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#### Abstract

Let $X_{1}, X_{2}, \ldots$ be the digits in the base- $q$ expansion of a random variable $X$ defined on $[0,1)$ where $q \geq 2$ is an integer. For $n=1,2, \ldots$, we study the probability distribution $P_{n}$ of the (scaled) remainder $T^{n}(X)=\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} X_{k} q^{n-k}$ : If $X$ has an absolutely continuous CDF then $P_{n}$ converges in the total variation metric to the Lebesgue measure $\mu$ on the unit interval. Under weak smoothness conditions we establish first a coupling between $X$ and a non-negative integer valued random variable $N$ so that $T^{N}(X)$ follows $\mu$ and is independent of $\left(X_{1}, \ldots, X_{N}\right)$, and second exponentially fast convergence of $P_{n}$ and its PDF $f_{n}$. We discuss how many digits are needed and show examples of our results. The convergence results are extended to the case of a multivariate random variable defined on a unit cube.


Keywords: asymptotic distribution; coupling; exponential convergence rate; extended Newcomb-Benford law; multivariate digit expansion; remainder of a digit expansion; total variation distance; uniform distribution
2020 Mathematics Subject Classification: 60F25; 62E17; 37A50

## 1 Introduction

Let $X$ be a random variable so that $0 \leq X<1$, and for $x \in \mathbb{R}$, let $F(x)=\mathrm{P}(X \leq x)$ be the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of $X$. For a given integer $q \geq 2$, we consider the base- $q$ transformation $T:[0,1) \mapsto[0,1)$ given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
T(x)=x q-\lfloor x q\rfloor \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\lfloor\cdot\rfloor$ is the floor function (so $\lfloor x q\rfloor$ is the integer part of $x q$ ). For $n=1,2, \ldots$, let $T^{n}=T \circ \cdots \circ T$ denote the composition of $T$ with itself $n$ times and define

$$
\begin{equation*}
X_{n}=\left\lfloor T^{n-1}(X) q\right\rfloor \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $T^{0}(X)=X$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
X=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} X_{n} q^{-n} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

is the base- $q$ expansion of $X$ with digits $X_{1}, X_{2}, \ldots$. Note that $X$ is in a one-to-one correspondence to the first $n$ digits $\left(X_{1}, \ldots, X_{n}\right)$ together with $T^{n}(X)=$ $\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} X_{k} q^{n-k}$, which is the remainder multiplied by $q^{n}$. Let $\mu$ denote Lebesgue measure on $[0,1), P_{n}$ the probability distribution of $T^{n}(X)$ and $F_{n}$ its CDF, so $X$ follows $P_{0}$ and has CDF $F_{0}=F$. The following facts are well-known (see [4]):
(a) $P_{0}=P_{1}$ (i.e., invariance in distribution under $T$ ) is equivalent to stationarity of the process $X_{1}, X_{2}, \ldots$.
(b) $P_{0}=P_{1}$ and $F$ is absolutely continuous if and only if $P_{0}=\mu$.
(c) $P_{0}=\mu$ if and only if $X_{1}, X_{2}, \ldots$ are independent and uniformly distributed on $\{0,1, \ldots, q-1\}$.

Items (a)-(c) together with the fact that $T$ is ergodic with respect to $\mu$ are used in metric number theory (see [5], [9, and the references therein) to establish properties such as 'for Lebesgue almost all numbers between 0 and 1 , the relative frequency of any finite combination of digits of a given length $n$ and which occurs among the first $m>n$ digits converges to $q^{-n}$ as $m \rightarrow \infty^{\prime}$ (which is basically the definition of a normal number in base-q, cf. [3]). To the best of our knowledge, less (or perhaps no) attention has been paid to the asymptotic behaviour of the (scaled) remainder $T^{n}(X)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. This paper fills this gap.

Assuming $F$ is absolutely continuous with a probability density function $f$ we establish the following. We start in Section 2 to consider a special case of $f$ where $T^{n}(X)$ follows exactly $\mu$ when $n$ is sufficiently large. Then in Section 3, under a weak assumption on $f$, we specify an interesting coupling construction involving a non-negative integer-valued random variable $N$ so that $T^{N}(X)$ follows exactly $\mu$ and is independent of $\left(X_{1}, \ldots, X_{N}\right)$. Moreover, in Section 4, we show that $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} d_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(P_{n}, \mu\right)=0$ where $d_{\mathrm{TV}}$ is the total variation metric (as given later in (12). Because of these results, if in an experiment a realization of $X$ is observed and the first $n$ digits are kept, and if (so far) the only model assumption is absolute continuity of $F$, then the remainder rescaled by $q^{n}$ is at least approximately uniformly distributed when $n$ is large. Since we interpret the uniform distribution as the case of complete randomness, no essential information about the distribution is lost. On the other hand, if the distribution of the remainder is far from uniform, this may indicate that the distribution one is trying to find has finer structure that one is missing by looking only at the first $n$ digits. We return to this issue in Section 5 when discussing sufficiency and ancillarity. Furthermore, in Section 4
we study the convergence rate of $d_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(P_{n}, \mu\right)$ and other related properties. In Section 55, we illustrate our results from Sections 3 and 4 in connection to various specific choices of $F$, including the case where $F$ follows the extended NewcombBenford law (Example 1). Finally, in Section 6, we generalize our convergence results to the situation where $X$ is extended to a multivariate random variable with values in the $k$-dimensional unit cube $[0,1)^{k}$ and each of the $k$ coordinates of $X$ is transformed by $T$.

We plan in a future paper to study the asymptotic behaviour of the remainder in other expansions, including a certain base- $\beta$ expansion of a random variable, namely when $q$ is replaced by $\beta=(1+\sqrt{5}) / 2$ (the golden ratio) in all places above.

## 2 Preliminaries

Let again the situation be as in (1)-(3). The following lemma is true in general (i.e., without assuming $F$ is absolutely continuous). As in [4], we define a base- $q$ fraction in $[0,1)$ to be a number of the form $\sum_{k=1}^{n} j_{k} q^{-k}$ with $\left(j_{1}, \ldots, j_{n}\right) \in\{0,1, \ldots, q-1\}^{n}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Lemma 2.1. If $F$ has no jump at any base-q fraction in $[0,1)$ then for every $x \in[0,1]$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
F_{n}(x)=\sum_{j=0}^{q^{n}-1} F\left(q^{-n}(j+x)\right)-F\left(q^{-n} j\right) . \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Clearly, (4) holds for $x=1$, so let $0 \leq x<1$. For $j_{1}, \ldots, j_{n} \in\{0,1, \ldots, q-1\}$ and $j=\sum_{i=1}^{n} j_{i} q^{n-i}$, the event that $X_{1}=j_{1}, \ldots, X_{n}=j_{n}$, and $T^{n}(X) \leq x$ is the same as the event that $q^{-n} j \leq X<q^{-n}(j+1)$ and $X \leq q^{-n}(j+x)$. Hence, since $0 \leq x<1$,

$$
F_{n}(x)=\sum_{j=0}^{q^{n}-1} \mathrm{P}\left(q^{-n} j \leq X \leq q^{-n}(j+x)\right)
$$

whereby (4) follows since $F(x)$ has no jumps at the base- $q$ fractions.
The property that $F$ has no jump at any base- $q$ fraction is of course satisfied when $F$ is continuous.

For the remainder of this section and the following Sections 35 we assume that $X$ has a probability density function (PDF) $f$ concentrated on ( 0,1 ), meaning that $F$ is absolutely continuous with $F(x)=\int_{-\infty}^{x} f(t) \mathrm{d} t$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, by (4), $F_{n}$ is absolutely continuous with PDF

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{n}(x)=q^{-n} \sum_{j=0}^{q^{n}-1} f\left(q^{-n}(j+x)\right) \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $0<x<1$.
In the following special case of $f$, convergence of $P_{n}$ is obtained within a finite number of steps.

Proposition 2.2. Let $m \geq 1$ be an integer. Then $P_{m}=\mu$ (and hence $P_{n}=\mu$ for $n=m, m+1, \ldots)$ if and only if for all $k \in\left\{0,1, \ldots, q^{m}-1\right\}$ and Lebesgue almost every $u \in[0,1)$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
f\left((k+u) q^{-m}\right)=q^{m} \mathrm{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} X_{i} q^{m-i}=k \mid T^{m}(X)=u\right) . \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

In particular, if $f$ is constant Lebesgue almost everywhere on each of the intervals $\left[j q^{-m},(j+1) q^{-m}\right), j=0,1, \ldots, q^{m}-1$, then for $n=m, m+1, \ldots, P_{n}=\mu$ and $\left(X_{1}, \ldots, X_{n}\right)$ is independent of $T^{n}(X)$.

Proof. If $P_{m}=\mu$ then by invariance of $\mu$ under $T, P_{n}=\mu$ for $n=m, m+1, \ldots$. Let $K=\sum_{i=1}^{m} X_{i} q^{m-i}$ and $U=T^{m}(X)$, so $X=(K+U) q^{-m}$. For Lebesgue almost every $t \in[0,1)$,

$$
f(t)=q^{m} \mathrm{P}\left(K=\left\lfloor q^{m} t\right\rfloor \mid U=q^{m} t-\left\lfloor q^{m} t\right\rfloor\right) f_{m}\left(q^{m} t-\left\lfloor q^{m} t\right\rfloor\right)
$$

since

$$
\begin{aligned}
& F(t)=\mathrm{P}\left((K+U) q^{-m} \leq t\right) \\
& =F\left(q^{-m}\left\lfloor q^{m} t\right\rfloor\right)+\int_{0}^{q^{m} t-\left\lfloor q^{m} t\right\rfloor} \mathrm{P}\left(K=\left\lfloor q^{m} t\right\rfloor \mid U=u\right) f_{m}(u) \mathrm{d} u .
\end{aligned}
$$

Thereby the first assertion follows.
Suppose that $c_{j}$ is a constant and $f=c_{j}$ Lebesgue almost everywhere on $\left[j q^{-m},(j+1) q^{-m}\right)$ for $j=0,1, \ldots, q^{m}-1$. Then

$$
\sum_{j=0}^{q^{m}-1} c_{j} q^{-m}=\sum_{j=0}^{q^{m}-1} \int_{j q^{-m}}^{(j+1) q^{-m}} c_{j}=\int_{0}^{1} f=1
$$

and so for Lebesgue almost all $x \in[0,1)$, (5) gives that $f_{m}(x)=1$. Therefore, $P_{m}=\mu$, and hence $P_{n}=\mu$ for $n=m, m+1, \ldots$ Consequently, the last assertion follows from (6), using that $\sum_{i=1}^{m} X_{i} q^{m-i}$ and ( $X_{1}, \ldots, X_{m}$ ) are in a one-to-one correspondence.

## 3 Couplings

Let $f$ be a PDF on $[0,1)$. We introduce the following notation. Let $I_{\emptyset}=I_{1 ; 0}=$ $[0,1)$ and $c_{\emptyset}=c_{1 ; 0}=\inf _{I_{\emptyset}} f$. For $n=1,2, \ldots$ and $x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots \in\{0,1, \ldots, q-1\}$, let $k=1+\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{i} q^{n-i}$ and

$$
I_{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}}=I_{k ; n}=\left[(k-1) q^{-n}, k q^{-n}\right)
$$

and

$$
c_{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}}=c_{k ; n}=\inf _{I_{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}}} f-\inf _{I_{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n-1}} f .} f .
$$

Recall that a function $f$ is lower semi-continuous at a point $x$ if for any sequence $y_{n} \rightarrow x$, it holds that $\liminf _{n} f\left(y_{n}\right) \geq f(x)$. Note that if $x=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_{n} q^{-n} \in[0,1)$ is not a base- $q$ fraction, then lower semi-continuity at $x$ is equivalent to

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(x)=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf _{y \in I_{x_{1}}, \ldots, x_{n}} f(y) . \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Write $U \sim \mu$ if $U$ is a uniformly distributed random variable on $[0,1)$.
Theorem 3.1. Suppose $f$ is lower semi-continuous at Lebesgue almost all points in $[0,1)$. Then there is a coupling between $X \sim f$ and a non-negative integer-valued random variable $N$ such that $T^{N}(X) \sim \mu$ is independent of $\left(X_{1}, \ldots, X_{N}\right)$.

Remark 1. Set $\{0,1, \ldots, q-1\}^{0}=\{\emptyset\}$ so we interpret $\emptyset$ as no digits. Then $\left(X_{1}, \ldots, X_{N}\right)$ is a discrete random variable with state space $\cup_{n=0}^{\infty}\{0,1, \ldots, q-1\}^{n}$.

Commonly used PDFs are lower semi-continuous almost everywhere. For an example where this condition does not hold, let $0<\epsilon_{k ; n}<q^{-n}$ such that $a=$ $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{q^{n}} \epsilon_{k ; n}<0$. Further, let $J_{k ; n}=\left[(k-1) q^{-n},(k-1) q^{-n}+\epsilon_{k ; n}\right], G=$ $\cup_{n=0}^{\infty} \cup_{k=1}^{q^{n}} J_{k ; n}$, and $H=[0,1) \backslash G$. Then $H$ is a Borel set with $0<\mu(H) \leq 1$, since $\mu\left(J_{k ; n}\right)=\epsilon_{k ; n}$ and so $\mu(G) \leq a<1$. Hence, the uniform distribution $\mu_{H}$ on $H$ is absolutely continuous. Since $H$ contains no base-q fraction and the set of base-q fractions is dense in $[0,1)$, any interval will contain points not in $H$. Now, any PDF $f$ for $\mu_{H}$ will be zero outside $H \cup A$ for some nullset $A$ (depending on the version of $f$ ), so for all integers $n \geq 0$ and $1 \leq k \leq q^{n}$, $f$ will be zero on $I_{k ; n} \backslash(H \cup A) \neq \emptyset$. Thus the right hand side in (7) is zero, so $f$ is not lower semi-continuous anywhere.

Proof. For Lebesgue almost all $x=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_{n} q^{-n} \in[0,1)$ with $x_{n}=\left\lfloor T^{n-1}(x) q\right\rfloor$, assuming $x$ is not a base- $q$ fraction (recalling that the set of base- $q$ fractions is a

Lebesgue nullset), (7) gives

$$
\begin{align*}
f(x) & =\inf _{I_{\emptyset}} f+\left(\inf _{I_{x_{1}}} f-\inf _{I_{\emptyset}} f\right)+\left(\inf _{I_{x_{1}, x_{2}}} f-\inf _{I_{x_{1}}} f\right)+\ldots \\
& =\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}} . \tag{8}
\end{align*}
$$

Let $N$ be a random variable such that for $f(x)>0$, conditionally on $X=x$,

$$
\mathrm{P}(N=n \mid X=x)=c_{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}} / f(x), \quad n=0,1, \ldots
$$

By (8) and since $c_{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}} \geq 0$, this is a well-defined conditional distribution.
By Bayes theorem, conditioned on $N=n$ with $\mathrm{P}(N=n)>0, X$ follows an absolutely continuous distribution with PDF

$$
f(x \mid n)=c_{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}} / \mathrm{P}(N=n) .
$$

Therefore, since $f(x \mid n)$ is constant on each of the intervals $I_{k ; n}$, conditioned on $N=n$ we immediately see that $\left(X_{1}, \ldots, X_{n}\right)$ (interpreted as nothing if $n=0$ ) and $T^{n}(X)$ are independent and that $T^{n}(X) \sim \mu$. The latter implies that $T^{N}(X) \sim \mu$ is independent of $N$. Consequently, if we do not condition on $N$, we have that $\left(X_{1}, \ldots, X_{N}\right)$ and $T^{N}(X) \sim \mu$ are independent.

Corollary 3.2. For the coupling construction in the proof of Theorem 3.1, conditioned on $X=x$ with $f(x)>0$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{P}(N \leq n \mid X=x)=\sum_{k=0}^{n} c_{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{k}} / f(x), \quad n=0,1, \ldots \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $x_{k}=\left\lfloor T^{k-1}(x) q\right\rfloor$ for $1 \leq k \leq n$. Moreover,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{P}(N \leq n)=q^{-n} \sum_{k=1}^{q^{n}} \inf _{L_{k ; n}} f, \quad n=0,1, \ldots \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Remark 2. Corollary 3.2 is used in Section 5 to quantify how many digits are needed to make the remainder uniformly distributed with sufficiently high probability.

Since a PDF is only defined up to a set of measure zero, it is possible for a distribution to have several PDFs that are almost everywhere lower semi-continuous but give rise to different constants $c_{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}}$. Hence the distribution of $\left(X_{1}, \ldots, X_{N}\right)$ is not uniquely defined. For example, if $X \sim \mu$, letting $f$ be the indicator function on $[0,1)$ gives $N=0$ almost surely, whilst letting $f$ be the indicator function on $[0,1) \backslash\left\{x_{0}\right\}$ for some $x_{0} \in[0,1)$ gives $\mathrm{P}(N \leq n)=1-q^{-n}$. By 10$\}$, in order to make $N$ as small as possible, we prefer a version of $f$ which is as large as possible.

Proof. The proof of Theorem 3.1 gives immediately (9). Thus, for $n=0,1, \ldots$,

$$
\mathrm{P}(N \leq n)=\int_{0}^{1} \mathrm{P}(N \leq n \mid X=x) f(x) \mathrm{d} x=\sum_{k=0}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{q^{k}} c_{j ; k} q^{-k} .
$$

So $\mathrm{P}(N=0)=c_{\emptyset}$ in agreement with 10). For $n=1,2, \ldots$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=0}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{q^{k}} c_{j ; k} q^{-k} & =c_{\emptyset}+\sum_{k=1}^{n} \sum_{\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{k}\right) \in\{0,1, \ldots, q-1\}^{k}} c_{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{k} q^{-k}} \\
& =\inf _{I_{\emptyset}} f+\sum_{x_{1} \in\{0,1, \ldots, q-1\}}\left(\inf _{I_{x_{1}}} f-\inf _{I_{\emptyset}} f\right) q^{-1}+\ldots \\
& +\sum_{\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right) \in\{0,1, \ldots, q-1\}^{n}}\left(\inf _{I_{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}}} f-\inf _{I_{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n-1}}}\right) q^{-n} \\
& =q^{-n} \sum_{\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right) \in\{0,1, \ldots, q-1\}^{n}} \inf _{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}} f \\
& =q^{-n} \sum_{j=1}^{q^{n}} \inf _{I_{j ; n}} f .
\end{aligned}
$$

Thereby (10) follows.
Corollary 3.3. Let the situation be as in Theorem 3.1. The output of the following simulation algorithm is distributed as $X \sim f$ :
(a) Draw $N$ from 10 .
(b) Conditionally on $N$, generate a discrete random variable $K$ with

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{P}(K=k-1 \mid N=n) \propto c_{k ; n}, \quad k=1, \ldots, q^{n}, n=0,1, \ldots \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

(c) Independently of $(N, K)$ pick a random variable $U \sim \mu$.
(d) Output $(K+U) q^{-N}$.

Proof. Let $a_{n}=\sum_{k=1}^{q^{n}} c_{k ; n}$ be the normalizing constant in 11). Conditioned on $N=n$ with $\mathrm{P}(N=n)>0$, steps (b) and (c) give that $U \sim \mu$ and $K$ are independent, so the conditional distribution of $(K+U) q^{-N}$ is absolutely continuous with a conditional PDF given by

$$
f(x \mid n)=q^{n} c_{k ; n} / a_{n} \quad \text { if } x \in I_{k ; n} .
$$

Moreover, we get from (10) that $\mathrm{P}(N=0)=c_{\emptyset}$ and

$$
\mathrm{P}(N=n)=\mathrm{P}(N \leq n)-\mathrm{P}(N<n)=a_{n} q^{-n}, \quad n=1,2, \ldots
$$

Therefore, the (unconditional) distribution of $(K+U) q^{-N}$ is absolutely continuous with a PDF which at each point $x=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_{n} q^{n} \in[0,1)$ with $x_{n}=\left\lfloor T^{n-1}(x) q\right\rfloor$ is given by

$$
\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} f(x \mid n) \mathrm{P}(N=n)=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} q^{n}\left(c_{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}} / a_{n}\right) a_{n} q^{-n}=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}} .
$$

This PDF agrees with (8), so $(K+U) q^{-N} \sim f$.
Denote by $\mathcal{B}$ the class of Borel subsets of $[0,1)$. The total variation distance between two probability measures $\nu_{1}$ and $\nu_{2}$ defined on $\mathcal{B}$ and with PDFs $g_{1}$ and $g_{2}$, respectively, is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
d_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(\nu_{1}, \nu_{2}\right)=\sup _{A \in \mathcal{B}}\left|\nu_{1}(A)-\nu_{2}(A)\right|=\frac{1}{2}\left\|g_{1}-g_{2}\right\|_{1} \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

see e.g. Lemma 2.1 in [11]. Then Theorem 3.1 shows the following.
Corollary 3.4. Let the situation be as in Theorem 3.1. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
d_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(P_{n}, \mu\right) \leq \mathrm{P}(N>n), \quad n=0,1, \ldots \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Remark 3. In general the coupling inequality (13) is sharp: For $n=0,1, \ldots$, let $b_{n}=1-d_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(P_{n}, \mu\right)=\int_{0}^{1} \min \left\{1, f_{n}(t)\right\} \mathrm{d} t$ (with $f_{0}=f$ ). It is well-known that $b_{n}$ is the maximal number such that there exists a coupling between $T^{n}(X) \sim P_{n}$ and a uniform random variable $U \sim \mu$ for which $T^{n}(X)=U$ with probability $b_{n}$ (see e.g. Theorem 8.2 in [10]). Thus $d_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(P_{n}, \mu\right)=\mathrm{P}(N>n)$ if and only if $\int_{0}^{1} \min \left\{1, f_{n}(t)\right\} \mathrm{d} t=q^{-n} \sum_{k=1}^{q^{n}} \inf _{I_{k ; n}} f$. In particular, $d_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(P_{0}, \mu\right)=\mathrm{P}(N>0)$ if and only if $X \sim \mu$.

It follows from Corollary 3.2 and 3.4 that (7) implies $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} d_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(P_{n}, \mu\right)=0$. In Theorem 4.1 below we show that (7) is not needed for this convergence result.

Proof. Using Corollary 3.3, let $X=(K+U) q^{-N}$. For $n=0,1, \ldots$, if $Q_{n}$ denotes the probability distribution of $T^{n}(U)$, then $Q_{n}=\mu$, and so

$$
d_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(P_{n}, \mu\right)=d_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(P_{n}, Q_{n}\right) \leq \mathrm{P}\left(T^{n}(X) \neq T^{n}(U)\right) \leq \mathrm{P}(N>n),
$$

where the first inequality is the standard coupling inequality for the coupled random variables $T^{n}(X)$ and $T^{n}(U)$, and the last inequality follows since $N \leq n$ implies $T^{n}(X)=T^{n}(U)$. Thereby (13) is verified.

Remark 4. By the Kantorovich-Rubinstein theorem, the Wasserstein distance between two probability measures $\nu_{1}$ and $\nu_{2}$ on $[0,1]$ is given by

$$
W_{1}\left(\nu_{1}, \nu_{2}\right)=\inf _{\gamma \in \Gamma\left(\nu_{1}, \nu_{2}\right)}\left\{\mathrm{E}\left|Y_{1}-Y_{2}\right| \mid\left(Y_{1}, Y_{2}\right) \sim \gamma\right\}
$$

where $\Gamma\left(\nu_{1}, \nu_{2}\right)$ consists of all couplings of $\nu_{1}$ and $\nu_{2}$. By [6, Thm 4],

$$
W_{1}\left(\nu_{1}, \nu_{2}\right) \leq d_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(\nu_{1}, \nu_{2}\right)
$$

so by Remark 3, Corollary 3.4 implies

$$
W_{1}\left(P_{n}, \mu\right) \leq \mathrm{P}(N>n) \rightarrow 0
$$

The latter bound can be improved by using the coupling between $T^{n}(X)$ and $T^{N}(X) \sim$ $\mu$ to obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
W_{1}\left(P_{n}, \mu\right) & \leq \mathrm{E}\left|\left(T^{n}(X)-T^{N}(X)\right) 1_{N>n}\right| \\
& \leq \int_{0}^{1} \max \{|x|,|x-1|\} \mathrm{d} x \mathrm{P}(N>n) \\
& =\frac{1}{4} \mathrm{P}(N>n)
\end{aligned}
$$

See also [6] for an overview of the relation between the total variation distance and other measures of distance between probability measures.

## 4 Asymptotic results

We need some notation for the following theorem. For a real, measurable function $g$ defined on $(0,1)$, denote its $L_{1^{-}}$and supremum-norm by $\|g\|_{1}=\int_{0}^{1}|g(t)| \mathrm{d} t$ and $\|g\|_{\infty}=\sup _{x \in(0,1)}|g(x)|$, respectively, and denote the corresponding $L_{1}$-space by $L_{1}(0,1)=\left\{g \mid\|g\|_{1}<\infty\right\}$ (here, $\|g\|_{\infty}$ may be infinite when there are no further assumptions on $g)$. Let $\bar{L}_{1}(0,1)=\left\{g \mid \int_{0}^{1} g(t) d t=1,\|g\|_{1}<\infty\right\}$ be the subset of functions with finite $L_{1}$-norm and integral over $[0,1]$ equal one, and $\bar{L}_{1}^{\prime}(0,1) \subset \bar{L}_{1}(0,1)$ its subset of differentiable functions $g$ such that $\left\|g^{\prime}\right\|_{\infty}<\infty$. For $g \in \bar{L}_{1}^{\prime}(0,1), n \in \mathbb{N}, j=0,1, \ldots, q^{n}-1$, and $0<x<1$, define $g_{n, j}^{\prime}(x)=g^{\prime}(x)$ if $q^{-n} j<x<q^{-n}(j+1)$ and $g_{n, j}^{\prime}(x)=0$ otherwise, and define

$$
\begin{equation*}
g_{n}(x)=q^{-n} \sum_{j=0}^{q^{n}-1} g\left(q^{-n}(j+x)\right) \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Henceforth, we also think of $f$ as an element of $\bar{L}_{1}(0,1)$.

Theorem 4.1. If $f \in \bar{L}_{1}(0,1)$ and $g \in \bar{L}_{1}^{\prime}(0,1)$ then

$$
\begin{equation*}
d_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(P_{n}, \mu\right) \leq \frac{1}{2}\|f-g\|_{1}+\frac{1}{6} q^{-2 n} \sum_{j=0}^{q^{n}-1}\left\|g_{n, j}^{\prime}\right\|_{\infty} \leq \frac{1}{2}\|f-g\|_{1}+\frac{1}{6} q^{-n}\left\|g^{\prime}\right\|_{\infty} \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

In particular,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} d_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(P_{n}, \mu\right)=0 \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

and we have the following sharper convergence results. If $f \in \bar{L}_{1}^{\prime}(0,1)$ then $P_{n}$ converges exponentially fast:

$$
\begin{equation*}
d_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(P_{n}, \mu\right) \leq \frac{1}{6} q^{-2 n} \sum_{j=0}^{q^{n}-1}\left\|f_{n, j}^{\prime}\right\|_{\infty} \leq \frac{1}{6} q^{-n}\left\|f^{\prime}\right\|_{\infty} \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $\|f\|_{\infty}<\infty$ and $f$ is continuous except for finitely many points, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|f_{n}(x)-1\right| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text { uniformly for } x \in(0,1) . \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $f$ is twice differentiable with $\left\|f^{\prime \prime}\right\|_{\infty}<\infty$ then we have the following improvement of (17):

$$
\begin{align*}
d_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(P_{n}, \mu\right) & =\frac{1}{8} q^{-2 n}\left|\sum_{j=0}^{q^{n}-1} f^{\prime}\left(\xi_{n j}\right)\right|+O\left(\left\|f^{\prime \prime}\right\|_{\infty} q^{-2 n}\right) \\
& \leq \frac{1}{8} q^{-n}\left\|f^{\prime}\right\|_{\infty}+O\left(\left\|f^{\prime \prime}\right\|_{\infty} q^{-2 n}\right) \tag{19}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\xi_{n, j} \in\left(q^{-n} j, q^{-n}(j+1)\right)$ is arbitrary.
Before proving this theorem we need the following lemma.
Lemma 4.2. Let $f \in \bar{L}_{1}(0,1), g \in \bar{L}_{1}^{\prime}(0,1)$. For every $x \in(0,1)$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|g_{n}(x)-1\right| \leq q^{-2 n}\left(x^{2}-x+\frac{1}{2}\right) \sum_{j=0}^{q^{n}-1}\left\|g_{n, j}^{\prime}\right\|_{\infty} \leq \frac{1}{2} q^{-n}\left\|g^{\prime}\right\|_{\infty}, \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{0}^{1}\left|f_{n}(x)-g_{n}(x)\right| \mathrm{d} x \leq\|f-g\|_{1} \tag{21}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $g$ is twice differentiable on $(0,1)$ with $\left\|g^{\prime \prime}\right\|_{\infty}<\infty$ then for every $x \in(0,1)$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
g_{n}(x)-1=q^{-2 n}\left(x-\frac{1}{2}\right) \sum_{j=0}^{q^{n}-1} g^{\prime}\left(\xi_{n, j}\right)+O\left(\left\|g^{\prime \prime}\right\|_{\infty} q^{-2 n}\right), \tag{22}
\end{equation*}
$$

where each $\xi_{n, j} \in\left(q^{-n} j, q^{-n}(j+1)\right)$ is arbitrary.

Remark 5. Of course, (20) and (22) hold with $g_{n}$ replaced by $f_{n}$ if $f$ is differentiable respectively twice differentiable with $\left\|f^{\prime \prime}\right\|_{\infty}<\infty$. For Example 2 below it is useful to realize that in (22), $q^{-n} \sum_{j=0}^{q^{n}-1} g^{\prime}\left(\xi_{n, j}\right)$ is a Riemann sum for the integral $\int_{0}^{1} g^{\prime}(t) \mathrm{d} t$.

Proof. Let $x \in(0,1)$. From 14 we have

$$
\begin{align*}
g_{n}(x)-1 & =\sum_{j=0}^{q^{n}-1} \int_{q^{-n} j}^{q^{-n}(j+1)}\left[g\left(q^{-n}(j+x)\right)-g(t)\right] \mathrm{d} t \\
& =\sum_{j=0}^{q^{n}-1} \int_{0}^{1} q^{-n}\left[g\left(q^{-n}(j+x)\right)-g\left(q^{-n}(j+y)\right)\right] \mathrm{d} y \tag{23}
\end{align*}
$$

If $g$ is differentiable on $(0,1)$ with $\left\|g^{\prime}\right\|_{\infty}<\infty$, we get by the mean value theorem,

$$
\left|g\left(q^{-n}(j+x)\right)-g\left(q^{-n}(j+y)\right)\right| \leq\left\|g_{n, j}^{\prime}\right\|_{\infty} q^{-n}|x-y|
$$

which yields the bound

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|g_{n}(x)-1\right| \leq q^{-2 n} \int_{0}^{1}|x-y| \mathrm{d} y \sum_{j=0}^{q^{n}-1}\left\|g_{n, j}^{\prime}\right\|_{\infty}=q^{-2 n}\left(x^{2}-x+\frac{1}{2}\right) \sum_{j=0}^{q^{n}-1}\left\|g_{n, j}^{\prime}\right\|_{\infty} \tag{24}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thereby (20) follows. Moreover,

$$
\begin{align*}
\int_{0}^{1}\left|f_{n}(x)-g_{n}(x)\right| \mathrm{d} x & \leq \sum_{j=0}^{q^{n}-1} \int_{0}^{1} q^{-n}\left|f\left(q^{-n}(j+x)\right)-g\left(q^{-n}(j+x)\right)\right| \mathrm{d} x \\
& =\|f-g\|_{1} \tag{25}
\end{align*}
$$

whereby (21) follows. If $g$ is twice differentiable on $(0,1)$ with $\left\|g^{\prime \prime}\right\|_{\infty}<\infty$, the mean value theorem gives
$g\left(q^{-n}(j+x)\right)-g\left(q^{-n}(j+y)\right)=g^{\prime}\left(\xi_{x, y}\right) q^{-n}(x-y)=g^{\prime}\left(\xi_{n, j}\right) q^{-n}(x-y)+O\left(\left\|g^{\prime \prime}\right\|_{\infty} q^{-2 n}\right)$, where $\xi_{x, y} \in\left(q^{-n} j, q^{-n}(j+1)\right)$ depends on $x$ and $y$ and $\xi_{n, j} \in\left(q^{-n} j, q^{-n}(j+1)\right)$ is arbitrary. The second equality was obtained by applying the mean value theorem to $g^{\prime}\left(\xi_{x, y}\right)-g^{\prime}\left(\xi_{n, j}\right)$. Inserting this into (23) yields

$$
g_{n}(x)-1=q^{-2 n} \sum_{j=0}^{q^{n}-1} g^{\prime}\left(\xi_{n, j}\right) \int_{0}^{1}(x-y) \mathrm{d} y+O\left(\left\|g^{\prime \prime}\right\|_{\infty} q^{-2 n}\right)
$$

which reduces to 22 .

We are now ready for the proof of Theorem 4.1.
Proof. We have

$$
\begin{align*}
d_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(P_{n}, \mu\right) & =\frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{1}\left|f_{n}(x)-1\right| \mathrm{d} x \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{1}\left|f_{n}(x)-g_{n}(x)\right| \mathrm{d} x+\frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{1}\left|g_{n}(x)-1\right| \mathrm{d} x \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2}\|f-g\|_{1}+\frac{1}{6} q^{-2 n} \sum_{j=0}^{q^{n}-1}\left\|g_{n j}^{\prime}\right\|_{\infty}  \tag{26}\\
& \leq \frac{1}{2}\|f-g\|_{1}+\frac{1}{6} q^{-n}\left\|g^{\prime}\right\|_{\infty}
\end{align*}
$$

where we get the equality from $(\sqrt{12})$ and the second inequality from $(20),(21)$, and since $\int_{0}^{1}\left(x^{2}-x+1 / 2\right) \mathrm{d} x=1 / 3$. Thereby (15) is verified. Taking $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (15) and using that $\bar{L}_{1}^{\prime}(0,1)$ is dense in $\bar{L}_{1}(0,1)$, we get 16 . Equation 17 follows from (15) by setting $g=f$.

For the proof of 18 we suppose $f$ is continuous except at $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{m} \in(0,1)$ and set $x_{0}=0$ and $x_{m+1}=1$. Let $\delta>0$ and

$$
\begin{aligned}
I_{n} & =\left\{j \in\left\{0,1, \ldots, q^{n}-1\right\}\left|\exists i \in\{0,1, \ldots, m+1\}:\left|q^{-n} j-x_{i}\right|<\delta\right\}\right. \\
J_{n} & =\left\{0,1, \ldots, q^{n}-1\right\} \backslash I_{n}
\end{aligned}
$$

By (23),

$$
\begin{align*}
f_{n}(x)-1 & =\sum_{j \in I_{n}} \int_{q^{-n} j}^{q^{-n}(j+1)}\left(f\left(q^{-n}(j+x)\right)-f(t)\right) \mathrm{d} t \\
& +\sum_{j \in J_{n}} \int_{q^{-n} j}^{q^{-n}(j+1)}\left(f\left(q^{-n}(j+x)\right)-f(t)\right) \mathrm{d} t \tag{27}
\end{align*}
$$

Given $\varepsilon>0$, we choose $\delta$ so that $\delta<\varepsilon /\left(6(m+2)\|f\|_{\infty}\right)$. Then, since the cardinality of $I_{n}$ is at most $(m+2)\left(2 q^{n} \delta+1\right)$, the first sum in 27 is bounded by

$$
\left(\frac{2 q^{n} \varepsilon}{6\|f\|_{\infty}}+m+2\right) q^{-n}\|f\|_{\infty}=\frac{\varepsilon}{3}+(m+2) q^{-n}\|f\|_{\infty}<\frac{\varepsilon}{2}
$$

for $n$ sufficiently large. Moreover, for $n$ large enough, the second sum in (27) is bounded by $\varepsilon / 2$ since $f$ is uniformly continuous on $(0,1) \backslash \bigcup_{i=0}^{m+1}\left(x_{i}-\delta / 2, x_{i}+\delta / 2\right)$, which is a closed set. Thus, for large enough $n,\left|f_{n}(x)-1\right|<\varepsilon$ which gives (18) since $\varepsilon>0$ is arbitrary.

To prove (19) we use (22) with $g$ replaced by $f$. Then, for every $A \in \mathcal{B}$,

$$
\int_{A}\left(f_{n}(t)-1\right) \mathrm{d} t=q^{-2 n} \int_{A}\left(t-\frac{1}{2}\right) \mathrm{d} t \sum_{j=0}^{q^{n}-1} f^{\prime}\left(\xi_{n j}\right)+O\left(\left\|f^{\prime \prime}\right\|_{\infty} q^{-2 n}\right)
$$

We have

$$
\sup _{A \in \mathcal{B}}\left|\int_{A}\left(t-\frac{1}{2}\right) \mathrm{d} t\right|=\frac{1}{2} \sup _{A \in \mathcal{B}}\left|\int_{A}\right| 2 t-1|\mathrm{~d} t|=\frac{1}{4} \int_{0}^{1}(2 t-1) \mathrm{d} t=\frac{1}{8}
$$

where the second identity follows from (12). This gives (19).
Remark 6. In continuation of Remark 3, by Theorem 4.1, $b_{n} \rightarrow 1$ and under weak conditions the convergence is exponentially fast.

## 5 So how many digits are needed?

This section starts with some theoretical statistical considerations and continues then with some specific examples.

Consider a parametric model for the probability distribution of $X$ given by a parametric class of lower semi-continuous densities $f_{\theta}$ where $\theta$ is an unknown parameter. By Theorem 3.1 this specifies a parametric model for $\left(X_{1}, \ldots, X_{N}\right)$ which is independent of $T^{N}(X) \sim \mu$. In practice we cannot expect $N$ to be observable, but let us imaging it is. Then, according to general statistical principles (see e.g. []), statistical inference for $\theta$ should be based on the sufficient statistic $\left(X_{1}, \ldots, X_{N}\right)$, whilst $T^{N}(X)$ is an ancillary statistic and hence contains no information about $\theta$. Moreover, Theorem 4.1 ensures (without assuming that the densities are lower semi-continuous) that $T^{n}(X)$ is approximately uniformly distributed. Hence, if $n$ is 'large enough', nearly all information about $\theta$ is contained in $\left(X_{1}, \ldots, X_{n}\right)$.

Remark 7. For another paper it could be interesting to consider a so-called missing data approach for a parametric model of the distribution of $\left(X_{1}, \ldots, X_{N}\right)$, with an unknown parameter $\theta$ and treating $N$ as an unobserved statistic (the missing data): Suppose $X^{(1)}, \ldots, X^{(k)}$ are IID copies of $X$, with corresponding 'sufficient statistics' $\left(X_{1}^{(i)}, \ldots, X_{N^{(i)}}^{(i)}\right), i=1, \ldots, k$. The EM-algorithm may be used for estimation of $\theta$. Or a Bayesian approach may be used, imposing a prior distribution for $\theta$ and then considering the posterior distribution of $\left(N^{(1)}, \ldots, N^{(k)}, \theta\right)$.

According to Corollary 3.2, the number of digits we need will in general depend on the realization of $X=x$. As a measure for this dependence, for $f(x)>0$ and
$n=0,1, \ldots$, we may consider $\mathrm{P}(N>n \mid X=x)$ as a function of $x$, which can be calculated from (9). Since $N \leq n$ implies $T^{n}(X) \sim \mu$, an overall measure which quantifies the number $n$ of digits needed is given by $\mathrm{P}(N>n)$, cf. 10). The use of these measures requires that $f$ is lower semi-continuous, whilst the bounds in Theorem 4.1 for the total variation distance $d_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(P_{n}, \mu\right)$ hold without this condition. The following Examples 1 and 2 demonstrate how these measures can be used to quantify the number $n$ of digits needed in order that $N>n$ (conditioned or not on $X=x)$ with a small probability or that $d_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(P_{n}, \mu\right)$ is small.

Example 1. Any number $y \neq 0$ can uniquely be written as $y=s q^{k}\left(y_{0}+y_{f}\right)$ where $s=s(y) \in\{ \pm 1\}$ is the sign of $y, k=k(y) \in \mathbb{Z}$ determines the decimal point of $y$ in base- $q, y_{0}=y_{0}(y) \in\{1, \ldots, q-1\}$ is the leading digit of $y$ in base- $q$, and $y_{0}+y_{f}$ is the so-called significand of $y$ in base- $q$, where $y_{f}=y_{f}(y) \in[0,1)$ is the fractional part of $y_{0}+y_{f}$ in base- $q$. Correspondingly, consider any realvalued random variable $Y \neq 0$ (or just $\mathrm{P}(Y=0)=0$ ), so (almost surely) $Y=$ $S q^{K}\left(X_{0}+X\right)$ where $S=s(Y), K=k(Y), X_{0}=y_{0}(Y)$, and $X=y_{f}(Y)$ are random variables. Let $X_{1}, X_{2}, \ldots$ be the digits of $X$ in the base- $q$ expansion, cf. (3). We call $X_{0}, X_{1}, X_{2}, \ldots$ the significant digits of $Y$ in base- $q$. By definition $Y$ satisfies the extended Newcomb-Benford law if

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{P}\left(X_{0}=x_{0}, \ldots, X_{n}=x_{n}\right)=\log _{q}\left(1+1 / \sum_{j=0}^{n} q^{n-j} x_{j}\right) \tag{28}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $n=0,1, \ldots$ and any $x_{0} \in\{1, \ldots, q-1\}$ and $x_{j} \in\{0,1, \ldots, q-1\}$ with $1 \leq j \leq$ n. Equivalently, the log-significand of $Y$ in base-q, $\log _{q}\left(X_{0}+X\right)$, is uniformly distributed on $[0,1)$ (Theorem 4.2 in [2]). Then $X$ has CDF and PDF given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
F(x)=\sum_{j=1}^{q-1}\left(\log _{q}(j+x)-\log _{q} j\right), \quad f(x)=\sum_{j=1}^{q-1} \frac{1}{\ln q} \frac{1}{j+x}, \tag{29}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $0 \leq x \leq 1$.
The extended Newcomb-Benford law applies to a wide variety of real datasets, see [7, 2] and the references therein. The law is equivalent to appealing scale invariance properties: Equation (28) is equivalent to that $Y$ has scale invariant significant digits (Theorem 5.3 in [2]) or just that there exists some $d \in\{1, \ldots$, $q-1\}$ such that $\mathrm{P}\left(y_{0}(a Y)=d\right)$ does not depend on $a>0$ (Theorem 5.8 in [2]). Remarkably, for any positive random variable $Z$ which is independent of $Y$, if the extended Newcomb-Benford law is satisfied by $Y$, it is also satisfied by $Y Z$ (Theorem 8.12 in [2]).


Figure 1: Left panel: $\mathrm{P}(N>n)$ as a function of $n$ for $q=2,3,5,10$. Middle panel: $\mathrm{P}(N>1 \mid X=x)$ as a function of $x$ for $q=10$. Right panel: An upper bound for $\mathrm{P}(N>n \mid X=x)$ as a function of $x$ for $n=0,1,2,3$ and $q=10$.

For the remainder of this example, suppose (28) is satisfied. Considering (10) gives for $n=0,1, \ldots$ that

$$
\mathrm{P}(N \leq n)=\frac{q^{-n}}{\ln q} \sum_{j=1}^{q-1} \sum_{k=1}^{q^{n}} \frac{1}{j+k q^{-n}} .
$$

The tail probabilities $\mathrm{P}(N>n)$ decrease quickly as $n$ and $q$ increase, see the left panel in Figure 1 for plots of $\mathrm{P}(N>n)$ against $n$ for $q=2,3,5,10$. The middle panel of Figure 1 shows $\mathrm{P}(N>1 \mid X=x)$ as a function of $x$ for $q=10$. We see large fluctuations, with probabilities dropping to zero when approaching the right limit of the intervals $I_{k ; 1}$, where $\inf _{I_{k ; 1}} f$ is attained. To avoid these fluctuations, the right panel of Figure 1 shows an upper bound on $\mathrm{P}(N>n \mid X=x)$ as a function of $x$ for $q=10$ and $n=0,1,2,3$. The upper bound is found by noting that on each $I_{k ; n}, \mathrm{P}(N>n \mid X=x)$ is convex decreasing towards zero. Hence an upper bound is given by evaluating at the left end points and interpolating linearly. The plot shows that $\mathrm{P}(N>n \mid X=x)$ is very close to zero for all $x$ already for $n=2$.

This is also in accordance with Theorem 4.1 stating that $T^{n}(X)$ converges to a uniform distribution on $[0,1)$ and hence the first digit $X_{n}$ of $T^{n}(X)$ is approximately uniformly distributed on $\{0,1, \ldots, q-1\}$ when $n$ is large. For $n=1,2, \ldots$


Figure 2: Left panel: $\mathrm{P}\left(X_{n}=0\right)-\mathrm{P}\left(X_{n}=q-1\right)$ as a function of $n$ for various values of $q$ when $f$ is as in (29). Right panel: $f_{n}$ when $q=2$ and $n=0, \ldots, 5$.
and $x_{n} \in\{0,1, \ldots, q-1\}$, we have

$$
\mathrm{P}\left(X_{n}=x_{n}\right)=\log _{q}\left(\prod_{j=1}^{q-1} \prod_{i=1}^{q^{n-1}}\left(1+\frac{1}{j q^{n}+(i-1) q+x_{n}}\right)\right)
$$

where $\mathrm{P}\left(X_{n}=x_{n}\right)$ is a decreasing function of $x_{n}$. The left part of Figure 2 shows plots of $\mathrm{P}\left(X_{n}=0\right)-\mathrm{P}\left(X_{n}=q-1\right)$ versus $n$ for $q=2,3,5,10$ indicating fast convergence to uniformity and that the convergence speed increases with $q$. The right part of Figure 2 illustrates the stronger statement in 18) that the PDF $f_{n}$ of $T^{n}(X)$ converges uniformly to the uniform PDF.

To further illustrate the fast convergence, we drew a sample of 1000 observations with CDF (29) and made a $\chi^{2}$ goodness-of-fit test for uniformity of $X_{n}$. Considering a significance level of 0.05 , the rejection rate for 10.000 repetitions is shown in Table 1. Such a $\chi^{2}$ test can also be used as a test for uniformity of the remainder $T^{n-1}(X)$. A more refined test can be performed by basing the goodness-of-fit test on $2^{k}$ combinations of the first $k$ digits $\left(X_{n}, \ldots, X_{n+k-1}\right)$. The result is shown in Table 1 for $k=1,2,3$. When $n=1$ we always rejected the hypothesis that $\left(X_{n}, \ldots, X_{n+k-1}\right)$ is uniformly distributed, when $n=2$ the rejection rate decreases as $k$ grows and it is 0.067 for $k=3$, and when $n \geq 3$ the rejection rates are close to 0.05 as expected if the hypothesis is true. When we instead tried with a sample

| $n$ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $k=1$ | 1.000 | 0.094 | 0.050 | 0.054 | 0.052 | 0.051 | 0.054 | 0.055 |
| $k=2$ | 1.000 | 0.081 | 0.047 | 0.050 | 0.051 | 0.053 | 0.052 | 0.047 |
| $k=3$ | 1.000 | 0.067 | 0.050 | 0.049 | 0.049 | 0.050 | 0.052 | 0.052 |

Table 1: Rejection rate for a $\chi^{2}$ goodness-of-fit test for uniformity of $\left(X_{n}, \ldots, X_{n+k-1}\right)$.
of 100 observations, even when $n=1$ the test had almost no power for $k=1,2,3$.

Example 2. To illustrate how the convergence rate in Theorem 4.1 depends on the smoothness of $f$, let $f(t)=\alpha t^{\alpha-1}$ be a beta-density with shape parameters $\alpha>0$ and 1 . Then, $f \in \bar{L}_{1}^{\prime}(0,1)$ if and only if $\alpha=1$ or $\alpha \geq 2$. Of course, $P_{n}$ and $\mu$ agree if $\alpha=1$. For $q=2$, Figure 2 shows plots of $d_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(P_{n}, \mu\right)$ and $\ln \left(d_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(P_{n}, \mu\right)\right)$ versus $n$ when $\alpha=0.1,0.5,1,1.5,5,10$ as well as a plot of $\ln \left(\frac{1}{8} q^{-2 n} \sum_{j=0}^{q^{n}-1}\left\|f_{n, j}^{\prime}\right\|_{\infty}\right)-$ $\ln \left(d_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(P_{n}, \mu\right)\right)$ (cf. 19p) versus $n$ when $\alpha=2,5,10$. For the calculation of $d_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(P_{n}, \mu\right)$ observe that $f_{n}^{\prime}$ is $<0$ if $\alpha<1$ and $>0$ if $\alpha>1$, so $f_{n}\left(x_{0}\right)=1$ for some unique $x_{0} \in(0,1)$, and hence since $F_{n}(0)-0=F_{n}(1)-1=0$,
$d_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(P_{n}, \mu\right)=\frac{1}{2}\left\|f_{n}-1\right\|_{1}=\frac{1}{2}\left|\int_{0}^{x_{0}}\left(f_{n}(t)-1\right) \mathrm{d} t\right|+\frac{1}{2}\left|\int_{x_{0}}^{1}\left(f_{n}(t)-1\right) \mathrm{d} t\right|=\left|F_{n}\left(x_{0}\right)-x_{0}\right|$.
We used the Newton-Raphson procedure to find $x_{0}$ (the procedure always converges).

The first plot in Figure 2 shows that for all values of $\alpha, d_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(P_{n}, \mu\right)$ goes to zero, as guaranteed by Theorem 4.1. The second plot indicates that for $\alpha>1$, $d_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(P_{n}, \mu\right)$ decays exponentially at a rate independent of $\alpha$, while for $\alpha<1$, the decay is also exponential, but with a slower rate. The graphs in the third plot seem to approach zero, indicating that for $\alpha \geq 2$, the rate of decay is indeed as given by (19), which holds since $f^{\prime \prime}$ is bounded. In the middle plot, the decay rate also seems to be $q^{-n}$ for $\alpha=1.5$, though this is not guaranteed by Theorem 4.1. To see why the rate $q^{-n}$ also holds for $1<\alpha<2$, we argue as follows. In (23), (24), and (26), we may refine to the cases $j=0$ and $j>0$ (observing that $\left\|f_{n, j}^{\prime}\right\|_{\infty}<\infty$ when $j>0$ ) to obtain the following modification of (17),

$$
d_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(P_{n}, \mu\right) \leq q^{-n}\left(\frac{1}{2}\left\|f_{n, 0}\right\|_{\infty}+\frac{1}{6} q^{-n} \sum_{j=1}^{q^{n}-1}\left\|f_{n, j}^{\prime}\right\|_{\infty}\right) .
$$



Figure 3: The first two plots show $d_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(P_{n}, \mu\right)$ and $\log \left(d_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(P_{n}, \mu\right)\right)$, respectively, as a function of $n$ for $q=2$ and various values of $\alpha$. The last plot shows the difference between $\log \left(\frac{1}{8} q^{-2 n} \sum_{j=0}^{q^{n}-1}\left\|f_{n, j}^{\prime}\right\|_{\infty}\right)$ and $\log \left(d_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(P_{n}, \mu\right)\right)$ for three values of $\alpha \geq 2$.

Furthermore, since $\left|f^{\prime}\right|$ is decreasing for $\alpha<2, \sum_{j=1}^{q^{n}-1}\left\|f_{n, j}^{\prime}\right\|_{\infty} q^{-n}$ is a lower Riemann sum for the improper Riemann integral $\int_{0}^{1}\left|f^{\prime}(t)\right| \mathrm{d} t$, which exists and is finite when $1<\alpha<2$. Consequently, for every $x \in(0,1)$,

$$
d_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(P_{n}, \mu\right) \leq q^{-n}\left(\frac{1}{2}\left\|f_{n, 0}\right\|_{\infty}+\frac{1}{6}\left\|f^{\prime}\right\|_{1}\right)
$$

As in Example 1, we tested for uniformity of $T^{n-1}(X)$ by a $\chi^{2}$ goodness-of-fit test for uniform distribution of the $k=3$ first digits $\left(X_{n}, X_{n+1}, X_{n+2}\right)$ again using 10.000 replications of samples of 1000 observations from a beta-distribution with $\alpha=0.1,0.5,1.5,2$. Table 2 shows that for $\alpha=0.1$, uniformity is rejected in all samples for all $n$ indicating that the distribution of the remainder remains far from uniform even for $n=8$. For $\alpha=0.5$, the rejection rate reaches the 0.05 level for $n=5$, while for $\alpha=1.5$, this happens already for $n=2$ and for $\alpha=5$ it happens around $n=3$ or $n=4$. For $\alpha>1$ close to 1 , the results are comparable to those for the Benford law in Example 1, while for large $\alpha$ and $\alpha<1$, the rejection rate is higher indicating slower convergence.

Remark 8. In conclusion, Examples 1 and 2 demonstrate that the answer to the title of our paper ('How many digits are needed?') of course depend much on $q$ (in Example 1, the higher $q$ is, the fewer digits are needed) and on how much $f$ deviates from the uniform PDF on $[0,1)$ (in Example 2 , the more skew $f$ is, the more digits are needed). Moreover, as this deviation increases or the sample size decreases, the $\chi^{2}$ goodness-of-fit test as used in the examples becomes less powerful; alternative tests are discussed in [8].

| $n$ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\alpha=0.1$ | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| $\alpha=0.5$ | 1.000 | 1.000 | 0.416 | 0.078 | 0.052 | 0.051 | 0.048 | 0.049 |
| $\alpha=1.5$ | 1.000 | 0.123 | 0.049 | 0.048 | 0.051 | 0.052 | 0.047 | 0.051 |
| $\alpha=5$ | 1.000 | 0.932 | 0.059 | 0.049 | 0.048 | 0.048 | 0.049 | 0.050 |

Table 2: Rejection rate for a $\chi^{2}$ goodness-of-fit test for uniformity of $\left(X_{n}, \ldots, X_{n+2}\right)$ in a beta-distribution for various values of $\alpha$.

## 6 The multivariate case

Theorem 4.1 extends as follows. For a given positive integer $k$, let now $X=$ $\left(X_{1}, \ldots, X_{k}\right)$ be a $k$-dimensional random variable with values in the unit cube $[0,1)^{k}$ so that its $\operatorname{CDF} F\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)=\mathrm{P}\left(X_{1} \leq x_{1}, \ldots, X_{k} \leq x_{k}\right)$ is absolutely continuous, and denote its multivariate PDF by $f$. Extend the function $T$ to be a function $T$ : $[0,1)^{k} \mapsto[0,1)^{k}$ so that $T\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{k}\right)=\left(T\left(x_{1}\right), \ldots, T\left(x_{k}\right)\right)$. For $n=1,2, \ldots$, denote the multivariate CDF of $T^{n}(X)$ by $F_{n}$. For a real Lebesgue integrable function $g$ defined on $(0,1)^{k}$, let $\|g\|_{1}=\int_{(0,1)^{k}}|g(t)| \mathrm{d} t$ and let $L_{1}\left((0,1)^{k}\right)$ be the set of such functions $g$ (i.e., $\|g\|_{1}<\infty$ ). For a real $k$-dimensional function $g=\left(g_{1}, \ldots, g_{k}\right)$ defined on $(0,1)^{k}$, let $\|g\|_{\infty}=\sup _{x \in(0,1)^{k}} \sqrt{g_{1}(x)^{2}+\ldots+g_{k}(x)^{2}}$. Define the set $\bar{L}_{1}\left((0,1)^{k}\right)=\left\{g \in L^{1}\left((0,1)^{k}\right) \mid \int_{(0,1)^{k}} g(t) \mathrm{d} t=1\right\}$ and $\bar{L}_{1}^{\prime}\left((0,1)^{k}\right)$ as its subset of differentiable functions $g$ with gradient

$$
\nabla g\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{k}\right)=\left(\frac{\partial g}{\partial x_{1}}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{k}\right), \ldots, \frac{\partial g}{\partial x_{k}}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{k}\right)\right)
$$

such that $\|\nabla g\|_{\infty}<\infty$. Thus, for $k=1, \bar{L}_{1}^{\prime}\left((0,1)^{k}\right)=\bar{L}_{1}^{\prime}(0,1)$ as used in Theorem 4.1. For $g \in \bar{L}_{1}^{\prime}\left((0,1)^{k}\right), n \in \mathbb{N}, j:=\left(j_{1}, \ldots, j_{k}\right) \in\{0,1, \ldots, q-1\}^{k}$, and $x=\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{k}\right) \in(0,1)^{k}$, define $\nabla g_{n, j}(x)=\nabla g(x)$ if $q^{-n} j_{i}<x_{i}<q^{-n}\left(j_{i}+1\right)$ for $i=1, \ldots, k$ and $\nabla g_{n, j}(x)=0$ otherwise, and define

$$
F_{g}(x)=\int_{0}^{x_{1}} \cdots \int_{0}^{x_{k}} g\left(t_{1}, \ldots, t_{k}\right) \mathrm{d} t_{1} \cdots \mathrm{~d} t_{k}
$$

For notational convenience, we can consider $F$ and $F_{n}$ to be functions defined on $(0,1)^{k}$, so $F=F_{f}$. Let $e=(1, \cdots, 1)$, that is $x$ with each component equal to 1 , and as a short hand notation write $\sum_{j=0}^{\left(q^{n}-1\right) e} \ldots$ for $\sum_{j_{1}=0}^{q^{n}-1} \cdots \sum_{j_{k}=0}^{q^{n}-1} \ldots$, and for a real function $g$ defined on $(0,1)^{k}, n=1,2, \ldots$, and $x \in(0,1)^{k}$, let

$$
g_{n}(x)=q^{-n k} \sum_{j=0}^{\left(q^{n}-1\right) e} g\left(q^{-n}(j+x)\right) .
$$

Then, as in (5), we see that $F_{n}$ is absolutely continuous with PDF $f_{n}$. Finally, let $P_{n}$ be the probability distribution with $\operatorname{CDF} F_{n}, \mu$ Lebesgue measure on $[0,1)^{k}$, and $d_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(P_{n}, \mu\right)$ the total variation distance between these measure (where 12) extends to the multivariate case with obvious modifications).

Theorem 6.1. If $g \in \bar{L}_{1}^{\prime}\left((0,1)^{k}\right)$ then

$$
\begin{align*}
d_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(P_{n}, \mu\right) & \leq \frac{1}{2}\|f-g\|_{1}+\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{k}{3}} q^{-n(k+1)} \sum_{j=0}^{\left(q^{n}-1\right) e}\left\|\nabla g_{n, j}\right\|_{\infty}  \tag{30}\\
& \leq \frac{1}{2}\|f-g\|_{1}+\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{k}{3}} q^{-n}\|\nabla g\|_{\infty} . \tag{31}
\end{align*}
$$

In particular,

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} d_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(P_{n}, \mu\right)=0
$$

Furthermore, if $f \in \bar{L}_{1}^{\prime}\left((0,1)^{k}\right)$ then $P_{n}$ converges exponentially fast:

$$
d_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(P_{n}, \mu\right) \leq \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{k}{3}} q^{-n(k+1)} \sum_{j=0}^{\left(q^{n}-1\right) e}\left\|\nabla f_{n, j}\right\|_{\infty} \leq \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{k}{3}} q^{-n}\|\nabla f\|_{\infty}
$$

Finally, if $\|f\|_{\infty}<\infty$ and $f$ is continuous except for finitely many points, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|f_{n}(x)-1\right| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text { uniformly for } x \in(0,1)^{k} . \tag{32}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Let $x \in(0,1)^{k}$ and $g \in \bar{L}_{1}^{\prime}\left((0,1)^{k}\right)$. As in 23),

$$
\begin{aligned}
g_{n}(x)-1 & =\sum_{j=0}^{\left(q^{n}-1\right) e} \int_{q^{-n} j_{1}}^{q^{-n\left(j_{1}+1\right)}} \cdots \int_{q^{-n} j_{k}}^{q^{-n\left(j_{k}+1\right)}}\left[g\left(q^{-n}(j+x)\right)-g(t)\right] \mathrm{d} t \\
& =\sum_{j=0}^{\left(q^{n}-1\right) e} \int_{(0,1)^{k}} q^{-n k}\left[g\left(q^{-n}(j+x)\right)-g\left(q^{-n}(j+y)\right)\right] \mathrm{d} y .
\end{aligned}
$$

By the mean value theorem,

$$
\left|g\left(q^{-n}(j+x)\right)-g\left(q^{-n}(j+y)\right)\right| \leq\left\|\nabla g_{n, j}\right\|_{\infty} q^{-n}\|x-y\|
$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is usual Euclidean distance. We estimate

$$
\int_{(0,1)^{k}}\|x-y\| \mathrm{d} y \leq\left(\int_{(0,1)^{k}}\|x-y\|^{2} \mathrm{~d} y\right)^{1 / 2} \leq \frac{\sqrt{k}}{3}
$$

which yields the bound

$$
\left|g_{n}(x)-1\right| \leq q^{-n(k+1)} \frac{\sqrt{k}}{3} \sum_{j=0}^{\left(q^{n}-1\right) e}\left\|\nabla g_{n, j}\right\|_{\infty} \leq q^{-n} \frac{\sqrt{k}}{3}\|\nabla g\|_{\infty} .
$$

As in (25) we have

$$
\int_{0}^{1}\left|f_{n}(x)-g_{n}(x)\right| \mathrm{d} x \leq\|f-g\|_{1} .
$$

Combining the last two estimates gives

$$
\begin{aligned}
2 d_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(P_{n}, \mu\right) & \leq\|f-g\|_{1}+\sqrt{\frac{k}{3}} q^{-n(k+1)} \sum_{j=0}^{\left(q^{n}-1\right) e}\left\|\nabla g_{n, j}\right\|_{\infty} \\
& \leq\|f-g\|_{1}+\sqrt{\frac{k}{3}} q^{-n}\|\nabla g\|_{\infty}
\end{aligned}
$$

whereby (30) follows.
To show (32), we assume for simplicity that $f$ only has one discontinuity at $x_{0}=\left(x_{0,1}, \ldots, x_{0, k}\right) \in(0,1)^{k}$. The case of more than one discontinuity can be treated as in the proof of Theorem 4.1, Let $\delta>0$ and define

$$
\begin{aligned}
I_{n} & =\left\{\left(j_{1}, \ldots, j_{k}\right) \in\left\{0,1, \ldots, q^{n}-1\right\}^{k} \mid \exists i: j_{i}<\left\lfloor q^{n} \delta\right\rfloor \vee j_{i}>\left\lceil q^{n}(1-\delta)\right\rceil\right\}, \\
J_{n} & =\left\{\left(j_{1}, \ldots, j_{k}\right) \in\left\{0,1, \ldots, q^{n}-1\right\}^{k}\left|\max _{i}\right| j_{i}-q^{n} x_{0, i} \mid<\left\lfloor q^{n} \delta\right\rfloor\right\}, \\
K_{n} & =\left\{0, \ldots, q^{n}-1\right\}^{k} \backslash\left(I_{n} \cup J_{n}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Then

$$
\begin{align*}
f_{n}(x)-1 & =\sum_{j \in I_{n}} \int_{(0,1)^{k}} q^{-n k}\left[f\left(q^{-n}(j+x)\right)-f\left(q^{-n}(j+y)\right)\right] \mathrm{d} y \\
& +\sum_{j \in J_{n}} \int_{(0,1)^{k}} q^{-n k}\left[f\left(q^{-n}(j+x)\right)-f\left(q^{-n}(j+y)\right)\right] \mathrm{d} y \\
& +\sum_{j \in K_{n}} \int_{(0,1)^{k}} q^{-n k}\left[f\left(q^{-n}(j+x)\right)-f\left(q^{-n}(j+y)\right)\right] \mathrm{d} y . \tag{33}
\end{align*}
$$

If $\varepsilon>0$ is given, we can choose $\delta$ such that each term in (33) is less than $\varepsilon / 3$. This follows as in the proof of Theorem 4.1 by noting that the cardinality of $I_{n}$ is at most $\delta q^{n(k-1)}$, the cardinality of $J_{n}$ is at most $2 \delta q^{n}$, and $f$ is bounded on $(0,1)^{k}$ and uniformly continuous on the closed set $[\delta / 2,1-\delta / 2]^{k} \backslash C\left(x_{0}\right)$ where $C\left(x_{0}\right)$ denotes the cube of sidelength $\delta$ centered at $x_{0}$.
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