

On the measure of Voronoi cells ^{*}

Luc Devroye [†] László Györfi [‡] Gábor Lugosi [§] Harro Walk [¶]

December 15, 2015

Abstract

n independent random points drawn from a density f in \mathbb{R}^d define a random Voronoi partition. We study the measure of a typical cell of the partition. We prove that the asymptotic distribution of the probability measure of the cell centered at a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is independent of x and the density f . We determine all moments of the asymptotic distribution and show that the distribution becomes more concentrated as d becomes large. In particular, we show that the variance converges to zero exponentially fast in d . We also obtain a density-free bound for the rate of convergence of the diameter of a typical Voronoi cell.

^{*}László Györfi was supported in part by the National Development Agency (NFÜ, Hungary) as part of the project Introduction of Cognitive Methods for UAV Collision Avoidance Using Millimeter Wave Radar, grant KMR-12-1-2012-0008. Luc Devroye was supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) of Canada. Gábor Lugosi was supported by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Technology grant MTM2012-37195.

[†]McGill University

[‡]Budapest University of Technology and Economics

[§]ICREA and Pompeu Fabra University

[¶]Universität Stuttgart

1 Introduction

Let X_1, \dots, X_n be independent, identically distributed random vectors taking values in \mathbb{R}^d . We denote the common distribution of the X_i by μ . We assume throughout the paper that μ is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure λ and denote the density of μ by f . Hence, $\mu(A) = \int_A f(x)dx$ for all Lebesgue measurable sets $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$.

The X_i define a random partition of \mathbb{R}^d into n sets S_1, \dots, S_n such that S_i contains all points in \mathbb{R}^d whose nearest neighbor among X_1, \dots, X_n is X_i . Ties are broken in favor of smaller indices. (Because of the assumption of absolute continuity of μ , the tie-breaking rule is irrelevant throughout the paper.) Formally,

$$S_i = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|x - X_i\| = \min_{j=1, \dots, n} \|x - X_j\| \right\} \cap \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|x - X_i\| < \min_{j=1, \dots, i-1} \|x - X_j\| \right\}.$$

$\{S_1, \dots, S_n\}$ is a so-called *Voronoi partition* and the S_i are the *Voronoi cells*.

In this paper we are interested in the measure of a “typical” Voronoi cell. In particular, we study the conditional distribution of the random variable $\mu(S_1)$ conditioned on the event that $X_1 = x$ for some x in the support of μ .

Note that since

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \mu(S_j) = 1$$

and $\mu(S_1), \dots, \mu(S_n)$ are identically distributed, we have

$$n\mathbb{E}[\mu(S_1)] = 1.$$

In Theorem 1 below we prove that, for μ -almost all x , we have $n\mathbb{E}[\mu(S_1)|X_1 = x] \rightarrow 1$. We also show that $n^2\mathbb{E}[\mu(S_1)^2|X_1 = x]$ converges to a limit that is independent of x and the distribution μ . In fact, we prove that for μ -almost all x , $n\mathbb{E}[\mu(S_1)|X_1 = x]$ has a limiting distribution that only depends on the dimension. We show that the limiting distribution becomes more concentrated as the dimension d grows.

Finally, we study the diameter $\text{diam}(S_1)$ of the Voronoi cell centered at X_1 . We show that for μ -almost all x , conditionally on $X_1 = x$, $\text{diam}(S_1)$ converges to zero at a rate of $n^{-1/d}$.

Throughout the paper, $B_{x,r}$ denotes the closed ball of radius $r > 0$ centered at $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Related work

The measure of a “typical” cell in a Voronoi tessellation has been mostly studied in the case when the points are drawn from a homogeneous Poisson process. Asymptotically, this

is equivalent to the special case of uniform distribution μ on (say) the unit ball. The study of the measure of Voronoi cells dates back to at least Gilbert [4] who derived formulas and numerical estimates for the second and third moments the measure of a Voronoi cell when $d = 2$ or 3 . See also Brakke [1], [2], Hayen and Quine [5].

Our notion of the distribution of a typical cell is analogous to the so-called “Palm distribution” of the volume of a Voronoi cell in stochastic geometry—Stojan, Kendall, and Mecke [12], Møller [8], Møller and Stoyan [9].

Brakke [1], [2], Hayen and Quine [5], Heinrich et al. [6], Heinrich and Muche [7], Zuyev [14], and others study characteristics of “typical” cells in a Voronoi tessellation of a homogeneous Poisson process, including the second moment of the volume.

For a survey and comprehensive treatment of Voronoi diagrams, we refer to Okabe, Boots and Sugihara [10] and Okabe, Noots, Sugihara and Nok Chiu [11].

2 Results

Theorem 1 below establishes the asymptotic value of the first and second moments of the measure of a typical cell centered at a point x . The remarkable feature is that the asymptotic values are independent of both the density f and the point x (for μ -almost all x) and only depend on the dimension d . In fact, in Theorem 2 we show that the limit distribution is also independent of f and x . We emphasize that both theorems hold without any assumption on the density f .

The asymptotic second moment is expressed in terms of a random variable W defined as follows. Let Y be a random vector uniformly distributed in $B_{0,1}$. Define $\bar{1} = (1, 0, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and let $\bar{B} = B_{\bar{1},1} \cup B_{Y,\|Y\|}$. Introduce the random variable

$$W = \frac{\lambda(\bar{B})}{\lambda(B_{0,1})} \tag{1}$$

and let

$$\alpha(d) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{2}{W^2} \right] .$$

The following result is proved in Section 5.1.

Theorem 1 *Assume that μ has a density f . Then*

(i)

$$n\mathbb{E} [\mu(S_1) \mid X_1 = x] \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{for } \mu\text{-almost all } x .$$

(ii)

$$n^2 \mathbb{E} [\mu(S_1)^2 \mid X_1 = x] \rightarrow \alpha(d) \quad \text{for } \mu\text{-almost all } x .$$

In Section 3 we obtain estimates for the asymptotic conditional second moment $\alpha(d)$. In particular, in Theorem 3 we show that for all dimensions, $1 \leq \alpha(d) \leq 1 + 6(3/4)^{d/2}$ and therefore the asymptotic variance of $\mu(S_1)$ (conditioned on $X_1 = x$) decreases to zero exponentially in d . In the next result (Theorem 2) we determine the asymptotic distribution of $\mu(S_1)$ (still conditioned on $X_1 = x$). We do this by determining the asymptotic moments of the limiting distribution. Once again, the limit is the same for all x .

In order to describe the asymptotic moments, for any positive integer define the random variable

$$W_k = \frac{\lambda(B_{\bar{1},1} \cup B_{Y_1, \|Y_1\|} \cup \dots \cup B_{Y_{k-1}, \|Y_{k-1}\|})}{\lambda(B_{0,1})} ,$$

where Y_1, \dots, Y_{k-1} are independent random variables distributed uniformly in $B_{0,1}$. Note that

$$1 = W_1 \leq W_2 \leq \dots \leq \frac{\lambda(B_{0,2})}{\lambda(B_{0,1})} = 2^d .$$

Now we may define a non-negative random variable Z with moments

$$\mathbb{E}[Z^k] = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{k!}{W_k^k} \right]$$

for $k \geq 1$. We may use Carleman's condition to verify that the distribution of Z is uniquely defined. Indeed, note that

$$\mathbb{E}[Z^k] \leq k!$$

and therefore

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\mathbb{E}[Z^k])^{-1/(2k)} \geq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (k!)^{-1/(2k)} = \infty ,$$

and Carleman's condition is satisfied. Note that if E is an exponential (1) random variable, then

$$\mathbb{E}[E^k] = k! \geq \mathbb{E}[Z^k] \geq k!/2^{dk} = \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{E}{2^d} \right)^k \right] .$$

We also have

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{sZ}] \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} s^k = \frac{1}{1-s}$$

for $0 < s < 1$ and

$$\mathbb{E} [e^{sZ}] \geq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{s}{2^d}\right)^k = \frac{1}{1 - s/2^d}$$

for $0 < s < 2^d$.

The next theorem establishes the convergence announced above. The proof is sketched in Section 5.2.

Theorem 2 *Assume that μ has a density f . Then, for μ -almost all x , we have that, conditionally on the event $X_1 = x$, the random variable $n\mu(S_1)$ converges, in distribution, to Z .*

Note that for the case of a Voronoi tessellation of \mathbb{R}^d defined by a Poisson point process of constant intensity, Zuyev [14] describes the distribution of the volume of the so-called “fundamental region” of the cell containing the origin, conditionally on having a point at the origin, as a mixture of Gamma distributions. The fundamental region contains the Voronoi cell. Since this distribution equals the limit for the uniform density and our result is density free, the random variable Z described here is stochastically dominated by the same mixture of Gamma random variables.

In the case of $d = 1$ it is easily seen that Z is distributed as $(E_1 + E_2)/2$, where E_1 and E_2 are independent exponential(1) random variables.

3 Some values of $\alpha(d)$

In this section we investigate the asymptotic second moment $\alpha(d)$. Since the limiting first moment equals 1, we must have that $\alpha(d) \geq 1$. On the other hand, for all d , we have $\alpha(d) \leq 2$. To see this, recall from the proof of Theorem 1 that

$$\alpha(d)/2 = \lim_{z \downarrow 0} \frac{\mathbb{P} \{ \mu(B_{X, \|X-x\|} \cup B_{X', \|X'-x\|}) \leq z \}}{z^2}$$

where X, X' are i.i.d. with distribution μ . But clearly

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \{ \mu(B_{X, \|X-x\|} \cup B_{X', \|X'-x\|}) \leq z \} \\ &= \mathbb{P} \{ \mu(B_{X, \|X-x\|} \cup B_{X', \|X'-x\|}) \leq z, \mu(B_{X, \|X-x\|}) \leq z, \mu(B_{X', \|X'-x\|}) \leq z \} \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \{ \mu(B_{X, \|X-x\|}) \leq z, \mu(B_{X', \|X'-x\|}) \leq z \} \\ &= \mathbb{P} \{ \mu(B_{X, \|X-x\|}) \leq z \}^2 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\frac{\mathbb{P} \{ \mu(B_{X, \|X-x\|}) \leq z \}^2}{z^2} \rightarrow 1 ,$$

once again from the proof of Theorem 1.

It is not difficult to see that $\alpha(1) = 3/2$. Indeed, by the definition (1) of W ,

$$\bar{B} = B_{\bar{1},1} \cup B_{Y, \|Y\|} = B_{1,1} \cup B_{Y, |Y|} = \begin{cases} B_{1,1} & \text{if } Y \geq 0 \\ B_{1,1} \cup B_{Y, |Y|} & \text{if } Y < 0 , \end{cases}$$

we have

$$W = \frac{\lambda(\bar{B})}{\lambda(B_{0,1})} \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \begin{cases} 1 & \text{with probability } 1/2, \\ 1 + U & \text{with probability } 1/2, \end{cases}$$

where U is uniform $[0, 1]$. Hence,

$$\alpha(1) = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{2}{W^2} \right] = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{2}{1} + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{2}{(1+U)^2} \right] \right) = 1 + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{(1+U)^2} \right] = 3/2 .$$

Previous work has considered the variance of the Lebesgue measure of the Voronoi cell containing the origin defined by a homogeneous Poisson process, conditioned on the fact that a point falls in the origin. From these results, we deduce values of $\alpha(d)$ for $d = 2, 3$. Indeed Gilbert [4], Brakke [1], and Hayen and Quine [5] showed that $\alpha(2) \approx 1.2801760409267$ while Gilbert [4] and Brakke [2] showed $\alpha(3) \approx 1.179032437845$.

Here we show that for large values of d , $\alpha(d)$ approaches 1 exponentially fast. The proof is given in Section 5.3.

Theorem 3 *For all d ,*

$$1 \leq \alpha(d) \leq 1 + 6(3/4)^{d/2} .$$

4 On the diameter of a Voronoi cell

Here we prove that, independently of the density, for μ -almost all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, conditionally on $X_1 = x$, the diameter of the Voronoi cell centered at X_1 converges to zero, in probability, at a rate of $n^{-1/d}$. More precisely, we have the following:

Theorem 4 *Let μ have a density f . Then for μ -almost all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \{ n^{1/d} \text{diam}(S_1) \geq t | X_1 = x \} = 0 .$$

In particular, for μ -almost all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, conditionally on $X_1 = x$, $\text{diam}(S_1) \rightarrow 0$ in probability. The theorem is proved in Section 5.4.

5 Proofs

The proofs use a version of the Lebesgue density theorem that we recall first.

We say that a class \mathcal{B} of Borel sets in \mathbb{R}^d is *good* if the following two conditions hold:

$$\sup_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \frac{\lambda(\text{smallest ball } B_{0,r} \text{ containing } B)}{\lambda(B)} < \infty$$

and

there exists a sequence $B_k \in \mathcal{B}$ with $\lambda(B_k) \downarrow 0$.

We say that x is a *Lebesgue point* for f if for all good classes of Borel sets \mathcal{B} , and all sequences $B_k \in \mathcal{B}$ with $\lambda(B_k) \downarrow 0$,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\int_{x+B_k} f}{\lambda(B_k)} = f(x) .$$

Let A be the set of all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $f(x) > 0$ and x is a Lebesgue point for f . Then $\mu(A) = 1$ by Wheeden and Zygmund [13, pp. 106–108]. See also Devroye and Györfi [3], Chapter 2.

5.1 Proof of Theorem 1

Proof of part (i).

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mu(S_1) \mid X_1 = x] &= \mathbb{P}\{X_{n+1} \in S_1 \mid X_1 = x\} \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left\{\bigcap_{i=2}^n \{X_i \notin B_{X_{n+1}, \|X_{n+1}-x\|}\}\right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[(1 - Z(x))^{n-1}\right] , \end{aligned}$$

where

$$Z(x) = \mu(B_{X, \|X-x\|}) .$$

It follows by integration by parts and the dominated convergence theorem that

$$n\mathbb{E}\{(1 - Z(x))^{n-1}\} \rightarrow 1$$

whenever

$$\lim_{z \downarrow 0} \frac{\mathbb{P}\{\mu(B_{X, \|X-x\|}) \leq z\}}{z} = 1 . \tag{2}$$

The intuitive reason of why such convergence should hold is that for any x , $\mu(B_{x,\|X-x\|})$ is uniformly distributed on $[0, 1]$ and that $\mu(B_{X,\|X-x\|}) \approx \mu(B_{x,\|X-x\|})$ when $\|X-x\|$ is small. The rest of the proof establishes this convergence.

By the Lebesgue density theorem, it suffices to prove (2) for all Lebesgue points x with $f(x) > 0$. Fix such a point x . Let \mathcal{B} be the class of all closed balls of \mathbb{R}^d containing the origin. Since for any sequence $B_k \in \mathcal{B}$ with $\lambda(B_k) \downarrow 0$ we have

$$\frac{\mu(x + B_k)}{\lambda(x + B_k)} \rightarrow f(x) ,$$

for any $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ we can find $\delta > 0$ (possibly depending on x) such that $\|v-x\| \leq \delta$ implies

$$\left| \frac{\mu(B_{v,\|v-x\|})}{\lambda(B_{v,\|v-x\|})} - f(x) \right| \leq \epsilon f(x)$$

and

$$\left| \frac{\mu(B_{x,\|v-x\|})}{\lambda(B_{x,\|v-x\|})} - f(x) \right| \leq \epsilon f(x) .$$

This also implies that for any v with $\|v-x\| \geq \delta$,

$$\mu(B_{v,\|v-x\|}) \geq \mu(B_{v^*,\delta}) \geq (1-\epsilon)f(x)\lambda(B_{0,\delta}) , \quad (3)$$

where v^* is the unique point on the surface of $B_{x,\delta}$ and on the line segment (x, v) . Take $z > 0$ so small that

$$z < (1-\epsilon)f(x)\lambda(B_{0,\delta}).$$

Note also that

$$\mu(B_{x,\|X-x\|}) \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} U ,$$

where U is a uniform random variable on $[0, 1]$. We rewrite

$$\mu(B_{X,\|X-x\|}) = \frac{\mu(B_{X,\|X-x\|})}{\lambda(B_{X,\|X-x\|})} \cdot \frac{\lambda(B_{x,\|X-x\|})}{\mu(B_{x,\|X-x\|})} \cdot \mu(B_{x,\|X-x\|}) .$$

If $\|X-x\| \leq \delta$, then the first two factors are sandwiched between

$$\frac{f(x)(1-\epsilon)}{f(x)(1+\epsilon)} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{f(x)(1+\epsilon)}{f(x)(1-\epsilon)} .$$

Since $\mu(B_{X,\|X-x\|}) \leq z$ implies $\|X - x\| \leq \delta$ (see (3)), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\{\mu(B_{X,\|X-x\|}) \leq z\} &= \mathbb{P}\{\mu(B_{X,\|X-x\|}) \leq z, \|X - x\| \leq \delta\} \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}\left\{\frac{f(x)(1-\epsilon)}{f(x)(1+\epsilon)}\mu(B_{x,\|X-x\|}) \leq z, \|X - x\| \leq \delta\right\} \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}\left\{\frac{1-\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}U \leq z\right\} \\
&= \min\left\{z\frac{1+\epsilon}{1-\epsilon}, 1\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\{\mu(B_{X,\|X-x\|}) \leq z, \|X - x\| \leq \delta\} &\geq \mathbb{P}\left\{\frac{1+\epsilon}{1-\epsilon}\mu(B_{x,\|X-x\|}) \leq z, \|X - x\| \leq \delta, \mu(B_{X,\|X-x\|}) \leq z\right\} \\
&\geq \mathbb{P}\left\{\frac{1+\epsilon}{1-\epsilon}U \leq z\right\} - \mathbb{P}\{\|X - x\| > \delta, \mu(B_{X,\|X-x\|}) \leq z\} \\
&= z\frac{1-\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}.
\end{aligned}$$

This proves (2) and part (i) of Theorem 1. \square

Proof of part (ii).

Similarly to the proof of part (i), observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\mu(S_1)^2 \mid X_1 = x] &= \mathbb{P}\{X_{n+1} \in S_1, X_{n+2} \in S_1 \mid X_1 = x\} \\
&= \mathbb{P}\left\{\bigcap_{i=2}^n \{X_i \notin B_{X_{n+1},\|X_{n+1}-x\|} \cup B_{X_{n+2},\|X_{n+2}-x\|}\}\right\} \\
&= \mathbb{E}[(1 - Z_2(x))^{n-1}],
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$Z_2(x) = \mu(B_{X,\|X-x\|} \cup B_{X',\|X'-x\|})$$

with X and X' independent and distributed as μ . In analogy with the argument of part (i), in order to prove that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^2 \mathbb{E}\{(1 - Z_2(x))^{n-1}\} = \alpha(d),$$

it suffices to show that

$$\lim_{z \downarrow 0} \frac{\mathbb{P}\{\mu(B_{X,\|X-x\|} \cup B_{X',\|X'-x\|}) \leq z\}}{z^2} = \alpha(d)/2.$$

The rough idea of the proof is as follows. The approximate equalities are made rigorous below. For small z ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\mathbb{P} \left\{ \mu(B_{X, \|X-x\|} \cup B_{X', \|X'-x\|}) \leq z \right\}}{z^2} \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{\mu(B_{X, \|X-x\|} \cup B_{X', \|X'-x\|})}{\max\{\mu(B_{X, \|X-x\|}), \mu(B_{X', \|X'-x\|})\}} \max\{\mu(B_{X, \|X-x\|}), \mu(B_{X', \|X'-x\|})\} \leq z \right\}}{z^2} \\
&\approx \frac{\mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{\mu(B_{X, \|X-x\|} \cup B_{X', \|X'-x\|})}{\max\{\mu(B_{X, \|X-x\|}), \mu(B_{X', \|X'-x\|})\}} \max\{\mu(B_{0, \|X\|}), \mu(B_{0, \|X'\|})\} \leq z \right\}}{z^2} \\
&\approx \frac{\mathbb{P} \left\{ W \max\{U_1, U_2\} \leq z \right\}}{z^2} \\
&\quad (\text{where } U_1, U_2 \text{ are i.i.d. uniform, independent of } W) \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{P} \left\{ W U^{1/2} \leq z \right\}}{z^2} \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{E}[\min(z^2/W^2, 1)]}{z^2} \approx \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{W^2} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

To prove the desired limit formally, as before, by the Lebesgue density theorem, we may assume that $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is such that $f(x) > 0$ and x is a Lebesgue point for f . A key point of the proof uses coupling. Let (Y_1, Y_2) be the canonical reordering of (X, X') such that

$$\|Y_2 - x\| \geq \|Y_1 - x\| .$$

and introduce $M = \max(\|X - x\|, \|X' - x\|) = \|Y_2 - x\|$. Define the random variable N by

$$N = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } Y_1 = X' \\ 2 & \text{if } Y_2 = X' . \end{cases}$$

Then set $V_2 = Y_2$ and let V_1 be uniformly distributed on $B_{x, \|V_2-x\|}$ such that V_1 is maximally coupled with Y_1 given Y_2 . From Doeblin's coupling argument,

$$\mathbb{P}\{Y_1 \neq V_1 \mid Y_2\} = \frac{1}{2} \int |f_{Y_1}(v) - f_{V_1}(v)| dv ,$$

where f_{Y_1}, f_{V_1} are the conditional densities of Y_1 and V_1 given Y_2 .

Choose $\delta > 0$ so small that for $M \leq \delta$, we have, simultaneously,

$$\frac{\mu(B_{x, M})}{\lambda(B_{x, M})} \in [f(x)(1 - \epsilon), f(x)(1 + \epsilon)] ,$$

$$\frac{\mu(B_{X,\|X-x\|} \cup B_{X',\|X'-x\|})}{\lambda(B_{X,\|X-x\|} \cup B_{X',\|X'-x\|})} \in [f(x)(1-\epsilon), f(x)(1+\epsilon)] ,$$

and

$$\frac{\mu(B_{X,M})}{\lambda(B_{X,M})} \left| \frac{\lambda(B_{x,M})}{\mu(B_{x,M})} - \frac{1}{f(x)} \right| + \frac{1}{\lambda(B_{x,M})f(x)} \int_{B_{x,M}} |f(v) - f(x)| dv \leq \epsilon .$$

Such a δ exists by three applications of the Lebesgue density theorem. (Recall that x is a Lebesgue point.) Since

$$f_{Y_1}(v) = \frac{f(v)}{\mu(B_{x,\|Y_2-x\|})} \mathbb{1}_{v \in B_{x,M}} \quad \text{and} \quad f_{V_1}(v) = \frac{1}{\lambda(B_{x,M})} \mathbb{1}_{v \in B_{x,M}} ,$$

(where $\mathbb{1}$ denotes the indicator function) we have, writing $B = B_{x,M}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int |f_{Y_1}(v) - f_{V_1}(v)| dv &= \int_B \left| \frac{f(v)}{\lambda(B)} \frac{\lambda(B)}{\mu(B)} - \frac{1}{\lambda(B)} \right| dv \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\lambda(B)} \int_B f(v) \left| \frac{\lambda(B)}{\mu(B)} - \frac{1}{f(x)} \right| dv + \frac{1}{\lambda(B)} \int_B \left| \frac{f(v)}{f(x)} - 1 \right| dv \\ &= \frac{\mu(B)}{\lambda(B)} \left| \frac{\lambda(B)}{\mu(B)} - \frac{1}{f(x)} \right| + \frac{1}{f(x)} \frac{1}{\lambda(B)} \int_B |f(v) - f(x)| dv \\ &\leq \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

if $M \leq \delta$, by choice of δ . Finally, define a pair of random variables (V, V') , both taking values in \mathbb{R}^d , as follows.

$$(V, V') = \begin{cases} (V_1, V_2) & \text{if } N = 2 \\ (V_2, V_1) & \text{if } N = 1 , \end{cases}$$

so that

$$\mathbb{P}\{(V, V') \neq (X, X') \mid M\} \leq \mathbb{1}_{M > \delta} + \mathbb{1}_{M \leq \delta} \frac{\epsilon}{2} .$$

Since

$$(\mu(B_{x,\|X-x\|}), \mu(B_{x,\|X'-x\|})) \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} (U, U') ,$$

where U, U' are independent uniform $[0, 1]$ random variables, we have,

$$\mu(B_{x,M}) \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \max(U, U') \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \sqrt{U} .$$

By construction, V_1 is uniform on $B_{x,\|Y_2-x\|}$, so that, given Y_2 ,

$$\frac{\lambda(B_{Y_2,\|Y_2-x\|} \cup B_{Y_1,\|Y_1-x\|})}{\lambda(B_{Y_2,\|Y_2-x\|})} \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} W ,$$

where W was defined in (1). To complete the argument, set

$$B_X = B_{X, \|X-x\|}, \quad B_{X'} = B_{X', \|X'-x\|}, \quad M = \max(\|X-x\|, \|X'-x\|).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(B_X \cup B_{X'}) &= \frac{\mu(B_X \cup B_{X'})}{\lambda(B_X \cup B_{X'})} \cdot \frac{\lambda(B_X \cup B_{X'})}{\lambda(B_{x,M})} \cdot \frac{\lambda(B_{x,M})}{\mu(B_{x,M})} \cdot \mu(B_{x,M}) \\ &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} I \cdot II \cdot III \cdot IV. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$I \in [f(x)(1-\epsilon), f(x)(1+\epsilon)]$$

when $M \leq \delta$, and similarly,

$$III \in \left[\frac{1}{f(x)(1+\epsilon)}, \frac{1}{f(x)(1-\epsilon)} \right]$$

when $M \leq \delta$. When $(X, X') = (V, V')$, we have

$$II = \frac{\lambda(B_X \cup B_{X'})}{\lambda(B_{x,M})} \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} W$$

with W independent of

$$IV = \mu(B_{x,M}) \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \sqrt{U}.$$

Thus, since for small enough z , $\mu(B_X \cup B_{X'}) \leq z$ implies $M \leq \delta$ (as argued in the proof of (2)), for such z , we have

$$\mathbb{P}\{\mu(B_X \cup B_{X'}) \leq z, (X, X') = (V, V')\} \leq \mathbb{P}\left\{\frac{1-\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}W\sqrt{U} \leq z\right\}$$

and thus,

$$\mathbb{P}\{\mu(B_X \cup B_{X'}) \leq z\} = \mathbb{P}\{\mu(B_X \cup B_{X'}) \leq z, M \leq \delta\} + \mathbb{P}\{\mu(B_X \cup B_{X'}) \leq z, M > \delta\}.$$

Clearly,

$$\mathbb{P}\{\mu(B_X \cup B_{X'}) \leq z, M > \delta\} = 0$$

for z small enough. For such a z , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\{\mu(B_X \cup B_{X'}) \leq z, M \leq \delta\} &= \mathbb{P}\{\mu(B_X \cup B_{X'}) \leq z, M \leq \delta, (X, X') \neq (V, V')\} \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}\{\mu(B_X \cup B_{X'}) \leq z, M \leq \delta, (X, X') = (V, V')\} \\ &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} I + II. \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
I &\leq \mathbb{P}\{\mu(B_X) \leq z\} \mathbb{P}\{\mu(B_{X'}) \leq z\} \sup_{\rho \leq \delta} \mathbb{P}\{(X, X') \neq (V, V') \mid M \leq \rho\} \\
&= z^2(1 + o(1)) \sup_{\rho \leq \delta} \mathbb{P}\{(X, X') \neq (V, V') \mid M \leq \rho\} \\
&\quad \text{(by the proof of (2))} \\
&= z^2(1 + o(1))\epsilon \quad \text{(by the choice of } \delta \text{)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Also,

$$\begin{aligned}
II &\leq \mathbb{P}\{\mu(B_X \cup B_{X'}) \leq z, M \leq \delta\} \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}\left\{\frac{1-\epsilon}{1+\epsilon} W \sqrt{U} \leq z\right\} \\
&\leq \left(\frac{1+\epsilon}{1-\epsilon}\right)^2 \mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{1}{W^2}\right\} z^2 \\
&= \left(\frac{1+\epsilon}{1-\epsilon}\right)^2 z^2 \alpha(d)/2.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\{\mu(B_X \cup B_{X'}) \leq z\} \\
&\geq \mathbb{P}\{\mu(B_X \cup B_{X'}) \leq z, M \leq \delta, (X, X') = (V, V')\} \\
&\geq \mathbb{P}\left\{\frac{1+\epsilon}{1-\epsilon} \frac{\lambda(B_V \cup B_{V'})}{\lambda(B_{x,M})} \mu(B_{x,M}) \leq z, \mu(B_X \cup B_{X'}) \leq z, M \leq \delta, (X, X') = (V, V')\right\} \\
&\geq \mathbb{P}\left\{\frac{1+\epsilon}{1-\epsilon} W \sqrt{U} \leq z\right\} - \mathbb{P}\{\mu(B_X \cup B_{X'}) \leq z, M \leq \delta, (X, X') \neq (V, V')\} \\
&\geq \mathbb{P}\left\{U \leq \left(\frac{z(1-\epsilon)}{W(1+\epsilon)}\right)^2\right\} - \mathbb{P}\{\mu(B_X) \leq z, \mu(B_{X'}) \leq z, M \leq \delta, (X, X') \neq (V, V')\},
\end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}\{\mu(B_X \cup B_{X'}) \leq z\} \\
& \geq \mathbb{E} \left\{ \min \left\{ \left(\frac{z(1-\epsilon)}{W(1+\epsilon)} \right)^2, 1 \right\} \right\} \\
& \quad - \mathbb{P}\{\mu(B_X) \leq z\} \mathbb{P}\{\mu(B_{X'}) \leq z\} \sup_{\rho \leq \delta} \mathbb{P}\{(X, X') \neq (V, V') \mid M \leq \rho\} \\
& = (1 + o(1)) z^2 \left(\frac{1-\epsilon}{1+\epsilon} \right)^2 \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{1}{W^2} \right\} \\
& \quad - (1 + o(1)) z^2 \sup_{\rho \leq \delta} \mathbb{P}\{(X, X') \neq (V, V') \mid M \leq \rho\} \\
& \quad \text{(by the dominated convergence theorem, and proof of (2))} \\
& \geq (1 + o(1)) \left(\frac{1-\epsilon}{1+\epsilon} \right)^2 z^2 \alpha(d)/2 - (1 + o(1)) z^2 \epsilon \\
& \quad \text{(by the choice of } \delta \text{).}
\end{aligned}$$

Since ϵ was arbitrary, we are done. □

5.2 Sketch of proof of Theorem 2

Since the proof of Theorem 2 is an extension of that of Theorem 1, we only sketch the arguments.

By the moment method, it suffices to show that for all Lebesgue points $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $f(x) > 0$, and for all $k \geq 1$, we have

$$\mathbb{E} [(n\mu(S_1))^k | X_1 = x] \rightarrow \mathbb{E}[Z^k],$$

As we argued in the case $k = 2$ in the proof of Theorem 1,

$$\mathbb{E} [n^k \mu(S_1)^k | X_1 = x] = n^k \mathbb{E} [(1 - Z_k(x))^{n-1}],$$

where

$$Z_k(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mu(B_{X_1, \|X_1-x\|} \cup \cdots \cup B_{X_k, \|X_k-x\|}) \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{\approx} W_k U^{1/k}$$

where U is uniform $[0, 1]$. Here we use the fact that

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq k} \mu(B_{0, \|X_i\|}) \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} U_i \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} U^{1/k}$$

with the U_i being independent and uniform on $[0, 1]$.

Just like in the proof of Theorem 1, in order to show that

$$\mathbb{E} [n^k \mu(S_1)^k | X_1 = x] \rightarrow \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{k!}{W_k^k} \right],$$

it suffices to show that

$$\lim_{z \downarrow 0} \frac{\mathbb{P} \{ \mu(B_{X_1, \|X_1-x\|} \cup \dots \cup B_{X_k, \|X_k-x\|}) \leq z \}}{z^k} = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{W_k^k} \right].$$

By the approximation above, for small z ,

$$\frac{\mathbb{P} \{ \mu(B_{X_1, \|X_1-x\|} \cup \dots \cup B_{X_k, \|X_k-x\|}) \leq z \}}{z^k} \approx \frac{\mathbb{P} \{ W_k U^{1/k} \leq z \}}{z^k} \approx \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{W_k^k} \right].$$

The approximation can be made rigorous by the same arguments as detailed in the proof of Theorem 1. \square

5.3 Proof of Theorem 3

Define

$$A = B_{0,1}, \quad B = B_{\bar{1},1}, \quad \text{and} \quad C = B_{Y, \|Y\|},$$

where Y is uniformly distributed on A . Define

$$W = \frac{\lambda(B \cup C)}{\lambda(B)} \quad \text{and} \quad U = \frac{\lambda(C)}{\lambda(B)}$$

and observe that U is uniformly distributed on $[0, 1]$. We write

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(d) - 1 &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{2}{W^2} - \frac{2}{(1+U)^2} \right] \\ &= 2\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{W^2} \left(1 - \left(\frac{W}{1+U} \right)^2 \right) \right] \\ &\leq 2\mathbb{E} \left[1 - \left(\frac{W}{1+U} \right)^2 \right], \end{aligned}$$

since $W \geq 1$. We have that

$$2 \left[1 - \left(\frac{W}{1+U} \right)^2 \right] \leq 2$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
2 \left[1 - \left(\frac{W}{1+U} \right)^2 \right] &= 2 \left[\frac{(1+U-W)(1+U+W)}{(1+U)^2} \right] \\
&\leq 4 \left[\frac{1+U-W}{1+U} \right] \\
&= 4 \left[\frac{\lambda(B \cap C)}{\lambda(B) + \lambda(C)} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\alpha(d) - 1 \leq 2\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{Y \in B}] + 4\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\lambda(B \cap C)}{\lambda(B) + \lambda(C)} \mathbb{1}_{Y \notin B} \right].$$

We finish the proof by showing that

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{Y \in B}] \leq (3/4)^{d/2} \tag{4}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\lambda(B \cap C)}{\lambda(B) + \lambda(C)} \mathbb{1}_{Y \notin B} \right] \leq (3/4)^{d/2}. \tag{5}$$

For (4), note that

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{Y \in B}] = \frac{\lambda(A \cap B)}{\lambda(B)} \leq \frac{\lambda(B_{b, \sqrt{3/4}})}{\lambda(B)} = (3/4)^{d/2},$$

where $b = (1/2, 0, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, since $A \cap B \subset B_{b, \sqrt{3/4}}$. For (5), we bound

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\lambda(B \cap C)}{\lambda(B) + \lambda(C)} \mathbb{1}_{Y \notin B} &\leq \sup_{y \notin B} \frac{\lambda(B \cap B_{y, \|y\|})}{\lambda(B) + \lambda(B_{y, \|y\|})} \\
&\leq \frac{\lambda(B \cap B_{a, 1})}{\lambda(B)} \\
&\quad (\text{where } a = (1/2, \sqrt{3/4}, 0, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^d) \\
&= \frac{\lambda(A \cap B)}{\lambda(B)} \\
&\leq (3/4)^{d/2}
\end{aligned}$$

by arguing as above. That the supremum reached by placing Y (thus, y) at a is clear in two steps. First, the intersection can only grow by replacing y by $y/\|y\|$ since

$$B_{y,\|y\|} \subset B_{y/\|y\|,1}.$$

Next, of all the points on the surface, but outside $B_{\bar{1},1}$, the intersection $\lambda(B \cap B_{y/\|y\|,1})$ is maximized by placing y at a . \square

5.4 Proof of Theorem 4

Let γ_d be the minimal number of cones C_1, \dots, C_{γ_d} of angle $\pi/4$ centered at 0 such that their union covers \mathbb{R}^d . Let $R_{n,j}$, $j = 1, \dots, \gamma_d$, be the distance between X_1 and the nearest neighbor among X_2, \dots, X_n belonging to $X_1 + C_j$ (i.e., the cone C_j translated by X_1). Define $R_{n,j} = \infty$ if no such point exists.

We bound the diameter of the Voronoi cell S_1 by observing that

$$\text{diam}(S_1) \leq \sqrt{d} \max_{j=1, \dots, \gamma_d} R_{n,j}.$$

A simple extension of the Lebesgue density theorem implies that if $B = B_{0,1}$ is the unit ball centered at the origin, then for μ -almost all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\min_{j=1, \dots, \gamma_d} \frac{\int_{x+r[C_j \cap B]} f}{\lambda(r[C_j \cap B])} \rightarrow f(x) \quad \text{as } r \downarrow 0. \quad (6)$$

Thus, for μ -almost all x , there exists $R(x) > 0$ such that for all $0 < r \leq R(x)$,

$$\min_{j=1, \dots, \gamma_d} \int_{x+r[C_j \cap B]} f \geq r^d \frac{f(x)}{2} \lambda(C_1 \cap B).$$

If $f(x) = 0$ or x does not satisfy (6), set $R(x) = 0$. For any $t > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \{\text{diam}(S_1) > tn^{-1/d}\} &\subset \left\{ \max_{j=1, \dots, \gamma_d} R_{n,j} > \frac{tn^{-1/d}}{\sqrt{d}} \right\} \\ &\subset \bigcup_{j=1}^{\gamma_d} \left\{ X_1 + (C_j \cap B) \frac{tn^{-1/d}}{\sqrt{d}} \text{ has no point among } X_2, \dots, X_n \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P} \{ n^{1/d} \text{diam}(S_1) \geq t | X_1 = x \} \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{\gamma_d} \mathbb{P} \left\{ x + (C_j \cap B) \frac{tn^{-1/d}}{\sqrt{d}} \text{ has no point among } X_2, \dots, X_n \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We bound the probability of each event in the union as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P} \left\{ x + (C_j \cap B) \frac{tn^{-1/d}}{\sqrt{d}} \text{ has no point among } X_2, \dots, X_n \right\} \\
& \leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ x + (C_j \cap B) \min \left(R(x), \frac{tn^{-1/d}}{\sqrt{d}} \right) \text{ has no point among } X_2, \dots, X_n \right\} \\
& = \left(1 - \mu \left(x + (C_j \cap B) \min \left(R(x), \frac{tn^{-1/d}}{\sqrt{d}} \right) \right) \right)^{n-1} \\
& \leq \left(1 - \left(\min \left(R(x), \frac{tn^{-1/d}}{\sqrt{d}} \right) \right)^d \lambda(C_1 \cap B) \frac{f(x)}{2} \right)^{n-1} \\
& \leq \exp \left(-(n-1) \min \left(R(x)^d, \frac{t^d n^{-1}}{\sqrt{d^d}} \right) \left(\lambda(C_1 \cap B) \frac{f(x)}{2} \right) \right)
\end{aligned}$$

and the theorem follows since $R(x)^d f(x) > 0$ for μ -almost all x . □

References

- [1] K. A. Brakke, Statistics of random plane Voronoi tessellations, Dept. of Math. Sciences, Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove (Pennsylvania), 1–30, 1985.
<http://www.susqu.edu/brakke/aux/downloads/papers/vorplane.pdf>.
- [2] K. A. Brakke, Statistics of three dimensional random Voronoi tessellations, Dept. of Math. Sciences, Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove (Pennsylvania), 1–17, 1985.
<http://www.susqu.edu/brakke/aux/downloads/papers/3d.pdf>.
- [3] L. Devroye and L. Györfi, *Nonparametric Density Estimation: The L_1 View*. John Wiley, New York, 1985.
- [4] E. N. Gilbert, Random subdivisions of space into crystals. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, 33:958–972, 1962.
- [5] A. Hayen and M. P. Quine, Areas of components of a Voronoi polygon in a homogeneous Poisson process in the plane, *Adv. Appl. Prob.*, 34:281–291, 2002.
- [6] L. Heinrich, R. Körner, N. Mehlhorn and L. Muche, Numerical and analytical computation of some second-order characteristics of spatial Poisson-Voronoi tessellations, *Statistics*, 31:235–259, 1998.

- [7] L. Heinrich and L. Muche, Second-order properties of the point process of nodes in a stationary Voronoi tessellation, *Math. Nachr.*, 281:350-375, 2008.
- [8] J. Møller, *Lectures on Random Voronoi Tessellations*, Lecture Notes in Statistics Vol. 87, Springer, New York, 1994.
- [9] J. Møller and D. Stoyan, Stochastic geometry and random tessellations. In *Tessellations in the Sciences: Virtues, Techniques and Applications of Geometric Tilings*, eds. R. van de Weijgaert, G. Vegter, V. Icke, and J. Ritzerveld. Springer Verlag, 2007.
- [10] A. Okabe, B. Boots, and K. Sugihara, *Spatial Tessellations: Concepts and Applications of Voronoi Diagrams*. John Wiley, Chichester, England, 1992.
- [11] A. Okabe, B. Boots, K. Sugihara, and S. Nok Chiu, *Spatial Tessellations: Concepts and Applications of Voronoi Diagrams*. Second edition. John Wiley, Chichester, England, 2000.
- [12] D. Stoyan, W.S. Kendall, and J. Mecke, *Stochastic Geometry and its Applications*. Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, 1987.
- [13] R. Wheeden and A. Zygmund, *Measure and Integral*. Marcel Dekker, New York, 1977.
- [14] S. A. Zuyev, Estimates for distributions of the Voronoi polygon's geometric characteristics, *Random Structures and Algorithms*, 3:149-162, 1992.