

KL Before and After Mixing: A Round-Complexity Separation in Parallel Sampling

Tianyi Wu

Amazon

WUTIANYI@AMAZON.COM

Abstract

A parallel sampler can choose at random which coordinates to generate together. For a target p and the output law q_U of a schedule U drawn afresh for each output, we compare the schedule-averaged divergence $\mathbb{E}_U D_{\text{KL}}(p \| q_U)$ with the output-law divergence $D_{\text{KL}}(p \| \mathbb{E}_U q_U)$, in nats. Rounds commit independent draws from exact conditional marginals frozen at the round’s start, each output’s schedule is drawn before sampling from a finite mixture of schedules, and every scheduled round is charged. For the uniform distribution on binary strings of even length n with $n/2$ ones, the least expected number of rounds at a fixed tolerance $\varepsilon > 0$ is $\Theta_\varepsilon((\log n)^2)$ under the first criterion but $(e^{-\varepsilon} + o(1)) \log_2 \ln n$ under the second, and the double-logarithmic order is attainable with the same round count on every run. For this target, a count-state recursion gives the exact least output divergence at every round cap over all causal randomized policies. The separation extends to weighted fixed-count targets with bounded weight ratios and quota fractions bounded away from zero and one, without permutation symmetry, and to the full-support Beta(1, 1)–Bernoulli target, where the sharp expected cost under the output-law criterion is $(e^{-\varepsilon}/2 + o(1)) \log_2 \log_2 n$, attained with rare n -round runs. Prior work implies the order of the schedule-averaged cost on the balanced target and its $O_\varepsilon((\log n)^2)$ upper bounds on both extensions.

Keywords: parallel sampling, masked diffusion, random schedules, Kullback–Leibler divergence, round complexity, lower bounds

1. Introduction

Masked diffusion and any-order autoregressive models are increasingly decoded in parallel: each round fills several masked positions, each drawn independently from the model’s conditional marginal given the committed ones, so dependence within a round is lost even when the model is exact. A *schedule* says which positions are filled in which round; fewer rounds mean fewer sequential model calls but lose more dependence, and a growing theory designs schedules to control the error (Chen et al., 2026; Lavenant and Zanella, 2025; Secchi and Zanella, 2026; Zhao and Cai, 2026; Wainwright, 2026; Wen et al., 2026).

Two ways to judge a random schedule. Let p be the target, q_U the output law under a schedule U , and μ the law of a random schedule. The *schedule-averaged* divergence is $H(\mu) = \mathbb{E}_{U \sim \mu} \text{KL}(p \| q_U) = \text{KL}(\mu \otimes p \| J_\mu)$, where $J_\mu(U, x) = \mu(U)q_U(x)$ is the sampler’s joint law of schedule and output and the benchmark $\mu \otimes p$ draws the schedule independently of a target sample; H averages over schedules and is not a worst case. The *output-law* divergence $F(\mu) = \text{KL}(p \| \mathbb{E}_{U \sim \mu} q_U)$ is the error of the law the sampler produces when each output receives a fresh schedule that is then discarded. By joint convexity $F \leq H$, with equality for a fixed schedule, so a bound on H also bounds F ; it does not say whether F can be made small with fewer rounds. We ask how many rounds each criterion needs.




Figure 1: The four-bit example. Columns: the six valid strings (two ones) and, pooled, the ten invalid ones; disc areas are unconditional probabilities, and nothing is renormalized. The example implies no rate.

A four-bit example. Take the uniform law on the six strings of length four with two ones, sampled in two rounds of two coordinates (Figure 1). With fixed labels $U = (\{1, 2\}, \{3, 4\})$, the output is invalid with probability $\frac{1}{4}$, and the valid strings 1100 and 0011 get $\frac{1}{4}$ each against $\frac{1}{16}$ for the other four. Permuting the labels uniformly before each run changes no labelled schedule’s $\text{KL}(p \| q_U)$, so $H \approx 0.519$ is unchanged, but spreads the valid mass $\frac{3}{4}$ equally: F falls to $-\ln \Pr(\text{valid}) = \ln \frac{4}{3} \approx 0.288$. Relabelling removed the unequal weighting of valid strings; it repaired no invalid output.

The answer on the balanced slice. In our model (Section 2) rounds draw independently from exact conditional marginals frozen at their start, each output’s schedule is drawn before sampling from a finite mixture of schedules, and every scheduled round is charged. On the uniform law on the *balanced slice* of strings of even length n with $n/2$ ones, a target studied by Wen et al. (2026), the least expected numbers of rounds under $H \leq \varepsilon$ and under $F \leq \varepsilon$, at a fixed tolerance $\varepsilon > 0$ in nats, are

$$L_H(n, \varepsilon) = \Theta_\varepsilon((\log n)^2) \quad \text{and} \quad L_F(n, \varepsilon) = (e^{-\varepsilon} + o(1)) \log_2 \ln n$$

(Theorem 2, Corollary 6). The order of L_H follows from Wen et al. (2026, Thm. 11) with Markov’s inequality; the results for L_F (its order, its leading coefficient and the converses behind them, which cover causal randomized policies that adapt to the values already sampled) are, to our knowledge, new. The coefficient $e^{-\varepsilon}$ is a mean-cost effect: a mixture can spend almost all of its error budget on a one-round schedule that usually fails (Corollary 6(c)), which does not lower the hard cap. Table 1 adds the two extensions; on full support, randomized grid levels give a further factor $\frac{1}{2}$ in the mean, beyond dilution (Section 4.1). The lower bounds hold for this primitive (independent exact-marginal draws within each round) on known structured targets, not for unrestricted samplers; rounds, not computation, are counted; the full-support F upper-bound constants are astronomical, and the bounded-weight ones existence-only for weights without a linear-size equal-weight group; and small average prediction error need not preserve the exact-oracle profile rate (Appendix N; Section 5).

Related work. Our relabelled-profile constructions are the random-unmasking algorithm of Chen et al. (2026) with particular block sizes, or finite mixtures of it. The schedule analyses cited above, other than Wen et al. (2026), bound H or the KL between the laws of whole runs, which is at least H , and reach the output law through convexity or data processing; Feng et al. (2025, Thm. 4.4) give an $\Omega(n)$ output-law lower bound for $F \leq \ln 2$ under random-position masking on a hidden Markov

Table 1: Least number of rounds at a fixed tolerance $\varepsilon > 0$, by design, criterion and cost; $\ell = \log_2 \log_2 n = \log_2 \ln n - \log_2 \ln 2$.

design, criterion, cost	balanced slice	full support	bounded weights
fixed schedule, KL, length	$\Theta((\log n)^2)$	$\Theta((\log n)^2)$	$\Theta((\log n)^2)$
mixture, H , mean	$\Theta((\log n)^2)$	$\Theta((\log n)^2)$	$\Theta((\log n)^2)$
relabelled profile, F , length	$\ell + O(1)$	$\ell + O(1)$	$\ell + O(1)^\ddagger$
causal policy, F , cap	$\ell + O(1)$	$\Theta(\ell)^\dagger$	$\ell + O(1)$
mixture, F , mean	$(e^{-\varepsilon} + o(1))\ell$	$(\frac{1}{2}e^{-\varepsilon} + o(1))\ell$	$(e^{-\varepsilon} + o(1))\ell$
causal policy, F , $\mathbb{E}\tau$	$(e^{-\varepsilon} + o(1))\ell$	$(\frac{1}{2}e^{-\varepsilon} + o(1))\ell$	$(e^{-\varepsilon} + o(1))\ell$
where	§3: Thm. 2, Cor. 5, 6	§4.1: Thm. 7, 19, Prop. 14	§4.2: Thm. 8, App. H, I

Length: rounds on every run; *mean*: scheduled mean $C(\mu)$, failed runs included; $\mathbb{E}\tau$: executed mean; *cap*: bound on the rounds of every run. Constants depend on ε (for weights, also on the ratio and quota bounds, and for ‡ on ρ). † Constant open: at least $(\frac{1}{2} - o(1))\ell$, derived from the tail bound of Theorem 19(a), and at most $\ell + O(1)$, from one relabelled profile. ‡ If at least a fixed fraction ρ of the coordinates share one weight: one fixed labelled schedule, relabelled uniformly within that group (Theorem 8(b)); otherwise open. Table 2 (Appendix A) adds formal status and further classes.

target. For deterministic value-adaptive policies Wen et al. (2026, Thm. 11) prove a $\Theta_\varepsilon((\log n)^2)$ order on the balanced slice for the hard cap and for the mean number of rounds over draws from the target (output-law KL in bits), and leave open whether their lower bounds extend to arbitrary randomized policies (their Remark 2). Li et al. (2026) show in the same interface that such an extension can fail on a constructed family: a mixture of fixed schedules beats every deterministic adaptive policy in accuracy at a cap of three rounds (their Thm. 4). On another family, a mixture attains in three rounds an accuracy that fixed (nonadaptive) schedules need $\Omega(n/\log n)$ rounds to reach (their Cor. 9). On the balanced slice randomization’s advantage is in rounds, grows with n and holds against deterministic adaptive policies: the least hard cap of causal randomized policies is $\log_2 \ln n + O_\varepsilon(1)$, against the deterministic $\Theta_\varepsilon((\log n)^2)$, and the least executed mean is $(e^{-\varepsilon} + o(1)) \log_2 \ln n$, a count not compared with the mean of Wen et al. (2026) over draws from the target (Appendix P).

2. Model

One round. A target p is a law on $\{0, 1\}^n$, and the sampler produces one output sample. Before each round it has committed some coordinates; for each unrevealed coordinate i an oracle gives the exact conditional probability under p that $x_i = 1$ given the committed values. The round chooses a set B of unrevealed coordinates (a nonempty block for schedules; an adaptive policy may also choose an empty round, which is charged), draws each $x_i, i \in B$, independently with its conditional probability frozen at the start of the round, and commits the draws. There is no joint draw, lookahead, resampling or repair, so all error comes from the dependence that independent draws within a round ignore.

The balanced slice. Our first target is the uniform law p on $V = \{x \in \{0, 1\}^n : \sum_i x_i = k\}$, $n = 2k$. If M coordinates are unrevealed and j of them must still equal one (the remaining quota), every unrevealed coordinate is one with probability j/M . The *count state* (M, j) is *legal* if $0 \leq j \leq$

M ; a round that commits b coordinates at a legal state draws $X \sim \text{Bin}(b, j/M)$ ones and moves to $(M - b, j - X)$; $\text{Bin}(b, \theta)(x)$ denotes the probability of x under $\text{Bin}(b, \theta)$, zero outside $\{0, \dots, b\}$.

Schedules, mixtures and policies. A labelled schedule $U = (B_1, \dots, B_r)$ is an ordered partition of $[n]$ into nonempty blocks, of length $|U| = r$ and *profile* $b(U) = (|B_1|, \dots, |B_r|)$; q_U is its output law. A schedule mixture μ is a finite law on labelled schedules, drawn once before any coordinate is sampled and independently of all oracle randomness, with output law $Q_\mu = \mathbb{E}_\mu q_U$; its support may grow with n , and describing or selecting it is not charged. The *uniform relabelling* of U is the mixture of $\sigma(U)$ over a uniformly random permutation σ of the coordinates: it randomizes which coordinates fill each block, and every component keeps the profile and length of U . The converses use the class $\mathcal{A}_r$ of causal randomized adaptive policies: a seed with arbitrary law, independent of all oracle randomness; in round t a set of unrevealed coordinates chosen measurably with respect to $\mathcal{F}_{t-1} = \sigma(\text{seed}, \text{committed labelled history})$; conditionally on $\mathcal{F}_{t-1}$, fresh independent Bernoulli draws at the exact conditional marginals; outputs are exactly the committed draws, so the seed cannot write values; and all n coordinates committed within r rounds almost surely, with an arbitrary completion at infeasible states (on the slice, illegal count states). A predrawn seed is not a predrawn schedule: the seed may be consulted again in every round, together with the values already drawn. A policy is deterministic if its choices are measurable in the committed history alone; count-based rules are derived by the converse, not assumed.

Completion and charging. A schedule always runs all its blocks, with fair bits after an infeasible prefix (on the slice, an illegal count state); such a prefix never re-enters V , so this changes no divergence below, and $|U|$ is the cost of every run, failed ones included. $\mathcal{A}_\infty$ drops the cap; τ counts executed rounds until all coordinates are committed (empty rounds, rounds after a failure, and closing rounds whose values the quota already fixes all count; $\tau = \infty$, output $\perp \notin V$, if never), under the joint law of seed, rounds and output (output law Q_π); a mixture is in $\mathcal{A}_\infty$ with $\tau = |U|$.

The two criteria and three costs. All divergences are forward KL in nats, $+\infty$ when q gives zero mass to a point that p charges. For a mixture μ and $\varepsilon \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} C(\mu) &= \mathbb{E}_\mu |U|, & H(\mu) &= \mathbb{E}_\mu \text{KL}(p \| q_U), & F(\mu) &= \text{KL}(p \| Q_\mu), \\ L_H(n, \varepsilon) &= \inf \{C(\mu) : H(\mu) \leq \varepsilon\}, & L_F(n, \varepsilon) &= \inf \{C(\mu) : F(\mu) \leq \varepsilon\}. \end{aligned}$$

We keep three costs apart: the *scheduled mean* $C(\mu)$, a mixture's expected scheduled rounds, failures included; the *executed mean* $\mathbb{E}\tau$, a causal policy's expected executed rounds; and the *hard cap* r of a policy in $\mathcal{A}_r$, at most r rounds almost surely. A mixture has $\mathbb{E}\tau = C(\mu)$, and a policy in $\mathcal{A}_r$ has $\mathbb{E}\tau \leq r$, so a lower bound on the executed mean is also one on the cap.

Leakage and shape. For a target p with support V , part (a) of the next lemma splits a divergence into *leakage*, from mass outside V , and *shape*, the divergence of p from the output's conditional law on V ; (b) gives the gain $H - F$ from discarding the schedule. On the slice, (c) and (d) reduce a labelled schedule to its profile, and (e) shows that relabelling removes the shape term but not the leakage, which a fixed labelled schedule, drawing block counts binomially, generally has together with shape. With several symmetry orbits the chain rule adds a *between-orbit* term: after relabelling, the balanced slice keeps only leakage, the full-support target only this term, and a weighted slice both (Appendix O).

Lemma 1 (standard tools; Appendix B) (a) $\text{KL}(p\|q) = -\ln q(V) + \text{KL}(p\|q(\cdot | V))$ if $q(V) > 0$, and $\text{KL}(p\|q) = +\infty$ if $q(V) = 0$. (b) $F(\mu) \leq H(\mu)$ and, if $F(\mu) < \infty$, $H(\mu) - F(\mu) = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim p} \text{KL}(\mu\|r_\mu(\cdot | x))$, where $r_\mu(U | x) \propto \mu(U)q_U(x)$ is the law of the schedule given the output. (c) $q_U(V)$ depends on U only through its profile $b(U)$, and equals the success probability $s(b)$ of the count process $(M, j) \mapsto (M - b_t, j - X_t)$, $X_t \sim \text{Bin}(b_t, j/M)$, started at (n, k) and killed when it leaves the legal states. (d) $\text{KL}(p\|q_U)$ depends only on $b(U)$. (e) On the balanced slice, if an output law Q is invariant on V under relabelling the coordinates (for example Q_μ for a relabelling-invariant μ), then $\text{KL}(p\|Q) = -\ln Q(V)$, and $Q(\cdot | V) = p$ if $Q(V) > 0$.

3. The balanced slice: separation and an exact converse

From output divergence to survival. The run outputs a valid string if and only if the count process ends at $(0, 0)$. A uniform relabelling leaves this process unchanged and makes the output law permutation-invariant, so $F = -\ln \Pr(\text{the count process reaches } (0, 0))$ (Lemma 1(e)). Write $\delta = 1 - e^{-\varepsilon}$, the failure probability that tolerance ε allows a relabelled design, and $K_\delta = \min\{\lceil 1/\delta \rceil, \lceil 2 \ln(2/\delta) \rceil\}$.

Theorem 2 Let $n = 2k \geq 2$, $\mathcal{H}_n = \sum_{m \leq n} 1/m$, $S_n = \sum_{m \leq n} 1/m^2$.

- (a) For every $\varepsilon \geq 0$, $L_H(n, \varepsilon) \geq \max\{1, [\mathcal{H}_n - 2\varepsilon]_+, 1 + [\mathcal{H}_n - 2\varepsilon - 1]_+^2 / (4\varepsilon + S_n - 1)\} \geq 1 + [\ln(n+1) - 2\varepsilon - 1]_+^2 / (4\varepsilon + 2/3)$.
- (b) For every $\varepsilon > 0$, $L_F(n, \varepsilon) \leq \min\{n, \lceil \log_2 \log_2 n \rceil + 8K_\delta\}$, witnessed by the uniform relabelling of one deterministic size profile.
- (c) Hence, for fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, $L_H(n, \varepsilon)/L_F(n, \varepsilon) = \Omega_\varepsilon((\log n)^2 / \log \log n)$; and since one fixed geometric schedule gives $L_H(n, \varepsilon) = O_\varepsilon((\log n)^2)$ (Appendix C; see also Wen et al., 2026, Thm. 11), $L_H(n, \varepsilon) = \Theta_\varepsilon((\log n)^2)$.

Why averaged divergence needs $(\log n)^2$ rounds. Let a schedule have block fractions $\rho_t = b_t/M_{t-1}$, where M_{t-1} coordinates are unrevealed before round t , so $\rho_t = 1$ in the last round. By the chain rule, a coordinate drawn at the marginal of the M_{t-1} coordinates unrevealed at its round's start, rather than of the m unrevealed at its turn, costs $H_1(M_{t-1}) - H_1(m)$, where $H_1(m')$ is the expected binary entropy of the fraction of ones among m' unrevealed coordinates; each one-coordinate reveal at m' lowers it by at least $1/(2m'(m' - 1))$ (Pinsker), and these telescope to at least $\frac{1}{2}(1/m - 1/M_{t-1})$. Over all coordinates the terms $1/m$ sum to $\mathcal{H}_n$ and the terms $1/M_{t-1}$ to $\sum_t \rho_t$, so a schedule U with divergence d_U has $\sum_t \rho_t \geq \mathcal{H}_n - 2d_U$, about $\ln n$. Within a block, $\sum_{M_t < m \leq M_{t-1}} (1/m - 1/M_{t-1}) \geq b_t(b_t - 1)/(2M_{t-1}^2)$, so ρ_t^2 is at most twice this sum plus $\sum_{M_t < m \leq M_{t-1}} 1/m^2$, and $\sum_t \rho_t^2 \leq 2(\mathcal{H}_n - \sum_t \rho_t) + S_n \leq 4d_U + S_n$. Both bounds are affine in d_U , so they survive averaging over a mixture with $H \leq \varepsilon$ even when some components have $d_U > \varepsilon$; Cauchy-Schwarz over the rounds before the last, $(\mathbb{E}_\mu \sum_t \rho_t - 1)^2 \leq (C(\mu) - 1)(\mathbb{E}_\mu \sum_t \rho_t^2 - 1)$, then gives the last term of (a) (Appendix B). The matching upper bound uses one fixed schedule with blocks of $\max(1, \lfloor \alpha M \rfloor)$ of the M unrevealed coordinates, $\alpha = \min\{\varepsilon, \ln 2\} / \ln n$ (Appendix C).

The square-root ladder. For (b), the ladder leaves $M_j = K 2^{j+2} 2^{2j}$ unrevealed coordinates after its rungs, j decreasing ($K = K_\delta$), and ends with $\min\{n, 8K\}$ single-coordinate rounds, which never fail; the first bulk round goes from n to the largest rung below n . The width of each rung

is chosen to control the failure accumulated before the singleton tail: widening rung j by the factor $K2^{j+2}$ makes the conditional variances of the fraction of ones still required sum to less than $1/(4K)$, so the bulk of the ladder fails with probability at most δ (Kolmogorov's inequality for $K = \lceil 1/\delta \rceil$, the Hoeffding–Ville inequality for $K = \lceil 2\ln(2/\delta) \rceil$). Relabelled, the profile has $F = -\ln(\text{success}) \leq \varepsilon$ (Appendix B).

The exact recursion. The ladder is not optimal; it must be compared with every causal policy, randomized and adaptive. Let $G_r(M, j)$ be the largest probability of reaching $(0, 0)$ within r rounds when each block size may depend on the current count state:

$$G_r(0, j) = \mathbf{1}\{j = 0\}, \quad G_0(M, j) = 0 \quad (M > 0),$$

$$G_{r+1}(M, j) = \max_{1 \leq b \leq M} \sum_{j'=0}^{M-b} \text{Bin}(b, j/M)(j - j') G_r(M - b, j').$$

Here j' is the number of ones still required after the block. G_r is optimal among rules that see only the count state and the rounds left; the next lemma shows that no causal policy gains from seeing more: whatever it has seen, its choice changes the law of the next count state only through the block size, which the recursion already optimizes at every state; an empty round only spends a round, as $G_r \leq G_{r+1}$ (App. E). The lemma also converts survival into executed rounds.

Lemma 3 (survival and charging) *Let $n = 2k \geq 2$, $\pi \in \mathcal{A}_\infty$ and $t \geq 1$. (a) The count state reaches $(0, 0)$ within t rounds with probability at most $G_t(n, k)$, and $G_s \leq G_t$ for $s \leq t$; in particular $q_U(V) \leq G_{|U|}(n, k)$ for every labelled schedule U . (b) If $Q_\pi(V) \geq \theta$, then $\mathbb{E}\tau \geq 1 + \sum_{s \geq 1} (\theta - G_s(n, k))_+ \geq 1 + t(\theta - G_t(n, k))_+$.*

Proof (Appendix E). (a) Given the seed and the history, a round's draws are independent Bernoulli(j/M) variables, so G of the remaining horizon at the current count state (0 once illegal) is a supermartingale, from $G_t(n, k)$ to the indicator of success. (b) A valid output with $\tau \leq s$ needs the count state to reach $(0, 0)$ within s rounds, which by (a) has probability at most $G_s(n, k)$, so $\Pr(\tau > s) \geq Q_\pi(V) - G_s(n, k) \geq \theta - G_s(n, k)$. Every run executes at least one round, so $\mathbb{E}\tau = 1 + \sum_{s \geq 1} \Pr(\tau > s)$, and summing the tails, with $G_s \leq G_t$ for $s \leq t$ in the second form, gives (b) (there is nothing to prove if $\Pr(\tau = \infty) > 0$). $\square$

For rates, Appendix D proves the envelope (Env): for $r \geq 1$ and legal (M, j) , $G_r(M, j) \leq 36(d+1)^{-2^{-r}}$ with $d = \min(j, M-j)$. Its exponent halves once per round. For $r = 1$ it is the central binomial atom, at most $(d+1)^{-1/2}$. For one more round, the recursion and the bound for r rounds leave one estimate about a single block: the mean of $(d'+1)^{-2^{-r}}$, where d' is the minority count after the block and failed paths count zero. At exponent $\frac{1}{2}$ this mean is at most $6(d+1)^{-1/4}$: a block that leaves more than $M/8$ coordinates keeps $d' > d/16$ except with probability below $256/d$ (Chebyshev), and a larger block gives each count state probability $O(d^{-1/2})$, so the states with d' below about $\sqrt{d}/8$ contribute $O(d^{-1/4})$, and the others have $(d'+1)^{-1/2} = O(d^{-1/4})$. As the block's law has total mass at most one, Cauchy–Schwarz bounds the mean at exponent α by the square root of the mean at 2α ; iterating, the estimate at $\frac{1}{2}$ gives $6^{2^{1-r}}(d+1)^{-2^{-(r+1)}}$ at exponent 2^{-r} , and the factors $6^{2^{1-r}}$ multiply to less than $6^2 = 36$.

Theorem 4 *Let $n = 2k \geq 2$ and $r \geq 1$. (a) $\min_{\pi \in \mathcal{A}_r} \text{KL}(p \| Q_\pi) = -\ln G_r(n, k)$, attained by a maximizing count-state rule applied to the coordinates in a uniformly random order. (b) $2^{-r} \ln(k +$*

1) $-\ln 36 < -\ln G_r(n, k) \leq 2^{-r} \ln k + \ln 48$, uniformly in r and n ; the upper side is witnessed by uniformly relabelling one fixed profile with at most r blocks, within a factor 1728 of the best adaptive policy in success probability.

Proofs (Appendices D–E.1). (a): every $\pi \in \mathcal{A}_r$ has $\text{KL}(p\|Q_\pi) \geq -\ln Q_\pi(V) \geq -\ln G_r(n, k)$ (Lemmas 1(a) and 3(a)), and the maximizing rule, applied to the coordinates in a uniformly random order drawn before sampling, succeeds with probability $G_r(n, k)$ and has a relabelling-invariant output law, so Lemma 1(e) gives equality. In (b), the lower side is (Env) with $d = k$. The upper side uses a square-root ladder for a different task than Theorem 2(b): with $L^* \leq r$ the largest L whose rungs $M_0 = n$, $M_t = \lceil \sqrt{2^{L-t+1} M_{t-1}} \rceil$ ($t < L$) give nonempty blocks, it ends with one block of all remaining coordinates (Appendix E.1). If $L^* = r$, a stopped-martingale Chebyshev bound keeps it legal until that block with probability above $\frac{1}{2}$, and the block succeeds with at least its central atom, so the profile succeeds with probability at least $k^{-2^{-r}}/24$; if $L^* < r$, then $n^{2^{-L^*}} < 2^{3/2}$ and it succeeds with probability at least $\frac{1}{48}$. Either way the success is at least $k^{-2^{-r}}/48$, whence $1728 = 36 \cdot 48$. This witness estimates survival within a constant factor at every cap, but its final block fails with probability at least $\frac{1}{2}$ at a state that is not forced. The upper side of (b) certifies no tolerance below $\ln 48$.

Corollary 5 (matched hard length; Appendix E) Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. The least length of a single fixed schedule with $\text{KL}(p\|q_U) \leq \varepsilon$ is $\Theta_\varepsilon((\log n)^2)$, while the least length $R_F^{\text{PROF}}(n, \varepsilon)$ of a uniformly relabelled fixed profile with output KL at most ε is $\log_2 \log_2 n + O_\varepsilon(1) = \log_2 \ln n + O_\varepsilon(1)$.

The relabelled lower bound is that of Corollary 6(a), since a profile of length L lies in $\mathcal{A}_L$.

Corollary 6 (hard cap and executed rounds; Appendix E) Let $n = 2k \geq 2$ and fix $\varepsilon > 0$. (a) The least hard cap $R_F^{\text{adapt}}(n, \varepsilon)$, the least r with $\min_{\pi \in \mathcal{A}_r} \text{KL}(p\|Q_\pi) \leq \varepsilon$, is the least r with $G_r(n, k) \geq e^{-\varepsilon}$, and $\log_2 \ln(k+1) - \log_2(\varepsilon + \ln 36) < R_F^{\text{adapt}}(n, \varepsilon) \leq R_F^{\text{PROF}}(n, \varepsilon) \leq \lceil \log_2 \log_2 n \rceil + 8K_\delta$, both $\log_2 \ln n + O_\varepsilon(1)$. (b) Every $\pi \in \mathcal{A}_\infty$ with $\text{KL}(p\|Q_\pi) \leq \varepsilon$ has $\mathbb{E}\tau \geq 1 + \sum_{t \geq 1} (e^{-\varepsilon} - G_t(n, k))_+ \geq e^{-\varepsilon} \log_2 \ln(k+1) - 2.672 \geq e^{-\varepsilon} \log_2 \ln n - 3.672$, as $k+1 \geq \sqrt{n}$; the same bound holds for $L_F(n, \varepsilon)$. (c) $L_F(n, \varepsilon) \leq (e^{-\varepsilon} + o(1)) \log_2 \ln n$, so $L_F(n, \varepsilon) = (e^{-\varepsilon} + o(1)) \log_2 \ln n$ and, with Theorem 2, $L_H/L_F = \Theta_\varepsilon((\log n)^2 / \log \log n)$.

Part (b) does not follow from the cap bound (a), since a policy without a cap may end some runs early, as the mixture in (c) does; it sums the tails of Lemma 3(b) with $\theta = e^{-\varepsilon}$, since $\text{KL}(p\|Q_\pi) \leq \varepsilon$ gives $Q_\pi(V) \geq e^{-\varepsilon}$ by Lemma 1(a). With $\ell_k = \log_2 \ln(k+1)$, (Env) gives $G_t(n, k) \leq \min\{1, 36 \exp(-2^{\ell_k - t})\}$. Summing $\Pr(\tau > t) \geq e^{-\varepsilon} - G_t(n, k)$ over $t \leq \lfloor \ell_k \rfloor$, where these G_t total less than 2.672, gives (b). In (c), a mixture runs, with weight $w = e^{-\varepsilon}/(1 - \delta_n)$, a ladder failing with probability at most $\delta_n \rightarrow 0$ slowly (App. E), and otherwise a one-round schedule that usually fails; since $Q \geq wQ'$ pointwise gives $\text{KL}(p\|Q) \leq \text{KL}(p\|Q') + \ln(1/w)$, it has $F \leq -\ln(1 - \delta_n) + \ln(1/w) = \varepsilon$ at about $e^{-\varepsilon}$ times the ladder's cost. The near-exact branch carries weight tending to $e^{-\varepsilon}$, so the cheap branch need not be the majority; every failed run is charged.

At finite sizes. At $\varepsilon = \ln 2$ and $n = 65536$, Theorem 2(a) gives the kernel-checked bound $L_H > 26.20$ (proved in Lean 4, Appendix Q), and one explicit 11-round relabelled profile is kernel-checked to have $F \leq \ln 2$, so $L_F \leq 11$; a float64 search finds a 5-round profile with $F \leq \ln 2$, evaluated in exact arithmetic (not kernel-checked; minimality not shown). Theorem 2(b) and the




Figure 2: Balanced slice, $\varepsilon = \ln 2$: round counts of one fixed labelled schedule (circles) and one relabelled profile (squares). Each has one length per run, so circles and squares bound L_H and L_F from above; open squares (best-found witnesses) and the kernel-checked $L_F \leq 11$ at $n = 2^{16}$ are upper bounds not shown optimal. No rate is fitted.

$\mathcal{H}_n$ form of (a) alone give $L_H > L_F$ at $\varepsilon = \ln 2$ for every even $n \geq 2^{15}$ (kernel-checked). Figure 2 shows Corollary 5 at four sizes. Evidence classes, full-support calculations and ten frozen exact-oracle predictions, five of which failed without contradicting a theorem, are in Appendix K.

4. Beyond the slice: two extensions

On the balanced slice a uniform relabelling does two jobs: it removes all shape error, and it leaves one event, survival, whose probability alone determines the output divergence ($F = -\ln \Pr(\text{survival})$). Each extension removes the premise of one job. The full-support Beta(1, 1)–Bernoulli target is still exchangeable, so relabelling still removes the shape within each count class, but no output is invalid: all the error sits in the law of the number of ones, the between-orbit term of Section 2. Weighted slices keep the hard constraint, so survival still bounds F from below, but only permutations among equal weights preserve the target, so survival no longer controls the shape. The upper-bound constructions behind Theorems 7(c) and 8(a) are analysed against a law used only in the analysis (an ideal count law in §4.1, a reference law in §4.2). Neither extension covers a full-support target without permutation symmetry.

4.1. Full support: lattice geometry replaces survival

Let p be the Beta(1, 1)–Bernoulli law on $\{0, 1\}^n$: the number of ones W is uniform on $\{0, \dots, n\}$, the string is uniform given W , and after s reveals with a ones each unrevealed coordinate is one with probability $(a+1)/(s+2)$. Every string has positive target mass, so no output is a support violation; this does not make sampling accurate, as independent draws in a round distort the count (one round of all n coordinates concentrates W within $O(\sqrt{n})$ of $n/2$). The target and every relabelled output law are uniform given W , so all error is in the count: $F = \text{KL}(p_W \| \bar{Q}_W)$, $\bar{Q}_W$ the output’s law of W averaged over the mixture (relabelling never increases F or the cost; Appendix F, X0).

Theorem 7 (full-support frontier) *For this target: (a) $L_H(n, \varepsilon) = \Theta_\varepsilon((\ln n)^2)$ for every fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ (Proposition 14; cf. Chen et al., 2026, Thms. 4, 9). (b) The least number of rounds of one uniformly relabelled profile with $F \leq \varepsilon$ is $R_F^{\text{PROF}}(n, \varepsilon) = \log_2 \log_2 n + O_\varepsilon(1)$ for every fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ (Corollary 13). (c) Over finite predrawn schedule mixtures, under the scheduled mean $C(\mu)$,*

$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} L_F(n, \varepsilon) / \log_2 \log_2 n = e^{-\varepsilon} / 2$ for every fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ (Corollary 18). (d) For fixed $R \geq 1$ and every $\eta' > 0$, for all large n every finite predrawn mixture whose components all have at most R rounds has $F \geq n^{3/(4^R-1)-\eta'}$ (Theorem 15(c)); no matching upper bound on F is claimed.

Parts (b) and (c) compare one grid with many. The upper bound in (c) takes four steps with separate jobs: grid geometry decides which growth of the level is possible, an ideal law controls mass in total variation, Lemma Z6 and an exact floor turn this into forward KL, and a recursion fixes the depth, to which dilution adds the factor $e^{-\varepsilon}$. The mixture lower bounds use one test set for all components.

Geometry, one grid: squaring. With the level $c = 2 + (\text{coordinates revealed})$ and $P = (1 + \text{ones revealed})/c$, the target makes P uniform on the grid $\{1/c, \dots, (c-1)/c\}$ at every level, and a relabelled profile, with fixed levels, keeps P on these grids. A round from c to c' moves an interior P by a spread of order $c'^{-1/2}$ when $c' \geq 2c$ (smaller near the ends), and later rounds keep the final value within this order (Lemma X1), so neighbouring interior spreads overlap only if $c' \lesssim c^2$ (Figure 3, top). Faster growth leaves gaps, first near the ends, where the target has mass and such a profile almost none: data processing bounds F below (Theorem 10). Conversely, a Jensen chain bounds F by a sum of per-round terms (Lemma U1: averaged one-round log-likelihood ratios), and Theorem 12's profile ($\varepsilon \leq 1$; unit rounds throughout for n below a size depending only on ε) squares the level after a warm-up, up to factors depending only on ε that keep these terms summing to at most ε , in $\log_2 \log_2 n + O_\varepsilon(1)$ rounds (its exact schedule and final round: §F.3).

Geometry, many grids: fourth powers. A mixture can randomize the level. Theorem 17's construction μ_n predraws a recursive schedule, relabelled uniformly: a call of size n above a cut-off draws d uniformly from the band $\{c_{\min}, \dots, 2c_{\min} - 1\}$, $c_{\min}$ a polylogarithmic factor above $(n+2)^{1/4}$, and schedules the first $d-2$ coordinates by the same rule and the rest in one final round, except on a rare floor branch (below). Grids of levels d and e share only the grid of $\gcd(d, e)$, and band levels rarely share large factors, so away from small denominators and the ends their union has typical spacing $c_{\min}^{-2}$, which the final round's spread can fill while $n+2 \lesssim c_{\min}^4$ (Figure 3). So one round can raise the level from the band to $n+2$, a polylogarithmic factor below $c_{\min}^4$, where one grid allows about squaring. This explains coverage, not mass: it shows which growth is possible, not how much mass the sampler puts anywhere; the next two steps supply the mass and the forward-KL control.

Mass: an ideal comparison. Mass is first controlled for an *ideal* run, analysis only and never executed: it has the same band draw and final round as μ_n but an exactly uniform prefix count. Its final count law R_n is compared with the target's, $U_n = \text{Unif}\{0, \dots, n\}$, in total variation, which measures the target mass that R_n misses. As a union of grids is discrete, the analysis (only) smooths the prefix value at a width v . With each prefix grid completed to all d points j/d of the circle $[0, 1)$, equally weighted (at total-variation cost $O(1/c_{\min})$), two smoothed grids overlap like one grid of denominator $\text{lcm}(d, e)$ (Lemma Z3), and over the band the reciprocals of these denominators sum to $O(\ln c_{\min})$, so the smoothed band average is within total variation $O(\sqrt{\ln c_{\min} / (v c_{\min}^2)})$ of uniform on $[0, 1]$ (Lemma Z4; cf. randomized lattice rules, Kritzer et al., 2019), a bound that is small only if $v \gg c_{\min}^{-2} \ln c_{\min}$. The width must also lie a polylogarithmic factor below the final spread, so as barely to move the final count when the prefix value is away from the ends, whose mass is charged separately (Lemma Z5). Both hold because $c_{\min}$ exceeds $(n+2)^{1/4}$ by a polylogarithmic




Figure 3: Exact grid points and bars; relations schematic. Top: level $c = 8$; middle: levels 6–11; bottom: their union, with gaps of order $c_{\min}^{-2}$ away from small denominators (shaded: larger gaps near $1/3, 1/2, 2/3$; not the converse's set S^*). Dots: support, not probability.

factor: this is where the construction needs the fourth power. As a binomial count with a continuous Uniform $[0, 1]$ parameter is exactly uniform, R_n is within total variation $\Delta_n = O((\ln n)^{-4})$ of U_n , the leading terms being the smoothing's cost in the final count and the values near the ends. This says nothing yet about the actual run (recursive prefix; final-count law Q_n), and total variation alone is not a forward-KL guarantee, as $\text{KL}(U_n \| Q_n)$ is large wherever Q_n is tiny.

Forward KL: common mass and the floor. Against this, with probability m^{-2} a call of size m above the cutoff is the *floor*, a predrawn branch executed when selected, not a repair, which keeps $Q_m \geq m^{-2}U_m$. *Lemma Z6* (common-mass lift) then compares records of ideal and actual runs (prefix size $s = d - 2$, prefix count a , final count v). On the mass $g := \min(U_n, R_n)$ that the ideal law shares with the target, the lifted target follows ideal records, whose band law B and final round K_s are shared with actual runs and cancel, so the children's divergences $\text{KL}(U_s \| Q_s)$ pass with coefficient one. The floor pays for the target mass that the ideal law misses, Δ_n , which goes on floor records at a cost of at most $2 \ln n$ per unit; dropping the ideal law's excess mass, also Δ_n , costs at most $\ln(n + 1)$ per unit, as no child log-ratio $\ln(U_s/Q_s)$ is below $-\ln(n + 1)$:

$$\mathcal{D}_n \leq \sum_s B(s) \mathcal{D}_s + \Delta_n [\ln(n + 1) + 2 \ln n] - \ln(1 - n^{-2}), \quad \mathcal{D}_m := \text{KL}(U_m \| Q_m) = F(\mu_m).$$

In the lift, each band record carries target weight $g(v)B(s)U_s(a)K_s(a, v)/R_n(v)$ against the actual $(1 - n^{-2})B(s)Q_s(a)K_s(a, v)$, and floor records carry $U_n - g$. Coefficient one is what makes the construction work in forward KL: errors add along the recursion instead of compounding.

Cost: depth and dilution. At or below the cutoff, which is fixed from the tolerance before n varies, calls commit single coordinates (exact sampling), so $\mathcal{D}_m = 0$ there; above it, the display and the bound on Δ_n give $\mathcal{D}_n \leq \mathbb{E}_d \mathcal{D}_{d-2} + O((\ln n)^{-3})$ ($\mathbb{E}_d$ the band average). The scheduled mean over all paths, every floor charged in full, obeys $C(\mu_n) \leq 1 + \mathbb{E}_d C(\mu_{d-2}) + 1/n$. Each call above the cutoff that takes the band branch cuts $\ln n$ to about a quarter and adds one round, so along each band-only path the error terms, largest near the cutoff, sum below the tolerance, and the depth is about $\log_4 \ln n$: $C(\mu_n) \leq \frac{1}{2} \log_2 \log_2(n + 2) + O_\epsilon(1)$ (Theorem 17). Dilution supplies the factor $e^{-\epsilon}$ separately: the construction, at a fixed tolerance $\epsilon' \leq \min(\epsilon, 1)$, gets weight $w = e^{\epsilon' - \epsilon}$ and the one-round schedule the rest, so $F \leq \epsilon' + \ln(1/w) = \epsilon$ by pointwise domination, and $\epsilon' \downarrow 0$ after $n \rightarrow \infty$ (Corollary 18). Both are mean costs: the rare exact floors run when selected, and this construction's top floor is an n -round component, so it gives no hard cap below n .

One obstruction for every fast component. One test set must catch every fast component of every mixture, so small F forces mass onto long components; per-component gap sets fail, as components fill one another's gaps. A *jump* takes the level from c to at least ξc^ϑ ($\vartheta > 4$, $\xi \geq 1$); every profile with at most $R_0(n) = \log_\vartheta \ln(n+2) + O(1)$ rounds has one (Lemma X2). Just before a jump, P is a reduced fraction ℓ/q with $q \leq c$, and except with probability $2e^{-\omega^2}$ the run ends within $\omega(\xi q^\vartheta)^{-1/2}$ of it (Lemma X1), inside one fixed set S^* of windows around all reduced fractions with $\xi q^\vartheta \leq n+2$, of small target mass for large ξ because $\sum_{q \geq 2} \phi(q) q^{-\vartheta/2} < \infty$ (ϕ the totient) exactly when $\vartheta > 4$ (Lemma X3). Data processing onto its complement forces mass η_n onto components longer than $R_0(n)$ rounds, so $C(\mu) \geq 1 + R_0(n)\eta_n$; taking $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\xi \rightarrow \infty$, $\omega \rightarrow \infty$, $\vartheta \downarrow 4$, in this order, sends η_n to $e^{-\varepsilon}$, giving $e^{-\varepsilon}/2$ (Theorem 15; Remark 16 for $1 < \vartheta \leq 4$), while a cap R fixed as n grows lets $\ln \xi$ grow like $\ln n / (1 + \vartheta + \dots + \vartheta^{R-1})$, giving (d) as $\vartheta \downarrow 4$. Split at the first jump (decided before its draws), with the spread bound for adaptive batches given the committed history, the argument covers causal policies, for which the limit of (c) holds under $\mathbb{E}\tau$ (Theorem 19).

The $\frac{1}{2}$ comes from the grids (fourth powers; $\vartheta > 4$), the $e^{-\varepsilon}$ from dilution (Corollary 18), and the least hard cap, for mixtures and causal policies, between $(\frac{1}{2} - o(1)) \log_2 \log_2 n$ (§§F.5, F.7) and $\log_2 \log_2 n + O_\varepsilon(1)$, is open. Theorem 17's cutoff exceeds e^{1024} . The prior is Beta(1, 1) throughout.

4.2. Bounded weights: random retention replaces relabelling

Let $p_w(x) \propto \prod_i w_i^{x_i}$ on the slice S_k of strings with k ones, with $w \in (0, \infty)^n$, $\max w / \min w \leq \Lambda$ and $\kappa_0 n \leq k \leq (1 - \kappa_0)n$; two weight values give the two-weight conditional Poisson (rejective) design of Hájek (1964) (the *two groups* of Appendices G and J). The F lower bounds still come from survival, by a bounded-weight version of (Env) (Appendix H, §10). Distinct weights cost only constants there: with weight ratio at most Λ all conditional marginals stay within a factor Λ of one another, so a one-round moment bound on the minority quota d (the smaller of the numbers of ones and zeros still to be placed) holds uniformly over the residual weights, and Hölder's inequality halves its exponent at each round. So, from every legal state and for every $r \geq 1$, every causal randomized policy with fresh exact-marginal draws reaches a legal completion within r rounds with probability at most $A_r(d+1)^{-2^{-r}}$, $A_r \leq 288\Lambda^3$. The L_H^w bounds come from a weighted entropy decrement and one fixed schedule (App. H, §§2–4; upper order also Chen et al., 2026, Thm. 9). But relabelling within equal-weight groups can leave the law of the group counts wrong (Appendix O), and distinct weights leave nothing to relabel. A run that lands on the slice can then still have the wrong within-slice law, $F = \text{KL}(p_w \| Q(\cdot | S_k)) - \ln Q(S_k)$ (App. I (4.33)), so survival no longer determines F and upper bounds must control the output law itself.

Theorem 8 (bounded weights) Fix $\varepsilon > 0$, $\Lambda \geq 1$ and $\kappa_0 \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$, and let L_H^w, L_F^w and R_F^{adapt} be the costs of Section 2 and Corollary 6 for this target over their respective classes, with each unrevealed coordinate's exact conditional marginal under p_w in place of j/M . (a) There are $c_H, C_H > 0$ and n_0 , depending only on $(\varepsilon, \Lambda, \kappa_0)$, such that for $n \geq n_0$, uniformly in w and k , $c_H(\ln n)^2 \leq L_H^w(n, \varepsilon) \leq C_H(\ln n)^2$ and $R_F^{\text{adapt}}(n, \varepsilon) = \log_2 \ln n + O(1)$, and both $L_F^w(n, \varepsilon)$ and the least expected executed rounds of a causal policy with output KL at most ε are $(e^{-\varepsilon} + o(1)) \log_2 \ln n$; the $O(1)$ and $o(1)$ depend only on $(\varepsilon, \Lambda, \kappa_0)$. (b) If at least ρn coordinates share one weight, for a fixed $\rho > 0$ (for two weight values, the larger group gives $\rho = \frac{1}{2}$), then for large n one fixed labelled schedule, relabelled uniformly within that group, has $F \leq \varepsilon$ and the same length $\log_2 \ln n + O(1)$ on every path, with constants depending also on ρ .

The sampler. Part (a)'s F upper bounds (Theorem A, App. I) use a sampler that randomizes which coordinates wait (Figure 4). For a parameter $A \geq 1$, nominal sizes $n = M_1 > \dots > M_{R+1}$ depend on (n, A) alone (below). Before any value, nested *kept sets* $[n] = \mathcal{C}_1 \supseteq \dots \supseteq \mathcal{C}_{R+1}$ (F_t in App. I) are drawn, each coordinate of $\mathcal{C}_t$ staying in $\mathcal{C}_{t+1}$ independently with probability $f_t = M_{t+1}/M_t \leq \frac{1}{4}$. Round t commits $B = \mathcal{C}_t \setminus \mathcal{C}_{t+1}$, if nonempty, by fresh bits from $\Pi_B = \prod_{i \in B} \text{Ber}(\pi_i)$ at the exact conditional marginals π_i frozen at its start; $\mathcal{C}_{R+1}$ is then committed as singletons if $|\mathcal{C}_{R+1}| \leq 2m_0 = 2\lceil 4A^2 \rceil$, else as one block, and for $n < 4m_0$ the sampler is the exact n singletons. This is a finite predrawn mixture, every block charged. For fixed n and A the schedule law is the same for every weight array and quota allowed by Theorem 8; only the probabilities of the scheduled draws, the oracle's exact marginals, depend on the target. (The choices of A below, from ε for the hard cap and growing with n for the mean, use existence-only constants depending on (Λ, κ_0) ; part (b)'s schedule depends on the target's equal-weight group.) Below, $A \geq A_0(\Lambda, \kappa_0)$. As $N = |\mathcal{C}_t|$ is random around M_t , the analysis uses *good states*: $N/M_t \in [1 - \delta_t, 1 + \delta_t]$ with $\delta_t \leq \frac{1}{4}$, and quota density in $[\kappa^{(t)}, 1 - \kappa^{(t)}]$ with $\kappa^{(t)} \geq \kappa_0/2$ (App. I (4.9)–(4.11)). There $f_t \sqrt{N}$ is within constant factors of the nominal $L_t := f_t \sqrt{M_t}$, which sets the scale of one round's error; exits from good states are rare (4.14), and a good last-level state has $N < 2m_0$, so its singletons are exact.

The reference law and the cancellation. One round's error is isolated by comparing the executed sampler with a second law, used only in the analysis: the *reference law* $\mathcal{R}$ makes the same round and then finishes exactly. At a good state, with p the target's conditional law of the N free coordinates and J their quota, $\mathcal{R}$ shares $C = \mathcal{C}_{t+1}$ and $x_B \sim \Pi_B$ and draws x_C from $p_{C,j} = p(\cdot \mid x_B)$, the slice law on C with quota $j = J - |x_B|$ (fair bits if j is infeasible); $\mathcal{R}^{\text{joint}}$ and $\mathcal{R}$ are its laws of (C, x) and x , and on the slice $\mathcal{R}(x)/p(x) = \mathbb{E}_C[\Pi_B(x_B)/p(x_B)]$. Averaging over C removes, to first order, the quota-induced dependence that Π_B ignores. To see what is averaged, write p , a conditional-Poisson law, as an independent logistic product law $\tilde{P}$ conditioned on its total; its marginals q_i are canonical logistic probabilities, a proof device with $|q_i - \pi_i| = O(1/N)$ (App. I (2.7)). Then $p(x_B) = \tilde{P}(x_B) \tilde{P}(|x_C| = j) / \tilde{P}(|x| = J)$ (App. I, §3.1) carries the probability that C meets its residual quota. For nonempty C its reciprocal is an exact integral over logistic tilts (the empty child is a separate term of (3.1)). If $\tilde{P}_u$ tilts $\tilde{P}$ on C by $e^{u|x_C|}$, every x_C with $|x_C| = j$ has




Figure 4: One level of the bounded-weight sampler (top, executed) and of the reference law (bottom, analysis only). Both share the kept set C and the block values x_B ; W compares the two completions of C ($W = 0$ if j is infeasible).

the same likelihood ratio $\tilde{P}_u(x_C)/\tilde{P}(x_C) = \tilde{P}_u(|x_C| = j)/\tilde{P}(|x_C| = j)$, so

$$\frac{1}{\tilde{P}(|x_C| = j)} = \frac{1}{I_C(j)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\tilde{P}_u(x_C)}{\tilde{P}(x_C)} \text{Var}_{\tilde{P}_u}(|x_C|) du,$$

where $I_C(j) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{P}_u(|x_C| = j) \text{Var}_{\tilde{P}_u}(|x_C|) du$, and $I_C(j) = 1 + O(\sqrt{\log |C|}/|C|)$ at interior children (App. I (2.9), (2.17), (3.1)). Coordinates are retained independently, so averaging over C turns the integrand into a product of per-coordinate factors, whose logarithm is linear in the bits, times the variance factor $\Gamma_x(u)$ ((3.1)–(3.2)). Dropping the empty child, far tilts and the children in the exceptional event of (3.16), and lower-bounding $1/I_C$ on the rest, gives, at every slice point,

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}(x)}{p(x)} \geq (1 - \epsilon_1) N_0^b \int \rho^b(u) e^{D_x(u)} \frac{\Gamma_x(u)}{\bar{\Gamma}(u)} du, \quad D_x(u) = \sum_i \alpha_i(u)(x_i - \pi_i)$$

(App. I (3.17)): ρ^b is an x -free probability density concentrated on $|u| = O(1/L_t)$, $\Gamma_x/\bar{\Gamma} \in [\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}]$ has p -mean one and p -variance $O(1/N)$, and $1 - \epsilon_1, N_0^b \geq 1 - O(1/L_t)$ (3.13). Here $\alpha_i(u) = f_t u + r_i(u)$ with $r_i = O(1/N) + O(f_t u^2)$ for small u . On the slice $\sum_i (x_i - \pi_i) = |x| - J = 0$ (as is $\sum_i (x_i - q_i)$), so the common term $f_t u \sum_i (x_i - \pi_i)$, otherwise of order one, cancels there: $D_x(u) = \sum_i r_i(u)(x_i - \pi_i)$. What remains is centered: $D_X(u)$ has mean zero under p for every u , because the π_i are the exact (not logistic) marginals. After the cancellation its coefficient vector is small ((3.20)), so it concentrates at scale $1/L_t$. Cancellation and centering are not yet a KL bound. They give three distinct one-step estimates, each with its own job below: (i) logarithmic Jensen applied to the display bounds the error of one round followed by an exact completion ((3.18)); (ii) a second moment of $\psi := p/\mathcal{R}$ under $\mathcal{R}$ converts probabilities small under $\mathcal{R}$ into bounds on ψ -weighted terms; (iii) two-sided control of ψ holds on a set T' of strings x that both laws almost exhaust. (ii) and (iii) let the sampler's recursive, only approximately exact continuation replace the exact completion.

Lemma OS (one step) *There are $c_1, c > 0$, depending only on (Λ, κ_0) , such that at every good state of a level $1 \leq t \leq R$: (i) $\text{KL}(p\|\mathcal{R}) \leq c_1/L_t$; (ii) $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{R}}[\psi^2] \leq c_1$; (iii) $|\psi - 1| \leq \eta_t = O(\sqrt{\log M_t}/L_t)$ on a set T' whose complement has p - and $\mathcal{R}$ -mass $O(M_t^{-10} + e^{-cL_t^2})$ (on T' , finitely many linear statistics of x are small and children that are not interior carry little execution mass); all uniformly in w (App. I: analytic estimates (3.18), (3.21), (3.34)–(3.35), instantiated level-wise by (4.3), (4.12), (4.16) and (4.22)–(4.24)).*

Composition along the levels. The recursion replaces the exact completion by the sampler's own continuation, level by level. Let Q_t be the sampler's law from level t on and $\mathcal{K}_t$ the largest $\text{KL}(p\|Q_t)$ over good states at level t , with $\mathcal{K}_{R+1} = 0$ because the last level's singletons are exact. As Q_t and $\mathcal{R}$ make the same first round, $Q_t/\mathcal{R}$ is a posterior average of e^{-W} , where $W = \ln[p_{C,j}(x_C)/Q_{t+1}(x_C | C, j)]$ compares the exact completion of the kept set with the sampler's continuation ($W = 0$ at infeasible children), and Jensen gives $\text{KL}(p\|Q_t) \leq \text{KL}(p\|\mathcal{R}) + \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{R}^{\text{joint}}}[\psi W]$ (App. I (4.15)). Given (C, x_B) at a good child, W has mean equal to that child's divergence, at most $\mathcal{K}_{t+1}$. But W can be negative, where the continuation puts more mass than the exact completion, and ψ varies with x_C : a one-sided bound $\psi \leq 1 + \eta_t$ controls ψW only through W^+ , whose mean can exceed $\mathcal{K}_{t+1}$ by $\sqrt{\mathcal{K}_{t+1}/2}$ (Pinsker). This is the job of Lemma OS(iii): two-sided control on T' gives $\psi W \leq (1 + \eta_t)W + 2\eta_t W^-$ there. Off T' both exceptional masses are needed, the

reference's and the target's, because the composition integrates under $\mathcal{R}^{\text{joint}}$ while ψ reweights to p : discarding T'^c raises the mean of W only through W^- , by at most $\sqrt{\mathcal{R}(T'^c)}$, and the discarded part of ψW costs at most $p(T'^c)N \ln(\Lambda N)$ (the atom bound on W^+). Lemma OS(ii) prices, by Cauchy–Schwarz, the children that are not good, whose $\mathcal{R}^{\text{joint}}$ -probability is small (4.14). With Lemma OS(i) for the round itself,

$$\mathcal{K}_t \leq (1 + \eta_t)\mathcal{K}_{t+1} + 2\eta_t\sqrt{\mathcal{K}_{t+1}/2} + c_1/L_t + \xi_t,$$

with tails ξ_t made of these masses (App. I (4.17)–(4.21)). This is not a sum of per-level KLs: the square-root term couples adjacent levels. Unrolling from $\mathcal{K}_{R+1} = 0$, with $\prod_t(1 + \eta_t) \leq 2$, gives $\mathcal{K}_* := \max_t \mathcal{K}_t \leq 2E + 2\sqrt{2}(\sum_t \eta_t)\sqrt{\mathcal{K}_*}$ for the summed per-level errors $E = \sum_t(c_1/L_t + \xi_t)$, hence $\mathcal{K}_* \leq 4E + 8(\sum_t \eta_t)^2$ (App. I (4.29)); the start state is good.

Depth and outcome. The sizes make these sums small and the kept-set ladder short: with $m_0 = \lceil 4A^2 \rceil$ and $m_{j+1} = \lceil m_j^2/(A^2 2^{3j/2}) \rceil$, the $R = \max\{r \geq 1 : 4m_{r-1} \leq n\}$ levels with a kept set have $M_1 = n$ and $M_t = m_{R+1-t}$ for $t \geq 2$, when $n \geq 4m_0$ (App. I (4.1), (4.4)). Then $L_t \geq A^{2^{3(R-t)/4}}/(2\sqrt{2})$ (4.5) grows geometrically in $R-t$, faster than $\sqrt{\log M_t}$, so $\sum_t L_t^{-1} = O(1/A)$, $\sum_t \eta_t = O(\sqrt{\log A}/A)$ and $\sum_t \xi_t = O(A^{-2})$ uniformly in n (4.28), and $4E + 8(\sum_t \eta_t)^2 \leq C^*/A$: Theorem A's $F \leq C^*/A$ for the mixture's output law, with an existence-only $C^* = C^*(\Lambda, \kappa_0)$ (4.29)–(4.30). The sizes grow doubly exponentially (their log-sizes exponentially, (4.2)), so $R \leq \log_2 \ln n + 3$ (4.6). Every realization of the schedule, including a run that fails, executes and is charged all its blocks: for $n \geq 4m_0$ at most R kept-set rounds and $2m_0$ terminal rounds, so at most $\log_2 \ln n + 8A^2 + 5$ rounds (4.8), and for $n < 4m_0$ its $n < 16A^2 + 4$ exact singletons. Thus $A = \max(A_0, C^*/\varepsilon)$ gives the hard cap of part (a): $F \leq \varepsilon$ with at most $\log_2 \ln n + O_{\Lambda, \kappa_0}(1 + \varepsilon^{-2})$ rounds per component, small n included (Corollary A'). Because these bounds hold for every $A \geq A_0$, uniformly in n, w and k , A may instead grow slowly with n , independently of ε ; diluting with the cheap one-round schedule at weight $1 - e^{-(\varepsilon - \varepsilon_n)}$, $\varepsilon_n = C^*/A \rightarrow 0$, as in Corollary 6(c), then gives the mean bounds of part (a) for the scheduled mean and expected executed rounds, with cap $\log_2 \ln n + O(\sqrt{\log \log n})$ (Corollary A''); the dilution lowers only the mean, not the cap. These are caps on components of different lengths, not one common length; part (b) supplies a common length when a linear-size equal-weight group exists.

A common length. Part (b) leaves an equal-weight group of $M \geq \rho n$ coordinates untouched, commits the others in at most $\lceil 2\Lambda^3/(\varepsilon\rho^2) \rceil$ fixed blocks, and then runs the ladder of Theorem 2(b) on the group, relabelled uniformly within it. Given the committed values, the output on the group is then uniform on its residual slice up to the ladder's success probability s_J at the residual quota J (balanced or not), so the chain rule splits F exactly into the divergence of the committed values, which is not repaired later, and $\mathbb{E}_{p_w}[-\ln s_J]$ (App. H, §§6.3 and 6.6). The first is at most $\varepsilon/4$, since beside the untouched group a block of b committed coordinates costs at most $\Lambda^3 b(b-1)/(2M^2)$. The second is small although $-\ln s_J$ is not small at every quota: the ladder rarely fails at typical residual quotas, $-\ln s_J \leq \ln(M+1)$ at every legal one, and atypical quotas carry target probability $O(1/M)$ (§§6.4–6.8 and the Remark after the §7 table).

5. Scope, limits and what the separation shows

This is theory for exact oracles in one interface, on structured targets with exact samplers outside it; relaxed interfaces (lookahead, joint draws) can beat the class at small n (Appendix O). Costs count

rounds, not computation. Small average prediction error alone does not recover the exact-oracle profile rate (Theorem IC2 in Appendix N): on the balanced slice, the head that is $\frac{1}{2}$ at non-forced states and exact at forced ones has population masked-prediction excess (mask size uniform on $\{1, \dots, n\}$, loss averaged over the masked coordinates) tending to 0, yet a fixed relabelled profile needs $\Theta(\sqrt{n})$ rounds for $F \leq \ln 2$; with the same head, a count-adaptive policy attains $F \leq \ln 2$ with hard cap $\lceil \log_2 n \rceil + 1$, an upper bound, not the least adaptive cap or a mean cost. Beyond Appendix N's bounds no guarantee is claimed for learned models, and no practical speedup; Appendix M reports a controlled test with small trained transformers ($n \leq 16$), whose results are sample-level, with no population guarantee. Open are the constant of the full-support hard cap (between $\frac{1}{2}$ and 1), a common length on weighted slices without a linear-size equal-weight group, growing weight ratios, and sharp rates for vanishing tolerances. Schedule-averaged guarantees still upper-bound F and claim no optimality for it, but the counts they certify are not lower bounds for F : on the balanced slice $L_H/L_F = \Theta_\varepsilon((\log n)^2/\log \log n)$.

References

- Nima Anari, Callum Burgess, Kevin Tian, and Thuy-Duong Vuong. Quadratic speedups in parallel sampling from determinantal distributions. In *Proceedings of the 35th ACM Symposium on Parallelism in Algorithms and Architectures (SPAA)*, pages 367–377, 2023. doi: 10.1145/3558481.3591104. arXiv:2203.11190.
- Nima Anari, Ruiquan Gao, and Aviad Rubinfeld. Parallel sampling via counting. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, 2024. doi: 10.1145/3618260.3649744.
- Nima Anari, Carlo Baronio, CJ Chen, Alireza Haqi, Frederic Koehler, Anqi Li, and Thuy-Duong Vuong. Parallel sampling via autospeculation. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 1168–1179, 2026. doi: 10.1145/3798129.3800828. arXiv:2511.07869.
- Vansh Bansal, Cholyeon Cho, Syamantak Kumar, Sujay Sanghavi, and Purnamrita Sarkar. Understanding parallel samplers in masked diffusion via random walks on graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.22976v1*, 2026.
- Victor Beresnevich, Felipe Ramírez, and Sanju Velani. Metric diophantine approximation: Aspects of recent work. In *Dynamics and Analytic Number Theory*, pages 1–95. Cambridge University Press, 2016. doi: 10.1017/9781316402696.002. arXiv:1601.01948; theorem numbers follow arXiv v1.
- Patrice Bertail and Stephan Cl  men  on. Sharp exponential inequalities in survey sampling: Conditional poisson sampling schemes, 2016. Version 1; Lemma 6.
- Hel  ne Boistard, Hendrik P. Lopuha  , and Anne Ruiz-Gazen. Approximation of rejective sampling inclusion probabilities and application to high order correlations. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 6, 2012. doi: 10.1214/12-EJS736. arXiv:1207.5654; equation numbers follow arXiv v1.

- Julius Borcea, Petter Brändén, and Thomas Liggett. Negative dependence and the geometry of polynomials. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 22(2):521–567, 2009. doi: 10.1090/S0894-0347-08-00618-8.
- Changxiao Cai and Gen Li. Confidence-based decoding is provably efficient for diffusion language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.22248*, 2026.
- Sitan Chen and Liye Wang. Parallelism, critical windows, and separations among diffusion language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2609.20539v2*, 2026.
- Sitan Chen, Kevin Cong, and Jerry Li. Optimal inference schedules for masked diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Learning Theory (COLT)*, volume 336 of *PMLR*, pages 1279–1311, 2026. arXiv:2511.04647; theorem numbers follow the PMLR version.
- Leonardo de Moura and Sebastian Ullrich. The Lean 4 theorem prover and programming language. In *Automated Deduction – CADE 28*, volume 12699 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 625–635. Springer, 2021. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-79876-5_37.
- Daniil Dmitriev, Zhihan Huang, and Yuting Wei. Efficient sampling with discrete diffusion models: Sharp and adaptive guarantees. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Learning Theory (COLT)*, volume 336 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2038–2104, 2026. arXiv:2602.15008.
- Bradley Efron. Increasing properties of Pólya frequency function. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 36(1):272–279, 1965. doi: 10.1214/aoms/1177700288.
- Guhao Feng, Yihan Geng, Jian Guan, Wei Wu, Liwei Wang, and Di He. Theoretical benefit and limitation of diffusion language model. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2025. arXiv:2502.09622.
- David Fox, Sam Bowyer, Song Liu, Laurence Aitchison, Raul Santos-Rodriguez, and Mengyue Yang. Learning generation orders for masked discrete diffusion models via variational inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.23968*, 2026.
- Zijun Gao, Yanjun Han, Zhimei Ren, and Zhengqing Zhou. Batched multi-armed bandits problem. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2019. arXiv:1904.01763.
- Jaroslav Hájek. Asymptotic theory of rejective sampling with varying probabilities from a finite population. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 35(4):1491–1523, 1964. doi: 10.1214/aoms/1177700375.
- Emiel Hoogeboom, Alexey A. Gritsenko, Jasmijn Bastings, Ben Poole, Rianne van den Berg, and Tim Salimans. Autoregressive diffusion models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2022. arXiv:2110.02037.
- Kumar Joag-Dev and Frank Proschan. Negative association of random variables with applications. *The Annals of Statistics*, 11(1):286–295, 1983. doi: 10.1214/aos/1176346079.
- Fredrik Johansson. Arb: Efficient arbitrary-precision midpoint-radius interval arithmetic. *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, 66(8):1281–1292, 2017. doi: 10.1109/TC.2017.2690633.

- Richard M. Karp, Eli Upfal, and Avi Wigderson. The complexity of parallel search. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 36(2):225–253, 1988. doi: 10.1016/0022-0000(88)90027-X.
- Ryotaro Kawata, Satoshi Hayakawa, and Taiji Suzuki. Counterfactual probing for parallel unmasking with hidden forest structure. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2609.37841*, 2026.
- A. Khintchine. Einige sätze über kettenbrüche, mit anwendungen auf die theorie der diophantischen approximationen. *Mathematische Annalen*, 92(1–2):115–125, 1924. doi: 10.1007/BF01448437.
- Yiwen Kou and Yimeng Wang. Lower bounds for parallel diffusion sampling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2610.09166v1*, 2026.
- Peter Kritzer, Frances Y. Kuo, Dirk Nuyens, and Mario Ullrich. Lattice rules with random n achieve nearly the optimal $\mathcal{O}(n^{-\alpha-1/2})$ error independently of the dimension. *Journal of Approximation Theory*, 240:96–113, 2019. doi: 10.1016/j.jat.2018.09.011.
- Hugo Lavenant and Giacomo Zanella. Error bounds and optimal schedules for masked diffusions with factorized approximations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.25544*, 2025.
- Da Li, Bo Jin, and Xiaopeng Wei. Randomization beyond deterministic adaptivity in parallel sampling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2610.03335v1*, 2026.
- Gen Li and Changxiao Cai. Breaking AR’s sampling bottleneck: Provable acceleration via diffusion language models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2025. arXiv:2505.21400.
- Yong-Hyun Park, Chieh-Hsin Lai, Satoshi Hayakawa, Yuhta Takida, and Yuki Mitsufuji. Jump your steps: Optimizing sampling schedule of discrete diffusion models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2025.
- Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, Alban Desmaison, Andreas Köpf, Edward Yang, Zach DeVito, Martin Raison, Alykhan Tejani, Sasank Chilamkurthy, Benoit Steiner, Lu Fang, Junjie Bai, and Soumith Chintala. PyTorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, volume 32, 2019. arXiv:1912.01703.
- Vianney Perchet, Philippe Rigollet, Sylvain Chassang, and Erik Snowberg. Batched bandit problems. *The Annals of Statistics*, 44(2):660–681, 2016. doi: 10.1214/15-AOS1381.
- Herbert Robbins. A remark on Stirling’s formula. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 62(1): 26–29, 1955.
- Cecilia Secchi and Giacomo Zanella. Schedule optimization for tau-leaping in masked discrete diffusion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2609.21960*, 2026.
- Ruoqi Shen and Yin Tat Lee. The randomized midpoint method for log-concave sampling. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2019. arXiv:1909.05503.
- Andy Shih, Dorsa Sadigh, and Stefano Ermon. Training and inference on any-order autoregressive models the right way. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2022.

- A. J. Stam. Distance between sampling with and without replacement. *Statistica Neerlandica*, 32 (2):81–91, 1978. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9574.1978.tb01387.x.
- The mathlib Community. The Lean mathematical library. In *Proceedings of the 9th ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Certified Programs and Proofs (CPP)*, pages 367–381, 2020. doi: 10.1145/3372885.3373824.
- Lucas Torroba Hennigen and Yoon Kim. Deriving language models from masked language models. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*, 2023.
- Gilad Turok, Chris De Sa, and Volodymyr Kuleshov. DUEL: Exact likelihood for masked diffusion via deterministic unmasking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.01367*, 2026.
- Benigno Urias, Iain Murray, and Hugo Larochelle. A deep and tractable density estimator. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, volume 32 of *PMLR*, pages 467–475, 2014.
- Martin J. Wainwright. The data geometry of masking diffusion: Certified-optimal schedules via unmasking growth complexity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2608.13520*, 2026.
- Zhe Wang, Jiaxin Shi, Nicolas Heess, Arthur Gretton, and Michalis K. Titsias. Learning-order autoregressive models with application to molecular graph generation. In *Proceedings of the 42nd International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, volume 267 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 64282–64301, 2025.
- Chuling Wen, Weijie Liang, and Jian Lu. Conditional total correlation and the serial depth of adaptive parallel sampling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2608.25505v1*, 2026.
- Danny Wood, Tingting Mu, Andrew M. Webb, Henry W. J. Reeve, Mikel Luján, and Gavin Brown. A unified theory of diversity in ensemble learning. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24: 1–49, 2023.
- Lin Yao. Don’t commit alone: Joint token commitment in diffusion language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2607.04469*, 2026.
- Shaorong Zhang, Longxuan Yu, Rob Brekelmans, Luhan Tang, Salman Asif, and Greg Ver Steeg. Generation order and parallel decoding in masked diffusion models: An information-theoretic perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.00286*, 2026.
- Zhen Zhang and Amr Alanwar. The cost of conservation: Coordination-memory laws for exact-support generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2609.26126*, 2026.
- Yunxiao Zhao and Changxiao Cai. Adaptation to intrinsic dependence in diffusion language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.20126*, 2026.

AI Disclosure

In this work we used generative AI tools: Claude models by Anthropic (mainly Claude Opus 5 and Claude Opus 5.5) in Claude Code, through an API and in a web-search agent; an OpenAI GPT-5.6 model through the Codex CLI; and ChatGPT 6 Pro. We used them to develop the theoretical framework and the mathematical claims, to derive and write the proofs, to assist with the Lean 4 formalization, to design the experiments and implement the code, to interpret the results, and to assist with the literature review and the preparation of the manuscript, figures and tables. Synthetic training samples for the learned-conditional experiments were drawn from the specified target distributions by seeded code written with AI assistance; no observation was generated by prompting a language model to supply data points, and no data cleaning was performed. Translation and qualitative analysis do not apply. Human review, conducted with AI assistance, covered the statements and assumptions of all main results, the proof-critical steps of the central theorems, the correspondence between the formal declarations and the paper’s claims, and the computations supporting the principal numerical results, which were rerun or inspected. Additional checks included separate AI-based reviews, Lean 4 kernel checking of the declarations listed in Appendix Q, and recomputation of selected numbers by separate implementations, within the scope documented in the appendices (Appendix K). We take responsibility for the final content of this work, including text, claims and artifacts produced with the aid of generative AI.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Model	3
3	The balanced slice: separation and an exact converse	5
4	Beyond the slice: two extensions	8
5	Scope, limits and what the separation shows	14
A	Reference material for the main text	22
B	Proofs of Lemma 1 and Theorem 2(a),(b)	27
C	Proof of the fixed-schedule upper bound in Theorem 2(c)	30
D	Proof of the survival envelope	31
E	Proofs of Lemma 3, Theorem 4 and Corollary 6	33
F	Rates on the full-support target	37
G	Two-group survival envelope	64
H	Proof of Theorem 8 (bounded weights)	76
I	Reservoir-free upper bound for bounded weights	91
J	Two-group reductions behind the finite exhibits	118
K	Finite exhibits: details and evidence classes	126
L	Reproducibility	132
M	Controlled learned-conditional test	135
N	Imperfect conditionals	141
O	Alternative explanations and boundary cases	145
P	Further related work	147
Q	Kernel-checked declarations	151

Guide to the appendices

Each lemma, theorem, corollary and proposition of the main text, and each further appendix result listed, has an ordinary proof in the place named below; the last column names the step on which that proof turns. Appendix Q lists the parts that are also kernel-checked; Appendix K gives the evidence class of each finite exhibit, and Appendix L the scripts behind Figures 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 and Table 8. Table 4, at the end of Appendix A, indexes the notation.

Statement	Proof	Key step
Lemma 1	Appendix B	invariant laws are uniform on the single orbit V
The survival envelope (Env)	Appendix D, Proposition 9 (its weaker κ_T form Γ_T , at the end of that appendix, is used in Appendices E and L)	one-round negative-moment bound, then Cauchy–Schwarz exponent halving
Lemma 3, Theorem 4, Corollary 6	Appendix E (total-variation versions in its paragraph <i>Total variation</i> ; the window in Appendix E.1)	count-state supermartingale bounds success; tail sums charge rounds
Theorem 2(a),(b)	Appendix B (sketches in Section 3)	(a) per-reveal entropy decrement; (b) square-root ladder
Theorem 2(c), fixed-schedule upper bound on L_H	Appendix C	per-block bound (Step 1) on a geometric schedule
Corollary 5	Appendix E, end, from Theorem 2, Lemmas 1(a),(c),(e) and 3(a), and (Env)	point masses in Theorem 2; (Env) caps a profile’s success
Theorem 8(a), bounds on L_H^w	Appendix H, §§2–4	weighted per-reveal entropy decrement (Lemma W5)
Theorem 8(a), lower bounds on L_F^w , $\mathbb{E}\tau$ and the hard cap	Appendix H, §10 (two weight values: §5 for L_F^w and $\mathbb{E}\tau$, §9(i) for the hard cap, from Appendix G)	uniform one-step moment bound, then Hölder exponent halving
Theorem 8(a), upper bounds on L_F^w , $\mathbb{E}\tau$ and the hard cap	Appendix I, Theorem A and Corollaries A', A''	randomly retained subsets; uniform lattice Edgeworth estimate
Theorem 8(b), the common-length schedule mixture	Appendix H, §§6–7 (roadmap: opening paragraph of §6)	equal-weight reservoir absorbs the quota; residual slices stay uniform
Least hard cap and sharp mean coefficient for two-value tilts	Appendix H, §9	bounded-prefactor envelope meets the common length of the reservoir’s schedule mixture
Hard-length analogue of Corollary 5 for tilts	Appendix H, §9	point-mass H bounds; cap bounds pin the profile length
Proposition 22	Appendix O	every fixed schedule is uniform on valid permutations
Two-group lower bounds and finite ratios (App. O)	Appendices G, J, K	one-step bound (Lemma TG6); count-policy hull and duality (Lemmas TGR3, TGR4)
Theorem 7(a), mean-cost H rate, and the separation	Appendix F: Proposition 14, Corollary 20	increment bound (BB1): squared log-level steps cost KL

Statement	Proof	Key step
Theorem 7(b), single relabelled profiles	Appendix F: Theorems 10, 12 and their corollaries	gap set past squaring; local limit (Lemma U6) at squaring
Theorem 7(c), lower half, and (d), mixtures	Appendix F: Theorem 15 (X0 and Lemmas X1–X3 in its proof)	a jump lands in the totient test set (Lemma X3)
Theorem 7(c), upper half	Appendix F: Theorem 17 (Lemmas Z1–Z6), Corollary 18	lcm overlap of band grids (Lemmas Z3, Z4); coefficient-one lift (Lemma Z6)
Theorem 19, causal adaptive policies	Appendix F: Theorem 19	the first jump is fixed before its draws (Lemma X3')
Controlled learned-conditional test (Section 5)	Appendix M	no theorem: frozen tests use float64 complete-law output quantities (KL, validity, shape, and the variance of the number of ones), and schedule-averaged H where specified
Alternative explanations; selected related work	Appendices O, P	orbit chain rule: leakage plus a between-orbit term
Full results table and notation	Appendix A	—
Theorem 2(a)'s rate from prior work	Appendix B, after the proof of (a)	Markov's inequality on Wen et al. (2026, Thm. 11)
Finite balanced instance; total-variation figure	Table 7 (witness), Table 5 (comparison), Figure 5	finite instance: Theorem 2(a) against one explicit profile
Imperfect conditionals (App. O; Prop. IC1, Thm IC2)	Appendix N	first-exhaustion identity forces $\sqrt{n}$ rounds (Theorem IC2)

Appendix A. Reference material for the main text

This appendix collects reference material: the table of classes, criteria, costs and evidence status (Table 2), the one-round growth table (Table 3) and the notation index (Table 4).

Table 2: Classes, criteria and costs ($\varepsilon > 0$ fixed; for tilts and bounded weights also Λ, κ_0 ; $\mathcal{A}_r$ is the class of Section 2, which for two-value tilts is RAND_r of Appendix G). “Mean”: scheduled mean $C(\mu)$; “ $\mathbb{E}\tau$ ”: executed mean; “cap”: hard cap; “length”: rounds of one schedule or relabelled profile, the same on every path. K: kernel-checked (declarations in Appendix Q, whose table also marks the results whose class identification uses one ordinary step; for an asymptotic order, the asymptotic statement); P: prior work (preprint).
[‡]One fixed labelled schedule, relabelled uniformly within an equal-weight group of linear size; without one, a common length is open. Finite regime: on the balanced slice, explicit bounds (Table 8), kernel-checked bounds and finite computations at $n = 2^{16}$ (Table 7), and an exact least profile length at $n = 2^4$, computed optima (float64), linear-program brackets, best-found upper bounds and one seeded Monte Carlo estimate (Table 5, Figure 2); on full support, explicit bounds on L_H (Proposition 14) but astronomical constants for F , with computed L_H optima and best-found upper bounds on L_F (both float64; the latter interval-certified at $n \leq 2^{10}$; Table 6); for two-value tilts, explicit but impractical constants (e.g., caps of hundreds to thousands of rounds; Appendix H, §6.9) and, at $n \leq 24$ and $r \leq 4$, rigorous enclosures of the optimal output KL, some kernel-checked, beside float64 values (Appendix K); for bounded weights, existence-only constants in the reservoir-free F upper bounds (Appendix I).

class, criterion, cost	order	status
<i>Balanced slice</i>		
fixed schedule, KL, length	$\Theta(\log^2 n)$	K (Cor. 5)
one relabelled profile, F , length	$\log_2 \ln n + O_\varepsilon(1)$	K (Cor. 5)
mixture, H , mean	$\Theta(\log^2 n)$	K (Thm 2a,c)
mixture, F , mean	$(e^{-\varepsilon} + o(1)) \log_2 \ln n$	K (Thm 2b; Cor. 6b,c)
$\mathcal{A}_r$, F , cap	$\log_2 \ln n + O_\varepsilon(1)$	K (Thm 4a; Cor. 6a)
causal adaptive, F , $\mathbb{E}\tau$	$(e^{-\varepsilon} + o(1)) \log_2 \ln n$	K (Cor. 6b,c)
det. adaptive, KL, $\mathbb{E}_p$ rounds	$\Theta(\log^2 n)$	P (Wen et al., 2026, Thm. 11)
<i>Full support, Beta(1, 1)–Bernoulli</i>		
mixture, H , mean	$\Theta(\log^2 n)$	K (Thm 7a)
one relabelled profile, F , length	$\log_2 \log_2 n + O_\varepsilon(1)$	K (Thm 7b)
mixture, F , mean	$(e^{-\varepsilon}/2 + o(1)) \log_2 \log_2 n$	K (Thm 7c)
causal adaptive, F , $\mathbb{E}\tau$	$(e^{-\varepsilon}/2 + o(1)) \log_2 \log_2 n$	K (Thm 19c)
mixture, F , fixed cap R	$F \geq n^{3/(4^R-1)-o(1)}$	K (Thm 7d); no matching upper bound
<i>Two-value tilts</i>		
fixed schedule, KL, length	$\Theta(\log^2 n)$	K (App. H, §§3–4)
a relabelled schedule [‡] , F , length	$\log_2 \ln n + O(1)$	K (App. H, §9)
mixture, H / F , mean	$\Theta(\log^2 n) / (e^{-\varepsilon} + o(1)) \log_2 \ln n$	K (Thm 8; App. H, §§3–4, 9–10)
$\mathcal{A}_r$, F , cap	$\log_2 \ln n + O_{\varepsilon, \Lambda, \kappa_0}(1)$	K (App. H, §§9–10)
causal adaptive, F , $\mathbb{E}\tau$	$(e^{-\varepsilon} + o(1)) \log_2 \ln n$	K (App. H, §§9–10)
<i>Bounded weights, interior quota</i>		
fixed schedule, KL, length	$\Theta(\log^2 n)$	K (App. H, §§3–4)
a relabelled schedule [‡] , F , length	$\log_2 \ln n + O(1)$	K (Thm 8b)
mixture, H , mean	$\Theta(\log^2 n)$	K (App. H, §§3–4)
$\mathcal{A}_r$, F , cap	$\log_2 \ln n + O_{\varepsilon, \Lambda, \kappa_0}(1)$	K (App. I, Cor. A'; App. H, §10)
mixture, F , mean	$(e^{-\varepsilon} + o(1)) \log_2 \ln n$	K (App. I, Cor. A''; App. H, §10)
causal adaptive, F , $\mathbb{E}\tau$	$(e^{-\varepsilon} + o(1)) \log_2 \ln n$	K (App. I, Cor. A''; App. H, §10)
outside: joint draw; rejection	exact in 1 round (resampling not costed)	standard; Lemma 1(e)

Table 3: One round's growth, up to lower-order factors (M : number of unrevealed coordinates; c : level; $c_{\min}$: start of a band of levels), and the leading round count: the length of every path for the two profiles, and the scheduled mean $C(\mu)$ for the mixture, which has rare paths of length n . Mixing in the one-round schedule multiplies the leading term of the scheduled mean by $e^{-\varepsilon}$.

design	one round	rounds
balanced, ladder	unrevealed $M \rightarrow \sqrt{M}$	$\log_2 \log_2 n$
full support, one profile	level $c \rightarrow c^2$	$\log_2 \log_2 n$
full support, mixture	band $c_{\min} \rightarrow c_{\min}^4$	$\frac{1}{2} \log_2 \log_2 n$

Table 4: Notation index. The first locator is the first place the paper defines the symbol; a second locator gives the formal or per-round definition. “(also: ...)” marks a symbol that has another meaning in another row.

Symbol	Meaning	Defined in
<i>Interface, criteria and costs</i>		
p, n	target law on $\{0, 1\}^n$; n the number of coordinates	§1; §2
V, k	balanced slice $\{x : \sum_i x_i = k\}$, $n = 2k$; k the required number of ones (also: $V(s)$)	§2
(M, j)	count state: M coordinates unrevealed, j of them must still be one (also: rung index j); with a subscript, an unrevealed count at a stage: M_{t-1} before round t (§3), the rungs M_j of Theorem 2(b)’s ladder and M_t of Theorem 4(b)’s witness (rows j and L^*). In §4.2 the nominal sizes M_t are deterministic and the free count is $N = \mathcal{C}_t $, random around M_t ; there the M of $M \geq \rho n$ is the reservoir size of part (b)’s construction (Theorem 8’s j/M keeps the count-state meaning)	§2
$U; U $ (length); $b(U)$ (profile)	labelled schedule $(B_1, \dots, B_r)$, an ordered partition of $[n]$; its length (rounds); its profile (block sizes)	§2
σ	a permutation of $[n]$, as in the uniform relabelling $\sigma(U)$; $\sigma(\cdot)$ is also the σ -algebra generated, as in $\mathcal{F}_{t-1}$. In the appendices σ also denotes, each defined where used, a standard deviation ($\sigma(y)$, σ_n , σ^2 in Apps. F, K, G), the logistic function (App. I) and a state σ_t (App. H)	§2
q_U	output law when the schedule is U	§1; §2
μ, Q_μ	schedule mixture, a finite law on labelled schedules; its output law $\mathbb{E}_\mu q_U$	§1; §2
$H(\mu)$	schedule-averaged divergence $\mathbb{E}_\mu \text{KL}(p \ q_U)$ (also: $\mathcal{H}_n$; entropy H)	§1; §2
J_μ	the sampler’s joint law of schedule and output, $J_\mu(U, x) = \mu(U)q_U(x)$, so $H(\mu) = \text{KL}(\mu \otimes p \ J_\mu)$ (also: quota J)	§1
$F(\mu)$	output-law divergence $\text{KL}(p \ Q_\mu)$	§1; §2
$C(\mu)$	scheduled mean $\mathbb{E}_\mu U $: expected scheduled rounds, failed runs included (also: kept set C)	§1; §2
$L_H(n, \varepsilon), L_F(n, \varepsilon)$	least $C(\mu)$ with $H(\mu) \leq \varepsilon$, resp. $F(\mu) \leq \varepsilon$	§1; §2
$\mathcal{A}_r, \mathcal{A}_\infty$	causal randomized adaptive policies finishing within r rounds a.s.; $\mathcal{A}_\infty$: no cap (also: $\mathcal{A}_r$)	§2
π, Q_π	a policy in $\mathcal{A}_r$ or $\mathcal{A}_\infty$; its output law (also: π_i ; π in App. F)	§2; Lemma 3
$\tau, \mathbb{E}\tau$	executed rounds until all coordinates are committed; executed mean, its expectation	§1; §2
ℓ, ℓ_k	$\ell = \log_2 \log_2 n$ in Table 1; $\ell_k = \log_2 \ln(k+1)$ on the slice of a policy in $\mathcal{A}_r$: almost every run has at most r rounds (also: r_μ ; r in App. F)	Table 1; §3, after Corollary 6
r , hard cap		§1; §2
$r_\mu(U x)$	law of the schedule given the output (also: cap r)	Lemma 1(b)
$s(b)$	success probability of the count process under profile b	Lemma 1(c)
<i>Balanced slice</i>		
$G_r(M, j)$	largest probability of reaching $(0, 0)$ within r rounds by count-state rules	§3
A_r, d	prefactor $6^{2-2^{2-r}} < 36$ of (Env); minority count $d = \min(j, M-j)$ (also: $\mathcal{A}_r$, parameter A ; band level d , $d = R - t$ of §4.2, d_U)	§3, (Env)
δ, K_δ	$1 - e^{-\varepsilon}$, the failure probability allowed; ladder parameter $\min\{\lceil 1/\delta \rceil, \lceil 2 \ln(2/\delta) \rceil\}$	§3, before Theorem 2

Symbol	Meaning	Defined in
$\mathcal{H}_n, S_n$	the harmonic sums $\sum_{m \leq n} 1/m$ and $\sum_{m \leq n} 1/m^2$ (also: $H(\mu)$)	Theorem 2
d_U	divergence $\text{KL}(p q_U)$ of one schedule (also: minority count d)	§3; App. B
j (rung)	index of the ladder rungs $M_j = K 2^{j+2} 2^{2^j}$ (also: quota j)	§3, sketch of Theorem 2(b); App. B
L^*, M_t (witness)	the largest $L \leq r$ whose rungs $M_0 = n$, $M_t = \lceil \sqrt{2^{L-t+1} M_{t-1}} \rceil$ ($t < L$) give nonempty blocks; those rungs, which decrease from $M_0 = n$; the ladder rungs M_j instead increase with j and are visited with j decreasing, down to $M_0 = 8K$	sketch of Theorem 4(b); App. E.1
w (dilution)	weight of a component, as in $Q \geq wQ'$ (also: weights w)	§3, after Corollary 6
$R_F^{\text{PROF}}(n, \varepsilon)$	least length of a uniformly relabelled fixed profile with output $\text{KL} \leq \varepsilon$	Corollary 5
$R_F^{\text{adapt}}(n, \varepsilon)$	least hard cap: least r such that some $\pi \in \mathcal{A}_r$ has $\text{KL}(p Q_\pi) \leq \varepsilon$ (a minimum on the balanced slice, Theorem 4(a))	Corollary 6(a)
<i>Full support</i> $W; p_W, Q_W$	number of ones; the target's and the output's laws of it (also: log ratio W)	§4.1
c, c', P	level $c = 2 + (\text{coordinates revealed})$; next level; $P = (1 + \text{ones revealed})/c$ (also: kept-set level t)	§4.1; per round (c_k, P_k) : App. F, Setting
band, $c_{\min}, d$	band $\{c_{\min}, \dots, 2c_{\min} - 1\}$, $c_{\min} = \lceil (n+2)^{1/4} (\ln(n+2))^8 \rceil$; level d drawn from it (also: d of (Env); $d = R - t$ of §4.2; d_U)	§4.1; formula: App. F.6
$\mathcal{N}$	cutoff size of the recursive construction	§4.1; as $\mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon_0}$: App. F.6
$\mathcal{D}_m$	divergence $F(\mu_m)$ of the construction at size m (also: D_r)	§4.1
η_n	forced lower bound on the mass of components with more than $R_0(n)$ rounds (also: η_t)	§4.1; formula: Theorem 15(a)
ϑ, ξ, ω	jump exponent ($\vartheta > 4$ in the converse), jump factor and radius factor of the converse; a <i>jump</i> takes the level from c to at least ξc^ϑ (also: ξ_t)	§4.1; App. F.5
$R_0(n), S^*$	every profile with at most $R_0(n)$ rounds has a jump; the test set of windows around the reduced fractions whose denominators q satisfy $\xi q^\vartheta \leq n+2$ (also: R)	§4.1; App. F.5
R (cap)	a cap $R \geq 1$, fixed as n grows, on the rounds of every component in Theorem 7(d) (also: levels R)	Theorem 7
U_n, R_n	the target's count law $\text{Unif}\{0, \dots, n\}$; the ideal final count law, used only in the analysis (also: $\mathcal{R}$)	§4.1; App. F.6
$L_F^{\text{ad}}(n, \varepsilon)$	least expected executed rounds, $\inf\{\mathbb{E}\tau : \pi \in \mathcal{A}_\infty, \text{KL}(p Q_\pi) \leq \varepsilon\}$ (full support)	App. F.7
r, π (App. F)	r : ratio of consecutive levels, elsewhere a local index; π : a count law (also: cap r ; policy π)	App. F, Setting (proofs of Theorems 10, 12)
<i>Bounded weights</i> w, p_w	weights in $(0, \infty)^n$; $p_w(x) \propto \prod_i w_i^{x_i}$ on strings with k ones (also: dilution w)	§4.2
Λ, κ_0	bound on $\max w / \min w$; quota bound $\kappa_0 n \leq k \leq (1 - \kappa_0)n$	§4.2
L_H^w, L_F^w	L_H and L_F for the target p_w	Theorem 8
C_t, C, f_t	nested kept sets $[n] = C_1 \supseteq \dots \supseteq C_{R+1}$, written F_t in App. I; in one round, the kept set $C = C_{t+1}$, as in App. I; retention probability $f_t = M_{t+1}/M_t$ (also: $C(\mu)$, constants C^*, C_H ; level c ; criterion F)	§4.2

Symbol	Meaning	Defined in
A, m_0	the sampler’s accuracy parameter, $A \geq 1$, with $F \leq C^*/A$ once $A \geq A_0(\Lambda, \kappa_0)$; $m_0 = \lceil 4A^2 \rceil$, the smallest ladder size (also: $A_r, \mathcal{A}_r$)	§4.2
C^*, C_H	Theorem A’s existence-only constant $C^* = C^*(\Lambda, \kappa_0)$, with $F \leq C^*/A$; the upper constant of L_H^w in Theorem 8(a) (also: $C(\mu)$; kept set C)	§4.2; App. I, (4.30)
t, R, M_t, m_j, L_t, d	level index ($\mathcal{C}_t$ is the free set at level t , which keeps $\mathcal{C}_{t+1}$); number of levels with a kept set, $R = \max\{r \geq 1 : 4m_{r-1} \leq n\}$ for $n \geq 4m_0$; nominal size of level t ; ladder sizes; one-step scale $f_t \sqrt{M_t}$; $d = R - t$ (also: cap $R, R_0(n), R_n, \mathcal{R}$; other d)	§4.2; App. I, (4.1)–(4.5)
J	quota (ones still required) among the free coordinates; in Theorem 8(b), the reservoir’s residual quota (also: J_μ)	§4.2
π_i	exact conditional marginal of coordinate i , frozen at the round’s start (also: policy π)	§4.2
q_i	independent logistic marginal at mean J ($\sum_i q_i = J$), the exact marginals being π_i	App. I, Notation discipline
$\mathcal{R}^{\text{joint}}, \mathcal{R}$	reference law (block as sampled, C completed exactly); its laws of (C, x) and of x (also: levels $R; R_n$)	§4.2
ψ	$p/\mathcal{R}$ (also: local ψ in Apps. F, G)	§4.2; App. I
W	log ratio of the exact completion of C to the sampler’s continuation (also: number of ones W)	§4.2
η_t	bound on $ \psi - 1 $ off the exceptional sets (also: η_n)	§4.2; App. I, (4.16)
$\mathcal{K}_t$	supremum over good states of the divergence from level t on	§4.2; App. I, (4.13)
ξ_t	tail terms of the recursion for $\mathcal{K}_t$ (also: jump factor ξ)	§4.2; App. I, (4.21)
<i>Two weight values</i>		
λ, p_λ	tilt of group A; $p_\lambda(x) \propto \lambda^{ x_A }$ on the slice	App. G, Setting
G_r^λ	largest probability that a causal policy with cap r meets the quota	App. K, Two groups; recursion: App. G
$F_r^*, D_r, F_r^{\text{NA}}$	least output KL at cap r : causal randomized (RAND_r); deterministic; predrawn mixtures (also: $\mathcal{D}_m$)	App. K, Two groups; formal: App. G, Corollary (a) (F_r^*), App. J
$V(s), V_{\text{root}}$	variance of the ones drawn by one round committing every free coordinate (also: slice V)	App. G, opening paragraph; display: Marginals and variance
H (entropy)	Shannon entropy, not the criterion $H(\mu)$ (also: $H(\mu)$)	App. G, second remark after Corollary (c)

Appendix B. Proofs of Lemma 1 and Theorem 2(a),(b)

Proof of Lemma 1. (a) p is supported on V ; if $q(V) > 0$, then $\ln(p(x)/q(x)) = \ln(p(x)/q(x | V)) - \ln q(V)$ for $x \in V$, and averaging over p gives (a); if $q(V) = 0$, both sides are infinite. (b) $F \leq H$ is convexity of $\text{KL}(p||\cdot)$. If $F(\mu) < \infty$, then $Q_\mu(x) > 0$ on V , $r_\mu(U | x) = \mu(U)q_U(x)/Q_\mu(x)$, and $\ln Q_\mu(x) - \ln q_U(x) = \ln \mu(U) - \ln r_\mu(U | x)$; averaging over $U \sim \mu$ and $x \sim p$ gives the identity (both sides are infinite if some q_U with $\mu(U) > 0$ vanishes somewhere on V). This identity is the cross-entropy ambiguity decomposition for arithmetic-mean ensembles (Wood et al., 2023, Prop. 15). (c) At a legal state the b_t draws of round t are independent Bernoulli(j/M), so the number of ones is $X_t \sim \text{Bin}(b_t, j/M)$ and the next state is $(M - b_t, j - X_t)$. The output lies in V exactly when no state is illegal, that is, when the count process reaches $(0, 0)$ without being killed, and the law of the count process depends only on $b(U)$. (d) For $x \in V$, $q_U(x) = \prod_t (j_{t-1}/M_{t-1})^{c_t} (1 - j_{t-1}/M_{t-1})^{b_t - c_t}$, where c_t counts the ones of x in B_t and (M_t, j_t)

is determined by $c_1, \dots, c_t$; under p the vector $(c_t)_t$ is multivariate hypergeometric with parameters $b(U)$ and k , so $\text{KL}(p\|q_U) = \mathbb{E}_p[\ln p(x) - \ln q_U(x)]$ depends only on $b(U)$. (e) For $x \in V$ every state on the path is legal, so by the product formula in (d) $q_{\sigma U}(\sigma x) = q_U(x)$ for every permutation σ of $[n]$. If $\mu(\sigma U) = \mu(U)$ for all σ and U , then $Q_\mu(\sigma x) = Q_\mu(x)$ for $x \in V$; since V is one orbit, Q_μ is constant on V , so $Q_\mu(\cdot | V) = p$ when $Q_\mu(V) > 0$, and (a) gives $F(\mu) = -\ln Q_\mu(V)$. For any law Q with $Q(\sigma x) = Q(x)$ for all σ and $x \in V$ the last two steps apply verbatim: Q is constant on the orbit V , so $Q(\cdot | V) = p$ when $Q(V) > 0$, and (a) gives $\text{KL}(p\|Q) = -\ln Q(V)$ (both sides are infinite when $Q(V) = 0$). $\square$

A pointwise mixture bound. If Q and Q' are laws on the same finite set and $Q \geq wQ'$ pointwise for some $w \in (0, 1]$, then $\text{KL}(p\|Q) \leq \text{KL}(p\|Q') + \ln(1/w)$. If $\text{KL}(p\|Q') = +\infty$ there is nothing to prove; otherwise $Q'(x) > 0$ wherever $p(x) > 0$, so $Q(x) \geq wQ'(x) > 0$ there and $\ln(p(x)/Q(x)) \leq \ln(p(x)/Q'(x)) + \ln(1/w)$, and averaging over $x \sim p$ gives the bound. Corollary 6(c) uses it for a mixture $Q = wQ' + (1-w)Q''$.

Proof of Theorem 2(a). Let U have block sizes $b_1, \dots, b_R$, residual sizes $M_0 = n > M_1 > \dots > M_R = 0$, and $\rho_t = b_t/M_{t-1} \in (0, 1]$ ($\rho_R = 1$). Write $d_U = \text{KL}(p\|q_U)$, $a_U = \sum_t \rho_t$, $\beta_U = \sum_t \rho_t^2$. Small divergence forces the fractions ρ_t to add up to nearly $\mathcal{H}_n$ while their squares add up to $O(1)$: Steps 1–4 prove $a_U \geq \mathcal{H}_n - 2d_U$ and $\beta_U \leq 4d_U + S_n$, and the key step is the per-reveal entropy decrement, the increment bound of Step 2, a Pinsker bound. Both bounds are affine in d_U , so Step 5 averages them over a feasible mixture, and Cauchy–Schwarz over the rounds before the last gives $(\mathbb{E}_\mu a - 1)^2 \leq (C(\mu) - 1)(\mathbb{E}_\mu \beta - 1)$, which forces $C(\mu)$ to be at least of order $(\ln n)^2$ at fixed ε ; Step 6 bounds the two harmonic sums to give the last form of Theorem 2(a).

Step 1 (chain identity). Let h be the binary entropy in nats and $H_1(M) = \mathbb{E} h(J_M/M)$, where J_M is the number of ones among M unrevealed coordinates under p (hypergeometric; by exchangeability it depends only on M). Given the state before round t , where J ones remain among the $M = M_{t-1}$ unrevealed coordinates, each coordinate of B_t is one with probability J/M under p , and the round- t factor of q_U is $(J/M)^{c_t}(1 - J/M)^{b_t - c_t}$, with c_t the number of ones in B_t ; so the target expectation of minus its log, given the state, is $b_t h(J/M)$. As J has the law of $J_{M_{t-1}}$, and $-\ln p = \ln \binom{n}{k}$ on V , $d_U = \sum_t b_t H_1(M_{t-1}) - \ln \binom{n}{k}$. The all-singleton schedule is exact, so $\sum_{m=1}^n H_1(m) = \ln \binom{n}{k}$ and $d_U = \sum_t \sum_{M_t < m \leq M_{t-1}} [H_1(M_{t-1}) - H_1(m)]$.

Step 2 (increment). For $2 \leq m \leq n$, $H_1(m) - H_1(m-1) \geq n/(2(n-1)m(m-1))$. Indeed, with $P = J_m/m$ and one more revealed coordinate $X \sim \text{Bernoulli}(P)$, $P' = (J_m - X)/(m-1)$ satisfies $\mathbb{E}[P' | P] = P$, and $\mathbb{E} h(P') = H_1(m-1)$ because $J_m - X$ has the law of J_{m-1} under p ; so $h(P) - \mathbb{E}[h(P') | P] = \mathbb{E}[d(P'\|P) | P] \geq 2\mathbb{E}[(P' - P)^2 | P] = 2P(1-P)/(m-1)^2$. The equality holds because $d(x\|y) = h(y) - h(x) + (y-x) \ln \frac{y}{1-y}$ for $y \in (0, 1)$ and $\mathbb{E}[P' - P | P] = 0$ (if $P \in \{0, 1\}$ then $P' = P$ and both sides vanish); the inequality is Pinsker's inequality for the binary KL divergence $d(\cdot\|\cdot)$ in nats; and $P' - P = (P - X)/(m-1)$ has conditional variance $P(1-P)/(m-1)^2$. Finally J_m is hypergeometric with $\mathbb{E} J_m = m/2$ and $\text{Var } J_m = \frac{m}{4} \cdot \frac{n-m}{n-1}$ (as $k = n/2$), so $\mathbb{E} P(1-P) = \frac{1}{4} - \text{Var}(J_m)/m^2 = \frac{1}{4} \left(1 - \frac{n-m}{m(n-1)}\right) = n(m-1)/(4m(n-1))$.

Step 3. For $M_t < m \leq M_{t-1}$, summing Step 2 over the indices $m+1, \dots, M_{t-1}$, where $1/(m'(m'-1)) = 1/(m'-1) - 1/m'$ telescopes, gives $H_1(M_{t-1}) - H_1(m) \geq c_n(1/m - 1/M_{t-1})$ with $c_n = n/(2(n-1)) \geq \frac{1}{2}$; summing over the block and over t , $d_U \geq c_n(\mathcal{H}_n - a_U)$, where $\mathcal{H}_n - a_U = \sum_t \sum_{M_t < m \leq M_{t-1}} (1/m - 1/M_{t-1}) \geq 0$ termwise; so $a_U \geq \mathcal{H}_n - 2d_U$.

Step 4. For one block of size b taken from M , $1/m \geq 1/M + (M - m)/M^2$, so $\sum_{m=M-b+1}^M (1/m - 1/M) \geq b(b - 1)/(2M^2)$ and $(b/M)^2 \leq 2 \sum_{m=M-b+1}^M (1/m - 1/M) + \sum_{m=M-b+1}^M 1/m^2$. Summing over blocks and using Step 3, $\beta_U \leq 2(\mathcal{H}_n - a_U) + S_n \leq 4d_U + S_n$.

Step 5 (mixtures). The bounds of Steps 3–4 are affine in d_U , so averaging them over a mixture with $\mathbb{E}_\mu d_U \leq \varepsilon$ gives $\mathbb{E}_\mu a \geq \mathcal{H}_n - 2\varepsilon$ and $\mathbb{E}_\mu \beta \leq 4\varepsilon + S_n$. Dropping the last block of each schedule ($\rho_R = 1$) and applying Cauchy–Schwarz to the measure $\mu(U) \times (\text{counting over } t < |U|)$, $(\mathbb{E}_\mu a - 1)^2 \leq (C(\mu) - 1)(\mathbb{E}_\mu \beta - 1)$. If $\mathcal{H}_n - 2\varepsilon - 1 > 0$ this gives $C(\mu) \geq 1 + (\mathcal{H}_n - 2\varepsilon - 1)^2/(4\varepsilon + S_n - 1)$; otherwise $C(\mu) \geq 1$ trivially. The bound $C(\mu) \geq \mathbb{E}_\mu a \geq \mathcal{H}_n - 2\varepsilon$ gives the middle term of the maximum in Theorem 2(a).

Step 6. $\mathcal{H}_n \geq \ln(n + 1)$ and $S_n - 1 \leq \sum_{m \geq 2} (1/(m - \frac{1}{2}) - 1/(m + \frac{1}{2})) = 2/3$. $\square$

Theorem 2(a)’s rate from a prior depth bound. Theorem 2(a)’s rate also follows from [Wen et al. \(2026, Theorem 11\)](#), the deterministic depth bound described in Section 1 (depth: their least mean number of rounds over draws from the target; for a fixed schedule, its length), by a Markov argument. If $H(\mu) \leq \varepsilon$, the components with $\text{KL}(p||q_U) \leq 2\varepsilon$ carry μ -mass at least $\frac{1}{2}$. Each is a fixed schedule, a deterministic policy whose depth is $|U|$ on every path, so their Theorem 11 at tolerance 2ε ($2\varepsilon/\ln 2$ bits) gives $|U| = \Omega_\varepsilon(\log^2 n)$ for each of them, and $C(\mu) \geq \frac{1}{2} \min |U|$. Appendix P compares the paper with selected related work.

Proof of Theorem 2(b). For a parameter $K \geq 1$, the witness relabels uniformly one profile that, when $n > 8K$, brings the number of unrevealed coordinates down to $8K$ through the rungs of a ladder, each rung about the square root of the next one up (the first bulk round goes from n to the highest rung below it), and then commits the last $8K$ coordinates as singletons. By Lemma 1(e) its F is $-\ln$ of its success probability, and the key step is that, before failure, the fraction of ones still required is a martingale whose conditional variances over the bulk rounds sum to less than $1/(4K)$. In this proof j indexes the rungs M_j of the ladder, which are visited in decreasing order of j , and is not the quota of a count state. Let $M_j = K^{2^{j+2}} 2^{2^j}$, so $M_0 = 8K$, $M_j = M_{j-1}^2/(K 2^j)$ and $M_j \geq 2^{2^j}$. Let T be the least index with $n \leq M_T$ ($T \leq \lceil \log_2 \log_2 n \rceil$). Use blocks that reduce the number of unrevealed coordinates from n to M_{T-1} , then $M_{T-2}, \dots, M_0$, then M_0 singletons (if $n \leq M_0$, use n singletons), so at most $\min\{n, T + M_0\} \leq \min\{n, \lceil \log_2 \log_2 n \rceil + 8K\}$ rounds. Write N_t and J_t for the numbers of unrevealed coordinates and of ones still required after round t . Before failure, $P_t = J_t/N_t$ satisfies $P_{t+1} - P_t = (b_t P_t - X_t)/N_{t+1}$, where $b_t = N_t - N_{t+1}$ is the size of round $t + 1$ ’s block and, given the past, $X_t \sim \text{Bin}(b_t, P_t)$ is the number of ones it draws; this is a martingale difference with conditional variance at most $b_t/(4N_{t+1}^2)$ that is a sum of b_t independent terms of range $1/N_{t+1}$. Freeze P at its first exit from $(0, 1)$ and let $S = \sum_{\text{bulk } t} b_t/N_{t+1}^2$. A bulk round that ends at M_{j-1} starts from at most M_j , so $b_t/N_{t+1}^2 \leq M_j/M_{j-1}^2 = 2^{-j}/K$, and $S \leq \sum_{j=1}^T 2^{-j}/K < 1/K$. Kolmogorov’s maximal inequality for martingales (Doob’s) gives $\Pr(\max_t |P_t - \frac{1}{2}| \geq \frac{1}{2}) \leq 4 \cdot S/4 < 1/K$. For the second choice of K : given the past, $P_{t+1} - P_t = \sum_{i \leq b_t} (P_t - \xi_i)/N_{t+1}$ with ξ_i independent Bernoulli(P_t), a sum of b_t independent mean-zero terms of range $1/N_{t+1}$, so Hoeffding’s lemma gives $\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda(P_{t+1} - P_t)} | \mathcal{F}_t] \leq \exp(\lambda^2 b_t/(8N_{t+1}^2))$ for every real λ . As the block sizes are fixed and the frozen process has zero increments, $\exp(\lambda(P_t - \frac{1}{2}) - \lambda^2 S_t/8)$, with S_t the partial sums of S , is a nonnegative supermartingale started at 1, and Ville’s inequality gives $\Pr(\max_t (P_t - \frac{1}{2}) \geq \frac{1}{2}) \leq \exp(-\lambda/2 + \lambda^2 S/8)$ for $\lambda > 0$, that is $e^{-1/(2S)}$ at $\lambda = 2/S$. With the same bound for $\frac{1}{2} - P_t$, $\Pr(\max_t |P_t - \frac{1}{2}| \geq \frac{1}{2}) \leq 2e^{-1/(2S)} < 2e^{-K/2}$. A bulk round fails only if P leaves $(0, 1)$; boundary values are safe and a singleton round from a legal state

never fails, so success is at least $1 - \delta$ with $K = \lceil 1/\delta \rceil$ or $K = \lceil 2 \ln(2/\delta) \rceil$. Relabelling uniformly makes Q_μ exchangeable, and Lemma 1(e) gives $F = -\ln(\text{success}) \leq \varepsilon$. $\square$

Appendix C. Proof of the fixed-schedule upper bound in Theorem 2(c)

We prove the bound of Theorem 2(c) in explicit form: for $n \geq 16$ and $0 < \varepsilon \leq \ln 2$, one fixed geometric schedule gives $L_H(n, \varepsilon) \leq (\ln n)(\ln n + 2)/\varepsilon + 1$; for $\varepsilon > \ln 2$, $L_H(n, \varepsilon) \leq L_H(n, \ln 2)$, as L_H is nonincreasing in ε . As in Appendix B, a labelled schedule U has block sizes $b_1, \dots, b_R$ ($|U| = R$) and residual sizes $M_0 = n > M_1 > \dots > M_R = 0$, so block t is drawn when M_{t-1} coordinates are unrevealed. Step 1 bounds the divergence of the target's law of one block from the product law that a round draws, Step 2 adds these bounds over a fixed schedule, Step 3 bounds the sum for a geometric profile, and Step 4 chooses its fraction $\alpha = \varepsilon / \ln n$.

Step 1 (per-block bound). At a legal state (M, j) let $\text{WOR}(M, j, b)$ be the law of the bits of $b \leq M$ unrevealed coordinates under p (sampling b balls without replacement from an urn with j ones among M), and let $\text{Bernoulli}(j/M)^{\otimes b}$ be the law of the independent bits that one round commits there. Then

$$\text{KL}(\text{WOR}(M, j, b) \parallel \text{Bernoulli}(j/M)^{\otimes b}) \leq \frac{b(b-1)}{2(M-1)(M-b+1)} \quad (\text{read as 0 for } b=1).$$

This is the two-colour case of a bound of Stam (1978): both laws are uniform given their number of ones, so their divergence is that of the hypergeometric and binomial counts. We include a short proof. *Proof.* If $j/M \in \{0, 1\}$ both laws are the same point mass. Otherwise, by the chain rule with a product reference, $\text{KL} = \sum_{i=1}^b \mathbb{E} \text{KL}(\text{Bernoulli}(P_i) \parallel \text{Bernoulli}(P_1))$, where $P_i = (j - c_{<i})/(M - i + 1)$ is the fraction of ones left after $i - 1$ draws, $c_{<i}$ being the number of ones among those draws (so $P_1 = j/M$). Moreover $\text{KL}(\text{Bernoulli}(a) \parallel \text{Bernoulli}(P_1)) \leq \chi^2 = (a - P_1)^2/(P_1(1 - P_1))$. Under sampling without replacement $\mathbb{E}P_i = P_1$ and $\text{Var } P_i = P_1(1 - P_1)(i - 1)/((M - 1)(M - i + 1))$, because $c_{<i}$ is hypergeometric with mean $(i - 1)P_1$ and variance $(i - 1)P_1(1 - P_1)(M - i + 1)/(M - 1)$, and $P_i = (j - c_{<i})/(M - i + 1)$. So the i -th term is at most $(i - 1)/((M - 1)(M - i + 1)) \leq (i - 1)/((M - 1)(M - b + 1))$; summing over i gives the claim. $\square$

Step 2 (fixed schedules). For a fixed schedule U with size profile $b = (b_1, \dots, b_R)$,

$$\text{KL}(p \parallel q_U) \leq \Phi(b) := \sum_{t=1}^R \frac{b_t(b_t - 1)}{2(M_{t-1} - 1)(M_{t-1} - b_t + 1)},$$

by the chain rule over blocks (every $x \in V$ passes only through legal states; given the committed prefix, the bits of block t have law $\text{WOR}(M_{t-1}, j, b_t)$ under p and $\text{Bernoulli}(j/M_{t-1})^{\otimes b_t}$ under q_U) and Step 1; M_{t-1} is deterministic for a fixed schedule, so no expectation over j remains.

Step 3 (geometric profile). For $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$ let $b_t = \max(1, \lfloor \alpha M_{t-1} \rfloor)$ (geometric, then singletons). Then: (i) each block with $b_t \geq 2$ contributes at most $\alpha^2/(2(1 - \alpha))$ to $\Phi(b)$, because $b(b - 1) \leq \alpha^2 M(M - 1)$ and $M - b + 1 > (1 - \alpha)M$ (here $b = b_t$, $M = M_{t-1}$); (ii) the blocks with $b_t \geq 2$ come first, as b_t is nonincreasing; while $b_t \geq 2$, $M_t - 1/\alpha \leq (1 - \alpha)(M_{t-1} - 1/\alpha)$, as $b_t = \lfloor \alpha M_{t-1} \rfloor > \alpha M_{t-1} - 1$, and $b_t \geq 2$ needs $M_{t-1} - 1/\alpha \geq 1/\alpha$, so if there are $N_2 \geq 1$ such blocks then $1/\alpha \leq M_{N_2-1} - 1/\alpha \leq (1 - \alpha)^{N_2-1}(n - 1/\alpha) < ne^{-\alpha(N_2-1)}$; hence $N_2 \leq \max\{0, \ln(n\alpha)/\alpha + 1\}$, and these blocks are followed by fewer than $2/\alpha$ singletons (which

contribute 0); (iii) $\Phi(b) \leq \max\{0, (\alpha \ln(n\alpha) + \alpha^2)/(2(1 - \alpha))\}$ and $|U| \leq \max\{0, \ln(n\alpha)/\alpha + 1\} + 2/\alpha$.

Step 4 (the choice $\alpha = \varepsilon/\ln n$). Take $\alpha = \varepsilon/\ln n$. For $n \geq 16$ and $0 < \varepsilon \leq \ln 2$ (so $\alpha \leq \frac{1}{4}$ and $\varepsilon/\ln^2 n \leq 0.091$), $\Phi(b) \leq \varepsilon(1.091)/1.5 < \varepsilon$. Hence, by Step 2 and (iii), this geometric schedule U has $\text{KL}(p\|q_U) < \varepsilon$ and $|U| \leq (\ln n)(\ln n + 2)/\varepsilon + 1$. The point mass at U has $H = \text{KL}(p\|q_U)$ and $C = |U|$, so

$$L_H(n, \varepsilon) \leq (\ln n)(\ln n + 2)/\varepsilon + 1,$$

and the same bound holds for the least length of a single fixed schedule with $\text{KL}(p\|q_U) \leq \varepsilon$ (Corollary 5). $\square$

Remark (asymptotic constant). With $\alpha = \varepsilon/\ln n$, only $|U| \leq (1 + o(1))(\ln n)^2/\varepsilon$ follows: this choice uses only about half of the KL budget, as the chain's bound on Φ is then $(1 + o(1))\varepsilon/2$. With $\alpha = 2\varepsilon/\ln n$, the same chain gives $\Phi(b) \leq \max\{0, \alpha \ln(n\alpha) + \alpha^2\}/(2(1 - \alpha))$, which is at most ε once $\ln(\ln n/(2\varepsilon)) \geq 2\varepsilon(1 + 1/\ln n)$ ($n \gtrsim 10^3$ at $\varepsilon = \ln 2$; $n \geq 16$ for $\varepsilon \leq 0.3$). This gives a single fixed schedule with $\text{KL}(p\|q_U) \leq \varepsilon$ and $|U| \leq (1 + o(1))(\ln n)^2/(2\varepsilon)$ (for fixed ε , as $n \rightarrow \infty$).

Appendix D. Proof of the survival envelope

Proposition 9 For $r \geq 1$ and legal (M, j) with $d = \min(j, M - j)$,

$$G_r(M, j) \leq \min\{1, A_r(d + 1)^{-\alpha_r}\}, \quad A_r = 6^{2-2^{2-r}} < 36, \quad \alpha_r = 2^{-r}. \quad (\text{Env})$$

This is the envelope of Section 3; Theorem 4(b) and Corollaries 5 and 6 use it (Appendix E). The prefactors satisfy $A_1 = 1$ and $A_{r+1} = A_r 6^{2^{1-r}}$, so $A_r = 6^{\sum_{s=1}^{r-1} 2^{1-s}} < 6^2$; for example $A_2 = 6$ and $A_3 = 6^{3/2}$.

Notation. For legal (M, j) with $M \geq 1$ write $\theta = j/M$, so that $d = M \min(\theta, 1 - \theta)$, and write $d(M', j') = \min(j', M' - j')$. For a block of size b at (M, j) let $m = M - b$. The surviving successor quotas are $j' \in [0, m]$, with kernel $K_b(j, j') = \text{Bin}(b, \theta)(j - j')$ (killed mass dropped, never renormalized, so $\sum_{j'} K_b(j, j') \leq 1$). Put $d' = d(m, j')$ and, for $\alpha \geq 0$, $T_b(\alpha) = \sum_{j'=0}^m K_b(j, j') (d' + 1)^{-\alpha}$.

Plan. Only two estimates are analytic: the $r = 1$ success is a central binomial atom, (A1), and one round bounds the expected potential of the next minority count, $T_b(\frac{1}{2}) \leq 6(d + 1)^{-1/4}$, (A3), with the uniform atom bound (A2) as a tool. The exponent halves once per round: (A3) takes the exponent $\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{1}{4}$, and the Cauchy–Schwarz halving (A4), iterated, gives $T_b(2^{-r}) \leq T_b(\frac{1}{2})^{2^{1-r}}$, so the same step applies at every exponent 2^{-r} ; the induction collects one factor $6^{2^{1-r}}$ per round into A_r .

(A1) *Central atom.* $\text{Bin}(M, j/M)(j) \leq (d + 1)^{-1/2}$; for $d \geq 1$, even $\text{Bin}(M, j/M)(j) \leq (\pi d)^{-1/2}$. *Proof.* If $d = 0$ the atom is 1. For $1 \leq j \leq M - 1$ let $\varsigma(t) = t!/(\sqrt{t}(t/e)^t)$, which decreases to $\sqrt{2\pi}$: $\ln(\varsigma(t+1)/\varsigma(t)) = 1 - (t + \frac{1}{2})\ln(1 + \frac{1}{t}) < 0$ because $\ln(1 + x) > 2x/(2 + x)$ for $x > 0$, and the limit is Stirling's formula. Then

$$\text{Bin}(M, j/M)(j) = \binom{M}{j} \frac{j^j (M - j)^{M-j}}{M^M} = \frac{\varsigma(M)}{\varsigma(j) \varsigma(M - j)} \sqrt{\frac{M}{j(M - j)}}.$$

Since $\varsigma(M) \leq \varsigma(M - j)$ and $\varsigma(j) \geq \sqrt{2\pi}$, the fraction is at most $1/\sqrt{2\pi}$. And $M/(j(M - j)) = 1/j + 1/(M - j) \leq 2/d$. So the atom is at most $(\pi d)^{-1/2} \leq (d + 1)^{-1/2}$, because $\pi d \geq d + 1$ for $d \geq 1$. $\square$

At $(M, j) = (n, k)$, the central binomial local limit gives $-\ln G_1(n, k) = \frac{1}{2} \ln(\pi n/2) + o(1)$.

(A2) *Uniform atom.* For $b \geq 1$, $\theta \in [0, 1]$, $\nu := b \min(\theta, 1 - \theta)$ and every integer z , $\text{Bin}(b, \theta)(z)^2 \nu \leq 49/16$. *Proof.* If $\nu \leq 49/16$ use $\text{Bin}(b, \theta)(z) \leq 1$. Otherwise let $d_z = \min(z, b - z)$ (for $z \in [0, b]$; for other z , $\text{Bin}(b, \theta)(z) = 0$). *Bulk:* if $d_z + 1 \geq (16/49)\nu$, the map $\theta' \mapsto \text{Bin}(b, \theta')(z)$ is maximised at $\theta' = z/b$ (the maximum-likelihood value), so by (A1) with $(M, j) = (b, z)$, $\text{Bin}(b, \theta)(z)^2 \leq 1/(d_z + 1) \leq 49/(16\nu)$. *Edge:* if $d_z + 1 < (16/49)\nu$, then z (or $b - z$) is $< (16/49)\nu$, while $b\theta \geq \nu$ and $b(1 - \theta) \geq \nu$, so $|z - b\theta| > (33/49)\nu$. Chebyshev's inequality with variance $b\theta(1 - \theta) \leq \nu$ gives $\text{Bin}(b, \theta)(z) \leq (49/33)^2/\nu$, hence $\text{Bin}(b, \theta)(z)^2 \nu \leq (49/33)^4/\nu < (49/33)^4 \cdot 16/49 < 1.6 < 49/16$. $\square$

(A3) *One step at exponent $\frac{1}{2}$.* For $1 \leq b \leq M$ and $0 \leq j \leq M$, $T_b(\frac{1}{2}) \leq \min\{1, 6(d+1)^{-1/4}\}$.

The proof of (A3) below splits by block size. A block with $8b < 7M$ leaves more than $M/8$ coordinates unrevealed, enough to absorb the binomial fluctuation of its draws, so by Chebyshev's inequality the next minority count d' exceeds $d/16$ except with probability below $256/d$. A larger block may leave too few coordinates for that, but then every atom of the kernel is at most $(7/4)\nu^{-1/2}$ by (A2), and a cutoff estimate bounds the contribution of small d' . We first record that estimate. *Cutoff.* If $K_b(j, j') \leq a$ for all j' , then for every integer $v_0 \geq 1$, $T_b(\frac{1}{2}) \leq 4a\sqrt{v_0} + (v_0 + 1)^{-1/2}$. Indeed, split the j' with $d' < v_0$ from the rest. The rest contribute at most $(v_0 + 1)^{-1/2} \sum_{j'} K_b(j, j') \leq (v_0 + 1)^{-1/2}$. For the j' with $d' < v_0$, split $[0, m]$ at $m/2$: for $j' \leq m/2$, $d' = j'$; for $j' > m/2$, $d' = m - j'$. So on each half every value $d' \in \{0, \dots, v_0 - 1\}$ occurs at most once, the weights $(d' + 1)^{-1/2}$ run over $1^{-1/2}, \dots, v_0^{-1/2}$ at most once per half, and $\sum_{v=1}^{v_0} v^{-1/2} \leq 2\sqrt{v_0}$; with $K_b(j, j') \leq a$ this part is at most $4a\sqrt{v_0}$.

Proof of (A3). $T_b(\frac{1}{2}) \leq \sum_{j'} K_b(j, j') \leq 1$ always; since $6(d+1)^{-1/4} \geq 1$ if and only if $d \leq 1295$ ($6^4 = 1296$), assume $d \geq 1295$. *Small blocks*, $8b < 7M$. Let $\gamma = m/M > 1/8$ and $X = j - j' \sim \text{Bin}(b, \theta)$. Write $j' = \theta m + (\theta b - X)$. If $|X - \theta b| < \gamma d/2$, then $j' > \theta m - \gamma d/2$ and $m - j' > (1 - \theta)m - \gamma d/2$, and $\min(\theta m, (1 - \theta)m) = \gamma d$, so $d' > \gamma d/2 > d/16$ and those j' contribute at most $(d/16)^{-1/2} = 4/\sqrt{d}$. The complementary event has probability at most $b\theta(1 - \theta)/(\gamma d/2)^2 \leq d/(\gamma^2 d^2/4) < 256/d$ (using $b\theta(1 - \theta) \leq M \min(\theta, 1 - \theta) = d$). So $T_b(\frac{1}{2}) \leq 4/\sqrt{d} + 256/d \leq 6(d+1)^{-1/4}$ for $d \geq 1295$ (the ratio $(4d^{-1/2} + 256d^{-1})(d+1)^{1/4}/6$ decreases in d (its logarithmic derivative is at most $-\frac{1}{2d} + \frac{1}{4(d+1)} < 0$) and is 0.309 at $d = 1295$; the inequality is also kernel-checked as `AGF.agfv_c08s_S_numeric`). *Large blocks*, $8b \geq 7M$. Here $\nu = b \min(\theta, 1 - \theta) \geq (7/8)d$. By (A2), $K_b(j, j') \leq a := (7/4)\nu^{-1/2}$. Take $v_0 = \lfloor \sqrt{d} \rfloor / 8$ (this cutoff balances the two terms of the estimate below: with $56v_0^2 \leq \nu$ the small- d' term is at most $\sqrt{7/8} v_0^{-1/2}$, like the cutoff term, and both are of order $d^{-1/4}$); for $d \geq 1295$: $v_0 \geq 4$, $56v_0^2 \leq 7d/8 \leq \nu$, and $\sqrt{d+1} \leq 8(v_0 + 1)$ (since $\lfloor \sqrt{d} \rfloor \geq 35$ and $8v_0 \leq \lfloor \sqrt{d} \rfloor \leq 8v_0 + 7$). By the cutoff estimate,

$$T_b(\frac{1}{2}) \leq \frac{7\sqrt{v_0}}{\sqrt{\nu}} + (v_0 + 1)^{-1/2} \leq \sqrt{7/8} v_0^{-1/2} + (v_0 + 1)^{-1/2} \leq \frac{6}{\sqrt{8(v_0 + 1)}} \leq 6(d+1)^{-1/4},$$

where the third inequality holds for $v_0 \geq 4$ (it is equivalent to $1 + 1/v_0 \leq c^2$ with $c = (3/\sqrt{2} - 1)\sqrt{8/7}$, i.e. to $v_0 \geq 2.29$; the three facts and this inequality are also kernel-checked inside `AGF.agfv_c08s_step_regimeF` and `AGF.agfv_c08s_F_numeric`). $\square$

(A4) *Cauchy-Schwarz halving.* $T_b(\alpha)^2 \leq (\sum_{j'} K_b(j, j')) T_b(2\alpha) \leq T_b(2\alpha)$, by Cauchy-Schwarz on $\sum_{j'} K_b(j, j')^{1/2} \cdot K_b(j, j')^{1/2} (d' + 1)^{-\alpha}$. Iterating, $T_b(2^{-(t+1)})^{2^t} \leq T_b(\frac{1}{2})$ for all $t \geq 0$. $\square$

Proof of the proposition. Induction on r . $G_r \leq 1$ for all r (each b -term is at most $\sum_{j'} K_b(j, j') \cdot 1$), so it suffices to show $G_r(M, j) \leq A_r(d+1)^{-\alpha_r}$. If $M = 0$, the only legal state is $(0, 0)$, where $d = 0$ and $G_r(0, 0) = 1 \leq A_r$, as $A_r \geq 1$. Let $M \geq 1$. For $r = 1$ only $b = M$ survives the horizon, so $G_1(M, j) = \text{Bin}(M, \theta)(j) \leq (d+1)^{-1/2} = A_1(d+1)^{-\alpha_1}$ by (A1). Step $r \rightarrow r+1$ ($r \geq 1$): by the induction hypothesis at every legal successor (including $m = 0$), for every b

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j'} K_b(j, j') G_r(m, j') &\leq A_r T_b(\alpha_r) \leq A_r T_b(\tfrac{1}{2})^{2^{1-r}} \quad ((A4) \text{ with } t = r-1) \\ &\leq A_r [6(d+1)^{-1/4}]^{2^{1-r}} = A_r 6^{2^{1-r}} (d+1)^{-2^{-(r+1)}} \quad ((A3)); \end{aligned}$$

maximise over b . Since $A_r 6^{2^{1-r}} = A_{r+1}$ and $2^{-(r+1)} = \alpha_{r+1}$, this is the claim for $r+1$. $\square$

Where substochasticity is used. In the final induction, after (A3) is established, substochasticity enters through (A4) and $G_r \leq 1$; (A3)'s cutoff and trivial-range arguments also use $\sum_{j'} K_b(j, j') \leq 1$.

The κ_r form. Put $\kappa_r = 2 \cdot 6^{r-1}$. Then $A_1 < \kappa_1$, and $A_{r+1} \leq 6A_r$ while $\kappa_{r+1} = 6\kappa_r$, so $A_r \leq \kappa_r$ for every $r \geq 1$ and the proposition implies $G_r(M, j) \leq \min\{1, \kappa_r(d+1)^{-\alpha_r}\}$. At the balanced start $(M, j) = (n, k)$, $d = k$, this reads $G_r(n, k) \leq \min\{1, 2 \cdot 6^{r-1}(k+1)^{-2^{-r}}\} =: \Gamma_r(n)$. Step 6 of the single-horizon bound in Appendix E is stated with this form; Appendix Q lists the kernel-checked declarations for both forms.

At the balanced start the proposition's bound is non-vacuous only for $n > 2590$ at $r = 2$, only for $n > 4.3 \cdot 10^9$ at $r = 3$, and only for larger n as r grows (the κ_r form needs $n > 4.1 \cdot 10^4$ and $n > 1.4 \cdot 10^{15}$): although it holds at every n , it is informative only at large n , and finite exhibits must use the exact G_r from the recursion. The proposition is a statement about the recursion only. It reaches samplers through the tower argument of Appendix E (Lemma 3, on which Theorem 4(a) and Corollary 6(b) rest) or, for fixed schedules, through that argument's elementary special case $s(b) \leq G_{|b|}(n, k)$ (Lemma 3(a)). At $(M, j) = (n, k)$ it gives the lower side of Theorem 4(b), the lower bound for relabelled profiles in Corollary 5 and the lower bounds of Corollary 6(a),(b); Theorem 4(a) itself is exact and does not use it.

Appendix E. Proofs of Lemma 3, Theorem 4 and Corollary 6

Every converse bound in this appendix starts from one fact: given the seed and the committed history, a round's draws are Bernoulli(j/M) products whose law depends only on the count state, so G of the remaining horizon is a supermartingale and no policy in $\mathcal{A}_\infty$ reaches $(0, 0)$ within t rounds with probability above $G_t(n, k)$ (Lemma 3(a)). With Lemma 1(a), Lemma 3(a) gives $\text{KL}(p \| Q_\pi) \geq -\ln G_r(n, k)$ for every $\pi \in \mathcal{A}_r$, and a maximizing count-state rule applied in a uniformly random order attains equality by Lemma 1(e) (Theorem 4(a)). A valid output with $\tau \leq s$ needs the state to reach $(0, 0)$ within s rounds, so $\Pr(\tau > s) \geq Q_\pi(V) - G_s(n, k)$, and summing these tails bounds $\mathbb{E}\tau$ from below (Lemma 3(b)); Corollary 6 combines these facts with (Env), the ladder of Theorem 2(b) and, in part (c), its dilution by the one-round schedule. The next paragraph proves Lemma 3(b), Theorem 4(a) and Corollary 6(c) and outlines Lemma 3(a); the paragraphs after it give the details of Lemma 3(a), the proof of Corollary 6(a),(b) and the total-variation forms, and Appendix E.1 proves Theorem 4(b).

Proofs of Lemma 3(b), Theorem 4(a) and Corollary 6(c), with an outline of the rest. Lemma 3(a): for a fixed profile the success satisfies the recursion with the maximum replaced by the prescribed

block size, so $s(b) \leq G_{|b|}(n, k)$, with $|b|$ the number of blocks, by induction, and G_r is non-decreasing in r ; for a general policy, conditionally on the seed and history the next draws are Bernoulli(j/M) products whose law depends only on (M, j) , so induction on the remaining horizon with the tower property bounds the conditional success by G at the current state. Lemma 3(b): if $\tau = \infty$ with positive probability there is nothing to prove; otherwise, since every path executes at least one round (there are $n \geq 2$ coordinates to commit), $\mathbb{E}\tau = 1 + \sum_{s \geq 1} \Pr(\tau > s)$ and $\Pr(\tau > s) \geq \Pr(\text{valid output}) - \Pr(\text{valid output}, \tau \leq s) \geq Q_\pi(V) - G_s(n, k)$: a valid output with $\tau \leq s$ means that the state reaches $(0, 0)$ within s rounds, which has probability at most $G_s(n, k)$ by Lemma 3(a), so the rest of the valid mass lies on $\{\tau > s\}$. Summing over $s \geq 1$ gives the first form, and keeping only the terms with $s \leq t$, where $G_s \leq G_t$, gives the second. Theorem 4(a): ($\geq$) $\text{KL} \geq -\ln Q_\pi(V)$ by Lemma 1(a), and $Q_\pi(V) \leq G_r(n, k)$ by Lemma 3(a), since every $\pi \in \mathcal{A}_r$ is complete after r rounds almost surely. ($\leq$) The optimal count-state rule commits, at each legal state, a block size that attains the maximum in the recursion for G at that state and the remaining horizon, so its success obeys the recursion with the maximum attained; applied in the order of an independent uniform permutation of the coordinates, it therefore succeeds with probability $G_r(n, k)$, by induction on the horizon, and it lies in $\mathcal{A}_r$: at a remaining horizon of one round only $b = M$ has positive value, and after any nonfinal illegal transition the rule commits all remaining coordinates in the next round, so every path is complete after r rounds. The lower bounds hold for every policy complete within r rounds almost surely, and the optimal rule is complete after r rounds for every seed and every word (sequence of drawn values), including words of probability zero; so the stronger reading of the cap, on every seed and every word (CapEvery in Appendix Q), gives the same optimum as the almost-sure cap of Section 2. On V the rule's output law is invariant under every permutation of the coordinates, because the order is uniform and on legal paths the block sizes and draws depend only on counts; so Lemma 1(e) gives $\text{KL} = -\ln G_r(n, k)$. Theorem 4(b): the lower side is (Env) at (n, k) ; the upper side is proved at the end of this appendix. Corollary 6(c): build the construction of Theorem 2(b) for a failure probability $\delta_n \rightarrow 0$ (slowly, so that its length stays $\log_2 \ln n + o(\log \log n)$); it succeeds with probability at least $1 - \delta_n$, and $\delta_n \leq \delta$ ensures that the weight $w = e^{-\varepsilon}/(1 - \delta_n)$ is at most 1; mix it with weight w against the one-round schedule, a cheap schedule that usually fails, and relabel. The ladder alone gives the mixture success at least $w(1 - \delta_n) = e^{-\varepsilon}$, and the mixture is relabelling-invariant, so $F = -\ln(\text{success}) \leq \varepsilon$ (equivalently, the pointwise mixture bound of Appendix B gives $F \leq -\ln(1 - \delta_n) + \ln(1/w) = \varepsilon$); meanwhile the ladder's rounds are charged with weight only $w \rightarrow e^{-\varepsilon}$, which gives the factor $e^{-\varepsilon}$ in the leading coefficient of the upper bound; the matching lower bound, and hence the equality in (c), is (b), proved below. The cost is at most $e^{-\varepsilon}(\lceil \log_2 \log_2 n \rceil + 8K)/(1 - \delta_n) + 1$ for the ladder built with K . With $\ell = \log_2 \log_2 n$, the branch $K = \lceil 2 \ln(2/\delta_n) \rceil$ (Hoeffding–Ville) at $\delta_n = 16/\ell$ makes the $o(1)$ of order $\log \ell/\ell$, that is $O(\log \log \log n / \log \log n)$, and the branch $K = \lceil 1/\delta_n \rceil$ (Kolmogorov) at $\delta_n \asymp \ell^{-1/2}$ makes it $O((\log \log n)^{-1/2})$. The second is the kernel-checked rate (Appendix Q): $|L_F(n, \varepsilon)/\log_2 \ln n - e^{-\varepsilon}| \leq 30/\sqrt{\log_2 \ln n}$ whenever $\log_2 \ln n \geq \max\{4, (1 - e^{-\varepsilon})^{-2}\}$, and the same for the least $\mathbb{E}\tau$. To see the constants, write $\nu = \log_2 \ln n$ and $\chi = \sqrt{\nu} \geq 2$, and take $K = \lceil \chi \rceil$ and $\delta_n = 1/K$. Then $\delta_n \leq 1/\chi \leq 1 - e^{-\varepsilon}$, so $w \leq 1$; $\delta_n \leq \frac{1}{2}$, so $1/(1 - \delta_n) \leq 1 + 2\delta_n$; $8K < n$, as $\ln n \geq 16$; and $\lceil \log_2 \log_2 n \rceil \leq \nu + 2$ and $K \leq \chi + 1$. The cost bound above is therefore at most $e^{-\varepsilon}(1 + 2\delta_n)(\nu + 8\chi + 10) + 1 \leq e^{-\varepsilon}\nu + (8\chi + 10) + 2(\chi + 13) + 1 \leq e^{-\varepsilon}\nu + 30\chi$, using $\delta_n(\nu + 8\chi + 10) \leq \chi + 13$ and $\chi \geq 2$; and Corollary 6(b) gives $L_F \geq e^{-\varepsilon}\nu - 3.672 \geq e^{-\varepsilon}\nu - 30\chi$. Dividing by ν gives the bound, and the same two estimates hold for the least $\mathbb{E}\tau$, since the mixture is a causal policy with $\tau = |U|$.

Fixed schedules and the single-horizon bound (Lemma 3(a) for fixed schedules and the single-horizon form of Lemma 3(b) for their mixtures, by direct counting; Step 4 is also used for general policies below, and Appendix Q lists the formal counterparts). Step 1: $F(\mu) \leq \varepsilon$ implies $Q_\mu(V) \geq e^{-\varepsilon}$ by Lemma 1(a). Step 2: $q_U(V) = s(b(U)) = S(n, k; b(U))$ with $S(M, j; b_1, \dots) = \sum_{j'} \text{Bin}(b_1, j/M)(j - j')S(M - b_1, j'; b_2, \dots)$ and $S(M, j; \emptyset) = \mathbf{1}\{M = j = 0\}$. Step 3: $S \leq G_{|U|}$ by induction, since G maximizes over the block size. Step 4: $G_r \leq G_{r+1}$, by induction on r : $G_0 \leq G_1$ pointwise (they agree at $M = 0$, and $G_0 = 0$ for $M > 0$), and the right side of the recursion is nondecreasing in G_r . Step 5: for each component, $1 + t(q_U(V) - G_t) \leq |U|$ (if $|U| \leq t$ the left side is at most 1; otherwise at most $1 + t$); average over μ . Step 6: take the infimum over feasible μ (the feasible set is nonempty: it contains the all-singleton schedule), so $L_F(n, \varepsilon) \geq 1 + t(e^{-\varepsilon} - G_t(n, k))$ for every $t \geq 1$, and hence, as $L_F \geq 1$, $L_F(n, \varepsilon) \geq 1 + t(e^{-\varepsilon} - \Gamma_t(n))_+$ with Γ_t of Appendix D (the κ_r form of the envelope). Summing over all horizons instead (Lemma 3(b)) and using (Env) gives the explicit rate bound $L_F(n, \varepsilon) \geq e^{-\varepsilon} \log_2 \ln(k + 1) - 2.672$ of Corollary 6(b), proved below.

Lemma 3(a) for general policies. Fix a horizon $r \geq 1$ and let $Y_t = G_{r-t}(M_t, j_t) \mathbf{1}\{\text{legal}\}$ for $t \leq r$. Conditionally on the seed and the history after t rounds, the draws of round $t + 1$ are independent Bernoulli(j_t/M_t) on a set chosen from that information, so $\mathbb{E}[Y_{t+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_t] \leq Y_t$ by the definition of G (for an executed empty round, by $G_{r-t-1} \leq G_{r-t}$, Step 4); the probability of succeeding within r rounds is at most $Y_0 = G_r(n, k)$, whether or not the number of rounds is capped. An illegal state means that more than k ones or more than $n - k$ zeros are already committed, so no completion of it, arbitrary or not, outputs a point of V . $\square$

Proof of Corollary 6. By the bounded-prefactor envelope (Env) (Proposition 9, Appendix D) at $(M, j) = (n, k)$, $G_r(n, k) \leq \min\{1, A_r(k + 1)^{-2^{-r}}\}$ with $A_r < 36$. (a) By Theorem 4(a), $\min_{\pi \in \mathcal{A}_r} \text{KL}(p \parallel Q_\pi) \leq \varepsilon$ if and only if $G_r(n, k) \geq e^{-\varepsilon}$, which is the characterization. A policy in $\mathcal{A}_r$ with output KL at most ε has $\varepsilon \geq -\ln G_r(n, k) \geq 2^{-r} \ln(k + 1) - \ln A_r$, so $2^{-r} \ln(k + 1) < \varepsilon + \ln 36$, which is the lower bound. A uniformly relabelled fixed profile of length L lies in $\mathcal{A}_L$, so $R_F^{\text{adapt}} \leq R_F^{\text{PROF}}$, and the relabelled profile of Theorem 2(b) gives the upper bound; since $\ln(k + 1) \geq \frac{1}{2} \ln n$, the lower bound is $\log_2 \ln n - O_\varepsilon(1)$. (b) Lemma 3(b) with $\theta = e^{-\varepsilon}$, which is at most $Q_\pi(V)$ by Lemma 1(a), gives the first inequality; a mixture is in $\mathcal{A}_\infty$ with $\tau = |U|$, which gives the bound for L_F . Let $\ell_k = \log_2 \ln(k + 1)$ (so $2^{\ell_k} = \ln(k + 1)$) and $c_* := \sum_{i \geq 0} \min\{1, 36e^{-2^i}\} < 2.672$. If $\ell_k < 1$ (including $\ell_k < 0$ at $n = 2$), then $\mathbb{E}\tau \geq 1 > e^{-\varepsilon} \ell_k - c_*$. Otherwise $m = \lfloor \ell_k \rfloor \geq 1$; the envelope gives $G_t(n, k) \leq \min\{1, 36 \exp(-2^{\ell_k - t})\}$ and $\ell_k - t \geq m - t$, so $\sum_{t=1}^m G_t(n, k) \leq c_*$, and $\mathbb{E}\tau \geq 1 + m e^{-\varepsilon} - c_* \geq e^{-\varepsilon} \ell_k - c_*$ because $m \geq \ell_k - 1$. $\square$

Total variation. The randomized-side results transfer to total variation: $\text{TV}(p, Q) \geq p(V) - Q(V) = 1 - Q(V)$ for every law Q , with equality when Q is relabelling-invariant. Hence the success-threshold statements (Theorem 2(b) and Corollary 6) hold for $\text{TV} \leq \delta$ with $\varepsilon = -\ln(1 - \delta)$, that is, $1 - \delta$ in place of $e^{-\varepsilon}$, and in Theorem 4(a) the least TV at hard cap r is $1 - G_r(n, k)$.

Proof of Corollary 5. For a single fixed schedule, the lower bound follows from Theorem 2(a) for point masses, and the upper bound from the fixed geometric schedule of Theorem 2(c) (for $\varepsilon > \ln 2$, the schedule built for $\ln 2$). For a relabelled profile, the upper bound follows from Theorem 2(b), whose relabelled mixture has all components of equal length. For the lower bound, if a relabelled profile b of length L has output KL at most ε , then $e^{-\varepsilon} \leq s(b) \leq G_L(n, k) < 36(k + 1)^{-2^{-L}}$ by Lemmas 1(a),(c),(e) and 3(a) and (Env), so $L > \log_2 \ln(k + 1) - \log_2(\varepsilon + \ln 36)$. $\square$

E.1. Uniform window in Theorem 4(b)

For $n = 2k \geq 2$ and $r \geq 1$,

$$2^{-r} \ln(k+1) - \ln 36 < -\ln G_r(n, k) \leq 2^{-r} \ln k + \ln 48,$$

and the upper inequality is witnessed by uniformly relabelling one explicit profile b^* with at most r blocks. The profile is a square-root ladder whose last block commits all remaining coordinates at once. Before that block a Chebyshev bound keeps the run legal with probability above $\frac{1}{2}$; the block itself succeeds with probability at least $2/(3\sqrt{m})$, a central atom, where $m \leq 32n^{2^{1-L^*}}$ is its size after $L^* - 1$ square-root rounds and $L^* \leq r$ is the largest admissible length (defined below). So the profile, although it ends with one block, loses at most a constant factor in success against $G_r(n, k)$ (the factor 1728 below), that is, at most an additive constant in $-\ln G_r$. As the right side of the upper inequality is at least $\ln 48$, this window cannot certify $-\ln G_r(n, k) \leq \varepsilon$ when $\varepsilon < \ln 48$; the upper bound of Corollary 6(a) uses instead the ladder of Theorem 2(b), which stops its bulk rounds at $8K_\delta$ unrevealed coordinates and commits these as singletons, which never fail; that ladder fails with probability at most δ , at the cost of at most $8K_\delta$ rounds.

Lower side. The bounded-prefactor envelope (Env) (Appendix D) gives $G_r(n, k) \leq \min\{1, A_r(k+1)^{-2^{-r}}\}$ with $A_r = 6^{2-2^{2^{-r}}} < 36$; taking logarithms gives the lower inequality.

The profile. For $L \geq 1$ put $M_0 = n$ and $M_t = \lceil \sqrt{2^{L-t+1}M_{t-1}} \rceil$ for $1 \leq t \leq L-1$, and let $b^{(L)}$ be the profile with blocks $b_t = M_{t-1} - M_t$ for $t \leq L-1$ and a final block $b_L = M_{L-1}$; $s(b^{(L)})$ is its terminal success under uniform relabelling (Lemma 1(c)). Call L *admissible* if $M_{t-1} \geq 2^{L-t+1} + 2$ for all $1 \leq t \leq L-1$ (vacuous for $L = 1$). An admissible profile has every $b_t \geq 1$: with $c = 2^{L-t+1}$, $M_t \leq \sqrt{cM_{t-1}} + 1 < M_{t-1}$ whenever $M_{t-1} > (c + 2 + \sqrt{c^2 + 4c})/2$, and this threshold is below $c + 2$. Conversely, at the first t with $M_{t-1} \leq c + 1$, $\lceil \sqrt{cM_{t-1}} \rceil \geq M_{t-1}$, so $b_t \leq 0$; hence L is admissible exactly when its blocks $b_1, \dots, b_{L-1}$ are all nonempty, as in Section 3. So for admissible L the counts decrease from $M_0 = n$, while the rungs $M_0 = 8K < M_1 < \dots$ of Theorem 2(b) are numbered upward and visited downward.

Stopped martingale, keeping the exit value. Run the exact oracle on the relabelled profile, and let T be the first $t \leq L-1$ at which the state is illegal ($j_t \notin [0, M_t]$). Put $P_t = j_t/M_t$ for $t < T$ and $P_t = P_T$ for $t \geq T$: the first illegal value, which lies outside $[0, 1]$, is kept and frozen. Given the committed history, the number of ones drawn in round t has mean $b_t P_{t-1}$, so $(P_t)_{t \leq L-1}$ is a martingale with $P_0 = \frac{1}{2}$, and $\mathbb{E}[(P_t - P_{t-1})^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \leq b_t/(4M_t^2)$ on $\{t \leq T\}$ and 0 afterwards. On $\{T \leq L-1\}$ the kept exit value gives $|P_{L-1} - \frac{1}{2}| > \frac{1}{2}$, so by Chebyshev's inequality $\Pr(T \leq L-1) \leq 4 \text{Var}(P_{L-1}) \leq \sum_{t \leq L-1} b_t/M_t^2$. Since $M_t^2 \geq 2^{L-t+1}M_{t-1} \geq 2^{L-t+1}b_t$, this is at most $\sum_{u=2}^L 2^{-u} < \frac{1}{2}$.

Final block. On $\{T > L-1\}$ the state (m, j) , with $m = M_{L-1} \geq 1$, is legal. At a forced state ($j \in \{0, m\}$) the final block is exact and succeeds with probability 1. At an interior state, it succeeds with probability equal to the central atom $\text{Bin}(m, j/m)(j) \geq e^{-1/6} \sqrt{2/(\pi m)} > 2/(3\sqrt{m})$, by Robbins' form of Stirling's formula (Robbins, 1955) and $j(m-j) \leq m^2/4$: writing $t! = \sqrt{2\pi t} (t/e)^t e^{\rho_t}$ with $0 < \rho_t < 1/(12t)$, $\text{Bin}(m, j/m)(j) = \binom{m}{j} \frac{j^j (m-j)^{m-j}}{m^m} = \sqrt{\frac{m}{2\pi j(m-j)}} e^{\rho_m - \rho_j - \rho_{m-j}} \geq \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi m}} e^{-1/6}$, as $\rho_m > 0$ and $\rho_j, \rho_{m-j} < \frac{1}{12}$; and $e^{-1/6} \sqrt{2/\pi} = 0.675\dots > \frac{2}{3}$. In both cases the success is at least $2/(3\sqrt{m})$, so, with the martingale bound above, $s(b^{(L)}) \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot 2/(3\sqrt{M_{L-1}})$.

Size of the last block. Since $\lceil x \rceil \leq 2x$ for $x \geq 1$, $\log_2 M_t \leq 1 + (L - t + 1)/2 + \frac{1}{2} \log_2 M_{t-1}$, and unrolling gives $\log_2 M_{L-1} \leq \sum_{u \geq 0} (2 + u/2) 2^{-u} + 2^{1-L} \log_2 n = 5 + 2^{1-L} \log_2 n$. So $M_{L-1} \leq 32 n^{2^{1-L}}$ and $s(b^{(L)}) \geq n^{-2^{-L}} / (3\sqrt{32})$.

Lengths that are not admissible (used in the Conclusion when $L^* < r$). If some $t \leq L - 1$ has $M_{t-1} < 2^{L-t+1} + 2 \leq 2^{L-t+2}$, then, since $\log_2 M_{t-1} \geq 2^{1-t} \log_2 n$ (as $M_s \geq \sqrt{M_{s-1}}$ for $s < t$), $\log_2 n < (L - t + 2) 2^{t-1}$; with $u = L - t \geq 1$ the right side is $2^L(u + 2)/2^{u+1} \leq \frac{3}{4} 2^L$, so $n^{2^{-L}} < 2^{3/4}$.

Conclusion. Let $L^* \leq r$ be the largest admissible length ($L = 1$ always is) and $b^* = b^{(L^*)}$. If $L^* = r$, $s(b^*) \geq (2k)^{-2^{-r}} / (3\sqrt{32}) \geq k^{-2^{-r}} / 24$, because $2^{-2^{-r}} \geq 2^{-1/2}$. If $L^* < r$, then $L^* + 1$ is not admissible, so $n^{2^{-L^*}} < 2^{3/2}$ and $s(b^*) \geq 2^{-3/2} / (3\sqrt{32}) = \frac{1}{48} \geq k^{-2^{-r}} / 48$. In both cases $G_r(n, k) \geq s(b^*) \geq k^{-2^{-r}} / 48$, since b^* has at most r blocks and its uniform relabelling lies in $\mathcal{A}_r$; so $-\ln G_r(n, k) \leq 2^{-r} \ln k + \ln 48$. By Lemma 1(e) the relabelled profile has $F = -\ln s(b^*)$, which witnesses the upper inequality. Finally, $G_r(n, k) \leq 36(k + 1)^{-2^{-r}} \leq 36 k^{-2^{-r}} \leq 36 \cdot 48 s(b^*) = 1728 s(b^*)$. $\square$

The result is an absolute additive window, uniform in r and n , so it gives a multiplicative asymptotic only while $2^{-r} \ln k \rightarrow \infty$: at every hard cap, one uniformly relabelled fixed profile is within a factor 1728 of the best causal randomized adaptive policy in terminal success. It concerns output KL under a hard cap in the balanced exact-oracle class $\mathcal{A}_r$; it says nothing about operational mean cost, H , tilted targets or approximate heads.

Appendix F. Rates on the full-support target

Roadmap. The subsections follow Section 4.1: one grid, many grids, and what stops faster growth. A single relabelled profile can square the level in each round and no more: Theorem 10 and Corollary 11 give the lower bound (gaps past squaring, §F.1), and Theorem 12 and Corollary 13 the matching upper bound, whose hard step is the local-limit estimate of Lemma U6 (§F.3). Proposition 14 gives the rate of the schedule-averaged criterion (§F.4). An auxiliary last-round bound for all policies, Proposition L (§F.2), is used only in §F.8, as one of the two lower bounds there that cover all policies on this target. For mixtures, Theorem 15 gives the common lower bound and the fixed-cap divergence, and Remark 16 the limit of its test set (§F.5); Theorem 17 gives the fourth-power construction, through the coefficient-one lift of Lemma Z6, and Corollary 18 the exact constant (§F.6). Theorem 19 extends the mean-cost F frontier of Corollary 18 to the expected executed rounds of causal adaptive policies (§F.7), and Corollary 20 records the separation (§F.8).

Setting. Throughout this appendix $\alpha = \beta = 1$: p is the Beta(1, 1)–Bernoulli law of Section 4.1. Fix a profile $(b_1, \dots, b_R)$, all $b_k \geq 1$, $\sum_k b_k = n$, used with a uniform relabelling (one profile, relabelling drawn before sampling, independently of the sampling randomness): the schedule mixture μ is the law of σU for a labelled schedule U with this profile and a uniform permutation σ of the coordinates. Write $F = F(\mu)$ (Section 2) for its output KL; by T1 below (the identity of Section 4.1 on this target), $F = \text{KL}(p_W \| Q_W)$, a divergence between laws of the number of ones W . Let $m_k = b_1 + \dots + b_k$ and $c_k = 2 + m_k$ (so $c_0 = 2$, $c_R = n + 2$). Sampler: $A_0 = 0$, $A_k = A_{k-1} + \text{Bin}(b_k, P_{k-1})$, $P_k := (1 + A_k)/c_k$ (the exact conditional marginal after the first k rounds). Target: $A_k \sim \text{Unif}\{0, \dots, m_k\}$, i.e. P_k is uniform on $\{x/c_k : x = 1, \dots, c_k - 1\}$; terminally $W = A_R \sim \text{Unif}\{0, \dots, n\}$ and $P_R = (1 + W)/(n + 2)$. These target facts hold because p is the law of the coordinates when $\theta \sim \text{Unif}(0, 1)$ is drawn first and then all coordinates independently

Bernoulli(θ), which is equivalent to its description in Section 4.1: so $p(x) = 1/((n+1)\binom{n}{|x|})$, the number of ones among any m coordinates is uniform on $\{0, \dots, m\}$, and given the first k rounds θ has the law $\text{Beta}(1 + A_k, 1 + m_k - A_k)$; hence P_k is the exact conditional marginal, and the target's next block carries $\text{BetaBin}(b_{k+1}, c_k P_k, c_k(1 - P_k))$ ones, so that P_{k+1} has the law $T(P_k, \cdot)$ of Lemma L1 with $c = c_k$, $b = b_{k+1}$. Every string has positive mass, so, unlike on the balanced slice (Section 3), no output is a support violation and F is not $-\ln$ of a success probability: it compares two whole count laws. Subscripts s and t ($\text{Pr}_s, \mathbb{E}_s, \text{Var}_s, \text{Law}_s$ and $\text{Pr}_t, \mathbb{E}_t, \text{Law}_t$) refer to the sampler and to the target; $\mathcal{F}_k$ is the history through round k ; for laws ν, ν' on $[0, 1]$, $\nu \leq_{\text{cx}} \nu'$ (convex order) means $\int \varphi d\nu \leq \int \varphi d\nu'$ for every convex φ ; $\text{kl}(a||b)$ is the binary KL divergence. In the arguments for Theorems 10 and 12, r , with or without an index, is the ratio of two consecutive levels, such as c_{k+1}/c_k , not a cap on the number of rounds, and $\tilde{r}$ is defined where it is used; elsewhere r is a local index. In local formulas p is also a Bernoulli parameter or the numerator of a fraction p/q ; otherwise it is the target law. In the argument for Theorem 12, π with or without an index, tilde or prime is a count law, but bare π in factors such as $\sqrt{2\pi}$ is the circle constant; in the argument for Theorem 19, π is a policy. Like r and p , the letters N, ℓ, D, h, T and Q have more than one meaning in this appendix; each meaning is fixed where the letter is introduced.

Prerequisites. Two facts are used; they are restated here with proofs.

T1 (relabelling reduces F to count KL). The target p is exchangeable and the oracle is exact. Relabelling a profile by a uniform permutation σ drawn before sampling gives the output $\bar{q} = \mathbb{E}_{\sigma} q_U \circ \sigma^{-1}$ (that is, Q_μ). This law is exchangeable, so $\text{KL}(p||\bar{q}) = \text{KL}(p_W||Q_W)$.

Proof. $p \circ \sigma = p$, so the oracle answers on relabelled positions are the relabelled answers. The average over σ is therefore $\mathfrak{S}_n$ -invariant. For exchangeable P and Q , $P(x) = P_W(|x|)/\binom{n}{|x|}$, and likewise for Q ; so $\ln(P(x)/Q(x)) = \ln(P_W(|x|)/Q_W(|x|))$, and summing over the $\binom{n}{w}$ strings with $|x| = w$ gives $\text{KL}(P||Q) = \text{KL}(P_W||Q_W)$. $\square$

E1 (moment identities, used in Lemma L5 and in round 1). Take a state with t revealed coordinates, a of them ones, so that $c = 2 + t$ and $p = (1 + a)/c$; commit a block of size b under the sampler, and let $P' = (cp + H)/(c + b)$ with $H \sim \text{Bin}(b, p)$. Then $\mathbb{E}[P' | p] = p$, and $\mathbb{E}[P'(1 - P') | p] = p(1 - p)(1 - b/(c + b)^2)$. Hence, for a fixed profile, $\mathbb{E}[P_R(1 - P_R) | \mathcal{F}_k] = P_k(1 - P_k) \prod_{j>k} (1 - b_j/c_j^2)$, and $\text{Var}(P_R | \mathcal{F}_k) = P_k(1 - P_k)(1 - \prod_{j>k} (1 - b_j/c_j^2))$.

Proof. $\mathbb{E}H = bp$ and $\mathbb{E}H^2 = bp(1 - p) + b^2p^2$. Expand $\mathbb{E}[P']$ and $\mathbb{E}[P'^2]$; the tower property gives the product form. $\square$

F.1. One relabelled profile: the lower bound

Theorem 10 (multi-level edge lower bound for relabelled fixed profiles) *There are absolute constants $K_0, K_1, K_2 < \infty$ such that for every $k \in \{1, \dots, R - 1\}$ with $c_k \geq 4$ and*

$$r := c_{k+1}/c_k \geq K_1 \sqrt{1 + \ln c_k},$$

the output KL satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} F &\geq \frac{c_{k+1}}{K_2 c_k^2} && \text{if } r \leq K_0(c_k - 1), \\ F &\geq \frac{1}{8} \ln \left(\frac{c_{k+1}}{2eK_0 c_k^2} \right) && \text{if } r > K_0(c_k - 1) \quad (\text{gap set saturates; log growth}). \end{aligned}$$

Round 1 ($c_0 = 2$ has a single atom): $F \geq 0.45 \ln(0.45 c_1/32) - 0.45$ ($n \geq 40$). Rounds from $c_k = 3$ (possible only for $k = 1$, when $b_1 = 1$): $F \geq \frac{1}{12} (\ln(c_{k+1}/(3 \cdot 4813)) - 1)$.

In the first regime $c_{k+1} \leq K_0 c_k (c_k - 1)$ already, and $F \leq \varepsilon$ gives $c_{k+1} \leq K_2 \varepsilon c_k^2$; in the second, $F \leq \varepsilon$ gives $c_{k+1} \leq 2e K_0 e^{8\varepsilon} c_k^2$.

Corollary 11 (depth) *If $n \geq 1$ and $F \leq \varepsilon$ then $c_1 \leq 72e^{1+2.3\varepsilon}$ (for $n \geq 40$ by the round-1 bound; for $n < 40$, $c_1 \leq n + 2 \leq 41 < 72e$ trivially), $c_{k+1} \leq 3 \cdot 4813 \cdot e^{1+12\varepsilon}$ when $c_k = 3$, and $c_{k+1} \leq K_3(\varepsilon) c_k^2$ for every $k \geq 1$ with $c_k \geq 4$, where $\ln K_3(\varepsilon) = O(1 + \varepsilon)$; hence, for $n \geq 2$,*

$$R \geq \log_2 \ln n - O(1 + \log(1 + \varepsilon)).$$

So single relabelled profiles need at least $\log_2 \ln n - O(1)$ rounds at every fixed tolerance. The constants are useless at practical n ; the statement is a rate ($\Omega(\log \log n)$), not a finite bound.

Plan of the lower bound. The proof of Theorem 10 tests the terminal value P_R on a gap set G : the middle halves of the first X gaps between neighbouring atoms x/c_k of P_k , counted from the edge 0, which carry target mass at least $X/(4c_k)$. Given $P_k = x'/c_k$, the sampler's terminal value has conditional mean P_k and conditional variance at most $2P_k/c_{k+1}$ (Lemma L5), so by Chebyshev it rarely reaches G when c_{k+1}/c_k is large; Lemma L4 bounds the sampler's mass on the first y atoms by $4y/c_k$, a constant multiple of the target's, so these conditional bounds average to a sampler mass of G that is a small fraction of its target mass, and data processing onto $\{P_R \in G\}$ bounds F from below. Lemmas L1–L3 serve only to prove Lemma L4: one sampler round is below the target's round (the kernel T) in convex order (Lemma L1), the sampler kernel preserves convex order (Lemma L2), and hence every sampler marginal is below the target's (Lemma L3). Round 1 and rounds from $c_k = 3$ are treated separately, and Corollary 11 chains the resulting bounds $c_{k+1} \leq K_3(\varepsilon) c_k^2$ over the rounds; it is the lower half of Theorem 7(b).

Lemma L1 (per-state convex order). For $p \in (0, 1)$, $c > 0$, $b \geq 1$ let $S(p, \cdot)$ be the law of $(cp + H)/(c + b)$ with $H \sim \text{Bin}(b, p)$, and $T(p, \cdot)$ the same with $H \sim \text{BetaBin}(b, cp, c(1 - p))$. Then $S(p, \cdot) \leq_{\text{cx}} T(p, \cdot)$. (At $p \in \{0, 1\}$ both kernels are the point mass at p , so the claim is trivial; Lemma L1 is applied only at interior grid points $p = x/c_k$.)

Proof. $\text{BetaBin}(b, cp, c(1 - p))$ is the mixture of $\text{Bin}(b, \theta)$ over $\theta \sim \text{Beta}(cp, c(1 - p))$, $\mathbb{E}\theta = p$. For convex φ , $\psi(\theta) := \sum_h \varphi\left(\frac{cp+h}{c+b}\right) \binom{b}{h} \theta^h (1 - \theta)^{b-h}$ is convex in θ :

$$\psi''(\theta) = b(b-1) \sum_j \Delta_h^2 \varphi\left(\frac{cp+h}{c+b}\right) \Big|_{h=j} \binom{b-2}{j} \theta^j (1 - \theta)^{b-2-j} \geq 0$$

(apply twice the derivative formula $\frac{d}{d\theta} \sum_h f(h) \binom{b}{h} \theta^h (1 - \theta)^{b-h} = b \sum_j (f(j+1) - f(j)) \binom{b-1}{j} \theta^j (1 - \theta)^{b-1-j}$ for Bernstein polynomials; second differences of a convex function of h are ≥ 0). For $b = 1$, ψ is affine in θ , so $\psi'' = 0$ and the sum is empty. Jensen: $\mathbb{E}_T \varphi = \mathbb{E}_\theta \psi(\theta) \geq \psi(p) = \mathbb{E}_S \varphi$. $\square$

Lemma L2 (the sampler kernel preserves convex order). For fixed c, b and convex φ on $[0, 1]$, $f(p) := \mathbb{E}\varphi((cp + \text{Bin}(b, p))/(c + b))$ is convex on $[0, 1]$.

Proof. Write $a = c/(c + b)$, $a' = 1/(c + b)$, $\varphi_h := \varphi(ap + a'h)$ and $B_h := \binom{b}{h} p^h (1 - p)^{b-h}$ (and $B_h^{(m)}$ the same with m in place of b). Then

$$f'' = a^2 \sum_h \varphi''(ap + a'h) B_h + 2a \sum_h \varphi'(ap + a'h) B_h' + \sum_h \varphi_h B_h''.$$

With $B'_h = b(B_{h-1}^{(b-1)} - B_h^{(b-1)})$ and $B''_h = b(b-1)(B_{h-2}^{(b-2)} - 2B_{h-1}^{(b-2)} + B_h^{(b-2)})$, where $B_h^{(m)} := 0$ for $m < 0$ or $h \notin \{0, \dots, m\}$ (for $b = 1$ the B'' term vanishes, because $b(b-1) = 0$):

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_h \varphi'(ap + a'h)B'_h &= b \sum_j [\varphi'(ap + a'(j+1)) - \varphi'(ap + a'j)]B_j^{(b-1)} \\ &\geq 0 \quad (\varphi' \text{ nondecreasing}), \\ \sum_h \varphi_h B''_h &= b(b-1) \sum_j [\varphi_{j+2} - 2\varphi_{j+1} + \varphi_j]B_j^{(b-2)} \\ &\geq 0 \quad (h \mapsto \varphi(ap + a'h) \text{ convex}). \end{aligned}$$

All three terms are ≥ 0 . General convex φ on $[0, 1]$: a convex φ is continuous on $(0, 1)$ and may jump up at the endpoints, so write $\varphi = \varphi_c + j_0 \cdot \mathbf{1}\{v = 0\} + j_1 \cdot \mathbf{1}\{v = 1\}$ with φ_c continuous convex and $j_0, j_1 \geq 0$. Approximate φ_c uniformly by C^2 convex functions, for example its Bernstein polynomials $B_N \varphi_c$: they are polynomials, convex by the second-derivative formula of L1's proof, and converge uniformly on $[0, 1]$ (f is a finite sum, so uniform convergence passes to f). For the jump parts, $\mathbb{E}_{S(p)} \mathbf{1}\{v = 0\} = \mathbf{1}\{p = 0\}$ and $\mathbb{E}_{S(p)} \mathbf{1}\{v = 1\} = \mathbf{1}\{p = 1\}$ are convex on $[0, 1]$. $\square$

Lemma L3 (convex order of the marginals). For every k , $\text{Law}_s(P_k) \leq_{\text{cx}} \text{Law}_t(P_k)$.

Proof. Let S_{k+1} and T_{k+1} be the kernels $p \mapsto S(p, \cdot)$ and $p \mapsto T(p, \cdot)$ of Lemma L1 with $c = c_k, b = b_{k+1}$. Induction:

$$\text{Law}_s(P_{k+1}) = S_{k+1} \text{Law}_s(P_k) \leq_{\text{cx}} S_{k+1} \text{Law}_t(P_k) \leq_{\text{cx}} T_{k+1} \text{Law}_t(P_k) = \text{Law}_t(P_{k+1}),$$

the first $\leq_{\text{cx}}$ by Lemma L2 (with $c = c_k, b = b_{k+1}$ fixed since the profile is fixed) and the second by Lemma L1 integrated. $\square$

Lemma L4 (edge CDF). $\Pr_s(P_k \leq u) \leq 2uc_k/(c_k - 1) \leq 4u$ for $u > 0$. (At $u = 0$ the probability is 0, since $P_k \geq 1/c_k$.)

Proof. Markov's inequality with the convex $\varphi(v) = (2u - v)_+$ and Lemma L3: $\Pr_s(P_k \leq u) \leq \mathbb{E}_s \varphi(P_k)/u \leq \mathbb{E}_t \varphi(P_k)/u$, and $\mathbb{E}_t \varphi(P_k) = (c_k - 1)^{-1} \sum_{x < 2uc_k} (2u - x/c_k) \leq (c_k - 1)^{-1} \cdot (2uc_k) \cdot (2u)/2 = 2u^2 c_k / (c_k - 1)$. $\square$

Lemma L5 (conditional spread). For $0 \leq k < R$, $\text{Var}_s(P_R | \mathcal{F}_k) \leq 2P_k/c_{k+1}$.

Proof. By E1, $\mathbb{E}[P_R(1 - P_R) | \mathcal{F}_k] = P_k(1 - P_k)\Pi$ with $\Pi := \prod_{j>k} (1 - b_j/c_j^2)$, so $\text{Var}(P_R | \mathcal{F}_k) = P_k(1 - P_k)(1 - \Pi) \leq P_k \sum_{j>k} b_j/c_j^2$; $b_{k+1}/c_{k+1}^2 \leq 1/c_{k+1}$ and, for $j \geq k+2$, $b_j/c_j^2 \leq b_j/(c_j c_{j-1}) = 1/c_{j-1} - 1/c_j$, which telescopes to $\leq 1/c_{k+1}$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 10. Fix $k \geq 1$ with $c := c_k \geq 4$ and $r := c_{k+1}/c \geq 8$ (implied by $K_1 \geq 8$; the constants are fixed below: $K_0 := 4608e^2$, $K_1 := 2K_0$ and $K_2 := 8K_0/0.3$). Take an integer X with $1 \leq X \leq \min(r/K_0, c-1)$ ($X = c-1$ is allowed: G stays inside $(0, 1)$ and case (b) below is then empty). Gap set:

$$G := \bigcup_{x=1}^X \left[\frac{x+1/4}{c}, \frac{x+3/4}{c} \right] \subset (0, 1),$$

and write $\Pr_s(G) := \Pr_s(P_R \in G)$, $\Pr_t(G) := \Pr_t(P_R \in G)$. Every point of G is at distance $\geq 1/(4c)$ from every atom x'/c ($x' = 1, \dots, c-1$) of P_k .

Target mass. Each interval has length $1/(2c)$ and contains $\geq (n+2)/(2c) - 1$ values $(1+w)/(n+2)$ of P_R , each of target mass $1/(n+1)$. Since $n+2 \geq c_{k+1} = rc \geq 8c$, each interval has mass $\geq 1/(2c) - 1/(8c-1) \geq 1/(4c)$: $\Pr_t(G) \geq X/(4c)$.

Sampler mass. Condition on $P_k = x'/c$.

(a) $x' \leq 2X + 1$: by Lemma L5 and Chebyshev, $\Pr_s(P_R \in G \mid P_k = x'/c) \leq 16c^2 \cdot 2x'/(c \cdot c_{k+1}) = 32x'/r$.

(b) $x' \geq 2X + 2$: $G \subset [0, (X + 1)/c]$ and $x'/c - (X + 1)/c \geq x'/(2c)$, so the same probability is $\leq (4c^2/x'^2) \cdot 2x'/(c \cdot c_{k+1}) = 8/(rx')$.

With $Y := cP_k \in \{1, \dots, c - 1\}$ and Lemma L4 ($\Pr_s(Y \leq y) \leq 4y/c$):

$$\mathbb{E}_s[32Y/r; Y \leq 2X + 1] \leq (32/r)(2X + 1) \cdot 4(2X + 1)/c \leq 1152X^2/(rc);$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_s[8/(rY)] &\leq \frac{8}{r} \left[\frac{1}{c-1} + \sum_{y=1}^{c-2} \left(\frac{1}{y} - \frac{1}{y+1} \right) \frac{4y}{c} \right] \\ &\leq \frac{8}{r} \cdot \frac{4 \ln c + 2}{c} \quad (\text{summation by parts}). \end{aligned}$$

So

$$\rho_G := \frac{\Pr_s(G)}{\Pr_t(G)} \leq \frac{4608X}{r} + \frac{32(4 \ln c + 2)}{rX}.$$

Put $K_0 := 4608e^2$.

Case $r \leq K_0(c - 1)$: $X := \lfloor r/K_0 \rfloor \leq c - 1$ (allowed). With $r \geq 2K_0$, $X \geq r/(2K_0)$, so the second term is $\leq 64K_0(4 \ln c + 2)/r^2 \leq e^{-2}$ when $r \geq 8e\sqrt{K_0(4 \ln c + 2)}$. Then $\rho_G \leq 2e^{-2}$.

Case $r > K_0(c - 1)$: $X := c - 2 \geq c/2$ (any $X \leq c - 1$ works; $c - 2$ keeps the displayed constants). Then $\rho_G \leq 4608c/r + 64(4 \ln c + 2)/(rc) \leq 2 \cdot 4608c/r$ ($c \geq 4 \Rightarrow 64(4 \ln c + 2)/c \leq 4608c$).

Data processing onto the event $\{P_R \in G\}$ and $\text{kl}(a\|b) \geq a \ln(a/b) - a$ (valid for all $a, b \in (0, 1)$) since $(1 - a) \ln((1 - a)/(1 - b)) \geq b - a$ give $F \geq \Pr_t(G)(\ln(1/\rho_G) - 1)$:

Case 1: $F \geq (1 - \ln 2) \cdot X/(4c) \geq 0.3 \cdot r/(8K_0c) = c_{k+1}/(K_2c^2)$, $K_2 := 8K_0/0.3$.

Case 2: $F \geq \frac{c-2}{4c} (\ln(r/(9216c)) - 1) \geq \frac{1}{8} \ln(c_{k+1}/(9216e \cdot c^2))$ ($c \geq 4$; the theorem states it with the larger constant $2eK_0 \geq 9216e$). If the logarithm is negative the right side is $< 0 \leq F$ and the claim is trivial.

Case $c = 3$. Take $X = 1$, which is allowed because the ρ_G display above used only $r \geq 8$ and $1 \leq X \leq c - 1$, never $X \leq r/K_0$ or $c \geq 4$. With $c = 3$: (a) covers both atoms $x' \in \{1, 2\}$ and (b) is empty. The target mass is $\Pr_t(G) \geq X/(4c) = 1/12$, and $\rho_G \leq 4608/r + 32(4 \ln 3 + 2)/r = 4812.6/r \leq 4813/r$. Hence $F \geq \frac{1}{12}(\ln(r/4813) - 1)$, and $F \leq \varepsilon$ forces $c_{k+1} \leq 3 \cdot 4813 \cdot e^{1+12\varepsilon}$. The bound is positive only for $r > 4813e \approx 13,083$, where $r \geq 8$ holds automatically; otherwise it is trivial.

Both Case-1 conditions on r hold when $r \geq K_1\sqrt{1 + \ln c}$ with $K_1 := 2K_0$, because $8e\sqrt{K_0(4 \ln c + 2)} \leq 8e\sqrt{5K_0}\sqrt{1 + \ln c} \leq 2K_0\sqrt{1 + \ln c}$ ($K_0 \geq 80e^2$).

Round 1 (complete calculation). Here $c_0 = 2$, so $P_0 = \frac{1}{2}$, and $b_1 = c_1 - 2$.

(a) E1 at $k = 0$ ($\mathcal{F}_0$ trivial, $P_0 = \frac{1}{2}$) gives $\mathbb{E}_s P_R = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\text{Var}_s(P_R) = \frac{1}{4}(1 - \prod_{j=1}^R (1 - b_j/c_j^2))$; since each $b_j/c_j^2 \in [0, 1]$, $1 - \prod_{j=1}^R (1 - b_j/c_j^2) \leq \sum_{j=1}^R b_j/c_j^2$.

(b) $b_1/c_1^2 \leq 1/c_1$, and for $2 \leq j \leq R$, $b_j/c_j^2 \leq b_j/(c_j c_{j-1}) = 1/c_{j-1} - 1/c_j$; so $\sum_{j=1}^R b_j/c_j^2 \leq 2/c_1 - 1/c_R$.

(c) Hence $1 - \prod_{j=1}^R (1 - b_j/c_j^2) \leq 2/c_1$, and $\text{Var}_s(P_R) \leq 1/(2c_1)$.

- (d) Chebyshev gives $\beta_1 := \Pr_s(|P_R - \frac{1}{2}| \geq \frac{1}{4}) \leq 16 \cdot \text{Var}_s(P_R) \leq 8/c_1$.
- (e) Target mass. $P_R = (1 + W)/(n + 2)$ with $W \sim \text{Unif}\{0, \dots, n\}$. The event holds for $(1 + W) \leq (n + 2)/4$ or $(1 + W) \geq 3(n + 2)/4$, so $\alpha_1 := \Pr_t(|P_R - \frac{1}{2}| \geq \frac{1}{4}) \geq ((n + 2)/2 - 2)/(n + 1) = (n - 2)/(2(n + 1)) \geq 0.45$ for $n \geq 40$ (the exact minimum of α_1 over $n \in [40, 2000]$ is $10/21 \approx 0.4762$, at $n = 41$).
- (f) Data processing onto the event gives $F \geq \text{kl}(\alpha_1 \parallel \beta_1) \geq \alpha_1 \ln(\alpha_1/\beta_1) - \alpha_1$. Split on c_1 :
- If $c_1 \geq 18$ then $\beta_1 \leq 8/18 < 0.45 \leq \alpha_1$ ($n \geq 40$). The map $a' \mapsto a' \ln(a'/\beta_1) - a'$ is increasing on $[\beta_1, 1]$, and the bound decreases in β_1 . Hence $F \geq 0.45 \ln(0.45 c_1/8) - 0.45 \geq 0.45 \ln(0.45 c_1/32) - 0.45$ (the statement's form).
 - If $c_1 < 18$ the right side is negative, so the claim is trivial.

Consequence: $c_1 \leq (8/0.45) \cdot e^{1+F/0.45} \leq 17.8 \cdot e^{1+2.23\varepsilon}$, which implies the Corollary's $c_1 \leq 72e^{1+2.3\varepsilon}$. $\square$

Proof of Corollary 11. Let $\varepsilon \geq F$. Round 1 gives $\ln c_1 \leq O(1 + \varepsilon)$. If $c_1 = 3$ ($b_1 = 1$), the Case $c = 3$ bound gives $\ln c_2 \leq O(1 + \varepsilon)$, so the chain may start from whichever of c_1, c_2 is ≥ 4 (without this step the profile $(1, n - 1)$ would escape). For k with $c_k \geq 4$: either $r < K_1 \sqrt{1 + \ln c_k} \leq K_1 c_k$, or Case 1 gives $c_{k+1} \leq K_2 \varepsilon c_k^2$, or Case 2 gives $c_{k+1} \leq 2eK_0 e^{8\varepsilon} c_k^2$. So $c_{k+1} \leq K_3(\varepsilon) c_k^2$ with

$$K_3 = \max(K_1, K_2 \varepsilon, 2eK_0 e^{8\varepsilon}, (4813/3) \cdot e^{1+12\varepsilon}).$$

The last entry covers the $c = 3$ step exactly: $c_2 \leq 3 \cdot 4813 e^{1+12\varepsilon} = (4813/3) e^{1+12\varepsilon} \cdot c_1^2$ with $c_1 = 3$, so the same doubling applies from $k = 1$. With $u_k := \ln c_k + \ln K_3$: $u_{k+1} \leq 2u_k$, so $\ln(n + 2) \leq u_R \leq 2^{R-1} u_1$, i.e. $R \geq 1 + \log_2 \ln(n + 2) - \log_2(\ln c_1 + \ln K_3) = \log_2 \ln n - O(1 + \log(1 + \varepsilon))$. $\square$

F.2. An auxiliary last-round bound for general policies

The restricted class. A policy reveals coordinates in rounds, as in Section 2 but without a cap. Before each round it chooses a set of unrevealed coordinates, measurably in an exogenous seed (drawn once, before any coordinate is sampled) and the values revealed so far; conditionally on that information, the round's coordinates are drawn independently from their exact conditional marginals given all revealed values. Every path commits all n coordinates, and there is no joint draw and no revision.

Proposition L (last-round edge bound, all policies). Take any policy in the restricted class: labelled or relabelled, value-adaptive, seeded; write q for its output law. Let $\tilde{m}$ be the number of coordinates committed before the round that commits the last coordinate, and $\tilde{a}$ the number of ones among them. For every $j \geq 0$,

$$\Pr_q(W \leq j) \leq \mathbb{E}[\varphi_j(\tilde{m})], \quad \varphi_j(m) := \Pr(\text{Bin}(n - m, 1/(2 + m)) \leq j),$$

and hence $\text{KL}(p \parallel q) \geq \text{kl}(\Pr_t(W \leq j) \parallel \mathbb{E}\varphi_j(\tilde{m}))$ whenever $\mathbb{E}\varphi_j(\tilde{m}) \leq \Pr_t(W \leq j)$.

Proof. The final round is identifiable when it starts: it is the round whose block is all $n - \tilde{m}$ remaining coordinates, chosen from the past. So $\tilde{m}$, and $\tilde{a}$ (the ones among the first $\tilde{m}$ committed coordinates), are determined by the past at its start. Given that past, every unrevealed coordinate has the exact marginal $(1 + \tilde{a})/(2 + \tilde{m}) \geq 1/(2 + \tilde{m})$, because the target is exchangeable. The

final round draws them independently, so its count stochastically dominates $\text{Bin}(n - \tilde{m}, 1/(2 + \tilde{m}))$. Since W is at least that count, take expectations. Then apply data processing onto $\{W \leq j\}$; $\text{kl}(a \parallel \cdot)$ is decreasing on $[0, a]$. $\square$

It constrains only the last round.

F.3. One relabelled profile: the matching upper bound

The lower bound of Corollary 11 is attained, up to an additive $O_\varepsilon(1)$, by one explicit relabelled profile. Write $R_F^{\text{PROF}}(n, \varepsilon)$, as in Corollary 5 but for this target, for the least number of rounds of a profile $(b_1, \dots, b_R)$ (all $b_k \geq 1$, $\sum_k b_k = n$, one uniform relabelling drawn before sampling, as in the Setting) whose output KL satisfies $F \leq \varepsilon$.

Theorem 12 (single-profile upper bound) *For every $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ and every $n \geq 2$, the profile constructed below (Schedule) satisfies $F \leq \varepsilon$ and has*

$$R \leq \log_2 \log_2 n + 8c_\varepsilon \text{ rounds}, \quad c_\varepsilon := \lceil 4.680 \cdot 10^{20} \varepsilon^{-2} \rceil.$$

Corollary 13 (single-profile rate) *With Corollary 11, $R_F^{\text{PROF}}(n, \varepsilon) = \log_2 \log_2 n + O_\varepsilon(1)$ for every fixed $\varepsilon > 0$.*

The constant is astronomical, so Theorem 12, though an explicit finite bound, is meaningful only as an asymptotic rate, not as a practical finite- n guarantee. It concerns the same class as Theorem 10 (one profile, one predrawn uniform relabelling, the exact oracle, forward KL, the number of rounds, the target with $\alpha = \beta = 1$). No matching bound is claimed for adaptive schedules or other α, β . For mixtures of profiles the mean-length quantity L_F is matched: Theorem 12 gives an upper bound (a relabelled profile being one feasible design), Theorem 15 below gives the order, and Corollary 18 the exact constant, $L_F(n, \varepsilon) / \log_2 \log_2 n \rightarrow e^{-\varepsilon}/2$; so the separation of Corollary 20 below is two-sided. An exact sampler exists outside the interface, in this sense: draw $\theta \sim \text{Unif}(0, 1)$, then all coordinates independently $\text{Bernoulli}(\theta)$; for $n \geq 2$ this one-shot draw is not a round of the interface, since a first round makes the committed values independent $\text{Bernoulli}(\frac{1}{2})$, so two of them are both 1 with probability $\frac{1}{4}$, against $\frac{1}{3}$ for the one-shot sampler. The theorem therefore concerns the round complexity of this interface, not a new sampler.

Plan of the upper bound. The proof first bounds F by a sum over rounds of one-round log-likelihood ratios (d_k below), each averaged under a law pulled back from the terminal target through the posterior kernels of the later rounds (Lemma U1). It then replaces each pulled-back law by the target's count law at that round, at the cost of the variation of an envelope of d_k times the later rounds' Kolmogorov distances (Lemmas U2–U4). What remains is one round at a time: an envelope with small mean and variation at most $4r + O(1)$ (Lemmas U5 and U6 and the per-round bound; the hard step is the local-limit lower bound of Lemma U6 in the bulk), and the Kolmogorov bound of Lemma U7, by which, since the schedule's levels grow geometrically, the later rounds' distances sum to order $1/(rc)$, so that the replacement costs order $1/c$. In the schedule each non-unit round goes from a level c to a level c' with c'/c^2 at most a design slot $\bar{\kappa}_j$ that depends only on ε (at most $8\bar{\kappa}_J$ for a merged final round), and the slots and the warm-up level c_ε are chosen so that the per-round terms add up to at most ε ; Theorem 12, applied at $\min(\varepsilon, 1)$ (proof of Corollary 13), is thus the upper half of Theorem 7(b).

Notation for the upper bound. Write $\pi_k := \text{Unif}\{0, \dots, m_k\} = \text{Law}_t(A_k)$ and $Q_k := \text{Law}_s(A_k)$, so that $F = \text{KL}(\pi_R \| Q_R)$ by T1. Round k uses the kernel

$$\mathcal{S}_k(a, y) := \Pr(a + \text{Bin}(b_k, (1+a)/c_{k-1}) = y), \quad a \in \{0, \dots, m_{k-1}\},$$

so $Q_k = Q_{k-1}\mathcal{S}_k$. Put $\tilde{\pi}_k := \pi_{k-1}\mathcal{S}_k$ (one sampler round applied to the target law), $d_k := \ln(\pi_k/\tilde{\pi}_k)$ and $\ell_k := \ln(\pi_k/Q_k)$ on $\{0, \dots, m_k\}$, so $F = \mathbb{E}_{\pi_R} \ell_R$. The posterior kernel is $\mathcal{B}_k(a | y) := \pi_{k-1}(a)\mathcal{S}_k(a, y)/\tilde{\pi}_k(y)$; for a function f on level $k-1$, $(\mathcal{B}_k f)(y) := \sum_a \mathcal{B}_k(a | y)f(a)$, and for a measure λ on level k , $(\lambda \mathcal{B}_k)(a) := \sum_y \lambda(y)\mathcal{B}_k(a | y)$. Write F_ν for the distribution function of a law ν on the integers, $\text{Kol}_k := \max_y |F_{\pi_k}(y) - F_{\tilde{\pi}_k}(y)|$, and $V(g) := \sum_y |g(y+1) - g(y)|$ for the variation of a function. For one round from level c to $c' = c + b$ (so $r = c'/c$, $b = (r-1)c$, and $N := c' - 1$ output values), put, for $0 \leq y \leq N-1$,

$$\chi(y) := \frac{c}{c'} \min(y+1, c'-1-y), \quad \chi_y := \lfloor \chi(y) + \frac{1}{2} \rfloor, \quad \sigma(y)^2 := (r-1)\chi(y)(1-\chi(y)/c).$$

What $\chi(y)$ and $\sigma(y)^2$ measure is said after the symmetry below. In one-round statements the index k is dropped: $\pi := \text{Unif}\{0, \dots, c-2\}$, $\pi' := \text{Unif}\{0, \dots, N-1\}$, $p_a := (1+a)/c$, $\mathcal{S}(a, y) := \Pr(a + \text{Bin}(b, p_a) = y)$, $\tilde{\pi} := \pi\mathcal{S}$, $d := \ln(\pi'/\tilde{\pi})$ and $\text{Kol} := \max_y |F_{\pi'}(y) - F_{\tilde{\pi}}(y)|$ (for round k : $\pi_{k-1}, \pi_k, (1+a)/c_{k-1}, \mathcal{S}_k, \tilde{\pi}_k, d_k, \text{Kol}_k$). The map $a \mapsto m_{k-1} - a$, $y \mapsto m_k - y$ leaves $\mathcal{S}_k$, π_{k-1} , π_k and $\tilde{\pi}_k$ invariant, so every bound below is stated on the lower half $y \leq (c'-2)/2$ and transfers by symmetry. On the lower half $\chi(y) = (y+1)/r$, which is $1+a$ for the real number a (non-integer in general, and negative when $y+1 < r$) whose one-round mean $a + bp_a = r(1+a) - 1$ equals y ; for $y+1 \geq r/2$, $\chi_y - 1 \geq 0$ is the nearest integer state, and $\sigma(y)^2$ is the binomial variance $bp_a(1-p_a)$ of the round at $a = \chi(y) - 1$. Lemma U5(ii) bounds $d(y)$ through the state $\chi_y - 1$, Lemma U6 through a window of integer states around $\chi(y) - 1$, and Lemma U5(i) through the edge state $a = 0$.

Lemma U1 (pointwise Jensen chain). For every k and y , $\ell_k(y) \leq d_k(y) + (\mathcal{B}_k \ell_{k-1})(y)$. Hence, with $\lambda_R := \pi_R$ and $\lambda_{k-1} := \lambda_k \mathcal{B}_k$ (probability measures), $F \leq \sum_{k=1}^R \mathbb{E}_{\lambda_k} [d_k]$.

Proof. $Q_k(y)/\tilde{\pi}_k(y) = \sum_a \mathcal{B}_k(a | y)e^{-\ell_{k-1}(a)}$, and $Q_{k-1} > 0$ on $\{0, \dots, m_{k-1}\}$ because every $(1+a)/c_{k-1} \in (0, 1)$. Since $-\ln$ is convex, $\ln(\tilde{\pi}_k/Q_k)(y) \leq (\mathcal{B}_k \ell_{k-1})(y)$; add $d_k(y)$. Iterate down to $\ell_0 = 0$ and take $\mathbb{E}_{\pi_R}$. $\square$

Lemma U2 (monotone posteriors). $\mathcal{S}_k$ is totally positive of order two: for $a < a'$ and $y < y'$, $\mathcal{S}_k(a, y)\mathcal{S}_k(a', y') \geq \mathcal{S}_k(a, y')\mathcal{S}_k(a', y)$. Hence $\mathcal{B}_k(\cdot | y')$ dominates $\mathcal{B}_k(\cdot | y)$ stochastically for $y' > y$, and $V(\mathcal{B}_k f) \leq V(f)$ for every f .

Proof. Adjacent case: with $h = y - a$, $p = (1+a)/c_{k-1}$, $p' = (2+a)/c_{k-1}$ and all four terms positive,

$$\frac{\mathcal{S}_k(a, y)\mathcal{S}_k(a+1, y+1)}{\mathcal{S}_k(a, y+1)\mathcal{S}_k(a+1, y)} = \frac{\binom{b}{h}^2}{\binom{b}{h-1}\binom{b}{h+1}} \cdot \frac{p'(1-p)}{p(1-p')} > 1$$

by log-concavity of binomial coefficients and $p' > p$; if a right-hand term vanishes ($h \notin \{1, \dots, b-1\}$) the inequality is trivial. The support $\{0 \leq y - a \leq b\}$ is a band, so the adjacent inequalities chain to all $a < a'$, $y < y'$: if $\mathcal{S}_k(a, y')\mathcal{S}_k(a', y) = 0$ there is nothing to prove; otherwise $y - a' \geq 0$ and $y' - a \leq b$, so every entry of the rectangle $\{a, \dots, a'\} \times \{y, \dots, y'\}$ is positive, and the logarithm of the claimed ratio is the sum of the logarithms of the adjacent ratios over the rectangle's unit squares. The prior factor $\pi_{k-1}(a)$ does not affect total positivity, so the posteriors increase in likelihood ratio, hence stochastically. Write $f = f^+ - f^-$ with $f^\pm$ non-decreasing and $V(f) =$

$\text{range}(f^+) + \text{range}(f^-)$; $\mathcal{B}_k$ maps non-decreasing functions to non-decreasing ones and does not enlarge ranges. $\square$

Lemma U3 (pull-back error). $\tilde{\pi}_j \mathcal{B}_j = \pi_{j-1}$ (Bayes), hence $\lambda_k - \pi_k = \sum_{j>k} (\pi_j - \tilde{\pi}_j) \mathcal{B}_j \mathcal{B}_{j-1} \cdots \mathcal{B}_{k+1}$. For every g on level j , $|\sum_y (\pi_j - \tilde{\pi}_j)(y)g(y)| \leq \text{Kol}_j V(g)$.

Proof. $(\tilde{\pi}_j \mathcal{B}_j)(a) = \sum_y \pi_{j-1}(a) \mathcal{S}_j(a, y) = \pi_{j-1}(a)$; telescope $\lambda_k - \pi_k = (\lambda_{k+1} - \pi_{k+1}) \mathcal{B}_{k+1} + (\pi_{k+1} - \tilde{\pi}_{k+1}) \mathcal{B}_{k+1}$ from $\lambda_R = \pi_R$. For the second claim sum by parts: with $\Delta := F_{\pi_j} - F_{\tilde{\pi}_j}$ ($\Delta(m_j) = 0$), $\sum_y (\pi_j - \tilde{\pi}_j)(y)g(y) = -\sum_{y < m_j} \Delta(y) (g(y+1) - g(y))$. $\square$

Lemma U4 (envelope bound). For every family of functions $\text{env}_k \geq d_k$ on level k ,

$$F \leq \sum_{k=1}^R \left[\mathbb{E}_{\pi_k} \text{env}_k + V(\text{env}_k) \sum_{j>k} \text{Kol}_j \right].$$

Proof. By Lemma U1, $F \leq \sum_k \mathbb{E}_{\lambda_k} d_k \leq \sum_k \mathbb{E}_{\lambda_k} \text{env}_k$. Summation by parts gives $\mathbb{E}_{\lambda_k} \text{env}_k - \mathbb{E}_{\pi_k} \text{env}_k \leq V(\text{env}_k) \max_y |F_{\lambda_k}(y) - F_{\pi_k}(y)|$. By Lemma U3, $F_{\lambda_k}(y) - F_{\pi_k}(y) = \sum_{j>k} \sum_z (\pi_j - \tilde{\pi}_j)(z) g_{j,y}(z)$ with $g_{j,y} := \mathcal{B}_j \cdots \mathcal{B}_{k+1} \mathbf{1}_{[0,y]}$, which by Lemma U2 is monotone with values in $[0, 1]$, so $V(g_{j,y}) \leq 1$ and each term is at most Kol_j . $\square$

Unit rounds. If $b_k = 1$ then $\text{Bin}(1, (1+a)/c_{k-1})$ is the exact conditional of the target, so $\tilde{\pi}_k = \pi_k$, $d_k \equiv 0$ and $\text{Kol}_k = 0$; such rounds contribute nothing (take $\text{env}_k \equiv 0$).

Lemma U5 (edge pointwise bounds). Fix one round with $r \geq 2$ and $c \geq 8r + 4$, and $y \leq (c' - 2)/2$. Then (i) $d(y) \leq 2r$ if $y + 1 < r/2$; (ii) $d(y) \leq r/\chi_y + \frac{1}{2} \ln(16\chi_y/r)$ if $y + 1 \geq r/2$ and $\chi_y \leq c/2$.

Proof. Tools: (T-a) $\text{Bin}(b, p)(h) \geq e^{-b \text{kl}(h/b|p)} / \sqrt{8h(1-h/b)}$ for $1 \leq h \leq b-1$, and $\text{Bin}(b, p)(0) = (1-p)^b \geq e^{-bp/(1-p)}$; (T-b) $\text{kl}(q|p) \leq (q-p)^2/(p(1-p))$. For the first bound in (T-a), put $u := h/b$. Then $\text{Bin}(b, p)(h) = \text{Bin}(b, u)(h) e^{-b \text{kl}(u|p)}$, and Robbins' bounds (Robbins, 1955), $\sqrt{2\pi m} (m/e)^m \leq m! \leq \sqrt{2\pi m} (m/e)^m e^{1/(12m)}$ for $m \geq 1$, give $\text{Bin}(b, u)(h) \geq e^{-1/(12h) - 1/(12(b-h))} / \sqrt{2\pi h(1-u)}$. For $b \geq 4$ the exponent is at least $-1/9$, and $e^{-1/9} / \sqrt{2\pi} > 1/\sqrt{8}$; for $b \leq 3$ directly, $\text{Bin}(2, \frac{1}{2})(1) = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\text{Bin}(3, \frac{1}{3})(1) = \text{Bin}(3, \frac{2}{3})(2) = \frac{4}{9} > \sqrt{3}/4$. The second bound in (T-a) holds because $\ln(1-p) \geq -p/(1-p)$, and (T-b) because KL is at most χ^2 . For every state a , $\tilde{\pi}(y) \geq \pi(a) \mathcal{S}(a, y)$, so $d(y) \leq -\ln \tilde{r} - \ln \mathcal{S}(a, y)$ with $\tilde{r} := (c' - 1)/(c - 1) \geq r$. The mean of $a + \text{Bin}(b, (1+a)/c)$ is exactly $r(1+a) - 1$. (i) Take $a = 0$: $h = y$, $bp = r - 1$, $|h - bp| \leq r - 1$ and $bp(1-p) \geq (r-1)/2$. For $h \geq 1$, $-\ln \mathcal{S}(0, y) \leq 2(r-1) + \frac{1}{2} \ln(4r)$; for $h = 0$ (the point $y = 0$), $-\ln \mathcal{S}(0, 0) = -b \ln(1 - 1/c) \leq (r-1)c/(c-1) \leq 2(r-1)$. Hence $d(y) \leq -\ln r + 2(r-1) + \frac{1}{2} \ln(4r) \leq 2r$. (ii) Take $a = \chi_y - 1 \leq c/2 - 1$: then $\delta := h - bp_a = y + 1 - r\chi_y$ satisfies $|\delta| \leq r/2$, $bp_a(1-p_a) = (r-1)\chi_y(1-\chi_y/c) \geq (r-1)\chi_y/2$ and $h \leq (r-1)\chi_y + r/2 \leq 2r\chi_y$, and $h \leq b-1$ since $\chi_y \leq c/2$ and $b \geq c \geq 8r + 4$. If $h \geq 1$, (T-a) and (T-b) give $-\ln \mathcal{S}(a, y) \leq r^2/(2(r-1)\chi_y) + \frac{1}{2} \ln(16r\chi_y) \leq r/\chi_y + \frac{1}{2} \ln(16r\chi_y)$, and $-\ln \tilde{r} \leq -\ln r$ gives the claim. In (ii) the only point with $h = 0$ is $r = 2, y = 0$ ($\chi_y = 1, a = 0$), where $d(0) \leq 2 - \ln 2$, below the claimed $2 + \frac{1}{2} \ln 8$. $\square$

Lemma U6 (bulk local limit, lower bound). Fix one round with $c \geq 64$ and $8 \leq r \leq c/4$, and let $y \leq (c' - 2)/2$ with $\chi(y) \geq 4r$. Then

$$\frac{\tilde{\pi}(y)}{\pi'(y)} \geq 1 - C_\star \left(\frac{r}{\sigma(y)} + \frac{1}{c} \right), \quad C_\star := 1,600,100,$$

where π' is the uniform law on $\{0, \dots, N-1\}$ and $\tilde{\pi}$ is the one-round law. Only this lower bound is used, in the third row of the per-round envelope below.

Proof. Write $\chi := \chi(y) = (y+1)/r$ and $\sigma := \sigma(y)$. On the lower half $\chi \leq c/2$, so $(r-1)\chi/2 \leq \sigma^2 \leq (r-1)\chi$; also $\chi \geq 4r \geq 32$. If $\sigma < 8r$, the right side is below $1 - C_*/8 < 0$; so assume $\sigma \geq 8r$, whence $\sigma \geq 64$ and $1/\sigma \leq r/(8\sigma)$. Since $\tilde{\pi}(y)/\pi'(y) = \frac{c'-1}{c-1} \sum_{a=0}^{c-2} \mathcal{S}(a, y)$ and $\frac{c'-1}{c-1} \geq r$, it suffices to show $r \sum_{a \in \mathcal{W}} \mathcal{S}(a, y) \geq 1 - 72r/\sigma$, where $\mathcal{W}$ is the set of integers a with $|g_a| \leq \chi/4$ and $g_a := a - a_0$ with $a_0 := \chi - 1$; as $72 \leq C_*$, this gives the lemma. (The proof needs only $C_* \geq 72$, and not the term C_*/c ; the larger stated C_* is the one with which the side conditions and constants of the per-round bound and of the schedule below are computed.)

Pointwise bound. Fix $a \in \mathcal{W}$, write $g := g_a$, and let $h := y - a$ be the number of ones drawn in the round, as in Lemma U5. Then $bp_a = (r-1)(\chi + g)$ and $b(1 - p_a) = (r-1)(c - \chi - g)$ are both at least $\frac{3}{4}(r-1)\chi$, and $h - bp_a = -rg$ with $r|g| \leq \frac{3}{8}(r-1)\chi$. So $\mathcal{W} \subseteq \{0, \dots, c-2\}$; and $h = (r-1)\chi - g$ and $b - h = (r-1)(c - \chi) + g$ are at least $(r - \frac{5}{4})\chi \geq \sigma^2/6$. Robbins' bounds $\sqrt{2\pi m} (m/e)^m \leq m! \leq \sqrt{2\pi m} (m/e)^m e^{1/(12m)}$ ($m \geq 1$) give

$$\ln \mathcal{S}(a, y) \geq -\left[h \ln \frac{h}{bp_a} + (b-h) \ln \frac{b-h}{b(1-p_a)} \right] - \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{2\pi h(b-h)}{b} - \frac{1}{12h} - \frac{1}{12(b-h)}.$$

The two terms in the bracket are $bp_a(1+u) \ln(1+u)$ and $b(1-p_a)(1+u') \ln(1+u')$ with $u = -rg/(bp_a)$ and $u' = rg/(b(1-p_a))$, both in $[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$; use $(1+u) \ln(1+u) \leq u + u^2/2 + 3|u|^3$ there. The linear terms cancel. The quadratic terms sum to $r^2 g^2/(2v_g)$, where $v_g := bp_a(1-p_a)$; since $v_g - \sigma^2 = (r-1)g(1 - (2\chi + g)/c)$, we have $|v_g - \sigma^2| \leq (r-1)|g| \leq \sigma^2/2$ and so $1/v_g \leq 1/\sigma^2 + 2(r-1)|g|/\sigma^4$. The cubic terms are at most $6r^3|g|^3/(\frac{3}{4}(r-1)\chi)^2 \leq \frac{32}{3}r^3|g|^3/\sigma^4$. So the bracket is at most $r^2 g^2/(2\sigma^2) + 12r^3|g|^3/\sigma^4$. Next, $h(b-h)/b = v_g + rg(2p_a - 1) - r^2 g^2/b \leq \sigma^2 + 2r|g|$, so the middle term is at least $-\frac{1}{2} \ln(2\pi\sigma^2) - r|g|/\sigma^2$; and the last two terms are at least $-1/\sigma^2$. With $e^{-x} \geq 1 - x$,

$$\mathcal{S}(a, y) \geq \frac{e^{-r^2 g^2/(2\sigma^2)}}{\sqrt{2\pi} \sigma} (1 - \mathcal{E}(g)), \quad \mathcal{E}(g) := \frac{12r^3|g|^3}{\sigma^4} + \frac{r|g|}{\sigma^2} + \frac{1}{\sigma^2}.$$

Summation. Put $\psi := r^2/(2\sigma^2)$ and $w := r|g|/\sigma$, so that $e^{-\psi g^2} = e^{-w^2/2}$ and $\mathcal{E}(g) \leq (12w^3 + w + 1)/\sigma$. As $w^3 e^{-w^2/2} \leq 32e^{-w^2/4}$ and $w e^{-w^2/2} \leq e^{-w^2/4}$, $e^{-\psi g^2} \mathcal{E}(g) \leq \frac{386}{\sigma} e^{-\psi g^2/2}$. For $f(t) = e^{-\psi'(t-a_0)^2}$ with $\psi' > 0$, comparing each monotone piece of f with its integral gives $\sum_{a \in \mathbb{Z} \cap I} f(a) \geq \int_I f - 1$ for every interval I and $\sum_{a \in \mathbb{Z}} f(a) \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} f + 1$; also $\int_{|t-a_0| \geq \chi/4} f \leq e^{-\psi' \chi^2/32} \sqrt{2\pi/\psi'}$. Apply these with $\psi' \in \{\psi, \psi/2\}$. As $\sqrt{\pi/\psi} = \sqrt{2\pi} \sigma/r$,

$$\begin{aligned} r \sum_{a \in \mathcal{W}} \mathcal{S}(a, y) &\geq \frac{r}{\sqrt{2\pi} \sigma} \left[\sum_{a \in \mathcal{W}} e^{-\psi g_a^2} - \frac{386}{\sigma} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{W}} e^{-\psi g_a^2/2} \right] \\ &\geq 1 - \sqrt{2} e^{-\psi \chi^2/32} - \frac{r}{\sqrt{2\pi} \sigma} - \frac{386}{\sigma} \left(\sqrt{2} + \frac{r}{\sqrt{2\pi} \sigma} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Finally $\psi \chi^2/32 = r^2 \chi^2/(64\sigma^2) \geq r\chi/64 \geq \sigma$, because $\sigma^2 \leq r\chi$ and $\sigma \geq 64$; so $e^{-\psi \chi^2/32} \leq e^{-\sigma} \leq 1/\sigma$. With $r/\sigma \leq \frac{1}{8}$ and $1/\sigma \leq r/(8\sigma)$, the three subtracted terms total at most $(0.18 + 0.4 + 70.7)r/\sigma < 72r/\sigma$. $\square$

Lemma U7 (one-round Kolmogorov distance). For one round from $c \geq 2$ to $c' = c + b$, $b \geq 1$,

$$(c-1) \max_y |F_{\pi'}(y) - F_{\tilde{\pi}}(y)| \leq 1 - \frac{b}{c'(c'-1)} < 1.$$

Proof. At a fixed y , $(c-1)F_{\bar{\pi}}(y)$ is a sum of binomial distribution functions evaluated at the grid parameters j/c , while $(c-1)F_{\pi'}(y)$ is linear in y . The proof writes each grid value as an integral of polynomials in the parameter t over the interval $[(j-1)/c, j/c]$ just below it, by the fundamental theorem of calculus, and sums over the intervals; the scaled difference (written $D(y)$ below) is then an explicit term minus a nonnegative term that is at most $\rho \leq 1$. Write $G_K(t) := \Pr(\text{Bin}(b, t) \leq K)$ and $q_K(t) := \Pr(\text{Bin}(b-1, t) = K)$, polynomials in t that vanish identically for $K < 0$. From $\frac{d}{dt} \Pr(\text{Bin}(b, t) = k) = b(q_{k-1} - q_k)$, telescoping gives $G'_K = -b q_K$. For real $\bar{y}$ let $Q_K(t) := \sum_{k \leq K} \Pr(\text{Bin}(b, t) = k)(\bar{y} - ct - k)$; the same derivative and $G_K = \Pr(\text{Bin}(b-1, t) \leq K-1) + (1-t)q_K$ give $-Q'_K = c'G_K - b((c-1)t - (\bar{y} - K - 1))q_K$. Both distribution functions equal 1 from $y = N-1$ on, so fix $0 \leq y \leq N-2$ and put $\bar{y} := y+1$. For $0 \leq i \leq c-1$ let $I_i := [i/c, (i+1)/c]$ and write $G^{(i)}, q^{(i)}, Q^{(i)}$ for G_K, q_K, Q_K at $K = y-i$, so that $\bar{y} - K - 1 = i$. With $j = a+1$, $(c-1)F_{\bar{\pi}}(y) = \sum_{j=1}^{c-1} G^{(j-1)}(j/c)$, while $(c-1)F_{\pi'}(y) = (c-1)\bar{y}/N$. On each I_i the fundamental theorem of calculus gives

$$Q^{(i)}\left(\frac{i}{c}\right) - Q^{(i)}\left(\frac{i+1}{c}\right) = \int_{I_i} [c'G^{(i)} - b((c-1)t - i)q^{(i)}], \quad G^{(i)}\left(\frac{i+1}{c}\right) = \int_{I_i} [cG^{(i)} - b(ct - i)q^{(i)}],$$

the second by differentiating $(ct-i)G^{(i)}$, and $G^{(i)}\left(\frac{i}{c}\right) - G^{(i)}\left(\frac{i+1}{c}\right) = \int_{I_i} b q^{(i)}$. Sum over i . The first identities telescope to $\bar{y}$: $Q^{(0)}(0) = \bar{y}$, $Q^{(c-1)}(1) = 0$ because $\bar{y} - c < b$, and $Q^{(i)}$ and $Q^{(i+1)}$ agree at $(i+1)/c$, where the extra term $k = y-i$ of $Q^{(i)}$ has the factor 0. The second sum to $(c-1)F_{\bar{\pi}}(y)$, since $G^{(c-1)}(1) = 0$. The third sum to $\rho := \sum_i \int_{I_i} b q^{(i)} = 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{c-1} \Pr(\text{Bin}(b, j/c) = \bar{y} - j)$, since $G^{(0)}(0) = 1$, so $0 \leq \rho \leq 1$. With $\Sigma_G := \sum_i \int_{I_i} G^{(i)}$, the first sums give $c'\Sigma_G = \bar{y} + \sum_i \int_{I_i} b((c-1)t - i)q^{(i)}$ and the second $c\Sigma_G = (c-1)F_{\bar{\pi}}(y) + \sum_i \int_{I_i} b(ct - i)q^{(i)}$. Eliminating Σ_G , and using $c((c-1)t - i) - c'(ct - i) = -((b+1)ct - bi)$ and $\frac{c}{c'} - \frac{c-1}{N} = \frac{b}{c'N}$,

$$D(y) := (c-1)(F_{\bar{\pi}}(y) - F_{\pi'}(y)) = \frac{\bar{y}b}{c'N} - \frac{1}{c'} \sum_{i=0}^{c-1} \int_{I_i} ((b+1)ct - bi) b q^{(i)}(t) dt.$$

On I_i the weight $(b+1)ct - bi = b(ct - i) + ct$ lies in $[0, c']$, and $q^{(i)} \geq 0$, so $\bar{y}b/(c'N) - \rho \leq D(y) \leq \bar{y}b/(c'N)$. As $1 \leq \bar{y} \leq N$ and $0 \leq \rho \leq 1$, $b/(c'N) - 1 \leq D(y) \leq b/c' = 1 - c/c'$, and $c/c' \geq b/(c'N)$ because $c(c' - 1) \geq b$. Hence $|D(y)| \leq 1 - b/(c'N)$; for $y < 0$ and $y \geq N-1$, $D(y) = 0$. $\square$

Per-round bound. Consider a non-unit round with $8 \leq r \leq c/4$, $c \geq \max(64, 8C_*, 8r+4)$ and $\kappa := c'/c^2 \leq 1/(128C_*^2)$. Put $\Xi := 64C_*^2$ (so $\Xi r \leq c/2$) and $L_{\Xi} := \frac{1}{2} \ln(16\Xi) + \frac{1}{4} = 18.0013\dots$. On the lower half let

$$\text{env}(y) := \begin{cases} \max(2r, r + L_{\Xi}), & y+1 < r/2, \\ r/\chi_y + L_{\Xi}, & y+1 \geq r/2 \text{ and } \chi(y) < \Xi r, \\ 4C_*(\sqrt{r/\chi(y)} + 1/c), & \chi(y) \geq \Xi r, \end{cases}$$

and extend it by symmetry. It dominates d : the first row by Lemma U5(i); the second by Lemma U5(ii), because $\chi(y) < \Xi r \leq c/2$ gives $\chi_y = \lfloor \chi(y) + \frac{1}{2} \rfloor \leq \lfloor c/2 \rfloor \leq c/2$ and $\frac{1}{2} \ln(16\chi_y/r) \leq L_{\Xi}$; the third by Lemma U6, because there $x := 2C_*(\sqrt{r/\chi(y)} + 1/c) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $d \leq -\ln(1-x) \leq 2x$ (using $r/\sigma \leq 2\sqrt{r/\chi}$, as $\sigma^2 \geq (r-1)\chi/2 \geq r\chi/4$). It is non-increasing from each end towards the middle (each row is non-increasing, the first row is $\geq r + L_{\Xi} \geq$ the second, and the second row is

$\geq L_\Xi > 1 \geq \frac{1}{2} + 4C_\star/c$, the largest value of the third), so $V(\text{env}) \leq 2 \max \text{env} \leq 4r + \ln(16\Xi) + 1$. For the mean, sum over the $N = rc - 1$ output values by halves ($\text{env} \geq 0$ is symmetric) and index the lower half by $t := y + 1 \leq T := \lfloor (N - 1)/2 \rfloor + 1 \leq rc/2$, so that $\chi(y) = t/r$. The first row has fewer than $r/2$ values of t ; in the second, χ_y takes the values $1, \dots, \chi_{\max}$, $\chi_{\max} := \lfloor \Xi r + \frac{1}{2} \rfloor$, each for at most $r + 1$ values of t ; in the third, $\sqrt{r/\chi(y)} = r/\sqrt{t}$, and $\sum_{t \leq T} t^{-1/2} \leq 2\sqrt{T}$. Hence

$$\sum_y \text{env}(y) \leq 2 \left[\frac{r}{2} \max(2r, r + L_\Xi) + (r + 1)(r(1 + \ln \chi_{\max}) + L_\Xi \chi_{\max}) + 4C_\star(2r\sqrt{T} + T/c) \right].$$

Divide by $N = c' - 1 \geq 0.9999rc$ (as $rc \geq 64C_\star$) and use $\kappa = r/c$, $(r + 1)/r \leq 1.125$, $\max(2r, r + L_\Xi) \leq 2r + L_\Xi - 8$, $\chi_{\max} \leq \Xi r + \frac{1}{2}$, $\ln \chi_{\max} \leq \ln \Xi + \ln r + 1$ and $2L_\Xi = \ln(16\Xi) + \frac{1}{2}$: the first row contributes at most $1.001\kappa(2 + (L_\Xi - 8)/8)$, the second at most $1.127\kappa(4 + 2\ln \Xi + 2\ln r + \Xi(\ln(16\Xi) + \frac{1}{2}) + L_\Xi/8)$, and the third at most $11.33C_\star\sqrt{\kappa} + 4.01C_\star/c$. Since $1.001(2 + (L_\Xi - 8)/8) + 1.127L_\Xi/8 < 5.8 < 1.13(\frac{1}{4}\ln(16\Xi) + 5)$ and $1.127 \leq 1.13$, the first two rows together contribute at most $1.13\kappa(2\ln r + A_\Xi)$, with A_Ξ as below, and $11.33 \leq 1.13 \cdot 11.32$ and $4.01 \leq 1.13 \cdot 4$ bound the third, so

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\pi'} \text{env} &\leq 1.13[\kappa(2\ln r + A_\Xi) + 11.32C_\star\sqrt{\kappa} + 4C_\star/c], \\ A_\Xi &:= 4 + 2\ln \Xi + \Xi(\ln(16\Xi) + \frac{1}{2}) + \frac{1}{4}\ln(16\Xi) + 5. \end{aligned}$$

Schedule. Put $\varepsilon' := \varepsilon/16$ and let c_ε be as in Theorem 12. If $n + 2 \leq 8c_\varepsilon$, use n unit rounds ($F = 0$, $R = n$). Otherwise use $c_\varepsilon - 2$ unit rounds (levels $2, 3, \dots, c_\varepsilon$), set $\gamma_0 := c_\varepsilon$, and define the design slots, for every $j \geq 1$,

$$\bar{\kappa}_j := \min \left\{ \frac{\varepsilon' 2^{-j}}{8(2u_{j-1} + A_\Xi)}, \left(\frac{\varepsilon' 2^{-j}}{90.6 C_\star} \right)^2 \right\}, \quad \gamma_j := \lfloor \bar{\kappa}_j \gamma_{j-1}^2 \rfloor,$$

with $u_j := \ln \gamma_j$ ($j \geq 0$), $x_j := \bar{\kappa}_j \gamma_{j-1}$ (the squaring ratio γ_j/γ_{j-1} before the floor) and $\hat{\kappa}_j := \gamma_j/\gamma_{j-1}^2 \leq \bar{\kappa}_j$; the slots depend on ε only, not on n . Stop at $J := \min\{j \geq 0 : \bar{\kappa}_{j+1}\gamma_j^2 \geq n + 2\}$. If $J = 0$ or $(n + 2)/\gamma_J \geq 8$, the realised squaring rounds are $\gamma_{j-1} \rightarrow \gamma_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq J$, followed by a final round $\gamma_J \rightarrow n + 2$ with $\kappa_f := (n + 2)/\gamma_J^2 \leq \bar{\kappa}_{J+1}$. Otherwise (merge, as the per-round bound needs $r \geq 8$) level γ_J is dropped: the squaring rounds are those with $1 \leq j \leq J - 1$, followed by a final round $\gamma_{J-1} \rightarrow n + 2$ with $\kappa_f := (n + 2)/\gamma_{J-1}^2 < 8\hat{\kappa}_J \leq 8\bar{\kappa}_J$ and $r_f = (n + 2)/\gamma_{J-1} > \gamma_J/\gamma_{J-1} > 20$ (by the minimality of J , $n + 2 > \bar{\kappa}_J \gamma_{J-1}^2 \geq \gamma_J$), and slot J is not realised. ($J = 0$ never needs the merge, since $n + 2 > 8c_\varepsilon$.)

Growth and side conditions. c_ε is an explicit sufficient choice: $c_\varepsilon \geq 64$, $c_\varepsilon \geq 8C_\star$, $c_\varepsilon \geq 8.5B_\Xi/\varepsilon$ with $B_\Xi := 4.6C_\star + 4.3 + 1.1(\ln(16\Xi) + 1)$, and $x_1 \geq 8e$: the second term of $\bar{\kappa}_1$ gives $x_1 \geq 4.680 \cdot 10^{20}/(2899.2 C_\star)^2 = 21.74679 \dots > 8e = 21.74625 \dots$, and the first gives $x_1 \geq 309$. Since $\varepsilon' 2^{-j} \leq 1/32$, $\bar{\kappa}_j \leq (32 \cdot 90.6 C_\star)^{-2} < 1/(128 C_\star^2)$. For $j \geq 2$ each term of the minimum shrinks by at most a factor 4 per step ($2u_{j-1} + A_\Xi \leq 2(2u_{j-2} + A_\Xi)$, as $\gamma_{j-1} \leq \gamma_{j-2}^2$), so $\bar{\kappa}_j \geq \bar{\kappa}_{j-1}/4$; the floor loses at most a factor 2 ($\gamma_j \geq \bar{\kappa}_j \gamma_{j-1}^2/2$, as $\bar{\kappa}_j \gamma_{j-1}^2 = x_j \gamma_{j-1} \geq 2$). Hence $x_{j+1} \geq x_j^2/8$ for $j \geq 1$, so $x_j \geq 8e^{2^{j-1}}$, every squaring ratio $\gamma_j/\gamma_{j-1} \geq x_j - 1/\gamma_{j-1}$ exceeds 20, $u_j \geq u_{j-1} + 2^{j-1}$, and $J \leq \lceil \log_2 \ln(n + 2) \rceil + 1$ (as $u_j \geq u_0 + 2^j - 1 \geq 2^j$ and $\bar{\kappa}_{j+1}\gamma_j^2 = x_{j+1}\gamma_j \geq \gamma_j$, the stopping condition holds once $2^j \geq \ln(n + 2)$). The block count is $R = c_\varepsilon - 1 + J$ without the merge and $R = c_\varepsilon - 2 + J$ with it, so $R \leq c_\varepsilon - 1 + J \leq \log_2 \log_2 n + 8c_\varepsilon$. Every

non-unit round, including the final round in both cases, has $8 \leq r \leq c/4$, $c \geq \max(64, 8C_*, 8r + 4)$ and $\kappa \leq 1/(128C_*^2)$.

Proof of Theorem 12. Apply Lemma U4 with $\text{env}_k \equiv 0$ on unit rounds and the per-round envelope on the others. By Lemma U7, $(c_{j-1} - 1)\text{Kol}_j < 1$ for every round j , and consecutive squaring levels grow by factors > 20 , so $\sum_{j>k} 1/(c_{j-1} - 1) \leq 1.02 \cdot \frac{20}{19}/c_k < 1.074/c_k$, as every starting level is at least 64 and so $1/(c - 1) \leq 1.02/c$ (the final level $n + 2$ never appears as a denominator). Hence, for a round from level c to $c_k = r_k c$,

$$V(\text{env}_k) \sum_{j>k} \text{Kol}_j \leq (4r_k + \ln(16\Xi) + 1) \frac{1.074}{r_k c} \leq [4.3 + 1.1(\ln(16\Xi) + 1)/r_k]/c.$$

This estimate uses the schedule and is not a consequence of the per-round hypotheses alone; it holds with and without the merge, since the realised starting levels grow by factors > 20 . The design budgets run over all slots $j \geq 1$: $\sum_{j \geq 1} \bar{\kappa}_j(2u_{j-1} + A_\Xi) \leq \sum_{j \geq 1} \varepsilon' 2^{-j}/8 = \varepsilon'/8$ and $\sum_{j \geq 1} \sqrt{\bar{\kappa}_j} \leq \varepsilon'/(90.6C_*)$. A realised squaring round j ($1 \leq j \leq J$ without the merge, $1 \leq j \leq J - 1$ with it) has $\hat{\kappa}_j \leq \bar{\kappa}_j$ and $\ln r_j \leq u_{j-1}$, so it is dominated by slot j ; an unmerged final round has $\kappa_f \leq \bar{\kappa}_{J+1}$ and $\ln r \leq u_J$ (as $n + 2 \leq \gamma_J^2$), so it is dominated by slot $J + 1$. These rounds occupy distinct slots, so together they contribute at most $1.13\varepsilon'/8$ through the terms $1.13\kappa(2 \ln r + A_\Xi)$ and at most $1.13 \cdot 11.32 \varepsilon'/90.6 < 0.1413\varepsilon'$ through the terms $1.13 \cdot 11.32C_*\sqrt{\kappa}$. A merged final round ($\kappa_f < 8\bar{\kappa}_J$, and $\ln r \leq u_{J-1}$ as $r = \kappa_f \gamma_{J-1} < 8\bar{\kappa}_J \gamma_{J-1} \leq \gamma_{J-1}$) is charged separately and adds at most $1.13(\varepsilon' 2^{-J} + 11.32\sqrt{8} \varepsilon' 2^{-J}/90.6) \leq 1.53\varepsilon'$. A realised non-unit round from level c contributes at most $(4.52C_* + 4.3 + 1.1(\ln(16\Xi) + 1))/c \leq B_\Xi/c$ through its $1/c$ terms; the starting levels grow by factors > 20 from c_ε , so these total at most $\frac{20}{19}B_\Xi/c_\varepsilon \leq 1.053B_\Xi/c_\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon/8$ in both cases. So $F \leq (0.1413 + 0.1413 + 1.53)\varepsilon' + \varepsilon/8 < 0.2384\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon$. $\square$

Proof of Corollary 13. Theorem 12 at $\min(\varepsilon, 1)$ gives $R_F^{\text{PROF}}(n, \varepsilon) \leq \log_2 \log_2 n + 8c_{\min(\varepsilon, 1)}$ (for $\varepsilon > 1$, a profile with $F \leq 1$ also has $F \leq \varepsilon$), and Corollary 11 gives $R_F^{\text{PROF}}(n, \varepsilon) \geq \log_2 \ln n - O(1 + \log(1 + \varepsilon))$; the two differ by $O_\varepsilon(1)$, since $\log_2 \ln n = \log_2 \log_2 n + \log_2 \ln 2$. $\square$

F.4. The schedule-averaged criterion

In the mean-cost class of Section 2 (finite predrawn mixtures μ of full labelled schedules, $C(\mu) = \mathbb{E}_\mu |U|$, $H(\mu) = \mathbb{E}_\mu \text{KL}(p||q_U)$, $L_H(n, \varepsilon) = \inf\{C(\mu) : H(\mu) \leq \varepsilon\}$), put $T_n := \ln \frac{n+2}{2}$ and $D_n := \mathcal{H}_{n+1} - 1 - T_n$, where $\mathcal{H}_m := \sum_{i \leq m} 1/i$.

Proposition 14 (schedule-averaged depth on this target) *For every $n \geq 1$ and every finite pre-drawn mixture μ ,*

$$C(\mu) (6H(\mu) + 2D_n) \geq T_n^2, \quad 0 < D_n < \frac{1}{2};$$

hence $L_H(n, \varepsilon) \geq \max\{1, T_n^2/(6\varepsilon + 1)\}$ for every $\varepsilon \geq 0$. For $\varepsilon > 0$ put $\alpha_H := \min\{\frac{1}{2}, \varepsilon/(4(T_n + 1))\}$; the labelled schedule that, while $c < n + 2$, commits $b = \min\{n + 2 - c, \max(1, \lfloor \alpha_H c \rfloor)\}$ coordinates at level c has $\text{KL}(p||q_U) < \varepsilon$ and at most $\min\{n, 2 + (3T_n + 2)/\alpha_H\}$ rounds. So $L_H(n, \varepsilon) = \Theta_\varepsilon((\ln n)^2)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ at every fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, while $L_H(n, 0) = n$.

Proof. After s reveals put $c = s + 2$ and $\hat{\theta}_s := (1 + A_s)/c$, the posterior mean; under p the count A_s is uniform on $\{0, \dots, s\}$. Put $h_s := \mathbb{E} h(\hat{\theta}_s)$, with h the binary entropy in nats. The next reveal gives $\hat{\theta}_{s+1} = \hat{\theta}_s + (X - \hat{\theta}_s)/(c + 1)$, where the revealed value X is Bernoulli($\hat{\theta}_s$) given the past. So $\hat{\theta}_{s+1}$ has conditional mean $\hat{\theta}_s$ and conditional variance $\hat{\theta}_s(1 - \hat{\theta}_s)/(c + 1)^2$,

and $h_s - h_{s+1} = \mathbb{E} \text{kl}(\hat{\theta}_{s+1} \| \hat{\theta}_s)$. Pinsker's inequality $\text{kl}(x \| y) \geq 2(x - y)^2$ and $\mathbb{E}[\hat{\theta}_s(1 - \hat{\theta}_s)] = (c + 1)/(6c)$ give the lower bound $2(c + 1)/(6c(c + 1)^2) = 1/(3c(c + 1))$; the Bernoulli bound $\text{kl}(x \| y) \leq (x - y)^2/(y(1 - y))$ gives the upper bound $1/(c + 1)^2$ conditionally. Hence

$$\frac{1}{3c(c + 1)} \leq h_s - h_{s+1} \leq \frac{1}{(c + 1)^2}. \quad (\text{BB1})$$

By the chain rule, $\text{KL}(p \| q_U)$ is the sum over rounds of the mean, over the committed values, of the divergence $\text{KL}(p(x_{B_t} | \cdot) \| \bigotimes_{i \in B_t} p(x_i | \cdot))$ of the block's conditional law from the product of its conditional marginals, which is the block's conditional total correlation: the sum of its coordinates' conditional entropies minus their joint conditional entropy. After s committed coordinates each unrevealed one is Bernoulli($\hat{\theta}_s$), so each coordinate's conditional entropy has mean h_s , and expanding the joint entropy coordinate by coordinate inside the block gives mean $\sum_{i < b} h_{s+i}$. So a block of b coordinates entered at level c costs exactly $d(c, b) := b h_s - \sum_{i < b} h_{s+i}$ in expectation under p , and $\text{KL}(p \| q_U) = \sum_t d(c_{t-1}, b_t)$; this is the block total-correlation decomposition of fixed-schedule KL (Chen et al., 2026; Secchi and Zanella, 2026; Wen et al., 2026). For fixed schedules the exact optimum is characterized by Chen et al. (2026, Thm. 4); the proposition bounds it explicitly on this target through the two-sided increment bound (BB1), and extends the lower bound to predrawn mixtures with expected cost by the linearity of H and C in the schedule law together with Cauchy–Schwarz over the mixture and its rounds; the upper-order conclusion also follows from Chen et al. (2026, Thm. 9) with the mutual-information bound on the dual total correlation in Secchi and Zanella (2026, App. D). The consequence specific to this paper is the same-class join with Theorems 12 and 15 in Corollary 20. At fixed dimension, as the number of steps grows, Wainwright (2026, Thm. 3) gives sharp asymptotics of the optimal path divergence; the proposition instead holds at fixed ε as n grows. Telescoping (BB1) gives $\frac{1}{3}\Psi \leq d \leq \Psi$ with $\Psi(c, b) := \sum_{i < b} i/(c(c + i)) \leq b(b - 1)/(2c^2)$. Over a schedule the terms $1/(c_{t-1} + i)$, $0 \leq i < b_t$, cover the levels $2, \dots, n + 1$ once each, so $\sum_t \Psi(c_{t-1}, b_t) = \sum_t b_t/c_{t-1} - (\mathcal{H}_{n+1} - 1)$. With $z_t := \ln(c_t/c_{t-1})$, which sum to T_n , and $e^z - 1 - z \geq z^2/2$, this yields

$$\sum_t z_t^2 \leq 6\text{KL}(p \| q_U) + 2D_n, \quad D_n = \sum_{c=2}^{n+1} \left[\frac{1}{c} - \ln \left(1 + \frac{1}{c} \right) \right] \in (0, \tfrac{1}{2}).$$

Cauchy–Schwarz over μ and rounds gives $T_n^2 = (\mathbb{E}_\mu \sum_t z_t)^2 \leq C(\mu) \mathbb{E}_\mu \sum_t z_t^2 \leq C(\mu)(6H(\mu) + 2D_n)$ for components of any lengths. For the schedule: singletons cost 0; every other block has $b \leq \alpha_H c$ and so costs at most $\alpha_H^2/2$; there are fewer than $2/\alpha_H$ initial singletons, at most one final truncated block, and at most $3T_n/\alpha_H$ other blocks, since each multiplies c by at least $1 + \alpha_H/2$ and $\ln(1 + \alpha_H/2) \geq \alpha_H/3$; so $\text{KL}(p \| q_U) \leq \alpha_H^2/2 + \frac{3}{2}\alpha_H T_n < \varepsilon$. Finally $d(c, b) > 0$ for $b \geq 2$ by (BB1), so $H(\mu) = 0$ forces all-singleton schedules. $\square$

F.5. Mixtures: the common lower bound

The gap sets of Theorem 10 depend on the profile, and the atoms of one component fill another's gaps (§F.8), so Corollary 11 gives no lower bound on L_F . A single test set, the same for every component, does: a finite union of thin neighbourhoods of the reduced fractions in $(0, 1)$ with small denominators (S^* below). In the mean-cost class of Section 2, with $L_F(n, \varepsilon) = \inf\{C(\mu) : F(\mu) \leq \varepsilon\}$ evaluated for the present Beta(1, 1)–Bernoulli target, write $b(U) = (|B_1|, \dots, |B_{|U|}|)$

for the profile of a labelled schedule U , $Q_W^{(b)}$ for the count law of the relabelled profile b (T1), and $\bar{Q}_W := \sum_U \mu(U) Q_W^{(b(U))}$; under a profile the sampler is that of the Setting, with $P_k = (1 + A_k)/c_k$ and $\mathcal{F}_k$. Let ϕ be Euler's totient, $Z(\vartheta) := \sum_{q \geq 2} \phi(q) q^{-\vartheta/2} = \zeta(\vartheta/2 - 1)/\zeta(\vartheta/2) - 1$ (ζ the Riemann zeta function), which is finite iff $\vartheta > 4$, and h the binary entropy in nats. For $\vartheta > 1$, $\xi \geq 1$ and $\omega > 0$ put $\mathcal{Q}_n := \{q \geq 2 : \xi q^\vartheta \leq n + 2\}$, $N_n := \sum_{q \in \mathcal{Q}_n} \phi(q)$, $\omega_q := \omega(\xi q^\vartheta)^{-1/2}$,

$$S^* := \bigcup_{q \in \mathcal{Q}_n} \bigcup_{1 \leq p < q, \gcd(p, q) = 1} [p/q - \omega_q, p/q + \omega_q], \quad \delta_\omega := 2e^{-\omega^2},$$

$\lambda_\xi := \ln \xi / (\vartheta - 1)$ and $R_0(n) := \lfloor \log_\vartheta((\ln(n + 2) + \lambda_\xi)/(\ln 2 + \lambda_\xi)) \rfloor$; for $\vartheta > 4$ also put $a_n := \lfloor 2\omega(n + 2)\xi^{-1/2}Z(\vartheta) + N_n \rfloor / (n + 1)$. Here ϑ , ξ and ω are the jump exponent, the jump factor and the radius factor; $\mathcal{Q}_n$ contains every reduced denominator that the run's value can have just before a jump, N_n counts the reduced fractions in $(0, 1)$ with these denominators, and a_n bounds the target mass of S^* (Lemma X3(ii)).

The obstruction. Just before a jump, a round from level c to at least ξc^ϑ , the run's value is a reduced fraction p/q with $q \leq c$, so $q \in \mathcal{Q}_n$, and the run then ends within ω_q of it except with probability δ_ω (Lemmas X1 and X3(i) below). One set must serve every component, so S^* surrounds all $\phi(q)$ reduced fractions of each $q \in \mathcal{Q}_n$; its target mass is at most about $2\omega\xi^{-1/2}Z(\vartheta)$ (Lemma X3(ii)), small for large ξ only because $Z(\vartheta) < \infty$, that is, $\vartheta > 4$. Every component with at most $R_0(n) \approx \log_\vartheta \ln n$ rounds jumps (Lemma X2), so $F \leq \varepsilon$ forces mass about $e^{-\varepsilon}$ onto longer components. The resulting coefficient $(\ln 2 / \ln \vartheta) e^{-\varepsilon}$ of $\log_2 \log_2 n$ tends to $e^{-\varepsilon}/2$ as $\vartheta \downarrow 4$, and Remark 16 shows why $\vartheta \leq 4$ gives nothing.

Theorem 15 (finite predrawn mixtures on this target) (a) Let $n \geq 1$. Take $\vartheta > 4$, $\xi \geq 1$, $\omega > 0$ and $\varepsilon \geq 0$ with $a_n < 1$ and $\delta_\omega < 1$. Every finite predrawn mixture μ with $F(\mu) \leq \varepsilon$ satisfies

$$\mu(|U| > R_0(n)) \geq \eta_n := \frac{e^{-(\varepsilon + h(a_n))/(1 - a_n)} - \delta_\omega}{1 - \delta_\omega},$$

and hence $C(\mu) \geq 1 + R_0(n) \max(\eta_n, 0)$. So $L_F(n, \varepsilon) \geq 1 + R_0(n) \max(\eta_n, 0)$.

(b) For every $\varepsilon \geq 0$, $\liminf_n L_F(n, \varepsilon) / \log_2 \log_2 n \geq e^{-\varepsilon}/2$, and for every $\varepsilon > 0$, $\limsup_n L_F(n, \varepsilon) / \log_2 \log_2 n \leq e^{-\varepsilon}$. Hence, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, $L_F(n, \varepsilon) = \Theta_\varepsilon(\log \log n)$.

(c) Take $R \geq 1$, $\vartheta > 4$, $n + 2 \geq 2^{\vartheta R}$ and $\bar{\omega} > 0$. Set $\xi_n := ((n + 2)/2^{\vartheta R})^{(\vartheta - 1)/(\vartheta R - 1)}$ and $\omega := \bar{\omega}\sqrt{\xi_n}$, and write $a_n = \lfloor 2\bar{\omega}(n + 2)Z(\vartheta) + N_n \rfloor / (n + 1)$, with N_n computed at $\xi = \xi_n$. Then every finite predrawn mixture μ whose components all have at most R rounds satisfies

$$F(\mu) \geq (1 - a_n)_+ (\bar{\omega}^2 \xi_n - \ln 2)_+ - \ln 2.$$

With $\bar{\omega} = 1/(3Z(\vartheta))$, $a_n \leq 0.85$ for all $n \geq 14$ with $n + 2 \geq 2^{\vartheta R}$, and the infimum $F_R^{\text{mix}}(n)$ of F over these mixtures satisfies $F_R^{\text{mix}}(n) \geq (1/(27Z(\vartheta)^2) - o(1)) \xi_n$. Since $\xi_n \asymp n^{1/(1 + \vartheta + \dots + \vartheta^{R-1})}$, for every $\eta' > 0$ a fixed $\vartheta = \vartheta(\eta') > 4$ gives $F_R^{\text{mix}}(n) \geq n^{3/(4^R - 1) - \eta'}$ for all large n ; for $R = 2$ that is $n^{1/5 - \eta'}$.

The upper bound in (b) is not sharp: for every $\varepsilon > 0$, Corollary 18, through Theorem 17, lowers its coefficient from $e^{-\varepsilon}$ to $e^{-\varepsilon}/2$. The proof of the lower half of (b) also shows that, for every $\varepsilon \geq 0$, the least hard cap of finite predrawn mixtures with $F \leq \varepsilon$ is at least $(\frac{1}{2} - o(1)) \log_2 \log_2 n$. The finite- n reach of Theorem 15 is discussed after Theorem 19 and in §F.8.

Remark 16 (the limit of this test set) Let $2 \leq \vartheta < 4$, $\xi \geq 1$ and $\omega > 0$, assume $\mathcal{Q}_n \neq \emptyset$, put $q_n := \max \mathcal{Q}_n$, and suppose $q_n^{2-\vartheta/2} \geq \sqrt{\xi}/\omega$. Then $S^* \supseteq [1/q_n, 1-1/q_n]$. For $1 < \vartheta < 2$ the same conclusion holds, now under the hypothesis $q_n \geq \sqrt{\xi}/\omega$. At $\vartheta = 4$ with ξ and ω fixed, $\Pr_t(P_R \in S^*) \rightarrow 1$. So no test set of this form, with ϑ , ξ and ω fixed, gives a coefficient of $\log_2 \log_2 n$ above $\frac{1}{2}$ in the lower bound on L_F : for $1 < \vartheta \leq 4$ it captures almost all target mass for large n , so the divergence step of Part (a) yields nothing, and for $\vartheta > 4$ the coefficient $(\ln 2 / \ln \vartheta) \eta_\infty$ of the proof of (b) is below $\frac{1}{2}$.

Proof of Theorem 15. Four facts are used.

X0 (count reduction for mixtures). $F(\mu) \geq \text{KL}(p_W \| \bar{Q}_W)$. Indeed $x \mapsto |x|$ pushes p to p_W and Q_μ to $\bar{Q}_W$: given the past, round t adds $\text{Bin}(|B_t|, (1 + A_{t-1})/(2 + |B_1| + \dots + |B_{t-1}|))$ ones, so a labelled schedule's count law depends only on its block sizes. KL does not increase under a measurable map. Equality holds for the uniform relabelling of μ , which has the same cost.

Lemma X1 (tail after round $k-1$; any single profile). For every $1 \leq k \leq R$ and $t > 0$, almost surely, $\Pr_s(|P_R - P_{k-1}| \geq t \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}) \leq 2 \exp(-2t^2/V_k) \leq 2 \exp(-c_k t^2)$, with $V_k := \sum_{j=k}^R b_j/c_j^2 < 2/c_k$.

Proof. Order the coordinates within each round. Let $\mathcal{G}_{j,i}$ be $\mathcal{F}_{j-1}$ together with the first i coordinates of round j , and $Y_{j,i} := \mathbb{E}_s[P_R \mid \mathcal{G}_{j,i}]$. P is a martingale, and round j is i.i.d. Bernoulli(P_{j-1}) given $\mathcal{F}_{j-1}$. Hence $Y_{j,i} = (1 + A_{j-1} + H_{j,i} + (b_j - i)P_{j-1})/c_j$, with $H_{j,i}$ the ones among those first i coordinates. So $Y_{k,0} = P_{k-1}$, $Y_{R,b_R} = P_R$ and $Y_{j,b_j} = Y_{j+1,0}$. Each increment $(x - P_{j-1})/c_j$, with $x \in \{0, 1\}$ the new coordinate, lies in $[-P_{j-1}/c_j, (1 - P_{j-1})/c_j]$, an interval of deterministic length $1/c_j$ with a predictable left end. Iterating conditional Hoeffding over all coordinates of rounds $k, \dots, R$ gives $\mathbb{E}_s[e^{\lambda(P_R - P_{k-1})} \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] \leq e^{\lambda^2 V_k/8}$. Chernoff with $\lambda = 4t/V_k$ bounds each tail by e^{-2t^2/V_k} ; the same argument applies to $-(P_R - P_{k-1})$. Finally $V_k < 2/c_k$: first $b_k/c_k^2 < 1/c_k$; then for $j > k$, $b_j/c_j^2 \leq (c_j - c_{j-1})/(c_j c_{j-1}) = 1/c_{j-1} - 1/c_j$, which telescopes to $< 1/c_k$. $\square$

Lemma X2 (forced jumps). Fix $\vartheta > 1$ and $\xi \geq 1$, and call round k a *jump* if $c_k \geq \xi c_{k-1}^\vartheta$. Let $\Gamma_R := \xi^{(\vartheta^R - 1)/(\vartheta - 1)} 2^{\vartheta^R}$. If $n \geq 1$ and $\Gamma_R \leq n + 2$, every profile of n with at most R parts has a jump. Moreover $R_0(n) = \max\{R \geq 0 : \Gamma_R \leq n + 2\} = \lfloor \log_\vartheta((\ln(n + 2) + \lambda_\xi)/(\ln 2 + \lambda_\xi)) \rfloor$.

Proof. If there is no jump, then $c_k < \xi c_{k-1}^\vartheta$ for every k . Since $x \mapsto \xi x^\vartheta$ is increasing, induction gives $c_k < \Gamma_k$ for $k \geq 1$, where $\Gamma_0 = 2 = c_0$ and $\Gamma_k = \xi \Gamma_{k-1}^\vartheta$. Γ_k is nondecreasing because $\xi \geq 1$ and $\Gamma \geq 2$. For a profile with $R' \leq R$ parts ($R' \geq 1$, since $n \geq 1$) this gives $n + 2 = c_{R'} < \Gamma_{R'} \leq \Gamma_R \leq n + 2$, a contradiction. The closed form is $\ln \Gamma_R = \vartheta^R (\lambda_\xi + \ln 2) - \lambda_\xi$. $\square$

Lemma X3 (one test set). Fix $\vartheta > 4$, $\xi \geq 1$ and $\omega > 0$. (i) If the profile b has a jump, then $\Pr_s(P_R \notin S^*) \leq \delta_\omega$ under b . (ii) $\Pr_t(P_R \in S^*) \leq a_n$, and $N_n \leq ((n + 2)/\xi)^{2/\vartheta}/2$.

Proof. (i) Let $c = c_{k-1}$ at the jump round k , so $\xi c^\vartheta \leq c_k \leq n + 2$. $P_{k-1} = j/c$ with $1 \leq j \leq c - 1$ reduces to p/q with $2 \leq q \leq c$ and $\gcd(p, q) = 1$. Then $\xi q^\vartheta \leq \xi c^\vartheta \leq n + 2$, so $q \in \mathcal{Q}_n$, and $\omega_q \geq \omega(\xi c^\vartheta)^{-1/2} \geq \omega c_k^{-1/2}$. So $P_R \notin S^*$ forces $|P_R - P_{k-1}| \geq \omega c_k^{-1/2}$. By Lemma X1, conditionally on $\mathcal{F}_{k-1}$ this has probability at most $2e^{-\omega^2}$. Take expectations. (ii) The target's atoms are the $n + 1$ points $1/(n + 2), \dots, (n + 1)/(n + 2)$, each with mass $1/(n + 1)$, and a closed interval of length ℓ contains at most $(n + 2)\ell + 1$ atoms. Sum over the $\phi(q)$ intervals of length $2\omega_q$ for each $q \in \mathcal{Q}_n$, and use $\sum_{q \geq 1} \phi(q)q^{-s} = \zeta(s - 1)/\zeta(s)$ at $s = \vartheta/2$, which is finite iff $\vartheta > 4$. Finally $N_n \leq \sum_{q=2}^Q (q - 1) \leq Q^2/2$, with $Q = ((n + 2)/\xi)^{1/\vartheta}$. $\square$

Part (a). By X0 and data processing onto the indicator of $\{P_R \notin S^*\}$, $\varepsilon \geq \text{kl}(u\|v)$, where $u := \Pr_t(P_R \notin S^*) \geq 1 - a_n$ and $v := \bar{Q}_W(P_R \notin S^*)$. We claim $v \geq e^{-(\varepsilon + h(a_n))/(1-a_n)}$. If $v \geq 1 - a_n$, this holds because $1 - a_n \geq e^{-h(a_n)/(1-a_n)}$, which is equivalent to $-a_n \ln a_n \geq 0$. Otherwise $v < 1 - a_n \leq u$. $\text{kl}(\cdot\|v)$ is increasing on $[v, 1]$, so $\varepsilon \geq \text{kl}(1 - a_n\|v) \geq (1 - a_n) \ln(1/v) - h(a_n)$; the dropped term $-a_n \ln(1 - v)$ is ≥ 0 . Rearrange. By Lemma X2, every U with $|U| \leq R_0(n)$ has a jump. By Lemma X3(i), such a component puts mass at most δ_ω on $\{P_R \notin S^*\}$. With $m := \mu(|U| > R_0(n))$ this gives $v \leq \delta_\omega(1 - m) + m$, hence $m \geq (v - \delta_\omega)/(1 - \delta_\omega) \geq \eta_n$. Finally $|U| \geq 1$ always, as $n \geq 1$, and $|U| \geq R_0(n) + 1$ on $\{|U| > R_0(n)\}$. So $C(\mu) \geq 1 + R_0(n)m$.

Part (b), lower bound. Fix $\vartheta > 4$, $\xi \geq 1$ and ω with $a_\infty := 2\omega Z(\vartheta)/\sqrt{\xi} < 1$ and $\omega^2 > \ln 2$ (so $\delta_\omega < 1$); part (a) needs both premises. As $n \rightarrow \infty$, $N_n/(n+1) \rightarrow 0$ because $\vartheta > 2$, so $a_n \rightarrow a_\infty$. Also $R_0(n) \geq \log_\vartheta \ln(n+2) - \log_\vartheta(\ln 2 + \lambda_\xi) - 1$. Part (a) gives $\liminf_n L_F(n, \varepsilon)/\log_\vartheta \ln n \geq \eta_\infty := [e^{-(\varepsilon + h(a_\infty))/(1-a_\infty)} - \delta_\omega]/(1 - \delta_\omega)$. Since $\log_\vartheta \ln n / \log_2 \log_2 n \rightarrow \ln 2 / \ln \vartheta$, $\liminf_n L_F(n, \varepsilon)/\log_2 \log_2 n \geq (\ln 2 / \ln \vartheta) \eta_\infty$. Every admissible fixed (ϑ, ξ, ω) bounds the same liminf, so take the supremum: $\xi \rightarrow \infty$ gives $a_\infty \rightarrow 0$ and $h(a_\infty) \rightarrow 0$; then $\omega \rightarrow \infty$ gives $\delta_\omega \rightarrow 0$; then $\vartheta \downarrow 4$ gives $\ln 2 / \ln \vartheta \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}$. The bound is $e^{-\varepsilon}/2$. For a lower bound on the least hard cap only $\eta_\infty > 0$ is needed, and for every $\varepsilon \geq 0$ and $\vartheta > 4$ some admissible (ξ, ω) (with $\xi \geq 1$, $\omega > 0$, $\omega^2 > \ln 2$ and $a_\infty < 1$) gives it. Then $\eta_n > 0$ for all large n , so by part (a) every finite predrawn mixture with $F(\mu) \leq \varepsilon$ gives positive weight to a component with more than $R_0(n)$ rounds; as $R_0(n)/\log_2 \log_2 n \rightarrow \ln 2 / \ln \vartheta$, letting $\vartheta \downarrow 4$ shows that the least hard cap of these mixtures is at least $(\frac{1}{2} - o(1)) \log_2 \log_2 n$.

Part (b), upper bound. Fix $\varepsilon' \in (0, \min(\varepsilon, 1)]$. Theorem 12 holds for every $n \geq 2$ and $\varepsilon' \in (0, 1]$; let μ' be the uniform relabelling of its profile, with $F(\mu') \leq \varepsilon'$ and cost at most $\log_2 \log_2 n + 8c_{\varepsilon'}$. Put $w := e^{-(\varepsilon - \varepsilon')}$ and $\mu := w\mu' + (1-w) \cdot (\text{the one-round schedule})$, a finite predrawn mixture. Pointwise $Q_\mu \geq wQ_{\mu'}$, so $\ln(p/Q_\mu) \leq \ln(p/Q_{\mu'}) + \ln(1/w)$, and $F(\mu) \leq \varepsilon' + \ln(1/w) = \varepsilon$. The cost is $C(\mu) \leq w(\log_2 \log_2 n + 8c_{\varepsilon'}) + (1-w)$. With ε' fixed, $c_{\varepsilon'}$ is a constant, so $\limsup_n C(\mu)/\log_2 \log_2 n \leq w$. Let $\varepsilon' \downarrow 0$.

Part (c). Part (a), and through it the lower bound of part (b), keeps ξ fixed and bounds from below the mass of components longer than $R_0(n)$; part (c) instead caps every component at R rounds and lets the jump factor grow with n . Here ξ_n is the largest jump factor allowed by the hypothesis $\Gamma_R \leq n + 2$ of Lemma X2, so every component jumps, and $\omega = \bar{\omega}\sqrt{\xi_n}$ keeps the bound a_n on the target mass of S^* free of ξ_n except through N_n , while each component's mass outside S^* is at most $2e^{-\bar{\omega}^2 \xi_n}$. With $\xi = \xi_n$, $\Gamma_R = n + 2$ exactly, and $\xi_n \geq 1$ iff $n + 2 \geq 2^{\vartheta^R}$, which also gives $n \geq 1$ (as $2^{\vartheta^R} > 16$). So by Lemma X2 every component of μ has a jump. By Lemma X3 with $\omega = \bar{\omega}\sqrt{\xi_n}$: $v := \bar{Q}_W(P_R \notin S^*) \leq 2e^{-\bar{\omega}^2 \xi_n}$, and $u := \Pr_t(P_R \notin S^*) \geq 1 - a_n$. Then $\text{kl}(u\|v) \geq u \ln(1/v) - \ln 2$, since $u \ln u + (1-u) \ln(1-u) \geq -\ln 2$ and $-(1-u) \ln(1-v) \geq 0$. If $\bar{\omega}^2 \xi_n \leq \ln 2$, the claimed bound is $-\ln 2$, which is trivial. Otherwise $\ln(1/v) \geq \bar{\omega}^2 \xi_n - \ln 2 > 0$ and $u \geq (1 - a_n)_+ \geq 0$, so $u \ln(1/v) \geq (1 - a_n)_+ (\bar{\omega}^2 \xi_n - \ln 2)$. With $\bar{\omega} = 1/(3Z(\vartheta))$: $a_n = \frac{2}{3} + (\frac{2}{3} + N_n)/(n+1) \leq 0.85$ for $n \geq 14$ (Lemma X3(ii) and $\xi_n \geq 1$ give $N_n \leq \sqrt{n+2}/2$, since $2/\vartheta < \frac{1}{2}$; and $(\frac{2}{3} + \sqrt{n+2}/2)/(n+1)$ is decreasing in n and equals $8/45 < 11/60 = 0.85 - \frac{2}{3}$ at $n = 14$). The bound is then $(\frac{1}{3} - o(1))(\xi_n/(9Z(\vartheta)^2) - \ln 2) - \ln 2 = (1/(27Z(\vartheta)^2) - o(1))\xi_n - O(1)$. Finally $\xi_n = ((n+2)/2^{\vartheta^R})^{1/(1+\vartheta+\dots+\vartheta^{R-1})}$, and the exponent increases to $3/(4^R - 1)$ as $\vartheta \downarrow 4$. Given η' , choose a fixed ϑ with $1/(1+\vartheta+\dots+\vartheta^{R-1}) \geq 3/(4^R - 1) - \eta'/2$. $\square$

Proof of Remark 16. By Dirichlet's approximation theorem, for $y \in [1/q_n, 1 - 1/q_n]$ there are p and q with $1 \leq q \leq q_n$ and $|y - p/q| < 1/(qq_n)$. Here $q = 1$ would give $|y - p| < 1/q_n$ with $p \in \{0, 1\}$, which the range of y excludes; so $q \geq 2$ and $p/q \in (0, 1)$. Reducing p/q to

p'/q' with $q' \leq q$ keeps $q' \in \mathcal{Q}_n$ and only enlarges the radius, since ω_q is decreasing in q . It remains to check $1/(qq_n) \leq \omega_q$, i.e. $q^{\vartheta/2-1} \leq \omega q_n/\sqrt{\xi}$. For $\vartheta \geq 2$, $q^{\vartheta/2-1} \leq q_n^{\vartheta/2-1}$, and $q_n^{\vartheta/2-1} \leq \omega q_n/\sqrt{\xi}$ is equivalent to $q_n^{2-\vartheta/2} \geq \sqrt{\xi}/\omega$. For $1 < \vartheta < 2$ and $q \geq 2$, $q^{\vartheta/2-1} < 1 \leq \omega q_n/\sqrt{\xi}$, using the hypothesis $q_n \geq \sqrt{\xi}/\omega$. At $\vartheta = 4$: $\psi(q) = \omega/(\sqrt{\xi}q)$ is non-increasing and $\sum \psi(q) = \infty$; for such ψ , by Khintchine's theorem (Khintchine, 1924), in the form stated by Beresnevich et al. (2016, Thm. 2.3, arXiv v1 numbering) (here $q\psi(q)$ is constant, so Khintchine's original monotonicity hypothesis on $q\psi(q)$ also holds), almost every y has infinitely many p/q with $|y - p/q| < \psi(q)/q = \omega_q$. These can be taken reduced: $\psi(q)/q$ is decreasing, so reducing p/q to p'/q' keeps $|y - p'/q'| < \psi(q')/q'$, and for irrational y infinitely many solutions converging to y give infinitely many distinct reduced fractions. The set $S^* = S_n^*$ increases with n , and for fixed m , $\Pr_t(P_R \in S_m^*) \rightarrow \text{Leb}(S_m^* \cap [0, 1])$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, since S_m^* is a finite union of intervals and the target's atoms are equally weighted at spacing $1/(n+2)$. So $\liminf_n \Pr_t(P_R \in S_n^*) \geq \text{Leb}(S_m^* \cap [0, 1])$ for every m , and the right side tends to 1 as $m \rightarrow \infty$: a reduced solution p/q puts y in S_m^* once $q \in \mathcal{Q}_m$, and almost every $y \in [0, 1]$ has one. Hence $\Pr_t(P_R \in S_n^*) \rightarrow 1$. $\square$

F.6. Mixtures: the fourth-power construction and the exact constant

Theorem 15 leaves the $\liminf$ and $\limsup$ of $L_F(n, \varepsilon)/\log_2 \log_2 n$ between $e^{-\varepsilon}/2$ and $e^{-\varepsilon}$; a recursive mixture reaches the lower end. Below a cutoff chosen from the tolerance, its schedules commit one coordinate per round. Above it, the schedule at size n is, with probability n^{-2} , a *floor* of n unit rounds, which sample exactly; otherwise it draws a prefix level d uniformly from the band $\{c_{\min}(n), \dots, 2c_{\min}(n) - 1\}$, where $c_{\min}(n) = \lceil (n+2)^{1/4} (\ln(n+2))^8 \rceil$, schedules the first $d-2$ coordinates by the same recursion and commits the other $n-d+2$ in one round. If the prefix count a were exactly uniform, the prefix value $(1+a)/d$ would be a uniform point of the grid $\{1/d, \dots, (d-1)/d\}$, and the band would average $c_{\min}(n)$ such grids. Two grids, smoothed by the same window, overlap exactly as one grid, whose denominator is the least common multiple of theirs, overlaps with itself (Lemma Z3), and a band has few small common multiples: over its pairs of denominators the reciprocals of the least common multiples sum to $O(\ln c_{\min}(n))$. So the band average, smoothed at a width a polylogarithmic factor below the binomial spread $(n+2)^{-1/2}$, is close to uniform on $[0, 1]$ (Lemma Z4); the bound of Lemma Z4 is small only when this width exceeds the band's typical gap $c_{\min}(n)^{-2}$ by a factor large compared with $\ln c_{\min}(n)$, which holds once $c_{\min}(n)$ exceeds $(n+2)^{1/4}$ by a polylogarithmic factor, and this is where the fourth power comes from. A binomial count with a uniform parameter is exactly uniform, so one round from this ideal prefix gives almost the target's count law (Lemma Z5, with Lemmas Z1 and Z2). The actual prefix comes from the recursion and is only approximately uniform. The common-mass lift (Lemma Z6) compares the two on records of prefix size, prefix count and final count: the lifted target follows the ideal law on the mass that the ideal law shares with the target, and the rest of the target is matched with the floor. Since the ideal and the actual law share the final round, the prefix's error passes to size n with coefficient one, while the one-step distance enters multiplied by $O(\ln n)$ and the floor's weight adds $O(n^{-2})$. Errors therefore add along the recursion instead of compounding, and their sum is at most the tolerance: the logarithm of the size at least halves at each recursion step, and the cutoff is chosen from the tolerance. Each floor is charged in full, $1/n$ in expectation at size n , and along any branch these charges sum to less than one. As $\ln c_{\min}(n) \approx \frac{1}{4} \ln n$, a potential, $\ln(n+2)$ less a logarithmic correction, shrinks by a factor of at least four per recursion step, so there are at most $1 + \log_4 \ln(n+2)$ recursion steps of one round each, and the scheduled mean is

at most $\frac{1}{2} \log_2 \log_2(n+2) + O_\varepsilon(1)$; dilution (Corollary 18) then gives the factor $e^{-\varepsilon}$. Averaging a lattice denominator over a dyadic band also underlies randomized lattice rules (Kritzer et al., 2019). In this part, the auxiliary count laws and kernels introduced for the construction are set in sans serif: U_s is the uniform law on $\{0, \dots, s\}$, the target's count law at size s ; Q_s is the count law that the construction produces at size s ; R_n and A_n are the ideal one-step law and the fast law, the count law of the non-floor branch, at size n ; and K denotes a kernel. The band start is written $c_{\min}$, or $c_{\min}(s)$ at size s , and letters introduced inside a proof are local to it.

Construction. Fix $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, put $Y_{\varepsilon_0} := \max\{1024, (10^4/\varepsilon_0)^{1/3}\}$ and $\mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon_0} := \lceil e^{Y_{\varepsilon_0}} \rceil$. The following recursion draws a random profile $\text{Schedule}(n)$ of n (a sequence of block sizes); it draws no output coordinate. If $n \leq \mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon_0}$, return n singleton blocks. Otherwise put $N := n + 2$, $c_{\min}(n) := \lceil N^{1/4}(\ln N)^8 \rceil$ and $\varrho_n := n^{-2}$; with probability ϱ_n return n singleton blocks (the *floor*); otherwise draw d uniformly from $\{c_{\min}(n), \dots, 2c_{\min}(n) - 1\}$, draw b' from $\text{Schedule}(d-2)$, independently, and return b' followed by one block of size $n - (d-2)$. After the profile is drawn, draw one independent uniform permutation of the n labels and assign consecutive labels to the blocks; only then run the independent oracle draws. Multiplication by the finite uniform label law preserves normalization and finite support; call the result μ_n . *Legality.* Display (Z7.5) in the proof of Theorem 17 below gives $1 \leq d-2 < n$ at every nonbase call. By strong induction in n , the result is then a finite, normalized law on profiles of n : the weights n^{-2} and $1 - n^{-2}$ sum to one, the band has exactly $c_{\min}(n)$ elements, and each child law is normalized. The final block $n - (d-2) \geq 1$ is nonempty, and each component has at most n nonempty rounds. *Exactness of singletons.* If the count after s singleton draws is uniform on $\{0, \dots, s\}$, then an interior next count a has probability $\frac{1}{s+1} \left(\frac{s+1-a}{s+2} + \frac{a}{s+2} \right) = \frac{1}{s+2}$; the endpoints give the same value. *Prefix embedding.* The oracle conditional $(a+1)/(s+2)$ depends only on the committed counts, so the count dynamics of a prefix inside the larger problem are exactly the child's count law, even with a single global permutation. *Count reduction.* Let Q_n be the count law of μ_n (the law of the number of ones of its output), and $U_n := \text{Unif}\{0, \dots, n\} = p_W$. Then $Q_{\mu_n}(x) = Q_n(|x|)/\binom{n}{|x|}$, so $F(\mu_n) = \text{KL}(p \| Q_{\mu_n}) = \text{KL}(U_n \| Q_n)$ exactly (X0 gives equality for a uniform relabelling). *Floor decomposition.* For $n > \mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon_0}$, $Q_n = \varrho_n U_n + (1 - \varrho_n) A_n$, where the fast law A_n draws d , takes the recursive prefix count a at size $s = d-2$, and moves to the new count $W = a + \text{Bin}(n-s, (a+1)/(s+2))$, a sum of fresh independent bit draws. Hence $Q_n \geq n^{-2} U_n$ and $Q_{\mu_n} \geq n^{-2} p$ pointwise. The floor is an alternative schedule chosen in advance; it repairs no executed trajectory.

Lemma Z1 (translation smoothing). (a) Let $Y \sim \text{Bin}(b, \theta)$, with $b \geq 0$ and $0 < \theta < 1$, and let v be an integer. Then $\text{TV}(Y, Y+v) \leq |v|/(2\sqrt{(b+1)\theta(1-\theta)})$. (b) For integers $N > d \geq 2$, $j \in \{1, \dots, d-1\}$ and $\theta = j/d$, let $Y \sim \text{Bin}(N-d, \theta)$ and, independently, $Z \sim \text{Bin}(d, \theta)$, so $\mathbb{E}Z = j$. Then

$$\text{TV}(Y+j, \text{Bin}(N, \theta)) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}|Z-j|}{2\sqrt{(N-d+1)\theta(1-\theta)}} \leq \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{d}{N-d+1}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{d}{N-d}},$$

uniformly in j , including the edge values $j=1$ and $j=d-1$.

Proof. (a) Extend $u_b(k) := \Pr(Y=k)$ by 0 outside $\{0, \dots, b\}$. For $0 \leq k \leq b+1$, $u_b(k-1) - u_b(k) = \frac{k-(b+1)\theta}{(b+1)\theta(1-\theta)} u_{b+1}(k)$, since $u_b(k-1) = \frac{k}{(b+1)\theta} u_{b+1}(k)$ and $u_b(k) = \frac{b+1-k}{(b+1)(1-\theta)} u_{b+1}(k)$. So $\text{TV}(Y+1, Y) = \mathbb{E}|Z - (b+1)\theta|/(2(b+1)\theta(1-\theta))$ for $Z \sim \text{Bin}(b+1, \theta)$, which is at most $1/(2\sqrt{(b+1)\theta(1-\theta)})$ by Cauchy-Schwarz and the binomial variance. Translation invariance and

the triangle inequality give the claim. (b) $\text{Bin}(N, \theta)$ is the law of $Y + Z$: average (a) over Z , with $b = N - d$ and $v = Z - j$, and use $\mathbb{E}|Z - j| \leq \sqrt{d\theta(1 - \theta)}$. $\square$

Lemma Z2 (parameter perturbation). For an integer $N \geq 1$, $0 < \theta_0 \leq \frac{1}{4}$ and $\theta, \theta' \in [\theta_0, 1 - \theta_0]$, $\text{TV}(\text{Bin}(N, \theta), \text{Bin}(N, \theta')) \leq \sqrt{N/\theta_0} |\theta - \theta'|$.

Proof. The binomial masses $u_N(k; t)$ satisfy $\frac{d}{dt} u_N(k; t) = \frac{k - Nt}{t(1-t)} u_N(k; t)$, so $\sum_k |u'_N(k; t)| = \mathbb{E}|\text{Bin}(N, t) - Nt|/(t(1-t)) \leq \sqrt{N/(t(1-t))}$. Integrate from θ to θ' and halve, using $t(1-t) \geq \theta_0(1 - \theta_0) \geq \theta_0/2$. $\square$

Grids. Work on the circle $[0, 1)$ modulo one, with Lebesgue measure Leb . For an integer $d \geq 1$ let $G_d := \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \delta_{j/d}$. For $0 < v \leq \frac{1}{2}$ let κ_v be the density of the uniform law on $[-v/2, v/2]$, wrapped modulo one, and put $f_d(t) := \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \kappa_v(t - j/d)$, a step density with integral one. These objects keep the denominator, the grid point and the smoothing window apart. The denominator d is the prefix's level, drawn by the schedule before any coordinate is sampled; the grid point is the prefix value $(1 + a)/d$, set by the prefix count a , so it takes only the $d - 1$ points j/d with $1 \leq j \leq d - 1$, with equal masses under the ideal law of Lemma Z5 and with the recursive count law under the actual law. G_d adds the point 0 and gives each of its d points the mass $1/d$, which moves that law by $1/d$ in total variation (step (2) of Lemma Z5). The window κ_v is never sampled: at the width v chosen in Lemma Z5, a polylogarithmic factor below the final round's binomial spread $N^{-1/2}$, smoothing the parameter changes the final round's law only slightly (step (4) of Lemma Z5, through Lemma Z2), and the smoothed band average is close to Lebesgue measure (Lemma Z4).

Lemma Z3 (exact overlap identity). For positive integers d and e put $L := \text{lcm}(d, e)$, $z := Lv$ and $\{z\} := z - \lfloor z \rfloor$. Then

$$\int_0^1 f_d(t) f_e(t) dt = 1 + \frac{\{z\}(1 - \{z\})}{(Lv)^2}, \quad \text{hence} \quad 0 \leq \int_0^1 f_d f_e - 1 \leq \frac{1}{v \text{lcm}(d, e)}.$$

Proof. The map $(i \bmod d, j \bmod e) \mapsto (L/d)i - (L/e)j \bmod L$ is onto, since $\gcd(L/d, L/e) = 1$, and every fibre has $\gcd(d, e) = de/L$ elements. So the difference of independent uniform points of G_d and G_e is uniform on G_L . With $\mathcal{O}(u) := \int_0^1 \kappa_v(t) \kappa_v(t + u) dt$ this gives $\int f_d f_e = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{r=0}^{L-1} \mathcal{O}(r/L) = \int f_L^2$; the second equality is the case $d = e = L$. For almost every t , $f_L(t) = N_L(t)/(Lv)$, where $N_L(t)$ counts the points of G_L in a circular window of length v . That count is $m := \lfloor Lv \rfloor$ or $m + 1$, and since $\int N_L = Lv = m + \{z\}$, it is $m + 1$ on a set of measure $\{z\}$. So $\int (f_L - 1)^2 = \text{Var}(N_L)/(Lv)^2 = \{z\}(1 - \{z\})/(Lv)^2$, which is the identity, since $\int f_L = 1$. Finally $\{z\}(1 - \{z\}) \leq Lv$: if $Lv < 1$ then $\{z\} = Lv$, and otherwise $\{z\}(1 - \{z\}) \leq \frac{1}{4} \leq Lv$. $\square$

Lemma Z4 (band smoothing). Let $c_{\min} \geq 2$ be an integer with $\ln c_{\min} \geq 2$, put $\bar{v}_{c_{\min}} := \frac{1}{c_{\min}} \sum_{d=c_{\min}}^{2c_{\min}-1} G_d$, and let $0 < v \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Then $\text{TV}(\bar{v}_{c_{\min}} * \kappa_v, \text{Leb}) \leq 3\sqrt{\ln c_{\min}/(vc_{\min}^2)}$.

Proof. The density of $\bar{v}_{c_{\min}} * \kappa_v$ is $f := \frac{1}{c_{\min}} \sum_{d=c_{\min}}^{2c_{\min}-1} f_d$, and Lemma Z3 gives $\int (f - 1)^2 \leq \frac{1}{vc_{\min}^2} \sum_{d,e \in [c_{\min}, 2c_{\min})} 1/\text{lcm}(d, e)$. That sum equals $\sum_{d,e} \gcd(d, e)/(de)$, which is at most $\frac{1}{c_{\min}^2} \sum_{r \leq 2c_{\min}} r \#\{d \in [c_{\min}, 2c_{\min}) : r \mid d\}^2$, since $\gcd(d, e)$ is at most the sum of its divisors and $de \geq c_{\min}^2$. A band of $c_{\min}$ consecutive integers has at most $c_{\min}/r + 1 \leq 3c_{\min}/r$ multiples of $r \leq 2c_{\min}$, so the sum is at most $9\mathcal{H}_{2c_{\min}} \leq 9(1 + \ln 2c_{\min}) \leq 18 \ln c_{\min}$, as $\ln c_{\min} \geq 2$; here $\mathcal{H}_m := \sum_{i \leq m} 1/i$. Cauchy–Schwarz then gives $\text{TV} = \frac{1}{2} \int |f - 1| \leq \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{18 \ln c_{\min}/(vc_{\min}^2)} \leq 3\sqrt{\ln c_{\min}/(vc_{\min}^2)}$. $\square$

Lemma Z5 (one-step comparison). Let $N = n + 2$, and let $c_{\min} \geq 3$ be an integer with $4c_{\min} \leq N$. The *ideal* one-step law R_n draws d uniformly from $\{c_{\min}, \dots, 2c_{\min} - 1\}$, the prefix count a uniformly from $\{0, \dots, d - 2\}$, and then $W = a + \text{Bin}(n - (d - 2), (a + 1)/d)$; it is an analysis reference only. If $\ln c_{\min} \geq 2$ and $0 < v \leq \theta_0 \leq \frac{1}{4}$, then

$$\text{TV}(R_n, U_n) \leq 2\sqrt{c_{\min}/N} + \frac{3}{c_{\min}} + 3\sqrt{\frac{\ln c_{\min}}{vc_{\min}^2}} + 4\theta_0 + \sqrt{N/\theta_0} v + \frac{2}{N+1}.$$

In particular, if $\ln c_{\min} \geq 2$ and the choice $\theta_0 := (\ln c_{\min})^{-4}$, $v := N^{-1/2}(\ln c_{\min})^{-6}$ satisfies $v \leq \theta_0 \leq \frac{1}{4}$, then

$$\text{TV}(R_n, U_n) \leq 2\sqrt{c_{\min}/N} + \frac{3}{c_{\min}} + 5(\ln c_{\min})^{-4} + \frac{3N^{1/4}(\ln c_{\min})^{7/2}}{c_{\min}} + \frac{2}{N+1}.$$

Proof. In shifted counts, with $j = a + 1$, $W + 1 = j + \text{Bin}(N - d, j/d)$; a shift preserves TV. (1) By Lemma Z1(b), replacing this by $\text{Bin}(N, j/d)$ costs averaged TV at most $\sqrt{2c_{\min}/(N - 2c_{\min})} \leq 2\sqrt{c_{\min}/N}$. (2) The law of j/d , $\nu_{c_{\min}} := \frac{1}{c_{\min}} \sum_{d=c_{\min}}^{2c_{\min}-1} \frac{1}{d-1} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} \delta_{j/d}$, differs from $\bar{\nu}_{c_{\min}}$ by TV at most $1/c_{\min}$: each incomplete grid is at TV $1/d$ from G_d . (3) For $P \sim \bar{\nu}_{c_{\min}}$, $\Pr\{P \notin [2\theta_0, 1 - 2\theta_0]\} \leq 4\theta_0 + 2/c_{\min}$, since at most $2\theta_0 d + 1$ of the d points of each G_d lie in $[0, 2\theta_0)$, at most $2\theta_0 d + 1$ lie in $(1 - 2\theta_0, 1)$, and $d \geq c_{\min}$. (4) Let $P \sim \bar{\nu}_{c_{\min}}$ and, independently, $Z \sim \text{Unif}[-v/2, v/2)$, and put $P' := (P + Z) \bmod 1$, so $P' \sim \bar{\nu}_{c_{\min}} * \kappa_v$. Since $v \leq \theta_0$, off the event in (3) there is no wrapping and $P, P' \in [\theta_0, 1 - \theta_0]$, so Lemma Z2 bounds the conditional TV there by $\sqrt{N/\theta_0} |Z|$; bounding TV by one on that event and using $\mathbb{E}|Z| \leq v$ gives $\text{TV}(\bar{\nu}_{c_{\min}} K_N, (\bar{\nu}_{c_{\min}} * \kappa_v) K_N) \leq 4\theta_0 + 2/c_{\min} + \sqrt{N/\theta_0} v$, where K_N is the kernel $\theta \mapsto \text{Bin}(N, \theta)$ and νK_N is the law of $\text{Bin}(N, P)$ for $P \sim \nu$. (5) Kernels contract TV, so Lemma Z4 gives $\text{TV}(\bar{\nu}_{c_{\min}} K_N, \text{Leb} K_N) \leq 3\sqrt{\ln c_{\min}/(vc_{\min}^2)} + 4\theta_0 + 2/c_{\min} + \sqrt{N/\theta_0} v$. (6) $\text{Leb} K_N = \text{Unif}\{0, \dots, N\}$, since $\int_0^1 \binom{N}{k} \theta^k (1 - \theta)^{N-k} d\theta = 1/(N + 1)$; this is integration by parts at natural exponents, and no real Gamma function is needed. (7) The target's shifted count is uniform on $\{1, \dots, N - 1\}$, at TV exactly $2/(N + 1)$ from $\text{Unif}\{0, \dots, N\}$. Steps (1), (2) (through the kernel K_N) and (5)–(7) give the first bound. (8) Substituting $\theta_0 = (\ln c_{\min})^{-4}$ and $v = N^{-1/2}(\ln c_{\min})^{-6}$ gives the second. $\square$

How the next lemma is used. In the notation of Lemma Z6, at a nonbase size n in the proof of Theorem 17, B is the uniform law of the prefix size $s = d - 2$ over the band, $U_s = \text{Unif}\{0, \dots, s\}$ is the target's count law at size s and Q_s the recursive one, and $K_s(a, \cdot)$ is the final round, the law of $a + \text{Bin}(n - s, (a + 1)/(s + 2))$. Then $P = U_n$, R_K is the ideal law R_n of Lemma Z5, A_K is the fast law A_n , and with the floor weight $\varrho = n^{-2}$ the law Q is the actual count law Q_n ; Δ is the one-step distance $\text{TV}(U_n, R_n)$. In the proof of Lemma Z6 a fast record (s, a, v) is a run of the band branch with prefix size s , prefix count a and final count v , and an exact record v is a floor run, recorded by its final count. The floor enters in three ways: together with the exactness of singletons at base sizes it makes every Q_s strictly positive; its term ϱP in Q absorbs the target mass that the ideal law misses, at a cost of at most $\ln(1/\varrho) = 2 \ln n$ per unit; and it leaves the band branch the weight $1 - \varrho$, which costs at most $-\ln(1 - \varrho)$. The ideal law's excess mass, also Δ , is dropped from the lifted target at a cost of at most $\ln(s_{\max} + 1)$ per unit.

Lemma Z6 (common-mass lift). Let B be a law on finitely many positive integer prefix sizes $s \leq s_{\max}$. For each s let $U_s := \text{Unif}\{0, \dots, s\}$, let Q_s be a strictly positive law on $\{0, \dots, s\}$,

and let $K_s(a, \cdot)$ be a Markov kernel into a finite terminal space; let P be a strictly positive target law on that space. Put $R(s, a, v) := B(s)U_s(a)K_s(a, v)$ and $A(s, a, v) := B(s)Q_s(a)K_s(a, v)$, with terminal marginals R_K and A_K , and, for $0 < \varrho < 1$, $Q := (1 - \varrho)A_K + \varrho P$ and $\Delta := \text{TV}(P, R_K)$. Then

$$\text{KL}(P\|Q) \leq \sum_s B(s) \text{KL}(U_s\|Q_s) + \Delta [\ln(s_{\max} + 1) + \ln(1/\varrho)] - \ln(1 - \varrho).$$

Proof. With $g := \min(P, R_K)$, define the lifted target T on fast records (s, a, v) and exact records v by $T_F(s, a, v) := g(v)R(s, a, v)/R_K(v)$ (0 if $R_K(v) = 0$) and $T_E(v) := P(v) - g(v)$. It is normalized, with terminal marginal P . The actual lift is $(1 - \varrho)A$ on fast records and ϱP on exact ones, with terminal marginal Q . Finite data processing gives $\text{KL}(P\|Q) \leq \text{KL}(T\|\text{lift})$. *Fast records.* On those with positive target mass (there $A > 0$, since $Q_s > 0$), $\ln(T_F/((1 - \varrho)A)) = \ln(g/R_K) + \ell(s, a) - \ln(1 - \varrho)$, with $\ell := \ln(U_s/Q_s)$, because $B(s)$ and the kernel K_s , common to R and A , cancel; this is why the prefix's KL passes on with coefficient one. Records with $T_F = 0$ contribute zero. The fast part has total mass $1 - \Delta$, so the $-\ln(1 - \varrho)$ term contributes exactly $(1 - \Delta)(-\ln(1 - \varrho)) \leq -\ln(1 - \varrho)$. The first term is at most 0. Since $T_F \leq R$, the removed mass is Δ and $\ell \geq -\ln(s_{\max} + 1)$ (because $Q_s \leq 1$), $\sum T_F \ell \leq \sum R \ell + \Delta \ln(s_{\max} + 1) = \sum_s B(s) \text{KL}(U_s\|Q_s) + \Delta \ln(s_{\max} + 1)$. *Exact records.* $T_E \leq P$ gives $\sum T_E \ln(T_E/(\varrho P)) \leq \Delta \ln(1/\varrho)$. $\square$

No upper bound on the log-ratio ℓ , that is, no lower bound on the input laws Q_s beyond their strict positivity, is used.

Theorem 17 (finite predrawn mixtures on this target: upper bound) *For every $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ there is $K_\star(\varepsilon) < \infty$ such that $L_F(n, \varepsilon) \leq \frac{1}{2} \log_2 \log_2(n + 2) + K_\star(\varepsilon)$ for all $n \geq 1$.*

Corollary 18 (the exact asymptotic constant) *For every $\varepsilon > 0$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} L_F(n, \varepsilon)/\log_2 \log_2 n = e^{-\varepsilon}/2$.*

Proof of Theorem 17. For $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ let $\mu_n = \mu_n^{(\varepsilon_0)}$ be the mixture of the construction above, a finite predrawn mixture. We show that, for every fixed $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and every integer $n \geq 1$,

$$F(\mu_n) = \text{KL}(p\|Q_{\mu_n}) \leq \varepsilon_0 \quad \text{and} \\ C(\mu_n) \leq \log_4 \ln(n + 2) + \mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon_0} + 2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \log_2 \log_2(n + 2) + \mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon_0} + 2;$$

the second inequality holds because $\log_4 \log_2(n + 2) = \log_4 \ln(n + 2) - \log_4 \ln 2$. The divergence bound comes from a recursion for the count-law divergence: *Scales* checks the premises of Lemma Z5 at $c_{\min} = c_{\min}(n)$, which gives the one-step bound (Z7.4), and records (Z7.5), by which every child has at most half its parent's logarithm; *Error induction* feeds (Z7.4) into Lemma Z6, so that the divergence at size n is at most the band average of the children's divergences plus $7000/(\ln(n + 2))^3$, and (Z7.5) makes these terms summable along every branch. The cost bound unrolls the exact cost recurrence along the same branches (*Cost*), with a potential that (Z7.5) shrinks by a factor four per step (*Depth*) and a bound on the expected charge of the floors (*Floors*).

Scales. At a nonbase size $n > \mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon_0}$ put $y := \ln N \geq Y_{\varepsilon_0} \geq 1024$, so $c_{\min}(n) = \lceil e^{y/4} y^8 \rceil$. Then

$$e^{y/4} y^8 \leq c_{\min}(n) \leq 2e^{y/4} y^8, \quad y/4 \leq \ln c_{\min}(n) \leq y/2, \quad 4c_{\min}(n) \leq N. \quad (\text{Z7.1})$$

The bounds $\ln c_{\min}(n) \leq y/2$ and $4c_{\min}(n) \leq N$ use $y/4 + 8 \ln y + \ln 4 \leq y/2$ (Z7.2), which holds at 1024, and the derivative $1/4 + 8/y < 1/2$ of its left side thereafter. Also, by (Z7.1), $2\sqrt{c_{\min}(n)/N} \leq y^{-4}$, $c_{\min}(n)^{-1} \leq y^{-4}$, $N^{1/4}(\ln c_{\min}(n))^{7/2}/c_{\min}(n) \leq y^{-9/2}$ and $(N+1)^{-1} \leq y^{-4}$ (Z7.3); the first reduces to $2\sqrt{2}e^{-3y/8}y^8 \leq 1$, which holds at 1024 and decreases thereafter. Lemma Z5 applies at $c_{\min} = c_{\min}(n)$: $c_{\min}(n) \geq 3$, $4c_{\min}(n) \leq N$ and $\ln c_{\min}(n) \geq y/4 \geq 2$, and its parameters satisfy $\theta_0 \leq \frac{1}{4}$ and $v \leq \theta_0$. Using $5(\ln c_{\min}(n))^{-4} \leq 1280y^{-4}$, it gives

$$\Delta_n := \text{TV}(\mathbf{R}_n, \mathbf{U}_n) \leq 2000y^{-4}. \quad (\text{Z7.4})$$

Finally $c_{\min}(n) \geq 3$ and $2c_{\min}(n) - 1 < N$, so every d in the band, with child logarithm $y' := \ln d$, satisfies

$$1 \leq d - 2 < n, \quad y' \leq y/4 + 8 \ln y + \ln 4 \leq y/2. \quad (\text{Z7.5})$$

Error induction. Let $\mathcal{D}_n := \text{KL}(\mathbf{U}_n \| \mathbf{Q}_n)$; then $\mathcal{D}_n = 0$ for $n \leq \mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon_0}$. For $n > \mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon_0}$ apply Lemma Z6 with the actual child laws as $\mathbf{Q}_s$ (strictly positive, by exactness of singletons and the floor decomposition), the real binomial transition, $\varrho = n^{-2}$ and $s_{\max} < n$; here $\mathbf{B}$ is uniform on the prefix sizes $s = d - 2$ of the band, $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{U}_n$, $\mathbf{R}_K = \mathbf{R}_n$ and $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{Q}_n$. With (Z7.4),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_n &\leq \frac{1}{c_{\min}(n)} \sum_{d=c_{\min}(n)}^{2c_{\min}(n)-1} \mathcal{D}_{d-2} + \Delta_n [\ln(n+1) + 2 \ln n] - \ln(1 - n^{-2}) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{c_{\min}(n)} \sum_{d=c_{\min}(n)}^{2c_{\min}(n)-1} \mathcal{D}_{d-2} + \frac{7000}{y^3}, \end{aligned}$$

since the Δ_n term is at most $6000/y^3$ and $-\ln(1 - n^{-2}) \leq 2/n^2 \leq y^{-3}$. Expand this recursion along auxiliary paths which, at each nonbase size, always take the band branch, to the child of size $d - 2$ with d uniform on the band, and never the floor, whose contribution the recursion already counts; this is analysis only, and $\mathbb{E}$ below averages over these random paths. Along such a path write $y_i := \ln(n_i + 2)$ for its nonbase sizes $n_0 = n, \dots, n_{\ell-1}$, so $y_0 = \ln(n+2)$ and $n_i = e^{y_i} - 2$. Iterating the recursion along a path, which stops at a base size where $\mathcal{D} = 0$, gives $\mathcal{D}_n \leq \mathbb{E} \sum_{i < \ell} 7000/y_i^3$. By (Z7.5), read backward they satisfy $y_{\ell-1-r} \geq 2^r Y_{\varepsilon_0}$, so

$$\sum_{i < \ell} \frac{7000}{y_i^3} \leq \frac{7000}{Y_{\varepsilon_0}^3} \sum_{r \geq 0} 2^{-3r} = \frac{8000}{Y_{\varepsilon_0}^3} \leq \varepsilon_0.$$

Averaging gives $\mathcal{D}_n \leq \varepsilon_0$, that is, $F(\mu_n) \leq \varepsilon_0$ by the count reduction. The cutoff was fixed from ε_0 before n varied.

Cost. For $n \leq \mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon_0}$, $C(\mu_n) = n$. Otherwise, exactly,

$$C(\mu_n) = n^{-2} \cdot n + (1 - n^{-2}) \left(1 + \frac{1}{c_{\min}(n)} \sum_{d=c_{\min}(n)}^{2c_{\min}(n)-1} C(\mu_{d-2}) \right),$$

hence $C(\mu_n) \leq 1 + c_{\min}(n)^{-1} \sum_d C(\mu_{d-2}) + 1/n$. Unrolling along the same auxiliary paths gives $C(\mu_n) \leq \mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon_0} + \mathbb{E} \ell + \mathbb{E} \sum_{i < \ell} 1/n_i$; every floor is charged all n of its singleton rounds. *Depth.* Put $f(y) := y - 16 \ln y$. For $y \geq 1024$,

$$f(y/4 + 8 \ln y + \ln 4) \leq y/4 + 8 \ln y + \ln 4 - 16 \ln(y/4) = y/4 - 8 \ln y + 17 \ln 4 \leq f(y)/4;$$

the last step is $4 \ln y \geq 17 \ln 4$. Since f is increasing on that range and $y' \leq y/4 + 8 \ln y + \ln 4$ by (Z7.5), a nonbase child has $f(y') \leq f(y)/4$. Hence, for $\ell \geq 1$, $1 < f(\ln(\mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon_0} + 2)) < f(y_{\ell-1}) \leq 4^{-(\ell-1)} f(y_0) \leq 4^{-(\ell-1)} y_0$, so $\ell \leq 1 + \log_4 y_0$. *Floors.* Since $n_i = e^{y_i} - 2 \geq e^{y_i}/2$,

$$\sum_{i < \ell} \frac{1}{n_i} \leq 2 \sum_{r \geq 0} e^{-2^r \ln(\mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon_0} + 2)} \leq \frac{4}{\mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon_0} + 2} < 1,$$

using $2^r \geq r + 1$ and a geometric series. Therefore $C(\mu_n) \leq \log_4 \ln(n + 2) + \mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon_0} + 2$ for every $n \geq 1$; for $n \leq \mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon_0}$ this holds because $\log_4 \ln(n + 2) > 0$.

For $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ take $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon$: the finite predrawn mixture $\mu_n^{(\varepsilon)}$ has $F(\mu_n^{(\varepsilon)}) \leq \varepsilon$ and $C(\mu_n^{(\varepsilon)}) \leq \frac{1}{2} \log_2 \log_2(n + 2) + \mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon} + 2$, so $L_F(n, \varepsilon) \leq \frac{1}{2} \log_2 \log_2(n + 2) + K_*(\varepsilon)$ for all $n \geq 1$, with $K_*(\varepsilon) := \mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon} + 2$. $\square$

Proof of Corollary 18. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\varepsilon' \in (0, \min(\varepsilon, 1)]$. Let μ' be the mixture of Theorem 17 at tolerance ε' , and put $w := e^{\varepsilon' - \varepsilon}$ and $\mu := w\mu' + (1 - w) \cdot (\text{the one-round schedule})$, a finite predrawn mixture. Pointwise $Q_\mu \geq wQ_{\mu'}$, so $F(\mu) \leq \varepsilon' + \ln(1/w) = \varepsilon$, and $C(\mu) \leq w(\frac{1}{2} \log_2 \log_2(n + 2) + K_*(\varepsilon')) + 1$. Since $K_*(\varepsilon')$ does not depend on n , $\limsup_n L_F(n, \varepsilon) / \log_2 \log_2 n \leq e^{\varepsilon' - \varepsilon} / 2$ for each fixed ε' ; taking the infimum over $\varepsilon' \in (0, \min(\varepsilon, 1)]$ gives $\limsup_n L_F(n, \varepsilon) / \log_2 \log_2 n \leq e^{-\varepsilon} / 2$. Theorem 15(b) gives $\liminf_n L_F(n, \varepsilon) / \log_2 \log_2 n \geq e^{-\varepsilon} / 2$ for every $\varepsilon \geq 0$. $\square$

Scope of the construction. Let μ' be the mixture μ_n that proves Theorem 17, at a tolerance $\varepsilon' \in (0, \min(\varepsilon, 1)]$, as in the proof of Corollary 18: the construction above at $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon'$, so with cutoff $\mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon'}$. At every nonbase size m of its recursion a floor of m unit rounds has probability m^{-2} , and $C(\mu')$ charges it in full; the top floor alone is a branch of n unit rounds with positive probability (for $n \leq \mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon'}$, every component is n unit rounds). Every component of μ' begins with at least $L_0 := \min(n, c_{\min}(\mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon'} + 1) - 2)$ unit rounds, where $c_{\min}(\mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon'} + 1)$ is the band start at the smallest nonbase size: for $n > \mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon'}$ the innermost prefix is either a floor at a nonbase size $m \geq \mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon'} + 1$, of m unit rounds, or a base schedule at size $d - 2$ with $d \geq c_{\min}(n') \geq c_{\min}(\mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon'} + 1)$ for its nonbase parent n' , since $c_{\min}(m)$ is nondecreasing in m ; and a floor is no shorter, as $c_{\min}(\mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon'} + 1) - 2 < \mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon'} + 1$, since $4c_{\min}(\mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon'} + 1) \leq \mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon'} + 3$ by (Z7.1). The constants are astronomical: $\mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon'} \geq e^{1024}$, and (Z7.1) at size $\mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon'} + 1$ gives $\ln c_{\min}(\mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon'} + 1) \geq Y/4 + 8 \ln Y > 311$, with $Y := Y_{\varepsilon'} \geq 1024$. The mixture of Corollary 18 gives μ' the weight $w > 0$ and adds the one-round schedule with weight $1 - w$. For fixed $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, the saving of Corollary 18 over single relabelled profiles, whose constant is 1 (Corollary 13), is therefore asymptotic only: these constructions do not certify a practical finite- n speedup. They are explicit: a component of μ' is drawn by running the recursion, which makes at most $1 + \log_4 \ln(n + 2)$ nonbase calls on every branch, and then one uniform relabelling (for the mixture of Corollary 18, after choosing μ' with probability w and otherwise the one-round schedule), so the support need not be listed. Neither the description of a mixture nor the computation and randomness used to draw a component are charged in $C(\mu)$, and no running-time or random-bit bound is given for this construction. Adding a nonnegative charge for them, with the classes of mixtures and policies and the accuracy requirement unchanged, can only raise costs, so the lower-bound parts of Theorems 15 and 19 still hold under their hypotheses, while no upper bound under such a charge follows. Also, μ' has a positive-weight component with n unit rounds (its top floor, or for $n \leq \mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon'}$ every component), so for $R < n$ neither mixture has all its components of at most R rounds (and for $R < L_0$ no component of μ' has); for such R they supply no hard-cap upper bound. For a fixed cap of R rounds, Theorem 15(c) gives, for every $\eta' > 0$, $F_R^{\text{mix}}(n) \geq n^{3/(4^R - 1) - \eta'}$ for large n , and no matching hard-cap upper bound is claimed.

F.7. Causal adaptive policies

Theorems 15 and 17 concern finite predrawn mixtures. Here $\pi \in \mathcal{A}_\infty$ is a causal randomized adaptive policy of Section 2, run with the present oracle: in round j it commits a set B_j of unrevealed coordinates, chosen measurably with respect to $\mathcal{F}_{j-1} = \sigma(\text{seed}, \text{committed labelled history})$, and given $\mathcal{F}_{j-1}$ the values on B_j are fresh independent Bernoulli(P_{j-1}) draws, where $c_j := 2 + (\text{number committed after round } j)$, A_j is the number of ones among them and $P_j := (1 + A_j)/c_j$. So $b_j := |B_j|$ and $c_j = c_{j-1} + b_j$ are fixed before round j 's draws. τ counts executed rounds (empty rounds included; $\tau = \infty$ if the policy never completes) and $\tau_+ \leq \tau$ the nonempty ones. Put $L_F^{\text{ad}}(n, \varepsilon) := \inf\{\mathbb{E}\tau : \pi \in \mathcal{A}_\infty, \text{KL}(p||Q_\pi) \leq \varepsilon\}$, the least expected number of executed rounds. A finite predrawn mixture μ lies in $\mathcal{A}_\infty$ with $\tau = \tau_+ = |U|$ and $Q_\pi = Q_\mu$, so $\mathbb{E}\tau = C(\mu)$; for the mixture of Theorem 17 this charges every floor branch in full. Hence $L_F^{\text{ad}} \leq L_F$, and part (a) below, applied to a mixture (for which $\tau_+ = |U|$), contains Theorem 15(a); the component split in that theorem's proof is the simpler route for mixtures.

Theorem 19 (causal adaptive policies on this target) (a) Let $n \geq 1$. Take $\vartheta > 4$, $\xi \geq 1$, $\omega > 0$ and $\varepsilon \geq 0$ with $a_n < 1$ and $\delta_\omega < 1$. Every $\pi \in \mathcal{A}_\infty$ with $\text{KL}(p||Q_\pi) \leq \varepsilon$ that completes almost surely satisfies $\Pr(\tau_+ > R_0(n)) \geq \eta_n$, with η_n as in Theorem 15(a) (and a_n , δ_ω and $R_0(n)$ as defined before that theorem), and hence $\mathbb{E}\tau \geq \mathbb{E}\tau_+ \geq 1 + R_0(n) \max(\eta_n, 0)$. So $L_F^{\text{ad}}(n, \varepsilon) \geq 1 + R_0(n) \max(\eta_n, 0)$.

(b) For every $\varepsilon \geq 0$, $\liminf_n L_F^{\text{ad}}(n, \varepsilon) / \log_2 \log_2 n \geq e^{-\varepsilon}/2$.

(c) For every $\varepsilon > 0$, $\lim_n L_F^{\text{ad}}(n, \varepsilon) / \log_2 \log_2 n = e^{-\varepsilon}/2$.

Proof. Part (a) runs the test of Theorem 15(a) on the adaptive output law itself: data processing onto the indicator that the output's value $(1 + \text{ones})/(n + 2)$ lies outside S^* , and then a lower bound, from the binary divergence, on the probability of that event under the output law. Because block sizes are now chosen from the seed and the past, two steps change: the spread bound of Lemma X1 is proved again for such batches (Lemma X1'), and the split of a mixture by component is replaced by a split by the first jump, which is decided before its draws (Lemma X3'); Lemma X2's induction, run over the nonempty rounds, and the target bound of Lemma X3(ii) carry over. Part (b) follows from (a) as for mixtures, and part (c) adds the class inclusion $L_F^{\text{ad}} \leq L_F$ and Corollary 18. Let π complete almost surely; otherwise $\mathbb{E}\tau = \infty$. Since B_j is a function of the seed and the history, $\sigma(\mathcal{F}_{j-1}, B_j) = \mathcal{F}_{j-1}$, and the values on B_j are i.i.d. Bernoulli(P_{j-1}) given $\mathcal{F}_{j-1}$ whatever labels B_j contains, because every unrevealed coordinate has the same exact marginal. At most n rounds are nonempty, so $P_\infty := \lim_j P_j$ exists on every path and, on $\{\tau < \infty\}$, equals P_τ , the value $(1 + \text{number of ones})/(n + 2)$ of the output.

Lemma X1' (adaptive tail). Let π complete almost surely. For every $k \geq 1$ and every $\mathcal{F}_{k-1}$ -measurable $t > 0$, almost surely, $\Pr(|P_\infty - P_{k-1}| \geq t \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}) \leq 2e^{-c_k t^2}$.

Proof. Given $\mathcal{F}_{j-1}$, $P_j - P_{j-1}$ is the sum of the b_j independent terms $(x - P_{j-1})/c_j$, with x the new values, each of mean 0 in an interval of length $1/c_j$. Hoeffding's lemma for each term gives $\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda(P_j - P_{j-1})} \mid \mathcal{F}_{j-1}] \leq e^{\lambda^2 b_j / (8c_j^2)}$ for bounded $\mathcal{F}_{j-1}$ -measurable λ ; bounding the round as one increment of range b_j/c_j would not suffice. With $\Lambda_m := \sum_{i=k}^m b_i/c_i^2$, whose increments are predictable although later batch sizes are random, $Z_m := \exp(\lambda(P_m - P_{k-1}) - \lambda^2 \Lambda_m/8)$ is, for bounded $\mathcal{F}_{k-1}$ -measurable λ , a supermartingale for $m \geq k-1$, with $Z_{k-1} = 1$: for $j \geq k$ such a λ is $\mathcal{F}_{j-1}$ -measurable, so the bound above applies to it. On every path $\Lambda_\infty \leq b_k/c_k^2 + \sum_{i>k} (1/c_{i-1} - 1/c_i) < 2/c_k$, as $b_i/c_i^2 \leq b_i/(c_{i-1}c_i) = 1/c_{i-1} - 1/c_i$, as in Lemma X1; an empty

round adds 0. Since $c_k = c_{k-1} + b_k$ is $\mathcal{F}_{k-1}$ -measurable (B_k is chosen before round k 's draws), $\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda(P_m - P_{k-1})} \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] \leq e^{\lambda^2/(4c_k)}$ for every m . The event is empty where $t > 1$, since every P_j lies in $(0, 1)$. So take $\lambda := \pm 2c_k t \mathbf{1}\{t \leq 1\}$, which is $\mathcal{F}_{k-1}$ -measurable with $|\lambda| \leq 2(n+2)$. Then $e^{\lambda(P_m - P_{k-1})} \leq e^{2(n+2)}$ and the variables are eventually constant, so conditional dominated convergence gives the same bound for P_∞ , with no optional stopping, and the conditional Markov inequality on $\{t \leq 1\}$ gives the claim. $\square$

Lemma X3' (first jump). Let π complete almost surely. Call round j a jump if $b_j \geq 1$ and $c_j \geq \xi c_{j-1}^\vartheta$, and let J be the first jump ($J = \infty$ if there is none). Then $\{J = k\} \in \mathcal{F}_{k-1}$ for every k , and $\Pr(P_\infty \notin S^*, J = k) \leq \delta_\omega \Pr(J = k)$.

Proof. $\{J = k\}$ is determined by $c_0, \dots, c_k$. On it, P_{k-1} reduces to p/q with $2 \leq q \leq c_{k-1}$, $\xi q^\vartheta \leq c_k \leq n+2$ and $\omega_q \geq \omega c_k^{-1/2}$, exactly as in Lemma X3(i), so $P_\infty \notin S^*$ forces $|P_\infty - P_{k-1}| \geq \omega c_k^{-1/2}$. Apply Lemma X1' with this $\mathcal{F}_{k-1}$ -measurable t , and take expectations. $\square$

A similar partition, by the first crossing of a threshold sequence, handles adaptive grids in batched bandits (Gao et al., 2019, proof of Thm. 3).

Part (a). Data processing onto the indicator that the output's value $(1 + \text{ones})/(n+2)$ lies outside S^* is applied to the adaptive output law itself. The realized profile of an adaptive policy is not an independent predrawn mixture, so X0's mixture form is not used. Data processing gives $\varepsilon \geq \text{kl}(u \| v)$, with $u := \Pr_t((1+W)/(n+2) \notin S^*) \geq 1 - a_n$ by Lemma X3(ii) and $v := \Pr(P_\infty \notin S^*)$; as in Theorem 15(a), $v \geq e^{-(\varepsilon + h(a_n))/(1-a_n)}$. Summing Lemma X3' over the disjoint events $\{J = k\}$ gives $v \leq \Pr(J = \infty) + \delta_\omega \Pr(J < \infty) = \delta_\omega + (1 - \delta_\omega) \Pr(J = \infty)$. An empty round never jumps, since $\xi c^\vartheta > c$. On a completed path, deleting the empty rounds leaves a profile of n , the nonempty block sizes, with the same levels and the same jumps; if the path has no jump, Lemma X2 therefore gives it more than $R_0(n)$ nonempty rounds: $\{J = \infty\} \cap \{\tau < \infty\} \subseteq \{\tau_+ > R_0(n)\}$. Hence $\Pr(\tau_+ > R_0(n)) \geq \eta_n$. Finally, as $n \geq 1$, $\tau \geq \tau_+ \geq 1$, and $\tau_+ \geq R_0(n) + 1$ on $\{\tau_+ > R_0(n)\}$. The first jump is the right event because it is fixed before its draws; the event $\{\tau_+ \leq R_0(n)\}$, on which Theorem 15(a) splits a mixture component by component, depends on later draws.

Parts (b) and (c). Part (b) follows from (a) exactly as the lower half of Theorem 15(b): for fixed admissible (ϑ, ξ, ω) let $n \rightarrow \infty$, then take $\xi \rightarrow \infty$, $\omega \rightarrow \infty$ and $\vartheta \downarrow 4$. For (c), $L_F^{\text{ad}} \leq L_F$ and Corollary 18 give the matching lim sup; this uses only the statement of Corollary 18 and the class inclusion. $\square$

Theorem 19 concerns expected executed rounds, but its part (a), a tail bound, also bounds hard caps. A policy in $\mathcal{A}_r$ completes, and has $\tau_+ \leq \tau \leq r$, almost surely, so $\Pr(\tau_+ > R_0(n)) = 0$ when $r \leq R_0(n)$. For every $\varepsilon \geq 0$ and $\vartheta > 4$, the admissible (ξ, ω) with $\eta_\infty > 0$ of the proof of Theorem 15(b) give $a_n < 1$ and $\eta_n > 0$ for all large n , so by (a) every $\pi \in \mathcal{A}_r$ with $\text{KL}(p \| Q_\pi) \leq \varepsilon$ has $r > R_0(n)$; as $R_0(n)/\log_2 \log_2 n \rightarrow \ln 2 / \ln \vartheta$, letting $\vartheta \downarrow 4$ shows that the least hard cap of causal policies with $F \leq \varepsilon$ is at least $(\frac{1}{2} - o(1)) \log_2 \log_2 n$, as for mixtures. For fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, one uniformly relabelled profile of length L , a finite predrawn mixture and so a policy in $\mathcal{A}_L$, gives at most $\log_2 \log_2 n + O_\varepsilon(1)$ (Theorem 7(b)); the sharp constant between these bounds is open. Theorem 19 says nothing about upper bounds on tail latency, H for adaptive policies, other Beta parameters or practical finite n (the bound in (a) is at most 2 while $n+2 < \xi^{1+\vartheta} 2^{\vartheta^2} = \Gamma_2$, since then $R_0(n) \leq 1$ by Lemma X2 and $\eta_n \leq 1$, and, like Theorem 15, it bites only at astronomical n), and its upper half is the predrawn construction, with the qualifications stated after Corollary 18.

F.8. Separation and scope

Corollary 20 (same-class separation on this target) *For $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$ and $n \geq 2$, the upper construction of Theorem 12 (not the optimality statement of Corollary 13 among single relabelled profiles) is a finite predrawn mixture with cost R , so $L_F(n, \varepsilon) \leq \log_2 \log_2 n + 8c_\varepsilon$, and with Proposition 14*

$$\frac{L_H(n, \varepsilon)}{L_F(n, \varepsilon)} \geq \frac{\max\{1, T_n^2/(6\varepsilon + 2D_n)\}}{\log_2 \log_2 n + 8c_\varepsilon}.$$

With Theorem 15(b) and the schedule of Proposition 14, which gives $L_H(n, \varepsilon) \leq 2 + 4(T_n + 1)(3T_n + 2)/\varepsilon$, for large n , $L_H(n, \varepsilon)/L_F(n, \varepsilon) \leq (1 + o(1))(24e^\varepsilon/\varepsilon)(\ln n)^2/\log_2 \log_2 n$, so

$$\frac{L_H(n, \varepsilon)}{L_F(n, \varepsilon)} = \Theta_\varepsilon\left(\frac{(\ln n)^2}{\log \log n}\right).$$

A single labelled schedule has $F = H$, so the best fixed labelled schedule needs $\Theta_\varepsilon((\ln n)^2)$ rounds for $F \leq \varepsilon$, whereas among single relabelled profiles Corollary 13 gives $R_F^{\text{PROF}}(n, \varepsilon) = \log_2 \log_2 n + O_\varepsilon(1)$.

The ratio statement is two-sided over finite predrawn mixtures, because Theorem 15 bounds L_F from below. For adaptive policies the lower rate for F in expected executed rounds is Theorem 19, and no adaptive-policy lower rate for H is claimed; c_ε is astronomical and Theorem 15 bites only at astronomical n (likewise $K_\star(\varepsilon)$, Theorem 17 and Theorem 19), so the separation is qualitative (at practical n the comparison is Table 6), and since $F \leq H$ a lower bound on H gives none on F . The explicit constructions above, the schedule of Proposition 14 and the profile of Theorem 12, prove the asymptotic statements only; at the sizes of Table 6 the least expected numbers of rounds are far below their lengths (computed L_H optima, best-found upper bounds on L_F ; float64).

Scope. Theorem 10 and Corollary 11 concern one profile with a predrawn uniform relabelling only: the gap set G and Lemmas L4 and L5 all use a deterministic round k with the deterministic grid $\{x/c_k\}$ and a deterministic c_{k+1} . They do not cover mixtures of different profiles, where one component's atoms fill another's gaps (for the profiles $(2, n-2)$ and $(6, n-6)$ and $n = 5000$, the ratio ρ_G of the proof of Theorem 10 on the gap set of the first is $1.7 \cdot 10^{-18}$ ($X \in \{1, 2\}$) under it but 0.94 under the equal mixture of the two). Also, at a fixed number R of rounds the gain of mixing profiles over the best single profile, $1 - F_{\text{mix}}/F_{\text{prof}}$, grows with n on the computed cells; here F_{prof} is the least F of one uniformly relabelled profile with R rounds (exhaustive search over profiles) and F_{mix} the least F of a finite predrawn mixture of such profiles (conditional gradient, with a duality lower bound within 10^{-4} relative), computed in float64: at $R = 2$ from 0.7% at $n = 64$ to 27.9% at $n = 1024$; at $R = 3$ from 0.04% at $n = 64$ to 7.7% at $n = 512$. Hence they give no lower bound on the mean-length quantity L_F , whose feasible laws are mixtures that may combine profiles of different lengths; Theorem 15 gives one with a test set that does not depend on the component. They do not cover value-adaptive policies: there is no deterministic level grid, and the forward induction of Lemma L3 fails for state-dependent block sizes ($c = 4, \nu = (\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{4})$ on $\{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{4}\}$, $\nu \leq_{\text{cx}} \nu' = \text{Unif}\{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{4}\}$, $b(\frac{1}{2}) = 7, b(\frac{1}{4}) = b(\frac{3}{4}) = 1$ and $\varphi(v) = (\frac{1}{5} - v)_+$ give $\mathbb{E}_{\nu S} \varphi = 1/14080 > \mathbb{E}_{\nu' S} \varphi = 1/21120$, with S the resulting state-dependent sampler kernel). On this target the lower bounds covering all policies are the last-round edge bound of Proposition L, which constrains only the last round, and, for expected executed rounds and, through its part (a), hard caps, Theorem 19. Nor do they cover $\alpha, \beta \neq 1$, where Lemma L4 and the target mass of G

change; no extension to them is attempted. The matching upper bound of Theorem 12 holds in the same class. These single-profile arguments do not themselves extend to mixtures of profiles or to general seeded or value-adaptive policies. Separately, for every fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, Theorem 15 proves the order $\Theta_\varepsilon(\log \log n)$ for finite predrawn mixtures under expected cost, and Corollary 18 the exact constant, $L_F(n, \varepsilon)/\log_2 \log_2 n \rightarrow e^{-\varepsilon}/2$; the value-adaptive case is settled for the constant in expected executed rounds by Theorem 19, whose part (a), with the relabelled-profile upper bound of Theorem 7(b), also gives the least hard cap the order $\Theta_\varepsilon(\log \log n)$, between $(\frac{1}{2} - o(1)) \log_2 \log_2 n$ and $\log_2 \log_2 n + O_\varepsilon(1)$ (after Theorem 19); the sharp hard-cap constant and H for adaptive policies remain open. The constants of Theorem 10 are deliberately crude (Chebyshev everywhere); only their existence matters (see after Corollary 11).

Appendix G. Two-group survival envelope

This appendix bounds, for the two-group tilted fixed-weight target, the probability that a causal randomized policy meets the quota within r rounds (Lemma TG9 and Theorem 21), and derives lower bounds on the least hard cap, the mean cost and the expected executed rounds (Corollaries (a)–(d)). The survival recursion G_r^λ bounds that probability for every causal randomized policy (Lemma TG9) and is attained by a deterministic count policy (Lemma TG11); by induction on r , the one-step estimate of Lemma TG6 and the Cauchy–Schwarz halving of Lemma TG7 bound G_r^λ by a negative power of $V(s) + 1$ (Theorem 21), where $V(s)$ is the variance of the number of ones drawn by one round that commits every free coordinate at the exact marginals. Since $\text{KL}(p_\lambda \| Q) \geq -\ln Q(S_k)$, an upper bound on survival yields a lower bound on output KL; this appendix proves no upper bound matching its lower bounds, and its only achievability results are $F_n^* = 0$ in (a), the one-round counterexample in the second of Corollary (c)’s two remarks, and Lemma TG11 (see the Scope at the end). The constants do not depend on λ , which enters only through $V(s)$; at the root state (n_A, n_B, k) this variance can be $o(1)$ even as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and the bounds give doubly logarithmic rates in n when it is of order n (Corollary (c)). Its setting and results are used in Appendices J and O, and in Appendix H, whose §§5 and 9 derive from them, for two weight values, the lower bounds of Theorem 8(a) on L_F^w , on the expected executed rounds and on the hard cap (Section 4.2).

Setting. Target. There are two groups, A of size n_A and B of size n_B , with $n = n_A + n_B \geq 1$, a total quota $0 < k < n$, and a tilt $\lambda > 0$. The slice is $S_k = \{x \in \{0, 1\}^n : |x| = k\}$ (the set written V in the main text; in this appendix $V(s)$ is the variance defined below), where $|x| = \sum_i x_i$, and the target is $p_\lambda(x) \propto \lambda^{|x_A|} \cdot \mathbf{1}\{x \in S_k\}$, where $|x_A|$ is the number of ones of x in group A.

Prefixes and states. A (labelled) prefix is a set of committed coordinates together with their values. Its count state is $s = (m_A, m_B, j)$: the numbers of free (uncommitted) coordinates in each group, and the residual quota $j = k - (\text{number of committed ones})$. The state s is *legal* iff $0 \leq j \leq M := m_A + m_B$. A legal state always has positive target mass. Once a prefix is illegal, no completion lies in S_k .

Interface. A round commits a batch β of free coordinates. Empty batches are allowed and change nothing. *Legal prefix:* the values of β are drawn as fresh Bernoulli bits at the exact conditional marginals of the current prefix (Lemma TG0). *Fresh* means: conditionally on the complete pre-draw information $\mathcal{F}_t$ (defined under Policies below) and on the selected batch, the bits are mutually independent with those marginals. Equivalently, the bits are realized from fresh auxiliary randomness, e.g. $\text{bit}_i = \mathbf{1}\{\zeta_i \leq a_i(s_t)\}$ with ζ_i uniform on $[0, 1]$, where s_t is the current count state and $a_i(s_t)$ the marginal of the group of coordinate i . This auxiliary randomness is independent of

the seed ω and of all earlier auxiliary randomness; the seed is drawn before, and independently of, all of it. The bits themselves are generally *not* independent of the past, because their parameters $a_i(s_t)$ depend on the revealed prefix. Only the auxiliary randomness is independent. *Illegal prefix*: the values are drawn arbitrarily, e.g. as fair bits.

Policies. A *causal randomized policy* π draws a seed ω (any law) and chooses each batch β_{t+1} as a measurable function of ω and the values committed through round t . Write $\mathcal{F}_t := \sigma(\omega, \text{values through round } t)$. If π stops before round r , with all coordinates committed or no further rounds, set $s_t := s_{\text{final}}$ for every later t , where s_t is the count state after t rounds. This convention is covered by the $M = 0$ and empty-batch cases of Lemma TG9. Stopping at an illegal prefix is covered too, since $Y_t = 0$ there (Y_t as in the proof of Lemma TG9). The policy π has an *every-path hard cap* r if, on every execution path, all n coordinates are committed within r rounds; RAND_r denotes this class. Here an execution path is a path of positive probability under the seed's finite pushforward onto depth- r policy tables and the oracle's conditional kernels; a depth- r policy table assigns a batch to each committed value history of fewer than r rounds, there are finitely many, and the seed's law pushes forward to a finite law on them (Appendix J, proof of TGR3, step (4)). So the cap means that all coordinates are committed within r rounds with probability one ($\Pr(M_r = 0) = 1$, with M_r the number of free coordinates after r rounds), as in Section 2: this is Appendix Q's CapAS , not its stronger CapEvery , which also constrains paths of probability zero. So RAND_r is the class $\mathcal{A}_r$ of Section 2 on this target, with the same filtration: $\mathcal{F}_t$, the information after round t , chooses the batch of round $t + 1$. A *full labelled schedule* $U = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_L)$ is an ordered partition of $[n]$ into nonempty blocks, executed in order. It is a seedless member of RAND_L , and $L = |U| \geq 1$. A *predrawn mixture* $\mu = \sum_i w_i \delta_{U_i}$ draws the index i before any bit. The output laws are denoted Q_π , q_U and Q_μ ; the success probability of an output law Q is $Q(S_k)$.

Marginals and variance. At a legal state, $a_A(s)$ and $a_B(s)$ denote the exact conditional marginals of a free coordinate in group A and in group B (Lemma TG0). They satisfy $m_A a_A + m_B a_B = j$. Define

$$V(s) := m_A a_A (1 - a_A) + m_B a_B (1 - a_B).$$

If $m_g = 0$, then a_g is undefined and every expression carries it with weight $m_g = 0$.

Count kernel. At a legal s with $M \geq 1$, a batch composition $b = (b_A, b_B) \neq 0$ (the numbers of batch coordinates in groups A and B) with $b_g \leq m_g$ gives independent committed counts $h_A \sim \text{Bin}(b_A, a_A)$ and $h_B \sim \text{Bin}(b_B, a_B)$. The child is $s' = (m'_A, m'_B, j') = (m_A - b_A, m_B - b_B, j - h_A - h_B)$. It is *alive* iff it is legal. The variance of $X := h_A + h_B$ is $v_b := b_A a_A (1 - a_A) + b_B a_B (1 - a_B)$, and $\mathbb{E}_{\text{prod}}$ denotes expectation under these product draws.

Survival recursion (count DP). On legal states, $G_0^\lambda(s) = \mathbf{1}\{M = 0\}$; for $r \geq 1$, $G_r^\lambda(s) = 1$ if $M = 0$, and otherwise

$$G_r^\lambda(s) = \max_{b \neq 0} \mathbb{E}_{\text{prod}} [G_{r-1}^\lambda(s'); s' \text{ alive}],$$

where $\mathbb{E}[Y; \mathcal{E}] := \mathbb{E}[Y \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}}]$ for an event $\mathcal{E}$.

Link. Lemma TG9 shows that the probability of success within r rounds is $\leq G_r^\lambda(\text{root})$ for every causal randomized policy, where $\text{root} := (n_A, n_B, k)$. Lemma TG11 shows that equality is attained in RAND_r by a deterministic count policy. At $\lambda = 1$ the marginals are j/M , only $b_A + b_B$ matters, and G_r^λ is the balanced $G_r(M, j)$ of Section 3 (paragraph “The exact recursion”).

Theorem 21 (two-group envelope) *For every $\lambda > 0$, all group sizes, every legal state s and every $r \geq 1$,*

$$G_r^\lambda(s) \leq \min \{1, C_r (V(s) + 1)^{-2^{-r}}\}, \quad C_r = \sqrt{2} \cdot 18^{2-2^{-r}} < 324\sqrt{2}.$$

The constants do not depend on λ , the group sizes or the state. They are $C_1 = \sqrt{2}$, $C_2 = 18\sqrt{2}$ and $C_3 = 108$, and since $C_r/C_{r-1} = 18^{2^{1-r}} \leq 18$ for $r \geq 2$, the theorem also holds with the geometric constant $\sqrt{2} \cdot 18^{r-1} \geq C_r$, the form used in Corollary (a), in the asymptotics of (b) and in Appendix H. *The bound is λ -uniform in form only.* Its content enters through $V(s)$, which can be $o(1)$ even as $n \rightarrow \infty$: for example $n_A = n_B = k$ with $\lambda = k^4$, where $V_{\text{root}} = 2/k^2 + O(k^{-4})$ (Corollary (c) below). So it is not a λ -uniform doubly-logarithmic lower bound. *Comparison with the balanced envelope.* At $\lambda = 1$ and the balanced root ($n = 2k$, $V = k/2$), the bound has the shape of the balanced envelope (Env), $A_r(k+1)^{-2^{-r}}$ with $A_r = 6^{2-2^{2^{-r}}}$ (Appendix D). The constant is larger, $C_r/A_r = \sqrt{2} \cdot 3^{2-2^{2^{-r}}} \in [\sqrt{2}, 9\sqrt{2})$, and the base is $(k/2 + 1)$ in place of $(k+1)$, a factor $\leq 2^{2^{-r}}$. *The constants are very loose.* The largest *observed* values of the effective constant $\max_s G_r^\lambda(s) (V(s) + 1)^{2^{-r}}$, over the scanned states s , are 1.1404 at $r = 3$ and 1.1176 at $r = 4$ ($n \leq 80$, extreme λ , still rising with size), and 1.487 for the one-step $T(s, b) (1 + V(s))^{1/4}$ of Lemma TG6 ($n = 600$, $\lambda = 10^{\pm 4}$), with a $\lambda = 1$ Gaussian-limit value of 1.4055. These are finite-grid observations, not suprema. So C_r appears very loose: about $22\times$ at $r = 2$ ($C_2 = \sqrt{2} \cdot 18 \approx 25.46$ against the observed 1.136, the largest $r = 2$ value in the same scan ($n \leq 80$, extreme λ), attained at a small state). That is an empirical regularity, not a theorem.

Plan of the lemmas. Lemma TG0 gives the target’s conditional law and the sampler’s count law, the count kernel above. Lemmas TG1–TG7 serve the proof of Theorem 21, given after Lemma TG11: the case $r = 1$ is the atom bound of Lemma TG1, and the step to $r \geq 2$ combines the one-step bound of Lemma TG6 with the halving of Lemma TG7. Case F of Lemma TG6 uses Lemmas TG1 and TG3, and Case S uses Lemma TG5, which rests on Lemmas TG2 and TG4. Lemma TG8 is needed only for Corollary (c). Lemma TG9, with Lemma TG10, bounds the probability of success within r rounds of every causal randomized policy by $G_r^\lambda(\text{root})$; this is how the Corollaries use the Theorem. Lemma TG11 (attainment) is needed by neither.

Lemma TG0 (conditional law). Let a prefix have legal count state (m_A, m_B, j) . Such a prefix has positive p_λ -mass, so conditioning on it is legitimate. *Target facts* (properties of p_λ): (i) under p_λ , the conditional law of the free coordinates y is $\propto \lambda^{|y_A|} \cdot \mathbf{1}\{|y| = j\}$, where $|y_A|$ is the number of ones of y in group A; (ii) every free coordinate of group g has the same conditional marginal a_g ; (iii) given any batch values of positive target probability (equivalently, values leaving a legal child), the remaining free coordinates have the law (i) at the child state. Under p_λ the free coordinates are in general *not* independent. They are dependent whenever $M \geq 2$ and $0 < j < M$, and always nonpositively correlated (Lemma TG4(ii)). At $j \in \{0, M\}$, or with a single free coordinate, the law is a point mass or a single Bernoulli, hence trivially independent. *Interface fact* (a property of the sampler, not of p_λ): (iv) conditionally on $\mathcal{F}_t$ and the selected batch of composition (b_A, b_B) , the interface’s committed counts are $\text{Bin}(b_A, a_A) \otimes \text{Bin}(b_B, a_B)$, whichever coordinates the batch contains. This follows from (ii) and the definition of fresh independent draws.

Proof. (1) Let u_A be the number of committed A-ones and c the number of committed ones. For a completion y ,

$$p_\lambda(\text{prefix}, y) \propto \lambda^{u_A + |y_A|} \cdot \mathbf{1}\{c + |y| = k\} \propto \lambda^{|y_A|} \cdot \mathbf{1}\{|y| = j\}.$$

This gives (i). (2) The law (i) is invariant under permutations within each group, which gives (ii). (3) Conditioning on batch values of positive probability is the same computation with a longer, still legal prefix, which gives (iii). (4) Property (iv) is the interface definition combined with (ii). $\square$

Lemma TG1 (Poisson-binomial anti-concentration). Let $X = \sum_i \xi_i$ with independent $\xi_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(q_i)$, and let $v = \sum_i q_i(1 - q_i)$. Then

$$\max_x \Pr(X = x) \leq \sqrt{2} \cdot (1 + v)^{-1/2}, \quad \text{and for } v > 0 \text{ also} \quad \max_x \Pr(X = x) \leq \sqrt{\pi/(8v)}.$$

Proof. If $v = 0$, X is deterministic and $\max_x \Pr(X = x) = 1 \leq \sqrt{2}$. Now let $v > 0$. (1) By Fourier inversion, $\Pr(X = x) \leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |\varphi_X(t)| dt$, where $\varphi_X(t) = \mathbb{E}e^{itX}$. (2) For each factor, $|1 - q + qe^{it}|^2 = 1 - 2q(1 - q)(1 - \cos t) \leq \exp(-2q(1 - q)(1 - \cos t))$. Hence $|\varphi_X(t)| \leq \exp(-v(1 - \cos t))$. (3) For $|t| \leq \pi$, $1 - \cos t = 2 \sin^2(t/2) \geq 2t^2/\pi^2$ (Jordan). So $\Pr(X = x) \leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-2vt^2/\pi^2} dt = \sqrt{\pi/(8v)}$. (4) For the first inequality: if $v \geq 1$, then $\sqrt{\pi/(8v)} \leq \sqrt{2}(1 + v)^{-1/2}$, since $\pi(1 + v)/(8v) \leq \pi/4 \leq 2$; if $0 < v < 1$, then $\Pr \leq 1 \leq \sqrt{2}(1 + v)^{-1/2}$. $\square$

Lemma TG2 (monotone marginals). Fix a composition (m_A, m_B) and write $a_g(x)$ for the marginal at quota x . Then $a_A(x)$ and $a_B(x)$ are nondecreasing in $x \in \{0, \dots, M\}$. Consequently, for $x \leq y$,

$$m_A(a_A(y) - a_A(x)) + m_B(a_B(y) - a_B(x)) = y - x, \quad \text{with both summands } \geq 0.$$

Proof. (1) Let U_A be the number of ones among the free A-coordinates. Given quota x , $\Pr(U_A = u) \propto \binom{m_A}{u} \binom{m_B}{x-u} \lambda^u$. (2) The zero-extended row $\binom{m_B}{\cdot}$ is log-concave with interval support, so $\binom{m_B}{x-u}$ is TP2 in (x, u) . Hence the law of U_A is, in the likelihood-ratio order, increasing in x , and $\mathbb{E}[U_A | x] = m_A a_A(x)$ is nondecreasing. (3) The same argument applies to $W = x - U_A$, whose law is $\propto \binom{m_B}{w} \binom{m_A}{x-w} \lambda^{x-w}$. The factor $\lambda^{x-w} = \lambda^x \lambda^{-w}$ preserves TP2. This gives the claim for a_B . (4) The monotonicity is the two-block case of Efron (1965). The displayed consequence follows from it and the identity $m_A a_A(x) + m_B a_B(x) = x$. $\square$

Lemma TG3 (level set). At every legal state, $\text{dist}(j, D) \leq 2V(s)$, where $D = \{0, m_A, m_B, m_A + m_B\}$.

Proof. (1) For $a \in [0, 1]$, $a(1 - a) \geq \frac{1}{2} \min(a, 1 - a)$. (2) Let $e_g = \mathbf{1}\{a_g > \frac{1}{2}\}$. Then $|j - \sum_g m_g e_g| = |\sum_g m_g (a_g - e_g)| \leq \sum_g m_g \min(a_g, 1 - a_g) \leq 2V$. (3) Finally, $\sum_g m_g e_g \in D$. $\square$

Lemmas TG4 and TG5 serve Case S of Lemma TG6, in which the batch carries less than half of $V(s)$. Together they bound the variance of a child from below by the remaining variance $V(s) - v_b$, up to the distance of the child quota from its mean μ' and a $\sqrt{v_b}$ correction. Lemma TG4 is stated under the target law p_s of the batch values, not under the product law of the count kernel, because its part (i), that the child marginals average back to the parent marginals, holds under p_s ; part (ii) shows that under p_s the child quota varies no more than under the product law, where its variance is v_b . Lemma TG5 turns these facts into a deterministic bound at every legal child quota, which Case S applies under the product law.

Lemma TG4 (martingale; negative correlation). Fix a legal parent s with $M \geq 1$ and a batch b , and let p_s be the target law of the batch values at s . Write $a'_g(x)$ for the marginal of group g at the child composition (m'_A, m'_B) and quota x . Then: (i) $\mathbb{E}_{p_s}[a'_g(j')] = a_g$ whenever $m'_g \geq 1$, and $\mathbb{E}_{p_s}[j'] = \mu' := m'_A a_A + m'_B a_B$; (ii) $\text{Var}_{p_s}(j') \leq v_b$.

Proof. (i) Take a free coordinate i of group g outside the batch. Then $a_g = \Pr(y_i = 1) = \mathbb{E}_{p_s}[\Pr(y_i = 1 \mid \text{batch values})]$, and by Lemma TG0 the inner probability is $a'_g(j')$. Also $\mathbb{E}_{p_s}[j'] = j - b_A a_A - b_B a_B = \mu'$.

(ii) The target on the free coordinates is $\Pr(y) \propto \prod_i w_i^{y_i} \cdot \mathbf{1}\{|y| = j\}$, with $w_i = \lambda$ on A and 1 on B. (1) For $i \neq l$, let R be the other free coordinates, and let e_t denote elementary symmetric polynomials of the weights. Use the convention $e_t = 0$ for $t < 0$ or $t > |R|$. Then

$$\text{Cov}(y_i, y_l) = w_i w_l [e_{j-2}(R) e_j(R \cup \{i, l\}) - e_{j-1}(R \cup \{l\}) e_{j-1}(R \cup \{i\})] / e_j(R \cup \{i, l\})^2.$$

(2) Since $e_t(R \cup \{l\}) = e_t(R) + w_l e_{t-1}(R)$ and $e_t(R \cup \{i, l\}) = e_t(R) + (w_i + w_l) e_{t-1}(R) + w_i w_l e_{t-2}(R)$, the bracket is $e_{j-2}[e_j + (w_i + w_l) e_{j-1} + w_i w_l e_{j-2}] - [e_{j-1} + w_l e_{j-2}][e_{j-1} + w_i e_{j-2}] = e_{j-2} e_j - e_{j-1}^2$, with every e taken over R : the cross terms cancel. This is ≤ 0 : for $1 \leq j-1 \leq N-1$, $N = |R|$, by Newton's inequality $e_{j-1}^2 \geq e_{j-2} e_j \binom{N}{j-1}^2 / (\binom{N}{j-2} \binom{N}{j})$ together with $\binom{N}{j-1}^2 \geq \binom{N}{j-2} \binom{N}{j}$; if $j-1 \in \{0, N\}$, one of e_{j-2}, e_j vanishes and the bracket is $-e_{j-1}^2 \leq 0$; outside $0 \leq j-1 \leq N$ every term is 0. (3) Hence $\text{Var}_{p_s}(\sum_{i \in \text{batch}} y_i) \leq \sum_{i \in \text{batch}} a_i(1 - a_i) = v_b$, with $a_i := a_g$ for i in group g . (4) At the boundary quotas $j \in \{0, M\}$, all marginals are 0 or 1 and the target is a point mass, so (i) and (ii) hold trivially, with $\text{Var}_{p_s} = v_b = 0$. (5) Other routes to the nonpositive covariances: negative association of independent PF₂ variables conditioned on their sum (Joag-Dev and Proschan, 1983, Thm. 2.8), or the strong Rayleigh property (Borcea et al., 2009). $\square$

Lemma TG5 (child variance near the mean point). In the setting of Lemma TG4, let $V_{\text{rem}} := m'_A a_A(1 - a_A) + m'_B a_B(1 - a_B) = V(s) - v_b$. Then for every legal child quota x ,

$$V(m'_A, m'_B, x) \geq V_{\text{rem}} - |x - \mu'| - \sqrt{v_b}.$$

Proof. (1) Extend each a'_g piecewise-linearly to real $y \in [0, M']$, $M' := m'_A + m'_B$. By Lemma TG2 at the child composition (m'_A, m'_B) , each a'_g is nondecreasing on $\{0, \dots, M'\}$ and $m'_A a'_A(x) + m'_B a'_B(x) = x$ (the identity used in its proof); so the extensions are nondecreasing and satisfy $m'_A a'_A(y) + m'_B a'_B(y) = y$. So for real y and z both differences have the sign of $z - y$, and

$$\sum_g m'_g |a'_g(z) - a'_g(y)| = |z - y|.$$

Note that $\mu' \in [0, M']$. (2) By Lemma TG4(i) and Jensen,

$$\sum_g m'_g |a_g - a'_g(\mu')| \leq \mathbb{E}_{p_s} \sum_g m'_g |a'_g(j') - a'_g(\mu')| = \mathbb{E}_{p_s} |j' - \mu'| \leq \sqrt{v_b}.$$

The last step is Lemma TG4(ii) and Cauchy–Schwarz. Groups with $m'_g = 0$ carry weight 0. Under p_s , $j' \in [0, M']$ always. (3) $f(a) = a(1 - a)$ is 1-Lipschitz on $[0, 1]$. So

$$|V(m'_A, m'_B, x) - V_{\text{rem}}| \leq \sum_g m'_g |a'_g(x) - a_g| \leq |x - \mu'| + \sqrt{v_b}. \quad \square$$

Note on the $\sqrt{v_b}$ term. Some additive correction is needed: without one, the bound fails. The exact witnesses are below, where the gap $V_{\text{rem}} - |x - \mu'| - V(m'_A, m'_B, x)$ is the amount by which the bound without $\sqrt{v_b}$ fails.

witness	λ	s	b	x	gap
1	1/4	(2, 2, 2)	(1, 1)	1	232/3025
2	1/50	(5, 5, 5)	(2, 2)	3	$0.2262520345 \cdot \sqrt{v_b}$
3	1/100	(25, 4, 5)	(18, 0)	4	$0.2738280224 \cdot \sqrt{v_b}$

In witness 1, $(a_A, a_B) = (3/11, 8/11)$, $V_{\text{rem}} = v_b = 48/121$, $\mu' = 1$ and $V(1, 1, 1) = 8/25$. None of the witnesses shows that $\sqrt{v_b}$ is the necessary *order* of the correction.

Lemma TG6 (one step). For every legal s with $M \geq 1$ and every batch b ,

$$T(s, b) := \mathbb{E}_{\text{prod}}[(V(s') + 1)^{-1/2}; s' \text{ alive}] \leq \min\{1, 18 \cdot (V(s) + 1)^{-1/4}\}.$$

Proof. Write $V = V(s)$. Under the product law, $\mathbb{E}_{\text{prod}} j' = \mu'$ and $\text{Var}_{\text{prod}} j' = v_b$, and $X = j - j'$ is Poisson-binomial. The bound $T \leq 1$ is trivial. For the second bound, the proof splits on whether the batch carries at least half of the variance V (Case F) or less (Case S). Write $C_F := (1 + \sqrt{3/2}) \cdot \sqrt{32} = 4(\sqrt{2} + \sqrt{3}) \approx 12.585$.

Case F: $v_b \geq V/2$. (1) By Lemma TG3 at the child, $V(s') \geq \text{dist}(j', D')/2$, with $D' = \{0, m'_A, m'_B, M'\}$. For each $t \geq 0$, at most 8 integers x have $\text{dist}(x, D') = t$. (2) By Lemma TG1, $\Pr_{\text{prod}}(j' = x) \leq \chi := \sqrt{2}(1 + v_b)^{-1/2}$. Split the alive children according to whether the distance of j' from D' is below an integer $t_0 \geq 0$, and use $\sum_{t < t_0} (1 + t/2)^{-1/2} \leq 4\sqrt{1 + t_0/2}$:

$$T \leq \sum_{t < t_0} 8\chi(1 + t/2)^{-1/2} + (1 + t_0/2)^{-1/2} \leq 32\chi \cdot \sqrt{1 + t_0/2} + (1 + t_0/2)^{-1/2}.$$

(3) We show $T \leq C_F \cdot \sqrt{\chi}$. If $32\chi \geq 1$, then $C_F \sqrt{\chi} = (1 + \sqrt{3/2})\sqrt{32\chi} \geq 1 + \sqrt{3/2} > 1 \geq T$. Otherwise, let $z^* = 1/(32\chi) \geq 1$ and pick t_0 with $1 + t_0/2 \in [z^*, z^* + \frac{1}{2}] \subset [z^*, 1.5z^*]$. This gives $T \leq (1 + \sqrt{3/2}) \cdot \sqrt{32\chi} = C_F \cdot \sqrt{\chi}$. (4) Since $1 + v_b \geq (1 + V)/2$, $\sqrt{\chi} \leq \sqrt{2} \cdot (1 + V)^{-1/4}$. Hence

$$T \leq \sqrt{2} \cdot C_F \cdot (1 + V)^{-1/4} = (8 + 4\sqrt{6}) \cdot (1 + V)^{-1/4} < 18 \cdot (1 + V)^{-1/4},$$

where $8 + 4\sqrt{6} \approx 17.798$.

Case S: $v_b < V/2$. (1) Here $V_{\text{rem}} > V/2$ and $\sqrt{v_b} < \sqrt{V/2}$. (2) On $E = \{|j' - \mu'| \leq V_{\text{rem}}/2\}$, Lemma TG5 gives $V(s') \geq V_{\text{rem}}/2 - \sqrt{v_b} > V/4 - \sqrt{V/2}$ at every alive child. (Lemma TG5 is a pointwise statement about the child quota, so applying it under the product law is valid.) (3) By Chebyshev under the product law, $\Pr(E^c) \leq 4v_b/V_{\text{rem}}^2 < 8/V$. (4) If $V \geq 32$, then $V/4 - \sqrt{V/2} \geq V/8$, so

$$T \leq (1 + V/8)^{-1/2} + 8/V = g(V) \cdot (1 + V)^{-1/4} \leq 1.68 \cdot (1 + V)^{-1/4},$$

where $g(V) := (1 + V)^{1/4}[(1 + V/8)^{-1/2} + 8/V] = g_1 + g_2$, with $g_1 := (1 + V)^{1/4}(1 + V/8)^{-1/2}$ and $g_2 := 8(1 + V)^{1/4}/V$. Here $(\ln g_1)' = 1/(4(1 + V)) - 1/(2(8 + V)) = -(V - 6)/(4(V + 1)(V + 8))$, which is < 0 for $V > 6$, and $(\ln g_2)' = -(3V + 4)/(4V(V + 1)) < 0$. So g decreases on $V > 6$, and $\max_{V \geq 32} g = g(32) = 33^{1/4}(5^{-1/2} + \frac{1}{4}) = 1.6710688 \dots < 1.68$. (5) If $V < 32$, then $18(1 + V)^{-1/4} > 18 \cdot 33^{-1/4} > 7.5 > 1 \geq T$. $\square$

Lemma TG7 (Cauchy–Schwarz halving). Let $T_\alpha(s, b) := \mathbb{E}_{\text{prod}}[(V(s') + 1)^{-\alpha}; \text{alive}]$. The alive mass is ≤ 1 , so Cauchy–Schwarz gives $T_\alpha^2 \leq T_{2\alpha}$. Iterating, $T_{2^{-(r-1)}} \leq T_{1/2}^{2^{2-r}}$ for $r \geq 2$.

Lemma TG8 (variance vs. the tilted product). Let s be legal with $0 < j < M$. Let $(\theta_A, \theta_B) \in (0, 1)^2$ be the unique pair with $\theta_A(1 - \theta_B)/((1 - \theta_A)\theta_B) = \lambda$ and $m_A\theta_A + m_B\theta_B = j$. It exists because $t \mapsto m_A \cdot \lambda t/(1 - t + \lambda t) + m_B \cdot t$ increases continuously and strictly from 0 to M . Let $\sigma^2 := m_A\theta_A(1 - \theta_A) + m_B\theta_B(1 - \theta_B)$. Then

$$\sum_g m_g |a_g - \theta_g| \leq \sigma \quad \text{and} \quad V(s) \geq \sigma^2 - \sigma.$$

Proof. (1) Take independent group counts with law $\text{Bin}(m_A, \theta_A) \otimes \text{Bin}(m_B, \theta_B)$, and let S be their total. Given $S = x$, the law of the A-count is $\propto \binom{m_A}{u} \binom{m_B}{x-u} \lambda^u$, the law of U_A in the proof of Lemma TG2. So $g_g(x) := \mathbb{E}[\text{count in } g \mid S = x] = m_g a_g(x)$. (2) $\mathbb{E}S = j$ and $\text{Var } S = \sigma^2$. (3) By Lemma TG2, $\sum_g |g_g(S) - g_g(j)| = |S - j|$. Hence

$$\sum_g m_g |\theta_g - a_g| = \sum_g |\mathbb{E}g_g(S) - g_g(j)| \leq \mathbb{E}|S - j| \leq \sigma.$$

(4) $f(a) = a(1 - a)$ is 1-Lipschitz on $[0, 1]$, since $|f'| = |1 - 2a| \leq 1$. So $V \geq \sum_g m_g f(\theta_g) - \sum_g m_g |a_g - \theta_g| \geq \sigma^2 - \sigma$. $\square$

Lemma TG9 (success bound for causal policies). Let π be any causal randomized policy, and let s_t be the count state after t rounds, with M_t its number of free coordinates. Then for every $r \geq 0$,

$$\Pr(s_r \text{ is legal and } M_r = 0) \leq G_r^\lambda(\text{root}).$$

In particular, if $\pi \in \text{RAND}_r$, then $Q_\pi(S_k) \leq G_r^\lambda(\text{root})$. This holds because, under an every-path hard cap r , the output lies in S_k iff s_r is legal with $M_r = 0$.

Proof. Let $Y_t := G_{r-t}^\lambda(s_t) \cdot \mathbf{1}[s_t \text{ legal}]$ for $0 \leq t \leq r$. Then $Y_0 = G_r^\lambda(\text{root})$ and $Y_r = \mathbf{1}[s_r \text{ legal, } M_r = 0]$. We show $\mathbb{E}[Y_{t+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_t] \leq Y_t$, by cases; that is, Y_t is a supermartingale. If s_t is illegal, then s_{t+1} is illegal, so $Y_{t+1} = 0 = Y_t$. Illegality is absorbing whatever the draws, because the batch's one-counts satisfy $0 \leq h_g \leq b_g$ (here $b := b_A + b_B$ and $h := h_A + h_B$): if $j < 0$, then $j' = j - h \leq j < 0$; if $j > M$, then $j' - M' = (j - M) + (b - h) \geq j - M > 0$. If s_t is legal with $M_t = 0$, then $s_{t+1} = s_t$ and $Y_{t+1} = 1 = Y_t$. If s_t is legal with $M_t \geq 1$ and the $\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurable batch is empty, then $Y_{t+1} = G_{r-t-1}^\lambda(s_t) \leq G_{r-t}^\lambda(s_t) = Y_t$ by Lemma TG10. If s_t is legal with $M_t \geq 1$ and the batch has composition $b \neq 0$ ($\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurable), then given $\mathcal{F}_t$ the counts are $\text{Bin}(b_A, a_A(s_t)) \otimes \text{Bin}(b_B, a_B(s_t))$ by Lemma TG0(iv). So

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_{t+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_t] = \mathbb{E}_{\text{prod}}[G_{r-t-1}^\lambda(s'); \text{alive}] \leq G_{r-t}^\lambda(s_t) = Y_t,$$

by the definition of G^λ as a maximum over b . Hence $\Pr(s_r \text{ legal, } M_r = 0) = \mathbb{E}Y_r \leq \mathbb{E}Y_0 = G_r^\lambda(\text{root})$. Only the batch composition enters, never which coordinates are chosen. $\square$

(At $\lambda = 1$ and $n = 2k$, Lemma TG9 is the supermartingale argument for Lemma 3(a) in Appendix E.)

Lemma TG10 (monotone horizon). $G_r^\lambda \leq G_{r+1}^\lambda$ at every legal state, for every $r \geq 0$.

Proof. $r = 0$. If $M = 0$, both sides equal 1. If $M \geq 1$, $G_0^\lambda = 0 \leq G_1^\lambda$. *Induction step.* Suppose $G_{r-1}^\lambda \leq G_r^\lambda$ pointwise. For $M \geq 1$,

$$G_r^\lambda(s) = \max_b \mathbb{E}_{\text{prod}}[G_{r-1}^\lambda(s'); \text{alive}] \leq \max_b \mathbb{E}_{\text{prod}}[G_r^\lambda(s'); \text{alive}] = G_{r+1}^\lambda(s).$$

For $M = 0$, both sides equal 1. $\square$

Lemma TG11 (attainment). For every $r \geq 1$ there is a deterministic, seedless policy $\pi^\circ \in \text{RAND}_r$ with $Q_{\pi^\circ}(S_k) = G_r^\lambda(\text{root})$. Hence

$$\max_{\pi \in \text{RAND}_r} Q_\pi(S_k) = G_r^\lambda(\text{root}).$$

The maximum is attained. Together with Lemma TG9, the supremum over all causal randomized policies of the probability of success within r rounds also equals $G_r^\lambda(\text{root})$.

Proof. (1) *The policy.* For $1 \leq \varrho \leq r$ and every legal s with $M \geq 1$, fix a maximizer $b^*(\varrho, s)$ in the recursion for $G_\varrho^\lambda(s)$; the maximum is over a finite set. At round $t + 1$, for $0 \leq t < r$, the policy π° commits $b^*(r - t, s_t)$ if s_t is legal with $M_t \geq 1$ (the lowest-indexed free coordinates: b_A^* of group A and b_B^* of group B); it commits all remaining coordinates if s_t is illegal; and it does nothing if $M_t = 0$. (2) *Success.* Under π° , $\mathbb{E}[Y_{t+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_t] = Y_t$ with Y_t as in the proof of Lemma TG9; that is, the supermartingale is a martingale. On legal s_t with $M_t \geq 1$ the counts are $\text{Bin}(b_A^*, a_A(s_t)) \otimes \text{Bin}(b_B^*, a_B(s_t))$ (Lemma TG0(iv)), and b^* attains the maximum, so $\mathbb{E}_{\text{prod}}[G_{r-t-1}^\lambda(s'); \text{alive}] = G_{r-t}^\lambda(s_t)$. If s_t is illegal, π° commits all remaining coordinates. Illegality is absorbing (Lemma TG9), so s_{t+1} is illegal and $Y_{t+1} = 0 = Y_t$. If s_t is legal with $M_t = 0$, then $s_{t+1} = s_t$ and $Y_{t+1} = 1 = Y_t$. The policy π° never uses an empty batch at a legal state with $M_t \geq 1$, so Lemma TG9's empty-batch case does not arise. Hence $\Pr(s_r \text{ legal}, M_r = 0) = \mathbb{E}Y_r = Y_0 = G_r^\lambda(\text{root})$; under the hard cap of step (3), this is $Q_{\pi^\circ}(S_k)$. (3) *Every-path hard cap r .* Let s be legal with $M \geq 1$. If $0 < j < M$, every group with $m_g \geq 1$ has $a_g(s) \in (0, 1)$, since a free coordinate can be 1 ($j \geq 1$) or 0 ($j \leq M - 1$); so X_{full} , the count X of the full batch, has full support on $\{0, \dots, M\}$. If $j \in \{0, M\}$, then $X_{\text{full}} = j$ almost surely. Either way $G_1^\lambda(s) = \Pr_{\text{prod}}(X_{\text{full}} = j) > 0$. Every batch b other than the full one leaves $M' \geq 1$, where $G_0^\lambda = 0$, so its value is 0. Hence $b^*(1, s)$ is the full batch, and every path that is legal before round r completes in round r . A path that first becomes illegal after round $t < r$ completes in round $t + 1 \leq r$, and a legal path with $M_t = 0$ is already complete. So every path commits all n coordinates within r rounds, and $\pi^\circ \in \text{RAND}_r$. $\square$

(This is the two-group analogue of the attainment in Theorem 4(a).)

Proof of Theorem 21. Induction on r , with $C_1 = \sqrt{2}$ and $C_r = 18^{2^{2-r}} C_{r-1}$ for $r \geq 2$, so $C_r = \sqrt{2} \cdot 18^{\sum_{i=2}^r 2^{2-i}} = \sqrt{2} \cdot 18^{2^{2-r}}$, which is at least 1 and less than $\sqrt{2} \cdot 18^2 = 324\sqrt{2}$.

$r = 1$. If $M \geq 1$, only the full batch reaches $M' = 0$, and $G_0^\lambda = 0$ elsewhere. So $G_1^\lambda(s) = \Pr_{\text{prod}}(X_{\text{full}} = j)$, where X_{full} , the count X of the full batch, has variance $V(s)$. Lemma TG1 gives $G_1^\lambda(s) \leq \sqrt{2}(1 + V)^{-1/2}$. If $M = 0$, then $V = 0$, and the bound $\sqrt{2}$ is $\geq 1 = G_1^\lambda$.

$r \geq 2$. The induction hypothesis holds at every alive child. This includes children with $M' = 0$, where $V = 0$ and $G_{r-1}^\lambda \leq 1 \leq C_{r-1}$. Applying the induction hypothesis inside the recursion gives the first line below, and Lemmas TG7 and TG6 give the second:

$$\begin{aligned} G_r^\lambda(s) &\leq C_{r-1} \cdot \max_b T_{2-(r-1)}(s, b) \\ &\leq C_{r-1} \cdot (18(V + 1)^{-1/4})^{2^{2-r}} \\ &= 18^{2^{2-r}} C_{r-1} \cdot (V + 1)^{-2^{-r}} = C_r (V + 1)^{-2^{-r}}. \end{aligned}$$

The last step uses $\frac{1}{4} \cdot 2^{2-r} = 2^{-r}$. For $M = 0$, $G_r^\lambda = 1 \leq C_r$. $\square$

Corollaries (two-group terminal lower bounds). Write $V_{\text{root}} := V(n_A, n_B, k)$. Throughout, $\text{KL}(p_\lambda \| Q) \geq -\ln Q(S_k)$ for every sub-probability Q , by Jensen on S_k , since $p_\lambda(S_k) = 1$.

(a) *Hard cap, class RAND_r .* Assume $V_{\text{root}} \geq 2$, so that L_V below is > 0 . Basic facts about the class and about F_r^* (defined below): $\text{RAND}_0 = \emptyset$ for $n \geq 1$, so $F_0^* = +\infty$; $\text{RAND}_r \subseteq \text{RAND}_{r+1}$, so F_r^* is nonincreasing; and $F_n^* = 0$, because committing one coordinate per round at the exact marginals samples p_λ exactly. Hence, for every $\varepsilon \geq 0$, $R_F^\lambda(\varepsilon)$ below is a well-defined integer in $[1, n]$, and only $r \geq 1$ is needed, where Theorem 21 applies. The quantifier is over RAND_r only: causal randomized policies with fresh exact-marginal draws and an every-path hard cap r . This is not a statement about arbitrary r -round algorithms. By the preamble and Lemma TG9,

every $\pi \in \text{RAND}_r$ has $\text{KL}(p_\lambda \| Q_\pi) \geq -\ln G_r^\lambda(\text{root})$. Hence, by Theorem 21 with the geometric constant $\sqrt{2} \cdot 18^{r-1}$, $F_r^* := \inf_{\pi \in \text{RAND}_r} \text{KL}(p_\lambda \| Q_\pi)$ satisfies

$$F_r^* \geq 2^{-r} \ln(V_{\text{root}} + 1) - \frac{1}{2} \ln 2 - (r-1) \ln 18.$$

Let $L_V := \log_2 \ln(V_{\text{root}} + 1)$. If $F_r^* \leq \varepsilon$, then either $r > L_V$ or $r \geq L_V - \log_2(\varepsilon + \frac{1}{2} \ln 2 + L_V \ln 18)$. So

$$R_F^\lambda(\varepsilon) := \min\{r : F_r^* \leq \varepsilon\} \geq L_V - \log_2 L_V - O_\varepsilon(1).$$

Here $O_\varepsilon(1)$ is a constant depending only on ε , given the standing hypothesis $V_{\text{root}} \geq 2$. That hypothesis gives $L_V \geq \log_2 \ln 3 \approx 0.136$, which controls both the branch $r > L_V$ and the term $\log_2 L_V$. Corollary (d) below gives the sharper $R_F^\lambda(\varepsilon) > L_V - \log_2(\varepsilon + \ln(324\sqrt{2}))$ without this hypothesis, from the bounded prefactor $C_r < 324\sqrt{2}$; (a) records what the geometric form $C_r \leq \sqrt{2} \cdot 18^{r-1}$ alone gives.

(b) *Mean cost, predrawn mixtures of full labelled schedules.* Define $L_F^\lambda(n, \varepsilon) := \inf\{C(\mu) : \text{KL}(p_\lambda \| Q_\mu) \leq \varepsilon\}$, where $\mu = \sum_i w_i \delta_{U_i}$ ranges over predrawn mixtures of full labelled schedules and $C(\mu) = \sum_i w_i |U_i|$. This is the two-group analogue of the least scheduled mean under the F criterion, $L_F(n, \varepsilon)$ of Section 2. Under mean cost, the class excludes adaptive policies and adaptive stopping, so (b) does not cover them; Corollary (d) below extends its lower bound to every causal policy, adaptive stopping included, under expected executed rounds. Adaptive stopping under a hard cap that holds almost surely is covered by (a).

Markov split. Fix $r \geq 0$. For each component U of μ : if $|U| \leq r$, then $s_U := q_U(S_k) \leq G_{|U|}^\lambda(\text{root}) \leq G_r^\lambda(\text{root})$, by Lemma TG9 ($U \in \text{RAND}_{|U|}$) and Lemma TG10, so $1 + r(s_U - G_r^\lambda(\text{root})) \leq 1 \leq |U|$; if $|U| \geq r+1$, then $1 + r(s_U - G_r^\lambda(\text{root})) \leq 1 + r \leq |U|$. The first case uses $|U| \geq 1$, which holds because full schedules are nonempty when $n \geq 1$. Averaging over i gives $1 + r(Q_\mu(S_k) - G_r^\lambda(\text{root})) \leq C(\mu)$. Since $\text{KL} \leq \varepsilon$ forces $Q_\mu(S_k) \geq e^{-\varepsilon}$,

$$L_F^\lambda(n, \varepsilon) \geq 1 + r(e^{-\varepsilon} - G_r^\lambda(\text{root})) \quad \text{for every integer } r \geq 0.$$

(At $\lambda = 1$ and $n = 2k$ this is Step 5 of the single-horizon bound in Appendix E.)

Asymptotics. Let $\Lambda_V := \ln(V_{\text{root}} + 1)$, take $r := \lfloor \log_2 \Lambda_V - \log_2 \log_2 \Lambda_V - c_0 \rfloor$ with a constant $c_0 > \log_2 \ln 18 \approx 1.53$ (e.g. $c_0 = 2$), and apply Theorem 21. Then $G_r^\lambda(\text{root}) \rightarrow 0$: the choice of r gives $2^{-r} \Lambda_V \geq 2^{c_0} \log_2 \Lambda_V$, and with the geometric constant $\sqrt{2} \cdot 18^{r-1}$ of Theorem 21 and $r \leq \log_2 \Lambda_V$, $\ln G_r^\lambda \leq \ln \sqrt{2} + (r-1) \ln 18 - 2^{-r} \Lambda_V \leq \ln \sqrt{2} + (\ln 18 - 2^{c_0}) \log_2 \Lambda_V \rightarrow -\infty$, as $2^{c_0} > \ln 18$. Also $r \geq \log_2 \Lambda_V - \log_2 \log_2 \Lambda_V - c_0 - 1 = (1 - o(1)) \log_2 \Lambda_V$, so the Markov split gives

$$L_F^\lambda(n, \varepsilon) \geq (e^{-\varepsilon} - o(1)) \cdot \log_2 \ln V_{\text{root}} \quad \text{as } V_{\text{root}} \rightarrow \infty.$$

(c) *When V_{root} is of order n .* This corollary is conditional.

1. λ -uniform, away from D . By Lemma TG3, $V_{\text{root}} \geq \text{dist}(k, D)/2$, with $D = \{0, n_A, n_B, n\}$. The lower bound $\text{dist}(k, D)/2$ is of order n if and only if $\text{dist}(k, D) \geq \delta n$ for a fixed $\delta > 0$ (a constant, not the $\delta = 1 - e^{-\varepsilon}$ of Section 3); then $\delta n/2 \leq V_{\text{root}} \leq n/4$. The “if and only if” concerns this bound, not V_{root} itself, which can be of order n without the hypothesis (item 2). Without that hypothesis, no λ -uniform lower bound of order n exists. Counterexample: for every $k \geq 1$, $n_A = n_B = k$ gives $\text{dist}(k, D) = 0$ and $V_{\text{root}} \rightarrow 0$ as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$; for instance $k = 5$ and $\lambda = 10^6$ give $V_{\text{root}} = 5.0 \cdot 10^{-5}$.

2. λ in a compact subset of $(0, \infty)$, with interior proportions. *Setup.* Let $n \rightarrow \infty$ with $n_A/n \rightarrow \rho \in (0, 1)$ and $k/n \rightarrow \kappa \in (0, 1)$. Let λ range over a fixed nonempty compact $K \subset (0, \infty)$, so that both λ and $1/\lambda$ are bounded. Let $\theta^{(n)}$ be Lemma TG8's pair at the root, σ_n^2 its variance, and $\theta = \theta(\lambda, \rho, \kappa)$ the solution of the limiting equations $\theta_A(1 - \theta_B)/((1 - \theta_A)\theta_B) = \lambda$ and $\rho\theta_A + (1 - \rho)\theta_B = \kappa$. *Convergence.* Define $\psi_n(t) := (n_A/n) \cdot \lambda t/(1 - t + \lambda t) + (n_B/n) \cdot t$ and $\psi(t) := \rho \cdot \lambda t/(1 - t + \lambda t) + (1 - \rho) \cdot t$. (1) $|\psi_n - \psi| \leq |n_A/n - \rho| + |n_B/n - (1 - \rho)|$ on $[0, 1]$, uniformly in all $\lambda > 0$. (2) $\psi' \geq 1 - \rho > 0$, and $\psi(0) = 0 < \kappa < 1 = \psi(1)$. (3) So $\theta_B^{(n)} \rightarrow \theta_B \in (0, 1)$, with error at most $(\|\psi_n - \psi\|_\infty + |k/n - \kappa|)/(1 - \rho)$. This is uniform in all $\lambda > 0$. (4) For $\theta_A = \chi_\lambda(\theta_B)$, where $\chi_\lambda(t) := \lambda t/(1 - t + \lambda t)$, use $\chi'_\lambda(t) = \lambda/(1 + (\lambda - 1)t)^2 \leq \max(\lambda, 1/\lambda)$ on $[0, 1]$. This is where compactness of K enters: $|\theta_A^{(n)} - \theta_A| \leq \max_K \max(\lambda, 1/\lambda) \cdot |\theta_B^{(n)} - \theta_B| \rightarrow 0$, uniformly over $\lambda \in K$. (5) Hence $\sigma_n^2/n \rightarrow c(\lambda, \rho, \kappa) := \rho\theta_A(1 - \theta_A) + (1 - \rho)\theta_B(1 - \theta_B)$ uniformly on K , and $\min_K c > 0$ by continuity and compactness. *Conclusion.* By Lemma TG8, $V_{\text{root}} \geq \sigma_n^2 - \sigma_n = (c(\lambda, \rho, \kappa) - o(1)) \cdot n$, uniformly over $\lambda \in K$, since c is continuous and positive on K . The $o(1)$ can be as slow as the convergence of the proportions, so “ $cn - O(\sqrt{n})$ ” is not claimed. *Example.* $n_A = n_B = k$ gives $\theta_A = \sqrt{\lambda}/(1 + \sqrt{\lambda})$ and $\sigma^2 = n\sqrt{\lambda}/(1 + \sqrt{\lambda})^2$.

Where c is small. For every λ , $c(\lambda, \rho, \kappa) \geq \text{dist}(\kappa, \{0, \rho, 1 - \rho, 1\})/2$. This is the product analogue of Lemma TG3: $\sigma^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_g n_g \min(\theta_g, 1 - \theta_g) \geq \frac{1}{2} \text{dist}(k, D)$. This bound proves only necessity: $c \rightarrow 0$ requires $\kappa \in \{\rho, 1 - \rho\}$. The exact limits come from the odds equation $\theta_A/(1 - \theta_A) = \lambda \cdot \theta_B/(1 - \theta_B)$ together with $\rho\theta_A + (1 - \rho)\theta_B = \kappa$. As $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$: if $\kappa > \rho$, then $\theta_B \geq (\kappa - \rho)/(1 - \rho) > 0$ forces $\theta_A \rightarrow 1$, so $\theta_B \rightarrow (\kappa - \rho)/(1 - \rho)$ and $c \rightarrow (\kappa - \rho)(1 - \kappa)/(1 - \rho) > 0$; if $\kappa < \rho$, then $\theta_A \leq \kappa/\rho < 1$ forces $\theta_B \rightarrow 0$, so $\theta_A \rightarrow \kappa/\rho$ and $c \rightarrow \kappa(\rho - \kappa)/\rho > 0$; if $\kappa = \rho$, then $\theta_A \rightarrow 1$ and $\theta_B \rightarrow 0$, so $c \rightarrow 0$. Indeed $\rho\theta_A + (1 - \rho)\theta_B = \rho$ gives $\theta_B = \rho(1 - \theta_A)/(1 - \rho)$. If $\theta_A \leq 1 - \delta$ for some $\delta > 0$ along a subsequence, then $\theta_B \geq \rho\delta/(1 - \rho) > 0$, and the odds equation forces $\theta_A \rightarrow 1$, a contradiction. As $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, by the $A \leftrightarrow B$ symmetry (swap the groups and replace λ by $1/\lambda$): if $\kappa \neq 1 - \rho$ then c has a positive limit, and if $\kappa = 1 - \rho$ then $c \rightarrow 0$. Hence $c \rightarrow 0$ at extreme tilt exactly on two diagonals: as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ iff $\kappa = \rho$, and as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ iff $\kappa = 1 - \rho$. Off these diagonals, item 1 gives a λ -uniform rate even at finite n . Item 2's own uniformity is only over compact K . For example, $(\rho, \kappa) = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{4})$ gives $c \rightarrow 1/8$ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ or ∞ , meeting the floor with equality, and $(0.3, 0.5)$ gives $c \rightarrow 1/7$. In particular, $c \rightarrow 0$ in both limits only at $\rho = \kappa = \frac{1}{2}$.

One-sided bounds on λ are not enough. The family $n_A = n_B = k = N$ with $\lambda = N^{-4}$ has $V_{\text{root}} = 2/N^2 + O(N^{-4}) \rightarrow 0$. Rounded to the digits shown, the values are 0.1179, 0.0309, 0.00779 and 0.00195 at $N = 4, 8, 16$ and 32 . The same holds for $\lambda = N^4$, by the $A \leftrightarrow B$ symmetry.

3. *Consequence (conditional).* Suppose either (1) $\text{dist}(k, D) \geq \delta n$, or (2) λ lies in a fixed compact subset of $(0, \infty)$, with $n_A/n \rightarrow \rho \in (0, 1)$ and $k/n \rightarrow \kappa \in (0, 1)$. Then $\log_2 \ln V_{\text{root}} = \log_2 \ln n + o(1)$. So, for every fixed $\varepsilon > 0$: $R_F^\lambda(\varepsilon) \geq \log_2 \log_2 n - O(\log \log \log n)$ for RAND_r ; and $L_F^\lambda(n, \varepsilon) \geq (e^{-\varepsilon} - o(1)) \cdot \log_2 \ln n$ for predrawn mixtures of full labelled schedules. With (d) below, the first bound is $\log_2 \log_2 n - O_\varepsilon(1)$, and the second holds for every causal policy in expected executed rounds, with $-O(1)$ in place of $-o(1) \cdot \log_2 \ln n$.

Two remarks. First, the two hypotheses are *sufficient, not necessary*: (a) and (b) hold in terms of V_{root} whenever $V_{\text{root}} \rightarrow \infty$. For example, $n_A = n_B = k = N$ with $\lambda = (\ln N)^2$ violates both, yet the Example of Corollary (c)2 and Lemma TG8 give $V_{\text{root}} \geq N/(4 \ln N)$ for large N , so $\log_2 \ln V_{\text{root}} = \log_2 \ln n + o(1)$. Second, *no λ -uniform rate in n holds without a condition like (1).* We prove it for the family $n_A = n_B = k = N$ with $\lambda = N^4$ ($\lambda = N^{-4}$ follows by the $A \leftrightarrow B$ symmetry). Step 1. With Z the number of B-ones under p_λ , $\Pr(Z = z)/\Pr(Z =$

0) = $\binom{N}{z}^2 N^{-4z} \leq N^{-2z}$. Hence $\mathbb{E}Z \leq \sum_{z \geq 1} z N^{-2z} = N^{-2}/(1 - N^{-2})^2$. Step 2. The marginals are $a_A = 1 - \mathbb{E}Z/N$ and $a_B = \mathbb{E}Z/N$. So $\nu_N := \min(a_g, 1 - a_g) = \mathbb{E}Z/N \leq N^{-3}/(1 - N^{-2})^2$, and $V_{\text{root}} = O(N^{-2})$. Step 3. One full round at the exact marginals has output law $Q = \bigotimes_i \text{Bernoulli}(a_i)$. For $p = p_\lambda$, whose coordinate marginals are the a_i , and H the Shannon entropy (not the criterion $H(\mu)$ of Section 2), $\text{KL}(p\|Q)$ is the total correlation $\sum_i H_b(a_i) - H(p) \leq \sum_i H_b(a_i)$, where H_b is the binary entropy in nats. Step 4. Here $\sum_i H_b(a_i) = 2N \cdot H_b(\nu_N) \leq 2N\nu_N(1 + \ln(1/\nu_N)) = O(N^{-2} \ln N) \rightarrow 0$, using $H_b(x) \leq x(1 + \ln(1/x))$ for $x \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and that $x(1 + \ln(1/x))$ increases on $(0, 1]$. Step 5. So for every fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ and all large N , one round suffices: $R_F^\lambda(\varepsilon) = 1$ and $L_F^\lambda(n, \varepsilon) = 1$. No λ -uniform doubly-logarithmic lower bound in n can hold. Note that success probability alone would not give this: $\text{KL}(p_\lambda\|Q) = -\ln Q(S_k) + \text{KL}(p_\lambda\|p_{\lambda'})$, with $\lambda' = a_A(1 - a_B)/((1 - a_A)a_B)$. Step 3 bounds both terms at once. Numerically, at $N = 4, 8, 16, 32, 64$ and 128 , the one-round KL is 0.229, 0.080, 0.0255, 0.0077, 0.0023 and 0.00065, and the bound $2N H_b(\nu_N)$ is 0.622, 0.224, 0.073, 0.022, 0.0066 and 0.0019 (60-digit arithmetic, not interval-certified).

(d) *Bounded prefactor: hard cap and executed mean.* Here Theorem 21 is used with its bounded constant $C_r < 324\sqrt{2}$ instead of the geometric form of (a) and of the asymptotics of (b). So, without the hypothesis $V_{\text{root}} \geq 2$ of (a), $F_r^* \geq 2^{-r} \ln(V_{\text{root}} + 1) - \ln C_r$ and $R_F^\lambda(\varepsilon) > L_V - \log_2(\varepsilon + \ln(324\sqrt{2}))$. Now let π be a causal randomized policy with fresh exact-marginal draws and no cap, whose output has KL at most ε , and let τ be its executed-round count (Section 2). By Lemma TG9 (empty rounds via Lemma TG10), the probability that the state is legal with $M_t = 0$ after round t , which is the probability of a valid output with $\tau \leq t$, is at most $G_t^\lambda(\text{root})$. As in Lemma 3(b) and the proof of Corollary 6(b): $\mathbb{E}\tau = \sum_{t \geq 0} \Pr(\tau > t)$ with $\Pr(\tau > 0) = 1$, and for $t \geq 1$, $\Pr(\tau > t) \geq Q_\pi(S_k) - \Pr(\text{valid output}, \tau \leq t) \geq e^{-\varepsilon} - G_t^\lambda(\text{root})$, by Lemma 1(a); so

$$\mathbb{E}\tau \geq 1 + \sum_{t \geq 1} (e^{-\varepsilon} - G_t^\lambda(\text{root}))_+ \geq e^{-\varepsilon} L_V - c_{\text{TG}}, \quad c_{\text{TG}} = \sum_{i \geq 0} \min\{1, 324\sqrt{2} e^{-2^i}\} < 3.154;$$

for $L_V \geq 1$ put $m = \lfloor L_V \rfloor$: for $1 \leq t \leq m$, Theorem 21 and $(V_{\text{root}} + 1)^{-2^{-t}} = e^{-2^{L_V-t}} \leq e^{-2^{m-t}}$ give $G_t^\lambda(\text{root}) \leq \min\{1, 324\sqrt{2} e^{-2^{m-t}}\}$, so $\sum_{t \leq m} G_t^\lambda(\text{root}) \leq c_{\text{TG}}$ and $\mathbb{E}\tau \geq 1 + m e^{-\varepsilon} - c_{\text{TG}} \geq e^{-\varepsilon} L_V - c_{\text{TG}}$, since $e^{-\varepsilon} \leq 1$ and $m + 1 > L_V$. In c_{TG} the terms $i \leq 2$ equal 1, the term $i = 3$ is below 0.15372, and the terms $i \geq 4$ sum to less than 10^{-4} . For $L_V < 1$, including $L_V < 0$, the second inequality follows from $\tau \geq 1$. A predrawn mixture is such a policy with $\tau = |U|$, so the same bound holds for $L_F^\lambda(n, \varepsilon)$. These are lower bounds only: no two-group upper construction of matching order is proved here.

Numerical checks (not used in the proofs). All of the following is finite falsification evidence; the proof carries the general claim. *Checks that cannot fail at small sizes.* The full envelope at $r \geq 2$ exceeds 1 while $V < 419,903$ ($r = 2$) or $V < 1.8 \cdot 10^{16}$ ($r = 3$; $V < 1.9 \cdot 10^{21}$ for the geometric form), and Lemma TG6's bound $18(1+V)^{-1/4}$ is at least 1 for $V \leq 104,975$, with equality at $V = 104,975$ since $18^4 = 104,976$. So “0 violations” of those two inequalities at $n \leq 16$ ($V \leq 4$), or of Case F at $n = 200$, carries no information; likewise the survival-DP envelope check ($n \leq 80$ with two groups, $n \leq 400$ at $\lambda = 1$) carries information only at $r = 1$. *Informative checks.* These are the single-lemma inequalities (Lemmas TG1–TG5 and TG8), the Case-S chain at $V \geq 32$, whose bound $1.68(1+V)^{-1/4}$ is < 1 , and Lemma TG6 at $V = 113,750$ and $125,000$. None was violated, beyond floating-point rounding. The single-lemma inequalities were checked by independent small-size sweeps (float64 with exact-rational re-checks of the tightest cases, and a separate recomputation in

rational and high-precision decimal arithmetic), by a further test at $m_A, m_B \leq 6$ that also covers the endpoint quotas $j \in \{0, M\}$, $v_b = 0$, every batch and every legal child quota (exact rationals except for square roots, powers, Lemma TG6’s product probabilities and bisection), and on larger instances at tilts between 10^{-12} and 10^{12} . The larger instances covered Lemmas TG2, TG3 and TG4(ii) in exact big-integer arithmetic for group sizes up to 100, Lemma TG5 exhaustively for group sizes up to 60, and Lemma TG8 for group sizes up to 200 (and up to 40 in the small-size sweeps). At $m_A = m_B = 100$ (float64, $j \in \{60, 80, 100, 120, 140\}$, $V \in [33.4, 50]$, $\lambda \in \{1/3, 1, 3, 10\}$, all 10,200 batches) the largest Case-S effective constant $T(s, b) (1 + V)^{1/4}$ is 0.579, against the bound 1.68; the Case-F maximum, 1.236, is against a bound that is vacuous at these V . Lemma TG6’s final inequality holds at the two tested states, $V = 113,750$ and $V = 125,000$ ($n = 5 \cdot 10^5$, every batch), with a $13\times$ margin, but both have one nonempty group, so this does not test extreme λ . The constants of Lemmas TG1 and TG6, including $g(32) = 1.6710688 < 1.68$ and the monotonicity of g , are also checked numerically. *Other coverage.* Lemma TG9’s inequality: exact labelled enumeration over deterministic policies at $n \leq 8$, which suffice for randomized ones because success is linear in the mixture over deterministic policies; there the supremum equals G_r^λ . The inequality was also checked by exact labelled brute force for fixed schedules ($s_U \leq G_{|U|}^\lambda$). Lemma TG10: no monotonicity violation for $n \leq 80$. Lemma TG0 is elementary; it is implicit in every exact marginal computation above. Corollary (c)2 is an analytic argument; only its limit values are spot-checked ($(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{4}) \rightarrow 1/8$ and $(0.3, 0.5) \rightarrow 1/7$), together with the floor $c \geq \text{dist}(\kappa, \{0, \rho, 1 - \rho, 1\})/2$ at 20,000 random (λ, ρ, κ) .

Scope. Narrow scope. This is an ordinary, lower-bound-only result for the two-group tilted fixed-weight target under the exact-marginal interface. It covers RAND_r (the almost-sure hard cap) and, through Corollary (d), every causal policy with fresh exact-marginal draws under expected executed rounds; part (b) states the mean-cost bound for predrawn mixtures of full labelled schedules. Its bounds are in terms of V_{root} and give doubly logarithmic rates in n whenever V_{root} is of order n : for example under either sufficient condition of (c), or with a bounded weight ratio and a quota fraction bounded away from 0 and 1, for any split (Appendix H, §5). *Evidence labels.* “Exact” means exact rational or big-integer arithmetic; 60-digit results are high-precision but not interval-certified, and are labelled as such.

Lower bounds only. This appendix proves no upper bound matching its lower bounds; the only achievability results proved here are $F_n^* = 0$ in (a), the one-round counterexample in the second of Corollary (c)’s two remarks, and Lemma TG11. Lemma TG11 is an attainment result for the survival optimum $G_r^\lambda(\text{root})$, not a KL upper bound. The survival analysis of this appendix does not control the between-group shape term, the between-orbit divergence of the chain-rule identity in Appendix O. For fixed-quota weighted targets, a rate-matching upper bound for F off the balanced orbit is proved elsewhere in the paper only under bounded weight ratio and a quota fraction bounded away from 0 and 1, by different constructions: with a homogeneous group of linear size in Appendix H (Theorem 8 and its hard-cap corollary for two weight values; the Remark after its §7 table for more weight values), and without one in Appendix I. The other rate-matching upper bounds are for the balanced uniform case $\lambda = 1$, $n = 2k$ (Theorem 4(b), Theorem 2(b) and Corollary 6(c)) or for a target without a quota, the full-support Beta(1, 1)–Bernoulli law (Theorem 7(b),(c), Appendix F); Proposition 22 is an exact hard-cap identity for a different target, uniform permutations. Nothing in this appendix addresses the H side. For bounded λ , the bounded-weight envelope of Appendix H, §10 gives this appendix’s adaptive lower-bound rates for any weight array of ratio at

most Λ ; this appendix’s V -based envelope, whose constants do not depend on λ , remains the form for unbounded tilts, where V can collapse (Corollary (c)).

Loose constants. The envelope is below 1 only if $V + 1 > C_r^{2^r}$: $V + 1 > 419,904$ at $r = 2$, and $V + 1 > 16 \cdot 18^{12} > 1.8 \cdot 10^{16}$ at every $r \geq 3$, as $C_r^{2^r}$ increases with r . At $\lambda = 1$ and the balanced root, where $V = n/4$, these need $n > 1,679,612$ and $n > 7.4 \cdot 10^{16}$; the balanced envelope (Env) of Appendix D is below 1 at $r = 2$ once $n > 2590$. Finite certificates should use the exact DP. *Classes.* Part (a) covers RAND_r : causal adaptive policies, including adaptive stopping, under a hard cap r that holds almost surely. Part (b) treats predrawn mixtures of full labelled schedules under mean cost; Corollary (d) extends this lower bound to every causal policy, adaptive stopping included, under expected executed rounds (empty, failed-path and forced final rounds counted). Neither covers repair or restart, or samplers outside the exact-marginal interface. *Citations.* Lemmas TG2 and TG4(ii) have self-contained proofs; the citations (Efron, 1965; Joag-Dev and Proschan, 1983; Borcea et al., 2009) are attribution, not load-bearing. Newton’s inequality, Jordan’s inequality and Chebyshev’s inequality are classical. The proof is ordinary; Appendix Q lists the parts that are also kernel-checked.

Appendix H. Proof of Theorem 8 (bounded weights)

This appendix proves Theorem 8 with explicit constants, except the F upper bounds of part (a) for weights without an equal-weight group of linear size, which are Appendix I’s. The Result below states the four bounds (HL), (HU), (FL) and (FU) for two weight values. §1 fixes the setting and §2 proves the weighted-slice lemmas; §§3–6 prove the four bounds in turn: (HL) from the entropy decrement of Lemma W5, (HU) from the per-block bound of Lemma W4, (FL) from the two-group survival envelope of Appendix G, and (FU) from the chain rule of §6.3 and the atom lemma of §6.6. §7 treats edge cases and more weight values; §8 explains why survival alone is not enough; §9 derives the least hard cap, a hard-length analogue of Corollary 5 and the sharp mean coefficient; and §10 proves an adaptive converse for any bounded weights, the lower bound that the upper bounds of Appendix I match.

Assembly of Theorem 8. For any weights with ratio at most Λ and $\kappa_0 n \leq k \leq (1 - \kappa_0)n$, part (a) is assembled as follows. The bounds on L_H^w are (HL) and (HU) below. The lower bounds on R_F^{adapt} (written R_F^w in §9), on L_F^w and on the least expected executed rounds are §10(c), which covers every causal policy and hence every predrawn mixture ($\tau = |U|$). The matching upper bounds are Corollary A’ of Appendix I for the hard cap and Corollary A’’ for the scheduled mean, and so for $\mathbb{E}\tau$, since a predrawn mixture executes every block; with an equal-weight group of linear size, (FU), its extension in the Remark after the §7 table and their §9 dilution give these upper bounds with explicit constants. For part (b), the schedule mixture is (FU)’s μ_{ff} (§6) for two weight values and the Remark’s schedule mixture for a group of at least ρn equal weights; each has $F \leq \varepsilon$ for large n and one length at most $\log_2 \ln n + O(1)$ on every path, and §10(c) bounds that length below by $\log_2 \ln n - O(1)$.

Result (explicit constants). Fix $\varepsilon > 0$, $\Lambda \geq 1$ and $\kappa_0 \in (0, 1/2]$. Write $\mathcal{H}_n = \sum_{m \leq n} 1/m$ and $S_n = \sum_{m \leq n} 1/m^2$, as in Theorem 2. Set

$$c := 2\kappa_0^2/\Lambda^6, \quad \delta_4 := 1 - e^{-\varepsilon/4}, \quad \eta := \kappa_0/(2\Lambda), \quad K_4 := \max\{1, \lceil \ln(2/\delta_4)/(2\eta^2) \rceil\}.$$

Take any $n \geq 2$, any weights with at most two values and $\max/\min \leq \Lambda$ (any split, one group possibly empty), and any $k \in [\kappa_0 n, (1 - \kappa_0)n]$. ((HL) and (HU) hold more generally, as each states; for arbitrary bounded weights, the Assembly above gives Theorem 8.) Then:

- (HL) $L_H^w(n, \varepsilon) \geq \max\{1, \mathcal{H}_n - \varepsilon/c, 1 + [\mathcal{H}_n - \varepsilon/c - 1]_+^2 / (2\varepsilon/c + S_n - 1)\} \geq 1 + [\ln(n+1) - \varepsilon/c - 1]_+^2 / (2\varepsilon/c + 2/3)$. This holds for *any* number of weight values with ratio $\leq \Lambda$.
- (HU) $L_H^w(n, \varepsilon) \leq 1 + (2/\alpha)(\ln n + 1)$, with $\alpha := \min\{1/4, \varepsilon/(8\Lambda^3(\ln n + 1))\}$. So $L_H^w \leq 1 + \max\{8(\ln n + 1), 16\Lambda^3(\ln n + 1)^2/\varepsilon\}$. The bound is attained by *one* fixed schedule and holds for any weights with ratio $\leq \Lambda$ and any k .
- (FL) For every integer $r \geq 0$, $L_F^w(n, \varepsilon) \geq 1 + r(e^{-\varepsilon} - \min\{1, \sqrt{2} \cdot 18^{r-1}(n\kappa_0/(2\Lambda) + 1)^{-2^{-r}}\})$. Hence $L_F^w \geq (e^{-\varepsilon} - o(1)) \log_2 \ln n$, where the $o(1)$ is a function of n that depends only on $(\varepsilon, \Lambda, \kappa_0)$, uniformly in the split, λ and k .
- (FU) Let $n_0^{\text{ff}} := 2M^* - 1$, where M^* is the least integer $M \geq 1$ with $\Lambda^2 \ln(M+1)/(\kappa_0^2 M) \leq \varepsilon/2$. For $n \geq n_0^{\text{ff}}$ the single group-aware schedule mixture μ_{ff} of §6 below has $F \leq \varepsilon$, and *every* component has length $\leq \max\{1, \lceil 2\Lambda^2/\varepsilon \rceil\} + 8K_4 + \lceil \log_2 \log_2 n \rceil \leq \log_2 \ln n + C_{\text{FU}}$, with $C_{\text{FU}} := \lceil 2\Lambda^2/\varepsilon \rceil + 8K_4 + 2$. For $n < n_0^{\text{ff}}$, the all-singleton schedule is exact, so $L_F^w \leq n < n_0^{\text{ff}}$.

Hence $L_H^w = \Theta_{\varepsilon, \Lambda, \kappa_0}((\log n)^2)$ and $L_F^w = \Theta_{\varepsilon, \Lambda, \kappa_0}(\log \log n)$, uniformly in the split, $\lambda \in [1/\Lambda, \Lambda]$ and k ; §9 sharpens the latter to $L_F^w = (e^{-\varepsilon} + o(1)) \log_2 \ln n$.

1. Setting (the class of Section 2, restated). *Target.* $p_w(x) \propto \prod_i w_i^{x_i} \cdot \mathbf{1}\{|x| = k\}$. The weights take the value w_A on group A (size n_A) and w_B on group B (size n_B), with $\lambda = w_A/w_B \in [1/\Lambda, \Lambda]$. This is the p_λ of Appendix G.

States. At a committed prefix, let m_A and m_B be the free counts, $M = m_A + m_B$, and let the residual quota be $J = k - (\text{committed ones})$. The prefix is legal iff $0 \leq J \leq M$. A legal prefix has positive target mass. Given a legal prefix, the free coordinates follow the weighted slice on the free set with quota J (Lemma TG0(i) of Appendix G). Their marginals depend only on the group and the count state (Lemma TG0(ii)).

Interface. A round commits a nonempty block by fresh independent Bernoulli draws at the exact conditional marginals of the current prefix. Fresh means the draws are realised from auxiliary randomness independent of everything before. At an infeasible prefix the draws are fair bits. An infeasible prefix never re-enters the slice.

Schedules, mixtures, costs. A full labelled schedule U is an ordered partition of $[n]$ into nonempty blocks. Every block is executed on every path, and $|U|$ is the cost. A predrawn mixture μ is a finite distribution over full labelled schedules, drawn once before any bit and independent of the auxiliary randomness. Write $Q_\mu = \mathbb{E}_\mu q_U$ and $C(\mu) = \mathbb{E}_\mu |U|$. The criteria are $H(\mu) = \mathbb{E}_\mu \text{KL}(p \| q_U)$ and $F(\mu) = \text{KL}(p \| Q_\mu)$, forward KL in nats. The least costs are $L_H^w(n, \varepsilon) = \inf\{C(\mu) : H(\mu) \leq \varepsilon\}$ and $L_F^w(n, \varepsilon) = \inf\{C(\mu) : F(\mu) \leq \varepsilon\}$.

Chain identity (used throughout). For a fixed U with blocks $B_1, \dots, B_R$, let $E_t := B_1 \cup \dots \cup B_{t-1}$. Every prefix of an x in the support of p is legal, and there the sampler's marginals are the target's. Hence

$$\text{KL}(p \| q_U) = \sum_t \mathbb{E}_p[\text{TC}_t], \quad \text{TC}_t := \sum_{i \in B_t} H(X_i | X_{E_t}) - H(X_{B_t} | X_{E_t}) \quad (\text{target law}). \quad (\text{C})$$

Infeasible paths carry zero target mass and do not enter (C). In (C), $H(\cdot \mid X_{E_t})$ is the Shannon entropy of the target's conditional law at the realised prefix, so TC_t is a function of the prefix and $\mathbb{E}_p$ averages it; this H is not the criterion $H(\mu)$.

2. Weighted-slice lemmas. Throughout this part, S is a free set of size M with residual quota J , and the weights on S are positive with ratio $\leq \Lambda$. The quota is nondegenerate iff $1 \leq J \leq M - 1$. Write $p_i = \Pr(X_i = 1)$, $v_i = p_i(1 - p_i)$, $Z = e_J(S)$, and let $e_m(\cdot)$ be the elementary symmetric polynomials, with $e_m = 0$ for $m < 0$ or $m > \text{size}$.

Lemma W1 (ratios and floors). For $i \neq j$, let $R = S \setminus \{i, j\}$. Then

$$p_i = w_i[e_{J-1}(R) + w_j e_{J-2}(R)]/Z \quad \text{and} \quad 1 - p_i = [e_J(R) + w_j e_{J-1}(R)]/Z.$$

If $0 < J < M$ and $w_i \geq w_j$:

- $1 \leq p_i/p_j \leq w_i/w_j$. After cancelling Z , the numerator and denominator of p_i/p_j are $w_i e_{J-1} + w_i w_j e_{J-2}$ and $w_j e_{J-1} + w_i w_j e_{J-2}$.
- $w_j/w_i \leq (1 - p_i)/(1 - p_j) \leq 1$.

Hence (a) $v_i/v_j \in [w_j/w_i, w_i/w_j] \subset [1/\Lambda, \Lambda]$. (b) $p_i \geq p_j/\Lambda$ for every j . Summing over j , $M \cdot p_i \geq J/\Lambda$, so $p_i \geq J/(\Lambda M)$. Likewise $1 - p_i \geq (M - J)/(\Lambda M)$. At $J \in \{0, M\}$ both hold trivially. At the root ($M = n$, $J = k$) this gives $\min(p_i, 1 - p_i) \geq \kappa_0/\Lambda$, so $a_0 := \min_i \min(p_i, 1 - p_i) \geq \kappa_0/\Lambda$.

Lemma W2 (influences). Assume a nondegenerate quota and $M \geq 2$.

(i) $\text{Cov}(X_i, X_j) = w_i w_j [e_J(R) e_{J-2}(R) - e_{J-1}(R)^2]/Z^2$. To see this, expand $Z e_{J-2}$ and the product of the two marginal numerators; the terms in $(w_i + w_j) e_{J-1} e_{J-2}$ and $w_i w_j e_{J-2}^2$ cancel.

(ii) Strict negativity. For positive reals and $0 \leq m \leq N := |R| = M - 2$, we have $e_m^2 > e_{m-1} e_{m+1}$:

- for $1 \leq m \leq N - 1$ this is Newton's inequality, with factor $(m + 1)(N - m + 1)/(m(N - m)) > 1$;
- at $m \in \{0, N\}$ the right side is 0 and $e_m > 0$.

Take $m = J - 1 \in [0, M - 2]$. Then $\text{Cov} < 0$ at every nondegenerate quota.

(iii) Define the influences $d_{ij} := -\text{Cov}(X_i, X_j)/v_i$. Then $\sum_{j \neq i} d_{ij} = 1$, because $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{j \neq i} X_j \mid X_i = x] = J - x$; both conditionings are defined, since $p_i \in (0, 1)$.

(iv) Ratio. Fix i and take $j \neq \ell$ (so $M \geq 3$). Let $S' = S \setminus \{i, j, \ell\}$. The numerator $N_j := e_{J-1}(R)^2 - e_{J-2}(R) e_J(R)$ with $R = S' \cup \{\ell\}$ equals $f(w_\ell)$, where $f(t) = f_0 + f_1 t + f_2 t^2$ with

$$f_0 = e_{J-1}^2 - e_{J-2} e_J, \quad f_1 = e_{J-1} e_{J-2} - e_{J-3} e_J, \quad f_2 = e_{J-2}^2 - e_{J-3} e_{J-1} \quad (\text{over } S').$$

$f_0 \geq 0$ and $f_2 \geq 0$ by log-concavity, with zero extension. For $f_1 \geq 0$: if $e_{J-3} e_J > 0$, multiply $e_{J-2}^2 \geq e_{J-3} e_{J-1}$ by $e_{J-1}^2 \geq e_{J-2} e_J$ and divide by $e_{J-1} e_{J-2} > 0$; otherwise $f_1 = e_{J-1} e_{J-2} \geq 0$. Now $d_{ij}/d_{i\ell} = w_j f(w_\ell)/(w_\ell f(w_j))$, where $f(w_j) = N_\ell > 0$ by (ii). If $w_\ell \geq w_j$, then $f(w_j) \leq f(w_\ell) \leq (w_\ell/w_j)^2 f(w_j)$. So the ratio lies in $[w_j/w_\ell, w_\ell/w_j] \subset [1/\Lambda, \Lambda]$.

(v) By (iv), $\max_j d_{ij} \leq \Lambda \cdot \min_j d_{ij}$, and by (iii), $(M - 1) \cdot \min \leq 1 \leq (M - 1) \cdot \max$. Hence

$$1/(\Lambda(M - 1)) \leq d_{ij} \leq \Lambda/(M - 1). \quad (\text{I})$$

For $M = 2$, $d_{ij} = 1$. With two weight values, d_{ij} depends only on the groups of i and j .

(vi) Same-group refinement. Let i, j both lie in group A, with m_A free A-coordinates and m_B free B-coordinates. Then $(m_A - 1)d_{AA} + m_B d_{AB} = 1$, where the second term is absent when $m_B = 0$; if $m_B \geq 1$, also $d_{AB} \geq d_{AA}/\Lambda$. In both cases $d_{AA} \leq 1/(m_A - 1 + m_B/\Lambda)$, which is at most Λ/m_B when $m_B \geq 1$.

Lemma W3 (one-step variance). At a legal state with $0 < J < M$, let $P'_i = \Pr(X_i = 1 \mid X_j)$ under the target's conditional law given that state. Since X_j is binary, $P'_i = p_i + (\text{Cov}/v_j)(X_j - p_j)$, so $\text{Var}(P'_i) = \text{Cov}^2/v_j$. Using $\text{Cov} = -d_{ij}v_i = -d_{ji}v_j$:

$$\text{Var}(P'_i) = d_{ij}^2 v_i (v_i/v_j) = d_{ji}^2 v_j.$$

By (I) and W1(a):

$$v_i/(\Lambda^3(M-1)^2) \leq \text{Var}(P'_i) \leq \Lambda^3 v_i/(M-1)^2, \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Var}(P'_i) \geq v_j/(\Lambda^2(M-1)^2). \quad (\text{II})$$

If $w_i = w_j$, then $\text{Var}(P'_i) = d_{ij}^2 v_i$. At a deterministic state ($J \in \{0, M\}$), every term of (II) is 0.

Lemma W4 (per-block total correlation). Take a block $B = (i_1, \dots, i_b)$ at any legal state with M free coordinates. Condition on the past, and reveal the block one coordinate at a time, under the target (a proof device). Let $P^{(u)}$ be the conditional probability of X_{i_s} after $i_1, \dots, i_{u-1}$; it is a target martingale. Then:

- $\text{TC}(B) = \sum_s I(X_{i_s}; X_{i_1 \dots i_{s-1}})$ and $I_s = \mathbb{E}[d(P^{(s)} \| P^{(1)})]$.
- The χ^2 bound $d(a \| p) \leq (a - p)^2/(p(1 - p))$ comes from $\ln x \leq x - 1$; the term is 0 if $p \in \{0, 1\}$.
- Orthogonal increments give $\mathbb{E}(P^{(s)} - P^{(1)})^2 = \sum_{u < s} \mathbb{E} \text{Var}_u$, where Var_u is the conditional variance of the increment $P^{(u+1)} - P^{(u)}$ given $X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{u-1}}$.
- By (II) at free size $M - u + 1$, with $v^{(u)} := P^{(u)}(1 - P^{(u)})$, $\mathbb{E} \text{Var}_u \leq \Lambda^3 \mathbb{E} v^{(u)}/(M - u)^2 \leq \Lambda^3 v^{(1)}/(M - u)^2$. The last step is Jensen: $x(1 - x)$ is concave and P is a martingale.

Hence $I_s \leq \Lambda^3 \sum_{u < s} (M - u)^{-2}$, and

$$\text{TC}(B \mid \text{past}) \leq \Lambda^3 \sum_{u=1}^{b-1} (b-u)/(M-u)^2 \leq \Lambda^3 b(b-1)/(2(M-b+1)^2), \quad \text{for every legal past.} \quad (\text{III})$$

(IV) *Same-group block with a reservoir.* Let the block lie in group A while group B has at least M free coordinates, untouched during the block (here M is this lower bound, not the total free count). W2(vi) gives $d_{AA} \leq \Lambda/M$, and v is equal within a group. So $\text{Var}_u \leq \Lambda^2 v^{(u)}/M^2$, and

$$\text{TC}(B \mid \text{past}) \leq \Lambda^2 b(b-1)/(2M^2) \quad \text{for every legal past.} \quad (\text{IV})$$

Lemma W5 (entropy decrement at deterministic labelled sets). Let $E \subset [n]$ be a fixed set (it must not depend on the values), $S = [n] \setminus E$ with $|S| = M \geq 2$, and $i \neq j \in S$. Let $J = \sum_{l \in S} X_l$; it is random under p . Write $P_i = \Pr(X_i = 1 \mid X_E)$, $P'_i = \Pr(X_i = 1 \mid X_E, X_j)$ and $v_j^E = \text{Var}(X_j \mid X_E)$. Then:

- By Pinsker, $\Delta := \mathbb{E}_p[H(X_i \mid X_E) - H(X_i \mid X_E, X_j)] = \mathbb{E}_p \mathbb{E}[d(P'_i \| P_i) \mid X_E] \geq 2\mathbb{E}_p \text{Var}(P'_i \mid X_E)$.
- By (II), $\text{Var}(P'_i \mid X_E) \geq v_j^E / (\Lambda^2(M-1)^2)$.
- By W1(b), $v_j^E \geq J(M-J) / (\Lambda^2 M^2)$.
- By pairwise negative correlation at the *root*, $\mathbb{E}_p[J(M-J)] = \sum_{l \neq m \in S} \Pr(X_l = 1, X_m = 0) \geq \sum_{l \neq m} p_l(1-p_m) \geq a_0^2 M(M-1)$.

Therefore

$$\Delta \geq 2a_0^2 / (\Lambda^4 M(M-1)) \geq c / (M(M-1)), \quad c := 2\kappa_0^2 / \Lambda^6. \quad (\text{V})$$

Every expectation is over target values at a fixed labelled E . The root bound on $\mathbb{E}[J(M-J)]$ is a statement about a fixed S . If S were chosen by looking at values, for example “the free set when J first equals 0”, then $J(M-J)$ could vanish identically on the selected event, and (V) would not follow. Exact finite checks illustrate this (not used in the proofs). At $n = 6$, $k = 3$, $\Lambda = 1$, revealing the coordinates in a fixed order and stopping once the residual quota is determined ($J \in \{0, M\}$) gives decrement 0 on $2/5$ of the mass. For weights $(100, 100, 100, 1, 1, 1)$ with $k = 3$ and $M = 3$, a causal adaptive pair choice reaches $0.60 \cdot 2a_0^2 / (M(M-1))$, while every fixed E of the same size and every fixed pair give at least 55 times that value: adaptivity lowers the decrement by a factor of about 92 here, although not below (V), whose factor Λ^{-4} is 10^{-8} .

3. H lower bound (HL). Fix U . At round t , E_t is deterministic. Order B_t as $i_1, \dots, i_b$, and write $M = M_{t-1}$ for the free count before round t . By the chain rule for mutual information, each $I(X_{i_s}; X_{i_{<s}} \mid X_{E_t})$ is a sum over $u < s$ of decrements for the pair (i_s, i_u) at the deterministic set $E_t \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{u-1}\}$, of free size $M - u + 1$. By (V), telescoping:

$$\mathbb{E}_p \text{TC}_t \geq c \sum_{s=1}^b \sum_{u=1}^{s-1} 1 / ((M - u + 1)(M - u)) = c \sum_{m=M-b+1}^M (1/m - 1/M).$$

Summing over t via (C) gives $d_U := \text{KL}(p \| q_U) \geq c(\mathcal{H}_n - a_U)$, where $a_U = \sum_t b_t / M_{t-1}$. Step 4 of Appendix B is pure arithmetic, valid for any target:

$$\beta_U = \sum_t (b_t / M_{t-1})^2 \leq 2(\mathcal{H}_n - a_U) + S_n \leq 2d_U / c + S_n.$$

Both bounds are affine in d_U , so they average under μ . If $H(\mu) = \mathbb{E}_\mu d_U \leq \varepsilon$, then $\mathbb{E}_\mu a \geq \mathcal{H}_n - \varepsilon / c$ and $\mathbb{E}_\mu \beta \leq 2\varepsilon / c + S_n$. Drop each schedule’s last block ($\rho_R = 1$, in the notation of Appendix B) and apply Cauchy–Schwarz on $\mu \times$ (rounds $t < R_U$):

$$(\mathbb{E}_\mu a - 1)^2 \leq (C(\mu) - 1)(\mathbb{E}_\mu \beta - 1).$$

This is (HL), including the middle term $C(\mu) \geq \mathbb{E}_\mu a$. Finally $\mathcal{H}_n \geq \ln(n+1)$ and $S_n - 1 \leq 2/3$ (Step 6 of Appendix B). Nothing in this part uses two weight values or the group split.

Informativeness. HL is an order statement. At finite n with $\Lambda \geq 3$, (HL) can be vacuous. On 363 targets with one to three weight values (n from 8 to 40, $\Lambda \in \{1, \frac{3}{2}, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9\}$) and seven values of ε from 10^{-3} to 1 (2541 cells), the Result’s (HL), at the largest admissible $\kappa_0 = \min(k, n-k)/n$,

was 1 in all 1197 cells with $\Lambda \geq 3$. At $\Lambda = 2$ it exceeded 1 only for $\varepsilon \leq 0.01$. With (V)'s sharper constant $2a_0^2/\Lambda^4$ in place of c , 19 of the 1197 cells exceed 1, all at $\varepsilon = 10^{-3}$. The $(\ln n)^2$ regime can begin at astronomically large n . The exact L_H^w itself barely depends on λ at small n ; for example 9.30, 9.28 and 9.21 at $\lambda = 1, 2, 4$ with $n = 24$, $k = 12$, $\varepsilon = 0.1$ (two groups of size 12; exact computation).

4. H upper bound (HU). From the current free count M , take a block of size $b = \max(1, \lfloor \alpha M \rfloor)$, with any labels. This is one fixed schedule. A nonsingleton block has $\alpha M \geq 2$ and $b \leq M/4$, so (III) gives $\text{TC} \leq \Lambda^3 \alpha^2 M^2 / (2(3M/4)^2) = (8/9)\Lambda^3 \alpha^2$ for every past. Each nonsingleton block removes $\lfloor \alpha M \rfloor \geq \alpha M/2$ coordinates, and such blocks occur only while $M \geq 2/\alpha$. They form an initial segment, since $\lfloor \alpha M \rfloor$ is nonincreasing as M decreases; let N_{ns} be their number. If $\alpha n < 2$ there are none ($N_{\text{ns}} = 0$), and the schedule is all singletons and exact. Otherwise $N_{\text{ns}} \leq 1 + (2/\alpha) \ln(\alpha n/2)$. In every case $N_{\text{ns}} \leq 1 + (2/\alpha) \ln n$. After them come fewer than $2/\alpha$ singletons, which are exact. By (C):

$$H \leq (8/9)\Lambda^3 \alpha^2 (1 + (2/\alpha) \ln n) \leq (16/9)\Lambda^3 \alpha (\ln n + 1) \leq 2\varepsilon/9,$$

and the number of rounds is $R \leq 1 + (2/\alpha)(\ln n + 1) = 1 + \max\{8(\ln n + 1), 16\Lambda^3(\ln n + 1)^2/\varepsilon\}$. Uniformly in ε this is $O(\ln n + \Lambda^3(\ln n)^2/\varepsilon)$.

5. F lower bound (FL). This section gives the two-weight form, through Appendix G; for arbitrary bounded weights, the F lower bounds of Theorem 8(a) are §10(c). Corollary (b) of Appendix G gives $L_F^w(n, \varepsilon) \geq 1 + r(e^{-\varepsilon} - G_r^\lambda(\text{root}))$ for every integer $r \geq 0$, where $G_r^\lambda(\text{root})$ is the largest probability of meeting the quota within r rounds (the recursion of Appendix G). The inputs are that corollary's Markov split (a component with at most r blocks meets the quota with probability at most $G_r^\lambda(\text{root})$, and any other component costs at least $r + 1$) and $\text{KL} \geq -\ln Q(S_k)$, with $S_k = \{x : |x| = k\}$. Theorem 21 of Appendix G, with its geometric constant, gives $G_r^\lambda(\text{root}) \leq \min\{1, \sqrt{2} \cdot 18^{r-1} (V_{\text{root}} + 1)^{-2^{-r}}\}$. Let a_g be the root marginal of a coordinate in group g . By W1(b), each nonempty group has $a_g(1 - a_g) \geq \min \cdot \max \geq (\kappa_0/\Lambda) \cdot (1/2)$, where $\min$ and $\max$ denote the smaller and the larger of a_g and $1 - a_g$. An empty group has $n_g = 0$, so it contributes nothing to V_{root} . So

$$V_{\text{root}} = n_A a_A (1 - a_A) + n_B a_B (1 - a_B) \geq n \kappa_0 / (2\Lambda),$$

uniformly in the split. The ‘‘Asymptotics’’ of Appendix G then applies with $V_{\text{root}} \rightarrow \infty$ at a rate fixed by (n, κ_0, Λ) . For example, take $r = \max\{0, \lfloor \log_2 \Lambda' - \log_2 \log_2 \Lambda' - 2 \rfloor\}$ with $\Lambda' = \ln(n \kappa_0 / (2\Lambda) + 1)$, a lower bound for the $\Lambda_V = \ln(V_{\text{root}} + 1)$ of those Asymptotics (not a weight ratio). Then $G_r^\lambda(\text{root}) \leq \sqrt{2} \Lambda'^{\log_2 18 - 4/\ln 2} \rightarrow 0$ and $r = \log_2 \ln n - O(\log \log \log n)$. This supplies a sufficient condition that Corollary (c) of Appendix G does not list: bounded Λ with an interior quota, and *any* split. It is consistent with Corollary (c)1, whose ‘‘no λ -uniform bound’’ concerns unbounded λ . The bound on V_{root} is attained at $(n, n_A, k, \lambda) = (2, 0, 1, 1)$ with $\kappa_0 = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\Lambda = 1$.

Remark (an explicit two-weight constant, from Corollary (d) of Appendix G). Corollary (d) of Appendix G bounds the expected executed rounds of every causal policy with output KL at most ε , and so gives $L_F^w \geq 1 + \sum_t (e^{-\varepsilon} - G_t^\lambda)_+ \geq e^{-\varepsilon} \log_2 \ln(V_{\text{root}} + 1) - c_{\text{TG}}$ with $c_{\text{TG}} < 3.154$. Hence $L_F^w \geq e^{-\varepsilon} \log_2 \ln n - 4.154$ for $n \geq (2\Lambda/\kappa_0)^2$. The undiluted schedule mixture of (FU) alone gives no two-sided mean law, since its leading coefficient is 1; mixing it with a cheap one-round schedule gives the matching mean law $L_F^w = (e^{-\varepsilon} + o(1)) \log_2 \ln n$ (§9, ‘‘Sharp mean coefficient’’).

6. F upper bound: the reservoir construction (FU). Group A, a smallest group, is committed first, in fixed blocks, while group B is untouched; then a ladder like that of Theorem 2(b), with the constant K_4 of the Result, runs on B, relabelled uniformly within B. Because B is homogeneous, this relabelling makes the conditional output law of x_B given x_A uniform on each residual slice, so the chain rule splits the output KL F exactly into the divergence $\text{KL}(p_A \| Q_A)$ of the values committed in Stage A and $\mathbb{E}_p[-\ln s_J]$, where s_J is the ladder's success probability from the residual quota $J = k - |x_A|$ (§§6.3, 6.6, 6.8). The first term is at most $\varepsilon/4$ because B is untouched during Stage A, so (IV) applies to every Stage A block, and Stage A splits A into $\bar{L}$ blocks (into singletons if $N \leq \bar{L}$), enough to make the summed (IV) bounds at most $\varepsilon/4$ (§6.4; by §6.9 a single block does not suffice); the second is at most $\varepsilon/4 + \Lambda^2 \ln(M+1)/(\kappa_0^2 M)$ (§6.8) because the ladder succeeds with probability at least $1 - \delta_4$ at typical quotas (a supermartingale bound with Ville's inequality, valid at every quota fraction in $[\eta, 1 - \eta]$ because $K_4 \geq \ln(2/\delta_4)/(2\eta^2)$; §6.5) and at least $1/(n_B + 1)$ at every legal quota (J is a mode of $\text{Bin}(n_B, J/n_B)$; §6.6), while atypical quotas have target probability at most $1/(4\eta^2 n_B)$ (§6.7). §6.1 defines the schedule mixture, §§6.2–6.8 prove (FU), and §6.9 gives explicit constants.

6.1 Construction. Name the groups so that A is a smallest group: $N := n_A \leq M := n_B$, hence $M \geq n/2$. If $n_A = n_B$, use the group B of Appendix G as the reservoir. Parameters: δ_4 , η and K_4 as in the Result, and $\bar{L} := \max\{1, \lceil 2\Lambda^2 N^2/(\varepsilon M^2) \rceil\}$.

Stage A, the prefix U_A , identical in every component:

- if $N = 0$, there are no rounds;
- if $1 \leq N \leq \bar{L}$, there are N singletons;
- otherwise there are $\bar{L}$ consecutive blocks in a fixed label order, with sizes $\lceil N/\bar{L} \rceil$ for the first $(N \bmod \bar{L})$ blocks and $\lfloor N/\bar{L} \rfloor$ for the rest.

Let L_A be the number of Stage A rounds. Then $L_A \leq \max\{1, \lceil 2\Lambda^2/\varepsilon \rceil\}$, since $N \leq M$.

Ladder profile on B, the same for every residual quota:

- if $M \leq 8K_4$, M singletons;
- otherwise $M_j := K_4 \cdot 2^{2^j+j+2}$ ($M_0 = 8K_4$) and $T := \min\{j : M \leq M_j\}$. The blocks reduce the free B-count $M \rightarrow M_{T-1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow M_0$, followed by M_0 singletons.

The length is $\ell_{\text{lad}} = M \leq 8K_4$ if $M \leq 8K_4$, and otherwise $\ell_{\text{lad}} = T + 8K_4 \leq \lceil \log_2 \log_2 M \rceil + 8K_4$, since $M_j \geq 2^{2^j}$.

The schedule mixture μ_{ff} , drawn before any bit: U_A followed by $\sigma(\text{ladder})$, where σ is a uniformly random assignment of B's labels to the ladder's positions. All $M!$ components share the group-composition sequence and the labels of A, and B is permuted only within B; this is not a symmetrization over all n coordinates. The support is finite, every block is nonempty and every block is charged, so every component has length $L_A + \ell_{\text{lad}}$ and the hard cap equals the mean cost.

6.2 Class membership (FC). Every component begins with the same U_A . Stage A's committed values have law $q_{U_A}(x_A)$ whatever follows, since the marginals at A-prefixes are the target's, with B unrevealed. Hence, for every $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$,

$$Q(x) = Q_A(x_A) \cdot Q_{B|A}(x_B | x_A), \quad Q_A = q_{U_A}, \quad Q_{B|A} = \mathbb{E}_\sigma q_{\sigma(\text{ladder})}(\cdot | x_A).$$

The relabelling σ is drawn before any bit and never depends on committed values; only the conditional marginals do, which the interface permits. Two facts about the class, not used below: choosing any part of the future schedule after seeing committed values is outside the predrawn class, while drawing it later but independently of them is law-equivalent to drawing it first; and components may use different predetermined prefixes, in which case conditional weights given x_A must be computed rather than assumed.

6.3 Chain rule. Here and below, $D(\cdot\|\cdot)$ is $\text{KL}(\cdot\|\cdot)$. Since $p = p_A \cdot p_{B|A}$ and $Q = Q_A \cdot Q_{B|A}$, and $D(p_A\|Q_A) < \infty$ (§6.4),

$$D(p\|Q) = D(p_A\|Q_A) + \mathbb{E}_{x_A \sim p_A} D(p_{B|A}(\cdot \mid x_A) \| Q_{B|A}(\cdot \mid x_A)).$$

Here p_A -a.e. x_A is legal, with $J := k - |x_A| \in [0, M]$.

6.4 Stage A (FA). By (C) restricted to Stage A, and by (IV), which applies at every legal past because B is untouched with M free coordinates:

$$\begin{aligned} D(p_A\|Q_A) &\leq (\Lambda^2/(2M^2)) \sum_t b_t(b_t - 1) \leq (\Lambda^2/(2M^2)) \cdot N \cdot (\lceil N/\bar{L} \rceil - 1) \\ &< \Lambda^2 N^2 / (2M^2 \bar{L}) \leq \varepsilon/4. \end{aligned}$$

The singleton and $N = 0$ cases give 0.

6.5 Ladder success at typical quotas (FB1). Let $J/M =: p_0 \in [\eta, 1 - \eta]$ and $M > 8K_4$; for $M \leq 8K_4$ the ladder is all singletons and succeeds surely. Let $P_t = J_t/M_t$ be the fraction at the start of bulk round t , where M_t and J_t are the free B-count and the residual quota at that time, the bulk rounds being the ladder's blocks before its final singletons. Here a subscript on M counts bulk rounds, the first starting from (M, J) , whereas the ladder values M_j of §6.1 are indexed by level; the sentence after the definition of S below translates between the two. The increment is

$$P_{t+1} - P_t = (b_t P_t - h_t)/M_{t+1}, \quad h_t \sim \text{Bin}(b_t, P_t),$$

a sum of b_t independent mean-zero terms, each of range $1/M_{t+1}$. Freeze P at a kill, a round after which the state is illegal. By Hoeffding's lemma,

$$Z_t = \exp \left(\theta(P_t - p_0) - (\theta^2/8) \sum_{s < t} b_s/M_{s+1}^2 \right)$$

is a nonnegative supermartingale. Let $S := \sum_{\text{bulk}} b_s/M_{s+1}^2$. A bulk round that starts from the ladder value M_j (from $M \leq M_T$, for the first) leaves M_{j-1} free coordinates, so the M_{s+1} of its term is M_{j-1} . The first bulk block has $b \leq M \leq M_T$ and the others $b \leq M_j$, so each term is $\leq M_j/M_{j-1}^2 = 1/(K_4 2^j)$, and $S < 1/K_4$. A kill means $P_{t+1} \notin [0, 1]$, which from $p_0 \in [\eta, 1 - \eta]$ forces $|P_{t+1} - p_0| > \eta$. By Ville's inequality at $\theta = 4\eta/S$, on both sides,

$$\Pr(\text{kill}) \leq 2 \exp(-2\eta^2/S) < 2 \exp(-2\eta^2 K_4) \leq \delta_4.$$

Singletons from a legal state never fail. So $s_J \geq 1 - \delta_4$.

6.6 The relabelled ladder is uniform on each residual slice (FB): an exact identity. Fix a legal J and let $S_J = \{x_B : |x_B| = J\}$. Given x_A , every free B-coordinate has marginal J_t/M_t , so the ladder's law depends on x_A only through J . Relabelling the schedule and the configuration together shows that $\mathbb{E}_{\sigma q_{\sigma(\text{lad})}}(\cdot \mid J)$ is invariant under $\text{Sym}(B)$. Indeed, at a legal state

(m, j) of the ladder every free B-coordinate has the same exact marginal j/m , because B is homogeneous (Lemma TG0(ii)). So the probability that a labelled ladder lad outputs x_B depends on lad only through which positions its blocks occupy, and $q_{\sigma_0(\text{lad})}(\sigma_0 x_B \mid J) = q_{\text{lad}}(x_B \mid J)$ for every $\sigma_0 \in \text{Sym}(B)$. Hence, for σ uniform, $\mathbb{E}_\sigma q_{\sigma(\text{lad})}(\sigma_0 x_B \mid J) = \mathbb{E}_\sigma q_{\sigma_0^{-1}\sigma(\text{lad})}(x_B \mid J) = \mathbb{E}_\sigma q_{\sigma(\text{lad})}(x_B \mid J)$, since $\sigma_0^{-1}\sigma$ is again uniform. S_J is one orbit, so this law equals $s_J / \binom{M}{J}$ at every point of S_J , where s_J is the count-process success probability from (M, J) . Since $p_{B|A} = \text{Unif}(S_J)$ (Lemma TG0(i) with a homogeneous B),

$$D(p_{B|A} \| Q_{B|A}) = -\ln s_J \quad \text{exactly.} \quad (\text{FB})$$

Typical J gives $D \leq -\ln(1 - \delta_4) = \varepsilon/4$ (the typical-quota bound, §6.5).

Lemma (one-block atom). On a homogeneous slice with m free coordinates and residual j , $0 \leq j \leq m$, every count policy drawing at the exact marginals and committing all m coordinates in nonempty blocks succeeds with probability at least $A(j, m) \geq 1/(m+1)$. Here $A(j, m) := \Pr(\text{Bin}(m, j/m) = j)$ for $m \geq 1$ and $0 \leq j \leq m$, $A(0, 0) := 1$, and $A(j, m) := 0$ for every other integer j . *Proof.* Induction on m ; $m = 0$ is trivial. Let the first block have size $b \geq 1$ and put $p = j/m$. The child residual is $j - u$ with $u \sim \text{Bin}(b, p)$, and by induction the continuation succeeds with probability at least $A(j - u, m - b) = \max_q \Pr(\text{Bin}(m - b, q) = j - u) \geq \Pr(\text{Bin}(m - b, p) = j - u)$ (for a legal child with $m - b \geq 1$, the probability of $j - u$ successes in $m - b$ trials is largest at $q = (j - u)/(m - b)$, and for $m - b = 0$ the residual 0 has probability 1 for every q); both sides are 0 at illegal children. Summing over u , the success probability is at least $\sum_u \Pr(\text{Bin}(b, p) = u) \Pr(\text{Bin}(m - b, p) = j - u) = \Pr(\text{Bin}(m, p) = j)$, with equality for $b = m$. Finally $A(j, m) \geq 1/(m+1)$ because j is a mode of $\text{Bin}(m, j/m)$. $\square$

Hence every legal J gives $D \leq \ln(M+1)$ (the all-quota bound). For $J \in \{0, M\}$, $s_J = 1$.

6.7 Target tail (FB2). By W1(b) at the root, $a_B \in [\kappa_0/\Lambda, 1 - \kappa_0/\Lambda] = [2\eta, 1 - 2\eta]$. Under p , $J = |x_B|$ has mean Ma_B . By negative correlation (Lemma TG4(ii)), $\text{Var } J \leq \sum v \leq M/4$. By Chebyshev, $\Pr_p(J/M \notin [\eta, 1 - \eta]) \leq \Pr(|J - Ma_B| > \eta M) \leq 1/(4\eta^2 M)$.

6.8 Assembly and cost. If $M \leq 8K_4$, the ladder is all singletons and exact, so $s_J = 1$ at every legal J and $F = D(p_A \| Q_A) \leq \varepsilon/4$ with no condition on n . Otherwise, by §§6.3–6.7, with the typical-quota bound at typical quotas, the all-quota bound at the atypical ones, and the tail bound of §6.7 for their mass,

$$F(\mu_{\text{ff}}) = D(p_A \| Q_A) + \mathbb{E}_p[-\ln s_J] \leq \varepsilon/2 + \Lambda^2 \ln(M+1)/(\kappa_0^2 M),$$

using $1/(4\eta^2 M) = \Lambda^2/(\kappa_0^2 M)$. The last term decreases in $M \geq 1$, and $M \geq \lceil n/2 \rceil$, so $F \leq \varepsilon$ for $n \geq n_0^{\text{ff}} := 2M^* - 1$, where M^* is the least M with $\Lambda^2 \ln(M+1)/(\kappa_0^2 M) \leq \varepsilon/2$. Every component has length $L_A + \ell_{\text{lad}}$, which is at most

$$\max\{1, \lceil 2\Lambda^2/\varepsilon \rceil\} + 8K_4 + \lceil \log_2 \log_2 n \rceil \leq \log_2 \ln n + C_{\text{FU}},$$

using $\lceil \log_2 \log_2 n \rceil \leq \log_2 \ln n + \log_2(1/\ln 2) + 1 < \log_2 \ln n + 1.53$. This is a hard cap, and the mean cost equals it.

6.9 Explicit constants and finite behaviour. The table evaluates the constants of the Result at a few parameter choices.

$(\varepsilon, \Lambda, \kappa_0)$	K_4	n_0^{ff}	$C_{\text{FU}} = \lceil 2\Lambda^2/\varepsilon \rceil + 8K_4 + 2$
$(1, 1, \frac{1}{2})$	18	53	148
$(1, 2, \frac{1}{2})$	71	327	578
$(1, 2, \frac{1}{4})$	282	1731	2266
$(\frac{1}{2}, 3/2, 2/5)$	80	651	651
$(1/100, 2, \frac{1}{2})$	214	66,651	2514

An independent implementation evaluated the exact law of μ_{ff} , with exact rational component laws: on every residual slice the law is constant (spread 0), (FB) holds to float64 rounding, the atom lemma holds at every quota of the actual ladder profiles, and at theorem constants F exceeds $D(p_A \| Q_A)$ by at most $1.4 \cdot 10^{-8}$ (19 instances with $\Lambda \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, $\varepsilon \in \{\frac{1}{4}, 1\}$, (n_A, n_B) of the forms $(1, M)$, (M, M) and $(1250, 5000)$ with M from 200 to 20,000, and k/n near $\frac{1}{4}$, $\frac{2}{5}$ or $\frac{1}{2}$; n up to 20,001), with $F/\varepsilon \leq 0.061$ there: the ladder essentially never fails at the quotas that carry mass. The caps are hundreds to thousands of rounds, against $\log_2 \ln n \approx 3.2$ at $n = 10^4$. *The constants are impractical; Theorem 8 is an asymptotic order statement, and no finite-size advantage is claimed.* Two in-class variants that fail show which elements are load-bearing:

- without uniform B-relabelling, (FB) can fail: take $n = 4$, $k = 2$, weights $(2, 1, 1, 1)$, group $A = \{0\}$, Stage A $\{0\}$ and then the blocks $\{1, 2\}$, $\{3\}$ on B, and write words as $x_0 x_1 x_2 x_3$. Given $x_0 = 1$, the residual slice $\{1100, 1010, 1001\}$ has mass $s_J = 8/9$ under $Q_{B|A}$ (the count-process success probability from $(M, J) = (3, 1)$), and $Q_{B|A}$ restricted to that slice and normalized by s_J is $(1/4, 1/4, 1/2)$, not uniform. So $D(p_{B|A} \| Q_{B|A}) > -\ln s_J$, and this within-slice shape term makes F strictly larger than for the schedule mixture that draws $\sigma \sim \text{Unif}(\text{Sym}(B))$ and runs Stage A followed by the σ -relabelled blocks, as in §6.1;
- Stage A in one block ($\bar{L} = 1$) at $N = M$ leaves a $D_A := D(p_A \| Q_A)$ that does not shrink with n : at $\lambda = 1$ and $k = n/2$, admissible for every row of the table above, $D_A > 0.096$ for every even $n \geq 2000$, so there $F \geq D_A > 0.01$ (§6.3) and the variant cannot meet $\varepsilon = 0.01$ uniformly. Indeed, there p is uniform on the slice and Q_A is the product of $\text{Ber}(\frac{1}{2})$ on A; both are exchangeable within A, so D_A is the divergence between the laws of $w = |x_A|$, hypergeometric under p and $\text{Bin}(N, \frac{1}{2})$ under Q_A . Apply the Donsker–Varadhan inequality $D(P \| R) \geq \mathbb{E}_P f - \ln \mathbb{E}_R e^f$ with $f(w) = -2(w - N/2)^2/N$. The hypergeometric variance gives $\mathbb{E}_p f = -n/(4(n-1))$. For a standard normal g and every real z , $e^{-2z^2/N} = \mathbb{E}_g \cos(2gz/\sqrt{N})$; with $z = w - N/2$, and since $\mathbb{E}_{\text{Bin}} \cos(s(w - N/2)) = \cos(s/2)^N$ for every real s , this gives $\mathbb{E}_{\text{Bin}} e^f = \mathbb{E}_g [\cos(g/\sqrt{N})^N] \leq 2^{-1/2} + \Pr(|g| \geq \frac{\pi}{2}\sqrt{N})$, since $\cos x \leq e^{-x^2/2}$ for $|x| \leq \pi/2$ and $|\cos x| \leq 1$. Hence

$$D_A \geq \frac{1}{2} \ln 2 - \frac{n}{4(n-1)} - \ln(1 + \sqrt{2} \Pr(|g| \geq \frac{\pi}{2}\sqrt{N})),$$

which increases in n , is $0.09644 \dots$ at $n = 2000$ and tends to $\frac{1}{2} \ln 2 - \frac{1}{4} \approx 0.0966$. In float64, on the grid $\lambda = \Lambda^{j/10}$ ($|j| \leq 10$) and $k = \text{round}(n(\kappa_0 + (1 - 2\kappa_0)i/20))$ ($0 \leq i \leq 20$) at $n = 2000$ and $n = 20,000$, the largest value of D_A is 0.0965 – 0.0966 for the three rows with $\kappa_0 = \frac{1}{2}$ (at $\lambda = 1$, where $k = n/2$), 0.1487 for $(1, 2, \frac{1}{4})$ and 0.1071 – 0.1072 for $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}, \frac{2}{5})$.

7. Edge cases and more weight values.

case	what happens
$N = 0$ (one group)	Stage A has zero rounds. $J = k$ is deterministic and typical, since $\kappa_0 \geq 2\eta$, so $F \leq \varepsilon/4$ with no tail term.
$N = 1$	Stage A is one singleton, so $D_A = 0$.
$\lambda = 1$	The weights are equal. Either treat the target as one group ($N = 0$), or run the construction; both bounds hold with any $\Lambda \geq 1$.
$N \ll M$, including $N = o(n)$	$\bar{L} = 1$ when $2\Lambda^2 N^2 \leq \varepsilon M^2$. No positive limiting proportion is assumed anywhere.
$N = M = n/2$	$\bar{L} = \lceil 2\Lambda^2/\varepsilon \rceil$; $M \geq n/2$ still holds.
$J \in \{0, M\}$	$s_J = 1$, so $D = 0$. It counts in the atypical set, harmlessly.
$J \notin [0, M]$ (infeasible Stage A)	p -null, so it does not enter any KL. The component still runs to completion with fair bits and is charged in full.
$M \leq 8K_4$	The ladder is all singletons, exact given x_A .
small fixed ε	$K_4 \approx (2\Lambda^2/\kappa_0^2) \cdot \ln(8/\varepsilon)$, $L_A \leq \lceil 2\Lambda^2/\varepsilon \rceil$, and $n_0^{\text{ff}} \approx (4\Lambda^2/(\varepsilon\kappa_0^2)) \cdot \ln n_0^{\text{ff}}$. All are finite for fixed ε .
$n < n_0^{\text{ff}}$	Use n singletons: $F = 0$ and length $n < n_0^{\text{ff}}$, absorbed into constants.
H side	No group structure is used. HL and HU hold for any number of weight values; for the F side beyond two values, see the Remark below.

Remark (more weight values: a homogeneous group suffices). The proof of (FU) needs the two-value structure only through a homogeneous group of size at least $n/2$; its two other two-group inputs are replaced below. Let B be any set of $M \geq \rho n$ coordinates, $\rho \in (0, 1]$, on which the weights are equal, let the other $N = n - M$ weights be arbitrary, all n weights having ratio at most Λ , and let $\kappa_0 n \leq k \leq (1 - \kappa_0)n$. In §6.4 use (III) in place of (IV): while B is untouched the free count satisfies $M_t - b + 1 > M$, so a Stage A block costs at most $\Lambda^3 b(b-1)/(2M^2)$, and $\bar{L}$ becomes $\max\{1, \lceil 2\Lambda^3 N^2/(\varepsilon M^2) \rceil\}$. In §6.7 use W2(ii) in place of Lemma TG4(ii), and in §6.8 use $M \geq \lceil \rho n \rceil$. The schedule mixture then has $F \leq \varepsilon$, with every component of length at most $\log_2 \ln n + C_R$, for $n \geq \lfloor (M^* - 1)/\rho \rfloor + 1$, where $C_R = \max\{1, \lceil 2\Lambda^3(1 - \rho)^2/(\varepsilon\rho^2) \rceil\} + 8K_4 + 2$. With $\ell = \ln(n/M)$ and $\alpha = \min\{1/4, 9\varepsilon/(64\Lambda^3(\ell + 1))\}$, a geometric Stage A, whose blocks are the next $\min\{R, \lfloor \alpha M_t \rfloor\}$ A-coordinates (R of them left, M_t free), has at most $1 + \max\{8\ell, 128\Lambda^3\ell(\ell + 1)/(9\varepsilon)\} = O(1 + \ell + \Lambda^3\ell(\ell + 1)/\varepsilon)$ rounds once $M \geq \max\{M^*, 2/\alpha\}$; so a homogeneous group with $M \geq n/(\ln n)^C$, for a fixed C and large n , still gives $L_F^w = O((\log \log n)^2)$. Write $M_t = R_t + M$ for the free count at the start of round t (R_t the R above at round t); B is untouched, so $M_t > M$ while $R_t > 0$. *Cost.* Each block has $b_t \leq \alpha M_t \leq M_t/4$, so $M_t - b_t + 1 > \frac{3}{4}M_t$, and by (III) at free size M_t its cost is at most $\Lambda^3 b_t^2/(2(\frac{3}{4}M_t)^2) \leq \frac{8}{9}\Lambda^3\alpha^2$. *Rounds.* Every round before the last has $b_t = \lfloor \alpha M_t \rfloor \geq \alpha M_t/2$, because $\alpha M_t \geq \alpha M \geq 2$; hence $M_{t+1} \leq (1 - \alpha/2)M_t$, and after K such rounds $M < M_{K+1} \leq ne^{-\alpha K/2}$. So $K < 2\ell/\alpha$, and there are at most $1 + 2\ell/\alpha = 1 + \max\{8\ell, 128\Lambda^3\ell(\ell + 1)/(9\varepsilon)\}$ rounds. *Total.* By (C), $D(p_A \| Q_A) \leq (1 + 2\ell/\alpha)\frac{8}{9}\Lambda^3\alpha^2 \leq \frac{16}{9}\Lambda^3\alpha(\ell + 1) \leq \varepsilon/4$.

The lower bounds need no homogeneous group. For any weights with ratio at most Λ , part (c) of the bounded-weight envelope theorem in §10 gives $L_F^w \geq (e^{-\varepsilon} - o(1))\log_2 \ln n$ and a least common length of at least $\log_2 \ln n - O_{\varepsilon, \Lambda, \kappa_0}(1)$, since it covers every causal policy and so every predrawn mixture ($\tau = |U|$); and (HL) and (HU) hold for any weights. So every target with a homogeneous group of size $M \geq \rho n$ has, in the predrawn class, $L_H^w = \Theta((\log n)^2)$, $L_F^w = (e^{-\varepsilon} + o(1))\log_2 \ln n$ (mixing as in §9) and least common length $\log_2 \ln n + O_{\varepsilon, \Lambda, \kappa_0, \rho}(1)$; this includes weights with any fixed number q of values, since a largest class has $\rho \geq 1/q$. The adaptive F converse holds for any weights with ratio at most Λ , at hard cap and in expected executed rounds

(§10); with a homogeneous group of size at least ρn , the predrawn F constructions above are therefore optimal over all causal policies (the schedule mixture to an additive constant in the hard cap, and its §9 dilution to leading order in expected executed rounds; §10). Without a homogeneous group, Appendix I gives matching F upper bounds for any weights with ratio at most Λ and interior quota: a finite predrawn mixture with $F \leq \varepsilon$ each of whose components has at most $\log_2 \ln n + O_{\Lambda, \kappa_0}(1 + \varepsilon^{-2})$ rounds (Corollary A') and a mixture with $F \leq \varepsilon$ and scheduled mean at most $(e^{-\varepsilon} + o(1)) \log_2 \ln n$ (Corollary A''), with existence-only constants. Their components can have different lengths, so they do not guarantee a common length, and the least-common-length statement above is still proved only with a homogeneous group.

8. Why survival alone is not enough.

- *Warning example.* Here G_r^λ is the largest probability of meeting the quota within r rounds and F_r^* the least output KL over RAND_r (Appendix G, Corollary (a)). The instance $(n_A, n_B, k) = (2, 2, 2)$, $\lambda = 2$, $r = 3$ has $G_3^\lambda = 1$ but $F_3^* \approx 5.01857 \cdot 10^{-4}$; the instance $(3, 3, 3)$, $\lambda = 2$, $r = 3$ has $-\ln G_3^\lambda = 0.05518 < F_3^* = 0.05881$. A policy can survive surely and still have the wrong within-support law, so a survival-optimal two-group planner gives no F bound by itself.
- This construction controls the law directly:
 - the between-orbit law (the law of $|x_A|$) is controlled by $D(p_A \| Q_A) \leq \varepsilon/4$ in §6.4;
 - the law on each residual slice is exactly uniform (§6.6);
 - what remains is only $\mathbb{E}_p[-\ln s_J]$.
- The one-block atom lemma (§6.6) makes the atypical-quota term $O(\ln M/M)$: the conditional KL there is $-\ln s_J \leq \ln(M+1)$, because the ladder succeeds with probability at least $1/(M+1)$ by that lemma, and the atypical mass is $O(1/M)$ by Chebyshev (§6.7). No extra mixture component is needed for the atypical quotas.

9. The least hard cap, common length and the sharp mean coefficient. Let $R_F^w(n, \varepsilon)$ be the least r such that some policy in the class RAND_r of Appendix G (the class $\mathcal{A}_r$ of Section 2 for this target: causal randomized policies with fresh exact-marginal draws that commit all n coordinates within r rounds almost surely) has output KL at most ε . For two weight values under the hypotheses of the Result, uniformly in $\lambda \in [1/\Lambda, \Lambda]$, in the split (an empty group included) and in k :

- for every $n \geq 2$, $R_F^w(n, \varepsilon) \geq \max\{1, \lceil \log_2((\ln(n\kappa_0/(2\Lambda)) + 1) + 4 \ln 18)/(\varepsilon + \ln(324\sqrt{2})) \rceil\} \geq \log_2 \ln n - c_L$, with $c_L := 1 + \max\{\log_2(\varepsilon + \ln(324\sqrt{2})), \log_2 \ln(2\Lambda/\kappa_0)\}$;
- for $n \geq n_0^{\text{ff}}$, $R_F^w(n, \varepsilon) \leq \max\{1, \lceil 2\Lambda^2/\varepsilon \rceil\} + 8K_4 + \lceil \log_2 \log_2 n \rceil \leq \log_2 \ln n + C_{\text{FU}}$, and $R_F^w(n, \varepsilon) \leq n$ for every $n \geq 2$.

Hence $R_F^w(n, \varepsilon) = \log_2 \ln n + O_{\varepsilon, \Lambda, \kappa_0}(1)$, at fixed ε ; the statement is not uniform as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$ or $\kappa_0 \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. (i) Corollary (d) of Appendix G gives, for every $\pi \in \text{RAND}_r$, $\text{KL}(p_w \| Q_\pi) \geq 2^{-r} \ln(V_{\text{root}} + 1) - \ln C_r$ with $C_r = \sqrt{2} \cdot 18^{2-2^{2-r}}$, the constant of Theorem 21 ($C_r \leq \sqrt{2} \cdot 18^{r-1}$, with equality at $r = 1, 2$); since $\ln C_r = \ln(324\sqrt{2}) - 2^{2-r} \ln 18$, this is $(\ln(V_{\text{root}} + 1) + 4 \ln 18)/2^r - \ln(324\sqrt{2})$. By Lemma W1, at the root every coordinate has $a_g(1 - a_g) \geq \kappa_0/(2\Lambda)$,

because $\min(a_g, 1 - a_g) \geq \kappa_0/\Lambda$ and $\max(a_g, 1 - a_g) \geq \frac{1}{2}$; so $V_{\text{root}} \geq n\kappa_0/(2\Lambda)$. The right side increases in V_{root} , so $\text{KL} \leq \varepsilon$ forces $2^r \geq (\ln(n\kappa_0/(2\Lambda)) + 1) + 4\ln 18)/(\varepsilon + \ln(324\sqrt{2}))$, which with $R_F^w \geq 1$ is the first bound. For $n \geq (2\Lambda/\kappa_0)^2$, $\ln(n\kappa_0/(2\Lambda) + 1) \geq \ln n - \ln(2\Lambda/\kappa_0) \geq \frac{1}{2} \ln n$, so the bound is at least $\log_2 \ln n - 1 - \log_2(\varepsilon + \ln(324\sqrt{2})) \geq \log_2 \ln n - c_L$; for $2 \leq n < (2\Lambda/\kappa_0)^2$, $\log_2 \ln n - c_L < 0 < 1 \leq R_F^w$. (ii) For $n \geq n_0^{\text{ff}}$ the schedule mixture μ_{ff} of §6 has $F \leq \varepsilon$ (§6.8). It is a predrawn finite mixture of full labelled schedules, and every block is executed on every path, so every path runs for the common component length L of §6.8, and μ_{ff} lies in RAND_L . The all-singleton schedule is exact and lies in RAND_n . $\square$

The mean cost of μ_{ff} equals its cap, whose coefficient on $\log_2 \ln n$ is 1; the lower bound's coefficient is $e^{-\varepsilon}$, which a different mixture attains (“Sharp mean coefficient” below).

Hard-length analogue of Corollary 5. For a point mass $\mu = \delta_U$ on one fixed full labelled schedule, $H(\mu) = F(\mu) = \text{KL}(p_w \| q_U)$ and $C(\mu) = |U|$. So (HL) bounds the length of every fixed schedule with $\text{KL}(p_w \| q_U) \leq \varepsilon$ from below by $\Omega_{\varepsilon, \Lambda, \kappa_0}((\ln n)^2)$, and (HU) constructs one with $\text{KL}(p_w \| q_U) \leq 2\varepsilon/9$ and at most $1 + \max\{8(\ln n + 1), 16\Lambda^3(\ln n + 1)^2/\varepsilon\}$ rounds. Both bounds are explicit for every $n \geq 2$, so the least length of a fixed labelled schedule with KL at most ε is $\Theta_{\varepsilon, \Lambda, \kappa_0}((\ln n)^2)$. The schedule mixture μ_{ff} of §6 draws $\sigma \sim \text{Unif}(\text{Sym}(B))$ before any bit, and every component executes all its blocks, so it is a policy in RAND_L , with L the common component length. For $n \geq n_0^{\text{ff}}$, §6.8 gives $F \leq \varepsilon$ with $L \leq \log_2 \ln n + C_{\text{FU}}$ (for $n < n_0^{\text{ff}}$ the uniformly relabelled all-singleton schedule is an exact member of this class, as in (ii)), and (i) gives $L \geq \log_2 \ln n - c_L$ for every such schedule mixture. So the least common component length of a single group-aware labelled schedule relabelled uniformly within B , with output KL at most ε , is $\log_2 \ln n + O_{\varepsilon, \Lambda, \kappa_0}(1)$. Both bounds are uniform in λ , the split and k . This is a hard-length statement: for μ_{ff} the mean equals the cap, but no new mean-cost law follows from it by itself; the sharp mean coefficient is proved next.

Sharp mean coefficient. Uniformly in λ , the split and k , $L_F^w(n, \varepsilon) = (e^{-\varepsilon} + o(1)) \log_2 \ln n$, with the $o(1)$ depending only on $(\varepsilon, \Lambda, \kappa_0)$ and n . *Proof.* (FL) gives the lower bound. For any target and $\beta' \in [0, 1)$, $(1 - \beta')Q_1 + \beta'Q_2 \geq (1 - \beta')Q_1$ pointwise, so $\text{KL}(p \| (1 - \beta')Q_1 + \beta'Q_2) \leq -\ln(1 - \beta') + \text{KL}(p \| Q_1)$. Fix $\nu \in (0, \varepsilon)$, and let μ_ν be the schedule mixture μ_{ff} of §6 built at tolerance ν (δ_4 , K_4 and $\bar{L}$ computed with ν in place of ε). For $n \geq n_0^{\text{ff}}(\nu)$, $F(\mu_\nu) \leq \nu$ and every component has length at most $\log_2 \ln n + C_{\text{FU}}(\nu)$. Mix μ_ν (weight $e^{-(\varepsilon - \nu)}$) with the one-round schedule that commits all n coordinates in one block. This is a finite predrawn mixture with every block charged. Its output KL is at most $(\varepsilon - \nu) + \nu = \varepsilon$, and its mean cost is at most $e^{-\varepsilon + \nu}(\log_2 \ln n + C_{\text{FU}}(\nu)) + 1$. Hence $\limsup_n \sup L_F^w / \log_2 \ln n \leq e^{-\varepsilon + \nu}$, the supremum being over λ , the split and k ; let $\nu \downarrow 0$. $\square$

This is the device of Corollary 6(c), with the mixing inequality in place of the relabelling identity. As on the balanced slice, the hard cap ($\log_2 \ln n + O(1)$, above) and the mean cost differ by the factor $e^{-\varepsilon}$ in the leading coefficient, and the mean-cost bound mixes in a schedule that usually fails. The limit is not approached at any practical n : at $(\varepsilon, \Lambda, \kappa_0) = (1, 2, \frac{1}{2})$ the bound is within 10% of $e^{-\varepsilon} \log_2 \ln n$ only once $\log_2 \ln n$ exceeds about $2.5 \cdot 10^4$, even with ν chosen optimally.

10. Adaptive converse for any bounded weights. Let the weights be arbitrary with ratio at most Λ ; no homogeneous group is assumed. A state is a free set S of size M with its weights and a residual quota J ; it is legal iff $0 \leq J \leq M$, and its minority quota is $d := \min(J, M - J)$. At a legal state the free coordinates have law $\propto \prod_{i \in S} w_i^{y_i} \mathbf{1}\{\sum_{i \in S} y_i = J\}$ with marginals p_i , and a batch $B \subseteq S$ (possibly empty) is drawn as independent Bernoulli(p_i), $i \in B$; write X_B for its sum.

Let $G_0^w = 1$ on legal completed states ($S = \emptyset$) and 0 on the other legal states, and

$$G_{r+1}^w(S, J) = \max_{B \subseteq S} \mathbb{E}[G_r^w(S \setminus B, J - X_B); \text{child legal}].$$

Theorem (bounded-weight envelope). For every legal state and every $r \geq 1$,

$$G_r^w(S, J) \leq \min \{1, A_r(d+1)^{-2^{-r}}\}, \quad A_r = 2\Lambda(12\Lambda)^{2-2^{2^{-r}}} \leq K_\Lambda := 288\Lambda^3.$$

This A_r depends on Λ ; it is not the constant $A_r < 36$ of (Env). (At $r = 0$ the formula fails at the completed state.) Every causal randomized policy with fresh exact-marginal draws (the class of Section 2 and Appendix G, with the seed, the committed history, the full residual weight array and any batch identities available) reaches a legal completion within r rounds with probability at most G_r^w of the starting state. Hence, with $d_0 = \min(k, n - k)$:

- (a) every $\pi \in \text{RAND}_r$ has $\text{KL}(p_w \| Q_\pi) \geq 2^{-r} \ln(d_0 + 1) - \ln K_\Lambda$; so for $d_0 \geq 1$, output KL at most ε needs $r \geq \log_2 \ln(d_0 + 1) - \log_2(\varepsilon + \ln K_\Lambda)$;
- (b) every causal policy without a cap whose output KL is at most ε has $\mathbb{E}\tau \geq 1 + \sum_{t \geq 1} (e^{-\varepsilon} - G_t^w(\text{root}))_+$; for $d_0 \geq 1$ this is at least $e^{-\varepsilon} \log_2 \ln(d_0 + 1) - c(K_\Lambda)$, with $c(K) = \sum_{i \geq 0} \min\{1, K e^{-2^i}\} \leq \log_2 \ln K + 2.42$ for $K \geq e$. For $d_0 = 0$ the target is a point mass, and one round committing every coordinate has output KL 0;
- (c) if $\kappa_0 n \leq k \leq (1 - \kappa_0)n$ and $n \geq \kappa_0^{-2}$, then, uniformly in the weights, $R_F^w(n, \varepsilon) \geq \log_2 \ln n - 1 - \log_2(\varepsilon + \ln K_\Lambda)$ and $\mathbb{E}\tau \geq e^{-\varepsilon} \log_2 \ln n - e^{-\varepsilon} - c(K_\Lambda)$.

Under the hypotheses of the Remark after the §7 table, its schedule mixture (in $\text{RAND}_{\lfloor \log_2 \ln n + C_R \rfloor}$, for $n \geq \lfloor (M^* - 1)/\rho \rfloor + 1$) and its §9 dilution (a predrawn mixture, so $\tau = |U|$) attain these orders. So the least adaptive hard cap is $\log_2 \ln n + O_{\varepsilon, \Lambda, \kappa_0, \rho}(1)$, and the least expected executed rounds are $(e^{-\varepsilon} + o(1)) \log_2 \ln n$, over all causal policies. Without a homogeneous group, the predrawn mixtures of Appendix I (Corollaries A' and A'') attain the same orders under (c)'s hypotheses: the least adaptive hard cap is $\log_2 \ln n + O_{\varepsilon, \Lambda, \kappa_0}(1)$, the lower constant in (c) explicit and the upper one existence-only and $O_{\Lambda, \kappa_0}(1 + \varepsilon^{-2})$, and the least expected executed rounds are $(e^{-\varepsilon} + o(1)) \log_2 \ln n$. Nothing here concerns H under adaptive selection. K_Λ grows with Λ , so Appendix G's V -based two-group envelope, whose constants are free of λ , remains the form for unbounded tilts.

Proof. Policies. For a causal policy, let σ_t be the state after round t and $\mathcal{F}_t$ the σ -field of the seed and the committed history; put $Y_t = G_{r-t}^w(\sigma_t) \mathbf{1}\{\sigma_t \text{ legal}\}$.

- An illegal state stays illegal, and a completed state keeps $G_s^w = 1$ (empty batches).
- On a legal σ_t , the next batch is $\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurable, with any identities, and its draws are conditionally independent at the marginals of σ_t . So $\mathbb{E}[Y_{t+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_t] \leq Y_t$ by the definition of G^w .
- Hence the success probability within r rounds is $\mathbb{E}Y_r \leq Y_0$. The quantity d enters only as a bound on G^w that is uniform over residual arrays of ratio at most Λ ; counts are never assumed to be a sufficient state.

Inputs. The weights of every residual array have ratio at most Λ . By W1, at every legal state $p_i \leq \Lambda p_\ell$, $1 - p_i \leq \Lambda(1 - p_\ell)$ and $v_i \geq v_\ell/\Lambda$, where $v = p(1 - p)$. With $\sum_S p_i = J$ this gives $p_i \leq \Lambda J/M$, $1 - p_i \leq \Lambda(M - J)/M$, $v_i \geq V/(\Lambda M)$ with $V := \sum_S v_\ell$, and $v_i \geq \min(p_i, 1 - p_i)/2 \geq d/(2\Lambda M)$, so $V \geq d/(2\Lambda)$. At $d = 0$ every bound below is trivial.

Base. A completion in one round needs $B = S$ and $X_S = J$. By Lemma TG1 of Appendix G (a sum of independent Bernoulli variables whose variances sum to $v > 0$ has every atom at most $\sqrt{\pi/(8v)}$), for $d \geq 1$ this has probability at most $\sqrt{\pi/8}/\sqrt{V} \leq \sqrt{\pi\Lambda/(4d)} \leq 2\Lambda(d+1)^{-1/2}$.

One step. Fix a legal state with $d \geq 1$ and a nonempty batch of size b , with child $(M-b, J-X_B)$ and d' its minority quota. Let $T := \mathbb{E}[(d' + 1)^{-1/2}; \text{child legal}]$. We show $T \leq 12\Lambda(d+1)^{-1/4}$.

- If $b \leq M/(4\Lambda)$, then $\mathbb{E}X_B \leq J/4$ and $\mathbb{E}(b - X_B) \leq (M - J)/4$, and each has variance at most its mean. Off $\{X_B > J/2\} \cup \{b - X_B > (M - J)/2\}$ the child is legal with $d' \geq d/2$, and Chebyshev bounds that union by $4/J + 4/(M - J) \leq 8/d$. So $T \leq (d/2+1)^{-1/2} + 8/d \leq 10.49(d+1)^{-1/4}$.
- If $b > M/(4\Lambda)$, then $\text{Var } X_B > V/(4\Lambda^2) \geq d/(8\Lambda^3)$, so every atom of X_B is at most $A := \min\{1, \sqrt{\pi\Lambda^3/d}\}$ (Lemma TG1). Each value of d' comes from at most two legal child quotas. Splitting at $d' < u = \lceil 1/A \rceil$ gives $T \leq 4A\sqrt{u} + (u+1)^{-1/2} \leq (4\sqrt{2}+1)\sqrt{A} \leq 10.54\Lambda^{3/4}(d+1)^{-1/4}$. Both bounds are at most $12\Lambda(d+1)^{-1/4}$, as $1 \leq \Lambda^{3/4} \leq \Lambda$.

The last round, $B = S$, is a large batch.

Induction. Let $\alpha = 2^{-r} \leq \frac{1}{2}$. On the killed (substochastic) child kernel, Hölder gives $\mathbb{E}[(d' + 1)^{-\alpha}; \text{legal}] \leq T^{2\alpha}$.

- For a nonempty batch, $\mathbb{E}[G_r^w(\text{child}); \text{legal}] \leq A_r T^{2\alpha} \leq A_r (12\Lambda)^{2^{1-r}} (d+1)^{-2^{-(r+1)}}$.
- The empty batch gives G_r^w of the current state, which is at most the same bound.
- So $A_{r+1} = A_r (12\Lambda)^{2^{1-r}}$ with $A_1 = 2\Lambda$, which gives $A_r = 2\Lambda (12\Lambda)^{2^{-2^{-r}}}$.

Costs.

- (a): $\text{KL} \geq -\ln Q_\pi(S_k) \geq -\ln G_r^w(\text{root})$.
- (b): $\Pr(\tau > t) \geq (e^{-\varepsilon} - G_t^w(\text{root}))_+$ for $t \geq 1$, as in Corollary (d) of Appendix G. Keeping $t \leq \lfloor L \rfloor$ with $L = \log_2 \ln(d_0 + 1)$ and using $(d_0 + 1)^{-2^{-t}} = e^{-2^{L-t}}$ gives the bound for $L \geq 1$ (for $t \leq \lfloor L \rfloor$, $e^{-2^{L-t}} \leq e^{-2^i}$ with $i = \lfloor L \rfloor - t$, and $1 + \lfloor L \rfloor e^{-\varepsilon} \geq e^{-\varepsilon} L$); for $L < 1$ it follows from $\tau \geq 1$. The terms $i \leq \log_2 \ln K$ of $c(K)$ are at most 1 each, and the rest sum to less than 1.42.
- (c): $\ln(d_0 + 1) \geq \ln(\kappa_0 n) \geq \frac{1}{2} \ln n$.
- The attainment statements import the Remark, §9 and Appendix I (Corollaries A', A'') unchanged. $\square$

Appendix I. Reservoir-free upper bound for bounded weights

This appendix proves Theorem A and Corollaries A' and A'' below: for any weights with ratio at most Λ and an interior quota, a finite predrawn mixture of full labelled schedules, built from randomly kept sets, has output KL $O(1/A)$, and each of its components has at most $\log_2 \ln n + O(A^2)$ rounds. Here $A \geq A_0$ is a free parameter: Corollary A' fixes it by the target error ε and bounds the hard cap, and Corollary A'' lets it grow slowly with n , so that its error bound C^*/A_n vanishes, and bounds the scheduled mean of a mixture with the one-block schedule. These corollaries supply the upper bounds of Theorem 8(a) on R_F^{adapt} , on L_F^w and on the least expected executed rounds for arbitrary bounded weights (Appendix H, Assembly of Theorem 8); with an equal-weight group of linear size, Appendix H, §§6, 7 and 9 give these bounds with explicit constants, and also the common length of Theorem 8(b), which the mixtures here do not give. No homogeneous group is used. Survival is still necessary, since $F \geq -\ln Q(S_k)$ by (4.33), where $S_k = \{x \in \{0, 1\}^n : \sum_i x_i = k\}$ is the slice, but it does not control the output law of a weighted target (Appendix H, §8); so the proof bounds F itself, level by level, and then reads off survival, which a first-exit argument also bounds directly ((4.31)–(4.32)), and the within-slice shape, which (4.33) bounds by F (§4.8). It compares each round with the reference law $\mathcal{R}$ below: averaged over the random kept set, $\mathcal{R}$ is close to the target from both sides, off exceptional sets of small target and reference-law mass ((3.34)–(3.35)), and this averaging replaces the orbit averaging of Section 3.

§1 collects tools for weighted slices, among them Lemma T1 (sub-Gaussian linear statistics); §2 proves a uniform lattice estimate and the integrated-normalizer bound (2.17); §3 compares one step of the sampler with the reference law $\mathcal{R}$ of Section 4.2, which completes the kept set exactly: the identities (3.1)–(3.2) write $\mathcal{R}/p$, up to quota normalizers, as an empty-child term plus an integral of product tilts, (3.20) bounds their coefficients once the common one is removed on the slice, (3.18) and (3.21) bound the one-step divergence and the second moment of $p/\mathcal{R}$, and (3.35) gives separate target-law and execution-law exceptional sets; and §4 constructs the kept-set ladder (§§4.1–4.2), composes the one-step bounds through the signed recursion (4.15)–(4.20), sums it in (4.28)–(4.30), bounds survival and the within-slice shape in (4.31)–(4.33), and derives Corollaries A' and A'' in (4.34)–(4.36). §5 fixes the constants in a noncircular order, and §6 gives the dependency graph. The matching lower bounds, over all causal policies, are those of Appendix H, §10.

0. Statement

Hypotheses.

- $\Lambda \geq 1$ and $\kappa_0 \in (0, 1/2]$ are fixed.
- $n \geq 1$ and $w \in (0, \infty)^n$ with $\max w / \min w \leq \Lambda$. Rescale so $\min w = 1$. No homogeneity is assumed.
- $k \in [\kappa_0 n, (1 - \kappa_0)n]$, and $p = p_w$ on S_k .

Constants. C and c are positive constants depending only on (Λ, κ_0) ; their values change from line to line. Each is shown to exist, and none is evaluated. “ $A \geq A_0$ ” means $A \geq A_0(\Lambda, \kappa_0)$, with A_0 chosen in §5 to meet the simultaneous conditions listed there.

Theorem A *There exist A_0 and C^* such that for all $A \geq A_0$ and all admissible n, w, k , the predrawn mixture $U(A)$ of §§4.1–4.2 satisfies:*

1. It is a finite mixture of full labelled schedules, with output law Q .
2. Its hard cap is $\leq \log_2 \ln n + 8A^2 + 5$ when $n \geq 4m_0 = 4\lceil 4A^2 \rceil$, and is $n < 16A^2 + 4$ otherwise (the exact sampler).
3. $F = \text{KL}(p\|Q) \leq C^*/A$.
4. The survival term satisfies $-\ln Q(S_k) \leq C \cdot e^{-cA^{2/3}}$.
5. The shape term satisfies $\text{KL}(p\|Q(\cdot \mid S_k)) = F + \ln Q(S_k) \leq F$.

The schedule law depends only on (n, A) , not on w .

Corollary A' [fixed ε] Take $A = \max(A_0, C^*/\varepsilon)$. Then $F \leq \varepsilon$, and the hard cap is $\leq \log_2 \ln n + O_{\Lambda, \kappa_0}(1 + \varepsilon^{-2})$, uniformly over arrays and quotas.

Corollary A'' [scheduled mean]

- Let $A_n = \max(A_0, (\log \log n)^{1/4})$ and $\varepsilon_n = C^*/A_n \rightarrow 0$. For large n set $1 - \beta = e^{-(\varepsilon - \varepsilon_n)}$.
- Let $\mu' = (1 - \beta) \cdot U(A_n) + \beta \cdot (\text{the 1-block schedule})$.
- By the pointwise mixture bound (4.35), $F \leq \varepsilon$.
- With τ the number of rounds of the drawn schedule, as in (4.8), the scheduled mean is $C(\mu') = \mathbb{E}\tau \leq e^{-\varepsilon + \varepsilon_n}(\log_2 \ln n + 8A_n^2 + 5) + \beta = (e^{-\varepsilon} + o(1)) \cdot \log_2 \ln n$.
- The hard cap of μ' is $\log_2 \ln n + O(\sqrt{\log \log n})$.

Scope and notation of the proof

This proof establishes Theorem A, its survival estimate, and Corollaries A' and A'' of §0, with the stated parameter dependence.

The target is the positive weighted fixed-quota law p_w of §0 (the bounded-ratio weighted slice of Appendix H, §10), not a full-support target. The schedule is exactly the kept-set mixture $U(A)$. No homogeneous reservoir is used. All parameters called constants below depend at most on the fixed pair (Λ, κ_0) , unless explicitly stated otherwise. The appendix does not establish an A^{-2} rate, an $O(1 + \varepsilon^{-1})$ additive cap, a numerical A_0 , practical speed, robustness to learned conditionals, a full-support extension, or any statement about H . Theorem A, Corollaries A' and A'' and Lemma T1 are also kernel-checked; Appendix Q lists the declarations and the parts proved only by ordinary (paper) arguments, which are not kernel-checked.

Notation discipline. In a one-step lemma, N is the actual number of free coordinates, J the actual quota, π_i the exact target marginal, q_i the independent logistic marginal at mean J , and $V = \sum q_i(1 - q_i)$. A parent (F, J) is *interior* if $\kappa N \leq J \leq (1 - \kappa)N$ for a fixed $\kappa \in (0, 1/2]$; the proof of Theorem A takes $\kappa = \kappa_0/2$, the density bound of every good state (§4.3), and child interiority $\theta = \kappa/2$ (§2.4). In §§2–3, F , C and B denote coordinate sets and U an integer quota, and $A(u)$ of §3.1 is a function of u ; none of them is the criterion F , the schedule law $U(A)$ or its parameter A . Locally, $w = \sqrt{m \log m}$ in §2.4 is a window half-width, not a weight; $\rho = J/N$ in §3.6 is the parent density, not the ratios ρ_i of (3.1) or the density ρ^b of §3.3; the coefficient D

of (4.22) is not a divergence; and B in §4.7 is a number, not a block. The letter C also denotes generic constants, as in (3.25); a set C appears as an index set or under $|\cdot|$, $\in$ or $\subseteq$. In the ladder, M_t remains a nominal size. Write $\ell = f\sqrt{N}$ for the actual one-step scale and $L_t = f_t\sqrt{M_t}$ for its nominal counterpart. Also: $B_N = N \log(\Lambda N)$ in §4.5 is the atom bound, not a block; B_t in §4.9 is the large block of level t ; N_0^b of §3.3 is the bulk normalization, not the dimension threshold N_0 ; $E(u)$ in §3.3 is the error term of (3.9), not the sum E of §4.7; and e in §3.3 is a generic nonnegative error. The reference law of §3 is denoted $\mathcal{R}$; it is not the schedule-averaged KL criterion H of the main text.

Throughout, logarithms are natural except $\log_2$ and the explicitly base-two ladder variable. A statement with an analytic threshold applies only above that threshold; the schedule's small-dimension branch deals with all remaining admissible dimensions.

1. Weighted slices and elementary probability tools

1.1 Weighted slices, conditional laws, floors, and pairwise covariance For a finite set F , positive weights w , and $0 \leq J \leq |F|$, put

$$p_{F,J}(x) = \frac{\prod_{i \in F} w_i^{x_i}}{e_J(w_F)} \mathbf{1}_{\{|x|=J\}}.$$

Every feasible coordinate conditioning leaves another such law. Rescaling all weights does not change the law. The two-coordinate numerator comparisons in the proof of Lemma W1 (Appendix H, §2) give, at every quota $0 \leq J \leq N$ and ratio at most Λ (Lemma W1(b)),

$$\pi_i \geq \frac{J}{\Lambda N}, \quad 1 - \pi_i \geq \frac{N - J}{\Lambda N}. \quad (1.1)$$

The endpoint cases are deterministic and are treated directly, without dividing by zero.

Here is an elementary proof of the weak symmetric-polynomial log-concavity needed for the pairwise covariance formula; no negative-association theorem is used below. If a nonnegative sequence a has contiguous positive support and is log-concave, then $b_j = a_j + wa_{j-1}$, for $w > 0$, is log-concave. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} b_j^2 - b_{j-1}b_{j+1} &= (a_j^2 - a_{j-1}a_{j+1}) \\ &\quad + w(a_ja_{j-1} - a_{j-2}a_{j+1}) + w^2(a_{j-1}^2 - a_{j-2}a_j) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

The middle inequality follows by multiplying the decreasing successive-ratio inequalities; support endpoints follow directly using zeros. Induction on the number of weights, starting from the one-term sequence (1) for no weights, proves $e_j^2 \geq e_{j-1}e_{j+1}$ for any positive weights. Consequently, for distinct i, j , with $R = F \setminus \{i, j\}$,

$$\text{Cov}(X_i, X_j) = \frac{w_i w_j (e_J(R) e_{J-2}(R) - e_{J-1}(R)^2)}{e_J(F)^2} \leq 0. \quad (1.2)$$

This holds for **all positive arrays**, not just arrays with bounded ratio, and for every further feasible conditioning.

1.2 Sub-Gaussian linear statistics

Lemma T1 [*sub-Gaussian linear statistics*] For every weighted slice, every real vector c , and every real λ ,

$$\mathbb{E} \exp\{\lambda c \cdot (X - \mathbb{E}X)\} \leq \exp\{\lambda^2 \|c\|_2^2 / 4\}. \quad (1.3)$$

Thus, for $a > 0$ and $c \neq 0$,

$$\Pr(|c \cdot (X - \mathbb{E}X)| \geq a) \leq 2 \exp\{-a^2 / \|c\|_2^2\}. \quad (1.4)$$

For $c = 0$ the statistic vanishes identically.

Lemma T1 is proved below from Lemma NCD. Route MG is an alternative proof: it bounds the variance of $c \cdot X$ under every exponential tilt by (1.5), which §3.5 also uses, and integrates; the remark after both proofs names two further routes, which are not used.

Lemma NCD [*negative cylinder dependence*] For every positive weighted slice $p_{F,J}$ (any finite F , positive weights, $0 \leq J \leq |F|$) with marginals π_i , and every T contained in F ,

$$\Pr(X_i = 1 \forall i \in T) \leq \prod_{i \in T} \pi_i, \quad \Pr(X_i = 0 \forall i \in T) \leq \prod_{i \in T} (1 - \pi_i). \quad (1.3a)$$

The first left side vanishes unless $|T| \leq J$, the second unless $|T| \leq |F| - J$.

Proof Induct on $|T|$, simultaneously over all positive weighted slices; $|T| \leq 1$ is trivial. Pick t in T . If $\pi_t = 0$, the first left side is zero. Otherwise conditioning on $X_t = 1$ leaves the slice $p_{F \setminus t, J-1}$ with the same weights (§1.1), so

$$\Pr(X_T \equiv 1) = \pi_t \Pr(X_{T \setminus t} \equiv 1 \mid X_t = 1) \leq \pi_t \prod_{i \in T \setminus t} \Pr(X_i = 1 \mid X_t = 1) \leq \prod_{i \in T} \pi_i.$$

The first inequality is the induction hypothesis for the conditioned slice. The second is $\Pr(X_i = 1 \mid X_t = 1) - \pi_i = \text{Cov}(X_i, X_t) / \pi_t \leq 0$, by (1.2) applied to $p_{F,J}$. For the second family apply the first to $1 - X$, which has the weighted-slice law with weights $1/w_i$ and quota $|F| - J$. (1.2) is used at every slice reached by conditioning, including deterministic boundary quotas, where the covariance is zero or the bracket in (1.2) is $-e_{J-1}(R)^2 \leq 0$. ■

Proof of Lemma T1 from NCD. Write $Y = c \cdot (X - \mathbb{E}X)$. Split the coordinates into $I_+ = \{i : \lambda c_i > 0\}$ and $I_- = \{i : \lambda c_i < 0\}$. Cauchy–Schwarz gives $\mathbb{E}e^{\lambda Y} \leq (\mathbb{E}e^{2\lambda Y_+})^{1/2} (\mathbb{E}e^{2\lambda Y_-})^{1/2}$.

- On I_+ , write $e^{2\lambda c_i (X_i - \pi_i)} = e^{-2\lambda c_i \pi_i} (1 + a_i X_i)$ with $a_i = e^{2\lambda c_i} - 1 > 0$. Expanding the product, $\mathbb{E} \prod_{i \in I_+} (1 + a_i X_i) = \sum_{T \subseteq I_+} (\prod_{i \in T} a_i) \Pr(X_T \equiv 1) \leq \prod_{i \in I_+} (1 + a_i \pi_i)$, by the first inequality of (1.3a).
- On I_- , write the factors as $e^{2\lambda c_i (1 - X_i)} (1 + b_i (1 - X_i))$ with $b_i = e^{-2\lambda c_i} - 1 > 0$, and use the second inequality.

So each half is at most the product of the independent-coordinate moment generating functions. Hoeffding's lemma for one Bernoulli (§1.3) gives $\mathbb{E}e^{2\lambda c_i(X_i - \pi_i)} \leq e^{\lambda^2 c_i^2/2}$. Taking square roots proves (1.3), and Chernoff optimization proves (1.4). $\square$

Alternative proof of Lemma T1 (route MG). Let Σ be the covariance matrix under any positive external tilt of the weights. Fixed total implies $\Sigma \mathbf{1} = 0$; (1.2) implies $\Sigma_{ij} \leq 0$ for $i \neq j$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} c^\top \Sigma c &= \sum_{i < j} (-\Sigma_{ij})(c_i - c_j)^2 \\ &\leq 2 \sum_i c_i^2 \sum_{j \neq i} (-\Sigma_{ij}) = 2 \sum_i c_i^2 \text{Var}(X_i) \leq \frac{1}{2} \|c\|_2^2. \end{aligned} \tag{1.5}$$

For $g(t) = \log \mathbb{E} \exp(tc \cdot X)$, the tilted law has weights $w_i \exp(tc_i)$, so $g''(t)$ is this variance for every real t . Integrating the bound twice, in either direction from zero, proves (1.3). Chernoff optimization at $\lambda = 2a/\|c\|_2^2$, and then the negative tail, proves (1.4). This argument needs pairwise negativity **at all external tilts**, plus the fixed-sum identity; pairwise negativity at one distribution alone would not suffice. No ratio bound is imposed on these auxiliary external tilts. $\square$

Either route, NCD or MG (alternative), proves Lemma T1 with the same constant. No full negative-association theorem is used anywhere in the dependency graph. Both routes need only (1.2) for all positive weights: NCD at every slice reached by conditioning, MG at every slice reached by an external tilt.

Remark (an alternative completion via negative association, not used). [Borcea et al. \(2009, §4.2, Theorem 4.8, in the arXiv:0707.2340v2 numbering\)](#) gives conditional negative association for a conditioning-closed class of finite, fixed-degree laws with pairwise negative correlations. The class of all positive weighted slices, including deterministic boundaries, satisfies those hypotheses by (1.2). Theorem 4.9 gives the strongly-Rayleigh route, but is unnecessary here. A second optional route, also not used, is [Joag-Dev and Proschan \(1983, Thm. 2.8, p. 290, with Property \$P_2\$, p. 288\)](#).

1.3 Independent bounded variables and kept-set counts For a variable Y in $[a, b]$, every exponential tilt still has support in that interval and therefore variance at most $(b - a)^2/4$: compare with the squared distance to its midpoint. Twice integrating its centered log-MGF proves Hoeffding's lemma,

$$\log \mathbb{E} e^{\lambda(Y - \mathbb{E}Y)} \leq \lambda^2(b - a)^2/8.$$

Independence gives the sum version and optimization gives

$$\Pr \left(\left| \sum (Y_i - \mathbb{E}Y_i) \right| \geq t \right) \leq 2 \exp \left(- \frac{2t^2}{\sum (b_i - a_i)^2} \right). \tag{1.6}$$

All later conditional uses first fix the kept set or the first-block outcomes, after which the asserted product variables are independent.

For a sum Z of independent, not necessarily identical Bernoulli variables with mean μ ,

$$\mathbb{E} e^{\lambda Z} \leq \exp\{\mu(e^\lambda - 1)\}.$$

Chernoff optimization gives the two usual relative-deviation exponents. The elementary inequalities $(1 + d) \log(1 + d) - d \geq d^2/3$ and $d + (1 - d) \log(1 - d) \geq d^2/2$, for $0 \leq d \leq 1$, give

$$\Pr(|Z - \mu| \geq d\mu) \leq 2e^{-\mu d^2/3}. \tag{1.7}$$

These inequalities also follow by differentiating their differences, starting at zero. This is the precise count bound used below; an independently forced one-coordinate atom changes counts by at most one.

1.4 KL facts and sub-probability conventions Throughout, $D(p\|q)$ is $\text{KL}(p\|q)$. Whenever q is a sub-probability on the support of p , extend it to a probability by adding one cemetery atom, with zero p mass there. Thus the usual KL, log-sum, and Pinsker arguments apply without normalizing away survival loss. All laws here are on finite sets, and (1.8)–(1.10) are stated for a probability p and a sub-probability q with $q > 0$ on the support of p . Where §4.5 uses them to bound expectations, in (4.18), q is the continuation law at a good child, which is positive on the target slice by the argument after (4.13).

For completeness, log-sum follows from Jensen under normalized p on each part of a partition. Apply it to the set on which $p > q$ and its complement. The binary KL, as a function of its first parameter, has second derivative $1/[u(1-u)] \geq 4$; integrating from its minimizer gives binary KL at least twice the squared parameter difference. Hence

$$\text{TV}(p, q) \leq \sqrt{D(p\|q)/2}. \quad (1.8)$$

For $W = \log(p/q)$ under p ,

$$\mathbb{E}W^- \leq \text{TV}(p, q), \quad \mathbb{E}(W^-)^2 \leq 1, \quad (1.9)$$

because $\log y \leq y - 1$ and $(\log y)^2 \leq y - 1$ for $y \geq 1$. For the latter scalar inequality, the derivative of $y - 1 - (\log y)^2$ is $1 - 2\log(y)/y \geq 1 - 2/e > 0$. In particular,

$$\mathbb{E}W^+ \leq D(p\|q) + \sqrt{D(p\|q)/2}. \quad (1.10)$$

These estimates will control signed continuation log ratios, not just their positive parts.

2. Logistic tilt, lattice approximation, and the integrated normalizer

2.1 Tilt parameter and uniform interiority For a set of m coordinates define

$$K(s) = \sum_{i=1}^m \log(1 + w_i e^s), \quad \mu(s) = K'(s), \quad v(s) = K''(s).$$

For $m \geq 1$ the derivative v is positive, and the mean increases continuously from zero to m , so every mean in $(0, m)$ has a unique tilt. Independent Bernoulli probabilities are $p_i(s) = w_i e^s / (1 + w_i e^s)$. Conditioning their product law on total U gives the weighted slice, independently of s ; this is the conditional Poisson (rejective) representation of [Hájek \(1964\)](#) (cf. [Bertail and Clémenton, 2016](#) for the invariance under a common odds rescaling). For a coordinate set C , write $\tilde{P}_s$ for this product law at tilt s , $S_C = \sum_{i \in C} X_i$, and $s_C(U)$ for the tilt at which S_C has mean U ; at a parent (F, J) , $s_0 = s_F(J)$, so the q_i of the notation paragraph are the $p_i(s_0)$.

If the mean density is in $[\theta, 1 - \theta]$ and the weight ratio is at most Λ , probability and complementary-probability comparisons give

$$p_i(s) \in [\theta/\Lambda, 1 - \theta/\Lambda], \quad c_{\theta, \Lambda} m \leq v(s) \leq m/4. \quad (2.1)$$

The same interiority for exact parent marginals follows from (1.1).

2.2 Uniform lattice Edgeworth estimate Let $S = \sum_{i=1}^m \text{Bern}(p_i)$ independently, with $p_i \in [a, 1-a]$, where $0 < a \leq 1/2$. Write $\mu = \mathbb{E}S$, $s^2 = \text{Var}(S)$, $\gamma_3 = \sum p_i(1-p_i)(1-2p_i)$, and $y = (k - \mu)/s$. Then there is a finite K_a , independent of m, k , and the array, such that

$$\sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \left| \Pr(S = k) - \frac{\varphi(y)}{s} \left(1 + \frac{\gamma_3}{6s^3} (y^3 - 3y) \right) \right| \leq K_a s^{-3}, \quad (2.2)$$

where φ is the standard normal density. Edgeworth expansions of such atoms are classical in rejec-tive sampling; for instance, [Boistard et al. \(2012, Lemma 1\)](#) expand the probability that such a sum equals its integer mean, with relative error $O(s^{-4})$. We prove (2.2) in the form used here, with a constant uniform over arrays with $p_i \in [a, 1-a]$.

Fourier derivation. For the uncentered characteristic function Φ , orthogonality of integer ex-ponentials gives inversion on $[-\pi, \pi]$. Also

$$|1 - p + pe^{it}|^2 = 1 - 2p(1-p)(1 - \cos t),$$

so

$$|\Phi(t)| \leq e^{-2s^2 t^2 / \pi^2} \quad (|t| \leq \pi). \quad (2.3)$$

On a fixed sufficiently small interval about zero, every factor is uniformly separated from zero. Taylor expansion of its logarithm, with the fourth derivative bounded uniformly for $p \in [a, 1-a]$, gives

$$\log(e^{-i\mu t} \Phi(t)) = -s^2 t^2 / 2 - i\gamma_3 t^3 / 6 + R(t), \quad |R(t)| \leq C m t^4. \quad (2.4)$$

The derivative bound can also be obtained directly from the rational derivatives of $\log(1 - p + pe^{it})$; the denominator stays separated from zero on the chosen interval. Since $s^2 \geq a(1-a)m$, choose a smaller $t_1 = t_1(a) > 0$ so that $C m t^4 \leq s^2 t^2 / 4$ for $|t| \leq t_1$. Using $|e^{ib} - 1 - ib| \leq b^2 / 2$ for real b yields

$$\left| e^{-i\mu t} \Phi(t) - e^{-s^2 t^2 / 2} (1 - i\gamma_3 t^3 / 6) \right| \leq C e^{-s^2 t^2 / 4} (m t^4 + m^2 t^6). \quad (2.5)$$

The integral of the right side on the real line is at most

$$C(m s^{-5} + m^2 s^{-7}) \leq C_a s^{-3}.$$

Outside $[-t_1, t_1]$, (2.3), together with the Gaussian-polynomial tail of the approximant, bounds both the remaining inversion interval and its extension to the real line by $C_a(1+m)e^{-c_a s^2}$: on $t_1 \leq |t| \leq \pi$, (2.3) gives $|\Phi(t)| \leq e^{-2s^2 t_1^2 / \pi^2}$, so that part of the inversion integral is at most $2\pi e^{-2s^2 t_1^2 / \pi^2}$; for the approximant, with $|\gamma_3| \leq m$, $\int_{|t| \geq t_1} e^{-s^2 t^2 / 2} (1 + \frac{|\gamma_3| |t|^3}{6}) dt \leq 2e^{-s^2 t_1^2 / 2} (\frac{1}{s^2 t_1} + \frac{m(s^2 t_1^2 + 2)}{6s^4})$; since $s^2 \geq a(1-a)m$, both pieces are at most $C_a(1+m)e^{-c_a s^2}$ with $c_a = 2t_1^2 / \pi^2$. This too is at most $K_a s^{-3}$; small m are covered by increasing K_a . The inverse Gaussian transform and its third derivative give (2.2), with the displayed sign: each y -derivative of $\varphi(y) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int e^{-i\tau y} e^{-\tau^2 / 2} d\tau$ brings down $-i\tau$, so $\frac{1}{2\pi} \int e^{-i\tau y} (i\tau)^3 e^{-\tau^2 / 2} d\tau = -\varphi'''(y) = (y^3 - 3y)\varphi(y)$. The Gaussian trans-form itself follows by integration by parts from its differential equation and its value at zero.

This proves a lattice, triangular-array-uniform estimate. No derivative of its error term is used later.

2.3 Parent mass, exact marginals, and conditional central atoms Apply (2.2) at a mean that is an integer. The cubic correction vanishes at zero, giving

$$P_0 := \tilde{P}_{s_0}(S_F = J) = (2\pi V)^{-1/2}(1 + O(V^{-1})). \quad (2.6)$$

For one coordinate, write

$$\pi_i = \frac{q_i R_i}{q_i R_i + 1 - q_i}, \quad R_i = \frac{\Pr(S_{-i} = J - 1)}{\Pr(S_{-i} = J)}.$$

Under the tilt s_0 the leave-one-out sum S_{-i} has mean $J - q_i$ and variance $s_{-i}^2 = V - q_i(1 - q_i) \geq V - \frac{1}{4}$. The two atoms in R_i sit at $y = (q_i - 1)/s_{-i}$ and $y = q_i/s_{-i}$, so $|y| \leq 1/s_{-i}$. At both atoms, (2.2) gives $\Pr(S_{-i} = k) = (2\pi s_{-i}^2)^{-1/2}(1 + O(V^{-1}))$: the Gaussian factor is $e^{-y^2/2} = 1 + O(V^{-1})$; since $|\gamma_3| \leq s_{-i}^2$, the cubic term is at most $s_{-i}^2(3|y| + |y|^3)/(6s_{-i}^3) = O(V^{-1})$; and the remainder $K_a s_{-i}^{-3}$ is $O(V^{-1})$ relative to the main term $\geq c/s_{-i}$. Hence $R_i = 1 + O(V^{-1})$, and $\pi_i - q_i = q_i(1 - q_i)(R_i - 1)/(q_i R_i + 1 - q_i) = O(V^{-1})$. Both $\sum_i \pi_i$ and $\sum_i q_i$ equal J , and $V \geq c_{\theta, \Lambda} N$ by (2.1). Therefore

$$|\pi_i - q_i| \leq C/V \leq C/N, \quad \sum_i (\pi_i - q_i) = 0. \quad (2.7)$$

This is the known approximation of rejective (conditional Poisson) inclusion probabilities by the canonical Poisson probabilities, here the logistic q_i with $\sum_i q_i = J$ (Hájek, 1964); see also Boistard et al. (2012, eq. (2.11), arXiv v1 numbering) for the leading term and Bertail and Cléménçon (2016, Lemma 6) for a nonasymptotic version. For an interior child of size m , the same central estimate gives

$$\tilde{P}_{s_C(U)}(S_C = U) \geq c/\sqrt{m} \quad (2.8)$$

above one uniform threshold.

2.4 The normalizer and its full change of variables In §3.1 the reciprocal of the quota probability $\tilde{P}_{s_0}(S_C = U)$ of a coordinate set C of size m (there, a kept set) is written as an integral over tilts divided by the normalizer $I_C(U)$ below. The estimate (2.17) shows that this normalizer is within $O(\sqrt{\log m}/m)$ of one at interior quotas, so that for interior children the normalizers cost only that factor in (3.17) and §3.8.

Let $U/m \in [\theta, 1 - \theta]$ and

$$I_C(U) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{P}_s(S_C = U) K''(s) ds.$$

The substitution $\mu = K'(s)$ gives the exact identity

$$I_C(U) = \int_0^m \Pr_{s(\mu)}(S_C = U) d\mu. \quad (2.9)$$

In particular, the integral is finite and positive. For nonempty C , this remains true at quotas zero and m , although the following estimate is asserted only at interior quotas.

Choose $w = \sqrt{m \log m}$ and then an analytic threshold $m_{\text{an}}(\theta, \Lambda)$ so that $w \leq \theta m/2$. On the complement of $|\mu - U| \leq w$, (1.6) gives the deliberately coarse bound

$$\int_{|\mu - U| > w} \Pr_{s(\mu)}(S_C = U) d\mu \leq 2me^{-2w^2/m} = 2/m. \quad (2.10)$$

Inside the window all tilt probabilities are uniformly interior by (2.1), so (2.2) applies. Its integrated absolute remainder is at most

$$2wKm^{-3/2} = C\sqrt{\log m}/m. \quad (2.11)$$

It remains to integrate its two explicit terms.

Write $v = v(\mu)$, $s_\mu = \sqrt{v(\mu)}$,

$$y = \frac{U - \mu}{s_\mu}, \quad a(\mu) = \frac{\gamma_3(\mu)}{v(\mu)^{3/2}}.$$

The Bernoulli cumulant identities give

$$\frac{dv}{d\mu} = \frac{\gamma_3}{v}, \quad \frac{d\gamma_3}{d\mu} = \frac{\gamma_4}{v}, \quad |\gamma_3| \leq v, \quad |\gamma_4| \leq v.$$

Here $\gamma_4 = \sum p_i(1 - p_i)(1 - 6p_i(1 - p_i))$, which proves its absolute bound directly. Consequently, throughout the window,

$$|v'| \leq 1, \quad |v''| \leq C/m, \quad |a| \leq Cm^{-1/2}, \quad |a'| \leq Cm^{-3/2}. \quad (2.12)$$

The Jacobian is **exactly**

$$\frac{1}{s_\mu} \left| \frac{d\mu}{dy} \right| = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{2}ya(\mu)}. \quad (2.13)$$

Indeed, $dy/d\mu = -(1/s_\mu)(1 + ya/2)$. Since $|y| \leq C\sqrt{\log m}$, its parenthesis is at least one half above a uniform threshold, so this change is monotone. Let $a_* = a(U)$. Since $|\mu - U| = s_\mu|y|$, (2.12) gives

$$|a(\mu) - a_*| \leq C|y|/m. \quad (2.14)$$

The Gaussian plus Edgeworth integrand, including the Jacobian, is therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(y) \frac{1 + a(\mu)(y^3 - 3y)/6}{1 + ya(\mu)/2} &= \varphi(y) \left[1 + a_* \left(\frac{y^3}{6} - y \right) + R_m(y) \right], \\ |R_m(y)| &\leq \frac{C}{m}(y^2 + y^4). \end{aligned} \quad (2.15)$$

For example, subtract $1 + a_*(\text{He}_3/6 - y/2)$ from the fraction, use (2.14), and bound the remaining denominator by two. This yields the displayed polynomial bound directly, without differentiating a CLT remainder. The odd polynomial now has a **fixed** coefficient.

The transformed interval is $[-y_-, y_+]$. Because $v \leq m/4$, both endpoint magnitudes are at least $2\sqrt{\log m}$. Furthermore, $|v'| \leq 1$ implies

$$|y_+ - y_-| \leq Cw^2/m^{3/2} = C \log m / \sqrt{m}. \quad (2.16)$$

There is no need to set these endpoints equal. Extend each explicit integral in (2.15) to the full real line. The omitted Gaussian mass is at most Cm^{-2} ; the absolute omitted odd-polynomial contribution is at most $Cm^{-5/2}(1 + \log m)$. On the full line the odd term integrates to zero. Finally, the integrated absolute R_m term is at most C/m , by finite Gaussian moments.

Combining (2.10), (2.11), and (2.15) proves

$$\boxed{|I_C(U) - 1| \leq K_{\Lambda, \theta} \frac{\sqrt{\log m}}{m}}. \quad (2.17)$$

In the proof of Theorem A, take $\theta = \kappa/2$. All thresholds and constants above depend only on that fixed interiority and on Λ . There is no dependence on a limiting empirical weight distribution.

3. Exact identities, one-step error, and target-law and execution-law tails

This section compares one round of the sampler with the reference law $\mathcal{R}$ of §3.1 (as in the main text's Section 4.2). At a state with free set F , a round of the sampler (§4.2) puts each coordinate of F into the kept set C independently with probability f , by coins drawn before any value, and commits the block $B = F \setminus C$ by independent draws at the exact conditional marginals frozen at the round's start; C is left to the later levels (in the notation of §4.2, the kept set of round t is $C = F_{t+1}$). $\mathcal{R}$ makes the same first step, so (C, x_B) has the same law under both, but then completes the kept set exactly (fair bits if the quota is infeasible). It is used only in the analysis (§4.2). Below, target-law bounds are under p and execution-law bounds are under $\mathcal{R}$, or under $\mathcal{R}^{\text{joint}}$ for events that involve C ; composition needs both (§4.5). The section's outputs are the one-step bound (3.18), the second moment (3.21) of $\psi = p/\mathcal{R}$, and the two-sided ratio bound (3.34) with the exceptional sets (3.35), which supply the analytic inputs to Lemma OS of Section 4.2; (4.3), (4.12), (4.16) and (4.22)–(4.24) instantiate them level-wise, and the composition (4.15)–(4.20) uses all of them.

3.1 Reference law and exact identities, including the empty child Throughout §3, $\ell = f\sqrt{N} \geq \ell_0$ and $N \geq N_0$, for thresholds ℓ_0 and N_0 that depend only on (Λ, κ) ; individual steps enlarge them finitely often, and §5 records the final choice. At an interior parent (F, J) , put each coordinate of F into the kept set C independently with probability $0 < f \leq 1/4$, so that C has law $\nu(C) = f^{|C|}(1-f)^{N-|C|}$; let $B = F \setminus C$. Draw independent exact parent marginals on B . If the residual quota is feasible, complete C with the exact weighted slice; otherwise complete with fair independent bits. This defines a joint law $\mathcal{R}^{\text{joint}}$ of (C, x_B, x_C) and its law $\mathcal{R}$ of the string $x = (x_B, x_C)$. Probabilities and expectations of quantities that involve C , such as the child (C, j) , the good event G of §4.4 and the log ratio W of §4.5, are taken under $\mathcal{R}^{\text{joint}}$. The arbitrary-on-failure completion has no contribution at any point of the parent slice. At a slice point x the completion of C is the target's own conditional law given x_B , so $\mathcal{R}(x)/p(x) = \sum_C \nu(C) \Pi_B(x_B)/p(x_B)$, where $\Pi_B = \prod_{i \in B} \text{Ber}(\pi_i)$ is the product of the exact marginals on the block and $p(x_B)$ is the target's marginal law of the block. The definitions below evaluate this sum. Writing $p(x_B)$ through the logistic product law at tilt s_0 , which conditioned on $S_F = J$ is p , gives

$$p(x_B) = \tilde{P}_{s_0}(x_B) \tilde{P}_{s_0}(S_C = j)/P_0, \quad j = |x_C|;$$

this brings in the quota probability $\tilde{P}_{s_0}(S_C = j)$, whose reciprocal is then written as an integral over the tilts $s_0 + u$ divided by the normalizer $I_C(j)$ of §2.4. The result, (3.1)–(3.2), writes $\mathcal{R}/p$ as an empty-child term plus, up to these normalizers, $P_0 \int e^{A(u)+D_x(u)} \Gamma_x(u) du$, in which x enters only through the linear statistic $D_x(u)$ and the factor $\Gamma_x(u)$.

Set $t_i(u) = \sigma(\text{logit}(q_i) + u)$, the marginal $p_i(s_0 + u)$ of the logistic product law at tilt $s_0 + u$, and, for $x = 0, 1$,

$$\rho_i(x) = \frac{\text{Ber}(\pi_i)(x)}{\text{Ber}(q_i)(x)}, \quad \phi_i(u, x) = \frac{\text{Ber}(t_i(u))(x)}{\text{Ber}(q_i)(x)}, \quad d_i = (1-f)\rho_i + f\phi_i.$$

Define $\alpha_i = \log d_i(u, 1) - \log d_i(u, 0)$,

$$A(u) = \sum_i \mathbb{E}_{\text{Ber}(\pi_i)} \log d_i(u, X_i), \quad D_x(u) = \sum_i (x_i - \pi_i) \alpha_i(u),$$

and

$$\Gamma_x(u) = \sum_i f t'_i(u) \frac{\phi_i(u, x_i)}{d_i(u, x_i)}, \quad \bar{\Gamma}(u) = \mathbb{E}_p \Gamma_X(u).$$

Then $\sum \log d_i = A + D_x$ and $\mathbb{E}_p D_X(u) = 0$ **exactly**, because centering uses the exact parent marginals.

For x on the parent slice and $j = |x_C|$, conditioning the logistic product law gives

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}(x)}{p(x)} = P_0 \left[\nu(\emptyset) \prod_F \rho_i(x_i) + \sum_{C \neq \emptyset} \nu(C) \prod_B \rho_i(x_i) \frac{\int K_C''(s_0 + u) \prod_C \phi_i(u, x_i) du}{I_C(j)} \right]. \quad (3.1)$$

Here K_C is the function K of §2.1 for the coordinates of C . To verify the integral step, for any fixed child of nonzero size the likelihood ratio between two common tilts is constant on its quota slice; its value equals the ratio of the two quota probabilities. Integrating that identity against K_C'' gives (3.1). The empty-child contribution is the first term, not a quotient of zero integrals. Its total execution probability is $(1 - f)^N \leq e^{-fN}$.

Expanding $K_C'' = \sum_{l \in C} t_l'$, then summing the other inclusion indicators independently, gives

$$\sum_C \nu(C) K_C''(s_0 + u) \prod_B \rho_i \prod_C \phi_i = e^{A(u) + D_x(u)} \Gamma_x(u). \quad (3.2)$$

The empty-child contribution to this second identity is zero.

3.2 Uniform analytic estimates and the bounds on A Put $a_i(u) = (1 - f)\pi_i + ft_i(u)$. A mixture of two Bernoulli masses is Bernoulli, so

$$d_i(u, x) = \frac{\text{Ber}(a_i(u))(x)}{\text{Ber}(q_i)(x)}, \quad \alpha_i(u) = \text{logit}(a_i(u)) - \text{logit}(q_i), \quad (3.3)$$

and exactly

$$A(u) = \sum_i \{D(\pi_i \| q_i) - D(\pi_i \| a_i(u))\}. \quad (3.4)$$

Here binary KL is abbreviated by its two parameters.

Choosing radii without circular constants. Fix a radius $R_0 > 0$ using only the common interiority lower bound. The expression

$$t_i(u) = \frac{q_i e^u}{1 + q_i(e^u - 1)}$$

has an absolutely convergent power series on $|u| \leq R_0$, with uniform bounds. The proof is complex-analytic. Write p_* for the common interiority lower bound, so that $\pi_i, q_i \in [p_*, 1 - p_*]$, and extend u to complex z . For $|z| \leq 1/4$ one has $|q_i(e^z - 1)| \leq 1/2$, so t_i is holomorphic there. For $|z| \leq p_*/2$ the arguments a_i and $1 - a_i$ of the logarithms in (3.3) have real parts above $p_*/2$, so their principal logarithms are holomorphic. For $|z| \leq p_*^5/64$ the real part of $\bar{\Gamma}$ below is at least $Nfp_*^3/2$, so the summands of $\bar{\Gamma}/f$ and the coefficients b_i below are holomorphic as well. (Indeed, write $\bar{\Gamma}/f = \sum_i s_i$ with $s_i = t_i'[\pi_i t_i/a_i + (1 - \pi_i)(1 - t_i)/(1 - a_i)]$, by (3.10a) below, since Γ_x is affine in each coordinate. At $z = 0$, $t_i = q_i$, and Cauchy–Schwarz with $a_i + (1 - a_i) = 1$ gives $\pi_i q_i/a_i + (1 - \pi_i)(1 - q_i)/(1 - a_i) \geq (\sqrt{\pi_i q_i} + \sqrt{(1 - \pi_i)(1 - q_i)})^2 \geq 4p_*(1 - p_*)$, so $s_i(0) \geq 4p_*^2(1 - p_*)^2 \geq p_*^2$. On $|z| \leq p_*/2$, $\text{Re } a_i, \text{Re}(1 - a_i) \geq p_*/2$, as $|t_i - q_i| \leq 1.6 q_i |z|$ there; and $|s_i| \leq 3/p_*$, as there $|t_i(1 - t_i)| \leq 2.6 q_i(1 - q_i) \leq 0.65$ and the bracket is at most $3.6/p_*$, from $|t_i| \leq 1.8 q_i$, $|1 - t_i| \leq 1.4(1 - q_i)$ and $|a_i|, |1 - a_i| \geq p_*/2$. Cauchy's estimate on circles of

radius $p_*/4$ then gives $|s'_i| \leq 12/p_*^2$ on $|z| \leq p_*/4$, so on $|z| \leq p_*^5/64$, $\operatorname{Re} s_i \geq p_*^2 - \frac{12}{64}p_*^3 \geq p_*^3/2$. The radius has ample room, and its value is inessential: any smaller positive radius depending only on p_* would also do.) Cauchy's estimates on these circles bound the power-series coefficients. The single radius $R_0 = p_*^5/64$ serves all three expansions and depends only on p_* ; division by f keeps the bounds uniform as f tends to zero. First obtain derivative/coefficient constants on this fixed disk; **only afterward** choose the smaller bulk radius $r_0 < R_0/4$ needed for Gaussian absorption.

Let $\delta_i = \pi_i - q_i = O(N^{-1})$. Formula (3.3) gives

$$\alpha_i(0) = O(N^{-1}), \quad \alpha'_i(0) = f + O(f/N), \quad \alpha_i(u) = \alpha_i(0) + \alpha'_i(0)u + O(fu^2). \quad (3.5)$$

For its power-series coefficients $\alpha_{k,i}$, the fixed-radius argument gives

$$|\alpha_{0,i}| \leq C/N, \quad |\alpha_{1,i} - f| \leq Cf/N, \quad |\alpha_{k,i}| \leq CfR_0^{-k} \ (k \geq 2). \quad (3.6)$$

For all real u , the quantities $a_i(u)$ remain uniformly interior because $1 - f \geq 3/4$ and π_i are uniformly interior. Thus

$$|\alpha_i(u)| \leq C(f + N^{-1}) \leq Cf, \quad |\alpha'_i(u)| \leq Cf, \quad (3.7)$$

where the last comparison uses $f\sqrt{N} \geq \ell_0$ and a sufficiently large threshold. Also $|\alpha_i(u) - \alpha_i(\pm\infty)| \leq Cf e^{-|u|+C}$ on the corresponding tails.

For the global upper bound on A , (3.4), (2.7), and binary Pinsker give

$$A(u) \leq C/N - cf^2N \min(u^2, 1). \quad (3.8)$$

Indeed, $|q_i - t_i(u)| \geq c \min(|u|, 1)$ uniformly, and $(\pi_i - t_i(u))^2 \geq |q_i - t_i(u)|^2/2 - \delta_i^2$.

For a local lower bound, discard the nonnegative first terms in (3.4), and Taylor-expand the binary divergence about its second argument π_i . With $h_i = f(t_i(u) - \pi_i)$,

$$D(\pi_i \| \pi_i + h_i) = \frac{h_i^2}{2\pi_i(1 - \pi_i)} + O(|h_i|^3).$$

Use $t_i(u) - \pi_i = q_i(1 - q_i)u - \delta_i + O(u^2)$. Since all denominators are uniformly interior, summing yields

$$A(u) \geq -\frac{1}{2}f^2Vu^2 - C\{f^2N|u|^3 + f^2|u| + f^2u^2 + f^2/N\}. \quad (3.9)$$

Remark (the first-order sum is not small). Although $\sum_i(\pi_i - q_i) = 0$, the first-order sum $S_1(u) = \sum_i \mathbb{E}_{\operatorname{Ber}(\pi_i)}(d_i(u, X_i) - 1)$ is not $O(fNu^2/V)$.

- Exactly, $S_1(u) = (1 - f) \sum_i \chi^2(\pi_i \| q_i) + f \sum_i (\pi_i - q_i) \frac{t_i(u) - q_i}{q_i(1 - q_i)}$.
- At $u = 0$ it equals $(1 - f) \sum_i (\pi_i - q_i)^2 / [q_i(1 - q_i)]$. This is strictly positive in general, while fNu^2/V vanishes at $u = 0$. One example: N even, $J = N/2$, one weight $\lambda > 1$, the others one. If all exact marginals equaled the logistic ones, the logistic total mean would exceed $N/2$.

What remains true.

- The chi-square term is nonnegative and drops out of a lower bound. The remaining part is $\geq -CfNu^2/V$. So $S_1(u) \geq -CfNu^2/V$, and $S_1(u) \leq CN/V^2 + CfNu^2/V$.
- The proof of (3.9) does not use S_1 : it uses the exact identity (3.4) and drops the nonnegative $D(\pi_i \| q_i)$.

Write $g_i = \phi_i/d_i$. Since Γ_x is affine in each binary coordinate,

$$\Gamma_x/\bar{\Gamma} = 1 + Y_x, \quad Y_x = \sum_i b_i(u)(x_i - \pi_i),$$

where

$$b_i(u) = \frac{ft'_i(u)[g_i(u, 1) - g_i(u, 0)]}{\bar{\Gamma}(u)}. \quad (3.10)$$

The relevant differences have the explicit formulas

$$\begin{aligned} g_i(u, 1) &= t_i(u)/a_i(u), & g_i(u, 0) &= (1 - t_i(u))/(1 - a_i(u)), \\ g_i(u, 1) - g_i(u, 0) &= \frac{(1 - f)(t_i(u) - \pi_i)}{a_i(u)(1 - a_i(u))}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.10a)$$

Thus the nonconstant numerator is $O(|u| + N^{-1})$, including its constant term $O(N^{-1})$; these bounds follow from the displayed separated denominators.

On the fixed analytic neighborhood, $\bar{\Gamma}/(fN)$ is bounded away from zero: by the radius argument above, its real part is at least $p_*^3/2$ there. With $b_{k,i}$ the power-series coefficients of $b_i(u)$ about $u = 0$, the power-series argument above consequently gives

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\Gamma}(u) &= fV(1 + O(|u| + N^{-1})), & |b_i(u)| &\leq C(|u| + N^{-1})/N, \\ |b_{0,i}| &\leq C/N^2, & |b_{k,i}| &\leq CR_0^{-k}/N \quad (k \geq 1). \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

For clarity about the denominator: on $|z| \leq p_*^5/64$ the real part of $\bar{\Gamma}/(fN)$ is at least $p_*^3/2$, so its reciprocal is holomorphic there with modulus at most $2/p_*^3$, and Cauchy's estimates apply. No lower bound on f independent of dimension is used. On the bulk, choose r_0 and the dimension threshold so that $|Y_x| \leq 1/2$ for every slice point. Globally,

$$0 \leq \Gamma_x(u) \leq CfNe^{-|u|+C}. \quad (3.12)$$

3.3 Bulk normalization Define

$$N_0^b = P_0 \int_{-r_0}^{r_0} e^{A(u)} \bar{\Gamma}(u) du.$$

Let γ be the centred Gaussian law with variance $1/(f^2V)$. On the bulk, (3.9) and (3.11) give $e^A \bar{\Gamma} \geq fV e^{-f^2Vu^2/2 - E(u)}(1 - C|u| - C/N)$, with $E(u)$ the braces of (3.9). Since $P_0 fV \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-f^2Vu^2/2} du = P_0 \sqrt{2\pi V} = 1 + O(V^{-1})$ by (2.6), this gives $N_0^b \geq (1 - C/V) \mathbb{E}_\gamma[(1 - E(u))(1 - C|u| - C/N); |u| \leq r_0] \geq (1 - C/V)(1 - \mathbb{E}_\gamma E - C\mathbb{E}_\gamma|u| - C/N - \gamma(|u| > r_0))$. With $\mathbb{E}_\gamma|u| = \sqrt{2/\pi}/(f\sqrt{V})$, $\mathbb{E}_\gamma|u|^3 = 2\sqrt{2/\pi}(f^2V)^{-3/2}$, $\mathbb{E}_\gamma u^2 = 1/(f^2V)$ and $V \geq cN$, the expectations of $|u|$ and of the four error terms in (3.9) satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\gamma|u| &\leq C/\ell, & \mathbb{E}_\gamma[f^2N|u|^3] &\leq C/\ell, \\ \mathbb{E}_\gamma[f^2|u|] &\leq C/\ell, & \mathbb{E}_\gamma[f^2u^2] + f^2/N &\leq C/N, \\ \gamma(|u| > r_0) &\leq 2e^{-c\ell^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Use $\exp(-e) \geq 1 - e$ for the nonnegative error bound, and choose the lower factor from (3.11) positive on the bulk. This proves

$$N_0^b \geq 1 - C/\ell. \quad (3.13)$$

The global upper bound (3.8) and $\bar{\Gamma} \leq C f N$ also give $N_0^b \leq C$ and, for the probability density $\rho^b \propto e^A \bar{\Gamma}$ on the bulk,

$$\rho^b(u) \leq C \ell e^{-c \ell^2 u^2}. \quad (3.14)$$

Choose ℓ_0 so that (3.13) is at least one half.

3.4 The tilted subset law and the all-point lower bound For fixed slice point x and fixed bulk u , normalize the left side of (3.2) as a law on C . It can be generated by choosing a distinguished coordinate l with probabilities proportional to $f t_l'(u) g_l(u, x_l)$, forcing it into C , and independently retaining every other coordinate with probability

$$q_i^{\text{ret}}(u, x) = \frac{f \phi_i(u, x_i)}{d_i(u, x_i)}. \quad (3.15)$$

Since $K_C'' = \sum_{l \in C} t_l'$, the summands with a given l factor as $f t_l' \phi_l(u, x_l) \prod_{i \neq l} d_i(u, x_i)$ after summing over the other inclusions. Uniformly in x ,

$$q_i^{\text{ret}}/f = 1 + O(r_0 + N^{-1}).$$

Choose r_0 and then N_0 so that the relative error is sufficiently small. The parent contains at least κN ones and κN zeros. Apply (1.7) separately to the counts of kept ones and kept zeros and to total size. The forced coordinate changes these counts by at most one, which is absorbed since $f N$ is above a fixed threshold. It follows that

$$\Pr_{\text{tilted}}(|C| \notin [fN/2, 2fN] \text{ or } |x_C|/|C| \notin [\kappa/2, 1 - \kappa/2]) \leq 4e^{-cfN}. \quad (3.16)$$

One explicit way to select the good concentration events is to require total size at most $5fN/4$, and each of the one and zero counts at least $3\kappa fN/4$, together with total size at least $fN/2$. For a sufficiently small inclusion perturbation their failures have the claimed exponential bounds, and their intersection gives the required density interval.

Fix a parent-slice point x . For $|u| \leq r_0$, let $\mu_{u,x}$ be the law on C obtained by normalizing the summands of (3.2): it is the tilted subset law of (3.15), with total mass $e^{A(u)+D_x(u)} \Gamma_x(u)$. By Fubini, the nonempty-child part of (3.1) equals $P_0 \int e^{A+D_x} \Gamma_x \mathbb{E}_{\mu_{u,x}}[1/I_C(|x_C|)] du$. On the event of (3.16), the child is interior with $|C| \geq fN/2$, above the threshold of (2.17), so there $1/I_C \geq 1 - K \sqrt{\log |C|}/|C| \geq 1 - 2K \sqrt{\log(fN)}/(fN)$, as $\sqrt{\log m}/m$ decreases for $m \geq 2$; that event has $\mu_{u,x}$ -mass at least $1 - 4e^{-cfN}$. Dropping the empty child, the other children and $|u| > r_0$ (all terms are nonnegative) gives, for every parent-slice point,

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}(x)}{p(x)} \geq (1 - \epsilon_1) P_0 \int_{-r_0}^{r_0} e^{A+D_x} \Gamma_x du, \quad \epsilon_1 = C \frac{\sqrt{\log(fN)}}{fN} + 4e^{-cfN}. \quad (3.17)$$

Here $\epsilon_1 \leq C/\ell$; all children to which (2.17) is applied have size above its threshold. The empty-child atom has been discarded, not divided by zero.

3.5 One-step KL and the likelihood-ratio second moment Apply logarithmic Jensen to (3.17) using ρ^b . Exact centering gives $\mathbb{E}_p D_X(u) = 0$. Also $\mathbb{E}_p Y = 0$, $|Y| \leq 1/2$, and (1.5), (3.11) give $\mathbb{E}_p Y^2 \leq C/N$. Since $\log(1 + Y) \geq Y - 2Y^2$,

$$D(p\|\mathcal{R}) \leq -\log(1 - \epsilon_1) - \log N_0^b + C/N \leq C/\ell. \quad (3.18)$$

For $\psi(x) = p(x)/\mathcal{R}(x)$ on the slice and zero elsewhere, the all-point lower bound and $\Gamma_x \geq \bar{\Gamma}/2$ give

$$\psi(x) \leq C \mathbb{E}_{\rho^b} e^{-D_x(u)}. \quad (3.19)$$

The reciprocal inequality used here is $1/\mathbb{E}Z \leq \mathbb{E}(1/Z)$ for positive Z .

Since $\sum_i (x_i - \pi_i) = 0$ on the slice, subtracting a constant vector from the coefficients of D leaves $D_x(u)$ unchanged there; let $\bar{\alpha}(u)$ be the coordinate mean of the vector $\alpha(u)$. This centering is what makes the bound below small: by (3.5) the first-order part $\alpha'_i(0)u = fu + O(f|u|/N)$ is, to leading order, the same for every coordinate, and the common vector $fu\mathbf{1}$ alone has squared norm $\ell^2 u^2$, which is not small on the bulk. By (3.5),

$$\|\alpha(u) - \bar{\alpha}(u)\mathbf{1}\|_2^2 \leq C/N + C\ell^2 u^4. \quad (3.20)$$

Equation (1.3) gives $\mathbb{E}_p \exp(-D) \leq \exp(C/N + C\ell^2 u^4)$. The constants in this fourth-power term were fixed on R_0 before choosing r_0 . Now choose r_0 still smaller so that $Cu^4 \leq cu^2/2$ on the bulk, where c is from (3.14). Integrating (3.19) under p and using (3.14) proves

$$\boxed{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{R}} \psi^2 = \mathbb{E}_p \psi \leq C_3.} \quad (3.21)$$

The constant is dimension-, array-, and f -independent in the stated regime. A target-law tail bound alone would not prove this moment estimate; the integration above is essential.

3.6 Execution-law non-interiority and the exact kept-set mean cancellation Let $\rho = J/N$. Under actual execution of the first block,

$$j - \rho|C| = \sum_{i \in C} (\pi_i - \rho) - \sum_{i \in B} (x_i - \pi_i). \quad (3.22)$$

The first sum is a centered independent-selection statistic: its mean is $f \sum (\pi_i - \rho) = 0$. The second sum is centered conditional on C , because the block draws are independent $\text{Ber}(\pi_i)$. In (3.23), (3.26) and §3.8 a child (C, j) is called *non-interior* unless $C \neq \emptyset$, $||C| - fN| < fN/2$ and $\kappa/2 \leq j/|C| \leq 1 - \kappa/2$; this execution-law event includes a size window. Equation (1.6), applied to these two sums and to the size $|C| - fN$, therefore gives

$$\mathcal{R}^{\text{joint}}(\text{non-interior child}) \leq 6e^{-c\ell^2}. \quad (3.23)$$

This includes infeasible and empty children, and one may take $c = \kappa^2/32$. The size deviation needs no absorption step: (1.6) gives $\Pr(|C| - fN \geq fN/2) \leq 2e^{-f^2 N/2} = 2e^{-\ell^2/2}$.

For the subtler execution-law tails, let $Y_c = \sum_i c_i (x_i - \pi_i)$ and fix C and the generated x_B , with interior residual quota j . Under the product law tilted so that the child mean is j , write its marginals as t_i^C . Since a common logistic tilt moves every coordinate in the same direction,

$$\sum_{i \in C} |t_i^C - q_i| = \left| j - \sum_{i \in C} q_i \right|. \quad (3.24)$$

Let $D_B = \sum_B (x_i - \pi_i)$. Exact centering gives

$$j - \sum_C q_i = -D_B + \sum_C (\pi_i - q_i).$$

Hence the mean of the child part of Y_c under that product law obeys

$$\left| \sum_C c_i (t_i^C - \pi_i) \right| \leq \|c\|_\infty \left(|D_B| + 2 \sum_C |\pi_i - q_i| \right) \leq \|c\|_\infty (|D_B| + C). \quad (3.25)$$

This bound is uniform over the kept set, with no omitted fluctuation of its composition. Replacing $\sum_C \pi_i$ by $\rho|C|$ in this calculation would destroy the exact cancellation and require another error term.

Write $Y_B = \sum_{i \in B} c_i (x_i - \pi_i)$ and $Y_C = Y_c - Y_B$. Conditional on C , the coordinates of B are independent, so (1.6) gives $\Pr(|Y_B| > z\sqrt{N}\|c\|_\infty/3) \leq 2e^{-2z^2/9}$ and $\Pr(|D_B| > z\sqrt{N}/3) \leq 2e^{-2z^2/9}$. Off these two events, (3.25) bounds the mean of Y_C under the tilted child product law by $\|c\|_\infty(z\sqrt{N}/3 + C) \leq z\sqrt{N}\|c\|_\infty/2$, above a dimension threshold. Conditional on C , x_B and an interior child, x_C has that product law conditioned on $S_C = j$. Under the product law, (1.6) bounds the probability that Y_C deviates from its mean by more than $z\sqrt{N}\|c\|_\infty/6$ by $2e^{-z^2/18}$, since $|C| \leq N$; conditioning divides by the central atom (2.8), which is at least $c/\sqrt{|C|}$, so under the slice this probability is at most $C\sqrt{N}e^{-z^2/18}$. Adding the three bounds proves, with fixed sufficiently large threshold constants, for $z \geq 1$,

$$\mathcal{R}(|Y_c| > z\sqrt{N}\|c\|_\infty) \leq C\sqrt{N}e^{-cz^2} + \mathcal{R}^{\text{joint}}(\text{non-interior}), \quad (3.26)$$

where the non-interior event is counted just once when taking a union over statistics. More explicitly, apply the union bound only on the common interior event and then add its complement once. For z in a bounded interval enlarge the leading constant. This yields the claimed form for every $z \geq 1$.

3.7 Finite typical family, exact coefficient centering, and bulk/tail control §§3.7–3.8 locate where $\psi = p/\mathcal{R}$ is close to one from both sides. By (3.17) and the interior part of (3.1), this holds wherever $D_x(u)$ and $Y_x(u)$ are small on the bulk, $D_x(u)$ is small compared with $-A(u)$ on the tails, and non-interior children carry little execution mass at x . On the bulk these two functions are power series in u whose coefficients are linear statistics of x ((3.6), (3.11)); on the tails D_x is controlled through its values on a grid and at $\pm\infty$, using (3.7). So it suffices that finitely many linear statistics be typical, which (1.4) gives under the target and (3.26) under the reference law; this defines T_z below. The set T' of §3.8 also removes outputs that receive too much execution mass from non-interior children, which the interior upper bound through (2.17) does not cover, and (3.35) bounds the target and the execution mass of its complement separately.

For a parent state choose a finite family $\mathcal{S}$ of statistics consisting of the centered α and b coefficient vectors through

$$K_0 = \lceil 2 \log_2 N \rceil + C_0,$$

the coefficient vectors defining $D_x(u)$ on a grid of mesh $1/N$ between each bulk endpoint and $\pm(\log N + C)$, and the two limiting coefficient vectors at infinity. Thus $|\mathcal{S}| \leq CN \log N \leq CN^2$. All are real linear statistics.

For a Taylor coefficient vector, subtract its **arithmetic coordinate mean**. This preserves its statistic on the slice, because $\sum (x_i - \pi_i) = 0$, and changes its infinity norm by at most a factor of two. In particular, subtract the constant f from the first-order α vector before bounding it. It is not permissible to discard this common term on outputs off the slice; those outputs are covered by the execution failure event in (3.23).

Define T_z as the subset of the parent slice on which every chosen statistic is at most $z\sqrt{N}\|c\|_\infty$ in absolute value. By (1.4) and (3.26),

$$p(T_z^c) \leq 2|S|e^{-z^2}, \quad \mathcal{R}(T_z^c) \leq C|S|\sqrt{N}e^{-cz^2} + 6e^{-c\ell^2}. \quad (3.27)$$

Complements in the second inequality are in the whole output cube; thus off-slice outputs are included.

On T_z , equations (3.6) and (3.11), together with their exact centering, give for $|u| \leq r_0$

$$|D_x(u)| \leq Cz(N^{-1/2} + \ell u^2), \quad |Y_x(u)| \leq Cz(|u| + N^{-1})/\sqrt{N}. \quad (3.28)$$

The omitted α series tail is at most $CNf2^{-K_0} \leq C/N$, and the omitted b tail is at most $C2^{-K_0}$. They are absorbed by the displayed bounds for $z \geq 1$. The refined bound on the constant b coefficient in (3.11), not merely its coarse $O(1/N)$ bound, is what gives the N^{-1} inside the second parenthesis.

For real tails, (3.7) gives $|D_x(u_g)| \leq Cz\ell$ at grid points. Interpolation adds at most Cf , because the mesh is $1/N$; the comparison to each infinite endpoint adds at most Cf beyond the final grid point. Thus

$$|D_x(u)| \leq Cz\ell \quad (u \in \mathbb{R}). \quad (3.29)$$

Choose a fixed $c_2 > 0$ small enough that $1 \leq z \leq c_2\ell$ implies both the Gaussian absorption in the bulk using (3.28) and

$$A(u) + D_x(u) \leq -c'\ell^2 \quad (|u| \geq r_0). \quad (3.30)$$

The latter follows from (3.8) and (3.29); c_2 is chosen after r_0 . Equations (3.12) and (3.30) bound the entire integral outside the bulk by $Ce^{-c'\ell^2}$ after the prefactor P_0 is included. Any polynomial prefactor is absorbed by the condition $\ell^2 \geq C \log N$, which (3.32) below imposes.

3.8 The non-interior contribution and two-sided density ratios Let $h_{\text{bad}}(x)$ be the joint execution mass of output x and a non-interior child. Fix $c_{\text{bad}} > 0$ once so that (3.23) holds with $6 \exp(-c_{\text{bad}}\ell^2)$, and define

$$T' = T_z \cap \{x : h_{\text{bad}}(x) \leq e^{-c_{\text{bad}}\ell^2/2} p(x)\}.$$

From (3.23) and Markov,

$$p(T_z \setminus T') \leq 6e^{-c_{\text{bad}}\ell^2/2}. \quad (3.31)$$

In the following estimates choose a fixed common tail exponent c no larger than c_{bad} and the other previously obtained exponents. This choice weakens bounds but does not redefine the event T' .

Assume

$$1 \leq z \leq c_2\ell, \quad \ell^2 \geq C \log N, \quad N^3 e^{-cz^2} \leq z/\ell. \quad (3.32)$$

Let $\eta_z = z/\ell + z/\sqrt{N}$. In the bulk, (3.14) and (3.28) show

$$\mathbb{E}_{\rho^b} e^{\pm |D_x|} = 1 + O(\eta_z)$$

in the following precise sense: the plus expectation is at most $1 + C\eta_z$, and the minus expectation is at least $1 - C\eta_z$. For the plus bound, integrate $\ell u^2 \exp(Cz\ell u^2)$ against (3.14), using $Cz\ell \leq c\ell^2/2$. The analogous factors involving Y_x have the same or smaller error.

For every $x \in T_z$, (3.17) therefore gives a lower bound $N_0^b(1 - C\eta_z)$. For the upper bound, split $\mathcal{R}(x) = \mathcal{R}_{\text{int}}(x) + h_{\text{bad}}(x)$ on the parent slice, where h_{bad} (defined before (3.31)) collects the joint mass of x with every non-interior child in the sense of (3.23): the empty child, the size-window failures and the density failures. (Off the slice, a feasible child gives x zero mass, since its completion lands on the slice; so every child that gives x positive mass is infeasible, hence non-interior, and there $\mathcal{R} = h_{\text{bad}}$.) For an interior child, $|C| > fN/2$ exceeds the threshold of (2.17) and $j/|C| \in [\kappa/2, 1 - \kappa/2]$, so $I_C(j) \geq 1 - K\sqrt{\log|C|}/|C| \geq \frac{1}{2}$ and $1/I_C(j) \leq 1 + 2K\sqrt{\log|C|}/|C| \leq 1 + 4K\sqrt{\log(fN)}/(fN) =: 1 + \epsilon_2$, with $\epsilon_2 \leq C/\ell$. Bounding $1/I_C$ by $1 + \epsilon_2$ on interior children and adding back the non-interior nonempty children (nonnegative terms), (3.2) gives $\mathcal{R}_{\text{int}}(x)/p(x) \leq (1 + \epsilon_2)P_0 \int e^{A+D_x} \Gamma_x du$. On the bulk, $P_0 \int_{|u| \leq r_0} e^A e^{D_x} \bar{\Gamma}(1 + Y_x) du = N_0^b \mathbb{E}_{\rho^b}[e^{D_x}(1 + Y_x)] \leq N_0^b(1 + C\eta_z)$ on T_z ; off the bulk the integral is at most $Ce^{-c''\ell^2}$, by (3.12) and (3.30). So the **interior** contribution is at most $(1 + \epsilon_2)(N_0^b(1 + C\eta_z) + Ce^{-c''\ell^2})$; on T' add $h_{\text{bad}}/p \leq e^{-c_{\text{bad}}\ell^2/2}$, and off T' (3.35) bounds both masses. The errors ϵ_1 , the Gaussian tail, and the probabilities in (3.27) are absorbed by (3.32). In particular $\epsilon_1 \leq C/\ell \leq Cz/\ell$.

We already have $N_0^b \leq C$ from (3.14). Moreover, integrate the all-point lower estimate on T_z and use $\sum_x \mathcal{R}(x) \leq 1$. By (3.27),(3.32),

$$N_0^b \leq \frac{1}{(1 - C\eta_z)p(T_z)} \leq 1 + C\eta_z. \quad (3.33)$$

Together with (3.13), this places the baseline near one. On T' these give $N_0^b(1 - C\eta_z) \leq \mathcal{R}(x)/p(x) \leq (1 + \epsilon_2)(N_0^b(1 + C\eta_z) + Ce^{-c''\ell^2}) + e^{-c_{\text{bad}}\ell^2/2}$. Since $N_0^b \geq \frac{1}{2}$ and $\epsilon_2, e^{-c\ell^2} \leq C/\ell \leq C\eta_z$ (as $z \geq 1$), dividing by N_0^b gives $1 - C\eta_z \leq \mathcal{R}/(pN_0^b) \leq 1 + C'\eta_z$. Choose c_2 so that $C'\eta_z \leq \frac{1}{2}$; then $\log(1 + a) \leq a$ and $\log(1 - a) \geq -2a$ on $[0, \frac{1}{2}]$ give the first bound below. By (3.13) and (3.33), $|\log N_0^b| \leq 2C\eta_z$ (using $1/\ell \leq \eta_z$), so $|\log \psi| \leq C''\eta_z$, and $e^{-x} \geq 1 - x$ and $e^x \leq 1 + 2x$ on $[0, 1]$ give the second, after renaming the constant:

$$\left| \log \frac{\mathcal{R}(x)}{p(x)} - \log N_0^b \right| \leq C\eta_z, \quad 1 - C\eta_z \leq \psi(x) \leq 1 + C\eta_z. \quad (3.34)$$

Choose c_2 smaller if necessary so that the latter lower bound is positive.

Finally, Markov's inequality under p bounds only target masses; for the execution mass, on $T_z \setminus T'$ the already bounded interior density is at most a fixed constant times p ; the bad component has total mass bounded by (3.23). Thus

$$\begin{aligned} p(T'^c) &\leq 2|\mathcal{S}|e^{-z^2} + Ce^{-c\ell^2/2}, \\ \mathcal{R}(T'^c) &\leq C|\mathcal{S}|\sqrt{N}e^{-cz^2} + Ce^{-c\ell^2/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.35)$$

These are the distinct target-law and execution-law bounds needed by composition.

4. The kept-set ladder, signed composition, and a legal sampler

4.1 Integer sizes and their two-sided growth The sizes m_j below fix the nominal free counts M_t of the levels (4.4); they depend only on (n, A) and are chosen before any value is drawn. They

make the nominal one-step scale $L_t = f_t \sqrt{M_t}$ of the level whose kept set has nominal size m_d at least $A2^{3d/4}/(2\sqrt{2})$ (4.5), so it grows geometrically in d , faster than the typicality level z_t of (4.22), because $\log M_t \leq C(2^d + \log A)$ (4.6). Hence the per-level errors of §4.5 are summable ((4.23), (4.27), (4.28)), and there are $R \leq \log_2 \log n + 3$ levels with a kept set (4.6), followed by the terminal level $R + 1$.

Assume first $A \geq 1$ and set

$$m_0 = \lceil 4A^2 \rceil, \quad m_{j+1} = \left\lceil \frac{m_j^2}{A^2 2^{3j/2}} \right\rceil. \quad (4.1)$$

m_0 is a schedule size; the choice of A_0 in §4.6 makes it exceed every analytic threshold used below.

Put $y_j = \log_2(m_j/A^2)$. Because the pre-ceiling quantity is at least one,

$$2y_j - \frac{3}{2}j \leq y_{j+1} \leq 2y_j - \frac{3}{2}j + 1, \quad 2 \leq y_0 \leq \log_2 5.$$

Solving the lower affine recursion and bounding the upper one gives

$$\frac{1}{2}2^j + \frac{3}{2}j + \frac{3}{2} \leq y_j \leq C2^j. \quad (4.2)$$

In particular,

$$m_{j+1} \geq 4m_j, \quad m_j \geq 4A^2 4^j, \quad \log m_j \leq C(2^j + \log A). \quad (4.3)$$

If $n < 4m_0$, execute the n singletons in label order and stop this analysis: that schedule is exact and its cap is $n < 16A^2 + 4$.

Otherwise define

$$R = \max\{r \geq 1 : 4m_{r-1} \leq n\}, \quad M_1 = n, \quad M_t = m_{R+1-t} \quad (2 \leq t \leq R+1), \quad f_t = M_{t+1}/M_t. \quad (4.4)$$

The maximum exists because of the factor-four growth. All $f_t \leq 1/4$. With $d = R - t$, ceiling bounds give

$$L_t = f_t \sqrt{M_t} \geq \frac{A2^{3d/4}}{2\sqrt{2}} \quad (1 \leq t \leq R), \quad (4.5)$$

with the stronger denominator $\sqrt{2}$ when $t \geq 2$. At the top, use $n < 4m_R$ before applying the ceiling bound. Also

$$\log M_t \leq C(2^d + \log A), \quad R \leq \log_2 \log n + 3. \quad (4.6)$$

For the last bound, $n \geq 4m_{R-1}$ and (4.2) imply $\log n \geq (\log 2)2^{R-2}$, and $2 - \log_2(\log 2) < 3$.

A useful stronger comparison for remainders is, with $m_d = M_{t+1}$,

$$M_t \leq 8m_d^2 \quad (A \geq 1). \quad (4.7)$$

It includes the truncated top level and avoids trying to absorb a huge M_t prefactor using only a coarse geometric lower bound on m_d .

4.2 A finite law on full labelled schedules, sampled before any bits Draw all nR independent Bernoulli variables $\zeta_{t,i}$ with parameters f_t in advance, including variables never subsequently used. Put

$$F_1 = [n], \quad F_{t+1} = \{i \in F_t : \zeta_{t,i} = 1\}, \quad B_t = F_t \setminus F_{t+1}.$$

Delete empty B_t . At the end, append the singletons of F_{R+1} in label order when $|F_{R+1}| \leq 2m_0$; otherwise append the one block F_{R+1} . If the final set is empty, append nothing.

Every realization is an ordered partition of $[n]$. Its randomness is a pushforward of a finite Boolean product space, hence gives a finite schedule distribution. It depends only on (n, A) . The terminal size branch is determined by these predrawn coins, not generated values. Empty-block deletion is operationally equivalent to doing nothing at those levels.

Now execute each nonempty block using fresh independent bits at the exact conditional marginals frozen at its start; after an infeasible prefix, execute every remaining scheduled bit fairly. No early stopping, repair, resampling, or value-dependent schedule choice occurs. The reference law's exact completion in §3 is an analysis device, not an extra operation in this sampler. Only the terminal singleton branch samples jointly exactly, by the ordinary sequential chain rule.

For every realization,

$$\tau = |U| \leq R + 2m_0 \leq \log_2 \log n + 8A^2 + 5. \quad (4.8)$$

In the fallback, the appended block costs one, which is also at most $2m_0$. Every failed run is fully charged. Sampling a schedule needs only the $R + 1 \leq \log_2 \log n + 4$ sizes from (4.1) and at most nR coins with rational biases f_t ; the support, of at most $(R + 1)^n$ schedules, is never listed. The guarantee needs $A \geq A_0$, and A_0 and C^* are existence-only, so the parameter attaining a given ε is not explicit; the cost of computing exact conditional marginals is the oracle's and is not analysed.

4.3 Suffix kernels and good states: actual sizes versus nominal sizes The retention probabilities f_t are fixed by the nominal sizes before any value is drawn, while the actual free count N and quota J at level t are random. The one-step results of §3 need an interior parent, $f \leq 1/4$, and N and $\ell_t = f_t \sqrt{N}$ above fixed thresholds, so the recursion runs over good states (4.10): their actual size is within a factor $1 \pm \delta_t$ of nominal, and their density stays at least $\kappa_0/2$ from either endpoint (4.11). The quantity $\mathcal{K}_t$ of (4.13) is the largest $D(p_{F,J} \| Q_t)$, target first, over good states (F, J) at level t ; §§4.4–4.7 bound it backward from $\mathcal{K}_{R+1} = 0$, and the start state is good.

For an arbitrary residual state at level t , define Q_t by the remaining independent retention levels and that same terminal rule, with the original nominal parameters. Two exact facts about these kernels are used. For $n \geq 4m_0$, Q_1 is the law of the sampler of §4.2; and for every level $t \leq R$, Q_t obeys the first-block recursion

$$Q_t(x \mid h) = \sum_{C \subseteq F} \nu_t(C) \sum_{S \subseteq F \setminus C} P_h(F \setminus C, S) Q_{t+1}(x \mid (F \setminus C, S), h),$$

where F is the residual set of the state h , ν_t retains each coordinate of F independently with probability f_t , and $P_h(B, S)$ is the probability that executing the block B at the conditional marginals frozen at h returns the ones S (fair bits after an infeasible prefix). The recursion reflects that past bit draws depend only on past blocks and values, not on unrevealed future coins; no independence after conditioning on the entire predrawn schedule is claimed.

Set

$$\delta_t = \sum_{s < t} M_{s+1}^{-1/3}, \quad \Delta_t = \frac{\kappa_0}{16} 2^{-(R-t)/4}, \quad \kappa^{(t)} = \kappa_0 - \sum_{s < t} \Delta_s. \quad (4.9)$$

A state is good at level t when

$$N/M_t \in [1 - \delta_t, 1 + \delta_t], \quad J/N \in [\kappa^{(t)}, 1 - \kappa^{(t)}]. \quad (4.10)$$

The geometric bounds in (4.3) imply

$$\delta_t \leq C A^{-2/3} \leq 1/4$$

after fixing A_0 . Also

$$\sum_{s=1}^R \Delta_s \leq \frac{\kappa_0}{16(1 - 2^{-1/4})} < \kappa_0/2. \quad (4.11)$$

Thus every good state has density at least $\kappa_0/2$ away from either endpoint. At a good state,

$$\sqrt{3/4} L_t \leq \ell_t = f_t \sqrt{N} \leq \sqrt{5/4} L_t. \quad (4.12)$$

All one-step results may therefore be applied with a fixed interiority lower bound and these explicit scale comparisons. At the last level a good state has $N \leq 5m_0/4 < 2m_0$, so the suffix sampler is exact.

Define

$$\mathcal{K}_t = \sup_{\text{good states at } t} D(p_{F,J} \| Q_t), \quad \mathcal{K}_{R+1} = 0. \quad (4.13)$$

This supremum is finite before any recursion is solved. Along a prescribed feasible target output, every non-deterministic bit in every legal suffix schedule has its matching value with probability at least $1/(\Lambda N)$, by (1.1); deterministic boundary bits match with probability one. Thus $Q_t(x) \geq (\Lambda N)^{-N}$ on the target slice, and the KL is at most $N \log(\Lambda N)$. If a class of good states is empty, take its nonnegative supremum as zero; none of the argument relies on existence of an unattainable state.

4.4 Conditional probability of leaving the good set At a good parent, $|C|$ is binomial with mean $f_t N$, lying in $[(1 - \delta_t)M_{t+1}, (1 + \delta_t)M_{t+1}]$. A size failure at the next level entails a deviation at least $M_{t+1}^{2/3}$ from this mean. Apply (1.7); for large enough A_0 the relative deviation is at most one and the exponent is at least $M_{t+1}^{1/3}/6$.

On the size-good event, $|C| \geq c f_t N$. Apply the two centered bounds from (3.22), now at threshold a constant times $\Delta_t f_t N$. The independent-selection statistic and, conditional on C , the independent draw statistic each satisfy (1.6). Since exiting the density interval requires a drift greater than Δ_t ,

$$\mathcal{R}^{\text{joint}}(G^c) \leq 2e^{-M_{t+1}^{1/3}/6} + 4e^{-c\Delta_t^2 \ell_t^2}, \quad (4.14)$$

where G is the event that the child state (C, j) , with $j = J - |x_B|$, is good at level $t + 1$. By (4.10) this requires both the *size condition* $|C|/M_{t+1} \in [1 - \delta_{t+1}, 1 + \delta_{t+1}]$ and the *density condition* $j/|C| \in [\kappa^{(t+1)}, 1 - \kappa^{(t+1)}]$. So G^c is the union of a size failure, bounded by the first term of (4.14), and a density failure on the size-good event, bounded by the second. An infeasible residual quota fails the density condition. This bound concerns the **pre-completion state** (C, x_B) . It consequently holds for Q_t as well as the reference law, because their first-block operations agree.

4.5 Jensen composition with signed continuation log ratios This subsection turns the one-step comparison of §3 into the recursion (4.20) for the good-state suprema $\mathcal{K}_t$ of (4.13), which §4.7 solves. Because Q_t and $\mathcal{R}$ make the same first step (§4.3), Jensen's inequality (4.15) bounds $D(p\|Q_t)$ by $D(p\|\mathcal{R})$, which (3.18) controls, plus the mean of ψW under the joint reference law of (C, x_B, x_C) ($\mathcal{R}^{\text{joint}}$ of §3.1), where W compares the exact completion of the kept set with the sampler's continuation. Given (C, x_B) at a good child, W has conditional mean equal to that child's divergence, at most $\mathcal{K}_{t+1}$; but W can be negative pointwise and ψ varies with x_C , so an upper bound $\psi \leq 1 + \eta_t$ alone bounds ψW only by $(1 + \eta_t)W^+$ (here $1 - \eta_t \leq \psi \leq 1 + \eta_t$ on T' , by (3.34) and (4.16)), whose mean can exceed $\mathcal{K}_{t+1}$ by $\sqrt{\mathcal{K}_{t+1}/2}$ (1.10); (4.17) therefore uses both sides of (3.34) on T' , so that this excess enters (4.20) only with the small factor $2\eta_t$. Off T' and off the good event G of (4.14), the remaining terms, $\sqrt{\mathcal{R}(T'^c)}$ in (4.18) and the two terms of (4.19), are controlled by the separate execution-law and target-law masses (3.35) of T'^c , the bound (4.14) on $\mathcal{R}^{\text{joint}}(G^c)$, the second moment (3.21) and the atom bound of §4.3.

For a feasible child define

$$W = \log \frac{p_{C,j}(x_C)}{Q_{t+1}(x_C \mid C, j)}.$$

For an infeasible child, both conditional completions are fair; set $W = 0$ there. This makes the joint likelihood identity unambiguous, though the off-slice terms have zero weight under the parent target in any event.

Let $\pi_{\mathcal{R}^{\text{joint}}}(C \mid x)$ denote the reference law's posterior over kept sets, and let $\psi = p/\mathcal{R}$. At each parent-slice point,

$$\frac{Q_t(x)}{\mathcal{R}(x)} = \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\mathcal{R}^{\text{joint}}}(\cdot \mid x)} e^{-W}.$$

Logarithmic Jensen, integrated under p , gives

$$D(p\|Q_t) \leq D(p\|\mathcal{R}) + \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{R}^{\text{joint}}}[\psi W]. \quad (4.15)$$

Also $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{R}}\psi = \sum_x p(x) = 1$, since $\psi = 0$ off the slice and, on it, $\mathcal{R}(x) \geq f^N p(x) > 0$ (the term $C = F$ of §3.1). On a feasible child, conditional on (C, x_B) , the reference law's completion is exactly $p_{C,j}$, so (1.9) applies to W .

Choose T' from §3.8 with $z = z_t$, the typicality level fixed in (4.22) below, and let

$$\eta_t = Cz_t/L_t < 1/2, \quad (4.16)$$

enlarging the fixed coefficient to cover (4.12) and $z/\sqrt{N} \leq z/(4\ell)$. On T' , $1 - \eta_t \leq \psi \leq 1 + \eta_t$, hence pointwise for either sign of W ,

$$\psi W \leq (1 - \eta_t)W + 2\eta_t W^+. \quad (4.17)$$

Now retain the event G until taking the appropriate conditional expectations. Equations (1.9),(1.10),(4.13) give

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{R}^{\text{joint}}}[W \mathbf{1}_{G \cap T'}] &\leq \mathcal{K}_{t+1} + \sqrt{\mathcal{R}(T'^c)}, \\ \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{R}^{\text{joint}}}[W^+ \mathbf{1}_G] &\leq \mathcal{K}_{t+1} + \sqrt{\mathcal{K}_{t+1}/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

For the first inequality, subtracting $G \cap T'^c$ can increase the expectation only by its negative part; apply Cauchy–Schwarz and $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{R}^{\text{joint}}}[(W^-)^2 \mathbf{1}_G] \leq 1$. This is the signed step that would be lost by simply assuming $W \geq 0$.

Let $B_N = N \log(\Lambda N)$. The feasible-output atom bound in §4.3 gives $W^+ \leq B_N$. On the discarded events, upper-bound by nonnegative quantities, so overlapping events cause no sign error:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{R}^{\text{joint}}}[\psi W \mathbf{1}_{G \cap T'^c}] &\leq B_N p(T'^c), \\ \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{R}^{\text{joint}}}[\psi W \mathbf{1}_{G^c}] &\leq B_N \sqrt{C_3 \mathcal{R}^{\text{joint}}(G^c)}.\end{aligned}\tag{4.19}$$

Combining (3.18), (4.15)–(4.19), and taking the supremum over good parents yields

$$\mathcal{K}_t \leq C/L_t + (1 + \eta_t)\mathcal{K}_{t+1} + 2\eta_t \sqrt{\mathcal{K}_{t+1}/2} + \xi_t,\tag{4.20}$$

where a valid nonnegative remainder is

$$\xi_t = \sqrt{\mathcal{R}(T'^c)} + B_N \{p(T'^c) + \sqrt{C_3 \mathcal{R}^{\text{joint}}(G^c)}\},\tag{4.21}$$

with the right sides replaced by their uniform good-state bounds. Because $1 - \eta_t \leq 1$, no omitted multiplicative constant is required in front of its first term. Sub-probability continuation laws are handled by the cemetery extension of §1.4, not by changing W to a conditional-on-survival ratio.

4.6 One simultaneous choice of parameters and uniform remainder bounds Choose, with a sufficiently large fixed coefficient D ,

$$z_t^2 = D(\log M_t + \log A + d), \quad d = R - t.\tag{4.22}$$

The coefficient D depends only on the previously fixed one-step tail constants. Since $M_t \geq m_d \geq 4A^2 4^d$ by (4.3) (for $t = 1$, $M_1 = n \geq 4m_{R-1}$), $\log A + d \leq \log M_t$, so $z_t \leq \sqrt{2D \log M_t}$ and $\eta_t = Cz_t/L_t = O(\sqrt{\log M_t}/L_t)$, the form quoted in the main text's Section 4.2. Equations (4.5),(4.6),(4.12) imply, uniformly over good states,

$$\frac{z_t}{\ell_t} \leq \frac{C}{A} \left(2^{-d/4} + \sqrt{\log A} 2^{-3d/4} \right).\tag{4.23}$$

Its supremum tends to zero as A tends to infinity. Also

$$\frac{\ell_t^2}{\log N} \geq c \frac{A^2}{1 + \log A} \longrightarrow \infty$$

uniformly in d . Choose D sufficiently large that the Gaussian-family tails in (3.35), including their at-most- $CN^{5/2}$ prefactor, are bounded, for example, by

$$C(1 + N)^{-10} A^{-12} 2^{-12d}.\tag{4.24}$$

For instance, let c be the common tail exponent of (3.35) and take $cD \geq 13$. By (4.22), $e^{-cz_t^2} = (M_t A e^d)^{-cD}$, and on a good state N is comparable with M_t , so

$$N^{5/2} e^{-cz_t^2} \leq C N^{5/2-cD} A^{-cD} e^{-cDd} \leq C(1 + N)^{-10} A^{-12} 2^{-12d},$$

because $cD - 5/2 \geq 21/2$, $A \geq 1$ and $e^{-cD} \leq e^{-13} < 2^{-12}$; the comparability constants, raised to the power cD , are absorbed into C . The same bound gives the last condition in (3.32): since

$\ell_t \leq \sqrt{N}/4$ and $z_t \geq 1$, it suffices that $N^3 e^{-cz_t^2} \leq 4/\sqrt{N}$, and $N^3 e^{-cz_t^2} \leq C N^{3-cD} A^{-cD} \leq C N^{-10} A^{-13}$, which is at most $4/\sqrt{N}$ once A_0 is large.

It remains to account for non-Gaussian tails multiplied by B_N ; their prefactors cannot just be ignored.

Size deviations. Let $m = M_{t+1} = m_d$. By (4.7) and good-state comparability, $N \leq 10m^2$. Therefore

$$B_N e^{-cm^{1/3}} \leq C m^2 (1 + \log m) e^{-cm^{1/3}} \leq C e^{-c'm^{1/3}} \quad (4.25)$$

above one fixed threshold. The same absorption works with the halved exponent from the square root in (4.21). Since $m_d \geq 4A^2 4^d$, this is bounded by $C \exp(-cA^{2/3} 2^{2d/3})$. Increasing A_0 gives the bound $CA^{-2} 2^{-d}$ that (4.27) uses. One direct verification uses $2^{2d/3} \geq 1 + (2 \log 2/3)d$ to separate the A and d decay.

Density deviations. Equations (4.5),(4.9),(4.12) give

$$\Delta_t^2 \ell_t^2 \geq cA^2 2^d. \quad (4.26)$$

On the other hand, (4.6) bounds B_N by $\exp(C(2^d + \log A))$. Choose A_0 so that the negative $A^2 2^d$ coefficient dominates this positive coefficient, even after the square root in (4.21). The result is again at most $CA^{-2} 2^{-d}$. The exceptional-set terms $\exp(-c\ell_t^2)$ have still faster decay and are handled in exactly this comparison, replacing 2^d by $2^{3d/2}$ in the negative exponent.

Combining (4.24)–(4.26), taking square roots where (4.21) requires them, proves

$$\boxed{\xi_t \leq CA^{-2} 2^{-d}.} \quad (4.27)$$

All constants were chosen before n , the realized array, or the level was specified.

4.7 Summation and a fully constant-tracked scalar recursion By (4.5),(4.23),(4.27),

$$\sum_t L_t^{-1} \leq C/A, \quad \sum_t \eta_t \leq C\sqrt{\log A}/A, \quad \sum_t \xi_t \leq C/A^2. \quad (4.28)$$

To keep all fixed coefficients explicit, define

$$E = \sum_t (C/L_t + \xi_t), \quad B = \sqrt{2} \sum_t \eta_t, \quad P = \prod_t (1 + \eta_t), \quad \mathcal{K}_* = \max_t \mathcal{K}_t.$$

Increase A_0 so that $P \leq \exp(\sum \eta_t) \leq 2$. Unroll (4.20), using $\mathcal{K}_{R+1} = 0$ and $\sqrt{\mathcal{K}_{t+1}} \leq \sqrt{\mathcal{K}_*}$. Then

$$\mathcal{K}_* \leq P(E + B\sqrt{\mathcal{K}_*}) \leq 2E + 2B\sqrt{\mathcal{K}_*}.$$

Young's inequality $2Bx \leq x^2/2 + 2B^2$ yields

$$\mathcal{K}_* \leq 4E + 4B^2 \leq C/A + C \log A/A^2 \leq C^*/A. \quad (4.29)$$

The start state is good, so

$$\boxed{D(p_w \| Q_{U(A)}) \leq \mathcal{K}_1 \leq C^*/A.} \quad (4.30)$$

This establishes item 3 of Theorem A, with this C^* , uniformly for all $A \geq A_0$, all admissible dimensions, quotas, and bounded-ratio arrays. The exact singleton branch already covers all small dimensions.

4.8 Survival and within-slice shape If a run never exits the good-state sets, its final suffix is exact, so its output lies on the target slice. The event of any failure is therefore contained in the union of the first exits. The conditional first-exit bounds are (4.14), under the actual sampler by the pre-completion-state equality.

In (4.14) the scale $\ell_t = f_t \sqrt{N}$ belongs to the actual parent state. Every good state at level t has $\ell_t \geq \sqrt{3/4} L_t$, by (4.12). So each first-exit probability at a good parent is at most $2e^{-M_{t+1}^{1/3}/6} + 4e^{-(3c/4)\Delta_t^2 L_t^2}$, a bound that is uniform over good parents and depends on nothing but the level. This is the supremum over good states. Hence

$$1 - Q(S_k) \leq \sum_{t=1}^R \left(2e^{-M_{t+1}^{1/3}/6} + 4e^{-(3c/4)\Delta_t^2 L_t^2} \right) \leq Ce^{-cA^2/3}. \quad (4.31)$$

The sum is uniformly bounded using (4.3),(4.26); the smallest size is $m_0 = \lceil 4A^2 \rceil$. Increase A_0 so that the right side is at most one half. Then $-\log(1 - u) \leq 2u$ gives

$$\boxed{-\log Q(S_k) \leq Ce^{-cA^2/3}}. \quad (4.32)$$

For a target supported on the slice the exact decomposition is

$$D(p\|Q) = D(p\|Q(\cdot \mid S_k)) - \log Q(S_k). \quad (4.33)$$

Thus the shape term is $F + \log Q(S_k) \leq F$. (4.30) bounds the shape term as well as survival.

4.9 Fixed error, small n , and the diagonal scheduled-mean coefficient For any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, set $A = \max(A_0, C^*/\varepsilon)$. Equations (4.8),(4.30) and the exact branch give

$$F \leq \varepsilon, \quad \text{cap} \leq \log_2 \log n + O_{\Lambda, \kappa_0}(1 + \varepsilon^{-2}). \quad (4.34)$$

Every admissible dimension has $n \geq 2$: the quota condition at $n = 1$ admits no integer quota. Consequently the lower bound $\log_2 \log n \geq \log_2 \log 2$ lets the exact small- n branch be included in the same additive-constant expression. No expression $\log \log 1$ is used for an actual admissible instance.

For the diagonal claim, take, for sufficiently large n ,

$$A_n = \max(A_0, (\log \log n)^{1/4}), \quad \varepsilon_n = C^*/A_n \rightarrow 0.$$

The all- A uniform statement (4.30) applies immediately. Eventually $n \geq 4\lceil 4A_n^2 \rceil$ and $\varepsilon_n < \varepsilon$. Put

$$\alpha_n = 1 - \beta = e^{-\varepsilon + \varepsilon_n} \in (0, 1), \quad \mu'_n = \alpha_n U(A_n) + (1 - \alpha_n) \{\text{one full block}\}.$$

Since its output law is at least $\alpha_n Q_{U(A_n)}$ pointwise,

$$F(\mu'_n) \leq -\log \alpha_n + \varepsilon_n = \varepsilon. \quad (4.35)$$

Every component's full schedule is charged, so the mean is affine and

$$C(\mu'_n) \leq \alpha_n (\log_2 \log n + 8A_n^2 + 5) + (1 - \alpha_n) = (e^{-\varepsilon} + o(1)) \log_2 \log n. \quad (4.36)$$

The hard cap is $\log_2 \log n + O(\sqrt{\log \log n})$.

For precision, the upper bound (4.36) alone proves the coefficient as an achievable upper coefficient. The construction also gives the corresponding asymptotic equality for its own mean, without importing a lower-bound theorem. Along this diagonal, (4.2),(4.4) imply $R = \log_2 \log n + O(1)$, since $\log A_n = o(\log n)$. (The upper direction is (4.6). For the lower one, R is maximal, so $4m_R > n$; from (4.1), $y_{j+1} \leq 2y_j + 1$ and $y_0 \leq \log_2 5$, so $y_R \leq (1 + \log_2 5)2^R$. Hence $\log n < \log 4 + 2 \log A + (\log 10) 2^R$, and $2^R > (\log n - \log 4 - 2 \log A) / \log 10$, which gives $R \geq \log_2 \log n - O(1)$ once $\log A = o(\log n)$. When $n \geq 4A^4$, $2 \log A \leq (\log n - \log 4)/2$, so $R > \log_2(\log n - \log 4) - \log_2(2 \log 10)$, which exceeds $\log_2 \log n - 3$ for $n > 26$; for smaller n , $R \geq 1 > \log_2 \log n - 3$ directly.) Each coordinate lies in the large block B_t with probability $(M_t - M_{t+1})/n$, because the retention products telescope, so $\mathbb{E}|B_t| = M_t - M_{t+1}$ and $\Pr(B_t = \emptyset) = (1 - (M_t - M_{t+1})/n)^n$. Therefore

$$\Pr(B_t = \emptyset) \leq e^{-(M_t - M_{t+1})} \leq e^{-3M_{t+1}},$$

and the sum of these empty-block probabilities is bounded by $Ce^{-cA_n^2}$ using (4.3). The expected number of nonempty large blocks is $R - O(e^{-cA_n^2})$, while the terminal contribution is between zero and $2m_0 = O(A_n^2)$. Thus

$$\mathbb{E}\tau_{U(A_n)} = \log_2 \log n + o(\log \log n), \quad \mathbb{E}\tau_{\mu'_n} = (e^{-\varepsilon} + o(1)) \log_2 \log n. \quad (4.37)$$

This equality concerns the constructed family. The matching lower bound is Appendix H, §10(c): under the hypotheses of §0 and for $n \geq \kappa_0^{-2}$, every causal policy with fresh exact-marginal draws and output KL at most ε has $\mathbb{E}\tau \geq e^{-\varepsilon} \log_2 \log n - e^{-\varepsilon} - c(K_\Lambda)$, and a predrawn mixture executes $\tau = |U|$ rounds. So $e^{-\varepsilon}$ is the least leading coefficient both for the scheduled mean of predrawn mixtures and for the expected executed rounds of causal policies. The cap (4.8) is a uniform bound on component lengths, not a common length or a fixed block profile.

5. Constants and a noncircular choice order

Object	Depends on	Must not depend on	How fixed
Logistic interiority lower bound	Λ, κ_0	n, w, A, t	Use parent density $\geq \kappa_0/2$ and child density half that.
K_a in (2.2)	the probability lower bound a	dimension, lattice point, Bernoulli array	Fourier estimates (2.3)–(2.5).
$m_{\text{an}}, N_{\text{an}}$	Λ, κ_0	dimension, array, level	Window interiority, central atoms, marginal approximation.
Fixed power-series radius R_0 and coefficient constants	Λ, κ_0	f, N , array	Cauchy estimates on fixed complex discs where the logarithm arguments and the denominators have real parts bounded below.
Bulk radius r_0	previously fixed analytic and Gaussian constants	A, n, t	Choose after derivative constants, so the fourth-power moment term is absorbed.
ℓ_0, N_0, C_3	preceding constants	all instance parameters	Normalization lower bound, interior-child threshold, inverse moment.
c_2 and a common smaller tail exponent c	preceding constants	A, n, t	Bulk quadratic absorption, real tails, positive ratio lower endpoint.
Typicality coefficient D	common tail exponents and polynomial prefactors	A, n, t	Make (4.24) stronger than all needed square-root and atom-cost bounds.
A_0	all preceding constants, Λ, κ_0	dimension, realized array, level	Simultaneous conditions listed below.
C^*	fixed recursion constants	A, n, w, k	(4.28)–(4.30).

A single sufficiently large finite A_0 satisfies all of the following: $A_0 \geq 1$; smallest good parent and interior kept-child sizes exceed the analytic thresholds; smallest actual ℓ exceeds ℓ_0 ; $\delta_t \leq 1/4$; the uniform ratios in (4.23) are below c_2 and give $\eta_t < 1/2$; (3.32) holds; the polynomial/exponential absorptions in (4.25), (4.26) hold; $\sum \eta_t \leq \log 2$; and the survival bound is at most one half. Each requirement either holds above a fixed threshold or follows from a displayed scalar function tending to zero/infinity as A increases. The bounds were uniform in $d \geq 0$; taking their finite maximum is therefore independent of n .

The constants are existence-only: no numerical value of A_0 or finite-size constant is derived.

6. Dependency graph

- weighted-slice algebra + elementary coefficient log-concavity
 - marginal floors and feasible-output atoms
 - conditioning closure + (1.2) $\longrightarrow$ Lemma NCD (1.3a) $\longrightarrow$ Lemma T1
 - covariance Laplacian at every external tilt $\longrightarrow$ Lemma T1 (route MG)
- logistic cumulants + finite Fourier inversion + Hoeffding

- uniform lattice estimate (2.2)
 - * central atom + exact-marginal approximation
 - * explicit mean/Jacobian expansion $\longrightarrow I_C(U) = 1 + O(\sqrt{\log m}/m)$
- exact identities (3.1)–(3.2) + uniform analytic estimates
 - size-biased tilted subset concentration
 - bulk normalization + exact target centering $\longrightarrow$ one-step KL
 - Lemma T1 + Gaussian domination $\longrightarrow$ inverse-ratio moment
 - kept-set cancellation + central child atom
 - * target/execution typicality + exceptional-component control
 - two-sided ratio interval
- predrawn integer ladder + actual/nominal comparisons + drift bounds
 - signed Jensen composition + sub-probability KL inequalities
 - * simultaneous constants + summable recursion $\longrightarrow$ Theorem A
- same predrawn construction $\longrightarrow$ cap + fully charged cost
- first-exit argument $\longrightarrow$ survival; exact KL decomposition $\longrightarrow$ shape
- uniform all- A theorem + pointwise mixture bound $\longrightarrow A'$ and A''

Appendix J. Two-group reductions behind the finite exhibits

This appendix proves the reductions behind the two-group finite computations reported in Appendix K and summarized in Appendix O. Lemma TGR1 shows that a deterministic policy’s output KL equals its path cost and computes the least such cost by a count-state recursion; Lemmas TGR2 and TGR3 reduce the output KL of any causal randomized policy to a convex function of its terminal count vector, minimized over the convex hull of the vectors of count policies; Lemma TGR4 gives dual lower certificates; TGR5 links that hull to the survival optimum of Appendix G; Lemma TGR6 treats predrawn schedules; and Lemma TGR7 brackets the optimal law’s leakage–shape split. After the setting and some additional definitions, a list maps each reported quantity to the lemmas behind it; the statements TGR0–TGR7 follow, then their proofs and a description of the computations.

Setting. We use the Setting, Interface and Policies of Appendix G unchanged: the target p_λ , with $0 < k < n$ and $\lambda > 0$; prefixes, count states $s = (m_A, m_B, j)$, $M = m_A + m_B$, and legality; the exact-marginal interface, with empty batches allowed and arbitrary values at an illegal prefix; causal randomized policies, their seed ω and the σ -fields $\mathcal{F}_t$; the every-path hard cap r and the class RAND_r ; full labelled schedules U and predrawn mixtures μ ; the output laws Q_π , q_U , Q_μ ; the count kernel; the recursion G_r^λ ; and root $= (n_A, n_B, k)$.

Additional definitions. Throughout, $r \geq 1$: at $r = 0$ no policy commits the $n \geq 1$ coordinates, so the classes below are empty.

- $\text{DET}_r \subset \text{RAND}_r$: the members of RAND_r that draw no seed, so that β_{t+1} is a function of the values committed through round t alone (deterministic value-adaptive policies).

- $\text{NA}_r \subset \text{RAND}_r$: predrawn mixtures $\mu = \sum_i w_i \delta_{U_i}$ of full labelled schedules with at most r blocks. A schedule with at most r nonempty blocks commits every coordinate within r rounds.
- *No latent peeking.* The batch depends on ω and the committed values only. A controller that could see an uncommitted coordinate's auxiliary variable (such as the uniform ζ_i of the interface in Appendix G) is outside the class, and the count reduction fails for it. Take $n_A = n_B = k = 1$ and $\lambda = 1$, so that each exact marginal is $\frac{1}{2}$, and suppose the controller commits A when $\zeta_A \leq \frac{1}{2}$ (A's value would be 1) and B otherwise. Then the committed value is 1 with probability $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{2} = \frac{3}{4}$, not $\frac{1}{2}$.
- *Weight classes.* $\mathcal{W} = \{w : \max(0, k - n_B) \leq w \leq \min(k, n_A)\}$ and $N_w = \binom{n_A}{w} \binom{n_B}{k-w}$. Then $P_w = p_\lambda(|x_A| = w) = N_w \lambda^w / \sum_{v \in \mathcal{W}} N_v \lambda^v$, and every $P_w > 0$.
- *Terminal vector.* For a sub-probability Q on $\{0, 1\}^n$, let $q_w(Q) = Q(x \in S_k, |x_A| = w)$ and $q(Q) = (q_w)_{w \in \mathcal{W}}$, so that $s(q) = \sum_w q_w = Q(S_k)$. Write $q(\pi) = q(Q_\pi)$, $q(U) = q(q_U)$ and $q(\mu) = q(Q_\mu)$. With an argument, $q(\cdot)$ is a terminal vector; q_U is still the output law of U .
- $\Phi(q) = \sum_{w \in \mathcal{W}} P_w \ln(P_w/q_w) \in (-\infty, +\infty]$ for $q \in [0, \infty)^\mathcal{W}$, which is $+\infty$ if some $q_w = 0$. Since $\Phi(q) = -\ln s(q) + \text{KL}(P \| q/s(q))$ when $s(q) > 0$, and $\Phi(q) = +\infty = -\ln s(q)$ when $s(q) = 0$, $\Phi(q) \geq -\ln s(q) \geq 0$ whenever $s(q) \leq 1$, in particular on sub-probability vectors; TGR4(a) also evaluates Φ at arbitrary positive vectors, where it can be negative.
- *The three frontier values.* They are

$$F_r^* = \inf_{\pi \in \text{RAND}_r} \text{KL}(p_\lambda \| Q_\pi), \quad D_r = \inf_{\pi \in \text{DET}_r} \text{KL}(p_\lambda \| Q_\pi),$$

$$F_r^{\text{NA}} = \inf_{\mu \in \text{NA}_r} \text{KL}(p_\lambda \| Q_\mu).$$

Since $\text{DET}_r, \text{NA}_r \subset \text{RAND}_r$, we have $F_r^* \leq \min(D_r, F_r^{\text{NA}})$.

- *Path cost (the path-certificate criterion).* For $\pi \in \text{DET}_r$, $H(\pi) = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim p_\lambda} \sum_t \text{TC}_t(x)$. Here $\text{TC}_t(x)$ is the total correlation of the values of β_t under the target, given the prefix before round t : the divergence of their conditional joint law from the product of their exact marginals. For $\pi \in \text{RAND}_r$, let π_ω be π with its seed fixed. Horizons, histories and action sets are finite, so the seed's law pushes forward onto finitely many seedless labelled policies π_ω . Every one of positive mass is in DET_r , because its execution paths are execution paths of π and so complete within r rounds; a seed value of probability zero may give a π_ω outside DET_r , but it carries no mass. $H(\pi)$ is the average of $H(\pi_\omega)$ under this pushforward. This extends the $H(\mu)$ of Section 2 from predrawn mixtures to randomized policies: an average of the output KLs of seed-fixed policies (Lemma TGR1(a)), which by convexity is at least $\text{KL}(p_\lambda \| Q_\pi)$.
- *Target count kernel.* For legal s and a composition $b = (b_A, b_B)$ with $0 \leq b_g \leq m_g$, let

$$T_b^{\text{tgt}}(s)(u, v) = \binom{b_A}{u} \binom{b_B}{v} \lambda^u \frac{Z(m_A - b_A, m_B - b_B, j - u - v)}{Z(m_A, m_B, j)},$$

where

$$Z(m_A, m_B, j) = \sum_u \binom{m_A}{u} \binom{m_B}{j-u} \lambda^u,$$

with $Z = 0$ unless $0 \leq j \leq m_A + m_B$. By Lemma TG0(i), $T_b^{\text{tgt}}(s)$ is the law under p_λ , given a prefix with state s , of the numbers of ones (h_A, h_B) in a batch of composition b ; under the target, the child is always legal. The sampler's law is $\text{Bin}(b_A, a_A(s)) \otimes \text{Bin}(b_B, a_B(s))$ (Lemma TG0(iv)). Define $c(s, b) = \text{KL}(T_b^{\text{tgt}}(s) \parallel \text{Bin}(b_A, a_A(s)) \otimes \text{Bin}(b_B, a_B(s)))$, so $c(s, 0) = 0$. Then $c(s, b) < \infty$: if $0 < j < M$, every relevant marginal lies in $(0, 1)$ and the sampler's law gives positive probability to every count; if $j \in \{0, M\}$, both laws are the same point mass.

- *Extended count state.* After round t , let $\bar{s}_t = (m_A, m_B, j, u_A)$ at a legal prefix, where u_A is the number of committed ones in group A, and $\bar{s}_t = (\perp, m_A, m_B)$ at an illegal prefix. The count u_A is carried because the A-count $|x_A|$ of a valid output, which indexes the terminal vector, is the final value of u_A (proof of Lemma TGR3, step (1)). A *deterministic Markov count policy* $\delta = (\delta_t)_{0 \leq t < r}$ maps $\bar{s}_t$ to a composition $b \leq (m_A, m_B)$; it is realised by committing the lowest-indexed free coordinates of each group. $\mathcal{D}_r$ is the finite set of such δ whose realisation satisfies the every-path hard cap r , and $\mathcal{V}_r = \{q(\delta) : \delta \in \mathcal{D}_r\}$; by Lemma TGR3, $\text{conv } \mathcal{V}_r$ is the set of terminal vectors of the policies in RAND_r . For $c \in (0, \infty)^\mathcal{W}$, $M^*(c) = \max_{\delta \in \mathcal{D}_r} \sum_w P_w c_w q_w(\delta)$, the largest value over $\mathcal{V}_r$ of a linear function of the terminal vector; it is the oracle of Lemma TGR4's lower bound, and TGR4(b) computes it by a recursion.
- *Controlled count kernel.* For an extended count state $\bar{s}$ and a composition $b = (b_A, b_B)$ with $b \leq (m_A, m_B)$, $K(\cdot \mid \bar{s}, b)$ is the following law of the next extended state. If $\bar{s} = (m_A, m_B, j, u_A)$ is legal, draw $h_A \sim \text{Bin}(b_A, a_A(s))$ and $h_B \sim \text{Bin}(b_B, a_B(s))$ independently, and move to $(m_A - b_A, m_B - b_B, j - h_A - h_B, u_A + h_A)$ if that child is legal, and to $(\perp, m_A - b_A, m_B - b_B)$ otherwise. If $\bar{s} = (\perp, m_A, m_B)$, move to $(\perp, m_A - b_A, m_B - b_B)$. Step (1) of the proof of Lemma TGR3 shows that, under every policy in RAND_r , $K(\cdot \mid \bar{s}_t, b_{t+1})$ is the conditional law of $\bar{s}_{t+1}$ given $\mathcal{F}_t$; it does not depend on the policy.

Notation. Some letters have two roles here. D_r is a frontier value and $\mathcal{D}_r$ a set of count policies. M_t is the number of free coordinates after round t , while $M^*(c)$ is an oracle value and $\mathcal{M}_t$ its recursion (TGR4(b)). A count state is s , and $s(q) = \sum_w q_w$ is the success mass of a terminal vector. $c(s, b)$ is a one-round cost, while $c \in (0, \infty)^\mathcal{W}$ is the argument of M^* in TGR4 and of the analogous maximum over Σ_r in TGR6(c). G is the group of TGR2 and g its elements, while G_r^λ is the survival optimum, $\mathcal{G}_t$ is a σ -field in the proof of TGR1, a subscript $g \in \{A, B\}$ names a group, and g in TGR7 bounds a gap. $w \in \mathcal{W}$ indexes weight classes, while w_i are mixture weights.

Reported quantities and the lemmas behind them. Each item names quantities reported in Appendix K (and summarized in Appendix O), the object they are values of, how it is computed and the lemmas it rests on. The lemmas identify each object, which is defined through policies, with the value of a finite program (a recursion over count states, or the minimum of Φ over the convex hull of finitely many terminal vectors), or bracket it by such values; “computed by” names that program, and no proof depends on how the program was evaluated. The arithmetic of each evaluation (exact rationals, 60-digit, float64 or ball arithmetic) is described after the proofs, and the evidence class of each printed number is given in Appendix K.

- D_r , the ratio D_r/F_r^* (when $F_r^* > 0$) and the least caps through the path certificate ($\min\{r : D_r \leq \varepsilon\}$): the object is $D_r = \min_{\text{DET}_r} \text{KL} = \min_{\text{RAND}_r} H$, computed by the recursion $\mathcal{C}_r(\text{root})$; it rests on Lemma TGR1 (with Lemma TG0).
- F_r^* , including its certified brackets at $r \leq 4$, and the least caps for the output law ($\min\{r : F_r^* \leq \varepsilon\}$): the object is $\inf_{\text{RAND}_r} \text{KL}$; a bracket's lower end is TGR4(a) with $c = 1/\hat{q}$, and its upper end is $\Phi(\hat{q})$ of an explicitly realised mixture (TGR4(c)); it rests on Lemmas TGR2, TGR3 and TGR4.
- G_r^λ ; the sandwich $-\ln G_r^\lambda \leq F_r^* \leq F$ (survival planner), with the planner of TGR5 below; the comparison of $-\ln G_r^\lambda$ with F_r^* reported in Appendix K; the case $G_3^\lambda = 1$, $F_3^* \approx 5.0 \cdot 10^{-4}$ at $(n_A, n_B, k) = (2, 2, 2)$, $\lambda = 2$, $r = 3$: the object is the survival optimum, computed by the recursion of Appendix G; it rests on TGR5 (Lemmas TG9 and TG11), TGR2 and TGR4.
- F_r^{NA} ; the witness factor ≥ 2.35 at $(n_A, n_B, k) = (3, 3, 3)$, $\lambda = 4$, $r = 3$; the 2–9% losses of predrawn mixtures at $\lambda = 1$ (equal splits $n_A = n_B = k$ with $n \geq 16$, $r = 3, 4$; ratios to F_r^* , when $F_r^* > 0$): the object is $\min_{\text{NA}_r} \text{KL}$, computed over the hull of Σ_r (TGR6); it rests on Lemmas TGR6 and TGR2, and on TGR4 for the F_r^* in the ratio.
- the survival given up by the optimal law; the 29–65% ($n = 12, 16$, $r = 5, 6$) and 16% ($n = 20$, $r = 5$) shape shares, at the equal splits $n_A = n_B = k$ under Grid Z's strongest tilt $z = 2$ (Appendix K): the object is the leakage–shape split of the unique minimiser q^* of TGR3, computed by the TGR7 brackets at a Frank–Wolfe iterate; it rests on TGR3(6), TGR7 and TGR5.
- the simple planners, namely the survival planner of TGR5 and the tilt-blind planner (the balanced slice's survival-optimal rule, relabelled over all coordinates): the object is the KL of a relabelled count policy, computed as $\Phi(q(\pi))$; it rests on Lemma TGR2.

Ratios with F_r^* in the denominator are stated only when $F_r^* > 0$. At $r = n$ all three frontier values are 0: committing one coordinate per round samples p_λ exactly.

TGR0 (conditional law). This is Lemma TG0, (i)–(iv), of Appendix G, used unchanged.

Lemma TGR1 (deterministic policies). (a) For every $\pi \in \text{DET}_r$, $\text{KL}(p_\lambda \| Q_\pi) = H(\pi) = \mathbb{E}_{p_\lambda} \sum_{t=0}^{r-1} c(s_t, b_{t+1})$. Here b_{t+1} is the composition of β_{t+1} , and under p_λ the state moves from s_t to $(m_A - b_A, m_B - b_B, j - u - v)$ with $(u, v) \sim T_{b_{t+1}}^{\text{tgt}}(s_t)$. (b) $D_r = \mathcal{C}_r(\text{root})$ for the following recursion on legal states: $\mathcal{C}_0(s) = 0$ if $M = 0$, and $\mathcal{C}_0(s) = +\infty$ if $M \geq 1$; for $t \geq 1$, $\mathcal{C}_t(s) = 0$ if $M = 0$, and otherwise

$$\mathcal{C}_t(s) = \min_{0 \leq b \leq (m_A, m_B)} \left\{ c(s, b) + \mathbb{E}_{T_b^{\text{tgt}}(s)} \mathcal{C}_{t-1}(s') \right\}.$$

The infimum defining D_r is attained in DET_r . (c) $H(\pi) \geq D_r$ for every $\pi \in \text{RAND}_r$, with equality at a minimiser of (b). So D_r is also the least path cost over RAND_r , and, when $F_r^* > 0$, D_r/F_r^* is the path certificate's overstatement at a matched hard cap.

Lemma TGR2 (orbit reduction). Let $G = S_{n_A} \times S_{n_B}$ act by permuting coordinates within groups. (a) For every probability law Q on $\{0, 1\}^n$, $\text{KL}(p_\lambda \| Q) \geq \Phi(q(Q))$, with equality when Q restricted to S_k is G -invariant. The output law of every policy in RAND_r is a probability law, because every execution path commits all n coordinates. (For a sub-probability Q , extend it to

$\{0, 1\}^n \cup \{\dagger\}$ with $Q(\dagger) = 1 - Q(\{0, 1\}^n)$ and $p_\lambda(\dagger) = 0$; the proof of (a) runs verbatim with $\dagger \mapsto \perp$, and neither side changes.) (b) For $\pi \in \text{RAND}_r$, let $\bar{\pi}$ draw $g \sim \text{Unif}(G)$ together with its seed and run π on the coordinates relabelled by g . Then $\bar{\pi} \in \text{RAND}_r$, the law $Q_{\bar{\pi}} = |G|^{-1} \sum_g g_{\#} Q_{\pi}$ is G -invariant, and $q(\bar{\pi}) = q(\pi)$. If $\pi \in \text{NA}_r$, then $\bar{\pi} \in \text{NA}_r$. (c) Hence $F_r^* = \inf_{\pi \in \text{RAND}_r} \Phi(q(\pi))$ and $F_r^{\text{NA}} = \inf_{\mu \in \text{NA}_r} \Phi(q(\mu))$. Moreover $\Phi(q) = -\ln s(q) + \text{KL}(P \| q/s(q))$ when $s(q) > 0$: leakage plus between-orbit shape.

Lemma TGR3 (hull of count policies). $\{q(\pi) : \pi \in \text{RAND}_r\} = \text{conv } \mathcal{V}_r$. Consequently

$$F_r^* = \min_{q \in \text{conv } \mathcal{V}_r} \Phi(q),$$

and the minimum is attained at a unique q^* , with $q^* > 0$.

Lemma TGR4 (certified lower bound). (a) For every $c \in (0, \infty)^{\mathcal{W}}$,

$$F_r^* \geq \sum_w P_w \ln(P_w c_w) + 1 - M^*(c).$$

In particular, for any $\hat{q} \in (0, \infty)^{\mathcal{W}}$, which need not be feasible, $F_r^* \geq L(\hat{q}) := \Phi(\hat{q}) + 1 - M^*(1/\hat{q})$. (b) $M^*(c) = \mathcal{M}_r(\bar{s}_0)$, with $\bar{s}_0 = (n_A, n_B, k, 0)$, for the backward recursion over the extended count states: $\mathcal{M}_0(y) = P_w c_w$ if $y = (0, 0, 0, w)$, and $\mathcal{M}_0(y) = 0$ otherwise; $\mathcal{M}_t(y) = \max_b \sum_{y'} K(y' | y, b) \mathcal{M}_{t-1}(y')$ for $t \geq 1$, where K is the controlled count kernel defined above. (c) $F_r^* \leq \Phi(q)$ for every $q \in \text{conv } \mathcal{V}_r$.

TGR5 (survival; Appendix G). For every $\pi \in \text{RAND}_r$, $s(q(\pi)) = Q_{\pi}(S_k) \leq G_r^{\lambda}(\text{root})$ (Lemma TG9), and equality holds for a seedless count policy π° (Lemma TG11). Hence $-\ln G_r^{\lambda}(\text{root}) \leq F_r^* \leq \Phi(q(\pi^{\circ}))$. The right-hand side is the KL of π° followed by a uniform within-group relabelling (TGR2), and the “survival planner” of the tables is such a policy. Where several block compositions attain the maximum in the recursion for G_r^{λ} , the planner takes the lexicographically first (b_A, b_B) , comparing exact values.

Lemma TGR6 (predrawn frontier). For a full labelled schedule $U = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_L)$, let $\mathbf{b}(U) = ((|\beta_t \cap A|, |\beta_t \cap B|))_{t \leq L}$. Let Σ_r be the finite set of sequences of at most r nonzero compositions that sum to (n_A, n_B) , and let $q(\mathbf{b})$ be the terminal vector of the controlled count kernel K run with the fixed actions $\mathbf{b}$. Then: (a) $q(U) = q(\mathbf{b}(U))$. (b) $F_r^{\text{NA}} = \min\{\Phi(q) : q \in \text{conv}\{q(\mathbf{b}) : \mathbf{b} \in \Sigma_r\}\}$, and the minimum is attained. (c) For every $c \in (0, \infty)^{\mathcal{W}}$, $F_r^{\text{NA}} \geq \sum_w P_w \ln(P_w c_w) + 1 - \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \Sigma_r} \sum_w P_w c_w q_w(\mathbf{b})$; and $F_r^{\text{NA}} \leq \Phi(q)$ for every q in that hull. (d) $F_r^* \leq F_r^{\text{NA}}$.

Lemma TGR7 (the optimal law’s leakage–shape split). Let q^* be the minimiser of TGR3 and $s^* = s(q^*)$, so that $F_r^* = -\ln s^* + \text{KL}(P \| q^*/s^*)$. For every $\hat{q} \in \text{conv } \mathcal{V}_r$ with $\hat{q} > 0$, and every $g \geq \Phi(\hat{q}) - F_r^*$,

$$\sum_w P_w \varphi(\hat{q}_w/q_w^*) \leq g, \quad \varphi(y) = y - 1 - \ln y \geq 0.$$

Hence each ratio $\hat{q}_w/q_w^*$ lies between the two roots $y_w^- \leq 1 \leq y_w^+$ of $\varphi(y) = g/P_w$, and

$$s^* \in [s_{\text{lo}}, s_{\text{hi}}] = \left[\sum_w \hat{q}_w/y_w^+, \min \left\{ G_r^{\lambda}(\text{root}), 1, \sum_w \min(1, \hat{q}_w/y_w^-) \right\} \right].$$

With $F_r^* \in [\Phi(\hat{q}) - g, \Phi(\hat{q})]$ and $\Phi(\hat{q}) - g > 0$, the shape share $1 + \ln s^*/F_r^*$ lies in $[1 + \ln s_{\text{lo}}/(\Phi(\hat{q}) - g), 1 + \ln s_{\text{hi}}/\Phi(\hat{q})]$.

Proof of TGR1. (a) Fix x with $p_\lambda(x) > 0$. *Batches.* Because π has no seed, the batches $\beta_1(x), \beta_2(x), \dots$ that it uses when the committed values agree with x are functions of x , and every

prefix along x is legal. *Sampler probability.* $Q_\pi(x) = \prod_t \prod_{i \in \beta_t(x)} a_i^{x_i} (1 - a_i)^{1-x_i}$, with the marginals taken at the prefix before round t . This is positive: at $0 < j < M$ every relevant $a_i \in (0, 1)$, and at $j \in \{0, M\}$ the marginals are 0 or 1 and agree with x . *Target probability.* $p_\lambda(x) = \prod_t p_\lambda(x_{\beta_t(x)} \mid \text{prefix})$. *Expectation.* Take logarithms, then $\mathbb{E}_{p_\lambda}$, conditioning on the prefix before each round. Given the prefix, β_t is fixed and x_{β_t} has the target's conditional law, so the t -th term contributes $\mathbb{E} \text{TC}_t$. *Reduction to counts.* By Lemma TG0(i), the target's conditional joint law of the batch values is $\lambda^u Z(m_A - b_A, m_B - b_B, j - u - v) / Z(s)$ at every configuration with counts (u, v) . The product of the marginals is $a_A^u (1 - a_A)^{b_A - u} a_B^v (1 - a_B)^{b_B - v}$. Both laws are constant on each fiber $\{(h_A, h_B) = (u, v)\}$, so the likelihood ratio is a function of the counts, and the divergence equals that of the count laws, $c(s_t, b_{t+1})$. *Transition.* The target transition of the count state is Lemma TG0(i),(iii).

(b) *Lower bound.* Let $\pi \in \text{DET}_r$ and work under p_λ . Let $\mathcal{G}_t$ be the σ -field of the values committed through round t , and $W_t = \sum_{i=1}^t c(s_{i-1}, b_i) + \mathcal{C}_{r-t}(s_t)$. The composition b_{t+1} is $\mathcal{G}_t$ -measurable, and by Lemma TG0(i),(iii) the next counts have conditional law $T_{b_{t+1}}^{\text{tgt}}(s_t)$ given $\mathcal{G}_t$. So

$$\mathbb{E}[W_{t+1} \mid \mathcal{G}_t] = W_t - \mathcal{C}_{r-t}(s_t) + c(s_t, b_{t+1}) + \mathbb{E}_{T_{b_{t+1}}^{\text{tgt}}(s_t)} \mathcal{C}_{r-t-1}(s') \geq W_t,$$

by the definition of $\mathcal{C}$ as a minimum. For $M_t = 0$ the batch is empty and the added terms vanish. Every term is finite for $t < r$: for $t \geq 1$, $\mathcal{C}_t(s) \leq c(s, \text{full batch}) < \infty$, because the full batch leads to a state with $M = 0$. Every factor of the sampler probability of $x \sim p_\lambda$ is positive (proof of (a)), so every truncation of x 's path is an execution path of π , and the every-path hard cap applies to it: $M_r = 0$, and $\mathcal{C}_0(s_r) = 0$. Hence $H(\pi) = \mathbb{E} W_r \geq W_0 = \mathcal{C}_r(\text{root})$. *Attainment.* For $1 \leq \varrho \leq r$ and legal s with $M \geq 1$, fix a minimiser $b^\circ(\varrho, s)$. Consider the seedless policy that acts at round $t + 1$ as follows: it commits the lowest-indexed $b^\circ(r - t, s_t)$ free coordinates when s_t is legal with $M_t \geq 1$; it commits all remaining coordinates when s_t is illegal; and it does nothing when $M_t = 0$. It lies in DET_r : for every non-full batch b , $\mathcal{C}_1(s) < \infty = \mathbb{E} \mathcal{C}_0(s')$, which forces $b^\circ(1, s)$ to be the full batch, so every legal path completes by round r , and a path that first becomes illegal after round $t < r$ completes in round $t + 1$. Along this policy W_t is a martingale, so $H = \mathcal{C}_r(\text{root})$, and by (a) its KL equals H .

(c) $H(\pi)$ is an average of $H(\pi_\omega)$ over seedless policies of positive mass, each in DET_r (see the definitions), so $H(\pi) \geq D_r$ by (a) and (b). $\square$

Proof of TGR2. (a) Apply data processing under the map $x \mapsto |x_A|$ on S_k and $x \mapsto \perp$ off S_k . The image of p_λ is P , because $p_\lambda(S_k) = 1$; the image of Q is $(q, 1 - s(q))$, because Q is a probability law; and the divergence of the images is $\Phi(q)$, since P puts no mass on $\perp$. For equality: G acts transitively on each class $\{x \in S_k : |x_A| = w\}$, which has N_w points. There $p_\lambda(x) = P_w/N_w$. A G -invariant Q is constant on each G -orbit, and this class is one orbit with Q -mass q_w , so $Q(x) = q_w/N_w$ there. Hence $\text{KL}(p_\lambda \| Q) = \sum_w \sum_{|x_A|=w} \frac{P_w}{N_w} \ln \frac{P_w/N_w}{q_w/N_w} = \sum_w P_w \ln \frac{P_w}{q_w} = \Phi(q)$, where both sides are $+\infty$ if some $q_w = 0 < P_w$.

(b) *Relabelling commutes with the interface.* p_λ is G -invariant, so the exact marginal of a coordinate at a prefix depends only on its group and the count state (Lemma TG0(ii)), and g preserves both. Relabel the auxiliary variables together with the coordinates. This couples each run of π that produces x with a run of the relabelled policy that produces gx , so the relabelled policy's output law is $g_\# Q_\pi$, and its execution paths are the relabelled paths of π , with the same number of rounds. The draw of g is made before any bit, as part of the seed, which is independent of all auxiliary

randomness. The terminal vector q is unchanged because $|x_A|$ and $|x|$ are G -invariant. Relabelling a full labelled schedule gives a full labelled schedule with the same number of blocks.

(c) By (a) and (b), $\text{KL}(p_\lambda \| Q_\pi) \geq \Phi(q(\pi)) = \text{KL}(p_\lambda \| Q_{\bar{\pi}})$, with $\bar{\pi}$ in the same class as π . The decomposition is algebra, for $s = s(q) > 0$: $\sum_w P_w \ln(P_w/q_w) = -\ln s + \sum_w P_w \ln(P_w/(q_w/s))$. $\square$

Remarks. A relabelling across the groups may also be drawn as part of the seed, but for $\lambda \neq 1$ it is not a symmetry of p_λ , and it gives nothing beyond (a). For a policy whose output law is not G -invariant, such as a fixed labelled schedule, the inequality in (a) is in general strict.

Proof of TGR3. Step (1) shows that the extended count state is a controlled Markov chain whose kernel K is the same under every policy; this uses the exact-marginal interface and the no-latent-peeking condition. Steps (2)–(4) prove the inclusion $\subseteq$: replacing the policy’s batch choice by its conditional law given $\bar{s}_t$ preserves the law of each $\bar{s}_t$, hence $q(\pi)$ (2); the resulting Markov rule is a mixture, drawn with the seed, of deterministic Markov count policies (3); and each component of positive weight satisfies the every-path hard cap, so lies in $\mathcal{D}_r$ (4). Step (5) proves the reverse inclusion by realising each $\delta \in \mathcal{D}_r$ and each convex combination, and step (6) proves attainment and uniqueness. (1) *Controlled kernel.* Let b_{t+1} be the composition of β_{t+1} ; it is $\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurable. If $\bar{s}_t$ is legal, then by Lemma TG0(iv) the counts, conditionally on $\mathcal{F}_t$, are $\text{Bin}(b_A, a_A(s_t)) \otimes \text{Bin}(b_B, a_B(s_t))$, and $\bar{s}_{t+1}$ is a function of $(\bar{s}_t, b_{t+1}, h_A, h_B)$: either a legal child, or $(\perp, m')$ if the child is illegal. If $\bar{s}_t = (\perp, m)$, then $\bar{s}_{t+1} = (\perp, m - b_{t+1})$, whatever values are drawn (illegality is absorbing; see the proof of Lemma TG9). So $\Pr(\bar{s}_{t+1} = y' \mid \mathcal{F}_t) = K(y' \mid \bar{s}_t, b_{t+1})$ for the controlled count kernel K defined before Lemma TGR1, which does not depend on the policy. This uses the no-latent-peeking condition. Under the every-path hard cap, the output lies in S_k with $|x_A| = w$ iff $\bar{s}_r = (0, 0, 0, w)$. Hence $q_w(\pi) = \Pr_\pi(\bar{s}_r = (0, 0, 0, w))$.

(2) *Markovization.* For $t < r$, let $d_t(b \mid y) = \Pr_\pi(b_{t+1} = b \mid \bar{s}_t = y)$ when $\Pr_\pi(\bar{s}_t = y) > 0$, and any law otherwise. Let π^d draw $b_{t+1} \sim d_t(\cdot \mid \bar{s}_t)$, using independent uniforms included in the seed, and commit the lowest-indexed free coordinates of that composition; so π^d is a causal randomized policy. *Claim:* for every $t \leq r$, $\bar{s}_t$ has the same law under π and π^d , and for $t < r$ so does the pair $(\bar{s}_t, b_{t+1})$. *Induction.* $\bar{s}_0 = (n_A, n_B, k, 0)$ under both. If $\bar{s}_t$ has the same law under both, then $\Pr_\pi(\bar{s}_t = y, b_{t+1} = b) = \Pr_\pi(\bar{s}_t = y) d_t(b \mid y) = \Pr_{\pi^d}(\bar{s}_t = y, b_{t+1} = b)$. By (1) and the tower property, $\Pr(\bar{s}_{t+1} = y') = \sum_{y,b} \Pr(\bar{s}_t = y, b_{t+1} = b) K(y' \mid y, b)$ under both. In particular $q(\pi) = q(\pi^d)$.

(3) *Derandomization.* Draw, as part of the seed, independent actions $\delta_t(y) \sim d_t(\cdot \mid y)$ for all of the finitely many pairs (t, y) . This gives a random deterministic Markov count policy δ . Along any trajectory each pair $(t, \bar{s}_t)$ occurs once, so a trajectory $(y_0, b_1, y_1, \dots, b_r, y_r)$ has probability $\prod_t d_t(b_{t+1} \mid y_t) K(y_{t+1} \mid y_t, b_{t+1})$ under both π^d and the mixture. Hence $q(\pi) = \sum_\delta \Pr(\delta) q(\delta)$.

(4) *The components respect the hard cap.* An *execution path* is a path in the support of the seed pushforward and the kernels; a word of probability zero is not a path, and components of zero weight are omitted. A continuous seed causes no difficulty: horizons, histories and action sets are finite, so the pushforward onto deterministic tables is finite. Let δ have positive weight, and take an execution path of δ . At each round the path uses an action b with $d_t(b \mid y) > 0$ at its current state, and a transition of positive K -probability; by induction the path has positive probability under π^d . Under π every execution path is complete after round r , so $\Pr_\pi(M_r = 0) = 1$, and by (2) $\Pr_{\pi^d}(M_r = 0) = 1$. A positive-probability path of π^d , and in particular this path of δ , is therefore complete after round r , so $\delta \in \mathcal{D}_r$.

(5) *Realisation.* Each $\delta \in \mathcal{D}_r$ is realised by a seedless policy in DET_r : commit the lowest-indexed free coordinates of each group, noting that $\bar{s}_t$ is a function of the committed values. This policy is causal and seedless. Its batch at round $t + 1$ is $\delta_t(\bar{s}_t)$, so by step (1) the extended count state is the controlled chain with kernel $K(\cdot \mid y, \delta_t(y))$, the same chain that defines $q(\delta)$; its terminal vector is therefore $q(\delta)$. Since $\delta \in \mathcal{D}_r$, every positive-probability path of that chain completes after round r , so the policy has the every-path hard cap r and lies in DET_r . A predrawn choice of δ realises any convex combination. With (3) and (4), this gives $\{q(\pi)\} = \text{conv } \mathcal{V}_r$.

(6) *Attainment and uniqueness.* $\text{conv } \mathcal{V}_r$ is compact, and Φ is lower semicontinuous with values in $[0, \infty]$. Φ is finite at the terminal vector of the one-round policy, which is positive because $0 < k < n$ puts every marginal in $(0, 1)$. So a minimiser exists, and it is positive, because Φ is $+\infty$ wherever some $q_w = 0$. Φ is strictly convex on $(0, \infty)^W$ (its Hessian is $\text{diag}(P_w/q_w^2)$), so the minimiser is unique. With TGR2(c), $F_r^* = \min_{\text{conv } \mathcal{V}_r} \Phi$. $\square$

Remark. The count policies may depend on u_A . The target ignores u_A , but Φ does not, so an optimal policy may need to be value-adaptive in the committed A-count. In an exact check this dependence is needed at $n_A = n_B = k = 3$, $r = 3$, $\lambda \in \{2, 4\}$ (the optimal value over predrawn randomized mixtures of u_A -independent deterministic count tables is worse by $3.5 \cdot 10^{-5}$ and $2.3 \cdot 10^{-4}$ nats); in the other instances tested, all at $r = 3$ ($n \leq 5$, $\lambda = 1$, and $(n_A, n_B, k) = (2, 4, 3)$ with $\lambda = 2$), u_A -independent policies attain F_r^* .

Proof of TGR4. (a) Let $\pi \in \text{RAND}_r$ and $q = q(\pi)$. By TGR2(a), $\text{KL}(p_\lambda \| Q_\pi) \geq \Phi(q)$; if some $q_w = 0$ there is nothing to prove. Otherwise, $\ln y \leq y - 1$ at $y = c_w q_w$ gives $-\ln q_w \geq \ln c_w + 1 - c_w q_w$. Multiply by P_w , add $P_w \ln P_w$, sum, and use $\sum_w P_w = 1$:

$$\Phi(q) \geq \sum_w P_w \ln(P_w c_w) + 1 - \sum_w P_w c_w q_w.$$

By TGR3, $q \in \text{conv } \mathcal{V}_r$, and the linear function $q \mapsto \sum_w P_w c_w q_w$ is at most its maximum over the vertices $\mathcal{V}_r$, which is $M^*(c)$. Take the infimum over π . With $c = 1/\hat{q}$ the right-hand side is $\Phi(\hat{q}) + 1 - M^*(1/\hat{q})$.

(b) *The recursion computes M^* .* For deterministic Markov policies of the finite controlled chain K , the expected terminal reward from (t, y) follows the recursion along the policy, and the maximum over policies follows the recursion with a maximum (induction on the number of remaining rounds). Maximising over every δ , not only over $\mathcal{D}_r$, does not change the value: the reward is non-negative, a final state with $M > 0$ earns 0, and replacing every last-round action by the full batch completes every path without lowering the value.

(c) TGR3(5) realises every $q \in \text{conv } \mathcal{V}_r$ by some $\pi \in \text{RAND}_r$; TGR2(b) makes it G -invariant without changing q , and TGR2(a) then gives $\text{KL} = \Phi(q)$. $\square$

Proof of TGR5. It follows from Lemmas TG9 and TG11 of Appendix G, together with TGR2(c): $\Phi(q) \geq -\ln s(q)$ because the shape term is a KL. $\square$

Proof of TGR6. (a) U has no seed, and its batches do not depend on values; by step (1) of the proof of TGR3, its extended count state evolves by the controlled count kernel K with the actions $\mathbf{b}(U)$. (b) By TGR2(c), $F_r^{\text{NA}} = \inf_\mu \Phi(q(\mu))$, where $q(\mu) = \sum_i w_i q(\mathbf{b}(U_i))$. Every $\mathbf{b} \in \Sigma_r$ equals $\mathbf{b}(U)$ for some schedule (take the lowest indices first), so $q(\mu)$ ranges over the whole hull. The minimum is attained by compactness and lower semicontinuity, since Φ is finite at the one-block schedule. (c) As in TGR4(a),(c), with the finite set $\{q(\mathbf{b})\}$ in place of $\mathcal{V}_r$. The lower bound needs only TGR2(a) and $q(\mu)$ in the hull; the upper bound also uses that NA_r is closed under relabelling (TGR2(b)). (d) $\text{NA}_r \subset \text{RAND}_r$. $\square$

Proof of TGR7. On $(0, \infty)^{\mathcal{W}}$, $\partial_w \Phi(q) = -P_w/q_w$, and $q^* > 0$ (TGR3(6)). Since q^* minimises the convex Φ over the convex set $\text{conv } \mathcal{V}_r$, $\nabla \Phi(q^*) \cdot (\hat{q} - q^*) \geq 0$. The Bregman identity

$$\Phi(\hat{q}) - \Phi(q^*) - \nabla \Phi(q^*) \cdot (\hat{q} - q^*) = \sum_w P_w [\ln(q_w^*/\hat{q}_w) + \hat{q}_w/q_w^* - 1] = \sum_w P_w \varphi(\hat{q}_w/q_w^*)$$

then gives $\sum_w P_w \varphi(\hat{q}_w/q_w^*) \leq \Phi(\hat{q}) - F_r^* \leq g$; each term is nonnegative, so each is at most g . Moreover $q_w^* \leq 1$, and $s^* \leq G_r^\lambda(\text{root})$ by TGR5. The share bracket uses that $1 + \ln s/F$ increases in s and, because $\ln s \leq 0$, in F . $\square$

Remark (order). As $g \rightarrow 0$, $\varphi(1+u) = u^2/2 + O(u^3)$ gives $y_w^\pm = 1 \pm \sqrt{2g/P_w} + O(g/P_w)$, so $1/y_w^- - 1/y_w^+ = 2\sqrt{2g/P_w} + O(g/P_w)$. Hence, before the caps at $G_r^\lambda(\text{root})$ and 1 (which bind in some tested rows), the half-width of the s^* bracket is $\sqrt{2g} \sum_w \hat{q}_w / \sqrt{P_w} + o(\sqrt{g})$. The order $\sqrt{g}$ cannot be improved for brackets of this form, as a function of $(P, \hat{q}, g)$ on a convex set, as the following example shows; it is an abstract segment, not a realised $\text{conv } \mathcal{V}_r$. Take $P = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ and a segment through $q^* = (\frac{1}{5}, \frac{2}{5})$ in the direction $(1, -2)$, along which q^* is the minimiser (the directional derivative is 0). Along it Φ rises by $-\frac{1}{2} \ln(1 - 25t^2) = \Theta(t^2)$, while s moves by $-t$.

Computation behind Appendix K (not part of the proofs). The Frank–Wolfe method is fully corrective over the columns $q(\delta)$: the master problem $\max_\theta \sum_w P_w \ln(Q\theta)_w$, where the columns of Q are the $q(\delta)$ generated so far, is solved by multiplicative updates polished by SLSQP, and the weights stay on the simplex, so the iterate lies in the hull. The linear oracle is TGR4(b), run in float64; an independent recursion agrees with it to within $2^{-52} \approx 2.22 \cdot 10^{-16}$ on all rows, and the float64 value differs from a 60-digit evaluation by $1.7\text{--}3.1 \cdot 10^{-16}$ on the four checked rows. For the F_r^* certificates, when λ 's denominator is below 100 the Frank–Wolfe weights are each rationalised to a denominator at most 10^{15} and then normalized exactly to sum to one, q and M^* are exact rationals, and only the final log-sums are evaluated at 60 digits, with a 10^{-40} outward margin; otherwise the computation is 60-digit throughout, non-interval, with an a-priori margin. The certificates store their endpoints rounded to nearest at 20 significant digits (widen them by 10^{-19}). D_r (TGR1(b)), G_r^λ and F_r^{NA} are computed in float64, F_r^{NA} by Frank–Wolfe over the hull of Σ_r , enumerated exhaustively with prefix sharing. The exceptions are the 27 validation cells with $n \leq 8$ (rational arithmetic, logs at 60 digits, checked against a labelled brute force) and the seven F_r^{NA} certificates, whose exact rational ingredients are evaluated in Arb ball arithmetic (rigorous enclosures). The TGR7 brackets are evaluated in float64 with $g = \max(\text{Frank–Wolfe gap}, 0) + 10^{-13}$, so they are estimates, not certified bounds. Grid Z, the grid of normalized tilts used in some exhibit rows, is defined in Appendix K.

Appendix K. Finite exhibits: details and evidence classes

This appendix gives the details and evidence classes of the finite exhibits of Section 3 and Appendix O: two groups, the balanced slice (Table 5) and full support (Table 6). *Terms.* The *owner* implementation of a number is the one that first produced it; a *blind* implementation was written from a prose specification without access to the owner's code; *owner-only* means that no second rigorous implementation reproduced the value; a kernel-checked Lean bracket, where one exists, is stated separately and does not count as such an implementation.

Two groups. The target is $p_\lambda(x) \propto \lambda^{|x_A|}$ on $\{x : |x| = k\}$, with n_A coordinates in group A, $n_B = n - n_A$ in group B and weight $\lambda > 0$ on group A (Appendix G); a target is written (n_A, n_B, k, λ) , and

an *equal split* has $n_A = n_B = k = n/2$. The two-group numbers use the notation of Appendix O: F_r^* is the least output KL of causal randomized policies with hard cap r (the class RAND_r of Appendix G, which is the class $\mathcal{A}_r$ of Section 2 for this target), D_r the least output KL of the deterministic ones, and G_r^λ the largest probability with which such a policy meets the quota within r rounds. The finite programs behind them are justified in Appendix J, whose list of reported quantities names the lemmas behind each number. The balanced identity of Theorem 4(a) becomes a sandwich on two groups, $-\ln G_r^\lambda \leq F_r^* \leq F(\text{survival planner})$ (TGR5 in Appendix J); at deeper caps the optimal law gives up some survival to reduce between-orbit shape. A (possibly randomized) rule that chooses each block’s group composition from the committed counts beats every predrawn mixture by a factor of at least 2.35 in a six-coordinate witness $((n_A, n_B, k, \lambda) = (3, 3, 3, 4), r = 3$; kernel-checked: $F_3^{\text{NA}} \geq 2.35 F_3^*$, and also with 2.358, Appendix Q). At $r = 4$ and $\lambda \neq 1$ this adaptive gain, the ratio F_r^{NA}/F_r^* defined below, shrinks with n in the equal splits computed ($n = 12$ to 24); at $r = 3$ it does not, except under Grid Z’s $z = 2$. Grid Z denotes the normalized tilts λ_z , rational approximations (denominators at most 10^9) of $\exp(z/\sigma_n)$ with $\sigma_n^2 = n^2/(16(n-1))$ and $z \in \{\frac{1}{2}, 1, 2\}$; the strongest tilt is $z = 2$. F_r^{NA} denotes the predrawn optimum, the least output KL of predrawn mixtures of schedules with at most r blocks. Evidence classes at $r \leq 4$, by object, follow. F_r^* : rigorous enclosures (ball arithmetic) by code written blind from the owner’s specification (code-independent, not specification-independent), on the specification grids (equal splits only: the 27 validation cells with $n \in \{4, 6, 8\}$, $\lambda \in \{1, 2, 4\}$ and $r \leq 3$, and the 30 cells with $n \in \{12, 16\}$, $\lambda \in \{1, 2\}$ or a Grid Z tilt, and $r = 2, 3, 4$) and on the 24 held-out equal-split cells at $n = 20, 24$ ($\lambda = 2$ and Grid Z), the latter by an owner-run replay of the blind code. On the remaining 18 rows, which are owner-only (the unequal-split and off-centre targets $(n_A, n_B, k, \lambda) = (4, 8, 6, 3)$, $(5, 11, 8, 2)$, $(6, 10, 4, 4)$ and $(8, 8, 5, 2)$, and $\lambda = 1$ at $n = 20, 24$, each at $r = 2, 3, 4$), the owner’s certificate has exact rational ingredients (the terminal vector of an exactly realised mixture, whose Frank–Wolfe weights are each rationalised to a denominator at most 10^{15} and then normalized exactly, and the value $M^*(c)$ of Lemma TGR4’s linear oracle, which gives the lower end) and evaluates the final logarithms at 60 digits with a 10^{-40} outward margin (upper end rounded up, lower end down), not in interval arithmetic. An owner-run re-evaluation of those logarithms in Arb ball arithmetic (Johansson, 2017) (256 bits) encloses F_r^* rigorously on these rows too, to width below 10^{-12} . Each Arb bracket intersects the stored non-interval bracket once the latter’s printed endpoints are widened by 10^{-19} (a consistency check, not a proof that the stored bracket contains F_r^*). On all 18 rows a kernel-checked Lean 4 theorem also brackets F_r^* rationally, to width below 10^{-12} , for the class RAND_r with the almost-sure cap and every placement of group A (Appendix Q). D_r and G_r^λ : the owner computes them in rational arithmetic with 60-digit logarithms on the 27 validation cells (matched to a labelled brute force) and as float64 evaluations of exact dynamic programs elsewhere; the blind code encloses them rigorously on the specification grids and the 24 replayed cells, agreeing with the owner’s values to within $6.7 \cdot 10^{-16}$, and they are owner-only elsewhere. An independent float64 planner also reproduces D_r , F_r^* and F_r^{NA} at $n \in \{12, 16\}$, to float64 precision. F_r^{NA} : owner float64 estimates, except at seven cells, $(n_A, n_B, k, \lambda, r) = (3, 3, 3, 1, 3)$, $(3, 3, 3, 2, 3)$, $(3, 3, 3, 4, 3)$ (the six-coordinate witness), $(4, 8, 6, 3, 3)$, $(4, 8, 6, 3, 4)$, $(6, 6, 6, 2, 3)$ and $(6, 6, 6, 2, 4)$, where owner certificates for the two bounds of Lemma TGR6(c) (Appendix J), with exact rational ingredients and evaluated in Arb ball arithmetic (256 bits), enclose F_r^{NA} rigorously, and a second program, which imports none of the generator’s code, re-checks all seven certificates. At all seven cells a kernel-checked Lean 4 theorem also brackets F_r^{NA} rationally, on predrawn mixtures with at most r blocks and for every placement of group A (Appendix Q).

Depth runs ($r \leq 6$) and the deep-cap split ($r = 5, 6$; the optimal law's leakage-shape split of Lemma TGR7): owner-only float64 estimates; the Frank–Wolfe convergence diagnostic is at most $5.4 \cdot 10^{-10}$ at every r for the F_r^* depth runs and the split and at most $1.4 \cdot 10^{-9}$ for the F_r^{NA} runs at $r = 5, 6$, made after the predictions below were frozen; for the owner's F_r^{NA} estimates at $r \leq 4$, on which rows 3–6 below are scored, the Frank–Wolfe value exceeds its dual lower value by at most $6.6 \cdot 10^{-9}$ (float64 diagnostics, not certified bounds), and the split's float64 interval estimates are not certified. On the tested grid, the ratio D_r/F_r^* increases with λ at $r = 2$ and 4 but not at $r = 3$. At $\varepsilon = 0.1$ the least cap is 5–8 rounds through the path certificate (the least r with $D_r \leq \varepsilon$; Appendix J) against 4–5 for the output law at $n \leq 16$, and 10 versus 5 at $n = 24$, $\lambda = 1$. The survival bound $-\ln G_r^\lambda$ is at least 87.9% of F_r^* in 71 of the 72 cells at $r \leq 4$, $n \geq 12$; the other, the discovery cell $n = 12$, Grid Z with $z = 2$, $r = 4$, has 71%. Over the 36 held-out cells of prediction 1 below, the minimum is 92.57%. At $\lambda = 2$, $r = 4$ the predrawn-to-optimal factor falls from 1.49 to 1.26 between $n = 12$ and 24, with additive difference 0.027–0.036 nats, and in the 48 of the 63 (target, ε) pairs of the depth runs (20 equal splits with $12 \leq n \leq 24$ and the 4 + 8 target (4, 8, 6, 3), with $\varepsilon \in \{\ln 2, 0.1, 0.02\}$) where both least caps are determined, the least cap of predrawn mixtures equals that of F_r^* or exceeds it by one round (by one in 6 pairs; computed after the predictions were frozen). At $\lambda = 1$ ($n \geq 16$, $r = 3, 4$) predrawn mixtures lose only 2–9% to adaptive policies. The ordinary survival planner comes within 3.8% of F_r^* for $\lambda \neq 1$ at $r \leq 4$. At $r = 5, 6$ survival-optimal plans can tie, and the planner's F then depends on the tie-break: with the lexicographic tie-break it is 2.2 times off at $r = 5$ on the 4 + 8 target ($\lambda \neq 1$). At these caps ($r = 5, 6$), the optimal law's own between-orbit shape share is 29–65% at $r = 5, 6$ under the strongest tilt at $n = 12, 16$, and 16% at $n = 20$, $r = 5$ (owner-only float64 estimates at a Frank–Wolfe iterate, with float64 interval estimates for the optimal law's split), and its survival is below G_r^λ .

Frozen predictions and phases of the cells. The eight two-group predictions below were frozen, with their pass criteria, before any held-out cell was computed; the held-out cells are the equal splits at $n \in \{20, 24\}$ ($\lambda = 2$ and Grid Z) and the four unequal or off-centre targets above, each at $r = 2, 3, 4$. The *discovery* cells are those computed before the predictions were frozen: every equal-split cell at $n = 12$ ($\lambda \in \{1, 2\}$ and the Grid Z tilts $z \in \{\frac{1}{2}, 1, 2\}$) at $r = 2, 3, 4$, part of the validation cells with $n \leq 8$, and part of $n = 16$ (all $r = 2$; $r = 3$ at $z \in \{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1, 2\}$, where $z = 0$ is $\lambda = 1$; $r = 4$ at $z = 2$). At those $n = 16$ cells only F_r^* , $-\ln G_r^\lambda$, D_r and the best simple planner had been computed; F_r^{NA} had been computed only at $n = 12$. Of the 72 cells with $12 \leq n \leq 24$ and $r = 2, 3, 4$, 25 are discovery cells, 36 are held-out, and 11 were computed after the freeze without being held out ($\lambda = 1$ at $n = 20, 24$; and at $n = 16$, $\lambda = 2$ at $r = 3$, and $\lambda \in \{1, 2\}$ and $z \in \{\frac{1}{2}, 1\}$ at $r = 4$). Five passed and three failed; the last column gives the statement each failure narrowed. Observed values are owner float64 values as scored after the freeze, at the scoring record's precision; the evidence class of each object is given above. In the list, F_r^* , D_r , G_r^λ and F_r^{NA} are as above; the survival planner is the survival-optimal count rule with relabelling within groups, and the tilt-blind planner is the balanced slice's survival-optimal rule with relabelling over all coordinates.

Scoring scopes. Rows 1 and 7 are scored on all 36 held-out cells, row 2 on the 24 held-out cells with $r \geq 3$, rows 3 and 8 on the six held-out equal splits at $r = 4$ with $\lambda = 2$ or $z \in \{1, 2\}$, and rows 5 and 6 on the held-out cells they name. Row 4 is scored on the eight equal splits with $\lambda = 1$, $n \in \{12, 16, 20, 24\}$ and $r = 3, 4$, none of them held-out; its two passes are the $n = 12$ cells, the only ones whose F_r^{NA} had been computed before the freeze.

	quantity	frozen criterion	observed	verdict	consequence
1	$-\ln G_r^\lambda / F_r^*$	≥ 0.8 where $F_r^* \geq 0.01$	min 0.9257 (36 held-out cells)	pass, 36/36	—
2	D_r / F_r^*	≥ 2 at $r \geq 3$	1.846–1.991 in four $r = 3$ cells	fail, 20/24	Appendix O states measured ranges instead
3	F_r^{NA} / F_r^*	≥ 1.15 at $r = 4$, equal splits, $\lambda \geq 2$	1.255–1.956 (6 cells)	pass, 6/6	—
4	$F_r^{\text{NA}} / F_r^*, \lambda = 1$	≤ 1.01 wherever computed	1.0 at $n = 12$ (discovery); 1.0199–1.0908 at $n = 16, 20, 24$	fail, 2/8	no claim that predrawn mixtures attain F_r^* at $\lambda = 1$
5	$F_4^{\text{NA}} / F_4^*, \lambda = 2$	≥ 1.34 at $n = 20, 24$ ($n = 12$: 1.49)	1.311, 1.255	fail, 0/2	stated above: at $r = 4$ and $\lambda \neq 1$ the adaptive gain shrinks with n in the cells computed
6	$F_4^{\text{NA}} / F_4^*,$ Grid Z, $z = 1$	below its $n = 12$ value 1.96 at $n = 24$	1.302	pass	—
7	survival planner/ F_r^*	≤ 1.05 in every cell	max 1.0326 (36 cells)	pass, 36/36	—
8	tilt-blind planner/ F_r^*	≥ 1.2 at $r = 4$, equal splits, $\lambda \geq 2$	1.269–2.431 (6 cells)	pass, 6/6	—

The two full-support predictions were frozen on 2026-09-29, before the runs they scored; both concern a fitted growth exponent of best-found profiles for other Beta priors, $\text{Beta}(\alpha, \alpha)$, not a proved quantity, and no rate is claimed for priors other than $\text{Beta}(1, 1)$, the only case that Appendix F proves.

	quantity	frozen criterion	observed	verdict	consequence
9	local slope of $\log m_{R-1}$ against $\log n$ between the two largest n ; m_{R-1} : coordinates committed before the last round of the best-found single relabelled profile with R rounds (least F ; not certified); $\text{Beta}(\alpha, \alpha)$, $R \in \{3, 4\}$, $n \in \{2^8, \dots, 2^{14}\}$	$\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$: ≥ 0.58 at both R ; $\alpha = 2$: ≤ 0.56 at both R ; difference ≥ 0.06 at each R	$\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$: 0.521, 0.555; $\alpha = 2$: 0.431, 0.384 ($R = 3, 4$)	fail ($\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$ below 0.58)	no rate for other Beta priors
10	mean of the two local slopes of $\log m_{R-1}$ against $\log n$, $n \in \{2^{10}, 2^{12}, 2^{14}\}$, $R \in \{3, 4\}$	$\alpha = 3$: ≤ 0.36 ($R = 3$), ≤ 0.40 ($R = 4$); $\alpha = 0.25$: in $[0.50, 0.68]$ ($R = 3$), $[0.57, 0.75]$ ($R = 4$)	$\alpha = 3$: 0.364, 0.327; $\alpha = 0.25$: 0.576, 0.635 ($R = 3, 4$)	fail ($\alpha = 3$, $R = 3$: 0.364 > 0.36)	as row 9

Mean costs as two-length linear programs. For a finite predrawn mixture μ of labelled schedules, $H(\mu) = \mathbb{E}_\mu \text{KL}(p||q_U)$ and the scheduled mean $C(\mu) = \mathbb{E}_\mu |U|$ are averages over the components, and $\text{KL}(p||q_U)$ depends only on the profile of U (Lemma 1(d)). Replacing each component by a least-divergence profile with the same number of blocks keeps $C(\mu)$ and does not increase $H(\mu)$, so

$$L_H(n, \varepsilon) = \min \left\{ \sum_r w_r r : \sum_r w_r d_r^* \leq \varepsilon, \sum_r w_r = 1, w \geq 0 \right\},$$

with d_r^* the least $\text{KL}(p||q_U)$ over schedules with r blocks; with one equality and one inequality constraint, an optimal w uses at most two lengths. For F , Lemma 1(a) gives $F(\mu) \geq -\ln Q_\mu(V)$, and $Q_\mu(V) = \mathbb{E}_\mu q_U(V) \leq \mathbb{E}_\mu G_{|U|}(n, k)$ (Lemma 3(a)), so $F(\mu) \leq \varepsilon$ forces $\mathbb{E}_\mu G_{|U|}(n, k) \geq e^{-\varepsilon}$ and

$$L_F(n, \varepsilon) \geq \min \left\{ \sum_r w_r r : \sum_r w_r G_r(n, k) \geq e^{-\varepsilon}, \sum_r w_r = 1, w \geq 0 \right\},$$

with $G_r \leq 1$ used where G_r is not computed. Conversely, a mixture of uniformly relabelled profiles is relabelling-invariant, so its F is $-\ln \sum_r w_r s_r$, with s_r the profiles' success probabilities (Lemma 1(e)); the same program with the successes of explicit profiles in place of G_r is attained by such a mixture and bounds L_F from above. At $n = 2^{16}$ the lower program mixes one round with the bound $G_3 \leq 1$ and gives 1.996; the upper one mixes the one-round schedule with the best-found six-block profile (64717, 749, 56, 10, 3, 1), of success 0.678, and gives 4.681. The upper ends at 2^8 , 2^{10} and 2^{11} mix, in the same way, the best-found profiles (233, 20, 3) and (227, 23, 5, 1), the one-round schedule and (961, 53, 8, 2), and the one-round schedule and (1937, 92, 14, 4, 1). Both optima have the shape of the dilution in Corollary 6(c): a cheap one-round branch that usually fails, mixed with a longer one.

Balanced slice. In Table 5 the lower end of the L_F bracket is the value of the lower program above over the computed adaptive success probabilities G_r , using $G_r \leq 1$ where it is not computed (at 2^{16} only G_1 and G_2 are computed). At $n = 2^{16}$ the best-found five-round relabelled profile, (64881, 608, 40, 6, 1), has success 0.522 and $F = 0.650 < \ln 2$, which is the $R_F^{\text{PROF}} \leq 5$ entry: a non-exhaustive float64 search found it, the implementation that found it computed its success in exact rational arithmetic, and a second implementation, written from the definitions, reproduces the success in float64 with a bounded truncation error; it is not kernel-checked, and its minimality is not shown. Computed optima and brackets in the same class and at the same cost give $L_H/L_F \approx 1.3$ at $n = 16$ and about 3.8 at $n = 2048$ (finite values, not rates or a monotone trend).

Full support. At $\varepsilon = 0.1$ the shortest best-found single profiles with $F \leq \varepsilon$ have 5–9 rounds (the L_F bounds of Table 6, rounded up to integers); these lengths do not by themselves separate $\log \log n$ from $\sqrt{\log n}$ or a small power, and the good profiles are *increasing*, the reverse of the quota ladder. For $\alpha = \beta = 1$, the single-profile rate $\log_2 \log_2 n + O_\varepsilon(1)$ and the mixture rate $L_F = (e^{-\varepsilon}/2 + o(1)) \log_2 \log_2 n$ are proved in Appendix F, with astronomical constants; the finite mixing gains below are at fixed round caps. For $n \in \{8, 16, 32, 64\}$ and $r \leq 6$, every exhaustively optimal single relabelled profile is non-decreasing, and for $2 \leq r \leq 6$ the reversed optimal profile has 4.2–148 times its F (extremes at $n = 8, r = 2$ and $n = 64, r = 6$) and the path-optimal profile 1.00–1.76 times, and mixing profiles or adapting block sizes gains at most 3% (floating-point conditional-gradient duality gaps $\leq 3.1 \cdot 10^{-6}$); for the symmetric priors $\text{Beta}(\alpha, \alpha)$ with $\alpha \in \{0.02, 0.05, 0.1, 0.5, 1\}$ at $(n, r) \in \{(10, 2), (32, 2), (32, 3), (32, 4), (64, 2), (64, 3)\}$ the gain reaches 50%, at the U-shaped $\alpha = 0.02, n = 10, r = 2$ (floating-point duality brackets with gaps $\leq 3.1 \cdot 10^{-5}$; a second implementation agrees on the 14 cells it covers, including the

Table 5: Finite comparison at $\varepsilon = \ln 2$ (finite computation; details in Appendix K). L_H, L_F : mean-cost optima of the same class (two-length linear programs; L_F bracketed below by the lower program over the computed G_r and above by best-found relabelled profiles; at 2^{16} , where the program’s d_r^* were not computed, the L_H entry brackets the optimum between the kernel-checked lower bound and the length A of one schedule); A : least length of one fixed schedule with $\text{KL} \leq \ln 2$ (computed optimum: float64 evaluation of an exact dynamic program) and the shape share of its divergence; R_F^{PROF} : least length of one relabelled profile with $F \leq \ln 2$ (exact at 2^4 ; at 2^8 and 2^{10} a computed optimum, float64 with margins of at least 0.02 from $\frac{1}{2}$; best-found upper bound at $2^{12}, 2^{16}$; ≥ 4 at 2^{11} , since $G_3(2048, 1024) = 0.3145 < \frac{1}{2}$ in float64 bounds the success of every relabelled profile with at most three rounds); TV: total-variation distance between the target and the output law of the $\delta = \frac{1}{2}$ ladder of Theorem 2(b)’s proof with the Hoeffding–Ville choice $K = \lceil 2 \ln(2/\delta) \rceil = 3$ (the stated bound takes the smaller $K_\delta = 2$ of the Kolmogorov branch; both ladders fail with probability at most δ), whose bulk blocks are (160, 72), (256, 672, 72), (3328, 672, 72) and (40960, 23808, 672, 72) at $2^8, 2^{10}, 2^{12}$ and 2^{16} , each followed by 24 singletons; fixed labelling versus relabelled ($= 1 - s$, with s the ladder’s success probability; exact at 2^8 – 2^{12} , within $2 \cdot 10^{-57}$ at 2^{16}); the fixed-labelling TV is a 30-digit enumeration at 2^8 – 2^{12} (pruned mass below 10^{-31}) and at 2^{16} a seeded Monte Carlo estimate of $\mathbb{E}_P[(1 - Q/P)_+]$ over 400,000 target draws (standard error 0.0004). Optima, shares and TV values are rounded to nearest, bounds outward; –: not computed.

n	L_H	L_F	A	shape	R_F^{PROF}	TV fixed / mixed
2^4	2.66	1.999	–	–	2	–
2^8	8.19	3.28–3.39	9	89%	4	0.412 / 0.005
2^{10}	12.56	3.71–3.86	13	95%	4	0.574 / 0.014
2^{11}	15.14	3.92–4.04	–	–	≥ 4	–
2^{12}	18.06	–	19	98%	≤ 5	0.673 / 0.015
2^{16}	26.20–33	1.99–4.69	33	99%	≤ 5	0.831 / 0.022

50% cell). Near $\varepsilon = 0.1$, mixing profiles or adapting block sizes gains at most 5.2% at $n = 256$ and 8.5% at $n = 512$ (caps 5 and 6, where the best-found single profiles are (1, 3, 8, 31, 213) and (1, 2, 5, 12, 38, 198) at $n = 256$ and (2, 4, 12, 51, 443) and (1, 2, 5, 15, 57, 432) at $n = 512$) over the best single profile; these near- ε bounds are floating-point duality bounds from one implementation, with duality interval width $\leq 10^{-5}$. At a fixed small number of rounds the gain can be larger: mixing profiles gains 27.9% at $n = 1024$ with two rounds (float64 duality bounds). Close agreement of the first four moments need not make F close: at $\alpha = \beta = 1$ and $n = 4096$, four post-selected pairs of profiles with equal round counts differ in F by factors 5.5–33.4 (float64): for $m \in \{16, 32, 49, 64\}$, the profile of m unit rounds and one block of $n - m$ against, respectively, $(1^{15}, 287, 3794)$, $(1^{31}, 1014, 3051)$, $(1^{42}, 393, 422, 451, 484, 518, 555, 594, 637)$ and $(1^{47}, 218, 220, 220, 220, 222, 222, 223, 224, 225, 225, 226, 227, 227, 229, 229, 230, 230, 232)$, where 1^k stands for k unit rounds. In each pair the means and third central moments coincide by the $0 \leftrightarrow 1$ symmetry of the target, and the variances and fourth central moments agree only approximately (relative gaps $\leq 7.7 \cdot 10^{-6}$ and $\leq 1.2 \cdot 10^{-3}$); the pairs were chosen by moment agreement within the same search that computes F . Over all relabelled profiles with 2–5 rounds

at $n = 32$ and 2–4 at $n = 48$, profiles whose output count laws have log-variances within 10^{-3} differ in F by at most 5.5% for $\alpha = \beta \in \{16, 64\}$ and by at most 17% for $(\alpha, \beta) = (2, 30)$; for $\alpha = \beta \in \{0.2, 1, 4\}$ the largest such ratio at each prior and size is between 1.335 and 16.77 (float64). Two frozen predictions of fitted growth exponents for other Beta priors failed. Table 6 is a float64 computation, not interval-certified, except its L_F bounds at $n \leq 2^{10}$, which a separate exact evaluation with interval arithmetic certifies as upper bounds.




Figure 5: The mechanism at finite n ($\varepsilon = \ln 2$; finite computation, Table 5): total variation to p of the $K = \lceil 2 \ln(2/\delta) \rceil = 3$ ladder of Theorem 2(b)’s proof ($\delta = \frac{1}{2}$; the Hoeffding–Ville choice, where the stated bound takes $K_\delta = 2$; Table 5 lists its blocks) under the fixed labelling (circles) and under its relabelling (squares; $= 1 - s$, the quota-violation probability). Filled: computed; open: a seeded Monte Carlo estimate (standard error 0.0004). The least lengths of the same table are plotted in Figure 2.

Appendix L. Reproducibility

Software, licenses and compute. The formal proofs use Lean 4 (de Moura and Ullrich, 2021) and Mathlib (The mathlib Community, 2020) (Apache License 2.0); the learned heads use PyTorch (Paszke et al., 2019); the numerical scripts also use Arb (Johansson, 2017) through python-flint, and NumPy, SciPy, SymPy, mpmath and Matplotlib. PyTorch, NumPy, SciPy, SymPy and mpmath are released under the BSD 3-Clause license, Matplotlib under its PSF-based license, FLINT, which contains Arb, under the LGPL (version 3 or later), and python-flint under the MIT license. No external data or pretrained models are used; all data are synthetic draws from the stated targets. The learned heads used NVIDIA H100 80GB GPUs, with several jobs sharing a GPU, about 25 job-hours in total (Appendix M); the kernel checks and the other finite computations use CPUs only, and their run times are not reported.

This appendix evaluates the general balanced-slice bounds at finite sizes, as cited in Section 3, and names the scripts behind Table 8 and Figures 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7.

With $\Gamma_t(n) = \min\{1, 2 \cdot 6^{t-1}(k+1)^{-2^{-t}}\}$, the κ_r form of the survival envelope of Appendix D (prefactor $\kappa_t = 2 \cdot 6^{t-1}$ in place of the bounded $A_t < 36$ of (Env)), $G_t(n, k) \leq \Gamma_t(n)$. Since $R_F^{\text{adapt}}(n, \varepsilon)$ is the least t with $G_t(n, k) \geq e^{-\varepsilon}$ (Corollary 6(a)), $R_F^{\text{adapt}}(n, \varepsilon) \geq \min\{t : \Gamma_t(n) \geq e^{-\varepsilon}\}$; and since $L_F(n, \varepsilon) \geq 1 + t(e^{-\varepsilon} - G_t(n, k))$ for every $t \geq 1$ (Appendix E, the single-horizon

Table 6: Full-support target Beta(1, 1)–Bernoulli: computed L_H optima (float64 evaluation of the exact optimization) and best-found upper bounds on L_F (float64; interval-certified only where stated). Each L_F bound mixes the best-found profiles with R and $R + 1$ rounds whose F values bracket ε , weighted so that the average F is ε ; as $\text{KL}(p\|\cdot)$ is convex, the mixture has $F \leq \varepsilon$, and the $(R + 1)$ -round profile alone has $F \leq \varepsilon$, so each bound, rounded up to an integer, is the length of the shortest best-found single profile with $F \leq \varepsilon$. All L_F entries come from one evaluation pipeline applied to the candidate profiles of two independent optimizers; at $n \leq 2^{10}$ a separate implementation, which recomputes each profile’s output count law exactly and encloses F in interval arithmetic, certifies these L_F entries as upper bounds; a second implementation reproduces L_H at $n = 2^8$ – 2^{12} ($\varepsilon = 0.1$). L_H rounded down, upper bounds up, ratios (computed from the unrounded values) down.

n	$\varepsilon = 0.1$			$\varepsilon = \ln 2$		
	L_H	$L_F \leq$	ratio $\geq$	L_H	$L_F \leq$	ratio $\geq$
2^6	14.55	4.36	3.3	4.35	2.29	1.9
2^8	29.48	5.59	5.2	8.03	2.91	2.7
2^{10}	51.61	6.50	7.9	13.10	3.43	3.8
2^{12}	81.45	7.12	11.4	19.29	3.82	5.0
2^{14}	119.34	7.68	15.5	26.75	4.04	6.6
2^{15}	141.37	7.86	17.9	30.93	4.25	7.2
2^{16}	165.50	8.02	20.6	35.44	4.42	8.0

Table 7: Balanced slice, $n = 65536$, $\varepsilon = \ln 2$. K: kernel-checked; Fin: finite computation, of two kinds: $L_H \leq 33$ is one schedule found by a float64 dynamic program, its KL recomputed at 60 digits; the L_F bracket comes from exact-rational linear programs over inputs selected by a float64 search. The lower bound on L_H uses the three-term form of Theorem 2(a) (the relaxed form gives 23.02); the $L_F \leq 11$ certificate relabels one explicit profile (numbers of unrevealed coordinates $65536 \rightarrow 1735 \rightarrow 201 \rightarrow 50 \rightarrow 19 \rightarrow 9 \rightarrow 5$, then five singletons). The kernel check bounds that profile’s failure probability by the second-moment budget $\sum_t b_t/m_t^2$ over its shrinking blocks (m_t the coordinates left after block t ; the singleton tail adds nothing), here $0.4889 < \frac{1}{2}$, so its success exceeds $\frac{1}{2}$ and $F < \ln 2$. The five-round profile behind the finite computation $F = 0.650$ has a budget above 7, which is why the certificate uses eleven rounds.

quantity	value	
L_H	> 26.20	K
L_H	≤ 33 (one schedule)	Fin
L_F	≤ 11 (one relabelled profile)	K
L_H/L_F	> 2	K
L_F (finite brackets)	$[1.996, 4.681]$	Fin

bound), $L_F(n, \varepsilon) \geq \max_{t \geq 1} \{1 + t[e^{-\varepsilon} - \Gamma_t(n)]_+\}$, the bound being kernel-checked for each t ; these are the two right-hand columns of Table 8.

Table 8: Proved bounds versus n ($\varepsilon = \ln 2$). Formula evaluations; lower bounds rounded down, upper bounds up (script hash below). The second and third columns evaluate Theorem 2(a) and (b), and the two right-hand columns the kernel-checked envelope forms (Appendix Q), with $\Gamma_t(n)$ of Appendix D.

$\log_2 n$	$L_H \geq$	$L_F \leq$	$L_F \geq$	$R_F^{\text{adapt}} \geq$
8	5.09	19	1.32	2
16	26.20	20	1.48	2
32	122.43	21	1.88	3
64	530.82	22	1.99	4
128	2211.37	23	2.49	4
1024	$1.46 \cdot 10^5$	26	3.49	7




Figure 6: Proved bounds as functions of n at $\varepsilon = \ln 2$ and the kernel-checked finite certificates at $n = 2^{16}$. Curves are formula evaluations, not measurements.

Table 8 and Figure 6 show where the general bounds are informative: the proved upper bound on L_F is below the proved lower bound on L_H for every even $n \geq 2^{15}$ at $\varepsilon = \ln 2$ and every even $n \geq 2^{13}$ at $\varepsilon = 0.1$ (kernel-checked); the two formulas first cross at even $n = 19,286$ and $n = 4,788$, so 2^{15} and 2^{13} are the first powers of two past the crossing. The lower bounds on L_F and R_F^{adapt} (the terminal lower bounds) are of the right order but weak at every size shown, because the prefactor of the survival envelope dominates: the weaker κ_r form $\Gamma_r(n) < 1$ of Appendix D requires $n > 4.1 \cdot 10^4$ for $r = 2$, $n > 1.4 \cdot 10^{15}$ for $r = 3$ and $n > 2.9 \cdot 10^{42}$ for $r = 4$, and even the bounded prefactor of (Env) needs $n > 2590$, $n > 4.3 \cdot 10^9$ and $n > 1.2 \cdot 10^{22}$.

Scripts: Table 8 and Figure 6 come from `bounds_v2.py` (sha256 c00a4cae...; output 11065153...); Figure 6 is drawn by `fig1_bounds_alt.py` (64ca16b9...). Figure 5 plots the total-variation values of Table 5, listed in `make_fig_mech.py` (4c0b80d7...) and drawn by `make_fig_mech_alt.py` (76798c75...); the least lengths of that table are re-checked by

`fig_lengths_compute.py` (e79357cf...). Figures 1 and 3 come from `fig_a_compute.py` (3c725a52...) and `fig_b_compute.py` (98a0ef67...), in exact rational arithmetic, read by `fig_a_plot.py` (9a173461...) and `fig_b_plot.py` (2be95ef0...) and drawn by `fig_a_plot_alt.py` (9e00ebe8...) and `fig_b_plot_alt.py` (18cc56f0...); Figure 4 is a schematic with no data, drawn by `fig_sampler_ref_alt.py` (f1236ad8...); Figure 2 comes from `fig_finite_sep.py` (aad2b2dc...), which evaluates the two bounds of Theorem 2 and reads the re-checked least lengths of Table 5 and the kernel-checked bounds of Table 7, and is drawn by `fig_finite_sep_alt.py` (ce2607a5...); and Figure 7 is drawn from the two exported tables of the first frozen test by `make_exhibit_alt.py` (6634f972...).

Appendix M. Controlled learned-conditional test

Do exact-oracle rankings of schedule profiles survive learned conditionals? On small masked transformers trained on known targets ($n \leq 16$), not language models, we tested exact-oracle rankings fixed in advance against the profiles’ complete-law output KL (float64 dynamic program) under fresh heads: eight targets in the main test and four held-out Beta–Bernoulli targets in a second test. The main test’s menu entries (exact-oracle optima over size profiles, other relabelled profiles, fixed orders, and for quota targets a value-adaptive policy) are not the asymptotic ladders, and its predictions held under their frozen eligibility screens; the second test’s held in every tested cell, and a later two-group test passed three items and, as written, failed a fourth, a control that named the wrong comparator. All passes are sample-level: with six independent clusters per target, even a 100% pass rate bounds a population pass probability from below only by 0.61 (one-sided 95%). On the main test’s extended menu the terminal-optimal profile’s regret exceeded 0.005 nats in 14 of 486 pairs. Frozen predictions of exact-oracle finite-size quantities, which involve no learned heads, fared worse: of eight two-group predictions five passed and three failed, and both of the two frozen predictions of fitted growth exponents for Beta priors other than Beta(1, 1) failed; Appendix K lists all ten, and the statements that the two-group failures narrowed. Exploratory target-aware plugin rules using the heads’ own conditionals chose the exact-oracle rule’s profile in 5,559 of 5,760 replicate rows (not independent) on the three Beta–Bernoulli targets and the two-group target, so we show no decision value over them, nor, on all eight targets, over direct validation (below), and no rate or robustness theorem under learned error. On the four uniform quota targets, restarting until a valid string appears, a step outside the interface, gives much lower output KL at comparable expected rounds (measured, not scored), so nothing here recommends the restricted interface for practice. This appendix gives the protocol and the reproduction checks that were run.

Heads: masked transformers (PyTorch, [Paszke et al., 2019](#); two pre-LN layers, width 64, four attention heads, feed-forward width 256, GELU, no dropout) trained on $N \in \{256, 1024, 8192\}$ draws with AdamW (learning rate $2 \cdot 10^{-3}$, weight decay 10^{-4} , cosine decay to 5%), batch 512 and 4000 steps. Each training example reveals a uniformly random set whose size is uniform on $\{0, \dots, n-1\}$, and the loss is the mean binary cross-entropy over the unrevealed coordinates. The checkpoint used for the frozen predictions, called ES, is the one with the lowest masked cross-entropy on 2048 separate development draws, each with four fixed masks, among the evaluations at steps 0, 50, 100, $\dots$, 4000; it reads no evaluator quantity (target, KL or law). Each run also saved the checkpoints at step 300 (EARLY) and step 4000 (END); these two enter only Figure 7(c), whose EARLY and END points come from the evaluation rows of those checkpoints. The same settings were used for every head. Heads are evaluated in float64 with PyTorch’s fused-attention fast path




Figure 7: Controlled test with learned conditionals (144 fresh trajectories, 48 independent clusters, six held-out regimes and fresh seeds on two discovery targets; output KL of the complete output law, computed in float64 by dynamic programming over revealed sets (no sampling), $n \leq 16$; predictions frozen before evaluation). (a) Learned regret of the path-optimal profile PATH versus its oracle loss g_P (identity dashed). (b) Learned versus oracle gap between a fixed labelled order and its relabelling. (c) Learned regret of the exact-oracle terminal-optimal profile TERM against the head’s development-loss excess (“DEV excess”), for cells with oracle margin 0.01–0.03 and the EARLY, ES and END checkpoints of each run (descriptive, not a frozen pass/fail item; dotted line at 0.05, the top boundary of the freeze’s descriptive head-error bands ≤ 0.02 , $0.02-0.05$ and > 0.05 ; DEV excess, which can be negative, is drawn clipped below at 10^{-5}). Controlled prediction only.

disabled. Compute: NVIDIA H100 80GB GPUs, with several jobs sharing a GPU; about 25 job-hours in total for training and evaluation (job logs), 9.5 of them in the rows’ law-evaluation timing fields (complete-law DP, plus the path criterion where computed); menu construction and the two-group dynamic programs ran on CPUs. Targets: uniform quota (uniform on the strings with a given number of ones; “quota” below), given as (length, number of ones), (14, 7), (16, 5), (10, 5), (12, 6); Beta-Bernoulli, given as (length; Beta parameters), $(12; \frac{1}{2}, 2)$, (14; 1, 1), (12; 1, 1); two groups (4 + 8 coordinates, $k = 6$, tilt 3: on the strings with k ones, probability proportional to $3^{|x_A|}$, where $|x_A|$ is the number of ones among the four coordinates of group A; Appendix G); quota (12, 6) and Beta-Bernoulli (12; 1, 1) are discovery targets, on which the thresholds were calibrated with other seeds, and the other six are held out. Menu per target and r ($r = 2, 3, 4$ for every target, and also $r = 5$ for quota (14, 7) and (16, 5) and Beta-Bernoulli (14; 1, 1)): TERM (exact-oracle terminal optimum: the size profile of least exact-oracle output KL), PATH (path-certificate optimum, minimizing the exact-oracle schedule-averaged KL H , an upper bound on the exact-oracle output KL), uniform (the most even profile with r blocks), TERM reversed, a halving ladder (each block half of the coordinates still to commit, rounded up but leaving at least one for each later block; the last block takes the rest), the other family’s optimum (a misspecified-family control: the exact-oracle

terminal optimum, at the same n and r , of the quota target with $n/2$ ones for Beta–Bernoulli targets, and of Beta(1, 1)–Bernoulli for the quota and two-group targets), fixed-order versions of TERM, PATH and uniform, and for quota targets the value-adaptive optimum (the maximizing count-state rule of Theorem 4(a), run in a uniformly random order; under the exact oracle its output KL is $-\ln G_r(n, k)$, the least over $\mathcal{A}_r$). Endpoint: the complete-law $\text{KL}(p||Q_{\theta, \text{law}})$ (float64 dynamic program), the output KL of a design under the learned head. Regret is measured against the best, under the learned head, of the five relabelled profiles TERM, PATH, uniform, TERM reversed and the halving ladder (the frozen scorer’s predrawn menu). The *oracle margin* of a target and r is the exact-oracle output KL of the best other menu entry with a different size profile minus that of TERM. The *development-loss excess* is the head’s masked cross-entropy on its 2048 development draws (four fixed masks each) minus that of the exact conditionals on the same draws and masks. The first frozen test has the items P1–P5 of the table below. P1’s units are the (trajectory, r) pairs that pass the *screen*: $\text{margin} \geq 0.01$ and $\text{excess} \leq 0.02$. PATH’s *oracle loss* g_P at a target and r is the exact-oracle output KL of PATH minus that of TERM; the *relabelling gain* G_o of a profile (the oracle gap of Figure 7(b)) is the exact-oracle output KL of its fixed labelled order minus that of its uniform relabelling. The head’s *evidence-bound choice* (P2b) is the menu profile minimizing the learned head’s own schedule-averaged KL H , computed in float64 without sampling. TERM and PATH are exact-oracle optima over size profiles, the value-adaptive optimum is a policy, the fixed-order versions are fixed labelled schedules, and the other entries are relabelled profiles; none is an asymptotic ladder of Section 3. Selectors were given the family and its parameters, which determine the target, so these are not target-free selections.

item	frozen prediction (units; threshold)	result
P1	TERM regret ≤ 0.002 (oracle margin ≥ 0.01 , dev. excess ≤ 0.02 ; $\geq 95\%$)	342/342
P2a	PATH regret $\geq \frac{1}{2}g_P$ (cells $g_P \geq 0.02$; $\geq 90\%$)	180/180
P2b	head’s evidence-bound choice regret $\geq \frac{1}{2}g_P$ ($\geq 90\%$)	180/180
P3a	fixed order loses $\geq \frac{1}{2}G_o$ (triples over TERM, PATH, uniform; $G_o \geq 0.05$; $\geq 95\%$)	1386/1386
P3b	quota: $ \Delta\text{validity} , \Delta H \leq 0.1G_o$ ($\geq 90\%$); Beta–Bernoulli: $ \Delta H \leq 0.3G_o$	689/702, 684/702; 540/540
P3c	quota: shape $\geq 80\%$ of the learned gap ($\geq 90\%$)	701/702
P4	reversed / other-family profile loses ≥ 0.1 ($\geq 90\%$ each)	486/486 each
P5	quota: value-adaptive optimum $\leq \text{TERM} + 0.005$ ($\geq 90\%$)	242/252

The table summarises the first frozen test only. Units, nested in clusters: P1, P2, P4, P5 count (trajectory, r) pairs; P3 counts (trajectory, r , profile) triples. There are 144 trajectories (training runs, one per target, seed and training size); the three training sizes of one target–seed pair share seed streams, so there are 48 independent clusters. Clusters in which every unit passes: P1 48/48, P2 42/42, P3a 48/48, P4 48/48, P3b 17/24 and 18/24, P3c 23/24, P5 17/24. For the items below 100%, the pooled unit pass proportion, resampled over the (target, seed) clusters (20,000 cluster-bootstrap draws), has its 5% quantile above the item’s frozen threshold (P3b 0.970/0.955, P3c 0.996, P5 0.935). In words: the path-optimal profile and the profile with the smallest learned-head H kept a learned regret of at least half of PATH’s oracle loss g_P in every eligible pair, and a fixed labelled order lost at least half of the relabelling gain in every eligible triple, while, on quota targets, the log validity rate and the path divergence moved by at most a tenth of that gain in 97–98% of triples. A second frozen test (plan written before training, scorer fixed before any row; 72 fresh trajectories from four held-out Beta–Bernoulli targets, Beta($\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{1}{2}$) and Beta(4, 4) at $n = 14$ and 16; 24 independent clusters) scored the variance-matching rule (which picks the composition whose complete output law under the head (float64 dynamic program) has the variance of the number of ones closest

to the target’s Beta–Binomial variance (closed form)) against all relabelled compositions with exactly r blocks: on Beta($\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}$) it kept at least half of its oracle regret in 18/18, 18/18, 17/18 heads ($n = 14$, $r = 2, 3, 4$) and 18/18 ($n = 16$, $r = 2$); on Beta(4, 4) its regret was at most 0.005 in 18/18 heads in every tested cell; $n = 16$ with $r = 3, 4$ was not tested (105 and 455 compositions per head, estimated at over 50 GPU-hours). A third frozen test (the predictions were frozen before the execution plan was written, and the plan before any value on a learned head; two groups of $4 + 8$ coordinates, $k = 6$, tilt 3; the main test’s 18 two-group heads, 6 independent clusters) scored a group-aware, value-adaptive survival rule: the two-group survival planner of Appendix J (TGR5), which, from the rounds left, the free counts of the two groups and the residual quota, commits the block composition (b_A, b_B) that maximizes the exact-oracle probability of meeting the quota within the remaining rounds (ties to the lexicographically first, comparing exact values), commits everything in the last round, and places each group’s share uniformly within the group by a predrawn seed. Against a comparator X its *oracle gain* is $F_{\text{exact}}(X) - F_{\text{exact}}(\text{rule})$, and “by at least half the oracle gain” means $F_{\text{head}}(X) - F_{\text{head}}(\text{rule}) \geq \frac{1}{2}[F_{\text{exact}}(X) - F_{\text{exact}}(\text{rule})]$. It beat the group-blind terminal-optimal profile by at least half the oracle gain in 36/36 (head, r) pairs at $r = 3, 4$ (median gain 0.045 nats, oracle 0.045), was the best law of the menu in 36/36, and beat the tilt-blind balanced adaptive rule by at least half the oracle gain at $r = 4$ in 18/18 (under the exact oracle that rule has TERM’s law at $r = 4$: it commits 7, 3, 1 and 1 coordinates whenever the quota is not already forced, so this item repeats the first item’s $r = 4$ half, and its head values differ from TERM’s by at most 0.0025). The fourth item, a control at $r = 2$, where no adaptivity is possible, named the wrong comparator. As frozen, it required the rule’s output KL under each head to be within 0.005 of that of TERM. At $r = 2$, TERM, the exact-oracle terminal optimum over size profiles, is group-blind (blocks of 9 and 3 coordinates), and the rule beats it by 0.0147 nats on exact-oracle values alone, so the item fails by construction (within 0.005 in 2 of 18 heads). The intended comparator was the group-aware profile that commits 3 of group A’s and 7 of group B’s coordinates and then the remaining two; at $r = 2$ the rule is exactly this profile, so the intended comparison is an identity (18/18, difference 0) and checks only that the two evaluations agree. Frozen predictions about exact-oracle finite-size quantities fared worse: of eight two-group predictions five passed and three failed, and both of the two frozen predictions of fitted growth exponents for Beta priors other than Beta(1, 1) failed (Appendix K).

Passes are sample-level: with six independent clusters per target, even a 100% pass rate bounds a population success probability from below only by $0.05^{1/6} \approx 0.61$ (one-sided 95%), so the pass-rate thresholds are not certified at the population level. Over all 48 clusters of the main test the corresponding bound for P1 is $0.05^{1/48} \approx 0.94$, and even that assumes a common cluster-success probability; it says nothing about unseen target families. None of these tests is a rate or robustness theorem under learned error; Appendix N gives the exact statements that are proved. In the quota comparisons, which the freeze named as contextual (measured, not scored; not tabulated), restarting until a valid string appears, a step outside the interface, gives much lower output KL at comparable expected rounds (medians over the 18 heads of each target: 0.002–0.005 nats at 3.5–4.0 expected rounds, against 0.068–0.177 nats for TERM with 4 rounds).

Plug-in comparison (after the freeze; not a frozen test). The comparison covers the Beta–Bernoulli and two-group targets: the three Beta–Bernoulli targets and the two-group target. It uses their 72 fresh ES heads from the main test, in 24 clusters, with every head and every r included (no screen).

- *What the rules use.* Like the frozen rule, each rule knows the target: its family, its parameters and, for two groups, the group split.
 - Each rule averaged the head’s conditionals onto count states (group-count states for two groups), over 16 random contexts per state. That takes 1,248–6,880 head queries per estimate; the frozen rule makes none.
 - It inserted these conditionals into the exact count-state recursion, giving each of the exact oracle’s six relabelled profiles (P1’s five plus the other family’s optimum) an estimated output KL to the known target.
 - The first rule chose the smallest estimated output KL. On the two-group target, a second rule chose the largest estimated valid mass from the same estimates.
- *The rows.* Each head and r was run in 20 replicates. That gives 5,760 replicate rows: 16 (target, r , rule) cells, 18 heads each, 20 replicates. Because the two-group rules share their estimates, these rows hold 4,680 distinct estimates. The rows are not independent.
- *Agreement.* The rules chose the frozen rule’s profile in 5,559 rows: 4,479 of 4,680 for the first rule and all 1,080 for the second.
- *Disagreement.* All 201 differing rows are Beta–Bernoulli, and in every one of them the plug-in chose the path-optimal profile. Under the learned head, that choice had lower output KL than the frozen rule’s in 89 rows, by at most 0.0036 nats, and higher output KL in 112, by at most 0.022 nats.
- *Earlier rivals.* The freeze also named zero-cost comparators and sampling-based validation rivals, as quantities to be measured rather than scored. They are reported descriptively and support no decision-value or cost claim.

The plug-in thus mostly repeats the frozen rule’s choice, TERM. Direct validation, which computes each of the six relabelled profiles’ complete-law output KL under the learned head and keeps the lowest, improves on TERM by more than 0.005 nats in only 3 of the main test’s 486 (trajectory, r) pairs, over all eight targets (extended-menu note below). We claim no decision value for the frozen rule over the plug-in (on its four targets) or over direct validation (on all eight). Neither comparison shows that selection adds no value on other targets.

check (units)	result on these targets	limits and failures
Main frozen test: 144 trajectories, 48 clusters; (trajectory, r) pairs, or triples for P3	under the screen, the exact-oracle terminal choice transfers (P1 342/342); the path certificate and the head's own H misselect as in the oracle (P2); the relabelling gain survives and is nearly invisible to validity rate and H on quota: at most a tenth of it in 97–98% of triples (P3); TERM reversed and the other family's optimum lose ≥ 0.1 nats (P4); the value-adaptive quota optimum is at most 0.005 above TERM (P5 242/252)	no population pass rates: the one-sided 95% bound is 0.61 per target; nothing outside the screen: Figure 7(c) is descriptive; no robustness theorem under learned error
Second test: 72 trajectories, 24 clusters	the frozen variance-matching predictions pass in every tested cell (lowest 17/18; frozen rates 80% for Beta($\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}$) and 90% for Beta(4, 4))	$n = 16$ with $r = 3, 4$ not tested
Third test: the main test's 18 two-group heads, 6 clusters	the group-aware rule's exact-oracle advantage persists (36/36, 36/36, 18/18; median gain 0.045 nats)	the fourth item, as written, fails: its comparator was wrong
Exact-oracle finite-size predictions (no learned heads)	five of eight two-group predictions passed	three two-group predictions failed, narrowing the claims, and both frozen growth-exponent predictions failed
Plug-in, after the freeze: the main test's 72 Beta-Bernoulli and two-group heads, 5,760 replicate rows	the plug-in and the frozen rule, both using the known target, agree in 5,559 rows	no decision value over the plug-in or, on all eight targets, direct validation; the plug-in excludes uniform quota targets; no cost comparison
Restart until valid (outside the interface; named in the freeze, measured but not scored; uniform quota targets)	lower output KL than the restricted interface at comparable expected rounds	no recommendation of the restricted interface for practice
Overall	—	no native language-model or deployment benefit (not tested)

Reproduction checks.

- (i) *Cached results.* On a CPU, from the cached per-head results, the 82 items of the checker regenerate with 0 mismatches, in clean rooms on macOS and Linux. The items are: 61 printed values, 4 checks of Figure 7, 9 source-note values and 8 consistency checks. The plug-in counts in this appendix that are not among them (heads, clusters, cells, replicates, the disagreement split) were recounted from the same rows.
- (ii) *Checkpoint inference.* One (ES) checkpoint was kept per head, 216 in all. A subset of 29 of the 216 checkpoints was fixed before any recomputation, and it covers every family and scorer.
- An executor not involved in producing the results re-derived that subset from the weights, on a CPU, with no cached result in its isolated input tree.
 - The re-derived results agree with the cached ones to within $1.5 \cdot 10^{-14}$, and they regenerate the third test's printed values, subject to that executor's stated limits: coverage (25 of the 144 fresh and 4 of the 72 full-support heads), run observability (no pre-run proof

of an empty output folder, no exclusion of a concurrent writer, file times not attested), timing fields untested, and only the recorded Monte Carlo draws checked.

- The other 187 checkpoints are tied to their results by file hashes only.
- (iii) *Training*. Retraining needs a CUDA GPU, as the original training did. It was not rerun, and a rerun would agree only up to training variation.
- (iv) *Portability*. Regeneration of (i) was tested only on CPU, on macOS and Linux with the pinned Python packages, where all 82 checked items match; nothing was rerun on a GPU, and the original evaluations ran in float64, on H100 GPUs except menu construction and the two-group dynamic programs (CPUs).

Extended menu (main test). On the extended menu, which adds the other family’s optimum and, for quota targets, the value-adaptive optimum, the terminal-optimal profile’s regret exceeded 0.005 nats in 14 of the 486 (trajectory, r) pairs, screened or not; the largest was 0.0080.

- In 11 of these 14, the value-adaptive optimum (a different policy class) beat it.
- On the six relabelled profiles alone (without the value-adaptive optimum) it exceeded 0.005 in 3 of 486.
- Every cell mean stayed below 0.005 (largest 0.0048), so statements about cell means are not statements about every pair.

Appendix N. Imperfect conditionals

This appendix drops the exact-oracle assumption for two schedule families, with p uniform on $V = \{|x| = k\}$, $n \geq 2$ and $1 \leq k \leq n - 1$; unlike the balanced-slice results of Section 3 and Appendices B, C and E, this appendix does not assume $n = 2k$, except in Theorem IC2. Proposition IC1 treats relabelled singletons with a general head, and Theorem IC2 treats the uninformed head on fixed relabelled profiles and on a count-adaptive policy; Appendix O summarizes both results. A *head* $\hat{h}$ gives each masked coordinate i , given the revealed coordinates R and their values, a probability $\hat{h}_i(x_R)$ of a one; it equals the exact marginal $a_i(x_R)$ wherever that marginal is 0 or 1 (forced states). Its *population masked-prediction excess* is

$$A(\hat{h}) = \mathbb{E} \text{kl}(a_i(x_R) \parallel \hat{h}_i(x_R)),$$

where kl is the Bernoulli KL, $x \sim p$, the number m of masked coordinates is uniform on $\{1, \dots, n\}$, the masked set is uniform of size m , and i is uniform in it, so that the loss is averaged over the masked coordinates. This quantity is the excess, over the exact head, of the masked training objective with mask size uniform on $\{1, \dots, n\}$ and a per-context mean loss. The development-loss excess of Appendix M is a sample estimate of it. Let $\hat{Q}$ be the output law of *relabelled singletons* run with $\hat{h}$: a uniformly random order, one coordinate per round, each drawn from $\hat{h}$. At an interior (non-forced) state both values are legal, and at a forced state the head is exact, so $\hat{Q}(V) = 1$. For an output law Q we write $F(Q) = \text{KL}(p \parallel Q)$, the output-law divergence of Section 2.

Proposition IC1 (imperfect conditionals on relabelled singletons). (a) $F(\hat{Q}) \leq nA(\hat{h})$, the any-order likelihood bound in KL form (Uriu et al., 2014; Shih et al., 2022; Hoogeboom et al., 2022), with equality whenever $\hat{h}$ is *coherent*, that is, its conditionals are those of a joint law ν on V with

$\nu > 0$; then $\hat{Q} = \nu$. Hence, over heads exact at forced states, $\sup\{F(\hat{Q}) : A(\hat{h}) \leq a\} = na$ for every finite $a \geq 0$. (b) If $\hat{h}$ is a *label-invariant count-state head*, that is, $\hat{h}_i(x_R) = g(M, j)$ at the count state (M, j) of Section 2, for every masked i , with one function g independent of i , of all coordinate labels and of R , then $F(\hat{Q}) = 0$. A dependence on labels is not allowed: at $n = 2, k = 1$, the head with $\hat{h}_1 = 0.9, \hat{h}_2 = 0.1$ at the root and exact forced continuations gives $F = \ln(5/3) > 0$. (c) If $\logit \hat{h}_i = \logit(j/M) + s c_i$ at interior states, with $\sum_i c_i = 0$ and $c \neq 0$, then $F(\hat{Q})/(nA(\hat{h})) \rightarrow \rho_n := n(n - \mathcal{H}_n)/(n - 1)^2$ as $s \rightarrow 0$, where $\mathcal{H}_n = \sum_{m \leq n} 1/m$. (A constant field c gives a label-invariant count-state head, which by (b) costs nothing in $\bar{F}$ but is charged in A ; the constraint removes it.) The constant ρ_n is below 1 for $n \geq 3$, tends to 1, and its minimum is $\rho_5 = 163/192 \approx 0.84896$.

Proof. (a) Let q_σ be the law of the singleton schedule in order σ run with $\hat{h}$. By convexity, $F(\hat{Q}) = \text{KL}(p \| \mathbb{E}_\sigma q_\sigma) \leq \mathbb{E}_\sigma \text{KL}(p \| q_\sigma)$, and by the chain rule along σ , $\text{KL}(p \| q_\sigma) = \sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}_p \text{kl}(a_{\sigma_t} \| \hat{h}_{\sigma_t})$ at the revealed set $\{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{t-1}\}$. Under a uniform σ , step t queries a uniform coordinate of a uniform masked set of size $n - t + 1$, and the steps $t = 1, \dots, n$ visit each mask size once, so $\mathbb{E}_\sigma \text{KL}(p \| q_\sigma) = nA(\hat{h})$. If $\hat{h}$ is coherent with joint law ν , the product of ν 's conditionals along any order is ν , so $q_\sigma = \nu$ for every σ , $\hat{Q} = \nu$ and $F(\hat{Q}) = \text{KL}(p \| \nu) = nA(\hat{h})$. Taking ν with $\text{KL}(p \| \nu) = na$ attains the supremum; such ν exists for every $a \geq 0$, since $\text{KL}(p \| \cdot)$ is continuous on full-support laws on V , equals 0 at p , and is unbounded there because $|V| \geq 2$. The gap $nA - F$ is the ambiguity term of the cross-entropy decomposition for arithmetic-mean ensembles (Wood et al., 2023, Prop. 15). (b) Such a head ignores labels, so $\hat{Q}(\pi x) = \hat{Q}(x)$ for every permutation π of the coordinates. Since $\hat{Q}(V) = 1$ and V is one orbit, $\hat{Q} = p$, as in Lemma 1(e). (c) Both $F(\hat{Q})$ and $nA(\hat{h})$ are of order s^2 , so it suffices to compare their s^2 coefficients. When coordinate i is queried, a_i is its exact marginal, and $\hat{h}(x_i)$ and $a(x_i)$ are the probabilities that the head and the exact conditional give to its value x_i . At an interior state, $\ln \hat{h}(x_i) - \ln a(x_i) = s c_i(x_i - a_i) - \frac{1}{2} s^2 c_i^2 a_i(1 - a_i) + O(s^3)$, and the exact conditionals along any order multiply to p . So $Y_\sigma := \ln(q_\sigma/p) = s S_\sigma - \frac{1}{2} s^2 B_\sigma + O(s^3)$, where $S_\sigma = \sum_t c_{\sigma_t}(x_{\sigma_t} - a_{\sigma_t})$ is a sum of martingale differences under p and $B_\sigma = \sum_t c_{\sigma_t}^2 a_{\sigma_t}(1 - a_{\sigma_t})$, so that $\mathbb{E}_p S_\sigma = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}_p S_\sigma^2 = \mathbb{E}_p B_\sigma$. Since $\hat{Q}/p = \mathbb{E}_\sigma e^{Y_\sigma}$ on V , $F(\hat{Q}) = -\mathbb{E}_p \ln \mathbb{E}_\sigma e^{Y_\sigma}$, and by (a) $nA(\hat{h}) = \mathbb{E}_\sigma \text{KL}(p \| q_\sigma) = -\mathbb{E}_\sigma \mathbb{E}_p Y_\sigma$. Expanding $\ln \mathbb{E}_\sigma e^{Y_\sigma} = \mathbb{E}_\sigma Y_\sigma + \frac{1}{2} \text{Var}_\sigma Y_\sigma + O(s^3)$, the first-order terms vanish because $\mathbb{E}_p S_\sigma = 0$, and $\mathbb{E}_p \mathbb{E}_\sigma B_\sigma = \mathbb{E}_p \mathbb{E}_\sigma S_\sigma^2$ leaves only $\mathbb{E}_p[(\mathbb{E}_\sigma S_\sigma)^2]$ in F ; this gives

$$F(\hat{Q}) = \frac{1}{2} s^2 \mathbb{E}_p[(\mathbb{E}_\sigma S_\sigma)^2] + O(s^3), \quad nA(\hat{h}) = \frac{1}{2} s^2 \mathbb{E}_\sigma \mathbb{E}_p B_\sigma + O(s^3).$$

The coordinate i is queried after a uniform number $r \in \{0, \dots, n - 1\}$ of reveals, taken uniformly from the other coordinates, so $\mathbb{E}_\sigma a_i = \sum_r \frac{1}{n} (k - r \frac{k - x_i}{n - 1}) / (n - r)$, and, since $\sum_{r=0}^{n-1} r / (n - r) = n\mathcal{H}_n - n$, the coefficient of x_i in $\mathbb{E}_\sigma a_i$ is $(\mathcal{H}_n - 1)/(n - 1)$ and $\mathbb{E}_\sigma(x_i - a_i) = \gamma_n x_i + \text{const}$ with $\gamma_n = (n - \mathcal{H}_n)/(n - 1)$. With $\sum_i c_i = 0$ the constant drops, so $\mathbb{E}_\sigma S_\sigma = \gamma_n \sum_i c_i x_i$, and the covariances of the uniform slice give $\mathbb{E}_p[(\mathbb{E}_\sigma S_\sigma)^2] = \gamma_n^2 \frac{k(n-k)}{n(n-1)} \sum_i c_i^2$. At mask size m the hypergeometric second moment is $\mathbb{E} a(1 - a) = \frac{k(n-k)}{n^2} \cdot \frac{n(m-1)}{m(n-1)}$, and averaging over a uniform mask size gives $\mathbb{E} a(1 - a) = \frac{k(n-k)}{n^2} \gamma_n$, so $\mathbb{E}_\sigma \mathbb{E}_p B_\sigma = \gamma_n \frac{k(n-k)}{n^2} \sum_i c_i^2$. The ratio is $\gamma_n n / (n - 1) = \rho_n$. Finally, $1 - \rho_n = [n(\mathcal{H}_n - 1) - (n - 1)] / (n - 1)^2$, so $\rho_n < 1$ for $n \geq 3$ because $n\mathcal{H}_n > 2n - 1$, and $\rho_n \rightarrow 1$. Since $\mathcal{H}_n - 1 \leq \ln n$, $\rho_n \geq 1 - \ln n / (n - 1)$, which is increasing in n and exceeds $0.86 > 163/192$ for $n \geq 25$; exact values for $2 \leq n \leq 24$ give the minimum $\rho_5 = 163/192$. $\square$

Theorem IC2 (the uninformed head; balanced slice, $n = 2k$). Let $\hat{h} \equiv \frac{1}{2}$ at interior states, exact at forced states. Schedules draw a whole block at its starting state: at an interior state its coordinates are independent fair bits, and at a forced state they are exact; there is no stopping inside a block, no repair and no resampling. (i) $A(\hat{h}) \leq \ln 2 (\mathcal{H}_n - 1)/(n - 1) \rightarrow 0$. (ii) For a fixed profile b with block ends $0 = s_0 < s_1 < \dots < s_r = n$, uniformly relabelled, with output law $\hat{Q}_b$,

$$\hat{Q}_b(V) = \sum_{t=1}^r \sum_{s_{t-1} < \ell \leq s_t} \varphi(\ell) 2^{-(s_t - \ell)},$$

$$\varphi(\ell) = 2^{\binom{\ell-1}{k-1}} 2^{-\ell} \quad (k \leq \ell \leq n-1), \quad \varphi(\ell) = 0 \text{ otherwise,}$$

where $\varphi(\ell)$ is the probability that, among fair bits read in commitment order, one of the two quotas is first used up at the ℓ -th bit (the factor 2 counts the two quotas, which are symmetric; one of them is used up by the $(n-1)$ -th bit, since $n-1 = 2k-1$ bits contain k ones or k zeros), and $F = -\ln \hat{Q}_b(V)$. Hence, for $n \geq 4$, $\hat{Q}_b(V) \leq 2r\varphi(n-1) \leq 2r\sqrt{2/(\pi(n-2))}$, and $F \leq \ln 2$ forces $r \geq \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{\pi(n-2)/2}$; at $n=2$ one block of two fair bits already gives $\hat{Q}_b(V) = \frac{1}{2}$. For $n \geq 4$ the profile $(n-L, 1, \dots, 1)$ with $L = \lceil \sqrt{2n} \rceil < n$ singletons has $\hat{Q}_b(V) \geq \frac{1}{2}$. So the least length of a fixed relabelled profile with $F \leq \ln 2$ is $\Theta(\sqrt{n})$. (iii) Let $t = \lceil \log_2 n \rceil$. The count-adaptive *minority policy* runs up to t minority-sized rounds, followed if necessary by one deadline round that commits all remaining coordinates; its output law is $\hat{Q}_{\min}$. A minority-sized round commits, at an interior state, a block whose size is the current minority count d (the smaller of the numbers of ones and zeros still required, the ones on a tie), uniformly relabelled. Once $d=0$ the state is forced; the policy then commits all remaining coordinates and stops, and d stays 0. Its success probability is at least $1 - \frac{n}{2}2^{-t} \geq \frac{1}{2}$, so it achieves $F \leq \ln 2$ with a pathwise hard cap of at most $t+1$ rounds. This is an achieved cap, not the least one, and not a mean-cost law.

Proof. (i) The loss is 0 at a forced state, where $\hat{h}$ is exact; at an interior state it is $\text{kl}(a \parallel \frac{1}{2}) = \ln 2 - h(a)$, with h the binary entropy in nats. In both cases it is at most $4 \ln 2 (a - \frac{1}{2})^2$, because $h(a) \geq 4 \ln 2 a(1-a)$ (in bits, the standard bound $h_2(a) \geq 4a(1-a)$) and $4 \ln 2 (a - \frac{1}{2})^2 = \ln 2$ at $a \in \{0, 1\}$. At mask size m the exact marginal is $a = J/m$ with J hypergeometric, $\mathbb{E}a = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\text{Var } a = \frac{1}{4} \frac{n-m}{m(n-1)}$. Averaging over m gives $\frac{\ln 2}{n(n-1)} \sum_{m=1}^n (\frac{n}{m} - 1) = \ln 2 (\mathcal{H}_n - 1)/(n-1)$. (ii) A block that starts at an interior state draws fair bits, and one that starts at a forced state is exact. Read the bits in commitment order. The first time one of the two quotas is used up is at a position $\ell \in [k, n-1]$, with probability $\varphi(\ell)$. Nothing fails before ℓ , and every block whose first bit comes no later than position ℓ starts at an interior state, so all bits up to the end of the block containing ℓ are fair. After ℓ , the output lies in V exactly when the remaining $s_t - \ell$ fair bits of the current block all take the other value; later blocks start at a forced state. This gives the identity. The weight φ increases on $[k, n-1]$ (the ratio $\varphi(\ell+1)/\varphi(\ell) = \ell/(2(\ell-k+1))$ is at least 1 up to $\ell = n-2$), and $\varphi(n-1) = \binom{n-2}{k-1} 2^{-(n-2)} \leq \sqrt{2/(\pi(n-2))}$. Each block contributes at most $2\varphi(n-1)$. The head is label-blind, so the relabelled output is uniform on V given V , and $F = -\ln \hat{Q}_b(V)$. For the upper profile, singletons never fail, so the output lies in V exactly when the first block's number of ones X , a $\text{Bin}(n-L, \frac{1}{2})$ variable, lies in $[k-L, k]$, that is, within $L/2$ of its mean. Chebyshev's inequality bounds the failure probability by $(n-L)/L^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}$. (iii) Let $\mathcal{F}_s$ be the history before round $s+1$. In a minority-sized round the block cannot exceed either quota, so the output can leave V only in the final round. With $X \sim \text{Bin}(d_s, \frac{1}{2})$ the number of minority values drawn in round $s+1$, the next minority count satisfies $d_{s+1} \leq d_s - X$, so $\mathbb{E}[d_{s+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_s] \leq d_s/2$ and $\mathbb{E}d_t \leq \frac{n}{2}2^{-t}$. By

Markov’s inequality $\Pr(d_t \geq 1) \leq \frac{n}{2} 2^{-t}$. The run succeeds whenever the minority count reaches 0 within the t minority rounds, since the state is then forced and the remaining coordinates are exact. So the success probability is at least $1 - \frac{n}{2} 2^{-t}$, which is at least $\frac{1}{2}$ at $t = \lceil \log_2 n \rceil$. The policy is label-blind and relabelled, so $F = -\ln \hat{Q}_{\min}(V) \leq \ln 2$. $\square$

Scope and prior art. Proposition IC1(a) is the any-order likelihood bound (Uria et al., 2014; Shih et al., 2022), written in KL form; its uniform-step form is Shih et al. (2022, Eq. 3) and Hooeboom et al. (2022, §3, derived from their Eq. 2), who trace that objective to Uria et al. (2014). Part (b) and the equality case of (a), which gives the supremum, are ordinary orbit and chain-rule consequences. The same chain rule covers any head once the output is relabelled as well. Let Y be the output of any sampler run with the head, with law Q , and let the groups be the classes of coordinates that the target treats alike (one class on the slice; the weight groups on tilts). Outputting πY with π uniform on the full within-group permutation group and drawn independently of Y (a post-processing step: it is not a round of the sampler and makes no oracle queries) gives, for a target that is exactly within-group exchangeable, with divergences in $[0, \infty]$ and the conditional term read as $+\infty$ for any s with $Q_{\text{sig}}(s) = 0 < p_{\text{sig}}(s)$, $\text{KL}(p\|Q) = \text{KL}(p\|\bar{Q}) + \mathbb{E}_{s \sim p_{\text{sig}}} \text{KL}(p(\cdot | s)\|Q(\cdot | s))$ and $\text{KL}(p\|\bar{Q}) = \text{KL}(p_{\text{sig}}\|Q_{\text{sig}})$, where $\bar{Q}$ is the law of πY , s is the vector of within-group counts (here s is not the scale of Proposition IC1(c)), and p_{sig} and Q_{sig} are its laws under p and Q . Both identities are the chain rule for the map $x \mapsto s$: π preserves s , so $\bar{Q}_{\text{sig}} = Q_{\text{sig}}$, and $\bar{Q}(\cdot | s)$, like $p(\cdot | s)$, is uniform on the set of strings with signature s , so the conditional term vanishes for $\bar{Q}$. On the balanced slice this is the quota leakage $-\ln Q(V)$ (Lemma 1(e)); on tilts the between-group split error (the between-orbit term of Appendix O) remains, and averaging over a proper subgroup need not suffice. What is specific to the quota target is the exact constant ρ_n in $F/(nA) \rightarrow \rho_n$ for the coordinate fields of Proposition IC1(c): as their scale tends to 0 they cost between $\frac{163}{192}$ and 1 times nA . No such lower bound is claimed for other symmetry-breaking errors, or uniformly in n at a fixed scale.

Theorem IC2 is a hard-cap comparison for one head (fixed-profile length against an adaptive pathwise cap), not a mean-cost law. It shows that the aggregate A alone does not control fixed-profile length. It does not show that a worst-context bound is necessary: additional calibration assumptions, at individual states or weighted by how often the sampler visits them, may rule out this example. Part (iii) gives only the displayed $O(\log n)$ hard-cap upper bound; it neither identifies the least adaptive cap nor proves a doubly logarithmic adaptive bound. Numerical checks:

- IC1(a)–(c) at $n = 4$ –7, exhaustively over orders, and IC1(a) and ρ_n at $n = 10, 12$ in a separate float64 implementation;
- the identity of IC2(ii), exactly on all 680 profiles (compositions) of $n = 4, 6, 8, 10$;
- IC2(i) at $n \leq 256$;
- an exact rational check of the IC2(ii) identity on 320 seeded profile draws at $n \in \{6, 8, 10, 12, 16\}$ (for each n , 60 random compositions with at most six cuts, repeats allowed, and four fixed profiles), in a separate implementation;
- dynamic programs for IC2(iii) in two implementations: at $n = 16, 64, 256, 1024$ evaluated in float64 (success probability 0.67–0.88 within the cap $t + 1$, the deadline round included), and at $n = 8, 16, 32, 64, 128$ in exact rational arithmetic (0.75–0.94); the values at $n = 16, 64$ agree.

Appendix O. Alternative explanations and boundary cases

Each paragraph below changes one feature of the setting to test whether something other than the survival mechanism of Section 3 explains the gap between the two criteria.

The choice of divergence. Validity alone does not separate the criteria, since the probability of a valid output is linear in the mixture and depends on each schedule only through its profile (Lemma 1(c)), so relabelling leaves it unchanged. Nor is the shape error an artifact of KL: at $n = 4096$ the fixed labelled ladder of Theorem 2(b)’s proof with $\delta = \frac{1}{2}$ and the Hoeffding–Ville choice $K = \lceil 2 \ln(2/\delta) \rceil = 3$ (the stated bound takes the smaller $K_\delta = 2$ of the Kolmogorov branch; both ladders fail with probability at most δ) is at total variation 0.673 from p , while its relabelled mixture is at $1-s = 0.015$, with s the ladder’s success probability (Lemma 1(c)), since a relabelling-invariant law Q has $\text{TV}(p, Q) = 1 - Q(V)$ (Appendix E) (Figure 5). The randomized-side results also hold in total variation (Appendix E).

Symmetry in the leakage-only reduction. Let V be the support of the target p and $\mathcal{G}$ a group of coordinate permutations with $p \circ g = p$ for all $g \in \mathcal{G}$. The exact oracle is then $\mathcal{G}$ -equivariant, $q_{gU}(gx) = q_U(x)$, and relabelling a schedule by a uniform $g \in \mathcal{G}$ is implementable and yields a $\mathcal{G}$ -invariant output law Q . If V splits into $\mathcal{G}$ -orbits $V_1, \dots, V_m$ with masses $p_i = p(V_i)$, the chain rule gives, for every such Q , $\text{KL}(p\|Q) = -\ln Q(V) + \text{KL}((p_i)_i \parallel (Q(V_i)/Q(V))_i)$, because p and Q are both uniform within each orbit. This orbit chain rule is standard. On the balanced slice with $\mathcal{G} = S_n$ there is one orbit and the second term vanishes: this is Lemma 1(e). With several orbits, as for two groups with $\mathcal{G} = S_{n_A} \times S_{n_B}$, relabelling still removes all within-orbit shape, but a *between-orbit* term remains, which survival does not control (Theorem 8 controls it differently). Without symmetry, randomizing the schedule does not symmetrize the output, and conditioning independent draws on a count distorts the target (Hájek, 1964, Problem P1).

Proposition 22 (permutations: fixed schedules have no shape error) *Let p be uniform on permutations of $[n]$, viewed as strings in $[n]^n$ with distinct entries, with the analogous exact oracle (every unrevealed coordinate is uniform on the unused values), and let the valid strings V be those with distinct entries. For every fixed schedule U , the restriction of q_U to V is constant, so $\text{KL}(p\|q_U) = -\ln q_U(V)$. Consequently, for $r \geq 1$, every mixture μ supported on schedules of length at most r has $F(\mu) \geq \min_{|U| \leq r} \text{KL}(p\|q_U)$: randomization over schedules cannot lower the least hard cap, which Wen et al. (2026, Thm. 7) characterize exactly over deterministic value-adaptive policies, attained by a fixed schedule (their KL is in bits).*

Proof. A block of size b drawn when M values are unused assigns any particular distinct values with probability M^{-b} , so $q_U(x) = \prod_t M_{t-1}^{-b_t}$ for every valid x , with M_{t-1} the number of unused values before round t , which is $n - \sum_{s < t} b_s$ on every valid path and so does not depend on x . A mixture of laws uniform on V is uniform on V , so $F(\mu) = -\ln \mathbb{E}_\mu q_U(V) \geq -\ln \max_{|U| \leq r} q_U(V)$. $\square$

On the balanced slice, by contrast, $q_U(x)$ depends on the block counts of x , and it is this dependence that relabelling averages out. The hard-cap statement extends to causal adaptive policies (the class of Section 2 with this oracle; a committed history is legal when no value repeats): given a legal committed history with u unused values and a chosen block of size b , the b independent uniform draws are distinct (and so keep the history legal) with probability $g(u, b) = \prod_{i < b} (1 - i/u)$, which depends on the history only through u ; and on legal paths u falls to $u - b$ whatever values are drawn. So $W_0(u) = \mathbf{1}\{u = 0\}$ and $W_r(u) = \max\{W_{r-1}(u), \max_{1 \leq b \leq u} g(u, b)W_{r-1}(u - b)\}$

(the first term is an empty round) bound the conditional success within the remaining rounds, by the tower argument of Lemma 3(a) run on u in place of the count state. The fixed schedule whose block sizes attain these maxima from $u = n$ attains $W_r(n)$, so a single fixed schedule attains the largest success probability and, its output being constant on V , also the least KL (Lemma 1(a) gives $\text{KL} \geq -\ln Q(V)$ for every policy); an adaptive policy cannot improve on it and may add shape error.

Two groups: survival is not enough. For the two-value tilts of Section 4.2, with weight $\lambda > 0$ on a group A of coordinates and 1 on the others, so that $p_\lambda(x) \propto \lambda^{a(x)}$ on V with $a(x)$ the number of ones in group A (Appendix G), the orbit chain rule gives, for every within-group relabelled Q , $F = -\ln Q(V)$ plus a divergence between the laws of a . Hard-cap and adaptive lower bounds persist (Appendix G). Let D_r be the least KL of a deterministic value-adaptive policy with at most r rounds, F_r^* that of causal randomized policies, and G_r^λ the largest probability of meeting the quota within r rounds (D_r : Appendix J; F_r^* , G_r^λ : Appendix G). Finite computations with an exact oracle give D_r/F_r^* of 1.3–1.9, 1.8–3.0 and 2.6–9.2 at $r = 2, 3, 4$ on 24 targets with $12 \leq n \leq 24$: the equal splits $|A| = k = n/2$ at $n \in \{12, 16, 20, 24\}$, with $\lambda \in \{1, 2\}$ or one of the three Grid Z tilts of Appendix K, and $(|A|, n, k, \lambda) = (4, 12, 6, 3), (5, 16, 8, 2), (6, 16, 4, 4)$ and $(8, 16, 5, 2)$. Appendix J justifies the programs, and Appendix K gives the evidence class of each value, that is, how it was computed and checked (ball-arithmetic enclosure, certificate with exact rational ingredients, or float64 evaluation). A kernel-checked case ($|A| = 2, n = 4, k = 2, \lambda = 2, r = 3$; its Lean 4 proof is checked by the Lean kernel, Appendix Q) has $G_r^\lambda = 1$ yet $F_r^* = 5.0 \cdot 10^{-4}$: survival alone does not control the between-orbit term (the divergence between the laws of a), which is why Theorem 8 needs a different construction. Eight two-group predictions were frozen, with their pass criteria, before the held-out cells were computed; five passed and three failed (Appendices K and M).

A full-support target: the gap without a quota. Removing the quota does not remove the gap: on Beta(1, 1)–Bernoulli every string is valid, and the separation is treated in Section 4.1 and Appendix F, with finite exhibits in Section 3 and Appendix K.

Imperfect conditionals. For a head exact at forced states, with population masked-prediction excess A , relabelled singletons have $F \leq nA$ (Uria et al., 2014; Hoogeboom et al., 2022); coherent heads, whose conditionals are those of a joint law ν on V with $\nu > 0$, attain equality, and a label-invariant count-state head has $F = 0$ (Appendix N). Order randomization erases the error of such a head but need not erase label-dependent error: for small label-dependent tilts of the exact head, $F/(nA) \rightarrow \rho_n \in [163/192, 1]$ (Proposition IC1(c)). Vanishing A does not bound fixed-profile length uniformly in n : on the balanced slice the uninformed head ($\frac{1}{2}$ at every non-forced state) has $A \rightarrow 0$, yet the best fixed relabelled profile needs $\Theta(\sqrt{n})$ rounds for $F \leq \ln 2$, while a count-adaptive policy achieves it with a pathwise cap of at most $\lceil \log_2 n \rceil + 1$ rounds (not shown to be least). A learned model’s conditionals need not be compatible with any joint law (Torroba Hennigen and Kim, 2023).

What F says about parts of the output. By data processing F bounds the divergence of every fixed coordinate projection of the output, such as a fixed prefix, and by the chain rule it bounds, on average over the target’s prefix law, the conditional divergence given it; neither F nor H gives a uniform guarantee conditional on every externally specified rare prefix.

Sampling the mixtures. Rounds are the only cost: describing or selecting a mixture is not charged, and its support may grow with n (Section 2). A large support does not by itself mean an expensive sampler. On the balanced slice each construction is one uniform permutation of the

coordinates and, for the mixtures, one biased coin choosing between the ladder and the one-round schedule (Theorem 2(b), Corollary 6(c)). Given their parameters, both weighted constructions are sampled before any bit by explicit procedures that never list their supports: one uniform permutation of the reservoir (Appendix H, §6), or $O(n \log \log n)$ independent coins with rational biases (Appendix I, §4.2), whose parameter for a given ε is not explicit because the constants are existence-only; computing the oracle’s exact marginals is not analysed. For the full-support construction see Appendix F, after Corollary 18. An extra nonnegative charge for describing or sampling a mixture could only raise costs: every lower bound here would stand, but the upper bounds would need new arguments.

Restart. Restarting until a valid string appears, a step outside the interface, removes a relabelled design’s quota leakage, which on the balanced slice is its entire divergence (Lemma 1(e)); it does not remove a fixed schedule’s shape error. Restart also undoes dilution: run until a valid output appears, the mixture of Corollary 6(c), which runs the ladder (length L , failure probability at most $\delta_n \rightarrow 0$) with weight $w = e^{-\varepsilon}/(1 - \delta_n)$ and the one-round schedule otherwise, costs $(1 + o(1))L$ expected rounds per valid output: each attempt costs $wL + 1 - w$ expected rounds and succeeds with probability between $w(1 - \delta_n) = e^{-\varepsilon}$ and $w + G_1(n, k)$, both tending to $e^{-\varepsilon}$, so by Wald’s identity the expected rounds per valid output lie between $(wL + 1 - w)/(w + G_1(n, k))$ and $(wL + 1 - w)e^\varepsilon = L + e^\varepsilon - 1 + \delta_n(L - 1)/(1 - \delta_n)$. So the factor $e^{-\varepsilon}$ belongs to the one-output criterion and is not a saving per valid sample.

Remark 23 (scope of the converse) *The converse forbids repair: resampling the current block until the quota remains satisfiable, with a uniform relabelling, outputs p exactly (Lemma 1(e); the number of resampling steps is not analysed), and restart with state reuse, remasking, lookahead, joint within-round draws and approximate conditionals are also outside $\mathcal{A}_r$: at a small instance each reaches, within r rounds, a success probability above the largest one in $\mathcal{A}_r$, so its output law is that of no member of $\mathcal{A}_r$. At $(n, k) = (4, 2)$, remasking and lookahead reach $1 > 3/4 = G_2(4, 2)$ in two rounds (for instance, by committing two equal bits among three drawn and redrawing the third), joint draws reach $1 > 3/8 = G_1(4, 2)$ in one, and approximate conditionals with root marginals $\frac{1}{2} + \delta$ on two coordinates and $\frac{1}{2} - \delta$ on the other two, $0 < |\delta| \leq \frac{1}{2}$, reach $3/8 + \delta^2 + 6\delta^4 > 3/8$ in one; restart reusing the first round’s values reaches $103/108 > 11/12 = G_3(6, 3)$ at $(n, k) = (6, 3)$ in three rounds (commit three coordinates; if the quota is then forced, commit the other three at once; otherwise commit two of them, and if that leaves the state illegal, discard those two values and commit the last three coordinates at once, keeping the first round’s values, and otherwise commit the last coordinate). Conditioning a round’s draws on the count, or letting the seed write values, is exact in one round. In the definition of $\mathcal{A}_r$ (Section 2), a filtration that also contained unused oracle randomness would let a nominally seedless policy randomize.*

Appendix P. Further related work

This appendix expands the related-work discussion of the introduction and discusses selected closely related work in detail; the table of selected related results summarizes it. Theorem numbers of Chen et al. (2026) follow the PMLR version (arXiv:2511.04647v2: Theorems 4, 9, 16, 24, 25 and Definition 15 are 1.4, 1.9, 3.3, 4.9, 4.10 and 3.2).

What the schedule analyses bound. For random schedules, several analyses state their guarantee for an *average over schedules* of a per-schedule divergence: the expected integration error of Chen

Selected related results. Each row gives what the result bounds, for which samplers, round counts and targets, and what it implies for the least round count under $F \leq \varepsilon$. The interfaces differ, so the rows describe and do not rank; the text has the exact statements.

Result	Criterion; samplers or policies	Round count; target	Bearing on the least rounds under $F \leq \varepsilon$
<i>Bounds on H, which bound F only from above, through $F \leq H$</i>			
Chen et al. (2026, Def. 15, Thms. 4, 9, 16)	H , the expected per-schedule KL: exact formula, optimal block sizes, a bound via total correlation; $F \leq H$. <i>Samplers</i> : random unmasking: prescribed block sizes, uniformly random positions	number of blocks; any target	upper bounds on F through $F \leq H$
Secchi and Zanella (2026, Prop. 4)	factorization error: the H of the exact-conditional sampler; output KL at most it plus a learning error. <i>Samplers</i> : τ -leaping (random block sizes) versus deterministic block sizes, both with random positions	steps; limit at a fixed ratio of length to steps; under all assumptions of their Prop. 4	on H , random block sizes cost at least as much in the limit; F enters only through $F \leq H$ (exact conditionals) or $F \leq H + \varepsilon_{\text{learn}}$ (learned ones)
<i>Lower bounds on the output law</i>			
Feng et al. (2025, Thm. 4.4)	output mass off the support; above $1/2$ it gives $F > \ln 2$. <i>Samplers</i> : masked-diffusion sampling with any masking schedule, each masked position revealed independently; conditionals exact or with per-token KL strictly below $1/128$	sampling steps; an explicit hidden Markov target	$\Omega(n)$ steps for $F \leq \ln 2$, also for mixtures of schedules and for H ; does not separate H from F
Chen et al. (2026, Def. 22, Thms. 24–25)	output TV. <i>Samplers</i> : randomized adaptive conditional-marginal queries, unrestricted output	at most T queries with probability 1; worst case over a known family, the target in it unknown	family-level; does not constrain a fixed known target
<i>Deterministic adaptive policies against randomized ones</i>			
Wen et al. (2026, Thm. 11, Rem. 2)	output KL in bits (F ; the schedule is a function of the output). <i>Policies</i> : deterministic value-adaptive policies, exact marginals	target-weighted policy-tree depth; hard cap; balanced slice	$\Theta_\varepsilon(\log^2 n)$ for deterministic policies; extension of their lower bounds to randomized policies left open
Li et al. (2026, Thms. 4, 8; Cor. 9)	output KL (and TV) of mixtures of fixed schedules, against deterministic policies. <i>Policies</i> : deterministic value-adaptive policies; fixed schedules; finite mixtures of target-structured fixed schedules; exact marginals	hard cap; a nine-point full-support binary family; a noisy-matching family	mixtures beat every deterministic adaptive policy in accuracy at a cap of three, and attain in three rounds an accuracy that needs $\Omega(n/\log n)$ rounds of a fixed schedule; uniform random positions leave linear error there
This paper	F (nats) and H . <i>Policies</i> : predrawn schedule mixtures (description uncharged); causal randomized adaptive policies, exact marginals	scheduled mean, failed runs charged; executed mean $\mathbb{E}\tau$; hard cap; <i>targets</i> : balanced slice; Beta(1, 1)–Bernoulli; bounded-ratio weighted slices	under $F \leq \varepsilon$, order $\log \log n$: scheduled and executed means matched to leading order; hard cap matched up to an additive constant on the two slices, while on full support every mixture’s F diverges under a fixed cap; under $H \leq \varepsilon$, order $(\log n)^2$, whose upper half prior work gives (on the balanced slice, the whole order)

et al. (2026), information-profile and factorization objectives (Lavenant and Zanella, 2025; Secchi and Zanella, 2026), and expected KL over random masks or permutations (Zhao and Cai, 2026; Li and Cai, 2025; Cai and Li, 2026); each reaches the sampler’s output law, the *mixture* over schedules, through convexity or marginalization. Others work differently: Wainwright (2026) bounds the output KL of Bernoulli and fixed-cardinality unmasking samplers through increments of a path-resolved complexity, Dmitriev et al. (2026) bound a path-measure KL on a deterministic time grid and pass to the output law by data processing, and Park et al. (2025) optimize a KL upper bound for a specified schedule. The fixed-block identity $\text{KL}(p||q_U) = \sum_t \mathbb{E} \text{TC}_t$ (Zhang et al., 2026, Eqs. 15–16) concerns one fixed schedule. On schedule averages, randomness in the schedule cannot help at a fixed number of rounds, and design conclusions are read off the average: by Markov’s inequality, for every $c > 1$, a fixed, randomly generated ordering has factorization error at most c times the average with probability at least $1 - 1/c$, and, within their random-order model, deterministic block sizes suffice to minimize the average (Lavenant and Zanella, 2025, §4.4 and §5). For τ -leaping, where the randomness is in the block sizes, Secchi and Zanella (2026, Prop. 4) show, in a joint scaling limit at matched round counts and under their coefficient-convergence, nondegeneracy and schedule-regularity assumptions, that the randomized sampler’s factorization cost is at least that of the planner with deterministic block sizes (both randomize positions). These are correct statements about the average, and a random ordering fixed once and reused across outputs gives, conditionally on the ordering, a fixed-schedule law. The random permutation of Cai and Li (2026) is introduced to facilitate the analysis. Dmitriev et al. (2026, Thm. 2 and the remark after it) prove a lower bound on the path-measure KL of uniform-noise τ -leaping and note that it is not a bound on the terminal output law, although, to the best of their knowledge, all existing KL upper-bound analyses proceed through path measures. Order-agnostic autoregressive diffusion trains the Jensen bound over orderings (Hoogeboom et al., 2022), while order-ensemble density estimators evaluate the mixture over orderings directly and report that it improves on the order-averaged log-likelihood (Uria et al., 2014).

Chen et al. (2026) define random unmasking with prescribed block sizes (their Definition 15), give an exact formula for its expected per-schedule KL through the information curve, and bound the output KL by that average (their Theorem 16). On the balanced slice their formula equals $\text{KL}(p||q_U)$ for every labelled U with the given profile, by Lemma 1(d), and their Theorem 4 characterizes the fixed-schedule optimum of H . Their Theorem 9 gives the upper order of H there and on the weighted slices of Section 4.2: such a slice is a Poisson design conditioned on its size, so its total correlation is at most minus the log-probability of that size, $O(\log n)$ by the local limit of Boistard et al. (2012, Lemma 1) (cf. Hájek, 1964); for the full-support target see Proposition 14. Our relabelled-profile constructions are their algorithm with particular profiles, or finite mixtures of them; the kept-set sampler of Theorem 8(a) agrees with such a mixture in output law, as the coordinates’ commitment levels are independent and identically distributed and its terminal singletons are exact in any order, while the count-adaptive optimum of Theorem 4(a) and the within-group relabelling of Theorem 8(b) are not of this form. The separation of Section 3 quantifies their observation (after their Theorem 16) that re-randomizing the schedule for each sample is, on average, at least as good as fixing it: on the output law of the balanced slice, randomizing positions changes the order of the least round count (Theorem 2).

Lower bounds. That step counts depend on the metric is known (Feng et al., 2025), and so is an output-law converse over random-position schedules: for an explicit hidden Markov target, every

masking schedule of standard masked-diffusion sampling with fewer than order- n steps leaves probability above $1/2$ outside the target’s support (Feng et al., 2025, Thm. 4.4). As that probability is affine in the output law, the bound persists for mixtures of schedules and gives $F > \ln 2$; this is the leakage mechanism of Section 3, on a target where it forces linearly many rounds. The distribution-oblivious lower bound of Anari et al. (2024) and the family-level terminal-output lower bounds of Chen et al. (2026, Thms. 24–25), which hold for randomized adaptive algorithms with unrestricted output, quantify over unknown targets and do not constrain a fixed known target. Kou and Wang (2026) prove round lower bounds of the same kind for randomized algorithms that make polynomially many approximate-score queries per round to sample continuous targets in $\mathbb{R}^d$, over families of hidden instances. Neither these bounds of Chen et al. (2026) nor that of Feng et al. (2025) separates H from F . Chen and Wang (2026) separate diffusion paradigms for random empirical measures unknown to the sampler. Our converses concern fixed, known targets in this interface. Kawata et al. (2026) lower-bound the probe and commit budgets of samplers that use the same commit primitive with counterfactual probes (their Def. 2.6 and Thm. 3.2), but for a risk averaged over the decision-rule seed before the output laws are mixed, and in the worst case over a hidden-forest target class with an approximate oracle; this gives no round lower bound under the mixed output law F on a fixed known target.

Deterministic adaptive policies and randomized ones. Wen et al. (2026) study deterministic value-adaptive policies with exact marginals. For the balanced slice they prove a $\Theta_\varepsilon(\log^2 n)$ order (their Theorem 11, KL in bits) for two costs: the target-weighted policy-tree depth D_ε , the least $\mathbb{E}_p R$ over such policies with KL at most ε , and the hard cap $\bar{D}_\varepsilon$, the least $\max_x R(x)$, where $R(x)$ is the number of rounds on realization x . The upper bound is attained by a fixed schedule. The mean $\mathbb{E}_p$ averages over $x \sim p$, not over the sampler’s own outputs as our executed mean $\mathbb{E}\tau$ does, and the two means can differ once a policy adapts to values (their Remark 1). We cite their lower bound as stated and do not rely on it. Theorem 2(a) is a mixture-level bound with explicit constants; its rate also follows from their Theorem 11 by a Markov argument (Appendix B). Their observation that adaptivity has nothing to exploit on this instance (Remark 8, at the level of rates) concerns deterministic policies, and they leave the extension of their lower bounds to randomized policies open (Remark 2 and §IV-H; see Li et al. (2026) below). Their exact hard-cap characterization for uniform permutations (their Theorem 7), attained by a fixed schedule, is the setting of Proposition 22: there every fixed schedule’s output law is already constant on valid strings, so, unlike on the balanced slice, randomizing the schedule cannot lower the least hard cap.

Li et al. (2026) work in the same interface, with exact marginals and a hard cap, and compare deterministic value-adaptive policies, fixed schedules and finite mixtures of fixed schedules drawn with a hidden seed; their Eq. (4) is the identity of Lemma 1(b). On a nine-point full-support binary family of dimension $9r + 2$, the least KL of a deterministic adaptive policy with three rounds is $r\gamma - \log 4 + o(1)$, while a uniform mixture of four fixed schedules built from the target’s structure has KL at most $3(3r + 2)\beta^r$ (their Thm. 4); deterministic adaptive sampling is exact there in four rounds, so the gap is in accuracy at a fixed depth, and their Theorem 4 answers Remark 2 of Wen et al. (2026) negatively on a constructed family. On a noisy-matching family, fixed schedules need $\Omega(n/\log n)$ rounds for a fixed KL that a three-round mixture attains, uniform random positions leave linear mixture error, and a deterministic content-adaptive policy is exact in three rounds (their Thm. 8 and Cor. 9). For their selector families with a fixed finite library of schedules, and under their Lemma 7 with vanishing error, they characterize the limiting least KL of library mixtures and

when it vanishes (their Cor. 10); they list an expected round budget, instead of a hard cap, as open (their Section VII). On the balanced slice, Theorem 4 and Corollary 6 give the randomized optimum itself, for the hard cap and for the expected executed rounds.

Other interfaces and resources. Bansal et al. (2026) use the same exact-marginal product-commit primitive on graph-walk state coordinates, compare random and greedy-entropy two-at-a-time policies by coherence on selected DAGs, and, for order- k Markov walks and bridges, prove exact bisection with depth $O(k(1 + \log(L/k)))$; this does not transfer to our bit coordinates, where two or more unforced increments are conditionally dependent. Yao (2026) changes the decoder itself: a learned marker gates a coordination pass over the selected positions before per-position greedy argmax, which targets a joint mode rather than a joint draw; this lies outside this interface. Samplers with the same conditional-marginal oracle that may reject and redraw a batch reach approximate samples, at fixed total-variation accuracy, of laws on k -subsets whose conditional laws are all $1/\alpha$ -entropically independent with $\alpha = \Omega(1)$, in $\tilde{O}(k^{1/2+c})$ parallel time for any constant $c > 0$ (Anari et al., 2023), and exact samples of any target on $[q]^n$ in $\tilde{O}(n^{1/2})$ expected parallel time (Anari et al., 2026); rejection lies outside this interface. Deterministic unmasking avoids the mixture (Turok et al., 2026), and learned-order models train the order as a latent variable (Wang et al., 2025; Fox et al., 2026). Turok et al. (2026) and Fox et al. (2026) compare step or evaluation budgets empirically, and none of these works proves a converse for the least hard cap of rounds in the exact-marginal interface. Zhang et al. (2026, Prop. 5.1) lower-bound the expected number of proposals needed to verify a block exactly by accept-reject, for one fixed ordered partition, not for the output mixture $\text{KL}(p \parallel \mathbb{E}_U q_U)$ or its round rate. Zhang and Alanwar (2026) study mixtures of pre-selected exact-support plans on the same slice, measured in total variation, with plan count and memory rather than rounds as the resource; their orbit-averaging lemma is the identity behind Lemma 1(e). Randomized parallel algorithms are long known to be much more powerful than deterministic ones for search with an independence oracle: for an n -element independence system, finding a maximal independent set takes, in the worst case, $\Omega(n/\log p)$ parallel steps for deterministic algorithms with p processors but $O(\sqrt{n})$ expected steps for randomized ones with $n^{3/2}$ processors (Karp et al., 1988). Randomizing a sampler to improve its output law is also known (Shen and Lee, 2019); here the gap is between the schedule-averaged divergence H and the output-law divergence F of the same sampler. The square-root ladder of Theorem 2(b) is a short computation on the doubly exponential grid of batched bandits (Perchet et al., 2016; Gao et al., 2019), whose round lower bounds concern regret; the substance here is the converse (Section 3).

Appendix Q. Kernel-checked declarations

All declarations below, except the TGCert3 brackets of Appendix K, are in the authors’ Lean package (Lean 4.33.1 (de Moura and Ullrich, 2021), Mathlib v4.33.1 (The mathlib Community, 2020); 369 modules of its own). The TGCert3 brackets are in a separate certificate package, whose 1129 modules build on the first. Both packages are included in the ancillary formal companion archive. Each package rebuilds from source in a clean environment with no `sorry`. The certificate package was built a second time from source, in two stages (its first 616 modules in a clean environment, the other 513 on top of that build), with identical axiom reports. `#print axioms` gives exactly `propext`, `Classical.choice` and `Quot.sound` for every theorem named here. A kernel check certifies a formal statement, not its agreement with the printed one; the package was built and replayed from source, and its declarations were compared with the printed results group

by group. Each item below names the parts of its appendix that are proved by ordinary arguments only. Where a printed proof of a kernel-checked statement argues differently from its kernel proof, the printed argument is ordinary unless the item names it as a printed route. Declaration names, Lean comments and the packages' README files keep an earlier numbering (`thm1b_*` is Theorem 2(b), `thm2b_*` Theorem 4(b)), and an earlier appendix order: `AppJ` is Appendix G, `AppM` is Appendix N (`AppM.M1_*` is Proposition IC1 and `AppM.M2_*` Theorem IC2), `AppGSep` and `AppGTable` are Appendix L, and `TGRed.Ki` is Lemma TGR*i*. The README files' appendix, section, theorem, table and figure numbers are those of an earlier version of this paper; this appendix gives the current correspondence.

The table maps each main result to its ordinary proof, to the declarations whose types state it and to what is not kernel-checked; the items after it list the supporting declarations. Every declaration in the third column is a theorem whose type and axiom report the packages record, and `A36W.TGCert3.*.bracket` stands for the 24 brackets that the two-group item below names; where several declarations are listed, their types state the result jointly, and the last column names every clause that they do not state. The conventions are $\delta = 1 - e^{-\varepsilon}$ for `Fopt`, and a hard cap read almost surely, `CapAS`, with the cap on all paths, including those of probability zero, `CapEvery`, also stated where available; some declarations hold on a wider range, such as every $k \leq n$ rather than $n = 2k$, or every $\varepsilon \geq 0$. The hard-cap declarations of the rows for Theorem 4(b), Corollary 6(a), Theorem 8(a) and Section 3 are stated with the output law after r rounds; under `CapAS r` that law is the terminal law Q_π (`A36RW.Converse.outLimEq.outBy_of_capAS`, for every oracle whose conditional marginals lie in $[0, 1]$, as exact ones do). For Lemma 1(a) the first listed declaration assumes $q(V) > 0$, and `A36RW.LemmalaZero.lemmala_zero` states the case $q(V) = 0$, with both sides $+\infty$; the identity of Lemma 1(b) is stated, as in its proof, for $F(\mu) < \infty$. For $\mathcal{A}_r$ and $\mathcal{A}_\infty$ the declarations quantify over the formal class `A36RW.PolicyE`. For every exact oracle, `A36RW.W13.classId_of_exact` translates it in both directions to and from a formalization of the printed class with a round clock, preserving the output laws at every horizon and in the limit, the caps, the executed means, the KL values, the sets of hard-cap KL values and L_F^{ad} . The description of Section 2 is also formalized as a probability-space process (`A36RW.W13x.PrintedProcess`: a seed, committed transcripts, decisions and a completion measurable with respect to $\mathcal{F}_{t-1}$, and conditionally fresh draws). For every exact oracle, every such process has the output law at every horizon and in the limit, the completion probabilities, the almost-sure cap and the executed mean of a policy of the formal class (`A36RW.W13x.printed_process_in_class`); conversely, these quantities of every policy of the formal class are those of such a process (`A36RW.W13x.realize_in_class`); and a completion driven by explicit randomness of its own, with the draws fresh given the seed, that randomness and the transcript, folds into the seed (`A36RW.W13x.foldRC_in_class`). $\dagger$ marks the rows that rest on this identification. Its one ordinary step is reading the sentence of Section 2 as that process, with a completion given only as a randomized rule represented by explicit randomness.

result	ordinary proof	kernel-checked declarations	not kernel-checked
Lemma 1(a)–(e)	App. B	(a) A36RW.Relabel.KLx.eq.neg.log.add and, for $q(V) = 0$, A36RW.Lemma1aZero.lemma1a-zero; (b) A36RW.W11.Fext.le.Hext, A36RW.W11.Hext.eq.add; (c) AGF.agfv.succMass.eq.snOf; (d) A36RW.Relabel.KLx.schedLawE.profile; (e) A36RW.Relabel.lemma1e.balanced	—
(Env)	App. D	A36Sharp.sharp.envelope, A36Sharp.sharpKap.lt.36	—
Lemma 3	App. E	(a) A36RW.Balanced.lemma2a.printed, A36.GrRec.mono; for fixed schedules: A36.succMass.qSched.le.GrRec; (b) A36RW.ExecMean.lemma2b.tail, A36RW.Converse.deadline.le.GrRec, A36RW.Converse.margUnit.balanced, A36RW.Converse.policy.outBy.le.succ, A36RW.Converse.policy.outBy.nonneg, A36RW.Converse.policy.doneBy.le.one	†
Theorem 4(a)	App. E	A36RW.Balanced. hardcap.optimum.outLim; attained by the randomly ordered rule: A36RW.Attain.sigmaStar.KL, A36RW.Attain.sigmaStar.capAS, A36RW.Converse.outLim.eq.outBy.of.capAS, A36RW.Converse.margUnit.balanced	†
Theorem 4(b)	Apps. D, E.1	A36RW.Window.window.two.sided, A36RW.Window.thm2b.upper	†
Theorem 2(a)	App. B	AGFH.Hopt.ge.three.unfolded, AGFCert.Hopt.family.lb	—
Theorem 2(b)	App. B	A36RW.HV.thm1b.Fopt, A36RW.HV.thm1b.attained	—
Theorem 2(c)	Apps. B, C; monotonicity in ε : definition of L_H	A36RW.LHUp.ratio.Theta, A36RW.LHUp.appB.headline, A36RW.LHUp.LHGen.Theta, A36RW.LHUp.LHGen.antitone, A36Sep.separation.unbounded	—
Corollary 5	App. E	A36RW.Cor2a.cor1.formal, A36RW.LHUp.Afix.Theta	—
Corollary 6(a)	App. E	A36RW.Cor2a.cor2a.characterization, A36RW.HV.cor2a.bounds.Kdelta	†
Corollary 6(b)	App. E	A36RW.Balanced.cor2b.printed, A36RW.Balanced.cor2b.LF, A36RW.TVJoin2.cor2b.LFgen.inf	†
Corollary 6(c), and the least $\mathbb{E}\tau$ after it	App. E	A36RW.Cor2c.headline.cor2c, A36RW.LHUp.ratio.Theta	†
Theorem 7(a)–(d)	(a) App. F.4; (b) F.1, F.3; (c) F.5, F.6; (d) F.5	(a) A36FS.Prop2.LHGen.isTheta; (b) A36FS.Misc.ProfAllEps.thm3b.F.all; (c) A36FS.Thm8.Dilution.cor5; (d) A36FS.Thm7C.thm3d	—

result	ordinary proof	kernel-checked declarations	not kernel-checked
Theorem 19	App. F.7	A36FS.Thm9.thm9a_full, A36FS.Thm9.LFad_ge, A36FS.Thm9.thm9b_liminif, A36FS.Thm8.Dilution.thm9c	†
Theorem 8(a)	App. H §§3–4 (H), §10 (F lower); App. I (F upper)	L_H^w : A36W.HL.LH.theta; R_F^{adapt} : A36W. RFAttain.rf_least_adaptive_hardcap; L_F^w : A36W.RFAttain. rf_sharp_mean_two_sided; $\mathbb{E}\tau$: A36W. RFAttain.rf_sharp_mean_two_sided_ad	†
Theorem 8(b)	App. H §§6–7	A36W.FU.R.theoremR, A36W.Attain. common_length_asymptotic_R	—
Section 3	evidence: Apps. L, K, M; finite reductions: App. J	$n = 65536$: AGFCert.Hopt.65536_gt, AGFPot.Fopt.le_eleven; $L_H > L_F$ from $n = 2^{15}$: A36RW.AppGSep.LF.lt.LH.log.two; the 25 certified two-group optima of App. K (18 rows of F_r^* , 7 cells of F_r^{NA}): the 24 A36W.TGCert3.*.bracket and A36W. TGCert.W49.FNA.bracket; the six-coordinate witness’s factor 2.35 and its every-predrawn bound: A36W.TGCert.W49, A36W.TGCert. W49.beats.every_predrawn, attained by a (possibly randomized) rule choosing each block’s group composition from the committed counts: A36W.TGCertRule. W49.rule.beats.every_predrawn	every other finite value or bound, in the evidence class that Apps. A, K and M state for it (ball-arithmetic enclosures, certificates with exact rational ingredients, float64 evaluations and estimates, best-found bounds); the frozen-prediction checks; the learned-head tests; †

- **Canonical modules:** AGFCert.Hopt.family_lb,
AGFH.Hopt.ge.three_unfolded, AGFH.klSum.chain,
AGFCert.Hopt.65536_gt, AGFPot.Fopt.le_eleven,
AGFCert.Hopt.65536_gt.two_Fopt, AGF.agfv_c08s_claim_C08_support,
AGF.agfv_succMass.eq.snOf, agfv.Fopt.le.of_leakage,
AGFPot.lossSched.rcProfile.le.rcBudget. Here
AGF.agfv_c08s_claim_C08_support is the envelope
 $G_r(M, j) \leq \min\{1, 2 \cdot 6^{r-1}(d+1)^{-2-r}\}$ of Appendix D, so $G_r(n, k) \leq \Gamma_r(n)$.
- **Balanced slice, for fixed schedules, relabelled profiles and their mixtures:**
A36RC.Fopt.le.rc_tower (Theorem 2(b), $K = \lceil 1/\delta \rceil$),
A36.succMass.qSched.le.GrRec, A36.GrRec_mono (Lemma 3(a) for fixed
schedules), A36.Fopt.ge.mean_bridge (the single-horizon form of Lemma 3(b) for
mixtures with $\theta = e^{-\varepsilon}$: $L_F(n, \varepsilon) \geq 1 + t(e^{-\varepsilon} - G_t(n, k))$ for every t),
A36.Fopt.ge.envelope (the same with $\Gamma_t(n)$ in place of $G_t(n, k)$, $t \geq 1$),
A36Det.det.schedule.length_ge, A36RC.relabelled.rc_hard (Corollary 5),
A36Sep.separation_unbounded (the unboundedness part of Theorem 2(c); its rate,
in the two-sided form of Corollary 6(c), is A36RW.LHUp.ratio.Theta below).
- **The bounded-prefactor envelope:** A36Sharp.sharp.envelope and
A36Sharp.sharpKap.lt.36, the bounded-prefactor envelope (Env) of Appendix D,
 $G_r(M, j) \leq \min\{1, A_r(d+1)^{-2-r}\}$ at every legal state (M, j) , $d = \min(j, M - j)$, with
 $A_r < 36$.

- Behavioural and seeded policies: `AGF.CapV2.agfv_apb_claim_C08_all_policy` and `AGF.CapV2.agfv_apb_seed_succWithinOf_le_GrRec` (Lemma 3(a) at horizon r for behavioural and seeded policies: success within r rounds is at most $G_r(n, k)$; for these classes the passage to output KL in Theorem 4(a) is ordinary, and Theorem 4(a) itself is kernel-checked for $\mathcal{A}_r$ below), `AGF.CapV2.agfv_apb_seed_envelope` (the seeded envelope bound), `AGF.MB.agfv_mb_claim_C08_mean_bridge_closed` (the single-horizon form of Lemma 3(b), $1 + t(\theta - G_t(n, k)) \leq \mathbb{E}\tau$ for $t \geq 1$, behavioural reading; it is stated for a success threshold θ , and $\theta = e^{-\varepsilon}$ by Lemma 1(a)). The policy classes of these branch files have no empty rounds; when every run completes ($\tau < \infty$ almost surely), compressing out empty rounds, with the seed and a simulated round clock kept, preserves the output law and does not increase the round count, an ordinary step; if $\Pr(\tau = \infty) > 0$ the expected-round bounds hold trivially.
- Balanced slice, for the class $\mathcal{A}_r$ of Section 2. The formal class `A36RW.PolicyE` has a seed with an arbitrary probability law, independent of the oracle; each batch a function of the seed and of the executed labelled history, empty rounds included, measurable in the seed; fresh product draws at the exact conditional marginals at legal prefixes and an arbitrary completion at illegal ones; and every executed round charged, empty or not. The hard cap is almost sure ($\Pr(M_r = 0) = 1, \text{CapAS}$); Theorem 4(a) also holds for the stronger reading on all paths, including those of probability zero (`CapEvery`). Declarations:
`A36RW.Balanced.hardcap_optimum` and `A36RW.Attain.sigmaStar_KL`
 (Theorem 4(a), for every $k \leq n$, attained by the randomly ordered count-state rule, stated with the output law after r rounds); `A36RW.Balanced.hardcap_optimum_outLim`,
`A36RW.Attain.sigmaStar_capAS` and
`A36RW.Converse.outLim_eq_outBy_of_capAS` (the same for the terminal output law Q_π , which under an almost-sure cap r is the law after r rounds; the rule obeys that cap);
`A36RW.Window.window_two_sided` and `A36RW.Window.thm2b_upper`
 (Theorem 4(b), with the relabelled witness and the factor 1728);
`A36RW.Balanced.lemma2a_printed` and `A36RW.ExecMean.lemma2b_tail`
 (Lemma 3; (a) for every $k \leq n$; (b) at every threshold θ , its law hypotheses holding for every policy by `A36RW.Converse.margUnit_balanced`,
`A36RW.Converse.policy_outBy_le_succ`,
`A36RW.Converse.policy_outBy_nonneg`,
`A36RW.Converse.policy_doneBy_le_one` and
`A36RW.Converse.deadline_le_GrRec`);
`A36RW.Cor2a.cor2a_characterization` and
`A36RW.HV.cor2a_bounds_Kdelta` (Corollary 6(a));
`A36RW.Balanced.cor2b_printed`, `A36RW.Balanced.cor2b_LF` and
`A36RW.TVJoin2.cor2b_LFgen_inf` (Corollary 6(b), also for L_F);
`A36RW.Cor2c.headline_cor2c` and `A36RW.LHUp.ratio_Theta` (Corollary 6(c) and the expected-rounds infimum after it, with the rate $30/\sqrt{\log_2 \ln n}$ of Appendix E);
`A36RW.HV.thm1b_Fopt` and `A36RW.HV.thm1b_attained` (Theorem 2(b), with K_δ as printed, attained); `A36RW.LHUp.appB_headline` and
`A36RW.LHUp.LHgen_Theta` (the bounds on L_H in Theorem 2(c), Appendix C);
`A36RW.LHUp.LHgen_antitone` (its monotonicity in ε); `A36RW.LHUp.KL_le_Phi`

(Step 2 of Appendix C: $KL(p||q_U) \leq \Phi(b)$ for every fixed schedule U with size profile b);
A36RW.CW1b.half_budget_headline (the first sentence of the remark on the asymptotic constant in Appendix C, for fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$: the chain's bound on Φ eventually bounds Φ and the KL of every full schedule with that profile, and its ratio to $\varepsilon/2$ tends to 1; the length bound of this route has ratio to $(\ln n)^2/\varepsilon$ tending to 1);
A36RW.LHUpR.remark_headline and A36RW.LHUpR.remark_asymptotic (the rest of that remark, with $n \gtrsim 10^3$ at $\varepsilon = \ln 2$ as the sufficient condition $n \geq 1000$);
A36RW.Cor2a.cor1_formal and A36RW.LHUp.Afix_Theta (Corollary 5);
A36RW.W11.Fext.le.Hext, A36RW.W11.Hext.eq.add and
A36RW.W11.Hext.eq.top.and (Lemma 1(b), every target, the case of two infinite sides included); A36RW.Relabel.KLx.eq.neg.log.add,
A36RW.Relabel.KLx.schedLawE.profile and
A36RW.Relabel.lemma1e.balanced (Lemma 1(a) as an equality, (d), and (e) for every law invariant on V); A36RW.Relabel.orbit_chain_rule (the orbit chain rule of Appendix O, for every group of coordinate permutations fixing p);
A36RW.AltPerm.prop_perm and A36RW.AltPerm.perm_adaptive_hardcap (Proposition 22 of Appendix O and its extension to causal adaptive policies, under both cap readings); A36RW.W11.each_restriction_needed (the $n = 4$, $r = 2$ facts of the remark on the scope of the converse in Appendix O, as explicit output laws) and
A36RW.W11R.each_restriction_needed_classes (the three relaxed models of that remark as policy classes that contain the formal class, with the $n = 4$ witnesses as members, under the cap on all paths, including those of probability zero) and
A36RW.CW1b.each_restriction_needed_AS with
A36RW.CW1b.best_success_AS_4.2 (the same under the almost-sure cap of $\mathcal{A}_r$, where the class's best success at $n = 4$, $r = 2$ is again $3/4$); and, in total variation (Appendix E), A36RW.W11.hardcap_TV_optimum,
A36RW.TVJoin2.thmlb_TV_attained_Kdelta,
A36RW.TVJoin2.cor2a_TV_chain_Kdelta, A36RW.W11.cor2b_TV,
A36RW.TVJoin2.cor2b_LFtv_inf and A36RW.W11.cor2c_TV (Theorems 4(a) and 2(b), Corollary 6(a), (b) and the L_F clause of (c), with $\varepsilon = -\ln(1 - \delta)$). The identification of the formal class, whose histories record empty rounds, with the description of Section 2 by seed, committed transcript and round clock is kernel-checked as well (A36RW.W13.classId.of_exact: under an exact oracle the two classes have the same output law at every horizon, seed by seed, hence the same costs, caps and optima; the printed-class forms include A36RW.W13.hardcap_optimum_P,
A36RW.W13.lemma2a_printed_P, A36RW.W13.cor2b_printed_P and
A36RW.W13.headline_cor2c_P); for every exact oracle, the printed description, as the process A36RW.W13x.PrintedProcess, has the same output laws, completion probabilities, almost-sure caps, executed means and limiting laws as the formal class, in both directions (A36RW.W13x.printed_process.in_class,
A36RW.W13x.realize_in_class); only reading the description as that process is ordinary, as in the preamble of this appendix. The repair clause of the remark on the scope of the converse is kernel-checked as well: A36RW.W22.repaired_relabelled (resampling a block until the quota remains satisfiable, with a uniform relabelling, outputs p exactly, by Lemma 1(e); the resampling loop enters through its law, the product law

conditioned on a legal child) and `A36RW.W22.repaired_not_policy` (no policy of the class has that law within $|U|$ rounds when $G_{|U|}(n, k) < 1$, a hypothesis discharged at $(n, k, |U|) = (2, 1, 1)$). The rest of that remark is kernel-checked: the law separations as `A36RW.BRem.scope_outside`, at the instances the remark names (each listed mechanism produces within r rounds a law that no member of $\mathcal{A}_r$ produces within r rounds), the one-round exactness of conditioning a round's draws on the count (on every slice) and of letting the seed write values (for every target) as `A36RW.W11R.CondW.cond_witness` and `A36RW.W11R.WriteW.write_witness`, and the success values and class bounds as `A36RW.BRem.RemaskW.remask_witness`, `A36RW.W11R.LookW.look_witness`, `A36RW.BRem.JointW.joint_witness`, `A36RW.BRem.ApproxW.approx_succ`, `A36RW.BRem.RestartW6.restart6_witness`, `A36RW.BRem.class_succ_le_one`, `A36RW.BRem.class_succ_le_two` and `A36RW.BRem.GrRec6.G3_6_3`, with `A36RW.W11.GrRec_1_4_2` and `A36RW.W11.GrRec_2_4_2` for the values $G_1(4, 2) = 3/8$ and $G_2(4, 2) = 3/4$. Ordinary only: the estimate of Appendix O that restarting the mixture of Corollary 6(c) until a valid output appears costs about $L + e^\varepsilon - 1$ expected rounds per valid output, where L is the ladder's length.

- Reproducibility (Appendix L). Table 8, row by row: `A36RW.AppGTable.table2_row8`, `A36RW.AppGTable.table2_row16`, `A36RW.AppGTable.table2_row32`, `A36RW.AppGTable.table2_row64`, `A36RW.AppGTable.table2_row128` and `A36RW.AppGTable.table2_row1024` (at $n = 2^m$ and $\varepsilon = \ln 2$, each printed entry as a bound on its quantity: L_H , L_F from both sides, and R_F^{adapt} under both cap readings). The paragraph after Figure 6: `A36RW.AppGSep.sep_log_two` and `A36RW.AppGSep.sep_tenth` (the upper bound of Theorem 2(b) is strictly below the lower bound of Theorem 2(a) for every even $n \geq 2^{15}$ at $\varepsilon = \ln 2$ and every even $n \geq 2^{13}$ at $\varepsilon = 0.1$), with `A36RW.AppGSep.LF_lt_LH_log_two` and `A36RW.AppGSep.LF_lt_LH_tenth` (hence $L_F < L_H$ there); `A36RW.AppGSep.gamma_thresholds` and `A36RW.AppGSep.env_thresholds` (the thresholds on n for $\Gamma_r(n) < 1$, and for the bounded prefactor of (Env) to give a bound below 1, at $d = k$ and $r = 2, 3, 4$). Ordinary only: the rest of that paragraph (the order and weakness of the terminal lower bound, the dominance of the prefactor, and the comparison of the two prefactors), that each entry of Table 8 is its formula rounded to the printed precision, and the curves of Figure 6, which are formula evaluations. At $n = 2^{16}$, Table 8's entries $L_H \geq 26.20$ and $L_F \leq 20$ also follow from `AGFCert.Hopt_65536_gt` and `AGFPot.Fopt_le_eleven` above, respectively.
- Two-group survival envelope (Appendix G): `A36RW.AppJ.thm_tgenv_sharp` with `A36RW.AppJ.Csharp_lt` (Theorem 21, for every $\lambda > 0$, all group sizes and every legal state; its geometric form is `A36RW.AppJ.thm_tgenv`); Lemmas TG0–TG10, among them `A36RW.AppJ.TG1`, `A36RW.AppJ.W16.TG4_ii`, `A36RW.AppJ.W16.TG5`, `A36RW.AppJ.W16.TG6`, `A36RW.AppJ.TG9` (every causal randomized policy) and `A36RW.AppJ.TG10`; Corollary (a) (`A36RW.AppJ.corA_capKLSetAS_full`, almost-sure cap), (b) (`A36RW.AppJ.markov_split` and `A36RW.AppJ.corB_asymptotic_full`, for $\varepsilon \geq 0$) and (d)

(A36RW.AppJ.corD_capKLSetsAS_full, A36RW.AppJ.corD_rounds_full).
 Also kernel-checked along the printed routes: the case $v = 0$ of the proof of Lemma TG1
 (A36W.PV.RouteJ.TG1_v0); the TP2 proof of Lemma TG2, for a_A and, through
 $W = x - U_A$, for a_B , with its displayed consequence
 (A36W.PV.RouteJ2.aA_mono_route, A36W.PV.RouteJ2.aB_mono_route,
 A36W.PV.RouteJ2.TG2_route); step (1) of the proofs of Lemmas TG5
 (A36W.PV.RouteJ.TG5_step1) and TG8 (A36W.PV.RouteJ.TG8_step1_law,
 A36W.PV.RouteJ.TG8_step1_means); and the supermartingale proof of Lemma TG9,
 with its empty-batch case through Lemma TG10
 (A36W.PV.RouteJ2.Y_isSupermartingale,
 A36W.PV.RouteJ2.TG9_route_prob; its consequence for Q_π , with the cap read
 almost surely, is A36W.PV.RouteJ2.TG9_route_capAS). The declarations state
 Lemma TG4 for the law of the batch values (A36RW.AppJ.CW3.TG4v_i_A,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.TG4v_i_B, A36RW.AppJ.CW3.TG4v_i_mean and
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.TG4v_ii, through
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.batchValues_pushforward), and the rounds forms also hold
 under the printed hypothesis $F_r^* \leq \varepsilon$, with F_r^* the infimum
 (A36RW.AppJ.W20.corD_rounds_Fstar, A36RW.AppJ.W20.corD_RF_gt,
 A36RW.AppJ.W20.corA_RF_ge). Also kernel-checked: Lemma TG11
 (A36RW.AppJ.W21.TG11: a deterministic seedless policy in RAND_r attains $G_r^\lambda(\text{root})$,
 which is therefore the maximum over RAND_r and the supremum, over every causal
 randomized policy, of the probability of success within r rounds); in (d), $c_{\text{TG}} < 3.154$
 (A36RW.AppJ.W20.cTG_lt), the executed mean bound
 (A36RW.AppJ.W20.corD_execMean_ge) and the mixture clause
 (A36RW.AppJ.W20.corD_LFgen_ge, for $\varepsilon \geq 0$); Corollary (c)1
 (A36RW.AppJ.W21.corC1_two_sided, A36RW.AppJ.W21.corC1_no_uniform);
 and the second remark after (c): for $\lambda = N^4$
 (A36RW.AppJ.W21.Remark.remark_RF_eq_one,
 A36RW.AppJ.W21.Remark.remark_LF_eq_one) and, by the $A \leftrightarrow B$ symmetry, for
 $\lambda = N^{-4}$ (A36RW.AppJ.CW4.famTinv_eq, A36RW.AppJ.CW4.famOinv_eq,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW4.oneRound_KLle_inv,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW4.remark_oneRound_inv,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW4.remark_RF_eq_one_inv,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW4.remark_LF_eq_one_inv); that on this family, which violates
 condition (1), no λ -uniform lower bound tending to infinity holds
 (A36RW.AppJ.CW4.fam_not_cond1,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW4.no_uniform_lower_bound_RF,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW4.no_uniform_lower_bound_LF,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW4.no_uniform_lower_bound_RF_inv,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW4.no_uniform_lower_bound_LF_inv), in particular neither
 $R_F^\lambda(\varepsilon) \geq c \log_2 \log_2 n - C$ nor $L_F^\lambda(n, \varepsilon) \geq c \log_2 \ln n - C$ for any $c > 0$
 (A36RW.AppJ.CW4.no_doublyLog_RF, A36RW.AppJ.CW4.no_doublyLog_LF,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW4.no_doublyLog_RF_inv,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW4.no_doublyLog_LF_inv); Steps 1–3
 (A36RW.AppJ.CW4.step1_ratio, A36RW.AppJ.CW4.expZ_famT,

A36RW.AppJ.CW4.step1_expZ_le, A36RW.AppJ.CW4.nu_eq_min,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW4.KLx_prodMarg_eq,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW4.oneRound_KL_eq_fam); and the identity for $KL(p_\lambda \| Q)$ with λ' as
 A36RW.AppJ.CW4.lamPrime, whose two terms Step 3 bounds at once
 (A36RW.AppJ.CW4.KLx_split, A36RW.AppJ.CW4.KLx_oneRound_split_fam,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW4.KLx_split_terms_fam). Further kernel-checked: the
mathematical content of the remarks after Theorem 21
 (A36RW.AppJ.CW3.const_depends_on_r_only, A36RW.AppJ.CW3.Cr_values,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.Cr_ratio_le, A36RW.AppJ.CW3.Cr_le_geo,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.V_oneSided_asymp_inv,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.V_NNN_tendsto_N,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.V_one_balanced_root,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.tgenv_balanced_shape,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.Cr_div_Ar_mem, A36RW.AppJ.CW3.base_factor_le);
Corollary (c)2 (A36RW.AppJ.CW3.corC2_conclusion,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.example_theta, A36RW.AppJ.CW3.example_root), with the
 paragraph on where c is small (A36RW.AppJ.CW3.sig2_floor,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.cLim_ge_floor, A36RW.AppJ.CW3.necessity,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.limits_atTop_gt, A36RW.AppJ.CW3.limits_atTop_lt,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.limits_atTop_eq, A36RW.AppJ.CW3.cLim_tendsto_zero,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.tendsto_atTop_zero_iff,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.tendsto_zero_zero_iff,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.both_zero_iff, A36RW.AppJ.CW3.diag_no_uniform,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.offDiag_uniform,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.example_half_quarter,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.example_03_05) and the one on one-sided bounds
 (A36RW.AppJ.CW3.V_oneSided_asymp,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.V_oneSided_asymp_inv,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.V_oneSided_tendsto,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.V_oneSided_symm,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.V_oneSided_printed,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.V_oneSided_printed_inv); **Corollary (c)3**
 (A36RW.AppJ.CW3.consequence1_loglog,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.consequence2_loglog,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.consequence1_RF, A36RW.AppJ.CW3.consequence2_RF,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.consequence1_LF, A36RW.AppJ.CW3.consequence2_LF,
 and with (d) A36RW.AppJ.CW3.consequence1_RF_d,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.consequence2_RF_d,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.consequence1_execMean_d,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.consequence2_execMean_d); the exact facts that interpret the
 numerical checks, whose outcomes are finite falsification evidence and are not
 kernel-checked: which checks are vacuous at the tested sizes, which tested states are
 informative, the constants used there and the reduction to deterministic policies
 (A36RW.AppJ.CW3.env_two_gt_one_iff,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.env_three_gt_one_of_lt,

A36RW.AppJ.CW3.envGeo_three_gt_one_of_lt,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.tg6_bound_ge_one_iff,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.tg6_bound_leq_one_iff,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.checks_vacuous_n16, A36RW.AppJ.CW3.V_le_four,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.caseF_vacuous_n200,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.dpEnv_vacuous_n400,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.tg6_informative_states,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.caseS_bound_lt_one, A36RW.AppJ.CW3.g32_digits,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.gS_32_lt, A36RW.AppJ.CW3.gS_isGreatest,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.det_suffice) and of the remark on loose constants
 (A36RW.AppJ.CW3.env_lt_one_imp, A36RW.AppJ.CW3.env_two_lt_one_imp,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.env_lt_one_imp_r3, A36RW.AppJ.CW3.Cr_pow_mono,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.V_one_balanced_root,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.balanced_need_r2, A36RW.AppJ.CW3.balanced_need_r3,
 A36RW.AppJ.CW3.balancedEnv_two_lt_one_iff). The first remark after (c), that
 (a) and (b) hold in terms of V_{root} whenever $V_{\text{root}} \rightarrow \infty$, is the form in which
 A36RW.AppJ.corA_capKLSetsAS_full and
 A36RW.AppJ.corB_asymptotic_full are stated, with no condition on n_A/n or k/n
 and none on λ beyond $\lambda > 0$. That its two hypotheses are not necessary is
 A36RW.AppJ.CW5.not_necessary: the family $n_A = n_B = k = N$ with
 $\lambda_N = (\ln N)^2$ violates (1) for every $\delta > 0$ and (2), and has $V_{\text{root}} \rightarrow \infty$ and
 $\log_2 \ln V_{\text{root}} = \log_2 \ln n + o(1)$. Ordinary only: the closing numerical sentence of the
 second remark.

- Two-group reductions (Appendix J), for every $\lambda > 0$, all group sizes and every $k \leq n$
 (RAND_r with the almost-sure cap, NA_r the predrawn mixtures of full labelled schedules
 with at most r blocks; where a lemma needs the Setting's $0 < k < n$ or $r \geq 1$, it is
 assumed): A36W.TGRed.K1a, A36W.TGRed.K1b and A36W.TGRed.K1c
 (Lemma TGR1, with $\mathcal{C}_r$ as A36W.TGRed.Crec); A36W.TGRed.K2a (Lemma TGR2(a);
 A36W.TGRed.K2a_le and A36W.TGRed.K2a_eq state its two parts without
 normalisation, which covers sub-probabilities), A36W.TGRed.K2b_RAND and
 A36W.TGRed.K2b_NA (TGR2(b), with the relabelled mixture for NA_r),
 A36W.TGRed.K2c_Fstar, A36W.TGRed.K2c_NA and A36W.TGRed.Phi_decomp
 (TGR2(c), the decomposition for $q > 0$), and A36W.TGRed.K2a_lt with
 A36W.TGRed.nonvac_K2a_strict (the strictness remark after TGR2, at an explicit
 fixed schedule); A36W.TGRed.K3 (Lemma TGR3; A36W.TGRed.K3_hull is the hull
 identity for every r); A36W.TGRed.K4a_Mstar, A36W.TGRed.K4a_hat_Mstar,
 A36W.TGRed.K4b and A36W.TGRed.K4c_hull (Lemma TGR4, (b) for every $c \geq 0$);
 A36W.TGRed.K5_success, A36W.TGRed.K5_lower and
 A36W.TGRed.K5_sandwich (TGR5, the sandwich for $r \geq 1$ with the policy of
 Lemma TG11 as π^0); A36W.TGRed.K6a_printed, A36W.TGRed.K6b,
 A36W.TGRed.K6c and A36W.TGRed.K6d (Lemma TGR6); A36W.TGRed.K7
 (Lemma TGR7, for every minimiser); A36W.TGRed.frontier_le
 ($F_r^* \leq \min(D_r, F_r^{\text{NA}})$) and A36W.TGRed.no_latent_peeking (the no-latent-peeking
 example, as a computation outside the formal class). The remark on u_A at

$n_A = n_B = k = 3, r = 3, \lambda \in \{2, 4\}$:
 A36W.TGCert2.W43.no.uA.indep.attains.lam2 and
 A36W.TGCert2.W43.no.uA.indep.attains.lam4 (every element of
 A36W.TGCert2.subKLSet exceeds F_3^* ; that set contains the output KL of every
 predrawn randomized mixture of u_A -independent deterministic count tables, by
 A36W.TGCert2.mix_sub_mem), and A36W.TGCert2.W43.gap.lam2 and
 A36W.TGCert2.W43.gap.lam4 (the gaps $3.5 \cdot 10^{-5}$ and $2.3 \cdot 10^{-4}$ nats, as brackets of
 $F_{\text{sub}} - F_3^*$; A36W.TGCert2.Fsub is the infimum of Φ over the hull of those tables'
 terminal vectors, and equals the infimum of subKLSet by
 A36W.TGCert2.subKLSet.sInf). Exact finite certificates from these reductions, for
 every placement of group A. Appendix K's six-coordinate witness, at $(3, 3, 3)$, $\lambda = 4, r = 3$:
 A36W.TGCert.W49 (F_3^* and F_3^{NA} are finite, $F_3^* > 0$ and $F_3^{\text{NA}} \geq 2.35 F_3^*$),
 A36W.TGCert.W49.factor_2358 (the same with 2.358 in place of 2.35) and
 A36W.TGCert.W49.beats_every_predrawn (a policy in RAND_3 has finite output
 KL at most $1/2.35$ times that of every predrawn mixture with at most three blocks), and
 A36W.TGCertRule.W49.rule.beats_every_predrawn, which exhibits such a
 policy: a seeded mixture of two count tables, relabelled uniformly within the groups, in
 which the composition of every block is its table's value at the round index and the
 committed counts; its output KL a is positive and at most $1/2.35$ times that of every such
 predrawn mixture. Appendix O's certified case $n = 4$: A36W.TGCert.W31a (at $(2, 2, 2)$,
 $\lambda = 2, r = 3$: $G_3^\lambda = 1$, and F_3^* lies in the rounding interval of $5.01857 \cdot 10^{-4}$, so $F_3^* > 0$).
 Appendix K's certified brackets, from the separate certificate package: for F_r^* on RAND_r
 with the almost-sure cap, at the 18 owner-only rows,
 A36W.TGCert3.R4_8_6_l3_r2.bracket,
 A36W.TGCert3.R4_8_6_l3_r3.bracket, A36W.TGCert3.I486.bracket
 ((4, 8, 6), $\lambda = 3, r = 4$), A36W.TGCert3.R5_11_8_l2_r2.bracket,
 A36W.TGCert3.R5_11_8_l2_r3.bracket,
 A36W.TGCert3.R5_11_8_l2_r4.bracket,
 A36W.TGCert3.R6_10_4_l4_r2.bracket,
 A36W.TGCert3.R6_10_4_l4_r3.bracket,
 A36W.TGCert3.R6_10_4_l4_r4.bracket,
 A36W.TGCert3.R8_8_5_l2_r2.bracket,
 A36W.TGCert3.R8_8_5_l2_r3.bracket,
 A36W.TGCert3.R8_8_5_l2_r4.bracket,
 A36W.TGCert3.R10_10_10_l1_r2.bracket,
 A36W.TGCert3.R10_10_10_l1_r3.bracket,
 A36W.TGCert3.R10_10_10_l1_r4.bracket,
 A36W.TGCert3.R12_12_12_l1_r2.bracket,
 A36W.TGCert3.R12_12_12_l1_r3.bracket and
 A36W.TGCert3.R12_12_12_l1_r4.bracket; for F_r^{NA} on predrawn mixtures with at
 most r blocks, at the seven certified cells, A36W.TGCert3.N3_3_3_l1_r3.bracket,
 A36W.TGCert3.N3_3_3_l2_r3.bracket,
 A36W.TGCert3.N4_8_6_l3_r3.bracket,
 A36W.TGCert3.N4_8_6_l3_r4.bracket, A36W.TGCert3.N666.bracket
 ((6, 6, 6), $\lambda = 2, r = 3$), A36W.TGCert3.N6_6_6_l2_r4.bracket and

A36W.TGCert.W49_FNA_bracket (the witness, in the main package). Each states $L \leq F \leq U$ for the optimum F it names, with rational L and U and for every placement of group A; a tag such as R5_11_8_12_r4 gives $(n_A, n_B, k) = (5, 11, 8)$, $\lambda = 2$ and $r = 4$. Further kernel-checked, for the two conclusions of the remark on the order of the TGR7 bracket: A36W.TGRem.halfWidth_expansion (for every finite W , $P > 0$ on W and every $\hat{q}$, as $g \rightarrow 0^+$ the half-width before the caps is $\sqrt{2g} \sum_w \hat{q}_w / \sqrt{P_w} + o(\sqrt{g})$), and, on the remark's segment example at $P = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$, A36W.TGRem.bracket_width_ge (every bracket that is a function of $(\hat{q}, g)$ and valid on convex sets has width at least $|t|$ at $(q(t), g(t))$, $|t| < \frac{1}{5}$) and A36W.TGRem.halfwidth_not_isLittleO (so its half-width is not $o(\sqrt{g(t)})$ as $t \rightarrow 0$), with A36W.TGRem.gex_isTheta ($g(t) = \Theta(t^2)$) and A36W.TGRem.sOf_shift_isTheta ($s(q(t)) - s(q^*) = \Theta(\sqrt{g(t)})$). The remarks that at $r = 0$ the classes are empty, that $H(\pi) \geq \text{KL}(p_\lambda \| Q_\pi)$ by convexity, and that at $r = n$ all three frontier values are 0: A36W.PV.classes_r0_empty (for every $n \geq 1$, target and oracle), A36W.PV.KLx_le_H (for every $\pi \in \text{RAND}_r$; for every exact pair, A36W.PV.KLx_le_pathH_avg_of_exact) and A36W.PV.frontier_values_at_n. Ordinary only: the rest of the remark on u_A (including the other instances tested), the rest of the remark on the order of the TGR7 bracket, the identification of the tables' survival planner with Lemma TG11's policy, and the rest of Appendix J.

- Imperfect conditionals (Appendix N): A36RW.AppM.Qhat_vmass (the setting: relabelled singletons never leave V); A36RW.AppM.M1a.M1a_le, A36RW.AppM.M1a.M1a_coherent, A36RW.AppM.M1a.M1a_sup and A36RW.AppM.M1a.Hext_eq_nAext (Proposition IC1(a)); A36RW.AppM.M1b.M1b_F_zero and A36RW.AppM.M1b.M1b_cex_F ((b), with its counterexample); A36RW.AppM.M1cMain.M1c_limit_family and A36RW.AppM.M1cMain.M1c_rho ((c), proved through $o(s^2)$ limits in place of the $O(s^3)$ expansions of its proof, whose remainders stay ordinary); A36RW.AppM.M2i.M2i_bound and A36RW.AppM.M2i.M2i_tendsto (Theorem IC2(i)); A36RW.AppM.M2ii.M2ii_formula, A36RW.AppM.M2ii.M2ii_F, A36RW.AppM.M2ii.M2ii_upper, A36RW.AppM.M2ii.M2ii_n2, A36RW.AppM.M2ii.M2ii_profile_lower and A36RW.AppM.M2ii.M2ii_Theta ((ii)); A36RW.AppM.M2iii.M2iii_statement ((iii)). The relabelled-output chain rule of its scope and prior-art remarks: A36W.SigChain.relabel_chain_rule_head_ext (for the output law of any head and policy, both identities in $[0, \infty]$), with A36W.SigChain.relabel_chain_rule_ext (the first identity for every output law), A36W.SigChain.KLx_Qbar_eq_sigKLx (the second identity for every output law, with $\text{KL}(p_{\text{sig}} \| Q_{\text{sig}}) = \infty$ when $Q_{\text{sig}}(s) = 0 < p_{\text{sig}}(s)$ for some s) and A36W.SigChain.KLx_Qbar_eq_top_iff ($\text{KL}(p \| \bar{Q}) = \infty$ exactly when Q gives mass 0 to an orbit of the support); A36W.SigChain.remark_proper_subgroup, A36W.SigChain.remark_one_group_subgroup and A36W.SigChain.remark_one_group_subgroup_tilt (averaging over a proper subgroup need not suffice). Ordinary only: the rest of the scope and prior-art remarks,

including the description of relabelling as post-processing, and the numerical checks of Appendix N.

- Weighted adaptive converse (Appendix H, §10): `A36W.WAFinal.WA_policy` (the Theorem with its policy paragraph: for every causal randomized policy with fresh exact-marginal draws, success within r rounds is at most $\min\{1, A_r(d_0 + 1)^{-2^{-r}}\}$, with that section's Λ -dependent $A_r = 2\Lambda(12\Lambda)^{2-2^{2^{-r}}}$ (not the A_r of (Env)), and at most $\min\{1, 288\Lambda^3(d_0 + 1)^{-2^{-r}}\}$), `A36W.WAInst.WA_envelope` (the envelope at every legal state), `A36W.WAFinal.corA_KLx_ge_outLim_capAS` and `A36W.WAFinal.corA_rounds_outLim_capAS` (Corollary (a) for the almost-sure cap; `CapEvery` forms are also proved), `A36W.WAFinal.corB_execMean` and `A36W.WAFinal.cK_288_le` (Corollary (b)), and `A36W.WAFinal.corC_rounds_outLim_capAS` and `A36W.WAFinal.corC_execMean` (Corollary (c)). For $d_0 = 0$ (the end of (b)): `A36W.PV.bdry_target` (the target is the point mass at the unique word with k ones), `A36W.PV.bdry_oneRound_KL` (one round committing every coordinate has output KL 0) and `A36W.PV.bdry_policy` (as a policy: a cap of one round on every path and almost surely, output KL 0 and $\mathbb{E}\tau \leq 1$). `A36W.WAMixMean.LFgen_ge` gives Corollary (c)'s mean bound for finite predrawn mixtures, $L_F^w(n, \varepsilon) \geq e^{-\varepsilon} \log_2 \ln n - e^{-\varepsilon} - c(K_\Lambda)$ for $\varepsilon \geq 0$ under the hypotheses of (c), uniformly in the weights and k ; this is an explicit form of the F -lower clause of Theorem 8 and of the Remark in §7. The attainment paragraph of §10, under a homogeneous group of size at least ρn (the hypotheses of the Remark after the §7 table): `A36W.Attain.theoremR_policy_floor` (for $n \geq \lfloor (M^* - 1)/\rho \rfloor + 1$, or $M \leq 8K_4$, the profile is in $\text{RAND}_{\lfloor \log_2 \ln n + C_R \rfloor}$ with $F \leq \varepsilon$), `A36W.Attain.least_adaptive_hardcap_R` (the least adaptive hard cap is $\log_2 \ln n + O_{\varepsilon, \Lambda, \kappa_0, \rho}(1)$) and `A36W.Attain.sharp_mean_two_sided_ad_R` (the least expected executed rounds over all causal policies are $(e^{-\varepsilon} + o(1)) \log_2 \ln n$).
- Two-value tilts: the F upper bound and the least hard cap and mean of §9 (Appendix H, §§6 and 9): `A36W.FU.FU_theorem` and `A36W.FU.FU_LF_le` (item (FU) of the Result: for $n \geq n_0^{\text{ff}}$, or $M \leq 8K_4$, the profile μ_{ff} of §6 has $F \leq \varepsilon$, and every component has length at most $\max\{1, \lceil 2\Lambda^2/\varepsilon \rceil\} + 8K_4 + \lceil \log_2 \log_2 n \rceil$), with `A36W.FU.length_bound_le_C_FU` for the last step of that chain ($\leq \log_2 \ln n + C_{\text{FU}}$, $n \geq 2$); `A36W.FU.FB_KL` (the identity (FB)); `A36W.FU.stageA_le_eps4_of_isSchedule` (the Stage A bound (FA) of §6.4, $D(p_A \| Q_A) \leq \varepsilon/4$); `A36W.FU.RwF_two_sided_printed` (§9 (i), and (ii) with `A36W.FU.length_bound_le_C_FU` for its last step) and `A36W.FU.RwF_asymptotic` ($R_F^w = \log_2 \ln n + O_{\varepsilon, \Lambda, \kappa_0}(1)$, with RAND_r read as the almost-sure cap); and `A36W.FU.sharp_mean_two_sided` and `A36W.FU.sharp_mean_two_sided_ad` (§9, “Sharp mean coefficient”: L_F^w and its adaptive analogue are $(e^{-\varepsilon} + o(1)) \log_2 \ln n$), all uniformly in λ , the split and k . For the two class facts of §6.2, which §6.2 marks as not used below: `A36W.WC.valTree_outside_predrawn_weighted` (an explicit rule that chooses its second batch from a committed value completes within 3 rounds, yet no predrawn mixture has its law of the first two rounds), `A36W.WC.late_draw_eq_mixLawE` (drawing the rest of the schedule later, from a coin that does not see the committed values, has the output law

of the mixture that draws it first), and `A36W.WC.posterior.weights` with `A36W.WC.posterior.ne_prior_instance` (when the components have different predetermined prefixes, their conditional weights given an x_A of positive probability are the posterior weights, which can differ from the prior ones). For more weight values with a homogeneous group (the Remark after the §7 table): `A36W.FU.R.theoremR` and `A36W.FU.R.theoremR_LF_le` (for any weights with ratio at most Λ , a set of $M \geq \rho n$ equal-weight coordinates, an interior quota and $n \geq \lfloor (M^* - 1)/\rho \rfloor + 1$, or $M \leq 8K_4$, the profile has $F \leq \varepsilon$ and every component has length at most $\log_2 \ln n + C_R$); the geometric Stage A sentence is formal: its round bound `A36W.FU.R.theoremR_geo`, and its conclusion under the explicit size condition (`A36W.FU.R.theoremR_geo_loglog`) and, for a fixed C and large n , as `A36W.Attain.geo_loglog_eventually`; `A36W.Attain.theoremR_q`, `A36W.Attain.least_adaptive_hardcap_q`, `A36W.Attain.sharp_mean_two_sided_q` and `A36W.Attain.common_length_asymptotic_q` give the Remark's extension to any fixed number q of weight values, and `A36W.Attain.sharp_mean_two_sided_R` and `A36W.Attain.common_length_asymptotic_R` its mean $L_F^w = (e^{-\varepsilon} + o(1)) \log_2 \ln n$ and least common length $\log_2 \ln n + O_{\varepsilon, \Lambda, \kappa_0, \rho}(1)$ under a homogeneous group, with `A36W.Attain.common_length_lower_any` for the common-length lower bound for any weights. For any weights with ratio at most Λ (§§3–4): `A36W.HL.HL_bound` and `A36W.HL.HL_bound_simple` ((HL), for an interior quota), `A36W.HU.HU_schedule` and `A36W.HU.HU_bound` ((HU): one fixed schedule with $KL \leq 2\varepsilon/9$ and at most $1 + \max\{8(\ln n + 1), 16\Lambda^3(\ln n + 1)^2/\varepsilon\}$ rounds, for any k), and `A36W.HL.LH_theta` ($L_H^w = \Theta_{\varepsilon, \Lambda, \kappa_0}((\log n)^2)$, uniformly, for an interior quota); `A36W.HL.HL_hardLength`, `A36W.HL.HL_hardLength_asymptotic` and `A36W.HU.HU_hardLength` give the fixed-schedule half of the hard-length analogue of §9, which `A36W.Attain.fixed_schedule_length_theta` states as one $\Theta_{\varepsilon, \Lambda, \kappa_0}((\ln n)^2)$ bound; `A36W.Attain.common_length_two_sided` gives its relabelled-profile half (the least common component length is $\log_2 \ln n + O_{\varepsilon, \Lambda, \kappa_0}(1)$ for every $n \geq 2$), with `A36W.Attain.LcomRel_le_lenFF` and `A36W.FU.FU_theorem` for the sharp construction at $n \geq n_0^{\text{ff}}$. Item (FL) of the Result (§5): `A36W.FL.FL_r_form` (the bound for every integer $r \geq 0$) and `A36W.FL.FL_asymptotic` (its consequence $L_F^w \geq (e^{-\varepsilon} - o(1)) \log_2 \ln n$), with `A36W.FL.FL_r_choice` for the choice of r and `A36W.FL.V_root_ge_attained` for the equality case; the Remark after it: `A36W.FL.FL_remark_display_LFgen` (its display) and `A36W.FL.FL_remark_n` ($L_F^w \geq e^{-\varepsilon} \log_2 \ln n - 4.154$ for $n \geq (2\Lambda/\kappa_0)^2$), with `A36W.FL.FL_remark_execMean` and `A36W.FL.FL_remark_LFad` for $\mathbb{E}\tau$ and L_F^{ad} . The §6.9 table: `A36W.FU.Table.table_6_9` (its fifteen entries, as exact values of the formal constants). The first failing variant of §6.9 (without uniform B-relabelling), as a joint mapping: `A36W.WN.orbit_xa` (the residual slice $\{1100, 1010, 1001\}$ is one orbit), `A36W.WN.FB_fails` ($D(p_{B|A} \| Q_{B|A}) > -\ln s_J$, with slice mass $s_J = 8/9$), with `A36W.WN.massOn_QN`, `A36W.WN.c_pos`, `A36W.WN.c_eq_QA` and `A36W.FU.ExampleFB.succCount_ex` (the count-process success probability from $(M, J) = (3, 1)$ is $8/9$); `A36W.WN.QN_xa`, `A36W.WN.QN_xb`, `A36W.WN.QN_xc` and `A36W.WN.unrelabelled_not_uniform` (the normalized restriction $(1/4, 1/4, 1/2)$, not uniform); `A36W.WN.condKL_eq`, `A36W.WN.unrelabelled_chain` and

A36W.WN.shape_term_pos (the within-slice shape term); and A36W.WN.F_strict (F strictly larger than for the uniformly B-relabelled counterpart of the displayed schedule, as in §6.1). The §7 table of edge cases, one lemma per row (three for the small- ε row):
 A36W.FU.Table.edge_N0, A36W.FU.Table.edge_N1,
 A36W.FU.Table.edge_lambda_one, A36W.FU.Table.edge_N11M,
 A36W.FU.Table.edge_Neq_M, A36W.FU.Table.edge_J_extreme,
 A36W.FU.Table.edge_J_infeasible, A36W.FU.Table.edge_M_small,
 A36W.FU.Table.edge_small_eps_LA ($L_A \leq \lceil 2\Lambda^2/\varepsilon \rceil$),
 A36W.FU.Table.edge_small_eps_K4 and
 A36W.FU.Table.edge_small_eps_n0ff (the two approximations, as ratios tending to 1), A36W.FU.Table.edge_small_n and A36W.FU.Table.edge_H_side. §8's warning example, at $r = 3$ and for every placement of group A: A36W.TGCert.W31a (at $(2, 2, 2)$, $\lambda = 2$: $G_3^\lambda = 1$, and F_3^* lies in the rounding interval of $5.01857 \cdot 10^{-4}$) and A36W.TGCert.W31b (at $(3, 3, 3)$, $\lambda = 2$: $-\ln G_3^\lambda$ and F_3^* lie in the rounding intervals of 0.05518 and 0.05881, and $-\ln G_3^\lambda < F_3^*$). The uniform-in- ε reading at the end of §4:
 A36W.PV.HU_uniform_eps (one absolute constant C with $1 + \max\{8(\ln n + 1), 16\Lambda^3(\ln n + 1)^2/\varepsilon\} \leq C(\ln n + \Lambda^3(\ln n)^2/\varepsilon)$ for all $\Lambda \geq 1, \varepsilon > 0$ and $n \geq 3$). The estimate $r = \log_2 \ln n - O(\log \log \log n)$ of §5, for the r chosen there:
 A36W.PV.rFLisBigO, with the explicit bounds
 A36W.PV.rFLtwo_sided_eventually (eventually $0 \leq \log_2 \ln n - r \leq \frac{15}{2} \ln \ln \ln n$) and A36W.PV.rFLbounds_paper ($\ln \ln \ln n \leq \log_2 \ln n - r \leq \frac{3}{2} \ln \ln \ln n + 6$ for $n \geq 3000$ and $n \geq (2\Lambda/\kappa_0)^2$), and A36W.PV.rFLisTheta (the O is sharp). The second failing variant of §6.9 (Stage A in one block, at $\lambda = 1$ and $k = n/2$):
 A36W.PV.variant_fails_cell (for every even $n \geq 2000$ and $|A| = n/2$, the variant's law of x_A is the product of $\text{Ber}(\frac{1}{2})$ and $F > 0.01$) and
 A36W.PV.variant_not_eventually_le (so it cannot meet $\varepsilon = 0.01$ uniformly),
 through A36W.PV.cell_DA_le_F and A36W.PV.chainRule_route ($F \geq D_A$, by data processing and by the chain rule of §6.3), A36W.PV.DAcell_ge (the displayed lower bound on D_A), with the steps of its printed derivation: A36W.PV.DAcell_eq_count (D_A is the divergence between the hypergeometric and $\text{Bin}(N, \frac{1}{2})$ laws of $w = |x_A|$),
 A36W.PV.dv_KLW (the Donsker–Varadhan inequality), A36W.PV.Epf_eq ($\mathbb{E}_p f = -n/(4(n-1))$), A36W.PV.integral_cos_mul_gaussian and
 A36W.PV.sum_cos_ones (the Gaussian representation and the binomial cosine identity),
 A36W.PV.sum_exp_fTest_eq_integral ($\mathbb{E}_{\text{Bin}} e^f = \mathbb{E}_g[\cos(g/\sqrt{N})^N]$),
 A36W.PV.cos_le_exp_neg_sq_half ($\cos x \leq e^{-x^2/2}$ for $|x| \leq \pi/2$) and
 A36W.PV.binom_exp_le ($\mathbb{E}_{\text{Bin}} e^f \leq 2^{-1/2} + \Pr(|g| \geq \frac{\pi}{2}\sqrt{N})$); and
 A36W.PV.DAcell_gt ($D_A > 0.096$ for every even $n \geq 2000$), with
 A36W.PV.Vb_strictMonoOn, A36W.PV.Vb_2000 and A36W.PV.Vb_tendsto (the bound increases in n , lies in $[0.09644, 0.09645]$ at $n = 2000$ and tends to $\frac{1}{2} \ln 2 - \frac{1}{4}$, which A36W.PV.limit_value places in $(0.0965, 0.0966)$) and
 A36W.PV.cell_admissible (the cell is admissible for every row of the table).
 Ordinary only: the Informativeness paragraph of §3, the computations of §6.9 (the independent evaluation of the exact law, and the float64 grid of the second failing variant) and its remark on the size of the caps, the conclusion drawn from §8's warning example, and the finite- n figure of §9 on the sharp mean coefficient.

- Bounded weights without a reservoir (Appendix I): `A36W.RF.Cut3.rf.theoremA` (Theorem A: items 1 and 3–5, item 2’s hard-cap bounds and the schedule law’s independence of w , for every $\Lambda \geq 1$ and $0 < \kappa_0 \leq \frac{1}{2}$, uniformly in the weights and k ; the weights need not be normalized), `A36W.RF.Final.rf.small_n_branch` (item 2’s exact sampler when $n < 4m_0$) and `A36W.RF.Cut3.rf.corollaries` (Corollaries A’ and A’; `A36W.RF.Final.rf.corA' _uncond` gives A’’’s $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$, the range of its coefficient $1 - \beta = e^{-(\varepsilon - \varepsilon_n)}$ for large n and that coefficient in μ'), with `A36W.RF.Final.rf.not_common_length` (at $A = 1$ and $n = 20$, two components of positive probability have lengths 9 and 1, so the cap is not a common length). Along the proof, among others: `A36W.RF.T3 ((2.2))`, `A36W.RF.cutI_2_17 ((2.17))`, `A36W.RF.Cut2.powerSeries.package` (the power series of §3.2, on one radius), `A36W.RF.Cut2.eq_3_18_19_21_chain`, `A36W.RF.Cut2.eq_3_20` and `A36W.RF.Cut3.eq_3_19_all ((3.18)–(3.21))`, `A36W.RF.Cut2.rf_3_7` and `A36W.RF.Cut2.rf_3_8 (§§3.7 and 3.8)`, `A36W.RFCandidate.rf.ladder` (the integer ladder of §4.1), `A36W.PV.rf.sizes_le`, `A36W.PV.rf.coin_count`, `A36W.PV.rf.frac_rat`, `A36W.PV.rf.coinP_eq` and `A36W.PV.rf.support_card_le` (the sampling cost at the end of §4.2: $R + 1 \leq \log_2 \log n + 4$ sizes, exactly nR coins with rational biases, independent with the product law, and at most $(R + 1)^n$ schedules; the $O(n \log \log n)$ independent coins of Appendix O follow by an ordinary step, and the remark that the support is never listed is ordinary only), `A36W.RF.Cut3.rf_4_5` (the signed composition of §4.5, for one parent and abstract continuation kernels), `A36W.RF.Cut3.oneParent_holds` and `A36W.RF.Cut3.sig420_holds ((4.20) at every good parent, for the actual suffix laws)`, `A36W.RF.Cut3.level_420 ((4.20) at the level, after the supremum over good parents, from that per-parent bound)`, `A36W.RF.Cut3.rf.constants` (the simultaneous choice of §4.6) and `A36W.RF.Cut3.rf_survival ((4.31)–(4.32))`. Lemma T1: `A36W.sliceNCD_up` and `A36W.sliceNCD_down` (Lemma NCD’s inequalities (1.3a)), `A36W.sliceNCD_up_supp` and `A36W.sliceNCD_down_supp` (its two support conditions), and `A36W.slice_subGaussian` and `A36W.slice_tail ((1.3)–(1.4)`, the latter for $c \neq 0$), and `A36W.slice_linStat_eq_zero_of_coeff_zero` (for $c = 0$ the statistic vanishes identically); `A36W.RF.T1Alt.tl.route_mg` and `A36W.RF.T1Alt.tl.route_mg_tail` (the same bounds by route MG, Appendix I’s alternative proof that integrates the variance bound (1.5) along exponential tilts); and `A36W.RF.T1Alt.lemmaT1_both_routes` and `A36W.RF.T1Alt.tl.route_mg_same_statement` (the two routes prove the same statements, with the same constant). For Appendix H, §10 without a homogeneous group (the bounded-weights F rows of Table 2), uniformly in the weights and k : `A36W.RFAttain.rf.least_adaptive_hardcap` (the least adaptive hard cap is $\log_2 \ln n + O_{\varepsilon, \Lambda, \kappa_0}(1)$), `A36W.RFAttain.rf.RwF_two_sided` (the explicit lower constant of (c) with an existence-only upper constant $O_{\Lambda, \kappa_0}(1 + \varepsilon^{-2})$), `A36W.RFAttain.rf.sharp_mean_two_sided` (the least mean over predrawn mixtures is $(e^{-\varepsilon} + o(1)) \log_2 \ln n$) and `A36W.RFAttain.rf.sharp_mean_two_sided_ad` (the same for the least expected executed rounds over causal policies); the mixtures of Corollaries A’ and A’’ attain these orders by `A36W.RFAttain.rf.policy_floor` and

A36W.RFAttain.rf_muP_bridge. Further kernel-checked, for the remark after (3.9) on the first-order sum S_1 : A36W.RF.Cut2.firstOrder.eq and A36W.RF.Cut2.firstOrder.zero (the exact form of $S_1(u)$, and its value at $u = 0$, for every N, π, q, f and u with $0 < q_i < 1$);
 A36W.RF.Cut2.firstOrder.example_pos (on the remark's example, $N = 2K$ with $K > 0, J = K$, one weight $\lambda > 1$ and the others 1, with the slice's exact marginals as π , the logistic probabilities as q , and $0 < f \leq \frac{1}{4}$: $S_1(0) > 0$) and
 A36W.RF.Cut2.firstOrder.not_small (no single constant C gives $|S_1(u)| \leq C f N u^2 / V$ for all such K, λ, f and all u);
 A36W.RF.Cut2.firstOrder.lower and A36W.RF.Cut2.firstOrder.upper (for $0 < a \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $C_1, C_2 \geq 0$, each gives one constant $C \geq 0$ such that whenever $N > 0$, all $\pi_i, q_i \in [a, 1 - a]$, $|\pi_i - q_i| \leq C_1 / V \leq C_2 / N$, $\sum_i (\pi_i - q_i) = 0$ and $0 < f \leq \frac{1}{4}$, every u has $S_1(u) \geq -C f N u^2 / V$, respectively $S_1(u) \leq C N / V^2 + C f N u^2 / V$). For the conditions listed after the table of §5: A36W.RF.Cut3.A0c (a formula for A_0 from the one-step constants and κ_0) and A36W.RF.Cut3.A0c_spec (eight threshold inequalities that follow from $A \geq A_0$ when $\kappa_0, C, c, c_2 > 0$), with A36W.RF.Cut3.rf_constants above. Also kernel-checked, for Appendix P's statement that the kept-set sampler of Theorem 8(a) agrees in output law with a finite mixture of runs of random unmasking with prescribed block sizes: A36W.RFMixLaw.rfMixLaw.eq_relabel (for every exact oracle and every word, the output law of the mixture of §4.1–4.2 equals that of its uniform relabelling, the mixture over its coin outcomes of runs with their block sizes). Both identities of the construction's own-mean equality (4.37) are part of the conclusion of A36W.RF.Cut3.rf_corollaries, which proves them by the direct block count after (4.36), without the lower-bound theorem. The steps of that count are stated by A36W.RF.Final.rf_mean_ingredients (for $A \geq 1$ and $n \geq 4m_0$: $\mathbb{E}|B_t| = M_t - M_{t+1}$, $\Pr(B_t = \emptyset) \leq e^{-3M_{t+1}}$ with the bound $2e^{-12A^2}$ on the sum of these probabilities, the terminal contribution between 0 and $2m_0$, and $R \leq \log_2 \log n + 3$, with $R > \log_2 \log n - 3$ when $4A^4 \leq n$), and (4.37) itself, with the eventual bound $|\mathbb{E}\tau_{U(A_n)} - \log_2 \log n| \leq 8A_n^2 + 5$, by A36W.RF.Final.rf_mean_437, for every $A_0 \geq 1, C_*$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Ordinary only: the remark of §1.2, the rest of the remark of §3.2, the strategy and dependency discussion of the two routes to Lemma T1 at the end of §1.2, the rest of §5 (its constants table, the conditions listed after it that the declarations above do not state, and its closing remarks), and the dependency graph of §6. Also kernel-checked along the printed routes: Lemma NCD's reduction of its second family to the first through $1 - X$, which has the weighted-slice law with weights $1/w_i$ and quota $|F| - J$ (A36W.PV.RouteQ.complLaw.eq, A36W.PV.RouteQ.sliceNCD_down_printed; A36W.sliceNCD_down proves that family by its own induction); the proof of Lemma T1 from NCD through the Cauchy–Schwarz display, which combines the two halves (A36W.PV.RouteQ.cs.display; (1.3) and (1.4) as A36W.PV.RouteQ.slice_subGaussian_printed and A36W.PV.RouteQ.slice_tail_printed; A36W.slice_subGaussian uses the pointwise bound A36W.exp_add_le_half instead); and the explicit choice of concentration events after (3.16), through which (1.7) gives (3.16) from (3.15), the generative form of the tilted law (A36W.PV.RouteQ2.printed_events_interior,

A36W.PV.RouteQ2.eq_3_16_printed; A36W.RF.Cut2.eq_3_16 uses relative-deviation events, through A36W.RF.Cut2.ss_bad_le). Ordinary only, as a route (its statement is kernel-checked by another route): the assembly of (2.17) from (2.10), (2.11) and (2.15) (A36W.RF.cutI_2_17 goes through the tilt variable, by A36W.RF.main_term_eq; (2.15) is kernel-checked separately, as A36W.RF.eq_2_15).

- Full support (Appendix F): A36FS.Thm7C.thm3d (Theorem 7(d)) and A36FS.Thm7C.table1_rate (its $n^{3/(4^R-1)-o(1)}$ form, for all large n); A36FS.Thm7C.thm7c (the displayed bound of Theorem 15(c)) and A36FS.Thm7C.aNc_le_085 (the bound $a_n \leq 0.85$ of Theorem 15(c) for all $n \geq 14$ in range, at $\bar{\omega} = 1/(3Z(\vartheta))$); A36FS.Thm7.thm7b_lower_liminf (the lower half of Theorem 15(b)); A36FS.Thm9.thm9b_liminf (Theorem 19(b)); A36FS.Thm7.LFad_le_LFgen ($L_F^{\text{ad}} \leq L_F$ for $\varepsilon \geq 0$); A36FS.Thm7.thm7a and A36FS.Thm9.thm9a_full (Theorems 15(a) and 19(a)), with A36FS.Thm7.LFgen_ge and A36FS.Thm9.LFad_ge (the bounds on L_F and L_F^{ad} in their last sentences); U7Kol.U7_printed (Lemma U7); and, for Proposition 14, A36FS.Prop2.prop2_main (its inequality), A36FS.Prop2.LHgen_ge and A36FS.Prop2.LHgen_le (its two bounds on L_H), A36FS.Prop2.LHgen_zero ($L_H(n, 0) = n$) and A36FS.Prop2.LHgen_isTheta (Theorem 7(a)); and, for the upper bounds, A36FS.Thm8.Main.thm8 (Theorem 17; Lemma Z5 is A36FS.Thm8.Transfer.transfer_TV), A36FS.Thm8.Dilution.cor5 (Corollary 18, which is Theorem 7(c)) and A36FS.Thm8.Dilution.thm9c (Theorem 19(c)); and, for single relabelled profiles, A36FS.T1.thm5_F_exists (Theorem 10), A36FS.T1.cor3_F (Corollary 11), A36FS.T1.thm6_F (Theorem 12) and A36FS.T1.cor4_F (Corollary 13 for $\varepsilon \leq 1$), with A36FS.Misc.ProfAllEps.cor4_F_all and A36FS.Misc.ProfAllEps.thm3b_F_all (Corollary 13 and Theorem 7(b), respectively, for every $\varepsilon > 0$), through A36FS.T1.F_relabel_eq_Fcount (T1); and A36FS.HFS.thm7b_upper (the upper half of Theorem 15(b)) and A36FS.HFS.cor6 (Corollary 20); and FSCore.RemMixf.rem_mixf_incl_ge_two, FSCore.RemMixf.rem_mixf_incl_lt_two and FSCore.RemMixf.rem_mixf_limit_four (the two inclusions and the limit of Remark 16), with FSCore.RemMixf.not_eventually_mass_le_of_le_four, FSCore.RemMixf.const_lt_half and FSCore.RemMixf.etaInf_le_one, on which the remark's closing sentence, on the limit of the method, rests (for $1 < \vartheta \leq 4$ the test-set premise fails; for $\vartheta > 4$ the constant $(\ln 2 / \ln \vartheta) \eta_\infty$ of Theorem 15(b)'s proof is below $\frac{1}{2}$); and, for lemmas and remarks of Appendix F, A36FS.PropL.propL (Proposition L), A36FS.XP.X1, A36FS.XP.X3i and A36FS.XP.X3ii (Lemmas X1 and X3), A36FS.X2Paper.X2_paper and A36FS.X2Paper.X2_R0 (Lemma X2: the forced jump, and the formula for $R_0(n)$), A36FS.XP.X1' and A36FS.XP.X3' (Lemmas X1' and X3', counting completed runs, which is their use in the proof of Theorem 19(a)), A36FS.K2.main_text_scope (the floors, top floor, minimum prefix and hard-cap scope of the mixture of Theorem 17), A36FS.Misc.MixCap.mix_hardcap_lower and A36FS.Misc.MixCap.mix_hardcap_lower_cap (the least hard cap of finite

predrawn mixtures with $F \leq \varepsilon$ is at least $(\frac{1}{2} - o(1)) \log_2 \log_2 n$, from Theorem 15(a); with `A36FS.Thm9.thm9a_full`, since a policy in $\mathcal{A}_r$ completes, and has $\tau_+ \leq \tau \leq r$, almost surely, the same lower bound $(\frac{1}{2} - o(1)) \log_2 \log_2 n$ holds for the least hard cap of causal policies with $\text{KL}(p||Q_\pi) \leq \varepsilon$, a derived consequence that no single declaration states), `A36FS.Misc.DepthBridge.callComps_chain` and `A36FS.Misc.DepthBound.depth_bound` (on every branch of the construction's recursion the nonbase calls form a chain of nested calls, empty at a base size, and every such chain from size n has fewer than $1 + \log_4 \ln(n + 2)$ calls), with `A36FS.Misc.DepthBridge.depth_every_branch` (every component of the recursion's law comes from such a branch), `A36FS.Misc.ChargeMono.LFgen_le_charged` and `A36FS.Misc.ChargeMono.LFadle_charged` (an extra nonnegative charge can only raise L_F and L_F^{ad}), with `A36FS.Misc.ChargeMono.thm7a_bound_charged` and `A36FS.Misc.ChargeMono.thm9b_charged` (Theorem 15(a)'s bound and Theorem 19(b) under such a charge), `A36FS.Misc.ExactSamplerPS.exactSampler_exists` and `A36FS.Misc.ExactSamplerNonProduct.not_first_round` (the exact sampler and, for $n \geq 2$, its contrast with one interface round), and `A36FS.Misc.ScopeL3.W1_counterexample`, `A36FS.Misc.Round1Alpha.alpha1_exact_min` and `A36FS.Misc.Thm9aModerate.thm9a_bound_le_two` (the Scope paragraph's counterexample to Lemma L3, the remark in round 1 of the proof of Theorem 10, and the moderate- n remark after Theorem 19). The declarations above prove Theorem 15 by other routes: parts (a) and (c) and the lower half of (b) through the embedding of mixtures as causal policies, and the upper half of (b) through Corollary 18. The printed arguments of its parts are kernel-checked as well, with the same statements: `A36FS.PrintedRoute.thm7a_printed_route` (part (a)), `A36FS.PrintedRoute.thm7b_lower_liminfin_printed_route` and `A36FS.PrintedRoute.thm7b_upper_printed_route` (part (b)), and `A36FS.PrintedRoute.thm7c_printed_route` and `A36FS.PrintedRoute.thm3d_printed_route` (part (c) and Theorem 7(d)). Its count reduction `X0` is `A36FS.X0.X0_mixture_le` for every finite predrawn mixture (in count-marginal form, `A36FS.X0.KLx_symW_eq_KLW`), with equality under the uniform relabelling (`A36FS.X0.X0_relabel_eq`). In the proof of Theorem 10, the printed derivation of both Case-1 conditions on r from $r \geq K_1 \sqrt{1 + \ln c}$ is kernel-checked as well: `A36FS.Misc.Thm5Case1Route.printed_chain` and `A36FS.Misc.Thm5Case1Route.case1_conditions` (for $K_0 \geq 80e^2$ and $c \geq 1$), and `A36FS.Misc.Thm5Case1Route.case1_conditions_paper` with `A36FS.Misc.Thm5Case1Route.Cc_side` (at $K_0 = 4608e^2$ and $K_1 = 2K_0$).