

Universal Harmonic Sketching over Turnstile Streams*

Dingyu Wang
wangdy@umich.edu
University of Michigan

9th July, 2024

Abstract

In the turnstile streaming model, a dynamic vector $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n) \in \{-M, \dots, M\}^n$ is updated by a stream of entry-wise increments/decrements. Let $f : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be a symmetric function with $f(0) = 0$. The f -moment of \mathbf{x} is defined to be

$$f(\mathbf{x}) := \sum_{v \in [n]} f(\mathbf{x}_v).$$

If \mathcal{C} is a class of functions, a \mathcal{C} -universal sketch can estimate the f -moment for any $f \in \mathcal{C}$. It is clearly desirable to have the class \mathcal{C} be as large as possible.

Define \mathcal{T} to be the set of *tractable* functions: those that can be estimated with $\text{poly}(\log(nM))$ -space sketches. Previous efforts to build universal sketches were based on L_0 -sampling, or sampling layers of L_2 -heavy hitters [7, 9, 4, 5, 11]. This line of work culminated in a \mathcal{C} -universal sketch [5], where \mathcal{C} includes all functions in \mathcal{T} , except for some “nearly periodic” functions.

In this work we take a new approach to constructing a universal sketch that focuses on a class of *basis functions* $\{f_s(x) = 1 - \cos(sx) \mid s > 0\}$, so that any f -moment can be estimated if f can be expressed as a linear combination of basis functions. We construct and analyze the `SymmetricPoissonTower` sketch, which occupies $O(\epsilon^{-2} \log^2(nM\epsilon^{-1}))$ bits and is \mathcal{F} -universal for the function class

$$\mathcal{F} = \left\{ f(x) = cx^2 + \int_0^\infty (1 - \cos(xs)) \nu(ds) \mid \begin{array}{l} c \geq 0, \nu \text{ is a positive measure, and} \\ \int_0^\infty \min(s^2, 1) \nu(ds) \leq \text{poly}(nM\epsilon^{-1}) \xi(f, M), \\ \text{where } \xi(f, M) = \min_{x \in [M]} \{f(x) \mid f(x) > 0\} \end{array} \right\},$$

i.e., given any $f \in \mathcal{F}$, the new sketch $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -estimates the f -moment with probability $2/3$. The family \mathcal{F} includes all the classic frequency moments ($f(z) = |z|^p$, $p \in [0, 2]$) as well as a large family of nearly-periodic functions that cannot be estimated with L_2 -heavy hitter machinery. This new approach to universality requires significantly less space in comparison to previous universal schemes [7, 5] and sheds new light on the full characterization of the class \mathcal{T} of tractable functions.

1 Introduction

In the turnstile streaming model ([1, 14]), a *frequency vector* $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ is initialized as 0^n and updated through a stream of pairs (v, Δ) , $v \in [n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and $\Delta \in \mathbb{Z}$. Upon

*This work was supported by NSF Grant CCF-2221980.

receiving (v, Δ) , $\mathbf{x}_v \leftarrow \mathbf{x}_v + \Delta$. Let M be an upper bound on the magnitude of any \mathbf{x}_v . We consider the problem of estimating f -moments of \mathbf{x} , where $f : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is symmetric with $f(0) = 0$.

$$f(\mathbf{x}) := \sum_{v \in [n]} f(\mathbf{x}_v).$$

An estimator V $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximates the f -moment, if for any $\mathbf{x} \in [-M, M]^n$,

$$\mathbb{P}((1 - \epsilon)f(\mathbf{x}) \leq |V - f(\mathbf{x})| \leq (1 + \epsilon)f(\mathbf{x})) \geq 2/3.$$

We say a function f is *tractable* [7] if for any fixed $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximation algorithm of the f -moment using $O_\epsilon(\text{polylog}(nM))$ space.

The f -moments generalize the classic L_p -moments [2, 18], $p > 0$, where $f(x) = |x|^p$, and the L_0 -moment, where $f(x) = \mathbb{1}[x \neq 0]$. It is known that L_p -moments are tractable for $p \in [0, 2]$. Alon, Matias, and Szegedy [1] estimated L_2 using Rademacher random variables, Indyk [18] used p -stable random variables to estimate L_p for $p \in (0, 2]$, and Cormode, Datar, Indyk, and Muthukrishnan [14] approximated L_0 by L_p with very small $p > 0$; see also [21]. Bar-Yossef, Jayram, Kumar, and Sivakumar [3] proved that estimating the L_p -moment requires $\Omega(n^{1-2/p+o(1)})$ space, suggesting that the L_p -moment is *not tractable* for any $p > 2$. Upper bounds and lower bounds for large frequency moments ($L_p, p > 2$) are studied in [1, 6, 19, 10, 24, 17, 13, 8].

Alon, Matias, and Szegedy [2] posed the problem of *characterizing* the class of tractable functions f . Braverman and Ostrovsky [7] succeeding in characterizing the class of tractable, increasing functions f .¹ Roughly speaking, f must grow no faster than quadratic, even locally. Braverman and Chestnut [4] characterized all tractable decreasing functions. Finally, Braverman, Chestnut, Woodruff, and Yang [5] characterized generic, tractable f outside of the class of “nearly periodic” functions. As a surprising byproduct, the sketches in [7, 4, 5] are all *universal* [7] for their respective function classes. From a theoretical perspective, the pursuit of universality helps to characterize tractability. Universal sketches are obviously attractive from a practical perspective, if one cannot predict which query functions will be of interest in advance. See [22] for an application of universal sketching to network flow monitoring.

Definition 1 (universal sketches [4]). Let \mathcal{C} be a function family such that for any $f \in \mathcal{C}$, $f(0) = 0$ and $f(x) = f(-x)$ for any $x \in \mathbb{Z}$. A $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximation algorithm of the \mathcal{C} -moment is a collection of estimators $\{V_f\}_{f \in \mathcal{C}}$ such that for any $\mathbf{x} \in [-M, \dots, M]^n$ and any function $f \in \mathcal{C}$,

$$\mathbb{P}((1 - \epsilon)f(\mathbf{x}) \leq |V_f - f(\mathbf{x})| \leq (1 + \epsilon)f(\mathbf{x})) \geq 2/3.$$

Such an algorithm is \mathcal{C} -*universal*.

We now discuss the existing techniques for building universal sketches over turnstile streams.

L_0 -sampling. A simple universal sketch is to sample m elements $\mathbf{x}_{v_1}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{v_m}$ uniformly from $\text{supp}(\mathbf{x})$ and then estimate the f -moment by the empirical mean $V_f = \frac{\|\mathbf{x}\|_0}{m} \sum_{j \in [m]} f(\mathbf{x}_{v_j})$. The sampling can be done with L_0 -samplers (see [15]) and the support size $\|\mathbf{x}\|_0$ can be estimated by L_0 -estimators [14, 21]. This scheme is natural but the estimates are poor if f varies a lot. Specifically, for functions f such that $f(x) > 0$ when $x \neq 0$, the number m of samples needs to be $\Omega(\epsilon^{-2} \max_{j \in [M]} f(j) / \min_{j \in [M]} f(j))$ for V_f to be a $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximation of the f -moment;

¹Since f is assumed to be symmetric and $f(0) = 0$, we say a function f is *increasing* if it increases on \mathbb{N} ; it is *decreasing* if it decreases on \mathbb{Z}_+ .

see, Chestnut [11]. For decreasing functions, it is proved in [4] that all tractable moments can be estimated using this scheme. However, functions like $f(x) = |x|^p$ for $p \in (0, 2]$ take $\Omega(\text{poly}(M))$ space to estimate with this method. Furthermore, Chestnut [11] shows that if $f(x) = 0$ for some $x > 0$, then if f is to be tractable, it must be periodic with period x . Thus for a *fixed* periodic function f , the smallest period d of f is a constant and therefore $\max_{j \in [d-1]} f(j) / \min_{j \in [d-1]} f(j)$ is also a constant. Such function moments can be estimated by taking the vector \mathbf{x} modulo d [11].

L_2 -heavy hitters. A more powerful technique, used in [7, 9, 5], is to use variations on Indyk and Woodruff’s [20] method of collecting L_2 -heavy hitters at different sampling levels, and estimate f -moments based on the f -values of the heavy hitters. This technique is powerful enough to estimate all tractable f -moments, except for a class of *nearly periodic* functions [5]. One such function defined in [5, §5] is $g_{np} : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$.

$$g_{np}(0) = 0 \text{ and } g_{np}(x) = 2^{-\tau(x)}, \text{ where } \tau(x) = \max\{j \in \mathbb{N} : 2^j | x\}. \quad (1)$$

In other words, $\tau(x)$ is the least significant bit position in the binary representation of $x > 0$. For functions like g_{np} , the entries with large g_{np} -values are not necessarily L_2 -heavy hitters, so sampling L_2 -heavy hitters are generally not helpful. However, Braverman et al. [5, §5] gave an *ad hoc* sketch for approximating g_{np} -moments with $\text{poly}(\epsilon^{-1} \log(nM))$ space, showing that g_{np} is indeed tractable. The characterization of tractability for nearly periodic functions remains open.

One drawback of this line of work is that the universal sketches are often quite large. For example, the L_2 -heavy-hitter-based sketch in [5] occupies $O(h(M)\epsilon^{-2} \log^5 n \log(nM) \log \log n)$ bits, where h is a sub-polynomial function depending on the function f . The tailored sketch to estimate the g_{np} -moment [5, §5] occupies $O(\epsilon^{-8} \log^{14} n \log M)$ bits of space.

Previous methods for universal sketching depend heavily on *sampling* over the support, e.g., taking unweighted (L_0) samples in [4] or L_2 -heavy hitters in [7, 5]. *Universality* comes from the free choice of the function f when evaluating the samples. In this work, we attack the universal sketching problem from the *dual direction*. For any function f in our class \mathcal{F} , we estimate the *harmonic components* of the f -moment over the whole support of \mathbf{x} . Universality now comes from the free choice of *weighting* the harmonic moments.

We introduce a simple sketch called the `SymmetricPoissonTower`. It is parameterized by an integer $m = \epsilon^{-2}$ and maintains a vector $(X_k)_{k \in [a,b]}$ of integers, where $a = -\Theta(m \log n)$, $b = \Theta(m \log n)$. In the pseudocode below, $Y_{k,v}$, $v \in [n], k \in \mathbb{Z}$, is distributed as $Y_{k,v} \sim \text{SymmetricPoisson}(e^{-k/m})$.² The `Update(v, Δ)` function is implemented as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Update}(v, \Delta) : v \in [n], \Delta \in \mathbb{Z} \\ \text{For each } k \in [a, b), X_k \leftarrow X_k + \Delta \cdot Y_{k,v} \end{aligned}$$

We prove that the `SymmetricPoissonTower` is \mathcal{F} -universal for the function class

$$\mathcal{F} = \left\{ f(x) = cx^2 + \int_0^\infty (1 - \cos(xs)) \nu(ds) \left| \begin{array}{l} c \geq 0, \nu \text{ is a positive measure, and} \\ \int_0^\infty \min(s^2, 1) \nu(ds) \leq \text{poly}(nM\epsilon^{-1})\xi(f, M), \\ \text{where } \xi(f, M) = \min_{x \in [M]} \{f(x) \mid f(x) > 0\} \end{array} \right. \right\}.$$

which includes L_p moments, $p \in [0, 2]$, $\ln(1 + |x|)$, many nearly periodic functions like g_{np} , and the symmetric version of the “soft cap” functions studied by Cohen [12]. The total space complexity is $O(m \log^2(nMm)) = O(\epsilon^{-2} \log^2(nM\epsilon^{-1}))$ bits.

²`SymmetricPoisson`(λ) is the distribution of the difference of two independent `Poisson`($\lambda/2$) variables.

Throughout the paper we work in the *random oracle* model, in which we can evaluate uniformly random hash functions $H : [n] \rightarrow [0, 1]$. (The random variables $(Y_{k,v})$ are mutually independent, generated by the random oracle H .) The tractability results in [3, 7, 5] apply to the random oracle model, as do all lower bound reductions to problems in communication complexity, which assume public randomness.

Organization of §1. In Section 1.1 we introduce harmonic moments, explain why previous approaches cannot approximate most of the harmonic moments, and analyze a simple 1-cell version of the `SymmetricPoissonTower`. In Section 1.2 we illustrate how harmonic moments can be combined to yield many natural, well studied functions, and how estimators for harmonic moments can be combined with good estimation guarantees. Section 1.3 gives an informal development of the harmonic moment estimators, and in Section 1.4 we give a formal presentation of the `SymmetricPoissonTower`'s guarantees and other new results.

1.1 Harmonic Moments

We start by defining an important family of function moments that have been overlooked so far in the literature.

Definition 2 (harmonic moments). For any $\gamma > 0$, define $f_\gamma(x) = 1 - \cos(\gamma x)$. The γ -harmonic moment of a stream with frequency vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ is

$$f_\gamma(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{v \in [n]} f_\gamma(\mathbf{x}_v) = \sum_{v \in [n]} (1 - \cos(\gamma \mathbf{x}_v)).$$

In other words, the γ -harmonic moment is the f_γ -moment.

If $\gamma = 2\pi/k$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, then $f_\gamma(x)$ is a periodic function with period k . Such harmonic moments can be estimated by sampling from the support of \mathbf{x} modulo k [11]. We will show that most of the harmonic moments cannot be $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximated with poly-logarithmic space by either sampling [4, 11] or by recursively finding L_2 -heavy hitters [7, 5] at the end of this subsection. To the best of our knowledge, there is no known sketch that provably estimates the γ -harmonic for a generic $\gamma > 0$. We now describe a high-level strategy for estimating γ -harmonic moments, which uses *symmetric Poisson random variables*.

Definition 3 (symmetric Poisson distribution). A symmetric Poisson random variable with rate λ distributes as the difference of two independent Poisson random variables with rate $\lambda/2$. This distribution is denoted `SymmetricPoisson`(λ).

Consider the following 1-cell linear sketch, parameterized by a *level* $t > 0$.

$$R_t = \sum_{v \in [n]} \mathbf{x}_v Y_v,$$

where $Y_v \sim \text{SymmetricPoisson}(t)$ are i.i.d. random variables, provided by the random oracle. The following lemma contains the key idea.

Lemma 1. For any $\gamma > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E} e^{i\gamma R_t} = e^{-t f_\gamma(\mathbf{x})}.$$

Proof. Note that if $Z \sim \text{Poisson}(t)$, then by the Taylor expansion of the exponential,

$$\mathbb{E}e^{i\gamma Z} = e^{-t} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{t^j}{j!} e^{i\gamma j} = e^{-t(1-e^{i\gamma})}. \quad (2)$$

Thus for $Y \sim \text{SymmetricPoisson}(t)$ and $Z' \sim \text{Poisson}(t/2)$, Eq. (2) implies

$$\mathbb{E}e^{i\gamma Y} = \mathbb{E}e^{i\gamma Z'} \mathbb{E}e^{-i\gamma Z'} = e^{-\frac{t}{2}(1-e^{i\gamma})} e^{-\frac{t}{2}(1-e^{-i\gamma})} = e^{-t(1-\cos(\gamma))}. \quad (3)$$

We can now relate R_t to the f_γ -moment as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}e^{i\gamma R_t} &= \mathbb{E}e^{i\gamma \sum_{v \in [n]} \mathbf{x}_v Y_v} \\ &= \prod_{v \in [n]} \mathbb{E}e^{i\gamma \mathbf{x}_v Y_v} && (Y_v \text{ s are independent}) \\ &= \prod_{v \in [n]} e^{-t(1-\cos(\gamma \mathbf{x}_v))} && (Y_v \sim \text{SymmetricPoisson}(t) \text{ and Eq. (3)}) \\ &= e^{-t \sum_{v \in [n]} (1-\cos(\gamma \mathbf{x}_v))} = e^{-t f_\gamma(\mathbf{x})}. && (\text{Definition 2}) \end{aligned}$$

□

Therefore, $e^{i\gamma R_t}$ is an informative statistic of the γ -harmonic moment $f_\gamma(\mathbf{x})$. Specifically, since $|e^{i\gamma R_t}| = 1$, the empirical average of i.i.d. copies of $e^{i\gamma R_t}$ concentrates sub-gaussianly around $\mathbb{E}e^{i\gamma R_t}$. By choosing a suitable $t = \Theta(1/f_\gamma(\mathbf{x}))$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, the γ -harmonic moment $f_\gamma(\mathbf{x})$ can be estimated. We will discuss how this should be done in Section 1.3.

We now demonstrate why previous techniques for universal sketching will fail to estimate most harmonic moments. The key reason is that $1 - \cos(\gamma x)$ can occasionally be $O(1/\text{poly}(x))$, which drops too fast for previous techniques.

Lemma 2. *Let $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $\gamma/\pi \notin \mathbb{Q}$ and let $f_\gamma(x) = 1 - \cos(\gamma x)$. The following statements are true.*

$$\begin{aligned} \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}_+, f_\gamma(k) > 0 &&& (f_\gamma \text{ is positive over } \mathbb{Z}_+) \\ \forall k, j \in \mathbb{Z}_+, k \neq j \iff f_\gamma(k) \neq f_\gamma(j) &&& (f_\gamma \text{ is not periodic over } \mathbb{Z}_+) \\ \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}_+, \exists w_k \in \{1, \dots, k\}, f_\gamma(w_k) = O(1/k^2) &&& (f_\gamma \text{ is not slow-dropping}) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The first two are trivial since $\gamma/\pi \notin \mathbb{Q}$. The last one comes from the following classic pigeonhole argument. Let $\beta = 2\gamma/\pi$. For any $k \geq 1$, by the pigeonhole principle, there exist distinct $a, b \in \{1, 2, 3, \dots, k+1\}$, such that $|(a\beta - \lfloor a\beta \rfloor) - (b\beta - \lfloor b\beta \rfloor)| \leq 1/k$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} f_\gamma(a-b) &= 1 - \cos((a-b)\gamma) = 1 - \cos((a\beta - b\beta)2\pi) = 1 - \cos(((a\beta - \lfloor a\beta \rfloor) - (b\beta - \lfloor b\beta \rfloor))2\pi) \\ &\leq 2\pi^2((a\beta - \lfloor a\beta \rfloor) - (b\beta - \lfloor b\beta \rfloor))^2 \leq 2\pi^2/k^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that $1 - \cos(z) \leq z^2/2$ for any $z \in \mathbb{R}$. Define $w_k = |a-b| \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. Thus $f_\gamma(w_k) \leq 2\pi^2/k^2$. □

By Lemma 2, the ratio $\frac{\max_{j \in [M]} f_\gamma(j)}{\min_{j \in [M]} f_\gamma(j)} \geq \frac{f_\gamma(1)}{O(1/M^2)}$, which implies polynomially many samples are need for the L_0 -sampling scheme [4, 11]. Furthermore, for any fixed γ , $f_\gamma(1)$ is a constant but $f_\gamma(w_k) = O(1/k^2)$, which implies f_γ is not slow-dropping (see [5, Definition 7]) and thus is out of the reach of the technique of recursively finding L_2 -heavy hitters [7, 5].

1.2 Combination of Harmonic Moments

Except for the theoretical pursuit of fully characterizing tractability, the harmonic moments themselves may seem to be of little interest in practice. However, as we will see shortly, the information scattered in the harmonic moments can be *combined* to answer meaningful queries. We will show that the combination of harmonic moments form a rich class of function moments that include $f(x) = |x|^p$ for $p \in (0, 2]$, $f(x) = \mathbb{1}[x \neq 0]$, $\log(1 + |x|)$, and g_{np} . The combination is intuitive.

- Suppose a function f can be decomposed into harmonics $f(x) = \int_0^\infty f_\gamma(x) \nu(d\gamma)$ where ν is some positive measure.
- Suppose a universal sketch outputs a family estimates $\{V_\gamma\}_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ where V_γ is an approximation of the f_γ -moment.
- Define the *combined estimator* of f as $\int_0^\infty V_\gamma \nu(d\gamma)$.

At the first sight, it might look like the combined estimator can have a large error, since the estimates $\{V_\gamma\}_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ are *arbitrarily correlated* (they are produced with a single universal sketch!). However, Cohen [12] observed that as long as the *mean* and *variance* of each individual estimate V_γ have good guarantees, such guarantees can be transported to the combined estimator. In [12], Cohen developed a universal sketch over *incremental streams* with a min-based sampling scheme.³ In contrast to the turnstile model, incremental streams have a frequency vector \mathbf{x} in \mathbb{N}^n and only positive updates are allowed. For any $r > 0$, let $G_r(x) = 1 - e^{-rx}$. Cohen's sketch has a collection of estimators $\{V_r\}_{r>0}$ such that for any $r > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}V_r = G_r(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{v \in [n]} (1 - e^{-r\mathbf{x}_v}) \quad (4)$$

$$\mathbb{V}V_r = O(\epsilon^2)G_r(\mathbf{x})^2. \quad (5)$$

For any positive measure ν on $(0, \infty)$, let $G_\nu(x) = \int_0^\infty G_r(x) \nu(dr)$.⁴ Cohen noted [12] that

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^\infty V_r \nu(dr) = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{E}V_r \nu(dr) = \sum_{v \in [n]} G_\nu(\mathbf{x}_v) = G_\nu(\mathbf{x}) \quad (\text{Eq. (4)})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V} \int_0^\infty V_r \nu(dr) &= \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \text{Cov}(V_r, V_{r'}) \nu(dr) \nu(dr') \\ &\leq \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \sqrt{\mathbb{V}V_r} \sqrt{\mathbb{V}V_{r'}} \nu(dr) \nu(dr') \quad (\text{Cauchy-Schwartz}) \\ &= \left(\int_0^\infty \sqrt{\mathbb{V}V_r} \nu(dr) \right)^2 \\ &= \left(\int_0^\infty O(\epsilon^1) G_r(\mathbf{x}) \nu(dr) \right)^2 \quad (\text{Eq. (5)}) \\ &= O(\epsilon^2) G_\nu(\mathbf{x})^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by Chebyshev's inequality, $\int_0^\infty V_r \nu(dr)$ is a $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximation of the G_ν -moment $G_\nu(\mathbf{x})$.

In this work we follow Cohen's framework and construct harmonic estimators whose mean and variance can be analyzed. Combining such estimators, one may estimate any function moment of the form $f_\nu(x) = \int_0^\infty (1 - \cos(\gamma x)) \nu(d\gamma)$.⁵ We note the following examples of such functions. For

³Min-based schemes are not applicable over turnstile streams.

⁴For G_ν to exist, the measure ν has to satisfy that $\int_0^\infty \min(r, 1) \nu(dr) < \infty$.

⁵For f_ν to exist, the measure ν has to satisfy that $\int_0^\infty \min(\gamma^2, 1) \nu(d\gamma) < \infty$.

$x \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|x|^p &= \int_0^\infty (1 - \cos(x\gamma)) \frac{1}{(-\Gamma(-p)) \cos(p\pi/2) \gamma^{1+p}} d\gamma && (L_p\text{-moment}, p \in (0, 1) \cup (1, 2)) \\
|x| &= \int_0^\infty (1 - \cos(x\gamma)) \frac{2}{\pi\gamma^2} d\gamma && (L_1\text{-moment}) \\
\mathbb{1}[x \neq 0] &= \int_0^\pi (1 - \cos(x\gamma)) \frac{1}{\pi} d\gamma && (L_0\text{-moment/support size}, x \in \mathbb{Z}) \\
1 - e^{-r|x|} &= \int_0^\infty (1 - \cos(\gamma x)) \frac{2r}{\pi(x^2 + r^2)} d\gamma && (\text{symmetric “soft cap” moment}) \\
g_{np}(x) &= \frac{4}{3} \sum_{\gamma \in \mathbb{B}} (1 - \cos(2\pi\gamma x)) 2^{-2\tau_*(\gamma)} && (\text{the nearly periodic function example})
\end{aligned}$$

The set \mathbb{B} is the set of real numbers in $[0, 1)$ with finite binary representation. The function $\tau_*(\gamma) = \min\{j \in \mathbb{N} \mid 2^{-j}|\gamma\}$ returns the length of the binary representation of γ . See Appendix A.1 for a justification of the decomposition of g_{np} .

As seen above, all L_p -moments ($p \in [0, 2)$) are within the span of the harmonic moments. The symmetric version of Cohen’s basis functions $G_r^*(x) = 1 - e^{-r|x|}$ are in the span of the harmonic moments, as well as their linear combinations. For example,

$$\log(1 + |x|) = \int_0^\infty (1 - e^{-r|x|}) e^{-r} r^{-1} dr.$$

Not surprisingly, the featured nearly periodic function g_{np} from [5] lies in the span of the harmonic moments. Observe that $g_{np}(x) = 1/x$ for $x = 2^{-k}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, which makes it out of the reach of the technique of finding L_2 -heavy hitters [5]. Nevertheless, g_{np} can be accurately estimated by combining the estimates of harmonic moments.

The L_2 -moment, on the other hand, lies on the “border” of the harmonic moments, since $|x|^2 = \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 0} \frac{2}{\gamma^2} (1 - \cos(x\gamma))$, which will be estimated separately (see Section 3.1) in this harmonic sketching framework.

1.3 Implicit Level Selection

The take-away message from Section 1.1 is that if one maintains the linear sketch $R_t = \sum_{v \in [n]} \mathbf{x}_v Y_v$, where $Y_v \sim \text{SymmetricPoisson}(t)$, then for any $\gamma > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E} e^{i\gamma R_t} = e^{-t f_\gamma(\mathbf{x})}. \quad (\text{Lemma 1})$$

By selecting $t = \Theta(1/f_\gamma(\mathbf{x}))$, the γ -harmonic moment $f_\gamma(\mathbf{x})$ can be $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximated with $O(\epsilon^{-2})$ i.i.d. copies of R_t .

To minimize the space complexity, we will select the suitable level t *implicitly*.⁶ Instead of using auxiliary data structures to select a proper level t , we maintain levels⁷ R_t with $t = e^{-k/m}$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$,

⁶Kane, Nelson, and Woodruff faced a similar *level selection* problem in estimating distinct elements [21]. Their approach would be to choose t from a *rough estimator* of $f_\gamma(\mathbf{x})$, which would return a large constant factor approximate in the range $[c_1 f_\gamma(\mathbf{x}), c_2 f_\gamma(\mathbf{x})]$ with probability $1 - \delta$. However, here the *variance* is complicated to bound with such explicit level selectors. A rough bound for the increase in variance for failed selections is $O(n^2)$ (note that $f_\gamma(\mathbf{x}) = O(n)$), which will require $\delta = O(1/\text{poly}(n))$ to suppress. This will add an additional $\log(n)$ factor to the algorithm.

⁷While it is more common in the streaming literature [16] to maintain m i.i.d. cells at levels 2^{-k} , $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, here we sample a *single* cell at *finer* levels $e^{-k/m}$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. This trick is known as *smoothing* in [23], which is used for removing the oscillating component in the estimators.

and aggregate them as follows.

$$U_\gamma = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} (1 - e^{i\gamma R_{e^{-k/m}}}) e^{\frac{1}{3}k/m},$$

whose mean is⁸

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}U_\gamma &= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{E}(1 - e^{i\gamma R_{e^{-k/m}}}) e^{\frac{1}{3}k/m} \\ &= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} (1 - e^{-e^{-k/m} f_\gamma(\mathbf{x})}) e^{\frac{1}{3}k/m} && \text{(Lemma 1)} \\ &= f_\gamma(\mathbf{x})^{1/3} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} (1 - e^{-e^{-(k-m \log f_\gamma(\mathbf{x}))/m}}) e^{\frac{1}{3}(k-m \log f_\gamma(\mathbf{x}))/m} \\ &\approx f_\gamma(\mathbf{x})^{1/3} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} (1 - e^{-e^{-k/m}}) e^{\frac{1}{3}k/m} && \text{(Shift } k \leftarrow \lfloor k - m \log f_\gamma(\mathbf{x}) \rfloor) \end{aligned}$$

Roughly speaking we have $\mathbb{E}U_\gamma \propto f_\gamma(\mathbf{x})^{1/3}$. Let $U_\gamma^{(1)}, U_\gamma^{(2)}, U_\gamma^{(3)}$ be three i.i.d. copies of U_γ . We know $U_\gamma^{(1)} U_\gamma^{(2)} U_\gamma^{(3)}$ will be a roughly unbiased estimator for $f_\gamma(\mathbf{x})$ after normalization. The reason that this sum implicitly chooses the correct levels is because the contribution to the mean decays exponentially outside the suitable levels.

- When $k \gg \log_2 f_\gamma(\mathbf{x})$, $(1 - e^{-2^{-k} f_\gamma(\mathbf{x})}) 2^{k/3} \approx 2^{-k} f_\gamma(\mathbf{x}) 2^{k/3} = f_\gamma(\mathbf{x}) 2^{-2k/3}$. Thus the contribution to the mean $\mathbb{E}U_\gamma$ is vanishing exponentially as $k \rightarrow \infty$.
- When $k \ll \log_2 f_\gamma(\mathbf{x})$, $(1 - e^{-2^{-k} f_\gamma(\mathbf{x})}) 2^{k/3} \approx 2^{k/3}$. Thus the contribution to the mean is also vanishing exponentially as $k \rightarrow -\infty$.

The construction of U_γ is similar to Pettie and Wang's [25] recent " τ -GRA" cardinality estimators for HyperLogLog and PCSA, which aggregate statistics at each level 2^{-k} with weight $2^{-\tau k}$, called τ -aggregation. U_γ can be considered as a $(-1/3)$ -aggregation in [25]'s framework.

Remark 1. It may seem unnatural to first construct an estimator U_γ for $f_\gamma(\mathbf{x})^{1/3}$ and then estimate $f_\gamma(\mathbf{x})$ with three i.i.d. copies of U_γ . It would be simpler to set $U'_\gamma = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} (1 - e^{i\gamma R_{e^{-k/m}}}) e^{k/m}$ or $U''_\gamma = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} (1 - e^{i\gamma R_{e^{-k/m}}}) e^{\frac{1}{2}k/m}$, where by the same line of argument, one gets $\mathbb{E}U'_\gamma \propto f_\gamma(\mathbf{x})$ and $\mathbb{E}U''_\gamma \propto f_\gamma(\mathbf{x})^{1/2}$. However, we note that $\mathbb{E}U'_\gamma$ does not, in fact, exist, and $\mathbb{E}(U''_\gamma)^2$ also does not exist. Thus, for the estimator to have finite mean and variance, three copies are needed in this approach.

1.4 New Results

We now formally state the main theorem. We first define the function family

$$\mathcal{F}_* = \left\{ f(x) = cx^2 + \int_0^\infty (1 - \cos \gamma x) \nu(d\gamma) \mid c \in \mathbb{R}_+, \nu \text{ is a positive measure} \right\},$$

⁸Later on we will establish that U_γ is absolutely convergent almost surely and the summation and expectation can be interchanged. The construction of U_γ may look unnatural but it is just a mathematically correct version of the following "formal" computation. If one sets $U'_\gamma = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{i\gamma R_{2^{-k}}} 2^k$, then $\mathbb{E}U'_\gamma = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-2^{-k} f_\gamma(\mathbf{x})} 2^k \approx f_\gamma(\mathbf{x}) \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-2^{-k}} 2^k$, and $f_\gamma(\mathbf{x})$ is extracted. Such computation is mathematical nonsense ($\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-2^{-k}} 2^k = \infty$) but does convey the correct intuition for building U_γ .

which is the *mathematical* span of the harmonic moments as well as x^2 . The family \mathcal{F} mentioned earlier is a subset of \mathcal{F}_* that are proved to be tractable in the main theorem below.

For any $f \in \mathcal{F}_*$, define $C_f = \int_0^\infty \min(\gamma^2, 1) \nu(d\gamma)$. Note that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $f(x)$ is finite if and only if $C_f < \infty$. Recall $M \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ is the frequency bound. Define $\xi(f, M) = \min_{x \in [M]} \{f(x) \mid f(x) > 0\}$.

Theorem 1 (Universal Harmonic Sketch). *There exists an $O(\epsilon^{-2} \log^2(n\epsilon^{-1}M))$ -bit space sketch (SymmetricPoissonTower) such that for any turnstile stream with frequency vector $\mathbf{x} \in \{-M, \dots, M\}^n$, the following statements are true.*

Combination *For any function $f \in \mathcal{F}_*$ such that $C_f/\xi(f, M) = O(\text{poly}(nM\epsilon^{-1}))$, a $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximation of the f -moment can be returned with probability $2/3$.*

Signed combination *For any functions $f, g \in \mathcal{F}_*$ such that $f(x) - g(x) = \Omega(f(x) + g(x))$ for $x \in [M]$ and $(C_f + C_g)/\xi(f - g, M) = O(\text{poly}(nM\epsilon^{-1}))$, a $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximation of the $(f - g)$ -moment can be returned with probability $2/3$.*

Remark 2. In the usual region where $\epsilon^{-1} = O(\text{poly}(n))$ and $M = O(\text{poly}(n))$, the space is $O(\epsilon^{-2} \log^2 n)$. The family \mathcal{F} mentioned in the abstract and introduction covers the first case of Theorem 1. The signed combination in the second case greatly expands the class of approximable functions for the universal harmonic sketch. The condition $f(x) - g(x) = \Omega(f(x) + g(x))$ implies $f(x) - g(x)$ is always non-negative, which is a necessary condition for $(f - g)$ to be tractable [11].

We now discuss the parameters in the condition of the main theorem.

function constant C_f . For any *fixed* function $f \in \mathcal{F}_*$, C_f is a constant. For example, one may compute that for the L_p -moments where $f(x) = |x|^p$, the constants $C_{|x|^p} \leq 2$ for any $p \in (0, 2)$ and for the L_0 -moment, $C_{\mathbb{1}_{[x \neq 0]}} < 1$. For the g_{np} function, $C_{g_{np}} \leq \frac{2}{3}$; see Appendix A.1. However, given that the sketch is universal, when a *family* of functions f are considered, the constraint $C_f = O(\text{poly}(nM\epsilon^{-1}))$ may matter.

drop rate $\xi(f, M)$. For any *increasing* function $f \in \mathcal{F}_*$, $\xi(f, M) = f(1)$ is a constant. The constraint $\xi(f, M) = \Omega(1/\text{poly}(nM\epsilon^{-1}))$ only matters when f can become very small over the frequency range $\{1, \dots, M\}$. Note that this condition in the main theorem is much weaker than the corresponding condition in previous techniques. The sampling scheme [4] and L_2 -heavy hitter scheme [7, 5] will fail whenever $\xi(f, M)$ is not sub-polynomial. In our main theorem, $\xi(f, M)$ can decrease with any polynomial rate. This allows the harmonic sketch to approximate g_{np} for which $\xi(g_{np}, M) = \Theta(1/M)$ and the golden harmonic function g_{gold} (Lemma 3, below) for which $\xi(g_{gold}, M) = \Theta(1/M^2)$.

While there are potentially many function moments covered by the main theorem that cannot be done by previous techniques, it is not an easy task to identify a *specific* one. One example is the g_{np} function from [5], which has an *ad hoc* solution, but is covered by our main Theorem 1. To demonstrate the power of Theorem 1, we now define the *golden harmonic moment*, which has no obvious *ad hoc* solution. We prove that the golden harmonic moment is not periodic, not slow-dropping [5], but covered by Theorem 1. Refer to Appendix A.2 for the proof of Lemma 3.

Lemma 3 (golden harmonic moment). *Let $g_{gold}(x) = 1 - \cos(\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2} \cdot 2\pi x)$ for $x \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then*

- g_{gold} is not periodic over \mathbb{Z} .
- g_{gold} is not slow-dropping since $g_{gold}(1) > 1.7$ and $\xi(g_{gold}, M) = O(1/M^2)$.
- g_{gold} is covered by Theorem 1 since $C_{g_{gold}} = 1$ and $\xi(g_{gold}, M) = \Omega(1/M^2)$.

notation	definition	name	note
$\ \mathbf{x}\ _0$	$\sum_{v \in [n]} \mathbb{1}[\mathbf{x}_v \neq 0]$	support size	$\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$
$\ \mathbf{x}\ _p$	$(\sum_{v \in [n]} \mathbf{x}_v ^p)^{1/p}$	p -norm	$\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n, p \in (0, \infty)$
$\ \mathbf{x}\ _\infty$	$\max_{v \in [n]} \mathbf{x}_v $	maximum norm	$\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$
$f_\gamma(\mathbf{x})$	$\sum_{v \in [n]} (1 - \cos(\gamma \mathbf{x}_v))$	γ -harmonic moment	$\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}_+$
$\mathbb{V}Z$	$\mathbb{E}((Z - \mathbb{E}Z)(Z - \mathbb{E}Z))$	variance	complex random variable Z

Table 1: Notations

1.5 Organization

In Section 2, we construct the `SymmetricPoissonTower` sketch to estimate all harmonic moments. We analyze the combined estimators in Section 3. We assemble the proof of the main theorem in Section 4.

2 The SymmetricPoissonTower Sketch

Recall that a `SymmetricPoisson`(λ) random variable distributes as the difference of two independent Poisson random variables with rate $\lambda/2$. We first list a few more properties of symmetric Poissons.

Lemma 4. *Let $Y \sim \text{SymmetricPoisson}(\lambda)$.*

- $\mathbb{E}Y = 0, \mathbb{E}Y^2 = \mathbb{V}Y = \lambda, \mathbb{E}Y^4 = \lambda + 3\lambda^2, \mathbb{V}Y^2 = \lambda + 2\lambda^2$.
- $\mathbb{E}e^{izY} = e^{-\lambda(1-\cos(z))}$ for any $z \in \mathbb{R}$.
- $\mathbb{P}(Y = 0) = e^{-\lambda/2}$.

Following the discussion in Sections 1.1 to 1.3, we now formally define the `SymmetricPoissonTower` sketch.

Definition 4. An *abstract SymmetricPoissonTower* is parameterized by a single integer m , which controls the variance of the estimates, and consists of an infinite vector $(X_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ of *cells*, initialized as $0^{\mathbb{Z}}$. For any $j \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$X_j = \sum_{v \in [n]} \mathbf{x}_v Z_{v,j},$$

where $Z_{v,j} \sim \text{SymmetricPoisson}(e^{-j/m})$. All $Z_{v,j}$ s are independent and assigned by the random oracle. In other words, `Update`(v, y) is implemented as follows.

Update(v, y): For each $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, set $X_j \leftarrow X_j + Z_{v,j}y$, where $Z_{v,j}$ s are independent `Poisson`($e^{-j/m}$) random variables.

The $[a, b]$ -truncated *SymmetricPoissonTower* only stores $(X_j)_{j \in [a,b]}$.

We will first analyze this abstract (infinite) `SymmetricPoissonTower` and then prove that it suffices to store an $[a, b]$ -truncated `SymmetricPoissonTower` with $b - a = O(m \log(nmM))$ cells, at a cost of $O(1/\text{poly}(nmM))$ to the bias of the estimates. See Table 1 for notations.

2.1 $(-1/3)$ -Aggregation

As discussed in Section 1.3, the γ -harmonic moment $f_\gamma(\mathbf{x})$ can be inferred from $e^{i\gamma X_k}$ s where $e^{-k/m} = \Theta(1/f_\gamma(\mathbf{x}))$. The estimator is based on the following statistic which selects suitable levels implicitly.

Definition 5 ($(-1/3)$ -aggregation). For any $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_+$, define

$$U_\gamma = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} (1 - e^{i\gamma X_k}) e^{\frac{1}{3}k/m}.$$

To invoke Fubini's theorem when computing $\mathbb{E}U_\gamma$ and $\mathbb{E}U_\gamma^2$, we first prove the following lemma.

Lemma 5. *The following statements are true. For any $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$,*

- $\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}|1 - e^{i\gamma X_k}| e^{\frac{1}{3}k/m} \leq 14m \|\mathbf{x}\|_0^{1/3}$,
- $\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}|1 - e^{i\gamma X_k}|^2 e^{\frac{2}{3}k/m} \leq 44m \|\mathbf{x}\|_0^{2/3}$.

Proof. Recall that $Z_{v,k} \sim \text{SymmetricPoisson}(e^{-k/m})$ and thus by Lemma 4, $\mathbb{P}(Z_{v,k} = 0) = e^{-e^{-k/m}/2}$. Since $X_k = \sum_{v=1}^n Z_{v,k} \mathbf{x}_v$,

$$\mathbb{P}(X_k = 0) \geq \mathbb{P}(\forall v \in \text{supp}(\mathbf{x}), Z_{v,k} = 0) = e^{-e^{-k/m} \|\mathbf{x}\|_0/2}.$$

Note that $|1 - e^{i\gamma X_k}| \leq 2$. Thus $\mathbb{E}|1 - e^{i\gamma X_k}| \leq 2\mathbb{P}(X_k \neq 0) \leq 2(1 - e^{-e^{-k/m} \|\mathbf{x}\|_0/2})$ and $\mathbb{E}|1 - e^{i\gamma X_k}|^2 \leq 4\mathbb{P}(X_k \neq 0) \leq 4(1 - e^{-e^{-k/m} \|\mathbf{x}\|_0/2})$. Now we compute

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}|1 - e^{i\gamma X_k}| e^{\frac{1}{3}k/m} \\ & \leq 2 \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} (1 - e^{-e^{-k/m} \|\mathbf{x}\|_0/2}) e^{\frac{1}{3}k/m} \\ & = 2 \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \eta_1(k/m; a, b, c) \end{aligned}$$

where η_1 is defined in Lemma 15 and $a = 0, b = \|\mathbf{x}\|_0/2, c = 1/3$

$$\begin{aligned} & \leq 2m \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \eta_1(x; a, b, c) dx + 2 \left| m \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \eta_1(x; a, b, c) - \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \eta_1(k/m; a, b, c) \right| \\ & \leq 2(-\Gamma(-1/3))m(\|\mathbf{x}\|_0/2)^{1/3} + 2(3 + \Gamma(2/3))(\|\mathbf{x}\|_0/2)^{1/3} \quad (\text{Lemma 15(1,6)}) \\ & \leq 14m \|\mathbf{x}\|_0^{1/3}. \end{aligned}$$

Along the same lines, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}|1 - e^{i\gamma X_k}|^2 e^{\frac{1}{3}k/m} \\ & \leq 4 \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \eta_1(k/m; a, b, c) \end{aligned}$$




Figure 1: Gamma function $\Gamma(x)$ over $(-1, 0) \cup (0, 1)$

where $a = 0, b = \|\mathbf{x}\|_0/2, c = 2/3$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq 4(-\Gamma(-2/3))m(\|\mathbf{x}\|_0/2)^{2/3} + 4(6 + \Gamma(1/3))(\|\mathbf{x}\|_0/2)^{2/3} && \text{(Lemma 15(1,6))} \\ &\leq 44m\|\mathbf{x}\|_0^{2/3}. \end{aligned}$$

□

We now compute the mean and variance of U_γ . Note that we will use the Gamma function $\Gamma(x)$, which is negative over $(-1, 0)$ and positive over $(0, 1)$. See Fig. 1.

Lemma 6 (mean of U_γ). *For any $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_+$,*

$$m^{-1}\mathbb{E}U_\gamma = (-\Gamma(-1/3) + O(m^{-1}))f_\gamma(\mathbf{x})^{1/3},$$

as $m \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. By Lemma 5, we invoke Fubini's theorem and exchange the order of expectation and sum.

$$\mathbb{E}U_\gamma = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} (1 - \mathbb{E}e^{i\gamma X_k})e^{\frac{1}{3}k/m}$$

By Lemma 1,

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} (1 - e^{-e^{-k/m}f_\gamma(\mathbf{x})})e^{\frac{1}{3}k/m} \\ &= \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \eta_1(k/m; a, b, c), \end{aligned}$$

where $a = 0, b = f_\gamma(\mathbf{x}), c = 1/3$. By Lemma 15, we know

$$\left| \mathbb{E}U_\gamma - mf_\gamma(\mathbf{x})^{1/3}(-\Gamma(-1/3)) \right| \leq (3 + \Gamma(2/3))f_\gamma(\mathbf{x})^{1/3}.$$

□

Lemma 7 (variance of U_γ). For any $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_+$,

$$m^{-1}\mathbb{V}U_\gamma = 2^{2/3}(-\Gamma(-2/3))(1 + O(m^{-1}))f_\gamma(\mathbf{x})^{2/3},$$

as $m \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. We first check the integrability.

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}|1 - e^{i\gamma X_k}| |1 - e^{i\gamma X_j}| e^{\frac{1}{3}(k+j)/m} \\ & \leq \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}|1 - e^{i\gamma X_k}|^2 e^{\frac{2}{3}k/m} + \left(\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}|1 - e^{i\gamma X_k}| e^{\frac{1}{3}k/m} \right)^2 \\ & \leq 240m^2 \|\mathbf{x}\|_0^{2/3} < \infty. \end{aligned} \tag{by Lemma 5}$$

Then, by Fubini's theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}U_\gamma &= \mathbb{E}U_\gamma \overline{U_\gamma} - \mathbb{E}U_\gamma \mathbb{E} \overline{U_\gamma} = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}(1 - e^{i\gamma X_k})(1 - e^{-i\gamma X_j}) e^{\frac{1}{3}(k+j)/m} \\ & \quad - \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}(1 - e^{i\gamma X_k}) \mathbb{E}(1 - e^{-i\gamma X_j}) e^{\frac{1}{3}(k+j)/m} \\ &= \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} (1 - |\mathbb{E}e^{i\gamma X_k}|^2) e^{\frac{2}{3}k/m} \\ &= \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} (1 - e^{-2e^{-k/m}[\mathbf{x}; \gamma]}) e^{\frac{2}{3}k/m} \\ &= \eta_1(k/m; 0, 2f_\gamma(\mathbf{x}), 2/3). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 15, we know

$$\left| \mathbb{V}U_\gamma - m(2f_\gamma(\mathbf{x}))^{2/3}(-\Gamma(-2/3)) \right| \leq (6 + \Gamma(1/3))(2f_\gamma(\mathbf{x}))^{2/3}$$

□

2.2 Triple SymmetricPoissonTower

As in Section 1.3, the final trick is to store three independent copies of the SymmetricPoissonTower and obtain three i.i.d. copies of U_γ , denoted as $U_\gamma^{(1)}, U_\gamma^{(2)}, U_\gamma^{(3)}$. Define V_γ as

$$V_\gamma = (-\Gamma(-1/3))^{-3} m^{-3} U_\gamma^{(1)} U_\gamma^{(2)} U_\gamma^{(3)}.$$

Theorem 2 (triple SymmetricPoissonTower). Let $X = (X_k^{(j)})_{k \in \mathbb{Z}, j=1,2,3}$ be a triple SymmetricPoissonTower. For any $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_+$, let

$$V_\gamma = (-\Gamma(-1/3))^{-3} m^{-3} \prod_{j=1}^3 \left(\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} (1 - e^{i\gamma X_k^{(j)}}) e^{\frac{1}{3}k/m} \right)$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}V_\gamma &= (1 + O(m^{-1}))f_\gamma(\mathbf{x}) \\ \mathbb{V}V_\gamma &= (m^{-1} + O(m^{-2})) \cdot \frac{3 \cdot 2^{2/3}(-\Gamma(-2/3))}{(-\Gamma(-1/3))^2} \cdot f_\gamma(\mathbf{x})^2.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Recall that $(-\Gamma(-1/3))^3 V_\gamma = m^{-3} U_\gamma^{(1)} U_\gamma^{(2)} U_\gamma^{(3)}$, where $U^{(j)}_\gamma$ s are i.i.d. copies of U_γ . We first compute the mean. By Lemma 6,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}V_\gamma &= ((-\Gamma(-1/3))^{-1} m^{-1} \mathbb{E}U_\gamma)^3 \\ &= \left((1 + O(m^{-1})) f_\gamma(\mathbf{x})^{1/3} \right)^3 \\ &= (1 + O(m^{-1})) f_\gamma(\mathbf{x}).\end{aligned}$$

We now compute the variance.

$$\begin{aligned}(-\Gamma(-1/3))^6 \mathbb{E}V_\gamma \overline{V}_\gamma &= (m^{-2} \mathbb{E}U_\gamma \overline{U}_\gamma)^3 \\ &= (m^{-2} \mathbb{V}U_\gamma + m^{-2} \mathbb{E}U_\gamma \mathbb{E}\overline{U}_\gamma)^3 \\ (-\Gamma(-1/3))^6 \mathbb{E}V_\gamma \mathbb{E}\overline{V}_\gamma &= (m^{-2} \mathbb{E}U_\gamma \mathbb{E}\overline{U}_\gamma)^3 \\ (-\Gamma(-1/3))^6 \mathbb{V}V_\gamma &= (m^{-2} \mathbb{V}U_\gamma + m^{-2} \mathbb{E}U_\gamma \mathbb{E}\overline{U}_\gamma)^3 - (m^{-2} \mathbb{E}U_\gamma \mathbb{E}\overline{U}_\gamma)^3 \\ &= m^{-3} (m^{-1} \mathbb{V}U_\gamma)^3 + 3m^{-2} (m^{-1} \mathbb{V}U_\gamma)^2 (m^{-2} \mathbb{E}U_\gamma \mathbb{E}\overline{U}_\gamma) \\ &\quad + 3m^{-1} (m^{-1} \mathbb{V}U_\gamma) (m^{-2} \mathbb{E}U_\gamma \mathbb{E}\overline{U}_\gamma)^2.\end{aligned}$$

Note that by Lemma 7, $m^{-1} \mathbb{V}U_\gamma = (2^{2/3}(-\Gamma(-2/3)) + O(m^{-1})) f_\gamma(\mathbf{x})^{2/3}$ and by Lemma 6, $|m^{-1} \mathbb{E}U_\gamma| = (-\Gamma(-1/3) + O(m^{-1})) f_\gamma(\mathbf{x})^{1/3}$. Thus the last term dominates and we have

$$\begin{aligned}&= 3m^{-1} (m^{-1} \mathbb{V}U_\gamma) (m^{-2} \mathbb{E}U_\gamma \mathbb{E}\overline{U}_\gamma)^2 (1 + O(m^{-1})) \\ &= 3m^{-1} \left(2^{2/3}(-\Gamma(-2/3)) \right) f_\gamma(\mathbf{x})^{2/3} (-\Gamma(-1/3))^4 f_\gamma(\mathbf{x})^{4/3} (1 + O(m^{-1})).\end{aligned}$$

We conclude that

$$\mathbb{V}V_\gamma = (m^{-1} + O(m^{-2})) \cdot \frac{3 \cdot 2^{2/3}(-\Gamma(-2/3))}{(-\Gamma(-1/3))^2} \cdot f_\gamma(\mathbf{x})^2.$$

□

2.3 The Truncated Tower

We now consider a finite truncation $(X_k)_{a \leq k < b}$. The discussion in Section 1.3 suggests that we only need to store an interval of cells in order to estimate the γ -harmonic moment $f_\gamma(\mathbf{x})$. Define the $[a, b)$ -truncated $(-1/3)$ -aggregation as

$$U_{\gamma;a,b} = \sum_{k=a}^{b-1} (1 - e^{i\gamma X_k}) e^{\frac{1}{3}k/m},$$

The statistic $U_{\gamma;a,b}$ can be obtained by maintaining only $(b - a)$ cells. We now formally show that the contribution to the first and second moments being truncated decays exponentially in both directions.

Lemma 8. *Let $A = U_\gamma$, $B = U_{\gamma;-\infty,a}$ and $C = U_{b,\infty}$. Define $\|\mathbf{x}\|_0 = \sum_{v \in [n]} \mathbb{1}[\mathbf{x}_v \neq 0]$. Then*

1. $\mathbb{E}|A| \leq \text{poly}(\|\mathbf{x}\|_0 m)$.
2. $|B| \leq e^{\frac{1}{3}a/m} \text{poly}(\|\mathbf{x}\|_0 m)$.
3. $\mathbb{E}|C| \leq e^{-\frac{2}{3}b/m} \text{poly}(\|\mathbf{x}\|_0 m)$.
4. $\mathbb{E}|A|^2 \leq \text{poly}(\|\mathbf{x}\|_0 m)$.
5. $|B|^2 \leq e^{\frac{2}{3}a/m} \text{poly}(\|\mathbf{x}\|_0 m)$.
6. $\mathbb{E}|C|^2 \leq e^{-\frac{4}{3}b/m} \text{poly}(\|\mathbf{x}\|_0 m)$.
7. $\mathbb{E}|A||B| \leq e^{\frac{1}{3}a/m} \text{poly}(\|\mathbf{x}\|_0 m)$.
8. $\mathbb{E}|B||C| \leq e^{\frac{1}{3}a/m - \frac{2}{3}b/m} \text{poly}(\|\mathbf{x}\|_0 m)$.
9. $\mathbb{E}|C||A| \leq e^{-\frac{2}{3}b/m} \text{poly}(\|\mathbf{x}\|_0 m)$.

Proof. 1. Follow from Lemma 5 by noting that $\mathbb{E}|\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} (1 - e^{i\gamma X_k}) e^{\frac{1}{3}k/m}| \leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{E}|1 - e^{i\gamma X_k}| e^{\frac{1}{3}k/m}$.

2. $|B| = |\sum_{k=-\infty}^{a-1} (1 - e^{i\gamma X_k}) e^{\frac{1}{3}k/m}| \leq 2 \sum_{k=-\infty}^{a-1} e^{\frac{1}{3}k/m} = e^{\frac{1}{3}a/m} \cdot O(m)$.
3. $\mathbb{E}|C| \leq \sum_{k=b}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}|1 - e^{i\gamma X_k}| e^{\frac{1}{3}k/m}$. As in Lemma 5, $\mathbb{E}|1 - e^{i\gamma X_k}| \leq 2(1 - e^{-e^{-k/m}\|\mathbf{x}\|_0/2}) \leq e^{-k/m}\|\mathbf{x}\|_0$. Thus $\mathbb{E}|C| \leq \sum_{k=b}^{\infty} \|\mathbf{x}\|_0 e^{-\frac{2}{3}k/m} = \|\mathbf{x}\|_0 e^{-\frac{2}{3}b/m} \cdot O(m)$.
4. Proved in Lemma 7.
5. By part 2.
6. As in Lemma 5, we have $\mathbb{E}|1 - e^{i\gamma X_k}|^2 \leq 4(1 - e^{-e^{-k/m}\|\mathbf{x}\|_0/2}) \leq 2e^{-k/m}\|\mathbf{x}\|_0$ and for $j \neq k$, $\mathbb{E}|1 - e^{i\gamma X_k}| |1 - e^{i\gamma X_j}| = \mathbb{E}|1 - e^{i\gamma X_k}| \mathbb{E}|1 - e^{i\gamma X_j}| \leq e^{-(k+j)/m} \|\mathbf{x}\|_0^2$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}|C|^2 &\leq \sum_{j \geq b} \sum_{k \geq b} \mathbb{E}|1 - e^{i\gamma X_j}| |1 - e^{i\gamma X_k}| e^{\frac{j+k}{3}/m} \\
&\leq \sum_{j \geq b} \sum_{k \geq b} e^{-(j+k)/m} \|\mathbf{x}\|_0^2 e^{\frac{j+k}{3}/m} \\
&= \|\mathbf{x}\|_0^2 \left(\sum_{j \geq b} e^{-\frac{2}{3}j/m} \right)^2 \\
&= e^{-\frac{4}{3}b/m} \text{poly}(\|\mathbf{x}\|_0 m).
\end{aligned}$$

7. By parts 1 and 2.
8. By parts 2 and 3.
9. Follows from parts 4 and 6. Note that $\mathbb{E}|A||C| \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}|A|^2 \mathbb{E}|C|^2}$ by Cauchy-Schwartz. □

Theorem 3 (truncated harmonic estimator). *For any $\gamma > 0$, define the truncated estimator*

$$V_{\gamma; a, b} = m^{-3} (-\Gamma(-1/3))^{-3} \prod_{j=1}^3 \left(\sum_{k=a}^{b-1} (1 - e^{i\gamma X_k^{(j)}}) e^{\frac{1}{3}k/m} \right)$$

For any $a \leq 0 \leq b$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathbb{E}V_{\gamma; a, b} - \mathbb{E}V_{\gamma}| &\leq (e^{\frac{1}{3}a/m} + e^{-\frac{2}{3}b/m}) \text{poly}(\|\mathbf{x}\|_0 m) \\
|\mathbb{V}V_{\gamma; a, b} - \mathbb{V}V_{\gamma}| &\leq (e^{\frac{1}{3}a/m} + e^{-\frac{2}{3}b/m}) \text{poly}(\|\mathbf{x}\|_0 m).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let the $A^{(j)}$, $B^{(j)}$, and $C^{(j)}$ be i.i.d. copies of A , B , and C , defined in Lemma 8. Recall that the infinite SymmetricPoissonTower has estimator

$$V_\gamma = \frac{A^{(1)}A^{(2)}A^{(3)}}{m^3(-\Gamma(-1/3))^3}$$

and the truncated SymmetricPoissonTower has estimator

$$V_{\gamma;a,b} = \frac{(A^{(1)} - B^{(1)} - C^{(1)}) (A^{(2)} - B^{(2)} - C^{(2)}) (A^{(3)} - B^{(3)} - C^{(3)})}{m^3(-\Gamma(-1/3))^3}.$$

We first bound their difference in the mean.

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbb{E}V_\gamma - \mathbb{E}V_{\gamma;a,b}| \\ &= |(\mathbb{E}(A - B - C))^3 - (\mathbb{E}A)^3| \\ &\leq 3(\mathbb{E}|A|)^2(\mathbb{E}|B| + \mathbb{E}|C|) + 3(\mathbb{E}|A|)(\mathbb{E}|B| + \mathbb{E}|C|)^2 + (\mathbb{E}|B| + \mathbb{E}|C|)^3 \end{aligned}$$

According to Lemma 8, we know $\mathbb{E}|B| \leq e^{\frac{1}{3}a/m} \text{poly}(\|\mathbf{x}\|_0 m)$, $\mathbb{E}|C| \leq e^{-\frac{2}{3}b/m} \text{poly}(\|\mathbf{x}\|_0 m)$, and $\mathbb{E}|A| \leq \text{poly}(\|\mathbf{x}\|_0 m)$. Since we assume $a \leq 0 \leq b$, we have

$$\leq (e^{\frac{1}{3}a/m} + e^{-\frac{2}{3}b/m}) \text{poly}(\|\mathbf{x}\|_0 m),$$

Now we bound the difference in the second moment.

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbb{E}|V_\gamma|^2 - \mathbb{E}|V_{\gamma;a,b}|^2| \\ &= \left| (\mathbb{E}|A - B - C|^2)^3 - (\mathbb{E}|A|^2)^3 \right| \\ &= \left| (\mathbb{E}(|A|^2 + |B|^2 + |C|^2 - AB - AC - BA + BC - CA + CB))^3 - (\mathbb{E}|A|^2)^3 \right|, \end{aligned}$$

where the dominating term $(\mathbb{E}|A|^2)^3$ is canceled and we have

$$= O((\mathbb{E}|A|^2)^2 \cdot (\mathbb{E}|A||B| + \mathbb{E}|A||C|))$$

Similarly by Lemma 8, we know $\mathbb{E}|A|^2 = \text{poly}(\|\mathbf{x}\|_0 m)$, $\mathbb{E}|A||B| = e^{\frac{1}{3}a/m} \text{poly}(\|\mathbf{x}\|_0 m)$, and $\mathbb{E}|A||C| = e^{-\frac{2}{3}b/m} \text{poly}(\|\mathbf{x}\|_0 m)$. We thus have

$$\leq (e^{\frac{1}{3}a/m} + e^{-\frac{2}{3}b/m}) \text{poly}(\|\mathbf{x}\|_0 m).$$

We have proved first and second moment have vanishing differences, which implies the difference in variance is also $(e^{\frac{1}{3}a/m} + e^{-\frac{2}{3}b/m}) \text{poly}(\|\mathbf{x}\|_0 m)$. \square

3 Analysis of Combined Estimators

Let $\{V_{\gamma;a,b}\}_{\gamma>0}$ be the truncated harmonic estimators in Theorem 3. We just showed that the mean of $V_{\gamma;a,b}$ can be made arbitrarily close to the mean of V_γ by picking small enough a and large enough b . Choosing $a = -\Omega(m \log(mn))$ and $b = \Omega(m \log(mn))$, the difference $|\mathbb{E}V_{\gamma;a,b} - \mathbb{E}V_\gamma|$ becomes

$O(1/\text{poly}(mn))$. For a function $f(x) = \int_0^\infty (1 - \cos(x\gamma)) \nu(d\gamma)$, to estimate the f -moment one may try to combine the individual estimates as discussed in Section 1.2. However, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \int_0^\infty V_{\gamma;a,b} \nu(d\gamma) &= \int_0^\infty (\mathbb{E}V_\gamma + O(1/\text{poly}(mn))) \nu(d\gamma) && \text{(Theorem 3)} \\ &= \int_0^\infty ((1 + O(m^{-1}))f_\gamma(\mathbf{x}) + O(1/\text{poly}(mn))) \nu(d\gamma) && \text{(Theorem 2)} \\ &= (1 + O(m^{-1}))f(\mathbf{x}) + O(1/\text{poly}(mn)) \cdot \int_0^\infty \nu(d\gamma), \end{aligned}$$

where in general $\int_0^\infty \nu(d\gamma)$ can be *infinite*. For example, to estimate the L_1 -moment, we have $f(x) = |x| = \int_0^\infty (1 - \cos(x\gamma)) \frac{2}{\pi\gamma^2} d\gamma$. For this function f , we have $\int_0^\infty \frac{2}{\pi\gamma^2} d\gamma = \infty$. Recall that for $\int_0^\infty (1 - \cos(x\gamma)) \nu(d\gamma)$ to be well-defined, one only needs $\int_0^\infty \min(\gamma^2, 1) \nu(d\gamma)$ to be finite. The reason that the attempt above fails is that, when γ is near 0, the density $\nu(d\gamma)$ is unbounded and any non-zero additive bias is too large for the combined estimator. We thus need to split f into two parts $f_{<\zeta}(x) = \int_0^\zeta (1 - \cos(x\gamma)) \nu(d\gamma)$ and $f_{\geq\zeta}(x) = \int_\zeta^\infty (1 - \cos(x\gamma)) \nu(d\gamma)$ for estimation, where ζ is to be determined later.

Before we proceed, we first define a quantity that measures the “size” of the function f .

Definition 6 (function constant C_f). For any $f = \int_0^\infty (1 - \cos(x\gamma)) \nu(d\gamma)$ where ν is a positive measure, define $C_f = \int_0^\infty \min(\gamma^2, 1) \nu(d\gamma)$. Note that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $f(x)$ is finite if and only if $C_f < \infty$.

3.1 Estimation of the $f_{<\zeta}$ -Moment

We first show that, when ζ is small enough, the $f_{<\zeta}$ -moment can be approximated by the L_2 -moment $\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2$.

Lemma 9. Recall that $f_{<\zeta}(x) = \int_0^\zeta (1 - \cos(\gamma x)) \nu(d\gamma)$. The $f_{<\zeta}$ -moment of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ can be bounded as follows.

$$\left(1 - \frac{\zeta^2 \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2}{12}\right) \cdot \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \int_0^\zeta \gamma^2 \nu(d\gamma) \leq f_{<\zeta}(\mathbf{x}) \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \int_0^\zeta \gamma^2 \nu(d\gamma).$$

Proof. We first note the following approximation of $(1 - \cos(x))$. For any $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$x^2/2 - x^4/24 \leq 1 - \cos(x) \leq x^2/2.$$

On the one hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{v \in [n]} \int_0^\zeta (1 - \cos(\gamma \mathbf{x}_v)) \nu(d\gamma) &\leq \sum_{v \in [n]} \int_0^\zeta \gamma^2 \mathbf{x}_v^2 / 2 \nu(d\gamma) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \int_0^\zeta \gamma^2 \nu(d\gamma). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{v \in [n]} \int_0^\zeta (1 - \cos(\gamma \mathbf{x}_v)) \nu(d\gamma) &\geq \sum_{v \in [n]} \int_0^\zeta (\gamma^2 \mathbf{x}_v^2 / 2 - \gamma^4 \mathbf{x}_v^4 / 24) \nu(d\gamma) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \int_0^\zeta \gamma^2 \nu(d\gamma) - \frac{1}{24} \|\mathbf{x}\|_4^4 \int_0^\zeta \gamma^4 \nu(d\gamma) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \int_0^\zeta \gamma^2 \nu(d\gamma) - \frac{1}{24} \|\mathbf{x}\|_4^4 \zeta^2 \int_0^\zeta \gamma^2 \nu(d\gamma). \end{aligned}$$

Finally we note that $\|\mathbf{x}\|_4 \leq \|\mathbf{x}\|_2$. □

Thus by choosing $\zeta = O(1/\text{poly}(m\|\mathbf{x}\|_2))$, $\frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \int_0^\zeta \gamma^2 \nu(d\gamma)$ will be a $(1 \pm O(m^{-1}))$ -approximation of the $f_{<\zeta}$ -moment. It suffices now to approximate the L_2 -moment $\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2$. The classic L_2 -moment can be estimated with a separate AMS sketch [1]. Nevertheless, to demonstrate the universality of the `SymmetricPoissonTower` sketch, we will use its cells X_0, \dots, X_{m-1} to estimate L_2 , which are not independent from the harmonic estimators $\{V_{\gamma;a,b}\}$.

Lemma 10 (L_2 -moment estimator). *Let $(X_k)_{a \leq k < b}$ be a truncated symmetric Poisson tower with parameter m where $a \leq 0$ and $b \geq m$. Then we define the L_2 -estimator,*

$$\Psi = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} X_k^2 e^{k/m}.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\Psi &= \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \\ \mathbb{V}\Psi &\leq (3+e)m^{-1}\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^4. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Recall that $X_k = \sum_{v \in [n]} Z_{v,k} \mathbf{x}_v$ where $Z_{v,k} \sim \text{SymmetricPoisson}(e^{-k/m})$. By Lemma 4, we know $\mathbb{E}Z_{v,k} = 0$, $\mathbb{E}Z_{v,k}^2 = e^{-k/m}$, and $\mathbb{E}Z_{v,k}^4 = e^{-k/m} + 3e^{-2k/m}$. Thus similar to the AMS sketch,

$$\mathbb{E}X_k^2 = \sum_{v \in [n]} \mathbf{x}_v^2 \mathbb{E}Z_{v,k}^2 = e^{-k/m} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2.$$

Thus $\mathbb{E}\Psi = \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}X_k^4 &= \sum_{v \in [n]} \mathbf{x}_v^4 \mathbb{E}Z_{v,k}^4 + 6 \sum_{s < t} \mathbf{x}_s^2 \mathbf{x}_t^2 \mathbb{E}Z_{v,s}^2 \mathbb{E}Z_{v,t}^2 \\ &\leq (e^{-k/m} + 3e^{-2k/m}) \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^4 \end{aligned}$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\Psi^2 &\leq \frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{E}X_k^4 e^{2k/m} + \left(\frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{E}X_k^2 e^{k/m}\right)^2 \\ &= \frac{\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^4}{m^2} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} (e^{k/m} + 3) + \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^4 \\ &\leq \frac{\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^4}{m} (3+e) + \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^4. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\mathbb{V}\Psi \leq \mathbb{E}\Psi^2 - (\mathbb{E}\Psi)^2 \leq (3+e)m^{-1}\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^4$. □

3.2 Estimation of the $f_{\geq\zeta}$ -Moment

We proceed as in Section 1.2. Let $\{V_{\gamma;a,b}\}_{\gamma \geq \zeta}$ be the set of harmonic estimators generated from the truncated triple `SymmetricPoissonTower` in Theorem 3. For $f_{\geq\zeta}(x) = \int_\zeta^\infty (1 - \cos(x\gamma)) \nu(d\gamma)$, define

$$\phi_{f_{\geq\zeta};a,b} = \int_\zeta^\infty V_{\gamma;a,b} \nu(d\gamma).$$

By Theorem 3, we know $\mathbb{E}V_{\gamma;a,b} = \mathbb{E}V_{\gamma} + O(\delta)$ where $\delta = (e^{\frac{1}{3}a/m} + e^{-\frac{2}{3}b/m}) \text{poly}(\|\mathbf{x}\|_0 m)$.

We have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\phi_{f;\geq\zeta;a,b} &= \int_{\zeta}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}V_{\gamma;a,b} \nu(d\gamma) \\ &= \int_{\zeta}^{\infty} ((1 + O(m^{-1}))f_{\gamma}(\mathbf{x}) + O(\delta)) \nu(d\gamma) \\ &= (1 + O(m^{-1})) \int_{\zeta}^{\infty} f_{\gamma}(\mathbf{x}) \nu(d\gamma) + O(\delta) \int_{\zeta}^{\infty} \nu(d\gamma)\end{aligned}$$

note that since $\zeta < 1$, we have $\int_{\zeta}^{\infty} \nu(d\gamma) \leq \zeta^{-2} \int_0^{\infty} \min(\gamma^2, 1) \nu(d\gamma) = \zeta^{-2} C_f$

$$= (1 + O(m^{-1})) \int_{\zeta}^{\infty} f_{\gamma}(\mathbf{x}) \nu(d\gamma) + O(\delta)\zeta^{-2} C_f.$$

The variance can be bounded similarly and we will leave it in the proof of Theorem 4.

3.3 Combination

We now prove the main technical theorem.

Theorem 4 (“frequency-domain” estimator). *Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ be the input frequency vector and $(X_k^{(j)})_{a \leq k < b, j=1,2,3}$ be a $[a, b]$ -truncated triple SymmetricPoissonTower with parameter m . For any function $f(x) = \sigma^2 x^2 / 2 + \int_0^{\infty} (1 - \cos(x\gamma)) \nu(d\gamma)$ where ν is a positive measure with $C_f = \int_0^{\infty} \min(\gamma^2, 1) \nu(d\gamma)$. Denote the estimator for f as*

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_{f;a,b} &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\sigma^2 + \int_0^{\zeta} \gamma^2 \nu(d\gamma) \right) \frac{\sum_{j=1}^3 \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} (X_k^{(j)})^2 e^{k/m}}{3m} \\ &\quad + \int_{\zeta}^{\infty} \frac{\prod_{j=1}^3 \left(\sum_{k=a}^{b-1} (1 - e^{i\gamma X_k^{(j)}}) e^{\frac{1}{3}k/m} \right)}{m^3 (-\Gamma(-1/3))^3} \nu(d\gamma).\end{aligned}$$

Set $\zeta = O(1/\text{poly}(\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 m))$. If $a = -\Omega(m \log(\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 m))$ and $b = \Omega(m \log(\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 m))$, then $\phi_{f;a,b}$ is a $(1 \pm O(m^{-1}))$ -approximate of the f -moment with negligible bias.

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\phi_{f;a,b} &= (1 + O(m^{-1})) \sum_{v \in [n]} f(\mathbf{x}_v) + O\left(\frac{C_f}{\text{poly}(\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 m)}\right) \\ \mathbb{V}\phi_{f;a,b} &\leq O(m^{-1}) \cdot \left(\sum_{v \in [n]} f(\mathbf{x}_v) \right)^2 + O\left(\frac{C_f^2}{\text{poly}(\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 m)}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Proof. For simplicity, we write $\phi_{f;a,b}$ as $\alpha A + B$ where $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}(\sigma^2 + \int_0^{\zeta} \gamma^2 \nu(d\gamma))$, $A = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^3 \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} (X_k^{(j)})^2 e^{k/m}}{3m}$, and $B = \int_{\zeta}^{\infty} \frac{\prod_{j=1}^3 \left(\sum_{k=a}^{b-1} (1 - e^{i\gamma X_k^{(j)}}) e^{\frac{1}{3}k/m} \right)}{m^3 (-\Gamma(-1/3))^3} \nu(d\gamma)$. By Lemma 10, we know

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}A &= \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \\ \mathbb{V}A &\leq (1 + e/3)m^{-1} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^4.\end{aligned}$$

With Lemma 9, we know

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\alpha A &= (1 + O(m^{-1}))f_{<\zeta}(\mathbf{x}) \\ \mathbb{V}(\alpha A) &\leq (1 + e/3)m^{-1} (f_{<\zeta}(\mathbf{x}))^2 (1 + O(m^{-1}))\end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, we always have $\|\mathbf{x}\|_0 \leq \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2$. By the calculation in Section 3.2 and the assumptions on ζ, a, b , we have

$$\mathbb{E}B = (1 + O(m^{-1})) \sum_{v \in [n]} f_{\geq \zeta}(\mathbf{x}_v) + C_f \cdot O(1/\text{poly}(\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 m))$$

Similarly, for the variance we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{V}B &\leq \left(\int_{\zeta}^{\infty} \sqrt{\mathbb{V}V_{\gamma;a,b}} \nu(\gamma) \right)^2 \\ &\leq \left(\int_{\zeta}^{\infty} \sqrt{\mathbb{V}V_{\gamma} + O(1/\text{poly}(\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 m))} \nu(\gamma) \right)^2 && \text{(Theorem 3)} \\ &\leq \left(\int_{\zeta}^{\infty} \sqrt{(m^{-1} + O(m^{-2})) \cdot C \cdot f_{\gamma}(\mathbf{x})^2 + O(1/\text{poly}(\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 m))} \nu(\gamma) \right)^2 && \text{(Theorem 2)}\end{aligned}$$

note that $f_{\gamma}(\mathbf{x}) \leq 2\|\mathbf{x}\|_0 \leq 2\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2$ and $\int_{\zeta}^{\infty} \nu(d\gamma) \leq \zeta^{-2} \int_{\zeta}^{\infty} \min(\gamma^2, 1) \nu(d\gamma) = \zeta^{-2} C_f$.

$$\begin{aligned}&\leq \left(\int_{\zeta}^{\infty} \sqrt{(m^{-1} + O(m^{-2})) \cdot C \cdot f_{\gamma}(\mathbf{x})^2 + \sqrt{O(1/\text{poly}(\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 m))} \nu(\gamma)} \right)^2 \\ &\leq \left(\sqrt{(m^{-1} + O(m^{-2})) \cdot C} f_{\geq \zeta}(\mathbf{x}) + \sqrt{O(1/\text{poly}(\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 m))} \zeta^{-2} C_f \right)^2\end{aligned}$$

Note that we have $1 + e/3 < 2$ and $C = \frac{3 \cdot 2^{2/3} (-\Gamma(-2/3))}{(-\Gamma(-1/3))^2} < 2$. We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(\alpha A + B) &= (1 + O(m^{-1}))f(\mathbf{x}) + C_f \cdot O(1/\text{poly}(\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 m)) \\ \mathbb{V}(\alpha A + B) &\leq (\sqrt{\mathbb{V}(\alpha A)} + \sqrt{\mathbb{V}B})^2 \\ &\leq \left(\sqrt{2(m + O(m^{-2}))} f(\mathbf{x}) + O(1/\text{poly}(\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 m)) \cdot C_f \right)^2\end{aligned}$$

We know $f_{\geq \zeta}(\mathbf{x}) \leq \sum_{v \in [n]} \int_{\zeta}^{\infty} 2 \nu(d\gamma) = O(\zeta^{-2} C_f \|\mathbf{x}\|_0)$ and $f_{<\zeta}(\mathbf{x}) \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 C_f$ (Lemma 9). Therefore $f(\mathbf{x}) = O(\zeta^{-2} C_f \|\mathbf{x}\|_0)$. We have assumed $\zeta = O(1/\text{poly}(\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 m))$ and thus

$$\leq O(m^{-1}) (f(\mathbf{x}))^2 + O(1/\text{poly}(\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 m)) \cdot C_f^2.$$

□

The the “frequency domain” estimator above might look daunting but in practice f can usually be approximated with a few main harmonic moments. In the case where f cannot be approximated by sparse harmonics, we provide the following alternative estimator, which can be computed with at most $O(m^3 \log^3(nMm))$ evaluations of the function f_{ζ} .

Corollary 1 (“time-domain” estimator). *With the setup in Theorem 4, define $\psi_{f;a,b}$ as*

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{f;a,b} &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\sigma^2 + \int_0^\zeta \gamma^2 \nu(d\gamma) \right) \frac{\sum_{j=1}^3 \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} (X_k^{(j)})^2 e^{k/m}}{3m} \\ &\quad + m^{-3} (-\Gamma(-1/3))^{-3} \sum_{j=a}^{b-1} \sum_{k=a}^{b-1} \sum_{l=a}^{b-1} e^{\frac{k+j+l}{3m}} \left(f_{\geq \zeta}(X_j^{(1)}) + f_{\geq \zeta}(X_k^{(2)}) + f_{\geq \zeta}(X_l^{(3)}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - f_{\geq \zeta}(X_j^{(1)} + X_k^{(2)}) - f_{\geq \zeta}(X_k^{(2)} + X_l^{(3)}) - f_{\geq \zeta}(X_l^{(3)} + X_j^{(1)}) + f_{\geq \zeta}(X_j^{(1)} + X_k^{(2)} + X_l^{(3)}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then $\psi_{f;a,b}$ is a $(1 \pm O(m^{-1}))$ -approximate of the f -moment with negligible bias. In particular,

$$\psi_{f;a,b} = \text{Re}(\phi_{f;a,b}).$$

Proof. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} &\prod_{j=1}^3 \left(\sum_{k=a}^{b-1} (1 - e^{i\gamma X_k^{(j)}}) e^{\frac{1}{3}k/m} \right) \\ &= \sum_{j=a}^{b-1} \sum_{k=a}^{b-1} \sum_{l=a}^{b-1} (1 - e^{i\gamma X_j^{(1)}}) (1 - e^{i\gamma X_k^{(2)}}) (1 - e^{i\gamma X_l^{(3)}}) e^{\frac{1}{3}(k+j+l)/m} \end{aligned}$$

where for any integers A_1, A_2, A_3

$$\begin{aligned} &(1 - e^{i\gamma A_1})(1 - e^{i\gamma A_2})(1 - e^{i\gamma A_3}) \\ &= 1 - \sum_j e^{i\gamma A_j} + \sum_{j < k} e^{i\gamma(A_1+A_2)} - e^{i\gamma(A_1+A_2+A_3)} \\ &= (1 - e^{i\gamma(A_1+A_2+A_3)}) + \sum (1 - e^{i\gamma A_j}) - \sum_{j < k} (1 - e^{i\gamma(A_j+A_k)}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\text{Re}(1 - e^{i\gamma k}) = 1 - \cos(\gamma k)$ for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Thus by change the order of the triple-summation and integration we have what we want. Finally, note that for any complex random variable W , $\mathbb{V}W = \mathbb{V}\text{Re}W + \mathbb{V}\text{Im}W$ and thus $\mathbb{V}\psi_{f;a,b} \leq \mathbb{V}\phi_{f;a,b}$. \square

3.4 Signed Combination

As in [12], the transportation of the mean and the relative variance of $\{V_\gamma\}_{\gamma>0}$ in the combined estimator $\int_0^\infty V_\gamma \nu(d\gamma)$ relies crucially on the fact that ν is a positive measure. In general, when ν is a signed measure, the combined mean Eq. (4) still holds but the combined variance Eq. (5) now depend on $|\nu|$.

Corollary 2 (signed combination). *Let $f(x) = \sigma_1^2 x^2/2 + \int_0^\infty (1 - \cos(x\gamma)) \nu_1(d\gamma)$ and $g(x) = \sigma_2^2 x^2/2 + \int_0^\infty (1 - \cos(x\gamma)) \nu_2(d\gamma)$ where ν_1, ν_2 are positive measures. Let $\phi_{f;a,b}$ and $\phi_{g;a,b}$ be generated from a same truncated triple SymmetricPoissonTower sketch in Theorem 4. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\phi_{f;a,b} - \phi_{g;a,b}) &= (1 + O(m^{-1}))(f(\mathbf{x}) - g(\mathbf{x})) + O\left(\frac{C_f + C_g}{\text{poly}(\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 m)}\right) \\ \mathbb{V}(\phi_{f;a,b} - \phi_{g;a,b}) &\leq O(m^{-1}) \cdot (f(\mathbf{x}) + g(\mathbf{x}))^2 + O\left(\frac{C_f^2 + C_g^2}{\text{poly}(\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 m)}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Both follow from Theorem 4. The mean results from the linearity of expectation. For the variance, note that

$$\mathbb{V}(\phi_{f;a,b} - \phi_{g;a,b}) \leq (\sqrt{\mathbb{V}\phi_{f;a,b}} + \sqrt{\mathbb{V}\phi_{g;a,b}})^2.$$

□

Thus for $(\phi_{f;a,b} - \phi_{g;a,b})$ to be a multiplicative approximation of the $(f - g)$ -moment, one needs $f(\mathbf{x}) + g(\mathbf{x}) = \Omega(f(\mathbf{x}) - g(\mathbf{x}))$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$.

4 Proof of the Main Theorem

The main theorem (Theorem 1) almost directly follows from Theorem 4 and Corollary 2. We only need to analyze the space and translate the variance guarantee to $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximation with Chebyshev's inequality.

The truncated tower stores X_j s from $a = -\Omega(m \log(\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2m}))$ to $b = \Omega(m \log(\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2m}))$. Suppose $b - a = C_1 m \log(\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2m})$ for some $C_1 > 0$. Each cell j stores an integer. Specifically $X_j \sim \sum_{v \in [n]} \mathbf{x}_v Y_v$ where $Y_v \sim \text{SymmetricPoisson}(e^{-k/m})$. By a simple coupling argument, we have $|X_j| \leq MY$ where M is the frequency upper bound and $Y \sim \text{Poisson}(ne^{-k/m})$. Therefore by Markov's inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}(|X_j| \geq C_2 m \log(\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2m}) M n e^{-k/m}) \leq \mathbb{P}(Y \geq C_2 m \log(\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2m}) n e^{-k/m}) \leq \frac{1}{C_2 m \log(\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2m})}.$$

Choosing $C_2 = 18C_1$, by the union bound, with probability $1 - \frac{C_1 m \log(\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2m})}{C_2 m \log(\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2m})} = 17/18$, that $|X_j| < C_2 m \log(\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2m}) M n e^{-k/m} = O(\text{poly}(Mmn))$ for all $j \in [a, b)$, where we bound $\|\mathbf{x}\|_2$ by nM^2 . With probability at least $5/6$ that this event occurs for all three truncated towers.

By Theorem 4, an estimate of the f -moment can be returned with $O(m^{-1})$ relative variance and an $O(C_f/O(\text{poly}(\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2m})))$ additive bias. Note that for any non-empty stream, the f -moment $f(\mathbf{x})$ is at least $\xi(f, M)$. Thus the additive bias can be absorbed in the multiplicative term since we have $\xi(f, M) = \Omega(C_f/\text{poly}(nMm))$ by assumption in Theorem 1. Therefore, the estimator is a $(1 \pm O(m^{-1/2}))$ -approximation with probability $1/6$ by Chebyshev's inequality with a suitable constant in $O(m^{-1/2})$. It suffices to set $m = \Omega(\epsilon^{-2})$ for a $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximation.

By a union bound, with probability $2/3$ the estimate is a $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximation and at the same time $O(\log(Mmn))$ bits suffice to store every cell for the three i.i.d. copies of truncated tower. There are $O(m \log(\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2m})) = O(m \log(nMm))$ cells. Thus the total space in bits is $O(m \log^2(nMm)) = O(\epsilon^{-2} \log^2(nM\epsilon^{-1}))$. The proof for the signed combination goes the same with the variance guarantee provided by Corollary 2.

5 Conclusion

Theoretically, understanding which function moments can be approximated over streams has been a central problem in the streaming literature [16, 1, 18, 3, 7, 4, 5]. There has been little progress on this problem since the work of Braverman, Chestnut, Woodruff, and Yang [5], who characterized *tractability* outside of the class of nearly periodic functions. In this work we took a completely different approach to the tractability/universal sketching problem, which is based on estimating *harmonic moments*. This has greatly expanded the class of nearly periodic function moments that can be sketched efficiently, in polylog space.

Universal sketches should be attractive for those practical applications where the future query functions cannot be predicted in advance. Our new universal harmonic sketching scheme based on the `SymmetricPoissonTower` does not require any auxiliary data structures to sample from the support of the input vector \mathbf{x} , nor find heavy hitters. It uses only $O(\epsilon^{-2} \log^2 n)$ bits and covers all commonly used function moments (frequency moments $|x|^p, p \in (0, 2]$; support size $\mathbb{1}[x \neq 0]$; soft cap $1 - e^{-|x|}$; logarithm $\log(1 + |x|)$). The new sketch matches the space bound of an L_0 -sampling-based estimator [11, 4] with a much larger family of estimable functions, and is more space-efficient than the L_2 -heavy hitter framework [5] which occupies $O(h(M)\epsilon^{-2} \log^5 n \log(nM) \log \log n)$ bits, where h is a sub-polynomial function depending on the function f .

References

- [1] Noga Alon, Yossi Matias, and Mario Szegedy. The space complexity of approximating the frequency moments. In *Proceedings of the 28th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 20–29, 1996.
- [2] Noga Alon, Yossi Matias, and Mario Szegedy. The space complexity of approximating the frequency moments. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 58(1):137–147, 1999.
- [3] Ziv Bar-Yossef, Thathachar S. Jayram, Ravi Kumar, and D. Sivakumar. An information statistics approach to data stream and communication complexity. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 68(4):702–732, 2004.
- [4] Vladimir Braverman and Stephen R. Chestnut. Universal sketches for the frequency negative moments and other decreasing streaming sums. *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques*, page 591, 2015.
- [5] Vladimir Braverman, Stephen R. Chestnut, David P. Woodruff, and Lin F. Yang. Streaming space complexity of nearly all functions of one variable on frequency vectors. In *Proceedings of the 35th ACM Symposium on Principles of Database Systems (PODS)*, pages 261–276, 2016.
- [6] Vladimir Braverman, Jonathan Katzman, Charles Seidell, and Gregory Vorsanger. An optimal algorithm for large frequency moments using $O(n^{1-2/k})$ bits. In *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques (APPROX/RANDOM 2014)*. Schloss-Dagstuhl-Leibniz Zentrum für Informatik, 2014.
- [7] Vladimir Braverman and Rafail Ostrovsky. Zero-one frequency laws. In *Proceedings of the 42nd ACM symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 281–290, 2010.
- [8] Vladimir Braverman and Rafail Ostrovsky. Approximating large frequency moments with pick-and-drop sampling. In *International Workshop on Approximation Algorithms for Combinatorial Optimization*, pages 42–57. Springer, 2013.
- [9] Vladimir Braverman and Rafail Ostrovsky. Generalizing the layering method of Indyk and Woodruff: Recursive sketches for frequency-based vectors on streams. In *International Workshop on Approximation Algorithms for Combinatorial Optimization*, pages 58–70. Springer, 2013.
- [10] Amit Chakrabarti, Subhash Khot, and Xiaodong Sun. Near-optimal lower bounds on the multi-party communication complexity of set disjointness. In *18th IEEE Annual Conference on Computational Complexity, 2003. Proceedings.*, pages 107–117. IEEE, 2003.

- [11] Stephen Robert Chestnut. *Stream sketches, sampling, and sabotage*. PhD thesis, Johns Hopkins University, 2015.
- [12] Edith Cohen. Hyperloglog hyperextended: Sketches for concave sublinear frequency statistics. In *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 105–114, 2017.
- [13] Don Coppersmith and Ravi Kumar. An improved data stream algorithm for frequency moments. In *Proceedings of the fifteenth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, pages 151–156, 2004.
- [14] Graham Cormode, Mayur Datar, Piotr Indyk, and Shanmugavelayutham Muthukrishnan. Comparing data streams using Hamming norms (how to zero in). *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 15(3):529–540, 2003.
- [15] Graham Cormode and Donatella Firmani. A unifying framework for ℓ_0 -sampling algorithms. *Distributed Parallel Databases*, 32(3):315–335, 2014.
- [16] Philippe Flajolet and G Nigel Martin. Probabilistic counting algorithms for data base applications. *Journal of computer and system sciences*, 31(2):182–209, 1985.
- [17] Sumit Ganguly. Estimating frequency moments of data streams using random linear combinations. In *International Workshop on Randomization and Approximation Techniques in Computer Science*, pages 369–380. Springer, 2004.
- [18] Piotr Indyk. Stable distributions, pseudorandom generators, embeddings, and data stream computation. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 53(3):307–323, 2006.
- [19] Piotr Indyk and David Woodruff. Optimal approximations of the frequency moments of data streams. In *Proceedings of the thirty-seventh annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 202–208, 2005.
- [20] Piotr Indyk and David P. Woodruff. Tight lower bounds for the distinct elements problem. In *Proceedings 44th IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), October 2003, Cambridge, MA, USA, Proceedings*, pages 283–288, 2003.
- [21] Daniel M. Kane, Jelani Nelson, and David P. Woodruff. An optimal algorithm for the distinct elements problem. In *Proceedings 29th ACM Symposium on Principles of Database Systems (PODS)*, pages 41–52, 2010.
- [22] Zaoxing Liu, Antonis Manousis, Gregory Vorsanger, Vyas Sekar, and Vladimir Braverman. One sketch to rule them all: Rethinking network flow monitoring with univmon. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGCOMM Conference*, pages 101–114, 2016.
- [23] Seth Pettie and Dingyu Wang. Information theoretic limits of cardinality estimation: Fisher meets Shannon. In *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 556–569, 2021.
- [24] Eric Price and David P Woodruff. Applications of the Shannon-Hartley theorem to data streams and sparse recovery. In *2012 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory Proceedings*, pages 2446–2450. IEEE, 2012.

[25] Dingyu Wang and Seth Pettie. Better cardinality estimators for HyperLogLog, PCSA, and beyond. In *Proceedings of the 42nd ACM Symposium on Principles of Database Systems (PODS)*, pages 317–327, 2023.

A Example Functions

A.1 Nearly Periodic g_{np}

The function g_{np} is constructed in [5] for the purpose of showing there are tractable functions outside the reach of L_2 -heavy hitters framework. We decompose g_{np} into harmonic moments and compute its function constant $C_{g_{np}}$ in this section. Recall the following definitions.

- $\mathbb{B} = \{\sum_{j=1}^k a_j 2^{-j} \mid \forall j, a_j \in \{0, 1\}, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is the set of finite-precision binary numbers in $[0, 1)$;
- $\tau : \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ with $\tau(x) = \max\{j \in \mathbb{N} \mid 2^j \mid x\}$ which returns the position of the least significant bit of x ;
- $\tau_* : \mathbb{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ with $\tau_*(r) = \min\{j \in \mathbb{N} \mid 2^{-j} \mid r\}$ which returns the length of the binary representation of r .

Lemma 11. For any $x \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$g_{np}(x) = 2^{-\tau(x)} = \frac{4}{3} \sum_{\gamma \in \mathbb{B}} (1 - \cos(2\pi\gamma x)) 2^{-2\tau_*(\gamma)}$$

Proof. Partition \mathbb{B} as B_0, B_1, B_2, \dots where $B_k = \{r \in \mathbb{B} \mid \tau_*(r) = k\}$. We have $B_0 = \{0\}$, $B_1 = \{1/2\}$, $B_2 = \{1/4, 3/4\}$, $B_3 = \{1/8, 3/8, 5/8, 7/8\}$, and so on. By symmetry, for $k \geq 2$

$$\sum_{\gamma \in B_k} (1 - \cos(2\pi\gamma x)) = \begin{cases} 2^{k-1}, & \tau(x) \leq k-2 \\ 2^k, & \tau(x) = k-1 \\ 0, & \tau(x) \geq k \end{cases}$$

where in the first case $\sum_{\gamma \in B_k} \cos(2\pi\gamma x) = 0$, in the second case $\cos(2\pi\gamma x) = -1$ for any $\gamma \in B_k$, and in the last case, $\cos(2\pi\gamma x) = 1$ for any $\gamma \in B_k$. Thus if $\tau(x) \geq 1$, i.e., x is even, then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\gamma \in \mathbb{B}} (1 - \cos(2\pi\gamma x)) 2^{-2\tau_*(\gamma)} &= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{\gamma \in B_k} (1 - \cos(2\pi\gamma x)) 2^{-2k} \\ &= 2^{\tau(x)+1} 2^{-2(\tau(x)+1)} + \sum_{k=\tau(x)+2}^{\infty} 2^{k-1} \cdot 2^{-2k} \\ &= 2^{-(\tau(x)+1)} + 2^{-(\tau(x)+2)} \\ &= \frac{3}{4} 2^{-\tau(x)}. \end{aligned}$$

When x is odd, then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\gamma \in \mathbb{B}} (1 - \cos(2\pi\gamma x)) 2^{-2\tau_*(\gamma)} &= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{\gamma \in B_k} (1 - \cos(2\pi\gamma x)) 2^{-2k} \\ &= 2 \cdot 2^{-2} + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} 2^{k-1} \cdot 2^{-2k} \\ &= \frac{3}{4}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 12. $C_{g_{np}} \leq \frac{2}{3}$.

Proof.

$$C_{g_{np}} = \frac{4}{3} \sum_{\gamma \in \mathbb{B}} \min(4\pi^2\gamma^2, 1) 2^{-2\tau_*(\gamma)} \leq \frac{4}{3} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\gamma \in B_k} 2^{-2k} = \frac{4}{3} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^{k-1} 2^{-2k} = \frac{2}{3}.$$

□

A.2 The Golden Harmonic Moment g_{gold}

The gold harmonic moment g_{gold} is constructed for additional examples that are tractable in the harmonic sketching framework but out of the reach of prior techniques.

With the pigeonhole argument in Lemma 2, it is clear that $\xi(g_{gold}, M) = O(1/M^2)$. We now bound $\xi(g_{gold}, M)$ from below, which is based on the theory of continued fractions.

Lemma 13. *Let $g_{gold}(x) = 1 - \cos(\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2} \cdot 2\pi x)$ for $x \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then $\xi(g_{gold}, M) = \Omega(1/M^2)$.*

Proof. The convergents of $\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$ are $(F_{n+1}/F_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ where $(F_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is the Fibonacci sequence. It is known that for any $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $q \leq F_n$, $|\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2} - p/q| \geq |\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2} - F_{n+1}/F_n|$. Thus for any $x \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}x = w + r$ where $w \in \mathbb{N}$ and $r \in (-1/2, 1/2)$. Let $F_n \geq x$. Then

$$|r/x| = \left| \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2} - \frac{w}{x} \right| \geq \left| \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2} - F_{n+1}/F_n \right| \geq \left| \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2} - F_{n+2}/F_{n+1} \right|$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} 2|r/x| &\geq \left| \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2} - F_{n+1}/F_n \right| + \left| \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2} - F_{n+2}/F_{n+1} \right| \\ &\geq |F_{n+1}/F_n - F_{n+2}/F_{n+1}| \\ &= \frac{1}{F_n F_{n+1}} \end{aligned}$$

Note that $F_n = \Theta((\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2})^n)$ and thus we may choose F_n, F_{n+1} that are $O(x)$. Therefore $|r| = \Omega(1/x)$, which implies $1 - \cos(\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2} \cdot 2\pi x) = 1 - \cos(w2\pi + 2\pi r) = 1 - \cos(2\pi r) \leq 2\pi^2 r^2 = \Omega(1/x^2)$. □

B Mathematical Lemmas

This section we estimate the rate that sums like $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} (1 - e^{-e^{-k/m}}) e^{\frac{1}{3}k/m}$ converge to its limit $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (1 - e^{-e^{-k/m}}) e^{\frac{1}{3}r} dr$ as m increases, supporting our analysis of the smoothed $(-1/3)$ -aggregation.

Lemma 14. *Let $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a differentiable function. If both h and h' are (Lebesgue) integrable, then*

$$\left| \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} h(s) ds - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} h(k/m) \right| \leq m^{-1} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |h'(s)| ds.$$

Proof. We bound the difference

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} h(s) ds - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} h(k/m) \right| &= \left| \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \left(\int_0^{1/m} h(k/m + s) ds - \frac{1}{m} h(k/m) \right) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \left| \int_0^{1/m} h(k/m + s) ds - \frac{1}{m} h(k/m) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_0^{1/m} h(k/m + s) ds - \frac{1}{m} h(k/m) \right| &= \left| \int_0^{1/m} \int_0^s h'(k/m + t) dt ds \right| \\ &\leq \int_0^{1/m} \int_0^s |h'(k/m + t)| dt ds \\ &\leq \int_0^{1/m} \int_0^{1/m} |h'(k/m + t)| dt ds \\ &= \frac{1}{m} \int_0^{1/m} |h'(k/m + t)| dt. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} h(s) ds - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} h(j/m) \right| &\leq \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m} \int_0^{1/m} |h'(k/m + t)| dt \\ &= \frac{1}{m} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |h'(t)| dt. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 15. Let $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$. Define

$$\eta_1(x; a, b, c) = (e^{-ae^{-x}} - e^{-be^{-x}})e^{cx}, \quad \eta_2(x; a, c) = ae^{-x}e^{-ae^{-x}}e^{cx}.$$

If $\operatorname{Re}(a) \geq 0$, $\operatorname{Re}(b) \geq 0$ and $c \in (0, 1)$, then

1. $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \eta_1(x; a, b, c) dx = (a^c - b^c)\Gamma(-c)$, where $\Gamma(\cdot)$ here denotes the Gamma function (Fig. 1);
2. $\eta_1'(x; a, b, c) = c\eta_1(x; a, b, c) + \eta_2(x; a, c) - \eta_2(x; b, c)$;
3. $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\eta_1(x; a, b, c)| dx \leq 2 \left(\frac{1}{c} + \frac{1}{1-c} \right) |b - a|^c$.
4. $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\eta_2(x; a, c)| dx \leq |a|^c \Gamma(1 - c)$.
5. $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\eta_1'(x; a, b, c)| dx \leq 2 \left(1 + \frac{c}{1-c} \right) |b - a|^c + (|a|^c + |b|^c)\Gamma(1 - c)$.
- 6.

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \eta_1(x; a, b, c) dx - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \eta_1(k/m; a, b, c) \right| \\ \leq m^{-1} \left(2 \left(1 + \frac{c}{1-c} \right) |b - a|^c + (|a|^c + |b|^c)\Gamma(1 - c) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Part 1. Integral by parts.

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (e^{-ae^{-x}} - e^{-be^{-x}})e^{cx} dx \\ &= (e^{-ae^{-x}} - e^{-be^{-x}})c^{-1}e^{cx} \Big|_{-\infty}^{\infty} - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (ae^{-x}e^{-ae^{-x}} - be^{-x}e^{-be^{-x}})c^{-1}e^{cx} dx \end{aligned}$$

Since $\operatorname{Re}(a) \geq 0$, $\operatorname{Re}(b) \geq 0$ and $c \in (0, 1)$, $(e^{-ae^{-x}} - e^{-be^{-x}})c^{-1}e^{cx} \Big|_{-\infty}^{\infty} = 0$,

$$= -c^{-1} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} ae^{-(1-c)x}e^{-ae^{-x}} dx + c^{-1} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} be^{-(1-c)x}e^{-be^{-x}} dx.$$

Set $z = ae^{-x}$ and we have

$$\begin{aligned} c^{-1} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} ae^{-(1-c)x}e^{-ae^{-x}} dx &= c^{-1} \int_0^{\infty} a^c z^{-c} e^{-z} dz \\ &= a^c \frac{\Gamma(1-c)}{c} = a^c (-\Gamma(-c)). \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Thus

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (e^{-ae^{-x}} - e^{-be^{-x}})e^{cx} dx = -a^c(-\Gamma(-c)) + b^c(-\Gamma(-c)) = (a^c - b^c)\Gamma(-c).$$

Part 2.

$$\begin{aligned} \eta'_1(x; a, b, c) &= (e^{-ae^{-x}} - e^{-be^{-x}})ce^{cx} + (ae^{-x}e^{-ae^{-x}} - be^{-x}e^{-be^{-x}})e^{cx} \\ &= c\eta_1(x; a, b, c) + \eta_2(x; a, c) - \eta_2(x; b, c). \end{aligned}$$

Part 3. Define the path $\phi(t) = (1-t)a + tb$ and $g_x(r) = e^{-re^{-x}}$. By the path integral,

$$\begin{aligned} |e^{-ae^{-x}} - e^{-be^{-x}}| &= |g_x(a) - g_x(b)| = \left| \int_0^1 g'_x(\phi(t))\phi'(t) dt \right| \\ &= \left| \int_0^1 e^{-\phi(t)e^{-x}} (-e^{-x})(b-a) dt \right| \leq |b-a|e^{-x} \int_0^1 |e^{-\phi(t)e^{-x}}| dt \end{aligned}$$

We assumed $\operatorname{Re}(a), \operatorname{Re}(b) \geq 0$ and thus $\operatorname{Re}(\phi(t)) \geq 0$ for any $t \in [0, 1]$, which implies $|e^{-\phi(t)e^{-x}}| < 1$. We then have

$$|e^{-ae^{-x}} - e^{-be^{-x}}| \leq |b-a|e^{-x}.$$

On the other hand, since $\operatorname{Re}(a), \operatorname{Re}(b) \geq 0$, we have $|e^{-ae^{-x}}|, |e^{-be^{-x}}| \leq 1$ and thus

$$|e^{-ae^{-x}} - e^{-be^{-x}}| \leq |e^{-ae^{-x}}| + |e^{-be^{-x}}| \leq 2.$$

We conclude that for any $q \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |(e^{-ae^{-x}} - e^{-be^{-x}})e^{cx}| dx &= \int_{-\infty}^q |e^{-ae^{-x}} - e^{-be^{-x}}| e^{cx} dx + \int_q^{\infty} |e^{-ae^{-x}} - e^{-be^{-x}}| e^{cx} dx \\ &\leq \int_{-\infty}^q 2e^{cx} dx + \int_q^{\infty} |b-a|e^{-x}e^{cx} dx \\ &= 2\frac{e^{cq}}{c} + |b-a|\frac{e^{(c-1)q}}{1-c}, \end{aligned}$$

since $c \in (0, 1)$. Now set $q = \log |b - a|$ and we have

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |(e^{-ae^{-x}} - e^{-be^{-x}})e^{cx}| dx \leq 2 \left(\frac{1}{c} + \frac{1}{1-c} \right) |b - a|^c.$$

Part 4.

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |ae^{-x}e^{-ae^{-x}}e^{cx}| dx = |a| \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-x}e^{-\operatorname{Re}(a)e^{-x}}e^{cx} dx$$

by Eq. (6), since $\operatorname{Re}(a) \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} &= |a| \frac{1}{\operatorname{Re}(a)} (\operatorname{Re}(a))^c \Gamma(1-c) \\ &\leq |a|^c \Gamma(1-c). \end{aligned}$$

Part 5. Follows from 2, 3, and 4.

Part 6. Follows from 5 and Lemma 14. □