

Balanced Allocation on Graphs: A Random Walk Approach

Ali Pourmiri

Max Planck Institute for Informatics, Saarbrücken, Germany

`pourmiri@mpi-inf.mpg.de`

July 22, 2014

Abstract

In this paper we propose an algorithm for allocating n sequential balls into n bins that are organized as a n -vertex d -regular graph G , where $d \geq 3$ can be any integer. Let L be a given positive integer. In each round t , $1 \leq t \leq n$, ball t picks a node of G uniformly at random and performs a non-backtracking random walk (NBRW) of length L from the chosen node. Then it deterministically selects a subset of the visited nodes as the potential choices and allocates itself on one of the choices with minimum load (ties are broken uniformly at random). Suppose that G has girth at least $\Omega(L(\log L + \log \log d))$. We establish an upper bound for the maximum number of balls at any bin after allocating n balls by the algorithm, called *maximum load*, in terms of L with high probability. We also show that the upper bound is at most an $\mathcal{O}(\log L + \log \log d)$ factor above the lower bound that is proved for the algorithm. In particular we show that if G has girth at least $(\log n)^{\frac{1+\epsilon}{2}}$, for any constant $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$ and we set $L = \lfloor (\log n)^{\frac{1+\delta}{2}} \rfloor$, where $0 < \delta < \epsilon$ is a constant, then the maximum load is bounded by $\mathcal{O}(1/\delta)$ with high probability. Finally, we present some more general results which hold for a variant of this algorithm.

1 Introduction

The standard balls into bins model is a process which sequentially allocates n balls into n bins where each ball picks d bins independently and uniformly at random and the ball is then allocated in a least loaded bin in the set of d choices. When $d = 1$, it is well known that at the end of process the maximum number of ball at any bin, *maximum load*, is $(1 + o(1)) \frac{\log n}{\log \log n}$ with high probability¹. Azer et al. [3] showed that for $d \geq 2$, provided ties are broken randomly, the maximum load is $\frac{\log \log n}{\log d} + \mathcal{O}(1)$. The result implies that the maximum load is constant if and only if $d = \log^{\Omega(1)} n$. Vöcking [12] proposed an algorithm called *always-go-left* that uses exponentially smaller number of choices (i.e. $d = \Omega(\log \log n)$.) to reach a constant maximum load. In this algorithm the bins are partitioned into d groups of size n/d and each ball picks one random bin from each group. It is then allocated in a least loaded bin among the chosen bins and ties are broken asymmetrically. The algorithm results in a maximum load of $\frac{\log \log n}{d\phi_d} + \mathcal{O}(1)$,

¹With high probability means with probability $1 - o(1/n)$.

where $1 \leq \phi_d \leq 2$ with high probability. For a complete survey on standard balls into bins process we refer the reader to [11].

In many applications selecting any random set of choices is costly. For instance assume that the bins are processors that are interconnected as a graph and balls are tasks arriving one by one, where the goal is to assign tasks to the processor by minimizing the maximum load in a distributed fashion. So in these settings having two far away choices is not desirable. To take this constraint into account, Kenthapadi and Panigrahy [9] proposed a model in which bins are interconnected as a Δ -regular graph and each ball picks a random edge of the graph. It is then placed at one of its endpoints with smaller load. This allocation algorithm results in a maximum load of $\log \log n + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\log n}{\log(\Delta/\log^4 n)}\right) + \mathcal{O}(1)$. Following the study of balls into bins with correlated choices, Godfrey [8] generalized the mentioned result such that each ball picks an random edge of a hypergraph that has $\Omega(\log n)$ bins and satisfies some mild conditions. Recently, Bogdan et al. [5] studied a model where bins are nodes of a graph. Each ball picks a random node and performs a local search from the node to find a node with local minimum load and finally placed on. They show that when the graph is a constant degree expander, the local search guarantees a maximum load of $\Theta(\log \log n)$ with high probability.

Model, Results and Techniques. The present paper studies a model where bins are interconnected as a d -regular graph G and L is a given positive integer. Then in each round t , $1 \leq t \leq n$, ball t picks a node of G uniformly at random and performs a non-backtracking random walk (NBRW)² of length L which is denoted by $\mathcal{W}_t = (u_0, u_1, \dots, u_L)$. After that a set of potential choices called b -choice, $\beta_t := \{u_{j \cdot r} \mid 0 \leq j \leq \lfloor L/r \rfloor\}$ ($b = \lfloor L/r \rfloor + 1$ and $r = \lceil 2 \cdot \log_{d-1} \log n \rceil$), is selected and finally the ball is allocated in a least loaded bin of β_t (ties are broken randomly). We denote this allocation algorithm by \mathbf{A} and \mathcal{W}_t is said to be the NBRW corresponding to b -choice β_t or vice versa. To have more accessible proofs and avoid extensive case analysis we always assume that $L \geq 30r$.

Theorem 1.1 (Lower Bound). *Suppose that G be a n -vertex d -regular graph with girth at least $10L$. Then with probability $1 - n^{-\Omega(1)}$ the maximum load attained by \mathbf{A} on G is at least $\Omega(r \log_d n / L^2)$.*

For a proof see Section 2. Our main result is the following theorem. Let us define $r = \lceil 2 \cdot \log_{d-1} \log n \rceil$ and $\eta = \sqrt{r \log_{d-1} n}$.

Theorem 1.2 (Main Theorem). *Let $k > 3$ be any constant. Suppose that L be an integer and G is an n -vertex d -regular graph with $d \geq 3$ and girth at least $10L(\log L + \log \log d)$. Then with probability $1 - n^{-k+3}$, the maximum load attained by \mathbf{A} denoted by l^* is $\mathcal{O}(k \cdot \log \log n / \log(L/\eta))$ when $L > 5\eta$ and we have $l^* = \mathcal{O}(k(\log L + \log \log d) \cdot r \cdot \log_{d-1} n / L^2)$ for every $30r \leq L \leq 5\eta$.*

A special case of the main result is the following:

Corollary 1.3. *Let $0 < \delta < \epsilon \leq 1$ be constant. If G has girth at least $(\log n)^{\frac{1+\epsilon}{2}}$ and we set $L = \lfloor (\log n)^{\frac{1+\delta}{2}} \rfloor$, then the maximum load attained by \mathbf{A} on G is $\mathcal{O}(1/\delta)$ with high probability.*

²A non-backtracking random walk (NBRW) \mathcal{W} of length L started from a node is a random walk in L steps so that in each step the walker picks a neighbor uniformly at random and moves to that neighbor with an additional property that the walker never traverses an edge twice in a row. Further information about NBRWs can be found in [1] and [2].

Suppose that G be a 3-regular graph with girth at least $(\log n)^{7/10}$. By definition we have $r = \lceil 2 \log_2 \log n \rceil$. The following remarks are immediate results from the main theorem.

Remark 1. Let $L = \lfloor (\log_2 n)^{6/10} \rfloor$. Then with high probability the maximum load attained by \mathbf{A} on G is some constant.

Remark 2. Let $L = \lfloor \sqrt{(2 \log_2 \log n) \log_2 n} \rfloor = \lfloor \eta \rfloor$. Then with high probability the maximum load attained by \mathbf{A} on G is $\mathcal{O}(\log \log n)$.

We prove our main result in two steps, we first show that \mathbf{A} is (α, n_0) -uniform which means \Pr [ball t is placed on some arbitrary vertex] $\leq \frac{\alpha}{n}$ where $1 \leq t \leq n_0 = \Theta(n)$ and $\alpha = \mathcal{O}(1)$. Using this property we conclude that for a given set of nodes of size $\Omega(\log n)$, after allocating n_0 balls, the average load of nodes in the set is some constant, with high probability. Next using *witness trees* technique we show that if there is a node with load larger than some threshold then there is collection of nodes of size $\Omega(\log n)$ where each of them has load larger than some specified constant. Putting these together implies that maximum load is bounded as required with high probability.

Besides NBRWs of sub-logarithmic length, we also consider the setting where in each round t , $1 \leq t \leq n$, ball t picks a node of G uniformly at random and performs a NBRW on G in L steps. After that ball t allocates itself on a node with minimum load among the visited nodes (ties are broken randomly). We show that if G is the disjoint union of a number of cycles with girth $g = \Omega(\log n)$, then by setting $L = \min\{g, \log n\}$ the maximum load is a constant with high probability. Furthermore if G is a d -regular, non-bipartite graph, then by setting $L = \mathcal{O}(\log n/\mu)$ the maximum load is constant with high probability, where μ is the *spectral gap* of transition matrix of the random walk on G (see Section 5).

Comparison with Related Works. The setting of our work is closely related to [5]. In this paper in each step a ball picks a node of a graph uniformly at random and performs a local search to find a node with local minimum load and finally allocates itself on it. They showed that with high probability the local search on expander graphs obtains a maximum load of $\Theta(\log \log n)$. In comparison to the mentioned result, our new protocol achieves a further reduction in the maximum load, while still allocates a ball close to its origin. Our result suggests a tradeoff between allocation time and maximum load. In fact we show an constant upper bound for sufficient long walks (i.e. $L = (\log n)^{\frac{1+\epsilon}{2}}$, for any constant $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$).

Our work also can be related to the Kenthapadi and Panigrahy's work where balls pick a random edge in d -regular graphs with $d = n^{\Omega(1/\log \log n)}$ and they showed maximum load $\Theta(\log \log n)$. Godfrey [8] also studied an allocation algorithm where every ball chooses a random edge e of a hypergraph satisfying some conditions, that is, first the size of each edge is $d = \Omega(\log n)$ and $\Pr[u \in e] = \Theta(\frac{d}{n})$ for any bin u . The latter one is called *balanced condition*. It is not hard to see that if we have a graph with girth $\Omega(\log n)$ and set $L = \Omega(\log n)$, then visited nodes by a ball generates an hyperedge satisfying aforementioned conditions. Berenbrink et al. [4] simplified Godfrey's proof and slightly weakened the balanced condition but since the both analysis apply a Chernoff bound, it seems unlikely that one can extend the analysis for $L = o(\log n)$.

In a different context, Alon and Lubetzky [2] showed that if a particle starts a NBRW of length n on n -vertex graph with high-girth then the number of visits to nodes has a poisson

distribution. In particular they showed that the maximum visit to a node is at most $(1 + o(1)) \cdot \frac{\log n}{\log \log n}$. Our result can be also seen as an application of the mathematical concept of NBRWs to task allocation in distributed networks.

Notation. Throughout this paper we assume that G is an n -vertex d -regular graph with girth at least $10 \cdot L \cdot (\log L + \log \log d)$, $30r \leq L \leq \log n$ and $d \geq 3$ is any arbitrary integer. $V(\mathcal{W}_t)$ denotes the set of visited nodes by ball t . Let us redefine parameters : $r := \lceil 2 \log_{d-1} \log n \rceil$, $\eta := \sqrt{r \cdot \log_{d-1} n}$, $\kappa := \lfloor L/\eta \rfloor$ and $b := \lfloor L/r \rfloor + 1$. Note that minimum load of a b -choice is the minimum load of nodes contained in the b -choice.

2 Lower bound

We first state a Chernoff bound inequality and then prove Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 2.1 ([6]). *Suppose that X_i , $1 \leq i \leq n$, be a sequence of independent (or negatively correlated) and identically distributed zero-one random variables. If we define $X := \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ and $\mu := \mathbf{E}[X]$, then we have that for every δ , $0 < \delta < 1$,*

$$\Pr[X \leq (1 + \delta) \cdot \mu] \leq e^{-\frac{\delta^2 \mu}{2}},$$

$$\Pr[X \geq (1 - \delta) \cdot \mu] \leq e^{-\frac{\delta^2 \mu}{3}}.$$

In particular,

$$\Pr[|X - \mu| \geq \delta \cdot \mu] \leq 2 \cdot e^{-\frac{\delta^2 \mu}{3}}.$$

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let us define $\mathcal{K} := \{w \mid w \text{ be a walk of length } L \text{ generated by a NBRW}\}$ and $s = |\mathcal{K}|$. Clearly we have $s = \frac{n \cdot d(d-1)^{L-1}}{2}$. Let us define the indicator random variable $I_{w,\tau}$, $w \in \mathcal{K}$,

$$I_{w,\tau} := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } w \text{ is chosen } \tau \text{ times by } \mathbf{A}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where τ will be specified later. Let us define random variable $I_\tau = \sum_{w \in \mathcal{K}} I_{w,\tau}$. Since in each round t , $1 \leq t \leq n$, every w is chosen uniformly at random, $I_{w,\tau}$'s are identically distributed. Thus we get,

$$\mathbf{E}[I_\tau] = s \cdot \binom{n}{\tau} \left(\frac{1}{s}\right)^\tau \left(1 - \frac{1}{s}\right)^{n-\tau} \geq \binom{n}{\tau} \cdot \frac{1}{s^{\tau-1}} (1/e) = \frac{n}{e \cdot \tau^\tau (d(d-1))^{(L-1)(\tau-1)}} \geq \frac{n}{e \cdot d^{2\tau(\log_{d^2} \tau + L)}}.$$

We know that $L \geq \log_{d-1} \log n$ and by setting $\tau = \frac{\log_{d^2} n}{3 \cdot L}$ we have $\log_{d^2} \tau < L$. Hence we get

$$\mathbf{E}[I_\tau] \geq \frac{n}{e \cdot d^{2(2\tau \cdot L)}} = n^{\Omega(1)}.$$

Since $I_{w,\tau}$'s are negatively correlated (i.e. $\Pr[I_{w,\tau} = 1, I_{w',\tau} = 1] \leq \Pr[I_{w,\tau} = 1] \cdot \Pr[I_{w',\tau} = 1]$), applying a Chernoff bound (for instance see Theorem 2.1) yields that

$$\Pr\left[|I_\tau - \mathbf{E}[I_\tau]| \geq \frac{\mathbf{E}[I_\tau]}{2}\right] \leq e^{-\Omega(\mathbf{E}[I_\tau])}.$$

So we conclude that with probability $1 - n^{-\omega(1)}$, there is at least $n^{\Omega(1)}$ walks that each of them is chosen τ times. Let w be the walk that is chosen τ times and since it contains at most $L/r + 1$ different choices (bins), there exists a node in w with load at least $\frac{\tau}{L/r+1} = \Omega(r \log_d n / L^2)$. \square

3 The algorithm is (α, n_0) -uniform

In this section we formally define the notion of (α, n_0) -uniformity. After that by showing a useful lemma we prove the algorithm is (α, n_0) -uniform. To avoid lengthy case analysis we do not optimize the constants.

Definition. Suppose that \mathbf{B} be an allocation algorithm on graph G for n balls. Then we say \mathbf{B} is (α, n_0) -uniform, if there is $n_0 = \theta(n)$ so that for any $0 \leq t \leq n_0$,

$$\Pr[\text{ball } t+1 \text{ is allocated in any node } u \in V(G) \text{ by } \mathbf{B}] \leq \frac{\alpha}{n},$$

where α is some constant.

Note that for any $S \subseteq V(G)$, $\text{Empty}_t(S)$ is the number of empty nodes contained in set S after allocating t balls. If it is clear from the context we do not mention index t in $\text{Empty}_t(S)$. Let D_v^r denotes the set of nodes at distance r from node $v \in V(G)$.

Lemma 3.1. Suppose that for every $v \in V(G)$, with probability $1 - o(n^{-2})$, $\text{Empty}_t(D_v^r) \geq \frac{|D_v^r|}{2}$. Then for every $u \in V(G)$,

$$\Pr[\text{ball } t+1 \text{ is allocated by } \mathbf{A} \text{ in node } u] \leq \frac{\alpha_b}{n},$$

where $1 \leq \alpha_b \leq 32$.

Proof. Let us define $E_{t+1,u}$, for every $u \in V(G)$, to be the event that ball $t+1$ is placed on u . We call β_{t+1} is a good b -choice if at least $(b-1)/10$ of its nodes are empty and $B_{t+1}(\neg\beta_{t+1})$ be the event that β_{t+1} is a good (bad) b -choice. So we have that for every $u \in V(G)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[E_{t+1,u}] &= \underbrace{\Pr[E_{t+1,u} | u \notin \beta_{t+1}] \cdot \Pr[u \notin \beta_{t+1}]}_{=0} \quad (\text{if } u \notin \beta_{t+1}, \text{ then ball } t+1 \text{ can not be placed on } u) \\ &+ \Pr[E_{t+1,u} | u \in \beta_{t+1} \text{ and } B_{t+1}] \cdot \Pr[u \in \beta_{t+1} \text{ and } B_{t+1}] \\ &+ \Pr[E_{t+1,u} | u \in \beta_{t+1} \text{ and } \neg B_{t+1}] \cdot \Pr[u \in \beta_{t+1} \text{ and } \neg B_{t+1}] \\ &\leq \frac{10}{b-1} \cdot \Pr[u \in \beta_{t+1}] + \Pr[u \in \beta_{t+1} \text{ and } \neg B_{t+1}] \\ &= \left(\frac{10}{b-1} + \Pr[\neg B_{t+1} | u \in \beta_{t+1}] \right) \cdot \Pr[u \in \beta_{t+1}] \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where the last inequality follows because if B_{t+1} happens, then there are at least $(b-1)/10$ empty nodes and since ties are broken randomly, u gets ball $t+1$ with probability at most $10/(b-1)$. Let C_i , $1 \leq i \leq b$, be the event that $u \in \beta_{t+1}$ and $u = x_{(i-1)r}$, where $\mathcal{W}_{t+1} = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_L)$. Conditioning on C_i , without loss of generality \mathcal{W}_{t+1} can be viewed as the union of two edge

disjoint paths \mathcal{W}_u^1 and \mathcal{W}_u^2 started at u with lengths $(i-1) \cdot r$ and $L - (i-1) \cdot r$ respectively. Since G has girth at least $10L$, it locally looks like a d -ary tree and hence the total number of paths of length L with $x_{(i-1)r} = u$ is

$$d(d-1)^{(i-1)r-1} \times (d-1)^{L-(i-1)r} = d(d-1)^{L-1}.$$

On the other hand in each round, \mathbf{A} picks a walk of length L from $nd(d-1)^L$ possible walks randomly. Thus we get $\Pr[C_i] = \frac{d(d-1)^{L-1}}{nd(d-1)^{L-1}} = \frac{1}{n}$, and hence

$$\Pr[u \in \beta_{t+1}] = \sum_{i=1}^b \Pr[C_i] = \sum_{i=1}^b \frac{1}{n} = \frac{b}{n}. \quad (2)$$

Now let us compute an upper bound for $\Pr[\neg B_{t+1} | u \in \beta_{t+1}]$ in (1). Conditioning on event $u \in \beta_{t+1}$, we split \mathcal{W}_{t+1} into paths \mathcal{W}_u^1 and \mathcal{W}_u^2 . We define $\beta_{t+1}^1 = V(\mathcal{W}_u^1) \cap \beta_{t+1}$ and $\beta_{t+1}^2 = V(\mathcal{W}_u^2) \cap \beta_{t+1}$, where we have $\beta_{t+1} = \beta_{t+1}^1 \cup \beta_{t+1}^2$. Note that by definition of β_{t+1} for every $v, v' \in \beta_{t+1}$, we have $d(v, v') = c \cdot r$, where c is an integer. Let us order the nodes of β_{t+1}^1 and β_{t+1}^2 increasingly according to their distance from u . Let $|\beta_{t+1}^1| \geq 2$. Then we assume that every $v_j \in \beta_{t+1}^1$, $2 \leq j \leq |\beta_{t+1}^1|$, is randomly chosen from set $S_j \subseteq D_{v_{j-1}}^r$ (because we run a NBRW of length r from v_{j-1} to reach v_j). It might be happen that v_{j-1} is not an starting point for \mathcal{W}_u^1 so we have $|S_j| \in \{d(d-1)^{r-1}, (d-1)^r\}$. If $|D_{v_{j-1}}^r| = |S_j| = d(d-1)^{r-1}$, then $\text{Empty}(S_j) = \text{Empty}(D_{v_{j-1}}^r)$ otherwise we have

$$\text{Empty}(S_j) \geq \text{Empty}(D_{v_{j-1}}^r) - |D_{v_{j-1}}^r \setminus S_j| \geq \text{Empty}(D_{v_{j-1}}^r) - (d-1)^{r-1}.$$

Let E be the event that $\text{Empty}_t(D_{v_{j-1}}^r) \geq \frac{d(d-1)^{r-1}}{2}$. Then by assumption we have $\Pr[E] = 1 - o(n^{-2})$. So for every $2 \leq j \leq |\beta_{t+1}^1|$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[v_j \in \beta_{t+1}^1 \text{ is empty}] &= \Pr[v_j \in \beta_{t+1}^1 \text{ is empty} | E] \Pr[E] + \Pr[v_j \in \beta_{t+1}^1 \text{ is empty} | \neg E] \Pr[\neg E] \\ &\geq \frac{\text{Empty}(S_j)}{|S_j|} (1 - o(n^{-2})) + o(n^{-2}) \geq \frac{1}{4} - o(n^{-2}), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from previous lower bounds for $\text{Empty}(S_j)$ and the fact that $|S_j| \in \{(d-1)^r, d(d-1)^{r-1}\}$. Similar argument also works for β_{t+1}^2 if $|\beta_{t+1}^2| \geq 2$. So for every $v \in \beta_{t+1}$ except u we get $\Pr[v \text{ is empty}] \geq 1/5$. Let X be the number of empty nodes in β_{t+1} then we have that $\mathbf{E}[X] \geq (b-1)/5$. So we have $\Pr[X < (b-1)/10] \leq \Pr[|X - \mathbf{E}[X]| \geq \mathbf{E}[X]/2]$. Depending on value b we can apply either Chebychev or Chernoff inequality to get tighter bound. However if we apply a Chebychev's bound we get

$$\Pr[X < (b-1)/10] \leq \Pr[|X - \mathbf{E}[X]| \geq \mathbf{E}[X]/2] \leq \frac{\mathbf{Var}[X]}{\mathbf{E}[X]^2/4} \leq \frac{4}{\mathbf{E}[X]},$$

where the last inequality follows because we assume that X is the summation of $b-1$ independent Bernoulli random variables where we have $\mathbf{Var}[X] \leq \mathbf{E}[X]$. Thus we get the following upper bound

$$\Pr[\neg B_{t+1} | u \in \beta_{t+1}] = \Pr[X < (b-1)/10 | u \in \beta_{t+1}] \leq \frac{4}{\mathbf{E}[X]} \leq 20/(b-1), \quad (3)$$

Plugging bounds (2) and (3) in (1) yields that for every $u \in V(G)$,

$$\Pr [E_{t+1,u}] \leq \frac{30b}{n(b-1)} \leq \frac{32}{n}$$

where the last inequality holds because we assume that $L \geq 30r$ and consequently $b \geq 30$. \square

Lemma 3.2 (Key Lemma). ***A** is an $(\alpha, n/(6e\alpha))$ -uniform allocation algorithm on G .*

Proof. Let us define potential function $\Phi(t) = \sum_{u \in V(G)} \exp(f_u^t)$, where f_u^t denotes the number of nonempty nodes of D_u^r after allocating t balls. It is clear that $\Phi(0) = n$. Let us assume that after allocating t balls we have $\Phi(t) \leq n \cdot e^{\Delta/4}$, where $\Delta = d(d-1)^{r-1}$. Then for every $u \in V(G)$,

$$e^{f_u^t} \leq \Phi(t) \leq e^{\log n + \Delta/4}.$$

Recall that $r = \lceil 2 \log_{d-1} \log n \rceil$. So we get $f_u^t \leq \log n + \Delta/4 < \frac{\Delta}{2}$ and consequently $\text{Empty}_t(D_u^r) \geq \frac{\Delta}{2}$. Let us define indicator random variable $I_{t+1}(u)$ for every $u \in V(G)$ as follows:

$$I_{t+1}(u) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if ball } t+1 \text{ is placed at an empty node in } D_u^r, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Applying Lemma 3.1 shows that if $\text{Empty}_t(D_u^r) \geq \frac{\Delta}{2}$, then for every $u \in V(G)$

$$\Pr [I_{t+1}(u) = 1] \leq \frac{\alpha_b \cdot \text{Empty}_t(D_u^r)}{n} \leq \frac{\alpha_b \cdot \Delta}{n}.$$

So we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} \left[\Phi(t+1) | \Phi(t) \leq n \cdot e^{\Delta/4} \right] &\leq \sum_{u \in V(G)} \left\{ \Pr [I_{t+1}(u) = 1] \cdot e^{f_u^{t+1}} + \Pr [I_{t+1}(u) = 0] \cdot e^{f_u^t} \right\} \\ &\leq \sum_{u \in V(G)} \left(1 + \frac{\alpha_b \cdot e \cdot \Delta}{n} \right) \cdot e^{f_u^t} = \left(1 + \frac{\alpha_b \cdot e \cdot \Delta}{n} \right) \Phi(t). \end{aligned}$$

Let us define $\Psi(t) := \min\{\Phi(t), n \cdot e^{\Delta/4}\}$. By using above recursive inequality we have that

$$\mathbf{E} [\Psi(t+1)] \leq \left(1 + \frac{\alpha_b \cdot e \cdot \Delta}{n} \right) \Psi(t).$$

Thus inductively we have that $\mathbf{E} [\Psi(t)] \leq \left(1 + \frac{\alpha_b \cdot e \cdot \Delta}{n} \right)^t \Psi(0)$. Let us define $n_0 = \frac{n}{6e\alpha_b}$. Then applying Markov inequality implies that

$$\Pr \left[\Psi^{T_0} \geq n \cdot e^{\Delta/4} \right] \leq \frac{\left(1 + \frac{\alpha_b \cdot e \cdot \Delta}{n} \right)^{n_0}}{e^{\Delta/4}} \leq e^{-\Delta/12}$$

So with probability $1 - n^{-\omega(1)}$, we have $\Phi(n_0) = \Psi(n_0) < n \cdot e^{\Delta/4}$. Since $\Phi(t)$ is an increasing function in t , for every $0 \leq t \leq n_0$ we have that $\Phi^t \leq n \cdot e^{\Delta/4}$ and hence $\text{Empty}(D_u^r) \geq \frac{\Delta}{2}$ for every $u \in V(G)$. So the application of Lemma 3.1 shows that for any $0 \leq t \leq n_0$ and $u \in V(G)$,

$$\Pr [\text{ball } t+1 \text{ is placed on } u] \leq \frac{\alpha_b}{n} \leq \frac{32}{n}.$$

\square




Figure 1: The first application of Lemma 4.4 gives a family of disjoint walks intersecting \mathcal{W}_t denoted by $-\cdot-$. Bold and green lines indicate the intersection of two walks. Second application of the lemma with the validity property gives the second level of disjoint walks.

4 Construction of witness tree

In this section by showing several preliminary results and applying witness tree technique we prove our main theorem.

4.1 Interference graph corresponding to the algorithm

Let us define *interference* graph \mathcal{G} whose vertex set is all possible b -choices can be made by the algorithm and two vertices of \mathcal{G} are connected if and only if their intersection is nonempty. Clearly, in each round of the algorithm a random vertex of \mathcal{G} namely β_t is chosen and a ball is placed on a node contained in β_t . Therefore execution of the algorithm generates a random subgraph of \mathcal{G} . Suppose that $T \subset \mathcal{G}$ be a subtree of \mathcal{G} , let us define $\mathcal{N}_T := \cup_{\beta \in V(T)} \beta$ and N_T denotes the size of \mathcal{N}_T . Let $\mathcal{T}(m, \nu)$ denotes the set of all rooted subtrees of \mathcal{G} , on m vertices with $N_T \geq \nu$.

Lemma 4.1. *We have $|V(\mathcal{G})| \leq n \cdot d(d-1)^{L-1}$ and the maximum degree of \mathcal{G} is bounded by $b^2 \cdot d(d-1)^{L-1}$.*

Proof. Since G has girth at least $10L$, the set of nodes in distance at most L from any node induces a d -ary tree. So it is clear the the total number of different NBRWs of length L on G is $n \cdot d(d-1)^{L-1}$. On the other hand the number of all possible b -choices is bounded by all NBRWs of length L so we get

$$|V(\mathcal{G})| \leq n \cdot d(d-1)^{L-1}.$$

Suppose that $\mathcal{W} = (u_0, u_1, \dots, u_L)$ denotes a NBRW and v be arbitrary node of G . Recall that v is an element of the b -choice corresponding to \mathcal{W} if and only if $v = u_{(j-1)r}$ for some $1 \leq j \leq b$. Since the graph locally looks like a d -ary tree, it is not hard to see the total number of NBRWs visited node v as $(j-1)r$ -th node (i.e. $u_{(j-1)r} = v$) is at most

$$d(d-1)^{(j-1)r-1}(d-1)^{L-(j-1)r} = d(d-1)^{L-1}.$$

Since j varies from 1 to b , v can be an element of at most $bd(d-1)^{L-1}$ many b -choices and hence every b -choice intersects at most $b^2 d(d-1)^{L-1}$ other b -choices. So the maximum degree of \mathcal{G} is bounded by

$$b^2 \cdot d(d-1)^{L-1}.$$

□

Lemma 4.2. *Suppose that \mathbf{A} be an (α, n_0) -uniform algorithm. Then the probability that during allocation of first n_0 balls a set of b -choices of size m , chosen by \mathbf{A} , builds a tree $T \in \mathcal{T}(m, \nu)$ and every node in \mathcal{N}_T has load at least c is at most $n \cdot b^{2m} \cdot \left(\frac{n_0 \alpha \cdot e}{n \cdot c}\right)^{c \cdot \nu}$.*

Proof. Let us first count the total number of rooted subtrees of \mathcal{G} with m vertices or equivalently $m - 1$ edges. It was shown that the total number of different shape rooted trees on m vertices is 4^m (For example see [10]) (we say two rooted trees have different shapes if they are not isomorphic). Let Δ be the maximum degree of \mathcal{G} . Since for any given shape there are $|V(\mathcal{G})|$ ways to choose the root and there are at most Δ ways to choose an edge, we have that $|\mathcal{T}(m, \nu)| \leq 4^m \cdot |V(\mathcal{G})| \cdot \Delta^{m-1}$. Let us fix an arbitrary tree $T \in \mathcal{T}(m, \nu)$. Suppose that p_1 be the probability that given tree T is built by the algorithm and p_2 be the probability that every node in \mathcal{N}_T has load at least c . There are at most $n_0 \leq n$ ways to choose one ball per vertex of T and hence at most n^m ways to choose m balls to construct T . On the other hand, every vertex of T (or a b -choice) appears with probability $\frac{2}{n \cdot d \cdot (d-1)^{L-1}}$. Therefore we get

$$p_1 \leq n^m \cdot \left(\frac{2}{n \cdot d \cdot (d-1)^{L-1}}\right)^m = \left(\frac{2}{d(d-1)^{L-1}}\right)^m.$$

Since \mathbf{A} is (α, n_0) -uniform, the probability that every node in \mathcal{N}_T has load at least c is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} p_2 &\leq \sum_{q=0}^{\infty} \binom{n_0}{c \cdot (\nu + q)} \left(\frac{\alpha \cdot (\nu + q)}{n}\right)^{c \cdot (\nu + q)} \leq \sum_{q=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{e \cdot n_0}{c \cdot (\nu + q)}\right)^{c \cdot (\nu + q)} \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha \cdot (\nu + q)}{n}\right)^{c \cdot (\nu + q)} \\ &\leq \sum_{q=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{n_0 \cdot \alpha \cdot e}{n \cdot c}\right)^{c \cdot (\nu + q)} \leq 2 \cdot \left(\frac{n_0 \cdot \alpha \cdot e}{n \cdot c}\right)^{c \cdot \nu} \end{aligned}$$

Since balls are mutually independent, $p_1 \cdot p_2$ is an upper bound for the probability that using m balls T is built and every node in \mathcal{N}_T has load at least c . Therefore we conclude that tree $T \in \mathcal{T}(m, \nu)$ with prescribed conditions exists with probability at most

$$|\mathcal{T}(m, \nu)| \cdot p_1 \cdot p_2 \leq 4^m |V(\mathcal{G})| \cdot \Delta^{m-1} \left(\frac{2}{d(d-1)^{L-1}}\right)^m \cdot \left(\frac{n_0 \alpha \cdot e}{n \cdot h}\right)^{h \cdot \nu}.$$

Using Lemma 4.1 results into

$$n \cdot 8^m \cdot b^{2m} \cdot \left(\frac{n_0 \alpha \cdot e}{n \cdot c}\right)^{c \cdot \nu}.$$

□

4.2 Intersection of non-backtracking walks

In this subsection we show that if β_t has a certain minimum load up to round t then walk \mathcal{W}_t corresponding to β_t has been intersected by a family of disjoint walks before round t with high probability. Before proving our main lemma, let us define some notions. Suppose that $n(\ell)$ be the maximum number of times that an arbitrary path of length ℓ , $2 \log_{d-1} \log n \leq \ell \leq L$, is

traversed by balls. Let $\mathcal{E}(\ell, k)$ be the event that indicates $n(\ell) < \frac{2k \log_{d-1} n}{\ell}$. Note that a path of length at most L between any pairs of nodes let say u and v is unique (because girth of G is at least $10L$) and hence we denote it by $[u, v]$. Moreover we have that the intersection of two walks \mathcal{W} and \mathcal{W}' of lengths L is either empty or there is $[u, v] = \mathcal{W} \cap \mathcal{W}'$ where $u, v \in V(\mathcal{W}) \cap V(\mathcal{W}')$. For every $u, v \in V(\mathcal{W})$, $[u, v] \subseteq \mathcal{W}$ is called a subpath of \mathcal{W} . The height of ball t in node u is the number balls that are placed on u before ball t .

Lemma 4.3. *Let $k \geq 3$ be an arbitrary number. Then we have $\Pr[\mathcal{E}(\ell, k)] \geq 1 - n^{-k+2}$.*

Proof. Let us fix an arbitrary path $[u, v]$ of length ℓ . Since G is a d -regular graph with girth at least $10L$, then the total number of different paths of length L containing $[u, v]$ is $\sum_{a+b=L-\ell} (d-1)^{a+b} = (L-\ell+1) \cdot (d-1)^{L-\ell}$. Since the total number of different NBRWs of length L is $n \cdot d \cdot (d-1)^{L-1}$, the probability that in some round t , $1 \leq t \leq n$, we get $[u, v] \subset \mathcal{W}_t$ is at most

$$\frac{2(L-\ell+1)(d-1)^{L-\ell}}{n \cdot d \cdot (d-1)^{L-1}} = \frac{2(L-\ell+1)(d-1)}{n \cdot d \cdot (d-1)^\ell} \leq \frac{2L}{n(d-1)^\ell}.$$

Thus the probability that $[u, v]$ is traversed for τ times is at most

$$\binom{n}{\tau} \left(\frac{2L}{n(d-1)^\ell} \right)^\tau \leq \left(\frac{e \cdot n}{\tau} \right)^\tau \left(\frac{2L}{n(d-1)^\ell} \right)^\tau = \left(\frac{2e}{\tau} \right)^\tau \left(\frac{1}{(d-1)^{\ell - \log_{d-1} L}} \right)^\tau \leq \frac{1}{(d-1)^{\frac{\tau \cdot \ell}{2}}},$$

where the last inequality follows from $2 \log_{d-1} L \leq 2 \log_{d-1} \log n \leq \ell$. By setting $\tau = \frac{2k \cdot \log_{d-1} n}{\ell}$ and union bound over all paths of length ℓ whose size is at most $n \cdot d \cdot (d-1)^{\ell-1} < n^2$, we conclude that with probability $1 - n^{-k+2}$, $n(\ell) < \frac{2k \log_{d-1} n}{\ell}$. \square

Recall that $\kappa = \lfloor L/\eta \rfloor$.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $k > 3$ and $h > 2$ are arbitrary integers. Assume that $L \geq 5 \cdot \eta$ and in some round t , the minimum load of $\beta_t = \{u_i \mid 0 \leq i \leq b-1\}$ is at least $32kh$. Conditioning on event $\mathcal{E}(\eta/4, k)$, there exists a family of b -choices let say $\mathcal{F}_t = \{\beta_{t_j} \mid 1 \leq j \leq \kappa, t_j < t\}$ (or equivalently a family of walks $\mathcal{F}' = \{\mathcal{W}_{t_j} \mid 1 \leq j \leq \kappa, t_j < t\}$) satisfying following conditions:*

- I. *Every β_{t_j} , $1 \leq j \leq \kappa$, has minimum load at least $16k(h-1)$, $\emptyset \neq \beta_{t_j} \cap \beta_t \subseteq V(\mathcal{W}_{t_j} \cap \mathcal{W}_t)$ and $\mathcal{W}_{t_j} \cap \mathcal{W}_t \subset [z_{j-1}, z_j] \subset \mathcal{W}_t$ where $\lfloor \eta \rfloor \leq d(z_{j-1}, z_j) \leq \lceil \eta \rceil$.*
- II. *For every pair of i and j , $1 \leq i \neq j \leq \kappa$, $\beta_{t_i} \cap \beta_{t_j} = \mathcal{W}_{t_i} \cap \mathcal{W}_{t_j} = \emptyset$.*

Proof. We partition \mathcal{W}_t into edge disjoint subpaths $\mathcal{P}^j := [z_{j-1}, z_j]$, $1 \leq j \leq \kappa$, where $\lfloor \eta/r \rfloor \leq |V(\mathcal{P}^j) \cap \beta_t| \leq \lceil \eta/r \rceil$. Let $\mathcal{P}_c^j = [x_j, y_j]$ be a subpath of \mathcal{P}^j containing at least $\eta/(2r)$ choices from β_t and each of $[z_{j-1}, x_j]$ and $[y_j, z_j]$ has length at least $\eta/4$. By the assumption, we know that the nodes of \mathcal{P}_c^j , $1 \leq j \leq \kappa$, totally have at least $32k\eta/(2r) = 16k\sqrt{\log_{d-1} n/r}$ balls at height at least $32k(h-1)$. It implies that set $V(\mathcal{P}_c^j)$, $1 \leq j \leq \kappa$, had to be hit at least this many times before round t . We call a walk hitting $V(\mathcal{P}_c^j)$, let say \mathcal{W} , is a *bad* path if $\mathcal{W} \cap \mathcal{W}_t$ contains z_{j-1} or z_j . Since G has girth at least $10L$, a bad walk must contain at least one of $[z_{j-1}, x_j]$ and $[y_j, z_j]$. Conditioning on event $\mathcal{E}(\eta/4, k)$, implies that with probability at least $1 - n^{-k+2}$, $[z_{j-1}, x_j]$ or $[y_j, z_j]$ is traversed at most

$$8k \log_{d-1} n/\eta \leq 8k \sqrt{\log_{d-1} n/r}$$

times. So the total number of bad walks is bounded by $16k\sqrt{\log_{d-1} n/r}$ with high probability. Therefore there is a ball (placed on a node in $V(\mathcal{P}_c^j)$) with height at least $16k(h-1)$ so that its corresponding walk, namely \mathcal{W}_{t_j} , is not bad. In the following we show that for every pair i and j , $1 \leq i \neq j \leq \kappa$, $\mathcal{W}_{t_i} \cap \mathcal{W}_{t_j} = \emptyset$ and consequently $\beta_{t_i} \cap \beta_{t_j} = \emptyset$. Toward a contradiction let us assume that there exist i and j so that $v \in V(\mathcal{W}_{t_i}) \cap V(\mathcal{W}_{t_j})$. By definition of \mathcal{W}_{t_i} and \mathcal{W}_{t_j} we have that $(V(\mathcal{W}_{t_i}) \cup V(\mathcal{W}_{t_j})) \cap \{z_i, z_{i-1}, z_j, z_{j-1}\} = \emptyset$ and hence $v \notin \{z_i, z_{i-1}, z_j, z_{j-1}\}$. Let $x \in V(\mathcal{W}_{t_j}) \cap V(\mathcal{W}_t)$ and $y \in V(\mathcal{W}_{t_j}) \cap V(\mathcal{W}_t)$. Then $[x, y]$ contains at least one node from $\{z_i, z_{i-1}, z_j, z_{j-1}\}$. On the other hand $[x, v] \cup [v, y]$ is different path from x to y with length at most $2L$ which contradicts our assumption about girth of G . For a geometric view of walks, see Figure 1. □

Lemma 4.5. *Let $\gamma = 600k[r \cdot \log_{d-1} n/L^2]$, where $k > 3$ is an arbitrary number. Suppose that $30 \cdot r \leq L \leq 5 \cdot \eta$ and in some round t , the minimum load of $\beta_t = \{u_i \mid 0 \leq i \leq b-1\}$ is at least $h \cdot \gamma$, where $h > 2$ be any integer. Conditioning on event $\mathcal{E}(L/20, k)$, there exists a family of b -choices let say $\mathcal{F}_t = \{\beta_{t_j} \mid 1 \leq j \leq 5, t_j < t\}$ (or equivalently a family of walks $\mathcal{F}' = \{\mathcal{W}_{t_j} \mid 1 \leq j \leq 5, t_j < t\}$) satisfying following conditions:*

- I. *Every β_{t_j} , $1 \leq j \leq 5$, has minimum load at least $(h-1) \cdot \gamma$, $\emptyset \neq \beta_{t_j} \cap \beta_t \subseteq V(\mathcal{W}_{t_j} \cap \mathcal{W}_t)$ and $\mathcal{W}_{t_j} \cap \mathcal{W}_t \subset [z_{j-1}, z_j] \subset \mathcal{W}_t$ where $\lfloor L/5 \rfloor \leq d(z_{j-1}, z_j) \leq \lceil L/5 \rceil$.*
- II. *For every pair of i, j , $1 \leq i \neq j \leq 5$, $\beta_{t_i} \cap \beta_{t_j} = \mathcal{W}_{t_i} \cap \mathcal{W}_{t_j} = \emptyset$.*

Proof. Let us partition \mathcal{W}_t into edge disjoint subpaths $\mathcal{P}^j := [z_{j-1}, z_j]$, $1 \leq j \leq 5$, where $[z_{j-1}, z_j]$ is a subpath of \mathcal{W}_t and $\lfloor L/5 \rfloor \leq d(z_{j-1}, z_j) \leq \lceil L/5 \rceil$. Let $\mathcal{P}_c^j = [x_j, y_j]$ be subpath of \mathcal{P}^j containing at least $b/15$ of nodes of β_t and on the other hand each of $[z_{j-1}, x_j]$ and $[y_j, z_j]$ has length at least $L/20$. By the assumption, we know that the nodes of \mathcal{P}_c^j , $1 \leq j \leq 5$, totally have at least $h \cdot \gamma \cdot b/15$ balls. It implies that set $V(\mathcal{P}_c^j)$, $1 \leq j \leq 5$, had to be hit at least

$$h \cdot \gamma \cdot b/15 > h \cdot 40 \cdot k \cdot \log_{d-1} n/L$$

times before round t . We call a walk hitting $V(\mathcal{P}_c^j)$, let say \mathcal{W} , is a *bad* path if $\mathcal{W} \cap \mathcal{W}_t$ contains z_{j-1} or z_j . Since G has girth at least $10L$, a bad walk must contain at least one of $[z_{j-1}, x_j]$ and $[y_j, z_j]$ otherwise bad path cannot hit path $[x_j, y_j]$. Conditioning on event $\mathcal{E}(L/20, k)$, path $[z_{j-1}, x_j]$ ($[y_j, z_j]$) is traversed at most $20 \cdot k \log_{d-1} n/L$ times. Therefore the total number of bad walks is less than $40 \cdot k \log_{d-1} n/L$. On the other hand there are $\gamma b/15 = 40k \log_{d-1} n/L$ balls at height higher than $\gamma(h-1)$ in \mathcal{P}_c^j , so there exists a ball at height at least $\gamma \cdot (h-1)$ whose chosen b -choice β_{t_j} , has minimum load at least $\gamma(h-1)$ and \mathcal{W}_{t_j} is not a bad walk. In the following we show that for every pair i and j , $1 \leq i \neq j \leq 5$, $\mathcal{W}_{t_i} \cap \mathcal{W}_{t_j} = \emptyset$ and consequently $\beta_{t_i} \cap \beta_{t_j} = \emptyset$. Toward a contradiction let us assume that there exist i and j so that $v \in V(\mathcal{W}_{t_i}) \cap V(\mathcal{W}_{t_j})$. By definition of \mathcal{W}_{t_i} and \mathcal{W}_{t_j} we have that $(V(\mathcal{W}_{t_i}) \cup V(\mathcal{W}_{t_j})) \cap \{z_i, z_{i-1}, z_j, z_{j-1}\} = \emptyset$ and hence $v \notin \{z_i, z_{i-1}, z_j, z_{j-1}\}$. Let $x \in V(\mathcal{W}_{t_j}) \cap V(\mathcal{W}_t)$ and $y \in V(\mathcal{W}_{t_j}) \cap V(\mathcal{W}_t)$. Then $[x, y]$ contains at least one node from $\{z_i, z_{i-1}, z_j, z_{j-1}\}$. On the other hand $[x, v] \cup [v, y]$ is different path from x to y with length at most $2L$ which contradicts our assumption about girth of G . □

4.3 Proof of Theorem 1.2

In this subsection, based on witness tree technique we prove our main result and Corollary 1. Recall that $\mathcal{E}(\ell, k)$ is the event that any path of length ℓ is traversed less than $\frac{2k \log_d n}{\ell}$ during allocation of n balls.

Proof. By applying Lemma 3.2 we have \mathbf{A} is $(\alpha, n/(6e\alpha))$ -uniform. Let a be smallest positive integer where $n \geq a \cdot \lfloor n/(6e\alpha) \rfloor$. We divide the allocation process to a phases and bound the maximum load attained by \mathbf{A} after allocating n_0 balls. In what follows according to L we consider two cases:

Case 1. Let $L > 5\eta$. We bound the probability that there is a node with $l^* > 32kh + c$, after allocating n_0 balls where $h = \lceil \log \log n / \log(\kappa - 3) \rceil$, $\kappa = \lfloor L/\eta \rfloor$, $k > 3$ and c is an arbitrary constants. So we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[l^* > 32kh + c] &= \Pr[l^* > 32kh + c | \mathcal{E}(\eta/4, k)] \cdot \Pr[\mathcal{E}(\eta/4, k)] + \\ &\quad \Pr[l^* > 32kh + c | \neg \mathcal{E}(\eta/4, k)] \Pr[\neg \mathcal{E}(\eta/4, k)]. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.3 we have $\Pr[\neg \mathcal{E}(\eta/4, k)] < n^{-k+2}$ and hence the second term is bounded by n^{-k+2} . In what follows we bound the first term. Let us assume that in some round t , $1 \leq t \leq n_0$, β_t has minimum load at least $32kh + c$. Set $\mathcal{R} = \beta_t$. Conditioning on $\mathcal{E}(\eta/4, k)$ and applying Lemma 4.4 for \mathcal{R} implies that there exists a family of disjoint b -choices of size κ namely \mathcal{L}_1 where every $\beta \in \mathcal{L}_1$ has minimum load at least $32k(h-1)$ and $\beta \cap \mathcal{R} \neq \emptyset$. (Every $\beta \in \mathcal{L}_1$ is called a child of \mathcal{R} .) So the first application of Lemma 4.4 gives a tree in the interference graph \mathcal{G} with κ disjoint leaves. To continue the building process of the tree, we again apply Lemma 4.4 for every leaf β in the tree which gives $\kappa \geq 5$ children (b -choices) for β . We say a child is *valid* if its corresponding walk is disjoint from the corresponding walk of its grandfather and we only append valid children to their parents. Since $L > \eta$, we have

$$10L(\log(L \cdot \log d)) > 10 \cdot L \log \sqrt{\log_{d-1} n \log d} \geq 5L \log \log n > 5Lh.$$

So G has girth at least $5Lh$. Therefore as long as we apply Lemma 4.4 for h levels and append valid children, we do not have any cycle in the construction of the tree (See right picture 1). Now we claim that always there exists at least two valid children. Let β' be the father of β and \mathcal{W} (\mathcal{W}') is the corresponding walk to β (β'). Then the condition (I) in the statement of Lemma 4.4 shows that $\mathcal{W} \cap \mathcal{W}' = [z, z']$ is of length at most $\lceil \eta \rceil$. On the other hand applying Lemma 4.4 for β gives a family of walks (or equivalently b -choices) $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathcal{W}_j \mid 1 \leq j \leq \kappa\}$, where $\mathcal{W}_j \cap \mathcal{W} \subset P_j$. Since all P_j 's are edge disjoint and of length at most $\lceil \eta \rceil$, we conclude that at most 3 walks in \mathcal{F} intersects \mathcal{W}' . So application of Lemma 4.4 for any leaf gives at least $\kappa - 3$ valid children. Therefore applying Lemma 4.4 for h levels gives a tree $T \subset \mathcal{G}$ with height h whose leaves are disjoint b -choices and every node in \mathcal{N}_T has load at least c . Let \mathcal{E}_T be the event that such a tree T exists. The above construction shows that if event ' $l^* > 32kh + c \mid \mathcal{E}(\eta/4, k)$ ' happens, then event ' $\mathcal{E}_T \mid \mathcal{E}(\eta/4, k)$ ' happens so we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[l^* > 32kh + c \mid \mathcal{E}(\eta/4, k)] \Pr[\mathcal{E}(\eta/4, k)] &\leq \Pr[\mathcal{E}_T \mid \mathcal{E}(\eta/4, k)] \Pr[\mathcal{E}(\eta/4, k)] \\ &= \Pr[\mathcal{E}_T \cap \mathcal{E}(\eta/4, k)] \leq \Pr[\mathcal{E}_T]. \end{aligned}$$

Let m be the number of vertices of T . Since internal nodes of T have degree at least $\kappa - 2 \geq 3$, then the number of its leaves is at least $m/2$. Moreover, by construction, it has at least

$$\kappa \cdot (\kappa - 3)^{h-1} \geq \log n$$

leaves. Thus we have $m \geq 2 \log n$. By Lemma 3.2, we have that \mathbf{A} is $(\alpha, n/(6e\alpha))$ -uniform and hence using Lemma 4.2 yields,

$$\Pr[\mathcal{E}_T] \leq n \cdot 8^m \cdot b^{2m} \left(\frac{e \cdot \alpha}{6e\alpha \cdot c} \right)^{c \cdot b \cdot m/2} = n \cdot 8^m \cdot e^{2m \log b} \left(\frac{1}{6c} \right)^{c \cdot b \cdot m/2} \leq n \cdot e^{m(3+2 \log b - c \cdot b/2)} < n^{-2k},$$

where the last inequality follows by letting any constant $c \geq 6k$. So with probability $1 - n^{-2k} - n^{-k+2}$, in the allocation of first n_0 balls, we have $l^* \leq 16kh + c$. Therefore at the end of the allocation process the maximum load is bounded by $a \cdot l^*$ with high probability.

Case 2. Let $30r \leq L \leq 5\eta$. Similar to previous case we find an upper bound for the probability that a node has load at least $(h+1)\gamma$, where $\gamma = 600 \cdot k[r \cdot \log_{d-1} n/L^2]$, $h = 2\lceil \log L + \log \log d \rceil$. To do so we know that

$$\Pr[l^* > (h+1)\gamma] = \Pr[l^* > (h+1)\gamma \mid \mathcal{E}(L/20, k)] \cdot \Pr[\mathcal{E}(L/20, k)] + \Pr[l^* > (h+1)\gamma \mid \neg \mathcal{E}(L/20, k)] \cdot \Pr[\neg \mathcal{E}(L/20, k)].$$

By Lemma 4.3 we have $\Pr[\neg \mathcal{E}(L/20, k)] < n^{-k+2}$. So the second term is bounded by n^{-k+2} . Let us assume that in some round t , $1 \leq t \leq n_0$, β_t has minimum load at least $(h+1)\gamma$. Set $\mathcal{R} = \beta_t$. Similar to the case where $L > 5\eta$, conditioning on $\mathcal{E}(L/20, k)$ and applying Lemma 4.5 gives a tree in interference graph \mathcal{G} . By assumption, G has girth at least

$$10L(\log L + \log \log d) \geq 5Lh.$$

Therefore applying Lemma 4.5 for h levels gives a tree $T \subset \mathcal{G}$ with height h whose leaves are disjoint b -choices and every node in \mathcal{N}_T has load at least γ . Let \mathcal{E}_T be the event that such a tree T exists. The above construction shows that if event ' $l^* > (h+1)\gamma \mid \mathcal{E}(L/20, k)$ ' happens, then event ' $\mathcal{E}_T \mid \mathcal{E}(L/20, k)$ ' happens so we have

$$\Pr[l^* > (h+1)\gamma \mid \mathcal{E}(L/20, k)] \Pr[\mathcal{E}(L/20, k)] \leq \Pr[\mathcal{E}_T \mid \mathcal{E}(L/20, k)] \Pr[\mathcal{E}(L/20, k)] = \Pr[\mathcal{E}_T \cap \mathcal{E}(L/20, k)] \leq \Pr[\mathcal{E}_T].$$

Let m be the number of vertices of T . Since internal nodes of T have degree at least 3, then the number of its leaves is at least $m/2$. Moreover, by construction, it has at least

$$5 \cdot 2^{h-1} \geq 2^{2 \log(L \log d)} \geq L \cdot \log d$$

leaves. Thus we have $m \geq 2L \log d$. By Lemma 3.2, we have that \mathbf{A} is $(\alpha, n/(6e\alpha))$ -uniform and hence using Lemma 4.2 yields,

$$\Pr[\mathcal{E}_T] \leq n \cdot 8^m \cdot b^{2m} \left(\frac{e \cdot \alpha}{6 \cdot e \cdot \alpha \cdot \gamma} \right)^{\gamma \cdot b \cdot m/2} = n \cdot 8^m \cdot e^{2m \log b} \left(\frac{1}{6 \cdot \gamma} \right)^{\gamma \cdot b \cdot m/2} \leq n \cdot e^{m(3+2 \log b - \gamma \cdot b/2)} < n^{-2k},$$

where the last inequality follows because $\gamma \geq 600k$ and

$$m(2 \log b - \gamma b/2) \leq -mb\gamma/4 \leq -2k(L \log d)(r \log_{d-1} n/L^2)(L/r) < -2k \log n.$$

So with probability $1 - n^{-2k} - n^{-k+2}$, in the allocation of first n_0 balls, we have $l^* \leq (h+1)\gamma$. Therefore at the end of allocation process the maximum load is bounded by $a \cdot l^*$ with high probability. \square

Proof of Corollary 1. By assumption about girth of G denoted by g we have

$$g \geq (\log n)^{\frac{1+\epsilon}{2}} > 20(\log n)^{\frac{1+\delta}{2}} \log \log n > 10L(\log L + \log \log d).$$

On the other hand $L > 5\eta$. So by applying Theorem 1.2, we conclude that the maximum load is bounded by $\mathcal{O}(\log \log n / (\log(L/\eta))) = \mathcal{O}(1/\delta)$ with high probability. \square

5 Balanced allocation using long random walks

In this section we consider the following allocation algorithm. In each round t , $1 \leq t \leq n$, ball t chooses a node from $V(G)$ uniformly at random and performs a NBRW in L many steps. Then the ball allocates itself on a node with minimum load among visited nodes by the ball (ties are broken uniformly at random). Let us denote the algorithm by \mathbf{B} .

5.1 Cycles

Let us first state a result proved by Godfrey [8]. Godfrey considered a setting where n balls are sequentially allocated into n bins where every ball t comes with a set of choices called β_t and the ball is placed on a bin in β_t with minimum load (ties are broken randomly). β_t satisfies a balanced condition which means $\Pr[u \in \beta_t] = \Theta(|\beta_t|/n)$ for any bin u in the ground set. Then he showed if every β_t , $1 \leq t \leq n$ satisfies in the mentioned condition and $|\beta_t| = \Omega(\log n)$, then the maximum load is a constant with high probability. Using this result it is easy to prove the following:

Proposition 5.1. *Let G be union of disjoint cycle(s) with girth $g = \Omega(\log n)$ and size n . If we set $L = \min\{g, \log n\}$, then with high probability the maximum load attained by \mathbf{B} on G is a constant.*

Proof. The probability that a node of G is visited by ball t , $1 \leq t \leq n$, is $\Theta(L/n)$ and the number of visited nodes by a NBRW of length L on G is at least L . So applying the mentioned result implies that the maximum load is a constant. \square

5.2 Arbitrary d -regular graphs

Let G be any non-bipartite d -regular graph on n nodes and P be the transition matrix corresponding to a non-backtracking on G with following eigenvalues:

$$1 = \lambda_1 > \lambda_2 \geq \lambda_3 \dots \geq \lambda_n \geq -1$$

The quantity $\mu = 1 - \lambda_2$ is called the *spectral gap* of P . Let q be an arbitrary probability distribution over $V(G)$ and π be uniform distribution over $V(G)$. We define the π -norm q as

follows

$$\|q\|_\pi = \sqrt{\sum_{u \in V(G)} q^2(u)/\pi(u)}.$$

The following theorem was proved by Gilman [7].

Theorem 5.2 ([7], Theorem 2.1). *Let $A \subseteq V(G)$ and τ_L be the number of visits of any random walk of length L with starting distribution q to set A . Then we have*

$$\Pr[\tau_L - L \cdot \pi(A) \geq \xi] \leq (1 + \xi\mu/10L)\|q\|_\pi e^{-\xi^2\mu/20L},$$

where $\pi(A) = \sum_{u \in A} \pi(u)$ and μ is the spectral gap of the transition matrix.

Proposition 5.3. *Let $L = 100 \log n/\mu(G)$. Then with probability $1 - n^{-\Omega(1)}$, the maximum load attained by \mathbf{B} on G is a constant.*

Proof. Let us define A_t , $1 \leq t \leq n$, to be the number of nodes having load at least 4 after allocating $t \leq n$ balls. Clearly for all t we have $|A_t| \leq n/4$ and hence $\pi(A_t) \leq 1/4$. Since in each round every ball picks a node uniformly at random, the starting distribution of NBRW is uniform and hence we have $\|\pi\|_\pi = 1$. Let us set $L = 100 \log n/\mu$ and $\xi = L/2$. Then applying Theorem 5.2 shows that

$$\Pr[\tau_L \geq L \cdot \pi(A_t) + L/2] \leq (1 + \mu/20)e^{-L\mu/80}$$

So in each round $1 \leq t \leq n$, with probability at least $1 - n^{-4}$, $\tau_L \leq 3L/4$ and hence every ball visits a node with load less than 4. □

Acknowledgment. The author wants to thank Thomas Sauerwald for introducing the problem and several helpful discussions.

References

- [1] Noga Alon, Itai Benjamini, Eyal Lubetzky, and Sasha Sodin. Non-backtracking random walks mix faster. *Communications in Contemporary Mathematics*, 9:585–603, 2007.
- [2] Noga Alon and Eyal Lubetzky. Poisson approximation for non-backtracking random walks. *Israel J. Math.*, 174(1):227–252, 2009.
- [3] Yossi Azar, Andrei Z. Broder, Anna R. Karlin, and Eli Upfal. Balanced allocations. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 29(1):180–200, 1999.
- [4] Petra Berenbrink, André Brinkmann, Tom Friedetzky, and Lars Nagel. Balls into bins with related random choices. *J. Parallel Distrib. Comput.*, 72(2):246–253, 2012.
- [5] Paul Bogdan, Thomas Sauerwald, Alexandre Stauffer, and He Sun. Balls into bins via local search. In *Proc. 24th Annual ACM-SIAM Symp. Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 16–34, 2013.
- [6] D.P. Dubhashi and A. Panconesi. *Concentration of Measure for the Analysis of Randomized Algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.

- [7] David Gillman. A chernoff bound for random walks on expander graphs. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 27(4):1203–1220, 1998.
- [8] Brighten Godfrey. Balls and bins with structure: balanced allocations on hypergraphs. In *Proc. 19th Annual ACM-SIAM Symp. Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 511–517, 2008.
- [9] Krishnaram Kenthapadi and Rina Panigrahy. Balanced allocation on graphs. In *Proc. 17th Annual ACM-SIAM Symp. Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 434–443, 2006.
- [10] Donald Knuth. *The Art of Computer Programming, Vol. 1: Fundamental Algorithms*. Adison-Wesley, third edition, 1997.
- [11] Micheal Mitzenmacher, Andréa W. Richa, and Ramesh Sitaraman. The power of two random choices: A survey of technique and results. In *Handbook of Randomized Computation Volume 1*, pages 255–312, 2001.
- [12] Berthold Vöcking. How asymmetry helps load balancing. *J. ACM*, 50(4):568–589, 2003.