/\rho} \Gamma(1 + 1/\rho) n^{-1/\rho}$	$(\rho^{\beta} - 1/\rho^{\beta}) n^{-1}$
Pr (Right Tail)	$n^{-1}$	$n^{-1}$
$\mathbb{E}[\text{Occupancy}]$	$\log_{\rho} n$	$\beta^{-1} \log_{\rho} n$
$\mathbb{E}[\#\text{Empty}]$	$\log_{\rho} \left(\frac{3\rho}{2(\rho-1)}\right) + \frac{\gamma}{\log \rho} + 1$	$\frac{1}{\beta} \left[\log_{\rho} \left(\frac{1}{1-1/\rho^{\beta}}\right) + \frac{\gamma}{\log \rho}\right]$
Var (Occupancy)	“ $\lceil \log_{\rho} 2 \rceil + 1$ ”	$\lceil \beta^{-1} \log_{\rho} 2 \rceil$
$\mathbb{E}[\text{Largest Gap}]$	“(2.5 $\rho - 1$ )/( $\rho - 1$ )”	$(2.5\rho^{\beta} - 1)/(\rho^{\beta} - 1)$
Var (Largest Gap)	“ $\rho(7.8\rho - 5.5)/(\rho - 1)^2$ ”	$\rho^{\beta}(7.8\rho^{\beta} - 5.5)/(\rho^{\beta} - 1)^2$

Table 4: Key results and simulation-supported conjectures, which use quotes.  $F_{\text{Size}}^{-1}(q)$  and  $\mathcal{L}(\text{Size})$  give large- $n$  approximations; the remaining rows give large- $n$  upper bounds. Except for  $\mathcal{L}(\text{Size})$ , Pr (Largest Bin),  $\mathbb{E}[\#\text{Empty}]$ , and Var (Occupancy), the Exp ( $\lambda$ ) results equal Pareto ( $\nu, \beta$ ) results with  $\beta = 1$ .

- $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Exp}(\lambda)}(\text{Size})$  has a  $\log \log n$  term  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Pareto}(\nu, 1)}(\text{Size})$  lacks (Remark 2.4);
- Exp ( $\lambda$ ) (of course) puts more mass on its final bin than Pareto ( $\nu, 1$ );
- $\mathbb{E}_{\text{Exp}(\lambda)}[\#\text{Empty}] - \log_{\rho}(3/2) - 1 = \mathbb{E}_{\text{Pareto}(\nu, 1)}[\#\text{Empty}]$ ; and
- $\text{Var}_{\text{Exp}(\lambda)}(\text{Occupancy}) - 1 = \text{Var}_{\text{Pareto}(\nu, 1)}(\text{Occupancy})$ .

Of the eight Pareto values that depend on  $\beta$ , only Pr (Largest Bin) grows larger as  $\beta$  grows larger. This makes sense: larger  $\beta$  means fewer Pareto outliers.

In the end, we see that, if we set  $\beta = 1$  and ignore Pr (Largest Bin), exponential histograms holding Exp ( $\lambda$ ) and Pareto ( $\nu, \beta$ ) data have remarkably similar properties. While Pareto ( $\nu, \beta$ ) is heavy-tailed to the right, relative to the histogram Exp ( $\lambda$ ) is (in some sense) heavy-tailed to the left. While Pareto ( $\nu, \beta$ ) avoids overly small values, Exp ( $\lambda$ )—like Uniform (0, 1) (see §1.1)—does not.

Relative-error-guaranteed exponential histograms work well on Exp ( $\lambda$ ) and Pareto ( $\nu, \beta$ ) data. 1. Sizes grow like  $\log_{\rho} n$ . 2. Missing masses to the right of the largest bin decrease like  $1/n$ . 3. Numbers of unused bins plateau with  $n$ . 4. Longest gaps occupy a small fraction of the total number of empty bins. The Cormode et al (2021) approach to relative-error-guaranteed quantile estimation uses a much more involved algorithm—one that requires more space (see (8)).

Exponential histograms probably efficiently store many types of data. Take, e.g., Cauchy data. While this setting calls for two histograms:  $\mathcal{H}_{(-\infty, 0)}$  and  $\mathcal{H}_{(0, \infty)}$ , we imagine four:  $\mathcal{H}_{(-\infty, -1)}$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_{[-1, 0]}$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_{(0, 1]}$ , and  $\mathcal{H}_{(1, \infty)}$ . We expect  $\mathcal{H}_{[-1, 0]}$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_{(0, 1]}$ , and a histogram holding Uniform (0, 1) values to have similar size, accuracy, occupancy, and gap sizes. We expect  $\mathcal{H}_{(-\infty, -1)}$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_{(1, \infty)}$ , and a histogram holding Pareto (1, 1) values to have similar size, accuracy, occupancy, and gap sizes. In particular, we expect total size to be  $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

## Acknowledgements

I thank J.F. Huard for sharing his enthusiasm for computation on data streams.

## References

- Agarwal PK, G Cormode, Z Huang, JM Phillips, Z Wei, K Yi (2013) “Mergeable Summaries.” *ACM Transactions on Database Systems*, 38:4:26, pages 1–28.
- Aldor-Noiman S, Brown LD, Buja A, Rolke W, & Stine RA (2013) “The power to see: a new graphical test of normality.” *The American Statistician*, 67: 4, pages 249–260.
- Bogachev LV, AV Gnedin, & YV Yakubovich (2008) “On the variance of the number of occupied boxes.” *Advances in Applied Mathematics*, 40: pages 401–432.
- Cerone P (2007) “Special functions: Approximations and bounds.” *Appl Anal Discrete Math*, 1: 1, pages 72–91.
- Chambers JM, DA James, D Lambert, S Vander Wiel (2006) “Monitoring networked applications with incremental quantile estimation.” *Statistical Science*, 21(4): pages 463–475.
- Chatzigeorgiou I (2013) “Bounds on the lambert function and their application to the outage analysis of user cooperation.” *IEEE Comm Letters*, 17: 8, pages 1505–1508.
- Cormen TH, CE Leiserson, RL Rivest, C Stein (2001) *Introduction to Algorithms, Second Edition*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Cormode G, Z Karnin, E Liberty, J Thaler, & P Vesely (2021) “Relative error streaming quantiles.” *PODS’21: Proceedings of the 40th ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGAI Symposium on Principles of Database Systems*, pages 96–108.
- Cormode G & K Yi (2020) *Small Summaries for Big Data*. Cambridge UP, Cambridge, UK.
- David HA & HN Nagaraja (2003) *Order Statistics*, 3rd Edition. John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, NJ.
- Decrouez G, M Grabchak, Q Paris (2018) “Finite sample properties of the mean occupancy counts and probabilities.” *Bernoulli*, 24: 3, pages 1910–1941.
- Dunning T & O Ertl (2019) “Computing Extremely Accurate Quantiles Using t-Digests.” See <https://arxiv.org/abs/1902.04023>.
- Durrett R (2005) *Probability: Theory and Examples, 3rd edition*. Brooks/Cole—Thomas Learning, Belmont, CA.

- Dvoretzky A, J Kiefer, & J Wolfowitz (1956), “Asymptotic minimax character of the sample distribution function and of the classical multinomial estimator.” *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 27: 3, pages 642–669.
- Foss S, D Korshunov, & S Zachary (2013) *An Introduction to Heavy-Tailed and Subexponential Distributions, Second Edition*. Springer, New York, NY.
- Gnedin A, B Hansen, J Pitman (2007) “Notes on the occupancy problem with infinitely many boxes: general asymptotics and power laws.” *Probab. Surveys*, 4, pages 146–171.
- Greenwald M & S Khanna (2001) “Space-efficient online computation of quantile summaries.” *ACM SIGMOD Record*, 30: 2, pages 58–66.
- Grübel R & Hitczenko P (2009) “Gaps in discrete random samples.” *Journal of Applied Probability*, 46: 4, pages 1038–1051.
- de Haan L & A Ferreira (2006) *Extreme Value Theory: An Introduction*. Springer, New York, NY.
- Hartmann H & T Schlossnagle (2020) “Circllhist: the log-linear histograms for IT infrastructure monitoring.” See <https://arxiv.org/abs/2001.06561>.
- Johnson B McK & T Killeen (1983) “An explicit formula for the C.D.F. of the L1 norm of the Brownian bridge.” *Ann. Probab.*, 11: 3, pages 807–808.
- Karlin S (1967) “Central limit theorems for certain infinite urn schemes.” *J of Math & Mech*, 17: 4, pages 373–401.
- Karnin Z, K Lang, E Liberty (2016) “Optimal quantile approximation in streams.” *Proc IEEE FOCS '16*, pages 71–78.
- Massart P (1990) “The tight constant in the Dvoretzky–Kiefer–Wolfowitz inequality.” *Annals of Probability*, 18: 3, pages 1269–1283.
- Masson C, JE Rim, HK Lee (2019) “DDSketch: a fast and fully-mergeable quantile sketch with relative-error guarantees.” *Proc VLDB Endowment*, 12: 12.
- Munro JI & MS Paterson (1980) “Selecting and sorting with limited storage.” *Theoretical Computer Science*, 12, pages 315–323.
- Rényi A (1953) “On the theory of order statistics.” *Acta Mathematica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 4, pages 191–231.
- Resnick SI (1987) *Extreme Values, Regular Variation, and Point Processes*. Springer, New York, NY.
- Rosenkrantz WA (2000) “Confidence bands for quantile functions: a parametric and graphic alternative for testing goodness of fit.” *The American Statistician*, 54: 3, pages 185–190.

Schmid F & M Trede (1996) “An L1-variant of the Cramer-von Mises test.” *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 26: 1, pages 91–96.

Shrivastava N, C Buragohain, D Agrawal, S Suri (2004) “Medians and beyond: new aggregation techniques for sensor networks.” *SenSys '04: Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Embedded Networked Sensor Systems*, pages 239–249.

Tibshirani RJ (2008) “Fast computation of the median by successive binning.” See <https://www.stat.cmu.edu/~ryantibs/median/>.

## A Proofs for Section 2

**Theorem 2.1.** For  $n \geq 2$ ,  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Exp}(\lambda)$ , and  $M_n$  in (9), we have

$$F_{M_n}(\mu) = (n-1) B\left(\frac{\rho^{\mu-1} + n - 1}{\rho^{\mu-1} - 1}, n-1\right) \quad (10)$$

$$f_{M_n}(\mu) = \frac{n\rho^{\mu-1}F_{M_n}(\mu)\log\rho}{(\rho^{\mu-1} - 1)^2} \left\{ \psi\left(\frac{n\rho^{\mu-1}}{\rho^{\mu-1} - 1}\right) - \psi\left(\frac{\rho^{\mu-1} + n - 1}{\rho^{\mu-1} - 1}\right) \right\} \quad (11)$$

$$F_{M_n}^{-1}(q) \sim \log_\rho\left(\frac{n \log(n-1) + \log(1/q)}{\log(1/q)}\right) + 1 \sim \log_\rho n - \log_\rho(-\log q), \quad (12)$$

for  $\mu > 1$  and  $0 < q < 1$ . The asymptotic results in (12) hold as either or both  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $q \rightarrow 1^-$ . The first asymptotic result in (12) also holds as  $q \rightarrow 0^+$  while  $n$  remains fixed.

*Proof.* Letting  $W_n := \log X_{(n)} - \log X_{(1)}$ , we start by showing that

$$F_{W_n}(w) = (n-1) B\left(1 + \frac{n}{e^w - 1}, n-1\right) \quad (44)$$

$$f_{W_n}(w) = \frac{ne^w F_{W_n}(w)}{(e^w - 1)^2} \left\{ \psi\left(\frac{ne^w}{e^w - 1}\right) - \psi\left(1 + \frac{n}{e^w - 1}\right) \right\} \quad (45)$$

$$F_{W_n}^{-1}(q) \sim \log\left(\frac{n \log(n-1)}{\log 1/q} + 1\right) \sim \log n - \log(-\log q), \quad (46)$$

for  $w > 0$  and  $0 < q < 1$ , where the asymptotic results hold in the settings described in the theorem statement. Letting  $Y_i := \log X_i$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , and fixing  $y \in \mathbb{R}$ , we note that

$$F_{Y_i}(y) = \Pr(Y_i \leq y) = \Pr(X_i \leq e^y) = 1 - \exp(-\lambda e^y),$$

which gives  $f_{Y_i}(y) = \lambda \exp(-\lambda e^y + y)$ . Equation (2.3.3) of David & Nagaraja

(2003) then gives

$$F_{W_n}(w) = n\lambda \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda e^y + y} \left[ e^{-\lambda e^y} - e^{-\lambda e^y e^w} \right]^{n-1} dy \quad (47)$$

$$= n \int_0^{\infty} e^{-z} \left[ e^{-z} - e^{-ze^w} \right]^{n-1} dz \quad (48)$$

$$= n \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \binom{n-1}{j} (-1)^{n-1-j} \int_0^{\infty} e^{-z[(n-1-j)e^w + j + 1]} dz \quad (49)$$

$$= n \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{\binom{n-1}{j} (-1)^{n-1-j}}{(n-1-j)e^w + j + 1} = n \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \frac{\binom{n-1}{i} (-1)^i}{ie^w + n - i} \quad (50)$$

$$= {}_2F_1 \left( -(n-1), \frac{n}{e^w - 1}; 1 + \frac{n}{e^w - 1}; 1 \right) \quad (51)$$

$$= (n-1) B \left( 1 + \frac{n}{e^w - 1}, n-1 \right), \quad (52)$$

where (49) uses the binomial theorem, (50) uses  $i = n - 1 - j$ , and (52) uses an identity for the hypergeometric function  ${}_2F_1$ .<sup>7</sup> This gives (44), and so also (45). To see (46) note that

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} yB \left( 1 + \frac{\log(1/q)}{\log y}, y \right) = \lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} \frac{y\Gamma \left( 1 + \frac{\log(1/q)}{\log y} \right)}{y^{1 + \frac{\log(1/q)}{\log y}}} = q \quad (53)$$

$$\lim_{q \rightarrow 0^+} yB \left( 1 + \frac{\log(1/q)}{\log y}, y \right) = \lim_{q \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{y\Gamma(y)}{\left( 1 + \frac{\log(1/q)}{\log y} \right)^y} = 0 \quad (54)$$

$$\lim_{q \rightarrow 1^-} yB \left( 1 + \frac{\log(1/q)}{\log y}, y \right) = yB(1, y) = 1, \quad (55)$$

for  $y > 0$ , where (53)–(54) use a well-known approximation for  $\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} B(c, y)$  and (53) and (55) use the continuity of  $\Gamma$  and  $\log$  and  $B$  at 1. Setting

$$1 + \frac{n}{e^w - 1} = 1 + \frac{\log(1/q)}{\log(n-1)} \quad (56)$$

and solving for  $w$  yields (46); *i.e.*, we have (44)–(46). Results (10)–(12) follow by noting that  $M_n = W_n / \log \rho + 1$ , so that  $F_{M_n}(\mu) = F_{W_n}((\mu - 1) \log \rho)$ , which completes the proof.  $\square$

Lemma A.1 helps us prove Lemma 2.2.

**Lemma A.1.** *For  $x, y > 1$  and  $A(x) := \frac{x-1}{x\sqrt{2x-1}}$ , we have  $0 \leq 1/xy - B(x, y) \leq A(x)A(y) \leq A((3+\sqrt{5})/2)^2 \approx 0.09017$ .*

<sup>7</sup>See <https://functions.wolfram.com/07.23.03.0002.01>.

*Proof.* This is Theorem 7 on page 80 of Cerone (2007). □

**Lemma 2.2.** For  $n \geq 2$ ,  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Exp}(\lambda)$ ,  $M_n$  in (9), and

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_1 &:= \frac{n \log n}{n-1} \sim \log n \\ \lambda_2 &:= \frac{n \left\{ \log^2(n-1) + \frac{\pi^2}{3} + 2\text{Li}_2\left(\frac{n}{n-1}\right) \right\}}{n-1} \sim \log^2 n \\ \delta_1 &:= \frac{n(n-2) \left\{ \pi(\sqrt{2n-1}-1) - 2 \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{n-1}{\sqrt{2n-1}}\right) \right\}}{2\sqrt{(2n-1)(2n-3)}(n-1)} \sim \frac{\pi\sqrt{2n}}{4} \\ \delta_2 &:= \frac{4n(n-2) \left\{ \log\left(\frac{n-1}{4}\right) + 2 \sinh^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n-1}}\right) \right\}}{\sqrt{2n-3}(n-1)} \sim 2\sqrt{2n} \log n,\end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}\{\mathbb{E}M_n - 1\} \log \rho &\in [\lambda_1, \lambda_1 + \delta_1] \tilde{\in} \left[ \log n, \frac{\pi\sqrt{2n}}{4} \right] \\ \text{Var}(M_n) \log^2 \rho &\in [\lambda_2 - (\lambda_1 + \delta_1)^2, \lambda_2 + \delta_2 - \lambda_1^2] \tilde{\in} \left[ -\frac{\pi^2 n}{8}, 2\sqrt{2n} \log n \right],\end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{\in}$  indicates asymptotic upper and lower bounds as  $n$  becomes large.

*Proof.* Letting  $W_n := \log X_{(n)} - \log X_{(1)}$ , we first prove a related result for  $W_n$ . Using (44) and Lemma A.1 and starting with  $\mathbb{E}W_n$  we have

$$\mathbb{E}W_n = \int_0^\infty \{1 - F_{W_n}(w)\} dw \quad (57)$$

$$= \int_0^\infty \left\{ 1 - (n-1) B\left(1 + \frac{n}{e^w - 1}, n-1\right) \right\} dw \quad (58)$$

$$\geq n \int_0^\infty \frac{dw}{e^w + n - 1} = \lambda_1 \quad (59)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}W_n - \lambda_1 \leq \frac{n(n-2)}{\sqrt{2n-3}} \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{e^w + n - 1} \sqrt{\frac{e^w - 1}{e^w + 2n - 1}} dw = \delta_1. \quad (60)$$

Now turning to  $\mathbb{E}W_n^2$  and again using (44) and Lemma A.1 we have

$$\mathbb{E}W_n^2 = 2 \int_0^\infty w \{1 - F_{W_n}(w)\} dw \quad (61)$$

$$\geq 2n \int_0^\infty \frac{w}{e^w + n - 1} dw = \lambda_2 \quad (62)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}W_n^2 - \lambda_2 \leq \frac{2n(n-2)}{\sqrt{2n-3}} \int_0^\infty \frac{w}{e^w + n - 1} \sqrt{\frac{e^w - 1}{e^w + 2n - 1}} dw \quad (63)$$

$$= \frac{2n(n-2)}{\sqrt{2n-3}} \int_1^\infty \frac{\log z}{z(z+n-1)} \sqrt{\frac{z-1}{z+2n-1}} dz \quad (64)$$

$$\leq \frac{2n(n-2)}{\sqrt{2n-3}} \int_1^\infty \frac{\log z}{\sqrt{z}(z+n-1)^{3/2}} dz = \delta_2. \quad (65)$$

Combining (57) through (65) yields bounds for  $\text{Var}(W_n) = \mathbb{E}W_n^2 - (\mathbb{E}W_n)^2$ , and noting that  $M_n = W_n/\log \rho + 1$  gives the desired result.  $\square$

Lemma A.2 helps us prove Theorem 2.5.

**Lemma A.2.** For  $e^{-m} < q < 1$  (so that  $0 < -\log q < m$ ), we have

$$-\frac{\log q}{m} \leq q^{-1/m} - 1 \leq -\frac{\log q}{m + \log q}.$$

*Proof.* This follows from the inequality  $x + 1 \leq e^x \leq (1 - x)^{-1}$ , for  $|x| < 1$ . If we let  $e^x = q^{-1/m}$ , i.e.,  $x = -\frac{\log q}{m} \in (0, 1)$ , then the result follows.  $\square$

**Theorem 2.5.** For  $n \geq 2$ ,  $X_1, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim}$  Pareto( $\nu, \beta$ ), and  $M_n$  in (9), we have

$$F_{M_n}(\mu) = \left(1 - \rho^{-\beta(\mu-1)}\right)^{n-1} \quad (20)$$

$$f_{M_n}(\mu) = \beta(n-1) \left(1 - \rho^{-\beta(\mu-1)}\right)^{n-2} \rho^{-\beta(\mu-1)} \log \rho \quad (21)$$

$$F_{M_n}^{-1}(q) = 1 - \frac{1}{\beta \log \rho} \log \left(1 - q^{1/(n-1)}\right) \sim \frac{\log n - \log(-\log q)}{\beta \log \rho}, \quad (22)$$

for  $\mu > 1$  and  $0 < q < 1$ , where the asymptotic result holds as either or both  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $q \rightarrow 1^-$ .

*Proof.* Letting  $W_n := \log X_{(n)} - \log X_{(1)}$ , we start by showing that

$$F_{W_n}(w) = (1 - e^{-\beta w})^{n-1} \quad (66)$$

$$f_{W_n}(w) = (n-1) \beta (1 - e^{-w\beta})^{n-2} e^{-\beta w} \quad (67)$$

$$F_{W_n}^{-1}(q) = -\frac{\log(1 - q^{1/(n-1)})}{\beta} \sim \frac{\log n - \log(-\log q)}{\beta}, \quad (68)$$

for  $w > 0$  and  $0 < q < 1$ , where the asymptotic results hold in the settings described in the theorem statement. Letting  $Y_i := \log X_i$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , and fixing  $y > \log \nu$ , we note that

$$F_{Y_i}(y) = \Pr(Y_i \leq y) = \Pr(X_i \leq e^y) = 1 - (\nu/e^y)^\beta,$$

which gives  $f_{Y_i}(y) = (\nu/e^y)^\beta \beta$ . Equation (2.3.3) of David & Nagaraja (2003) then gives

$$F_{W_n}(w) = n\beta \int_{\log \nu}^{\infty} (\nu/e^y)^\beta \left[ (\nu/e^y)^\beta - (\nu/e^{y+w})^\beta \right]^{n-1} dy \quad (69)$$

$$= n\beta (1 - e^{-\beta w})^{n-1} \int_0^1 x^{\beta n-1} dx = (1 - e^{-\beta w})^{n-1}, \quad (70)$$

where (70) uses transformation  $x = \nu/e^y$ . This gives (66), (67), and the first part of (68). The second part of (68) follows from Lemma A.2 with  $m = n-1$ . Results (20) through (22) then follow from (66) through (68) because  $M_n = W_n/\log \rho + 1$ , so that  $F_{M_n}(\mu) = F_{W_n}((\mu-1)\log \rho)$ , which completes the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.6.** For  $X_1, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Pareto}(\nu, \beta)$  with  $n \geq 2$  and  $M_n$  in (9), we have  $\mathbb{E}e^{tM_n} = (n-1)e^t B(1 - t/\beta \log \rho, n-1)$ , for  $t < \beta \log \rho$ , so that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}M_n &= 1 + \frac{\psi(n) + \gamma}{\beta \log \rho} \sim \frac{\log n}{\beta \log \rho} \\ \text{Var}(M_n) &= \frac{\frac{\pi^2}{6} - \psi_1(n)}{\beta^2 \log^2 \rho} \sim \frac{\pi^2}{6\beta^2 \log^2 \rho} \\ \text{Skew}(M_n) &= \frac{2\zeta(3) + \psi_2(n)}{[\frac{\pi^2}{6} - \psi_1(n)]^{3/2}} \sim \frac{12\sqrt{6}\zeta(3)}{\pi^3}, \end{aligned}$$

where the asymptotic results hold as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

*Proof.* Using (21) in Theorem 2.5 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}e^{tM_n} &= (n-1)\beta \log \rho \int_1^{\infty} e^{t\mu} \left(1 - \rho^{-\beta(\mu-1)}\right)^{n-2} \rho^{-\beta(\mu-1)} d\mu \\ &= (n-1)e^t \int_0^1 x^{-t/(\beta \log \rho)} (1-x)^{n-2} dx \\ &= (n-1)e^t B(1 - t/\beta \log \rho, n-1). \end{aligned}$$

The remaining statements follow by taking  $\mathbb{E}M_n^k = \frac{d^k}{dt^k} \mathbb{E}e^{tM_n} \Big|_{t=0}$ , for  $k \geq 1$ , and noting that  $\psi(x) \sim \log x$ ,  $\psi_1(x) \sim 1/x$ , and  $\psi_2(x) \sim -1/x^2$ , as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ .  $\square$

## B Proofs for Section 3

**Theorem 3.1.** For  $X, X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Exp}(\lambda)$ ,  $J_n := \log_\rho X_{(n)}$ , and  $p_{\text{last}}$  and  $p_{\text{tail}}$  in (33), we have

$$p_{\text{last}} \leq nB(1 + 1/\rho, n) - nB(1 + \rho, n) \sim \frac{\Gamma(1 + 1/\rho)}{n^{1/\rho}} - \frac{\Gamma(1 + \rho)}{n^\rho} \quad (34)$$

$$\frac{\Gamma(1 + \rho)}{n^\rho} \sim nB(1 + \rho, n) \leq p_{\text{tail}} \leq \frac{1}{n+1} \sim \frac{1}{n}, \quad (35)$$

where the limits hold as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

*Proof.* For  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  we first note that

$$F_{J_n}(x) = \Pr(X \leq \rho^x)^n = (1 - \exp(-\lambda \rho^x))^n \quad (71)$$

$$f_{J_n}(x) = n\lambda(1 - \exp(-\lambda \rho^x))^{n-1} \rho^x \exp(-\lambda \rho^x) \log \rho \quad (72)$$

as in Theorem 2.8. Using (72) and  $y \in \{e^{-\lambda \rho^{x-1}}, e^{-\lambda \rho^x}, e^{-\lambda \rho^{x+1}}\}$  we then have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}e^{-\lambda \rho^{J_n-1}} &= n\rho \int_0^1 y^\rho (1-y^\rho)^{n-1} dy = nB(1+1/\rho, n) \\ \mathbb{E}e^{-\lambda \rho^{J_n}} &= n \int_0^1 y(1-y)^{n-1} dy = nB(2, n) = \frac{1}{n+1} \\ \mathbb{E}e^{-\lambda \rho^{J_n+1}} &= \frac{n}{\rho} \int_0^1 y^{1/\rho} (1-y^{1/\rho})^{n-1} dy = nB(1+\rho, n), \end{aligned}$$

which, because  $(\rho^{\lceil z \rceil-1}, \rho^{\lceil z \rceil}) \subset (\rho^{z-1}, \rho^{z+1})$ , for  $z \in \mathbb{R}$ , leads to

$$\Pr(\rho^{\lceil J_n \rceil-1} < X \leq \rho^{\lceil J_n \rceil}) \leq \Pr(\rho^{J_n-1} < X \leq \rho^{J_n+1}) \quad (73)$$

$$= \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{-\lambda \rho^{J_n-1}} - e^{-\lambda \rho^{J_n+1}} \right] \quad (74)$$

$$= nB(1+1/\rho, n) - nB(1+\rho, n) \quad (75)$$

$$\sim \frac{\Gamma(1+1/\rho)}{n^{1/\rho}} - \frac{\Gamma(1+\rho)}{n^\rho}, \quad (76)$$

where (76) uses  $B(c, n) \sim \Gamma(c) n^{-c}$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . This gives (34); (35) uses a similar argument.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.2.** For  $X, X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim}$  Pareto( $\nu, \beta$ ),  $J_n := \log_\rho X_{(n)}$ , and  $p_{\text{last}}$  and  $p_{\text{tail}}$  in (33), we have

$$p_{\text{last}} \leq \frac{\rho^\beta - 1/\rho^\beta}{n+1} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1/\rho^\beta}{n+1} \leq p_{\text{tail}} \leq \frac{1}{n+1}. \quad (36)$$

*Proof.* Theorem 2.8 gives  $\mathbb{E}e^{tJ_n} = n\nu^{t/\log \rho} B(1-t/\beta \log \rho, n)$ , for  $t < \beta \log \rho$ . Then, because  $(\rho^{\lceil x \rceil-1}, \rho^{\lceil x \rceil}) \subset (\rho^{x-1}, \rho^{x+1})$ , for  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , we have

$$\Pr(\rho^{\lceil J_n \rceil-1} < X \leq \rho^{\lceil J_n \rceil}) \leq \Pr(\rho^{J_n-1} < X \leq \rho^{J_n+1}) \quad (77)$$

$$= \mathbb{E} \left[ (\nu/\rho^{J_n-1})^\beta - (\nu/\rho^{J_n+1})^\beta \right] \quad (78)$$

$$= \nu^\beta (\rho^\beta - 1/\rho^\beta) \mathbb{E}e^{-\beta J_n \log \rho} \quad (79)$$

$$= n(\rho^\beta - 1/\rho^\beta) B(2, n) = \frac{\rho^\beta - 1/\rho^\beta}{n+1}. \quad (80)$$

where (80) uses  $\mathbb{E}e^{tJ_n}$  at  $t = -\beta \log \rho$ , bounding  $p_{\text{last}}$ . Bounds for  $p_{\text{tail}}$  follow in a similar manner.  $\square$

## C Proofs for Section 4

Lemma C.1 helps us prove Proposition 4.3.

**Lemma C.1.** *If  $X \sim \text{Binomial}(n, \rho)$ , then  $\mathbb{E}[\log(X+1)] \leq \log(np+1)$  and  $\mathbb{E}[\log(\log(X+1)+1)] \leq \log(\log(np+1)+1)$ .*

*Proof.* We note first that both

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(x) &:= -\log(x+1) \text{ and} \\ f_2(x) &:= -\log(\log(x+1)+1) \end{aligned}$$

are convex. Then, by Jensen's inequality, we have  $\mathbb{E}f_i(X) \geq f_i(\mathbb{E}X) = f_i(np)$ , for  $i = 1, 2$ . Dividing each inequality through by  $-1$  gives the desired result.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.3.** *Note that:*

1. *If  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} F_0$  in (41), then, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E}K_n \sim \log_\rho \left( \frac{n \log \rho}{1 - \rho^{-\frac{\rho}{\rho-1}}} \right) + \frac{1}{\log \rho} W_0 \left( -\frac{\left(1 - \rho^{-\frac{\rho}{\rho-1}}\right) \sqrt{\rho}}{(\rho-1)n} \right) \sim \log_\rho n.$$

2. *If  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} F_1$  in (42) and  $\eta_{\rho,n} := \log(n \log \rho) + \frac{\rho \log \rho}{\rho-1}$ , then, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}K_n &\sim \log_\rho \left( -\frac{\rho-1}{\log \rho} W_{-1} \left( -\frac{\rho^{-\frac{\rho}{\rho-1}}}{n \log \rho} \right) \right) \\ &\leq \log_\rho \left( \frac{\rho-1}{\log \rho} \left( \eta_{\rho,n} + \sqrt{2(\eta_{\rho,n} - 1)} \right) \right) \sim \log_\rho \log_\rho n. \end{aligned}$$

3. *If  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Exp}(\lambda)$ , then*

$$\mathbb{E}K_n \begin{cases} \approx \mathbb{E}_0 K_{n_0} + \mathbb{E}_1 K_{n_1} \\ \lesssim \log_\rho n \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty, \end{cases}$$

where " $\mathbb{E}_b$ " indicates expectation with respect to  $F_b$  in (41) or (42) and

$$n_0 := n \times \left(1 - \rho^{-\frac{\rho}{\rho-1}}\right) \text{ and } n_1 := n \times \rho^{-\frac{\rho}{\rho-1}}$$

give the expected numbers of values below and above cutoff  $\rho^{F,\lambda,\rho} = \frac{\rho \log \rho}{\lambda(\rho-1)}$ .

*Proof.* Parts 1 and 2 use Theorem 4.1; part 3 uses Lemma C.1. Note that:

1. When  $X_i \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} F_0$  in (41), we have

$$p_k := \Pr(\rho^{\kappa_{\lambda, \rho} + k - 1} < X_1 \leq \rho^{\kappa_{\lambda, \rho} + k}) = \frac{\rho^{-\frac{\rho^k}{\rho-1}} - \rho^{-\frac{\rho^{k+1}}{\rho-1}}}{1 - \rho^{-\frac{\rho}{\rho-1}}}, \quad (81)$$

for  $k \leq 0$ . By the mean value theorem there is a  $k^* \in (k, k+1)$  such that

$$\frac{\rho^{-\frac{\rho^k}{\rho-1}} - \rho^{-\frac{\rho^{k+1}}{\rho-1}}}{1 - \rho^{-\frac{\rho}{\rho-1}}} = \frac{\rho^{-\frac{\rho^{k^*}}{\rho-1}} \rho^{k^*} \log^2 \rho}{(\rho-1) \left(1 - \rho^{-\frac{\rho}{\rho-1}}\right)}.$$

Note in particular that, for any  $\rho > 1$ ,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{\rho^{-\frac{\rho^k}{\rho-1}} - \rho^{-\frac{\rho^{k+1}}{\rho-1}}}{\rho^{-\frac{\rho^{k+1/2}}{\rho-1}} \rho^k \log \rho} = 1, \quad (82)$$

which implies that

$$\frac{\rho^{-\frac{\rho^k}{\rho-1}} - \rho^{-\frac{\rho^{k+1}}{\rho-1}}}{1 - \rho^{-\frac{\rho}{\rho-1}}} \sim \frac{\rho^{-\frac{\rho^{k+1/2}}{\rho-1}} \rho^k \log \rho}{1 - \rho^{-\frac{\rho}{\rho-1}}}, \quad (83)$$

as  $k \rightarrow -\infty$ . We therefore have  $\alpha(x) := -\min\{k \leq 0 : p_k \geq 1/x\}$

$$\begin{aligned} &\sim -\min \left\{ k \leq 0 : \frac{\rho^{-\frac{\rho^{k+1/2}}{\rho-1}} \rho^k \log \rho}{1 - \rho^{-\frac{\rho}{\rho-1}}} \geq 1/x \right\} \\ &\sim \log_{\rho} \left( \frac{x \log \rho}{1 - \rho^{-\frac{\rho}{\rho-1}}} \right) + \frac{1}{\log \rho} W_0 \left( -\frac{\left(1 - \rho^{-\frac{\rho}{\rho-1}}\right) \sqrt{\rho}}{x(\rho-1)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which, citing Theorem 4.1 and noting that  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} W_0(-c/x) = 0$ , gives the desired result.

2. When  $X_i \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} F_1$  in (42), we have

$$p_k := \Pr(\rho^{\kappa_{\lambda, \rho} + k - 1} < X_1 \leq \rho^{\kappa_{\lambda, \rho} + k}) = \rho^{-\frac{\rho^k - \rho}{\rho-1}} - \rho^{-\frac{\rho^{k+1} - \rho}{\rho-1}}, \quad (84)$$

for  $k \geq 1$ . By the mean value theorem there is a  $k^* \in (k, k+1)$  such that

$$\rho^{-\frac{\rho^k - \rho}{\rho-1}} - \rho^{-\frac{\rho^{k+1} - \rho}{\rho-1}} = \frac{\rho^{-\frac{\rho^{k^*} - \rho}{\rho-1}} \rho^{k^*} \log^2 \rho}{\rho-1}. \quad (85)$$

Letting  $k^* := k + \epsilon =: k + 1 - \delta$ , for  $0 < \epsilon, \delta < 1$ , and taking the ratio of the two sides of (85), we note that

$$\frac{\rho-1}{\log^2 \rho} \left\{ \frac{\rho^{\frac{\rho^{k+\epsilon} - \rho}{\rho-1}} - \rho^{\frac{\rho^{k+1-\delta} - \rho}{\rho-1}}}{\rho^{k+\epsilon}} \right\} \approx \frac{\rho-1}{\log^2 \rho} \left\{ \frac{\rho^{\frac{\epsilon \rho^k \log \rho}{\rho-1}} - \rho^{\frac{\delta \rho^{k+1} \log \rho}{\rho-1}}}{\rho^{k+\epsilon}} \right\},$$

by Taylor series expansion, which implies that the expression above approaches zero as  $k$  grows if  $\epsilon = \mathcal{O}(1/\rho^k)$  and infinity otherwise, giving

$$\rho^{-\frac{\rho^k - \rho}{\rho - 1}} - \rho^{-\frac{\rho^{k+1} - \rho}{\rho - 1}} \approx \frac{\rho^{-\frac{\rho^k - \rho}{\rho - 1}} \rho^k \log^2 \rho}{\rho - 1}.$$

In this setting we therefore have  $\alpha(x) := \max\{k \geq 1 : p_k \geq 1/x\}$

$$\begin{aligned} &\approx \max \left\{ k \geq 1 : \frac{\rho^{-\frac{\rho^k - \rho}{\rho - 1}} \rho^k \log^2 \rho}{\rho - 1} \geq 1/x \right\} \\ &\sim \log_\rho \left( -\frac{\rho - 1}{\log \rho} W_{-1} \left( -\frac{\rho^{-\frac{\rho}{\rho - 1}}}{x \log \rho} \right) \right) \\ &\leq \log_\rho \left( \frac{\rho - 1}{\log \rho} \left( \eta_{\rho, x} + \sqrt{2(\eta_{\rho, x} - 1)} \right) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last step uses Theorem 1 of Chatzigeorgiou (2013) and  $\eta_{\rho, x} := \log(x \log \rho) + \frac{\rho \log \rho}{\rho - 1}$ . Theorem 4.1 then gives the result.

3. When  $X_i \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Exp}(\lambda)$ , we let

$$N_n := \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{X_j \leq \frac{\rho \log \rho}{\lambda(\rho - 1)}\}} \sim \text{Binomial} \left( n, 1 - \rho^{-\frac{\rho}{\rho - 1}} \right) \quad (86)$$

be the number of  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$  that fall below  $\frac{\rho \log \rho}{\lambda(\rho - 1)}$  and note that

$$\mathbb{E} K_n = \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E} [K_n | N_n]] = \mathbb{E}_0 K_{N_n} + \mathbb{E}_1 K_{n - N_n} \quad (87)$$

$$\approx \mathbb{E}_0 K_{n_0} + \mathbb{E}_1 K_{n_1}, \quad (88)$$

where “ $\mathbb{E}_b$ ” gives expectation with respect to  $F_b$  and (88) substitutes the means of  $N_n$  and  $n - N_n$  in for their values in (87). Continuing we have

$$\mathbb{E} K_n = \sum_{j=0}^n \binom{n}{j} \left( 1 - \rho^{-\frac{\rho}{\rho - 1}} \right)^j \rho^{-\frac{\rho(n-j)}{\rho - 1}} (\mathbb{E}_0 K_j + \mathbb{E}_1 K_{n-j}) \quad (89)$$

$$\lesssim \mathbb{E} [\log_\rho (N_n + 1)] + \mathbb{E} [\log_\rho (\log_\rho (n - N_n + 1) + 1)] \quad (90)$$

$$\leq \log_\rho \left( n \left( 1 - \rho^{-\frac{\rho}{\rho - 1}} \right) + 1 \right) + \log_\rho \left( \log_\rho \left( n \rho^{-\frac{\rho}{\rho - 1}} + 1 \right) + 1 \right) \quad (91)$$

$$\sim \log_\rho \left( n \left( 1 - \rho^{-\frac{\rho}{\rho - 1}} \right) \right) + \log_\rho \log_\rho \left( n \rho^{-\frac{\rho}{\rho - 1}} \right) \sim \log_\rho n, \quad (92)$$

where (90) uses parts 1 and 2 and (91) uses Lemma C.1.

□

Lemma C.2 helps us prove Proposition 4.4.

**Lemma C.2.** *If  $X \sim \text{Binomial}(n, p)$ , then  $\mathbb{E}[\log^2(X+1)] \lesssim \log^2(np+1)$  and  $\mathbb{E}[\log^2(\log(X+1)+1)] \lesssim \log^2(\log(np+1)+1)$ , for  $0 < p < 1$  and  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .*

*Proof.* For  $x \geq 0$  and

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(x) &:= \log^2(x+1) \\ f_2(x) &:= \log^2(\log(x+1)+1), \end{aligned}$$

we note that

$$\begin{aligned} f_1''(x) \underset{\geq}{\lesssim} 0 &\iff x \underset{\leq}{\lesssim} e-1 \approx 1.71828 \\ f_2''(x) \underset{\geq}{\lesssim} 0 &\iff x \underset{\leq}{\lesssim} x_0 \approx 0.63788, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  are concave for  $x \geq 2$  and  $x \geq 1$ . Assuming that  $n \geq 3$  we therefore have

$$\mathbb{E}f_1(X) = np(1-p)^{n-1} \log^2 2 + \sum_{j=2}^n \binom{n}{j} p^j (1-p)^{n-j} f_1(j) \quad (93)$$

$$\leq np(1-p)^{n-1} \log^2 2 + \theta_{n,p} f_1\left(\frac{np}{\theta_{n,p}} \left(1 - (1-p)^{n-1}\right)\right), \quad (94)$$

where (94) uses Jensen's inequality,  $\theta_{n,p} := 1 - (1-p)^n - np(1-p)^{n-1}$ , and

$$\mathbb{E}[X|X \geq 2] = \frac{np}{\theta_{n,p}} \left(1 - (1-p)^{n-1}\right).$$

Sending  $n \rightarrow \infty$  gives the result. A similar proof gives the second statement.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.4.** *Letting  $\mathbb{Z}_+ := \{1, 2, \dots\}$ , we note that:*

1. *If  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} F_0$  in (41), then*

$$\begin{aligned} \log_\rho 2 \in \mathbb{Z}_+ &\implies \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(K_n) = \log_\rho 2 \\ \log_\rho 2 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Z}_+ &\implies \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(K_n) \leq \lceil \log_\rho 2 \rceil. \end{aligned}$$

2. *If  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} F_1$  in (42), then  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(K_n) \leq 1$ .*

3. *If  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Exp}(\lambda)$ , then, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,*

$$\text{Var}(K_n) \begin{cases} \approx \text{Var}_0(K_{n_0}) + \text{Var}_1(K_{n_1}) \\ \lesssim \log_\rho^2 n, \end{cases}$$

where  $\text{Var}_b(X) := \mathbb{E}_b[(X - \mathbb{E}_b X)^2]$  takes the variance using  $F_b$  in (41) or (42) and

$$n_0 := n \times \left(1 - \rho^{-\frac{\rho}{\rho-1}}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad n_1 := n \times \rho^{-\frac{\rho}{\rho-1}}$$

give the expected numbers of values below and above cutoff  $\rho^{\kappa_{\lambda,\rho}} = \frac{\rho \log \rho}{\lambda(\rho-1)}$ . Note finally that  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \{\text{Var}_0(K_{n_0}) + \text{Var}_1(K_{n_1})\} \leq \lceil \log_\rho 2 \rceil + 1$ .

*Proof.* Parts 1 and 2 use Theorem 4.2; part 3 uses Lemma C.2. Note that:

1. As in (81) and (83) we note that

$$p_j = \frac{\rho^{-\frac{\rho^j}{\rho-1}} - \rho^{-\frac{\rho^{j+1}}{\rho-1}}}{1 - \rho^{-\frac{\rho}{\rho-1}}} \sim \frac{\rho^{-\frac{\rho^{j+1/2}}{\rho-1}} \rho^j \log \rho}{1 - \rho^{-\frac{\rho}{\rho-1}}}$$

for  $j \rightarrow -\infty$ , which gives  $\lim_{j \rightarrow -\infty} p_{j-1}/p_j = \lim_{j \rightarrow -\infty} \rho^{-1+\rho^{j-1/2}} = 1/\rho$ , so that, for  $k \geq 1$ ,

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{p_{j-k}}{p_j} = \lim_{j \rightarrow -\infty} \prod_{i=1}^k \frac{p_{j-k+i-1}}{p_{j-k+i}} = \prod_{i=1}^k \lim_{j \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{p_{j-k+i-1}}{p_{j-k+i}} = \frac{1}{\rho^k}.$$

The stated results then follow from parts 1 and 2 of Theorem 4.2.

2. As in (84) we note that  $p_j = \rho^{-\frac{\rho^j - \rho}{\rho-1}} - \rho^{-\frac{\rho^{j+1} - \rho}{\rho-1}}$ , so that  $\frac{p_{j+1}}{p_j} = \frac{1 - \rho^{-\rho^{j+1}}}{\rho^{\rho^j} - 1} \rightarrow 0$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ . The stated result then follows from part 2 of Theorem 4.2.
3. Define  $N_n$  as in (86). Assume for simplicity that  $n_0$  and  $n_1$  are integers. Let  $\mathcal{R}_0 := \left(0, \frac{\rho \log \rho}{\lambda(\rho-1)}\right]$  and  $\mathcal{R}_1 := \left(\frac{\rho \log \rho}{\lambda(\rho-1)}, \infty\right)$ . We imagine two scenarios:

- (a) We have

$$\begin{aligned} X_{0,1}, X_{0,2}, \dots, X_{0,n_0} &\sim F_0 \\ X_{1,1}, X_{1,2}, \dots, X_{1,n_1} &\sim F_1, \end{aligned}$$

for  $F_b$  in (41) and (42), where all  $n = n_0 + n_1$  random variables are independent. Letting  $K_{n_b}^{(b)}$  be the number of occupied cells in  $\mathcal{R}_b$ , we note that  $K_{n_0}^{(0)}$  and  $K_{n_1}^{(1)}$  are independent and the number of occupied cells in  $\mathcal{R}_0 \cup \mathcal{R}_1$  is  $K_n := K_{n_0}^{(0)} + K_{n_1}^{(1)}$ , so that

$$\text{Var}(K_n) = \text{Var}\left(K_{n_0}^{(0)}\right) + \text{Var}\left(K_{n_1}^{(1)}\right) = \text{Var}_0(K_{n_0}) + \text{Var}_1(K_{n_1}).$$

- (b) When  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Exp}(\lambda)$ , we have  $\text{Var}(K_n)$

$$= \text{Var}(\mathbb{E}[K_n | N_n]) + \mathbb{E}[\text{Var}(K_n | N_n)] \quad (95)$$

$$\leq \text{Var}(\mathbb{E}_0[K_{N_n} | N_n] + \mathbb{E}_1[K_{n-N_n} | N_n]) \quad (96)$$

$$+ \mathbb{E}[\text{Var}_0(K_{N_n} | N_n) + \text{Var}_1(K_{n-N_n} | N_n)] \quad (97)$$

$$\lesssim \text{Var}\left\{\log_\rho(N_n + 1) + \log_\rho(\log_\rho(n - N_n + 1) + 1)\right\} \quad (98)$$

$$\lesssim \log_\rho^2\left(\left(1 - \rho^{-\frac{\rho}{\rho-1}}\right)n + 1\right) \sim \log_\rho^2(n) \quad (99)$$

where (96) uses  $K_n = K_{N_n}^{(0)} + K_{n-N_n}^{(1)}$  and  $\text{Cov}\left(K_{N_n}^{(0)}, K_{n-N_n}^{(1)} \mid N_n\right) \leq 0$  almost surely; (98) uses Proposition 4.3 and parts 1 and 2 above; and (99) uses  $\text{Cov}(\log_\rho(N_n + 1), \log_\rho(\log_\rho(n - N_n + 1) + 1)) \leq 0$ ,  $\text{Var}(X) \leq \mathbb{E}[X^2]$ , and Lemma C.2.

□

Lemmas C.3 and C.4 help us prove Theorem 4.5.

**Lemma C.3.** For  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} F_0$  in (41),  $p_0 := 1 - \rho^{-\frac{\rho}{\rho-1}}$ , and  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$-\log \left( \frac{n\lambda X_{(1)}}{p_0} \right) \implies \text{Gumbel}(0, 1).$$

*Proof.* For  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $n$  large enough we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left( -\log \left( \frac{n\lambda X_{(1)}}{p_0} \right) \leq x \right) &= \Pr \left( X_1 \geq \frac{p_0 e^{-x}}{n\lambda} \right)^n \\ &= \left( \frac{\exp \left( -\frac{p_0 e^{-x}}{n} \right) - (1 - p_0)}{p_0} \right)^n \\ &= \left( 1 - \frac{e^{-x}}{n} + \mathcal{O} \left( \frac{1}{n^2} \right) \right)^n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} e^{-e^{-x}}. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma C.4.** For  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} F_1$  in (42) and  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we have

$$\lambda X_{(n)} - \frac{\rho \log \rho}{\rho - 1} - \log n \implies \text{Gumbel}(0, 1).$$

*Proof.* For  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $n$  large enough we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left( \lambda X_{(n)} - \frac{\rho \log \rho}{\rho - 1} - \log n \leq x \right) &= \Pr \left( X_1 \leq \frac{x + \log n + \frac{\rho \log \rho}{\rho - 1}}{\lambda} \right)^n \\ &= \left( 1 - \frac{e^{-x}}{n} \right)^n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} e^{-e^{-x}}. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Theorem 4.5.** Let  $\mathbb{E}_b$  represent expectation with respect to  $F_b$  in (41) or (42),  $p_0 := 1 - \rho^{-\frac{\rho}{\rho-1}}$ , and  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Then, for empty cell count  $E_n := M_n - K_n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_0 M_n &\lesssim \log_\rho \left( \frac{n\rho \log \rho}{(\rho-1)p_0} \right) + \frac{\gamma}{\log \rho} + 1 &\implies \mathbb{E}_0 E_n &\lesssim \log_\rho \left( \frac{\rho}{\rho-1} \right) + \frac{\gamma}{\log \rho} + 1 \\ \mathbb{E}_1 M_n &\lesssim \log_\rho \left( \frac{(\rho-1)(\gamma + \log n)}{\rho \log \rho} + 1 \right) + 1 &\implies \mathbb{E}_1 E_n &\lesssim \log_\rho \left( \frac{3}{2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

These results imply that  $\mathbb{E}E_n \lesssim \log_\rho \left( \frac{3\rho}{2(\rho-1)} \right) + \frac{\gamma}{\log \rho} + 1$  in the  $\text{Exp}(\lambda)$  setting.

*Proof.* We start with

$$\mathbb{E}_0 M_n \leq \log_\rho \left( \frac{\rho \log \rho}{\lambda(\rho-1)} \right) - \mathbb{E}_0 [\log_\rho X_{(1)}] + 1 \quad (100)$$

$$\sim \log_\rho \left( \frac{\rho \log \rho}{\lambda(\rho-1)} \right) + \log_\rho \left( \frac{n\lambda}{p_0} \right) + \frac{\gamma}{\log \rho} + 1 \quad (101)$$

$$= \log_\rho \left( \frac{n\rho \log \rho}{(\rho-1)p_0} \right) + \frac{\gamma}{\log \rho} + 1, \quad (102)$$

where (100) uses (9) and (41) and (101) uses Lemma C.3. This, along with part 1 of Proposition 4.3, gives the bound for  $\mathbb{E}_0 E_n$ . Turning to  $F_1$  we have

$$\mathbb{E}_1 M_n \leq \mathbb{E}_1 [\log_\rho X_{(n)}] - \log_\rho \left( \frac{\rho \log \rho}{\lambda(\rho-1)} \right) + 1 \quad (103)$$

$$\sim \log_\rho \left( \frac{\rho \log \rho}{\lambda(\rho-1)} + \frac{\gamma + \log n}{\lambda} \right) - \log_\rho \left( \frac{\rho \log \rho}{\lambda(\rho-1)} \right) + 1 \quad (104)$$

$$= \log_\rho \left( \frac{(\rho-1)(\gamma + \log n)}{\rho \log \rho} + 1 \right) + 1, \quad (105)$$

where (103) uses (9) and (42) and (104) uses Lemma C.4. Using Chatzigeorgiou (2013)'s upper bound for  $W_{-1}$ , we then have

$$W_{-1} \left( -\frac{\rho^{-\frac{\rho}{\rho-1}}}{n \log \rho} \right) \leq -1 - \sqrt{2\zeta_{\rho,n}} - \frac{2\zeta_{\rho,n}}{3},$$

where  $\zeta_{\rho,n} := \log(n \log \rho) + \frac{\rho \log \rho}{\rho-1} - 1$ . This, along with part 2 of Proposition 4.3, gives the bound for  $\mathbb{E}_1 E_n$ . The final statement follows from the first two and  $\mathbb{E} E_n = \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E}_0 [E_{N_n} | N_n] + \mathbb{E}_1 [E_{n-N_n} | N_n]]$ , with  $N_n$  as in (86).  $\square$

**Theorem 4.6.** For  $\mathbb{Z}_+ := \{1, 2, \dots\}$ ,  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim}$  Pareto  $(\nu, \beta)$ , and empty bin count  $E_n := M_n - K_n$ , we note that:

1. When  $n \rightarrow \infty$ :

$$\mathbb{E} K_n \sim 1 + \frac{\log_\rho((1 - 1/\rho^\beta)n)}{\beta}, \quad \mathbb{E} E_n \sim \frac{1}{\beta} \left[ \log_\rho \left( \frac{1}{1 - 1/\rho^\beta} \right) + \frac{\gamma}{\log \rho} \right].$$

2. Letting  $\xi_{\beta,\rho} := \frac{1}{\beta} \log_\rho 2$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_{\beta,\rho} \in \mathbb{Z}_+ &\implies \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(K_n) = \xi_{\beta,\rho} \\ \xi_{\beta,\rho} \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}_+ &\implies \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(K_n) \leq \lceil \xi_{\beta,\rho} \rceil. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Without loss of generality we assume bins  $\{(\nu\rho^{k-1}, \nu\rho^k]\}_{k \geq 1}$ , so that the smallest bin is not truncated. For  $k \geq 1$  we then have

$$p_k := \Pr(\nu\rho^{k-1} < X_1 \leq \nu\rho^k) = \rho^{-\beta(k-1)}(1 - \rho^{-\beta}); \quad (106)$$

i.e., the  $Y_i$  are i.i.d. Geometric  $(1 - 1/\rho^\beta)$ , with support  $k \geq 1$ . Then,

1. Theorem 4.1 gives the first result: Note that, for  $x > 0$ ,

$$\alpha(x) := \max \{k \geq 1 : p_k \geq 1/x\} = \frac{\log_\rho((1 - 1/\rho^\beta)x)}{\beta} + 1.$$

The second result then follows from Proposition 2.6 with  $\psi(n) \sim \log n$ .

2. Theorem 4.2 gives the result: For  $j, k \geq 1$ ,  $\frac{p_{j+k}}{p_j} = \frac{1}{2} \implies k = \frac{\log_\rho 2}{\beta}$ .

□

## D Proofs for Section 5

Lemma D.1 helps us prove Lemma 5.3.

**Lemma D.1.** For  $n \geq 1$  and  $0 < p < 1$ ,  $\frac{(1-p)^{2n}}{1-(1-p)^n} \sim \frac{1}{np}$  and  $\frac{(1-p)^{2n}}{(1-(1-p)^n)^2} \sim \frac{1}{n^2 p^2}$  as  $p \rightarrow 0^+$ .

*Proof.* Using induction on  $n \geq 1$ , we note that  $\frac{(1-p)^2}{1-(1-p)} = \frac{1}{p} - 2 + p \sim \frac{1}{p}$  as  $p \rightarrow 0^+$ . Then, assuming that the result holds for  $n \geq 1$ , we note that

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1 - (1-p)^n}{1 - (1-p)^{n+1}} = \lim_{p \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{n(1-p)^{n-1}}{(n+1)(1-p)^n} = \frac{n}{n+1} \quad (107)$$

by L'Hôpital's rule, so that

$$\frac{(1-p)^{2n+2}}{1 - (1-p)^{n+1}} \sim \left( \frac{1 - 2p + p^2}{np} \right) \left( \frac{1 - (1-p)^n}{1 - (1-p)^{n+1}} \right) \sim \frac{1}{(n+1)p}$$

as  $p \rightarrow 0^+$ . The second result follows in the same way, requiring two applications of L'Hôpital's rule at the step analogous to (107). □

**Lemma 5.3.** For  $\{Y_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$  i.i.d. with  $\Pr(Y_i = k) = (1-p)^k p$ , for  $0 < p < 1$ , we note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}L_n &\in \left[ \frac{(1-p)^2}{p} - \frac{(1-p)^{2n}}{1-(1-p)^n}, \frac{1.5}{p} + 1 \right] \\ \mathbb{E}L_n^2 &\in \left[ \frac{2(1-p)^2}{p^2} - \frac{2(1-p)^{2n}}{(1-(1-p)^n)^2}, \frac{3.3}{p^2} + \frac{3}{2p} + 2 \right] \\ \text{Var}(L_n) &\in \left[ 0, \frac{3.3}{p^2} + \frac{3}{2p} + 2 - \left( \frac{(1-p)^2}{p} - \frac{(1-p)^{2n}}{1-(1-p)^n} \right)^2 \right], \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}L_n &\tilde{\in} \begin{array}{ccc} \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty & \text{as } p \rightarrow 0^+ & \text{as } p \rightarrow 1^- \\ \left[ \frac{(1-p)^2}{p}, \frac{1.5}{p} + 1 \right], & \left[ \frac{n-1}{np}, \frac{1.5}{p} \right], & [0, 2.5], \\ \mathbb{E}L_n^2 &\tilde{\in} \left[ \frac{2(1-p)^2}{p^2}, \frac{3.3}{p^2} + \frac{3}{2p} + 2 \right], & \left[ \frac{2n^2(1-p)^2-2}{n^2p^2}, \frac{3.3}{p^2} \right], & [0, 6.8], \\ \text{Var}(L_n) &\tilde{\in} \left[ 0, \frac{2.3}{p^2} + \frac{5.5}{p} \right], & \left[ 0, \frac{2.3n^2+2n-1}{n^2p^2} \right], & [0, 6.8], \end{array}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{\in}$  indicates asymptotic upper and lower bounds.

*Proof.* The proof uses Theorem 5.2 and Lemma D.1. We focus on  $\mathbb{E}L_n$ . Bounds for  $\mathbb{E}L_n^2$  use the same argument and give bounds for  $\text{Var}(L_n) = \mathbb{E}L_n^2 - (\mathbb{E}L_n)^2$ . Note that  $\mathbb{E}L_n = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (1 - \Pr(L_n \leq l))$

$$\leq \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \left( 1 - \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} \left( 1 - (1-p)^{(l-1)i} \right) \right) \quad (108)$$

$$= \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \left( 1 - \exp \left( \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \log \left( 1 - (1-p)^{(l-1)i} \right) \right) \right) \quad (109)$$

$$= \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \left( 1 - \exp \left( - \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{(1-p)^{(l-1)ij}}{j} \right) \right) \quad (110)$$

$$= \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \left( 1 - \exp \left( - \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{(1-p)^{(l-1)j}}{j \left( 1 - (1-p)^{(l-1)j} \right)} \right) \right) \quad (111)$$

$$\leq \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \left( 1 - \exp \left( - \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{(1-p)^{(l-1)j}}{j \left( 1 - (1-p)^{l-1} \right)} \right) \right) \quad (112)$$

$$= \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \left( 1 - \left( 1 - (1-p)^{l-1} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-(1-p)^{l-1}}} \right) \quad (113)$$

$$\leq \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \left( 1.51 (1-p)^{l-1} \wedge 1 \right) \quad (114)$$

$$\leq 1 + \frac{1}{2p} + \frac{151}{100} \sum_{l=\lceil 1/2p \rceil+1}^{\infty} (1-p)^{l-1} \quad (115)$$

$$\leq 1 + \frac{1}{2p} + \frac{151}{100p\sqrt{e}}, \quad (116)$$

where (108) uses Theorem 5.2; (111) uses Fubini's theorem; (114) uses

$$1 - (1-x)^{\frac{1}{1-x}} \leq \min(1.51x, 1), \text{ for } x := (1-p)^{l-1} \in (0, 1);$$

and (115) and (116) use  $\frac{\log(100/151)}{\log(1-p)} \leq \frac{1}{2p}$  and  $(1-p)^{\lceil 1/2p \rceil} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{e}}$ , for  $0 < p < 1$ .

With  $\frac{151}{100\sqrt{e}} \approx 0.9159$ ,  $\mathbb{E}L_n \leq 1 + \frac{1.5}{p}$ . Similarly,  $\mathbb{E}L_n = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (1 - \Pr(L_n \leq l))$

$$\geq \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \left( 1 - \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \left( 1 - (1-p)^{(l+1)i} \right) \right) \quad (117)$$

$$= \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \left( 1 - \exp \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \log \left( 1 - (1-p)^{(l+1)i} \right) \right) \right) \quad (118)$$

$$= \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \left( 1 - \exp \left( - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{(1-p)^{(l+1)ij}}{j} \right) \right) \quad (119)$$

$$= \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \left( 1 - \exp \left( - \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{(1-p)^{(l+1)j} - (1-p)^{(l+1)jn}}{j(1-(1-p)^{(l-1)j})} \right) \right) \quad (120)$$

$$\geq \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \left( 1 - \exp \left( - \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{(1-p)^{(l+1)j}}{j} + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{(1-p)^{(l+1)jn}}{j} \right) \right) \quad (121)$$

$$= \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \left( 1 - \frac{1 - (1-p)^{l+1}}{1 - (1-p)^{(l+1)n}} \right) = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \left( \frac{(1-p)^{l+1} - (1-p)^{(l+1)n}}{1 - (1-p)^{(l+1)n}} \right) \quad (122)$$

$$\geq \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (1-p)^{l+1} - \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (1-p)^{(l+1)n} = \frac{(1-p)^2}{p} - \frac{(1-p)^{2n}}{1 - (1-p)^n}, \quad (123)$$

where (117) uses Theorem 5.2. We therefore have upper and lower bounds for  $\mathbb{E}L_n$ . Bounds for  $\mathbb{E}L_n^2 = 2 \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} l(1 - \Pr(L_n \leq l))$  use the same argument and lead to bounds for  $\text{Var}(L_n) = \mathbb{E}L_n^2 - (\mathbb{E}L_n)^2$ . Limiting results then follow, using Lemma D.1 for the  $p \rightarrow 0^+$  setting, which completes the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition 5.5.** *If  $X_1, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} F_1$  in (42), then  $\Pr(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} L_n = 0) = 1$ .*

*Proof.* Without loss of generality (if  $\kappa_{\lambda, \rho} \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Z}$ ), we consider an exponential histogram with bins  $\{(\rho^{\kappa_{\lambda, \rho} + k - 1}, \rho^{\kappa_{\lambda, \rho} + k}]\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ , so that

$$p_k := \Pr(Y_1 = k) = \Pr(\rho^{\kappa_{\lambda, \rho} + k - 1} < X_1 \leq \rho^{\kappa_{\lambda, \rho} + k}) = \rho^{-\frac{\rho^k - \rho}{\rho - 1}} - \rho^{-\frac{\rho^{k+1} - \rho}{\rho - 1}}$$

$$q_k := \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} p_j = \Pr(Y_1 \geq k) = \Pr(X_1 \geq \rho^{\kappa_{\lambda, \rho} + k - 1}) = \rho^{-\frac{\rho^k - \rho}{\rho - 1}}.$$

Now, because  $\rho > 1$ , we see that

$$\frac{q_{k+2}/q_{k+1}}{q_{k+1}/q_k} = \frac{q_k q_{k+2}}{q_{k+1}^2} = \frac{1}{\rho^{(\rho-1)\rho^k}} \rightarrow 0$$

as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , so that the ratio test and Theorem 5.1 part 1 give the result.  $\square$