

A Deterministic Constant-Competitive Algorithm for Dynamic Mixture-of-Experts Serving

Ian D'Ambrosio
Nth Research Collective

26 August 2026

Abstract

Dynamic Mixture-of-Experts Serving allocates k replica GPUs among m experts as workloads change. At each round, the online algorithm sees the current workload, chooses integral replica counts, and pays bottleneck service cost plus replica movement. It does not know future workloads. Huang, Lou, and Xiao gave an $O(\sqrt{\log k})$ -competitive randomized algorithm for this problem. We prove a deterministic $O(1)$ -competitive algorithm. For every number of experts and every $k \geq 1$, the algorithm satisfies

$$\text{ALG}_{\text{det}} \leq 10C_{\text{PB}} \cdot \text{OPT} + (5C_{\text{PB}} + 8)k + 16,$$

where C_{PB} is the absolute constant from Chasing Positive Bodies at resource augmentation one and covering sparsity two. Consequently, the deterministic competitive-ratio upper bound is

$$\boxed{\text{CR}_{\text{det}}(k) \leq 10C_{\text{PB}} \quad \text{for every } k \geq 1},$$

which is $O(1)$ because C_{PB} is absolute. The routine universal lower bound then gives $\text{CR}_{\text{det}}(k) = \Theta(1)$. The multiplicative factor does not depend on the number of experts, the replica budget, the horizon, or the workload values. Thus randomization is not needed for the asymptotic guarantee.

The proof has two layers. A finite tangent envelope, summable positive resets, and a nonexpansive balanced projection reduce reciprocal-max service costs to a deterministic exact-budget fractional path. A new deterministic rounding theorem converts every such path to integral allocations with service distortion three and movement bounded by the fractional movement plus $6k$. The complete reduction, rounding theorem, causal composition, and quantified main theorem are machine-checked in Lean 4 relative to the positive-body result as the sole scientific source premise. The theorem concerns the allocation model above. It does not include network topology, shared-edge congestion, or routing decisions.

1 Introduction

Dynamic Mixture-of-Experts (MoE) inference must decide how many replica GPUs to assign to each expert as workloads change. Moving replicas has a switching cost, while insufficient replication increases bottleneck latency. Huang, Lou, and Xiao formalized this tradeoff as an online problem and proved an $O(\sqrt{\log k})$ randomized competitive ratio for the integral primal problem [3]. Their $\Omega(\sqrt{\log k})$ construction concerns an offset-Fenchel-dual maximization problem. Weak duality points in the wrong direction for transferring it to a primal lower bound, and the asymptotic primal ratio remained open.

Two contemporaneous follow-ups then gave constant randomized bounds for the primal problem. Vergeres proved a deterministic factor-16 bound for the equality-budget fractional relaxation and, using Lazy Threshold Rounding, a randomized factor-48 integral bound against an oblivious adversary [5]. An earlier version of this manuscript obtained a constant randomized integral ratio through the positive-body reduction below and the same rounding theorem [3]. Neither result gave a deterministic

integral bound. A simple deterministic baseline keeps the supplied integral allocation fixed. Since every fractional coordinate lies in $[0, k]$, its service is within a factor $k + 1$ of that fractional path. Thus the previous deterministic bracket was $\Omega(1)$ to $O(k)$.

This paper closes that deterministic gap: for every $k \geq 1$, $\text{CR}_{\text{det}}(k) \leq 10C_{\text{PB}}$, an $O(1)$ upper bound because C_{PB} is absolute. The multiplicative factor is independent of the number of experts, replica budget, initial state, horizon, and workload values.

The proof preserves the positive-body reduction from the previous version. The epigraph of $r/(1 + u)$ admits a finite positive-polyhedral inner approximation with constant distortion. This permits a reduction to the positive-body chasing theorem of Bhattacharya, Buchbinder, Levin, and Saranurak [2]. A finite tangent grid handles the continuum of reciprocal tangents, geometrically shrinking positive resets charge service to movement, and a balanced projection removes resource augmentation without expanding movement.

The new component is deterministic pathwise rounding. A coordinate receives an integral unit only after its fractional mass crosses one of the activation thresholds at $2, 5, 8, \dots$. Once present, the unit remains until it has at least one unit of certified depth. The top-unit potential

$$\Phi(y, z) = \sum_i (3y_i - 1 - z_i)_+$$

decreases by at least one at every repair transfer. Exact fractional budgets bound its increase between rounds by half the fractional ℓ_1 movement. The resulting telescope has service distortion three and movement stretch one plus an additive $6k$, independent of the expert count and horizon.

Contribution. Our contribution is the deterministic $O(1)$ upper bound and the pathwise rounding theorem that makes it possible. This improves the prior deterministic $O(k)$ baseline to $O(1)$ and shows that randomization is not asymptotically necessary. The factor-one lower bound is only the universal observation that every online path is a feasible offline path; it is not a scientific contribution.

Verification. The complete theorem is formalized in Lean 4 relative to the two-sparse positive-body chaser as its sole scientific source premise. The companion archive rebuilds the proof and regenerates the exact controls from one command, including a deliberately false rounder without hysteresis.

2 Model and main result

Fix $m \geq 1$ experts and $k \geq 1$ replica GPUs. The integral state space is

$$X_{m,k} = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^m : \sum_{i=1}^m x_i = k \right\}.$$

At round t , a nonnegative workload vector $r_t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m$ is revealed. The online algorithm chooses $x_t \in X_{m,k}$ and pays

$$f_t(x_t) + \|x_t - x_{t-1}\|_1, \quad f_t(x) = \max_{i \in [m]} \frac{r_{t,i}}{1 + x_i},$$

where the integral initial state x_0 is part of the instance. For a fixed finite workload sequence, OPT is the minimum total cost over all integral paths.

For fixed k , write $\text{CR}_{\text{det}}(k)$ for the infimum of factors Γ with the following property: for every $m \geq 1$ there is a constant $A_{m,k} \geq 0$ such that, for every integral initial state, some deterministic causal integral algorithm satisfies $\text{ALG} \leq \Gamma \cdot \text{OPT} + A_{m,k}$ on every finite workload sequence. The additive

term may depend on m and k , but not on the horizon or workloads. Causality means that equal request prefixes produce equal allocation prefixes.

Let C_{PB} denote an absolute competitive constant supplied by Theorem 1.1 of [2] at resource augmentation $\epsilon = 1$ and maximum covering-row support $d = 2$. We absorb into C_{PB} the constant from reducing a positive body to positive halfspaces and the standard conversion between upward movement and full ℓ_1 movement.

Two properties of the service cost. The proof uses two elementary features of f_t . First, its reciprocal terms are smooth under capacity scaling: for every $r, u \geq 0$,

$$\frac{r}{1 + u/2} \leq 2 \frac{r}{1 + u}.$$

Thus halving capacity from $2k$ to k while retaining at least half of every coordinate increases service by at most a factor two. Second, f_t is the maximum of univariate coordinate functions. Its epigraph therefore separates into constraints involving only the height and one allocation coordinate, and the tangent discretization preserves covering-row support $d = 2$. Equation (2) makes the sparsity explicit, while (7) applies the capacity-scaling inequality.

Theorem 1 (Deterministic $O(1)$ -competitive upper bound). *For every $m, k \geq 1$ and every integral initial state, there is a causal deterministic integral online algorithm such that every finite nonnegative workload sequence satisfies*

$$\text{ALG}_{\text{det}} \leq 10C_{\text{PB}} \cdot \text{OPT} + (5C_{\text{PB}} + 8)k + 16.$$

The multiplicative constant is independent of m , k , the initial state, the horizon, and the workloads.

Interpretation and scope. The algorithm sees each workload before choosing that round's allocation, but it never sees future workloads. Its total service and movement cost is at most a fixed multiple of the best offline integral path, plus the displayed additive term. The fixed multiple is independent of every problem dimension. This is a competitive-cost guarantee, not a running-time or serving-latency benchmark. The model allocates replicas but does not model physical network topology, shared links, or routing.

Since C_{PB} is absolute, Theorem 1 gives the promised upper bound

$$\boxed{\text{CR}_{\text{det}}(k) \leq 10C_{\text{PB}} \quad \text{for every } k \geq 1}.$$

In particular, $\text{CR}_{\text{det}}(k) = O(1)$. Every realized online path is also feasible offline. Scaling one positive one-round workload makes any horizon-independent additive negligible, so $\text{CR}_{\text{det}}(k) \geq 1$. Consequently $\text{CR}_{\text{det}}(k) = \Theta(1)$. The lower inequality is routine and is not a separate contribution. Here $O(1)$ refers to the competitive factor multiplying OPT , not to the wall-clock running time of the algorithm.

3 Source theorem

We use the following exact consequence of a published result.

Positive-body chasing. A positive body has the form

$$K_t = \{z \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^D : C^t z \geq \mathbf{1}, P^t z \leq \mathbf{1}\},$$

where both matrices are nonnegative. Theorem 1.1 of [2] gives, for $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$, an $O(\epsilon^{-1} \log(d/\epsilon))$ -competitive online chaser whose covering constraints remain exact and whose packing constraints may

be violated by a factor $1 + \epsilon$; d is the largest covering-row support. Its movement is compared with an exact offline path beginning at zero. Thus, when $\epsilon = 1$ and $d = 2$, the movement factor C_{PB} is absolute, covering rows remain exact, and packing right-hand sides may be doubled. Strictly positive right-hand sides normalize to one without changing row support. A covering row with zero coefficients and zero right-hand side is vacuous and may be deleted.

The previous version also invoked Lazy Threshold Rounding from [3]. The deterministic rounding theorem in Section 7 replaces that step. No randomized rounding theorem is a premise of Theorem 1.

4 A finite positive approximation to reciprocal service

Fix a workload coordinate $r \geq 0$ and augmented allocation $u \geq 0$. Write $q = 1 + u$. For a scale $p \geq 1$, define the tangent

$$L_{r,p}(u) = \frac{r(2p - q)}{p^2} = \frac{r(2p - 1 - u)}{p^2}.$$

Lemma 2 (Tangent envelope). *For all $r \geq 0$, $q > 0$, and $p > 0$,*

$$\frac{r}{q} - L_{r,p}(u) = \frac{r(q - p)^2}{qp^2} \geq 0.$$

If $0 \leq u \leq 2k$, some $p \in \{1, \dots, 2k + 1\}$ also satisfies

$$L_{r,p}(u) \geq \frac{3}{4} \frac{r}{1 + u}.$$

Proof. The first identity follows by putting the two terms over qp^2 . For the second claim, take $p = \lceil q \rceil$. Then $1 \leq p \leq 2k + 1$ and $q \leq p < q + 1 \leq 2q$. Hence $a = q/p \in (1/2, 1]$, and

$$\frac{L_{r,p}(u)}{r/q} = a(2 - a) \geq \frac{3}{4}.$$

The case $r = 0$ is immediate. □

Define the finite envelope

$$H_r(u) = \max_{1 \leq p \leq 2k+1} L_{r,p}(u).$$

Lemma 2 gives

$$\frac{3}{4} \frac{r}{1 + u} \leq H_r(u) \leq \frac{r}{1 + u} \quad (0 \leq u \leq 2k). \quad (1)$$

For $r > 0$, the inequality $s \geq L_{r,p}(u)$ is equivalent to the positive covering row

$$\frac{p^2}{r(2p - 1)} s + \frac{1}{2p - 1} u \geq 1. \quad (2)$$

Its support has size at most two. This is the $d = 2$ sparsity supplied by the maximum-of-univariate form of f_t . Coordinates with $r = 0$ require no row; equivalently, one may insert and delete a vacuous zero-coefficient covering row with zero right-hand side, as in the formal reduction.

Remark 3. A geometric grid $p \in \{(3/2)^j : (3/2)^j \leq 1 + 2k\}$ gives the same $3/4$ factor with $O(\log(k + 1))$ rows per expert. The concrete Lean reduction uses the elementary integer grid above; both envelope lemmas are machine-checked.

5 The event/reset reduction

Use augmented coordinates $(u_1, \dots, u_m, s) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{m+1}$. When request r_t arrives, present the positive body

$$E_t = \left\{ (u, s) : \sum_i u_i \leq k, \quad s \geq L_{r_t, i, p}(u_i) \text{ for all } i, p \right\}. \quad (3)$$

After taking the round- t MoE action, present the reset body

$$R_t = \left\{ (u, s) : \sum_i u_i \leq k, \quad s \leq \delta_t \right\}, \quad \delta_t = 2^{-t} \quad (t \geq 1), \quad (4)$$

and set $\delta_0 := 0$ for the initial accounting convention. Both packing rows have positive right-hand side after normalization. The event covering rows have support at most two. Both bodies are nonempty. The reset is processed after the action at time t and before the next request, so the construction remains causal.

Run the positive-body chaser with $\epsilon = 1$. At an event, write its point as (u_t, s_t) . At the following reset, write its height as b_t . Then

$$\sum_i u_{t,i} \leq 2k, \quad s_t \geq H_{r_t, i}(u_{t,i}) \quad \forall i, \quad 0 \leq b_t \leq 2\delta_t. \quad (5)$$

5.1 Removing resource augmentation

Map every $u \geq 0$ with $\sum_i u_i \leq 2k$ to the exact-budget fractional allocation

$$\rho(u) = \frac{k - \frac{1}{2} \sum_i u_i}{m}, \quad x_i(u) = \frac{u_i}{2} + \rho(u). \quad (6)$$

Lemma 4 (Balanced projection). *The map in (6) satisfies $x(u) \geq 0$, $\sum_i x_i(u) = k$, $x_i(u) \geq u_i/2$, and*

$$\|x(u) - x(v)\|_1 \leq \|u - v\|_1.$$

Proof. The budget bound gives $\rho(u) \geq 0$, and summing (6) gives total mass k . Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \|x(u) - x(v)\|_1 &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|u - v\|_1 + m |\rho(u) - \rho(v)| \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \|u - v\|_1 + \frac{1}{2} \left| \sum_i (u_i - v_i) \right| \\ &\leq \|u - v\|_1. \end{aligned}$$

□

Combining (1), (5), and the capacity-halving bound $1 + x_i(u_t) \geq (1 + u_{t,i})/2$ gives

$$f_t(x(u_t)) \leq 2 \max_i \frac{r_{t,i}}{1 + u_{t,i}} \leq \frac{8}{3} s_t. \quad (7)$$

5.2 Charging service to vertical movement

Let a_{t-1} be the chaser height after the preceding reset, with $a_0 = 0$. Thus $a_{t-1} \leq 2\delta_{t-1}$ for every $t \geq 1$, including the initial case. Let V_t be the vertical movement while processing E_t, R_t . Endpoint distances imply

$$V_t \geq |s_t - a_{t-1}| + |s_t - b_t| \geq 2s_t - a_{t-1} - b_t.$$

Using (7), $a_{t-1} \leq 2\delta_{t-1}$, and $b_t \leq 2\delta_t$, we obtain

$$f_t(x(u_t)) \leq \frac{4}{3}V_t + \frac{8}{3}(\delta_{t-1} + \delta_t).$$

Because $\delta_0 = 0$ and $\sum_{t \geq 1} \delta_t = 1$, summing the error terms contributes at most $16/3$. If M denotes the chaser's complete movement, then

$$\sum_t f_t(x(u_t)) \leq \frac{4}{3}M + \frac{16}{3}. \quad (8)$$

The balanced projection is nonexpansive. Write $x_t := x(u_t)$ for $t \geq 1$ and identify the supplied integral x_0 with its real vector. The first state can be at distance at most $2k$ from x_0 , the diameter of the exact simplex. Hence

$$\|x_1 - x_0\|_1 + \sum_{t=2}^T \|x_t - x_{t-1}\|_1 \leq M + 2k. \quad (9)$$

6 Comparison with the MoE optimum

Take any integral comparator path $y_1, \dots, y_T$ and let $h_t = f_t(y_t)$. At event time use the body point (y_t, h_t) , and at reset time use $(y_t, 0)$. The tangent-underestimator identity makes the event point feasible; the reset point is feasible as well. Starting from zero, this lifted body path has movement

$$\begin{aligned} k + \sum_{t=2}^T \|y_t - y_{t-1}\|_1 + 2 \sum_{t=1}^T h_t \\ \leq k + 2 \operatorname{cost}(y_1, \dots, y_T). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Applying the positive-body theorem to an optimal MoE path gives

$$M \leq C_{\text{PB}}(k + 2 \operatorname{OPT}). \quad (11)$$

7 Deterministic pathwise rounding

This section supplies the new ingredient that replaces Lazy Threshold Rounding: a deterministic, pathwise conversion from fractional to integral allocations. Its service factor is three, while its total movement is at most the fractional movement plus $6k$. For $a \in \mathbb{R}$, write $a_+ = \max\{0, a\}$. Given $z \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m$ with $\sum_i z_i = k$, define the required integral level

$$\ell_i(z) = \max \left\{ 0, \left\lceil \frac{z_i - 2}{3} \right\rceil \right\}. \quad (12)$$

It is the smallest nonnegative integer satisfying

$$1 + z_i \leq 3(1 + \ell_i(z)). \quad (13)$$

Since $\ell_i(z) \leq z_i$, we have $\sum_i \ell_i(z) \leq k$.

Repair rule. Given the previous integral state $y \in X_{m,k}$ and current fractional state z , choose the least index i with $y_i < \ell_i(z)$ and temporarily add one unit there. Call the resulting mass- $(k+1)$ state w . Among its positive coordinates choose, using a fixed tie-breaking rule, a coordinate j maximizing

$$d_j(w, z) = 3w_j - 1 - z_j. \quad (14)$$

Set $y := w - e_j$ and repeat until every coordinate meets its required level. Starting from the supplied y_0 , apply this rule to z_t to obtain y_t .

Lemma 5 (Deep donor). *Every nonnegative integral vector y of mass $k+1$ contains a positive coordinate j with $3y_j - 1 - z_j \geq 1$. Removing one unit from such a coordinate leaves it at or above $\ell_j(z)$.*

Proof. Let $S = \{i : y_i > 0\}$. If every $j \in S$ had $3y_j - 1 - z_j < 1$, then

$$\sum_{j \in S} z_j > \sum_{j \in S} (3y_j - 2) = 3(k+1) - 2|S|.$$

Because $|S| \leq k+1$, the right side is at least $k+1$, while $\sum_{j \in S} z_j \leq \sum_j z_j = k$, a contradiction. The depth inequality rearranges to $1 + z_j \leq 3y_j = 3(1 + y_j - 1)$, so (13) implies $\ell_j(z) \leq y_j - 1$. $\square$

The receiver cannot be the donor. Deficiency before the addition implies $z_i > 3y_i + 2$, so its new depth is negative. Lemma 5 therefore makes every transfer feasible. The receiver deficiency falls by one and the donor remains nondeficient, so the loop terminates.

Define the top-unit potential

$$\Phi(y, z) = \sum_i (3y_i - 1 - z_i)_+. \quad (15)$$

Lemma 6 (Repair charge). *If $R_z(y)$ is the repaired state, then*

$$\|R_z(y) - y\|_1 \leq 2(\Phi(y, z) - \Phi(R_z(y), z)).$$

Proof. Adding a required unit leaves the receiver's potential unchanged because the top-depth expression is negative before and immediately after the addition. Removing a donor of depth $d \geq 1$ changes its contribution from d to $(d-3)_+$, a decrease of at least one. Each transfer changes two coordinates by one and therefore contributes at most two to ℓ_1 movement. The triangle inequality then bounds the final displacement by the transfer path. Summing over transfers proves the claim. $\square$

Lemma 7 (External variation). *For a fixed integral y and exact-budget fractional states z, z' ,*

$$2(\Phi(y, z') - \Phi(y, z)) \leq \|z' - z\|_1.$$

Proof. Coordinatewise,

$$(3y_i - 1 - z'_i)_+ - (3y_i - 1 - z_i)_+ \leq (z_i - z'_i)_+.$$

Equal budgets give $\sum_i (z_i - z'_i)_+ = \frac{1}{2}\|z' - z\|_1$. Summing proves the result. $\square$

Theorem 8 (Deterministic simplex rounding). *For every finite exact-budget fractional path $z_1, \dots, z_T$ and every supplied $y_0 \in X_{m,k}$, the repair rule produces a deterministic prefix-causal integral path $y_1, \dots, y_T$ satisfying*

$$1 + z_{t,i} \leq 3(1 + y_{t,i}) \quad \text{for every } t, i, \quad (16)$$

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \|y_t - y_{t-1}\|_1 \leq 6k + \sum_{t=2}^T \|z_t - z_{t-1}\|_1. \quad (17)$$

Consequently, every nonnegative workload sequence satisfies

$$\sum_t f_t(y_t) \leq 3 \sum_t f_t(z_t). \quad (18)$$

Proof. Termination and exact budget follow from the repair rule and Lemma 5. At termination $y_{t,i} \geq \ell_i(z_t)$, which gives (16) and (18).

For movement, apply Lemma 6 at every round. For each $t \geq 2$, split at $\Phi(y_{t-1}, z_{t-1})$. The repair decreases telescope, and Lemma 7 bounds every external increase. The final potential is nonnegative, while

$$\Phi(y_0, z_1) \leq \sum_i 3y_{0,i} = 3k.$$

Therefore

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=1}^T \|y_t - y_{t-1}\|_1 \leq 3k + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=2}^T \|z_t - z_{t-1}\|_1,$$

which is (17). Each round uses only y_{t-1} and z_t , so the path is prefix-causal. $\square$

Remark 9. Fixed tie-breaking makes the mathematical repair algorithm constructive. The Lean development instead uses `Classical.choose` from a proved nonempty one-step repair relation. The choice is state-local and preserves the same prefix law; the formal theorem makes no runtime claim for the complete positive-body algorithm.

8 Composition

Proof of Theorem 1. Apply Theorem 8 to the deterministic fractional path constructed above. Its internal fractional movement is no larger than the left side of (9). Equations (8), (9), and (18) therefore give

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ALG}_{\text{det}} &\leq (M + 2k) + 6k + 3 \left(\frac{4}{3}M + \frac{16}{3} \right) \\ &= 5M + 8k + 16 \\ &\leq 10C_{\text{PB}} \cdot \text{OPT} + (5C_{\text{PB}} + 8)k + 16, \end{aligned}$$

where the last step uses (11). Every component is deterministic and causal, and the additive is independent of the expert count, initial state, horizon, and workloads. This proves the $O(1)$ competitive-ratio upper bound $\text{CR}_{\text{det}}(k) \leq 10C_{\text{PB}}$. $\square$

9 Formal and executable verification

The formal development uses Lean 4.32.2 and pinned Mathlib 4.32.2. Its main declarations are

- `DynamicMoeDeterministicMain.`
`dynamicMoe_explicit_deterministic_upper_of_positive_body_source`; and
- `DynamicMoeDeterministicMain.`
`dynamicMoe_deterministic_theta_one_of_positive_body_source`.

They state the quantifiers in the order

$$\forall k \geq 1, \forall m \geq 1, \exists A \geq 0, \forall x_0, \exists \text{ one deterministic causal algorithm, } \forall(r_t).$$

The explicit additive is $(5C_{\text{PB}} + 8)k + 16$. Lean reports only the standard axioms `propext`, `Classical.choice`, and `Quot.sound` for every audited declaration.

The development formalizes the two-sparse positive-body consequence as its sole scientific premise and proves all Dynamic MoE implications from it. The promoted declarations reuse shared path-cost definitions, but no randomized rounding statement appears in their dependency footprint. The pinned source and theorem-bearing member are checked by SHA-256 before replay.

The companion archive binds the paper, formal sources, exact controls, and proof identities with a SHA-256 manifest. From the extracted archive, the complete replay is:

```
python3 verify_all.py
```

A complete replay builds the promoted Lean declarations, runs 33 focused tests, regenerates all three canonical JSON outputs byte for byte, and compiles this paper. The controls cover the positive-body reduction and deterministic rounding, including a 200-round oscillation and a false rule without hysteresis that demonstrates why the dead band is necessary. The manifest records the exact case counts, evidence hashes, and promoted proof hashes.

10 Relation to online rounding and open directions

The main conclusion is that $\text{CR}_{\text{det}}(k) \leq 10C_{\text{PB}}$ for every replica budget $k \geq 1$. Because C_{PB} is absolute, this is an $O(1)$ upper bound. Thus the deterministic ratio has the same asymptotic order as the randomized ratio from the previous version, and randomization is not asymptotically necessary.

Vergeres’s balanced-descent route is complementary: it gives an explicit deterministic factor-16 fractional algorithm and, after Lazy Threshold Rounding, a randomized factor-48 integral algorithm against an oblivious adversary [5]. Theorem 8 instead supplies the missing deterministic integral conversion. Composed with the positive-body path, it removes both random thresholds and the oblivious-adversary qualification, although we do not claim a polynomial-time implementation of the complete algorithm.

Correlated sampling on the hypersimplex gives dimension-free randomized movement couplings. Naor et al. obtain expected $O(\log k)$ stretch [4]; Anari, Haqi, and Ma give conditional expected constant stretch under a spectral hypothesis [1]. Those results preserve marginals. Theorem 8 instead gives a deterministic pathwise guarantee for allocations with multiplicity and couples movement to reciprocal service domination.

The theorem resolves the asymptotic deterministic integral ratio, but not the best numerical constant. The concrete integer tangent grid has $O(mk)$ covering rows per event; the geometric grid after Lemma 2 reduces this to $O(m \log(k + 1))$. The reset schedule uses exact real numbers, and the formal theorem does not claim a polynomial-time implementation of the complete algorithm. Sharper constants and an explicit bit-complexity analysis remain open.

Research-system disclosure. Beyond, the research system operated by Nth Research Collective, materially assisted with literature retrieval, hypothesis generation, formalization, executable controls, and adversarial review. Ian D’Ambrosio selected the target, directed the investigation, reconciled the evidence, verified the final claims, and accepts full responsibility for the manuscript.

References

- [1] N. Anari, A. Haqi, and E. Ma, On rounding on the hypersimplex, arXiv:2606.00996v2, 2026. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2606.00996v2>.
- [2] S. Bhattacharya, N. Buchbinder, R. Levin, and T. Saranurak, Chasing positive bodies, arXiv:2304.01889v2, 2023 (revised 2024). <https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.01889v2>.
- [3] Z. Huang, Q. Lou, and T. Xiao, Mixture-of-Experts Serving, arXiv:2607.17880v1, 2026. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2607.17880v1>.
- [4] J. Naor, N. Raju, A. Shetty, A. Srinivasan, R. Valieva, and D. Wajc, Dimension-free correlated sampling for the hypersimplex, arXiv:2511.13573v1, 2025. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2511.13573v1>.
- [5] T. Vergeres, A constant competitive ratio for dynamic mixture-of-experts serving, Zenodo, 2026. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21895984>.