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Abstract

In contention resolution, multiple processors are trying to coordinate to send discrete messages through a shared channel with sharply limited communication. If two processors inadvertently send at the same time, the messages collide and are not transmitted successfully. An important case is acknowledgement-based contention resolution, in which processors cannot listen to the channel at all; all they know is whether or not their own messages have got through. This situation arises frequently in both networking and cloud computing. One particularly important example of an acknowledgement-based contention resolution protocol is binary exponential backoff. Variants of binary exponential backoff are used in both Ethernet and TCP/IP, and both Google Drive and AWS instruct their users to implement it to handle busy periods.

In queueing models, where each processor has a queue of messages, stable acknowledgement-based protocols are already known (Hästad et al., SICOMP 1996). In queue-free models, where each processor has a single message but processors arrive randomly, it is widely conjectured that no stable acknowledgement-based protocols exist for any positive arrival rate of processors. Despite exciting recent results for full-sensing protocols which assume greater listening capabilities of the processors (see e.g. Bender et al. STOC 2020 or Chen et al. PODC 2021), this foundational question remains open even for backoff protocols unless the arrival rate of processors is at least 0.42 (Goldberg et al. SICOMP 2004). We prove the conjecture for all backoff protocols outside of a tightly-constrained special case, and set out the remaining technical obstacles to a full proof.
1 Introduction

In the field of contention resolution, multiple processors (sometimes called “stations”) are trying to coordinate to send discrete messages (sometimes called “packets”) through a shared channel called a multiple access channel. The multiple access channel is not centrally controlled and the processors cannot communicate, except by listening to the channel. The operation of the channel is straightforward. In each (discrete) time step one or more processors might send messages to the channel. If exactly one message is sent then it is delivered successfully and the sender is notified of the success. If multiple messages are sent then they collide and are not transmitted successfully (so they will have to be re-sent later).

We typically view the entire process as a discrete-time Markov chain. At each time step, new messages arrive at processors with rates governed by probability distributions with total rate $\lambda > 0$. After the arrivals, each processor independently chooses whether to send a message through the channel. A contention-resolution protocol is a randomised algorithm that the processors use to decide when to send messages to the channel (and when to wait because the channel is too busy!). Our objective is to find a stable protocol [14], which is a protocol with the property that the corresponding Markov chain is positive recurrent, implying that there is a stationary distribution bounding the likely extent to which messages build up over time. Other objectives include bounding the expected waiting time of messages and maximising the throughput, which is the rate at which messages succeed.

Issues of contention resolution naturally arise when designing networking protocols [1, 2], but it is also relevant to hardware design that enables concurrency [17, 24] and to interaction with cloud computing services [9, 10]. The example of cloud computing will be an instructive one, so we expand on it. Suppose that an unknown number of users is submitting requests to a server which is struggling under the load, with more users arriving over time. The users do not have access to load information from the server and they do not have knowledge of each other — all they know is whether or not their own requests to the server are getting through. The central question of contention resolution is then: how often should users send requests in order to get everyone’s requests through as quickly as possible?

There are two main categories of contention resolution protocol — these differ according to the extent to which processors listen to the channel. In full-sensing protocols, processors constantly listen to the shared channel obtaining partial information. For example, in addition to learning whether its own sends are successful, a processor may learn on which steps the channel is quiet (with no sends) [27] or it may learn on which steps there are successful sends [6] or it may learn both [22]. While full-sensing protocols are suitable in many settings, there are important settings where they cannot reasonably be implemented (such as the cloud computing example above). In acknowledgement-based protocols, the only information that processors receive about the shared channel is whether their own messages get through.

We distinguish between two ways of modelling message arrival. The earliest work in the field focused on queueing models, in which the number $N$ of processors is fixed and each processor maintains a queue of messages to be sent. These models are appropriate for a static network. A particularly simple example is the slotted ALOHA protocol [25], one of the first networking protocols. In this protocol, if there are $N$ processors with non-empty queues, then these processors send independently with probability $1/N$. For large $N$, this is stable if $\lambda < 1/e$. However, it requires the processors to know the value of $N$. In order to get around this difficulty, Metcalfe and Boggs proposed binary exponential backoff, in which a processor which has already had $i$ unsuccessful attempts to send a given message sends it with probability $p_i = 1/2^i$ on the next time step. Binary exponential backoff (with some modifications) forms the basis for Ethernet [20] and TCP/IP [5]. For any $N$, binary exponential backoff is known to be stable for sufficiently small $\lambda$ [14, 3]. Unfortunately, this value of $\lambda$ depends on $N$ and binary exponential backoff is unstable if $\lambda$ is sufficiently large [16]. Remarkably, Håstad, Leighton and Rogoff [16] showed that polynomial backoff (which takes $p_i = i^{-\alpha}$ for some $\alpha > 1$) is stable for all $\lambda \in (0, 1)$. This implies that for all arrival rates $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ there are stable acknowledgement-based protocols in queueing models. In these models even more powerful full-
sensing protocols are known — in particular, there is a stable full-sensing protocol even for the more general model in which some specified pairs of processors are allowed to use the channel simultaneously [26, 27].

In this paper, we focus on queue-free models, which allow for dynamic networks and are more appropriate for public wi-fi hotspots [1] or cloud computing [9, 10]. We again consider these models in discrete time. In these models, processors arrive in the system according to a Poisson distribution with rate \( \lambda \), and each processor only wants to send a single message rather than maintaining a queue; in fact, we typically identify the processors with the messages that they are trying to send. As usual, only one message can pass through the channel at any given time step. In this setting, an acknowledgement-based protocol can be viewed as a joint distribution \((T_1, T_2, \ldots)\) of times. For each message, the corresponding processor independently samples \((\tau_1, \tau_2, \ldots)\) from \((T_1, T_2, \ldots)\). If the message does not get through during the first \(i - 1\) times that it is sent then the processor waits for \(\tau_i\) time steps before sending it for the \(i^\text{th}\) time. An important special case is that of backoff protocols, in which \((T_1, T_2, \ldots)\) is a tuple of independent geometric variables. Equivalently, a backoff protocol is associated with a send sequence of probabilities \(p = p_0, p_1, \ldots\) such that, if a processor has already had \(i\) unsuccessful sends, then it will send its message on the following time step with probability \(p_i\). For example, the case \(p_i = 2^{-i}\) gives rise to the binary exponential backoff protocol that we have already described. This protocol is widely used in the queue-free model: both AWS and Google Drive advise users to implement binary exponential backoff when using their services [9, 10].

In the queue-free setting, there has been a great deal of interesting work developing full-sensing protocols and proving that these perform well. Some of this is described in the survey of Chlebus [8]. See also [22, 11, 15]. More recently, Bender et al. [6] have shown that in the full-sensing model without collision detection (where processors listen to the channel to learn on which steps there are successful sends but are unable to distinguish between silence and collisions) there is a full-sensing protocol which achieves constant throughput even when the message arrival is adversarial rather than random. Chen et al. [7] demonstrate a full-sensing protocol that can achieve a decent throughput, even in the presence of jamming. Despite these advances regarding full-sensing protocols, and other protocols assuming more capabilities from processors than acknowledgement-based protocols [23, 13], for acknowledgement-based protocols and even for backoff protocols, the most fundamental possible question remains open: do stable protocols exist at all?

This question was first raised in the literature by MacPhee in 1987 [19]. The following conjecture is widely believed.

**Conjecture 1.** In the queue-free setting, no acknowledgement-based protocol is stable for any positive value of \( \lambda \) (no matter how small).

Although this foundational conjecture has been around since the 1980s, even the special case corresponding to backoff protocols remains open.

**Conjecture 2.** In the queue-free setting, no backoff protocol is stable for any positive value of \( \lambda \).

Conjecture 2 was made by Aldous in [4]. It is the focus of this work.

When a send sequence decays at a smooth consistent rate, instability of the corresponding backoff protocol (for all arrival rates) is known, as discussed below. The main issue which causes backoff protocols to resist analysis is that the send sequence may decay at an inconsistent rate, or may not decay at all (jumping back and forth between large and small values of \( p_j \) as \( j \) increases). Our analysis almost entirely solves the problem of inconsistent decay rates and proves Conjecture 2 except in some extreme cases, which are characterised in Theorem 6. These extreme cases have the property that the send sequences alternates between \( p_j \)'s that are at least \( \Omega(1) \) and \( p_j \)'s that are exponentially small (but no smaller). Moreover, the large \( p_j \)'s have density \( 1 - o(1) \) in \( \{p_1, \ldots, p_n\} \) as \( n \to \infty \). We therefore refer to them as “LCED” send sequences (for “largely constant with exponential decay”).

In the following, we first describe the known results for protocols that decay very smoothly. We then state theorems giving some natural and important consequences of our new results before stating Theorem 6,
our main result, which shows that for any $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ every backoff protocol with a non-LCED send sequence is unstable.

We discuss the existing results for very smoothly varying protocols in detail in Section 1.2, but the most important cases are as follows.

- Kelly and MacPhee [18] exactly categorised the class of acknowledgement-based protocols which, for all $\lambda$, transmit only finitely many messages with probability 1. Amongst backoff protocols, these include the protocols whose send sequences satisfy $1/p_j = o(c^j)$ for all $c > 1$. (See Corollary 9.)
- Aldous [4] proved that binary exponential backoff is unstable for all $\lambda > 0$; his argument easily extends to all backoff protocols satisfying $1/p_j = \Theta(c^j)$ for some $c > 1$.
- A result which does not appear in the literature to our knowledge, but which was known to the authors of [12], says that there is no stable backoff protocol with an infinite subsequence $p_{j_1}, p_{j_2}, \ldots$ satisfying $1/p_{j_k} = \omega(c^{j_k})$ for all $c > 1$. We state and prove this as Lemma 21.

In short, it is known that there is no stable backoff protocol which is “nice” in the sense that the $p_j$’s decay at a uniform sub-exponential, uniform exponential, or uniform super-exponential rate. As discussed above, a major challenge in the area is that send sequences may switch between sub-exponential and exponential decay and these are far more difficult to handle. The only previously known result that applies to these send sequences is that there are no stable acknowledgement-based protocols when $\lambda \geq 0.531$, and no stable backoff protocols when $\lambda \geq 0.42$ [12].

In this paper, we show that for any positive arrival rate $\lambda$, no stable backoff protocol exists such that the $p_j$’s decay at any rate, even one that may change over time. In the following theorems (and throughout the paper) a “backoff process” is a backoff protocol in the queue-free model.

**Theorem 3.** For every $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ and every monotonically non-increasing send sequence $p = p_0, p_1, \ldots$, the backoff process with arrival rate $\lambda$ and send sequence $p$ is unstable.

Theorem 3 follows easily from our stronger result on non-LCED sequences (Theorem 6) which we discuss shortly. Theorem 6 is robust enough to handle substantial deviations from monotonicity, as demonstrated by the following further corollary.

**Theorem 4.** Let $p$ be a send sequence. Let $m_p(n)$ be the median of $p_0, \ldots, p_n$. Suppose that $m_p(n) = o(1)$. Then for every $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ the backoff process with arrival rate $\lambda$ and send sequence $p$ is unstable.

Theorem 3 and 4 both follow from the fact that every backoff process is unstable, apart from those with LCED send sequences. We now give a formal definition of these send sequences.

**Definition 5.** A send sequence $p$ is LCED (“largely constant with exponential delay”) if it satisfies the following properties:

(i) “Largely constant”: For all $\eta > 0$, there exists $c > 0$ such that for infinitely many $n$, $|\{j \leq n: p_j > c\}| \geq (1 - \eta)n$.

(ii) “with exponential decay”: $p$ has an infinite subsequence $(p_{\ell_1}, p_{\ell_2}, \ldots)$ which satisfies $\log(1/p_{\ell_x}) = \Theta(\ell_x)$ as $x \to \infty$.

(iii) “(but without super-exponential decay)”: $\log(1/p_j) = O(j)$ as $j \to \infty$.

With this definition we can state our main theorem.

3
**Theorem 6.** Let $p$ be a send sequence which is not LCED. Then for every $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ the backoff process with arrival rate $\lambda$ and send sequence $p$ is unstable.

Theorem 6 supports Conjecture 2. Indeed, it is very easy to conjecture that backoff protocols with LCED send sequences are unstable (due to the fact that the “largely constant” send probabilities will generate too much noise on the channel). Theorem 6 proves the conjecture for every other backoff protocol. In Section 1.4, we discuss the remaining obstacles to a full proof of the conjecture.

The remainder of the introduction is structured as follows. Section 1.1 gives the formal definition of a backoff process. Section 1.2 gives the technical context, including existing proof techniques. Section 1.3 sketches the main technical contributions of the paper, sketching the proof of Theorem 15, which is the main missing piece in the proof of Theorem 6. Section 1.4 discusses the remaining obstacles to proving Conjecture 2.

### 1.1 Formal definitions

Throughout, we say that a stochastic process is *stable* if it is positive recurrent, and *unstable* otherwise. An unstable process can be either null recurrent or transient. A “backoff process” is a backoff protocol in the queue-free model.

Informally, a backoff process is a discrete-time Markov chain associated with an arrival rate $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ and a send sequence $p = p_0, p_1, p_2, \ldots$ of real numbers in the range $(0, 1]$. Following Aldous [4], we identify processors and messages, and we think of these as balls moving through a sequence of bins. Each time a message sends, if no other message sends at the same time step, it leaves the system; otherwise, it moves to the next bin. Thus at time $t$, the $j$’th bin contains all messages which have sent $j$ times without getting through (these sends occurred at time steps up to and including time $t$). The system then evolves as follows at a time step $t$. First, new messages are added to bin 0 according to a Poisson distribution with rate $\lambda$. Second, for all $j \geq 0$, each message in bin $j$ sends independently with probability $p_j$. Third, if exactly one message sends then it leaves the system, and otherwise all messages that sent from any bin $j$ move to the next bin, bin $j + 1$.

**Remark 7.** There is no need to consider arrival rates $\lambda \geq 1$ because it is already known that backoff processes with arrival rate $\lambda \geq 1$ are unstable [12]. We also don’t allow $p_j = 0$ since that would trivially cause transience.

**Formal definition of backoff processes.** A backoff process with arrival rate $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ and send sequence $p = p_0, p_1, p_2, \ldots \in (0, 1]$ is a stochastic process $X$ defined as follows. Time steps $t$ are positive integers. Bins $j$ are non-negative integers. There is an infinite set of balls. We now define the set $b_j^X(t)$, which will be the set of balls in bin $j$ just after (all parts of) the $t$’th step. Initially, all bins are empty, so for all non-negative integers $j$, $b_j^X(0) = \emptyset$. For any positive integer $t$, the $t$’th step of $X$ involves (i) step initialisation (including birth), (ii) sending, and (iii) adjusting the bins. Step $t$ proceeds as follows.

- **Part (i) of step $t$ (step initialisation, including birth):** An integer $n_t$ is chosen independently from a Poisson distribution with mean $\lambda$. This is the number of newborns at time $t$. The set $b_0^X(t)$ contains the balls in $b_0^X(t - 1)$ together with $n_t$ new balls which are born at time $t$. For each $j \geq 1$ we define $b_j^X(t) = b_j^X(t - 1)$.

- **Part (ii) of step $t$ (sending):** For all $j \geq 0$, all balls in $b_j^X(t)$ send independently with probability $p_j$. We use $\text{send}^X(t)$ for the set of balls that send at time $t$.

- **Part (iii) of step $t$ (adjusting the bins):**
Thus if a ball is born at time \( t \) and \( j = 0 \), then for all \( j \geq 0 \) we define \( b_j^X(t) = b_j^X(t) \setminus \text{send}^X(t) \).

- Otherwise, no balls escape but balls that send move to the next bin, so we define \( b_j^X(t) = \text{send}^X(t) \setminus \text{send}^X(t) \) and, for all \( j \geq 1 \),
\[
b_j^X(t) = (b_{j-1}^X(t) \cap \text{send}^X(t)) \cup (b_j^X(t) \setminus \text{send}^X(t)).
\]

Finally, we define \( \text{balls}^X(t) = \bigcup_j b_j^X(t) \).

### 1.2 Technical context

We begin by describing the results of Kelly and MacPhee [18] and Aldous [4] in more detail than the previous section. This will allow us in Section 1.3 to clearly identify the regimes in which instability is not known, and to clearly highlight the novel parts of our arguments.

We first introduce a key notion from Aldous [4]. Informally, an **externally-jammed process** is a backoff process in which balls never leave; thus if a single ball sends at a given time step, it moves to the next bin as normal. (See Section 3.1 for a formal definition.) Unlike backoff processes, an externally-jammed process starts in its stationary distribution; thus for all \( j \geq 0 \), the size of \( b_j(0) \) is drawn from a Poisson distribution with mean \( \lambda/p_j \). There is a natural coupling between a backoff process \( X \) and an externally-jammed process \( Y \) such that \( |b_j^X(t)| \leq |b_j^Y(t)| \) for all \( j \) and \( t \) (see Observation 23); thus an externally-jammed process can be used to dominate (from above) the number of balls in a backoff process.

As discussed earlier, Kelly and MacPhee [18] gives a necessary and sufficient condition for infinitely many messages to get through in an acknowledgement-based protocol. In our context, the relevant case of their result can be stated as follows. Given a send sequence \( p \), let \( W_0, W_1, \ldots \) be independent geometric variables such that \( W_j \) has parameter \( p_j \) for all \( j \). Then for all \( \tau \geq 0 \), we define
\[
\mu_\tau(p) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left( \sum_{k=0}^{j} W_k \leq \tau \right).
\]

Thus if a ball is born at time \( t \) in an externally-jammed process, \( \mu_\tau(p) \) is the expected number of times that ball sends up to time \( t + \tau \).

**Theorem 8** ([18, Theorem 3.10]). Let \( p \) be a send sequence, and suppose that for all \( \lambda \in (0, 1) \),
\[
\sum_{\tau=0}^{\infty} \mu_\tau(p) e^{-\lambda \mu_\tau(p)} < \infty.
\]

Then for all \( \lambda \in (0, 1) \), the backoff process \( X \) with arrival rate \( \lambda \) and send sequence \( p \) is unstable. Moreover, with probability 1, only finitely many balls leave \( X \).

The following corollary is proved in Section 2.

**Corollary.** Let \( p \) be a send sequence such that \( \log(1/p_j) = o(j) \) as \( j \to \infty \). Then for all \( \lambda \in (0, 1) \), the backoff process \( X \) with arrival rate \( \lambda \) and send sequence \( p \) is unstable.

The result that is proved in Aldous [4] is the instability of binary exponential backoff, in which \( p_j = 2^{-j} \) for all \( j \), for all arrival rates \( \lambda > 0 \). Aldous’ paper says “without checking the details, [he] believe[s] the argument could be modified to show instability for [all backoff protocols]”. Unfortunately, this turns out not to be accurate. However, the proof does generalise in a natural way to cover a broader class of backoff protocols. Our own result extends this much further building on new ideas, but it is nevertheless based on a similar underlying framework, so we now discuss Aldous’ proof in more detail.
A key notion is that of **potential**. Informally, given a state \( x(t) \) of a backoff process at time \( t \), the potential (Definition 25) of \( x(t) \) is given by

\[
f(x(t)) = \lambda p_0 + \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} p_j |b_j^X(t)|.
\]

Thus, the potential of a backoff process at time \( t \) is the expected number of sends at time \( t+1 \) conditioned on the state at time \( t \); we can think of potential as “noise”. Unsurprisingly, while the potential is large, multiple balls are very likely to send at each time step so balls leave the process very slowly (see Lemma 45).

A slightly generalised version of Aldous’ proof works as follows. The first step is to choose \( j_0 \) to be a suitably large integer, and wait until a time \( t_0 \) at which bins \( 1, \ldots, j_0 \) are all “full” in the sense that \( |b_j(t_0)| \geq c\lambda/p_j \) for some constant \( c \) and all \( j \leq j_0 \). (Such a time \( t_0 \) exists with probability 1. Observe that in the stationary distribution of an externally-jammed process, bin \( j \) contains \( \lambda/p_j \) balls in expectation.) We then define \( \tau_1, \tau_2, \ldots \) with \( \tau_\ell = C \sum_{j=0}^{j_0+\ell} (1/p_j) \) for some constant \( C \); thus \( \tau_\ell \) is \( C \) times the expected number of time steps required for a newborn ball to reach bin \( b_{j_0+\ell} \) in a jammed channel. The key step of the proof is then to argue that with summable failure probability, for all \( \ell \) and all \( t \) satisfying \( t_0 + \tau_\ell \leq t \leq t_0 + \tau_{\ell+1} \), all bins \( j \) with \( (j_0 + \ell)/10 \leq j \leq j_0 + \ell \) satisfy \( |b_j(t)| \geq \zeta \lambda/p_i \) for some constant \( \zeta \). In other words, we prove that with summable failure probability, there is a slowly-advancing frontier of bins which are always full; in particular the potential increases to infinity, and the process is transient and hence unstable.

In order to accomplish this key step of the proof, the argument is split into two cases. If \( t \) is close to \( t_0 \), there is a simple argument based on the idea that bins \( 1 \) through \( j_0 \) were full at time \( t_0 \) and, since \( j_0 \) is large, they have not yet had time to fully empty. For the second case, suppose that \( t \) is significantly larger than \( t_0 \), and the goal is (for example) to show that bin \( j \) is very likely to be full at time \( t = t_0 + \tau_\ell \). By structuring the events carefully, one may assume that the process still has large potential up to time \( t - 1 \), so with high probability not many balls leave the process in time steps \( \{t_0 + 1, \ldots, t\} \). At this point, Aldous uses a time-reversal argument to show that, in the externally-jammed process, bin \( j \) fills with balls that are born after time \( t_0 \) during an interval of \( \tau_\ell \) time steps. Under a natural coupling, these balls follow the same trajectory in both the backoff process and the externally-jammed process unless they leave the backoff process; thus, by a union bound, with high probability most of these balls are present in bin \( j \) at time \( t \) as required. Aldous then applies a union bound over all bins \( j \) with \( (j_0 + \ell)/10 \leq j \leq j_0 + \ell \); crucially, the probability bounds for each individual bin \( j \) are strong enough that he does not need to engage with the more complicated joint distribution of the contents of the bins.

Since Aldous works only with binary exponential backoff in [4], he takes \( \tau_\ell \sim 2^{j_0+\ell} \); his conjecture that his proof can be generalised to all backoff protocols is based on the idea that the definition of \( \tau_\ell \) could be modified, which gives rise to the more general argument above. Unfortunately, there are very broad classes of backoff protocols to which this generalisation cannot apply. We now define the collection of send sequences which this modified version of Aldous’ proof could plausibly handle.

**Definition 10.** A send sequence \( p \) is **reliable** if it has the following property. Let \( \lambda > 0 \), and let \( X \) be a backoff process with arrival rate \( \lambda \) and send sequence \( p \). Then with positive probability, there exists \( \zeta > 0 \), and times \( t_0, t_1, t_2, \ldots \) and collections \( B_0, B_1, B_2, \ldots \) of bins such that:

- for all \( i \), for all \( t \) satisfying \( t_i \leq t \leq t_{i+1} \), for all \( j \in B_i \), we have \( |b_j(t)| \geq \zeta \lambda/p_i \).
- \( |B_i| \) is an increasing sequence with \( |B_i| \to \infty \) as \( i \to \infty \).

Indeed, if Aldous’ proof works for a send sequence \( p \), then it demonstrates that \( p \) is reliable: Aldous takes \( \zeta = 1/2 \), \( t_i = \tau_i \) for all \( i \), and \( B_i = \{(j_0 + i)/10, \ldots, j_0 + i\} \) for all \( i \). In short, a reliable protocol is one in which, after some “startup time” \( t_0 \), at all times one can point to a large collection of bins which will reliably all be full enough to provide significant potential. As discussed above, it is important that they are all full — otherwise it is necessary to delve into the complicated inter-dependencies of the bins.
1.3 Proof sketch

In order to describe the proof of Theorem 6 and explain how it works on unreliable send sequences that are not covered by Aldous’ proof techniques, we first set out a guiding example by defining the following family of send sequences.

Example 11. Given \( \rho \in (0, 1) \), an increasing sequence \( \mathbf{a} \) of non-negative integers with \( a_0 = 0 \), and a function \( f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \), the \((\rho, \mathbf{a}, g)\)-interleaved send sequence \( \mathbf{p} = p_0, p_1, \ldots \) is given by

\[
p_j = \begin{cases} 
\rho^j & \text{if } a_{2k} \leq j \leq a_{2k+1} - 1 \text{ for some } k \geq 0, \\
g(j) & \text{if } a_{2k+1} \leq j \leq a_{2k+2} - 1 \text{ for some } k \geq 0.
\end{cases}
\]

In other words, the \((\rho, \mathbf{a}, g)\)-interleaved send sequence consists of an exponentially-decaying send sequence with base \( \rho \) spliced together with a second send sequence specified by \( g \), with the splices occurring at points given by \( \mathbf{a} \).

In this section, we will take \( g(j) = 1/\log \log j \) and \( a_k = 2^k \). We will refer to the \((\rho, \mathbf{a}, g)\)-interleaved send sequence with this choice of \( g \) and \( \mathbf{a} \) as a \( \rho \)-interleaved send sequence.

Observe that a \((\rho, \mathbf{a}, g)\)-interleaved send sequence fails to be LCED whenever \( g(j) = o(1) \). Thus, a \( \rho \)-interleaved send sequence is not LCED.

We claim that as long as \( \rho \) is sufficiently small, a \( \rho \)-interleaved send sequence is not reliable and neither Theorem 8 nor Lemma 21 prove instability; we expand on this claim in Section 1.4. Our main technical result, which we introduce next, will be strong enough to show that backoff protocols with these send sequences are unstable. In order to introduce the technical result we first give some definitions.

Definition 12. Given an \( \eta \in (0, 1) \), let \( \kappa(\eta) = \lceil 3/\eta \rceil \).

Definition 13. Let

\[
p_*(\lambda, \eta, \nu) = \min \left\{ \frac{\lambda}{200}, \frac{\lambda \eta}{1800 \kappa(\eta)^2 \log(1/\nu)} \right\}.
\]

Definition 14. Fix \( \lambda, \eta \) and \( \nu \) in \((0, 1)\). A send sequence \( \mathbf{p} = p_0, p_1, \ldots \) is \((\lambda, \eta, \nu)\)-suitable if \( p_0 = 1 \) and there is a positive integer \( n_0 \) such that for all \( n \geq n_0 \),

- \(|\{j \in [n] \mid p_j \leq p_*(\lambda, \eta, \nu)\}| > \eta n \), and
- \( \nu^n < p_n \).

Theorem 15. Fix \( \lambda, \eta \) and \( \nu \) in \((0, 1)\). Let \( \mathbf{p} \) be a \((\lambda, \eta, \nu)\)-suitable send sequence. Let \( X \) be a backoff process with arrival rate \( \lambda \) and send sequence \( \mathbf{p} \). Then \( X \) is transient, and hence unstable.

Theorem 6 will follow from Theorem 15 (actually, from a slightly more technical version of it, stated as Corollary 27), from Corollary 9, and from Lemma 21. We give the proof of Theorem 6, along with the proofs of Theorems 3 and 4, in Section 6. Observe that for all \( \lambda, \eta > 0 \), every \( \rho \)-interleaved send sequence is a \((\lambda, \eta, 2\rho)\)-suitable send sequence, so Theorem 15 does indeed apply.

Fix \( \lambda > 0 \). Before sketching the proof of Theorem 15, we set out one more piece of terminology. Recall that there is a natural coupling between a backoff process \( X \) and an externally-jammed process \( Y \) with arrival rate \( \lambda \) and send sequence \( \mathbf{p} \). Under this coupling, the evolution of \( X \) is a deterministic function of the evolution of \( Y \) — balls follow the same trajectories in each process, except that they leave \( X \) if they send at a time step in which no other ball sends. As such, we work exclusively with \( Y \), calling a ball stuck if it is present in \( X \) and unstuck if it is not. We write \( \text{stuck}^Y_j(t) \) for the set of stuck balls in bin \( j \) at time \( t \).
and likewise \( \text{unstuck}^Y_j(t) \) for the set of unstuck balls. (See the formal definition of an externally-jammed process in Section 3.1.)

Intuitively, the main obstacle in applying Aldous’ proof sketch to a \( \rho \)-interleaved send sequence \( p \) is the long sequences of bins with \( p_j = 1/(\log \log j) \). In the externally-jammed process \( Y \), each individual bin \( j \) is likely to empty of balls — and hence also of stuck balls — roughly once every \( (\log j)^\lambda \) steps. (Indeed, in the stationary distribution, bin \( j \) is empty with probability \( e^{-\lambda/\rho(j)} = (\log j)^{-\lambda} \).) As such, the individual bins do not provide a consistent source of potential as reliability would require. We must instead engage with the joint distribution of bins and argue that a long sequence of bins with large \( \rho \) remain large. By far the most difficult part of our proof is making this idea rigorous, which we do in Lemma 46. This lemma is the heart of our proof; we spend Section 3 setting out the definitions needed to state it formally, then give the actual proof in Section 4. With Lemma 46 in hand, we then prove Theorem 26 in Section 5, using a version of Aldous’ framework in which a union bound over large bins is replaced by Chernoff bounds over a collection of independent Poisson variables which dominate a non-independent collection of smaller bins from below.

For the rest of this section, we will focus on the statement and proof of Lemma 46. A fundamental difficulty is that we can only hope for such a domination to work while the potential of \( Y \) is large, but the potential is just a weighted sum of terms \( |\text{stuck}^Y_j(t)| \), which are precisely the variables we are concerned with — we therefore expect a huge amount of dependency. To resolve this, we define the two-stream process in Section 3.2. Essentially, we split \( Y \) into a pair \( T = (Y^A, Y^B) \) of two externally-jammed processes \( Y^A \) and \( Y^B \), each with arrival rate \( \lambda/2 \), in the natural way. We then say that a ball becomes unstuck in \( Y^A \) if it sends on a time step at which no other ball in \( Y^B \) sends, and likewise for \( Y^B \). Thus only balls from \( Y^B \) can prevent balls in \( Y^A \) from becoming unstuck, and only balls from \( Y^A \) can prevent balls in \( Y^B \) from becoming unstuck. Each stream of the process acts as a relatively independent source of “noise” for the other stream while its potential is high. Naturally, there is a simple coupling back to the originally externally-jammed process under which stuck balls in \( Y \) are dominated below by stuck balls in \( T \).

We must also explain what we mean by \( T \) having “large potential”. We give an informal overview here, and the formal definitions in Section 3.5. We define a “startup event” \( E_{\text{init}}(t_0) \) which occurs for some \( t_0 \) with probability 1, and which guarantees very large potential at time \( t_0 \) (governed by a constant \( C_{\text{init}} \)). We divide the set of bins into \( \text{blocks} B_1, B_2, \ldots \) of exponentially-growing length, and define a map \( \tau \mapsto \text{bins}(\tau) \) from times \( t_0 + \tau \) to blocks \( B_\tau \). We define a constant \( \zeta > 0 \), and say that \( T \) is \( t_0 \)-jammed for \( \tau \) if both \( Y^A \) and \( Y^B \) have at least \( \zeta |\text{bins}(\tau - 1)| \) potential at time \( t_0 + \tau - 1 \). (Observe that if every ball were stuck, then in expectation the balls in \( \text{bins}(\tau - 1) \) would contribute \( \lambda |\text{bins}(\tau - 1)| \) total potential, so jammedness says that on average the bins in \( \text{bins}(\tau - 1) \) are “almost full”.) We can now state a somewhat simplified version of Lemma 46.

**Lemma 16.** Fix \( \lambda, \eta \) and \( \nu \) in \( (0, 1) \) and a \( (\lambda, \eta, \nu) \)-suitable send sequence \( p \) with \( p_0 = 1 \). Let \( Y^A \) and \( Y^B \) be independent externally-jammed processes with arrival rate \( \lambda/2 \) and send sequence \( p \) and consider the two-stream externally-jammed process \( T = T(Y^A, Y^B) \). Let \( t_0 \) and \( \tau \) be sufficiently large integers. Then there is a coupling of
• $T$ conditioned on $E_{\text{init}}(t_0)$,

• a sample $\{Z^A_j \mid j \in \text{bins}(\tau)\}$ where each $Z^A_j$ is chosen independently from a Poisson distribution with mean $\lambda/(4p_j)$, and

• a sample $\{Z^B_j \mid j \in \text{bins}(\tau)\}$ where each $Z^B_j$ is chosen from a Poisson distribution with mean $\lambda/(4p_j)$ and these are independent of each other but not of the $\{Z^A_j\}$ values

in such a way that at least one of the following happens:

• $T$ is not $t_0$-jammed for $\tau$, or

• for all $j \in \text{bins}(\tau)$, $|\text{stuck}^T_j(A, t_0 + \tau)| \geq Z^A_j$ and $|\text{stuck}^T_j(B, t_0 + \tau)| \geq Z^B_j$.

In order to prove Lemma 16 (or actually its full version Lemma 46), we first formalise the idea that $Y^A$ can act as a "relatively independent" source of noise to prevent balls in $Y^B$ becoming unstuck (and vice versa). In Section 4.1, we define a random unsticking process; this is an externally-jammed process in which balls become unstuck on sending based on independent Bernoulli variables, rather than based on the behaviour of other balls. In Lemma 52, we dominate the stuck balls of $Y^A$ below by a random unsticking process $R$ for as long as $Y^B$ is "locally jammed", and likewise for the stuck balls of $Y^B$.

In order to analyse the random unsticking process, we then make use of a time reversal, defining a reverse random unsticking process $\tilde{R}$ in Section 4.2 which we couple to $R$ using a probability-preserving bijection between ball trajectories set out in Lemma 48. We then exploit the fact that balls move independently and the fact that the number of balls following any given trajectory is a Poisson random variable to prove Lemma 16, expressing the set of balls in $\text{stuck}^R_j$ as a sum of independent Poisson variables (one per possible trajectory) with total mean at least $\lambda/(4p_j)$. Unfortunately, the coupling between $R$ and $\tilde{R}$ does not run over all time steps — for example, since we need to condition on $E_{\text{init}}(t_0)$, it certainly cannot cover times before $t_0$ in $R$. As a result, we cannot analyse all trajectories this way; instead, we define a subset $\text{Fill}^R_j(t)$ of balls in bin $j$ of $R$ at time $t$ which are born suitably late in $R$, and analyse the corresponding set $\text{Fill}^\tilde{R}_j(t)$ of balls in $\tilde{R}$ (see Section 4.6). We then prove in Lemma 49 that the variables $|\text{Fill}^R_j(t)|$ for $j \in \text{bins}(\tau - 1)$ are dominated below by a tuple of independent Poisson variables; this bound then propagates back through the couplings to a lower bound on $|\text{Fill}^R_j(t)|$ in $R$ and finally to the required bounds on $|\text{stuck}^{Y^A}(t)|$ and $|\text{stuck}^{Y^B}(t)|$ in $T$ given by Lemma 16.

### 1.4 Future work

It is natural to look at the definition of an LCED sequence and wonder where the remaining difficulties are in a proof of Conjecture 2. Intuitively, LCED sequences seem like quite a simple case, and at first glance one might suspect that they could be proved unstable by incremental improvements to Theorem 15, Corollary 9, and Lemma 21. Unfortunately, this is not the case — LCED send sequences can exhibit qualitatively different behaviour than the send sequences covered by these results.

Recall the definition of a $(\rho, a, g)$-interleaved send sequence from Example 11. Let $p$ be such a send sequence, and let $X$ be a backoff process with send sequence $p$ and arrival rate $\lambda \in (0, 1)$. Unless $g$ is exponentially small, Lemma 21 does not apply to $p$ for any $\lambda < 2\rho$. Also, Theorem 8 (and hence Corollary 9) does not apply to $p$ for any $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ whenever $\rho$ is sufficiently small and $a$ grows suitably quickly. To see this, suppose that $\rho$ is small and that $a$ grows quickly. Recall the definition of $\mu_r(p)$ from Theorem 8. It is not hard to show (e.g. via union bounds) that $\mu_r(p) \leq \log_{1/\rho}(\tau) + O(1)$ for all $\tau$ satisfying
\[ a_{2k} \leq \log_{1/\rho}(\tau) \leq a_{2k+1}/3 \] for any \( k \); from this, it follows that

\[ \sum_{\tau=0}^{\infty} \mu_{\tau}(p)e^{-\lambda \mu_{\tau}(p)} \geq \sum_{\tau=0}^{\infty} \mu_{\tau}(p)e^{-\mu_{\tau}(p)} = \infty \text{ for all } \lambda \in (0,1). \]

Since Theorem 8 is both a necessary and a sufficient condition for a backoff process to send only finitely many times (see [18]), we can conclude that the methods of Kelly and MacPhee do not apply here.

As discussed in Section 1.3, \( p \) is not LCED whenever \( g(j) = o(1) \) as \( j \to \infty \). It is also easy to see that \( p \) is LCED whenever \( g(j) = \Theta(1) \) and \( a_{2k+1} - a_{2k} = o(a_{2k+2} - a_{2k+1}) \) as \( k \to \infty \), so in this case our own Theorem 6 does not apply. To show that a simple generalisation of Theorem 15 will not suffice, we introduce the following definition.

**Definition 17.** A send sequence \( p \) has quiet periods if it has the following property for some \( \lambda \in (0,1) \). Let \( X \) be a backoff process with arrival rate \( \lambda \) and send sequence \( p \). Then with probability 1, there exist infinitely many time steps on which \( X \) has potential less than 1.

Recall that the proof of Theorem 15 (as with Aldous’ original proof [4]) relies on proving that the potential of a backoff process increases to infinity over time, so it is unsuitable for send sequences with quiet periods. Moreover, Corollary 9 is based on Kelly and MacPhee’s necessary and sufficient condition for a backoff protocol to have only finitely many successful sends (with probability 1). Backoff protocols with quiet periods have infinitely many successful sends, so cannot be proved unstable by Corollary 9. Finally, Lemma 21 handles many protocols with quiet periods (e.g. \( p_j = 2^{-2j} \)), but these protocols are always quiet, and have the property that they can be proved unstable by simple domination arguments (assuming that a ball always succeeds when it sends unless another ball is born at the same time). For many send sequences with quiet periods, these assumptions are not true.

The key problem is that if \( g(j) = 1/2 \) (say), \( \rho \) is sufficiently small, and \( a \) grows sufficiently quickly, then \( p \) is very likely to have quiet periods. Indeed, in the externally-jammed process, for large values of \( k \) all bins \( 1, \ldots, a_{2k} - 1 \) are likely to simultaneously empty (which happens with probability roughly at least \( 2^{-a_{2k}} \) in the stationary distribution) long before bin \( a_{2k} \) fills with stuck balls and begins contributing significant potential (which will take time at least \( (1/\rho)^{a_{2k}} \)). Heuristically, we would expect \( p \) to alternate between “quiet periods” with very low potential and “noisy periods” in which potential first grows rapidly, then stays high for a very long time. Our current methods are incapable of handling this juxtaposition.

However, despite this, we believe we have made significant progress towards a proof of Conjecture 2 even for LCED sequences. Recall from Section 1.3 that the key part of our proof of Theorem 15 is Lemma 46, which gives a way of dominating the number of stuck balls in different bins below by an independent tuple of Poisson variables as long as overall potential is large. Importantly, the proof of Lemma 46 doesn’t actually rely on the fact that \( p \) is suitable — suitability is important to determining the parameters of the block construction, which is vital in Section 6, but the Lemma 46 proof goes through regardless of what these parameters are. As such, we believe a slightly more general version of Lemma 46 will be important even for LCED sequences as a tool for analysing “noisy periods”. The main remaining challenge is in showing that such “noisy periods” are common enough to outweigh the effect of “quiet periods” of very low potential.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we set out some standard preliminaries and prove Lemma 21 and Corollary 9. In Section 3 we introduce the main random processes and block construction we will need in order to state Lemma 46, the key lemma for our proof of Theorem 15 (see Section 1.3). In Section 4, we state and prove Lemma 46. In Section 5, we use Lemma 46 to prove Theorem 26. Finally, in Section 6, we use Theorem 26 (together with Lemma 21 and Corollary 9) to prove Theorem 6, and derive Theorems 3 and 4 as corollaries.
2 Preliminaries

For all positive integers \( n \), we define \([n]\) to be the set \( \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \). All logarithms are to the base \( e \) unless specified otherwise.

A stochastic process is “stable” if it is positive recurrent. It is “unstable” otherwise. An unstable process can be either null recurrent or transient. We now define the filtration \( \mathcal{F}_0^X, \mathcal{F}_1^X, \ldots \) of a backoff process \( X \).

**Definition 18.** Let \( X \) be a backoff process. Since all bins are initially empty, \( \mathcal{F}_0^X \) contains no information. For each positive integer \( t \), \( \mathcal{F}_t^X \) contains \( \mathcal{F}_{t-1}^X \) together with \( b_0^X(t) \) and, for each \( j \geq 0 \), \( b_j^X(t) \). It is clear that \( \text{send}^X(t) \) and \( \text{balls}^X(t) \) can be deduced from \( \mathcal{F}_t^X \).

We now state some common Chernoff bounds.

**Lemma 19.** (E.g. [21, Theorems 4.5 and 5.4]) Let \( \Psi \) be a real random variable with mean \( \mu \) which is either Poisson or a sum of independent Bernoulli variables. Then for all \( 0 < \delta < 1 \), we have
\[
P(\Psi \leq (1 - \delta)\mu) \leq e^{-\delta^2 \mu/2}.
\]

**Lemma 20.** Let \( \Psi \) be a binomial random variable with mean \( \mu \). Then for all \( x > 1 \), we have
\[
P(\Psi \geq x\mu) < e^{-\mu x (\log x - 1)}.
\]

**Proof.** By the Chernoff bound of [21, Theorem 4.4(1)], for all \( \delta > 0 \), we have
\[
P(\Psi \geq (1 + \delta)\mu) < \left( \frac{e^\delta}{(1 + \delta)^{1+\delta}} \right)^\mu.
\]
Taking \( x = 1 + \delta \) and putting everything under the exponent implies that for all \( x > 1 \),
\[
P(\Psi \geq x\mu) < e^{\mu (x-1) - \mu x \log x} < e^{-\mu x (\log x - 1)},
\]
as required. \( \Box \)

We will also use some preliminary lemmas. The following lemma was also known to to the authors of [12].

**Lemma 21.** Let \( X \) be a backoff process with arrival rate \( \lambda \in (0, 1) \) and send sequence \( p = p_0, p_1, \ldots \). If, for infinitely many \( j \), \( p_j \leq (\lambda p_0/2)^j \), then \( X \) is unstable.

**Proof.** Suppose that for infinitely many \( j \) we have \( p_j \leq (\lambda p_0/2)^j \). We will show that \( X \) is not positive recurrent by showing that the expected time for \( X \) to return to its initial state (the state containing no balls) is infinite.

Let \( T_0 \) be the first time such that \( b_1^X(T_0) \neq \emptyset \), and note that \( T_0 < \infty \) with probability 1. Consider any positive integer \( t_0 \) and any value \( F_{t_0}^X \) of \( F_{t_0}^X \) such that \( T_0 = t_0 \). We will now consider the process \( X \) conditioned on \( F_{t_0}^X = F_{t_0} \). Let
\[
T = \min(\{\infty\} \cup \{t > t_0 \mid \text{balls}^X(t) = \emptyset\}).
\]
Then by the definition of positive recurrence, it suffices to show that \( E[T \mid F_{t_0}^X = F_{t_0}^X] = \infty \).

Let \( \beta \) be an arbitrary ball in \( b_1^X(t_0) \), and let
\[
T' = \min(\{\infty\} \cup \{t > t_0 \mid \beta \in \text{send}^X(t) \text{ and no newborns send at } t\}).
\]
Observe that $\beta$ must escape in order for $X$ to return to its initial state, and $\beta$ cannot escape before time $T'$, so $T' \leq T$; it therefore suffices to show that $\mathbb{E}[T' \mid F_{t_0}^X = F_{t_0}^X] = \infty$.

At any given step $t > t_0$, the number of newborns that send is a Poisson random variable with parameter $\lambda p_0$, so the probability of at least one newborn sending on any given step is $r = 1 - e^{-\lambda p_0}$. We therefore have

$$\mathbb{E}[T' \mid F_{t_0}^X = F_{t_0}^X] = \sum_{j \geq 1} r^{j-1}(\frac{1}{p_1} + \cdots + \frac{1}{p_j})(1-r) = \frac{1-r}{r} \sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{r^j}{p_j}.$$ 

By the assumption in the lemma statement, infinitely many values of $j$ contribute a summand which is at least $(2r/(\lambda p_0))^j$ which is at least 1 since $r = 1 - e^{-\lambda p_0} \geq \lambda p_0/2$, thus the sum diverges as required. □

Before setting up the structure for our own proof, we also prove Corollary 9, a Corollary of Kelly and MacPhee’s Theorem 8.

**Corollary 9.** Let $p$ be a send sequence such that $\log(1/p_j) = o(j)$ as $j \to \infty$. Then for all $\lambda \in (0, 1)$, the backoff process $X$ with arrival rate $\lambda$ and send sequence $p$ is unstable.

**Proof.** Let $p$ be a send sequence as in the corollary statement. As in Theorem 8, let $W_0, W_1, \ldots$ be independent geometric variables such that $W_j$ has parameter $p_j$ for all $j$. For all $\tau \geq 2/p_0$, let

$$\mu_\tau(p) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left( \sum_{k=0}^{j} W_k \leq \tau \right),$$

and let

$$M(\tau) = \max \left\{ j \geq 0 : \sum_{k=0}^{j} (1/p_k) \leq \tau/2 \right\}.$$ 

In order to apply Theorem 8, we first prove that for all $\tau \geq 2/p_0$, $\mu_\tau(p) \geq M(\tau)/2$. By the definition of $M(\tau)$, for all $j \leq M(\tau)$ we have $\mathbb{E}(\sum_{k=0}^{j} W_k) \leq \tau/2$. It follows by Markov’s inequality that for all $j \leq M(\tau)$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left( \sum_{k=0}^{j} W_k \leq \tau \right) = 1 - \mathbb{P}\left( \sum_{k=0}^{j} W_k > \tau \right) \geq 1/2.$$ 

It now follows from (1) that

$$\mu_\tau(p) \geq \sum_{j=0}^{M(\tau)} \mathbb{P}\left( \sum_{k=0}^{j} W_k \leq \tau \right) \geq M(\tau)/2.$$  

We now prove that $M(\tau) = \omega(\log \tau)$ as $\tau \to \infty$. Let $C > 1$ be arbitrary; we will show that when $\tau$ is sufficiently large, we have

$$\sum_{k=0}^{[C \log \tau]} (1/p_k) \leq \tau/2,$$

and hence that $M(\tau) \geq C \log \tau$ as required. Recall that $\log(1/p_j) = o(j)$ as $j \to \infty$, and let $j_C$ be such that $1/p_j \leq e^{j/C}/(Ce^4)$ for all $j \geq j_C$. Suppose $\tau \geq 2/p_0$ is large enough that

$$\sum_{k=0}^{j_C-1} (1/p_k) \leq \tau/4.$$
We then have
\[
\sum_{k=0}^{[C\log \tau]} \frac{1}{p_k} \leq \frac{\tau}{4} + \sum_{k=j_C}^{[C\log \tau]} \frac{1}{p_k} \leq \frac{\tau}{4} + \frac{1}{Ce^4} \sum_{k=0}^{[C\log \tau]} e^{k/C} < \frac{\tau}{4} + \frac{1}{Ce^4} \cdot \frac{e^{(1+[C\log \tau])/C}}{e^{1/C} - 1}.
\]

Since \(e^x \geq 1 + x\) for all \(x \geq 0\), \(C(e^{1/C} - 1) \geq 1\) and since \(C > 1\) it follows that
\[
\sum_{k=0}^{[C\log \tau]} \frac{1}{p_k} \leq \frac{\tau}{4} + \frac{1}{e^4} \cdot 2^{+\log \tau} < \frac{\tau}{2}.
\]
Hence \(M(\tau) \geq C \log \tau\), so \(M(\tau) = \omega(\log \tau)\) as \(\tau \to \infty\), as claimed; by (2), it follows that \(\mu_\tau(p) = \omega(\log \tau)\) as \(\tau \to \infty\).

Finally, we observe that, since \(\mu_\tau(p) = \omega(\log \tau)\), for all \(\lambda \in (0, 1)\) there is a \(\tau_\lambda\) such that, for \(\tau \geq \tau_\lambda\), \(\mu_\tau(p) \geq (2/\lambda) \log \tau\). Thus
\[
\sum_{\tau=0}^{\infty} \mu_\tau(p) e^{-\lambda \mu_\tau(p)} \leq \Theta(1) + \sum_{\tau=\tau_\lambda}^{\infty} \frac{(2/\lambda) \log \tau}{\tau^2} < \infty.
\]

The result therefore follows immediately from Theorem 8.

\[\square\]

3 Preparation for our Technical Result

We will prove Theorem 15 by studying stochastic processes that are related to, but not exactly the same as, backoff processes. To do this, it will be useful to assume that the send sequence \(p\) has \(p_0 = 1\). The next observation sets up the machinery that enables this.

**Observation 22.** Fix \(\lambda \in (0, 1)\). Let \(p\) be a send sequence. Let \(p'\) be the send sequence that is identical to \(p\) except that \(p'_0 = 1\). Let \(X\) be a backoff process with arrival rate \(\lambda\) and send sequence \(p\). Let \(X'\) be a backoff process with arrival rate \(\lambda p_0\) and send sequence \(p'\). Then there is a coupling of \(X\) and \(X'\) such that, for every positive integer \(t\) and every positive integer \(j\), \(b^X_j(t) \geq b^{X'}_j(t)\).

Indeed, in defining the coupling, we can identify the newborns of \(X'\) with the newborns of \(X\) which immediately send.

3.1 Definition of externally-jammed process

In order to study backoff processes it will be helpful to define another process that is associated with an arrival rate \(\lambda \in (0, 1)\) and a send sequence \(p = p_0, p_1, p_2, \ldots\) of real numbers in the range \((0, 1)\] with \(p_0 = 1\).

Note that in a backoff process \(X\) with \(p_0 = 1\) every bin \(b^X_0(t)\) is empty, and this is why bins are positive integers \(j\) in the following definition.

\(Y\) is an externally-jammed process with arrival rate \(\lambda \in (0, 1)\) and send sequence \(p\) if it behaves as follows. Time steps \(t\) are positive integers. Bins \(j\) are positive integers. We reserve \(j\) as an index for bins, and use \(\ell\) when we need a second index. Initialisation: For every positive integer \(j\), an integer \(x_j\) is chosen independently from a Poisson distribution with mean \(\lambda/p_j\). The set \(b^Y_j(0)\) is the set containing \(x_j\) balls which are “born in process \(Y\) at time 0 in bin \(j\)”. Formally, the names of these balls are \((Y, 0, j, 1), \ldots, (Y, 0, j, x_j)\). For any positive integer \(t\), the \(t\)'th step of \(Y\) involves (i) step initialisation (including birth), (ii) sending, and (iii) adjusting the bins. The set \(b^Y_j(t)\) is the set of balls in bin \(j\) just after (all parts of) the \(t\)'th step. Step \(t\) proceeds as follows.
• Part (i) of step $t$ (step initialisation, including birth): An integer $n_t$ is chosen independently from a Poisson distribution with mean $\lambda$. The set $b_j^Y (t)$ of newborns at time $t$ is the set containing $n_t$ balls which are “born in $Y$ at time $t$”. Formally, the names of these balls are $(Y, t, 1), \ldots, (Y, t, n_t)$. Then for all $j \geq 1$, $b_j^Y (t) = b_j^Y (t - 1)$.

• Part (ii) of step $t$ (sending): For all $j \geq 0$, all balls in $b_j^Y (t)$ send independently with probability $p_j$. We use $\text{send}^Y (t)$ for the set of balls that send at time $t$.

• Part (iii) of step $t$ (adjusting the bins): For all $j \geq 1$,

$$b_j^Y (t) = (b_{j-1}^Y (t) \cap \text{send}^Y (t)) \cup (b_j^Y (t) \setminus \text{send}^Y (t)).$$

Note that for any distinct $j$ and $j'$, $b_j^Y (t)$ is disjoint from $b_{j'}^Y (t)$. Also, since $p_0 = 1$, $\cup_{j \geq 1} b_j^Y (t) = \cup_{j \geq 1} b_j^Y (0)$. Then for each positive integer $t$, $\mathcal{F}_t^Y$ contains $\mathcal{F}_{t-1}^Y$ together with $b_0^Y (t)$ and, for each $j \geq 1$, $b_j^Y (t)$. It is clear that $\text{send}^Y (t)$ can be deduced from $\mathcal{F}_t^Y$. We define $\text{balls}^Y (t) = \cup_j b_j^Y (t)$. This can also be deduced from $\mathcal{F}_t^Y$. We will use the following notation: Each ball $\beta = (Y, 0, j, x)$ has birth $Y (\beta) = 0$. Each ball $\beta = (Y, t, x)$ has birth $Y (\beta) = t$.

It is going to be convenient in our analysis to think about the balls of an externally-jammed process $Y$ as having two states, “stuck” and “unstuck”. The set $\text{stuck}^Y (t)$ will be the set of all balls in $\text{balls}^Y (t)$ that are stuck in the process $Y$ at time $t$ and $\text{unstuck}^Y (t) = \text{balls}^Y (t) \setminus \text{stuck}^Y (t)$. (Given this identity, we will define either $\text{unstuck}^Y (t)$ or $\text{stuck}^Y (t)$ for each $t$, the other can be deduced.) We will assign the states “stuck” and “unstuck” in such a way that $\text{stuck}^Y (t)$ and $\text{unstuck}^Y (t)$ can be deduced from $\mathcal{F}_t^Y$, so the assignment of states to balls is just a convenience.

First, $\text{stuck}^Y (0) = \emptyset$. Then for any $t \geq 1$ we have the following definition.

• newstuck$^Y (t) = \text{stuck}^Y (t - 1) \cup b_0^Y (t)$.

• stuck$^Y (t) = \text{newstuck}^Y (t) \cap \text{send}^Y (t)$.

• If $|\text{stucksend}^Y (t)| = 1$ then $\text{unstuck}^Y (t) = \text{unstuck}^Y (t - 1) \cup \text{stucksend}^Y (t)$. Otherwise, $\text{unstuck}^Y (t) = \text{unstuck}^Y (t - 1)$.

For $t \geq 1$ we define $\text{stuck}_j^Y (t) = \text{stuck}^Y (t) \cap b_j^Y (t)$. Note that the stuck balls in an externally-jammed process correspond to a backoff process. This is captured in the following observation.

**Observation 23.** For any backoff process $X$ with arrival rate $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ and send sequence $p = p_0, p_1, \ldots$ with $p_0 = 1$, there is a coupling of $X$ with an externally-jammed process $Y$ with arrival rate $\lambda$ and send sequence $p$ such that for all $j \geq 1$ and $t \geq 0$, $|b_j^X (t)| = |\text{stuck}_j^Y (t)|$.

### 3.2 A two-stream externally-jammed process

Observation 23 shows that in order to study backoff processes we can instead study externally-jammed processes and focus on the stuck balls.

Typically, it is difficult to study externally-jammed processes due to correlation between balls. To alleviate this, we define another related process, called a two-stream externally-jammed process. The idea is that the balls are (arbitrarily) divided into two streams. Keeping track of separate streams enables domination by processes with more independence.

Here is the definition. We build a two-stream externally-jammed process $T = T(Y^A, Y^B)$ with arrival rate $\lambda$ and send sequence $p$ by combining two independent externally-jammed processes $Y^A$ and $Y^B$, each
with arrival rate $\lambda/2$ and send sequence $p$. The balls of $T$ are the balls of $Y^A$ together with the balls of $Y^B$. We refer to the former as $A$-balls of $T$ and to the latter as $B$-balls of $T$. For all $t \geq 0$ and $j \geq 1$, $b^T_j(t) = b^A_j(t) \cup b^B_j(t)$. For all $t \geq 1$ and $j \geq 0$, $b^T_j(t) = b^A_j(t) \cup b^B_j(t)$. For all $t \geq 1$, $\text{send}^T(t) = \text{send}^A(t) \cup \text{send}^B(t)$.

We define $\text{balls}^T(t) = \cup_j b^T_j(t)$. For $C \in \{A, B\}$, $\text{balls}^T(C, t)$ is the set of all $C$-balls in $\text{balls}^T(t)$. Also, each $C$-ball $\beta$ of $T$ has $\text{birth}^T(\beta) = \text{birth}^Y_C(\beta)$.

Lemma 24 below contains the following easy observation: Let $Y^A$ and $Y^B$ be independent externally-jammed processes with arrival rate $\lambda/2$ and consider the two-stream externally-jammed process $T = T(Y^A, Y^B)$. Let $Y$ be an externally-jammed process with arrival rate $\lambda$. There is a coupling of $Y$ with $T$ which provides, for every non-negative integer $t$, a bijection $\pi_t$ from $\text{balls}^Y(t)$ to $\text{balls}^T(t)$ such that $\beta \in b^Y_j(t)$ iff $\pi_t(\beta) \in b^T_j(t)$. Given this, it may seem unclear what the point is of defining the two-stream externally jammed process, since this is essentially “the same” as an externally jammed process. The only difference is the names of the balls! The point of it is that we will assign the states stuck and unstuck to balls of $T$ in a different, and more useful, way.

For $C \in \{A, B\}$, we will now define the set $\text{stuck}^T(C, t)$, which will be the set of all balls in $\text{balls}^T(C, t)$ that are stuck in the process $T$ at time $t$. We also define $\text{stuck}^T(t) = \text{stuck}^T(A, t) \cup \text{stuck}^T(B, t)$. Similarly to externally jammed processes, it will always be the case that $\text{unstuck}^T(C, t) = \text{balls}^T(C, t) \setminus \text{stuck}^T(C, t)$, so it is only necessary to define $\text{stuck}^T(C, t)$ or $\text{unstuck}^T(C, t)$ and the other is defined implicitly.

For any $C \in \{A, B\}$ we will define $\text{stuck}^T(C, 0) = \emptyset$. Then for any $t \geq 1$ we have the following definitions:

- For $C \in \{A, B\}$, $\text{newstuck}^T(C, t) = \text{stuck}^T(C, t - 1) \cup b^C_0(t)$.
- For $C \in \{A, B\}$, $\text{stucksend}^T(C, t) = \text{newstuck}^T(C, t) \cap \text{send}^T(t)$.
- Case 1: If, for distinct $C$ and $C'$ in $\{A, B\}$, $\text{stucksend}^T(C, t) = \emptyset$ and $\text{stucksend}^T(C', t) \neq \emptyset$, then
  
  - $\beta$ is chosen uniformly at random from $\text{stucksend}^T(C', t)$ and
  - $\text{unstuck}^T(C', t) = \text{unstuck}^T(C', t - 1) \cup \{\beta\}$ and
  - $\text{unstuck}^T(C, t) = \text{unstuck}^T(C, t - 1)$.

- Case 2: Otherwise, for each $C \in \{A, B\}$ $\text{unstuck}^T(C, t) = \text{unstuck}^T(C, t - 1)$.

Although the sets $b^T_j(t), b^T_j(t), \text{send}^T(t)$, and $\text{balls}^T(C, t)$ can be deduced from $F^Y_t$ and $F^Y_t$, the sets $\text{stuck}^T(C, t)$ cannot. This is because $F^A_t$ and $F^B_t$ do not capture any information about the choice of the random ball $\beta$ (from $\text{stucksend}^T(A, t)$ or $\text{stucksend}^T(B, t)$) that may become unstuck at time $t$. Thus, we take $F^A_t$ to be $F^Y_t$, $F^B_t$ and the sets $\text{stuck}^T(A, t')$ and $\text{stuck}^T(B, t')$ for $t' \leq t$ so that all information about the evolution of the process $T$, including the assignment of states to the balls, is captured.

For $C \in \{A, B\}$, $t \geq 1$ and $j \geq 1$, define $\text{stuck}^T_j(C, t) = \text{stuck}^T(C, t) \cap b^T_j(t)$.

We can now couple an externally-jammed process $Y$ to a two-stream externally-jammed process $T$ in the following lemma.

**Lemma 24.** Let $Y^A$ and $Y^B$ be independent externally-jammed processes with arrival rate $\lambda/2$ and consider the two-stream externally-jammed process $T = T(Y^A, Y^B)$. Let $Y$ be an externally-jammed process with arrival rate $\lambda$. There is a coupling of $Y$ with $T$ which provides, for every non-negative integer $t$, a bijection $\pi_t$ from $\text{balls}^Y(t)$ to $\text{balls}^T(t)$ such that the following two properties hold.
• \( \beta \in b^Y_j(t) \) iff \( \pi(t)(\beta) \in b^T_j(t) \), and

• \( \beta \in \text{unstuck}^Y(t) \) implies \( \pi(t)(\beta) \in \text{unstuck}^T(t) \).

**Proof.** We first define the bijections \( \pi_t \). In fact, it is easier to define the inverses \( \pi_t^{-1} \).

In the initialisation of \( T \), for each \( C \in \{A, B\} \), let \( x^C_j \) denote the number of \( C \)-balls born in \( T \) at time 0 in bin \( j \). Then \( x_j \), the number of balls born in \( Y \) at time 0 in bin \( j \), is given by \( x_j = x^A_j + x^B_j \). The bijection \( \pi_t^{-1} \) from \( \text{balls}^T(0) \) to \( \text{balls}^Y(0) \) then maps the ball \( (Y^A, 0, j, x) \) to \( (Y, 0, j, x) \) and the ball \( (Y^B, 0, j, x) \) to \( (Y, 0, j, x^A_j + x + x^B_j) \) (for each \( x \)).

For any \( t \geq 1 \), the bijection \( \pi_t^{-1} \) from \( \text{balls}^T(t) \) to \( \text{balls}^Y(t) \) is the same as \( \pi_{t-1} \) except that it maps the balls in \( b^T_0(Y^A(t)) \) to \( b^0_Y(t) \) using a similar re-naming of balls.

Note that both properties hold at time \( t = 0 \) since all balls are unstuck at time 0.

Suppose, for a positive integer \( t \), that the first \( t - 1 \) steps of \( Y \) and \( T \) have been coupled so that the two properties hold. We will show how to couple the \( t \)'th step of the process so that the two properties again hold.

The first property allows us to couple the send decisions so that \( \beta \in \text{send}^Y(t) \) iff \( \pi(t)(\beta) \in \text{send}^T(t) \). This allows us to conclude that the first property holds at time \( t \).

To finish, we wish to show that any ball \( \beta \in \text{unstuck}^Y(t) \) has \( \pi(t)(\beta) \in \text{unstuck}^T(t) \). If \( \beta \in \text{unstuck}^Y(t-1) \) then this is immediate by the second property at time \( t - 1 \); we may therefore focus on the case where \( \beta \) only becomes unstuck at time \( t \), i.e., where \( \beta \in \text{stucksend}^Y(t) \cap \text{unstuck}^Y(t) \). By the definition of the \( Y \) process, \( \beta \in \text{stucksend}^Y(t) \cap \text{unstuck}^Y(t) \) implies that \( \text{stucksend}^Y(t) = \{\beta\} \).

By the first property at time \( t \) and the second property at time \( t - 1 \), if any ball \( \beta^* \) satisfies \( \beta^* \in \text{stucksend}^T(t) \) then \( \pi_{t-1}^{-1}(\beta^*) \in \text{stucksend}^Y(t) \) so \( \pi_t^{-1}(\text{stucksend}^Y(t)) \subseteq \text{stucksend}^Y(t) \). Hence \( |\text{stucksend}^T(t)| \leq 1 \). Now we are finished because \( \pi_t(\beta) \) is either in \( \text{unstuck}^T(t-1) \) (in which case it is also in \( \text{unstuck}^Y(t) \)) or it is in \( \text{stucksend}^T(t) \) (in which case \( \text{stucksend}^T(t) = \{\pi_t(\beta)\} \) so \( \pi_t(\beta) \in \text{unstuck}^T(t) \)).

\( \square \)

### 3.3 Ball vectors and potential

So far, we have defined backoff processes, externally-jammed processes, and two-stream externally-jammed processes.

Here we collect some notation about these processes that we haven’t needed so far, but which will be useful later.

For an externally-jammed process \( Y \) we define

\[
\text{ballvect}^Y(t) = (b^Y_1(t), b^Y_2(t), \ldots),
\]

\[
\text{stuckvect}^Y(t) = (\text{stuck}^Y(t), \text{stuck}^Y_2(t), \ldots).
\]

Similarly, for a two-stream externally-jammed process \( T = T(Y^A, Y^B) \) we define

\[
\text{ballvect}^T(t) = (b^T_1(t), b^T_2(t), \ldots),
\]

\[
\text{stuckvect}^T(C, t) = (\text{stuck}^T(C, t), \text{stuck}^T_2(C, t), \ldots) \text{ for each } C \in \{A, B\}.
\]

We define \( \text{stuckvect}^T(t) \) as the position-wise sum of \( \text{stuckvect}^T(A, t) \) and \( \text{stuckvect}^T(B, t) \).

**Definition 25.** Suppose that \( \mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \ldots) \) is a sequence of non-negative integers. The potential of \( \mathbf{x} \) is defined by \( f(\mathbf{x}) = \lambda + \sum_{i \geq 1} x_i p_i \).
Note that for an externally-jammed process $Y$ with arrival rate $\lambda$, $f(\text{stuckvect}^Y(t - 1))$ is the expected size of $\text{stucksend}^Y(t)$ conditioned on the filtration $\mathcal{F}^Y_{t-1}$. Similarly, for a two-stream externally-jammed process $T$ with arrival rate $\lambda$, $f(\text{stuckvect}^T(t - 1))$ is the expected size of $\text{stucksend}^T(A, t) \cup \text{stucksend}^T(B, t)$ conditioned on the filtration $\mathcal{F}^T_{t-1}$.

### 3.4 Statement of our technical result

Recall the definition of $(\lambda, \eta, \nu)$-suitable (Definition 14). The following Theorem and Corollary form the centre of our argument. Corollary 27 immediately implies Theorem 15, the main technical theorem from the introduction. Theorem 26 and Corollary 27 are proved in Section 6.

**Theorem 26.** Fix $\lambda, \eta$ and $\nu$ in $(0, 1)$. Let $p$ be a $(\lambda, \eta, \nu)$-suitable send sequence. Let $T$ be a two-stream externally-jammed process with arrival rate $\lambda$ and send sequence $p$. Let $\mathcal{R}^T = \{t \mid \text{stuck}^T(t) = \emptyset\}$. With probability 1, $\mathcal{R}^T$ is finite.

**Corollary 27.** Fix $\lambda, \eta$ and $\nu$ in $(0, 1)$. Let $p$ be a $(\lambda, \eta, \nu)$-suitable send sequence. Let $X$ be a backoff process with arrival rate $\lambda$ and send sequence $p$. Let $\mathcal{R}^X = \{t \mid \text{balls}^X(t) = \emptyset\}$. Then, with probability 1, $\mathcal{R}^X$ is finite. Hence, $X$ is transient so it is unstable.

### 3.5 Definitions depending on a $(\lambda, \eta, \nu)$-suitable send sequence $p$

We will need lots of definitions to prove Theorem 26. For everything leading up to and including the proof of Theorem 26, fix an arrival rate $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ a real number $\eta \in (0, 1)$, a real number $\nu \in (0, 1)$, and a $(\lambda, \eta, \nu)$-suitable send sequence $p$. Since $\lambda, \eta$ and $\nu$ are fixed, we will use $\kappa$ as shorthand for $\kappa(\eta)$ and we will use $p_\ast$ as a shorthand for $p_\ast(\lambda, \eta, \nu)$. All of the following notation will depend on $p, \lambda, \eta,$ and $\nu$.

**Definition 28.** $j_0$ is a constant such that for every $j \geq j_0$ we have $p_j > \nu^j$.

**Definition 29.** $j_{\min} = \min\{j \mid p_j < 1\}$.

We know that $j_0$ and $j_{\min}$ exist since $p$ is $(\lambda, \eta, \nu)$-suitable.

Before proceeding with the rest of our formal definitions, we give a brief sense of what their purpose will be. Our proof will proceed by partitioning the bins of $T$ into contiguous “blocks” $B_1, B_2, \ldots$ of exponentially growing length, with block $B_i$ containing roughly $\kappa^i$ bins. We will wait until, by chance, at some time $t_0$, some large initial segment $B_1, \ldots, B_{I_0}$ of bins contains many stuck $A$-balls and $B$-balls; we will denote the number of balls required by $C_{\text{init}}$. Since we will choose $C_{\text{init}}$ to be large, these stuck balls are likely to take a long time to move out of $B_1, \ldots, B_{I_0}$, say until time $t_0 + \tau_{\text{init}}$. Until they do so, the $A$-balls will interfere with any balls escaping from $Y^B$, and crucially they will do so independently from the evolution of $Y^A$; likewise, the $B$-balls will interfere with any balls escaping from $Y^A$.

We will use this interference to argue that $B_{I_0 + 1}$ is likely to fill with newborn stuck $A$-balls and $B$-balls by some time $t_0 + \tau_1 < \tau + \tau_{\text{init}}$, that $B_{I_0 + 2}$ is likely to fill with stuck $A$-balls and $B$-balls by some time $t_0 + \tau_2 < \tau + \tau_{\text{init}}$, and so on. After time $t + \tau_{\text{init}}$, we will show that the process becomes self-sustaining, and that $B_i$ being full of stuck $A$-balls and $B$-balls is enough to fill $B_{i+1}$ by itself. We will formalise this idea at the end of the section with the definition of “jammedness”.

We now formalise this block construction and define our constants.

**Definition 30.** For each positive integer $i$, the block $B_i$ is a contiguous interval of positive integers (called bins). This block has bins $\ell(i), \ldots, u(i)$ which are defined as follows. First, $u(0) = 0$ and $\ell(1) = u(1) = 1$. Then for $i > 1$, $\ell(i) = u(i - 1) + 1$ and $u(i) = \kappa u(i - 1)$.
Definition 31. The weight of a bin $j$ is $w_j = 1/p_j$. The weight of a block $B_i$ is $W_i = \sum_{j \in B_i} 1/p_j$.

Observe that the weight of a block $B_i$ is the expected number of time steps required for a ball to pass through it, from $b_{\ell(i)}$ to $b_{u(i)+1}$.

Definition 32. $\zeta = \eta \lambda / 24$.

The constant $\zeta$ will control how full we require the bins of a given block to be in order to consider $T$ “jammed”.

Definition 33. Let $I_0$ be the smallest integer such that

- $I_0 \geq j_{\min}$.
- For all $n \geq \ell(I_0)$:
  - $\left| \{ j \in [n] \mid p_j \leq p_{\ast}(\lambda, \eta, \nu) \} \right| > \eta n$, and
  - $\nu^n < p_{\eta}$.
- $\zeta |B_{I_0}| \geq 4$.
- For $c = \frac{\kappa - 1}{100}$, we have $I_0 \geq \log(4/c)/c$ and $\exp(I_0 c) \geq 4I_0$.

Definition 34. Define $\tau_0 = 0$. For every positive integer $i$, define $\tau_i = \kappa \sum_{i=1}^{I_0+i} (I_0 + i - k + 1) [W_k]$.

Definition 35. Define $I(0) = I_0 + 1$. For every positive integer $\tau$, $I(\tau) \geq I_0 + 1$ is the integer such that

$$\tau I(\tau) - I_0 - 1 \leq \tau < \tau I(\tau) - I_0.$$  

Definition 36. For every non-negative integer $\tau$, $\text{bins}(\tau) = B_{I(\tau) - 1}$.

Intuitively, referring back to the above sketch, $I(\tau)$ is chosen so that at time $t_0 + \tau$, we expect $B_{I(\tau) - 1}$ to be full of stuck balls and $B_{I(\tau)}$ to be in the process of filling. (Recall that $W_k$ is the expected time required for a ball to travel through block $B_k$, and observe that $\tau_i - \tau_{i-1} = \kappa \sum_{k=1}^{I_0+i} [W_k]$.)

Definition 37. Let $\tau_{\text{init}}$ be the smallest integer such that

- $\tau_{\text{init}} \geq \max\{10^7/\lambda^2, 20, (2\kappa/(1 - \nu))^4\}$.
- $I(\tau_{\text{init}}) \geq \max\{I_0 + 3, 2I_0(2Q + 1)\}$ where $Q = \max_{k=1}^{I_0} [W_k]$.

Once again, it is not important that $\tau_{\text{init}}$ is the smallest integer satisfying the properties in Definition 37, it is just important that these properties are satisfied, and they can all be satisfied by making $\tau_{\text{init}}$ sufficiently large, since $I(\tau)$ is $\omega(1)$ as a function of $\tau$.

Definition 38. Let $C_{\text{init}} = \max \left( \frac{\zeta |B_{I_0}|}{p_{\text{Jmin}}}, \frac{12 \log(100 \tau_{\text{init}})}{(1 - p_{\text{Jmin}})^{\tau_{\text{init}}}}, \frac{2\zeta |\text{bins}(\tau_{\text{init}})|}{p_{\text{Jmin}}(1 - p_{\text{Jmin}})^{\tau_{\text{init}}}} \right)$.
Recall that \( p_{\text{min}} < 1 \) by the definition of \( j_{\text{min}} \), so the definition of \( C_{\text{init}} \) in Definition 38 is well-defined.

The following definitions refer to a two-stream externally-jammed process \( T = T(Y^A, Y^B) \) with arrival rate \( \lambda \) and send sequence \( p \).

**Definition 39.** For all integers \( t \geq 1 \), \( \mathcal{E}_{\text{init}}^T(t) \) is the event that for all \( C \in \{ A, B \}, |\text{stuck}_{\text{min}}^T(C, t)| \geq C_{\text{init}}. 

**Definition 40.** For \( C \in \{ A, B \} \) and positive integers \( t \) and \( \tau \), the two-stream externally-jammed process \( T \) is \((C, t)\)-jammed for \( \tau \) if \( f(\text{stuck}^T(C, t + \tau - 1)) \geq \zeta |\text{bins}(\tau - 1)|. \) It is \( t \)-jammed for \( \tau \) if it is \((A, t)\)-jammed and \((B, t)\)-jammed at \( \tau \).

**Definition 41.** For \( C \in \{ A, B \} \) and positive integers \( t \) and \( \tau \), \( \mathcal{E}_{\text{jam}}^T(C, t, \tau) \) is the event that, for all \( \tau' \in \{1, \ldots, \tau\}, T \) is \((C, t)\)-jammed for \( \tau' \). \( \mathcal{E}_{\text{jam}}^T(t, \tau) \) is \( \mathcal{E}_{\text{jam}}^T(A, t, \tau) \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{jam}}^T(B, t, \tau) \).

The heart of our proof will be Lemmas 57, which says that if \( \mathcal{E}_{\text{init}}^T(t_0) \) occurs, then \( T \) is likely to be \( t_0 \)-jammed for all \( \tau \geq 1 \) (and hence never return to a state with no stuck balls). We will split this proof into two regimes. The first regime, \( \tau \leq \tau_{\text{init}} \), will be relatively simple and is covered by Lemma 42; we are essentially just arguing that some of the stuck balls guaranteed by \( \mathcal{E}_{\text{init}}^T(t_0) \) are likely not to have sent yet. The second regime, \( \tau \geq \tau_{\text{init}} \), will be the heart of the proof and is covered by Lemma 56.

### 3.6 The \( \tau \leq \tau_{\text{init}} \) regime: Proving Lemma 42

**Lemma 42.** Fix \( \lambda, \eta \) and \( \nu \) in \((0, 1)\) and a \((\lambda, \eta, \nu)\)-suitable send sequence \( p \). Let \( T \) be a two-stream externally-jammed process with arrival rate \( \lambda \) and send sequence \( p \). Consider any \( C \in \{ A, B \} \). Let \( t_0 \) be any positive integer and let \( F_{t_0}^T \) be a value of \( \mathcal{F}_{t_0}^T \) such that \( \mathcal{E}_{\text{init}}^T(t_0) \) occurs. Then the following two statements hold.

\[
\text{If } \mathcal{F}_{t_0}^T = F_{t_0}^T \text{ occurs then } \mathcal{E}_{\text{jam}}^T(C, t_0, 1) \text{ occurs, and } \tag{3}
\]

\[
\Pr(\mathcal{E}_{\text{jam}}^T(t_0, \tau_{\text{init}}) \mid \mathcal{F}_{t_0}^T = F_{t_0}^T) \geq 49/50. \tag{4}
\]

**Proof.** We first establish Equation (3). We wish to show that \( \mathcal{E}_{\text{jam}}^T(C, t_0, 1) \) occurs which is the event that \( T \) is \((C, t_0)\)-jammed for time 1, i.e. that \( f(\text{stuck}^T(C, t_0)) \geq \zeta |\text{bins}(0)| = \zeta |B_{t(0)} - 1| = \zeta |B_{t_0}| \). To establish this, first note by the definition of \( f \) (Definition 25) that

\[
f(\text{stuck}^T(C, t_0)) \geq |\text{stuck}^T_{\text{min}}(C, t_0)|p_{\text{min}}.
\]

This quantity can be deduced from \( F_{t_0}^T \) and, since \( F_{t_0}^T \) guarantees that \( \mathcal{E}_{\text{init}}^T(t_0) \) happens, is at least \( C_{\text{init}}p_{\text{min}} \). To finish, we just need to show that \( C_{\text{init}}p_{\text{min}} \geq \zeta |B_{t_0}| \), which follows from the choice of \( C_{\text{init}} \) in Definition 38.

We next establish Equation (4). Consider any integer \( \tau \) in the range \( 1 \leq \tau \leq \tau_{\text{init}} \) and condition on \( \mathcal{F}_{t_0}^T = F_{t_0}^T \). Since \( \mathcal{E}_{\text{init}}^T(t_0) \) occurs under this conditioning, for each \( C \in \{ A, B \} \), we have \( |\text{stuck}^T_{\text{min}}(C, t_0)| \geq C_{\text{init}} \); we will argue that \( \text{stuck}^T_{\text{min}}(C, t_0) \) does not have time to empty before time \( t_0 + \tau \), so \( T \) is likely to be \((C, t_0)\)-jammed for \( \tau \). As before, observe that

\[
f(\text{stuck}^T(C, t_0 + \tau - 1)) \geq p_{\text{min}}|\text{stuck}^T_{\text{min}}(C, t_0 + \tau - 1)|
\]

\[
\geq p_{\text{min}}|\text{stuck}^T_{\text{min}}(C, t_0) \cap \text{stuck}^T_{\text{min}}(C, t_0 + \tau - 1)|. \tag{5}
\]

For convenience, write \( N_{\tau} = |\text{stuck}^T_{\text{min}}(C, t_0) \cap \text{stuck}^T_{\text{min}}(C, t_0 + \tau - 1)| \) for the size of the set in the right-hand side of (5).
A ball is in $N_r$ if it is in stuck$_{\text{jammed}}^T(C, t_0)$ and it does not send until time $t_0 + \tau$ or later. Since messages send independently, conditioned on $F_{t_0}^T = F_{t_0}^T$, $N_r$ is binomially distributed. Let $\mu = \mathbb{E}(|N_r| \mid F_{t_0}^T = F_{t_0}^T)$, and observe that $\mu = (1 - p_{\text{jammed}})^{\tau - 1}|\text{stuck}_{\text{jammed}}^T(C, t_0)| \geq (1 - p_{\text{jammed}})^{\tau_{\text{init}}}C_{\text{init}}$. By the definition of $C_{\text{init}}$ (definition 38), we have $\mu \geq 12\log(100\tau_{\text{init}})$ and $\mu \geq 2\zeta|\text{bins}(\tau - 1)/p_{\text{jammed}}$. Using this fact, we apply the Chernoff bound of Lemma 19 to $|N_r|$ with $\delta = 1/2$ to obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(|N_r| \geq \zeta|\text{bins}(\tau - 1)/p_{\text{jammed}} \mid F_{t_0}^T = F_{t_0}^T) \geq \mathbb{P}(|N_r| \geq \mu/2 \mid F_{t_0}^T = F_{t_0}^T) \geq 1 - e^{-\mu/8} \geq 1 - 1/(100\tau_{\text{init}}).$$

Hence by (5) and the definition of $(C, t_0)$-jammedness, we have that for all $1 \leq \tau \leq \tau_{\text{init}}$,

$$\mathbb{P}(T \text{ is } (C, t_0)-\text{jammed for time } \tau \mid F_{t_0}^T = F_{t_0}^T) \geq 1 - 1/(100\tau_{\text{init}}).$$

Thus (4), and therefore also the result, follows by a union bound over all $C \in \{A, B\}$ and $\tau \in \{1, \ldots, \tau_{\text{init}}\}$. 

\[\square\]

### 3.7 Properties of the block construction

**Observation 43.** For $i \geq 1$ we have $u(i) = \kappa^{-1}$. Also $|B_1| = 1$. For $i \geq 2$ we have $|B_i| = \kappa^{i-2}(\kappa - 1) = u(i)(\kappa - 1)/\kappa$.

**Proof.** For $i \geq 2$, we have $|B_i| = u(i) - u(i - 1) = \kappa^{i-1} - \kappa^{i-2}$.

\[\square\]

**Lemma 44.** For all $\tau \geq \tau_{\text{init}}$, $|\text{bins}(\tau)| > \log(\tau)/(2\kappa^2 \log(1/\nu))$.

**Proof.** By definition, we have $|\text{bins}(\tau)| = |B_{I(\tau) - 1}|$. By Observation 43 and since $\kappa \geq 2$, it follows that $|\text{bins}(\tau)| \geq \kappa^{I(\tau) - 3}$. Again by Observation 43, we have $u(I(\tau)) = \kappa^{I(\tau) - 1}$, and so

$$|\text{bins}(\tau)| \geq u(I(\tau))/\kappa^2.$$  

(6)

Our proof strategy will be to bound $I(\tau)$ below in order to apply (6). To do this, we will first bound $\tau$ above in terms of $u(I(\tau))$, and then convert this into a lower bound on $u(I(\tau))$ in terms of $\tau$. By the definitions of $I(\tau)$ and $\tau_i$, we have

$$\tau < \tau_{I(\tau) - I_0} = \kappa \sum_{k=1}^{I_0} (I(\tau) - k + 1) [W_k] + \kappa \sum_{k=I_0+1}^{I(\tau)} (I(\tau) - k + 1) [W_k].$$

We will argue that the second sum is larger than the first. To see this, let $Q = \max_{k=1}^{I_0} [W_k]$. Then the first sum is at most $\kappa I_0 I(\tau)Q$. To lower-bound the second sum, just consider $k$ up as high as $k = (I(\tau)/2) + 1$ and then each term (for each value of $k$) is at least $\kappa I(\tau)/2$ and the number of terms is at least $(I(\tau)/2) - I_0$. The definition of $\tau_{\text{init}}$ insures that $I(\tau_{\text{init}}) \geq 2I_0(2Q + 1)$. Thus, for every $\tau \geq \tau_{\text{init}}$, the second term is at least as large as the first.

It follows that

$$\tau < 2\kappa \sum_{k=I_0+1}^{I(\tau)} (I(\tau) - k + 1) [W_k] = 2\kappa \sum_{k=I_0+1}^{I(\tau)} \sum_{m=I_0+1}^{k} [W_m] = 2\kappa \sum_{k=I_0+1}^{I(\tau)} \sum_{j=\ell(I_0+1)}^{u(k)} (1/p_j).$$

We bound the right-hand side above by observing that

$$\{u(k): I_0 + 1 \leq k \leq I(\tau)\} \subseteq \{\ell(I_0 + 1), \ell(I_0 + 1) + 1, \ldots, u(I(\tau))\},$$

and therefore...
and so
\[ \tau < 2 \kappa \sum_{a=\ell(I_0+1)} \left| \sum_{j=\ell(I_0+1)}^a \left( \frac{1}{p_j} \right) \right| \leq 4 \kappa \sum_{a=\ell(I_0+1)} \sum_{j=\ell(I_0+1)}^a \left( \frac{1}{p_j} \right). \] (7)

By the definition of \( I_0 \), for all \( i \geq I_0+1 \) and all \( j \in B_i \) we have \( p_j > \nu^j \). It follows that for all \( a \geq \ell(I_0+1) \),
\[ \sum_{j=\ell(I_0+1)}^a \frac{1}{p_j} < \sum_{j=\ell(I_0+1)}^a \left( \frac{1}{\nu} \right)^j < \left( \frac{1}{\nu} \right)^a \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \nu^j = \frac{1}{1-\nu} \left( \frac{1}{\nu} \right)^a. \]

Hence by (7),
\[ \tau < \frac{4 \kappa}{1-\nu} \sum_{a=\ell(I_0+1)} \left( \frac{1}{\nu} \right)^a < 4 \kappa \frac{1}{1-\nu} \sum_{a=0}^{\infty} \nu^a = \frac{4 \kappa}{(1-\nu)^2} \left( \frac{1}{\nu} \right)^{u(I(\tau))}. \] (8)

Solving for \( u(I(\tau)) \) now yields
\[ u(I(\tau)) > \log_{1/\nu}(\tau) + 2 \log_{1/\nu} \left( \frac{1-\nu}{2\kappa} \right). \]

Since \( \tau \geq \tau_{\text{init}} \) and \( \tau_{\text{init}} \geq (2\kappa/(1-\nu))^4 \), it follows that \( u(I(\tau)) > \frac{1}{2} \log_{1/\nu} \tau \). By (6), it follows that
\[ |\text{bins}(\tau)| \geq \frac{1}{\kappa^2} u(I(\tau)) > \frac{1}{2 \kappa^2 \log(1/\nu)} \log \tau, \]
as required. \( \square \)

### 3.8 Potential

**Lemma 45.** Let \( T(Y^A, Y^B) \) be a two-stream externally-jammed process with arrival rate \( \lambda \) and send sequence \( p \) with \( p_0 = 1 \). Let \( t \geq 0 \) and let \( C \in \{ A, B \} \). Let \( x \) be any possible value of \( \text{stuckvect}^T(C,t) \). Then
\[ \mathbb{P}(\text{stucksend}^T(C,t+1) = \emptyset | \text{stuckvect}^T(C,t) = x) \leq \exp(-f(x)/3). \]

**Proof.** For brevity, write \( q \) for the probability in the statement of the lemma, and let \( \Psi \) be the number of balls in \( \text{stuck}^T(C,t) \cap \text{send}^T(t+1) \). Then since any ball in \( \text{stucksend}^T(C,t+1) \) is either born at time \( t+1 \) or in \( \Psi \), we have
\[ q = e^{-\lambda/2} \mathbb{P}(\Psi = 0 | \text{stuckvect}^T(C,t) = x). \] (9)

Conditioned on \( \text{stuckvect}^T(C,t) = x, \Psi \) is a sum of independent Bernoulli variables with mean \( \mu = f(x) - \lambda \). If one of these Bernoulli variables has parameter \( p \) then the probability that it is 0 is \( 1 - p \leq \exp(-p) \). Thus the probability that they are all 0 is at most \( \exp(-\mu) \). We therefore have
\[ \mathbb{P}(\Psi = 0 | \text{stuckvect}^T(C,t) = x) \leq e^{-\mu}. \]

It follows by (9) that \( q \leq e^{-f(x)+\lambda/2} < e^{-f(x)/3} \) as required (since \( f(x) \geq \lambda \) by definition). \( \square \)
4 Towards a proof of Theorem 26: Jamming causes a product distribution of stuck balls in a two-stream externally-jammed process

The purpose of this section is to prove the following lemma, which will be our main tool to analyse the two-stream process in the proof of Lemma 56 (and thereby Theorem 26).

**Lemma 46.** Fix \( \lambda, \eta \) and \( \nu \) in \((0,1)\) and a \((\lambda, \eta, \nu)\)-suitable send sequence \( p \) with \( p_0 = 1 \). Let \( Y^A \) and \( Y^B \) be independent externally-jammed processes with arrival rate \( \lambda/2 \) and send sequence \( p \) and consider the two-stream externally-jammed process \( T = T(Y^A, Y^B) \). Consider any \( t_0 \geq j_{\text{min}} \). Let \( F_{t_0}^T \) be a value of \( F^T_{t_0} \) such that \( \mathcal{E}_{\text{jam}}^{T}(t_0) \) happens. Consider any integer \( \tau \geq \tau_{\text{init}} \). Then there is a coupling of

- \( T \) conditioned on \( F_{t_0}^T \),
- a sample \( \{ Z_j^A \mid j \in \text{bins}(\tau) \} \) where each \( Z_j^A \) is chosen independently from a Poisson distribution with mean \( \lambda/(4p_j) \), and
- a sample \( \{ Z_j^B \mid j \in \text{bins}(\tau) \} \) where each \( Z_j^B \) is chosen from a Poisson distribution with mean \( \lambda/(4p_j) \) and these are independent of each other but not of the \( \{ Z_j^A \} \) values

in such a way that at least one of the following happens:

- \( \mathcal{E}_{\text{jam}}^{T}(t_0, \tau) \) does not occur, or
- for all \( j \in \text{bins}(\tau) \), \( |\text{stuck}^T_j(A, t_0 + \tau)| \geq Z_j^A \) and \( |\text{stuck}^T_j(B, t_0 + \tau)| \geq Z_j^B \).

In order to prove Lemma 46 we need to study several stochastic processes, starting with a random-unsticking process in the next section.

4.1 The definition of a random-unsticking process

Let \( Y \) be an externally-jammed process with arrival rate \( \lambda \) and send sequence \( p \). Let \( t_0 \) be a fixed positive integer. We will define a random-unsticking process \( R = R(Y, t_0) \) by redefining the “stuck” and “unstuck” states of \( Y \), so that balls in \( R \) become unstuck independently at random with probability depending on \( t_0 \). Later, in Lemma 52, we will show that \( R \) and \( T \) can be coupled in such a way that as long as \( T \) stays jammed, if a ball is stuck in \( R \) then it is also stuck in \( T \); this will allow us to analyse \( R \) rather than \( T \) in proving Lemma 46.

Apart from this redefinition, which explained below, everything about \( R \) is the same as \( Y \): for all \( t \geq 0 \), \( \text{balls}^R(t) = \text{balls}^T(t) \); for all \( t \geq 0 \) and \( j \geq 1 \), \( b_j^R(t) = b_j^Y(t) \); for all \( t \geq 1 \) and \( j \geq 0 \), \( b_j^R(t) = b_j^Y(t) \); for all \( t \geq 1 \), \( \text{send}^R(t) = \text{send}^Y(t) \); and for \( t \geq 0 \) and all \( \beta \in \text{balls}^T(t) \), \( \text{birth}^R(\beta) = \text{birth}^Y(\beta) \).

We now formalise the new “stuck” and “unstuck” states in \( R \). The set \( \text{stuck}^R(t) \) will be the set of all balls in \( \text{balls}^R(t) \) that are stuck in the process \( R \) at time \( t \) and \( \text{stuck}^R(t) = \text{stuck}^R(t) \cap b_j^T(t) \). As the reader will expect, \( \text{unstuck}^R(t) = \text{balls}^R(t) \setminus \text{stuck}^R(t) \) so for each \( t \) we only need to define \( \text{stuck}^R(t) \) or \( \text{unstuck}^R(t) \) and the other is defined implicitly. These variables are defined as follows. First, let \( \text{stuck}^R(0) = \emptyset \) and

\[
\text{P}_{\text{unstick}}(t) = \begin{cases} 
1, & \text{if } t \leq t_0 \\
\exp(-\zeta|\text{bins}(t-t_0)|/16), & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}
\]

Then for any \( t \geq 1 \) we have the following definitions:

- \( \text{newstuck}^R(t) = \text{stuck}^R(t-1) \cup b_0^R(t) \).
• stucksend\(^R\)(t) = newstuck\(^R\)(t) \cap send\(^R\)(t).

• For each \(\beta \in \text{balls}^R(t)\), unstick(\(\beta\), \(t\)) is an independent Bernoulli random variable which is 1 with probability \(p_{\text{unstick}}(t)\) and 0 otherwise.

• Then unstuck\(^R\)(t) = unstuck\(^R\)(t - 1) \cup \{\beta \in \text{stucksend}^R(t) \mid \text{unstick}(\beta, t) = 1\}.

We take \(\mathcal{F}^R_t\) to be \(\mathcal{F}_t^Y\) along with the values of the random variables unstick(\(\beta\), \(t'\)) for \(t' \leq t\) and \(\beta \in \text{balls}^R(t')\) so that all information about the evolution of the process \(R\), including the value of stuck\(^R\)(t), is captured.

## 4.2 Defining a reverse random-unsticking process

Given an externally-jammed process \(Y\) with arrival rate \(\lambda\), a positive integer \(t_0\), a random-unsticking process \(R = R(Y, t_0)\), and positive integers \(j\) and \(\tau_{\text{end}}\), we wish to find a lower bound on \(|\text{stuck}^R_j(t_0 + \tau_{\text{end}})|\) in order to prove Lemma 46. To do this, we’ll define the notion of a reverse random-unsticking process, which is essentially a time-reversal of a random-unsticking process; we will make this relation formal later, in Lemma 48. The reverse random-unsticking process \(\tilde{R} = \tilde{R}(Y, t_0, \tau_{\text{end}})\) will be easier to study than \(R\) itself, allowing us to deduce the lower bounds on \(|\text{stuck}^R_j(t_0 + \tau_{\text{end}})|\) that we need. Note that the basic idea of using a time-reversal in the context of backoff processes is due to Aldous [4]. Here we require independent lower bounds for different \(j\), so it is a lot more complicated.

The process \(\tilde{R}\) will run for steps \(1, \ldots, \tau_{\text{end}}\). Each step consists of (II) sending, (III) adjusting the bins, and (IV) random unsticking. (We start counting from (II) so that the indices line up with the parts of the steps of an externally-jammed process. Here there is no step initialisation, since there are no births. On the other hand, there is random unsticking.) Let \(J_{\text{max}} = u(I(\tau_{\text{end}}) - 1) + \tau_{\text{end}}\). The bins in the process \(\tilde{R}\) will be the integers \(j \in [J_{\text{max}}]\). For \(j \in [J_{\text{max}}]\), the set \(b^R_j(\tau)\) is the population of bin \(j\) just after (all parts of) the \(\tau\)’th step. For convenience, we define \(b^R_{j_{\text{max}} + 1}(\tau) = 0\). Also, \(\text{balls}^R(\tau) = \cup_{j=1}^{j_{\text{max}}} b^R_j(\tau)\).

The process \(\tilde{R}\) is initialised as follows. For each \(j \in [J_{\text{max}}]\), the number \(\tilde{x}_j\) of balls that start in \(\tilde{b}^R_j(0)\) is chosen independently from a Poisson distribution with mean \(\lambda/p_j\). These balls are given unique names \((\tilde{R}, j, 1), \ldots, (\tilde{R}, j, \tilde{x}_j)\). Step \(\tau\) is defined as follows.

• Part (II) of step \(\tau\): For \(j \in [J_{\text{max}}]\), all balls in \(\tilde{b}^R_j(\tau - 1)\) send independently with probability \(p_j\). We use send\(^{\tilde{R}}\)(\(\tau\)) for the set of balls that send at time \(\tau\).

• Part (III) of step \(\tau\): For all \(j \in [J_{\text{max}}]\),

\[
b^R_j(\tau) = (b^R_{j+1}(\tau - 1) \cap \text{send}^{\tilde{R}}(\tau)) \cup (b^R_j(\tau - 1) \setminus \text{send}^{\tilde{R}}(\tau)).
\]

• Part (IV) of step \(\tau\): For each \(\beta \in \text{balls}^R(\tau - 1)\), unstick(\(\beta\), \(\tau\)) is an independent Bernoulli random variable, which is 1 with probability \(p_{\text{unstick}}(t_0 + \tau_{\text{end}} - \tau + 1)\) and 0 otherwise.

Note that balls in \(\tilde{b}^R_j(\tau - 1)\) that send at step \(\tau\) are not part of \(\text{balls}^R(\tau)\) — instead, they leave the system at step \(\tau\). Note also that we do not define “stuck” and “unstuck” states for \(\tilde{R}\) — it will actually be more convenient to work with the unstick variables directly. (These will later be coupled to the corresponding variables in a random-unsticking process \(\tilde{R}\); as the definition suggests, unsticking events at times \(1, 2, \ldots, \tau_{\text{end}}\) in \(\tilde{R}\) will correspond to unsticking events at times \(t_0 + \tau_{\text{end}}, t_0 + \tau_{\text{end}} - 1, \ldots, t_0 + 1\) in \(R\).)
4.3 Defining trajectories in a random-unsticking process

Let $Y$ be an externally-jammed process with arrival rate $\lambda$ and let $t_0$ be a positive integer. Consider a random-unsticking process $R = R(Y, t_0)$.

We will only be concerned with balls $\beta$ with birth$^R(\beta) \geq t_0 + 1$. For $t \geq t_0 + 1$ consider a ball with name $\beta = (Y, t, x)$ for some $x$. The ball trajectory $B$ of the ball $\beta$ (up to time step $t_0 + \tau_{\text{end}}$ for a positive integer $\tau_{\text{end}}$) contains the following information:

- $t_{\text{birth}}(B) = \text{birth}^R(\beta)$.
- The bin $J(B)$ such that $\beta \in b^R_{J(B)}(t_0 + \tau_{\text{end}})$.
- Positive integers $N_1(B), \ldots, N_{J(B)}(B)$ adding up to $t_0 + \tau_{\text{end}} - t_{\text{birth}}(B) + 1$. For each $j \in [J(B)]$, $N_j(B) = |\{t' | t_{\text{birth}}(B) \leq t' \leq t_0 + \tau_{\text{end}}, \beta \in b^R_j(t')\}|$.
- For each integer $t'$ in the range $t_{\text{birth}}(B) \leq t' \leq t_0 + \tau_{\text{end}}$, the indicator variable $\text{unstick}(B, t') = \text{unstick}(\beta, t')$.

Note that any choice of positive integers $N_1(B), \ldots, N_{J(B)}(B)$ with the right sum leads to a valid (ball) trajectory, and so does any sequence of indicator random variables $\text{unstick}(B, t')$. Thus, for all fixed $\lambda$, $t_0$ and $\tau_{\text{end}}$, all of the information in trajectory $B$ is captured by $J(B)$, $t_{\text{birth}}(B)$, $\{N_j(B) | 1 \leq j \leq J(B)\}$ and $\{|\text{unstick}(B, t') | t_{\text{birth}}(B) \leq \tau \leq t_0 + \tau_{\text{end}}\}$. Let $B^R(t_0, \tau_{\text{end}}, t, J)$ be the set of trajectories up to $t_0 + \tau_{\text{end}}$ with $t_{\text{birth}}(B) = t$ and $J(B) = j$.

Given a trajectory $B$, let $S(B) = \{t_{\text{birth}}(B) + \sum_{k=1}^c N_k(B) | c \in \{0, \ldots, J(B) - 1\}\}$. We will use the fact that $S(B)$ is the set of time steps up to time $t_0 + \tau_{\text{end}}$ at which balls following trajectory $B$ send.

We can calculate the distribution of the number of balls following a given trajectory $B$. This is a Poisson random variable whose mean, $\mu^R(B)$, is given by $\mu^R(B) = F_1 F_2 F_3$ where $F_1$, $F_2$ and $F_3$ are defined as follows:

$$F_1 = \lambda(1 - p_{J(B)})^{N_{J(B)}(B) - 1}; \quad F_2 = \prod_{j=1}^{J(B)-1} p_j(1 - p_j)^{N_j(B) - 1};$$

$$F_3 = \prod_{t' = t_{\text{birth}}(B)}^{t_0 + \tau_{\text{end}}} p_{\text{unstick}}(t')^{\text{unstick}(B, t')(1 - p_{\text{unstick}}(t'))^{1 - \text{unstick}(B, t')}}.$$

4.4 Defining trajectories in a reverse random-unsticking process $\tilde{R}$

Let $Y$ be an externally-jammed process with arrival rate $\lambda$, let $t_0$ be a positive integer and let $\tau_{\text{end}}$ be a positive integer. Consider a reverse random-unsticking process $\tilde{R} = \tilde{R}(Y, t_0, \tau_{\text{end}})$.

We will only be concerned with balls in $\tilde{R}$ that leave the process by sending from bin 1 at some step $\tau \in \{1, \ldots, \tau_{\text{end}}\}$. We next define the trajectory $\tilde{B}$ of such a ball with name $\beta = (\tilde{R}, j', x)$ in $\tilde{R}$. The trajectory $\tilde{B}$ contains the following information:

- The bin $J(\tilde{B}) = j'$, the bin into which $\beta$ is placed in the initialisation, so $\beta \in \tilde{b}^R_{J(\tilde{B})}(0)$.
- The time $\tau_{\text{leave}}(\tilde{B})$ at which $\beta$ leaves the process by sending from bin 1, so $\beta \in \tilde{b}^R_1(\tau_{\text{leave}}(\tilde{B}) - 1)$ but $\beta \notin \tilde{b}^R_1(\tau_{\text{leave}}(\tilde{B}))$.
- Positive integers $N_1(\tilde{B}), \ldots, N_{J(\tilde{B})}(\tilde{B})$, adding up to $\tau_{\text{leave}}(\tilde{B})$. For each $j \in [J(\tilde{B})]$, $N_j(\tilde{B}) = |\{\tau' | 0 \leq \tau' \leq \tau_{\text{leave}}(\tilde{B}) - 1, \beta \in \tilde{b}^R_j(\tau')\}|$. 
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• For each time step \( \tau' \) in the range \( 1 \leq \tau' \leq \tau_{\text{leave}}(B) \), the indicator variable \( \text{unstick}(B, \tau') = \text{unstick}(\beta, \tau') \).

Note that any choice of positive integers \( N_1(\tilde{B}), \ldots, N_{J(\tilde{B})}(\tilde{B}) \) with the right sum leads to a valid trajectory, and so does any sequence of indicator random variables \( \text{unstick}(\tilde{B}, \tau) \). Thus for all fixed \( \lambda, t_0 \) and \( \tau_{\text{end}} \), all of the information in trajectory \( B \) is captured by \( J(B), \tau_{\text{leave}}(B), \{N_j(B) \mid 1 \leq j \leq J(B)\} \) and \( \{\text{unstick}(\tilde{B}, \tau) \mid 1 \leq \tau \leq \tau_{\text{leave}}(\tilde{B})\} \). Let \( B^R(t_0, \tau_{\text{end}}, \tau, J) \) be the set of trajectories with \( \tau_{\text{leave}}(B) = \tau \) and \( J(\tilde{B}) = J \).

Given a trajectory \( \tilde{B} \), let \( \tilde{S}(\tilde{B}) = \{\sum_{k=\tilde{c}}^{J(\tilde{B})} N_k(\tilde{B}) \mid \tilde{c} \in \{1, \ldots, J(\tilde{B})\}\} \). We will use the fact that \( \tilde{S}(\tilde{B}) \) is the set of time steps at which balls following trajectory \( \tilde{B} \) send.

In the process \( R \), the distribution for the number of balls following trajectory \( \tilde{B} \) is a Poisson random variable whose mean, \( \mu^R(\tilde{B}) \), is given by \( \mu^R(\tilde{B}) = \tilde{F}_1 \tilde{F}_2 \tilde{F}_3 \) where \( \tilde{F}_1, \tilde{F}_2 \) and \( \tilde{F}_3 \) are defined as follows.

\[
\tilde{F}_1 = \frac{\lambda}{p_{J(\tilde{B})}}; \quad \tilde{F}_2 = \prod_{j=1}^{J(\tilde{B})} p_j(1 - p_j)^{N_j(\tilde{B}) - 1}; \\
\tilde{F}_3 = \prod_{\tau=1}^{\tau_{\text{leave}}(\tilde{B})} p_{\text{unstick}}(\tau_{\text{end}} - \tau + t_0 + 1)^{\text{unstick}(\tilde{B}, \tau)}(1 - p_{\text{unstick}}(\tau_{\text{end}} - \tau + t_0 + 1))^{1 - \text{unstick}(\tilde{B}, \tau)}.
\]

### 4.5 A probability-preserving bijection from trajectories of a random-unsticking process \( R \) to those of the corresponding reverse random-unsticking process \( \tilde{R} \)

Let \( Y \) and \( Y' \) be externally-jammed processes with arrival rate \( \lambda \) and send sequence \( p \), and let \( t_0 \) and \( \tau_{\text{end}} \) be positive integers. Consider a random-unsticking process \( R = R(Y, t_0) \) and a reverse random-unsticking process \( \tilde{R} = \tilde{R}(Y', t_0, \tau_{\text{end}}) \). We now set out the natural bijection from trajectories of \( R \) to trajectories of \( \tilde{R} \) that will later form the basis of our coupling.

**Definition 47.** The time-reversal bijection \( \pi \) from \( B^R(t_0, \tau_{\text{end}}, t, J) \) to \( B^R(t_0, \tau_{\text{end}}, \tau_{\text{end}} - t + t_0 + 1, J) \) is defined as follows for all \( B \in B^R(t_0, \tau_{\text{end}}, t, J) \):

- \( \tau_{\text{leave}}(\pi(B)) = \tau_{\text{end}} - t_{\text{birth}}(B) + t_0 + 1; \)
- \( J(\pi(B)) = J; \)
- for all \( k \in [J] \), \( N_k(\pi(B)) = N_k(B); \)
- for all \( t' \) in the range \( t_{\text{birth}}(B) \leq t' \leq t_0 + \tau_{\text{end}} \), \( \text{unstick}(\pi(B), \tau_{\text{end}} - t' + t_0 + 1) = \text{unstick}(B, t'). \)

We now pause for a moment to observe that \( \pi \) is a valid map into \( B^R(t_0, \tau_{\text{end}}, \tau_{\text{end}} - t + t_0 + 1, J) \). Indeed, we have \( t_{\text{birth}}(B) \geq t_0 + 1, \) so \( \tau_{\text{leave}}(\pi(B)) \leq \tau_{\text{end}} \) as required. In order for \( J(\pi(B)) = J \) to be a bijection of the process \( \tilde{R} \) we need \( J \) to be in \( [J_{\text{max}}] \); this is fine since the definition of \( J(B) = J \) ensures that \( J(B) \leq \tau_{\text{end}} \) and the definition of \( J_{\text{max}} \) ensures that \( 1 \leq \tau_{\text{end}} \leq J_{\text{max}} \) so \( J(B) \leq J_{\text{max}} \). We also have from the definitions that

\[
\sum_{j=1}^{J} N_j(B) = \tau_{\text{end}} - t_{\text{birth}}(B) + t_0 + 1 = \tau_{\text{leave}}(B) = \sum_{j=1}^{J} N_j(\pi(B)),
\]
as required. Finally, the values of \( \tau \) for which we define \( \text{unstick}(\pi(B), \tau) \) range from \( \tau_{\text{end}} - t_{\text{birth}}(B) + t_0 + 1 = \tau_{\text{leave}}(\pi(B)) \) down to 1, as required. Thus the image of \( \pi \) is indeed contained in \( B^R(t_0, \tau_{\text{end}}, \tau_{\text{end}} - t + t_0 + 1, J) \), and it is clear that \( \pi \) is a bijection as claimed.

The following lemma formalises our intuition that \( R \) is a time reversal of \( R \), and will later form the basis for our coupling between them.

**Lemma 48.** Let \( Y \) and \( Y' \) be externally-jammed processes with arrival rate \( \lambda \) and send sequence \( p \) and let \( t_0 \) and \( \tau_{\text{end}} \) be positive integers. Consider a random-unsticking process \( R = R(Y, t_0) \) and a reverse random-unsticking process \( \tilde{R} = \tilde{R}(Y', t_0, \tau_{\text{end}}) \). Let \( t \) be an integer satisfying \( t \geq t_0 + 1 \). Let \( J \) be a positive integer. Let \( \pi \) be the time-reversal bijection from \( B^R(t_0, \tau_{\text{end}}, t, J) \) to \( B^R(t_0, \tau_{\text{end}}, \tau_{\text{end}} - t + t_0 + 1, J) \). Then for any \( B \in B^R(t_0, \tau_{\text{end}}, t, J) \), we have \( \mu^R(B) = \mu^\tilde{R}(\pi(B)) \) and \( \tilde{S}(\pi(B)) = \{ \tau_{\text{end}} - t + t_0 + 1 \mid t \in S(B) \} \).

**Proof.** It is straightforward to use the definitions of \( \pi, \mu^R \) and \( \mu^\tilde{R} \) to see that \( \mu^R(B) = \mu^\tilde{R}(\pi(B)) \). The only subtlety is checking that the probabilities of the unsticking indicator variables correspond. For this, note from the definition of \( \pi \) that for \( \tau \in \{1, \ldots, \tau_{\text{leave}}(\pi(B))\} \), the probability that \( \text{unstick}(\pi(B), \tau) = 1 \) is \( p_{\text{unstick}}(\tau') \) where \( \tau' = \tau_{\text{end}} - t' + t_0 + 1 \). So this probability is \( p_{\text{unstick}}(\tau_{\text{end}} - \tau + t_0 + 1) \), as required.

To see that \( \tilde{S}(\pi(B)) = \{ \tau_{\text{end}} - t + t_0 + 1 \mid t \in S(B) \} \), note that if we take \( t = t_{\text{birth}}(B) + \sum_{k=1}^{c} N_k(B) \) in \( S(B) \) (for some \( c \in \{0, \ldots, J(B) - 1\} \)) then the quantity \( \tau_{\text{end}} - t + t_0 + 1 \) is equal to \( \tau_{\text{end}} - t_{\text{birth}}(B) = \sum_{k=1}^{c} N_k(B) + t_0 + 1 \) which, using the fact that the sum of all of the \( N_k(B) \)'s is \( \tau_{\text{end}} - t_{\text{birth}}(B) + t_0 + 1 \), is

\[
\tau_{\text{end}} - t_{\text{birth}}(B) - (\tau_{\text{end}} - t_{\text{birth}}(B) + t_0 + 1) + \sum_{k=1}^{J(B)} N_k(t) + t_0 + 1.
\]

Clearly, this is \( \sum_{k=\tilde{c}}^{J(B)} N_k(\tilde{B}) \) for \( \tilde{c} = c + 1 \), which is in \( \tilde{S}(\pi(B)) \). 

\[\square\]

### 4.6 The set of balls that “fill” bin \( j \)

Let \( Y \) be an externally-jammed process with arrival rate \( \lambda \) and let \( t_0 \) be a positive integer. Consider a random-unsticking process \( R = R(Y, t_0) \). The following definitions will be convenient.

For any positive integer \( j \) in block \( B_i \) and any positive integer \( \tau \), we define \( \text{Fill}_j^R(\tau) \) to be the subset of balls \( \beta \in \text{stuck}_j^R(t_0 + \tau) \) such that

\[
\text{birth}_j^R(\beta) \geq \max\left\{ t_0 + 1, t_0 + \tau - \kappa \sum_{k=1}^{i} \left[ W_k \right] \right\}.
\]

We make a similar definition for the process \( T = T(Y^A, Y^B) \). For any \( C \in \{A, B\} \), any positive integer \( j \) in \( B_i \), and any positive integer \( \tau \), \( \text{Fill}_j^T(C, \tau) \) is the subset of balls \( \beta \in \text{stuck}_j^T(C, t_0 + \tau) \) such that

\[
\text{birth}_j^T(\beta) \geq \max\left\{ t_0 + 1, t_0 + \tau - \kappa \sum_{k=1}^{i} \left[ W_k \right] \right\}.
\]

It will be convenient to think about \( \text{Fill}_j^R(\tau) \) in terms of trajectories, so we make the following equivalent definition for \( \text{Fill}_j^R(\tau) \): For any positive integer \( j \) in block \( B_i \) and any positive integer \( \tau_{\text{end}} \), we define \( \text{Fill}_j^R(\tau_{\text{end}}) \) to be the set of balls that take trajectories \( B \) satisfying the following:

(i) \( J(B) = j \).
(ii) \( t_{\text{birth}}(B) \geq t_0 + \tau_{\text{end}} - \kappa \sum_{k=1}^{i} W_k \).

(iii) \( t_{\text{birth}}(B) \geq t_0 + 1 \).

(iv) for all \( t' \in S(B) \), \( \text{unstick}(B, t') = 0 \).

Finally, we define a corresponding notion \( \text{Fill}^R_j(\tau_{\text{end}}) \) for a reverse random-unsticking process. We first define \( \text{Fill}^R_j(\tau_{\text{end}}) \) in terms of trajectories. Let \( Y \) be an externally-jammed process with arrival rate \( \lambda \) and let \( t_0 \) and \( \tau_{\text{end}} \) be positive integers. Consider a reverse random-unsticking process \( \tilde{R} = \tilde{R}(Y, t_0, \tau_{\text{end}}) \). Let \( j \) be a positive integer in block \( B_i \). Then \( \text{Fill}^R_j(\tau_{\text{end}}) \) is defined to be the set of balls that take trajectories \( \tilde{B} \) satisfying the following.

(i) \( J(\tilde{B}) = j \).

(ii) \( \tau_{\text{leave}}(\tilde{B}) \leq 1 + \kappa \sum_{k=1}^{i} W_k \).

(iii) \( \tau_{\text{leave}}(\tilde{B}) \leq \tau_{\text{end}} \).

(iv) for all \( \tau' \in S(\tilde{B}) \), \( \text{unstick}(\tilde{B}, \tau') = 0 \).

Equivalently, \( \text{Fill}^R_j(\tau_{\text{end}}) \) is the set of balls \( \beta = (\tilde{R}, j, x') \) satisfying the following.

(I) \( \beta \in b_j^R(0) \).

(II) For some \( \tau' \leq 1 + \kappa \sum_{k=1}^{i} W_k \), \( \beta \in b_j^R(\tau' - 1) \) and \( \beta \) sends at time \( \tau' \).

(III) This \( \tau' \) also satisfies \( \tau' \leq \tau_{\text{end}} \).

(IV) \( \beta \) does not send on any step \( \tau \in \{1, 2, \ldots, 1 + \kappa \sum_{k=1}^{i} W_k\} \) with \( \text{unstick}(\beta, \tau) = 1 \).

4.7 Bounding \( \text{Fill}^R_j(\tau_{\text{end}}) \)

Lemma 49. Let \( Y \) be an externally-jammed process with arrival rate \( \lambda \) and send sequence \( p \). Consider any integer \( t_0 \geq j_{\min} \). Let \( \tau_{\text{end}} \geq \tau_{\text{init}} \) be an integer. Then there is a coupling of

(i) a reverse random-unsticking process \( \tilde{R}(Y, t_0, \tau_{\text{end}}) \) with

(ii) a sample \( \{Z_j^- \mid j \in \text{bins}(\tau_{\text{end}})\} \) where each \( Z_j^- \) is chosen independently from a Poisson distribution with mean \( \lambda/(4p_j) \)

in such a way that, for every integer \( j \in B_i(\tau_{\text{end}}) \), \( |\text{Fill}^R_j(\tau_{\text{end}})| \geq Z_j^- \).

Proof. Let \( \tilde{R} = \tilde{R}(Y, t_0, \tau_{\text{end}}) \). We will use the definition of \( \text{Fill}^R_j(\tau_{\text{end}}) \) without trajectories. To simplify the notation, let \( i = I(\tau_{\text{end}}) - 1 \), so that \( \text{bins}(\tau_{\text{end}}) = B_i \). Since \( \tau_{\text{end}} \geq \tau_{\text{init}} \), and since the definition of \( \tau_{\text{init}} \) (Definition 37) ensures that \( I(\tau_{\text{init}}) \geq I_0 + 3 \), we have \( i \geq I_0 + 2 \).

We will be considering \( j \in B_i \). Note that this ensures that \( j \leq u(i) \) and this is at most \( J_{\max} \), by the definition of \( J_{\max} \) in Section 4.2. Thus, by the initialisation of the process \( \tilde{R} \), the number of balls in \( b_j^R(0) \) is Poisson with mean \( \lambda/p_j \) (independently of any other \( j \)). Since each \( \text{Fill}^R_j(\tau_{\text{end}}) \) is determined by the trajectories of balls in \( b_j^R(0) \), and since all balls behave independently in the process \( \tilde{R} \), the random variables \( \text{Fill}^R_j(0) \) are already distributed as independent Poisson random variables as in (ii). So to finish,
we just need to show that, for all \( j \in B_i \) and all balls \( \beta \in b_j^R(0) \), the probability that (II), (III) and (IV) happens is at least 1/4. To do this, we’ll show that the probability that (II) or (III) fails is at least 1/2 and that the probability that (IV) fails is at most 1/4 (then we are finished by a union bound adding the failure probabilities 1/2 and 1/4).

For (IV), it suffices to show that for any \( \tau \in \{1, \ldots, 1 + \kappa \sum_{k=1}^i [W_k]\} \), \( p_{\text{unstick}}(t_0 + \tau_{\text{end}} - \tau + 1) \leq 1/(4j) \). Using a union bound over the (at most \( j \)) steps when \( \beta \) sends, this implies that the probability that \( \beta \) ever has \( \text{unstick}(\beta, \tau) = 1 \) on one of these steps \( \tau \) is at most 1/4. Towards this end, first note from the definitions of \( I(\cdot) \) and \( \tau_\ell \) that

\[
\tau_{\text{end}} \geq \tau_{I(\tau_{\text{end}})-I_0-1} = \tau_{i-I_0} = \tau_{i-I_0-1} + \kappa \sum_{k=1}^i [W_k].
\]  

(10)

In particular, (10) implies that \( t_0 + \tau_{\text{end}} - \tau + 1 \geq t_0 + 1 \) for all \( \tau \leq 1 + \kappa \sum_{k=1}^i [W_k] \). It follows from the definitions of \( p_{\text{unstick}}(\cdot) \) and \( \text{bins}(\cdot) \) that

\[
p_{\text{unstick}}(t_0 + \tau_{\text{end}} - \tau + 1) = \exp(-\zeta |\text{bins}(\tau_{\text{end}} - \tau + 1)|/16) = \exp(-\zeta |B_I(\tau_{\text{end}} - \tau + 1)|/16).
\]

Since \( |B_I(\cdot)| \) is monotonically increasing in \( \tau \) (which follows from \( \kappa > 2 \)) and \( I(\cdot) \) is monotonically increasing in its argument, the right hand side is maximised when \( \tau \) is as large as possible, so

\[
p_{\text{unstick}}(t_0 + \tau_{\text{end}} - \tau + 1) \leq \exp(-\zeta |B_I(\tau_{\text{end}} - \kappa \sum_{k=1}^i [W_k]|)/16).
\]  

(11)

To simplify the notation, let \( x = \tau_{\text{end}} - \kappa \sum_{k=1}^i [W_k] \). From the definition of \( I(\cdot) \) we have \( x < \tau_{I(x)-I_0} \), so since \( x \geq \tau_{(i-1)-I_0} \) by (10) we have \( i-1 < I(x) \) and hence \( i \leq I(x) \). Plugging in the value of \( x \), we conclude that \( I(\tau_{\text{end}} - \kappa \sum_{k=1}^i [W_k]) \geq i \). Plugging this into (11), we get

\[
p_{\text{unstick}}(t_0 + \tau_{\text{end}} - \tau + 1) \leq \exp(-\zeta |B_{i-1}|)/16).
\]

Since \( i \geq I_0 \geq 4 \), Observation 43 gives \( |B_{i-1}| \geq u(i-1)(\kappa - 1)/\kappa \), and we can simplify this as follows:

\[
p_{\text{unstick}}(t_0 + \tau_{\text{end}} - \tau + 1) \leq \frac{1}{e^{\zeta u(i-1)\frac{\kappa-1}{16\kappa}}} = \frac{1}{e^{\zeta u(i)\frac{4}{16\kappa}}}.
\]  

(12)

Since \( u(i) \geq i \geq I_0 \), the definition of \( I_0 \) ensures that \( \exp(\zeta u(i)\frac{4}{16\kappa}) \geq 4u(i) \); we therefore have \( p_{\text{unstick}}(t_0 + \tau_{\text{end}} - \tau + 1) \leq 1/(4u(i)) \leq 1/(4j) \), as required for the union bound.

For (II) and (III) we first note that (II) implies (III) by (10). So to finish the proof, we will prove the probability that (II) fails for a given ball \( \beta \in b_j^R(0) \) is at most 1/2. The number of time steps that it takes for \( \beta \) to send from bin 1 is a random variable \( \Psi \) which is the sum of independent geometric random variables with parameters \( p_j, \ldots, p_1 \). The expectation of \( \Psi \) is \( \mu := \sum_{k=1}^j (1/p_k) \), and we just need to show that

\[
P(\Psi > 1 + \kappa \sum_{k=1}^i [W_k]) \leq 1/2.
\]

Observe that since \( j \in B_i \), we have \( \mu \leq \sum_{k=1}^i W_k \leq \sum_{k=1}^i [W_k] \). Hence we have

\[
P\left(\Psi > 1 + \kappa \sum_{k=1}^i [W_k]\right) \leq P(\Psi > \kappa \mu).
\]

By Markov’s inequality, this is at most \( 1/\kappa \leq 1/2 \). 

□
4.8 Bounding $\text{Fill}_j^R(\tau_{\text{end}})$

We next use the time-reversal bijection from Section 4.5 to translate Lemma 49 from a reverse random-unsticking process $\tilde{R}$ to a random-unsticking process $R$ by coupling the two processes.

**Lemma 50.** Fix $\lambda$, $\eta$ and $\nu$ in $(0,1)$ and a $(\lambda, \eta, \nu)$-suitable send sequence $p$. Let $Y$ be an externally-jammed process with arrival rate $\lambda$ and send sequence $p$. Consider any integer $t_0 \geq j_{\text{min}}$. Let $\tau_{\text{end}} \geq \tau_{\text{init}}$ be an integer. Then there is a coupling of

- (i) a random-unsticking process $R = R(Y, t_0)$ with
- (ii) a sample $\{Z_j^- \mid j \in \text{bins}(\tau_{\text{end}})\}$ where each $Z_j^-$ is chosen independently from a Poisson distribution with mean $\lambda/(4p_j)$

in such a way that, for every integer $j \in B_I(\tau_{\text{end}}) - 1, \left|\text{Fill}_j^R(\tau_{\text{end}})\right| \geq Z_j^-$. 

**Proof.** Fix $t_0$ and $\tau_{\text{end}}$. Let $Y'$ be an externally-jammed process with arrival rate $\lambda$ and send sequence $p$, and let $\tilde{R} = R(Y', t_0, \tau_{\text{end}})$ be a reverse random-unsticking process. Consider any $t \geq t_0 + 1$ and positive integer $J$. Let $\pi$ be the time-reversal bijection from $B^R(t_0, \tau_{\text{end}}, t, J)$ to $B^R(t_0, \tau_{\text{end}}, \tau_{\text{end}} - t + t_0 + 1, J)$, and recall from Lemma 48 that for all trajectories $B \in B^R(t_0, \tau_{\text{end}}, t, J)$, we have $\mu^R(B) = \mu^R(\pi(B))$ and $\tilde{S}(\pi(B)) = \{\tau_{\text{end}} - t + t_0 + 1 \mid t \in S(B)\}$. From the first of these statements, the number of balls following a trajectory $B \in B^R(t_0, \tau_{\text{end}}, t, J)$ in the process $R$ has the same distribution as the number of balls following the trajectory $\pi(B)$ in the process $\tilde{R}$. We may therefore couple $R$ with $\tilde{R}$ by identifying these trajectories, so that for every ball following trajectory $B$ in $R$ there is a corresponding ball following trajectory $\pi(B)$ in $\tilde{R}$ and vice versa.

We next show that a ball following a trajectory $B \in B^R(t_0, \tau_{\text{end}}, t, J)$ contributes to $\text{Fill}_j^R(\tau_{\text{end}})$ if and only if a ball following the trajectory $\pi(B)$ contributes to $\text{Fill}_j^R(\tau_{\text{end}})$, so that $\left|\text{Fill}_j^R(\tau_{\text{end}})\right| = \left|\text{Fill}_j^{\tilde{R}}(\tau_{\text{end}})\right|$; given this, the lemma will follow immediately from Lemma 49. By the definition of $\pi$ (Definition 47), $J(\pi(B)) = J(B)$, so (i) is the same in the definitions of $\text{Fill}_j^R(\tau_{\text{end}})$ and $\text{Fill}_j^{\tilde{R}}(\tau_{\text{end}})$. Similarly, (ii) and (iii) are the same in both definitions. To see that (iv) is the same in both directions, consider $t' \in S(B)$ with $\text{unstick}(B, t') = 0$. Then $\tau_{\text{end}} - t' + t_0 + 1 \in \tilde{S}(B)$ by Lemma 48 and, by the definition of $\pi$, $\text{unstick}(\pi(B), \tau_{\text{end}} - t' + t_0 + 1) = \text{unstick}(B, t')$. Clearly, the same works in the other direction, so (iv) is the same in both definitions. Hence we do indeed have $\left|\text{Fill}_j^R(\tau_{\text{end}})\right| = \left|\text{Fill}_j^{\tilde{R}}(\tau_{\text{end}})\right|$, and we are done by Lemma 49. 

Finally, we show that Lemma 50 remains true when the value of $\mathcal{F}_{t_0}^R$ is exposed. (Since $\text{bins}(\tau_{\text{end}}) = B_I(\tau_{\text{end}}) - 1$ by definition, this is the only difference between the statement of Lemma 50 and that of the following lemma.)

**Lemma 51.** Fix $\lambda$, $\eta$ and $\nu$ in $(0,1)$ and a $(\lambda, \eta, \nu)$-suitable send sequence $p$. Let $Y$ be an externally-jammed process with arrival rate $\lambda$ and send sequence $p$. Consider any integer $t_0 \geq j_{\text{min}}$. Consider a random-unsticking process $R = R(Y, t_0)$. Let $F_{t_0}^R$ be any value of the filtration $\mathcal{F}_{t_0}^R$ covering the first $t_0$ steps of $R$. Let $\tau_{\text{end}} \geq \tau_{\text{init}}$ be an integer. Then there is a coupling of

- (i) The process $R$, conditioned on $\mathcal{F}_{t_0}^R = F_{t_0}^R$, with
- (ii) A sample $\{Z_j^- \mid j \in \text{bins}(\tau_{\text{end}})\}$ where each $Z_j^-$ is chosen independently from a Poisson distribution with mean $\lambda/(4p_j)$

in such a way that, for every integer $j \in \text{bins}(\tau_{\text{end}})$, $\left|\text{Fill}_j^R(\tau_{\text{end}})\right| \geq Z_j^-$. 
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Proof. Let $i = I(\tau_{\text{end}}) - 1$. For $j \in B_i$, from its definition in Section 4.6, $\text{Fill}^R_j(\tau_{\text{end}})$ is the subset of balls $\beta \in \text{stuck}^R_j (t_0 + \tau_{\text{end}})$ such that $\text{birth}^R(\beta) \geq \max\{t_0 + 1, t_0 + \tau_{\text{end}} -\kappa \sum_{k=1}^i[W_k]\}$. The important thing here is that $\text{birth}^R(\beta) \geq t_0 + 1$.

The definition of the process $R$ ensures that balls behave independently. Thus whether or not a ball $\beta$ contributes to $\text{Fill}^R_j(\tau_{\text{end}})$ is independent of $\mathcal{F}^R_{t_0}$. Thus, writing $R'$ for a copy of $R$ conditioned on $\mathcal{F}^R_{t_0} = \mathcal{F}^R_{t_0}$, we can couple $R$ and $R'$ in such a way that $\text{Fill}^R_j(\tau_{\text{end}}) = \text{Fill}^R_{j'}(\tau_{\text{end}})$. We conclude that Lemma 51 follows from Lemma 50. \qed

4.9 Proving Lemma 46

Lemma 52. Fix $\lambda, \eta$ and $\nu$ in $(0,1)$ and a $(\lambda, \eta, \nu)$-suitable send sequence $p$ with $p_0 = 1$. Let $Y^A$ and $Y^B$ be independent externally-jammed processes with arrival rate $\lambda/2$ and send sequence $p$ and consider the two-stream externally-jammed process $T = T(Y^A, Y^B)$. Consider any integer $t_0 \geq j_{\text{min}}$. Let $F^T_{t_0}$ be a value of $\mathcal{F}^T_{t_0}$ such that $\mathcal{E}^\text{init}_{t_0}$ occurs. Let $C$ and $C'$ be distinct elements of $\{A, B\}$. Let $R = R(Y^C, t_0)$ be a random-unsticking process. Let $F^R_{t_0}$ be a value of $\mathcal{F}^R_{t_0}$ that is consistent with $F^T_{t_0}$. Consider any integer $\tau \geq 1$. Then there is a coupling of

- $T$ conditioned on $\mathcal{F}^T_{t_0} = F^T_{t_0}$ and
- $R$ conditioned on $\mathcal{F}^R_{t_0} = F^R_{t_0}$

such that at least one of the following occurs:

- $\mathcal{E}^T_{\text{jam}}(C', t_0, \tau)$ does not occur, or
- $\text{unstick}^T(C, t_0 + \tau) \subseteq \text{unstick}^R(t_0 + \tau)$.

Proof. Note (from the definition of $\mathcal{F}^R_{t_0}$ and $\mathcal{F}^T_{t_0}$) since $F^R_{t_0}$ is consistent with $F^T_{t_0}$, $\text{unstick}^R(t_0) = \text{unstick}^T(C, t_0)$ and, for all $j$, $b^R_j(t_0) = b^T_j(t_0)$.

We will construct the coupling step-by-step. For every positive integer $\tau'$, we use the following notation.

- Invariant 1 for $\tau'$: $\mathcal{E}^T_{\text{jam}}(C', t_0, \tau')$ occurs, and
- Invariant 2 for $\tau'$: $\text{unstick}^T(C, t_0 + \tau' - 1) \subseteq \text{unstick}^R(t_0 + \tau' - 1)$.

Note that the invariants for $\tau'$ only depend on steps $1, \ldots, t_0 + \tau' - 1$ of the coupled process. Our high-level strategy is as follows: Given that the coupling on these steps satisfies both invariants for $\tau'$ we will show how to extend the coupling to step $t_0 + \tau'$ to satisfy Invariant 2 for $\tau' + 1$. After that there are two possibilities.

- If $\tau' = \tau$ then we have finished, by establishing $\text{unstick}^T(C, t_0 + \tau) \subseteq \text{unstick}^R(t_0 + \tau)$.
- Otherwise, $\tau' \leq \tau - 1$ and there are again two possibilities.
  - Either Invariant 1 is violated for $\tau' + 1$ in which case $\mathcal{E}^T_{\text{jam}}(C', t_0, \tau' + 1)$ does not occur so $\mathcal{E}^T_{\text{jam}}(C', t_0, \tau)$ does not occur (and we have finished),
  - or Invariant 1 is satisfied for $\tau' + 1$ and the construction of the coupling continues to the next step.

That completes the description of the high-level strategy. To finish the proof we must show that both invariants hold for $\tau' = 1$ and then we must show how to extend the coupling as promised.

We first establish the invariants for $\tau' = 1$. 30
• Invariant 1 follows from Equation (3) in Lemma 42.

• For Invariant 2 we wish to show \( \text{unstuck}^T(C, t_0) \subseteq \text{unstuck}^R(t_0) \). This follows from the consistency of \( F^T_{t_0} \) and \( F^R_{t_0} \), as already mentioned.

To finish the proof we consider \( \tau' \geq 1 \) such that both invariants hold for \( \tau' \), which implies (using the definition of \( \mathcal{E}^T_{\text{jam}}(C', t_0, \tau') \) in Definition 41) that

\[
\Pr[\text{stuckvect}^T(C', t_0 + \tau' - 1) \geq \zeta | \text{bins}(\tau' - 1)]
\]

and

\[
\text{unstuck}^T(C, t_0 + \tau' - 1) \subseteq \text{unstuck}^R(t_0 + \tau' - 1).
\]

Using \( \mathcal{F}^T_{t_0+\tau'-1} \) and \( \mathcal{F}^R_{t_0+\tau'-1} \) we now wish to consider step \( t_0 + \tau' \), and to extend the coupling to this step in such a way that \( \text{unstuck}^T(C, t_0 + \tau') \subseteq \text{unstuck}^R(t_0 + \tau') \). Once we do this, we’ll have completed the high-level strategy, hence we’ll have completed the proof.

It is helpful to note by the definition of the processes that for all \( t \) and \( j \) we have

\[
\text{balls}^T(C, t) \cap b_j^T(t) = b_j^C(t) = b_j^R(t).
\]

We will use this observation for \( t = t_0 + \tau' - 1 \). From this we deduce that

\[
\text{stucksend}^T(C, t) \subseteq \text{stucksend}^R(t) \cup \text{unstuck}^R(t).
\]

We are finally ready to do the coupling. We first determine \( b_0^Y(t+1) = b_0^R(t+1) \) and \( \text{send}^Y(t+1) = \text{send}^R(t+1) \). This allows us to deduce \( \text{stucksend}^T(C, t+1) \) and \( \text{stucksend}^R(t+1) \).

We will use this to finish the coupling of step \( t + 1 \) in such a way that any ball

\[
\beta \in \text{stucksend}^T(C, t+1) \cap \text{unstuck}^T(C, t+1)
\]

is also in \( \text{unstuck}^R(t+1) \). Here is how we do it: If \( \text{stucksend}^T(C, t+1) \) is empty, there is nothing to prove. Otherwise, choose \( \beta \) u.a.r. from \( \text{stucksend}^T(C, t+1) \) (this is the random ball that may become unstuck at time \( t + 1 \) in \( T \). The probability that \( \beta \) is in \( \text{unstuck}^T(C, t+1) \) is the probability that \( \text{stucksend}^T(C', t+1) = \emptyset \). We will use Lemma 45 to bound this probability. First note that the lemma applies since the definition of \( I_0 \) ensures that \( |B_{I_0}| \geq 4 \) so \( \zeta | \text{bins}(\tau')| \geq 4 \). By Lemma 45, the probability that \( \text{stucksend}^T(C', t+1) = \emptyset \) is at most

\[\exp(-\zeta | \text{bins}(\tau' - 1)|/16).\]

If \( \beta \) is in \( \text{unstuck}^R(t) \) then there is nothing to prove. Alternatively, if it is in \( \text{stucksend}^R(C, t) \), then the probability that it is in \( \text{unstuck}^R(C, t+1) \) is \( p_{\text{unstick}}(t) = \exp(-\zeta | \text{bins}(\tau' - 1)|/16) \). Thus we can extend the coupling as required, completing the proof.

\[\Box\]

It is not hard to see that the final bullet point of Lemma 52 implies \( \text{Fill}_j^R(\tau) \subseteq \text{Fill}_j^T(C, \tau) \); this is the only difference between the statements of Lemma 52 and Corollary 53.

**Corollary 53.** Fix \( \lambda, \eta \) and \( \nu \) in \((0, 1)\) and a \((\lambda, \eta, \nu)\)-suitable send sequence \( p \) with \( p_0 = 1 \). Let \( Y^A \) and \( Y^B \) be independent externally-jammed processes with arrival rate \( \lambda/2 \) and send sequence \( p \) and consider the two-stream externally-jammed process \( T = T(Y^A, Y^B) \). Consider any integer \( t_0 \geq j_{\text{min}} \). Let \( F^T_{t_0} \) be a value of \( \mathcal{F}^T_{\text{init}}(t_0) \) such that \( \mathcal{E}^T_{\text{init}}(t_0) \) occurs. Let \( C \) and \( C' \) be distinct elements of \( \{A, B\} \). Let \( R = R(Y^C, t_0) \) be a random-unsticking process. Let \( F^R_{t_0} \) be a value of \( \mathcal{F}^R_{t_0} \) that is consistent with \( F^T(t_0) \). Consider any integer \( \tau \geq 1 \). There is a coupling of
• $T$ conditioned on $\mathcal{F}_{t_0}^{T} = F_{t_0}^{T}$ and
• $R$ conditioned on $\mathcal{F}_{t_0}^{R} = F_{t_0}^{R}$
such that at least one of the following occurs:

• $\mathcal{E}_{\text{jam}}^{T}(C', t_0, \tau)$ does not occur, or

• For all positive integers $j$, $\text{Fill}_j^{R}(\tau) \subseteq \text{Fill}_j^{T}(C, \tau)$.

Proof. We use the coupling of Lemma 52. If $\mathcal{E}_{\text{jam}}^{T}(C', t_0, \tau)$ does not occur, then the result is immediate. Otherwise, we have $\text{unstuck}^{T}(C, t_0 + \tau) \subseteq \text{unstuck}^{R}(t_0 + \tau)$. Since every ball is either stuck or unstuck, it follows that $\text{stuck}^{R}(t_0 + \tau) \subseteq \text{stuck}^{T}(C, t_0 + \tau)$. By the definitions of $\text{Fill}_j^{R}(\tau)$ and $\text{Fill}_j^{T}(C, \tau)$, it follows that $\text{Fill}_j^{R}(\tau) \subseteq \text{Fill}_j^{T}(C, \tau)$ as required. \qed

Then combining the couplings of Corollary 53 (from one stream of $T$ to $R$) and Lemma 51 (from $R$ to i.i.d. Poisson variables), we get the following lemma.

**Lemma 54.** Fix $\lambda$, $\eta$ and $\nu$ in $(0, 1)$ and a $(\lambda, \eta, \nu)$-suitable send sequence $p$ with $p_0 = 1$. Let $Y^A$ and $Y^B$ be independent externally-jammed processes with arrival rate $\lambda/2$ and send sequence $p$ and consider the two-stream externally-jammed process $T = T(Y^A, Y^B)$. Consider any integer $t_0 \geq j_{\text{min}}$. Let $F_{t_0}^{T}$ be a value of $\mathcal{F}_{t_0}^{T}$ such that $\mathcal{E}_{\text{init}}^{T}(t_0)$ happens. Let $C$ and $C'$ be distinct elements of $\{A, B\}$. Consider any integer $\tau \geq \tau_{\text{init}}$. There is a coupling of

• $T$ conditioned on $\mathcal{F}_{t_0}^{T} = F_{t_0}^{T}$ and

• A sample $\{Z_{j}^{-} \mid j \in \text{bins}(\tau)\}$ where each $Z_{j}^{-}$ is chosen independently from a Poisson distribution with mean $\lambda/(4p_j)$
such that at least one of the following occurs:

• $\mathcal{E}_{\text{jam}}^{T}(C', t_0, \tau)$ does not occur, or

• For all integers $j \in \text{bins}(\tau)$, $|\text{Fill}_j^{T}(C, \tau)| \geq Z_{j}^{-}$.

Finally, applying Lemma 54 twice, once with $C = A$ and once with $C = B$ and using the definitions of $\text{Fill}_j^{T}(C, \tau)$ and $\mathcal{E}_{\text{jam}}^{T}(t_0, \tau)$, we get Lemma 46 as desired.

**Lemma 46.** Fix $\lambda$, $\eta$ and $\nu$ in $(0, 1)$ and a $(\lambda, \eta, \nu)$-suitable send sequence $p$ with $p_0 = 1$. Let $Y^A$ and $Y^B$ be independent externally-jammed processes with arrival rate $\lambda/2$ and send sequence $p$ and consider the two-stream externally-jammed process $T = T(Y^A, Y^B)$. Consider any integer $t_0 \geq j_{\text{min}}$. Let $F_{t_0}^{T}$ be a value of $\mathcal{F}_{t_0}^{T}$ such that $\mathcal{E}_{\text{init}}^{T}(t_0)$ happens. Consider any integer $\tau \geq \tau_{\text{init}}$. Then there is a coupling of

• $T$ conditioned on $\mathcal{F}_{t_0}^{T} = F_{t_0}^{T},$

• a sample $\{Z_{j}^{A} \mid j \in \text{bins}(\tau)\}$ where each $Z_{j}^{A}$ is chosen independently from a Poisson distribution with mean $\lambda/(4p_j)$, and

• a sample $\{Z_{j}^{B} \mid j \in \text{bins}(\tau)\}$ where each $Z_{j}^{B}$ is chosen from a Poisson distribution with mean $\lambda/(4p_j)$ and these are independent of each other but not of the $\{Z_{j}^{A}\}$ values
in such a way that at least one of the following happens:

• $\mathcal{E}_{\text{jam}}^{T}(t_0, \tau)$ does not occur, or

• for all $j \in \text{bins}(\tau)$, $|\text{stuck}^{T}(A, t_0 + \tau)| \geq Z_{j}^{A}$ and $|\text{stuck}^{T}(B, t_0 + \tau)| \geq Z_{j}^{B}$. 
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5 The main lemma for proving Theorem 26

Our goal in this section is to prove Lemma 57, which says that if $T$ is a two-stream externally-jammed process with suitable send sequence, and if $\mathcal{E}_{\text{init}}^T(t_0)$ occurs, then $T$ is likely to stay $t_0$-jammed forever. We start with a simple observation.

**Observation 55.** Suppose that $p$ is $(\lambda, \eta, \nu)$-suitable. If $i \geq I_0$ then $|\{j \in B_i \mid p_j \leq p_\ast\}| > 2\eta |B_i|/3$.

**Proof.** Since $p$ is $(\lambda, \eta, \nu)$-suitable, $|\{j \in [u(i)] \mid p_j \leq p_\ast\}| > \eta u(i)$. At most $u(i - 1)$ of these bins are in blocks $B_1, \ldots, B_{i - 1}$, and by definition we have $u(i - 1) = u(i)/\kappa \leq \eta u(i)/3$, so at least $2\eta u(i)/3$ of these bins are in block $B_i$.

We will prove Lemma 57 using a union bound over all time steps. For readability, we extract the most difficult case of this bound as Lemma 56.

**Lemma 56.** Let $p$ be $(\lambda, \eta, \nu)$-suitable. Let $T$ be a two-stream externally-jammed process with arrival rate $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ and send sequence $p$. Consider any integer $t_0 \geq j_{\text{min}}$. Let $F_{t_0}^T$ be a value of $\mathcal{F}_{t_0}^T$ such that $\mathcal{E}_{\text{init}}^T(t_0)$ happens. Let $\tau \geq \tau_{\text{init}}$. Conditioned on $\mathcal{F}_{t_0}^T = F_{t_0}^T$, with probability at least $1 - 1/(10\tau^2)$, at least one of the following happens:

- The process $T$ fails to be $t_0$-jammed for time $\tau$.
- The process $T$ is $t_0$-jammed for time $\tau + 1$.

**Proof.** Let $Y^A$ and $Y^B$ be independent externally-jammed processes with arrival rate $\lambda/2$ and send sequence $p$ such that $T = T(Y^A, Y^B)$. Consider $C \in \{A, B\}$. Let $\{Z_j \mid j \in \text{bins}(\tau)\}$ be independent Poisson variables with $\mathbb{E}(Z_j) = \lambda/(4p_j)$. Since $\zeta = \eta \lambda/24$, by Lemma 46 and the definition of $f$ (Definition 25),

$$
\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{E}_{\text{jam}}^T(t_0, \tau) \text{ or } f(\text{stuckvect}^T(C, t_0 + \tau)) \geq \zeta |\text{bins}(\tau)| \mid \mathcal{F}_{t_0}^T = F_{t_0}^T\right) \\
\geq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{j \in \text{bins}(\tau)} p_j Z_j \geq \frac{\eta \lambda |\text{bins}(\tau)|}{24}\right).
$$

(13)

Since $\tau \geq j_{\text{init}} \geq 0$, we have $\text{bins}(\tau) = B_{I(\tau) - 1}$ where $I(\tau) \geq I_0 + 1$. Observation 55 ensures that there is a set $\text{bins}'(\tau) \subseteq \text{bins}(\tau)$ such that $|\text{bins}'(\tau)| \geq 2\eta |\text{bins}(\tau)|/3$ and for all $j \in \text{bins}'(\tau)$, we have $p_j \leq p_\ast$. From Equation (13) and the lower bound on $|\text{bins}'(\tau)|$ we get

$$
\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{E}_{\text{jam}}^T(t_0, \tau) \text{ or } f(\text{stuckvect}^T(C, t_0 + \tau)) \geq \zeta |\text{bins}(\tau)| \mid \mathcal{F}_{t_0}^T = F_{t_0}^T\right) \\
\geq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{j \in \text{bins}'(\tau)} p_j Z_j \geq \frac{\eta \lambda |\text{bins}'(\tau)|}{16}\right).
$$

(14)

For each $j \in \text{bins}'(\tau)$, let $1_{Z_j}$ be the indicator variable of the event $Z_j \leq \lambda/(8p_j)$, so that

$$
\sum_{j \in \text{bins}'(\tau)} p_j Z_j \geq \frac{\lambda}{8} |\text{bins}'(\tau)| - \sum_{j \in \text{bins}'(\tau)} 1_{Z_j}.
$$

(15)

We dominate the sum in the right-hand side of (15) above by a binomial random variable, which we will bound above using the Chernoff bound of Lemma 20. We first bound the mean $\mu$ of this variable; by the Chernoff bound of Lemma 19 applied with $\delta = 1/2$, for all $j \in \text{bins}'(\tau)$ we have

$$
\mathbb{P}(1_{Z_j} = 1) = \mathbb{P}(Z_j \leq \mathbb{E}(Z_j)/2) \leq e^{-\mathbb{E}(Z_j)/8} \leq e^{-\mathbb{E}(Z_j)/12} = e^{-\lambda/(48p_j)} \leq e^{-\lambda/(48p_\ast)}.
$$
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Let \( x = e^{\lambda/(48p_*)}/2 \) and \( \mu = e^{-\lambda/(48p_*)}|\text{bins}'(\tau)| \). Since \( p_* \leq \lambda/48 \), we have \( x > 1 \), which ensures the applicability of Lemma 20. From this lemma, we obtain

\[
P\left( \sum_{j \in \text{bins}'(\tau)} 1_{Z_j \geq \frac{|\text{bins}'(\tau)|}{2}} \leq e^{-\mu x (\log x - 1)} \right) \leq \exp\left( -\frac{|\text{bins}'(\tau)|}{2} \left( \frac{\lambda}{48p_*} - 2 \right) \right).
\]

Recall that \(|\text{bins}'(\tau)| \geq 2\eta |\text{bins}(\tau)|/3\); hence by Lemma 44, it follows that

\[
P\left( \sum_{j \in \text{bins}'(\tau)} 1_{Z_j \geq \frac{|\text{bins}'(\tau)|}{2}} \right) \leq \exp\left( -\frac{2\eta \log(\tau)}{3 \cdot 4\kappa^2 \log(1/\nu)} \left( \frac{\lambda}{48p_*} - 2 \right) \right).
\]

The rest of the proof is simple manipulation. Since \( p_* \leq \lambda/200 \) we have \( \lambda/(48p_*) - 2 \geq \lambda/(100p_*) \). Since \( p_* \leq (\lambda\eta)/(1800\kappa^2 \log(1/\nu)) \) we have \( \lambda/(100p_*) \geq (18/\eta)\kappa^2 \log(1/\nu) \) so we get

\[
P\left( \sum_{j \in \text{bins}'(\tau)} 1_{Z_j \geq \frac{|\text{bins}'(\tau)|}{2}} \right) \leq \exp(-3 \log(\tau)) = \frac{1}{\tau^3}.
\]

Finally, since \( \tau \geq \tau_{\text{init}} \geq 20 \), this probability is at most \( 1/(20\tau^2) \). It follows from (15) that

\[
P\left( \sum_{j \in \text{bins}'(\tau)} p_j Z_j \geq \frac{\lambda |\text{bins}'(\tau)|}{16} \right) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{20\tau^2}.
\]

It follows from (14) that

\[
P\left( \mathcal{E}_{\text{jam}}(t_0, \tau) \text{ or } \mathcal{E}_{\text{stuckvect}}^T(C, t_0 + \tau) \right) \geq \zeta |\text{bins}(\tau)| \left| F_{t_0}^T = F_{t_0}^T \right| \geq 1 - \frac{1}{20\tau^2}.
\]

The result therefore follows by a union bound over \( C \in \{A, B\} \). \( \square \)

**Lemma 57.** Let \( \mathbf{p} \) be \((\lambda, \eta, \nu)\)-suitable. Let \( T \) be a two-stream externally-jammed process with arrival rate \( \lambda \in (0, 1) \) and send sequence \( \mathbf{p} \). Consider any integer \( t_0 \geq \tau_{\text{min}} \). Let \( F_{t_0}^T \) be a value of \( \mathcal{F}_{t_0}^T \) such that \( \mathcal{E}_{\text{init}}^T(t_0) \) happens. Then

\[
P\left( T \text{ is } t_0\text{-jam} \text{ for all } \tau \geq 1 \mid F_{t_0}^T = F_{t_0}^T \right) \geq 4/5.
\]

**Proof.** For all \( \tau \geq \tau_{\text{init}} \), let \( \mathcal{E}_\tau \) be the event that either \( T \) is not \( t_0 \)-jammed for \( \tau \) or that \( T \) is \( t_0 \)-jammed for \( \tau + 1 \). We then have

\[
P\left( \bigwedge_{\tau \geq 1} \mathcal{E}_{\text{jam}}^T(t_0, \tau) \mid F_{t_0}^T = F_{t_0}^T \right) = P\left( \bigwedge_{\tau \geq \tau_{\text{init}}} \mathcal{E}_\tau \mid F_{t_0}^T = F_{t_0}^T \right).
\]

By Lemmas 42 and 56 and a union bound, we therefore have

\[
P\left( \bigwedge_{\tau \geq 1} \mathcal{E}_{\text{jam}}^T(t_0, \tau) \mid F_{t_0}^T = F_{t_0}^T \right) \geq \frac{49}{50} - \sum_{\tau \geq \tau_{\text{init}}} \frac{1}{10\tau^2} \geq \frac{49}{50} - \frac{\pi^2}{60} \geq \frac{4}{5},
\]

as required. \( \square \)
6 Proof of Main Theorems

Theorem 26. Fix $\lambda$, $\eta$ and $\nu$ in $(0, 1)$. Let $p$ be a $(\lambda, \eta, \nu)$-suitable send sequence. Let $T$ be a two-stream externally-jammed process with arrival rate $\lambda$ and send sequence $p$. Let $\mathcal{R}^T = \{ t \mid \text{stuck}^T(t) = \emptyset \}$. With probability 1, $\mathcal{R}^T$ is finite.

Proof. For every positive integer $i$, let $R_i$ be the $i$'th smallest time step in $\mathcal{R}^T$. If $|\mathcal{R}^T| < i$, then we define $R_i = \infty$. Since $R_1 = 0$, for all $i \geq 2$ we have

$$\Pr(R_i < \infty) = \prod_{k=2}^{i} \Pr(R_i < \infty \mid R_{i-1} < \infty).$$

Let $\mathcal{E}_i$ be the event that $R_{i-1} < \infty$ and that $\mathcal{E}^{\text{init}}_{i-1} \cap (R_{i-1} + t)$ occurs for some positive integer $t$ such that $R_{i-1} + t < R_i$. Observe that conditioned on $R_{i-1} < \infty$, the probability of $\mathcal{E}_i$ occurring does not depend on $i$ since stuck$^T$ evolves independently of unstuck balls; let $p_{\text{init}} = \Pr(\mathcal{E}_i \mid R_{i-1} < \infty)$. Then by (16), we have

$$\Pr(R_i < \infty) \leq \prod_{k=2}^{i} \left(1 - p_{\text{init}} + p_{\text{init}} \Pr(R_i < \infty \mid \mathcal{E}_i, R_{i-1} < \infty)\right).$$

Observe that if $\mathcal{E}^{\text{init}}_{i-1} \cap (R_{i-1} + t)$ occurs for some $t < R_i - R_{i-1}$, and $T$ is $(R_{i-1} + t)$-jammed for all $\tau \geq 1$, then we have we must have stuck$^T(R_{i-1} + u) \neq \emptyset$ for all $u \geq 1$; hence $R_i = \infty$.

It follows by applying Lemma 57 to (17) that

$$\Pr(R_i < \infty) \leq \prod_{k=2}^{i} \left(1 - p_{\text{init}} + p_{\text{init}}/5\right) \leq e^{-4(i-1)p_{\text{init}}/5}.$$  

By (18), we have $\sum_i \Pr(R_i < \infty) < \infty$. It follows by the Borel-Cantelli lemma that with probability 1 we have $R_i = \infty$ for all but finitely many values of $i$, which proves the theorem. 

Corollary 27. Fix $\lambda$, $\eta$ and $\nu$ in $(0, 1)$. Let $p$ be a $(\lambda, \eta, \nu)$-suitable send sequence. Let $X$ be a backoff process with arrival rate $\lambda$ and send sequence $p$. Let $\mathcal{R}^X = \{ t \mid \text{balls}^X(t) = \emptyset \}$. Then, with probability 1, $\mathcal{R}^X$ is finite. Hence, $X$ is transient so it is unstable.

Proof. Let $T$ be a two-stream externally-jammed process with arrival rate $\lambda$ and send sequence $p$. Let $\mathcal{R}^T = \{ t \mid \text{stuck}^T(t) = \emptyset \}$. Theorem 26 shows that, with probability 1, $\mathcal{R}^T$ is finite. Let $Y$ be an externally-jammed process with arrival rate $\lambda$ and send sequence $p$, and let $\mathcal{R}^Y = \{ t \mid \text{stuck}^Y(t) = \emptyset \}$. By the coupling of $Y$ and $T$ from Lemma 24, with probability 1, $\mathcal{R}^Y$ is finite. Finally, by the coupling of $X$ and $Y$ from Observation 23, it follows that with probability 1, $\mathcal{R}^X$ is finite. 

In order to make the proof of Theorem 6 more convenient, we first re-state the definition of LCED.

Definition 5. A send sequence $p$ is LCED (“largely constant with exponential delay”) if it satisfies the following properties:

(i) “Largely constant”: For all $\eta > 0$, there exists $c > 0$ such that for infinitely many $n$, $|\{ j \leq n : p_j > c\} \geq (1 - \eta)n$.

(ii) “with exponential decay”: $p$ has an infinite subsequence $(p_{\ell_1}, p_{\ell_2}, \ldots)$ which satisfies $\log(1/p_{\ell_x}) = \Theta(\ell_x)$ as $x \to \infty$.

(iii) “(but without super-exponential decay)”: $\log(1/p_j) = O(j)$ as $j \to \infty$. 
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Theorem 6. Let $p$ be a send sequence which is not LCED. Then for every $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ the backoff process with arrival rate $\lambda$ and send sequence $p$ is unstable.

Proof. Suppose that $p$ is not LCED. Fix $\lambda \in (0, 1)$. Let $X$ be a backoff process with arrival rate $\lambda$ and send sequence $p$. We split the analysis into cases depending on which case of Definition 5 fails.

Case 1 (iii) fails: By definition, since (iii) fails, there is no real number $C > 0$ such that, for all but finitely many $j$, $\log(1/p_j) \leq Cj$. So for all $C > 0$, there are infinitely many $j$ such that $\log(1/p_j) > Cj$, which implies $p_j < \exp(-Cj)$. Taking $C = \log(2/(\lambda p_0))$, we conclude that there are infinitely many $j$ such that $p_j < (\lambda p_0/2)^j$. Lemma 21 implies that $X$ is unstable.

Case 2 (iii) holds but (i) fails: By definition, since (i) fails, there is an $\eta > 0$ such that for all $c > 0$, for all but finitely many $n$, $|\{j \leq n: p_j \leq c\}| > \eta n$. Taking $c = p_*(\lambda p_0, \eta, \nu)$ for positive $\nu$, we conclude that there is an $\eta > 0$ such that for all $\nu > 0$ and for all but finitely many $n$, $|\{j \leq n: p_j \leq p_*(\lambda p_0, \eta, \nu)\}| > \eta n$.

Let $p'$ be the send sequence derived from $p$ by setting $p'_0 = 1$ and, for every positive integer $j$, $p'_j = p_j$. Given that $\eta > 0$ that we have just identified, our goal will be find $\nu > 0$ such that $p'$ is $(\lambda p_0, \eta, \nu)$-suitable (Definition 14). To achieve this, we need to show that we can choose $\nu > 0$ such that, for all but finitely many $n$, $\nu^n < p_n = p'_n$. Here we will use the fact that (iii) holds. Since $\log(1/p_j) = O(j)$, there exists $C > 0$ such that for all but finitely many $j$, $1/p_j < e^{-Cj}$. So taking $\nu = e^{-C} < 1$ we have that for all but finitely many $j$, $p_j > \nu^j$. So we have now shown that $p'$ is $(\lambda p_0, \eta, \nu)$-suitable.

Let $X'$ be a backoff process with arrival rate $\lambda p_0$ and send sequence $p'$. Let $R^{X'} = \{t | \text{balls}^{X'}(t) = \emptyset\}$. By Corollary 27, with probability 1, $R^{X'}$ is finite.

Finally, let $X$ be a backoff process with arrival rate $\lambda$ and send sequence $p$. Let $R^X = \{t | \text{balls}^X(t) = \emptyset\}$. By the coupling of $X$ and $X'$ from Observation 22, with probability 1, $R^X$ is finite. Hence, the process $X$ is transient, so it is unstable.

Case 3 (iii) holds but (ii) fails: In this case $\log(1/p_j) = o(j)$ so the result follows from Corollary 9. Here is an argument that $\log(1/p_j) = o(j)$. Since (iii) holds but (ii) fails, there is no infinite subsequence $(p_{t_1}, p_{t_2}, \ldots)$ that satisfies $\log(1/p_{t_n}) = \Omega(\ell_x)$. Thus for every infinite subsequence $(p_{t_1}, p_{t_2}, \ldots)$ and for every $C > 0$, infinitely many $n$ satisfy $\log(1/p_{t_n}) < C\ell_x$. This implies that for all $C > 0$ and all infinite subsequences $(p_{t_1}, p_{t_2}, \ldots)$, some $n$ has $\log(1/p_{t_n}) < C\ell_x$. Hence, for all $C > 0$ there is no infinite subsequence $(p_{t_1}, p_{t_2}, \ldots)$ that satisfies $\log(1/p_{t_n}) \geq C\ell_x$. Finally, for all $C > 0$, there is a $j_C$ such that for all $j \geq j_C$, $\log(1/p_j) < Cj$ so $\log(1/p_j) = o(j)$, as required.

We can now use Theorem 6 to derive the other theorems stated in the introduction.

Theorem 3. For every $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ and every monotonically non-increasing send sequence $p = p_0, p_1, \ldots$, the backoff process with arrival rate $\lambda$ and send sequence $p$ is unstable.

Proof. We prove that $p$ is not LCED and use Theorem 6. Suppose for contradiction that $p$ is LCED. Let $c > 0$ be such that $p_j \geq c$ for infinitely many values of $j$; by (i) of Definition 5 applied with any $\eta > 0$, such a $c$ must exist. Let $(p_{t_1}, p_{t_2}, \ldots)$ be the infinite exponentially-decaying subsequence of $p$ guaranteed by (ii), and observe that there exists $i_c$ such that $p_{t_i} < c$ for all $i \geq i_c$. Since $p$ is monotonically non-increasing, it follows that for all $j \geq i_c$ we have $p_j \leq p_{i_c} \leq c$, giving a contradiction.

Theorem 4. Let $p$ be a send sequence. Let $m_p(n)$ be the median of $p_0, \ldots, p_n$. Suppose that $m_p(n) = o(1)$. Then for every $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ the backoff process with arrival rate $\lambda$ and send sequence $p$ is unstable.

Proof. We observe that $p$ is not LCED and use Theorem 6. In particular, we will observe that item (i) in the definition of LCED cannot be satisfied for $\eta = 1/2$. Item (i) implies that there is a $c > 0$ such that for infinitely many $n$, $m_p(n) > c$. But this is inconsistent with $m_p(n) = o(1)$.
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