

## Position Discovery for a System of Bouncing Robots

Jurek Czyzowicz, Leszek Gasieniec, Adrian Kosowski, Evangelos Kranakis,  
Oscar Morales Ponce, Eduardo Pacheco

► **To cite this version:**

Jurek Czyzowicz, Leszek Gasieniec, Adrian Kosowski, Evangelos Kranakis, Oscar Morales Ponce, et al.. Position Discovery for a System of Bouncing Robots. DISC - 26th International Symposium on Distributed Computing, 2012, Salvador, Brazil. pp.341-355, 2012, <10.1007/978-3-642-33651-5\_24>. <hal-00735828>

**HAL Id: hal-00735828**

**<https://hal.inria.fr/hal-00735828>**

Submitted on 26 Sep 2012

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# Position Discovery for a System of Bouncing Robots

Jurek Czyzowicz\*    Leszek Gąsieniec†    Adrian Kosowski‡  
Evangelos Kranakis§    Oscar Morales Ponce§    Eduardo Pacheco§

September 26, 2012

## Abstract

A collection of  $n$  anonymous mobile robots is deployed on a unit-perimeter ring or a unit-length line segment. Every robot starts moving at constant speed, and bounces each time it meets any other robot or segment endpoint, changing its walk direction. We study the problem of *position discovery*, in which the task of each robot is to detect the presence and the initial positions of all other robots. The robots cannot communicate or perceive information about the environment in any way other than by bouncing. Each robot has a clock allowing it to observe the times of its bounces. The robots have no control on their walks, which are determined by their initial positions and the starting directions. Each robot executes the same *position detection algorithm*, which receives input data in real-time about the times of the bounces, and terminates when the robot is assured about the existence and the positions of all the robots.

Some initial configuration of robots are shown to be *infeasible* — no position detection algorithm exists for them. We give complete characterizations of all infeasible initial configurations for both the ring and the segment, and we design optimal position detection algorithms for all feasible configurations. For the case of the ring, we show that all robot configurations in which not all the robots have the same initial direction are feasible. We give a position detection algorithm working for all feasible configurations. The cost of our algorithm depends on the number of robots starting their movement in each direction. If the less frequently used initial direction is given to  $k \leq n/2$  robots, the time until completion of the algorithm by the last robot is  $\frac{1}{2} \lceil \frac{n}{k} \rceil$ . We prove that this time is optimal. By contrast to the case of the ring, for the unit segment we show that the family of infeasible configurations is exactly the set of so-called *symmetric configurations*. We give a position detection algorithm which works for all feasible configurations on the segment in time 2, and this algorithm is also proven to be optimal.

---

\*Université du Québec en Outaouais, Gatineau, Québec J8X 3X7, Canada.

†University of Liverpool, Liverpool L69 3BX, UK.

‡INRIA Bordeaux Sud-Ouest, LaBRI, 33400 Talence, France.

§Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario K1S 5B6, Canada.

# 1 Introduction

A mobile robot is an autonomous entity with the capabilities of *sensing*, i.e. ability to perceive some parameters of the environment, *communication* - ability to receive/transmit information to other robots, *mobility* - ability to move within the environment, and *computation* - ability to process the obtained data. Mobile robots usually act in a distributed way, i.e. a collection of mobile robots is deployed across the territory and they collaborate in order to achieve a common goal by moving, collecting and exchanging the data of the environment. The typical applications are mobile software agents (e.g. moving around and updating information about a dynamically changing network) or physical mobile robots (devices, robots or nano-robots, humans).

In many distributed applications, mobile robots operate in large collections of massively produced, cheap, tiny, primitive entities with very restricted communication, sensing and computational capabilities, mainly due to the limited production cost, size and battery power. Such groups of mobile robots, called *swarms*, often perform exploration or monitoring tasks in hazardous or hard to access environments. The usual swarm robot attributes assumed for distributed models include anonymity, negligible dimensions, no explicit communication, no common coordinate system (cf. [14]). Moreover, some of these models may assume obliviousness, limited visibility of the surrounding environment and asynchronous operation. In most situations involving such weak robots the fundamental research question concerns the feasibility of solving the given task (cf. [7, 11, 14]). When the question of efficiency is addressed, the cost of the algorithm is most often measured in terms of length of the robot's walk or the time needed to complete the task. This is also the case of the present paper, despite the fact that the robot does not have any control on its walk. In our case, the goal is to stop the robot's walk, imposed by the adversary, at the earliest opportunity - when the collected information (or its absence) is sufficient to produce the required solution.

Although the most frequently studied question for mobile robots is environment exploration, numerous papers related to such weak robots often study more basic tasks, such as pattern formation ([11, 13, 14, 15]). Gathering or point convergence ([5, 10]) and spreading (e.g. see [4]) also fall into this category. [14] introduced anonymous, oblivious, asynchronous, mobile robots which act in a so-called *look-compute-move* cycle. An important robot sensing capacity associated with this model permits to perceive the entire ([11, 13, 14]) or partial ([1, 10]) environment.

Contrary to the above model, in our paper, the robot has absolutely no control on its movement, which is determined by the bumps against its neighbors or the boundary points of the environment. In [2, 3] the authors introduced *population protocols*, modeling wireless sensor networks by extremely limited finite-state computational devices. The agents of population protocols also move according to some mobility pattern totally out of their control and they interact randomly in pairs. This is called *passive mobility*, intended to model, e.g., some unstable environment, like a flow of water, chemical solution, human blood, wind or unpredictable mobility of agents' carriers (e.g. vehicles or flocks of birds). In the recent work [12], a coordination mechanism based on meetings with neighboring robots on the ring was considered, also aiming at location discovery. The approach of [12] is randomized and the robots operate in the discrete environment in synchronous rounds.

Pattern formation is sometimes considered as one of the steps of more complex distributed

task. Our involvement in the problem of this paper was motivated by the patrolling problem [6], where spreading the robots evenly around the environment may result in minimizing the *idleness* of patrolling, i.e., the time interval during which environment points remain unvisited by any robot. Clearly, position discovery discussed in the present paper is helpful in uniform spreading of the collection. A related problem was studied in [4], where the convergence rate of uniform spreading in one-dimensional environment in synchronous and semi-synchronous settings was discussed. Previously, [8] studied the problem of  $n$  robots  $\{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ , initially placed in arbitrary order on the ring. It was shown that the rule of each robot  $i$  moving to the middle point between  $i-1$  and  $i+1$  may fail to converge to equal spreading (it was also shown in [8] that the system would converge if a fair scheduler activates units sequentially).

The model adopted in our paper assumes robot anonymity, passive mobility (similarly to that adopted in [2, 3]), restricted local sensing through bounce perception with a neighbor robot only, no communication between the robots, and continuous time. The only ability of the robot is the tacit observation of the timing of bounces and the computation and reporting of robots' locations. The private clock of each robot turns out to be a very powerful resource permitting to solve the problem efficiently in most cases.

## 2 The Model and Our Results

We consider a continuous, connected, one-dimensional universe in which the robots operate, which is represented either by a unit-perimeter ring or by a unit-length line segment. The ring is modeled by a real interval  $[0, 1]$  with 0 and 1 corresponding to the same point. A set of  $n$  robots  $r_0, r_1, \dots, r_{n-1}$  is deployed in the environment and start moving at time  $t = 0$  (where the indexing of the robots is used for purposes of analysis, only). The robots are not aware of the original positions and directions of other robots or the total number of robots in the collection. The robots move at constant unit speed, each robot starting its movement in one of the two directions. Each robot knows the perimeter of the ring (or the length of the segment) and it has a clock permitting to register the time of each of its bounces and store it in its memory. We assume that the time and distance travelled are commensurable, so during time  $t$  each robot travels distance  $t$ . Consequently, in the paper we compare distances travelled to time intervals.

By  $r_i(t) \in [0, 1]$  we denote the position of robot  $r_i$  at time  $t$ . We suppose that originally each robot  $r_i$  occupies point  $r_i(0)$  of the environment and that  $0 \leq r_0(0) < r_1(0) < \dots < r_{n-1}(0) < 1$ . Each robot is given an initial direction (clockwise or counterclockwise in the ring and left-to-right or right-to-left on the segment) at which it starts its movement. By  $dir_i$  we denote the starting direction of robot  $r_i$  and we set  $dir_i = 1$  if  $r_i$  starts its movement in the counterclockwise direction around the ring or the left-to-right direction along the segment. By  $dir_i = -1$  we denote the clockwise starting direction (on the ring) or right-to-left (on the segment). We call the sequence of pairs  $(r_0(0), dir_0), \dots, (r_{n-1}(0), dir_{n-1})$  the *initial configuration* of robots.

When two robots meet, they *bounce*, i.e., they reverse the directions of their movements. We call the trajectory of a robot a *bouncing walk*. The robots have no control on their bouncing walks, which depend only on their initial positions and directions, imposed to

them by an adversary, and the bounces caused by meeting other robots. Each robot has to report the coordinates of all robots of the collection, i.e., their initial positions and their initial directions. The robots cannot communicate in any other way except for observing their meeting times. Each robot is aware of the type of the environment (ring or segment). All robots are anonymous, i.e. they have to execute the same algorithm. The only information available to each robot is the *bounce sequence*, i.e. the series of time moments  $t_1, t_2, \dots$ , corresponding to its bounces resulting from the meetings with other robots.

By *position detection algorithm* we mean a procedure executed by each robot, during which the robot performs its bouncing walk and uses its bounce sequence as the data of the procedure, outputting the initial positions and directions of all robots. By the *cost*  $C_{\mathcal{A}}(n)$  of algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$  we understand the smallest value, such that for any feasible initial configuration of  $n$  robots in the environment, each robot executing  $\mathcal{A}$  can report the initial configuration while performing a bouncing walk of total distance  $C_{\mathcal{A}}(n)$ . As in some cases the cost of the algorithm varies, depending on the robot initial directions, we denote by  $C_{\mathcal{A}}(n, k)$  the cost of  $\mathcal{A}$  for the class of initial configurations such that  $1 \leq k \leq n/2$  robots start in one direction and  $n - k$  start in the opposite one.

**Question:** Is it possible for each robot to find out, after some time of its movement, what is the number of robots in the collection and their relative positions in the environment? If not, what are the configurations of robots' initial positions and directions for which a position detection algorithm exists (i.e. it is possible to report the initial configuration after a finite time)? What is the smallest amount of time after which a robot is assured to identify all other robots in the collection?

Our goal is to propose an algorithm to be executed by any robot, which computes the original positions of all other robots of the collection. We say that such an algorithm is optimal if the time interval after which the robot is assured to have the knowledge of the positions of all other robots is the smallest possible.

We characterize all the feasible configurations for the ring and the segment. For both cases we give optimal position detection algorithms for all feasible configurations. Our algorithm for the segment requires  $O(n)$  robot's memory, while constant size memory is sufficient for robots bouncing on the ring. [We suppose that in one memory word we may store a real value representing the robot's position in segment  $[0, 1]$ .]

For the case of the ring, we show that all robot configurations with not all robots given the same initial direction are feasible. We give a position detection algorithm working for all feasible configurations. The cost of our algorithm is not constant, but it depends on the number of robots starting their movement in each direction. When  $k \leq n/2$  is the number of robots starting their walks in one direction with  $n - k$  given the opposite direction we prove that our algorithm has cost  $\frac{1}{2} \lceil \frac{n}{k} \rceil$ . We prove that this algorithm is optimal.

For the case of the segment we prove that no position detection algorithm exists for *symmetric* initial configurations. Each symmetric configuration is a configuration of a subset of robots on a subsegment, concatenated alternately with its reflected copy and itself. We give a position detection algorithm of cost 2 working for all feasible (non-symmetric) configurations on the segment. This algorithm is proven to be optimal.

In Section 3 we give the position detection algorithm for the ring and prove its correctness for all feasible configurations. Section 4 analyses the cost of the position detection algorithm for the ring and proves its optimality. The segment environment is addressed in Section 5.

The argument for the segment proceeds by reduction to that for the ring, but the criteria for a feasible configuration on the segment take a different form, dependent on the symmetry of the configuration.

### 3 The Algorithm on the Ring

As there is no system of coordinates on the ring common to all robots, each robot must compute the relative positions of other robots with respect to its own starting position. We may then infer that each robot assumes that its starting position is the point 0. We then suppose that  $0 = r_0(0) < r_1(0) < \dots < r_{n-1}(0) < 1$  and it is sufficient to produce the algorithm for robot  $r_0$ .

We assume in this paper that all robot indices are taken modulo  $n$ . When two robots meet, they reverse the directions of their movements, so the circular order of the robots around the ring never changes. When two robots  $r_i$  and  $r_{i+1}$  meet at time  $t$ , we have  $r_i(t) = r_{i+1}(t)$ , and  $r_i(t)$  was moving counterclockwise while  $r_{i+1}(t)$  was moving clockwise just before the meeting time  $t$ .

We denote by  $dist(x, y)$  the distance that  $x$  has to traverse in the counterclockwise direction around the ring to reach the position of  $y$  (we call it the *counterclockwise distance* from  $x$  to  $y$ ). Note that the *clockwise distance* from  $x$  to  $y$  equals  $1 - dist(x, y)$ .

In order to analyze the ring movement of the robots we consider an infinite line  $L = (-\infty, \infty)$  and for each robot  $r_i$ ,  $0 \leq i \leq n - 1$  we create an infinite number of its copies  $r_i^{(j)}$ , all having the same initial direction, such that their initial positions are  $r_i^{(j)}(0) = j + r_i(0)$  for all integer values of  $j \in \mathbb{Z}$  (see Fig. 1). We show that, when all copies of robots move along the infinite line while bouncing at the moments of meeting, all copies  $r_i^{(j)}$  of a robot  $r_i$  bounce and reverse their movements at the same time. More precisely we prove

**Lemma 1.** *For all  $t \geq 0$ ,  $0 \leq i \leq n - 1$  and  $j \in \mathbb{Z}$  we have  $r_i^{(j+1)}(t) = r_i^{(j)}(t) + 1$ .*

*Proof.* Since the claim of the lemma holds by construction at time  $t = 0$  and at any bounce moment all copies of the bouncing robots  $r_i^{(j)}$  simultaneously reverse their movement, the claim of the lemma holds by induction on the number of bounces. ■

We use the concept of a *baton*, applied recently in [12]. Suppose that each robot initially has a virtual object (baton), that the robot carries during its movement, but at the moment of meeting, two robots exchange their batons. By  $b_i^{(j)}$  we denote the baton originally held by robot  $r_i^{(j)}$  and by  $b_i^{(j)}(t)$  we denote the position of this baton on the infinite line at time  $t$ . We can easily show the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.** *For all  $t \geq 0$ ,  $0 \leq i \leq n - 1$  and  $j \in \mathbb{Z}$  we have  $b_i^{(j)}(t) = b_i^{(j)}(0) + dir_i \cdot t = b_i^{(0)}(0) + j + dir_i \cdot t$ .*

*Proof.* Since the bouncing robots exchange the batons, the batons travel at constant speed 1 in their original directions. Therefore, at time  $t$  each baton travelled the distance  $t$  so we have  $b_i^{(j)}(t) = b_i^{(j)}(0) + dir_i \cdot t$ . On the other hand, by construction we have  $b_i^{(j+1)}(0) = b_i^{(j)}(0) + 1$  and both batons  $b_i^{(j)}$ ,  $b_i^{(j+1)}$  travel at unit speed in the same direction. Hence, we have by induction on  $j$ , that  $b_i^{(0)}(t) = b_i^{(j)}(t) + j$ . The claim of the lemma follows. ■




Figure 1: Example of a bouncing movement of four robots

In Fig. 1 the trajectories of all the batons held originally by the robots going in direction  $dir$  are the lines of slope  $dir$ . Each robot  $r_i$  bounces while its trajectory intersects a trajectory of some baton, since this baton is then held by one of the robots  $r_{i-1}, r_{i+1}$ . For example, the trajectory of robot  $r_0^{(0)}$ , is represented by a fat polyline on Fig. 1, while the trajectories of its neighbor robots  $r_3^{(-1)}$  and  $r_1^{(0)}$  bouncing at  $r_0^{(0)}$  are given by dashed polylines.

**Lemma 3.** *Consider robot  $r_a$ , which at the time moment  $t$ , while traveling in direction  $dir$ , meets some other robot. Suppose that, at the time of this meeting,  $r_a$  travelled the total distance  $d$  in direction  $dir$  (hence the total distance of  $t - d$  in direction  $-dir$ ). Then there exists a robot  $r_b$ , which was originally positioned at distance  $(2d \bmod 1)$  in direction  $dir$  on the ring. More precisely,  $(2d \bmod 1) = dist(r_a, r_b)$  if  $dir = 1$  and  $(2d \bmod 1) = dist(r_b, r_a) = 1 - dist(r_a, r_b)$  if  $dir = -1$ . Moreover  $r_b$  started its movement in direction  $-dir$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that at time  $t$  robot  $r_a$  traveling in direction  $dir$  meets some other robot traveling in the opposite direction (e.g. see the intersection of the trajectory of  $r_0^{(0)}$  with the trajectory of the baton  $b_2^{(2)}$  originally held by  $r_2^{(2)}$ ). Suppose that the baton obtained by  $r_a$  at the moment of the meeting was originally held by some robot  $r_b$ . Robot  $r_a$  travelled the total distance  $d$  in direction  $dir$  and the total distance  $t - d$  in direction  $-dir$ , while the baton obtained by  $r_a$  at the moment of the bounce travelled distance  $t$  in direction  $-dir$ . Hence during time  $t - d$  robot  $r_a$  and the baton stayed at the same distance and during time  $d$  they were both traveling approaching each other (i.e. jointly covering total distance  $2d$  while approaching). Therefore, at time  $t = 0$  the distance between robots  $r_a$  and  $r_b$  was  $2d$ . Since  $r_b$  may be a copy of a robot and all copies of the same robot are at integer distance the distance of  $r_a$  to  $r_b$  on the ring is  $2d \bmod 1$ . The initial direction of  $r_b$  equals the direction of its original baton, i.e.  $-dir$ . ■

```

Algorithm RingBounce ( $dir : \{-1, 1\}$ );
1.  var  $left \leftarrow 0, right \leftarrow 0$  : real;
2.  reset  $clock$  to 0;
3.  while  $true$  do
4.    do walk in direction  $dir$  until
5.       $((clock - left \geq 1/2)$  and  $(clock - right \geq 1/2))$  or a
meeting occurs;
6.    if  $(clock - left \geq 1/2)$  and  $(clock - right \geq 1/2)$  then
EXIT;
7.    if  $dir = 1$  then
8.       $right \leftarrow clock - left$ ;
9.      if  $(0 < right < 1/2)$  then
10.     OUTPUT robot at original position  $2 \cdot right$  and
direction  $-dir$ ;
11.    else
12.       $left \leftarrow clock - right$ ;
13.      if  $(0 < left < 1/2)$  then
14.     OUTPUT robot at original position  $1 - 2 \cdot left$  and
direction  $dir$ ;
15.     $dir \leftarrow -dir$ ;

```

**Remark 1.** *The value  $(2d \bmod 1)$  may sometimes be equal to zero which corresponds to  $r_a$  meeting the robot currently holding the original baton of  $r_a$  (e.g. the sixth bounce of  $r_0^{(0)}$  on Fig. 1). On the other hand, some meetings of robots may correspond to the same computed value of  $(2d \bmod 1)$  (e.g. all odd-numbered bounces of  $r_0^{(0)}$  on Fig. 1), so some bounces do not have a new informative value about other robot positions.*

The algorithm **RingBounce** executed by a robot, which reports initial positions and directions of all other robots on the ring, uses Lemma 3. Each bounce results in the output of information concerning one robot of the ring. In this way, a robot running such an algorithm needs only a constant-size memory. An additional test is made in line 10 to avoid outputting the same robot position more than once.

The robot's memory consists of two real variables  $right$  and  $left$  in which the robot will store the total distance travelled, respectively, in the counterclockwise and clockwise direction. The robot also accesses its system variable  $clock$  which automatically increases proportionally to the time spent while traveling (i.e. to the distance travelled).

**Theorem 1.** *Suppose that among all robots bouncing on the ring there is at least one robot having initial clockwise direction and at least one robot with the initial counterclockwise direction. The algorithm **RingBounce**, executed by any robot of the collection, correctly reports the initial positions and directions of all robots on the ring with respect to its initial position.*

*Proof.* Suppose w.l.o.g., that the robot executing **RingBounce** is robot  $r_0$ . Since there exists at least one other robot starting in the direction different from  $dir_0$ , robot  $r_0$  will alternately



travel in both directions, indefinitely bouncing against its neighbors  $r_1$  and  $r_{n-1}$  on the ring. We show by induction, that at the start of each iteration of the while loop from line 3, the variable *left* (resp. *right*) equals to the total distance travelled by  $r_0$  clockwise (resp. counterclockwise). Suppose, by symmetry, that  $r_0$  walks counterclockwise in the  $i$ -th iteration and the inductive hypothesis is true at the start of this iteration. Since, by inductive hypothesis, variable *left* keeps the correct value through  $i$ -th iteration, variable *right* is correctly modified at line 8, as *clock* value equals the total distance travelled in both directions. Consequently, the inductive claim is true in the  $(i + 1)$ -th iteration.

We prove now that positions and directions of all robots are correctly reported before the algorithm ends. Take any robot  $r_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$ . We consider first the case when the initial direction of  $r_i$  was clockwise. The trajectory of its original baton  $b_i^{(0)}$  is then a line of slope 1 (cf. Fig. 1). Observe that robot  $r_0$  stays at the same distance from baton  $b_i$  when walking in the clockwise direction and approaches it (reducing their counterclockwise distance  $dist(r_0, b_i)$ ) when walking counterclockwise. Since  $dist(r_0, b_i) \leq 1$ , and  $r_0$  and  $b_i$  walk towards each other, they approach at speed 2 during the counterclockwise movement of  $r_0$ . Consequently, the trajectories of  $r_0$  and  $b_i$  intersect and  $r_0$  eventually meets robot  $r_1$  carrying baton  $b_i$ . Indeed, in line 4 of algorithm **RingBounce**, robot  $r_0$  continues its movement as long as its total distance travelled in the counterclockwise direction is less than  $1/2$ , which leads to the meeting of  $r_0$  and  $r_1$  (carrying baton  $b_i$ ), before both robots finish their executions of the algorithm. Consequently, at the moment of their meeting,  $r_0$  outputs at line 10 the initial distance between  $r_0^{(0)}$  and  $r_i^{(0)}$  on line  $L$ , which equals twice the time spent while the robots were approaching each other. As  $r_0$  may obtain a copy of the same baton more than once (cf.  $r_0$  intersecting several trajectories of batons  $b_2^{(j)}$  on Fig. 1), the condition  $(0 < right < 1/2)$  at line 9 permits to report the position of each other robot once only. Indeed, only  $r_i^{(0)}$  - the copy of  $r_i$  at the closest counterclockwise distance to  $r_0$  verifies this condition.

Consider now the case when robot  $r_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$ , starts its walk on the ring in the counterclockwise direction. Then  $r_0$  obtains baton  $b_i$  while walking clockwise, i.e. at the moment of some bounce at  $r_{n-1}$ , while  $r_{n-1}$  holds baton  $b_i$ . In this case, robot  $r_0$  stays at the same distance from baton  $b_i$  when walking in counterclockwise direction and approaches it (reducing their distance of  $dist(b_i, r_0) = 1 - dist(r_0, b_i)$ ) when walking clockwise. At the moment when  $r_0$  meets  $r_{n-1}$  holding baton  $b_i$  (whose trajectory originates from segment  $[-1, 0]$  of  $L$ ) the value of variable *left* equals half the clockwise distance from  $r_0(0)$  to  $r_i(0)$ . Indeed, at the moment of the meeting, half of this distance was covered by  $r_0$  walking clockwise (the value of *left*) and the other half was covered by the counterclockwise move of baton  $b_i$ . Consequently the clockwise distance from the initial position of  $r_0$  to the initial position of  $r_i$  equals  $1 - 2 \cdot left$ , correctly output at line 14. ■

Observe that, once the original positions and directions of all robots are reported, it is easy to monitor all further movements of all robots of the collection, i.e. their relative positions at any moment of time. However, this would require a linear memory of the robot performing such task.

## 4 The Execution Time of Bouncing on the Ring

As stated in the introduction, we look for the algorithm of the optimal cost, i.e. the smallest possible total distance travelled, needed to correctly report any initial configuration. We show that the algorithm `RingBounce` is the optimal one, i.e. that the time moment, at which the robot can be sure that the positions of all other robots have been reported, is the time when the robot stops executing `RingBounce`. Observe that algorithm `RingBounce` has cost at least 1, i.e. a robot executing it must travel at least distance 1. Indeed, the loop from lines 4-5 continues unless robot's walk distance in each direction totals at least half the size of the ring. On the other hand, the example from Fig. 1 shows, that if the number of robots starting their walks in one direction is different from the number of robots starting walking in the opposite direction, the total cost of `RingBounce` may be higher. We have

**Theorem 2.** *Consider a collection of  $n$  robots on the ring, such that  $k$  of them,  $1 \leq k \leq n/2$ , have one initial direction and the remaining  $n-k$  robots have the other initial direction. Then the cost of `RingBounce` is  $C_{\mathcal{RB}}(n, k) \leq \frac{1}{2} \lceil \frac{n}{k} \rceil$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 1, we can translate the collection of robots and start their enumeration so that any of them is at the point 0 of line  $L$  and, w.l.o.g., it is sufficient to consider the total walk length of  $r_0$ . By symmetry we assume that  $r_0$  starts walking counterclockwise on the ring.

Consider first the case when  $n-k$  robots from the claim of the theorem start walking counterclockwise and  $k$  robots start walking clockwise on the ring, with  $k \leq n-k$ . Note that  $r_0$  alternately changes its direction of walk and, according to lines 4-5 of algorithm `RingBounce`, it has to travel a distance of at least  $1/2$  in each direction. At the conclusion of each segment of the clockwise walk around the ring (i.e. left walk along line  $L$ ),  $r_0$  bounces against  $r_{n-1}$ , collecting one of the  $n-k$  batons traveling counterclockwise. Denote by  $t_{2i}$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, n-k$  the sequence of the consecutive time moments of all bounces of  $r_0$  against robot  $r_{n-1}$  (recall that time equals the total distance travelled up to that moment). Suppose that  $r_0$  starts executing algorithm `RingBounce` at time  $t_0 = 0$  and denote by  $t_{2i+1}$ , for  $i = 0, \dots, n-k-1$  the sequence of the consecutive time moments of all bounces of  $r_0$  against robot  $r_1$ . At time  $t_{2(n-k)}$ ,  $r_0$  gets originally held baton  $b_0$  and the total length of its clockwise travel becomes exactly  $1/2$  (i.e. the value of variable *left* becomes  $1/2$ ). Since  $t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_{2(n-k)}$ , before time  $t_{2(n-k)}$   $r_0$  bounced also  $n-k$  times against  $r_1$ , each time getting a baton, which is traveling clockwise. If  $k = n/2$ , there are  $k = n-k$  lines of slope 1 originating from segment  $[0, 1)$  of  $L$ , which are trajectories of  $k$  batons traveling clockwise. Therefore, the loop from lines 4-5 of algorithm `RingBounce` continues until variable *right* equals  $1/2$  and algorithm finishes through the exit condition at line 6. In this case the total walk time equals to *left* + *right* = 1 and  $\frac{1}{2} \lceil \frac{n}{k} \rceil = 1$  so the claim of the theorem holds.

In the case  $k < n/2$  there are only  $k$  batons traveling clockwise ( $k < n-k$ ), so some of them are received more than once by  $r_0$  during the bounces at times  $t_1, t_3, t_{2(n-k)-1}$ . Therefore, only  $k$  copies of batons traveling clockwise originate from each integer segment  $[i, i+1)$  on line  $L$ . Consequently,  $r_0$  obtains batons whose trajectories originate from segments other than  $[0, 1)$  and its total traveling distance in the counterclockwise direction exceeds  $1/2$ . More precisely, the  $(n-k)$ -th consecutive copy of a baton traveling clockwise, obtained at time  $t_{2(n-k)-1}$  must originate from the segment  $[i^* - 1, i^*]$ , where  $i^* = \lceil \frac{n-k}{k} \rceil$ . The distance

from  $r_0(0)$ - the initial position of  $r_0$  and the starting position of baton met at time  $t_{2(n-k)-1}$  does not exceed the value of  $\lceil \frac{n-k}{k} \rceil$ . Since robot  $r_0$  has to travel counterclockwise at most half of this distance (the other half being covered by the moving baton), the total time spend by  $r_0$  in both directions does not exceed

$$1/2 + \frac{1}{2} \left\lceil \frac{n-k}{k} \right\rceil = \frac{1}{2} \left\lceil \frac{n}{k} \right\rceil$$

Consider now the second case in which  $n-k$  robots from the claim of the theorem start walking clockwise and  $k$  robots start walking counterclockwise on the ring, with  $k < n-k$ . As in the previous case we can denote by  $t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_{2(n-k)-1}$  the consecutive bounce times, where  $t_i$  for odd values of  $i$  denote the times of the bounces of  $r_0$  against  $r_1$  and those for even values of  $i$  denote the times of the bounces against  $r_{n-1}$ . By symmetry to the first case, the bounce at time  $t_{2(n-k)-1}$ , when  $r_0$  moves counterclockwise, arises when the variable *right* does not exceed the value of  $1/2$  (i.e. the total distance travelled counterclockwise by  $r_0$ ) and the value of *left* is already greater than  $1/2$ . At this time moment, robot  $r_0$  goes clockwise and after the last bounce at time  $t_{2(n-k)}$  continues counterclockwise and exits algorithm **RingBounce** where variable *right* becomes equal to  $1/2$ . Indeed, since only  $n-k$  batons travel clockwise, the next bounce of robot  $r_0$  would imply getting a baton whose trajectory originates at segment  $[1, 2]$  of line  $L$ , but this would make variable *right* exceed first the value of  $1/2$  and cause the exit in line 6 of **RingBounce**.

Similarly to the previous case, as  $k < n-k$ , at some of the bounces at times  $t_2, t_4, \dots, t_{2(n-k)}$ , robot  $r_0$  obtains the same batons. More precisely, during the bounce at time  $t_{2(n-k)}$   $r_0$  obtains the baton whose trajectory originates at segment  $[-\lceil \frac{n-k}{k} \rceil, -\lceil \frac{n-k}{k} \rceil + 1]$  of line  $L$ . Hence the total clockwise distance travelled by  $r_0$  does not exceed  $\frac{1}{2} \lceil \frac{n-k}{k} \rceil$  and the distance travelled in both directions does not exceed  $1/2 + \frac{1}{2} \lceil \frac{n-k}{k} \rceil = \frac{1}{2} \lceil \frac{n}{k} \rceil$  proving the claim of the theorem. ■

From Theorem 2 we immediately have the following Corollary, which bounds the worst-case walking time for a robot.

**Corollary 1.** *Assuming that the collection of  $n$  robots admits robots starting their movements in both directions around the ring, Then the cost of **RingBounce** is  $C_{\mathcal{RB}}(n) \leq \frac{n-1}{2}$ .*

The algorithm **RingBounce** continues until the total lengths of walks in both directions reach the values of at least  $1/2$ , since this guarantees that the presence of each robot is eventually detected. The following theorem proves that the cost of **RingBounce** algorithm is optimal even if the (a priori) knowledge of the number of robots is assumed.

**Theorem 3.** *Suppose that there is a collection of  $n$  robots on the ring, such that  $k$  of them,  $1 \leq k < n/2$ , have one initial direction and the remaining  $n-k$  robots have the other initial direction. Then for every  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists a distribution of such robots on the ring with their initial positions  $0 \leq r_0 < r_1 < \dots < r_{n-1} < 1$ , so that a position detection algorithm terminating at time  $\frac{1}{2} \lceil \frac{n}{k} \rceil - \epsilon$  cannot determine the initial positions of all robots on the ring, even if the values of  $n$  and  $k$  are known in advance.*

*Proof.* Consider the following collection of  $n$  robots  $r_0, r_1, \dots, r_{k-1}, r_k, \dots, r_{n-1}$  on the ring, where each  $r_i$  has a counterclockwise starting direction for  $0 \leq i < k$  and the clockwise

starting direction for  $k \leq i \leq n-1$ , with the initial positions of the robots

$$r_0 = 0, r_1 = \frac{\epsilon}{2^{k-1}}, r_2 = \frac{\epsilon}{2^{k-2}}, \dots, r_{k-1} = \frac{\epsilon}{2},$$

$$r_k = 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2}, \dots, r_{n-1} = 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2^{n-k}}$$

Suppose, by contradiction, that a position detection algorithm executed by robot  $r_0$  can determine the positions of all other robots with the total walking distance of  $r_0$  at most  $\frac{1}{2} \lceil \frac{n}{k} \rceil - \epsilon$ . Robot  $r_0$ , in order to determine positions of all other robots, has to obtain each baton  $b_1, \dots, b_{n-1}$ . Robot  $r_0$  gets the clockwise-traveling batons  $b_k, b_{k+1}, \dots, b_{n-1}$  in this order at the moments of its bounces against  $r_1$ . On the other hand, the remaining batons are obtained by  $r_0$  in order  $b_{k-1}, b_{k-2}, \dots, b_1$  at the moments of its bounces against  $r_{n-1}$ . However, since  $k < n$ , at least some of the batons  $b_{k-1}, b_{k-2}, \dots, b_1$  are obtained repeatedly (in the same cyclic order) because the left and right bounces are alternated. More precisely, baton  $b_{k-1}$  is obtained  $\lceil (n-k)/k \rceil$  times by  $b_0$ , hence this sequence of batons is

$$\overleftarrow{b_k}, \overrightarrow{b_{k-1}}, \overleftarrow{b_{k+1}}, \overrightarrow{b_{k-2}}, \dots, \overleftarrow{b_{2k-1}}, \overrightarrow{b_0}, \overleftarrow{b_{2k}}, \overrightarrow{b_{k-1}},$$

$$\overleftarrow{b_{2k+1}}, \overrightarrow{b_{k-2}}, \dots, \overleftarrow{b_{3k-1}}, \overrightarrow{b_0}, \dots, \overleftarrow{b_{n-1}}, \overrightarrow{b_f}$$

where  $f = k(\lceil n/k \rceil + 1) - (n+1)$  and  $\overleftarrow{b_i}$  denotes baton  $b_i$  traveling clockwise and  $\overrightarrow{b_j}$  denotes baton  $b_j$  traveling counterclockwise. The copies of the last two batons of this sequence are the most distant from  $r_0$  on line  $L$ . The trajectory of baton  $\overleftarrow{b_{n-1}}$  origins in segment  $[0, 1)$  of line  $L$  and  $\text{dist}(r_0^0(0), b_{n-1}^0(0)) = 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2^{n-k}}$ . On the other hand, the trajectory of baton  $\overrightarrow{b_{k(\lceil n/k \rceil + 1) - (n+1)}}$  obtained by  $b_0$  starts in the segment  $[-\lceil (n-k)/k \rceil, -\lceil (n-k)/k \rceil + 1]$  and its original distance to  $b_0$  is

$$\text{dist}(b_f^{(-\lceil (n-k)/k \rceil)}(0), b_0^{(0)}(0)) > \lceil (n-k)/k \rceil - \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

As in order to meet each of these batons,  $r_0$  has to travel half of its original distance to each of them (the other half is covered by the corresponding baton itself) the total travel time by  $r_0$  is bound by

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2^{n-k}}\right) + \frac{1}{2} \left(\lceil (n-k)/k \rceil - \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) >$$

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \lceil (n-k)/k \rceil - \epsilon\right) > \frac{1}{2} \left(\lceil n/k \rceil\right) - \epsilon$$

which contradicts the assumed claim and proves the theorem. ■

Clearly each configuration of robots with the same initial direction of all robots is infeasible, because no robot ever bounces. Consequently from Theorem 2 and Theorem 3 follows

**Corollary 2.** *The family of infeasible initial configurations of robots on the ring contains all configurations with the same initial direction of all robots. RingBounce is the optimal position detection algorithm for all feasible initial configurations of robots on the ring. This algorithm assumes constant-size memory of the robot running it.*

Clearly, we can easily adapt algorithm RingBounce, so for infeasible initial configuration the algorithm stops and reports the infeasibility. It is sufficient to test whether the very first walk of the robot ends with a bounce before the robot traverses the distance of  $1/2$ .

## 5 Bouncing on the Line Segment

In this section we show how the algorithm for bouncing robots may be used for the case of a segment. We suppose that each robot walks along the unit segment changing its direction when bouncing from another robot or from an endpoint of the segment. Robots have the same capabilities as in the case of the ring and they cannot distinguish between bouncing from another robot and bouncing from a segment endpoint.

We consider the segment  $[0, 1)$  containing  $n$  robots, initially deployed at positions  $0 \leq r_0(0) < r_1(0), \dots, r_{n-1}(0) < 1$ . Each robot  $r_i$ ,  $0 \leq i \leq n - 1$  is given an initial direction  $dir_i$ , such that  $dir_i = 1$  denotes the left to right initial movement and  $dir_i = -1$  denotes initial movement from right to left on segment  $[0, 1)$ . The robots start moving with unit speed at the same time moment  $t = 0$  at the predefined directions and they change direction upon meeting another robot or bumping at the segment endpoint. The main difficulty of the segment case is that the robot  $r$  executing the position detection algorithm for the ring has to report the *relative* locations of other robots, i.e. their distances to its own initial position  $r(0)$ , while in the segment case the *absolute* distance from  $r(0)$  to the segment endpoint has to be found.

We show in this section that the bouncing problem is feasible for all initial robot configurations except a small set of symmetric ones. Intuitively, an initial configuration of robots is *symmetric* if the unit segment may be partitioned into  $k$  subsegments  $S_0, S_1, \dots, S_{k-1}$ , such that the positions and directions of robots in each subsegment form a reflected copy of positions and directions of robots in a neighboring subsegment (see Fig. 2). More formally we have the following

**Definition 1.** *A configuration  $C = ((r_0(0), dir_0), \dots, (r_{n-1}(0), dir_{n-1}))$  is symmetric if there exists a positive integer  $k < n$ , such that  $n \bmod k = 0$  and the partition of segment  $S = [0, 1)$  into subsegments  $S_0 = [0, \frac{1}{k})$ ,  $S_1 = [\frac{1}{k}, \frac{2}{k})$ ,  $\dots$ ,  $S_{k-1} = [\frac{k-1}{k}, 1)$  with the following property. For each robot  $r_i$ ,  $0 \leq i < n$ , if  $r_i(0) = \frac{p}{n} + x$ , for  $0 \leq x < \frac{1}{k}$ , (i.e.  $r_i(0) \in S_p$ ),  $0 \leq p < n$ , then, if  $p > 0$ , there exists a robot  $r_{i'}$ , such that  $r_{i'}(0) = \frac{p}{n} - x$  and  $dir_{i'} = 1 - dir_i$  and, if  $p < n - 1$ , there exists a robot  $r_{i''}$ , such that  $r_{i''}(0) = \frac{p+2}{n} - x$  and  $dir_{i''} = 1 - dir_i$ .*

**Theorem 4.** *Every symmetric initial configuration of robots is infeasible.*

*Proof.* Let  $C_1 = ((r_0(0), dir_0), \dots, (r_{n-1}(0), dir_{n-1}))$  be a symmetric configuration and  $k$  the number of consecutive subsegments, each one being the reflected copy of its neighbor. Construct now configuration  $C_2 = ((r'_0(0), dir'_0), \dots, (r'_{n-1}(0), dir'_{n-1}))$  of  $n$  robots considering also a sequence of  $n$  equal size intervals and swapping the roles of odd-numbered and even-numbered robots of  $C_1$ . More precisely for each robot  $r_i$ , such that  $r_i(0) \in S_p = [\frac{p}{n}, \frac{p+1}{n})$  there exists a robot  $r'_j$  such that  $r'_j(0) = \frac{2p+1}{n} - r_i(0)$  and  $dir'_j = 1 - dir_i$ . Observe that, no robot ever crosses the boundary of any subsegment  $S_p$ , i.e.  $r_i(0) \in S_p$  implies  $r_i(t) \in S_p$ , for any  $t \geq 0$ . Indeed, by construction, for any robot reaching an endpoint of  $S_p$ , different from points 0 and 1, at the same time moment there is another robot approaching this endpoint from the other side within the reflected copy of  $S_p$  provoking a bounce (cf. Fig. 3). Therefore, within each even-numbered subsegment  $S_{2n}$  of a symmetric configuration the relative positions of robots and their directions are the same (similarly within each




Figure 2: Example of a symmetric initial configuration of  $n = 12$  robots containing  $k = 3$  subsegments

odd-numbered subsegment). Consequently, no robot can distinguish whether it is, say, in an even-numbered segment of  $C_1$  or in an odd-numbered segment of  $C_2$  so its position in segment  $[0, 1)$  is unknown. ■

We show now how the position detection algorithm for the ring may be used in the case of the segment.

Let  $S$  be a unit segment containing  $n$  robots at initial positions  $r_0(0) < r_1(0) < \dots < r_{n-1}(0)$  and the initial directions  $dir_0, \dots, dir_{n-1}$ . Suppose that a segment  $S^R \subset [1, 2]$  is the reflected copy of  $S$  containing  $n$  robots  $r_n^R, \dots, r_{2n-1}^R$  at the initial positions  $r_n^R(0) = 2 - r_n(0) < r_{n-1}^R(0) = 2 - r_{n-1}(0) < \dots < r_0^R(0) = 2 - r_0(0)$ . The initial directions of each robot  $r_i^R$  is  $1 - dir_i$  for  $0 \leq i < n$ . Let  $R_2$  be the ring of perimeter 2 composed of segment  $S$  concatenated with segment  $S^R$ , with points 0 and 2 identified.

Consider the walk of robots  $r_i$ , for  $0 \leq i < n$ , within segment  $S$  and ring  $R_2$ . Let  $t_0 = 0$  and  $0 \leq t_1 < t_2 \dots$  be the sequence of time moments during which some bounces occur. Each such bounce takes place either between some pair of robots or when some robot bounces from an endpoint of  $S$ . It is easy to see by induction on  $i$  that at any time moment  $t \in [t_i, t_{i+1}]$  each robot  $r_j$  has the same positions in  $S$  and  $R_2$  as well as the same direction of movement and that the  $S^R$  part of  $R_2$  is a reflected copy of  $S$ . Indeed, by construction, this condition is true for the interval  $[t_0, t_1]$ . If robots  $r_j, r_{j+1}$  bounce against each other in  $S$  at time  $t_i$ , at the same time robots  $r_j, r_{j+1}$  bounce in  $R_2$ , as well as, by symmetry  $r_j^R$  bounces against  $r_{j+1}^R$ . If in time  $t_i$  robot  $r_0$  (or  $r_{n-1}$ ) bounce from an endpoint of  $S$ , by inductive hypothesis  $r_0$  bounces against  $r_0^R$  at point  $0 \in R_2$  (or  $r_{n-1}$  bounces against  $r_{n-1}^R$  at point  $1 \in R_2$ ). In each case, the inductive condition holds. We just showed

**Lemma 4.** *The bounce sequence of any robot  $r_i$  on segment  $S$  is the same as the bounce sequence of  $r_i$  on ring  $R_2$ .*




Figure 3: Five robots on a segment  $[0, 1)$  and their reflected copy

To prove that only symmetric configuration of robots on the segment are infeasible we need the following lemma.

**Lemma 5.** *Suppose that the initial configuration of robots  $C = ((r_0(0), dir_0), \dots, (r_{n-1}(0), dir_{n-1}))$  on a unit segment is not symmetric. Then no internal robot  $r_i$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq n - 2$ , may have all its left bounces or all right bounces at the same point of the unit segment.*

*Proof.* Suppose, by contradiction that there exists an internal robot having all its left bounces at the same point (the proof in the case of all right bounces falling at the same point is similar, by symmetry). Let  $i$  be the smallest index  $1 \leq i \leq n - 2$  of a robot with this property and point  $x$ ,  $0 < x < 1$ , be the point of all left bounces of  $r_i$ . We show first that the initial configuration of robots belonging to segment  $[0, x]$  is the reflected copy of the initial configuration of robots belonging to segment  $[x, 2x]$ . Then robot  $r_{i-1}$  has all its right bounces also at point  $x$ . Consequently, at each moment of time after the first such bounce, the position and the direction of robot  $r_{i-1}$  is a symmetric (reflected) copy of robot  $r_i$  with respect to point  $x$ . Then, if  $i \geq 2$ , the trajectory of  $r_{i-2}$  is a reflected copy of the trajectory of  $r_{i+1}$ . By induction on  $i$ , for any  $q \geq 0$  the trajectory of  $r_q$  is the reflected copy of the trajectory of  $r_{2i-q-1}$  and finally the trajectory of  $r_0$  is the reflected copy of the trajectory of  $r_{2i-1}$ . Therefore, all right bounces of robot  $r_{2i-1}$  are at point  $2x$  of the unit segment, so initial configuration of robots belonging to segment  $[0, x]$  is the reflected copy of the initial configuration of robots belonging to segment  $[x, 2x]$ , as needed.

By induction on  $j$  we prove that each subsegment  $[(j - 1)x, jx]$  is a reflected copy of subsegment  $[jx, (j + 1)x]$ . By minimality of  $x$ , no such subsegment contains a point which

is never crossed by any robot, hence, for some value of  $j$ , we have  $jx = 1$ , concluding the proof.  $\blacksquare$

We can show now, that the set of configurations on the unit segment for which no position detection algorithm exists is exactly the set of symmetric configurations. For all other configurations we propose an optimal position detection algorithm. We suppose that the robot assumes that its initial direction on the segment is positive. Otherwise, the robot needs to be *chirality aware*, i.e. capable of identifying the positive direction of the segment.

**Theorem 5.** *For any collection of  $n$  robots not in a symmetric initial configuration on the unit segment there exist a position detection algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$  with cost  $C_{\mathcal{A}}(n) = 2$ . For any  $\epsilon > 0$  there exist collections of robots, such that some of them cannot terminate the execution of any position detection algorithm before time  $2 - \epsilon$ .*

*Proof.* To construct algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$  adapt algorithm `RingBounce` in the following way. The constant of  $1/2$  used in lines 5, 6, 9 and 13 is changed to 1. Moreover, the values of original positions output in lines 10 and 14 are multiplied by a factor of 2 and put in the list  $C$  instead of being directly output. By Lemma 4 the algorithm finds the positions of  $2n$  robots of ring  $R_2$  constructed from segment  $S$ . Note that, as ring  $R_2$  has size 2, we needed to scale up the time and distance constants of the algorithm by the factor of 2.

Since the robots of  $S$  are not in a symmetric initial configuration, by Lemma 5, only the endpoints of  $S$  are the points which are never crossed by any robot in  $S$ . Consequently there are only two points in  $R_2$ , which are never crossed by any robot. This unique pair of (antipodal) points split ring  $R_2$  into two segments, segment  $S$ , and its reflected copy  $S^R$ . Since the positions of all robots are stored in list  $C$ , it is possible to perform in algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$  the generation of the bounce sequence of each robot of  $C$ , in order to find which two robots bounce in one direction against the same positions of the ring. This way, the first and the last robot on the unit segment as well as its left and right endpoints may be identified, which permits to determine the rank and the absolute initial position of the robot running the algorithm, as well as those of all other robots.

In order to analyze the cost of such algorithm, observe that, since exactly half of  $2n$  robots in  $R_2$  have the same initial direction, by Theorem 2, robot  $r_i$  terminates its walk at time  $\frac{1}{2} \lceil \frac{2n}{n} \rceil \cdot c = 2$ , where  $c = 2$  is the scaling factor.

We prove now the second part of the claim of the theorem. For any  $\epsilon > 0$  we construct two different configurations of robots  $C_1, C_2$  on the unit segment, such that for some robots from  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  the bounce sequence until time  $2 - \epsilon$  is the same. Consequently, the robot observing such bounce sequence cannot unambiguously report positions of other robots.

Let  $C_1$  be the configuration of two robots  $r_0, r_1$ , such that  $dir_0 = dir_1 = 1$  and  $r_0(0) = \frac{\epsilon}{5}, r_1(0) = \frac{2\epsilon}{5}$ . We find below the first two values  $t_1, t_2$  of the bounce sequence of robot  $r_0$ . Robot  $r_1$  reaches point 1 of the segment and bounces at time  $t^* = 1 - \frac{2\epsilon}{5}$ , while robot  $r_0$  is at point  $1 - \frac{\epsilon}{5}$  of the segment. Since at time  $t^*$  the robots start to approach, they meet after additional time  $\frac{\epsilon}{10}$ , so  $t_1 = 1 - \frac{2\epsilon}{5} + \frac{\epsilon}{10} = 1 - \frac{3\epsilon}{10}$  and  $r_0(t_1) = 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{5} + \frac{\epsilon}{10} = 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{10}$ . At time  $t_1$  robot  $r_0$  starts moving left on the segment until it bounces at its endpoint 0. This takes time  $1 - \frac{\epsilon}{10}$ , so  $t_2 = t_1 + 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{10} = 2 - \frac{2\epsilon}{5} > 2 - \epsilon$ .

Consider now configuration  $C_2$ , containing two robots  $r_0, r_1$ , such that  $dir_0 = dir_1 = 1$  and  $r_0(0) = \frac{\epsilon}{10}, r_1(0) = \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ . The similar analysis reveals that  $t^* = 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2}, r_1(t^*) = 1$ , and



$r_0(t^*) = 1 - \frac{2\epsilon}{5}$ . At time  $t^*$ ,  $r_0$  and  $r_1$  start approaching and meet at time  $t_1 = t^* + \frac{\epsilon}{5} = 1 - \frac{3\epsilon}{10}$ , while  $r_0(t_1) = 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{5}$ . After the bounce at time  $t_1$ ,  $r_0$  walks left until it bounces at endpoint 0 at time  $t_2 = t_1 + 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{5} = 2 - \frac{\epsilon}{2} > 2 - \epsilon$ .

Since for both configurations  $C_1, C_2$  we have  $t_1 = 1 - \frac{3\epsilon}{10}$  and  $t_2 > 2 - \epsilon$ , hence robot  $r_0$  cannot unambiguously output the initial robots' positions before time  $2 - \epsilon$ . ■

As the algorithm for the segment, presented in the proof of Theorem 5 assumes storing in robot's memory the positions of all robots, from Theorems 4 and 5 follows

**Corollary 3.** *The family of infeasible initial configurations of robots on the segment contains all symmetric initial configurations of robots. There exists an optimal position detection algorithm for all feasible initial configurations of robots on the segment. This algorithm assumes  $O(n)$ -size memory of the robot executing it.*

## 6 Conclusion

The algorithms of the paper may be extended to the case when only one robot  $r_0$  starts moving initially (while all other robot movements are triggered by bounces) and  $r_0$  must report other robots' initial positions. Indeed, observe that all robots must be moving at no later than time 1 for the ring and at no later than time 2 for the segment. Robot  $r_0$  may then compute the trajectories of all other robots as if they started moving simultaneously and then successively compute the sequence of motion triggering bounces of all robots.

One open problem is to determine whether there exists an optimal position detection algorithm for the segment using a constant size memory. Another open problem is whether the bouncing problem may be solved for the case of robots having different initial speeds. If we assume the momentum conservation principle, so that the bouncing robots exchange their speeds, the baton trajectories still remain semi-lines of constant slopes. Therefore, if each robot is always aware of its current speed, perhaps it might be possible, that, after a finite time, it learns the starting positions and initial speeds of all other robots.

The location discovery performed by the collection of robots, presented in this paper, may be used for the equally-spaced self-deployment of the robots around the environment (e.g. to perform optimal patrolling) or for some other pattern formation task. However, such a task would require an additional robot capacity besides passive mobility the way it is assumed in this paper. Once the positions of the entire collection is known, the robots need to synchronize their movements, e.g. by adding waiting periods.

## Acknowledgements

Research of J. Czyzowicz and E. Kranakis supported in part by NSERC grants, L. Gąsieniec was sponsored by the Royal Society Grant IJP - 2010/R2 , O. Morales by MITACS grant and E. Pacheco by CONACyT and NSERC grant.

## References

- [1] H. Ando, Y. Oasa, I. Suzuki, M. Yamashita. Distributed memoryless point convergence algorithm for mobile robots with limited visibility, *IEEE Transactions on Robotics and Automation* **15(5)** (1999), pp 818–828.
- [2] D. Angluin, J. Aspnes, Z. Diamadi, M.J. Fischer, R. Peralta. Computation in networks of passively mobile finite-state sensors, *Distributed Computing* (2006), pp. 235-253.
- [3] D. Angluin, J. Aspnes, D. Eisenstat. Stably computable predicates are semilinear, *Proc. of PODC*, (2006), pp. 292-299.
- [4] R. Cohen, D. Peleg. Local spreading algorithms for autonomous robot systems, *Theoretical Computer Science* *399(1-2)*, (2008), pp. 71-82.
- [5] R. Cohen, D. Peleg. Convergence Properties of the Gravitational Algorithm in Asynchronous Robot Systems, *SIAM Journal on Computing* **34(6)**, (2005), pp. 1516-1528.
- [6] J. Czyzowicz, L. Gąsieniec, A. Kosowski, E. Kranakis. Boundary Patrolling by Mobile Agents with Distinct Maximal Speeds, *Proc. of ESA* (2011), pp. 701-712.
- [7] S. Das, P. Flocchini, N. Santoro, M. Yamashita. On the Computational Power of Oblivious Robots: Forming a Series of Geometric Patterns, *Proc. of PODC*, (2010), pp. 267-276.
- [8] E.W. Dijkstra. Selected Writings on Computing: Personal Perspective, Springer, New York, (1982), pp. 34-35.
- [9] A. Efrima, D. Peleg. Distributed algorithms for partitioning a swarm of autonomous mobile robots, *Theoretical Computer Science* *410*, (2009), pp. 1355-1368.
- [10] P. Flocchini, G. Prencipe, N. Santoro, P. Widmayer. Gathering of asynchronous oblivious robots with limited visibility, *Theor. Comput. Sci.* *337(1-3)*, (2005), pp. 147-168.
- [11] P. Flocchini, G. Prencipe, N. Santoro, P. Widmayer. Arbitrary pattern formation by asynchronous, anonymous, oblivious robots, *Theor. Comput. Sci.* *407(1-3)*, (2008), pp. 412-447.
- [12] T. Friedetzky, L. Gasieniec, T. Gorry, R. Martin. Observe and remain silent (Communication-less agent location discovery), to appear in *Proc. of MFCS 2012*
- [13] K. Sugihara, I. Suzuki. Distributed algorithms for formation of geometric patterns with many mobile robots, *Journal of Robotic Systems* *13(3)*, (1996), pp. 127-139.
- [14] I. Suzuki, M. Yamashita. Distributed Anonymous Mobile Robots: Formation of Geometric Patterns, *SIAM J. Comput.*, vol. 28(4), (1999), pp. 1347-1363.
- [15] M. Yamashita, I. Suzuki. Characterizing geometric patterns formable by oblivious anonymous mobile robots, *Th. Comp. Science*, *411(26-28)*, (2010), pp. 2433-2453.