

**Theorem.** Given  $n$  integers with integer average, some permutation of them is a valid siteswap.

**Lemma.** Given  $n$  numbers which can be rearranged into a valid siteswap, if we change two of the numbers such that the average is still an integer, then the new set can also be rearranged into a valid siteswap.

**Proof of Lemma.** All arithmetic below is mod  $n$ . Assume that the starting sequence is already in valid siteswap order. Let  $t_i$  be the  $i^{\text{th}}$  throw and let  $l_i = i + t_i$  be its landing time. We have

$$\begin{array}{cccc} 1 & 2 & \dots & n \\ t_1 & t_2 & \dots & t_n \\ l_1 & l_2 & \dots & l_n \end{array}$$

Let us replace throws  $t_i$  and  $t_j$  by throws  $x_i$  and  $x_j$ , such that the resulting sequence still has integer average. Therefore,  $t_i + t_j = x_i + x_j$ , and so  $(i + x_i) + (j + x_j) = l_i + l_j$ . ( $\star$ )

Using ( $\star$ ), we get: if  $i + x_i = l_i$ , we already have a siteswap; if  $i + x_i = l_j$ , we swap  $l_i \leftrightarrow l_j$ ; if  $i + x_j = l_i$ , we swap  $x_i \leftrightarrow x_j$ ; and if  $i + x_j = l_j$ , we swap both  $x_i \leftrightarrow x_j$  and  $l_i \leftrightarrow l_j$ .

In any of those cases, we are done. But if none of those hold, let  $k = l_i - x_i$ . Then  $k \neq i$  and  $k \neq j$ , and  $k$  is the time at which throw  $x_i$  must happen in order to land at time  $l_i$ . We must therefore move the throw that is already occurring at time  $k$ . Rearrange the entries in the table:

$$\begin{array}{cccccc} \dots & i & \dots & j & \dots & k & \dots \\ \dots & x_i & \dots & x_j & \dots & x_k & \dots \\ \dots & l_i & \dots & l_j & \dots & l_k & \dots \end{array} \longrightarrow \begin{array}{cccccc} \dots & i & \dots & j & \dots & k & \dots \\ \dots & x_k & \dots & x_j & \dots & x_i & \dots \\ \dots & l_j & \dots & l_k & \dots & l_i & \dots \end{array}$$

Column  $k$  is valid, so we try to resolve the problems that still exist in columns  $i$  and  $j$ . Since  $k = l_i - x_i = l_k - x_k$ , equation ( $\star$ ) implies  $(i + x_k) + (j + x_j) = l_j + l_k$ , and thus an equivalent equation holds for the new columns  $i$  and  $j$ . Therefore, we may relabel the  $x$  and  $l$  terms and repeat the whole procedure, using the new entries in these columns. We must show that this terminates in a finite number of steps, and it is sufficient to show that each  $k$  we find is distinct.

Suppose that we encounter a repeat, and let  $k$  be the number with the earliest repeat. Let us continue from the rearrangement we made above, assuming that we haven't fallen into one of the earlier finishing cases. We let  $k' = l_j - x_k$  and move  $l_j$  into column  $k'$ . Since  $k = l_k - x_k$  and  $l_j \neq l_k$ , we know  $k' \neq k$ . Furthermore,  $l_j$  will stay in column  $k'$  until the next occurrence of  $k'$ . However, since we are assuming that  $k$  is the first repeat,  $l_j$  must still be in column  $k'$  at the time of  $k$ 's repeat. When we next encounter  $k$ , we change the table:

$$\begin{array}{cccccc} \dots & i & \dots & j & \dots & k & \dots \\ \dots & x'_i & \dots & x_j & \dots & x_i & \dots \\ \dots & l'_i & \dots & l'_j & \dots & l_i & \dots \end{array} \longrightarrow \begin{array}{cccccc} \dots & i & \dots & j & \dots & k & \dots \\ \dots & x_i & \dots & x_j & \dots & x'_i & \dots \\ \dots & l'_j & \dots & l_i & \dots & l'_i & \dots \end{array}$$

Equation ( $\star$ ) for the new position here is  $(i + x_i) + (j + x_j) = l'_j + l_i$ . However, from the original equation ( $\star$ ), we know that  $(i + x_i) + (j + x_j) = l_i + l_j$ . Therefore,  $l_j = l'_j$ . This is a contradiction, since we know that at this point  $l'_j$  is in column  $k'$ .

**Proof of Theorem.** Suppose we have the numbers  $a_1, \dots, a_n$ . Start with the valid siteswap consisting of  $n$  0s. Change the first two 0s to  $a_1$  and  $n - a_1$ . By the Lemma, some permutation of these is a valid siteswap. Now change that  $n - a_1$  to  $a_2$ , and the third 0 to  $n - a_1 - a_2$ , and so on. Since the  $a_i$  have integer average, after we change the second-to-last 0 to  $a_{n-1}$ , we must also have changed the final 0 to  $a_n$ , up to a multiple of  $n$ , and this takes a trivial final change.

**Acknowledgements.** The above is an adaptation of the proof found in *The Mathematics of Juggling* by Burkard Polster.