

# Being Efficient in Time, Space, and Workload: a Self-stabilizing Unison and its Consequences

S. Devismes, D. Ilcinkas, C. Johnen and **F. Mazoit**

Université de Picardie Jules Verne and **Université de Bordeaux**, France

# Synchronous vs. Asynchronous

Many kinds of “**daemons**”

# Synchronous vs. Asynchronous

Many kinds of “**daemons**”

## Synchronous daemon

At each step, **all** nodes are synchronously activated.

# Synchronous vs. Asynchronous

Many kinds of “**daemons**”

## Synchronous daemon

At each step, **all** nodes are synchronously activated.

## Distributed fair daemon

At each step, **some** nodes are activated.

# Synchronous vs. Asynchronous

Many kinds of “**daemons**”

## Synchronous daemon

At each step, **all** nodes are synchronously activated.

## Distributed fair daemon

At each step, **some** nodes are activated.

No constraints other than nodes **cannot** “starve”.

# Synchronous vs. Asynchronous

Many kinds of “**daemons**”

## Synchronous daemon

At each step, **all** nodes are synchronously activated.

## Distributed fair daemon

At each step, **some** nodes are activated.

No constraints other than nodes **cannot** “starve”.

## Distributed unfair daemon

At each step, **some** nodes are activated.

# Synchronous vs. Asynchronous

Many kinds of “**daemons**”

## Synchronous daemon

At each step, **all** nodes are synchronously activated.

## Distributed fair daemon

At each step, **some** nodes are activated.

No constraints other than nodes **cannot** “starve”.

## Distributed unfair daemon

At each step, **some** nodes are activated.

No constraints. Thus nodes **can** “starve”.

# Self-Stabilization & Unison

## Self-Stabilization

The initial configuration is **arbitrary**.

Models error recovery after “transient” faults.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>TCP is a self-stabilizing heuristic.

# Self-Stabilization & Unison

## Self-Stabilization

The initial configuration is **arbitrary**.

Models error recovery after “transient” faults.<sup>1</sup>

## (Asynchronous) Unison

Each node has a **local clock**.

Neighboring clocks differ by  $\leq 1$  increment.

All clocks increase infinitely often.

---

<sup>1</sup>TCP is a self-stabilizing heuristic.

# Self-Stabilization & Unison

## Self-Stabilization

The initial configuration is **arbitrary**.

Models error recovery after “transient” faults.<sup>1</sup>

## (Asynchronous) Unison

Each node has a **local clock**.

Neighboring clocks differ by  $\leq 1$  increment.

All clocks increase infinitely often.

## A consequence

Run a self-stabilizing algorithm under a synchronous daemon.

---

<sup>1</sup>TCP is a self-stabilizing heuristic.

# Being Efficient in Time, Space, and Workload : a Self-stabilizing Unison and its Consequences

# Being Efficient in **Time, Space, and Workload** : a Self-stabilizing Unison and its Consequences

# Complexity measures

## Round complexity

Captures the “execution time”.

# Complexity measures

## Round complexity

Captures the “execution time”.

relevant parameter:  $D$  (diameter of  $G$ ).

# Complexity measures

## Round complexity

Captures the “execution time”.

relevant parameter:  $D$  (diameter of  $G$ ).

## Move complexity

Captures the “total workload”.

# Complexity measures

## Round complexity

Captures the “execution time”.

relevant parameter:  $D$  (diameter of  $G$ ).

## Move complexity

Captures the “total workload”.

relevant parameter:  $n$  (the number of nodes of  $G$ ).

# Complexity measures

## Round complexity

Captures the “execution time”.

relevant parameter:  $D$  (diameter of  $G$ ).

## Move complexity

Captures the “total workload”.

relevant parameter:  $n$  (the number of nodes of  $G$ ).

## Space complexity

Captures the local memory requirement.

# Communication Model

# Communication Model

Atomic State Model: Classical in self-stabilization

[Dijkstra, 1974]

# Communication Model

Atomic State Model: Classical in self-stabilization

[Dijkstra, 1974]

Locally shared memory model with composite atomicity

Each node  $u$  has a **local state**.

# Communication Model

Atomic State Model: Classical in self-stabilization

[Dijkstra, 1974]

Locally shared memory model with composite atomicity

Each node  $u$  has a **local state**.

When moving,  $u$  **atomically**

- **reads** the states of its neighbors,
- **changes** its state.

# Communication Model

Atomic State Model: Classical in self-stabilization

[Dijkstra, 1974]

Locally shared memory model with composite atomicity

Each node  $u$  has a **local state**.

When moving,  $u$  **atomically**

- **reads** the states of its neighbors,
- **changes** its state.

Variants

- Nodes receive **sets**/multisets/... of states
- Nodes identified or **not identified**
- Ports labeled or **not labeled**

# Litterature on Unison

	Rounds	Moves	Space	Daemon
Couvreur et al. (ICDCS'92) <sup>2</sup>	?	?	$\Theta(\log N)$	unfair

---

Finite memory implies the knowledge of  $N \geq n$  or  $B \geq D$ .

<sup>2</sup>Not in Atomic State Model

# Litterature on Unison

	Rounds	Moves	Space	Daemon
Couvreur et al. (ICDCS'92) <sup>2</sup>	?	?	$\Theta(\log N)$	unfair
Awerbuch et al. (STOC'93) <sup>2</sup>	$O(D)$	?	$\infty$	unfair

---

Finite memory implies the knowledge of  $N \geq n$  or  $B \geq D$ .

<sup>2</sup>Not in Atomic State Model

# Litterature on Unison

	Rounds	Moves	Space	Daemon
Couvreur et al. (ICDCS'92) <sup>2</sup>	?	?	$\Theta(\log N)$	unfair
Awerbuch et al. (STOC'93) <sup>2</sup>	$O(D)$	?	$\infty$	unfair
Boulinier et al. (PODC'04)	$O(n)$	$O(Dn^3)$	$\Theta(\log N)$	unfair

---

Finite memory implies the knowledge of  $N \geq n$  or  $B \geq D$ .

<sup>2</sup>Not in Atomic State Model

# Litterature on Unison

	Rounds	Moves	Space	Daemon
Couvreur et al. (ICDCS'92) <sup>2</sup>	?	?	$\Theta(\log N)$	unfair
Awerbuch et al. (STOC'93) <sup>2</sup>	$O(D)$	?	$\infty$	unfair
Boulinier et al. (PODC'04)	$O(n)$	$O(Dn^3)$	$\Theta(\log N)$	unfair
Emek et Keren. (PODC'21)	$O(B^3)$	unbounded	$\Theta(\log B)$	fair

---

Finite memory implies the knowledge of  $N \geq n$  or  $B \geq D$ .

<sup>2</sup>Not in Atomic State Model

# Litterature on Unison

	Rounds	Moves	Space	Daemon
Couvreur et al. (ICDCS'92) <sup>2</sup>	?	?	$\Theta(\log N)$	unfair
Awerbuch et al. (STOC'93) <sup>2</sup>	$O(D)$	?	$\infty$	unfair
Boulinier et al. (PODC'04)	$O(n)$	$O(Dn^3)$	$\Theta(\log N)$	unfair
Emek et Keren. (PODC'21)	$O(B^3)$	unbounded	$\Theta(\log B)$	fair
<b>This paper</b>	<b><math>O(D)</math></b>	<b><math>O(n^3)</math></b>	<b><math>\Theta(\log B)</math></b>	<b>unfair</b>

---

Finite memory implies the knowledge of  $N \geq n$  or  $B \geq D$ .

<sup>2</sup>Not in Atomic State Model

# Consequences

	Rounds	Moves	Space
Unison	$2D + 2$	$O(\min(n^2B, n^3))$	$\lceil \log B \rceil + 2$

---

With  $B \geq 2D + 2$

# Consequences

	Rounds	Moves	Space
Unison	$2D + 2$	$O(\min(n^2B, n^3))$	$\lceil \log B \rceil + 2$
Synchronizer	$5D + 3T$	$O(\min(n^2B, n^3) + nT)$	$2M + \lceil \log B \rceil + 2$

Synchronizer input: self-stabilizing algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$   
 $T, M =$  synchronous time, space of  $\mathcal{A}$ .

---

With  $B \geq 2D + 2$

# Consequences

	Rounds	Moves	Space
Unison	$2D + 2$	$O(\min(n^2B, n^3))$	$\lceil \log B \rceil + 2$
Synchronizer	$5D + 3T$	$O(\min(n^2B, n^3) + nT)$	$2M + \lceil \log B \rceil + 2$

Synchronizer input: self-stabilizing algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$   
 $T, M =$  synchronous time, space of  $\mathcal{A}$ .

Problem	Rounds	Moves	Space
BFS tree in rooted networks	$O(D)$	$O(n^3)$	$\Theta(\log B + \log \Delta)$
BFS tree in identified networks	$O(D)$	$O(n^3)$	$\Theta(\log N)$
Leader election	$O(D)$	$O(n^3)$	$\Theta(\log N)$
$O(\frac{n}{k})$ -clustering	$O(D)$	$O(n^3)$	$\Theta(\log k + \log N)$

---

With  $B \geq 2D + 2$  and  $N \geq n$

# Questions?

**State:**  $p.s \in \{C, E\}$ ,  $p.c \in \begin{cases} [-B, B) & \text{if } p.s = C \\ [-B, 0) & \text{if } p.s = E \end{cases}$

**Predicates:**

$$\begin{aligned} \text{root}(p) := & (p.s = E \wedge \neg(\exists q \in N(p), q.s = E \wedge q.c < p.c)) \vee \\ & (p.s = C \wedge \exists q \in N(p), (q.c \geq p.c + 2) \wedge \neg(p.c = 0 \wedge q.c = B - 1)) \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{activeRoot}(p) := \text{root}(p) \wedge (p.c \neq -B \vee p.s = C)$$

$$\text{errPropag}(p, i) := i < 0 \wedge \exists q \in N(p), q.s = E \wedge q.c < i < p.c$$

$$\text{canClearE}(p) := p.s = E \wedge \forall q \in N(p), (|q.c - p.c| \leq 1 \wedge (q.c \leq p.c \vee q.s = C))$$

$$\text{updatable}(p) := p.s = C \wedge \forall q \in N(p), q.c \in \{p.c, p.c \oplus_B 1\}$$

**Rules:**

$$\begin{array}{l|l} R_R : \text{activeRoot}(p) \rightarrow (p.s, p.c) := (E, -B) & R_C : \text{canClearE}(p) \rightarrow p.s := C \\ R_P(i) : \text{errPropag}(p, i) \rightarrow (p.s, p.c) := (E, i) & R_U : \text{updatable}(p) \rightarrow p.c := p.c \oplus_B 1 \end{array}$$

$R_R$ : highest priority,  $R_P(i)$  higher priority than  $R_P(i + l)$  for  $l > 0$ .