

The Probability to Hit Every Bin with a Linear Number of Balls

Stefan Walzer  

Karlsruhe Institute of Technology

Abstract

Assume that $2n$ balls are thrown independently and uniformly at random into n bins. We consider the unlikely event E that every bin receives at least one ball, showing that $\Pr[E] = \Theta(b^n)$ where $b \approx 0.836$. Note that, due to correlations, b is *not* simply the probability that any single bin receives at least one ball. More generally, we consider the event that throwing αn balls into n bins results in at least d balls in each bin.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Mathematics of computing \rightarrow Distribution functions; Theory of computation \rightarrow Randomness, geometry and discrete structures

Keywords and phrases Balls into bins, Multinomial distribution, Poissonisation, Tail bound

1 Introduction

Let $n, d \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\alpha \geq d$. Let E be the event that throwing αn balls into n bins results in at least d balls in every bin. More formally, $c_1, \dots, c_{\alpha n} \sim \mathcal{U}(\{1, \dots, n\})$ are independent random variables where c_j denotes the bin of the j th ball for $1 \leq j \leq \alpha n$. Then $X_i = |\{j \in \{1, \dots, \alpha n\} \mid c_j = i\}|$ is the load of the i th bin for $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $E = \{\min_{1 \leq i \leq n} X_i \geq d\}$.

To state the main result we require a distribution $\Phi(\alpha, d)$ that is a Poisson distribution truncated to values $\geq d$ and tuned to have expectation α . Formally $Z \sim \Phi(\alpha, d)$ satisfies

$$\Pr[Z = i] = \begin{cases} 0 & i < d \\ \frac{1}{\zeta} \frac{\lambda^{i-d}}{i!} & i \geq d \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where $\zeta = \sum_{i \geq d} \frac{\lambda^{i-d}}{i!}$ is a normalisation factor and $\lambda = \lambda(\alpha, d)$ is tuned such that $\mathbb{E}[Z] = \alpha$.

► Theorem 1.

- (i) If α and d are constants with $\alpha > d$ then $\Pr[E] = \Theta(b^n)$ where $b = \frac{\alpha^\alpha \zeta}{e^\alpha \lambda^{\alpha-d}}$.
- (ii) For $\alpha = d$ (not necessarily constant) $\Pr[E] = \Theta(b^n \sqrt{dn})$ where $b = \frac{d^d}{e^d d!}$.

In Appendix A we provide code for computing $b = b(\alpha, d)$ and tabulate some values.

Related Work and Motivation In the same setting, let \check{X} be the load of the least loaded bin and \hat{X} the load of the most loaded bin. A lot is known about these random variables.

For instance, if $\alpha = 1$ then $\hat{X} = \frac{\log n}{\log \log n} \cdot (1 + o(1))$ with high probability [3]. More general results are found in [5] where α may depend on n . There are also works on computing $\Pr[\hat{X} = d]$ and $\Pr[\check{X} = d]$ exactly [2].

Our focus on \check{X} for *constant* α may seem strange because \check{X} is zero with high probability. Theorem 1 merely determines the base of the exponential function that describes the speed with which $\Pr[E] = \Pr[\check{X} \geq d]$ converges to zero for $n \rightarrow \infty$.

The author stumbled upon this problem in the context of minimal perfect hash functions (a randomised data structure). The probability $\Pr[\check{X} = \hat{X} = \alpha]$ for $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ appears in space-lower bounds for minimal α -perfect hash functions. The more difficult case of $\Pr[\check{X} \geq 1]$ for $\alpha = 2$ was useful for analysing an improved minimal perfect hash function based on cuckoo hashing [4]. Given that balls-into-bins problems pop up in many places, the author believes that others might find the result useful.

2 Simple Considerations

An upper bound. Let E_i for $1 \leq i \leq n$ be the event that the i th bin is non-empty. Since $X_i \sim \text{Bin}(n, \frac{1}{n})$ we have $\Pr[E_i] = 1 - \Pr[X_i = 0] = 1 - (1 - \frac{1}{n})^n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 1 - e^{-1}$.

This suggests, falsely, that $\Pr[E] = \Pr[\bigcap_{i=1}^n E_i] \stackrel{?!}{\approx} \Pr[E_1]^n = (1 - e^{-1})^n$. In truth, the events $(E_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ are negatively associated and the relation in question is actually “ \ll ” and $1 - e^{-1}$ is strictly larger than the value of b attained from Theorem 1.


Proof of Theorem 1 (ii). If $\alpha = d$ then E occurs if and only if every bin receives *exactly* d balls. The probability mass function of the multinomial distribution and Stirlings Approximation of $(dn)!$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[E] &= \Pr[(X_1, \dots, X_n) = (d, \dots, d)] = \frac{(dn)!}{(d!)^n} \cdot n^{-dn} \\ &= \frac{\Theta((dn)^{dn} \cdot e^{-nd} \sqrt{nd})}{(d!)^n n^{dn}} = \Theta\left(\left(\frac{d^d}{e^d d!}\right)^n \sqrt{nd}\right). \end{aligned} \quad \blacktriangleleft$$

3 Proof of Theorem 1 (i): The Base of the Exponential

Proof idea. The standard technique of Poissonisation exploits that the multinomial distribution of (X_1, \dots, X_n) can be attained by taking independent Poisson random variables Y_1, \dots, Y_n and conditioning them on $\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i = \alpha n$. We use Poissonisation with a twist.

The idea is illustrated in Figure 1. An outcome $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$ contributing to E must satisfy two conditions: The sum $x_1 + \dots + x_n$ must be αn and each x_i must be at least d . The vector (X_1, \dots, X_n) follows a multinomial distribution and automatically satisfies the sum condition, but not the minimum condition. The proof considers a sequence $Z_1, \dots, Z_n \sim \Phi(\alpha, d)$ of independent truncated Poisson random variables. The vector (Z_1, \dots, Z_n) automatically satisfies the minimum condition, but not the sum condition. This amounts to a mathematically simpler way to capture the outcomes we want.



■ **Figure 1** Let $n = 2$, $\alpha = 5$ and $d = 3$. The multinomial distribution (X_1, X_2) automatically satisfies $X_1 + X_2 = \alpha n$ (diagonal line). A pair (Z_1, Z_2) of truncated Poisson random variables automatically satisfies $Z_1 \geq d$ and $Z_2 \geq d$ (gray). This gives us two perspectives on the outcomes relevant for E (blue), which satisfy both conditions.

Proof of Theorem 1 (i). Let R denote the set of possible outcomes of $\vec{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ that are consistent with E , meaning

$$R = \{\vec{x} \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 1, \dots, d-1\})^n \mid \sum_{i=1}^n x_i = \alpha n\}.$$

Using that (X_1, \dots, X_n) has multinomial distribution gives

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[E] &= \Pr[\vec{X} \in R] = \sum_{\vec{x} \in R} \Pr[\vec{X} = \vec{x}] = \sum_{\vec{x} \in R} \binom{\alpha n}{x_1 \dots x_n} n^{-\alpha n} \\ &= \sum_{\vec{x} \in R} \frac{(\alpha n)!}{x_1! \dots x_n!} n^{-\alpha n} = \frac{(\alpha n)!}{n^{\alpha n}} \sum_{\vec{x} \in R} \frac{1}{x_1! \dots x_n!}. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Now consider independent $Z_1, \dots, Z_n \sim \Phi(\alpha, d)$ for $\Phi(\alpha, d)$ as defined in Equation (1). Let $\vec{Z} = (Z_1, \dots, Z_n)$ and $N_Z = \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i$. By construction the events $\vec{Z} \in R$ and $N_Z = \alpha n$ are equivalent. For any $\vec{x} \in R$ we can compute

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\vec{Z} = \vec{x} \mid N_Z = \alpha n] &= \frac{\Pr[\vec{Z} = \vec{x} \wedge N_Z = \alpha n]}{\Pr[N_Z = \alpha n]} = \frac{\Pr[\vec{Z} = \vec{x}]}{\Pr[N_Z = \alpha n]} = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^n \Pr[Z_i = x_i]}{\Pr[N_Z = \alpha n]} \\ &= \frac{\prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\zeta} \cdot \frac{\lambda^{x_i-d}}{x_i!}}{\Pr[N_Z = \alpha n]} = \frac{\lambda^{\alpha n - dn}}{\zeta^n \Pr[N_Z = \alpha n]} \frac{1}{x_1! \dots x_n!}. \end{aligned}$$

By summing this equation over all $\vec{x} \in R$ we get

$$1 = \frac{\lambda^{\alpha n - dn}}{\zeta^n \Pr[N_Z = \alpha n]} \sum_{\vec{x} \in R} \frac{1}{x_1! \dots x_n!}$$

We rearrange this equation for $\sum_{\vec{x} \in R} \frac{1}{x_1! \dots x_n!}$ and plug the result into Equation (2). We now assume that α is constant, we use Stirling's approximation of $(\alpha n)!$ and we use that $\Pr[N_Z = \alpha n] = \Theta(1/\sqrt{n})$, which we prove in Lemma 6. This gives

$$\Pr[E] = \frac{(\alpha n)!}{n^{\alpha n}} \frac{\zeta^n \Pr[N_Z = \alpha n]}{\lambda^{\alpha n - dn}} = \frac{(\alpha n)^{\alpha n} e^{-\alpha n} \Theta(\sqrt{n}) \zeta^n \Theta(1/\sqrt{n})}{n^{\alpha n} \lambda^{\alpha n - dn}} = \left(\frac{\alpha \zeta}{e \lambda^{\alpha - d}} \right)^n \cdot \Theta(1).$$

This concludes the proof of Theorem 1, except for the proof of Lemma 6 given below. ◀

4 Proof of Lemma 6 using Log-Concavity

A distribution and its probability mass function (pmf) $(p_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is *log-concave* [6] if its support $\{i \in \mathbb{Z} \mid p_i > 0\}$ is connected and $p_i^2 \geq p_{i-1} \cdot p_{i+1}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. The intuition, which is valid if $p_i > 0$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, is that $i \mapsto \log(p_i)$ is a concave function, meaning its discrete derivative $\log(p_{i+1}) - \log(p_i) = \log(p_{i+1}/p_i)$ is non-increasing, i.e. $p_i/p_{i-1} \geq p_{i+1}/p_i$.

An example is the Poisson distribution with parameter λ since its support is \mathbb{N}_0 and for $i \in \mathbb{N}$ the quotient $p_i/p_{i-1} = \lambda/i$ is decreasing. The truncated Poisson distribution $\Phi(\alpha, d)$ from Equation (1) inherits this property. This is useful because:

► **Lemma 2** ([6, Theorem 4.1]). *Log-concavity is preserved under convolution.*

As in Section 3 let $Z_1, \dots, Z_n \sim \Phi(\alpha, d)$ and $N_Z = \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i$.

► **Corollary 3.** *The distribution of N_Z is log-concave.*

Proof. The pmf of N_Z arises as an n -fold convolution of the pmf of $\Phi(\alpha, d)$, which is log-concave. Hence Lemma 2 applies. ◀

For the rest of this section, assume $(p_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a log-concave pmf, $\hat{p} = \max_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} p_i$ is the peak probability, μ the expectation¹, σ^2 the variance¹ and $p_\mu = \max\{p_{\lfloor \mu \rfloor}, p_{\lceil \mu \rceil}\}$. If $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}$ then p_μ is the probability that *exactly* the expectation is attained.


¹ Guaranteed to exist for log-concave distributions.

We need two Lemmas regarding \hat{p} and p_μ for log-concave distributions, the first of which we import from the literature.

► **Lemma 4** ([1, Theorem 1.1]). $\hat{p} = \Theta(1/(1 + \sigma))$.

► **Lemma 5.** $\frac{\hat{p}}{e} < p_\mu \leq \hat{p}$.

Proof of Lemma 5. The inequality $p_\mu \leq \hat{p}$ is true by definition. We have to show $\frac{p_\mu}{\hat{p}} > 1/e$. We may assume without loss of generality that $p_\mu < \hat{p}$ (otherwise we are done), that $\hat{p} = p_{\hat{i}}$ for some $\hat{i} < \mu$ (if $\hat{i} > \mu$ just mirror the setup) and that $\mu \in [0, 1)$ (otherwise shift the setup). Consider the illustration in Figure 2.



■ **Figure 2** Some log-concave pmf $(p_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ (black) and a modified function $(q_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ (red) that leads, after normalisation, to a pmf where the ratio of p_μ and \hat{p} is smaller.

The numbers $(q_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ are defined as

$$q_i = \begin{cases} 0 & i < \hat{i} \\ \hat{p} \left(\frac{p_0}{\hat{p}} \right)^{\frac{i-\hat{i}}{-1}} & i \geq \hat{i} \end{cases}$$

The values q_i for $i \geq \hat{i}$ form a geometrically decreasing sequence and appear in the logarithmic plot as a straight line through $(\hat{i}, p_{\hat{i}})$ and $(0, p_0)$. The zero values for $i < \hat{i}$ cannot be shown. Since we have decreased values for negative i and increased values for positive i we know

$$[0, 1) \ni \mu = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} i p_i \leq \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} i q_i.$$

By normalising $(q_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ we obtain a pmf $(q'_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ with expectation μ' of the same sign as μ , hence $\mu' \geq 0$. By construction and monotonicity we have

$$\frac{q'_{\mu'}}{\hat{q}'} = \frac{q'_{\mu'}}{q'_{\hat{i}}} \leq \frac{q'_0}{q'_{\hat{i}}} = \frac{q_0}{q_{\hat{i}}} = \frac{p_0}{p_{\hat{i}}} = \frac{p_\mu}{\hat{p}}.$$

In this sense the (shifted) geometric distribution $(q'_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ at least as extreme an example as $(p_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ so it is without loss of generality when we assume that $(p_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a geometric distribution to begin with (not shifted from now on for clarity). Let $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$ be its parameter. We then have $p_i = 0$ for $i \leq 0$ and $p_i = (1 - \lambda)^{i-1} \lambda$ for $i > 0$. This gives $\hat{p} = p_1 = \lambda$ and $\mu = 1/\lambda$. Moreover

$$\frac{p_\mu}{\hat{p}} = \frac{p_{\lfloor \mu \rfloor}}{\lambda} = \frac{(1 - \lambda)^{\lfloor \mu \rfloor - 1} \lambda}{\lambda} \geq (1 - \lambda)^{\mu - 1} \geq (1 - \lambda)^{1/\lambda - 1}.$$

Basic calculus shows that the function $f(\lambda) = (1 - \lambda)^{1/\lambda - 1}$ is strictly monotonic in λ on $(0, 1)$ with $\lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} f(\lambda) = 1/e$ and $\lim_{\lambda \uparrow 1} f(\lambda) = 1$. In particular $p_\mu/\hat{p} > 1/e$ as desired. ◀

We can finally proof the lemma needed in the main theorem.

► **Lemma 6.** If α and λ are viewed as constants with $\alpha > \lambda$ then $\Pr[N_Z = \alpha n] = \Theta(1/\sqrt{n})$.

Proof. Since N_Z has a log-concave pmf $(p_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ by Corollary 3 we can apply the previous two lemmas. We also use $\mu = \alpha n$ and $\sigma^2 = \text{Var}(N_Z) = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}(Z_i) = n \cdot \text{Var}(Z_1) = \Theta(n)$.

$$\Pr[N_Z = \alpha n] = p_\mu \stackrel{\text{Lem.5}}{=} \Theta(\hat{p}) \stackrel{\text{Lem.4}}{=} \Theta(1/(1 + \sigma)) = \Theta(1/(1 + \sqrt{n})) = \Theta(1/\sqrt{n}). \quad \blacktriangleleft$$

References

- 1 Sergey G. Bobkov, Arnaud Marsiglietti, and James Melbourne. Concentration functions and entropy bounds for discrete log-concave distributions. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 31(1):54–72, 2022. doi:10.1017/S096354832100016X.
- 2 Marco Bonetti, Pasquale Cirillo, and Anton Ogay. Computing the exact distributions of some functions of the ordered multinomial counts: maximum, minimum, range and sums of order statistics. *Royal Society Open Science*, 6(10):190198, 2019. doi:10.1098/rsos.190198.
- 3 Gaston H. Gonnet. Expected length of the longest probe sequence in hash code searching. *J. ACM*, 28(2):289–304, apr 1981. doi:10.1145/322248.322254.
- 4 Hans-Peter Lehmann, Peter Sanders, and Stefan Walzer. *ShockHash: Towards Optimal-Space Minimal Perfect Hashing Beyond Brute-Force*, pages 194–206. 2024. doi:10.1137/1.9781611977929.15.
- 5 Martin Raab and Angelika Steger. "balls into bins" - A simple and tight analysis. In *2nd RANDOM*, volume 1518 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 159–170. Springer, 1998. doi:10.1007/3-540-49543-6_13.
- 6 Adrien Saumard and Jon A. Wellner. Log-concavity and strong log-concavity: A review. *Statistics Surveys*, 8(none):45 – 114, 2014. doi:10.1214/14-SS107.

A Sagemath code and tabulated values

```

if  $\alpha < d$ :
    b = NaN
elif  $\alpha == d$ :
    b =  $d**d/e**d/factorial(d)$ 
else:
    f( $\lambda$ ) =  $e**\lambda - \text{sum}([\lambda**i/factorial(i) \text{ for } i \text{ in range}(d)])$ 
     $\lambda$  =  $\text{find\_root}(\lambda + \lambda**d/factorial(d-1)/f(\lambda) == \alpha, 0, \alpha)$  # $\mathbb{E}[Z] = \alpha$ 
     $\zeta$  =  $\lambda**-d*f(\lambda)$ 
    b =  $\alpha**\alpha*\zeta/e**\alpha/\lambda**(alpha-d)$ 

```

■ **Listing 1** Sagemath code for computing $b = b(\alpha, d)$.

$\alpha \setminus d$	1	2	3	4	5
1	0.3679	-	-	-	-
2	0.8359	0.2707	-	-	-
3	0.9457	0.7351	0.2240	-	-
4	0.9810	0.8933	0.6648	0.1954	-
5	0.9931	0.9562	0.8472	0.6119	0.1755

■ **Table 1** Approximate values of $b = b(\alpha, d)$ for some pairs (α, d) . Note that despite the selection here, non-integer values of α are in principle permitted.