

Mean-Biased Processes for Balanced Allocations*

Dimitrios Los¹, Thomas Sauerwald^{†1}, and John Sylvester^{‡2}

¹Department of Computer Science & Technology, University of Cambridge, UK,
`firstname.lastname@cl.cam.ac.uk`

²Department of Computer Science, University of Liverpool, UK,
`john.sylvester@liverpool.ac.uk`

Abstract

We introduce a new class of balanced allocation processes which bias towards underloaded bins (those with load below the mean load) either by skewing the probability by which a bin is chosen for an allocation (*probability bias*), or alternatively, by adding more balls to an underloaded bin (*weight bias*). A prototypical process satisfying the *probability bias* condition is MEAN-THINNING: At each round, we sample one bin and if it is underloaded, we allocate one ball; otherwise, we allocate one ball to a *second* bin sample. Versions of this process have been in use since at least 1986. An example of a process, introduced by us, which satisfies the *weight bias* condition is TWINNING: At each round, we only sample one bin. If the bin is underloaded, then we allocate two balls; otherwise, we allocate only one ball.

Our main result is that for any process with a probability or weight bias, with high probability the gap between maximum and minimum load is logarithmic in the number of bins. This result holds for any number of allocated balls (heavily loaded case), covers many natural processes that relax the TWO-CHOICE process, and we also prove it is tight for many such processes, including MEAN-THINNING and TWINNING.

Our analysis employs a delicate interplay between linear, quadratic and exponential potential functions. It also hinges on a phenomenon we call “mean quantile stabilization”, which holds in greater generality than our framework and may be of independent interest.

Keywords— Balls-into-bins, balanced allocations, potential functions, heavily loaded, gap bounds, maximum load, thinning, two-choices, weighted balls.

AMS MSC 2010— 68W20, 68W27, 68W40, 60C05

*Some results from the paper were presented at SODA 2022 [33].

[†]T.S. was supported by the ERC Starting Grant 679660 (DYNAMIC MARCH).

[‡]J.S. was supported by EPSRC project EP/T004878/1: Multilayer Algorithmics to Leverage Graph Structure.

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Notation and Balanced Allocation Processes	7
3	MEAN-BIASED Processes and Our Results	9
3.1	General MEAN-BIASED Framework and Bounds	9
3.2	MEAN-BIASED Processes Satisfying \mathcal{P}_1 and \mathcal{W}_2 (Weight Bias)	11
3.3	MEAN-BIASED Processes Satisfying \mathcal{P}_2 and \mathcal{W}_1 (Probability Bias)	12
3.4	RELATIVE-THRESHOLD($f(n)$) with $f(n) \geq 0$	15
4	Overview of the Analysis	17
5	Mean Quantile Stabilization	22
6	Potential Function Inequalities	27
6.1	Interplay between Absolute Value and Quadratic Potentials	28
6.2	Exponential Potential	30
6.3	Deterministic Bounds on the Quadratic Potential	41
7	Proof of the Bound on the Gap	42
7.1	The Adjusted Exponential Potential is a Super-Martingale	43
7.2	Taming the Mean Quantile and Absolute Value Potential	44
7.3	Recovery Phase of the Process	47
7.4	Stabilization Phase of the Process	49
7.5	Completing the Proof of Theorem 3.1	51
8	Lower Bounds	52
9	Sample Efficiency	54
10	Experimental Results	57
11	Conclusions	58
	Bibliography	59
A	Auxiliary Inequalities	62
B	Counterexample for the Exponential Potential Function	64

1 Introduction

We consider the sequential allocation of m balls (jobs or data items) to n bins (servers or memory cells), by allowing each ball to choose from a set of randomly sampled bins. The goal is to allocate balls efficiently, while also keeping the load vector balanced. The *balls-into-bins* framework has found numerous applications in hashing, load balancing, routing, but also has connections to more theoretical topics such as randomized rounding or pseudorandomness (we refer to the surveys [38] and [45] for more details).

A classical algorithm is the d -CHOICE process introduced by Azar, Broder, Karlin, Upfal [7] and Karp, Luby, and Meyer auf der Heide [28], where at each round, we sample $d \geq 1$ bins uniformly at random and then allocate the ball to the least loaded of the d sampled bins. It is well-known that for the ONE-CHOICE process ($d = 1$), the *gap* between the maximum and mean load is $\Theta(\sqrt{(m/n) \cdot \log n})$ for $m \geq n \log n$. In particular, this gap grows significantly as $m/n \rightarrow \infty$, which is called the *heavily loaded case*. For TWO-CHOICE ($d = 2$), it was proved [7] that the gap is only $\log_2 \log n + \mathcal{O}(1)$ for $m = n$. This result was generalized by Berenbrink, Czumaj, Steger and Vöcking [10] who proved that the same guarantee also holds for $m \geq n$, in other words, even as $m/n \rightarrow \infty$, the difference between the maximum and mean load remains bounded by a slowly growing function in n that is independent of m . This dramatic improvement of TWO-CHOICE over ONE-CHOICE is widely known as the “power of two choices” paradigm.

The importance of this paradigm was recently recognized in the 2020 ACM Paris Kanellakis Theory and Practice award [6]. However, in some real-world applications the original TWO-CHOICE process has been shown to underperform and so variants of TWO-CHOICE are being used instead (e.g. [35, 39, 46]). These variants relax the assumptions of TWO-CHOICE and can thus be regarded as more *sample-efficient* and *robust*.

As noted in [35], in some real-world systems one important shortcoming of TWO-CHOICE are its communication requirements:

More importantly, the [TWO-CHOICE] algorithm requires communication between dispatchers and processors at the time of job assignment. The communication time is on the critical path, hence contributes to the increase in response time.

An important family of processes, TWO-THINNING attempts to address this issue. In this process, each ball first samples a bin uniformly at random and if its load is below some threshold, the ball is allocated to that sample. Otherwise, the ball is allocated to a *second* bin sampled uniformly at random, without inspecting its load. These processes have the advantage that they relax communication between the job dispatchers and servers (see Fig. 1.1).

TWO-THINNING was used by Eager, Lazowska and Zahorjan [19] and was analyzed by Iwama and Kawachi [27] and Feldheim and Gurel-Gurevich [20] in the lightly-loaded case ($m = \mathcal{O}(n)$). In [20], the authors proved that for $m = n$, there is a TWO-THINNING process using a threshold on the number of times a bin has been used as a first sample, which achieves a gap of $\mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{\log \log n}}\right)$. This process achieves a significant improvement over ONE-CHOICE and also uses a total of $(1 + o(1)) \cdot n$ samples, which is an improvement over TWO-CHOICE. Similar threshold processes have been studied in queuing [19] and discrepancy theory [18]. For values of m sufficiently larger than n , some lower and upper bounds have been established for a more general class of *adaptive* TWO-THINNING processes [21, 29]. Here, adaptive means that the choice of the threshold *may* depend on the entire load vector, which is not ideal from a practical perspective. Related to this line of research, [29] also analyzed a so-called QUANTILE process, which is a version of TWO-THINNING where a ball is allocated to a second sample only if the first bin has a load which is at least the median load.

In [29], an extension of TWO-THINNING was studied, the k -THRESHOLD processes, where for each ball two bins are sampled uniformly at random and k queries of the form “is the load of the bin at least x ?” are sent to each. Then, the process allocates to the bin that was witnessed to be lesser loaded.




Figure 1.1: (left) The three stages A, B, C for an allocation in round t using TWO-CHOICE, which assumes that no other ball is being allocated to the two sampled bins (so the two bins are being “held” until both loads $x_{i_1}^t$ and $x_{i_2}^t$ are reported and the allocation is complete). (right) The (at most) two stages A, B for an allocation using TWO-THINNING process with threshold f^t . Here, none of the bins needs to be “held” and there are at most two stages.

Extensions of TWO-THINNING where up to d bins may be sampled have been studied in [22, 29, 36]. A similar class of adaptive sampling processes (where, depending on the loads of the samples so far, the ball may or may not sample another bin) was analyzed by Czumaj and Stemmann [16] who proved tight results for $m = n$ and by Berenbrink, Khodamoradi, Sauerwald and Stauffer [12] for some specific instances for $m \geq n$.

Another example of a process that reduces the number of samples is the $(1 + \beta)$ -process introduced by Mitzenmacher [36], where each ball is allocated using ONE-CHOICE with probability $1 - \beta$ and otherwise is allocated using TWO-CHOICE. Peres, Talwar and Wieder [41] proved that for any $\beta \in (0, 1]$, the gap is only $\mathcal{O}(\frac{\log n}{\beta})$. Hence, only a *small* fraction of TWO-CHOICE rounds are enough to inherit the property of TWO-CHOICE that the gap is independent of m . It was recently shown that this process asymptotically outperforms TWO-CHOICE in the presence of outdated information [30]. The $(1 + \beta)$ -process has been used to analyze *population protocols* [1, 3], *distributed data structures* [2, 4] and *online carpooling* [26]. Another sample-efficient variant of TWO-CHOICE is the (k, d) -CHOICE process allocates to the k lightest out of the d sampled bins [40].

From a more technical perspective, apart from analyzing a large class of natural allocation processes, an important question is to understand how sensitive the gap is to changes in the probability allocation vector p^t of the process, where p_i^t gives the probability to allocate to the i -th heaviest bin in round t . To this end, [41] formulated general conditions on the probability allocation vector, which, when satisfied in all rounds, imply a small gap bound. These were then applied not only to the $(1 + \beta)$ -process, but also to analyze *graphical balanced allocations* where an edge of a graph is chosen uniformly at random and the ball is allocated to the least loaded of its two endpoints. Other works which study perturbations on the probability allocation vector are: allocations on *hypergraphs* [25], balls-into-bins with *correlated choices* [44]; or balls-into-bins with *hash functions* [13].

Our Results We introduce a general framework that allows us to deduce a small gap independent of m for a large family of processes, but also opens the door for the study of novel allocation processes such as TWINNING (to be defined below). To ensure that an allocation process produces a balanced load vector, we could bias the allocation towards underloaded bins (bins whose load is below the mean) by skewing the probability by which a bin is chosen for an allocation (*probability bias*), or alternatively, we could add more balls to a bin if it is underloaded

(*weight bias*). We call both of these processes MEAN-BIASED.

Note that a small bias in the probability allocation vector can be achieved in various ways, for example, by taking a *second* bin sample: (i) in each round (TWO-CHOICE), or (ii) in each round with some probability β ($(1 + \beta)$ -process), or (iii) in each round dependent on the load of the first sample (TWO-THINNING). Regarding the weight bias, as pointed out in [37], allocating consecutive balls to the same bin is very natural in applications like sticky routing [24] or load balancing, where balls may often arrive in bursts. To this end, we study TWINNING which allocates two balls if the bin is underloaded and one ball if it is overloaded.

We now describe two general conditions, which state that the probability allocation vector is biased towards *underloaded* bins, and we allocate fewer balls to *overloaded* bins. Neglecting some technical details (see Section 3), for $\delta^t \in (0, 1)$ being the quantile of the mean load in round t , meaning there are $\delta^t n$ overloaded bins, the two conditions are (roughly) as follows:

Condition \mathcal{P}_2 : At each round, the probability of allocating to any fixed underloaded bin is $\frac{1}{n} \cdot (1 + \Omega(\delta^t))$, while to any fixed overloaded bin is $\frac{1}{n} \cdot (1 - \Omega(1 - \delta^t))$.

Condition \mathcal{W}_2 : At each round, if an underloaded bin is chosen for allocation, allocate (a constant number) more balls than if an overloaded bin is chosen.

As our main result we prove a gap bound of $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ whenever a process satisfies *at least one* of these two *mean-biasing* conditions (in addition to some mild and general conditions). It turns out that \mathcal{P}_2 is satisfied by MEAN-THINNING (i.e., the TWO-THINNING process with threshold being the mean load), while \mathcal{W}_2 is satisfied by TWINNING; thus for both of these processes a gap bound of $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ follows immediately. The result for TWINNING gives an example of a process with gap $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$, which is also more sample-efficient than ONE-CHOICE.

The result for MEAN-THINNING extends to any RELATIVE-THRESHOLD($f(n)$) process which uses a threshold of $\frac{t}{n} + f(n)$ for the *offset function* $f(n) \geq 0$, via a coupling argument, proving that w.h.p. $\text{Gap}(m) = \mathcal{O}(f(n) + \log n)$. Finally, the framework also applies to the $(1 + \beta)$ -process with any constant $\beta \in (0, 1)$ and a relaxation of MEAN-THINNING which we call the $(1 + \zeta)$ -process.

To the best of our knowledge, most of the related work on balls-into-bins focuses on a small number (usually one or two) allocation processes, and analyzes their gap (with [41, 43] being exceptions). Here we develop a framework that captures a variety of existing and new processes.

Our analysis, especially of TWINNING, bears some resemblance to the *weighted balls-into-bins setting* [11, 41, 42], but there, the weights of the balls are drawn from some distribution *before* the bin is sampled and there is a time-invariant probability bias towards lightly loaded bins (e.g., as in $(1 + \beta)$ -process and TWO-CHOICE). However, in our model the weights *depend* on the load of the sampled bin.

The TWINNING process can also be applied to the graphical balanced allocations on d -regular graphs for any $d \geq 2$ (see Remark 3.5). More specifically, the $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ bound from the classical setting (corresponding to the complete graph) still applies even for sparse regular graphs, like the cycle where TWO-CHOICE is conjectured to have an $\Omega(\text{poly}(n))$ gap [5, 8].

An extension of TWINNING, called PACKING, was studied by the authors of this paper in [34], where an underloaded bin is “filled” until it becomes overloaded, this process also achieves an $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ gap.

Overview of Proof Techniques Parts of our analysis are based on the use of the exponential potential pioneered in [41]. However, in [41] time/load independent conditions on the processes ensure that the potential *drops* in expectation in every round in every round, whereas for our more general conditions there exist load vectors where the potential may *increase* in expectation, even when it is *large* (Claim B.1). This precludes any standard application of the approach in [41] and presents our main challenge. To overcome this challenge we introduce two new ideas/techniques, which since the conference version of this paper [33] have already

Process	Lightly Loaded Case $m = \mathcal{O}(n)$		Heavily Loaded Case $m = \omega(n)$	
	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
$(1 + \beta)$ -process, const $\beta \in (0, 1)$	$\frac{\log n}{\log \log n}$ [41]		$\log n$ [41]	
TWINNING	$\frac{\log n}{\log \log n}$		$\log n$	
MEAN-THINNING	$\frac{\log n}{\log \log n}$		$\log n$	
RELATIVE-THRESHOLD($f(n)$)	$\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{\log \log n}}$ [22]	$\frac{\log n}{\log \log n}$	$\frac{\log n}{\log \log n}$ [29]	$f(n) + \log n$
(adaptive) TWO-THINNING	$\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{\log \log n}}$ [22]		$\frac{\log n}{\log \log n}$ [29]	$\frac{\log n}{\log \log n}$ [21]

Table 1.2: Overview of the gap achieved by different processes considered in this and previous works. All stated bounds hold asymptotically and with high probability; upper bounds hold for all values of m , while lower bounds may only hold for certain values of m . Cells shaded in **Green** are new results and cells shaded **Gray** are known results we re-prove. The upper bounds for RELATIVE-THRESHOLD and TWINNING when $m = \mathcal{O}(n)$ follow immediately from ONE-CHOICE.

found further application [31, 32]. The first is a series of quantitative relationships between the linear, quadratic, and exponential potential functions; this helps overcome the issue of bad configurations “blocking” progress. Our second innovation is the phenomenon of “Mean Quantile Stabilization” where we show that any round with $\mathcal{O}(n)$ linear potential is followed by a $\Theta(n)$ length interval in which for a constant fraction of rounds the ratio of overload/underload bins is bounded away from 0 or 1; this helps maintain progress once it is “unblocked”.

To see in more detail how these two components come together, we observe that in any round where the process has a *stable* quantile, i.e., $\delta^t \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$ for some constant $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, the exponential potential decreases in expectation; and prove that quantile of the mean load *self-stabilizes*. This is done by first proving that the *quadratic potential* drops as long as the *absolute value potential* is $\Omega(n)$ (Lemma 6.2). From this, we can deduce that the absolute value potential has to be $\mathcal{O}(n)$ at some point. Then we prove that once this happens, the quantile of the mean load will be stable for sufficiently many rounds (Theorem 5.1). The final ingredient is to prove that in rounds where the mean quantile is stable, the exponential potential drops by a sufficiently large factor in expectation, while in other rounds it increases by a smaller factor. A more detailed overview is given in Section 4 and the details of the proof in Sections 5 to 7.

Organization In Section 2, we define the aforementioned processes more formally (in addition, an illustration of TWINNING and MEAN-THINNING can be found in Figs. 3.1 and 3.2), and also introduce some basic mathematical notation needed for our analysis. In Section 3, we present our general framework for MEAN-BIASED processes. In this part, we also verify that a variety of processes fall into (or can be reduced to) the framework. In Section 4, we outline the proof of the upper bound on the gap for MEAN-BIASED processes. We also present experiments (Fig. 4.3 on page 21) illustrating the interplay between the different potential functions used in the analysis. In Section 5, we introduce the tools to show that for the MEAN-BIASED processes the mean quantile stabilizes. In Section 6, we mainly derive the inequalities for the expectation of the exponential potential over one round. In Section 7, we complete the proof for the upper bound on the gap of MEAN-BIASED processes. In Section 8 we derive lower bounds on the gap of several MEAN-BIASED processes, which are tight for TWINNING and MEAN-THINNING. In Section 9, we show that TWINNING is more sample-efficient than ONE-CHOICE and MEAN-THINNING is more sample-efficient than TWO-CHOICE. In Section 10, we empirically compare the gaps of the different processes. In Section 11, we conclude with some open problems.

2 Notation and Balanced Allocation Processes

We consider processes that sequentially allocate balls into n bins, labeled $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$. By x^t we denote the *load vector* of the n bins at round $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ (the state after t allocations have been completed). Initially, we start with the empty load vector $x^0 := (0, \dots, 0)$, unless we explicitly state otherwise. In many parts of the analysis, we will assume a labeling of the n bins so that their loads at round t are ordered non-increasingly, i.e.,

$$x_1^t \geq x_2^t \geq \dots \geq x_n^t.$$

Unlike many of the standard balls-into-bins processes, some of our processes may allocate more than one ball in a single allocation. To this end, we define $W^t := \sum_{i \in [n]} x_i^t$ as the total number of balls allocated in the first t allocations (for TWO-THINNING we allocate one ball per allocation, so $W^t = t$, however for TWINNING $W^t \geq t$). We will also use $w^{t+1} := W^{t+1} - W^t$ to denote the number of balls allocated in the $(t+1)$ -th allocation.

We define the *gap* as

$$\text{Gap}(t) := \max_{i \in [n]} x_i^t - \frac{W^t}{n},$$

which is the difference between the maximum load and mean load¹ at round t . When the process \mathcal{Q} is not clear from the context, we write $\text{Gap}_{\mathcal{Q}}(t)$ for the gap and $x_{\mathcal{Q}}^t$ for the load vector of the process. Finally, for any round $t \geq 0$ we define the *normalized load* of a bin $i \in [n]$ as:

$$y_i^t := x_i^t - \frac{W^t}{n}.$$

Further, we define \mathfrak{F}^t to be the *filtration* corresponding to the first t allocations of the process (so in particular, \mathfrak{F}^t reveals x^t). Following [41], let $p^t := p^t(\mathfrak{F}^t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the *probability allocation vector* of the process, where for every $i \in [n]$, p_i^t is the probability that $(t+1)$ -th allocation is to i -th heaviest bin.

Further, let $B_+^t := \{i \in [n]: y_i^t \geq 0\}$ be the set of *overloaded* bins, and $B_-^t := [n] \setminus B_+^t$ be the set of *underloaded* bins. Let $\delta^t := |B_+^t|/n \in \{\frac{1}{n}, \dots, 1\}$ be the *mean quantile* corresponding to the mean load. Let $P_+^t := \sum_{i \in B_+^t} p_i^t$ and $P_-^t := \sum_{i \in B_-^t} p_i^t$, which are the probabilities of allocating to an overloaded or underloaded bin respectively.

For two vectors p and q , we say that p *majorizes* q if $\sum_{i=1}^k p_i \geq \sum_{i=1}^k q_i$, for all $k \in [n]$. We denote this by $p \succeq q$. Typically we will be considering the majorization ordering between two (partial) probability allocation vectors, or sorted load vectors. For random variables Y, Z we say that Y is *stochastically smaller* than Z if $\Pr[Y \geq x] \leq \Pr[Z \geq x]$ for all real x .

For some specific allocation processes considered in this work, we will also analyze the *sample efficiency* defined as $\eta^m := W^m/S^m$, where W^m is the total number the balls allocated in the first m allocations, and S^m is the total number of uniform samples taken by the process in the first m allocations.

We begin with the definition of the classical ONE-CHOICE process.

ONE-CHOICE Process:

Iteration: For each round $t \geq 0$, sample one bin $i \in [n]$ uniformly at random. Then, update:

$$x_i^{t+1} = x_i^t + 1.$$

¹It is common in the literature to focus on this difference, rather than the difference between maximum and minimum load; however, our results for MEAN-BIASED processes apply to both.

The ONE-CHOICE process has a *time-independent* probability allocation vector

$$p := p^t = \left(\frac{1}{n}, \dots, \frac{1}{n} \right),$$

and it has a sample efficiency of $\eta^m = 1$. We proceed with the definition of the TWO-CHOICE process [7, 28].

TWO-CHOICE Process:

Iteration: For each round $t \geq 0$, sample two bins $i_1, i_2 \in [n]$, independently and uniformly at random. Let $i \in \{i_1, i_2\}$ be such that $x_i^t = \min\{x_{i_1}^t, x_{i_2}^t\}$, favoring bins with higher indices in case of a tie. Then, update:

$$x_i^{t+1} = x_i^t + 1.$$

The TWO-CHOICE process also has a time-independent probability allocation vector $p := p^t$, where

$$p_i := \frac{2i-1}{n^2}, \quad \text{for any } i \in [n],$$

and it has a sample efficiency of $\eta^m = \frac{1}{2}$.

Mixing ONE-CHOICE with TWO-CHOICE rounds at a rate β , one obtains the $(1+\beta)$ -process [41]:

$(1+\beta)$ -Process:

Parameter: A *mixing factor* $\beta \in (0, 1]$.

Iteration: For each round $t \geq 0$, with probability β allocate one ball via the TWO-CHOICE process, otherwise allocate one ball via the ONE-CHOICE process.

The probability allocation vector for the $(1+\beta)$ -process is a convex combination of the ONE-CHOICE and TWO-CHOICE probability allocation vectors given by

$$p_i := (1-\beta) \cdot \frac{1}{n} + \beta \cdot \frac{2i-1}{n^2}, \quad \text{for any } i \in [n].$$

The following process has been studied by several authors [20, 22, 27].

TWO-THINNING($f(n, x^t)$) Process:

Parameter: A *threshold function* $f(n, x^t) \geq 0$.

Iteration: For each round $t \geq 0$, sample two uniform bins i_1 and i_2 independently, and update:

$$\begin{cases} x_{i_1}^{t+1} = x_{i_1}^t + 1 & \text{if } x_{i_1}^t < f(n, x^t), \\ x_{i_2}^{t+1} = x_{i_2}^t + 1 & \text{if } x_{i_1}^t \geq f(n, x^t). \end{cases}$$

In this work, we focus on processes that have a threshold that is *relative* to the mean load, i.e., $f(n, x^t) = \frac{t}{n} + f(n)$. These have the attractive property that they can be implemented just having knowledge of the mean load (instead of the entire load vector). The prototypical such process is MEAN-THINNING (introduced in Section 3.3), which has threshold equal to the mean load, i.e., $f(n) = 0$.

The probability allocation vector for MEAN-THINNING is given by

$$p^t := \left(\underbrace{\frac{\delta^t}{n}, \dots, \frac{\delta^t}{n}}_{\delta^t n \text{ bins}}, \underbrace{\frac{1+\delta^t}{n}, \dots, \frac{1+\delta^t}{n}}_{(1-\delta^t) \cdot n \text{ bins}} \right).$$

Throughout the paper, we often make use of statements and inequalities which hold only for sufficiently large n . For simplicity, we do not state this explicitly.

3 MEAN-BIASED Processes and Our Results

In this section, we begin by defining the conditions for MEAN-BIASED processes. Then, we present our main result for MEAN-BIASED processes.

Following this we define some typical MEAN-BIASED processes, including TWINNING, MEAN-THINNING and the $(1 + \zeta)$ -process, and show that they fall under the probability and weight biased subclasses. We summarize our lower bounds and upper bounds for these processes, showing that these are tight, and also consider the sample efficiency of these processes. We also consider the RELATIVE-THRESHOLD($f(n)$) processes with $f(n) > 0$, which although are not MEAN-BIASED processes strictly speaking, we show that our general bound can be extended via a coupling to give tight gap bounds for any $f(n) \geq \log n$.

3.1 General Mean-Biased Framework and Bounds

First, we will start by defining some conditions on the probability allocation vector and on the weights of the balls allocated to underloaded and overloaded bins. Recall that for any $i \in [n]$, p_i^t is the probability of allocating to the i -th heaviest bin at round t . As before, p^t may depend on the filtration \mathfrak{F}^t . Recall also that $B_+^t := \{i \in [n] : y_i^t \geq 0\}$, $\delta^t := |B_+^t|/n$, and $B_-^t := [n] \setminus B_+^t$.

Condition \mathcal{P}_1 : There exists an integer constant $k_1 \geq 1$ and a constant $k_2 \in (0, 1]$, such that for each round $t \geq 0$,

- the overloaded bins satisfy

$$\max_{i \in B_+^t} p_i^t \leq \frac{k_1}{n} \quad \text{and} \quad (p_1^t, \dots, p_{\delta^t n}^t) \preceq \left(\frac{1}{n}, \dots, \frac{1}{n} \right),$$

- and the underloaded bins satisfy

$$\min_{i \in B_-^t} p_i^t \geq \frac{k_2}{n} \quad \text{and} \quad (p_n^t, \dots, p_{\delta^t n+1}^t) \succeq \left(\frac{1}{n}, \dots, \frac{1}{n} \right).$$

Condition \mathcal{W}_1 : For each round $t \geq 0$, when bin $i \in [n]$ is chosen for allocation,

- if $y_i^t < 0$, then allocate w_- balls to bin i ,
- if $y_i^t \geq 0$, then allocate w_+ balls to bin i ,

where $1 \leq w_+ \leq w_-$ are constant integers², i.e., independent of t and n .

Both conditions \mathcal{P}_1 and \mathcal{W}_1 are natural, but on their own they are not sufficient to establish a good bound on the gap, as the ONE-CHOICE process satisfies both conditions with $k_1 := k_2 := 1$. Thus, we will require that processes satisfy at least one of the following two stronger versions of \mathcal{P}_1 and \mathcal{W}_1 :

Condition \mathcal{P}_2 : There exists an integer constant $k_1 \geq 1$ and constants $k_2, k_3, k_4 \in (0, 1]$, such that for each round $t \geq 0$,

- the overloaded bins satisfy

$$\max_{i \in B_+^t} p_i^t \leq \frac{k_1}{n} \quad \text{and} \quad (p_1^t, \dots, p_{\delta^t n}^t) \preceq \left(\frac{1}{n} - \frac{k_3 \cdot (1 - \delta^t)}{n}, \dots, \frac{1}{n} - \frac{k_3 \cdot (1 - \delta^t)}{n} \right),$$

²By scaling, this can be generalized to constant rational weights.

– and the underloaded bins satisfy

$$\min_{i \in B_-^t} p_i^t \geq \frac{k_2}{n} \quad \text{and} \quad (p_n^t, \dots, p_{\delta^t n+1}^t) \succeq \left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{k_4 \cdot \delta^t}{n}, \dots, \frac{1}{n} + \frac{k_4 \cdot \delta^t}{n} \right).$$

Condition \mathcal{W}_2 : This is as Condition \mathcal{W}_1 , but additionally we have the strict inequality: $w_+ < w_-$. Also, we assume that for each round $t \geq 0$,

$$(p_n^t, \dots, p_{\delta^t n+1}^t) \succeq \left(\frac{P_-^t}{|B_-^t|}, \dots, \frac{P_-^t}{|B_-^t|} \right),$$

where $P_-^t := \sum_{i \in B_-^t} p_i^t$ is the sum of allocation probabilities over the underloaded bins.

We refer to a balanced allocation process as MEAN-BIASED if it satisfies $\mathcal{P}_2 \cap \mathcal{W}_1$ or $\mathcal{P}_1 \cap \mathcal{W}_2$, that is it has a probability or weight bias respectively. Our main result proves a logarithmic upper bound on the gap for any MEAN-BIASED process in the heavily loaded case.

Theorem 3.1 (Main Theorem). *Consider any $\mathcal{P}_2 \cap \mathcal{W}_1$ -process or $\mathcal{P}_1 \cap \mathcal{W}_2$ -process. Then, there exists a constant $\kappa > 0$ such that for any round $m \geq 0$,*

$$\Pr \left[\max_{i \in [n]} \left| x_i^m - \frac{W^m}{n} \right| \leq \kappa \log n \right] \geq 1 - n^{-4};$$

so in particular, $\Pr[\text{Gap}(m) \leq \kappa \log n] \geq 1 - n^{-4}$.

To prove a matching lower bound we add the following condition:

- **Condition \mathcal{P}_3 :** For any $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ there exists a $k_5 := k_5(\varepsilon) \in (0, 1]$ such that for each round $t \geq 0$ with $\delta^t \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$, the probability allocation vector p^t satisfies,

$$\min_{i \in [n]} p_i^t \geq \frac{k_5}{n}.$$

This condition is satisfied for many natural processes, including TWINNING, MEAN-THINNING, and the $(1 + \beta)$ -process with constant $\beta \in (0, 1)$. Assuming condition \mathcal{P}_3 in addition to the MEAN-BIASED conditions allows us to prove a tight lower bound.

Theorem 3.2. *Consider any $\mathcal{P}_2 \cap \mathcal{W}_1$ -process or $\mathcal{P}_1 \cap \mathcal{W}_2$ -process, which also satisfies condition \mathcal{P}_3 . Then there exists a constant $\kappa > 0$ such that*

$$\Pr[\text{Gap}(\kappa n \log n) \geq \kappa \log n] \geq 1 - n^{-1/2}.$$

In the next subsection we give some examples of processes for which our bounds hold, and some processes which are not MEAN-BIASED but are sufficiently close that we can cover them with our bounds. First we discuss the meaning behind the MEAN-BIASED conditions.

The rationale behind condition \mathcal{P}_2 is that we wish to slightly bias the probability allocation vector p^t towards underloaded bins at each round t . However, it is natural to assume that this influence is limited by a process that samples, say, at most two bins independently and uniformly, and then allocates balls to the least loaded of the two. Concretely, if a process takes *two* independent and uniform bin samples at each round, the probability of picking two overloaded bins equals $(\frac{|B_+^t|}{n})^2$. Hence by averaging, for each overloaded bin $i \in B_+^t$

$$p_i^t \geq \left(\frac{|B_+^t|}{n} \right)^2 \cdot \frac{1}{|B_+^t|} = \frac{|B_+^t|}{n^2} = \frac{\delta^t}{n}.$$

The relaxation of the first constraint in \mathcal{P}_2 by taking a strict convex combination of $\frac{1}{n}$ and $\frac{\delta^t}{n}$ ensures some slack, for instance, it allows the framework to cover the $(1 + \zeta)$ -process, where we perform a ONE-CHOICE allocation with some constant probability $\eta \in (0, 1]$, and otherwise we perform an allocation following the MEAN-THINNING process (see Lemma 3.10 for details). Similarly, for any process which takes at most two uniform samples, by averaging for any underloaded bin $i \in B_-^t$

$$p_i^t \leq \frac{1 - \frac{|B_+^t|^2}{n^2}}{|B_-^t|} = \frac{(n - |B_+^t|) \cdot (n + |B_+^t|)}{n^2 |B_-^t|} = \frac{1}{n} + \frac{|B_+^t|}{n^2} = \frac{1}{n} + \frac{\delta^t}{n}.$$

Finally, we remark that \mathcal{P}_2 resembles the framework of [41, Equation 2], where $p_i^t = p_i$ is non-decreasing in i and $p_{n/3} \leq \frac{1-4\epsilon}{n}$ and $p_{2n/3} \geq \frac{1+4\epsilon}{n}$ holds for some $0 < \epsilon < 1/4$ (not necessarily constant). In contrast to that, for constants $k_3, k_4 > 0$, the conditions in \mathcal{P}_2 are relaxed as they only imply such a bias if δ^t is bounded away from 0 and 1, which may not hold in all rounds.

We note that the requirements on the probability allocation vectors in \mathcal{P}_1 and \mathcal{P}_2 are a relaxation of those in the conference version of this paper [33]. Previously we assumed that the probability allocation vector is non-decreasing, which implies the current majorization condition. Also more restrictive bounds of $\max_{i \in B_+^t} p_i^t \leq \frac{1}{n}$ and $\min_{i \in B_-^t} p_i^t \geq \frac{1}{n}$ were assumed. As we shall see this relaxation allows our new framework to include the $(1 + \beta)$ -process with constant $\beta \in (0, 1)$ (Lemma 3.8) and the k -RELATIVE-THRESHOLD(f_1, \dots, f_k) processes with $f_k = 0$ (Lemma 3.9). Further, the bound on the maximum probability to allocate to any single bin is satisfied by any process that takes d uniform and independent samples in each round with $k_1 := d$. For instance, TWO-CHOICE, the $(1 + \beta)$ -process and TWO-THINNING processes, all satisfy this with $k_1 := 2$.

3.2 MEAN-BIASED Processes Satisfying \mathcal{P}_1 and \mathcal{W}_2 (Weight Bias)

We begin with an example of a natural process which satisfies conditions \mathcal{P}_1 and \mathcal{W}_2 of the framework, that is this process allocates more balls when it samples an underloaded bin. Specifically, we introduce a new process called TWINNING, which allocates *one* ball to an overloaded bin and *two* balls to an underloaded bin. This process is possibly the most similar to ONE-CHOICE among our processes, however, we still prove that w.h.p. it has an $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ gap and that it allocates $1 + \epsilon$ balls per sample for constant $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$.

TWINNING Process:

Iteration: For each round $t \geq 0$, sample a bin i uniformly at random, and update:

$$x_i^{t+1} = \begin{cases} x_i^t + 2 & \text{if } x_i^t < \frac{W^t}{n}, \\ x_i^t + 1 & \text{if } x_i^t \geq \frac{W^t}{n}. \end{cases}$$




Figure 3.1: Two possibilities for TWINNING: (i) allocate *one* ball to an overloaded bin, or (ii) allocate *two* balls to an underloaded bin.

It is fairly clear that TWINNING fits into the MEAN-BIASED framework.

Lemma 3.3. *The TWINNING process satisfies \mathcal{P}_1 and \mathcal{W}_2 .*

Proof. The TWINNING process trivially satisfies \mathcal{P}_1 with $k_1, k_2 := 1$ since it samples a bin uniformly at random in each round, and \mathcal{W}_2 since $w_- := 2 > 1 =: w_+$. \square

In Section 9, we show that TWINNING is more sample efficient than the ONE-CHOICE process.

Lemma 3.4. *There exists a constant $\rho > 0$, such that for any $m \geq \rho^{-1} \cdot n \log n$, the TWINNING process satisfies*

$$\mathbf{E}[\eta^m] \geq 1 + \rho \quad \text{and} \quad \Pr[\eta^m \geq 1 + \rho] \geq 1 - n^{-1/4}.$$

Remark 3.5. *The TWINNING process can be implemented in graphical balanced allocations on any d -regular graph (even on the cycle) in the following manner: (i) sample an edge randomly, (ii) sample one of its endpoints randomly and (iii) allocate using TWINNING. The first two steps are equivalent to sampling a bin uniformly at random, so the process is equivalent to TWINNING. As we show in Corollary 3.11, TWINNING achieves w.h.p. an $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ gap, which is much better than the observed $\text{poly}(n)$ gap of TWO-CHOICE (e.g., on the cycle) [5, 8].*

3.3 MEAN-BIASED Processes Satisfying \mathcal{P}_2 and \mathcal{W}_1 (Probability Bias)

We now turn our attention to introducing some processes which satisfy the conditions \mathcal{P}_2 and \mathcal{W}_1 of the framework, that is they have a bias towards sampling underloaded bins.

We begin with a special case of TWO-THINNING:

MEAN-THINNING Process:

Iteration: For each round $t \geq 0$, sample two bins i_1 and i_2 independently and uniformly at random, and update:

$$\begin{cases} x_{i_1}^{t+1} = x_{i_1}^t + 1 & \text{if } x_{i_1}^t < \frac{t}{n}, \\ x_{i_2}^{t+1} = x_{i_2}^t + 1 & \text{if } x_{i_1}^t \geq \frac{t}{n}. \end{cases}$$




Figure 3.2: Three different possibilities for MEAN-THINNING: (i) first bin is underloaded, so the ball is allocated there, (ii) first bin is overloaded and the ball is allocated to an underloaded bin, or (iii) the ball is allocated to an overloaded bin.

Lemma 3.6. *The MEAN-THINNING process satisfies \mathcal{P}_2 and \mathcal{W}_1 .*

Proof. The MEAN-THINNING process trivially satisfies \mathcal{W}_1 with $w_-, w_+ := 1$. To verify \mathcal{P}_2 , recall that a ball is allocated to the first sample, if the bin is underloaded; otherwise, the ball is allocated to the second sample. Hence, for any overloaded bin $i \in B_+^t$.

$$p_i^t = \delta^t \cdot \frac{1}{n} = \frac{1}{n} - \frac{1 \cdot (1 - \delta^t)}{n},$$

that is we first sample an overloaded bin (with prob. δ^t) and then sample the specific bin i (with prob. $\frac{1}{n}$). In particular, $\max_{i \in B_+^t} p_i^t \leq \frac{1}{n}$. Similarly, any underloaded bin $i \in B_-^t$,

$$p_i^t = \frac{1 + \delta^t}{n} = \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1 \cdot \delta^t}{n},$$

thus, $\min_{i \in B_-^t} p_i^t \geq \frac{1}{n}$. Therefore, MEAN-THINNING satisfies \mathcal{P}_2 with $k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4 := 1$. \square

Lemma 3.7. *There exists a constant $\rho > 0$, such that for any $m \geq \rho^{-1} \cdot n \log n$, the MEAN-THINNING process satisfies*

$$\mathbf{E}[\eta^m] \geq \frac{1}{2} + \rho \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{Pr}\left[\eta^m \geq \frac{1}{2} + \rho\right] \geq 1 - n^{-1/4}.$$

We now turn to the $(1 + \beta)$ -process.

Lemma 3.8. *The $(1 + \beta)$ -process with any constant $\beta \in (0, 1)$ satisfies \mathcal{P}_2 and \mathcal{W}_1 .*

Proof. The $(1 + \beta)$ -process trivially satisfies \mathcal{W}_1 with $w_-, w_+ := 1$. To verify \mathcal{P}_2 , recall that

$$p_i := (1 - \beta) \cdot \frac{1}{n} + \beta \cdot \frac{2i - 1}{n^2}.$$

Hence, $\max_{i \in [n]} p_i \leq \frac{2}{n}$ and $\min_{i \in [n]} p_i \geq \frac{1 - \beta}{n}$, and so $k_1 := 2$ and $k_2 := 1 - \beta$. Now, for the majorization condition, note that the prefix sum is given by

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\delta^t n} p_i = \delta^t n \cdot (1 - \beta) \cdot \frac{1}{n} + \beta \cdot \frac{(\delta^t n)^2}{n^2} = \delta^t - \beta \cdot \delta^t \cdot (1 - \delta^t).$$

This is the same prefix sum as for the uniform vector which has all entries being equal to $\frac{1}{n} - \beta \cdot (1 - \delta^t)$. Since the probability allocation vector of the $(1 + \beta)$ -process is non-decreasing in $i \in [n]$, it follows that for $k_3 := \beta$,

$$(p_1, \dots, p_{\delta^t n}) \preceq \left(\frac{1}{n} - \frac{k_3 \cdot (1 - \delta^t)}{n}, \dots, \frac{1}{n} - \frac{k_3 \cdot (1 - \delta^t)}{n} \right).$$

The argument for the suffix sum is analogous. We have,

$$\sum_{i=\delta^t n+1}^n p_i = 1 - \delta^t + \beta \cdot \delta^t \cdot (1 - \delta^t).$$

This is the same suffix sum as for the uniform vector $\frac{1}{n} + \beta \cdot \delta^t$. Since the probability allocation vector p_i is non-decreasing in $i \in [n]$, it follows that with $k_4 := \beta$,

$$(p_n, \dots, p_{\delta^t n+1}) \succeq \left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{k_4 \cdot \delta^t}{n}, \dots, \frac{1}{n} + \frac{k_4 \cdot \delta^t}{n} \right). \quad \square$$

For the $(1 + \beta)$ -process with $\beta = 1 - o(1)$ (which includes TWO-CHOICE), our framework implies an $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ bound on the gap by majorization [41, Section 3].

Following the definition of k -THRESHOLD processes [29], we define k -RELATIVE-THRESHOLD processes for $k \geq 1$.

k -RELATIVE-THRESHOLD($f_1(n), \dots, f_k(n)$) Process:

Parameter: *Threshold functions* f_1, \dots, f_k , such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\infty = f_0(n) > f_1(n) > f_2(n) > \dots > f_k(n).$$

Iteration: For each round $t \geq 0$, sample two bins i_1 and i_2 independently and uniformly at random, and define for $i \in \{i_1, i_2\}$:

$$\ell_i^t := \max \left\{ j \in [k] \cup \{0\} : \frac{t}{n} + f_j(n) > x_i^t \right\}.$$

Then, update

$$\begin{cases} x_{i_1}^{t+1} = x_{i_1}^t + 1 & \text{if } \ell_{i_1}^t \geq \ell_{i_2}^t, \\ x_{i_2}^{t+1} = x_{i_2}^t + 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We now show that a special case of this process where the lowest threshold is equal to the mean load satisfies our MEAN-BIASED conditions. The MEAN-BIASED framework implies an $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ bound on the gap and this may constitute a starting point for proving $o(\log n)$ bounds on the gap for $k \geq 2$.

Lemma 3.9. *For any $k \geq 1$, any k -RELATIVE-THRESHOLD(f_1, \dots, f_k) process with $f_k = 0$ satisfies \mathcal{P}_2 and \mathcal{W}_1 .*

Proof. The process trivially satisfies \mathcal{W}_1 with $w_-, w_+ := 1$. To verify \mathcal{P}_2 , let $\delta_{f_1}^t, \dots, \delta_{f_k}^t$ be the quantiles of the thresholds $\frac{t}{n} + f_1, \dots, \frac{t}{n} + f_k$. Then, the probability allocation vector p^t of the process is given by

$$p_i^t = \begin{cases} \frac{\delta_{f_1}^t}{n} & \text{if } i \leq \delta_{f_1}^t n, \\ \frac{\delta_{f_1}^t + \delta_{f_2}^t}{n} & \text{if } \delta_{f_1}^t n < i \leq \delta_{f_2}^t n, \\ \vdots & \\ \frac{\delta_{f_k}^t + 1}{n} & \text{if } \delta_{f_k}^t n < i \leq n. \end{cases}$$

Threshold f_j affects the probability of bins with normalized load in $[f_{j-1}, f_{j+1}]$. In particular it “moves” probability from bins with normalized load in $[f_j, f_{j+1}]$ to bins with normalized load in $[f_{j-1}, f_j]$. Letting $p_{\mathcal{Q}_1}^t, \dots, p_{\mathcal{Q}_k}^t$ be the probability allocation vectors corresponding to the processes $\mathcal{Q}_j = j$ -RELATIVE-THRESHOLD(f_{k-j}, \dots, f_k) for $j = 1, \dots, k$, we have that

$$p_{\mathcal{Q}_1}^t \preceq \dots \preceq p_{\mathcal{Q}_k}^t,$$

with \mathcal{Q}_1 corresponding to MEAN-THINNING and \mathcal{Q}_k corresponding to the process in the statement. Since MEAN-THINNING satisfies the majorization conditions of \mathcal{P}_2 with $k_3, k_4 := 1$, by transitivity of majorisation so does \mathcal{Q}_k . Finally, $\max_{i \in [n]} p_i^t \leq \frac{2}{n}$ and $\min_{i \in B_-} p_i^t \geq \frac{1}{n}$ and so $k_1 := 2$ and $k_2 := 1$. \square

Finally, we study a *noisy* version of the MEAN-THINNING process, the $(1 + \zeta)$ -process.

$(1 + \zeta)$ -Process:

Parameter: A *mixing factor* $\zeta \in (0, 1]$.

Iteration: For each round $t \geq 0$, with probability ζ allocate one ball via the MEAN-THINNING process, otherwise allocate one ball via the ONE-CHOICE process.

Lemma 3.10. *For any constant $\zeta \in (0, 1]$, the $(1 + \zeta)$ -process satisfies \mathcal{P}_2 and \mathcal{W}_1 .*

Proof. The $(1 + \zeta)$ -process trivially satisfies \mathcal{W}_1 with $w_-, w_+ := 1$. Let p^t be the probability allocation vector of the process. For any overloaded bin $i \in B_+^t$,

$$p_i^t = (1 - \zeta) \cdot \frac{1}{n} + \zeta \cdot \frac{\delta^t}{n} = \frac{1}{n} - \frac{\zeta \cdot (1 - \delta^t)}{n}.$$

Similarly, for any underloaded bin $i \in B_-^t$,

$$p_i^t = (1 - \zeta) \cdot \frac{1}{n} + \zeta \cdot \frac{1 + \delta^t}{n} = \frac{1}{n} + \frac{\zeta \cdot \delta^t}{n}.$$

Thus, $\max_{i \in [n]} p_i^t \leq \frac{2}{n}$ and $\min_{i \in B_-^t} p_i^t \geq \frac{1}{n}$. So, we conclude that the $(1 + \zeta)$ -process satisfies \mathcal{P}_2 with $k_1 := 2$, $k_2 := 1$ and $k_3, k_4 := \zeta \in (0, 1]$. \square

Having verified that the above processes are MEAN-BIASED, by Theorem 3.1 we obtain the following upper bound on their gaps.

Corollary 3.11. *Consider any of the TWINNING, k -RELATIVE-THRESHOLD(f_1, \dots, f_k) for any $k \geq 1$ and $f_k = 0$ (including MEAN-THINNING) and the $(1 + \beta)$ -process with any constant $\beta \in (0, 1]$. Then, there exists a constant $\kappa > 0$ (different for each process) such that for any round $m \geq 0$,*

$$\Pr[\text{Gap}(m) \leq \kappa \log n] \geq 1 - n^{-4}.$$

3.4 RELATIVE-THRESHOLD($f(n)$) with $f(n) \geq 0$

In the previous section, we showed that a special case of k -RELATIVE-THRESHOLD(f_1, \dots, f_k) process with $f_k = 0$ is MEAN-BIASED. We now turn our attention to instances with $k = 1$ but the offset function $f_1(n) = f(n)$ is arbitrary non-negative. This generalizes MEAN-THINNING, and for $f(n) > 0$ the process is not MEAN-BIASED as there are load configurations where the processes may not bias allocations away from all overloaded bins.

RELATIVE-THRESHOLD($f(n)$) Process:

Parameter: An offset function $f(n) \geq 0$.

Iteration: For each round $t \geq 0$, sample two bins i_1 and i_2 independently and uniformly at random, and update:

$$\begin{cases} x_{i_1}^{t+1} = x_{i_1}^t + 1 & \text{if } x_{i_1}^t < \frac{t}{n} + f(n), \\ x_{i_2}^{t+1} = x_{i_2}^t + 1 & \text{if } x_{i_2}^t \geq \frac{t}{n} + f(n). \end{cases}$$

Similarly to MEAN-THINNING, the RELATIVE-THRESHOLD processes are appealing, as they require just knowledge (or estimate) of the mean load, which changes only every n rounds. For this process we prove the following upper bound on the gap.

Theorem 3.12. *There exists a constant $\kappa > 0$ such that for any round $m \geq 0$ and function $f(n) \geq 0$ the RELATIVE-THRESHOLD($f(n)$) process satisfies*

$$\Pr[\text{Gap}(m) \leq \kappa (\log n + f(n))] \geq 1 - n^{-4}.$$

The bound above is tight for any RELATIVE-THRESHOLD($f(n)$) process with $f(n) \geq \log n$.

Lemma 3.13. *Consider any RELATIVE-THRESHOLD($f(n)$) process with $f(n) \geq \log n$. Then, for $m := \frac{1}{24} \cdot \frac{n \cdot (f(n))^2}{\log n}$,*

$$\Pr\left[\text{Gap}(m) \geq \frac{f(n)}{50}\right] \geq 1 - n^{-1/4}.$$

For the remaining offset functions $f(n) \in (0, \log n)$, we can apply the general TWO-THINNING lower bound of $\Omega\left(\frac{\log n}{\log \log n}\right)$ derived in [29] (and in [21]) to the RELATIVE-THRESHOLD($f(n)$) process. This means that the upper bound from Theorem 3.12 is tight within an $\log \log n$ factor. This also highlights the question of determining the behavior of the gap in this regime; we conjecture that the lower bound is tight for some values of $f(n)$.

We prove Lemma 3.13 later in Section 8, however we now proceed with the proof of Theorem 3.12. We use a coupling argument involving adding $f(n)$ “extra balls” to each bin, which allows us to reduce the RELATIVE-THRESHOLD($f(n)$) process with a non-negative offset function $f(n)$, to MEAN-THINNING. Thanks to this reduction, proved in Lemmas 3.14 and 3.15 we deduce Theorem 3.12.

Lemma 3.14. *Consider the MEAN-THINNING and RELATIVE-THRESHOLD($f(n)$) processes for any non-negative $f(n) \geq 0$. Let Gap_0 and $\text{Gap}_{f(n)}$ be their gaps respectively. Then, $\text{Gap}_{f(n)}$ is stochastically smaller than $\text{Gap}_0 + f(n)$.*

Before proving the lemma, we need the following domination result:

Lemma 3.15. *Let \mathcal{R} be the TWO-THINNING($\frac{t}{n} + f(n)$) process where $f(n)$ is non-negative, starting with an empty load vector $x_{\mathcal{R}}^0 = (0, \dots, 0)$. Further, let \mathcal{Q} be the TWO-THINNING($\frac{t}{n} + f(n)$) process with initial load vector $x_{\mathcal{Q}} = (f(n), \dots, f(n))$. Then, there is a coupling so that at any round $t \geq 0$, it holds that $(x_{\mathcal{R}}^t)_i \leq (x_{\mathcal{Q}}^t)_i$, for any bin $i \in [n]$.*

Proof of Lemma 3.15. Let $j_1 = j_1^t$ and $j_2 = j_2^t$ be the two bins sampled at round $t \geq 0$, which are uniform and independent over $[n]$. We consider a coupling between \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{Q} , where these random bin samples are identical, and prove inductively that for any $t \geq 0$ and any $i \in [n]$,

$$(x_{\mathcal{R}}^t)_i \leq (x_{\mathcal{Q}}^t)_i.$$

The base case $t = 0$ holds by definition. For the inductive step, we make a case distinction:

Case 1 [$(x_{\mathcal{R}}^t)_{j_1} < t/n + f(n)$]. In this case, \mathcal{R} allocates a ball to j_1 . If $(x_{\mathcal{Q}}^t)_{j_1} < t/n + f(n)$, then \mathcal{Q} also allocates a ball to j_1 ; otherwise, we have $(x_{\mathcal{Q}}^t)_{j_1} \geq t/n + f(n)$, and hence $(x_{\mathcal{Q}}^t)_{j_1} > (x_{\mathcal{R}}^t)_{j_1}$, i.e., $(x_{\mathcal{Q}}^t)_{j_1} \geq (x_{\mathcal{R}}^t)_{j_1} + 1$. This implies

$$(x_{\mathcal{Q}}^{t+1})_{j_1} = (x_{\mathcal{Q}}^t)_{j_1} \geq (x_{\mathcal{R}}^t)_{j_1} + 1 = (x_{\mathcal{R}}^{t+1})_{j_1},$$

and the inductive step follows from this and the induction hypothesis.

Case 2 [$(x_{\mathcal{R}}^t)_{j_1} \geq t/n + f(n)$]. In this case, \mathcal{R} allocates a ball to j_2 . By induction hypothesis, $(x_{\mathcal{R}}^t)_{j_2} \leq (x_{\mathcal{Q}}^t)_{j_2}$, which implies \mathcal{Q} also allocates a ball to j_2 . Thus we have

$$(x_{\mathcal{Q}}^{t+1})_{j_2} = (x_{\mathcal{Q}}^t)_{j_2} + 1 \geq (x_{\mathcal{R}}^t)_{j_2} + 1 = (x_{\mathcal{R}}^{t+1})_{j_2},$$

and the inductive step is complete.

Since in both cases all other bins remain unchanged the proof is complete. \square

Lemma 3.16. *Let \mathcal{R} be the TWO-THINNING($\frac{t}{n} + f(n)$) process starting with the initial load vector $(x_{\mathcal{R}}^0)_1 = \dots = (x_{\mathcal{R}}^0)_n = f(n)$ and \mathcal{Q} be the MEAN-THINNING process with initial load vector $x_{\mathcal{Q}}^0 = (0, \dots, 0)$. Then, there is a coupling so that $x_{\mathcal{R}}^t = x_{\mathcal{Q}}^t + f(n)$ for any round $t \geq 0$.*

Proof. In the execution of the process \mathcal{R} , we start the process at round $t = 0$ from an initial load of $f(n)$ balls in each bin. Since the threshold is $t/n + f(n)$, that is the process \mathcal{R} does not have a threshold relative to the actual mean load, the effect of adding these balls is to reduce the threshold of \mathcal{R} by exactly $f(n)$. Thus, \mathcal{R} is operating with a threshold of $t/n + f(n) - f(n) = t/n$, which is equivalent to the MEAN-THINNING process, i.e., \mathcal{Q} . So, we obtain a coupling such that $x_{\mathcal{R}}^t = x_{\mathcal{Q}}^t + f(n)$ for any round $t \geq 0$. \square

We can now complete the proof of Lemma 3.14.

Proof of Lemma 3.14. We define the following processes:

- \mathcal{R}_1 : The TWO-THINNING($\frac{t}{n} + f(n)$) process (starting from the empty load vector).
- \mathcal{R}_2 : The TWO-THINNING($\frac{t}{n} + f(n)$) starting with $(x_{\mathcal{R}_2}^0)_1 = \dots = (x_{\mathcal{R}_2}^0)_n = f(n)$.
- \mathcal{R}_3 : The MEAN-THINNING process (starting from the empty load vector).

By Lemma 3.15, there exists a coupling such that $x_{\mathcal{R}_2}^t$ pointwise majorises $x_{\mathcal{R}_1}^t$ for any round $t \geq 0$. By Lemma 3.16, there exists a coupling such that $x_{\mathcal{R}_2}^t = x_{\mathcal{R}_3}^t + f(n)$. Hence, we deduce that there is a coupling between the three processes such that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Gap}_{f(n)}(t) &= \text{Gap}_{\mathcal{R}_1}(t) = \max_{i \in [n]} (x_{\mathcal{R}_1}^t)_i - \frac{t}{n} \leq \max_{i \in [n]} (x_{\mathcal{R}_2}^t)_i - \frac{t}{n} = \max_{i \in [n]} (x_{\mathcal{R}_3}^t)_i + f(n) - \frac{t}{n} \\ &= \text{Gap}_0(t) + f(n). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

4 Overview of the Analysis

In this section, we outline the proof for the $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ upper bound on the gap for MEAN-BIASED processes, i.e., processes satisfying conditions \mathcal{P}_1 and \mathcal{W}_1 and in addition \mathcal{P}_2 or \mathcal{W}_2 . The proof details are given in Sections 5 to 7. Some of the properties we prove are useful for the lower bounds (Section 8) and in analyzing the sample-efficiency of the processes (Section 9).

Our analysis is based on the interplay between the following potential functions.

- The *absolute value potential* (also known as the *number of holes* [10]):

$$\Delta^t := \sum_{i=1}^n |y_i^t|.$$

In Theorem 5.1, we prove that when $\Delta^s = \mathcal{O}(n)$, then w.h.p., among the next $\Theta(n)$ rounds a constant fraction of them are rounds s where the quantile of the mean $\delta^s \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$, for some constant $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$.

- The *quadratic potential*:

$$\Upsilon^t := \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i^t)^2.$$

In Lemma 6.2, we prove that in any round t with $\Delta^t = \Omega(n)$ holds, the potential Υ^t decreases in expectation over the next round.

- The *exponential potential* for a constant smoothing parameter $\alpha > 0$ (specified in (7.2)):

$$\Lambda^t := \Lambda^t(\alpha) := \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\alpha \cdot |y_i^t|) = \sum_{i \in B_+^t} \exp(\alpha y_i^t) + \sum_{i \in B_-^t} \exp(-\alpha (-y_i^t)). \quad (4.1)$$

In Corollary 6.6, we prove that when $\Lambda^t = \Omega(n)$, if $\delta^t \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$, then Λ^t decreases in expectation, otherwise it increases by a smaller factor. This potential is similar to the *hyperbolic cosine potential* used in [41], but for each bin there is only one term. Our potential is slightly easier to analyze since the bias we study here is based on whether the bin is overloaded or underloaded. Further, unlike the analysis of the $(1 + \beta)$ -process in [41], the potential can increase in expectation over a single round, even when it is large (Claim B.1).

- A “weaker” instance of the Λ potential function with smoothing parameter $\tilde{\alpha} = \Theta(1/n)$:

$$V^t := V^t(\tilde{\alpha}) := \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\tilde{\alpha} \cdot |y_i^t|) = \sum_{i \in B_+^t} \exp(\tilde{\alpha} y_i^t) + \sum_{i \in B_-^t} \exp(-\tilde{\alpha} (-y_i^t)).$$

In Lemma 6.8, we prove that V drops in expectation in every round (regardless of the value of δ^t), and so we can establish that $\mathbf{E}[V^t] = \text{poly}(n)$ at an arbitrary round t . Then, using Markov’s inequality we establish w.h.p. that $\text{Gap}(t) = \mathcal{O}(n \log n)$. Note that this is similar to the case $\beta = \Theta(1/n)$ in the $(1 + \beta)$ -process [41]. We use this bound on the gap as a starting point for the tighter bound.

Having defined the potential functions, let us now describe in more detail why the potential Λ may increase in expectation in some rounds, for e.g., the MEAN-THINNING process. For this process, there exist bad configurations where (i) $\text{Gap}(t)$ is large and (ii) for all $s \in [t, t + \omega(n)]$ rounds the quantile of the mean load satisfies $\delta^s = 1 - o(1)$ (or $\delta^s = o(1)$). When δ^s is too close to 1 (or 0), then the bias away from any *fixed* overloaded (or towards any *fixed* underloaded) bin is too small, and the process allocates balls *almost* uniformly, similarly to ONE-CHOICE. As a result, the exponential potential may increase for several rounds, until δ^s is bounded away from 0 and 1 (see Fig. 4.3 for an illustration showing experimental results and Claim B.1 for a concrete example of a bad configuration).

So, instead we start with the weaker exponential potential function $V := V(\tilde{\alpha})$ where $\tilde{\alpha} = \Theta(1/n)$. Because MEAN-BIASED processes always have a small bias to allocate away from (or allocate fewer balls to) the maximum load, we are able to prove in Lemma 6.8 that when V is sufficiently large it decreases in expectation. This allows us to prove that $\mathbf{E}[V^t] = \text{poly}(n)$ at an arbitrary round t and infer, using Markov’s inequality, that the gap is w.h.p. $\text{Gap}(t) = \mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ (Lemma 6.8). Then, our next goal is to show that starting with $\text{Gap}(t_0) = \mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ we reach a round $s \in [t_0, t_0 + n^3 \log^4 n]$ where $\Lambda^s = \mathcal{O}(n)$ (the *recovery phase* – Section 7.3) and finally show that the gap remains $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ for the remaining rounds $[s, m]$ (the *stabilization phase* – Section 7.4).




Figure 4.1: Overview of the *recovery phase* and *stabilization phase*. In the recovery phase starting with $V^t = \text{poly}(n)$ (and so $\text{Gap}(t) = \mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ and $\Lambda^t \leq e^{\mathcal{O}(\log n)}$), after $n^3 \log^4 n$ rounds w.h.p. we find a round s_0 with $\Lambda^{s_0} \leq cn$. We then switch to the stabilization phase, where in Lemma 7.5 we prove that starting with $\Lambda^\tau \leq 2cn$ in the next $c_s n \log n$ rounds there is a round t with $\Lambda^t \leq cn$, which allows us to infer that $\text{Gap}(m) = \mathcal{O}(\log n)$.

In both the recovery and the stabilization phase, we will study the evolution of δ^t and prove

that from any load vector, the process eventually reaches a value δ^t in $[\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$ for some constant $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, sufficiently often. The next lemma provides a sufficient condition for this to occur.

Lemma 5.1 (Mean Quantile Stabilization, restated, page 22). *Consider any $\mathcal{P}_1 \cap \mathcal{W}_1$ -process and let $C \geq 1$ be any integer constant. Then, there exists a constant $\varepsilon := \varepsilon(C) \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ where $(4\varepsilon)^{-1}$ is an integer, such that for any round $t_0 \geq 0$,*

$$\Pr \left[\left| \left\{ t \in \left[t_0, t_0 + \frac{n}{4\varepsilon} \right] : \delta^t \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon] \right\} \right| \geq \varepsilon n \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \Delta^{t_0} \leq Cn \right] \geq 1 - e^{-\varepsilon n}.$$

Thus, whenever the absolute value potential Δ^{t_1} is at most linear, the mean quantile δ^t is *good* (bounded away from 0 or 1) in a constant fraction of the next $\Theta(n)$ rounds. The next step in the proof is to establish that the sufficient condition on Δ^{t_1} will be satisfied. To this end, we use a relation between the absolute value potential Δ^t and the quadratic potential Υ^t , showing that Υ^t drops in expectation over the next round as long as $\Delta^t = \Omega(n)$. Thus, Δ^t must eventually become linear.

Lemma 6.2 (Restated, page 29). *Consider any $\mathcal{P}_1 \cap \mathcal{W}_1$ -process. Then, for any round $t \geq 0$,*

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\Upsilon^{t+1} \mid \mathfrak{F}^t \right] \leq \Upsilon^t + \sum_{i \in B_+^t} 2y_i^t p_i^t \cdot w_+ + \sum_{i \in B_-^t} 2y_i^t p_i^t \cdot w_- + 4 \cdot (w_-)^2.$$

Hence for any $\mathcal{P}_2 \cap \mathcal{W}_1$ -process or $\mathcal{P}_1 \cap \mathcal{W}_2$ -process, this implies by Lemma 6.1 that there exist constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that for any round $t \geq 0$,

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\Upsilon^{t+1} \mid \mathfrak{F}^t \right] \leq \Upsilon^t - \frac{c_1}{n} \cdot \Delta^t + c_2.$$

Combining the above two lemmas, we prove that in any sufficiently long interval for a constant fraction rounds the mean quantile δ^t is good, i.e., $\delta^t \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$. In particular, for the recovery phase, we show this guarantee holds w.h.p. for an interval of length $n^3 \log^4 n$ and for the stabilization phase, we prove that it holds w.h.p. for an interval of length $\Theta(n \log n)$ given that we start with $\Lambda^s = \mathcal{O}(n)$ (Lemma 7.3). In these good rounds, we prove that the exponential potential Λ^t decreases by a multiplicative factor of at least $(1 - c_3 \alpha/n)$ (see Lemma 6.4). In other rounds, the potential Λ^t increases by at most $(1 + c_4 \alpha^2/n)$ (see Lemma 6.5). Combining these for sufficiently small α , we obtain that the exponential potential function eventually becomes $\mathcal{O}(n)$, which implies a logarithmic gap. We refer to Fig. 4.1 for a high-level overview of recovery and stabilization, as well as Fig. 4.2 for a diagram summarizing most of the crucial lemmas used in the analysis and outlining their relationship.




Figure 4.2: Summary of the key steps in the proof for Theorem 3.1. By $\tilde{G}_{t_0}^{t_1}$ we denote the number of rounds $t \in [t_0, t_1]$ with $\Delta^t \leq Cn$ and by $G_{t_0}^{t_1}$ the number of rounds $t \in [t_0, t_1]$ with $\delta^t \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$, also $r = \varepsilon^2$ and $\tilde{r} = 4\varepsilon^2$.

There are a considerable number of constants in this paper and their interdependence can be quite complex. We hope the following remark will shed some light on their respective roles. The concrete values are given in the beginning of Section 7.

Remark 4.1 (Relationship Between the Constants). *All the constants used in the analysis depend on the constants w_-, w_+, k_1, k_2 (and k_3, k_4 if \mathcal{P}_2 holds) of the process being analyzed. The relation between the absolute value and quadratic potential functions (and specifically c_1 and c_2 in Lemma 6.2) defines what it means for Δ^t to be small, i.e., $\Delta^t \leq Cn$ (defined in (7.1)). This C in turn specifies the constant $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, given by Theorem 5.1, which defines a good quantile to be $\delta^t \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$. Then, ε specifies the fraction $r = \varepsilon^2$ of rounds with $\delta^t \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$ in a sufficiently long interval (in Lemma 7.3) and the constants c_3, c_4 in the inequalities for the expected change of Λ^t for sufficiently small constant α (in Lemmas 6.4 and 6.5). Then, using the constants ε, c_3, c_4 we finally set the value of α in Λ . Finally, c_3 and c_4 specify c in Corollary 6.6, which defines what it means for Λ to be small, i.e., $\Lambda^t \leq cn$.*

Organization of the Remaining Part of the Proof.

- In Section 5, we prove the mean quantile stabilization Theorem (Theorem 5.1), starting from a round with $\Delta^t \leq Cn$.
- In Section 6, we start by proving the relation between the absolute value and the quadratic potentials (Lemma 6.2), then analyze the expected change of the exponential potential Λ (Section 6.2) and prove that $\mathbf{E}[V^t] = \text{poly}(n)$, deducing the $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ gap (Lemma 6.8). Finally, we prove some deterministic bounds on the quadratic potential.
- In Section 7, we complete the proof for the $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ gap for MEAN-BIASED processes by analyzing the recovery (Section 7.3) and stabilization (Section 7.4) phases.




Figure 4.3: Scaled versions of the potential functions for MEAN-THINNING with different initial load vectors for $n = 1000$ bins. (**Example 1**) In the top figure, the process starts from a load vector where half of the bins have (normalized) load $+\log n$ and the other half have $-\log n$. (**Example 2**) Here, the process starts from an unbalanced load vector where the quantile of the mean load remains very close to 1 for $\omega(n \log n)$ many rounds. As can be seen, the exponential potential increases a bit at the beginning, but both the absolute and quadratic potential improve immediately. Once the mean quantile is sufficiently far from 0 and 1, the exponential potential also decreases, eventually stabilizing at $\mathcal{O}(n)$, as shown in the third figure. Note that the dashed gray line corresponds a perfectly balanced mean quantile, i.e., $\delta^t = 1/2$.

5 Mean Quantile Stabilization

In this section we prove that once the absolute value potential is $\mathcal{O}(n)$, then the allocation process will satisfy $\delta^t \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$ for “many” of the following rounds. The condition on δ^t means that a constant fraction of bins are overloaded, and a constant fraction are underloaded. Interestingly, this lemma does not require either of the stronger properties \mathcal{P}_2 or \mathcal{W}_2 to hold.

Theorem 5.1 (Mean Quantile Stabilization). *Consider any $\mathcal{P}_1 \cap \mathcal{W}_1$ -process and let $C \geq 1$ be any integer constant. Then, there exists a constant $\varepsilon := \varepsilon(C) \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ where $(4\varepsilon)^{-1}$ is an integer, such that for any round $t_0 \geq 0$,*

$$\Pr \left[\left| \left\{ t \in \left[t_0, t_0 + \frac{n}{4\varepsilon} \right] : \delta^t \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon] \right\} \right| \geq \varepsilon n \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \Delta^{t_0} \leq Cn \right] \geq 1 - e^{-\varepsilon n}.$$

Proof. Define $B_{\#} := \{i \in [n] : |y_i^{t_0}| < 4C\}$ to be the bins whose load deviates from the mean W^t/n by less than $4C$. Then, conditional on the event $\mathcal{C} := \{\Delta^{t_0} \leq Cn\}$, we have

$$Cn \geq \Delta^{t_0} = \sum_{i \in [n]} |y_i^{t_0}| > \sum_{i: |y_i^{t_0}| \geq 4C} 4C = (n - |B_{\#}|) \cdot 4C,$$

rearranging this gives that conditional on \mathcal{C} ,

$$|B_{\#}| > n \cdot \frac{C(4-1)}{4C} = \frac{3n}{4}. \quad (5.1)$$

Note that the bins in $B_{\#}$ may be underloaded or overloaded.

We now proceed with two claims. Using the fact that $|B_{\#}|$ is large, the first claim (Claim 5.2) proves that there exists an “early” round $t \in [t_0, t_1]$ such that a constant fraction of bins are underloaded. Similarly, the second claim (Claim 5.3) proves that there exists a “late” round $t \in [t_2, t_3]$ with $t_2 = t_1 + \Theta(n)$ such that a constant fraction of bins are overloaded. Since the set of overloaded bins can only increase by 1 per round, we then finally conclude that for $\Omega(n)$ rounds $t \in [t_1, t_2]$, both conditions hold, i.e., $\delta^t \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$. This is made formal by Lemma 5.4.

Claim 5.2. *For any integer constant $C \geq 1$, there exists a constant $\kappa_1 := \kappa_1(C) > 0$ such that for $t_1 := t_0 + 4C \cdot n + 1$ we have*

$$\Pr \left[\bigcup_{t \in [t_0, t_1]} \{\delta^t \leq 1 - \kappa_1\} \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \Delta^{t_0} \leq Cn \right] \geq 1 - e^{-\kappa_1 n}.$$

Proof of Claim. If $|B_{-}^{t_0} \cap B_{\#}| > |B_{\#}|/3$, then, since $|B_{\#}| > 3n/4$ by (5.1), the statement of the claim follows immediately for $t = t_0$ and $\kappa_1 = 1/4$. Otherwise, we may assume $|B_{+}^{t_0} \cap B_{\#}| \geq 2|B_{\#}|/3$, i.e., at least two thirds of the bins in $B_{\#}$ are overloaded at round t_0 . Note that the bins in $B_{+}^{t_0} \cap B_{\#}$ all have loads in the range $[W^{t_0}/n, W^{t_0}/n + 4C)$. Thus, since loads are integers (as w_{+} and w_{-} are integers), there can be at most $4C$ different load levels within $B_{+}^{t_0} \cap B_{\#}$. Hence, by the pigeonhole principle and (5.1), conditional on \mathcal{C} , there exists a subset $B_{*} \subseteq B_{+}^{t_0} \cap B_{\#}$ with

$$|B_{*}| \geq \frac{1}{4C} \cdot |B_{+}^{t_0} \cap B_{\#}| \geq \frac{1}{4C} \cdot \frac{2}{3} \cdot |B_{\#}| \geq \frac{1}{4C} \cdot \frac{2}{3} \cdot \frac{3n}{4} = \frac{n}{8C}, \quad (5.2)$$

such that all bins $i \in B_{*}$ have the same (non-negative) load at round t_0 . Let this common load be denoted by $0 \leq \ell < 4C$. In the following, let us define the stopping time

$$\tau := \min \left\{ t \geq t_0 : \frac{W^t}{n} - \frac{W^{t_0}}{n} > \ell \right\},$$

that is τ is the minimum number of rounds until the average load has dropped by more than ℓ . By definition, if a bin in B_* was never chosen for an allocation during any round $[t_0, \tau)$, it becomes underloaded. Also note that, while τ is a random variable, there is a deterministic upper bound of $T := t_0 + n \cdot \ell + 1$, since in each round the total load increases by at least $w_+ \geq 1$. For any round $t \in [t_0 + 1, \tau]$, let B_*^t be the subset of bins in B_* that are never allocated to during $[t_0, t)$ and let $B_*^{t_0} := B_*$. Note that since any bin in B_*^t is still overloaded in such a round t , the bin is chosen for an allocation with probability at most k_1/n by condition \mathcal{P}_1 .

For any round $t \in [t_0, T]$, define

$$Z^t := \frac{|B_*^t|}{(1 - k_1/n)^{t-t_0}},$$

so in particular, $Z^{t_0} = |B_*^{t_0}| = |B_*|$. Then, for any round $t \in [t_0, \tau)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[Z^{t+1} \mid \mathfrak{F}^t] &= \frac{1}{(1 - k_1/n)^{t+1-t_0}} \cdot \mathbf{E}[|B_*^{t+1}| \mid \mathfrak{F}^t] \\ &\geq \frac{1}{(1 - k_1/n)^{t+1-t_0}} \cdot (1 - k_1/n) |B_*^t| \\ &= Z^t, \end{aligned}$$

thus $(Z^{t \wedge \tau})_{t=t_0}^T$ forms a sub-martingale.

We now state a bound that will be used often in the upcoming proof: Since $1 - x \geq e^{-2x}$ for any $0 \leq x \leq 1/2$, $T - t_0 \leq 4C \cdot n + 1 \leq 5Cn$, and n is large, for any $t \in [t_0, T]$ we have

$$(1 - k_1/n)^{t-t_0} \geq e^{-(t-t_0) \cdot 2k_1/n} \geq e^{-(T-t_0) \cdot 2k_1/n} \geq e^{-10k_1C}. \quad (5.3)$$

We proceed to bound $Z^{t+1} - Z^t$. First, observe that $|B_*^t|$ is non-increasing in t . Thus, by (5.3) and $|B_*^t| \leq n$,

$$Z^{t+1} - Z^t \leq \frac{|B_*^t|}{(1 - k_1/n)^{t-t_0}} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{1 - k_1/n} - 1 \right) \leq \frac{n}{e^{-10k_1C}} \cdot \frac{2k_1}{n} = 2k_1 e^{10k_1C}.$$

Similarly, for a lower bound, note that $|B_*^t|$ can decrease by at most one in each round, since only one bin is allocated to in each round, and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} Z^{t+1} - Z^t &\geq \frac{|B_*^t| - 1}{(1 - k_1/n)^{t+1-t_0}} - \frac{|B_*^t|}{(1 - k_1/n)^{t-t_0}} \\ &\geq \frac{|B_*^t| - 1}{(1 - k_1/n)^{t-t_0}} - \frac{|B_*^t|}{(1 - k_1/n)^{t-t_0}} \\ &\geq -\frac{1}{(1 - k_1/n)^{t-t_0}} \\ &\geq -e^{10k_1C}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $|Z^{t+1} - Z^t| \leq 2k_1 e^{10k_1C}$. Applying Azuma's inequality for sub-martingales (Lemma A.4) on $Z^{T \wedge \tau} = Z^\tau$ yields

$$\Pr \left[Z^\tau \leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot Z^{t_0} \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0} \right] \leq \exp \left(-\frac{(\frac{1}{2} \cdot Z^{t_0})^2}{2(T - t_0) \cdot (2k_1 e^{10k_1C})^2} \right). \quad (5.4)$$

Observe that $\{Z^\tau \leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot Z^{t_0}\} = \{|B_*^\tau| \leq (1 - k_1/n)^{\tau-t_0} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \cdot |B_*|\}$. Recall that, conditional on $\mathcal{C} := \{\Delta^{t_0} \leq Cn\}$, we have $|B_*| \geq \frac{n}{8C}$ by (5.2), and $\tau - t_0 \leq 5Cn$. Thus, by (5.3) and (5.4),

$$\Pr \left[|B_*^\tau| \leq e^{10k_1C} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{n}{8C} \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \mathcal{C} \right] \leq \exp \left(-\frac{n}{5 \cdot 2^{11} \cdot k_1^2 C^3 e^{20k_1C}} \right).$$

Since all load levels in B_* before round t_0 are identical, we conclude that they all become underloaded the first time in the same round $\tau \in [t_0, t_1]$, so, by merging the constants

$$\Pr \left[\bigcup_{t \in [t_0, t_1]} \{|B_-^t \cap B_*| \geq \kappa_1 \cdot n\} \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \mathcal{C} \right] \geq 1 - e^{-\kappa_1 n},$$

where $\kappa_1 := (5 \cdot 2^{11} \cdot k_1^2 C^3 e^{20k_1 C})^{-1} > 0$. \diamond

Claim 5.3. For any integer constant $C \geq 1$ there exists a constant $\kappa_2 := \kappa_2(C) > 0$ such that for $t_2 := t_1 + \lceil \frac{n}{w_+} \rceil$, where $t_1 := t_0 + 4Cn + 1$, and $t_3 := t_2 + \lceil \frac{n}{10w_-} \rceil$ we have

$$\Pr \left[\bigcup_{t \in [t_2, t_3]} \{\delta^t \geq \kappa_2\} \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \Delta^{t_0} \leq Cn \right] \geq 1 - e^{-\kappa_2 n}.$$

Proof of Claim. If $|B_+^{t_2} \cap B_\#| > |B_\#|/6$, the claim follows by (5.1) for $t = t_2$ and $\kappa_2 = 1/8$. So, if we let $B_* := B_-^{t_2} \cap B_\#$, then we can assume, by (5.1), that

$$|B_*| \geq \frac{5}{6} \cdot |B_\#| > \frac{5}{6} \cdot \frac{3n}{4} = \frac{5n}{8}. \quad (5.5)$$

Observe that for any bin $i \in B_*$, at round t_2 the normalized load satisfies

$$y_i^{t_2} \geq y_i^{t_0} - (t_2 - t_0) \cdot \frac{w_-}{n} > -4C - \left(4Cn + 1 + \left\lceil \frac{n}{w_+} \right\rceil\right) \cdot \frac{w_-}{n} > -10C \cdot w_-,$$

using that $y_i^{t_0} > -4C$ as $i \in B_* \subseteq B_\#$, $C \geq 1$, and $w_- \geq w_+ \geq 1$ by \mathcal{W}_1 . It follows that if i is chosen for an allocation $20C$ times during $[t_2, t_3]$ while underloaded, it must become overloaded before round t_3 as

$$y_i^{t_3} \geq y_i^{t_2} - (t_3 - t_2) \frac{w_-}{n} + 20C \cdot w_- \geq -10C \cdot w_- - 2 \cdot w_- + 20C \cdot w_- > 0. \quad (5.6)$$

Observe that, while $i \in B_*$ is underloaded, it will be chosen for allocation with probability at least k_2/n in each round by Condition \mathcal{P}_1 . Our aim now will be to couple the allocation process over the interval $[t_2, t_3]$ to some sequences of independent random variables. Firstly, denote

$$B_*^t := B_* \cap B_-^t \quad \text{and} \quad s := \frac{4}{5} \cdot |B_*|. \quad (5.7)$$

By (5.5) we have

$$s := \frac{4}{5} \cdot |B_*| \geq \frac{4}{5} \cdot \frac{5n}{8} = \frac{n}{2}. \quad (5.8)$$

Observe that, since $t_3 = t_2 + \lceil \frac{n}{10w_-} \rceil$ and by (5.1), for any time $t \in [t_2, t_3]$ we have

$$|B_*^t| \geq |B_*| - \left\lceil \frac{n}{10w_-} \right\rceil = s + \frac{1}{5} \cdot |B_*| - \left\lceil \frac{n}{10w_-} \right\rceil > s + \frac{n}{8} - \left\lceil \frac{n}{10w_-} \right\rceil \geq s, \quad (5.9)$$

thus at least s many bins from B_* remain underloaded during the interval $[t_2, t_3]$. For $t > t_2$ let $(\nu_i^t)_{i \in [n]}$ be given by

$$\nu_i^t := \begin{cases} \left(1 - \frac{k_2 s}{n}\right)^{-1} \cdot p_i^t & \text{if } i \in [n] \setminus B_*^t, \\ \left(1 - \frac{k_2 s}{n}\right)^{-1} \cdot \left(p_i^t - \frac{k_2 s}{|B_*^t|n}\right) & \text{if } i \in B_*^t. \end{cases}$$

We first show that $\nu_i^t \in [0, 1]$. As $k_2 \leq 1$ we see that $k_2 s/n \leq 4/5$ by (5.7). Thus, for $i \in [n] \setminus B_*^t$, we have $0 \leq p_i^t \leq \nu_i^t \leq 5k_1/n < 1$. For $i \in B_*^t$ we have $\nu_i^t \geq p_i^t - \frac{k_2 s}{|B_*^t|n} > p_i^t - \frac{k_2}{n} \geq 0$, as $|B_*^t| > s$ by (5.9) and $B_*^t \subseteq B_-^t$. Finally, since $p_i^t \geq k_2/n$ for all $i \in B_-^t$ and $s < |B_*^t| \leq |B_-^t|$ we have

$$\nu_i < \frac{p_i^t}{1 - k_2 s/n} \leq \frac{1 - k_2 |B_-^t|/n}{1 - k_2 s/n} < 1.$$

To see that ν^t , where $\nu_i^t \in [0, 1]$, is a probability vector, we observe that

$$\left(1 - \frac{k_2 s}{n}\right) \cdot \sum_{i \in [n]} \nu_i^t = \sum_{i \in [n] \setminus B_*^t} p_i^t + \sum_{i \in B_*^t} \left(p_i^t - \frac{k_2 s}{|B_*^t|n}\right) = 1 - \frac{k_2 s}{n}.$$

For a set $S \neq \emptyset$, the uniform distribution $\text{Uni}(S)$ samples each $s \in S$ with probability $1/|S|$.

The first step of the coupling is to sample two independent infinite sequences $(X^t)_{t > t_2}$ and $(U^j)_{j \geq 1}$, where $X^t \sim \text{Ber}(k_2 s/n)$ i.i.d. for each $t > t_2$, and $U^j \sim \text{Uni}(B_*)$ i.i.d., for each $j \geq 1$. We can then generate the process as follows: initialize $j^{t_2+1} := 1$, and for each round $t > t_2$,

- If $X^t = 0$, then allocate to a single bin $i \in [n]$ sampled according to ν^t , and set $j^{t+1} := j^t$.
- If $X^t = 1$ and $U^{j^t} \in B_*^t$, then allocate to the bin U^{j^t} , and set $j^{t+1} := j^t + 1$.
- If $X^t = 1$ and $U^{j^t} \notin B_*^t$, then allocate to a bin $R^t \sim \text{Uni}(B_*^t)$ sampled independently, and set $j^{t+1} := j^t + 1$.

Let \mathcal{A}_i^t be the event that bin $i \in [n]$ receives the allocation in round $t \in [t_2 + 1, t_3]$ and observe that, for $i \in B_*^t$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\mathcal{A}_i^t | X^t = 1] &= \Pr[U^{j^t} = i | U^{j^t} \in B_*^t] \cdot \Pr[U^{j^t} \in B_*^t] + \Pr[R^t = i] \cdot \Pr[U^{j^t} \notin B_*^t] \\ &= \frac{1}{|B_*^t|} \cdot \Pr[U^{j^t} \in B_*^t] + \frac{1}{|B_*^t|} \cdot \Pr[U^{j^t} \notin B_*^t] \\ &= \frac{1}{|B_*^t|}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, to see this gives a valid coupling, note that a ball is allocated to $i \in B_*^t$ with probability

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\mathcal{A}_i^t] &= \Pr[X^t = 0] \cdot \nu_i^t + \Pr[X^t = 1] \cdot \Pr[\mathcal{A}_i^t | X^t = 1] \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{k_2 s}{n}\right) \cdot \frac{p_i^t - \frac{k_2 s}{|B_*^t|n}}{1 - k_2 s/n} + \frac{k_2 s}{n} \cdot \frac{1}{|B_*^t|} \\ &= p_i^t. \end{aligned}$$

The corresponding calculation for $i \in [n] \setminus B_*^t$ is immediate.

Observe that by (5.8) we have $k_2 s/n \geq k_2/2$. Thus if we define the event

$$\mathcal{E}_1 := \left\{ \sum_{t=t_2+1}^{t_3} X^t \geq \tau_1 \right\}, \quad \text{where } \tau_1 := \left\lceil \frac{k_2(t_3 - t_2)}{4} \right\rceil.$$

Then, by a Chernoff bound, we have

$$\Pr[-\mathcal{E}_1 | \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \mathcal{C}] \leq \Pr\left[\text{Bin}\left(t_3 - t_2, \frac{k_2}{2}\right) < \tau_1\right] \leq e^{-\frac{k_2(t_3 - t_2)}{2 \cdot 2 \cdot 2}} \leq e^{-\frac{k_2 n}{160w_-}}. \quad (5.10)$$

For $i \in B_*$ let $S_i := \sum_{j=1}^{\tau_1} \mathbf{1}_{\{U^j = i\}}$. Then, since $\Pr[U^j = i] = 1/|B_*| \geq 1/n$, we have

$$\Pr[S_i \geq 20C | \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \mathcal{C}] \geq \Pr\left[\text{Bin}\left(\tau_1, \frac{1}{n}\right) \geq 20C\right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq \binom{\tau_1}{20C} \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^{20C} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{k_2}{n}\right)^{\tau_1 - 20C} \\
&\geq \left(\frac{k_2}{800Cw_-}\right)^{20C} \cdot e^{-1} =: \kappa,
\end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

since $\tau_1 = \left\lceil \frac{k_2(t_3 - t_2)}{4} \right\rceil = (1 + o(1)) \cdot \frac{k_2 n}{40w_-}$, where in the last inequality in (5.11) we used $\binom{n}{k} \geq \left(\frac{n}{k}\right)^k$, the inequality $1 - x \geq e^{-2x}$ for any $0 \leq x \leq 1/2$, and n being large. Define the random variable

$$Z := |\{i \in B_* : S_i \geq 20C\}| \quad \text{and the event} \quad \mathcal{E}_2 := \{Z \geq \kappa n/4\}.$$

Observe that by (5.11) and (5.8),

$$\mathbf{E}[Z \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \mathcal{C}] = \sum_{i \in B_*} \mathbf{Pr}[S_i \geq 20C \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \mathcal{C}] \geq |B_*| \cdot \kappa \geq \frac{\kappa n}{2}.$$

Notice also that Z is generated by the sequence $(U^j)_{j=1}^{\tau_1}$ of mutually independent B_* -valued random variables. Furthermore, changing the value of any single U^j can cause Z to change by at most one. Thus, applying the Method of Bounded Independent Differences (Lemma A.3), assuming (5.5), yields,

$$\mathbf{Pr}[\neg \mathcal{E}_2 \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \mathcal{C}] = \mathbf{Pr}\left[Z < \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{\kappa n}{2} \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \mathcal{C}\right] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\frac{1}{4}(\kappa n/2)^2}{2 \cdot \tau_1 \cdot 1^2}\right) \leq \exp(-\kappa^2 n). \tag{5.12}$$

Our first observation is that, conditional on $\mathcal{E}_1 \cap \mathcal{E}_2$, at least $Z \geq \kappa n/4$ bins become overloaded at least once at some round in $[t_2, t_3]$. To see this note conditional on \mathcal{E}_1 an allocation is made based on the value of U^j for each $j \leq \tau_1$, and conditional on \mathcal{E}_2 there are Z many $i \in B_*$ such that $\sum_{j=1}^{\tau_1} \mathbf{1}_{\{U^j=i\}} \geq 20C$. Finally, from the coupling, observe that whenever $U^j = i$, either an allocation is made to i , or i is already overloaded. Thus, for Z many bins at some time during the window $[t_2, t_3]$, either the bin has received at least $20C$ allocations (which would make them overloaded by (5.6)) or they became overloaded. However, if each bin is overloaded for only one round, and all at different rounds, then it is possible that at no single round in $[t_2, t_3]$ do we have $\Omega(n)$ overloaded bins. We now explain why this cannot happen.

Note that during the interval $[t_2, t_3]$, as $t_3 - t_2 = \lceil \frac{n}{10w_-} \rceil$, there is at most one round t where the integer parts of the mean load changes, that is, there is only at most one round $t \in [t_2, t_3]$ such that $\lfloor W^t/n \rfloor < \lfloor W^{t+1}/n \rfloor$. Hence only at the transition from t to $t+1$ could an overloaded bin become underloaded during the interval $[t_2, t_3]$. Therefore, if $Z \geq \kappa n/4$ we must have

$$|B_+^t \cap B_*| \geq \kappa n/8 \quad \text{or} \quad |B_+^{t+1} \cap B_*| \geq \kappa n/8.$$

Hence, conditional on $\mathcal{E}_1 \cap \mathcal{E}_2$, $Z \geq \kappa n/4$ implies that there exists $t \in [t_2, t_3]$ such that $|B_+^t| \geq \kappa n/8$. The claim then follows by choosing $\kappa_2 := \frac{1}{2} \cdot \min\{\kappa^2, \kappa/8, \frac{\kappa_2 n}{160w_-}\}$ as

$$\mathbf{Pr}[\neg \mathcal{E}_1 \cup \neg \mathcal{E}_2 \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \mathcal{C}] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\kappa_2 n}{160w_-}\right) + \exp(-\kappa_2 \cdot n) \leq \exp(-\kappa_2 \cdot n),$$

by the union bound over (5.10) and (5.12). \diamond

The first claim implies that, w.p. $1 - e^{-\kappa_1 n}$, that the process reaches a round $s_1 \in [t_0, t_1]$ with at least $\kappa_1 n$ underloaded bins. The second claim shows, w.p. $1 - e^{-\kappa_2 n}$, that the process reaches a round $s_2 \in [t_1 + \lceil \frac{n}{w_+} \rceil, t_3]$ with at least $\kappa_2 n$ overloaded bins. By the union bound, both events occur with probability $1 - e^{-\kappa_1 n} - e^{-\kappa_2 n}$. Since $\delta^t = |B_+^t|/n$, we have $\delta^{t+1} \leq \delta^t + \frac{1}{n}$, and in this case applying Lemma 5.4 below with

$$r_0 = s_1, \quad r_1 = s_2, \quad f(t) = \delta^t, \quad \text{and} \quad \vartheta := \min\{\kappa_2, \kappa_1, 2/3\},$$

yields

$$\begin{aligned} |\{t \in [t_0, t_3]: \delta^t \in [\vartheta/2, 1 - \vartheta/2]\}| &\geq |\{t \in [s_1, s_2]: \delta^t \in [\vartheta/2, 1 - \vartheta/2]\}| \\ &\geq \min\{\vartheta/2 \cdot n, s_2 - s_1\} \\ &\geq \min\left\{\vartheta/2 \cdot n, \frac{n}{w_+}\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, finally, we require an $\varepsilon > 0$ in the statement of Theorem 5.1 which satisfies the following three conditions: (i) : $\varepsilon \leq \min\{\vartheta/2, 1/w_+\}$, (ii) : $\frac{n}{4\varepsilon} \geq t_3 - t_0 = 4Cn + 1 + \lceil \frac{n}{w_+} \rceil + \lceil \frac{n}{10w_-} \rceil$, and (iii) : $(4\varepsilon)^{-1}$ is an integer. Observe that such an $\varepsilon > 0$ can always be found by making ε sufficiently small, giving the result. \square

It remains to state and prove the technical lemma used in the proof of Theorem 5.1.

Lemma 5.4. *For integers $0 \leq r_0 \leq r_1$, and reals $\vartheta \in (0, 2/3)$ and $\xi > 0$, we let $f : [r_0, r_1] \cap \mathbb{N} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a function satisfying*

$$(i) \quad f(r_0) \leq 1 - \vartheta,$$

$$(ii) \quad f(r_1) \geq \vartheta,$$

$$(iii) \quad f(t+1) \leq f(t) + \xi \text{ for all } t \in [r_0, r_1 - 1].$$

Then,

$$\left| \left\{ t \in [r_0, r_1]: f(t) \in \left[\frac{\vartheta}{2}, 1 - \frac{\vartheta}{2} \right] \right\} \right| \geq \min \left\{ \frac{\vartheta}{2\xi}, r_1 - r_0 \right\}.$$

Proof. First consider the case where there exists a $t \in [r_0, r_1]$ with $f(t) \geq 1 - \vartheta/2$. Further, let t be the first round with that property, hence for any $s \in [r_0, t]$, $f(s) < 1 - \vartheta/2$. Further, thanks to the third property, $f(t-x) \geq f(t) - x\xi \geq 1 - \vartheta/2 - x\xi$ for any $x \geq 0$ (which also implies $t - r_0 \geq \vartheta/(2\xi)$ due to precondition (i)), and thus as long as $0 \leq x \leq \vartheta/(2\xi)$,

$$f(t-x) \geq f(t) - x\xi \geq 1 - \vartheta/2 - \vartheta/2 \geq \vartheta/2,$$

since $\vartheta \leq 2/3$. Hence for any $s \in [t - \vartheta/(2\xi), t]$,

$$f(s) \in [\vartheta/2, 1 - \vartheta/2].$$

Now consider the case where for all rounds $t \in [r_0, r_1]$ we have $f(t) \leq 1 - \vartheta/2$. Since $f(r_1) \geq \vartheta$, we conclude for any $x \leq \vartheta/(2\xi)$,

$$f(r_1 - x) \geq f(r_1) - x\xi \geq \vartheta - \vartheta/2 \geq \vartheta/2.$$

Hence for any $s \in [\max\{r_0, r_1 - \vartheta/(2\xi)\}, r_1]$ we have $f(s) \in [\vartheta/2, 1 - \vartheta/2]$. \square

6 Potential Function Inequalities

In this section, we derive several inequalities involving potential functions.

In Section 6.1, we establish the interplay between the *absolute value* and *quadratic* potential which, later in Section 7.2, will be used in combination with Theorem 5.1 to establish that in a sufficiently long interval there is a constant fraction of rounds t with $\delta^t \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$.

In Section 6.2, most of the effort goes into establishing a drop in the expectation of the *exponential potential* $\Lambda := \Lambda(\alpha)$ for sufficiently small smoothing parameter $\alpha > 0$, which depends on the constants defined by the process. One of the main insights for $\Lambda := \Lambda(\alpha)$ with $\alpha = \Theta(1)$ is Corollary 6.6, which establishes: (i) a *drop* in the expectation of Λ over one round if the

mean quantile satisfies $\delta^t \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$, and (ii) a *not too large* increase for any quantile. For the potential $V := V(\tilde{\alpha})$ with $\tilde{\alpha} = \Theta(1/n)$ we establish that it drops in every round. In turn this implies that $\mathbf{E}[V^m] = \text{poly}(n)$, which implies the weak bound of $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ on the gap.

On a high level, much of the analysis in Section 6.2 follows relatively standard estimates and bears resemblance to the one in [41]. However, the conditions we enforce on processes are more relaxed than those in [41] and this makes the analysis a lot more challenging. In particular, unlike in [41], the conditions imposed on the probability allocation vector p^t are time/load dependent. That being said, a reader may wish to skip this part (or the proofs).

Finally, in Section 6.3, we prove some deterministic bounds on the quadratic potential.

6.1 Interplay between Absolute Value and Quadratic Potentials

In this section, we prove the relation between the absolute value and quadratic potentials. We will use this in Lemma 7.3 to deduce that in a sufficiently long interval, there is a constant fraction of rounds with $\delta^t \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$.

Lemma 6.1. *Consider any $\mathcal{P}_2 \cap \mathcal{W}_1$ -process or $\mathcal{P}_1 \cap \mathcal{W}_2$ -process. Then, there exists a constant $c_1 > 0$, such that for any round $t \geq 0$,*

$$\sum_{i \in B_+^t} 2y_i^t p_i^t \cdot w_+ + \sum_{i \in B_-^t} 2y_i^t p_i^t \cdot w_- \leq -\Delta^t \cdot \frac{c_1}{n}.$$

Proof. Before we begin, note that $\sum_{i \in B_+^t} y_i^t = -\sum_{i \in B_-^t} y_i^t = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \Delta^t$. We consider two cases based on the conditions satisfied:

Case 1 [\mathcal{P}_2 and \mathcal{W}_1 hold]: In this case \mathcal{W}_1 implies $w_- \geq w_+ \geq 1$, and so we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in B_+^t} 2y_i^t p_i^t \cdot w_+ + \sum_{i \in B_-^t} 2y_i^t p_i^t \cdot w_- &= \sum_{i \in B_+^t} 2y_i^t p_i^t \cdot w_+ - \sum_{i \in B_-^t} 2|y_i^t| p_i^t \cdot w_- \\ &\leq w_+ \cdot \left(\sum_{i \in B_+^t} 2y_i^t p_i^t - \sum_{i \in B_-^t} 2|y_i^t| p_i^t \right). \end{aligned} \quad (6.1)$$

By \mathcal{P}_2 we have $\sum_{i=1}^k p_i^t \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \left(\frac{1}{n} - \frac{k_3 \cdot (1 - \delta^t)}{n} \right)$ for all $1 \leq k \leq \delta^t n$, and also that $y_i^t \geq 0$ and non-increasing for all $1 \leq i \leq \delta^t n$ (equivalently for all $i \in B_i^t$). Hence, by Lemma A.1,

$$\sum_{i \in B_+^t} 2y_i^t \cdot p_i^t \leq \sum_{i \in B_+^t} 2y_i^t \cdot \left(\frac{1}{n} - \frac{k_3 \cdot (1 - \delta^t)}{n} \right) = \Delta^t \cdot \left(\frac{1}{n} - \frac{k_3 \cdot (1 - \delta^t)}{n} \right).$$

Similarly, $\sum_{i \in B_-^t} 2|y_i^t| p_i^t \geq \Delta^t \cdot \left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{k_4 \cdot \delta^t}{n} \right)$, also by Lemma A.1. Thus, it follows from (6.1) that

$$\sum_{i \in B_+^t} 2y_i^t p_i^t \cdot w_+ + \sum_{i \in B_-^t} 2y_i^t p_i^t \cdot w_- \leq w_+ \cdot \Delta^t \cdot \left(\frac{1}{n} - \frac{k_3 \cdot (1 - \delta^t)}{n} - \frac{1}{n} - \frac{k_4 \cdot \delta^t}{n} \right) \leq -\Delta^t \cdot \frac{c_1}{n},$$

where $c_1 := w_+ \cdot \min\{k_3, k_4\}$.

Case 2 [\mathcal{P}_1 and \mathcal{W}_2 hold]: By applying Lemma A.1 using the majorization conditions in \mathcal{P}_1 ,

$$\sum_{i \in B_+^t} 2y_i^t p_i^t \cdot w_+ + \sum_{i \in B_-^t} 2y_i^t p_i^t \cdot w_- \leq \sum_{i \in B_+^t} 2y_i^t \cdot \frac{w_+}{n} + \sum_{i \in B_-^t} 2y_i^t \cdot \frac{w_-}{n} = \frac{\Delta^t}{n} \cdot (w_+ - w_-) \leq -\Delta^t \cdot \frac{c_1}{n},$$

for $c_1 := w_- - w_+ > 0$, since the weights are constants satisfying $w_- > w_+$. \square

We can now prove the main result in this section.

Lemma 6.2. Consider any $\mathcal{P}_1 \cap \mathcal{W}_1$ -process. Then, for any round $t \geq 0$,

$$\mathbf{E} [\Upsilon^{t+1} | \mathfrak{F}^t] \leq \Upsilon^t + \sum_{i \in B_+^t} 2y_i^t p_i^t \cdot w_+ + \sum_{i \in B_-^t} 2y_i^t p_i^t \cdot w_- + 4 \cdot (w_-)^2.$$

Hence for any $\mathcal{P}_2 \cap \mathcal{W}_1$ -process or $\mathcal{P}_1 \cap \mathcal{W}_2$ -process, this implies by Lemma 6.1 that there exist constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that for any round $t \geq 0$,

$$\mathbf{E} [\Upsilon^{t+1} | \mathfrak{F}^t] \leq \Upsilon^t - \frac{c_1}{n} \cdot \Delta^t + c_2.$$

Proof. We begin by decomposing the quadratic potential Υ over the n bins, using $\Upsilon_i^{t+1} := (y_i^{t+1})^2$:

$$\Upsilon^{t+1} = \sum_{i=1}^n \Upsilon_i^{t+1} = \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i^{t+1})^2.$$

We shall analyze the aggregate terms for overloaded and underloaded bins. By the \mathcal{W}_1 condition, if the chosen bin is overloaded, we allocate a ball of weight w_+ , otherwise we allocate a ball of weight w_- . Also, recall that $P_+^t := \sum_{i \in B_+^t} p_i^t$ and $P_-^t := \sum_{i \in B_-^t} p_i^t$.

Case 1 [Overloaded bins]. Let $i \in [n]$ be any overloaded bin, Then,

$$\mathbf{E} [\Upsilon_i^{t+1} | \mathfrak{F}^t] = \underbrace{p_i^t \cdot \left(y_i^t + w_+ - \frac{w_+}{n} \right)^2}_{\text{allocate to } i} + \underbrace{(P_+^t - p_i^t) \cdot \left(y_i^t - \frac{w_+}{n} \right)^2}_{\text{allocate to } B_+^t \setminus \{i\}} + \underbrace{P_-^t \cdot \left(y_i^t - \frac{w_-}{n} \right)^2}_{\text{allocate to } B_-^t}.$$

Aggregating over all overloaded bins and expanding out the squares,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in B_+^t} \mathbf{E} [\Upsilon_i^{t+1} | \mathfrak{F}^t] &= \sum_{i \in B_+^t} \left[(y_i^t)^2 + 2y_i^t \cdot \left(p_i^t \cdot \left(w_+ - \frac{w_+}{n} \right) - (P_+^t - p_i^t) \cdot \frac{w_+}{n} - P_-^t \cdot \frac{w_-}{n} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + p_i^t \cdot \left(w_+ - \frac{w_+}{n} \right)^2 + (P_+^t - p_i^t) \cdot \frac{(w_+)^2}{n^2} + P_-^t \cdot \frac{(w_-)^2}{n^2} \right] \\ &= \sum_{i \in B_+^t} \left[(y_i^t)^2 + 2y_i^t \cdot \left(p_i^t \cdot w_+ - P_+^t \cdot \frac{w_+}{n} - P_-^t \cdot \frac{w_-}{n} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + p_i^t \cdot (w_+)^2 - 2 \cdot p_i^t \cdot \frac{(w_+)^2}{n} + P_+^t \cdot \frac{(w_+)^2}{n^2} + P_-^t \cdot \frac{(w_-)^2}{n^2} \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in B_+^t} \left[(y_i^t)^2 + 2y_i^t \cdot \left(p_i^t \cdot w_+ - P_+^t \cdot \frac{w_+}{n} - P_-^t \cdot \frac{w_-}{n} \right) \right] + 2 \cdot (w_-)^2, \quad (6.2) \end{aligned}$$

using in the last step that

$$\sum_{i \in B_+^t} \left[p_i^t \cdot (w_+)^2 + P_+^t \cdot \frac{(w_+)^2}{n^2} + P_-^t \cdot \frac{(w_-)^2}{n^2} \right] \leq (w_+)^2 + P_+^t \cdot \frac{(w_+)^2}{n} + P_-^t \cdot \frac{(w_-)^2}{n} \leq 2 \cdot (w_-)^2.$$

Case 2 [Underloaded bins]. Let $i \in [n]$ be any underloaded bin. Then,

$$\mathbf{E} [\Upsilon_i^{t+1} | \mathfrak{F}^t] = \underbrace{p_i^t \cdot \left(y_i^t + w_- - \frac{w_-}{n} \right)^2}_{\text{allocate to } i} + \underbrace{(P_-^t - p_i^t) \cdot \left(y_i^t - \frac{w_-}{n} \right)^2}_{\text{allocate to } i \in B_-^t \setminus \{i\}} + \underbrace{P_+^t \cdot \left(y_i^t - \frac{w_+}{n} \right)^2}_{\text{allocate to } i \in B_+^t}.$$

Aggregating over all underloaded bins and expanding out the squares,

$$\sum_{i \in B_-^t} \mathbf{E} [\Upsilon_i^{t+1} | \mathfrak{F}^t] = \sum_{i \in B_-^t} \left[(y_i^t)^2 + 2y_i^t \cdot \left(p_i^t \cdot \left(w_- - \frac{w_-}{n} \right) - (P_-^t - p_i^t) \cdot \frac{w_-}{n} - P_+^t \cdot \frac{w_+}{n} \right) \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + p_i^t \cdot \left(w_- - \frac{w_-}{n} \right)^2 + (P_-^t - p_i^t) \cdot \frac{(w_-)^2}{n^2} + P_+^t \cdot \frac{(w_+)^2}{n^2} \Big] \\
= & \sum_{i \in B_-^t} \left[(y_i^t)^2 + 2y_i^t \cdot \left(p_i^t \cdot w_- - P_-^t \cdot \frac{w_-}{n} - P_+^t \cdot \frac{w_+}{n} \right) \right. \\
& \left. + p_i^t \cdot (w_-)^2 - 2 \cdot p_i^t \cdot \frac{(w_-)^2}{n} + P_-^t \cdot \frac{(w_-)^2}{n^2} + P_+^t \cdot \frac{(w_+)^2}{n^2} \right] \\
\leq & \sum_{i \in B_-^t} \left[(y_i^t)^2 + 2y_i^t \cdot \left(p_i^t \cdot w_- - P_-^t \cdot \frac{w_-}{n} - P_+^t \cdot \frac{w_+}{n} \right) \right] + 2 \cdot (w_-)^2, \quad (6.3)
\end{aligned}$$

using in the last step that

$$\sum_{i \in B_-^t} \left[p_i^t \cdot (w_-)^2 + P_-^t \cdot \frac{(w_-)^2}{n^2} + P_+^t \cdot \frac{(w_+)^2}{n^2} \right] \leq (w_+)^2 + P_+^t \cdot \frac{(w_+)^2}{n} + P_-^t \cdot \frac{(w_-)^2}{n} \leq 2 \cdot (w_-)^2.$$

Recall that $\sum_{i \in B_+^t} y_i^t = -\sum_{i \in B_-^t} y_i^t = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \Delta^t$. This leads to cancellation from some terms in the brackets when we combine (6.2) and (6.3), as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E} [\Upsilon^{t+1} \mid \mathfrak{F}^t] & = \sum_{i \in B_+^t} \mathbf{E} [\Upsilon_i^{t+1} \mid \mathfrak{F}^t] + \sum_{i \in B_-^t} \mathbf{E} [\Upsilon_i^{t+1} \mid \mathfrak{F}^t] \\
& \leq \Upsilon^t + \sum_{i \in B_+^t} 2y_i^t p_i^t \cdot w_+ + \sum_{i \in B_-^t} 2y_i^t p_i^t \cdot w_- + 4 \cdot (w_-)^2. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

6.2 Exponential Potential

In this section, we consider the exponential potential $\Lambda := \Lambda(\alpha)$ defined in (4.1). Let $\mathcal{G}^t := \mathcal{G}^t(\varepsilon)$ be the event that $\delta^t \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$ holds. In Lemma 6.4, we will show that the potential Λ drops in expectation over one round t when \mathcal{G}^t holds, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{E} [\Lambda^{t+1} \mid \mathfrak{F}^t, \mathcal{G}^t] \leq \Lambda^t \cdot \left(1 - \frac{2c_3\alpha}{n} \right) + 8.$$

Note that for constant smoothing parameter α , the exponential potential cannot decrease in expectation in every round (Claim B.1). Therefore, in Lemma 6.5 we will show that it does not increase too much in a round when the mean quantile is not good, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{E} [\Lambda^{t+1} \mid \mathfrak{F}^t, \neg \mathcal{G}^t] \leq \Lambda^t \cdot \left(1 + \frac{c_4\alpha^2}{2n} \right) + c_4.$$

In the above expression the decrease factor can be made arbitrarily larger than the increase factor, by choosing $\alpha > 0$ small enough. Once we prove that there is a constant fraction of rounds with a good quantile (Lemma 7.3), we will use an adjusted version of Λ (defined in (7.3)) to show that overall it decreases in expectation (Lemma 7.4 and Lemma 7.5), when the potential is sufficiently large.

For the analysis of Λ as well as V , we consider the labeling of the bins $i \in [n]$ used by the allocation process in round t so that x_i^t is non-decreasing in $i \in [n]$. We write

$$\Lambda^t(\alpha) =: \sum_{i=1}^n \Lambda_i^t = \sum_{i=1}^n e^{\alpha |y_i^t|} \quad \left(\text{and} \quad V^t(\tilde{\alpha}) =: \sum_{i=1}^n V_i^t = \sum_{i=1}^n e^{\tilde{\alpha} |y_i^t|} \right),$$

and handle separately the following three cases of bins based on their load:

- **Case 1** [Robustly Overloaded Bins]. The set of bins B_{++}^t defined as the set of bins with load $y_i^t \geq \frac{w_-}{n}$. These bins are *robustly overloaded* in the sense that they are guaranteed to be overloaded in round $t + 1$ (i.e., to be in B_{++}^{t+1}), since the mean load can increase by at most $\frac{w_-}{n}$.

For the exponential potential Λ^t (and V^t respectively), the expected contribution of a single bin $i \in B_{++}^t$ in Λ^{t+1} is given by,

$$\mathbf{E} [\Lambda_i^{t+1} | \mathfrak{F}^t] = \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(\underbrace{p_i^t \cdot e^{\alpha w_+ - \alpha w_+ / n}}_{\text{allocate to } i} + \underbrace{(P_+^t - p_i^t) \cdot e^{-\alpha w_+ / n}}_{\text{allocate to } B_+^t \setminus \{i\}} + \underbrace{P_-^t \cdot e^{-\alpha w_- / n}}_{\text{allocate to } B_-^t} \right). \quad (6.4)$$

- **Case 2** [Robustly Underloaded Bins]. The set of bins B_{--}^t with load $y_i^t \leq -w_-$. These are bins in B_-^t that are guaranteed to be underloaded in round $t + 1$ (i.e., to be in B_{--}^{t+1}), since any bin can be allocated a ball of weight at most w_- in one round.

For the exponential potential Λ^t (and V^t respectively), the expected contribution of a single bin $i \in B_{--}^t$ in Λ^{t+1} is given by,

$$\mathbf{E} [\Lambda_i^{t+1} | \mathfrak{F}^t] = \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(\underbrace{p_i^t \cdot e^{-\alpha w_- + \alpha w_- / n}}_{\text{allocate to } i} + \underbrace{(P_-^t - p_i^t) \cdot e^{\alpha w_- / n}}_{\text{allocate to } B_-^t \setminus \{i\}} + \underbrace{P_+^t \cdot e^{\alpha w_+ / n}}_{\text{allocate to } B_+^t} \right). \quad (6.5)$$

- **Case 3** [Swinging Bins]. The set of bins $B_{+/-}^t$ with load $y_i^t \in (-w_-, \frac{w_-}{n})$.

We begin by showing that the aggregated contribution of the swinging bins to the expected change of the potential Λ is *small*. This will be used in the proofs of Lemmas 6.4 and 6.5.

Lemma 6.3. *Consider the potential $\Lambda := \Lambda(\alpha)$ for any $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{4w_-}]$ and any non-negative vector $(\kappa_i)_{i=1}^n$. Then, for any set of swinging bins $S \subseteq B_{+/-}^t$ and for any round $t \geq 0$,*

$$\sum_{i \in S} \mathbf{E} [\Lambda_i^{t+1} | \mathfrak{F}^t] \leq \sum_{i \in S} \Lambda_i^t \cdot (1 - \kappa_i) + 2 \cdot \sum_{i \in S} \kappa_i + 3.$$

Note that this statement says that we can make the *multiplicative factor* arbitrarily small at the expense of increasing the *additive factor*.

Proof. For each bin $i \in B_{+/-}^t$, the two events affecting the contribution of the bin to Λ^{t+1} are (i) “internal” due to a ball being allocated to i and (ii) “external” due to the change in the mean.

For (i), the chosen bin $i \in B_{+/-}^t$ can increase by at most w_- , so the potential value satisfies $\Lambda_i^{t+1} \leq e^{2\alpha w_-}$, since $\alpha \leq \frac{1}{4w_-}$. For (ii), the maximum change in the mean load is at most w_-/n , and so $\Lambda_i^{t+1} \leq \Lambda_i^t \cdot e^{\alpha w_- / n}$. Combining the two contributions and aggregating over all bins in S ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in S} \mathbf{E} [\Lambda_i^{t+1} | \mathfrak{F}^t] &\leq \sum_{i \in S} \Lambda_i^t \cdot e^{\alpha w_- / n} \cdot (1 - p_i^t) + \sum_{i \in S} 2 \cdot p_i^t \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in S} \Lambda_i^t \cdot e^{\alpha w_- / n} + e^{2\alpha w_-} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{i \in S} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 + \frac{2\alpha w_-}{n}\right) + e^{2\alpha w_-} \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \sum_{i \in S} \Lambda_i^t + 2\alpha w_- \cdot e^{\alpha w_-} + e^{2\alpha w_-} \end{aligned}$$

$$\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \sum_{i \in S} \Lambda_i^t + 3,$$

using in (a) the Taylor estimate $e^z \leq 1 + 2z$ for any $z < 1.2$, for sufficiently large n , in (b) that $\Lambda_i^t \leq e^{\alpha w_-}$ for any $i \in B_{+/-}^t$ and in (c) that $2\alpha w_- \cdot e^{\alpha w_-} + e^{2\alpha w_-} \leq 3$ since $\alpha w_- \leq \frac{1}{4}$. By adding and subtracting $\sum_{i \in S} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \kappa_i$,

$$\sum_{i \in S} \mathbf{E}[\Lambda_i^{t+1} | \mathfrak{F}^t] \leq \sum_{i \in S} \Lambda_i^t \cdot (1 - \kappa_i) + \sum_{i \in S} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \kappa_i + 3 \leq \sum_{i \in S} \Lambda_i^t \cdot (1 - \kappa_i) + 2 \cdot \sum_{i \in S} \kappa_i + 3,$$

using that $\Lambda_i^t \leq e^{\alpha w_-} \leq 2$ for $i \in S$. \square

Next, we show that if the mean quantile δ^t of the mean is in $[\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$, then the potential Λ drops in expectation over one round. The following lemma applies to both Λ and V , as V is an instance of Λ . For $\Lambda := \Lambda(\alpha)$ with $\alpha = \Theta(1)$ this lemma applies when ε is constant (Corollary 6.6). For $V := V(\tilde{\alpha})$ with $\tilde{\alpha} = \Theta(1/n)$, this lemma applies at any round as it always holds that $\delta^t \in [1/n, 1 - 1/n]$ or $\delta^t = 1$ in which case all loads are equal to the mean load (Lemma 6.8).

Lemma 6.4. *Consider any $\mathcal{W}_1 \cap \mathcal{P}_2$ -process, any $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, $c_3 := \frac{\varepsilon}{16} \cdot \min\{w_+ k_3, w_- k_4\}$ and any α such that*

$$0 < \alpha \leq \min \left\{ \frac{1}{4w_-}, \frac{k_4 \varepsilon}{2w_-(1 + k_4 \varepsilon)}, \frac{k_3 \varepsilon}{2w_+(1 - k_3 \varepsilon)} \right\}. \quad (6.6)$$

Likewise, for any $\mathcal{P}_1 \cap \mathcal{W}_2$ -process, any $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, $c_3 := \frac{\varepsilon}{16} \cdot (w_- - w_+)$ and any $\alpha > 0$ such that

$$0 < \alpha \leq \min \left\{ \frac{1}{4w_-}, \frac{\varepsilon(w_- - w_+)}{4w_-^2}, \frac{\varepsilon}{2w_-(2 + \varepsilon)} \right\}. \quad (6.7)$$

If (6.6) or (6.7) holds, then for the potential $\Lambda := \Lambda(\alpha)$ and for any round $t \geq 0$ we have

$$\mathbf{E}[\Lambda^{t+1} | \mathfrak{F}^t, \mathcal{G}^t(\varepsilon)] \leq \Lambda^t \cdot \left(1 - \frac{2c_3 \alpha}{n}\right) + 8.$$

Proof. Consider an arbitrary round t such that $\mathcal{G}^t := \mathcal{G}^t(\varepsilon) := \{\delta^t \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]\}$ holds and label the bins such that x_i^t is non-decreasing in $i \in [n]$.

Case 1 [Overloaded Bins]. Among the overloaded bins, let us first consider robustly overloaded bins. By (6.4), for any robustly overloaded bin $i \in B_{++}^t$,

$$\mathbf{E}[\Lambda_i^{t+1} | \mathfrak{F}^t] = \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(p_i^t \cdot e^{-\alpha w_+/n + \alpha w_+} + (P_+^t - p_i^t) \cdot e^{-\alpha w_+/n} + P_-^t \cdot e^{-\alpha w_-/n}\right).$$

Applying the Taylor estimate $e^z \leq 1 + z + z^2$, which holds for any $z \leq 1.75$, since $\alpha w_+ \leq 1$ (and $\alpha w_- \leq 1$), and using that $(-\frac{\alpha w_+}{n} + \alpha w_+)^2 \leq (\alpha w_+)^2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[\Lambda_i^{t+1} | \mathfrak{F}^t] &\leq \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 + p_i^t \cdot \left(-\frac{\alpha w_+}{n} + \alpha w_+ + (\alpha w_+)^2\right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (P_+^t - p_i^t) \cdot \left(-\frac{\alpha w_+}{n} + \left(\frac{\alpha w_+}{n}\right)^2\right) + P_-^t \cdot \left(-\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n}\right)^2\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Using that $P_-^t + P_+^t = 1$, $w_- \geq w_+$ and rearranging terms we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[\Lambda_i^{t+1} | \mathfrak{F}^t] &\leq \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 + p_i^t \cdot \left(-\frac{\alpha w_+}{n} + \alpha w_+ + (\alpha w_+)^2\right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - (P_+^t - p_i^t) \cdot \frac{\alpha w_+}{n} - P_-^t \cdot \frac{\alpha w_-}{n} + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n}\right)^2\right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 + p_i^t \cdot (\alpha w_+ + (\alpha w_+)^2) - P_+^t \cdot \frac{\alpha w_+}{n} - P_-^t \cdot \frac{\alpha w_-}{n} + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2 \right) \\
&= \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 + p_i^t \cdot (\alpha w_+ + (\alpha w_+)^2) + P_+^t \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} - \frac{\alpha w_+}{n} \right) - \frac{\alpha w_-}{n} + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2 \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{6.8}$$

Now, we turn our attention to swinging overloaded bins. By Lemma 6.3, for $S := B_{+/-}^t \cap B_+^t$ and $\kappa_i := \frac{\alpha w_-}{n}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i \in S} \mathbf{E} [\Lambda_i^{t+1} | \mathfrak{F}^t] &\leq \sum_{i \in S} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right) + 2 \cdot \sum_{i \in S} \frac{\alpha w_-}{n} + 3 \\
&\leq \sum_{i \in S} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right) + 4 \\
&\leq \sum_{i \in S} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 + p_i^t \cdot (\alpha w_+ + (\alpha w_+)^2) + P_+^t \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} - \frac{\alpha w_+}{n} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{\alpha w_-}{n} + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2 \right) + 4,
\end{aligned} \tag{6.9}$$

where in the last inequality we have added several non-negative terms.

Combining (6.8) and (6.9), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i \in B_+^t} \mathbf{E} [\Lambda_i^{t+1} | \mathfrak{F}^t] \\
&\leq \sum_{i \in B_+^t} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 + p_i^t \cdot (\alpha w_+ + (\alpha w_+)^2) + P_+^t \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} - \frac{\alpha w_+}{n} \right) - \frac{\alpha w_-}{n} + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2 \right) + 4.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.10}$$

By condition \mathcal{P}_1 , we have $P_+^t = \sum_{i=1}^{\delta^t n} p_i^t \leq (\delta^t n) \cdot \frac{1}{n} = \delta^t$. By the assumption \mathcal{G}^t , we have that $\delta^t \leq 1 - \varepsilon$, so it also follows that $P_+^t \leq 1 - \varepsilon$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i \in B_+^t} \mathbf{E} [\Lambda_i^{t+1} | \mathfrak{F}^t, \mathcal{G}^t] \\
&\leq \sum_{i \in B_+^t} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 - \alpha w_+ \cdot \left(\frac{1}{n} - p_i^t \cdot (1 + \alpha w_+) \right) - \frac{\alpha \varepsilon}{n} \cdot (w_- - w_+) + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2 \right) + 4.
\end{aligned}$$

Case 1.A [\mathcal{P}_2 holds]. Recall that by condition \mathcal{P}_2 , the probabilities of the overloaded bins satisfy,

$$(p_1^t, \dots, p_{n\delta^t}^t) \preceq \left(\frac{1}{n} - \frac{k_3 \cdot (1 - \delta^t)}{n}, \dots, \frac{1}{n} - \frac{k_3 \cdot (1 - \delta^t)}{n} \right)$$

and hence applying Lemma A.1 using that Λ_i^t are non-increasing in i over B_+^t ,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i \in B_+^t} \mathbf{E} [\Lambda_i^{t+1} | \mathfrak{F}^t, \mathcal{G}^t] \\
&\leq \sum_{i \in B_+^t} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\alpha w_+}{n} \cdot \left(1 - (1 - k_3 \varepsilon) \cdot (1 + \alpha w_+) \right) - \frac{\alpha \varepsilon}{n} \cdot (w_- - w_+) + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2 \right) + 4 \\
&\leq \sum_{i \in B_+^t} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\alpha w_+}{n} \cdot \left(1 - (1 - k_3 \varepsilon) \cdot (1 + \alpha w_+) \right) + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2 \right) + 4 \\
&= \sum_{i \in B_+^t} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\alpha w_+}{n} \cdot \left(k_3 \varepsilon - \alpha w_+ \cdot (1 - k_3 \varepsilon) \right) + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2 \right) + 4
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{i \in B_+^t} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\alpha w_+}{n} \cdot \frac{k_3 \varepsilon}{2} + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2 \right) + 4 \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \sum_{i \in B_+^t} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\alpha \varepsilon}{4n} \cdot w_+ k_3 \right) + 4,
\end{aligned}$$

using in (a) that $\frac{k_3 \varepsilon}{2} \geq \alpha w_+ (1 - k_3 \varepsilon)$ (which is equivalent to $\alpha \leq \frac{k_3 \varepsilon}{2w_+(1-k_3\varepsilon)}$) and in (b) that $\frac{\alpha \varepsilon}{4n} \cdot w_+ k_3 \geq \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2$ (which follows since $\alpha = O(\varepsilon)$).

Case 1.B [\mathcal{W}_2 holds]. By condition \mathcal{P}_2 , the probabilities of the overloaded bins satisfy

$$(p_1^t, \dots, p_{\delta^t n}^t) \preceq \left(\frac{1}{n}, \dots, \frac{1}{n} \right),$$

and hence applying Lemma A.1 using that Λ_i^t are non-increasing in i over B_+^t ,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i \in B_+^t} \mathbf{E} [\Lambda_i^{t+1} \mid \mathfrak{F}^t, \mathcal{G}^t] \\
&\leq \sum_{i \in B_+^t} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 - \alpha w_+ \cdot \left(\frac{1}{n} - \frac{1}{n} \cdot (1 + \alpha w_+) \right) - \frac{\alpha \varepsilon}{n} \cdot (w_- - w_+) + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2 \right) + 4 \\
&= \sum_{i \in B_+^t} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 + \frac{(\alpha w_+)^2}{n} - \frac{\alpha \varepsilon}{n} \cdot (w_- - w_+) + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2 \right) + 4 \\
&= \sum_{i \in B_+^t} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{n} \cdot \left(\varepsilon \cdot (w_- - w_+) - \alpha w_+^2 \right) + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2 \right) + 4 \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{i \in B_+^t} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{n} \cdot \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \cdot (w_- - w_+) + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2 \right) + 4 \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \sum_{i \in B_+^t} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\alpha \varepsilon}{4n} \cdot (w_- - w_+) \right) + 4,
\end{aligned}$$

using in (a) that $\frac{\varepsilon}{2} \cdot (w_- - w_+) \geq \alpha w_+^2$ (as implied by $\alpha \leq \frac{\varepsilon(w_- - w_+)}{4w_+^2} \leq \frac{\varepsilon(w_- - w_+)}{2w_+^2}$) and in (b) that $\frac{\alpha \varepsilon}{4n} \cdot (w_- - w_+) \geq \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2$ (since $\alpha = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$).

So, in both **Case 1.A** and **Case 1.B**, for the constant $c_3 > 0$ defined in the statement,

$$\sum_{i \in B_+^t} \mathbf{E} [\Lambda_i^{t+1} \mid \mathfrak{F}^t, \mathcal{G}^t] \leq \sum_{i \in B_+^t} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 - \frac{2c_3 \alpha}{n} \right) + 4.$$

Case 2 [Underloaded Bins]. Among the underloaded bins, let us first consider robustly underloaded bins. By (6.5), for any robustly underloaded bin $i \in B_{--}^t$,

$$\mathbf{E} [\Lambda_i^{t+1} \mid \mathfrak{F}^t] = \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(p_i^t \cdot e^{\alpha w_- / n - \alpha w_-} + (P_-^t - p_i^t) \cdot e^{\alpha w_- / n} + P_+^t \cdot e^{\alpha w_+ / n} \right).$$

Applying the Taylor estimate $e^z \leq 1 + z + z^2$, which holds for any $z \leq 1.75$, since $\frac{\alpha w_+}{n} \leq 1$ (and $\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \leq 1$) and using that $\left(-\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} + \alpha w_- \right)^2 \leq (\alpha w_-)^2$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E} [\Lambda_i^{t+1} \mid \mathfrak{F}^t] &\leq \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 + p_i^t \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} - \alpha w_- + (\alpha w_-)^2 \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (P_-^t - p_i^t) \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2 \right) + P_+^t \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha w_+}{n} + \left(\frac{\alpha w_+}{n} \right)^2 \right) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Using that $P_-^t + P_+^t = 1$, $w_- \geq w_+$ and rearranging terms we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E} [\Lambda_i^{t+1} | \mathfrak{F}^t] &\leq \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 + p_i^t \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} - \alpha w_- + (\alpha w_-)^2 \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (P_-^t - p_i^t) \cdot \frac{\alpha w_-}{n} + P_+^t \cdot \frac{\alpha w_+}{n} + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2 \right) \\
&= \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 - p_i^t \cdot (\alpha w_- - (\alpha w_-)^2) + P_-^t \cdot \frac{\alpha w_-}{n} + P_+^t \cdot \frac{\alpha w_+}{n} + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2 \right) \\
&= \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 - p_i^t \cdot (\alpha w_- - (\alpha w_-)^2) + P_-^t \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} - \frac{\alpha w_+}{n} \right) + \frac{\alpha w_+}{n} + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2 \right). \tag{6.11}
\end{aligned}$$

Now, we turn our attention to swinging underloaded bins. By Lemma 6.3 for $S := B_{+/-}^t \cap B_-^t$ and $\kappa_i := p_i^t \cdot (\alpha w_- - (\alpha w_-)^2)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i \in S} \mathbf{E} [\Lambda_i^{t+1} | \mathfrak{F}^t] &\leq \sum_{i \in S} \Lambda_i^t \cdot (1 - \kappa_i) - 2 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n p_i^t \cdot (\alpha w_- - (\alpha w_-)^2) + 3 \\
&\leq \sum_{i \in S} \Lambda_i^t \cdot (1 - \kappa_i) + 4 \\
&\leq \sum_{i \in S} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 - p_i^t \cdot (\alpha w_- - (\alpha w_-)^2) + P_-^t \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} - \frac{\alpha w_+}{n} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{\alpha w_+}{n} + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2 \right) + 4, \tag{6.12}
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we have added several non-negative terms.

Combining (6.11) and (6.12), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i \in B_-^t} \mathbf{E} [\Lambda_i^{t+1} | \mathfrak{F}^t] \\
&\leq \sum_{i \in B_-^t} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 - p_i^t \cdot (\alpha w_- - (\alpha w_-)^2) + P_-^t \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} - \frac{\alpha w_+}{n} \right) + \frac{\alpha w_+}{n} + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2 \right) + 4. \tag{6.13}
\end{aligned}$$

Case 2.A [\mathcal{P}_2 holds]. Recall that by condition \mathcal{P}_2 , the probabilities of the underloaded bins satisfy,

$$(p_n^t, \dots, p_{\delta^t n+1}^t) \succeq \left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{k_4 \cdot \delta^t}{n}, \dots, \frac{1}{n} + \frac{k_4 \cdot \delta^t}{n} \right).$$

Hence applying Lemma A.1 to (6.13) using that Λ_i^t are non-increasing in i , $(\alpha w_-)^2 \leq \alpha w_-$ (since $\alpha w_- \leq 1$) and $\delta^t \geq \varepsilon$, gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i \in B_-^t} \mathbf{E} [\Lambda_i^{t+1} | \mathfrak{F}^t, \mathcal{G}^t] \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{i \in B_-^t} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1 + k_4 \varepsilon}{n} \cdot (\alpha w_- - (\alpha w_-)^2) + 1 \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} - \frac{\alpha w_+}{n} \right) + \frac{\alpha w_+}{n} + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2 \right) + 4 \\
&= \sum_{i \in B_-^t} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 - \alpha w_- \cdot \left(\frac{1 + k_4 \varepsilon}{n} \cdot (1 - \alpha w_-) - \frac{1}{n} \right) + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2 \right) + 4 \\
&= \sum_{i \in B_-^t} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \cdot \left((1 + k_4 \varepsilon) \cdot (1 - \alpha w_-) - 1 \right) + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2 \right) + 4 \\
&= \sum_{i \in B_-^t} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \cdot \left(k_4 \varepsilon - \alpha w_- \cdot (1 + k_4 \varepsilon) \right) + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2 \right) + 4
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \sum_{i \in B_-^t} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \cdot \frac{k_4 \varepsilon}{2} + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2 \right) + 4 \\
&\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \sum_{i \in B_-^t} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\alpha \varepsilon}{4n} \cdot k_4 w_- \right) + 4,
\end{aligned}$$

using in (a) that $P_-^t \leq 1$, in (b) that $\frac{k_4 \varepsilon}{2} \geq \alpha w_- \cdot (1 + k_4 \varepsilon)$ (as implied by $\alpha \leq \frac{k_4 \varepsilon}{2w_- (1 + k_4 \varepsilon)}$) and in (c) that $\frac{\alpha \varepsilon}{4n} \cdot k_4 w_- \geq \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2$ (as implied by $\alpha = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$).

Case 2.B [\mathcal{W}_2 and $P_-^t \leq 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ hold]. By condition \mathcal{P}_1 , we have that

$$(p_n^t, \dots, p_{\delta^t n+1}^t) \succeq \left(\frac{1}{n}, \dots, \frac{1}{n} \right),$$

and hence applying Lemma A.1 to (6.13) using that Λ_i^t are non-increasing in i and that $(\alpha w_-)^2 \leq \alpha w_-$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i \in B_-^t} \mathbf{E} [\Lambda_i^{t+1} \mid \mathfrak{F}^t, \mathcal{G}^t] \\
&\leq \sum_{i \in B_-^t} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{n} \cdot (\alpha w_- - (\alpha w_-)^2) + \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right) \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} - \frac{\alpha w_+}{n} \right) + \frac{\alpha w_+}{n} + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2 \right) + 4 \\
&= \sum_{i \in B_-^t} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 + \frac{(\alpha w_-)^2}{n} - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} - \frac{\alpha w_+}{n} \right) + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2 \right) + 4 \\
&= \sum_{i \in B_-^t} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{n} \cdot \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2} \cdot (w_- - w_+) - \alpha w_-^2 \right) + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2 \right) + 4 \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{i \in B_-^t} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{n} \cdot \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \cdot (w_- - w_+) + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2 \right) + 4 \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \sum_{i \in B_-^t} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\alpha \varepsilon}{8n} \cdot (w_- - w_+) \right) + 4.
\end{aligned}$$

using in (a) that $\frac{\varepsilon}{4} \cdot (w_- - w_+) \geq \alpha w_-^2$ (as implied by $\alpha \leq \frac{\varepsilon(w_- - w_+)}{4w_-^2}$) and in (b) that $\frac{\alpha \varepsilon}{8n} \cdot (w_- - w_+) \geq \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2$ (as implied by $\alpha = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$).

Case 2.C [\mathcal{W}_2 and $P_-^t > 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ hold]. By condition \mathcal{W}_2 , the probabilities of the underloaded bins satisfy,

$$(p_n^t, \dots, p_{\delta^t n+1}^t) \succeq \left(\frac{P_-^t}{|B_-^t|}, \dots, \frac{P_-^t}{|B_-^t|} \right).$$

Using Claim A.2 and that $P_-^t > 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ and $|B_-^t| \leq (1 - \varepsilon) \cdot n$, we have that

$$\bar{p}_i^t := \frac{P_-^t}{|B_-^t|} > \frac{1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}}{(1 - \varepsilon)n} > \frac{1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}}{n}.$$

Hence, applying Lemma A.1 to (6.13) using that Λ_i are non-increasing in i and $(\alpha w_-)^2 \leq \alpha w_-$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i \in B_-^t} \mathbf{E} [\Lambda_i^{t+1} \mid \mathfrak{F}^t, \mathcal{G}^t] \\
&\leq \sum_{i \in B_-^t} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 - \bar{p}_i^t \cdot (\alpha w_- - (\alpha w_-)^2) + 1 \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} - \frac{\alpha w_+}{n} \right) + \frac{\alpha w_+}{n} + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2 \right) + 4
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{i \in B_-^t} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 - \bar{p}_i^t \cdot (\alpha w_- - (\alpha w_-)^2) + \frac{\alpha w_-}{n} + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2 \right) + 4 \\
&= \sum_{i \in B_-^t} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 - \alpha w_- \cdot \left(\bar{p}_i^t \cdot (1 - \alpha w_-) - \frac{1}{n} \right) + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2 \right) + 4 \\
&\leq \sum_{i \in B_-^t} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \cdot \left(\left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right) \cdot (1 - \alpha w_-) - 1 \right) + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2 \right) + 4 \\
&= \sum_{i \in B_-^t} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \cdot \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2} - \alpha w_- \cdot \left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right) \right) + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2 \right) + 4 \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{i \in B_-^t} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \cdot \frac{\varepsilon}{4} + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2 \right) + 4 \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \sum_{i \in B_-^t} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\alpha \varepsilon}{8n} \cdot w_- \right) + 4,
\end{aligned}$$

using in (a) that $\frac{\varepsilon}{4} \geq \alpha w_- \cdot (1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2})$ (which is equivalent to $\alpha \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2w_-(2+\varepsilon)}$) and in (b) that $\frac{\alpha \varepsilon}{8n} \cdot w_- \geq \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2$ (as implied by $\alpha = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$).

Hence, in all subcases of **Case 2**, for $c_3 > 0$ as defined in the statement,

$$\sum_{i \in B_-^t} \mathbf{E} [\Lambda_i^{t+1} | \mathfrak{F}^t] \leq \sum_{i \in B_-^t} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 - \frac{2c_3 \alpha}{n} \right) + 4.$$

Finally, combining the **Case 1** and **Case 2**, we get the conclusion. \square

Now, we will prove a loose upper bound on the expected increase of Λ over one round, which holds at an arbitrary round t , i.e., even when \mathcal{G}^t does not hold.

Lemma 6.5. *Consider any $\mathcal{P}_2 \cap \mathcal{W}_1$ -process or $\mathcal{P}_1 \cap \mathcal{W}_2$ -process and the potential $\Lambda := \Lambda(\alpha)$ with any $\alpha > 0$ satisfying the preconditions of Lemma 6.4. Then, for the constant $c_4 := \max\{8, 4w_-^2\} > 0$ and for any round $t \geq 0$,*

$$\mathbf{E} [\Lambda^{t+1} | \mathfrak{F}^t] \leq \Lambda^t \cdot \left(1 + \frac{c_4 \alpha^2}{2n} \right) + c_4.$$

Proof. **Case 1** [Overloaded Bins]. By (6.10) in **Case 1** of Lemma 6.4,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i \in B_+^t} \mathbf{E} [\Lambda_i^{t+1} | \mathfrak{F}^t] \\
&\leq \sum_{i \in B_+^t} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 + p_i^t \cdot (\alpha w_+ + (\alpha w_+)^2) + P_+^t \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} - \frac{\alpha w_+}{n} \right) - \frac{\alpha w_-}{n} + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2 \right) + 4.
\end{aligned}$$

Using the majorization in condition \mathcal{P}_1 and Lemma A.1, and that $P_+^t \leq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sum_{i \in B_+^t} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 + \frac{1}{n} \cdot (\alpha w_+ + (\alpha w_+)^2) + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} - \frac{\alpha w_+}{n} \right) - \frac{\alpha w_-}{n} + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2 \right) + 4 \\
&= \sum_{i \in B_+^t} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 + \frac{1}{n} \cdot (\alpha w_+)^2 + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2 \right) + 4 \leq \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 + \frac{2\alpha^2 w_+^2}{n} \right) + 4,
\end{aligned}$$

using in the last step that w_- is a constant.

Case 2 [Underloaded Bins]. By (6.13) in **Case 2** of Lemma 6.4,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i \in B_-^t} \mathbf{E} \left[\Lambda_i^{t+1} \mid \mathfrak{F}^t \right] \\ & \leq \sum_{i \in B_-^t} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 - p_i^t \cdot (\alpha w_- - (\alpha w_-)^2) + P_-^t \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} - \frac{\alpha w_+}{n} \right) + \frac{\alpha w_+}{n} + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2 \right) + 4 \end{aligned}$$

Using the majorization in condition \mathcal{P}_1 and Lemma A.1, and that $P_-^t \leq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \leq \sum_{i \in B_-^t} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 + \frac{1}{n} \cdot (-\alpha w_- + (\alpha w_-)^2) + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} - \frac{\alpha w_+}{n} \right) + \frac{\alpha w_+}{n} + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2 \right) + 4 \\ & = \sum_{i \in B_-^t} \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 + \frac{1}{n} \cdot (\alpha w_-)^2 + \left(\frac{\alpha w_-}{n} \right)^2 \right) + 4 \leq \Lambda_i^t \cdot \left(1 + \frac{2\alpha^2 w_-^2}{n} \right) + 4, \end{aligned}$$

using in the last step that w_+ and w_- are constants.

Thus, combining the two cases and choosing $c_4 := \max\{8, 4w_-^2\}$, gives the result. \square

We now combine the statements (and constants) from Lemmas 6.4 and 6.5 into a single corollary for $\Lambda := \Lambda(\alpha)$ with constant smoothing parameter α .

Corollary 6.6. *Consider any $\mathcal{P}_2 \cap \mathcal{W}_1$ -process or $\mathcal{P}_1 \cap \mathcal{W}_2$ -process, any constant $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and the potential $\Lambda := \Lambda(\alpha)$ with $\alpha := \alpha(\varepsilon) > 0$ satisfying the preconditions of Lemma 6.4. Further, let $c_3 := c_3(\varepsilon) > 0$ be as defined in Lemma 6.4 and $c_4 := c_4(\varepsilon) > 0$ as defined in Lemma 6.5. Then, for $c := \max\{\frac{8}{c_3\alpha}, \frac{2}{\alpha^2}\} \geq 1$, (i) for any round $t \geq 0$,*

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\Lambda^{t+1} \mid \mathfrak{F}^t, \mathcal{G}^t, \Lambda^t > cn \right] \leq \Lambda^t \cdot \left(1 - \frac{c_3\alpha}{n} \right).$$

Further, (ii) for any round $t \geq 0$,

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\Lambda^{t+1} \mid \mathfrak{F}^t, \Lambda^t > cn \right] \leq \Lambda^t \cdot \left(1 + \frac{c_4\alpha^2}{n} \right).$$

Proof. First statement. Using Lemma 6.4, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} \left[\Lambda^{t+1} \mid \mathfrak{F}^t, \mathcal{G}^t, \Lambda^t > cn \right] & \leq \Lambda^t \cdot \left(1 - \frac{2c_3\alpha}{n} \right) + 8 = \Lambda^t \cdot \left(1 - \frac{c_3\alpha}{n} \right) + \left(8 - \Lambda^t \cdot \frac{c_3\alpha}{n} \right) \\ & \leq \Lambda^t \cdot \left(1 - \frac{c_3\alpha}{n} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Second statement. Using Lemma 6.5, we have that

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\Lambda^{t+1} \mid \mathfrak{F}^t, \Lambda^t > cn \right] \leq \Lambda^t \cdot \left(1 + \frac{c_4\alpha^2}{2n} \right) + c_4 \leq \Lambda^t \cdot \left(1 + \frac{c_4\alpha^2}{2n} \right) + \Lambda^t \cdot \frac{c_4\alpha^2}{2n} = \Lambda^t \cdot \left(1 + \frac{c_4\alpha^2}{n} \right),$$

having used that $\Lambda^t > cn \geq \frac{2}{\alpha^2} \cdot n$. \square

The next upper bound we use in the application of the bounded difference inequality in the proof of Lemma 7.3.

Lemma 6.7. *Consider any $\mathcal{P}_2 \cap \mathcal{W}_1$ -process or $\mathcal{P}_1 \cap \mathcal{W}_2$ -process. Then, for any constant $\kappa > 0$, and for any rounds $t_0, t_1 \geq 0$ such that $t_0 \leq t_1 \leq t_0 + \kappa \cdot n \log n$,*

$$\Pr \left[\max_{t \in [t_0, t_1]} \max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^t| \leq \log^2 n \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \Lambda^{t_0} \leq n^2 \right] \geq 1 - n^{-12}.$$

Proof. Consider the sequence $(\mathbf{E}[\Lambda^t \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \Lambda^{t_0} \leq n^2])_{t=t_0}^{t_1}$. By Lemma 6.5 for every $t \in [t_0, t_1]$,

$$\mathbf{E}[\Lambda^{t+1} \mid \mathfrak{F}^t] \leq \Lambda^t \cdot \left(1 + \frac{c_4 \alpha^2}{2n}\right) + c_4.$$

Using the tower law of expectation, we have that

$$\mathbf{E}[\Lambda^{t+1} \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \Lambda^{t_0} \leq n^2] \leq \mathbf{E}[\Lambda^t \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \Lambda^{t_0} \leq n^2] \cdot \left(1 + \frac{c_4 \alpha^2}{2n}\right) + c_4.$$

Hence, applying Lemma A.6 (i) with $a := 1 + \frac{c_4 \alpha^2}{2n} > 1$ and $b := c_4 > 0$, we get that for any $t \in [t_0, t_1]$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[\Lambda^t \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \Lambda^{t_0} \leq n^2] &\leq \Lambda^{t_0} \cdot a^{t-t_0} + b \cdot \sum_{s=t_0}^{t-1} a^{s-t_0} \\ &\leq n^2 \cdot \left(1 + \frac{c_4 \alpha^2}{2n}\right)^{t-t_0} + c_4 \cdot (t-t_0) \cdot \left(1 + \frac{c_4 \alpha^2}{2n}\right)^{t_1-t_0} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} n^2 \cdot n^{\kappa \cdot \alpha^2 \cdot c_4} + c_4 \cdot (\kappa n \log n) \cdot n^{\kappa \cdot \alpha^2 \cdot c_4} \leq n^{3+\kappa \cdot \alpha^2 \cdot c_4}, \end{aligned}$$

where in (a) we used that $1+z \leq e^z$ for any z and that $t \leq t_1 \leq t_0 + \kappa n \log n$.

Using Markov's inequality, $\Pr[\Lambda^t \leq n^{3+\kappa \cdot \alpha^2 \cdot c_4+14} \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \Lambda^{t_0} \leq n^2] \geq 1 - n^{-14}$ for any $t \in [t_0, t_1]$, which implies

$$\Pr\left[\max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^t| \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} \cdot (\kappa \cdot \alpha^2 \cdot c_4 + 17) \cdot \log n \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \Lambda^{t_0} \leq n^2\right] \geq 1 - n^{-14}.$$

Since $\frac{1}{\alpha} \cdot (\kappa \cdot \alpha^2 \cdot c_4 + 17) \cdot \log n < \log^2 n$ for sufficiently large n , by taking a union bound over all rounds $t \in [t_0, t_1]$ we get the claim. \square

We now turn our attention to the potential $V := V(\tilde{\alpha})$ with $\tilde{\alpha} = \Theta(1/n)$ and show that $\mathbf{E}[V^m] = \text{poly}(n)$ which in turn implies the $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ bound on the absolute value of the normalized loads. This will be used in the proof of Theorem 3.1 as the starting point of the “recovery phase” (Lemma 7.4).

Lemma 6.8. *Consider any $\mathcal{P}_2 \cap \mathcal{W}_1$ -process or $\mathcal{P}_1 \cap \mathcal{W}_2$ -process. Then, there exists a constant $c_5 > 0$ such that for any round $t \geq 0$,*

$$\Pr\left[\max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^t| \leq c_5 n \log n\right] \geq 1 - n^{-12}.$$

Further, (ii) for any two rounds $t_0 \geq 0$ and $t_1 \geq t_0$,

$$\Pr\left[\max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^{t_1}| \leq 2c_5 n \log n \mid \max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^{t_0}| \leq c_5 n \log n\right] \geq 1 - n^{-12}.$$

Proof. First statement. We set $\tilde{\varepsilon} := \frac{1}{n}$. For any $\mathcal{P}_2 \cap \mathcal{W}_1$ -process, we define

$$\tilde{\alpha} := \min\left\{\frac{1}{4w_-}, \frac{k_4 \tilde{\varepsilon}}{2w_-(1+k_4 \tilde{\varepsilon})}, \frac{k_3 \tilde{\varepsilon}}{2w_+(1-k_3 \tilde{\varepsilon})}\right\} \quad \text{and} \quad c_3 := \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}}{16} \cdot \min\{w_+ k_3, w_- k_4\},$$

and for any $\mathcal{P}_1 \cap \mathcal{W}_2$ -process, we define

$$\tilde{\alpha} := \min\left\{\frac{1}{4w_-}, \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}(w_- - w_+)}{4w_-^2}, \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}}{2w_-(2+\tilde{\varepsilon})}\right\} \quad \text{and} \quad c_3 := \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}}{16} \cdot (w_- - w_+).$$

So, in both cases the smoothing parameter $\tilde{\alpha}$ satisfies the preconditions (6.6) and (6.7) respectively of Lemma 6.4, and so the potential $V := V(\tilde{\alpha})$ satisfies for some constant $c'_3 := c_3/\tilde{\varepsilon} > 0$ that

$$\mathbf{E} \left[V^{t+1} \mid \mathfrak{F}^t, \delta^t \in \left[\frac{1}{n}, 1 - \frac{1}{n} \right] \right] \leq V^t \cdot \left(1 - \frac{2c'_3 \tilde{\alpha} \tilde{\varepsilon}}{n} \right) + 8.$$

When $\delta^t = 1$, all bins have load equal to the mean load, so they are all swinging bins. So, by Lemma 6.3, we have that

$$\mathbf{E} [V^{t+1} \mid \mathfrak{F}^t, \delta^t = 1] \leq V^t \cdot \left(1 - \frac{2c'_3 \tilde{\alpha} \tilde{\varepsilon}}{n} \right) + 2c'_3 \tilde{\alpha} \tilde{\varepsilon} + 3 \leq V^t \cdot \left(1 - \frac{2c'_3 \tilde{\alpha} \tilde{\varepsilon}}{n} \right) + 8,$$

using that $2c'_3 \tilde{\alpha} \tilde{\varepsilon} \leq 1$.

Combining the two cases, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} [V^{t+1} \mid \mathfrak{F}^t] &\leq \max \left\{ \mathbf{E} \left[V^{t+1} \mid \mathfrak{F}^t, \delta^t \in \left[\frac{1}{n}, 1 - \frac{1}{n} \right] \right], \mathbf{E} [V^{t+1} \mid \mathfrak{F}^t, \delta^t = 1] \right\} \\ &\leq V^t \cdot \left(1 - \frac{2c'_3 \tilde{\alpha} \tilde{\varepsilon}}{n} \right) + 8. \end{aligned} \quad (6.14)$$

By Lemma A.6 (iii), and since $V^0 = n$ holds deterministically, it follows that for any round $t \geq 0$,

$$\mathbf{E} [V^t] \leq \frac{4}{c'_3 \tilde{\alpha} \tilde{\varepsilon}} \cdot n \leq \kappa \cdot n^3,$$

for some constant $\kappa > 0$, since $\tilde{\alpha} = \Theta(\frac{1}{n})$ and $\tilde{\varepsilon} = \frac{1}{n}$.

By Markov's inequality, we have $\Pr [V^t \leq \kappa \cdot n^{15}] \geq 1 - n^{-12}$, which also implies that

$$\Pr \left[\max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^t| \leq \frac{1}{\tilde{\alpha}} \log \kappa + \frac{15}{\tilde{\alpha}} \cdot \log n \right] \geq 1 - n^{-12}.$$

Thus, as $\tilde{\alpha} = \Theta(1/n)$, we have $\Pr [\max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^t| \leq c_5 n \log n] \geq 1 - n^{-12}$ for some constant $c_5 := \frac{16\tilde{\varepsilon}}{\tilde{\alpha}}$.

Second statement. Consider an arbitrary round $t_0 \geq 0$, where $\max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^{t_0}| \leq c_5 n \log n$. Then, we also have that

$$V^{t_0} \leq n \cdot e^{\tilde{\alpha} c_5 n \log n}.$$

Recalling (6.14), and applying Lemma A.6 (ii) with $a := 1 - \frac{2c'_3 \tilde{\alpha} \tilde{\varepsilon}}{n}$ and $b := 8$, we obtain

$$V^{t_1} \leq V^{t_0} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{2c'_3 \tilde{\alpha} \tilde{\varepsilon}}{n} \right)^{t_1 - t_0} + \kappa \cdot n^3 \leq 2n \cdot e^{\tilde{\alpha} c_5 n \log n},$$

using that $c_5 > \frac{15}{\tilde{\alpha}}$. By Markov's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left[V^{t_1} \leq n^{12} \cdot 2n \cdot e^{\tilde{\alpha} c_5 n \log n} \mid \max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^{t_0}| \leq c_5 n \log n \right] \\ \geq \Pr \left[V^{t_1} \leq e^{2\tilde{\alpha} c_5 n \log n} \mid \max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^{t_0}| \leq c_5 n \log n \right] \geq 1 - n^{-12}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, when $\{V^{t_1} \leq e^{2\tilde{\alpha} c_5 n \log n}\}$ holds, then

$$\max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^{t_1}| \leq \frac{1}{\tilde{\alpha}} \cdot \log V^{t_1} \leq 2c_5 n \log n. \quad \square$$

6.3 Deterministic Bounds on the Quadratic Potential

The next lemma provides a bound for the quadratic potential in terms of the exponential potential Λ and holds for an arbitrary process.

Lemma 6.9. *Consider an arbitrary load vector x^t and the potentials $\Upsilon^t := \Upsilon^t(x^t)$ and $\Lambda^t := \Lambda(\alpha, x^t)$ for any $\alpha \in (0, 1]$. Then,*

$$\Upsilon^t \leq \left(\frac{4}{\alpha} \cdot \log \left(\frac{4}{\alpha} \right) \right)^2 \cdot \Lambda^t.$$

Proof. Let $\kappa := (4/\alpha) \cdot \log(4/\alpha)$. For any $y \geq \kappa$, it follows that

$$e^{\alpha y/2} = e^{\alpha y/4} \cdot e^{\alpha y/4} \stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \frac{\alpha y}{4} \cdot e^{\alpha y/4} \stackrel{(b)}{\geq} \frac{\alpha y}{4} \cdot \frac{4}{\alpha} \geq y,$$

using in (a) that $e^y \geq y$ (for any $y \geq 0$) and in (b) that $\frac{\alpha y}{4} \geq \log(4/\alpha)$ (as $y \geq \kappa$). Hence for $y \geq \kappa$,

$$e^{\alpha y} = e^{\alpha y/2} \cdot e^{\alpha y/2} \geq y \cdot y = y^2.$$

Thus, we conclude

$$\Upsilon^t = \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i^t)^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \max \{ \Lambda_i^t, \kappa^2 \} \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{i=1}^n \max \{ \Lambda_i^t, \kappa^2 \cdot \Lambda_i^t \} \stackrel{(b)}{=} \kappa^2 \cdot \Lambda^t,$$

using in (a) that $\Lambda_i^t \geq 1$ for any $i \in [n]$ and in (b) that $\kappa \geq 1$. \square

The next lemma is very basic but is used in Lemma 7.3, so we prove it for completeness.

Lemma 6.10. *Consider any \mathcal{W}_1 -process. Then, for any round $t \geq 0$*

$$|\Upsilon^{t+1} - \Upsilon^t| \leq 4w_- \cdot \max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^t| + 2w_-^2.$$

Proof. Recall that $w^{t+1} := W^{t+1} - W^t$ is the number of balls allocated in the $(t+1)$ -th allocation. We will upper bound the change in the quadratic potential using

$$|\Upsilon^{t+1} - \Upsilon^t| \leq \sum_{i=1}^n |\Upsilon_i^{t+1} - \Upsilon_i^t|,$$

where $\Upsilon_i^t := (y_i^t)^2$ and $\Upsilon_i^{t+1} := (y_i^{t+1})^2$. Now, let $i \in [n]$ be an arbitrary bin. We bound $|\Upsilon_i^{t+1} - \Upsilon_i^t|$ by considering two cases based on whether bin i was allocated to in the $(t+1)$ -th allocation or not:

Case 1: If i was allocated to, then $y_{i+1}^t = y_i^t + w^{t+1} \cdot (1 - \frac{1}{n})$ and so

$$\begin{aligned} |\Upsilon_i^{t+1} - \Upsilon_i^t| &= \left| \left(y_i^t + w^{t+1} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{n} \right) \right)^2 - (y_i^t)^2 \right| \\ &\leq 2 \cdot |y_i^t| \cdot \left| w^{t+1} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{n} \right) \right| + \left| w^{t+1} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{n} \right) \right|^2 \\ &\leq 2 \cdot \max_{j \in [n]} |y_j^t| \cdot w_- + w_-^2. \end{aligned}$$

Case 2: If i was not allocated to, then $y_{i+1}^t = y_i^t - \frac{w^{t+1}}{n}$ and so

$$|\Upsilon_i^{t+1} - \Upsilon_i^t| = \left| \left(y_i^t - \frac{w^{t+1}}{n} \right)^2 - (y_i^t)^2 \right| \leq 2 \cdot \left| \frac{w^{t+1}}{n} \right| \cdot |y_i^t| + \left| \frac{w^{t+1}}{n} \right|^2 \leq \frac{2w_-}{n} \cdot \max_{j \in [n]} |y_j^t| + \frac{w_-^2}{n^2},$$

using that $w^{t+1} \leq w_-$.

By aggregating over all bins using the two cases above, we get the conclusion. \square

7 Proof of the Bound on the Gap

In this section, we complete the proof that any $\mathcal{P}_2 \cap \mathcal{W}_1$ or $\mathcal{P}_1 \cap \mathcal{W}_2$ -process satisfies $\text{Gap}(m) = \mathcal{O}(\log n)$ w.h.p. at an arbitrary round m . As outlined in Section 4, the proof consists of a recovery phase and a stabilization phase. Fig. 4.1 depicts these two phases. We start by specifying the constants used in the proof.

Let $\varepsilon := \varepsilon(C) \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ be as defined in Theorem 5.1 for

$$C := \left\lceil \frac{8c_2}{c_1} \right\rceil + 1, \quad (7.1)$$

where $c_1, c_2 > 0$ are as defined in Lemma 6.2. We will be using the potential $\Lambda := \Lambda(\alpha)$ with smoothing parameter $\alpha > 0$ defined as

$$\alpha := \min \left\{ \frac{c_3 \varepsilon^2}{2c_4(1 - \varepsilon^2)}, \alpha' \right\}, \quad (7.2)$$

where $c_3 := c_3(\varepsilon) > 0$ is as defined in Lemma 6.4, $c_4 := c_4(\varepsilon) > 0$ as defined in Lemma 6.5, and for $\mathcal{P}_2 \cap \mathcal{W}_1$ processes

$$\alpha' := \min \left\{ \frac{1}{4w_-}, \frac{k_4 \varepsilon}{2w_-(1 + k_4 \varepsilon)}, \frac{k_3 \varepsilon}{2w_+(1 - k_3 \varepsilon)} \right\},$$

and for $\mathcal{P}_1 \cap \mathcal{W}_2$ processes

$$\alpha' := \min \left\{ \frac{1}{4w_-}, \frac{\varepsilon(w_- - w_+)}{4w_-^2}, \frac{\varepsilon}{2w_-(2 + \varepsilon)} \right\}.$$

In the *recovery phase* (Section 7.3), we prove that starting at $t_0 = m - n^3 \log^4 n$ with $V^{t_0} = \text{poly}(n)$ (i.e., $\Lambda^{t_0} \leq \exp(2c_5 n \log n)$), w.h.p. there exists a round $s \in [t_0, m]$ with $\Lambda^s \leq cn$, for constant $c > 0$ defined in Corollary 6.6. We do this by proving that starting with $\Lambda^{t_0} \leq \exp(2c_5 n \log n)$, then w.h.p. there is a constant fraction of rounds $s \in [t_0, t_0 + n^3 \log^4 n]$ with $\delta^s \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$. By analyzing an “adjusted version” $\tilde{\Lambda}$ (defined below in (7.3)) of the exponential potential Λ , taking advantage of the fact that Λ^t decreases in expectation whenever $\delta^t \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$ and increases at most by a smaller factor otherwise (Corollary 6.6), we show that there exists $s \in [t_0, t_0 + n^3 \log^4 n]$ such that $\Lambda^s \leq cn$.

Next, in the *stabilization phase* (Section 7.4), we first show that starting with $\Lambda^{t_0} \leq 2cn$ at any round t_0 , we have that $\Lambda^s \leq cn$ for some round $s \in (t_0, t_0 + \Theta(n \log n)]$. We do this by proving that w.h.p. if $\Lambda^{t_0} \leq cn$, then there is a constant fraction of rounds $s \in [t_0, t_0 + \Theta(n \log n)]$ with $\delta^s \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$. Again, by analyzing an “adjusted version” $\tilde{\Lambda}$ of the exponential potential Λ , we show that w.h.p. there exists $s \in (t_0, t_0 + \Theta(n \log n)]$ such that $\Lambda^s \leq cn$. Next, we take the union bound over the remaining $\mathcal{O}(n^3 \log^4 n)$ rounds, which gives $\Lambda^{s_1} \leq cn$ w.h.p. at some $s_1 \in [m - \Theta(n \log n), m]$ and $\Lambda^{s_2} \leq cn$ w.h.p. at some $s_2 \in [m, m + \Theta(n \log n), m]$. By a smoothness argument, this in turn implies that $\max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^{m_i}| = \mathcal{O}(\log n)$.

In order to complete the analysis in Sections 7.3 and 7.4 described above, we must first give some definitions and establish some technical tools. In particular, in Section 7.1 we shall prove that the new adjusted exponential potential function $\tilde{\Lambda}^t$ is a super-martingale. In Section 7.2 we then use the interplay between the absolute value and quadratic potential functions to prove that in a constant fraction of the rounds the mean quantile is “good”.

In the following, we consider an arbitrary round $t_0 \geq 0$ which will be starting point of our analysis. For $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $c > 1$ as specified above, for any round $s \geq t_0$ we define the event,

$$\mathcal{E}_{t_0}^s := \bigcap_{t \in [t_0, s]} \{\Lambda^t > cn\}.$$

Showing that this event does not hold for suitable t_0 and s is crucial in both recovery and stabilization phases. For rounds $s \geq t_0$, we let $G_{t_0}^s := G_{t_0}^s(\varepsilon)$ be the number of rounds $t \in [t_0, s]$ with $\delta^t \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$, and similarly we define $B_{t_0}^s := (s - t_0 + 1) - G_{t_0}^s$.

We now introduce the *adjusted exponential potential function* $\tilde{\Lambda}_{t_0}^s$ which involves the random variables and event above. Let $c_3 := c_3(\varepsilon) > 0$ be the constant in Lemma 6.4 and $c_4 := c_4(\varepsilon) > 0$ the constant in Lemma 6.5. Then we define $\tilde{\Lambda}_{t_0}^{t_0}(\alpha, \varepsilon, c_3, c_4) := \Lambda^{t_0}(\alpha)$ and, for any round $s > t_0$,

$$\tilde{\Lambda}_{t_0}^s(\alpha, \varepsilon, c_3, c_4) := \Lambda^s \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{t_0}^{s-1}} \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{c_4\alpha^2}{n} \cdot B_{t_0}^{s-1}(\varepsilon)\right) \cdot \exp\left(+\frac{c_3\alpha}{n} \cdot G_{t_0}^{s-1}(\varepsilon)\right). \quad (7.3)$$

We also define $\tilde{G}_{t_0}^s := \tilde{G}_{t_0}^s(C)$ to be the number of rounds $t \in [t_0, s]$ with $\Delta^t \leq Cn$.

7.1 The Adjusted Exponential Potential is a Super-Martingale

We now show that the sequence defined in (7.3) forms a super-martingale.

Lemma 7.1. *Consider any $\mathcal{P}_2 \cap \mathcal{W}_1$ -process or $\mathcal{P}_1 \cap \mathcal{W}_2$ -process and an arbitrary round $t_0 \geq 0$. Further, let the potential $\tilde{\Lambda}_{t_0} := \tilde{\Lambda}_{t_0}(\alpha, \varepsilon, c_3, c_4)$ for $\alpha > 0$ as defined in (7.2), $\varepsilon > 0$ as defined in (7.1), and $c_3 := c_3(\varepsilon) > 0$ and $c_4 := c_4(\varepsilon) > 0$ as defined in Lemmas 6.4 and 6.5 respectively. Then, for any round $s \geq t_0$,*

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\tilde{\Lambda}_{t_0}^{s+1} \mid \mathfrak{F}^s \right] \leq \tilde{\Lambda}_{t_0}^s.$$

Proof. We see that $\mathbf{E}[\tilde{\Lambda}_{t_0}^{s+1} \mid \mathfrak{F}^s]$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{E} \left[\Lambda^{s+1} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{t_0}^s} \mid \mathfrak{F}^s \right] \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{c_4\alpha^2}{n} \cdot B_{t_0}^s\right) \cdot \exp\left(\frac{c_3\alpha}{n} \cdot G_{t_0}^s\right) \\ &= \mathbf{E} \left[\Lambda^{s+1} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{t_0}^s} \mid \mathfrak{F}^s \right] \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{c_4\alpha^2}{n} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{-\mathcal{G}^s} + \frac{c_3\alpha}{n} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{G}^s}\right) \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{c_4\alpha^2}{n} \cdot B_{t_0}^{s-1}\right) \cdot \exp\left(\frac{c_3\alpha}{n} \cdot G_{t_0}^{s-1}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we see that it suffices to prove that

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\Lambda^{s+1} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{t_0}^s} \mid \mathfrak{F}^s \right] \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{c_4\alpha^2}{n} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{-\mathcal{G}^s} + \frac{c_3\alpha}{n} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{G}^s}\right) \leq \Lambda^s \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{t_0}^{s-1}}. \quad (7.4)$$

To show (7.4), we consider two cases based on whether \mathcal{G}^s holds.

Case 1 [\mathcal{G}^s holds]. Recall that the event \mathcal{G}^s means $\delta^s \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$ holds. Further, we are additionally conditioning on the event $\mathcal{E}_{t_0}^s$, via the indicator, and so $\Lambda^t > cn$ holds for any round $t \in [t_0, s]$. Thus we can use the upper bound from Corollary 6.6 to get

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\Lambda^{s+1} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{t_0}^s} \mid \mathfrak{F}^s, \mathcal{G}^s \right] \leq \Lambda^s \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{t_0}^{s-1}} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{c_3\alpha}{n}\right) \leq \Lambda^s \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{t_0}^{s-1}} \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{c_3\alpha}{n}\right).$$

Hence, since in this case $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{G}^s} = 1$, the left-hand side of (7.4) is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{E} \left[\Lambda^{s+1} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{t_0}^s} \mid \mathfrak{F}^s, \mathcal{G}^s \right] \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{c_4\alpha^2}{n} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{-\mathcal{G}^s} + \frac{c_3\alpha}{n} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{G}^s}\right) \\ & \leq \left(\Lambda^s \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{t_0}^{s-1}} \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{c_3\alpha}{n}\right) \right) \cdot \exp\left(\frac{c_3\alpha}{n}\right) \\ & = \Lambda^s \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{t_0}^{s-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Case 2 [\mathcal{G}^s does not hold]. Similarly, by Corollary 6.6 (ii).

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\Lambda^{s+1} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{t_0}^s} \mid \mathfrak{F}^s, \neg\mathcal{G}^s \right] \leq \Lambda^s \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{t_0}^{s-1}} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{c_4\alpha^2}{n}\right) \leq \Lambda^s \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{t_0}^{s-1}} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{c_4\alpha^2}{n}\right).$$

Hence, since in this case $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{G}^s} = 0$, the left-hand side of (7.4) is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{E} \left[\Lambda^{s+1} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{t_0}^s} \mid \mathfrak{F}^s, -\mathcal{G}^s \right] \cdot \exp \left(-\frac{c_4 \alpha^2}{n} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{-\mathcal{G}^s} + \frac{c_3 \alpha}{n} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{G}^s} \right) \\ & \leq \left(\Lambda^s \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{t_0}^{s-1}} \cdot \exp \left(-\frac{c_4 \alpha^2}{n} \right) \right) \cdot \exp \left(\frac{c_4 \alpha^2}{n} \right) \\ & = \Lambda^s \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{t_0}^{s-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since (7.4) holds in both cases, we deduce that $(\tilde{\Lambda}_{t_0}^s)_{s \geq t_0}$ forms a super-martingale. \square

7.2 Taming the Mean Quantile and Absolute Value Potential

We have seen in the previous section that if we augment the exponential potential Λ^t with some terms involving the random variable $G_{t_0}^s$, then the resulting potential $\tilde{\Lambda}^t$ is a super-martingale. Thus, it will be useful to control $G_{t_0}^s := G_{t_0}^s(\varepsilon)$, which we recall is the number of rounds $t \in [t_0, s]$ with $\delta^t \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$. This is done in part by controlling $\tilde{G}_{t_0}^s := \tilde{G}_{t_0}^s(C)$, which we recall is the number of rounds $t \in [t_0, s]$ with $\Delta^t \leq Cn$. In particular, our first lemma shows that for an interval of length at least $\frac{n}{4\varepsilon}$, if we have a constant fraction of round t with $\Delta^t \leq Cn$, then w.h.p. we also have a constant fraction of rounds with $\delta^t \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$.

Lemma 7.2. *Consider any $\mathcal{P}_2 \cap \mathcal{W}_1$ -process or $\mathcal{P}_1 \cap \mathcal{W}_2$ -process and let $\varepsilon > 0$ as defined in (7.1). Then, for any rounds $t_0 \geq 0$ and $t_1 \geq t_0 + \frac{n}{4\varepsilon}$,*

$$\Pr \left[G_{t_0}^{t_1}(\varepsilon) \geq 4\varepsilon^2 \cdot \tilde{G}_{t_0}^{t_1 - \frac{n}{4\varepsilon}}(C) \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0} \right] \geq 1 - (t_1 - t_0) \cdot e^{-\varepsilon n}.$$

Proof. Let $\ell := \frac{n}{4\varepsilon}$. For any round $t \in [t_0, t_1]$, define

$$\mathcal{H}^t := \left\{ \Delta^t > Cn \right\} \cup \left\{ \left| \{s \in [t, t + \ell] : \delta^s \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]\} \right| \geq \varepsilon n \right\}.$$

Note that event \mathcal{H}^t is logically equivalent to the statement: $\Delta^t \leq Cn$ implies

$$\left| \{s \in [t, t + \ell] : \delta^s \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]\} \right| \geq \varepsilon n.$$

Then by Theorem 5.1,

$$\Pr \left[\mathcal{H}^t \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0} \right] \geq 1 - e^{-\varepsilon n},$$

and so the union bound gives

$$\Pr \left[\bigcap_{t=t_0}^{t_1} \mathcal{H}^t \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0} \right] \geq 1 - (t_1 - t_0) \cdot e^{-\varepsilon n}. \quad (7.5)$$

In the following, we will condition on the event $\bigcap_{t=t_0}^{t_1} \mathcal{H}^t$. Next define for any $t \in [t_0, t_1 - \ell]$,

$$g^t := \{s \in [t, t + \ell] : \delta^s \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]\}.$$

Then, conditional on (7.5),

$$G_{t_0}^{t_1} \geq \left| \bigcup_{t=t_0}^{t_1 - \ell} g^t \right| \geq \frac{\sum_{t=t_0}^{t_1 - \ell} |g^t|}{\max_{s \in [t_0, t_1 + \ell]} \left| \{t \in [t_0, t_1 - \ell] : s \in g^t\} \right|} \geq \frac{\tilde{G}_{t_0}^{t_1 - \ell} \cdot \varepsilon \cdot n}{\ell} \geq \tilde{G}_{t_0}^{t_1 - \frac{n}{4\varepsilon}} \cdot 4\varepsilon^2,$$

using in the last step that $\ell := \frac{n}{4\varepsilon}$. This completes the proof. \square

The next lemma establishes the key fact that w.h.p. when $\Upsilon^{t_0} \leq T$ there are many rounds close to t_0 with a good quantile (or the gap becomes too large). We will apply this lemma twice, once in the recovery phase with $T := n^3 \log^4 n$ (Lemma 7.4) and once in the stabilization phase with $T := \Theta(n \log n)$ (Lemma 7.5)

Lemma 7.3. *Consider any $\mathcal{P}_2 \cap \mathcal{W}_1$ -process or $\mathcal{P}_1 \cap \mathcal{W}_2$ -process and the potential $\Lambda := \Lambda(\alpha)$ with $\alpha > 0$ as defined in (7.2) and $\varepsilon > 0$ as defined in (7.1). Further, consider any $T \geq \frac{n}{\varepsilon}$, any round $t_0 \geq 0$ and let*

$$\tau := \inf \left\{ t \geq t_0 : \max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^t| > \sqrt{T} \cdot \log^{-2} n \right\}.$$

Then, for any round $t_1 \geq 0$ satisfying $t_0 + T \leq t_1 \leq t_0 + T \log^2 n$,

$$\Pr \left[\{G_{t_0}^{t_1}(\varepsilon) \geq \varepsilon^2 \cdot (t_1 - t_0)\} \cup \{\tau \leq t_1\} \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \Upsilon^{t_0} \leq T \right] \geq 1 - (t_1 - t_0) \cdot e^{-\varepsilon n} - n^{-\omega(1)}.$$

Proof. Let $c_1, c_2 > 0$ be the constants given in Lemma 6.2. We define $Z^{t_0} := \Upsilon^{t_0}$ and for any round $t > t_0$

$$Z^t := \Upsilon^t - c_2 \cdot (t - t_0) + \frac{c_1}{n} \sum_{s=t_0}^{t-1} \Delta^s.$$

This sequence forms a super-martingale since by Lemma 6.2,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} [Z^{t+1} \mid \mathfrak{F}^t] &= \mathbf{E} \left[\Upsilon^{t+1} - c_2 \cdot (t - t_0 + 1) + \frac{c_1}{n} \sum_{s=t_0}^t \Delta^s \mid \mathfrak{F}^t \right] \\ &= \mathbf{E} [\Upsilon^{t+1} \mid \mathfrak{F}^t] - c_2 \cdot (t - t_0 + 1) + \frac{c_1}{n} \sum_{s=t_0}^t \Delta^s \\ &\leq \Upsilon^t + c_2 - \frac{c_1}{n} \cdot \Delta^t - c_2 \cdot (t - t_0 + 1) + \frac{c_1}{n} \sum_{s=t_0}^t \Delta^s \\ &= \Upsilon^t - c_2 \cdot (t - t_0) + \frac{c_1}{n} \sum_{s=t_0}^{t-1} \Delta^s = Z^t. \end{aligned}$$

Further, consider the stopped random variable

$$\tilde{Z}^t := Z^{t \wedge \tau},$$

which also forms a super-martingale. To prove concentration of \tilde{Z}^{t+1} , we will now derive an upper bound on $|\tilde{Z}^{t+1} - \tilde{Z}^t|$, by considering the following two cases:

Case 1 [$t \geq \tau$]. In this case, $\tilde{Z}^{t+1} = Z^{(t+1) \wedge \tau} = Z^\tau$, and similarly, $\tilde{Z}^t = Z^{t \wedge \tau} = Z^\tau$, so

$$|\tilde{Z}^{t+1} - \tilde{Z}^t| = 0.$$

Case 2 [$t < \tau$]. In this case, we have that $\max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^t| \leq \sqrt{T} \cdot \log^{-2} n$ and so

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{Z}^{t+1} - \tilde{Z}^t| &\leq |\Upsilon^{t+1} - \Upsilon^t| + c_2 + \frac{c_1}{n} \cdot \Delta^t \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} 5w_- \cdot \sqrt{T} \cdot \log^{-2} n + c_2 + c_1 \sqrt{T} \cdot \log^{-2} n \\ &\leq (5w_- + 2c_1) \cdot \sqrt{T} \cdot \log^{-2} n, \end{aligned}$$

using in (a) that $|\Upsilon^{t+1} - \Upsilon^t| \leq 4w_- \cdot \sqrt{T} \cdot \log^{-2} n + 2w_-^2 \leq 5w_- \cdot \sqrt{T} \cdot \log^{-2} n$ by Lemma 6.10, and $\Delta^t \leq n \cdot \max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^t|$.

Combining **Case 1** and **Case 2** above, we conclude

$$\left| \tilde{Z}^{t+1} - \tilde{Z}^t \right| \leq (5w_- + 2c_1) \cdot \sqrt{T} \cdot \log^{-2} n.$$

Using Azuma's inequality (Lemma A.4) for super-martingales,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left[\tilde{Z}^{t_1+1} - \tilde{Z}^{t_0} > T \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \Upsilon^{t_0} \leq T \right] &\leq \exp \left(-\frac{T^2}{2 \cdot \sum_{t=t_0}^{t_1} ((5w_- + 2c_1) \cdot \sqrt{T} \cdot \log^{-2} n)^2} \right) \\ &= \exp \left(-\frac{T^2}{2 \cdot (t_1 - t_0) \cdot (5w_- + 2c_1)^2 \cdot T \cdot \log^{-4} n} \right) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \exp \left(-\frac{\log^2 n}{2 \cdot (5w_- + 2c_1)^2} \right) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} n^{-\omega(1)}, \end{aligned}$$

using in (a) that $t_1 \leq t_0 + T \log^2 n$ and in (b) that w_+ and c_1 are constants.

For the sake of a contradiction, assume now that at least half of the rounds $t \in [t_0, t_1]$ satisfy $\Delta^t \geq Cn$, which implies that

$$\sum_{t=t_0}^{t_1} \Delta^t \geq \frac{t_1 - t_0 + 1}{2} \cdot Cn.$$

When the event

$$\left\{ \tilde{Z}^{t_1+1} \leq \tilde{Z}^{t_0} + T \right\} \cap \{ \tau > t_1 \}$$

holds, then we have that $\{Z^{t_1+1} \leq Z^{t_0} + T\}$ and so

$$\Upsilon^{t_1+1} - c_2 \cdot (t_1 - t_0 + 1) + \frac{c_1}{n} \sum_{t=t_0}^{t_1} \Delta^t \leq \Upsilon^{t_0} + T.$$

Rearranging the inequality above gives

$$\begin{aligned} \Upsilon^{t_1+1} &\leq \Upsilon^{t_0} + T + c_2 \cdot (t_1 - t_0 + 1) - \frac{c_1}{n} \sum_{t=t_0}^{t_1} \Delta^t \\ &\leq \Upsilon^{t_0} + T + c_2 \cdot (t_1 - t_0 + 1) - \frac{c_1}{n} \cdot \frac{t_1 - t_0 + 1}{2} \cdot Cn \\ &\leq \Upsilon^{t_0} + T + (t_1 - t_0 + 1) \cdot \left(c_2 - \frac{c_1}{2} \cdot C \right). \end{aligned} \tag{7.6}$$

Recall that we start from a round t_0 where $\Upsilon^{t_0} \leq T$, that $C > \frac{8c_2}{c_1}$ (and $c_2 > 1$) and $t_1 - t_0 \geq T$. So by (7.6) we have

$$\Upsilon^{t_1+1} \leq T + T + T \cdot \left(c_2 - \frac{c_1}{2} \cdot C \right) < 2T - 3T \cdot c_2 < 0,$$

which is a contradiction. We conclude that when $\{Z^{t_1+1} \leq Z^{t_0} + T\}$, then half of the rounds $t \in [t_0, t_1]$ satisfy $\Delta^t \leq Cn$, i.e.

$$\Pr \left[\left\{ \tilde{G}_{t_0}^{t_1} \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot (t_1 - t_0) \right\} \cup \{ \tau \leq t_1 \} \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \Upsilon^{t_0} \leq T \right] \geq 1 - n^{-\omega(1)}. \tag{7.7}$$

Now, Lemma 7.2 gives

$$\Pr \left[G_{t_0}^{t_1} \geq 4\varepsilon^2 \cdot \tilde{G}_{t_0}^{t_1 - \frac{n}{4\varepsilon}} \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \Upsilon^{t_0} \leq T \right] \geq 1 - (t_1 - t_0) \cdot e^{-\varepsilon n}. \tag{7.8}$$

Then, noting that $\tilde{G}_{t_0}^{t_1 - \frac{n}{4\varepsilon}} \geq \tilde{G}_{t_0}^{t_1} - \frac{n}{4\varepsilon}$ and by taking the union bound of (7.7) and (7.8) we have,

$$\Pr \left[\left\{ G_{t_0}^{t_1} \geq 4\varepsilon^2 \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2} \cdot (t_1 - t_0) - \frac{n}{4\varepsilon} \right) \right\} \cup \{\tau \leq t_1\} \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \Upsilon^{t_0} \leq T \right] \geq 1 - (t_1 - t_0) \cdot e^{-\varepsilon n} - n^{-\omega(1)}.$$

Since, $\frac{1}{4} \cdot (t_1 - t_0) \geq \frac{1}{4}T \geq \frac{n}{4\varepsilon}$, we can deduce that

$$\Pr \left[\left\{ G_{t_0}^{t_1} \geq \varepsilon^2 \cdot (t_1 - t_0) \right\} \cup \{\tau \leq t_1\} \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \Upsilon^{t_0} \leq T \right] \geq 1 - (t_1 - t_0) \cdot e^{-\varepsilon n} - n^{-\omega(1)}. \quad \square$$

7.3 Recovery Phase of the Process

In the following, we start the analysis at round $t_0 = m - n^3 \log^4 n$ and using Lemma 6.8, we obtain that w.h.p. $\text{Gap}(t_0) = \mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ and $\Lambda^{t_0} \leq n \cdot \exp(\mathcal{O}(n \log n))$. Using Lemma 7.3 we conclude that w.h.p. for a constant fraction of the rounds $t \in [t_0, t_0 + n^3 \log^4 n]$, it holds that $\delta^t \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$. Next, using the adjusted exponential potential $\tilde{\Lambda}$ we exploit the drop of the exponential potential function in those rounds to infer that w.h.p. there is a round $s \in [t_0, t_0 + n^3 \log^4 n]$ with $\Lambda^s \leq cn$ (Lemma 7.4). In Section 7.4, we will prove that w.h.p. for the remaining rounds in $[s, m]$, which are at most $\mathcal{O}(n^3 \log^4 n)$, the potential becomes $\mathcal{O}(n)$ once every $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ rounds (Lemma 7.5).

Lemma 7.4 (Recovery). *Consider any $\mathcal{P}_2 \cap \mathcal{W}_1$ -process or $\mathcal{P}_1 \cap \mathcal{W}_2$ -process and the potential $\Lambda := \Lambda(\alpha)$ for $\alpha > 0$ as defined in (7.2). Then, for $c > 1$ as defined in Corollary 6.6, for any round $m \geq n^3 \log^4 n$,*

$$\Pr \left[\bigcup_{s \in [m - n^3 \log^4 n, m]} \{\Lambda^s \leq cn\} \right] \geq 1 - n^{-5}.$$

Proof. Let $T := n^3 \log^4 n$, $t_0 := m - T$ and $t_1 := m$. By Lemma 6.8, there exists a constant $c_5 > 0$, such that

$$\Pr \left[\max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^{t_0}| \leq c_5 n \log n \right] \geq 1 - n^{-12}. \quad (7.9)$$

Note that when $\{\max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^{t_0}| \leq c_5 n \log n\}$ holds, then we also have that

$$\Upsilon^{t_0} \leq n \cdot (c_5 n \log n)^2 \leq c_5^2 n^3 \log^2 n, \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda^{t_0} \leq n \cdot e^{\alpha c_5 n \log n} \leq e^{2c_5 n \log n}.$$

By Lemma 7.3 we have for $\tau := \inf \{t \geq t_0 : \max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^t| > \sqrt{T} \cdot \log^{-2} n\}$, and using that the event $\{\max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^{t_0}| \leq c_5 n \log n\}$ implies that $\{\Upsilon^{t_0} \leq T\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr \left[\left\{ G_{t_0}^{t_1} \geq \varepsilon^2 \cdot (t_1 - t_0) \right\} \cup \{\tau \leq t_1\} \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^{t_0}| \leq c_5 n \log n \right] \\ & \geq \Pr \left[\left\{ G_{t_0}^{t_1} \geq \varepsilon^2 \cdot (t_1 - t_0) \right\} \cup \{\tau \leq t_1\} \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \Upsilon^{t_0} \leq T \right] \\ & \geq 1 - T \cdot e^{-\varepsilon n} - n^{-\omega(1)} \geq 1 - n^{-\omega(1)}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 6.8 (i) and the union bound over $t_1 - t_0 = n^3 \log^4 n \leq n^4$ rounds, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr \left[\tau > t_1 \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^{t_0}| \leq c_5 n \log n \right] \\ & \geq \Pr \left[\max_{t \in [t_0, t_1]} \max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^t| \leq 2c_5 n \log n \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^{t_0}| \leq c_5 n \log n \right] \geq 1 - T \cdot n^{-12} \geq 1 - n^{-8}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, taking the union bound for the above two inequalities, we get that

$$\Pr \left[G_{t_0}^{t_1} \geq \varepsilon^2 \cdot (t_1 - t_0) \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^{t_0}| \leq c_5 n \log n \right] \geq 1 - n^{-\omega(1)} - 2n^{-8}. \quad (7.10)$$

We will now use the adjusted exponential potential $(\tilde{\Lambda}_{t_0}^t)_{t \geq t_0}$ (defined in (7.3)) to show that Λ becomes small in at least one round in $[t_0, t_1]$. By Lemma 7.1, it forms a super-martingale, so $\mathbf{E}[\tilde{\Lambda}_{t_0}^{t_1+1} \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}] \leq \tilde{\Lambda}_{t_0}^{t_0} = \Lambda^{t_0}$. Hence, using Markov's inequality we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left[\tilde{\Lambda}_{t_0}^{t_1+1} > \Lambda^{t_0} \cdot n^8 \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^{t_0}| \leq c_5 n \log n \right] \\ \leq \Pr \left[\tilde{\Lambda}_{t_0}^{t_1+1} > \Lambda^{t_0} \cdot n^8 \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \Lambda^{t_0} \leq e^{2c_5 n \log n} \right] \leq n^{-8}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.11)$$

Thus, negating and by the definition of $\tilde{\Lambda}_{t_0}^t$, we have

$$\Pr \left[\Lambda^{t_1+1} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{t_0}^{t_1}} \leq \Lambda^{t_0} \cdot n^8 \cdot \exp \left(\frac{c_4 \alpha^2}{n} \cdot B_{t_0}^{t_1} - \frac{c_3 \alpha}{n} \cdot G_{t_0}^{t_1} \right) \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \Lambda^{t_0} \leq e^{2c_5 n \log n} \right] \geq 1 - n^{-8}.$$

Further, if in addition to the two events $\{\tilde{\Lambda}_{t_0}^{t_1+1} \leq \Lambda^{t_0} \cdot n^8\}$ and $\{\Lambda^{t_0} \leq e^{2c_5 n \log n}\}$, also the event $\{G_{t_0}^{t_1} \geq \varepsilon^2 \cdot (t_1 - t_0)\}$ holds, then

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda^{t_1+1} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{t_0}^{t_1}} &\leq \Lambda^{t_0} \cdot n^8 \cdot \exp \left(\frac{c_4 \alpha^2}{n} \cdot B_{t_0}^{t_1} - \frac{c_3 \alpha}{n} \cdot G_{t_0}^{t_1} \right) \\ &\leq e^{2c_5 n \log n} \cdot n^8 \cdot \exp \left(\frac{c_4 \alpha^2}{n} \cdot (1 - \varepsilon^2) \cdot (t_1 - t_0) - \frac{c_3 \alpha}{n} \cdot \varepsilon^2 \cdot (t_1 - t_0) \right) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} e^{2c_5 n \log n} \cdot n^8 \cdot \exp \left(\frac{c_3 \alpha}{n} \cdot \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \cdot (t_1 - t_0) - \frac{c_3 \alpha}{n} \cdot \varepsilon^2 \cdot (t_1 - t_0) \right) \\ &= e^{2c_5 n \log n} \cdot n^8 \cdot \exp \left(-\frac{c_3 \alpha}{n} \cdot \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \cdot (t_1 - t_0) \right) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} e^{2c_5 n \log n} \cdot n^8 \cdot \exp \left(-\frac{c_3 \alpha}{n} \cdot \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \cdot n^3 \log^4 n \right) \stackrel{(c)}{\leq} 1, \end{aligned}$$

using in (a) that $\alpha \leq \frac{c_3 \varepsilon^2}{2c_4(1-\varepsilon^2)}$ and (b) that $T := n^3 \log^4 n$ and in (c) that $\alpha, \varepsilon, c_5 > 0$ are constants. Observe that $\{\Lambda^{t_1+1} \geq n\}$ holds deterministically, so we deduce from the above inequality that $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{t_0}^{t_1}} = 0$, that is,

$$\Pr \left[\neg \mathcal{E}_{t_0}^{t_1} \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{t_0}^{t_1+1} \leq \Lambda^{t_0} \cdot n^8, \Lambda^{t_0} \leq e^{2c_5 n \log n}, G_{t_0}^{t_1} \geq \varepsilon^2 \cdot (t_1 - t_0) \right] \leq 1.$$

Recalling the definition of $\mathcal{E}_{t_0}^{t_1} = \bigcap_{s \in [t_0, t_1]} \{\Lambda^s > cn\}$, and taking the union bound over (7.10) and (7.11) yields

$$\Pr \left[\bigcup_{s \in [t_0, t_1]} \{\Lambda^s \leq cn\} \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^{t_0}| \leq c_5 n \log n \right] \geq 1 - 2n^{-8} - n^{-8} = 1 - 3n^{-8}.$$

We conclude by combining with (7.9),

$$\Pr \left[\bigcup_{s \in [t_0, t_1]} \{\Lambda^s \leq cn\} \right] \geq (1 - 3n^{-8}) \cdot (1 - n^{-12}) \geq 1 - n^{-5}. \quad \square$$

7.4 Stabilization Phase of the Process

The next lemma establishes that a small value of the exponential potential function is preserved for some longer time period. We will refer to this property of the exponential potential function of being “trapped” in some region as *stabilization*. More precisely, we prove in the lemma below that if for some round t_0 the exponential potential is not too small, i.e., at most $2cn$, then within the next $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ rounds, the exponential potential will w.h.p. be smaller than cn at least once.

Lemma 7.5 (Stabilization). *Consider any $\mathcal{P}_2 \cap \mathcal{W}_1$ -process or $\mathcal{P}_1 \cap \mathcal{W}_2$ -process and the potential $\Lambda := \Lambda(\alpha)$ for $\alpha > 0$ as defined in (7.2). Further, let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given by (7.1), $c := c(\varepsilon) > 1$ be as defined in Corollary 6.6, and $c_s := \frac{22}{c_3 \varepsilon^2 \alpha}$, for $c_3 := c_3(\varepsilon) > 0$ as defined in Lemma 6.4. Then, for any round $t_0 \geq 0$,*

$$\Pr \left[\bigcup_{s \in [t_0, t_0 + c_s n \log n]} \{\Lambda^s \leq cn\} \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \Lambda^{t_0} \in (cn, 2cn] \right] \geq 1 - n^{-9}.$$

Proof. Let $T := c_s n \log n$ and $t_1 := t_0 + T$. By Lemma 7.3, we have for $\tau := \inf\{t \geq t_0 : \max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^t| > \sqrt{T} \cdot \log^{-2} n\}$ that

$$\Pr \left[\{G_{t_0}^{t_1} \geq \varepsilon^2 \cdot (t_1 - t_0)\} \cup \{\tau \leq t_1\} \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \Upsilon^{t_0} \leq T \right] \geq 1 - T \cdot e^{-\varepsilon n} - n^{-\omega(1)} \geq 1 - n^{-12}.$$

By Lemma 6.9, the event $\{\Lambda^{t_0} \in (cn, 2cn]\}$ implies that $\{\Upsilon^{t_0} \leq T\}$ (since $T = \omega(n)$), and hence

$$\Pr \left[\{G_{t_0}^{t_1} \geq \varepsilon^2 \cdot (t_1 - t_0)\} \cup \{\tau \leq t_1\} \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \Lambda^{t_0} \in (cn, 2cn] \right] \geq 1 - n^{-12}. \quad (7.12)$$

By Lemma 6.7 with $\kappa := c_s$, as $\sqrt{T} \cdot \log^{-2} n \geq \log^2 n$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left[\tau > t_1 \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \Lambda^{t_0} \in (cn, 2cn] \right] &\geq \Pr \left[\max_{t \in [t_0, t_1]} \max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^t| \leq \log^2 n \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \Lambda^{t_0} \in (cn, 2cn] \right] \\ &\geq \Pr \left[\max_{t \in [t_0, t_1]} \max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^t| \leq \log^2 n \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \Lambda^{t_0} \leq n^2 \right] \\ &\geq 1 - n^{-12}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.13)$$

Hence, taking the union bound over (7.12) and (7.13), we get that

$$\Pr \left[G_{t_0}^{t_1} \geq \varepsilon^2 \cdot (t_1 - t_0) \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \Lambda^{t_0} \in (cn, 2cn] \right] \geq 1 - 2n^{-12}. \quad (7.14)$$

We will now use the adjusted exponential potential $(\tilde{\Lambda}_{t_0}^t)_{t \geq t_0}$ (defined in (7.3)) to show that Λ becomes small in at least one round in $[t_0, t_1]$. By Lemma 7.1, it forms a super-martingale, so $\mathbf{E}[\tilde{\Lambda}_{t_0}^{t_1+1} \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}] \leq \tilde{\Lambda}_{t_0}^{t_0} = \Lambda^{t_0}$. Hence, using Markov's inequality we get

$$\Pr \left[\tilde{\Lambda}_{t_0}^{t_1+1} > \Lambda^{t_0} \cdot n^{10} \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \Lambda^{t_0} \in (cn, 2cn] \right] \leq n^{-10}. \quad (7.15)$$

Thus, by the definition of $\tilde{\Lambda}_{t_0}^t$, we have

$$\Pr \left[\Lambda^{t_1+1} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{t_0}^{t_1}} \leq \Lambda^{t_0} \cdot n^{10} \cdot \exp \left(\frac{c_4 \alpha^2}{n} \cdot B_{t_0}^{t_1} - \frac{c_3 \alpha}{n} \cdot G_{t_0}^{t_1} \right) \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \Lambda^{t_0} \in (cn, 2cn] \right] \geq 1 - n^{-10}.$$

Further, if in addition to the two events $\{\tilde{\Lambda}_{t_0}^{t_1+1} \leq \Lambda^{t_0} \cdot n^{10}\}$ and $\{\Lambda^{t_0} \in (cn, 2cn]\}$, also the event $\{G_{t_0}^{t_1} \geq \varepsilon^2 \cdot (t_1 - t_0)\}$ holds, then

$$\Lambda^{t_1+1} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{t_0}^{t_1}} \leq \Lambda^{t_0} \cdot n^{10} \cdot \exp \left(\frac{c_4 \alpha^2}{n} \cdot B_{t_0}^{t_1} - \frac{c_3 \alpha}{n} \cdot G_{t_0}^{t_1} \right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq 2cn^{11} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{c_4\alpha^2}{n} \cdot (1-\varepsilon^2) \cdot (t_1-t_0) - \frac{c_3\alpha}{n} \cdot \varepsilon^2 \cdot (t_1-t_0)\right) \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} 2cn^{11} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{c_3\alpha}{n} \cdot \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \cdot (t_1-t_0) - \frac{c_3\alpha}{n} \cdot \varepsilon^2 \cdot (t_1-t_0)\right) \\
&= 2cn^{11} \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{c_3\alpha}{n} \cdot \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \cdot (t_1-t_0)\right) \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{=} 2cn^{11} \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{c_3\alpha}{n} \cdot \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \cdot \frac{22}{c_3\varepsilon^2\alpha} \cdot n \log n\right) = 2c,
\end{aligned}$$

using in (a) that $\alpha \leq \frac{c_3\varepsilon^2}{2 \cdot (1-\varepsilon^2) \cdot c_4}$ and (b) that $T := \frac{22}{c_3\varepsilon^2\alpha} \cdot n \log n$. Observe that $\{\Lambda^{t_1} \geq n\}$ holds deterministically, so we deduce from the above inequality that $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{t_0}^{t_1}} = 0$, that is,

$$\Pr\left[-\mathcal{E}_{t_0}^{t_1} \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{t_0}^{t_1+1} \leq \Lambda^{t_0} \cdot n^{10}, \Lambda^{t_0} \in (cn, 2cn], G_{t_0}^{t_1} \geq \varepsilon^2 \cdot (t_1-t_0)\right] = 1.$$

Recalling the definition of $\mathcal{E}_{t_0}^{t_1} = \bigcap_{s \in [t_0, t_1]} \{\Lambda^s \geq cn\}$, and taking the union bound over (7.14) and (7.15) yields

$$\Pr\left[\bigcup_{s \in [t_0, t_0 + c_s n \log n]} \{\Lambda^s \leq cn\} \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \Lambda^{t_0} \in (cn, 2cn]\right] \geq 1 - 2n^{-12} - n^{-10} \geq 1 - n^{-9},$$

as claimed. \square

The next lemma shows that if there is a round with linear (exponential) potential then the gap is at most logarithmic for the next n^4 rounds. This follows by repeatedly applying Lemma 7.5 to any contiguous sub-interval of length $\Theta(n \log n)$ and showing that it contains a round where Λ is linear. The result then follows since a linear potential implies a logarithmic gap, and the load of a bin can change by at most $\Theta(\log n)$ in $\Theta(n \log n)$ rounds.

Lemma 7.6. *Consider any $\mathcal{P}_2 \cap \mathcal{W}_1$ -process or $\mathcal{P}_1 \cap \mathcal{W}_2$ -process, the potential $\Lambda := \Lambda(\alpha)$ for $\alpha > 0$ as defined in (7.2), $c > 0$ as defined in Corollary 6.6 and $c_s > 0$ as defined in Lemma 7.5. Then, for $\kappa := \frac{2}{\alpha} + w_- \cdot c_s$ and for any rounds $t_0 \geq 0$ and $t_0 < t_1 \leq t_0 + n^4$,*

$$\Pr\left[\max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^{t_1}| \leq \kappa \cdot \log n \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \Lambda^{t_0} \leq cn\right] \geq 1 - n^{-5}.$$

Proof. We start by defining the event

$$\mathcal{M}_{t_0}^{t_1} = \{\text{for all } t \in [t_0, t_1] \text{ there exists } s \in [t, t + c_s n \log n] \text{ such that } \Lambda^s \leq cn\},$$

that is, if $\mathcal{M}_{t_0}^{t_1}$ holds then we have $\Lambda^s < cn$ at least once every $c_s n \log n$ rounds.

Assume now that $\mathcal{M}_{t_0}^{t_1}$ holds. Choosing $t = t_1$, there exists $s \in [t_1, t_1 + c_s n \log n]$ such that $\Lambda^s \leq cn$, which in turn implies by definition of Λ that $\max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^s| \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} \cdot \log(cn) < \frac{2}{\alpha} \cdot \log n$. Clearly, any y_i^t can decrease by at most w_-/n in each round, and from this it follows that if $\mathcal{M}_{t_0}^{t_1}$ holds, then $\max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^{t_1}| \leq \max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^s| + w_- \cdot c_s \log n \leq \kappa \cdot \log n$, for $\kappa := \frac{2}{\alpha} + w_- \cdot c_s$.

We now turn to lower bounding the minimum load. If $t_1 \geq t_0 + c_s n \log n$ and $\mathcal{M}_{t_0}^{t_1}$ holds, then choosing $t = t_1 - c_s n \log n$, there exists $s \in [t_1 - c_s n \log n, t_1]$ such that $\Lambda^s \leq cn$. (In case $t_1 - c_s n \log n < t_0$, then we arrive at the same conclusion by taking $s = t_0$ and using the condition $\Lambda^{t_0} \leq cn$.) This in turn implies $\max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^s| < \frac{2}{\alpha} \cdot \log n$. Hence

$$\min_{i \in [n]} y_i^{t_1} \geq \min_{i \in [n]} y_i^s - w_- \cdot c_s \log n \geq -\max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^s| - w_- \cdot c_s \log n \geq -\kappa \cdot \log n.$$

Hence, $\mathcal{M}_{t_0}^{t_1}$ (conditioned on $\Lambda^{t_0} \leq cn$) implies that $\max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^{t_1}| \leq \kappa \cdot \log n$. It remains to bound $\Pr [\neg \mathcal{M}_{t_0}^{t_1} \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \Lambda^{t_0} \leq cn]$.

Note that since we start with $\Lambda^{t_0} \leq cn$, if for some round $j \geq t_0$, $\Lambda^j > 2cn$, there must exist some $s \in [t_0, j]$, such that $\Lambda^s \in (cn, 2cn]$, since for every $t \geq 0$ it holds $\Lambda^{t+1} \leq \Lambda^t \cdot e^{\alpha w_-} \leq 2\Lambda^t$ and $\alpha \leq 1/(2w_-)$. Let $t_0 < \tau_1 < \tau_2 < \dots$ and $t_0 =: s_0 < s_1 < \dots$ be two interlaced sequences defined recursively for $i \geq 1$ by

$$\tau_i := \inf\{\tau > s_{i-1} : \Lambda^\tau \in (cn, 2cn]\} \quad \text{and} \quad s_i := \inf\{s > \tau_i : \Lambda^s \leq cn\}.$$

Thus we have

$$t_0 = s_0 < \tau_1 < s_1 < \tau_2 < s_2 < \dots,$$

and since $\tau_i > \tau_{i-1}$ we have $\tau_{t_1-t_0} \geq t_1 - t_0$. Observe that if the event $\bigcap_{i=1}^{t_1-t_0} \{s_i - \tau_i \leq c_s n \log n\}$ holds, then also $\mathcal{M}_{t_0}^{t_1}$ holds.

Recall that by Lemma 7.5 we have for any $i = 1, 2, \dots, t_1 - t_0$ and any $\tau = t_0 + 1, \dots, t_1$

$$\Pr \left[\bigcup_{t \in [\tau_i, \tau_i + c_s n \log n]} \{\Lambda^t \leq cn\} \mid \mathfrak{F}^\tau, \Lambda^\tau \in (cn, 2cn], \tau_i = \tau \right] \geq 1 - n^{-9},$$

and by negating and the definition of s_i ,

$$\Pr \left[s_i - \tau_i > c_s n \log n \mid \mathfrak{F}^\tau, \Lambda^\tau \in (cn, 2cn], \tau_i = \tau \right] \leq n^{-9}.$$

Since the above bound holds for any i and \mathfrak{F}^τ , with $\tau_i = \tau$, it follows by the union bound over all $i = 1, 2, \dots, t_1 - t_0$, as $t_1 - t_0 \leq n^4$,

$$\Pr [\neg \mathcal{M}_{t_0}^{t_1} \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \Lambda^{t_0} \leq cn] \leq (t_1 - t_0) \cdot n^{-9} \leq n^{-5}. \quad \square$$

7.5 Completing the Proof of Theorem 3.1

We are now ready to combine the recovery and stabilization phases to complete the proof the main theorem.

Theorem 3.1 (Restated, page 10). *Consider any $\mathcal{P}_2 \cap \mathcal{W}_1$ -process or $\mathcal{P}_1 \cap \mathcal{W}_2$ -process. Then, there exists a constant $\kappa > 0$ such that for any round $m \geq 0$,*

$$\Pr \left[\max_{i \in [n]} \left| x_i^m - \frac{W^m}{n} \right| \leq \kappa \log n \right] \geq 1 - n^{-4};$$

so in particular, $\Pr [\text{Gap}(m) \leq \kappa \log n] \geq 1 - n^{-4}$.

Proof. Consider an arbitrary round $m \geq 0$ and the potential $\Lambda := \Lambda(\alpha)$ with smoothing parameter $\alpha > 0$ as defined in (7.2) and let $c \geq 1$ be as defined in Corollary 6.6. If $m < n^3 \log^4 n$, then the claim follows by Lemma 7.6 with $t_0 := 0$ and $t_1 := m$, since $\Lambda^{t_0} = n \leq cn$.

Otherwise, let $t_0 := m - n^3 \log^4 n$. Firstly, by Lemma 7.4, we get

$$\Pr \left[\bigcup_{s \in [t_0, m]} \{\Lambda^s \leq cn\} \right] \geq 1 - n^{-5}.$$

Hence for the stopping time $\sigma := \inf\{s \geq t_0 : \Lambda^s \leq cn\}$ we have $\Pr [\sigma \leq m] \geq 1 - n^{-5}$.

Secondly, by Lemma 7.6, there exists a constant $\kappa := \kappa(\alpha)$ such that for any round $s \in [t_0, m]$

$$\Pr \left[\max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^m| \leq \kappa \cdot \log n \mid \mathfrak{F}^s, \Lambda^s \leq cn \right] \geq 1 - n^{-5}.$$

Combining the two inequalities from above,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr \left[\max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^m| \leq \kappa \log n \right] &\geq \sum_{s=t_0}^m \Pr \left[\max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^m| \leq \kappa \log n \mid \sigma = s \right] \cdot \Pr [\sigma = s] \\
&\geq \sum_{s=t_0}^m \Pr \left[\max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^m| \leq \kappa \log n \mid \mathfrak{F}^s, \Lambda^s \leq cn \right] \cdot \Pr [\sigma = s] \\
&\geq (1 - n^{-5}) \cdot \Pr [\sigma \leq m] \\
&\geq (1 - n^{-5}) \cdot (1 - n^{-5}) \geq 1 - n^{-4}. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

8 Lower Bounds

In this section, we shall prove lower bounds for MEAN-BIASED processes satisfying condition \mathcal{P}_3 . We now recall the definition of condition \mathcal{P}_3 :

- **Condition \mathcal{P}_3 :** for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a $k_5 := k_5(\varepsilon) \in (0, 1]$ such that for each round $t \geq 0$ with $\delta^t \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$, the probability allocation vector p^t satisfies,

$$\min_{i \in [n]} p_i^t \geq \frac{k_5}{n}.$$

This condition is satisfied for many natural processes, including TWINNING, MEAN-THINNING, and the $(1 + \beta)$ -process with constant $\beta \in (0, 1)$. See Table 1.2 for a concise overview of old and new lower bounds. One interesting aspect is that our lower bound for MEAN-BIASED processes makes use of the quantile stabilization result from the previous section (Lemma 7.3).

Essentially this condition \mathcal{P}_3 implies that in any round t where the mean quantile δ^t is in $[\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$, there is at least an $\Omega(1/n)$ -probability of allocating to each bin.

We shall now observe that

- The MEAN-THINNING process has $p_i^t \geq \frac{\delta^t}{n}$, satisfying \mathcal{P}_3 with $k_5 := \varepsilon$.
- The TWINNING process has $p_i^t = \frac{1}{n}$, satisfying \mathcal{P}_3 with $k_5 := 1$.
- The $(1 + \beta)$ -process has $p_i^t = (1 - \beta) \cdot \frac{1}{n} + \beta \cdot \frac{2i-1}{n^2} > \frac{1-\beta}{n}$, satisfying \mathcal{P}_3 with $k_5 := 1 - \beta$.

Recall that $G_0^m := G_0^m(\varepsilon)$ is the number of rounds $t \in [0, m]$ with $\delta^t \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$. The next lemma shows that w.h.p. a constant fraction of the first $m = \text{poly}(n)$ rounds are good.

Lemma 8.1. *Consider any $\mathcal{P}_2 \cap \mathcal{W}_1$ -process or $\mathcal{P}_1 \cap \mathcal{W}_2$ -process. Let $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ be given by (7.1), and $m \in [c_s n \log n, n^3 \log^4 n]$ for $c_s := c_s(\varepsilon) > 0$ as defined in Lemma 7.5. Then,*

$$\Pr [G_0^m(\varepsilon) > \varepsilon^2 \cdot m] \geq 1 - n^{-1/2}.$$

Proof. The proof is analogous to the first steps in the proof of the stabilization lemma (Lemma 7.5). At round 0, we have that

$$\Lambda^0 = n, \quad \text{and} \quad \Upsilon^0 = 0.$$

Let $t_0 := 0$, $t_1 := m$, $T := m$, and $\tau := \inf\{t \geq 0 : \max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^t| > \sqrt{T} \cdot \log^{-2} n\}$. Then,

$$\Pr [\{G_0^m > \varepsilon^2 \cdot m\} \cup \{\tau \leq m\}] \geq 1 - T \cdot e^{-\varepsilon n} - n^{-\omega(1)} \geq 1 - n^{-12}, \quad (8.1)$$

by Lemma 7.3. By Theorem 3.1 and the union bound we have

$$\Pr [\tau > m] \geq \Pr \left[\max_{t \in [0, m]} \max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^t| \leq \log^2 n \right] \geq 1 - n^{-4} \cdot m \geq 1 - n^{-4/5}. \quad (8.2)$$

Hence, taking the union bound over (8.1) and (8.2), we get that

$$\Pr [G_0^m > \varepsilon^2 \cdot m] \geq 1 - n^{-12} - n^{-4/5} \geq 1 - n^{-1/2}. \quad \square$$

We will use the following lower bound on the ONE-CHOICE process (see also [41, Section 4]).

Lemma 8.2 ([32, Lemma A.2]). *Consider the ONE-CHOICE process for $m = \lambda n \log n$ balls where $\lambda \geq 1/\log n$. Then,*

$$\Pr \left[\max_{i \in [n]} x_i^m \geq \left(\lambda + \frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{10} \right) \cdot \log n \right] \geq 1 - n^{-2}.$$

We are now ready to restate and prove the main result of this section.

Theorem 3.2 (Restated, page 10). *Consider any $\mathcal{P}_2 \cap \mathcal{W}_1$ -process or $\mathcal{P}_1 \cap \mathcal{W}_2$ -process, which also satisfies condition \mathcal{P}_3 . Then there exists a constant $\kappa > 0$ such that*

$$\Pr [\text{Gap}(\kappa n \log n) \geq \kappa \log n] \geq 1 - n^{-1/2}.$$

Proof. We start by defining the constant $k_5 := k_5(\varepsilon) \in (0, 1]$ for $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ given by (7.1). Further, set $\kappa := \frac{k_5 \varepsilon^2}{800 w_-^2} > 0$, and let $m := \kappa n \log n$. Define the event $\mathcal{E}_1 := \{ \{t \in [0, m] : \delta^t \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]\} \geq \varepsilon^2 m \}$ and note that $\Pr [\neg \mathcal{E}_1] < n^{-2/3}$ by Lemma 8.1.

We will now define a coupling between the allocations of the process and a ONE-CHOICE process for each round $t \in [0, m]$:

If $\delta^t \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$: Sample an independent Bernoulli random variable $X^t \sim \text{Ber}(k_5)$.

- If $X^t = 1$, then we allocate the ball to a bin sampled uniformly at random.
- Otherwise, allocate to the i -th heaviest bin with probability $\frac{p_i^t - \frac{k_5}{n}}{1 - k_5}$.

If $\delta^t \notin [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$: allocate to bin $i \in [n]$ with probability p_i^t .

Observe that this has the correct marginal distribution, since for any step t with $\delta^t \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$,

$$k_4 \cdot \frac{1}{n} + (1 - k_4) \cdot \frac{p_i^t - \frac{k_4}{n}}{1 - k_4} = p_i^t.$$

Let $(Y^i)_{i \geq 0}$, where $Y^i \sim \text{Ber}(k_5)$, be a sequence of i.i.d. Bernoulli random variables used in the coupling. That is, we pre-sample $(Y^i)_{i \geq 0}$ and then at round t of the coupling if we have $\delta^t \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$ for the i -th time then we take $X^t = Y^i$. Define the event $\mathcal{E}_2 := \{ \sum_{i=1}^{\varepsilon^2 m} Y^i > k_5 \varepsilon^2 m / 2 \}$. Then conditional on $\mathcal{E}_1 \cap \mathcal{E}_2$, at least $(k_5 \varepsilon^2 \kappa / 2) \cdot n \log n$ balls are allocated according to the ONE-CHOICE process during the m steps of the coupling. By a Chernoff bound,

$$\Pr [\neg \mathcal{E}_2] = \Pr \left[\text{Bin}(\varepsilon^2 m, k_5) \leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot k_5 \varepsilon^2 m \right] \leq \exp \left(-\frac{k_5 \varepsilon^2 m}{8} \right) < n^{-2}.$$

We then sample a ONE-CHOICE process, with load vector denoted by \tilde{x}^t , on $h := \lambda n \log n$ rounds where $\lambda := \frac{k_5 \varepsilon^2 \kappa}{2}$, independently from all other random bits used in the coupling. Define the event $\mathcal{E}_3 = \{ \max_{i \in [n]} \tilde{x}_i^h \geq \left(c + \frac{\sqrt{c}}{10} \right) \cdot \log n \}$ and observe that $\Pr [\neg \mathcal{E}_3] < n^{-2}$ by Lemma 8.2.

Now, as $\kappa := k_5 \varepsilon^2 / (800 w_-^2)$, and each ball has weight in $[1, w_-]$, conditional on $\mathcal{E}_1 \cap \mathcal{E}_2 \cap \mathcal{E}_3$,

$$\frac{\text{Gap}(m)}{\log n} \geq \frac{k_5 \varepsilon^2 \kappa}{2} + \frac{1}{10} \sqrt{\frac{k_5 \varepsilon^2 \kappa}{2}} - w_- \kappa \geq \frac{1}{10} \sqrt{\frac{k_5^2 \varepsilon^4}{1600 w_-^2}} - w_- \kappa = w_- \kappa \geq \kappa.$$

The result then follows since $\Pr [\neg \mathcal{E}_1 \cup \neg \mathcal{E}_2 \cup \neg \mathcal{E}_3] \leq n^{-2/3} + n^{-2} + n^{-2} < n^{-1/2}$. \square

Hence, we can deduce from the lemma above by recalling that MEAN-THINNING, TWINNING and the $(1 + \beta)$ -process all satisfy \mathcal{P}_3 and the conditions \mathcal{P}_1 and \mathcal{W}_2 , or, \mathcal{W}_1 and \mathcal{P}_2 :

Corollary 8.3. *Consider any of the MEAN-THINNING, TWINNING or the $(1 + \beta)$ -process with any constant $\beta \in (0, 1)$. Then, there exists a constant $\kappa > 0$ (different for each process) such that*

$$\Pr[\text{Gap}(\kappa n \log n) \geq \kappa \log n] \geq 1 - n^{-1}.$$

Finally, we prove a tight lower bound for any RELATIVE-THRESHOLD($f(n)$) process with $f(n) \geq \log n$.

Lemma 8.4 (Restated, page 15). *Consider any RELATIVE-THRESHOLD($f(n)$) process with $f(n) \geq \log n$. Then, for $m := \frac{1}{24} \cdot \frac{n \cdot (f(n))^2}{\log n}$,*

$$\Pr\left[\text{Gap}(m) \geq \frac{f(n)}{50}\right] \geq 1 - n^{-1/4}.$$

Proof. Note that in any round $t \geq 0$ where $\max_{i \in [n]} y_i^t < f(n)$, the RELATIVE-THRESHOLD($f(n)$) process will always accept the first sample, and hence the allocation of this process can be coupled with the allocation of ONE-CHOICE.

In the following, fix an arbitrary bin $i \in [n]$. Let $(Y^t)_{1 \leq t \leq m}$ be independent $\text{Ber}(1/n)$ random variables, and for any $1 \leq t \leq m$, define $Z^t := \sum_{s=1}^t (Y^s - \frac{1}{n})$. Then $\mathbf{E}[Z^t] = 0$, and

$$\text{Var}[Z^{t+1} \mid Z^t] = \frac{1}{n} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right) \leq \frac{1}{n} =: \sigma^2.$$

Also $|Z^{t+1} - Z^t| \leq 1 =: M$ holds deterministically. Further, define $\tau := \min\{t \in \mathbb{N} : y_i^t \geq f(n)\}$. Further, since $Z^{t \wedge \tau}$ is a martingale, it follows by Lemma A.5 with $\lambda := f(n)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[|Z^{m \wedge \tau}| \geq f(n)] &\leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{f(n)^2}{2(m \cdot \frac{1}{n} + f(n)/3)}\right) \\ &= 2 \exp\left(-\frac{f(n)}{2 \cdot (f(n)/(24 \log(n)) + 1/3)}\right) \\ &\leq 2n^{-4/3}, \end{aligned}$$

using that $m := \frac{1}{24} \cdot \frac{n \cdot (f(n))^2}{\log n}$ and $f(n) \geq \log n$. If the event $|Z^{m \wedge \tau}| < f(n)$ holds, then this implies that $\max_{1 \leq t \leq m} Z^t < f(n)$, and thanks to the coupling, $\max_{1 \leq t \leq m} y_i^t < f(n)$. Taking the union bound over all n bins $i \in [n]$,

$$\Pr\left[\max_{i \in [n]} \max_{1 \leq t \leq m} y_i^t < f(n)\right] \geq 1 - 2n^{-1/3}.$$

Conditional on this, the allocations of RELATIVE-THRESHOLD($f(n)$) and ONE-CHOICE can be coupled until round m . Now, for ONE-CHOICE, Lemma 8.2 with $\lambda := (1/24) \cdot f(n)^2 / (\log n)^2$ implies,

$$\Pr\left[\max_{i \in [n]} y_i^m \geq \frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{10} \cdot \log n\right] \geq \Pr\left[\max_{i \in [n]} y_i^m \geq \frac{f(n)}{50}\right] \geq 1 - n^{-2}.$$

Hence by the union bound, with probability at least $1 - 2n^{-1/3} - n^{-2} \geq 1 - n^{-1/4}$ the gap of RELATIVE-THRESHOLD($f(n)$) at round m is at least $f(n)/50$. \square

9 Sample Efficiency

Recall that the *sample efficiency* $\eta^m = W^m / S^m$ of a process, as the ratio of the weight W^m of the balls allocated to the number of bin samples S^m taken in the first m rounds. The ONE-CHOICE process has $\eta^m = 1$ and the TWO-CHOICE process has $\eta^m = \frac{1}{2}$.

We begin by showing that MEAN-THINNING is more sample-efficient than TWO-CHOICE.

Lemma 3.7 (Restated, page 13). *There exists a constant $\rho > 0$, such that for any $m \geq \rho^{-1} \cdot n \log n$, the MEAN-THINNING process satisfies*

$$\mathbf{E}[\eta^m] \geq \frac{1}{2} + \rho \quad \text{and} \quad \Pr \left[\eta^m \geq \frac{1}{2} + \rho \right] \geq 1 - n^{-1/4}.$$

Proof. Consider any $m \geq c_s n \log n$ and any interval $[t_0, t_1]$ with $t_1 := t_0 + n^3 \log^4 n$. By (7.10) in the recovery lemma (Lemma 7.4), there exists a constant $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ such that,

$$\Pr \left[G_{t_0}^{t_1} > \varepsilon^2 \cdot (t_1 - t_0) \mid \mathfrak{F}^{t_0}, \max_{i \in [n]} |y_i^{t_0}| \leq c_5 n \log n \right] \geq 1 - 2n^{-12}.$$

Hence, using Lemma 6.8,

$$\Pr \left[G_{t_0}^{t_1} > \varepsilon^2 \cdot (t_1 - t_0) \right] \geq (1 - 2n^{-12}) \cdot (1 - n^{-12}) \geq 1 - 3n^{-12}.$$

Let $S_{t_0}^{t_1}$ be the number of samples in the interval $(t_0, t_1]$. Note that MEAN-THINNING takes only one sample in round t if the first sample is an underloaded bin, i.e., with probability $1 - \delta^t$, and when $\delta^t \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$, it follows that this probability is at least $\geq \varepsilon$.

Consider the following coupling between the MEAN-THINNING process and the random variables $Z_1, \dots, Z_N \sim \text{Ber}(\varepsilon)$ for $N := \varepsilon^2 \cdot (t_1 - t_0)$. For any $t \in [t_0, t_1)$, having initially $j^{t_0} = 1$:

If $\delta^t \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$ and $j^t \leq N$:

- If $Z^{j^t} = 1$, then allocate to an underloaded bin $i \in B_-^t$ with probability $\frac{1}{n \cdot (1 - \delta^t)}$, and set $j^{t+1} := j^t + 1$.
- Otherwise: Allocate to bin $i \in [n]$ with probability

$$\begin{cases} \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \cdot \frac{\delta^t}{n} & \text{if } i \in B_+^t, \\ \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \cdot \left(\frac{1+\delta^t}{n} - \frac{\varepsilon}{n \cdot (1-\delta^t)} \right) & \text{if } i \in B_-^t, \end{cases}$$

and set $j^{t+1} := j^t$.

Otherwise: Allocate to bin $i \in [n]$ with probability p_i^t .

The marginal distribution of this coupling is correct, since any bin $i \in B_+^t$ is allocated to with probability $(1 - \varepsilon) \cdot \frac{1}{1 - \varepsilon} \cdot \frac{\delta^t}{n} = \frac{\delta^t}{n}$, whereas any bin $i \in B_-^t$ is allocated to with probability

$$\varepsilon \cdot \frac{1}{n \cdot (1 - \delta^t)} + (1 - \varepsilon) \cdot \frac{1}{1 - \varepsilon} \cdot \left(\frac{1 + \delta^t}{n} - \frac{\varepsilon}{n \cdot (1 - \delta^t)} \right) = \frac{1 + \delta^t}{n}.$$

Next observe that, under the above coupling, $Z^t = 1$ implies that the first sample of MEAN-THINNING is an underloaded bin, and thus only one sample is used. This implies,

$$S_{t_0}^{t_1} \leq \sum_{t=1}^{j^{t_1}-1} Z^t + 2 \cdot \left(t_1 - t_0 - \sum_{t=1}^{j^{t_1}-1} Z^t \right).$$

By a Chernoff bound, and since $N = \Omega(n \log n)$, we have that

$$\Pr \left[\sum_{t=1}^N Z^t \geq \frac{1}{2} N \cdot \varepsilon \right] \geq 1 - n^{-12}.$$

By taking the union bound we have that,

$$\Pr \left[\left\{ G_{t_0}^{t_1} > \varepsilon^2 \cdot (t_1 - t_0) \right\} \cap \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^N Z^t \geq \frac{1}{2} N \cdot \varepsilon \right\} \right] \geq 1 - 4n^{-12}.$$

Note that $\{G_{t_0}^{t_1} > \varepsilon^2 \cdot (t_1 - t_0)\}$ implies that $\{j^{t_1} = N + 1\}$. Therefore, with probability at least $1 - 4n^{-12}$ we have that

$$S_{t_0}^{t_1} \leq 1 \cdot \left(\sum_{t=1}^N Z^t \right) + 2 \cdot \left(t_1 - t_0 - \sum_{t=1}^N Z^t \right) \leq (t_1 - t_0) \cdot \left(2 - \frac{\varepsilon^3}{2} \right).$$

For the first $t_0 := \text{rem}(m, n^3 \log^4 n)$ rounds, we consider two cases. If $t_0 \leq c_s n \log n$, then set $\xi := 1$ and we shall use the trivial estimate $S_0^{t_0} \leq 2t_0$. Otherwise, for $t_0 \in [c_s n \log n, n^3 \log^4 n]$, set $\xi := 0$ and by Lemma 8.1, we obtain,

$$\Pr [G_0^{t_0} > \varepsilon^2 \cdot t_0] \geq 1 - n^{-1/2},$$

and so using the coupling above

$$\Pr \left[S_0^{t_0} \leq t_0 \cdot \left(2 - \frac{\varepsilon^3}{2} \right) \right] \geq 1 - 2n^{-1/2}.$$

Let $k := \lfloor \frac{m}{n^3 \log^4 n} \rfloor$ and define

$$L^0 := \mathbf{1}_{S_0^{t_0} > t_0 \cdot \left(2 - \frac{\varepsilon^3}{2} \right)}, \quad \text{and} \quad L^j := \mathbf{1}_{S_{t_0 + j \cdot n^3 \log^4 n}^{t_0 + (j+1) \cdot n^3 \log^4 n} > n^3 \log^4 n \cdot \left(2 - \frac{\varepsilon^3}{2} \right)},$$

where $0 < j < k$. Then for $L := \sum_{j=\xi}^{k-1} L^j$, we have that $\mathbf{E}[L] \leq 2n^{-1/2} \cdot k$, and hence by Markov's inequality,

$$\Pr [L \leq 2n^{-1/4} \cdot k] \geq 1 - n^{-1/4}.$$

When $\{L \leq 2n^{-1/4} \cdot k\}$ holds, we have that

$$S^m = S_0^m \leq 2 \cdot (2n^{-1/4} + \xi \cdot n^{-2}) \cdot m + \left(2 - \frac{\varepsilon^3}{2} \right) \cdot (1 - 2n^{-1/4} - \xi \cdot n^{-2}) \cdot m \leq \left(2 - \frac{\varepsilon^3}{4} \right) \cdot m,$$

using that $t_0/m \leq n^{-2}$ when $\xi := 1$. Further, we obtain

$$\eta^m = \frac{W^m}{S^m} \geq \frac{m}{\left(2 - \frac{\varepsilon^3}{4} \right) \cdot m} \geq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon^3}{8},$$

using that $\frac{1}{1-z} \geq 1+z$ for any $z \in (0, 1)$. Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[\eta^m] &\geq \mathbf{E} \left[\eta^m \mid S_0^m \leq \left(2 - \frac{\varepsilon^3}{4} \right) \cdot m \right] \cdot \Pr \left[S_0^m \leq \left(2 - \frac{\varepsilon^3}{4} \right) \cdot m \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \cdot \Pr \left[S_0^m > \left(2 - \frac{\varepsilon^3}{4} \right) \cdot m \right] \geq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon^3}{16}. \end{aligned}$$

The statement follows by choosing $\rho := \min \left\{ \frac{\varepsilon^3}{16}, \frac{1}{c_s} \right\}$. \square

Next, we show that TWINNING is more sample-efficient than ONE-CHOICE.

Lemma 3.4 (Restated, page 12). *There exists a constant $\rho > 0$, such that for any $m \geq \rho^{-1} \cdot n \log n$, the TWINNING process satisfies*

$$\mathbf{E}[\eta^m] \geq 1 + \rho \quad \text{and} \quad \Pr[\eta^m \geq 1 + \rho] \geq 1 - n^{-1/4}.$$

Proof. The proof proceeds similarly to the proof of Lemma 3.7, but here we lower bound W^m instead of upper bounding S^m . In round t , TWINNING allocates two balls with probability $1 - \delta^t$, which is $\geq \varepsilon$ when $\delta^t \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$.

Similarly to Lemma 3.7, we define the following coupling between TWINNING and random variables $Z_1, \dots, Z_N \sim \text{Ber}(\varepsilon)$ for $N := \varepsilon^2 \cdot (t_1 - t_0)$. For any $t \in [t_0, t_1)$, having initially $j^{t_0} = 1$:

If $\delta^t \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$ and $j^t \leq N$:

- If $Z^t = 1$, then allocate to an underloaded bin $i \in B_-^t$ with probability $\frac{1}{n \cdot (1 - \delta^t)}$, and set $j^{t+1} := j^t + 1$.
- Otherwise: Allocate to bin $i \in [n]$ with probability

$$\begin{cases} \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \cdot \frac{1}{n} & \text{if } i \in B_+^t, \\ \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{n} - \frac{\varepsilon}{n \cdot (1-\delta^t)} \right) & \text{if } i \in B_-^t, \end{cases}$$

and set $j^{t+1} := j^t$.

Otherwise: Allocate to bin $i \in [n]$ with probability $\frac{1}{n}$.

The marginal distribution of this coupling is correct, since any bin $i \in B_+^t$ is allocated to with probability $(1 - \varepsilon) \cdot \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \cdot \frac{1}{n} = \frac{1}{n}$, whereas any bin $i \in B_-^t$ is allocated to with probability

$$\varepsilon \cdot \frac{1}{n} + (1 - \varepsilon) \cdot \frac{1}{1 - \varepsilon} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{n} - \frac{\varepsilon}{n} \right) = \frac{1}{n}.$$

Next observe that, under the above coupling, $Z^t = 1$ implies that the first sample of MEAN-THINNING is an underloaded bin, and thus only one sample is used. This implies,

$$W_{t_0}^{t_1} \geq 2 \cdot \sum_{t=1}^{j^{t_1}-1} Z^t + 1 \cdot \left(t_1 - t_0 - \sum_{t=1}^{j^{t_1}-1} Z^t \right).$$

Proceeding as in Lemma 3.7 (with the main difference being that we do not need to apply the inequality $\frac{1}{1-z} \geq 1+z$), we obtain

$$\Pr \left[\eta^m \geq 1 + \frac{\varepsilon^3}{4} \right] \geq 1 - n^{-1/4},$$

and thus also $\mathbf{E}[\eta^m] \geq 1 + \varepsilon^3/8$. □

10 Experimental Results

In this section, we present some experimental results for the MEAN-THINNING and TWINNING processes (Table 10.2 and Fig. 10.1) and compare their gap with that of a $(1 + \beta)$ -process with $\beta = 1/2$, a QUANTILE(1/2) process, and that of the TWO-CHOICE process.




Figure 10.1: Average Gap vs. number of bins $n \in \{10^3, 10^4, 5 \cdot 10^4, 10^5\}$ for the experimental setup of Table 10.2.

n	$(1 + \beta)$ -process with $\beta = 1/2$	TWINNING	MEAN-THINNING	QUANTILE(1/2)	TWO-CHOICE
10^3	12 : 5% 13 : 15% 14 : 31% 15 : 21% 16 : 15% 17 : 5% 18 : 4% 19 : 2% 20 : 1% 21 : 1%	8 : 3% 9 : 21% 10 : 25% 11 : 18% 12 : 13% 13 : 8% 14 : 9% 17 : 3%	4 : 2% 5 : 38% 6 : 35% 7 : 15% 8 : 8% 9 : 1% 12 : 1%	3 : 1% 4 : 11% 5 : 46% 6 : 33% 7 : 6% 8 : 2% 10 : 1%	2 : 93% 3 : 7%
10^4	16 : 3% 17 : 21% 18 : 19% 19 : 10% 20 : 23% 21 : 11% 22 : 10% 23 : 2% 24 : 1%	11 : 1% 12 : 9% 13 : 24% 14 : 22% 15 : 13% 16 : 9% 17 : 8% 18 : 5% 19 : 6% 20 : 1% 21 : 1% 26 : 1%	6 : 2% 7 : 30% 8 : 38% 9 : 19% 10 : 9% 11 : 1% 14 : 1%	6 : 14% 7 : 42% 8 : 25% 9 : 15% 10 : 2% 11 : 1% 12 : 1%	2 : 46% 3 : 54%
10^5	20 : 2% 21 : 7% 22 : 9% 23 : 26% 24 : 27% 25 : 14% 26 : 6% 27 : 3% 28 : 4% 29 : 1% 34 : 1%	14 : 2% 15 : 5% 16 : 25% 17 : 28% 18 : 17% 19 : 10% 20 : 8% 21 : 1% 22 : 1% 23 : 3%	8 : 3% 9 : 32% 10 : 38% 11 : 15% 12 : 6% 13 : 3% 14 : 3%	8 : 28% 9 : 42% 10 : 18% 11 : 7% 12 : 3% 14 : 1% 15 : 1%	3 : 100%

Table 10.2: Empirical gap distribution for $n \in \{10^3, 10^4, 10^5\}$ bins and $m = 1000 \cdot n$ balls, for 100 repetitions. The observed gap values are in bold and next to that is the % of runs where a particular gap value was observed.

11 Conclusions

In this work we introduced a framework for analyzing MEAN-BIASED processes in the heavily loaded case. These include processes that bias allocations (of single balls) towards underloaded bins as opposed to overloaded bins, the prototypical process being MEAN-THINNING. These also include processes that weight-bias allocations to underloaded bins as opposed to overloaded, the prototypical process being TWINNING. Our analysis which uses a complex interplay between three different types of potential functions implies an $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ upper bound on the gap for any process in the framework. For MEAN-THINNING and TWINNING we proved a matching lower bound on the gap and show that the processes are more sample-efficient than TWO-CHOICE and ONE-CHOICE respectively. By a coupling argument, we also obtain tight bounds for RELATIVE-THRESHOLD($f(n)$) processes with any $f(n) \geq \log n$.

There are several directions for future work. One avenue is to derive sub-logarithmic gap bounds. More specifically, one could investigate k -RELATIVE-THRESHOLD processes either with $k \geq 2$, or with $k = 1$ and $f(n) \in (0, \log n)$; we conjecture that for a suitable choice of $f(n)$ (being poly-logarithmic in n), a gap bound of $\mathcal{O}(\frac{\log n}{\log \log n})$ holds. A second direction is to extend the MEAN-BIASED framework to noisy settings, where load information is outdated [29], or dynamic settings, where in addition balls could also be removed [9, 15].

Acknowledgments

We thank David Croydon and Martin Krejca for some helpful discussions.

Bibliography

- [1] Dan Alistarh, James Aspnes, and Rati Gelashvili. Space-Optimal Majority in Population Protocols. In *29th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA'18)*. SIAM, 2221–2239. doi
- [2] Dan Alistarh, Trevor Brown, Justin Kopinsky, Jerry Zheng Li, and Giorgi Nadiradze. Distributionally Linearizable Data Structures. In *30th Annual ACM Symposium on Parallel Algorithms and Architectures (SPAA'18)*. ACM, 133–142. doi
- [3] Dan Alistarh, Rati Gelashvili, and Joel Rybicki. Fast Graphical Population Protocols. In *25th International Conference on Principles of Distributed Systems (OPODIS'21)*, Vol. 217. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 14:1–14:18. doi
- [4] Dan Alistarh, Justin Kopinsky, Jerry Li, and Giorgi Nadiradze. The Power of Choice in Priority Scheduling. In *36th Annual ACM-SIGOPT Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC'17)*. ACM, 283–292. doi
- [5] Dan Alistarh, Giorgi Nadiradze, and Amirmojtaba Sabour. Dynamic Averaging Load Balancing on Cycles. *Algorithmica* 84, 4 (2022), 1007–1029. doi
- [6] Yossi Azar, Andrei Z. Broder, Anna R. Karlin, Michael Mitzenmacher, and Eli Upfal. 2020. The ACM Paris Kanellakis Theory and Practice Award. <https://www.acm.org/media-center/2021/may/technical-awards-2020>.
- [7] Yossi Azar, Andrei Z. Broder, Anna R. Karlin, and Eli Upfal. Balanced allocations. *SIAM J. Comput.* 29, 1 (1999), 180–200. doi
- [8] Nikhil Bansal and Ohad N. Feldheim. The power of two choices in graphical allocation. In *54th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC'22)*. ACM, 52–63. doi
- [9] Nikhil Bansal and William Kuzmaul. Balanced Allocations: The Heavily Loaded Case with Deletions. In *63rd Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS'22)*. IEEE, 801–812. doi
- [10] Petra Berenbrink, Artur Czumaj, Angelika Steger, and Berthold Vöcking. Balanced allocations: the heavily loaded case. *SIAM J. Comput.* 35, 6 (2006), 1350–1385. doi
- [11] Petra Berenbrink, Tom Friedetzky, Zengjian Hu, and Russell Martin. On weighted balls-into-bins games. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.* 409, 3 (2008), 511–520. doi
- [12] Petra Berenbrink, Kamyar Khodamoradi, Thomas Sauerwald, and Alexandre Stauffer. Balls-into-bins with nearly optimal load distribution. In *25th Annual ACM Symposium on Parallel Algorithms and Architectures (SPAA'13)*. ACM, 326–335. doi
- [13] L. Elisa Celis, Omer Reingold, Gil Segev, and Udi Wieder. Balls and Bins: Smaller Hash Families and Faster Evaluation. In *52nd Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS'11)*. IEEE, 599–608.
- [14] Fan Chung and Linyuan Lu. Concentration inequalities and martingale inequalities: a survey. *Internet Math.* 3, 1 (2006), 79–127. <http://projecteuclid.org/euclid.im/1175266369>
- [15] Richard Cole, Alan Frieze, Bruce M. Maggs, Michael Mitzenmacher, Andréa W. Richa, Ramesh Sitaraman, and Eli Upfal. On balls and bins with deletions. In *2nd International Workshop on Randomization and Computation (RANDOM'98)*, Vol. 1518. Springer, Berlin, 145–158. doi
- [16] Artur Czumaj and Volker Stemann. Randomized allocation processes. *Random Structures & Algorithms* 18, 4 (2001), 297–331. doi
- [17] Devdatt P. Dubhashi and Alessandro Panconesi. 2009. *Concentration of Measure for the Analysis of Randomized Algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

- [18] Raaz Dwivedi, Ohad N. Feldheim, Ori Gurel-Gurevich, and Aaditya Ramdas. The power of online thinning in reducing discrepancy. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 174, 1-2 (2019), 103–131. doi
- [19] Derek L. Eager, Edward D. Lazowska, and John Zahorjan. Adaptive load sharing in homogeneous distributed systems. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* SE-12, 5 (1986), 662–675. doi
- [20] Ohad N. Feldheim and Ori Gurel-Gurevich. The power of thinning in balanced allocation. *Electron. Commun. Probab.* 26 (2021), Paper No. 34, 8. doi
- [21] Ohad N. Feldheim, Ori Gurel-Gurevich, and Jiange Li. Long-term balanced allocation via thinning. *The Annals of Applied Probability (to appear)*, arXiv:2110.05009.
- [22] Ohad N. Feldheim and Jiange Li. Load balancing under d -thinning. *Electron. Commun. Probab.* 25 (2020), Paper No. 1, 13. doi
- [23] Tobias Friedrich, Martin Gairing, and Thomas Sauerwald. Quasirandom Load Balancing. *SIAM J. Comput.* 41, 4 (2012), 747–771. doi
- [24] Richard J. Gibbens, Frank P. Kelly, and Peter B. Key. Dynamic alternative routing – modelling and behavior. In *12th International Teletraffic Congress (ITC’88)*. Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1019–1025.
- [25] P. Brighten Godfrey. Balls and bins with structure: balanced allocations on hypergraphs. In *19th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA’08)*. ACM, 511–517.
- [26] Anupam Gupta, Ravishankar Krishnaswamy, Amit Kumar, and Sahil Singla. Online Carpooling Using Expander Decompositions. In *40th IARCS Annual Conference on Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science (FSTTCS’20)*, Vol. 182. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 23:1–23:14. doi
- [27] Kazuo Iwama and Akinori Kawachi. Approximated Two Choices in Randomized Load Balancing. In *Algorithms and Computation*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 545–557.
- [28] Richard M. Karp, Michael Luby, and Friedhelm Meyer auf der Heide. Efficient PRAM simulation on a distributed memory machine. *Algorithmica* 16, 4-5 (1996), 517–542. doi
- [29] Dimitrios Los and Thomas Sauerwald. Balanced Allocations with Incomplete Information: The Power of Two Queries. In *13th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference (ITCS’22)*, Vol. 215. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 103:1–103:23. doi
- [30] Dimitrios Los and Thomas Sauerwald. Balanced Allocations in Batches: The Tower of Two Choices. In *35th Annual ACM Symposium on Parallel Algorithms and Architectures (SPAA’23)*. ACM, 51–61. doi
- [31] Dimitrios Los and Thomas Sauerwald. Balanced Allocations with the Choice of Noise. *J. ACM* 70, 6, Article 37 (nov 2023), 84 pages. doi
- [32] Dimitrios Los and Thomas Sauerwald. Tight Bounds for Repeated Balls-Into-Bins. In *40th International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science (STACS’23)*, Vol. 254. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 45:1–45:22. doi
- [33] Dimitrios Los, Thomas Sauerwald, and John Sylvester. Balanced Allocations: Caching and Packing, Twinning and Thinning. In *33rd Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA’22)*. SIAM, 1847–1874. doi
- [34] Dimitrios Los, Thomas Sauerwald, and John Sylvester. *to appear*. The Power of Filling in Balanced Allocations. , arXiv:2110.05009 pages.
- [35] Yi Lu, Qiaomin Xie, Gabriel Kliot, Alan Geller, James R. Larus, and Albert G. Greenberg. Join-Idle-Queue: A novel load balancing algorithm for dynamically scalable web services. *Perform. Evaluation* 68, 11 (2011), 1056–1071. doi
- [36] Michael Mitzenmacher. On the Analysis of Randomized Load Balancing Schemes. *Theory Comput. Syst.* 32, 3 (1999), 361–386. doi

- [37] Michael Mitzenmacher, Balaji Prabhakar, and Devavrat Shah. Load Balancing with Memory. In *43rd Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS'02)*. IEEE, 799–808. doi
- [38] Michael Mitzenmacher, Andréa W. Richa, and Ramesh Sitaraman. 2001. The power of two random choices: a survey of techniques and results. In *Handbook of randomized computing, Vol. I, II*. Comb. Optim., Vol. 9. Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 255–312. doi
- [39] Kay Ousterhout, Patrick Wendell, Matei Zaharia, and Ion Stoica. Sparrow: distributed, low latency scheduling. In *ACM SIGOPS 24th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles, SOSP '13, Farmington, PA, USA, November 3-6, 2013*. ACM, 69–84. doi
- [40] Gahyun Park. A generalization of multiple choice balls-into-bins: tight bounds. *Algorithmica* 77, 4 (2017), 1159–1193. doi
- [41] Yuval Peres, Kunal Talwar, and Udi Wieder. Graphical balanced allocations and the $(1 + \beta)$ -choice process. *Random Structures & Algorithms* 47, 4 (2015), 760–775. doi
- [42] Kunal Talwar and Udi Wieder. Balanced allocations: the weighted case. In *39th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC'07)*. ACM, 256–265. doi
- [43] Berthold Vöcking. How Asymmetry Helps Load Balancing. In *40th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS'99)*. IEEE, 131–141. doi
- [44] Udi Wieder. Balanced allocations with heterogenous bins. In *19th Annual ACM Symposium on Parallel Algorithms and Architectures (SPAA'07)*. ACM, 188–193. doi
- [45] Udi Wieder. Hashing, Load Balancing and Multiple Choice. *Found. Trends Theor. Comput. Sci.* 12, 3-4 (2017), 275–379. doi
- [46] Bartek Wydrowski, Robert Kleinberg, Stephen M. Rumble, and Aaron Archer. Load is not what you should balance: Introducing Prequal. In *21st USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation, (NSDI'24)*. USENIX Association.

A Auxiliary Inequalities

In this section we collect some useful inequalities used throughout the paper.

Deterministic Inequalities The following lemma is similar to [23, Lemma A.1].

Lemma A.1. *Let the sequences $(a_k)_{k=1}^n, (b_k)_{k=1}^n$ be non-negative and the sequence $(c_k)_{k=1}^n$ be non-negative and non-increasing. If $\sum_{k=1}^i a_k \leq \sum_{k=1}^i b_k$ holds for all $i \in [n]$ then,*

$$\sum_{k=1}^n a_k \cdot c_k \leq \sum_{k=1}^n b_k \cdot c_k. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Proof. We shall prove (A.1) holds by induction on $n \geq 1$. The base case $n = 1$ follows immediately from the fact that $a_1 \leq b_1$ and $c_1 \geq 0$. Thus we assume $\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} a_k \cdot c_k \leq \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} b_k \cdot c_k$ holds for all sequences $(a_k)_{k=1}^{n-1}, (b_k)_{k=1}^{n-1}$ and $(c_k)_{k=1}^{n-1}$ satisfying the conditions of the lemma.

For the inductive step, suppose we are given sequences $(a_k)_{k=1}^n, (b_k)_{k=1}^n$ and $(c_k)_{k=1}^n$ satisfying the conditions of the lemma. If $c_2 = 0$ then, since $(c_k)_{k=1}^n$ is non-negative and non-increasing, $c_k = 0$ for all $k \geq 2$. Thus as $a_1 \leq b_1$ and $c_1 \geq 0$ by the precondition of the lemma, we conclude

$$\sum_{k=1}^n a_k \cdot c_k = a_1 \cdot c_1 \leq b_1 \cdot c_1 = \sum_{k=1}^n b_k \cdot c_k.$$

We now treat the case $c_2 > 0$. Define the non-negative sequences $(a'_k)_{k=1}^{n-1}$ and $(b'_k)_{k=1}^{n-1}$ as follows:

- $a'_1 = \frac{c_1}{c_2} \cdot a_1 + a_2$ and $a'_k = a_{k+1}$ for $2 \leq k \leq n-1$,
- $b'_1 = \frac{c_1}{c_2} \cdot b_1 + b_2$ and $b'_k = b_{k+1}$ for $2 \leq k \leq n-1$,

Then as the inequalities $c_1 \geq c_2$, $a_1 \leq b_1$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^n b_i$ hold by assumption, we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} a'_k = \left(\frac{c_1}{c_2} - 1 \right) a_1 + \sum_{k=1}^n a_k \leq \left(\frac{c_1}{c_2} - 1 \right) b_1 + \sum_{k=1}^n b_k = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} b'_k.$$

Thus if we also let $(c'_k)_{k=1}^{n-1} = (c_{k+1})_{k=1}^{n-1}$, which is positive and non-increasing, then

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} a'_k \cdot c'_k \leq \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} b'_k \cdot c'_k,$$

by the inductive hypothesis. However

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} a'_k \cdot c'_k = \left(\frac{c_1}{c_2} \cdot a_1 + a_2 \right) c_2 + \sum_{k=2}^n a_{k+1} \cdot c_{k+1} = \sum_{k=1}^n a_k \cdot c_k,$$

and likewise $\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} b'_k \cdot c'_k = \sum_{k=1}^n b_k \cdot c_k$. The result follows. \square

Claim A.2. *For any $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, we have $(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}) / (1 - \varepsilon) \geq 1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$.*

Proof. For $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ the following chain of double implications holds

$$\frac{1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}}{1 - \varepsilon} \geq 1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \Leftrightarrow 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \cdot \left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right) = 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \Leftrightarrow \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \geq 0. \quad \square$$

Probabilistic Inequalities We begin by stating two well-known concentration inequalities.

Lemma A.3 (Method of Bounded Independent Differences [17, Corollary 5.2]). Let f be a function of N independent random variables X^1, \dots, X^N , where each X^i takes values in a set Ω^i . Assume that for each $i \in [N]$ there exists a $c_i \geq 0$ such that

$$|f(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_N) - f(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x'_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_N)| \leq c_i,$$

for any $x_1 \in \Omega_1, \dots, x_{i-1} \in \Omega_{i-1}, x_i, x'_i \in \Omega_i, x_{i+1} \in \Omega_{i+1}, \dots, x_N \in \Omega_N$. Then, for any $\lambda > 0$,

$$\Pr[f < \mathbf{E}[f] - \lambda] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\lambda^2}{2 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^N c_i^2}\right).$$

Lemma A.4 (Azuma's Inequality for Super-Martingales [17, Problem 6.5]). Let X^0, \dots, X^N be a super-martingale with filtration $\mathfrak{F}^0, \dots, \mathfrak{F}^N$. Assume that for each $i \in [N]$ there exists $c_i \geq 0$ such that

$$(|X^i - X^{i-1}| \mid \mathfrak{F}^{i-1}) \leq c_i.$$

Then, for any $\lambda > 0$,

$$\Pr[X^N \geq X^0 + \lambda] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\lambda^2}{2 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^N c_i^2}\right).$$

Lemma A.5 ([14, Theorems 6.1 & 6.5]). Let X^0, \dots, X^N be a martingale with filtration $\mathfrak{F}^0, \dots, \mathfrak{F}^N$. Assume that for each $i \in [n]$,

$$(|X^i - X^{i-1}| \mid \mathfrak{F}^{i-1}) \leq M,$$

and additionally,

$$\mathbf{Var}[X^i \mid \mathfrak{F}^{i-1}] \leq \sigma_i^2.$$

Then, for any $\lambda > 0$,

$$\Pr[|X^N - \mathbf{E}[X^N]| \geq \lambda] \leq 2 \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{\lambda^2}{2 \cdot (\sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i^2 + M\lambda/3)}\right).$$

Next, we state the following well-known inequality for a sequence of random variables, whose expectations are related through a recurrence inequality.

Lemma A.6. Consider any sequence of random variables $(X^i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ for which there exist $a > 0$ and $b > 0$, such that every $i \geq 1$,

$$\mathbf{E}[X^i \mid X^{i-1}] \leq X^{i-1} \cdot a + b.$$

Then, (i) for every $i \geq 0$,

$$\mathbf{E}[X^i \mid X^0] \leq X^0 \cdot a^i + b \cdot \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} a^j.$$

Further, (ii) for $a \in (0, 1)$ and for every $i \geq 0$,

$$\mathbf{E}[X^i \mid X^0] \leq X^0 \cdot a^i + \frac{b}{1-a}.$$

Finally, (iii) for $a \in (0, 1)$ and if $X^0 \leq \frac{b}{1-a}$ holds, then for every $i \geq 0$,

$$\mathbf{E}[X^i] \leq \frac{b}{1-a}.$$

Proof. First statement. We will prove this claim by induction. For $i = 0$, $\mathbf{E}[X^0 | X^0] \leq X^0$. Assuming the induction hypothesis holds for some $i \geq 0$, then since $a > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[X^{i+1} | X^0] &= \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{E}[X^{i+1} | X^i] | X^0] \leq \mathbf{E}[X^i | X^0] \cdot a + b \\ &\leq \left(X^0 \cdot a^i + b \cdot \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} a^j \right) \cdot a + b \\ &= X^0 \cdot a^{i+1} + b \cdot \sum_{j=0}^i a^j. \end{aligned}$$

Second statement. The claim follows using that $\sum_{j=0}^i a^j \leq \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a^j = \frac{1}{1-a}$, for any $a \in (0, 1)$.

Third statement. We will prove this claim by induction. For $i = 0$, it follows by the assumption. Then, assuming that $\mathbf{E}[X^i] \leq \frac{b}{1-a}$ holds for $i \geq 0$, then for $i + 1$

$$\mathbf{E}[X^{i+1}] = \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{E}[X^{i+1} | X^i]] \leq \mathbf{E}[X^i] \cdot a + b \leq \frac{b}{1-a} \cdot a + b = \frac{b}{1-a}. \quad \square$$

B Counterexample for the Exponential Potential Function

In this section, we present a load vector for which the potential function $\Lambda := \Lambda(\alpha)$ for any constant $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ may increase in expectation over one round, if we do not condition on any “good event”.

In contrast to processes with constant probability bias in every round, such as those studied in [41], for the MEAN-THINNING process, there exists configurations where the potential Λ for constant α increases in expectation over a single round, even when it is $\omega(n)$. This is because in the worst-case, the MEAN-THINNING process may have a very small $\Theta(1/n^2)$ probability bias to allocate away from overloaded bins, corresponding to the TOWARDS-MIN process in [41].

Claim B.1. *For any constant $\alpha > 0$ and for sufficiently large $n := n(\alpha) > 0$ consider the (normalized) load configuration at some round $t \geq 0$,*

$$y^t = \left(n^2, n, n, \dots, n, -\frac{n \cdot (2n - 3)}{2}, -\frac{n \cdot (2n - 3)}{2} \right).$$

Then for the MEAN-THINNING process, (i) the exponential potential $\Lambda := \Lambda(\alpha)$ increases in expectation over the next round, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{E}[\Lambda^{t+1} | \mathfrak{F}^t] \geq \Lambda^t \cdot \left(1 + 0.2 \cdot \frac{\alpha^2}{n} \right),$$

and (ii) the mean quantile satisfies $\delta^s \geq 1 - 2/n$ for all rounds $s \in [t, t + n^2]$.

Proof. First statement. Consider a labeling of the bins so that the normalized loads are sorted in non-increasing order. We will show that just the expected increase of bin $i = 1$ with maximum load $y_1^t = n^2$ implies an expected increase for the entire potential. The probability of allocating to that bin is $\frac{1-\frac{2}{n}}{n}$, so using the Taylor estimate $e^z \geq 1 + z + 0.3z^2$ for $z \geq -1.5$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[\Lambda_1^{t+1} | \mathfrak{F}^t] &= e^{\alpha n^2} \cdot e^{-\alpha/n} \cdot \left(1 + (e^\alpha - 1) \cdot \frac{1 - \frac{2}{n}}{n} \right) \\ &\geq e^{\alpha n^2} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{n} + 0.3 \cdot \frac{\alpha^2}{n^2} \right) \cdot \left(1 + (\alpha + 0.3\alpha^2) \cdot \frac{1 - \frac{2}{n}}{n} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= e^{\alpha n^2} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{n} + (\alpha + 0.3\alpha^2) \cdot \frac{1}{n} + o(n^{-1})\right) \\
&= e^{\alpha n^2} \cdot \left(1 + 0.4 \cdot \frac{\alpha^2}{n}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

To relate this change to the expected change of the rest of the bins, we note that for sufficiently large n and since α is constant,

$$\begin{aligned}
0.2 \cdot \frac{\alpha^2}{n} \cdot e^{\alpha n^2} &\geq \left(1 + 0.2 \cdot \frac{\alpha^2}{n}\right) \cdot n \cdot e^{\alpha n^2} \cdot e^{-\alpha \cdot 3n/2} = \left(1 + 0.2 \cdot \frac{\alpha^2}{n}\right) \cdot n \cdot e^{\alpha n(2n-3)/2} \\
&\geq \left(1 + 0.2 \cdot \frac{\alpha^2}{n}\right) \cdot \left(\sum_{i>1} \Lambda_i^t\right), \tag{B.1}
\end{aligned}$$

since $\Lambda_i^t \leq e^{\alpha n(2n-3)/2}$ for $i > 1$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}[\Lambda^{t+1} \mid \mathfrak{F}^t] &\geq \mathbf{E}[\Lambda_1^{t+1} \mid \mathfrak{F}^t] \geq e^{\alpha n^2} \cdot \left(1 + 0.4 \cdot \frac{\alpha^2}{n}\right) \\
&= e^{\alpha n^2} \cdot \left(1 + 0.2 \cdot \frac{\alpha^2}{n}\right) + 0.2 \cdot \frac{\alpha^2}{n} \cdot e^{\alpha n^2} \\
&\stackrel{(B.1)}{\geq} \Lambda_1^t \cdot \left(1 + 0.2 \cdot \frac{\alpha^2}{n}\right) + \left(\sum_{i>1} \Lambda_i^t\right) \cdot \left(1 + 0.2 \cdot \frac{\alpha^2}{n}\right) \\
&= \Lambda^t \cdot \left(1 + 0.2 \cdot \frac{\alpha^2}{n}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Second statement. Since there are $n - 2$ overloaded bins with overload at least n and these can decrease by at most $1/n$ in each round, we have that $\delta^s \geq 1 - 2/n$ for any $s \in [t, t + n^2)$. \square