

Skewness of a randomized quasi-Monte Carlo estimate

Zexin Pan Art B. Owen
Stanford University Stanford University

May 2024

Abstract

Some recent work on confidence intervals for randomized quasi-Monte Carlo (RQMC) sampling found a surprising result: ordinary Student t 95% confidence intervals based on a modest number of replicates were seen to be very effective and even more reliable than some bootstrap t intervals that were expected to be best. One potential explanation is that those RQMC estimates have small skewness. In this paper we give conditions under which the skewness is $O(n^\epsilon)$ for any $\epsilon > 0$, so ‘almost $O(1)$ ’. Under a random generator matrix model, we can improve this rate to $O(n^{-1/2+\epsilon})$ with very high probability. We also improve some probabilistic bounds on the distribution of the quality parameter t for a digital net in a prime base under random sampling of generator matrices.

1 Introduction

We study the skewness of randomized quasi-Monte Carlo (RQMC) sampling using some scrambled digital nets. We are interested in this because it helps to explain a phenomenon found in [8]. That was an empirical investigation of confidence intervals based on replicated RQMC estimates. A standard Student’s t confidence interval based on the central limit theorem had quite good performance, and was much more reliable than the bootstrap t method that had been expected to dominate.

On further inspection, it emerged that the RQMC estimates tended to have modest or even very low skewness, although often with quite large kurtosis. The standard intervals are sensitive to skewness but comparatively robust to kurtosis. One significant advantage of the bootstrap t method is that it can handle skewness well, but that advantage was not helpful in the setting of [8]. In this paper we consider the skewness of some scrambled net RQMC estimates for s -dimensional integrands with continuous mixed partial derivatives of order up to 2 in each variable. We believe that these are the first theoretical results on the skewness of RQMC estimates.

Our approach is based on a Walsh function expansion of the integrand from [1]. As described in more detail later, that expansion leads to an RQMC integration error that is a sum of contributions that are Walsh coefficients multiplied by an element of $\{-1, 0, 1\}$. Each such contribution has a symmetric distribution because the probability of multiplying by $+1$ equals the probability of multiplying by -1 . The integration error is then a sum of symmetric random variables. Those random variables are uncorrelated. A sum of independent symmetric random variables is symmetric but such need not hold when they are merely uncorrelated. The primary technical difficulty arises from this dependence.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces our notation and some background material on the construction of randomized digital nets, and their analysis via a Walsh-Fourier decomposition. Section 3 introduces the skewness of our RQMC estimate, shows how some sums over triples of Walsh-Fourier terms can be reduced to sums over pairs and bounds the probability that such pairs contribute to the skewness. Those are the results we later use to show that the skewness is $O(n^\epsilon)$. Section 4 considers generator matrices constructed completely at random and shows that with probability tending to one such matrices yield skewness $O(n^{-1/2+\epsilon})$. Both skewness results assume that the variance is $\Omega(n^{-3})$ in a setting where it is known to be $O(n^{-3+\epsilon})$. Of independent interest: we improve a probabilistic bound on the quality parameter of digital nets in base 2 compared to the result from [7] given as Theorem 5.37 of [1]. Section 5 has a summary and adds some context on the larger goal of forming confidence intervals from RQMC estimates.

2 Background and notation

We use \mathbb{N} for the set $\{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$ of natural numbers and $\mathbb{N}_0 = \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, and $\mathbb{N}_*^s = \mathbb{N}^s \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$. For $L \in \mathbb{N}$ we let $\mathbb{Z}_L = \{0, 1, \dots, L-1\}$. For $s \in \mathbb{N}$ we write $1:s = \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$. For $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^s$ and $u \subseteq 1:s$ we use \mathbf{x}_u to denote the vector of elements x_j for $j \in u$ and \mathbf{x}_{-u} to denote the vector of elements x_j for $j \notin u$. We use $\mathbf{1}$ for the vector of s ones. The cardinality of a set S is denoted by $|S|$.

For $a_n, b_n \in (0, \infty)$ we write $a_n = O(b_n)$ if there exists $c < \infty$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$ with $a_n \leq cb_n$ for all $n \geq N$. In that case we also write $b_n = \Omega(a_n)$.

The integrands f that we study are defined on $[0, 1]^s$. We will study them as members of $L^2[0, 1]^s$. We estimate $\mu = \int_{[0, 1]^s} f(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}$ by $\hat{\mu} = (1/n) \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} f(\mathbf{x}_i)$ for points $\mathbf{x}_i \in [0, 1]^s$ with $n = 2^m$ for some $m \geq 0$. The \mathbf{x}_i are obtained from a digital construction described next.

2.1 The point construction

For $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{2^m}$ with base 2 expansion $i = \sum_{\ell=1}^m i_\ell 2^{\ell-1}$ we write $\vec{i} = \vec{i}[m] = (i_1, \dots, i_m)^\top \in \{0, 1\}^m$. For $a \in [0, 1)$ we can write $a = \sum_{\ell=1}^\infty a_\ell 2^{-\ell}$. Whenever there are two such expansions, we force a unique choice by adopting the one with finitely many $a_\ell = 1$. Then for ‘precision’ $E \geq 1$ we write $\vec{a} = \vec{a}[E] = (a_1, \dots, a_E)^\top \in \{0, 1\}^E$.

Our digital construction uses s matrices $C_j \in \{0,1\}^{m \times m}$ for $m \geq 1$. We assume at first that these matrices have full rank m over \mathbb{Z}_2 . Later we will consider random C_j that may be rank deficient. Unrandomized digital nets are defined via

$$\vec{x}_{ij} = C_j \vec{i} \pmod{2} \quad (1)$$

for $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{2^m}$ and $j \in 1:s$. Here $\vec{i} = \vec{i}[m]$ and x_{ij} is the point in $a \in [0,1)$ with $\vec{a} = \vec{a}[m] = \vec{x}_{ij}$. Finally, $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_{i1}, \dots, x_{is})$. We can include $m = 0$ by convention, taking $\mathbf{x}_0 = \mathbf{0}$.

The randomization we study comes from [9] and it has

$$\vec{x}_{ij} = M_j C_j \vec{i} + \vec{D}_j \pmod{2} \quad (2)$$

for a random matrix $M_j \in \{0,1\}^{E \times m}$ and a random vector $\vec{D}_j \in \{0,1\}^E$ for precision $E \geq m$. The matrices M_j have ones on their diagonals, zeros above their diagonals and $\mathbb{U}\{0,1\}$ random entries below their diagonals. The vectors \vec{D}_j consist of $\mathbb{U}\{0,1\}$ random entries. All the random variables in all of the M_j and all of the \vec{D}_j are mutually independent. The matrices M_j induce a ‘matrix scramble’ while the vectors \vec{D}_j contribute a ‘digital shift’. The digital shift makes each \mathbf{x}_i uniformly distributed over $\{0, 1/2^E, 2/2^E, \dots, (2^E - 1)/2^E\}^s$ and for $E = \infty$, each $\mathbf{x}_i \sim \mathbb{U}[0,1)^s$.

Letting $\mathbf{x}_i[E]$ denote the above points constructed with precision E , our estimate is

$$\hat{\mu}_E = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} f(\mathbf{x}_i) \quad \text{for } \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}_i[E].$$

We focus our study on $\hat{\mu}_\infty$. In practice, the value of E is constrained by the floating point representation in use.

2.2 Elementary intervals and the t parameter

An elementary interval in base 2 is a Cartesian product of the form

$$\text{EI}(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{a}) = \prod_{j=1}^s \left[\frac{a_j}{2^{k_j}}, \frac{a_j + 1}{2^{k_j}} \right)$$

for $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}_0^s$ and $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_s)$ with each $a_j \in \mathbb{Z}_{2^{k_j}}$. For $m \geq 0$, the points $\mathbf{x}_0, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{2^m-1}$ defined at (1) are a (t, m, s) -net in base 2 if every elementary interval of volume 2^{t-m} contains precisely 2^t of those points. Randomization does not change the value of t . See [10] for a proof with a different scrambling. Smaller values of t provide better equidistribution and in some cases one can obtain $t = 0$. We never have $t > m$ because every $\mathbf{x}_i \in [0,1)^s$.

To construct a good digital one must make a careful choice of matrices $C_1, \dots, C_s \in \{0,1\}^{m \times m}$. The most popular choices are the Sobol’ nets [15]. Sobol’s construction requires one to choose some parameters called ‘direction numbers’ and the ones from [6] are widely used.

For $q \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $C \in \{0, 1\}^{m \times m}$, let $C(1:q, :) \in \{0, 1\}^{q \times m}$ denote the first q rows of C . Then for $q_1, \dots, q_s \in \mathbb{N}_0$ let

$$C^{\mathbf{q}} = C^{(q_1, \dots, q_s)} = \begin{pmatrix} C_1(1:q_1, :) \\ C_2(1:q_2, :) \\ \vdots \\ C_s(1:q_s, :) \end{pmatrix} \in \{0, 1\}^{\sum_{j=1}^s q_j \times m}.$$

The matrices C_1, \dots, C_s generate a (t, m, s) -net in base 2 if $\text{rank}(C^{\mathbf{q}}) \geq m - t$ whenever $q_1 + \dots + q_s = m$. In this case the rank is taken over the finite field of 2 elements, that is, it is taken in arithmetic modulo 2.

2.3 Fourier-Walsh decomposition

For $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $x \in [0, 1)$, the k 'th univariate Walsh function wal_k is defined by

$$\text{wal}_k(x) = (-1)^{\bar{x}^\top \bar{k}}.$$

The inner product above has only finitely many nonzero entries in it. For $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}_0^s$ $\text{wal}_{\mathbf{k}} : [0, 1)^s \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$ is defined by

$$\text{wal}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{j=1}^s \text{wal}_j(x_j) = (-1)^{\sum_{j=1}^s \bar{k}_j^\top \bar{x}_j}.$$

The functions $\text{wal}_{\mathbf{k}}$ for $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}_0^s$ form a complete orthonormal basis of $L^2[0, 1)^s$ [1]. We can then write

$$f(\mathbf{x}) \sim \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}_0^s} \hat{f}_{\mathbf{k}} \text{wal}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x}), \quad \text{for}$$

$$\hat{f}_{\mathbf{k}} = \int_{[0, 1)^s} f(\mathbf{x}) \text{wal}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x}.$$

The Fourier-Walsh representation above for f denotes equality in mean square.

We will need some bounds on the decay of Walsh coefficients. The Walsh coefficients of smooth functions tend to decay with increasing index, although in quite different ways than Fourier coefficients decay. For example, with $s = 1$ and r times differentiable f , a few coefficients decay at the $O(1/k)$ rate while the majority are much smaller. See [2] for these results.

Our analysis of $\hat{\mu}$ requires several quantities related to the indices $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}_0^s$. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ we write $k = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} a_\ell 2^{\ell-1}$ and then define the corresponding set $\kappa = \{\ell \in \mathbb{N} \mid a_\ell = 1\}$. Any appearance of k or κ specifies the other one. This κ will select a set of rows of a scramble matrix. The domain for κ is $\mathcal{N} = \{K \subset \mathbb{N} \mid |K| < \infty\}$. The cardinality of κ is $|\kappa|$ which is then the number of nonzero bits in the binary expansion of k . We use $\lceil \kappa \rceil = \max_{\ell \in \kappa} \ell$ to denote the last element of κ which determines the fineness of the function wal_k . By convention, $\lceil \emptyset \rceil = 0$.

Corresponding to $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}_0^s$ there is $\boldsymbol{\kappa} \in \mathcal{N}^s$, with κ_j corresponding to k_j for each $j \in 1:s$. Now $\lceil \boldsymbol{\kappa} \rceil$ is the vector with j 'th component $\lceil \kappa_j \rceil$. For $u \subseteq 1:s$ we use $\lceil \kappa_j, j \in u \rceil$ to denote a subvector of $\lceil \boldsymbol{\kappa} \rceil$ containing $\lceil \kappa_j \rceil$ for all $j \in u$.

In some settings we have several tuples of sets such as $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_2$. Their j 'th components can be denoted via κ_{1j} and κ_{2j} , however for a specific value of j such as $j = 2$ we use commas to make $\kappa_{1,2}$ more clearly distinct from $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_{12}$.

A theorem from [16] that we need uses the sum of the largest α elements of a vector or all of those elements if that vector has fewer than α elements. In [14] we used $\alpha = \infty$ which generates an L^1 norm. In the present setting we need $\alpha = 2$. For $\boldsymbol{\kappa} \in \mathcal{N}$ let

$$\lceil \boldsymbol{\kappa} \rceil_2 = \begin{cases} 0, & \boldsymbol{\kappa} = \emptyset \\ \lceil \boldsymbol{\kappa} \rceil, & |\boldsymbol{\kappa}| = 1 \\ \max\{\ell_1 + \ell_2 \mid \ell_1, \ell_2 \in \boldsymbol{\kappa}, \ell_1 \neq \ell_2\}, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

We use $\lceil \boldsymbol{\kappa} \rceil_2$ for the vector with j 'th component $\lceil \kappa_j \rceil_2$. Note that the sum of the largest $q \leq p$ absolute values of the components of a vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is a norm on \mathbb{R}^p [3]. We use $q = 2$ with a convention for $p < 2$.

In addition to the largest and sum of two largest elements, we also need notation for the second largest element. For this we use

$$\lceil \boldsymbol{\kappa} \rceil_{(2)} = \lceil \boldsymbol{\kappa} \rceil_2 - \lceil \boldsymbol{\kappa} \rceil$$

with $\lceil \boldsymbol{\kappa} \rceil_{(2)} = 0$ when $|\boldsymbol{\kappa}| \leq 1$.

We define some aggregate norms on $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$:

$$\|\boldsymbol{\kappa}\|_0 = \sum_{j=1}^s |\kappa_j|, \quad \|\lceil \boldsymbol{\kappa} \rceil\|_1 = \sum_{j=1}^s \lceil \kappa_j \rceil \quad \text{and} \quad \|\lceil \boldsymbol{\kappa} \rceil_2\|_1 = \sum_{j=1}^s \lceil \kappa_j \rceil_2.$$

The first is the total number of bits in all the k_j , which is why the subscript is 0 and not 1. The next ones sum over j the indices of the highest one or two bits of κ_j .

We define 'supports' of $\boldsymbol{\kappa} \in \mathcal{N}^s$ and $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}_0^s$ as

$$\mathbf{s}(\boldsymbol{\kappa}) = \{j \in 1:s \mid \kappa_j \neq \emptyset\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{s}(\mathbf{k}) = \{j \in 1:s \mid k_j > 0\},$$

respectively, with $\mathbf{s}(\boldsymbol{\kappa}) = \mathbf{s}(\mathbf{k})$. We have the following bound for Walsh coefficients in terms of these quantities.

Theorem 1. *Let f have continuous mixed partial derivatives up to order 2 in each variable x_j on $[0, 1]^s$. Then*

$$|\hat{f}(\mathbf{k})| \leq 2^{-\|\lceil \boldsymbol{\kappa} \rceil_2\|_1 - \|\boldsymbol{\kappa} \wedge 2\|_1} \sup_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{k})} \in [0, 1]^{|\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{k})|}} \left| \int_{[0, 1]^{s - |\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{k})|}} f^{|\boldsymbol{\kappa}| \wedge 2}(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x}_{-\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{k})} \right|$$

where $\|\boldsymbol{\kappa} \wedge 2\|_1 = \sum_{j=1}^s \min(|\kappa_j|, 2)$ and

$$f^{|\boldsymbol{\kappa}| \wedge 2} = \frac{\partial^{\sum_{j=1}^s \min(|\kappa_j|, 2)} f}{\partial x_1^{\min(|\kappa_1|, 2)} \dots \partial x_s^{\min(|\kappa_s|, 2)}}.$$

Proof. This is from Theorem 2 of Yoshiki [16] after taking $\alpha = 2$ and $p = \infty$. Our $\|\lceil \boldsymbol{\kappa} \rceil_2\|_1 + \|\boldsymbol{\kappa} \wedge 2\|_1$ is his $\mu'_\alpha(\mathbf{k}_v)$ for $\alpha = 2$ and $v = s(\mathbf{k})$. \square

We will not need the full strength of this result. It will suffice for us to replace $2^{-\|\lceil \boldsymbol{\kappa} \rceil_2\|_1 - \|\boldsymbol{\kappa} \wedge 2\|_1}$ by $2^{-\|\lceil \boldsymbol{\kappa} \rceil_2\|_1}$.

The integration error satisfies

$$\hat{\mu}_\infty - \mu \sim \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^s} \hat{f}(\mathbf{k}) \text{wal}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x}_i) - \mu = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}_*^s} \hat{f}(\mathbf{k}) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \text{wal}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x}_i).$$

Next we present a result on the coefficient of $\hat{f}(\mathbf{k})$ from [14]. For $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}_0^s$, let $\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k})$ be the event that $\sum_{j=1}^s \bar{k}_j^\top M_j C_j = \mathbf{0} \pmod{2}$. Similarly, let $Z(\mathbf{k})$ be the indicator function $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k})}$. We also use

$$S(\mathbf{k}) = (-1)^{\sum_{j=1}^s \bar{k}_j^\top \bar{D}_j}$$

the ‘sign of \mathbf{k} ’. We have the following mean square representation of f .

Theorem 2. *Let f satisfy the condition in Theorem 1 and let \mathbf{x}_i be defined by (2) for $0 \leq i < 2^m$. Then*

$$\hat{\mu}_\infty - \mu \sim \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}_*^s} Z(\mathbf{k}) S(\mathbf{k}) \hat{f}(\mathbf{k}). \quad (3)$$

Proof. This is from [14]. \square

3 Skewness

We have seen empirically that for large m , the RQMC error $\hat{\mu} - \mu$ tends to have a nearly symmetric distribution [14]. Here we study the skewness of $\hat{\mu} = \hat{\mu}_\infty$. Without loss of generality we take $\mu = 0$, so $\hat{f}(\mathbf{0}) = 0$. Then the skewness of $\hat{\mu}$ is

$$\gamma = \mathbb{E}(\hat{\mu}^3) / \mathbb{E}(\hat{\mu}^2)^{3/2}.$$

Accuracy of confidence intervals is also studied using the kurtosis

$$\theta = \mathbb{E}(\hat{\mu}^4) / \mathbb{E}(\hat{\mu}^2)^2 - 3.$$

This quantity is commonly denoted by κ but we reserve κ for subsets of \mathbb{N} . Neither γ nor θ is well defined if $\mathbb{E}(\hat{\mu}^2) = 0$. We assume from here on that $\mathbb{E}(\hat{\mu}^2) > 0$. With this assumption, we are ruling out integrands that can be integrated with zero error by scrambled nets. Those are integrands with a finite Walsh function expansion. A smooth function with a finite Walsh expansion must equal μ almost everywhere, which then provides only a trivial integration problem.

For $\mathbf{x}_i \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathbb{U}[0, 1]^s$ the skewness of $\hat{\mu}$ is $\gamma(f)/\sqrt{n}$ where $\gamma(f)$ is the skewness of a single function value $f(\mathbf{x}_0)$, and the kurtosis is $\theta(f)/n$ where $\theta(f)$ is the kurtosis of a single value $f(\mathbf{x}_0)$. The RQMC points we use are far from independent and so that formula does not apply. For instance, an analysis in [13, Section 3] shows that for differentiable f , there is generally an event \mathcal{E} of probability $\Omega(1/n)$ with $\mathbb{E}(\hat{\mu}^2 | \mathcal{E}) = \Omega(n^{-2})$. That event alone gives $\mathbb{E}(\hat{\mu}^4) = \Omega(n^{-5})$ and when $\mathbb{E}(\hat{\mu}^2) = O(n^{-3+\epsilon})$ we get $\theta = \Omega(n^{1+2\epsilon})$. Because $\theta \rightarrow \infty$, we do not get a central limit theorem for the scrambling of [9].

We will consider integrands f that have continuous partial derivatives of order up to 2 in each of the s components of \mathbf{x} on $[0, 1]^s$. This makes those partial derivatives absolutely continuous, hence bounded, and as a result $\mathbb{E}(|\hat{\mu}|^3) < \infty$ which we need in order to have $\mathbb{E}(\hat{\mu}^3)$ be well defined.

The contribution of $\hat{f}(\mathbf{k})$ to the error in (3) is the product of $S(\mathbf{k}) \in \{-1, 1\}$ and $Z(\mathbf{k}) \in \{0, 1\}$. From the way that \vec{D}_j are generated we have $S(\mathbf{k}) \sim \mathbb{U}\{-1, 1\}$ and these signs are pairwise independent (though not fully independent). The collection $(S(\mathbf{k}) | \mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^s)$ is independent of $(Z(\mathbf{k}) | \mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^s)$. As a result each $Z(\mathbf{k})S(\mathbf{k})\hat{f}(\mathbf{k})$ has a symmetric distribution with atoms at 0, $\hat{f}(\mathbf{k})$ and $-\hat{f}(\mathbf{k})$. The error contributions in (3) all have symmetric distributions and they are uncorrelated because for $\mathbf{k} \neq \mathbf{k}'$

$$\mathbb{E}(Z(\mathbf{k})S(\mathbf{k})Z(\mathbf{k}')S(\mathbf{k}')) = \mathbb{E}(Z(\mathbf{k})Z(\mathbf{k}'))\mathbb{E}(S(\mathbf{k})S(\mathbf{k}')) = 0$$

using pairwise independence of the signs. The sum itself need not have a symmetric distribution. Indeed we have seen asymmetric empirical distributions for small m . However for large m we typically see very symmetric histograms. One example, typical of what we have seen, is in the top right panel of Figure 1 in [8].

We can write the numerator of γ as

$$\mathbb{E}(\hat{\mu}^3) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}_1 \in \mathbb{N}_*^s} \sum_{\mathbf{k}_2 \in \mathbb{N}_*^s} \sum_{\mathbf{k}_3 \in \mathbb{N}_*^s} \hat{f}(\mathbf{k}_1)\hat{f}(\mathbf{k}_2)\hat{f}(\mathbf{k}_3) \mathbb{E}\left(\prod_{\ell=1}^3 Z(\mathbf{k}_\ell)\right) \mathbb{E}\left(\prod_{\ell=1}^3 S(\mathbf{k}_\ell)\right).$$

Letting $\mathbf{k}_\ell = (k_{\ell,1}, \dots, k_{\ell,s})$ for $\ell = 1, 2, 3$

$$\prod_{\ell=1}^3 S(\mathbf{k}_\ell) = (-1)^{\sum_{j=1}^s \vec{D}_j^\top \sum_{\ell=1}^3 \vec{k}_{\ell,j}}. \quad (4)$$

The expression in (4) can have nonzero expectation only if $\sum_{\ell=1}^3 \vec{k}_{\ell,j} = \mathbf{0}$ for each j . In that case we can write

$$\vec{k}_{3,j} = -\vec{k}_{1,j} - \vec{k}_{2,j} = \vec{k}_{1,j} + \vec{k}_{2,j},$$

with the last step following because we work modulo 2. Let $\mathbf{k}_{12} \in \mathbb{N}_0^s$ be the vector for which $\vec{k}_{12,j} = \vec{k}_{1,j} + \vec{k}_{2,j} \pmod{2}$ for $j \in 1:s$. When $\mathbb{E}(\prod_{\ell=1}^3 S(\mathbf{k}_\ell)) \neq 0$

it is because $\mathbf{k}_3 = \mathbf{k}_{12}$ and then $\Pr(\prod_{\ell=1}^3 S(\mathbf{k}_\ell) = 1) = 1$. As a result we may write

$$\mathbb{E}(\hat{\mu}^3) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}_1 \in \mathbb{N}_*^s} \sum_{\mathbf{k}_2 \in \mathbb{N}_*^s} \hat{f}(\mathbf{k}_1) \hat{f}(\mathbf{k}_2) \hat{f}(\mathbf{k}_{12}) \mathbb{E}(Z(\mathbf{k}_1) Z(\mathbf{k}_2)) \quad (5)$$

after noting that $Z(\mathbf{k}_1) = Z(\mathbf{k}_2) = 1$ implies that

$$\sum_{j=1}^s \vec{k}_{1,j}^\top M_j C_j = \sum_{j=1}^s \vec{k}_{2,j}^\top M_j C_j = \mathbf{0}$$

which then yields $Z(\mathbf{k}_{12}) = 1$.

Proposition 1. Let $A \in \{0, 1\}^{K \times m}$ have rank r over \mathbb{Z}_2 and let $\mathbf{y} \in \{0, 1\}^K$. Then the set of solutions $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^m$ to $A\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y} \pmod{2}$ has cardinality 0 or 2^{m-r} .

Proof. The null space of A has dimension $m - r$ so $A\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0} \pmod{2}$ has 2^{m-r} solutions \mathbf{x} . If $A\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y} \pmod{2}$ has any solution \mathbf{x}' then we get all solutions by adding to \mathbf{x}' an element of that null space (including $\mathbf{0}$ which gives us back \mathbf{x}'). Otherwise there are 0 solutions. \square

Lemma 1. If C_1, \dots, C_s generate a digital (t, m, s) -net in base 2 and $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}_*^s$, then

$$\Pr(\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k})) \leq 2^{-m+t+s}.$$

Proof. This is Corollary 1 of [14]. \square

Next we develop some results on the probability that $\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_1)$ and $\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_2)$ both occur. A key quantity in this work is the set

$$J_{1 \cap 2} := \{j \in 1:s \mid \lceil \kappa_{1j} \rceil = \lceil \kappa_{2j} \rceil\}. \quad (6)$$

We also write $M_{1 \cap 2}$ for $(M_j \mid j \in J_{1 \cap 2})$, the corresponding tuple of scramble matrices.

Lemma 2. If $J_{1 \cap 2} = \emptyset$, then $\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_1)$ and $\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_2)$ are independent. Otherwise, they are independent conditionally on scrambles $M_j, j \in J_{1 \cap 2}$, that is

$$\Pr(\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_1) \cap \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_2) \mid M_{1 \cap 2}) = \Pr(\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_1) \mid M_{1 \cap 2}) \Pr(\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_2) \mid M_{1 \cap 2}).$$

Proof. If $J_{1 \cap 2} = 1:s$, then conditionally on $M_{1 \cap 2}$, the events $\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_1)$ and $\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_2)$ are constants and hence trivially independent. Otherwise, the event $\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k})$ can be rewritten as

$$\sum_{j \notin J_{1 \cap 2}} \vec{k}_j^\top M_j C_j = - \sum_{j \in J_{1 \cap 2}} \vec{k}_j^\top M_j C_j, \quad (7)$$

where the right hand side is nonrandom conditionally on $M_{1 \cap 2}$. It suffices to show that $\sum_{j \notin J_{1 \cap 2}} \vec{k}_{1j}^\top M_j C_j$ is independent of $\sum_{j \notin J_{1 \cap 2}} \vec{k}_{2j}^\top M_j C_j$ given $M_{1 \cap 2}$.

That follows once we show $\vec{k}_{1j}^\top M_j$ is conditionally independent of $\vec{k}_{2j^*}^\top M_{j^*}$ for every pair $j, j^* \notin J_{1 \cap 2}$. Suppose at first that $J_{1 \cap 2} \neq \emptyset$. If $j \neq j^*$ then M_j, M_{j^*} and $M_{1 \cap 2}$ are mutually independent, making M_j and M_{j^*} conditionally independent given $M_{1 \cap 2}$, and so we only need to prove it for $j = j^*$. Because $j \notin J_{1 \cap 2}, \lceil \kappa_{1j} \rceil \neq \lceil \kappa_{2j} \rceil$. Assume without loss of generality that $\lceil \kappa_{1j} \rceil > \lceil \kappa_{2j} \rceil$. Then $\vec{k}_{2j}^\top M_j$ is fully determined by the first $\lceil \kappa_{1j} \rceil - 1$ rows of M_j while

$$\vec{k}_{1j}^\top M_j = M(\lceil \kappa_{1j} \rceil, :) + \sum_{r \in \kappa_{1j}, r < \lceil \kappa_{1j} \rceil} M(r, :) \stackrel{d}{=} M(\lceil \kappa_{1j} \rceil, :),$$

which does not depend on the first $\lceil \kappa_{1j} \rceil - 1$ rows of M_j . Let F represent the first $\lceil \kappa_{1j} \rceil - 1$ rows of M_j . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(Z(\mathbf{k}_1)Z(\mathbf{k}_2) | M_{1 \cap 2}) &= \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}(Z(\mathbf{k}_1)Z(\mathbf{k}_2) | F, M_{1 \cap 2}) | M_{1 \cap 2}) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(Z(\mathbf{k}_1)\mathbb{E}(Z(\mathbf{k}_2) | M_{1 \cap 2}) | M_{1 \cap 2}) \\ &= \Pr(\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_1) | M_{1 \cap 2}) \Pr(\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_2) | M_{1 \cap 2}) \end{aligned}$$

as required. Finally, if $J_{1 \cap 2} = \emptyset$, then the same argument goes through except that conditioning on $M_{1 \cap 2}$ is not conditioning at all, and we find that M_j and M_{j^*} are simply independent. \square

Corollary 1. *If $\mathbf{k}_1 \neq \mathbf{k}_2$ and $\sum_{j \notin J_{1 \cap 2}} \lceil \kappa_{1j} \rceil \geq m - t$, then*

$$\Pr(\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_1) \cap \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_2)) \leq 2^{-2(m-t-s)}. \quad (8)$$

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma 2 we use $J_{1 \cap 2}$ from (6) and the corresponding scrambles are in $M_{1 \cap 2}$. Let $A = \{j \in 1:s \mid \lceil \kappa_{1j} \rceil \neq \lceil \kappa_{2j} \rceil, \lceil \kappa_{1j} \rceil \geq 1\}$, that is $A = J_{1 \cap 2}^c \cap s(\kappa_1)$. We let $C^{\lceil \kappa_{1j}, j \in A \rceil}$ denote the matrix made up of the first $\lceil \kappa_{1j} \rceil$ rows of M_j for $j \in A$. Then $C^{\lceil \kappa_{1j} - 1, j \in A \rceil}$ has the first $\lceil \kappa_{1j} \rceil - 1$ rows of those M_j .

Because each M_j is lower-triangular with ones on the diagonal and $\mathbb{U}\{0, 1\}$ random entries below the diagonal, we see that $\vec{k}_{1j}^\top M_j \stackrel{d}{=} M_j(\lceil \kappa_j \rceil, :)$. From independence of $M_j, \sum_{j \in A} \vec{k}_{1j}^\top M_j C_j \stackrel{d}{=} \sum_{j \in A} M_j(\lceil \kappa_j \rceil, :) C_j$. Using $M_j(\lceil \kappa_j \rceil, \lceil \kappa_j \rceil) = 1$, we may write

$$\sum_{j \in A} M_j(\lceil \kappa_j \rceil, :) C_j = \sum_{j \in A} \sum_{\ell=1}^{\lceil \kappa_j \rceil - 1} M_j(\lceil \kappa_j \rceil, \ell) C_j(\ell, :) + \sum_{j \in A} C_j(\lceil \kappa_j \rceil, :).$$

We notice the first term on the right hand side is uniformly distributed on the row space $C^{\lceil \kappa_{1j} - 1, j \in A \rceil}$ while the second term is nonrandom. We therefore conclude that $\sum_{j \in A} \vec{k}_{1j}^\top M_j C_j$ is uniformly distributed on an affine space of dimension $\text{rank}(C^{\lceil \kappa_{1j} - 1, j \in A \rceil})$.

By the (t, m, s) -net property, $\sum_{j \in A} \lceil \kappa_{1j} \rceil = \sum_{j \notin J_{1 \cap 2}} \lceil \kappa_{1j} \rceil \geq m - t$ implies that $C^{\lceil \kappa_{1j}, j \in A \rceil}$ has rank at least $m - t$. Hence

$$\text{rank}(C^{\lceil \kappa_{1j} - 1, j \in A \rceil}) \geq \text{rank}(C^{\lceil \kappa_{1j}, j \in A \rceil}) - |A| \geq m - t - s$$

and then

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_1) \mid M_{1 \cap 2}) &= \Pr\left(\sum_{j \in A} \vec{k}_j^\top M_j C_j = - \sum_{j \in J_{1 \cap 2}} \vec{k}_j^\top M_j C_j \mid M_{1 \cap 2}\right) \\ &\leq 2^{-\text{rank}(C^{\lceil \kappa_{1j} - 1, j \in A \rceil})} \\ &\leq 2^{-m+t+s} \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from Proposition 1. Finally, we apply Lemmas 1 and 2 to get

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_1) \cap \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_2)) &= \mathbb{E}(\Pr(\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_1) \mid M_{1 \cap 2}) \Pr(\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_2) \mid M_{1 \cap 2})) \\ &\leq 2^{-m+t+s} \mathbb{E}(\Pr(\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_2) \mid M_{1 \cap 2})) \\ &= 2^{-m+t+s} \Pr(\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_2)) \\ &\leq 2^{-2(m-t-s)}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Unfortunately, the bound in (8) can fail to hold for some pairs of distinct \mathbf{k}_1 and \mathbf{k}_2 . For instance, suppose $s = 3$ and $t = 0$. Consider $\kappa_{1,1} = \kappa_{2,1} = \kappa_{1,2} = \kappa_{2,3} = \lfloor m/2 \rfloor + 1$ and $\kappa_{1,3} = \kappa_{2,2} = \emptyset$, in which case $J_{1 \cap 2} = \{1\}$. If there exists a vector that can be written as a linear combination of the first $r = \lfloor m/2 \rfloor + 1$ rows of C_j , simultaneously for all $j = 1, 2, 3$, then we can find row vectors $v_1, v_2, v_3 \in \{0, 1\}^r$ such that

$$v_2 C_2(1:r, :) = v_3 C_3(1:r, :) = -v_1 C_1(1:r, :) \pmod{2}.$$

Now $\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_1) \cap \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_2)$ occurs when $M_1(\lfloor m/2 \rfloor + 1, :) = v_1$, $M_2(\lfloor m/2 \rfloor + 1, :) = v_2$ and $M_3(\lfloor m/2 \rfloor + 1, :) = v_3$, which occurs with $2^{-3(\lfloor m/2 \rfloor + 1)}$ probability. This is asymptotically larger than the bound in Corollary 1.

Nevertheless, we can still proceed as in Corollary 1 and show that

$$\Pr(\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_1) \cap \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_2)) \leq 2^{-m+t+s-\text{rank}(C^{\lceil \kappa_{1j} - 1, j \notin J_{1 \cap 2} \rceil})}.$$

For $s = 1$, we can assume without loss of generality that $J_{1 \cap 2} = \emptyset$ because otherwise we can replace \mathbf{k}_2 by \mathbf{k}_{12} . Hence

$$\Pr(\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_1) \cap \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_2)) \leq 2^{-2(m-1)}.$$

For $s \geq 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{rank}(C^{\lceil \kappa_{2j} - 1, j \notin J_{1 \cap 2} \rceil}) + \text{rank}(C^{\lceil \kappa_{2j} - 1, j \in J_{1 \cap 2} \rceil}) \\ &\geq \text{rank}(C^{\lceil \kappa_2 \rceil - 1}) \\ &\geq m - t - s. \end{aligned}$$

We can assume $\text{rank}(C^{\lceil \kappa_{2j}-1, j \notin J_{1 \cap 2} \rceil}) \geq (m-t-s)/2$ because otherwise we can replace \mathbf{k}_2 by \mathbf{k}_{12} . Hence

$$\Pr(\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_1) \cap \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_2)) \leq 2^{-(3/2)(m-t-s)}. \quad (9)$$

4 Random generator matrices

We would like a better bound than the one in (9). We can show that a better bound holds for most generator matrices if we consider generator matrices $C_j \in \{0, 1\}^{m \times m}$ made up of independent uniformly distributed elements. We notice that the counterexample in the previous section had a common vector in the row spaces of $C^{\lceil \kappa_{1j}, j \in J_{1 \cap 2} \rceil}$, $C^{\lceil \kappa_{1j}, j \notin J_{1 \cap 2} \rceil}$ and $C^{\lceil \kappa_{2j}, j \notin J_{1 \cap 2} \rceil}$. That is unlikely to happen when their total rank is much less than $2m$. More precisely, we will show for any fixed $\epsilon > 0$, with high probability random C_j 's satisfy

$$\Pr(\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_1) \cap \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_2)) \leq 2^{-2(1-\epsilon)m}$$

for all pairs of distinct nonzero \mathbf{k}_1 and \mathbf{k}_2 .

With random C_j and random M_j we get a random product $M_j C_j$, and we could wonder whether these two randomizations can be replaced by one. First of all, removing C_j is the same as taking $C_j = I_m$. We cannot do for $s \geq 2$ because applying a random M_j will preserve the t value of taking $C_1 = C_2 = \dots = C_d = I_m$. For $s \geq 2$, that value is $t = m - 1$, a very bad outcome. Second, the product $M_j C_j$ does not have the uniform distribution on $\{0, 1\}^{M \times m}$, so replacing $M_j C_j$ by a single uniform random element of $\{0, 1\}^{M \times m}$ changes the distribution. To see this, there is a 2^{-m} probability that the first column of C_j is all zeros. Then for $M > m$, the probability that the first column of $M_j C_j$ is all zeros cannot be as small as 2^{-M} which it must be under a uniform distribution on $\{0, 1\}^{M \times m}$.

We recognize that the widely used constructions of digital nets are very specially constructed. So they might then be quite atypical compared to random generator matrices.

First, we need to find the average behavior of t and $\Pr(\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_1) \cap \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_2))$ under such randomization. Random generator matrices are discussed in Section 5.4 of [1]. Below we will use \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{C} as shorthand for $(M_j, j = 1:s)$ and $(C_j, j = 1:s)$, respectively. We will also write t as $t(\mathcal{C})$ and $\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k})$ as $\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}, \mathcal{C})$ to emphasize their dependence on \mathcal{C} . Our main interest is in digital nets in base 2, but some of these findings generalize to prime bases which are of independent interest.

Theorem 3. *For a prime number p , let all elements of $C_1, \dots, C_s \in \mathbb{Z}_p^{m \times m}$ be independent $\mathbb{U}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ random variables and let $t(\mathcal{C})$ be the smallest $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$ for which they generate a (t, m, s) -net in base p . Then*

$$\Pr(t(\mathcal{C}) \leq \lceil (s-1) \log_p(m) - \log_p(1-\alpha) \rceil) \geq \alpha$$

holds for $0 \leq \alpha < 1$.

Proof. This is Theorem 5.37 of [1]. They credit [7]. □

We are able to improve this result for general p though we only need it for $p = 2$. Then we provide a theorem to control $\Pr(\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathcal{C}) \cap \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_2, \mathcal{C}))$.

Theorem 4. *Let p be a prime number and suppose that C_j 's are independently drawn from a uniform distribution on $\mathbb{Z}_p^{m \times m}$ for $m \geq p$. Let $t(\mathcal{C})$ be the smallest $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$ for which they generate a (t, m, s) -net in base p . Then*

$$\Pr(t(\mathcal{C}) \geq s \log_p(m)) \leq \frac{1}{(s-1)!m}. \quad (10)$$

Proof. Any $q \leq m$ row vectors drawn independently from a uniform distribution on \mathbb{Z}_p^m are linearly independent over \mathbb{Z}_p with probability $\prod_{j=m-q+1}^m (1 - p^{-j})$. We can show by induction that the probability of q linearly dependent rows is bounded by p^{-m+q} . That is

$$1 - \prod_{j=m-q+1}^m (1 - p^{-j}) \leq p^{-m+q}. \quad (11)$$

It holds for $q = 1$. Next, if (11) holds for $q = q^*$, then for $q = q^* + 1$

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \prod_{j=m-q^*}^m (1 - p^{-j}) &\leq 1 - (1 - p^{-m+q^*})(1 - p^{-m+q^*}) \\ &< 2p^{-m+q^*} \leq p^{-m+q^*+1}, \end{aligned}$$

so (11) holds in general. For \mathcal{C} to generate a (t, m, s) -net, we need $C^{\lceil \kappa \rceil}$ to have full rank for all κ with $\|\lceil \kappa \rceil\|_1 = \sum_{j=1}^s \lceil \kappa_j \rceil = m - t$.

There are $\binom{m-t+s-1}{s-1}$ different $C^{\lceil \kappa \rceil}$ satisfying $\|\lceil \kappa \rceil\|_1 = m - t$ and each of them has $m - t$ rows. Therefore the probability that any one of them fails to have full rank is bounded by

$$\binom{m-t+s-1}{s-1} p^{-m+(m-t)} = \binom{m-t+s-1}{s-1} p^{-t}.$$

Because $m \geq p$, the threshold $s \log_p(m)$ for t in (10) is at least s . With $t \geq s$

$$\binom{m-t+s-1}{s-1} p^{-t} \leq \frac{m^{s-1}}{(s-1)!} p^{-t}.$$

The above is further bounded by $((s-1)!m)^{-1}$ once we take t to be greater than or equal to $s \log_p(m)$, establishing equation (10). \square

Theorem 4 has a sharper bound on $t(\mathcal{C})$ than Theorem 3. To make the comparison, let $\alpha = 1 - 1/((s-1)!m)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(t(\mathcal{C}) < s \log_p(m)) &\geq \alpha && \text{(Theorem 4), and} \\ \Pr(t(\mathcal{C}) \leq \lceil s \log_p(m) + \log_p((s-1)!) \rceil) &\geq \alpha && \text{(Theorem 3)} \end{aligned}$$

so Theorem 4 has a much smaller upper bound for $t(\mathcal{C})$ when s is large. It has a restriction that $m \neq 1$ (the claim holds trivially for $m = 0$) but applications with $p = 2$ generally use $m \geq 2$.

Theorem 5. Let C_1, \dots, C_s be independently drawn from a uniform distribution on $\{0, 1\}^{m \times m}$. If \mathbf{k}_1 and \mathbf{k}_2 are distinct and nonzero points in \mathbb{N}_0^s with $\max_j \lceil \kappa_{1j} \rceil \leq m$ and $\max_j \lceil \kappa_{2j} \rceil \leq m$, then

$$\Pr(\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathcal{C}) \cap \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_2, \mathcal{C})) = 2^{-2m}. \quad (12)$$

Proof. First, notice that

$$\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathcal{C}) \cap \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_2, \mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathcal{C}) \cap \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_{12}, \mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_2, \mathcal{C}) \cap \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_{12}, \mathcal{C}). \quad (13)$$

Therefore, by replacing \mathbf{k}_2 by \mathbf{k}_{12} if necessary, we can find $j^* \in 1:s$ such that $\lceil \kappa_{1j^*} \rceil \neq \lceil \kappa_{2j^*} \rceil$. We assume without loss of generality that $\lceil \kappa_{1j^*} \rceil > \lceil \kappa_{2j^*} \rceil$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr(\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathcal{C}) \cap \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_2, \mathcal{C}) \mid \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{C} \setminus C_{j^*}(\lceil \kappa_{1j^*} \rceil, :)) \\ &= Z(\mathbf{k}_2, \mathcal{C}) \Pr(\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathcal{C}) \mid \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{C} \setminus C_{j^*}(\lceil \kappa_{1j^*} \rceil, :)) \\ &= Z(\mathbf{k}_2, \mathcal{C}) \Pr\left(\sum_{r \in \kappa_{1j^*}} M_{j^*}(r, :)^\top C_{j^*} = - \sum_{j=1, j \neq j^*}^s \vec{k}_{1j^*}^\top M_j C_j \mid \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{C} \setminus C_{j^*}(\lceil \kappa_{1j^*} \rceil, :)\right) \\ &= 2^{-m} Z(\mathbf{k}_2, \mathcal{C}). \end{aligned}$$

The first equality follows because $\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_2, \mathcal{C})$ does not depend on $C_{j^*}(\lceil \kappa_{1j^*} \rceil, :)$ and the last equality follows because $\sum_{r \in \kappa_{1j^*}} M_{j^*}(r, :)^\top C_{j^*}$ equals $C_{j^*}(\lceil \kappa_{1j^*} \rceil, :)$ plus vectors determined by \mathcal{M} and $\mathcal{C} \setminus C_{j^*}(\lceil \kappa_{1j^*} \rceil, :)$.

Taking expectations of the above identity, we get

$$\Pr(\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathcal{C}) \cap \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_2, \mathcal{C})) = 2^{-m} \Pr(\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_2, \mathcal{C})).$$

We can apply the above argument again to get

$$\Pr(\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_2, \mathcal{C}) \mid \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{C} \setminus C_{j^*}(\lceil \kappa_{2j^*} \rceil, :)) = 2^{-m}.$$

Therefore $\Pr(\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_2, \mathcal{C})) = 2^{-m}$ and then (12) follows. \square

Theorem 6. For any $\epsilon > 0$, when m is large enough

$$\Pr(\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathcal{C}) \cap \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_2, \mathcal{C}) \mid \mathcal{C}) \leq 2^{-2(1-\epsilon)m}$$

for all pairs of distinct nonzero \mathbf{k}_1 and \mathbf{k}_2 for all \mathcal{C} in a set \mathcal{C}^* with probability at least $1 - ((s-1)!m)^{-1} - m^{3s}2^{-2\epsilon m}$.

Proof. We first prove the bound for pairs $\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2$ such that $\max_j \lceil \kappa_{1j} \rceil \geq m$ or $\max_j \lceil \kappa_{2j} \rceil \geq m$. By symmetry, we can assume that $\lceil \kappa_{1j^*} \rceil \geq m$ for some $j^* \in 1:s$, and by replacing \mathbf{k}_2 with \mathbf{k}_{12} if necessary (because of (13)), we can assume that $j^* \notin J_{1 \cap 2}$. Corollary 1 then shows that

$$\Pr(\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathcal{C}) \cap \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_2, \mathcal{C}) \mid \mathcal{C}) \leq 2^{-2(m-t(\mathcal{C})-s)} \leq 2^{-2(1-\epsilon)m}$$

for large enough m when $t(\mathcal{C}) < s \log_2(m)$. From Theorem 4,

$$\Pr(t(\mathcal{C}) \geq s \log_2(m)) \leq ((s-1)!m)^{-1}. \quad (14)$$

We proceed to bound the remaining pairs. First notice that $\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathcal{C}) \cap \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_2, \mathcal{C})$ can be rewritten as these two equalities:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^s \sum_{r \in \kappa_{1j} \cap \kappa_{2j}} M_j(r, :) C_j + \sum_{r \in \kappa_{1j} \setminus \kappa_{2j}} M_j(r, :) C_j &= \mathbf{0}, \quad \text{and} \\ \sum_{j=1}^s \sum_{r \in \kappa_{1j} \cap \kappa_{2j}} M_j(r, :) C_j + \sum_{r \in \kappa_{2j} \setminus \kappa_{1j}} M_j(r, :) C_j &= \mathbf{0}. \end{aligned}$$

Now $\sum_{r \in A} M_j(r, :) \stackrel{d}{=} M_j(\lceil A \rceil, :)$ and if $A \cap B = \emptyset$ then $\sum_{r \in A} M_j(r, :)$ is independent of $\sum_{r \in B} M_j(r, :)$. Therefore $\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathcal{C}) \cap \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_2, \mathcal{C})$ is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^s M_j(\lceil \kappa_{1j} \cap \kappa_{2j} \rceil, :) C_j + M_j(\lceil \kappa_{1j} \setminus \kappa_{2j} \rceil, :) C_j &= \mathbf{0}, \quad \text{and} \\ \sum_{j=1}^s M_j(\lceil \kappa_{1j} \cap \kappa_{2j} \rceil, :) C_j + M_j(\lceil \kappa_{2j} \setminus \kappa_{1j} \rceil, :) C_j &= \mathbf{0}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $\Pr(\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathcal{C}) \cap \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_2, \mathcal{C}) | \mathcal{C})$ only depends on $\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2$ through rows $\lceil \kappa_{1j} \cap \kappa_{2j} \rceil$, $\lceil \kappa_{1j} \setminus \kappa_{2j} \rceil$ and $\lceil \kappa_{2j} \setminus \kappa_{1j} \rceil$ of M_j for $j = 1:s$. Since the remaining pairs satisfy $\max_j \lceil \kappa_{1j} \rceil < m$ and $\max_j \lceil \kappa_{2j} \rceil < m$, each of $\lceil \kappa_{1j} \cap \kappa_{2j} \rceil$, $\lceil \kappa_{1j} \setminus \kappa_{2j} \rceil$ and $\lceil \kappa_{2j} \setminus \kappa_{1j} \rceil$ can only take values from 0 to $m-1$, constituting at most m^{3s} combinations. For each combination, we can apply Markov's inequality and get

$$\begin{aligned} &\Pr\left(\Pr(\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathcal{C}) \cap \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_2, \mathcal{C}) | \mathcal{C}) \geq 2^{-2(1-\epsilon)m}\right) \\ &\leq 2^{-2(1-\epsilon)m} \Pr(\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathcal{C}) \cap \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_2, \mathcal{C})) \\ &= 2^{-2\epsilon m}. \end{aligned}$$

After taking a union bound, we see that with probability at least $1 - m^{3s} 2^{-2\epsilon m}$ the desired bound holds for all the remaining pairs. The conclusion follows once we combine the failure probabilities from the preceding two cases. \square

Theorem 6 shows that when m is large then for most realizations of \mathcal{C} , $\Pr(\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathcal{C}) \cap \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_2, \mathcal{C}) | \mathcal{C})$ has a comparable bound to that of the $s = 1$ case. From now on, we assume that we have generated our \mathcal{C} , either by a pre-chosen design or by randomization, and continue our analysis on $\mathbb{E}[(\hat{\mu}_\infty - \mu)^3]$. We will again suppress the dependence of t and $\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k})$ on \mathcal{C} .

Next we provide a technical lemma that we need in the proof of our main result. There we will have to sum a triple product of the lead factor in the bound from Theorem 1 over a collection of Walsh coefficient indices. This next result is the core of the proof of our main theorem. Figure 1 helps to visualize the arguments.

	ℓ_1														
κ_1	○	○	⋯	○	○	○	●								
κ_{12}	○	○	⋯	○	○	○	●	○	○	○	○	⋯	○	○	●
κ_2	○	○	⋯	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	⋯	○	○	●
	ℓ_2														

Figure 1: This is a sketch of the sets κ_1 , κ_2 , κ_{12} , when all are non-empty. Solid circles mark indices that must be in those sets including $\ell_1 = \lceil \kappa_1 \rceil$ and $\ell_2 = \lceil \kappa_2 \rceil = \lceil \kappa_{12} \rceil$. Without loss of generality $\ell_1 \in \kappa_{12} \setminus \kappa_2$. Open circles in κ_1 and κ_2 indicate possible locations of $\ell_3 = \lceil \kappa_1 \rceil_{(2)}$ and $\ell_4 = \lceil \kappa_2 \rceil_{(2)}$, respectively. Every index must be in exactly 0 or 2 of sets κ_1 , κ_2 , κ_{12} .

Lemma 3. For $\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_{12} \in \mathbb{N}_0$, let $K(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_{12})$ be the set of pairs $(\kappa_1, \kappa_2) \in \mathcal{N}^2$ such that $\lceil \kappa_1 \rceil = \ell_1$ and $\lceil \kappa_2 \rceil = \ell_2$ and $\lceil \kappa_{12} \rceil = \ell_{12}$. Let

$$T(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_{12}) = \sum_{(\kappa_1, \kappa_2) \in K(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_{12})} 2^{-\lceil \kappa_1 \rceil_2 - \lceil \kappa_2 \rceil_2 - \lceil \kappa_{12} \rceil_2}.$$

Then

$$T(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_{12}) < 2^{-\ell_1 - \ell_2 - \ell_{12} + 2}. \quad (15)$$

Proof. First we consider the case where any of ℓ_1 , ℓ_2 , ℓ_{12} equals zero. For that case we can take $\ell_1 = 0$ without loss of generality. We can assume that $\kappa_2 = \kappa_{12}$, for otherwise $T = 0$. Now $\ell = \lceil \kappa_2 \rceil_{(2)}$ is an integer between 0 and $\max(\ell_2 - 1, 0)$ inclusive. For any nonzero ℓ there are $2^{\ell-1}$ sets κ_2 with $\lceil \kappa_2 \rceil = \ell_2$ and $\lceil \kappa_2 \rceil_{(2)} = \ell$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} T(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_{12}) &= \sum_{\kappa_2: \lceil \kappa_2 \rceil = \ell_2} 2^{-2\ell_2 - 2\lceil \kappa_2 \rceil_{(2)}} = 2^{-2\ell_2} \sum_{\ell=0}^{\max(\ell_2-1, 0)} 2^{-2\ell} 2^{\max(0, \ell-1)} \\ &< 2^{-2\ell_2} \left[1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} 2^{-\ell+1} \right] < 2^{-2\ell_2+2} = 2^{-\ell_1 - \ell_2 - \ell_{12} + 2}. \end{aligned}$$

With $\min(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_{12}) > 0$ the relation $\vec{k}_{12} = \vec{k}_1 + \vec{k}_2$ now implies that two of $\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_{12}$ are equal while the remaining one is smaller than the other two. By symmetry, we can permute the inputs $\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_{12}$ without changing the value of $T(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_{12})$. Therefore we assume without loss of generality that $1 \leq \ell_1 < \ell_2 = \ell_{12}$. Furthermore, one of κ_2, κ_{12} must contain ℓ_1 and then the other one cannot. By switching κ_2 with κ_{12} when $\ell_1 \in \kappa_2$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} T(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_{12}) &= 2 \sum_{\kappa_1: \lceil \kappa_1 \rceil = \ell_1} \sum_{\kappa_2: \lceil \kappa_2 \rceil = \ell_2, \ell_1 \notin \kappa_2} 2^{-\lceil \kappa_1 \rceil_2 - \lceil \kappa_2 \rceil_2 - \lceil \kappa_{12} \rceil_2} \\ &= 2^{-\ell_1 - 2\ell_2 + 1} \sum_{\kappa_1: \lceil \kappa_1 \rceil = \ell_1} \sum_{\kappa_2: \lceil \kappa_2 \rceil = \ell_2, \ell_1 \notin \kappa_2} 2^{-\lceil \kappa_1 \rceil_{(2)} - \lceil \kappa_2 \rceil_{(2)} - \lceil \kappa_{12} \rceil_{(2)}}, \end{aligned}$$

recalling that $\lceil \kappa \rceil_{(2)}$ was defined as the second largest element of κ , defaulting to zero if $|\kappa| < 2$.

Suppose that $\lceil \kappa_1 \rceil_{(2)} = \ell_3 < \ell_1$ and $\lceil \kappa_2 \rceil_{(2)} = \ell_4 < \ell_2$. Then $\lceil \kappa_{12} \rceil_{(2)} = \max(\ell_1, \ell_4)$. We need to get an upper bound for the number of pairs (κ_1, κ_2) that satisfy $\lceil \kappa_1 \rceil = \ell_1$, $\lceil \kappa_2 \rceil_1 = \ell_2$, $\lceil \kappa_1 \rceil_{(2)} = \ell_3$, $\lceil \kappa_2 \rceil_{(2)} = \ell_4$ and $\ell_1 \notin \kappa_2$. An index ℓ with $1 \leq \ell < \min(\ell_3, \ell_4)$ can be in both κ_1 and κ_2 , or in neither of them, or in exactly one of them (plus κ_{12}). That provides $4^{\max(\min(\ell_3, \ell_4) - 1, 0)}$ possibilities. Next consider ℓ with $\min(\ell_3, \ell_4) < \ell < \max(\ell_3, \ell_4)$. If $\ell_4 < \ell < \ell_3$ then ℓ can belong to κ_1 (and κ_{12}) or not. If $\ell_3 < \ell < \ell_4$ (but $\ell \neq \ell_1$) then ℓ can belong to κ_2 (and κ_{12}) or not. These combinations multiply the number of choices by at most $2^{\max(\ell_3, \ell_4) - \min(\ell_3, \ell_4) - 1}$. If $\ell = \min(\ell_3, \ell_4) > 0$, then there are two choices if $\ell_3 \neq \ell_4$ and just one if $\ell_3 = \ell_4$. Finally, if $\ell > \max(\ell_3, \ell_4)$, then there is just one choice for ℓ : if $\ell = \ell_2$, then $\ell \in \kappa_2$ but not κ_1 , while if $\ell \neq \ell_2$, then ℓ is not in either of those sets.

Therefore in this setting with $\ell_1 > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
& T(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_{12}) \\
& \leq 2^{-\ell_1 - 2\ell_2 + 1} \sum_{\ell_3=0}^{\ell_1-1} \sum_{\ell_4=0}^{\ell_2-1} 2^{-\ell_3 - \ell_4 - \max(\ell_1, \ell_4)} 4^{\max(\min(\ell_3, \ell_4) - 1, 0)} 2^{\max(\ell_3, \ell_4) - \min(\ell_3, \ell_4)} \\
& = 2^{-\ell_1 - 2\ell_2 + 1} \sum_{\ell_3=0}^{\ell_1-1} \sum_{\ell_4=0}^{\ell_2-1} 2^{-\max(\ell_1, \ell_4)} 4^{-\mathbf{1}\{\min(\ell_3, \ell_4) \neq 0\}} \\
& < 2^{-\ell_1 - 2\ell_2 + 1} \sum_{\ell_3=0}^{\ell_1-1} \left(\sum_{\ell_4=0}^{\ell_1} 2^{-\ell_1} + \sum_{\ell_4=\ell_1+1}^{\infty} 2^{-\ell_4} \right) \\
& = \ell_1(\ell_1 + 2) 2^{-2\ell_1 - 2\ell_2 + 1}. \tag{16}
\end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\ell_1 < \ell_2 = \ell_{12}$. Because $\sup_{\ell_1 \geq 1} \ell_1(\ell_1 + 2) 2^{-\ell_1} = 2$, we conclude that $T(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_{12}) < 2^{-\ell_1 - \ell_2 - \ell_{12} + 2}$. \square

Theorem 7. *Let $f : [0, 1]^s \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ have continuous mixed partial derivatives up to order 2 in each variable x_j for $j \in 1:s$. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}((\hat{\mu} - \mu)^3) = O(n^{-9/2 + \epsilon})$$

for any $\epsilon > 0$. If also $s = 1$ or the generator matrices satisfy the condition in Theorem 6, then

$$\mathbb{E}((\hat{\mu} - \mu)^3) = O(n^{-5 + \epsilon}).$$

Proof. We introduce the bound

$$\bar{P} = \begin{cases} 2^{-2(m-1)}, & s = 1, \\ 2^{-2(1-\epsilon)m}, & s \geq 2 \text{ and } \mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{C}^* \text{ of Theorem 6,} \\ 2^{-(3/2)(m-t-s)}, & \text{else.} \end{cases} \tag{17}$$

By the (t, m, s) -net property, we find $\Pr(\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_1) \cap \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{k}_2)) = 0$ if $\|\lceil \boldsymbol{\kappa}_\ell \rceil\|_1 \leq m - t$ for any of $\ell \in \{1, 2, 12\}$. Applying the above bounds to (5), we see that $\mathbb{E}[(\hat{\mu}_\infty - \mu)^3]$ is at most

$$\bar{P} \sum_{\mathbf{k}_1 \in \mathbb{N}_*^s} \sum_{\mathbf{k}_2 \in \mathbb{N}_*^s} |\hat{f}(\mathbf{k}_1)\hat{f}(\mathbf{k}_2)\hat{f}(\mathbf{k}_{12})| \prod_{\ell \in \{1, 2, 12\}} \mathbf{1}\{\|\lceil \boldsymbol{\kappa}_\ell \rceil\|_1 > m - t\}. \quad (18)$$

Now the Walsh coefficient bound from Theorem 1 gives

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{f}(\mathbf{k}_1)\hat{f}(\mathbf{k}_2)\hat{f}(\mathbf{k}_{12})| &\leq A 2^{-\|\lceil \boldsymbol{\kappa}_1 \rceil\|_1 - \|\lceil \boldsymbol{\kappa}_2 \rceil\|_1 - \|\lceil \boldsymbol{\kappa}_{12} \rceil\|_1} \\ &= A \prod_{j=1}^s 2^{-\lceil \kappa_{1j} \rceil_2 - \lceil \kappa_{2j} \rceil_2 - \lceil \kappa_{12j} \rceil_2} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$A = \left(\sup_{\boldsymbol{\kappa}: |\boldsymbol{\kappa}| \in \{0, 1, 2\}^s} \sup_{\mathbf{x}_{s(\boldsymbol{\kappa})} \in [0, 1]^{s(\boldsymbol{\kappa})}} \left| \int_{[0, 1]^{s - |\boldsymbol{\kappa}|}} f^{|\boldsymbol{\kappa}| \wedge 2}(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x}_{-s(\boldsymbol{\kappa})} \right| \right)^3.$$

For $\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_{12} \in \mathbb{N}_0^s$ let $\mathcal{K}(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_{12})$ be the set of pairs $(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2)$ such that $\lceil \boldsymbol{\kappa}_1 \rceil = \ell_1$, $\lceil \boldsymbol{\kappa}_2 \rceil = \ell_2$ and $\lceil \boldsymbol{\kappa}_{12} \rceil = \ell_{12}$. Then for any chosen $\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_{12}$

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2) \in \mathcal{K}(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_{12})} |\hat{f}(\mathbf{k}_1)\hat{f}(\mathbf{k}_2)\hat{f}(\mathbf{k}_{12})| \\ &\leq \sum_{(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2) \in \mathcal{K}(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_{12})} A \prod_{j=1}^s 2^{-\lceil \kappa_{1j} \rceil_2 - \lceil \kappa_{2j} \rceil_2 - \lceil \kappa_{12j} \rceil_2} \\ &= A \prod_{j=1}^s \sum_{(\kappa_{1j}, \kappa_{2j}) \in K(\ell_{1j}, \ell_{2j}, \ell_{12j})} 2^{-\lceil \kappa_{1j} \rceil_2 - \lceil \kappa_{2j} \rceil_2 - \lceil \kappa_{12j} \rceil_2} \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where $K(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_{12})$ is the set of pairs (k_1, k_2) such that $\lceil \boldsymbol{\kappa}_1 \rceil = k_1$, $\lceil \boldsymbol{\kappa}_2 \rceil = k_2$ and $\lceil \boldsymbol{\kappa}_{12} \rceil = k_{12}$.

Applying Lemma 3 to equation (19), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2) \in \mathcal{K}(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_{12})} |\hat{f}(\mathbf{k}_1)\hat{f}(\mathbf{k}_2)\hat{f}(\mathbf{k}_{12})| &\leq A \prod_{j=1}^s 2^{-\ell_{1j} - \ell_{2j} - \ell_{12j} + 2} \\ &= A 2^{-\|\ell_1\|_1 - \|\ell_2\|_1 - \|\ell_{12}\|_1 + 2s}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we put the above bound into equation (18) and get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(\hat{\mu}_\infty - \mu)^3] &\leq \bar{P} \sum_{\ell_1 \in \mathbb{N}_0^s} \sum_{\ell_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0^s} \sum_{\ell_{12} \in \mathbb{N}_0^s} A 2^{-\|\ell_1\|_1 - \|\ell_2\|_1 - \|\ell_{12}\|_1 + 2s} \mathbf{1}\{\|\ell_i\|_1 > m - t, i = 1, 2, 12\} \\ &= \bar{P} A 2^{2s} \left(\sum_{\boldsymbol{\ell} \in \mathbb{N}_0^s} 2^{-\|\boldsymbol{\ell}\|_1} \mathbf{1}\{\|\boldsymbol{\ell}\|_1 > m - t\} \right)^3. \end{aligned}$$

Because there are $\binom{N+s-1}{s-1}$ vectors $\boldsymbol{\ell} \in \mathbb{N}_0^s$ with $\|\boldsymbol{\ell}\|_1 = N$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\ell} \in \mathbb{N}_0^s} 2^{-\|\boldsymbol{\ell}\|_1} \mathbf{1}\{\|\boldsymbol{\ell}\|_1 > m-t\} &= \sum_{N=m-t+1}^{\infty} \binom{N+s-1}{s-1} 2^{-N} \\ &= O(m^{s-1} 2^{-m+t}) \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where s is deemed as a constant in the big-O notation. Therefore

$$\mathbb{E}[(\hat{\mu}_\infty - \mu)^3] = O(\bar{P} m^{3s-3} 2^{-3(m-t)}).$$

In view of equation (17), $\mathbb{E}[(\hat{\mu}_\infty - \mu)^3] = O(n^{-5+\epsilon})$ for any $\epsilon > 0$ if $s = 1$ or $\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{C}^*$ of Theorem 6, and is $O(n^{-9/2+\epsilon})$ in general. \square

Under our smoothness conditions on f , the RQMC variance is $O(n^{-3+\epsilon})$ because that holds for the scramble in [10] by [11, 12], and because the scramble of [9] has the same variance [17]. When the RQMC variance is $\Omega(n^{-3})$, then RQMC has $\gamma = O(n^{-1/2+\epsilon})$ in the former case and $O(n^\epsilon)$ otherwise.

Remark 1. It is possible to improve the above bound in the special cases with $s = 1$ or $s = 2$. When $s = 1$, equations (19) and (16) give

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2) \in \mathcal{K}(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_{12})} |\hat{f}(\mathbf{k}_1) \hat{f}(\mathbf{k}_2) \hat{f}(\mathbf{k}_{12})| \\ &\leq A \times T(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_{12}) \\ &\leq A \max(1, \ell_1) (\ell_1 + 2) 2^{-2\ell_1 - 2\ell_2 + 1} \end{aligned}$$

using (16), where we have replaced ℓ_1 by $\max(1, \ell_1)$ in order to include the case with $\ell_1 = 0$ that was not included in (16). The constraint $\|\boldsymbol{\ell}_i\|_1 > m-t, i = 1, 2, 12$ becomes $\ell_2 > \ell_1 > m$, so equation (18) becomes

$$\mathbb{E}[(\hat{\mu}_\infty - \mu)^3] \leq \bar{P} \sum_{\ell_1 > m} \sum_{\ell_2 > \ell_1} A \max(1, \ell_1) (\ell_1 + 2) 2^{-2\ell_1 - 2\ell_2 + 1}.$$

which is easily seen to be $O(n^{-6+\epsilon})$ for any $\epsilon > 0$, because $\bar{P} = 2^{-2(m-1)}$. Then for $\mathbb{E}[(\hat{\mu} - \mu)^2] = \Omega(n^{-3})$ we get $\gamma = O(n^{-3/2+\epsilon})$.

When $s = 2$, we let $L_j = \min_{i \in \{1, 2, 12\}} \lceil \kappa_{ij} \rceil$ and $H_j = \max_{i \in \{1, 2, 12\}} \lceil \kappa_{ij} \rceil$. Equations (19) and (16) give

$$\sum_{(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2) \in \mathcal{K}(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_{12})} |\hat{f}(\mathbf{k}_1) \hat{f}(\mathbf{k}_2) \hat{f}(\mathbf{k}_{12})| \leq A \prod_{j=1}^2 \max(1, L_j) (L_j + 2) \prod_{j=1}^2 2^{-2L_j - 2H_j + 1}.$$

We recall that $T(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_{12})$ is symmetric in its arguments and we used the order $\ell_1 < \ell_2 = \ell_{12}$ in Lemma 3. For two dimensions, we reconsider our order. We know that among $i = 1, 2, 12$, either one or two of the three satisfies both $\lceil \kappa_{i1} \rceil = H_1$ and $\lceil \kappa_{i2} \rceil = H_2$. If two of them satisfy the above conditions, we can assume, after reordering, that $\lceil \kappa_{1,1} \rceil = L_1$, $\lceil \kappa_{2,1} \rceil = \lceil \kappa_{12,1} \rceil = H_1$ and

$\lceil \kappa_{1,2} \rceil = L_2, \lceil \kappa_{2,2} \rceil = \lceil \kappa_{12,2} \rceil = H_2$. The constraint $\|\ell_i\|_1 > m - t, i = 1, 2, 12$ implies that $H_1 + H_2 > L_1 + L_2 > m - t$, so

$$\prod_{j=1}^2 2^{-2L_j - 2H_j + 1} = 2^{-2(L_1 + L_2) - 2(H_1 + H_2) + 2} \leq 2^{-4(m-t) + 2}.$$

Now suppose that only one of the three satisfies the those conditions. Then we can assume, after reordering, that $\lceil \kappa_{1,1} \rceil = L_1, \lceil \kappa_{2,1} \rceil = \lceil \kappa_{12,1} \rceil = H_1, \lceil \kappa_{2,2} \rceil = L_2$ and $\lceil \kappa_{1,2} \rceil = \lceil \kappa_{12,2} \rceil = H_2$. The constraint $\|\ell_i\|_1 > m - t, i = 1, 2, 12$ implies that $L_1 + H_2 > m - t$ and $L_2 + H_1 > m - t$, so

$$\prod_{j=1}^2 2^{-2L_j - 2H_j + 1} = 2^{-2(L_1 + H_2) - 2(L_2 + H_1) + 2} \leq 2^{-4(m-t) + 2}.$$

In both cases $\sum_{(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2) \in \mathcal{K}(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_{12})} |\hat{f}(\mathbf{k}_1) \hat{f}(\mathbf{k}_2) \hat{f}(\mathbf{k}_{12})|$ is $O(n^{-4+\epsilon})$ when $\|\ell_i\|_1 > m - t, i = 1, 2, 12$ and a similar calculation as in equation (20) shows $\mathbb{E}[(\hat{\mu}_\infty - \mu)^3] = O(\bar{P} n^{-4+\epsilon})$. In view of equation (17), $\mathbb{E}[(\hat{\mu}_\infty - \mu)^3]$ is $O(n^{-6+\epsilon})$ if \mathcal{C} satisfies the bound in Theorem 6 and is $O(n^{-11/2+\epsilon})$ in general. Again, with $\mathbb{E}((\hat{\mu} - \mu)^2) = \Omega(n^{-3})$, these translate into $\gamma = O(n^{-3/2+\epsilon})$ and $\gamma = O(n^{-1+\epsilon})$ respectively.

5 Discussion

We have given conditions under which random linear scrambling of base 2 digital nets brings leads to small values of $\mathbb{E}((\hat{\mu} - \mu)^3)$ as $n = 2^m \rightarrow \infty$. This numerator in the skewness γ is generally $O(n^{-9/2+\epsilon})$ and is even $O(n^{-5+\epsilon})$ under a condition on randomly chosen generator matrices that holds with probability approaching one as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Our conditions on f ensure that $\mathbb{E}((\hat{\mu} - \mu)^2) = O(n^{-3+\epsilon})$. For an integrand f with $\mathbb{E}((\hat{\mu} - \mu)^2) = \Omega(n^{-3})$ we get $\gamma = O(n^\epsilon)$ for any $\epsilon > 0$, which is ‘almost $O(1)$ ’. Under the condition on randomly chosen generator matrices, we get $\gamma = O(n^{-1/2+\epsilon})$, although that rate includes a bound with possibly very slow convergence of $m^{3s} 2^{-2\epsilon m}$ to zero when a small value of ϵ is chosen.

Our results are for smooth f , while the empirical findings in [8] included some non-smooth integrands. We used smoothness of f in order to bound $\mathbb{E}((\hat{\mu} - \mu)^3)$, the numerator of γ . Specifically, f had to be continuously differentiable up to two times in each variable. Continuous differentiability up to one time in each variable puts those derivatives in $L^2[0, 1]^s$ and hence makes the denominator $\mathbb{E}((\hat{\mu} - \mu)^2)^{3/2} = O(n^{-9/2+\epsilon})$. For discontinuous or otherwise non-smooth f , the denominator will generally be larger which then reduces γ . If f is once continuously differentiable in every variable, but not twice continuously differentiable in every variable, then the denominator of γ is just as small as before but the numerator may no longer satisfy our bounds. It is possible that integrands of this intermediate smoothness level would have large skewness.

The reliability of Student t based confidence intervals in [8] was not just for this one kind of scrambled nets. It was evident for nets scrambled as in [10] as well as for some randomized lattice rules. The skewness for those methods raises different technical issues than the linearly scrambled nets we considered do.

While [8] show good empirical performance when simply using the standard Student's t method to get asymptotic confidence intervals for μ on based on replicates $\hat{\mu}_1, \dots, \hat{\mu}_R$, much work remains in order to bound the coverage error of those intervals. Such an error analysis needs to consider both the central limit theorem as $R \rightarrow \infty$ and the distribution of $\hat{\mu}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Classical Berry-Esseen bounds require $\mathbb{E}(|\hat{\mu} - \mu|^3)/\mathbb{E}(|\hat{\mu} - \mu|^2)^{3/2}$ to be finite but our theory does not have an absolute value in the numerator. The theory of Hall [4, 5] uses central moments of order at least six and we know that $\mathbb{E}((\hat{\mu} - \mu)^4)/\mathbb{E}((\hat{\mu} - \mu)^2)^2 \rightarrow \infty$ is typical for random linear scrambling as $n \rightarrow \infty$. So both Hall's theory and Berry-Esseen apply to a limit as $R \rightarrow \infty$ for fixed n . This limits how well they can explain the results in [8] which had large n .

The skewness of $\hat{\mu}$ is a centered and scaled third moment. Therefore its sampling variance depends on the sixth moment of $\hat{\mu}$ and even an appropriately scaled fourth moment diverges to infinity as $n \rightarrow \infty$. As a result, we believe that distinguishing empirically between $\gamma = O(n^\epsilon)$ and $\gamma = O(n^{-1/2+\epsilon})$ would be extremely expensive.

In empirical work we have seen that the distribution of $\hat{\mu}$ tends to become symmetric as n increases. We believe but have not proved that the distribution of $\hat{\mu}$ is asymptotically symmetric as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We know from [14] that for smooth integrands, the distribution of $\hat{\mu}$ has a small probability of severe outliers which makes a median-of-means strategy very effective. For confidence intervals, a data set $\hat{\mu}_1, \dots, \hat{\mu}_R$ with no outliers would be expected to have reasonable coverage. When there are one or more outliers, the mean is adversely affected but the standard deviation is also greatly enlarged making the Student t interval wide enough that it can still cover the true mean μ . For instance, suppose there are $R - 1$ replicates $\hat{\mu}_r \approx 0 = \mu$ and one outlying replicate at $c \neq 0$. Without loss of generality we can take $c = 1$. Then we get $\hat{\mu} \approx 1/R$ and the sample standard error is approximately

$$\left[\frac{1}{R(R-1)} \left[(R-1) \left(0 - \frac{1}{R}\right)^2 + \left(1 - \frac{1}{R}\right)^2 \right] \right]^{1/2} = \frac{1}{R} \sqrt{\frac{R}{R-1}}.$$

Then the true mean is less than one standard error from the sample mean and will be well within the Student t confidence intervals for 95% coverage which always extend at least 1.96 standard errors in each direction from the sample mean. An explanation of this type does not require a symmetric distribution for $\hat{\mu}_n - \mu$. It is enough for that distribution to be a mixture of a benign distribution with probability $1 - \epsilon$ and a symmetric outlier distribution with probability ϵ . The benign component need not be symmetric.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the U.S. National Science Foundation under grant under grant DMS-2152780 and by a Stanford Graduate Fellowship in Science & Engineering.

References

- [1] J. Dick and F. Pillichshammer. *Digital sequences, discrepancy and quasi-Monte Carlo integration*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010.
- [2] Josef Dick. The decay of the Walsh coefficients of smooth functions. *Bulletin of the Australian Mathematical Society*, 80(3):430–453, 2009.
- [3] Michael Grant, Stephen Boyd, and Yinyu Ye. Disciplined convex programming. *Global optimization: From theory to implementation*, pages 155–210, 2006.
- [4] P. G. Hall. On the bootstrap and confidence intervals. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1431–1452, 1986.
- [5] P. G. Hall. Theoretical comparisons of bootstrap confidence intervals. *The Annals of Statistics*, 16(3):927–953, 1988.
- [6] S. Joe and F. Y. Kuo. Constructing Sobol’ sequences with better two-dimensional projections. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 30(5):2635–2654, 2008.
- [7] G. Larcher, H. Niederreiter, and W. Ch. Schmid. Digital nets and sequences constructed over finite rings and their application to quasi-Monte Carlo integration. *Monatshefte für Mathematik*, 121:231–253, 1996.
- [8] Pierre L’Ecuyer, Marvin K. Nakayama, Art B. Owen, and Bruno Tuffin. Confidence intervals for randomized quasi-monte carlo estimators. Technical report, hal-04088085, 2023.
- [9] J. Matoušek. On the L^2 -discrepancy for anchored boxes. *Journal of Complexity*, 14:527–556, 1998.
- [10] A. B. Owen. Randomly permuted (t, m, s) -nets and (t, s) -sequences. In H. Niederreiter and P. J.-S. Shiue, editors, *Monte Carlo and Quasi-Monte Carlo Methods in Scientific Computing*, pages 299–317, New York, 1995. Springer-Verlag.
- [11] A. B. Owen. Scrambled net variance for integrals of smooth functions. *Annals of Statistics*, 25(4):1541–1562, 1997.
- [12] A. B. Owen. Local antithetic sampling with scrambled nets. *Annals of Statistics*, 36(5):2319–2343, 2008.

- [13] Z. Pan and A. B. Owen. Super-polynomial accuracy of one dimensional randomized nets using the median-of-means. *Mathematics of Computation*, 92(340):805–837, 2023.
- [14] Z. Pan and A. B. Owen. Super-polynomial accuracy of multidimensional randomized nets using the median-of-means. *Mathematics of Computation*, 2024.
- [15] I. M. Sobol'. The distribution of points in a cube and the accurate evaluation of integrals (in Russian). *Zh. Vychisl. Mat. i Mat. Phys.*, 7:784–802, 1967.
- [16] Takehito Yoshiki. Bounds on Walsh coefficients by dyadic difference and a new Koksma-Hlawka type inequality for quasi-Monte Carlo integration. *Hiroshima Mathematical Journal*, 47(2):155–179, 2017.
- [17] R. X. Yue and F. J. Hickernell. The discrepancy and gain coefficients of scrambled digital nets. *Journal of Complexity*, 18:135–151, 2002.