

# IMPROVING DISCREPANCY BY MOVING A FEW POINTS

GLEB SMIRNOV AND ROMAN VERSHYNIN

ABSTRACT. We show how to improve the discrepancy of an iid sample by moving only a few points. Specifically, modifying  $O(m)$  sample points on average reduces the Kolmogorov–Smirnov distance to the population distribution to  $1/m$ .

**1. Main results.** Let  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  be an iid sample from a distribution on  $\mathbb{R}$  with cumulative distribution function  $F(x)$ . The empirical distribution function of the sample is defined as

$$F_n(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{X_i \leq x\}}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}$$

Define the sample discrepancy  $D_n$  as the Kolmogorov–Smirnov distance between the empirical and population distributions:

$$D_n = \sup_x |F_n(x) - F(x)|.$$

Dvoretzky–Kiefer–Wolfowitz inequality (DKW) implies that  $D_n = O(1/\sqrt{n})$  with high probability [2, 3]. Our first result shows that the discrepancy can be significantly reduced by carefully changing a small fraction of the sample:

**Theorem 1** (One-sample discrepancy). *Given iid observations  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  from a distribution with cumulative distribution function  $F(x)$  and a number  $m \in (0, n]$ , one can replace at most  $Cm$  observations on average so that*

$$D_n = \sup_x |F_n(x) - F(x)| \leq \frac{1}{m}, \tag{1.1}$$

where  $C > 0$  is an absolute constant.

Note that the replacements are done via a constructive procedure (Algorithm 1) that has an explicit time complexity of  $O(n \ln(n) \ln(m))$ . See §5.

Next, let  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  and  $Y_1, \dots, Y_n$  be two independent samples from the same distribution, each consisting of  $n$  independent observations. Define their empirical distribution functions as:

$$F_n(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{X_i \leq x\}}, \quad G_n(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_i \leq x\}},$$

and consider the two-sample discrepancy

$$D_{n,n} = \sup_x |F_n(x) - G_n(x)|.$$

Our second result shows that the discrepancy can be significantly reduced by changing a small fraction of observations in one sample:

---

R.V. is partially supported by NSF Grant DMS 1954233 and NSF+Simons Research Collaborations on the Mathematical and Scientific Foundations of Deep Learning.

**Theorem 2** (Two-sample discrepancy). *Given iid observations  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  and  $Y_1, \dots, Y_n$  from the same distribution and a number  $m > 0$ , one can replace at most  $Cm$  observations on average in  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  so that*

$$\sup_x |F_n(x) - G_n(x)| \leq \frac{1}{m},$$

where  $C > 0$  is an absolute constant.

Our results above are sharp, as the following matching lower bound shows:

**Proposition 1** (Lower bound). *Given iid observations  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  from the uniform distribution on  $[0, 1]$  and a number  $m \geq \sqrt{n}$ , achieving a discrepancy of  $c/m$  requires replacing at least  $cm$  observations on average. Here  $c > 0$  is an absolute constant.*

The constraint  $m \geq \sqrt{n}$  is explained by the fact that the discrepancy is always  $O(1/\sqrt{n})$  with high probability by the DKW inequality, even without replacing any points.

*Remark 1* (Removing instead of replacing). Our work was inspired by the recent result of D. Bilyk and S. Steinerberger [1], which achieves a discrepancy of  $O(\ln(n)/m)$  by *removing* at most  $m$  points from the original sample. As shown in [1], this result is optimal in terms of the number of removed points.

**2. Proof of Theorem 1.** Our argument will be based on DKW inequality [2]:

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{D_n > \frac{t}{\sqrt{n}}\right\} \leq 2e^{-2t^2}, \quad t \geq 0 \quad (2.1)$$

where the optimal constant 2 in front of the exponent was obtained by P. Massart [3].

To begin with, let us show that it suffices to consider the case where  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  follow the uniform distribution on  $[0, 1]$ . This step is standard:

**Lemma 1.** *If Theorem 1 holds for the uniform distribution  $\text{Unif}[0, 1]$ , then it holds for all distributions.*

*Proof.* Let  $X$  be a random variable with cumulative distribution function  $F(x)$ , which may not be continuous or strictly increasing. Consider the generalized inverse of  $F$ :

$$F^{-1}(u) = \inf \{x : F(x) \geq u\}.$$

For all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $u \in [0, 1]$ , we have

$$\{F^{-1}(u) \leq x\} \quad \text{iff} \quad \{u \leq F(x)\}. \quad (2.2)$$

If  $X$  is  $F$ -distributed, then so is  $F^{-1}(U)$  for a uniform random variable  $U$ , as follows from (2.2):

$$\mathbb{P}\{F^{-1}(U) \leq x\} = \mathbb{P}\{U \leq F(x)\} = F(x).$$

Thus, we may assume without loss of generality that  $X_i = F^{-1}(U_i)$ , where  $U_i$  are independent uniform random variables. By (2.2), for each  $x$ ,

$$\#\{X_i \leq x\} = \#\{U_i \leq F(x)\}.$$

Setting  $u = F(x)$ , we find:

$$\left| \frac{\#\{X_i \leq x\}}{n} - F(x) \right| = \left| \frac{\#\{U_i \leq u\}}{n} - u \right|,$$

and the lemma follows. □

Throughout, let us assume that the sample  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  is drawn from the uniform distribution  $\text{Unif}[0, 1]$ . For convenience, let us also assume that  $n$  is odd. If  $n$  is even, one may simply discard one observation and reintroduce it later; since a single point contributes negligibly to the discrepancy, this does not affect the overall result.

Our goal is to modify the sample by replacing, on average, only  $O(m)$  observations so that the new sample has discrepancy  $O(1/m)$ .

Introduce a uniform grid:

$$Y_k = \frac{k}{n}, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, n-1.$$

Let us use the following measure of discrepancy. For each (closed) interval  $I \subset [0, 1]$ , define:

$$d_Y(I) = \sup_J \left| \frac{\#\{X_i \in J\}}{n} - \frac{\#\{Y_k \in J\}}{n} \right|,$$

where the supremum is taken over all intervals  $J \subset I$  sharing the left endpoint with  $I$ . Note that for each  $J$ ,

$$\left| \frac{\#\{X_i \in J\}}{n} - |J| \right| \leq \left| \frac{\#\{X_i \in J\}}{n} - \frac{\#\{Y_k \in J\}}{n} \right| + \frac{1}{n},$$

where  $|J|$  denotes the length of  $J$ .

We shall say that an interval  $I$  is *acceptable* if

$$d_Y(I) \leq \frac{1}{m}.$$

We shall say that an interval  $I$  is *equalized* if

$$\#\{X_i \in I\} = \#\{Y_i \in I\}.$$

Our goal to arrange that  $[0, 1]$  is acceptable so that

$$D_n \leq d_Y([0, 1]) + \frac{1}{n} \leq \frac{1}{m} + \frac{1}{n} \leq \frac{2}{m},$$

while keeping the number of replaced points  $O(m)$  on average. To do so, let us arrange the replacements as follows.

Algorithm 1:

- Start with  $I = [0, 1]$ .
- If the current interval  $I$  is *not acceptable*, divide it into two equal halves,  $I_1$  and  $I_2$ . Then randomly and independently select the appropriate number of sample points in one half and relocate them to random positions in the other half (chosen independently and uniformly) so that the two halves become equalized.
- Apply the same procedure recursively to  $I_1$  and  $I_2$ .

Since we begin with  $I = [0, 1]$ , the endpoints of all intervals produced in this recursion are dyadic (i.e., of the form  $2^{-j}$ ). Moreover, with  $n$  odd, no grid point  $Y_k$  lies in more than one such interval, and almost surely none of the sample points  $X_i$  equals one of these dyadic endpoints. It is clear that Algorithm 1 terminates after a finite number of steps. Let us now verify that the final outcome makes  $[0, 1]$  acceptable.

**Lemma 2.** *At the end of Algorithm 1, the interval  $[0, 1]$  is acceptable.*

*Proof.* When the algorithm stops, it generates a partition of  $[0, 1]$  into equalized, acceptable intervals. For any  $x \in [0, 1]$ , let  $I$  be the unique interval (generated during the algorithm) that contains  $x$ , and let  $y$  denote the left endpoint of  $I$ . We calculate:

$$\left| \frac{\#\{X_i \leq x\}}{n} - \frac{\#\{Y_i \leq x\}}{n} \right| \leq \left| \frac{\#\{X_i \leq y\}}{n} - \frac{\#\{Y_i \leq y\}}{n} \right| + \left| \frac{\#\{X_i \in [y, x]\}}{n} - \frac{\#\{Y_i \leq [y, x]\}}{n} \right|$$

Since  $[0, y]$  is a disjoint union of back-to-back equalized intervals, it itself is equalized, so the first term on the right hand side is zero. Since  $I$  is acceptable, the second term is at most  $1/m$ . Consequently,

$$\left| \frac{\#\{X_i \leq x\}}{n} - \frac{\#\{Y_i \leq x\}}{n} \right| \leq 0 + \frac{1}{m} \leq \frac{1}{m},$$

and the lemma follows.  $\square$

Let  $M_1$  denote the total number of points moved by Algorithm 1. We shall show that  $M_1$  is  $O(m)$  on average. To bound the expected total number of replaced points, we compare Algorithm 1 to the following alternative algorithm:

Algorithm 2:

- Start with  $I = [0, 1]$ .
- Divide  $I$  into two equal halves,  $I_1$  and  $I_2$ . Then randomly and independently select the appropriate number of sample points in one half and relocate them to random positions in the other half (chosen independently and uniformly) so that the two halves become equalized.
- Repeat the previous step recursively for both  $I_1$  and  $I_2$ .

Thus, the alternative algorithm is identical to Algorithm 1 except it recursively divides *each* encountered interval, regardless of whether it is acceptable or not. Algorithm 2 terminates after a finite number of steps.

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $M_1$  denote the total number of points moved by Algorithm 1. Let  $M_2$  denote the total number of points moved by Algorithm 2 in those intervals that are unacceptable. If both algorithms are applied to the same input sample using the same random choices, then*

$$M_1 \leq M_2.$$

*Proof.* Up until an acceptable interval, both algorithms perform the same replacements. However, when an acceptable interval is encountered, Algorithm 1 stops processing that interval while Algorithm 2 continues to subdivide and perform additional relocations.  $\square$

At every stage in Algorithm 2, the interval  $[0, 1]$  is partitioned into equalized subintervals. Within each such interval, the points  $X_i$  remain independent and uniformly distributed. With this understood, we claim:

**Lemma 4.** *Let  $I$  be an interval of length  $|I| = 1/k$  encountered in Algorithm 2, and define:*

$$\delta(I) = d_Y(I) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{I \text{ is unacceptable}\}}.$$

*Then for each  $\lambda \geq 0$ ,*

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \delta(I) > \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{nk}} \right\} \leq C_1 e^{-\lambda^2/2} \tag{2.3}$$

for some absolute constant  $C_1 > 0$ . In particular,

$$\mathbb{E} \delta(I) \leq \frac{C_2}{\sqrt{nk}} \quad (2.4)$$

for some absolute constant  $C_2 > 0$ .

*Proof.* Let  $n_0$  be the number of sample points  $X_i$  in  $I$  when it is processed. Since  $I$  is equalized,  $n_0$  is the same as the number of grid points  $0, \frac{1}{n}, \frac{2}{n}, \dots, \frac{n-1}{n}$  in  $I$ .

If  $k > n$ , the interval  $I$  has length  $1/k < 1/n$  and so  $n_0 \leq 1$ . With either zero or one sample point, the discrepancy trivially satisfies  $d_Y(I) \leq 1/n \leq 1/m$ , so  $I$  is automatically acceptable.

Consider the case where  $k < n$  now. Then

$$n_0 \leq n/k + 1 \leq 2n/k. \quad (2.5)$$

Without loss of generality, assume that  $I = [0, 1/k]$ . DKW inequality (2.1) for  $n_0$  iid points sampled from the uniform distribution on  $[0, 1/k]$  implies that with probability at least  $1 - 2e^{-2t^2}$ , the following ‘‘good event’’ holds:

$$|\#\{X_i \leq x\} - n_0 x k| \leq t\sqrt{n_0} \quad \text{for any } x \in [0, 1/k].$$

On the other hand,

$$|\#\{X_i \leq x\} - n_0 x k| \stackrel{(2.5)}{\geq} |\#\{X_i \leq x\} - nx| - |kx| \geq |\#\{X_i \leq x\} - nx| - 1.$$

Then, on the good event, we have

$$|\#\{X_i \leq x\} - nx| \leq t\sqrt{n_0} + 1.$$

On the other hand, the grid points  $Y_i$  trivially satisfy

$$|\#\{Y_i \leq x\} - nx| \leq 1.$$

Since these two bounds hold for all  $x \in I$ , combining them gives

$$\begin{aligned} n d_Y(I) &= \sup_{x \in I} |\#\{X_i \leq x\} - \#\{Y_i \leq x\}| \leq t\sqrt{n_0} + 2 \stackrel{(2.5)}{\leq} t\sqrt{2n/k} + 2 \\ &\leq t\sqrt{2n/k} + 2\sqrt{n/k} \quad (\text{by the assumption } k < n) \\ &= (t\sqrt{2} + 2)\sqrt{n/k} = \lambda\sqrt{n/k}, \end{aligned}$$

where we can assume that  $\lambda \geq 2$  to ensure that  $t \geq 0$  (otherwise we can make the bound (2.3) trivial by adjusting  $C_1$ .)

Summarizing, we showed that if the good event occurs, then  $d_Y(I) \leq \lambda/\sqrt{nk}$ , and the good event occurs with probability at least

$$1 - 2e^{-2t^2} = 1 - 2e^{-(\lambda-2)^2} \geq 1 - C_1 e^{-\lambda^2/2}$$

for some  $C_1$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

Even without any replacements, the DKW inequality implies that the discrepancy of the original sample is  $O(n^{-1/2})$ . Hence, we may assume  $m \geq \sqrt{n}$ . For simplicity, assume also that there exists a dyadic (i.e., of the form  $2^{-j}$ ) integer  $k_0$  such that

$$\sqrt{nk_0} = m.$$

It then suffices to show that

$$\mathbb{E} M_2 = O(\sqrt{nk_0}),$$

since, by Lemma 3, the bound on  $\mathbb{E}M_1$  then follows.

For each interval  $I$  encountered in Algorithm 2, let

$$m(I) = \#\{\text{points moved between } I_1 \text{ and } I_2 \text{ by Algorithm 2}\}.$$

**Lemma 5.** *For each interval  $I$  encountered in Algorithm 2,*

$$m(I) \leq 2n d_Y(I) + 1.$$

*Proof.* Since  $I$  is equalized, it follows that

$$m(I) = |\#\{X_i \in I_1\} - \#\{X_i \in I_2\}| = |2(\#\{X_i \in I_1\} - \#\{Y_i \in I_1\}) + \#\{Y_i \in I_1\} - \#\{Y_i \in I_2\}|.$$

Consequently,

$$m(I) \leq 2n d_Y(I_1) + |\#\{Y_i \in I_1\} - \#\{Y_i \in I_2\}| = 2n d_Y(I) + 1,$$

since  $I_1$  and  $I_2$  have the same length.  $\square$

Each interval  $I$  in Algorithm 2 has length  $|I| = 1/k$  for some dyadic integer  $k \in \{1, 2, 4, \dots\}$ . Hence, the total number of replacements is given by

$$M_2 = \sum_{k=1,2,4,\dots} \sum_{|I|=1/k} m(I) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{I \text{ is unacceptable}\}}.$$

For each unacceptable  $I$ , we have  $n d_Y(I) > n/m \geq 1$ , so Lemma 5 gives  $m(I) \leq 3n d_Y(I)$ . Then, for each  $I$  with  $|I| = 1/k$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}[m(I) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{I \text{ is unacceptable}\}}] \leq \mathbb{E}[3n d_Y(I) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{I \text{ is unacceptable}\}}] = 3n \mathbb{E}[\delta(I)] \stackrel{(2.4)}{\leq} 3C_2 \sqrt{n/k}.$$

It is now convenient to treat the cases  $k \leq k_0$  and  $k > k_0$  separately. First consider the case when  $k \leq k_0$ . Since the algorithm encounters at most  $k$  intervals of length  $1/k$ , it follows that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{k \leq k_0} \sum_{|I|=1/k} m(I) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{I \text{ is unacceptable}\}} \right] \leq \sum_{k \leq k_0} 3C_2 \sqrt{nk} = 3C_2 \sqrt{n} \sum_{k \leq k_0} \sqrt{k} = O(\sqrt{nk_0}),$$

where the latter equality follows since the sum is over dyadic values of  $k$ . Next, consider the case when  $k > k_0$ . Since

$$m(I) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{I \text{ is unacceptable}\}} \leq 3n d_Y(I) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{I \text{ is unacceptable}\}} = 3n \delta(I) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{I \text{ is unacceptable}\}},$$

it follows from Cauchy–Schwarz inequality that for each  $I$  with  $|I| = 1/k$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[m(I) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{I \text{ is unacceptable}\}}] \leq 3n \mathbb{E}[\delta(I)^2]^{1/2} \cdot \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{\{I \text{ is unacceptable}\}}]^{1/2}.$$

From the tail bound (2.3), we find for each  $I$  with  $|I| = 1/k$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[\delta(I)^2] \leq \frac{C_3^2}{nk} \tag{2.6}$$

for some constant  $C_3 > 0$ . On the other hand, for  $k > k_0$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{\{I \text{ is unacceptable}\}}]^{1/2} = \mathbb{P} \left\{ \delta(I) > \frac{1}{\sqrt{nk_0}} \right\}^{1/2} \stackrel{(2.3)}{\leq} C_1 e^{-(k/k_0)/2}.$$

Consequently, for each  $k > k_0$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[m(I) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{I \text{ is unacceptable}\}}] \leq 3C_3 \sqrt{n/k} \cdot C_1 e^{-(k/k_0)/2}.$$

Since the algorithm encounters at most  $k$  intervals of length  $1/k$ , summing over all of them and then over numbers  $k > k_0$  that are powers of 2, we get

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{k > k_0} \sum_{|I|=1/k} m(I) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{I \text{ is unacceptable}\}} \right] \leq 3C_1 C_3 \sqrt{n} \sum_{k > k_0} \sqrt{k} e^{-(k/k_0)/2} = O(\sqrt{nk_0}).$$

Hence, adding the contributions from both ranges of  $k$ , we find:

$$\mathbb{E} M_2 = O(\sqrt{nk_0}) + O(\sqrt{nk_0}) = O(\sqrt{nk_0}),$$

and the proof of Theorem 1 is complete.

**3. Proof of Theorem 2.** The proof is analogous to that of the one-sample case. In this two-sample setting, the points  $Y_i$  denote the second independent sample drawn uniformly from  $[0, 1]$ , instead of a fixed uniform grid. One obtains an analogue of Lemma 4 by using DKW inequality along with the triangle inequality,

$$|\#\{X_i \leq I\} - \#\{Y_i \leq I\}| \leq |\#\{X_i \leq I\} - |I| \cdot n| + |\#\{Y_i \leq I\} - |I| \cdot n| \quad \text{for each } I \subset [0, 1],$$

and the rest of the proof follows that of Theorem 1.

**4. Proof of Proposition 1.** One can never achieve discrepancy less than  $1/n$  by replacing any number of observations. Thus, we can assume without loss of generality that  $c/m \geq 1/n$ , so  $\sqrt{n} \leq m \leq cn$ . Thus, there exists  $1 \leq k \leq c^2 n$  such that

$$\sqrt{nk} = m.$$

Assume for simplicity of exposition that  $k$  is an integer. Partition the interval  $[0, 1]$  into  $k$  subintervals  $I_1, I_2, \dots, I_k$  of equal length  $1/k$ . For each  $I_j$ , set:

$$\nu_j = \#\{X_i \in I_j\}.$$

We shall say that  $I_j$  is *regular* if

$$\nu_j \leq n/k + 0.5\sqrt{n/k}.$$

In order to achieve discrepancy  $D_n < 1/(4m)$ , all intervals  $I_j$  must be regular. Indeed, by triangle inequality we have

$$\left| \frac{\#\{X_i \in I_j\}}{n} - |I_j| \right| \leq 2D_n$$

so if  $I_j$  is irregular then we would have

$$2D_n \geq \frac{\nu_j}{n} - \frac{1}{k} \geq \frac{0.5}{\sqrt{nk}} = \frac{1}{2m}.$$

Note that  $\nu_j$  is a binomial random variable with mean  $n/k \geq c^{-2} \geq 100$ , if we choose  $c < 0.1$ . Call an interval  $I_j$  is *dense* if

$$\nu_j > n/k + \sqrt{n/k}.$$

Standard results (e.g., via the Berry–Esseen theorem or direct lower bounds for the binomial tail) imply that

$$\mathbb{P}\{I_j \text{ is dense}\} > \frac{1}{100}.$$

Thus, the expected number of dense intervals is at least  $k/100$ . To achieve the discrepancy  $D_n < 1/(4m)$ , we must make each interval regular, and this requires moving at least  $0.5\sqrt{n/k}$

points out of each dense interval. Thus, achieving  $D_n < 1/(4m)$  requires moving, on average, at least

$$\frac{k}{100} \cdot 0.5\sqrt{n/k} = \frac{\sqrt{nk}}{200} = \frac{m}{200}$$

points, and the proposition follows if we choose  $c < 1/200$ .

**5. Complexity of Algorithm 1.** The time complexity of Algorithm 1 is  $O(n \ln(n) \ln(m))$ . To check this, observe that for each *equalized* interval  $I$  with  $|I| \leq 1/m$ ,

$$d_Y(I) \leq \left| \frac{\#\{X_i \in I\}}{n} \right| = \left| \frac{\#\{Y_i \in I\}}{n} \right| \leq |I| + \frac{1}{n} \leq \frac{1}{m} + \frac{1}{n} \leq \frac{2}{m}.$$

Thus, every interval  $I$  of length at most  $1/m$  is acceptable (after a suitable adjustment of the constant in the definition of acceptability). Consequently, the recursion stops after at most  $O(\ln m)$  steps. On each step, computing the empirical distribution function requires  $O(n \ln n)$  operations, and the replacement of the sample points is done in linear time. Combining these yields the overall time complexity.

## References.

- [1] D. Bilyk and S. Steinerberger. Regularizing random points by deleting a few, 2025.
- [2] A. Dvoretzky, J. Kiefer, and J. Wolfowitz. Asymptotic minimax character of the sample distribution function and of the classical multinomial estimator. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 27(3):642–669, 1956.
- [3] Pascal Massart. The tight constant in the dvoretzky-kiefer-wolfowitz inequality. *The annals of Probability*, pages 1269–1283, 1990.

MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES INSTITUTE, AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY, CANBERRA, AUSTRALIA  
*Email address:* `gleb.smirnov@anu.edu.au`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, IRVINE, U.S.A.  
*Email address:* `rvershyn@uci.edu`