

Probability and Computing

Coupling, Balls into Bins, Poissonisation and the Poisson Point Process

Stefan Walzer | WS 2025/2026



1. Coupling

- Motivating Examples
- Definition

2. Balls into Bins

3. Poissonisation

4. Poisson Point Process

Coupling
○○○○○○○

Balls into Bins
○○○○

Poissonisation
○○○○○○○

Poisson Point Process
○○○○○

An easy choice?


A Simple Game

You win if you get ≥ 5 heads in 10 coin tosses. Choose:

- i a fair coin with $\Pr[\text{"heads"}] = \frac{1}{2}$
- ii a biased coin with $\Pr[\text{"heads"}] = \frac{2}{3}$



How to prove that (ii) is the better choice?




fair coin
biased coin

$$\sum_{i=5}^{10} \binom{10}{i} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^i \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{10-i} \stackrel{?}{<} \sum_{i=5}^{10} \binom{10}{i} \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^i \left(\frac{1}{3}\right)^{10-i}$$

Shouldn't there be an answer that needs no calculation?

Which Lottery do you prefer?

Consider two “wheels of fortune”:




Both can be rationally preferred


- $\mathbb{E}[X] > \mathbb{E}[Y]$ // maximises expected reward
- $\Pr[Y \geq 5\text{€}] > \Pr[X \geq 5\text{€}]$ // maximises probability that you can afford ice cream

See https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Von_Neumann%E2%80%93Morgenstern_utility_theorem to get started on rational choice theory.

Which Lottery do you prefer?



and $Y \sim$




Formal Reason you should prefer Y

For every c we have:

$$\Pr[X \geq c] \leq \Pr[Y \geq c].$$

Intuitive Reason you should prefer Y

Glueing the wheels together guarantees $X < Y$.



1. Coupling

- Motivating Examples
- Definition

2. Balls into Bins

3. Poissonisation

4. Poisson Point Process

Coupling
○○●○○○

Balls into Bins
○○○○

Poissonisation
○○○○○○○

Poisson Point Process
○○○○○

Notation

We write $X \stackrel{d}{=} X'$ for two random variables if X and X' have the same distribution.

Equivalent Definitions



$$\begin{aligned} X \stackrel{d}{=} X' &\Leftrightarrow \forall x : \Pr[X = x] = \Pr[X' = x] && \text{(for discrete R.V. } X \text{ and } X') \\ &\Leftrightarrow \forall x : \Pr[X \leq x] = \Pr[X' \leq x] && \text{(for real-valued R.V. } X \text{ and } X') \end{aligned}$$

To Clarify:

If $X, Y \sim \mathcal{U}([0, 1])$ are independent then

- $X \stackrel{d}{=} Y$
- $\Pr[X = Y] = 0$

Definition: Coupling of X and Y



Remarks

- No assumption on joint distribution of X and Y . Might be independent, correlated or undefined.
- X' and Y' should be correlated in an interesting/useful way.
- Example coupling shows:

$$\Pr[X \geq c] \stackrel{X \stackrel{d}{=} X'}{=} \Pr[X' \geq c]$$

$$\stackrel{X' \leq Y'}{\leq} \Pr[Y' \geq c]$$

$$\stackrel{Y' \stackrel{d}{=} Y}{=} \Pr[Y \geq c]$$

An easy choice!

A Simple Game (Generalised)

You win if your random variable exceeds $c \in \mathbb{N}$. Choose:

- i $X \sim \text{Bin}(n, \frac{1}{2})$ // number of heads of fair coin
- ii $Y \sim \text{Bin}(n, \frac{2}{3})$ // number of heads of biased coin



Prove that Y is better than X using a Coupling

Let $R_1, \dots, R_n \sim \mathcal{U}([6])$ be n fair dice rolls.


- $X' = |\{i \in [n] \mid R_i \in \{1, 2, 3\}\}|$
- $Y' = |\{i \in [n] \mid R_i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}\}|$

Observe:

- $X' \stackrel{d}{=} X$
- $Y' \stackrel{d}{=} Y$
- $X' \leq Y'$ guaranteed

Hence: $\Pr[X \geq c] = \Pr[X' \geq c] \leq \Pr[Y' \geq c] = \Pr[Y \geq c]$.

Coupling and Total Variation Distance



The histograms of X and Y intersect in an area of A if and only if there exists a coupling (X', Y') of X and Y such that $\Pr[X' = Y'] = A$.


Coupling
○○○○○○●

Balls into Bins
○○○○

Poissonisation
○○○○○○○

Poisson Point Process
○○○○○

Coupling of Random Walks



For any pair of start points W_0 and V_0 , intuitively:

- The distributions of W_t and V_t are asymptotically indistinguishable for large t .
- Random walks “forget” where they started.
- There is a coupling $(W'_t, V'_t)_{t \geq 0}$ of $(W_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and $(V_t)_{t \geq 0}$ such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Pr[W'_t = V'_t] = 1$.

1. Coupling

- Motivating Examples
- Definition

2. Balls into Bins

3. Poissonisation

4. Poisson Point Process

Coupling
○○○○○○○


Balls into Bins
●○○○

Poissonisation
○○○○○○○

Poisson Point Process
○○○○○

General Terminology

- m balls are randomly distributed among n bins
- the *load* of a bin is the number of balls in it




Fully Random Allocation

- $X_1, \dots, X_m \sim \mathcal{U}([n])$ independent
- $L_i := |\{j \in [m] \mid X_j = i\}|$ is the load of bin $i \in [n]$
- $(L_1, \dots, L_n)$ follows a (specific) *multinomial distribution*

Example for Partially Random Allocation (not in this lecture)

- balls are placed sequentially
- each ball chooses the *least loaded* among two randomly chosen bins (ties broken randomly)



Balls into Bins: Many Interesting Questions

- What is the distribution/expectation/concentration of

random variable	interpretation
$\max_{i \in [n]} L_i$	most loaded bin
$\max_{i \in [n]} L_i - \frac{m}{n}$	most loaded bin relative to mean
$ \{i \in [n] \mid L_i = 0\} $	number of empty bins

- Can we make the allocation more balanced by intervening in some way?

- e.g. with partially random allocation (last slide) $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\max_{i \in [n]} L_i - \frac{m}{n}] = \Theta(\log \log n)$ for any fixed n .

Countless variants exist...

“Balls into Bins” is everywhere

Hashing with Chaining $\longleftrightarrow n$ Balls into m Bins

length of the list in bucket $i \longleftrightarrow$ number of balls in bin i

Bloom Filter with k Hash Functions $\longleftrightarrow kn$ Balls into m Bins


a filter bit is set to 0 $\longleftrightarrow i$ th bin is empty

Degree Sequence of Random (Multi-)Graph $\longleftrightarrow 2m$ Balls into n bins

Given independent $v_1, \dots, v_{2m} \sim \mathcal{U}([n])$ let
 $G = (V = [n], E = \{\{v_1, v_2\}, \dots, \{v_{2m-1}, v_{2m}\}\})$

(we allow multi-edges and loops in G)

degree of vertex $i \longleftrightarrow$ load of bin i



$n = 5, \quad m = 4$

$v_1 = 1, \quad v_2 = 4$

$v_3 = 4, \quad v_4 = 2$

$v_5 = 3, \quad v_6 = 3$

$v_7 = 2, \quad v_8 = 4$

“Balls into Bins” is the standard language for discussing underlying mathematical questions.

Coupling
○○○○○○○

Balls into Bins
○○○●

Poissonisation
○○○○○○○

Poisson Point Process
○○○○○

1. Coupling

- Motivating Examples
- Definition

2. Balls into Bins

3. Poissonisation

4. Poisson Point Process

Coupling
○○○○○○○

Balls into Bins
○○○○

Poissonisation
●○○○○○○

Poisson Point Process
○○○○○


Load of a Single Bin

Setting: Expected Constant Load per Bin

- fully random allocation
- $m = \lambda n$ balls n bins for large n
- λ fixed constant

Load of the First Bin

Consider $L^{(n)} \sim \text{Bin}(\lambda n, \frac{1}{n})$. For $\lambda = 1$:



Coupling
○○○○○○○

Balls into Bins
○○○○

Poisson Distribution

For $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $X \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda)$ is a random variable with

$$\Pr[X = i] = e^{-\lambda} \frac{\lambda^i}{i!} \quad // \text{note: probabilities sum to 1}$$

Theorem (proof on blackboard)

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr[L^{(n)} = i] = \Pr[X = i].$$

Remarks

- we say “ $L^{(n)}$ converges in distribution to X ”
- we write $L^{(n)} \xrightarrow{d} X$
- this formally refers to convergence of CDFs

Poissonisation
●○○○○○

Poisson Point Process
○○○○○

Exercise: $X \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda)$ has Nice Properties

- i $\mathbb{E}[X] = \lambda.$
- ii $\text{Var}(X) = \lambda.$
- iii Let $Y \sim \text{Pois}(\rho)$ be independent of X . Then $X + Y \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda + \rho).$
- iv Let $X' \sim \text{Bin}(X, p)$. Then $X' \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda p).$

Poissonised Balls into Bins



λn Balls into n Bins Model

- $X_1, \dots, X_{\lambda n} \sim \mathcal{U}([n])$
- $L_i := |\{j \in [\lambda n] \mid X_j = i\}| \sim \text{Bin}(\lambda n, \frac{1}{n})$
- $(L_i)_{i \in [n]}$ *not independent*
 - e.g. large L_1 is (weak) evidence for small L_2
 - annoying in analysis
- number λn of balls *fixed*

“Poissonised” Model

- $L_1, \dots, L_n \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda)$ independent
 - extremely convenient for analysis
- $\mathbb{E}[L_1 + \dots + L_n] = \lambda n$
- number of balls *random* $\sim \text{Pois}(\lambda n)$
 - unusual setting in practice

Wouldn't it be nice...

... if we could switch between the models whenever convenient?

Connection: Poissonised and Regular Balls into Bins

Lemma 1

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lambda > 0$. Consider two variants of Poissonised balls into bins:

Regular Variant:

- sample $L_1, \dots, L_n \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda)$

Sum-First-Variant:

- sample $M \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda n)$
- perform a regular M balls into n bins experiment
 - sample $X_1, \dots, X_M \sim \mathcal{U}([n])$
 - let $L'_i := |\{j \in [M] \mid X_j = i\}|$

Both variants are equivalent, i.e. $(L_1, \dots, L_n) \stackrel{d}{=} (L'_1, \dots, L'_n)$.


What we need to show (calculation on blackboard):

For arbitrary $(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$: $\Pr[(L_1, \dots, L_n) = (\ell_1, \dots, \ell_n)] = \Pr[(L'_1, \dots, L'_n) = (\ell_1, \dots, \ell_n)]$.

Some Concentration Bounds

Lemma 2

- i Let $\Lambda > 0$ and $X \sim \text{Pois}(\Lambda)$. Then $\Pr[|X - \Lambda| > t] \leq \frac{\Lambda}{t^2}$ for any $t > 0$. // Chebyshev
- ii Let $\lambda = \Theta(1)$, and $X \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda n)$ then $\Pr[X = \lambda n \pm \mathcal{O}(n^{2/3})] = 1 - o(1)$.
- iii Let $\lambda = \Theta(1)$, $\lambda^+ := \lambda + n^{-1/3}$ and $X^+ \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda^+ n)$ then $\Pr[X^+ \geq \lambda n] = 1 - o(1)$.
- iv Let $\lambda = \Theta(1)$, $\lambda^- := \lambda - n^{-1/3}$ and $X^- \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda^- n)$ then $\Pr[X^- \leq \lambda n] = 1 - o(1)$.
- v In particular: $\Pr[X^- \leq \lambda n \leq X^+] = 1 - o(1)$.



Coupling of Poissonised and Regular Balls into Bins


Theorem

Let $n, \lambda, \lambda^+, \lambda^-$ be as before. Consider three “balls into bins” models:

- 1 $Y_1, \dots, Y_n \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda^-)$ // poissonised with slightly reduced λ
- 2 $L_1, \dots, L_n$ arising from regular $m = \lambda n$ balls into n bins
- 3 $Z_1, \dots, Z_n \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda^+)$ // poissonised with slightly increased λ

There is a coupling $(Y'_i, L'_i, Z'_i)_{i \in [n]}$ of $(Y_i)_{i \in [n]}, (L_i)_{i \in [n]}, (Z_i)_{i \in [n]}$ such that

with probability $1 - o(1)$: $Y'_i \leq L'_i \leq Z'_i$ for all $i \in [n]$.



Proof.

Let $X_1, X_2, \dots \sim \mathcal{U}([n])$, $M^- \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda^- n)$, $M^+ \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda^+ n)$.

- $Y'_i := |\{j \in [M^-] \mid X_j = i\}|$ for $i \in [n]$.
- $L'_i := |\{j \in [m] \mid X_j = i\}|$ for $i \in [n]$.
- $Z'_i := |\{j \in [M^+] \mid X_j = i\}|$ for $i \in [n]$.

By Lemma 2 (v) we have $M^- \leq m \leq M^+$ with probability $1 - o(1)$. In that case clearly $Y'_i \leq L'_i \leq Z'_i$ for all $i \in [n]$. $\square$

This is indeed a coupling as claimed:

- $(Y'_i)_{i \in [n]} \stackrel{d}{=} (Y_i)_{i \in [n]}$ by Lemma 1.
- $(L'_i)_{i \in [n]} \stackrel{d}{=} (L_i)_{i \in [n]}$ by construction.
- $(Z'_i)_{i \in [n]} \stackrel{d}{=} (Z_i)_{i \in [n]}$ by Lemma 1.

Coupling of Poissonised and Regular Balls into Bins


Theorem

Let $n, \lambda, \lambda^+, \lambda^-$ be as before. Consider three “balls into bins” models:

- 1 $Y_1, \dots, Y_n \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda^-)$ // poissonised with slightly reduced λ
- 2 $L_1, \dots, L_n$ arising from regular $m = \lambda n$ balls into n bins
- 3 $Z_1, \dots, Z_n \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda^+)$ // poissonised with slightly increased λ

There is a coupling $(Y'_i, L'_i, Z'_i)_{i \in [n]}$ of $(Y_i)_{i \in [n]}, (L_i)_{i \in [n]}, (Z_i)_{i \in [n]}$ such that

with probability $1 - o(1)$: $Y'_i \leq L'_i \leq Z'_i$ for all $i \in [n]$.



Application involving Monotonous Functions

Let $f : \mathbb{N}_0^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be non-decreasing in each argument.

Examples:

- maximum load of a bin
- longest run of non-empty bins
- collision number // numbers of pairs of co-located balls

For some bound $B \in \mathbb{R}$ let

- $p^- := \Pr[f((Y_i)_{i \in [n]}) \geq B]$ // easier to compute
- $p := \Pr[f((L_i)_{i \in [n]}) \geq B]$ // what we want
- $p^+ := \Pr[f((Z_i)_{i \in [n]}) \geq B]$ // easier to compute

Then $p \in [p^- - o(1), p^+ + o(1)]$.

Exercise:

Analyse Bloom filters in a “Poissonised” model and discuss how the results can be transferred to the exact model.

1. Coupling

- Motivating Examples
- Definition

2. Balls into Bins

3. Poissonisation

4. Poisson Point Process

Coupling
○○○○○○○

Balls into Bins
○○○○


Poissonisation
○○○○○○○

Poisson Point Process
●○○○○

What about “Balls into Continuous Domain”?

Setting

- D is space of finite measure
- $m \in \mathbb{N}$ // number of balls
- $X_1, \dots, X_m \sim \mathcal{U}(D)$ // randomly thrown into D



Note: If $D = \{1, \dots, n\}$ we have discrete balls into bins.

Same annoying issue

If $B_1, B_2 \subseteq D$ with $B_1 \cap B_2 = \emptyset$ are two “bins” then the numbers L_1 and L_2 of “balls” in B_1 and B_2 are correlated.

Similar elegant solution


- We can “Poissonise” the setting.
- But we drop “balls into bins” terminology:
 - we allow infinite domains D
 - we allow infinite number of balls

Definitions of the Poisson Point Process

General Definition

Let D be a measurable space with measure μ . // e.g. $D = \mathbb{R}^2$ and $\mu = \text{"area"}$
The Poisson point process with parameter $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is a random set $P \subseteq D$ such that

- 1 $|P \cap B| \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda\mu(B))$ for any $B \subseteq D$ with $\mu(B) < \infty$
- 2 $|P \cap B_1|$ and $|P \cap B_2|$ are independent whenever $B_1 \cap B_2 = \emptyset$



Generally:

$$|B_1 \cap P| \sim \text{Po}(3\lambda)$$
$$|B_2 \cap P| \sim \text{Po}(\tfrac{1}{2}\lambda)$$

This outcome:

$$|B_1 \cap P| = 2$$
$$|B_2 \cap P| = 0$$

Equivalent “Sum First” variant if $\mu(D) < \infty$

- sample $M \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda\mu(D))$
- sample $X_1, \dots, X_M \sim \mathcal{U}(D)$


Then $P \stackrel{d}{=} \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_M\}$.

Definitions of the Poisson Point Process

General Definition

Let D be a measurable space with measure μ . // e.g. $D = \mathbb{R}^2$ and μ = “area”
 The Poisson point process with parameter $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is a random set $P \subseteq D$ such that

- 1 $|P \cap B| \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda\mu(B))$ for any $B \subseteq D$ with $\mu(B) < \infty$
- 2 $|P \cap B_1|$ and $|P \cap B_2|$ are independent whenever $B_1 \cap B_2 = \emptyset$



Generally:

$$|B_1 \cap P| \sim \text{Po}(3\lambda)$$

$$|B_2 \cap P| \sim \text{Po}(\frac{1}{2}\lambda)$$


This outcome:

$$|B_1 \cap P| = 2$$

$$|B_2 \cap P| = 0$$

Construction as a limit

- subdivide D into pieces of measure ε
- let each piece contain a point with probability $\varepsilon\lambda$
- consider the limit for $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$



$$|B \cap P| \sim \text{Bin}(\mu(B)/\varepsilon, \lambda\varepsilon)$$


$$\xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \text{Po}(\lambda\mu(B))$$

Definitions of the Poisson Point Process

General Definition

Let D be a measurable space with measure μ . // e.g. $D = \mathbb{R}^2$ and μ = “area”
The Poisson point process with parameter $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is a random set $P \subseteq D$ such that

- 1 $|P \cap B| \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda\mu(B))$ for any $B \subseteq D$ with $\mu(B) < \infty$
- 2 $|P \cap B_1|$ and $|P \cap B_2|$ are independent whenever $B_1 \cap B_2 = \emptyset$



Generally:

$$|B_1 \cap P| \sim \text{Po}(3\lambda)$$

$$|B_2 \cap P| \sim \text{Po}(\frac{1}{2}\lambda)$$

This outcome:


$$|B_1 \cap P| = 2$$

$$|B_2 \cap P| = 0$$

Equivalent Definition if $D = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ (where μ is the Borel measure)

- sample $Z_1, Z_2, \dots \sim \text{Exp}(\lambda)$
- define $X_i = \sum_{j=1}^i Z_j$

Then $P \stackrel{d}{=} \{X_1, X_2, \dots\}$.



Proof idea: $\Pr[\min P > t] = \Pr[|P \cap [0, t]| = 0] = \Pr_{X \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda t)}[X = 0] = e^{-\lambda t} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Pr[Z_1 > t] = \Pr[X_1 > t]$.

Coupling

- embedding of two random variables X and Y into a common probability space
- relationships between distributions of X and Y become visible as relationships between outcomes of X' and Y'

Balls into Bins

- standard language when m objects are randomly assigned to n other objects

Poissonisation

- the act of replacing multinomially distributed $(L_1, \dots, L_n)$ with independent Poisson random variables $(L'_1, \dots, L'_n)$
- often much easier to think about
- often formally justifiable

Poisson Point Process

- important model where points from a continuous space occur independently from each other with fixed density λ

Appendix: Possible Exam Questions I

- What is a coupling?
 - Give examples in which a coupling can be useful.
 - What does equality in distribution mean?
- Where in the lecture have we (implicitly or explicitly) considered balls-into-bins processes?
- Poissonisation:
 - Which annoying property does the load distribution in balls-into-bins processes have? What is different in a Poissonised model?
 - How do Poisson distributions arise in a balls-into-bins setting?
 - How did we relate the Poissonised and the regular balls-into-bins models? How can switching between the models be formally justified?
- Poisson point processes
 - How are Poisson point processes defined?