

Lecture 10: February 13

Lecturer: James R. Lee

Scribe: Noam Honda

Disclaimer: These notes have not been subjected to the usual scrutiny reserved for formal publications. They may be distributed outside this class only with the permission of the Instructor.

10.1 The power of two choices

As we discussed previously, if one throws n balls uniformly at random into n bins, then the maximum load is $\Theta(\frac{\log n}{\log \log n})$ with high probability. Now suppose that to throw a ball, we choose two bins uniformly at random and place the ball in the least loaded of the two choices. We will show that with high probability, the maximum load is only $\frac{\ln \ln n}{\ln 2} + O(1)$.

Let $\alpha_6 = \frac{n}{2e}$ and define $\alpha_{i+1} = \frac{e\alpha_i^2}{n}$ for $i \geq 6$. Let B_i be the number of bins with load $\geq i$ at the end of the process, and let \mathcal{E}_i be the event that $\{B_i \leq \alpha_i\}$. Note that $\Pr[\mathcal{E}_6] = 1$ because $\frac{n}{2e} > \frac{n}{6}$.

Let $X(\beta)$ be a sum of n i.i.d. indicator random variables each with probability β of being 1 (i.e. X is distributed as $\text{Bin}(n, \beta)$, the binomial distribution with n independent trials and success probability β).

Claim 10.1 Majorization:

$$\Pr[B_{i+1} > \alpha_{i+1} | \mathcal{E}_i] \leq \Pr[X((\alpha_i/n)^2) > \alpha_{i+1}].$$

Proof: Define the *height* of a ball b to be the value h such that b is the h th ball thrown into its bin. We know that $B_{i+1} \geq \#\{\text{balls whose height is } \geq i+1\}$. Now for ball j , let Y_j be the indicator variable which is 1 precisely when ball j 's height is $\geq i+1$. Let X_j be an indicator variable for choosing two bins of load $\geq i$ when the fraction of such bins is precisely $\frac{\alpha_i}{n}$. Observe that $Y_j \leq X_j$, so $\sum_{j=1}^n Y_j \leq \sum_{j=1}^n X_j$, where the X_j 's are independent. Finally, $\sum_{j=1}^n X_j$ is distributed as $X((\alpha_i/n)^2)$. ■

Also, since $X(\beta)$ is a sum of i.i.d. $\{0, 1\}$ random variables, we can apply a Chernoff bound:

Lemma 10.2 For $\lambda \geq 1$, $\Pr[X(\beta) \geq \lambda e \cdot \beta n] \leq e^{-\lambda \beta n}$. In particular, $\Pr[X((\alpha_i/n)^2) > \alpha_{i+1}] \leq e^{-\alpha_i^2/n}$.

Now, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\neg \mathcal{E}_{i+1}] &\leq \Pr[\neg \mathcal{E}_{i+1} | \mathcal{E}_i] + \Pr[\neg \mathcal{E}_i] \\ &= \Pr[B_{i+1} > \alpha_{i+1} | \mathcal{E}_i] + \Pr[\neg \mathcal{E}_i] \\ &\leq e^{-\alpha_i^2/n} + \Pr[\neg \mathcal{E}_i], \end{aligned}$$

where we have used Claim 10.1 and Lemma 10.2 in the final line. Thus for $\alpha_i^2 > 2n \ln n$, we have $\Pr[\neg \mathcal{E}_{i+1}] \leq \frac{1}{n^2} + \Pr[\neg \mathcal{E}_i]$. We conclude (by induction) that for $\alpha_i^2 > 2n \ln n$, we have $\Pr[\mathcal{E}_{i+1}] \leq \frac{i+1}{n^2} \leq \frac{1}{n}$.

Now let $i^* = \min\{i : \alpha_{i^*}^2 < 2n \ln n\}$. Observe that $i^* = \frac{\ln \ln n}{\ln 2} + O(1)$, and by the preceding argument $\Pr[\neg \mathcal{E}_{i^*}] \leq \frac{1}{n}$.

Now we apply the Chernoff bound Lemma 10.2 and the majorization for one more step:

$$\Pr[B_{i^*+1} > 6 \ln n] \leq \Pr[B_{i^*+1} > 6 \ln n | \mathcal{E}_{i^*}] + \Pr[\neg \mathcal{E}_{i^*}]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \Pr[X(2(\ln n)/n) \geq 6 \ln n] + \frac{1}{n} \\
&\leq e^{-6 \ln n} + \frac{1}{n} \leq \frac{2}{n}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we use a simple union bound for the last step:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr[B_{i^*+2} > 1] &\leq \Pr[B_{i^*+2} > 1 \mid B_{i^*+1} \leq 6 \ln n] + \Pr[B_{i^*+1} > 6 \ln n] \\
&\leq \Pr\left[X\left(\left\{\frac{6 \ln n}{n}\right\}^2\right) > 1\right] + \frac{2}{n} \\
&\leq \left(\frac{6 \ln n}{n}\right)^2 \cdot n + \frac{2}{n} = O\left(\frac{(\ln n)^2}{n}\right).
\end{aligned}$$