



# Bridging the Gap between Population and Gossip-based Protocols

Yann Busnel, Marin Bertier, Anne-Marie Kermarrec

► **To cite this version:**

Yann Busnel, Marin Bertier, Anne-Marie Kermarrec. Bridging the Gap between Population and Gossip-based Protocols. [Research Report] RR-6720, INRIA. 2008, pp.26.

**HAL Id: inria-00338098**

**<https://hal.inria.fr/inria-00338098>**

Submitted on 11 Nov 2008

**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.



INSTITUT NATIONAL DE RECHERCHE EN INFORMATIQUE ET EN AUTOMATIQUE

*Bridging the Gap between Population and  
Gossip-based Protocols*

Yann Busnel — Marin Bertier — Anne-Marie Kermarrec

N° 6720

Novembre 2008

Thème NUM



*R*apport  
*de recherche*





## Bridging the Gap between Population and Gossip-based Protocols

Yann Busnel\*, Marin Bertier†, Anne-Marie Kermarrec‡

Thème NUM — Systèmes numériques  
Projets Asap

Rapport de recherche n° 6720 — Novembre 2008 — 23 pages

**Abstract:** Gossip-based protocols are simple, robust and scalable and have been consistently applied in many distributed, mostly wired, settings. Most validation in this area has been so far empirical and there is a clear lack of a theoretical counterpart clearly defining what can and cannot be computed with gossip-based protocols.

Population protocols, on the other hand, provide a clear and formal model for mobile sensor networks, capturing their power and limitations. In this paper, we establish a correlation between population and gossip-based protocols. Studying the equivalence between them, we propose a classification of gossip-based protocols, based on the nature of the underlying peer sampling service. First, we show that the class of gossip protocols, where each node relies on an arbitrary sample, is equivalent to population protocols. Second, we show that gossip-based protocols, relying on a more powerful peer sampling providing peers using a clearly identified set of other peers, are equivalent to community protocols, a variant of population protocols.

Leveraging the resemblances between these areas enables to provide a theoretical framework for distributed systems where global behaviours emerge from a set of local interactions, both in wired and wireless settings. Likewise, the practical validations of gossip-protocols provide empirical evidence of quick convergence times of such algorithms and demonstrate their practical relevance. While existing results in each area can be immediately applied, this also leaves the space to transfer any new results, practical or theoretical, from one domain to the other.

As an application of this possibility, we also propose a new result in the area of population protocols and show that a uniform distribution of interactions is optimal for population and community protocols with respect to convergence time. Consequently, we can conclude that the gossip-based random peer sampling service provides such an optimal sampling for gossip-based protocols, corroborating practical evidences.

**Key-words:** Population protocols, Gossip-based protocols, Community protocols, Theoretical analysis, Equivalence, Complexity.

\* IRISA / Université de Rennes 1

† IRISA / INSA Rennes

‡ IRISA / INRIA Rennes – Bretagne Atlantique

## **Comblant le fossé entre les protocoles épidémiques et de populations**

**Résumé :** Les contributions de ce rapport de recherche proviennent de multiples observations. Principalement, nous avons constaté que les protocoles de population en général et les protocoles épidémiques, présentés ci-après, possèdent de nombreuses ressemblances, bien que les uns soient issus d'une approche théorique et les autres aient une origine plus pratique. Ceci nous mène à proposer une première classification de ces protocoles épidémiques.

Inspirés de cette remarque, nous présentons ensuite les motivations qui nous ont menés aux résultats de ce chapitre. Puis, après avoir étendu notre classification en une seconde à granularité plus fine, nous montrons les relations d'équivalence existantes entre tous ces modèles. Nous concluons ce rapport de recherche par divers exemples de transfert de contributions issues d'un domaine vers l'autre.

**Mots-clés :** Protocoles de population, Protocoles épidémiques, Protocoles de communauté, Analyse théorique, Équivalence, Complexité.

## 1 Introduction

In analogy with rumour spreading among human beings, gossip-based protocols provide a scalable, robust and reliable substrate for many peer to peer applications [12, 14, 19, 23, 24]. They have recently received an increased attention due to their scalability and quick convergence in large-scale dynamic settings. In a gossip-based protocol, each node in the system periodically exchanges information with another peer sampled from the network. The robustness of gossip-based protocols stems from their random flavour in the sampling. However, while there are some ad-hoc analyses available for specific protocols [12, 15, 23], most validation in the area has been so far achieved through extensive simulations and experimentations.

In [22], a generic practical gossip-based substrate has been defined. In this model, a protocol is defined by three functions: (i) **the peer selection**, identifying the gossip target, provided by a *peer sampling service*; (ii) the **data exchanged**, specifying the information exchanged between the peers during a gossip interaction and (iii) the **data processing** following an interaction. While this framework was initially defined to unify gossip-based membership systems, it has been shown to be generic enough to be applied for the whole spectrum of gossip protocols including reliable dissemination, distributed computation, and overlay construction [25]. Yet, there is a lack of clear theoretical framework enabling reasoning about the power and limitations of this model.

On the other hand, population protocols [1] provide theoretical foundations for distributed systems in which global behaviour emerges from a set of simple interactions between their agents. Developed in the context of mobile tiny devices, typically sensors, in this model, agents are considered anonymous, and therefore, undistinguishable. Many variants of population protocols exist [2, 4, 5, 6, 11]. Among them, community protocols [18] augment the seminal model by assigning agents a unique identifier and letting nodes remember a limited number of other identifiers. Not only this significantly increases the computation power of the system but also provides a way to tolerate a bounded number of byzantine failures. In the sequel, the class of population protocols and variants will be referred as *population protocols*, and the seminal model as *basic population protocol*.

More formally, in population protocols, the model consists in a finite space of agent's states, a finite set of inputs, a finite set of outputs and a transition function. The set of possible node's interactions is represented by a graph of interactions. These interactions can be viewed as follow: when two agents are sufficiently close for a sufficiently long time, they interact by exchanging their local information, and update their state according to the transition function. For instance, if agents are small devices embedded on animals, an interaction takes place each time two animals are in the same radio range. The interaction patterns, orchestrated by a scheduler, are considered as unpredictable. Yet, the scheduler is assumed to be *fair i.e.*, it ensures that any reachable global system state can be reached infinitely often. In the absence of global knowledge, agents cannot usually verify that the protocol has terminated, therefore the model considers convergence (of the distributed output) rather than termination.

**Contributions: Correlating population and gossip-based protocols** Our contributions in this paper stem from several observations. First of all, population and gossip-based protocols bear many resemblances. They both rely on a *scheduler* orchestrating the interactions between nodes. The scheduler, fair by assumption in population pro-

protocols, specifies the node interactions in a mobile environment while the scheduler is a *peer sampling* in gossip-based protocols providing nodes with gossip targets. Both aim at achieving an emerging global behaviour from a set of local interactions in a fully decentralized manner. The first contribution of this paper is to acknowledge these similarities and leverage them in both contexts.

On one hand, the gossip-based structure presented in [22] provides a practical generic framework in the context of wired systems. Yet, this does not provide a fine-grained classification. Work in this area has shown that the gossip-based protocols scale well in practice as well as have fairly high speed of convergence. On the other hand, population protocols provide a theoretical framework for wireless systems. They clearly define the power and limitation of such protocols. Indeed population protocols show that such systems composed of anonymous agents ensure the convergence of a clearly defined set of functions. Community protocols extend this model, by adding a bounded set of identifiers. However, until now, these models have not had significant practical implication. In this paper, we improve on these limitations by making the following contributions:

- We establish a correlation between population and gossip-based protocols and introduce a *first classification* of gossip-based protocols depending on the nature of the underlying peer sampling. More precisely, we identify two classes of gossip protocols: *anonymous* (AGP) and *non anonymous* (NGP).
- We show that anonymous gossip protocols are *equivalent* to basic population protocols;
- We show that non anonymous gossip protocols are *equivalent* to community protocols;
- By doing so, we are in a position to leverage the theoretical framework of population protocols for understanding the power and limitations of gossip-based protocols. Likewise, we can exploit the results obtained in the area of gossip-based protocols to draw conclusions on the practicality of population protocols. This enables us to provide both theoretical and practical considerations for such large-scale systems: the parallel between population and gossip protocols can be exploited for both existing and new results.
- We provide a *new result* in the context of population protocol namely the *optimality of uniform distribution of interactions* with respect to speed of convergence and use our equivalence property to extend it to the domain of gossip protocols. This enables us to conclude that the random peer sampling service [22] is optimal for the speed of convergence of gossip-based protocols. This is a clear illustration of how the correlation can be exploited.

## 2 Population vs gossip protocols

### 2.1 Background on population protocols

In this section, we briefly present the basic population protocol model and the community protocol variant, which relaxes the assumption on the anonymity of agents.

**Basic population protocol** The basic population protocol model, initially introduced in [1], is composed of a collection of agents, interacting pairwise in an order determined by a fair scheduler. Each agent has an input value and is represented by a finite state machine. This agent can only update its state through an interaction. Updates are defined by a transition function that describes the function  $f$  computed by the system. At each time, the agents compute an output value from their current state and converge eventually to the correct output value, depending to the inputs initially spread to the agents.

More formally, a population protocol is composed of:

- a complete interaction graph  $\Lambda$  linking a set of  $n \geq 2$  agents;
- a finite input alphabet  $\Sigma$ ;
- a finite output alphabet  $Y$ ;
- a finite set of possible agent's states  $Q$ ;
- an input function  $\iota : \Sigma \rightarrow Q$  mapping inputs to states;
- an output function  $\omega : Q \rightarrow Y$  mapping states to outputs;
- a transition relation  $\delta : Q \times Q \rightarrow Q \times Q$  on pairs of states.

In the following, we call  $(p, q) \mapsto (p', q')$  or  $(p, q, p', q')$  a transition if  $(p, q, p', q') \in \delta$ . A transition can occur between two agents' states only if these two agents have an interaction. The protocol is deterministic if  $\delta$  is a function (*i.e.* at most one possible transition for each pair in  $Q^2$ ).

A configuration of the system corresponds to an unordered multiset containing states of all agents. We denote  $C \rightarrow C'$  the fact that  $C'$  can be obtained from  $C$  in one step (*i.e.* with only one transition for one existing interaction). An execution of the protocol is a finite or infinite sequence of population configurations  $C_0, C_1, C_2, \dots$  such that  $\forall i, C_i \rightarrow C_{i+1}$ .

As introduced above, the order of the interactions is unpredictable, and decided by the scheduler. The scheduler is assumed to be *fair*, *i.e.* a feasible configuration cannot be endlessly ignored. In other words, if a configuration  $C$  appears an infinite number of times during an execution, and there exists a step  $C \rightarrow C'$ , then  $C'$  must also appear an infinite number of times in the execution. This ensures that any attainable configuration is eventually reached.

**Community protocols** Many variants of the last model exist. In this paper, we focus on the community protocol [18] extension for it significantly increases the computational power. This model augments the basic population protocol model by assigning unique identifiers to agents. All possible identifiers and a special symbol  $\perp$  are grouped in an infinite set  $U$ . The difference between basic population protocols and community protocols is the definition of the set of states:  $Q = B \times U^d$  where  $B$  is the initial definition of the population protocol's set of states collapsed to a memory of  $d$  identifiers. As in population protocols, algorithms are uniform: they cannot use any bound on the number of agents and  $U$  is infinite. In order to maintain the population protocol spirit in this extended model, some constraints are added: only existing agent identifiers can be stored in the  $d$  slots intended for identifiers of an agent's state and no other structural information about identifiers can be used by algorithms. Thus, community protocols have to verify the two following formal constraints:



- In the context where  $id \in q$  means that  $q$  stores  $id$  in one of its  $d$  identifier slots, for  $q \in Q$  and  $id \in U$ :  $\forall (q_1, q_2) \mapsto (q'_1, q'_2) \in \delta, id \in q'_1 \vee id \in q'_2 \Rightarrow id \in q_1 \vee id \in q_2$
- For  $q = \langle b, u_1, u_2, \dots, u_d \rangle \in Q$ , let  $\hat{\pi}(q) = \langle b, \pi(u_1), \pi(u_2), \dots, \pi(u_d) \rangle$  where  $\pi$  a permutation of  $U$  with  $\pi(\perp) = \perp$ . We assume that:  $\forall (q_1, q_2) \mapsto (q'_1, q'_2) \in \delta : (\hat{\pi}(q_1), \hat{\pi}(q_2)) \mapsto (\hat{\pi}(q'_1), \hat{\pi}(q'_2)) \in \delta$ .

In short, the first assumption ensures that no transition may introduce new identifiers and the second one that identifiers can only be stored or compared for equality, but not manipulated in any other way. Any population protocol can be viewed as a community protocol with  $d = 0$ .

Finally, a population or community protocol stably computes a function  $f : \Sigma^+ \rightarrow Y$  if  $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \forall \sigma \in \Sigma^n$ , every fair execution with  $n$  agents initialized with the elements of  $\sigma$ , eventually stabilizes to output  $f(\sigma)$ . That means that the output value of every agent eventually stabilizes to  $f(\sigma)$ .

## 2.2 Gossip-based protocols: A practical framework

Originally introduced for information dissemination, gossip-based protocols are simple, robust and scalable. Initially, epidemic-based algorithms have been proposed for database maintenance in [12]. Since then, they have been applied in many settings in wired and wireless systems as in [9, 14, 15, 17, 19, 27, 28, 29].

A generic framework has been proposed in [22] to provide a generic substrate for gossip-based peer sampling protocols, providing a common ground for membership systems. In this paper, the authors explore the resulting topologies and show that the parameters of the generic gossip-based protocols can be set to achieve random-like graph topologies *i.e.* providing each node with a random sample of the network. This has been achieved through extensive experimentations and has been recognized as a way to achieve random peer sampling in large-scale dynamic networks.

In this framework, each peer maintains a local view of size  $c$  of the system, representing its restricted knowledge of the systems. The peer sampling service provides a sample from that view. This framework relies on three basic functions:

**SelectPeer()** returns a peer from the local view. This function is used to select the gossip target;

**DataExchange()** returns the data to be exchanged over a gossip communication;

**DataProcessing()** returns the resulting state and specifies the way the data exchanged are processed.

Each peer runs an active and a passive threads (see Algorithm 1). The active thread is run periodically and launches a gossip interaction. A gossip target is selected from its local view using (*SelectPeer()*), data is exchanged (*DataExchange()*) and processed between the two interacting peers (*DataProcessing()*).

Initially proposed in the context of protocols achieving unstructured topologies, it turns out that this very substrate is generic enough to be used for many other purposes [25]. For example, message dissemination [24, 14] can be achieved by parameterizing the protocol as follows. (i) *SelectPeer()* should return a random peer; (ii) *DataExchange()* should contain the message to disseminate; and (iii) *DataProcessing()* should do nothing. Likewise, distributed computations (average, sum or quantile) [21, 23], gossip-based size estimation [13, 26] or overlay construction [19, 29]

<p><b>Active thread</b>  <b>Do once</b> for each <math>T</math> time units at a random time  <b>begin</b>  <math>p = \text{SelectPeer}()</math>  <b>Send</b> <math>\text{DataExchange}(state)</math> <b>to</b> <math>p</math>  <b>Receive</b> <math>info_p</math> <b>from</b> <math>p</math>  <math>state = \text{DataProcessing}(info_p)</math>  <b>end</b></p>	<p><b>Passive thread</b>  <b>Do forever</b>  <b>begin</b>  <b>Receive</b> <math>info_q</math> <b>from</b> <math>q</math>  <b>Send</b> <math>\text{DataExchange}(state)</math> <b>to</b> <math>q</math>  <math>state = \text{DataProcessing}(info_q)</math>  <b>end</b></p>
--	--

**Algorithm 1:** Generic Gossip Protocol

can be achieved using the same protocol. This substrate provides a general framework for practical implementations of gossip-based protocols. Yet, to the best of our knowledge, there is no counterpart on the theoretical side.

### 2.3 Classifying gossip-based protocols: On the power of the peer sampling

In this section, we propose a novel classification of gossip-based protocols stemming from the observation that, although studied independently by two different communities, population and gossip-based protocols have a lot in common. Both class of protocols rely on the following properties:

- a fully decentralized model;
- a set of agents, having a finite storage capacity, periodically interacting in a pairwise manner. The agents are mobile and communicate in a wireless manner in population protocols; they are static and communicate through a dynamic network on a fixed infrastructure in gossip protocols;
- an unpredictable order of interactions orchestrated by a fair scheduler in population protocols modelling the agents' mobility patterns and by a peer sampling service serving the  $\text{selectPeer}()$  function in gossip-based protocols;
- a function specifying the way data is processed over an interaction: this is the transition function  $\delta$  in population protocols and the  $\text{DataProcessing}$  function in gossip-based protocols;
- a state exchange over an interaction: this is the state value in  $Q$  in population protocols and the  $\text{DataExchanged}$  function in gossip-based protocols.

Considering the gossip-based protocols in this light, we were able to make a parallel between (i) the difference between the basic population and community protocols and (ii) the requirements for peer identifiers in gossip-based protocols.

More specifically, gossip protocols differ from their requirement with respect to peer anonymity. This is instantiated by the nature of the underlying peer sampling protocol. The peer sampling service, *i.e.* the “black box” providing a peer with a given sample of the network, may either return any sample for the implementation of the gossip-based protocol. Therefore, we introduce the following classification. Two main classes of gossip-based protocols can then be defined depending on the power of the underlying peer sampling with respect to anonymity requirements.

**AGP: Anonymous Gossip protocols** do not require being aware of the identities of any peer for any of the three functions of the generic protocol. This is typically the case of protocols achieving some simple distributed computations such as average computation [21, 23] or system size estimations [20, 26]. Gossip-based dissemination protocols where each peer gossips to  $k$  nodes picked uniformly at random also fall into this category. Such protocols only rely on a peer sampling service providing them with a sample of the network, be it random or biased [9, 24].

**NGP: Non-anonymous Gossip Protocols** are not oblivious to the identities of peers they are communicating with or any other. Typically, gossip-based overlay construction protocols fall into this class. The identities of peers are required in the three functions of the substrate aforementioned. Non-anonymous gossip protocols have been used to implement overlays ranging from unstructured networks, providing random-graph like topologies [22] to structured networks [19, 24].

### 3 A classification of gossip protocols

In order to establish the parallel between population and gossip-based protocol, a finer-grain classification is required.

#### 3.1 Between synchronous and asynchronous

To refine the classification, we consider two complementary types of communication channels. A *synchronous* communication is modeled by a bounded transmission delay. Therefore, as the transmission time between source and destination is restricted, we consider that the gossip exchange (*i.e.* concurrent execution of both active and passive process) is atomic. Synchronous communication enables to take advantage of the periodicity of exchanges (*cf.* Algorithm 1), which is not the case for the following one.

An *asynchronous* communication does not impose a bound on the transmission delay of a message. Therefore, a message can be received after an arbitrary long time yet finite. In such an asynchronous environment, a node starting an active process cannot assume a bounded execution time of this process. Therefore, it is necessary to describe the node behavior when a new gossip exchange is requested while it is still engaged in another one. As nodes are represented by finite state machines, received message buffers have also a finite size and arbitrary long messages should lead to message losses (as buffer may overflow).

For the sake of simplification, in order to avoid considering message losses, we consider only one gossip exchange is processed at a time (exclusive gossip, see Algorithm 2). Any gossip will be ignored at a node already involved in a previous gossip operation (*i.e.*  $\text{currentXchange} = \text{true}$ ), until it is completed. In order for gossip initiator to wait only temporarily, it is informed of the refusal or acceptance of a gossip exchange. Note that since we do not consider failures in our model, messages are eventually received and processed.

```

currentXchange = false;
while true do
  On reception of a new exchange
  request do
    if currentXchange then
      Send (Refusal);
    else
      currentXchange = true ;
      Send (Accept);
    end
  done
  On reception of end of an exchange
  do
    currentXchange = false ;
  done
end

```

**Algorithm 2:** Asynchronous management




Figure 1: Relationship between gossip-based and population protocols

### 3.2 On the computational power of gossip protocols

Enriching our model with communication synchronism property, we obtain a refined classification as the one presented in Section 2.3. We now classify gossip protocols in four classes:

- syncAGP** Synchronous Communication and Anonymous Nodes;
- asyncAGP** Asynchronous Communication and Anonymous Nodes;
- syncNGP** Synchronous Communication and Non-anonymous Nodes;
- asyncNGP** Asynchronous Communication and Non-anonymous Nodes.

Obviously, the power of non-anonymous gossip protocols is greater than anonymous ones as the use of node identifier enables to achieve distributed computations which are impossible in the anonymous context (*eg.* exponential computation, logical overlay construction, *etc.*). Thus, we have:

$$\text{asyncAGP} \prec \text{asyncNGP} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{syncAGP} \prec \text{syncNGP}$$

As far as anonymous gossip protocols are concerned, it is possible to leverage the periodicity of exchange in order to increase their computational power. For instance, it is possible in syncAGP to establish a global time clock, thanks to cycle structure, but not in asyncAGP (due to the unbounded message delay). Then, it is obvious to conclude that:

$$\text{asyncAGP} \prec \text{syncAGP}$$

Finally, in the NGP context, we show in the proof of Lemma 6 that the identification of nodes enables to emulate synchronous communications, such that:

$$\text{asyncNGP} \cong \text{syncNGP}$$

This classification and the relation between all the considered modeled are summarized in Figure 1. This classification provides a refined classification gossip-based protocols based on synchronism and anonymity properties. Yet, there is no formal framework to define what can and cannot be achieved with the susmentioned protocols. Establishing the parallel between population and gossip-based protocols provides a first answer to that question.

## 4 Bridging the gap between population and gossip protocols

In a nutshell, in AGP, a peer sampling provides each peer with another peer to communicate with, regardless of its identifier. If the outcome of the peer sampling ensures that any pairwise interaction can endlessly take place, then a protocol of AGP resembles a basic population protocol. Inversely, a protocol from NGP requires a peer sampling to provide each node with a set of clearly identified peers, potentially along more information about each peer, where the identifier (whether it is an identifier or an IP address) is crucial. This means that the *SelectPeer* or the *DataProcessing* use the identifier or information attached to specific peer to achieve a given functionality. This clearly matches the community protocol model described above. We claim that these resemblances are actually equivalences and provide the the proofs in this section as illustrated on Figure 1.

### 4.1 Equivalence between basic population and anonymous asynchronous gossip protocols

In this section, we prove that the basic population and anonymous asynchronous gossip protocols (asyncAGP) are equivalent.

**Theorem 1** *A predicate is computable by a basic population protocol if and only if it can be computed by an anonymous gossip-based protocol via an asynchronous communication model (asyncAGP).*

**Proof.** In order to prove the equivalence, we consider the functions computable by basic population protocols and asyncAGP. Then, we prove in Lemmas 2 and 3 that they belong to the same equivalence class. In fact, we prove below that the class of functions computable by a basic population protocol is a subset of the ones computable by asyncAGP, and *vice-versa*.  $\square$

On one hand, consider that  $\text{PP} \prec \text{asyncAGP}$  with the following lemma.

**Lemma 2** *If  $f$  is computable by a basic population protocol, then there exists a protocol from asyncAGP which can compute  $f$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $\mathcal{P}$  the basic population protocol computing  $f$  and defined by the 7-tuples  $(\Lambda, \Sigma, Y, Q, \iota, \omega, \delta)$ . Consider the anonymous gossip-based protocol  $\mathcal{G}$  described below. We have to show that  $\mathcal{G}$  simulates  $\mathcal{P}$ .

**Similarities:** Each agent in  $\Lambda$  is hosted by a specific peer of  $\mathcal{G}$ . Input, output and state sets are the same in  $\mathcal{G}$  than in  $\mathcal{P}$ . *A fortiori*, the both map function  $\iota$  and  $\omega$  remain identical in  $\mathcal{G}$ .

**Dealing with the transition function:** The  $\mathcal{G}$ 's *DataProcessing* function is defined from  $\delta$ : consider two peers in the system  $l$  and  $r$ , gossiping together at a time  $t$ . Let assume that  $l$  initiates the gossip exchange with  $r$ . Let  $p_l$  (respectively  $p_r$ ) the selected information obtained by *DataExchange* from  $l$ 's state (respectively  $r$ 's state). Thus, as  $l$  calls the function during its active thread, *DataProcessing* returns locally the third entry of the 4-tuple  $(p_l, p_r, p'_l, p'_r) \in \delta$ , and the state of  $l$  becomes  $p'_l$ . On the remote peer  $r$ , a call to the function *DataProcessing* during its passive thread return the last entry of the same 4-tuple  $(p_l, p_r, p'_l, p'_r)$ .

Thus, the sequence of population configurations is valid and represents the basic population protocol  $\mathcal{P}$ , as it only stems from the transition function  $\delta$  using pairwise interactions.

**On the fairness assumption:** The last assumption to verify is the fairness condition. In asyncAGP, the scheduler is fully defined by the the order of gossip exchange, itself defined by (i) the *selectPeer* function; (ii) the randomization of the gossip time and; (iii) the asynchronous

environment which, as we mentioned before, potentially leads to gossip exchange losses. In that context, every possible finite scheduling has a non-null probability to happen. Thus, every possible transaction between two system configurations  $C \rightarrow C'$  has a non-null probability to happen. So, if the configuration  $C$  appears an infinite number of time during an execution of  $\mathcal{P}$  in the aforementioned context, then  $C'$  also appears an infinite number of times in this execution. The fairness assumption is then verified.

Then,  $\mathcal{G}$  simulates the basic population protocol  $\mathcal{P}$ , which computes the function  $f$ . Thus, for any function computable by basic population protocols, there exists an anonymous gossip-based protocol, which stably computes this function.  $\square$

On the other hand, let's show the inverse of Lemma 2, corresponding to the second implication of Theorem 1:  $\text{asyncAGP} \prec \text{PP}$ .

**Lemma 3** *If  $f$  is computable by a protocol from asyncAGP, then there exists a basic population protocol which can compute  $f$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $\mathcal{G}$  an anonymous gossip-based protocol that computes a specific function  $f$  using the primitive *DataExchange* and *DataProcessing*. As presented above, in a gossip-based protocol, peers are modeled by a finite-state machine.

**Mapping the domain of the transition function:** The domain of *DataProcessing* is finite (and corresponds to the Cartesian product of  $\mathcal{D}_S$ , the set of peer states, with  $\mathcal{D}_E$ , the range of *DataExchange*). Moreover, as *DataProcessing* is a function, its range is also finite by definition. Based on these sets, we define  $\mathcal{D}_G$  a specific subset of the Cartesian product between the domain and the codomain of *DataProcessing* (i.e.  $\mathcal{D}_G$  contains each ordered pair such that the first entry is in the domain of *DataProcessing* and the second entry is the mapped element of this first entry by *DataProcessing*). More formally,  $\mathcal{D}_G \subseteq (\mathcal{D}_S \times \mathcal{D}_E) \times \mathcal{D}_S$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{D}_G$  is finite and contains all the possible transitions of peer states, based on the knowledge of a remote peer sub-state.

**Design of the basic population protocol for the purpose of simulation:** Consider the following basic population protocol  $\mathcal{P}$ , represented by the 7-uplet  $(\Lambda, \Sigma, Y, Q, \iota, \omega, \delta)$ . Consider a complete interaction graph  $\Lambda$ . Let the set of agent states be identical to the set of peer states, i.e.  $Q = \mathcal{D}_S$ . Consider that  $\Sigma$  and  $Y$  are the same as the input and output sets of  $\mathcal{G}$ , if they exist. In this case,  $\iota$  and  $\omega$  are the same functions than the ones which respectively associate the input set of  $\mathcal{G}$  to  $\mathcal{D}_S$ , and  $\mathcal{D}_S$  to the output set of  $\mathcal{G}$ . Conversely, if no specific input and output sets are defined in  $\mathcal{G}$ , then  $\Sigma = Y = \mathcal{D}_S$  and  $\iota \equiv \omega$  corresponding to the identity function. Finally, the transition function  $\delta$  is defined as follows.

$$\forall (s_l, s_r, s'_l) \in \mathcal{D}_G, \exists (s_r, s_l, s'_r) \in \mathcal{D}_G \quad \text{such that} \quad (s_l, s_r, s'_l, s'_r) \in \delta.$$

**On the periodicity of the fair scheduler:** Periodicity of exchange is an inherent characteristic of many gossip protocols. However, the only difference between  $\text{asyncAGP}$  and  $\text{syncAGP}$  is that  $\text{asyncAGP}$  potentially temporary jeopardize the periodicity of exchange, in case of arbitrary long transmission delays. Thus, as presented in lemma 2, no periodic assumption can be considered in an asynchronous environment. Therefore, a fair scheduler is sufficient to lead to a correct execution of  $\mathcal{G}$ , using the aforementioned  $\mathcal{P}$ .

Thus, there exists a basic population protocol  $\mathcal{P}$ , which simulates the considered  $\text{asyncAGP}$   $\mathcal{G}$  and computes the function  $f$ . Then, for any function computable by a protocol from  $\text{asyncAGP}$ , there exists a basic population protocol, which stably computes this function.  $\square$

**Remark:** To establish the equivalence between population protocols and  $\text{syncAGP}$ , an additional constraint on the scheduler is required to ensure the periodicity of  $\text{syncAGP}$  (one gossip exchange per node and per  $T$  time-unit cycle). It is possible to express this *periodicity assumption* as follows. Let  $\Gamma$  be the set of peers in the system, and  $\mathcal{I}$  the sequence of interactions generated by the scheduler (i.e.  $\mathcal{I}$  is the infinite sequence of

agent pairs, in the order in which interactions take place during a given execution)<sup>1</sup>.

$$\forall p \in \Gamma, \forall j \in \mathbb{N}, \exists i \in \llbracket 1; |\Gamma| \rrbracket, \exists q \in \Gamma, \mathcal{I}[i \cdot j] = (p, q).$$

Intuitively, the last equation means that each agent initiates one, and only one, gossip exchange during a round. In fact, as no such notion of time exists in basic population protocols, in this equation, we split the sequence of interactions in blocks of size  $|\Gamma|$ , in which every node is an initiator exactly once (*i.e.* appears on the first entry of the pair).

## 4.2 Equivalence between community protocols and NGP

Along the same lines, we prove here the following theorem in order to prove the equivalence between community and NGP gossip protocols. In fact, we show in the proof of lemma 6 that it is possible to simulate the periodicity of protocols from syncNGP using a protocol from asyncNGP (these two classes are then equivalent).

**Theorem 4** *A predicate is computable by a community protocol if and only if it can be computed by a non-anonymous gossip-based protocol (NGP).*

**Proof.** As Theorem 1, the proof of Theorem 4 is directly inferred from the statements of Lemmas 5 and 6, which show respectively both implications of this equivalence.  $\square$

Consider the first implication of this theorem. Inspired from the equivalence between basic population protocols and asyncAGP, the following theorem is almost trivial.

**Lemma 5** *For each  $f$  computable by a community protocol, there exists a NGP protocol which compute  $f$ .*

**Proof.** The only difference between a basic population protocol and a community protocol consists in the definition of the set of states (*i.e.*  $Q = B \times U^d$ ) and the two constraints on the state's identifier part (*i.e.* the part belonging to  $U^d$  cannot be used freely). Then, due to Theorem 2 and its sketch of proof, the protocol from NGP has to be designed to simulate a given community protocol  $\mathcal{C}$ . Then, we can still consider the function *selectPeer* as a black box which provides a fair scheduler. In other hand, functions *DataExchange* and *DataProcessing* are defined respectively on the domain  $\mathcal{D}_S = B \times U^d$  (instead of  $B$  in the anonymous gossip-based version) and  $\mathcal{D}_S \times \mathcal{D}_E$ .

This does not violate the definition of NGP as the additional information used here only depends on the presence of unique identifier on agents, which is a mandatory assumption in non anonymous gossip-based protocols.  $\square$

Finally, let now show the opposite of Lemma 5, corresponding to the second part of Theorem 4.

**Lemma 6** *For each  $f$  computable by a NGP protocol, there exists a community protocol which compute  $f$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $\mathcal{G}$  the given protocol from NGP. Thus, each peer in the system is aware of its unique identifier. Consider the following community protocol  $\mathcal{C}$ .

**Preliminary assumptions on  $\mathcal{C}$ :** We assume that, in the community protocol used on  $\mathcal{C}$ , agents are uniquely identified, and a unique agent is assigned a specific identifier  $id_{\mathcal{L}}$ . This agent is considered as the leader by all other agents. In this specific community protocol, we assume that this leader is aware of the size of the system<sup>2</sup> (denoted  $n$  in the sequel). In other

<sup>1</sup>The notation  $\llbracket x; y \rrbracket$  represents the set including all integer between  $x$  and  $y$ , *i.e.*  $\llbracket x; y \rrbracket = \{i \in \mathbb{N} | x \leq i \leq y\}$ .

<sup>2</sup>This assumption is only expected for the synchronisation barrier. It can be relaxed using the probabilistic clock phase mechanism proposed for population protocols in [2].

words, the view of a peer is modeled as the set of  $d - 1$  identifiers in the community protocol model (one space of the  $d$ -tuple in  $U^d$  is set aside for storing its own identifier).

**Summary of agent state requirement:** In addition of the gossip peer state in  $\mathcal{D}_S$ , each agent maintains:

- a binary variable  $gc_{\text{parity}}$  to memorize the current gossip cycle arity;
- a ternary variable  $gc_{\text{progress}}$  storing the gossip state of an agent at the corresponding cycle.  $gc_{\text{progress}}$  can only take one of the three following values: (i) *todo* if the active thread has not been run yet during the current gossip cycle, (ii) *done* if it has been run or (iii) *wait* representing the inter-cycle state, as explained below (i.e. the agent waits to pass across the synchronization barrier);
- an agent's identifier variable  $id_{\text{next}}$ , which stores the identifier of the next agent to gossip with;
- and besides, the leader agent  $\mathcal{L}$  maintains a counter  $gc_{\text{count}}$  used in the synchronization cycle process.

To make a long story short, the set of agent states is defined as

$$Q = \mathcal{D}_S \times \{true, false\} \times \{todo, done, wait\} \times U \times \llbracket 1; n \rrbracket \times U^d$$

i.e. the Cartesian product between (i) the domain of the function *DataProcessing* (to represent the gossip peer state), (ii) the domain of  $gc_{\text{parity}}$ , (iii) the domain of  $gc_{\text{progress}}$ , (iv) the identifier set  $U$  for  $id_{\text{next}}$ , (v) the domain of  $gc_{\text{count}}$  and finally (vi)  $U^d$  for the view of the agent. At initialization, each agent sets  $gc_{\text{parity}}$  to *false*,  $gc_{\text{progress}}$  to *todo* and  $id_{\text{next}}$  to  $id_{\mathcal{L}}$ . Moreover,  $gc_{\text{count}}$  is set to 0 for the leader agent  $\mathcal{L}$ .

**Simulating a gossip cycle in  $\mathcal{C}$ :** We now describe the behavior of an agent during a gossip cycle, according to its  $gc_{\text{progress}}$  value. In the case that  $gc_{\text{progress}} = \textit{todo}$ , the corresponding agent has not run its active thread for the given gossip round. Then, it waits to meet its next gossip partner, corresponding to the identifier stored in  $id_{\text{next}}$ . For each interaction  $(id_1, id_2)$ , the agent corresponding to  $id_1$  verifies if  $gc_{\text{progress}} = \textit{todo}$ . If this is the case, it checks if  $id_2 = id_{\text{next}}$ . Only in that case,  $id_1$  and  $id_2$  run respectively *DataProcessing*( $q_1, \textit{DataExchange}(q_2)$ ) and *DataProcessing*( $q_2, \textit{DataExchange}(q_1)$ ) (where  $q_1$  and  $q_2$  represents respectively the state of these agents). All the possible transitions are included in  $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{G}}$  introduced in the proof of Theorem 3. At the end of this interaction,  $id_1$  and  $id_2$  have updated their own state according to the previous one ( $q_i$ ) and the remote one (*DataExchange*( $q_j$ )). Finally,  $id_1$  sets  $gc_{\text{progress}}$  to *done*. In other words, each agent waits until it encounters the agent with the identifier stored in  $id_{\text{next}}$  to gossip with.

**How to simulate the  $T$  periodicity:** In order to simulate the cycle in the context of community protocol, the  $T$  time slot can be simulated through a synchronization barrier. In the rest of this proof, we present how to establish such a barrier and how to assign agents to gossip cycles. So, we introduce the behavior of agents in case that  $gc_{\text{progress}} \neq \textit{todo}$ .

Consider an agent  $id$ . After its own active gossip,  $id$  becomes in *done* gossip state. In this state, it only waits until it encounters the agent  $id_{\mathcal{L}}$ . During its next interaction with  $id_{\mathcal{L}}$ ,  $id$  sets its  $gc_{\text{progress}}$  to *wait* and  $id_{\mathcal{L}}$  increments  $gc_{\text{count}}$  by 1. Thus, all agents eventually stabilized to the *wait* state, and  $gc_{\text{count}}$  eventually converges to  $n$  (the number of agents in the population). At this point, all agents have reached the synchronization barrier.

After the barrier,  $id_{\mathcal{L}}$  enables all agents to begin the next gossip cycle as describe hereinafter. It switches its own  $gc_{\text{parity}}$  to its opposite value,  $gc_{\text{progress}}$  to the *todo* value,  $id_{\text{next}}$  to the returned value of *selectPeer* and finally  $gc_{\text{count}}$  to 0. At this point, each time an agent in the *wait* state interacts with an agent owning the opposite value of  $gc_{\text{parity}}$ , will falls into the next cycle by switching  $gc_{\text{parity}}$ , and setting  $gc_{\text{progress}}$  and  $id_{\text{next}}$  respectively to the *todo* value and the returned value of *selectPeer*. Then, all agents eventually leave the *wait* state of the last cycle, and are ready for their next gossip exchange.

In conclusion, if  $\mathcal{G}$  computes the function  $f$ , then the community protocol  $\mathcal{C}$  simulates the behavior of  $\mathcal{G}$  and also computes the function  $f$ .  $\square$



The last step of this proof let us show that a protocol from NGP in an asynchronous environment is able to simulate a syncNGP. It is obvious that  $\text{asyncNGP} \prec \text{syncNGP}$  (for the same reason that in AGP). Thus, we can conclude that  $\text{asyncNGP} \cong \text{syncNGP}$ , and consequently, that community protocols are equivalent to all protocols from NGP ( $\text{asyncNGP} \cup \text{syncNGP}$ ). We then have proved all the claims presented in Figure 1.

### 4.3 A great impact on both protocols

The equivalences above are of the utmost importance in the area of gossip-based protocols. They clearly define what can be computed with an anonymous gossip-based protocol. They show that the functions of the Presburger arithmetic eventually converge using a gossip-based protocol. They also prove that no other function can be computed with such a protocol [1, 3]. This is a new and important result in the area of gossip-based protocols. On the other hand, the empirical results on the convergence times and practicality of the gossip-based protocols can be used to evaluate the efficiency of population protocols.

Likewise, gossip-based protocols relying on a peer sampling service providing peers, with a bounded set of identifiers, are equivalent to community protocols. This can be used to achieve any computation of symmetric function from  $NSPACE(n \log n)$  (namely almost everything) and also to implement algorithms tolerating failures (and not only benign ones).

These results can be leveraged for existing results as well as results to come in both areas. In this section, we illustrate this claim by considering a gossip-based protocol and considering it from the population protocol standpoint and the other way around. We also provide a main new result in Section 5 on the convergence speed of population protocols.

**Gossip-based majority computation** A typical protocol considered in population protocols is the *majority* predicate. Let consider two kinds of entities in the system (say male and female, leader and follower dancers, sensors in alert and standard state, etc.). Each agent represents exclusively one of the two kinds of entities. This protocol output 1 if the initial configuration contains a strict majority of the second kind of entities and 0 otherwise:

$$\forall x \in \{0, 1\}^+, f(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \sum_{x_i \in x} x_i > \frac{n}{2} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

As counting anonymous objects in a distributed way is impossible, the idea of the protocol is to pair up entities of opposite kind and observe which entities remain unpaired. We have  $\Sigma = \{\perp_0, \perp_1\}$  in which the first type of entities is represented by  $\perp_0$  and the second one by  $\perp_1$ . We also have  $Y = \{0, 1\}$  and  $Q = \{\perp_0, \perp_1, 0, 1\}$ .  $\iota$  corresponds to the identity function and  $\omega$  maps elements from  $\{\perp_0, 0\}$  to 0 and elements from  $\{\perp_1, 1\}$  to 1.  $\delta$  contains the four following transitions:  $(\perp_0, \perp_1) \mapsto (0, 0)$ ,  $(\perp_0, 1) \mapsto (\perp_0, 0)$ ,  $(\perp_1, 0) \mapsto (\perp_1, 1)$ ,  $(0, 1) \mapsto (0, 0)$ . All other transitions are defined to leave the pair of states unchanged. The first rule enables to eliminate all  $\perp_0$  or all  $\perp_1$  values. The second and third rules ensure that eventually, all agents will output the value corresponding to the last set of unpaired entities. The last rule ensures that the system stabilizes to 0 in case of ties. The fairness rule ensures that the system will stabilize to the correct value with probability 1.

This protocol has not been considered so far in the gossip-based area. We show here that we can parameterize a protocol from AGP to compute the majority in a wired setting in a fully decentralized manner.

The state  $q_i$  of a peer  $i$  is an element of  $Q$ . Each peer in the system owns an input value in  $\Sigma = \{\perp_0, \perp_1\}$ , and executes Algorithm 1 parameterized as follow.

- *selectPeer* returns a random sample;
- *dataExchanged* =  $q_i$ ;
- *dataProcessing* follows the  $\delta$  rules. Given two peers in state  $q_1$  and  $q_2$ , and  $(q_1, q_2) \mapsto (q'_1, q'_2) \in \delta$ : the new state of the active peer becomes  $q'_1$ , and the one of the passive peer  $q'_2$ .

Following the *dataProcessing* function, the configuration of the system evolves according to the same behavior than the aforementioned population protocol. This example shows that a gossip-based majority computation can be implemented.

In order to leverage the practical flavor of gossip-based protocols, we have simulated an execution of this gossip protocol under several initial distributions of inputs. We have considered the random peer sampling service (RPS) proposed in [29], associated to a synchronous communication channel. Figure 2 depicts the system evolution according to the gossip progress. For each end of gossip cycle, the number of nodes owning the correct output is represented. For input distributions has been used: (i) 90 % of nodes (ii) 66 % of nodes (iii) 50 % of nodes and then, (iv) 33 % of nodes with the input value  $\perp_0$  (and *a fortiori* the others are initialized to  $\perp_1$ ).

We observe that only 5 gossip cycles are required to converge from the distribution *i*. The lower the proportion of nodes initialized to  $\perp_0$ , the higher the number of cycle required to converge (11 for distribution *ii* and 4185 for *iii*). Finally, in case of strict majority of nodes initialized to  $\perp_1$ , the protocol requires a large convergence time. This side-effect is a consequence of the fourth rule of  $\delta$  (i.e.  $(0, 1) \rightarrow (0, 0)$ ), which helps to converge in the three first cases, but clearly hampers the convergence time in case *iv*. Should the PS avoid the use of this rule as much as possible, the convergence time would no impacted that much. Yet, a random peer sampling does not provide such a control.

Converting the majority population protocol in a gossip protocol, apart from providing such an algorithm for a wired setting, enables to study the convergence time of such a protocol fro various distributions of inputs. These empirical results can be immediately transferred to the population protocols and mobile settings.

**On the convergence of gossip-based slicing** Conversely, we model a gossip-based slicing algorithm as a basic population protocol to formally prove the convergence of such an algorithm. The gossip-based slicing protocol defined in [20] sorts the peers in a large-scale system according to peers attribute values. The algorithm works as follow: each peer in the system is characterized by an attribute value  $x$  picked in an ordered set  $\mathcal{X}$  (this attribute may reflect its storage capacity or bandwidth for example). As the size of state set is several order of magnitude higher than  $n$ , the size of the network, it




Figure 2: System evolution according to the majority synchronous gossip-based protocol's progression.

is quite impossible for a peer to assess its position in the list of peers sorted by their attribute value. Each node generates an *uniform* random number  $r$  from a fixed interval, and subsequently the set of these random number are sorted *along the attributes values* using the gossip-protocol presented below. Then, as they are picked uniformly in a fixed interval, peers get an estimate of their position in the system according to this random value. Eventually the order of the random value matches the attribute values so that a peer with a random value greater than 0.9 knows that it belongs to the 10% best nodes according to that attribute. The algorithm works as follows. Upon gossip, if there is a mismatch between the order of attribute values and random numbers, the peers exchanged their random values. Eventually the ordering of the random values and attribute values match for any pair of peers. Therefore, a peer is able to assess its position: for instance a peer holding a random value of 0.9 knows that its belong to the 10% of peers with the highest attribute.

The corresponding gossip protocol is parameterized as follows.

- *selectPeer* returns a random sample;
- *dataExchanged* returns the random value and the attribute value;
- *dataProcessing* if  $(x_p - x_q) \cdot (r_p - r_q) < 0$  (*i.e.* the random values are not well-ordered according to the attribute values), it sends to  $q$  its pair  $(x_p, r_p)$  in order that  $q$  updates its  $r$ , and finally sets  $r_p$  to  $r_q$ .

The simplest version of this protocol that we presented above is an anonymous gossip protocol and can be modeled as a basic population protocol: the transition function  $\delta : (\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{R})^2 \rightarrow (\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{R})^2$  such that:

$$((x_1, r_1), (x_2, r_2)) \mapsto \begin{cases} ((x_1, \min(r_1, r_2)), (x_2, \max(r_1, r_2))) & \text{si } x_1 < x_2 \\ ((x_1, \max(r_1, r_2)), (x_2, \min(r_1, r_2))) & \text{sinon.} \end{cases}$$

This enables to establish the eventually convergence of the slicing protocol, presented in [20]. This version takes extremely long time to converge, as interactions are fully random. The convergence can be greatly improved by exploiting at each gossip interaction, the local view of each peer. Interestingly enough, the seminal version of the protocol exploits this as peers exchange their local view in order to maximize the chance to find a suitable candidate to swap and therefore speed up the convergence time. This version should then be modeled as a community protocol. Due to the lack of space, we cannot expand the example. Yet, it is interesting to note that the difference between an anonymous or non-anonymous (population versus community) does not affect the convergence as such but has a huge impact on the convergence time.

## 5 Distribution of interactions versus convergence time

### 5.1 Uniform distribution is best in population protocols

The mobility patterns of agents are commonly known to have a significant impact on the convergence speed in mobile systems [16]. We observed empirically in [10] that mobility patterns have a significant impact on the time required for an algorithm to converge. We observed that a uniform distribution of interactions consistently outperforms any other distribution. Yet, this is an issue that is usually not considered in population protocols. In this section, we study further the impact of mobility patterns

on the convergence time of population protocol. More precisely, we show that the uniform distribution of interactions is optimal *i.e.* regardless of the population protocol, a uniform distribution of interactions always achieves the best convergence speed<sup>3</sup>.

**Theorem 7** *For any function computable by a population protocol, the best mean convergence speed is obtained using a uniform randomization of interactions.*

**Sketch of proof.** Let begin with an overview of this proof. Roughly speaking, we (1) model formally the fair scheduler and (2) represent the population configuration evolution using Markov chains. Then, using the characterization of population protocols introduced in Section 4.3, we (3) extract an equation of the stabilization mean hitting time (the average number of interactions required to reach the stabilized configuration). Finally, as this mean hitting time is a polynomial for any population protocol, we (4) prove that this mean hitting time accepts a lower bound for a uniform distribution of interactions.

**Probabilistic extension of the model (Step 1 and 2):** To model the scheduler, we augment the interaction graph by assigning probability values on edges. More formally, for all pairs of agents  $(i, j)$  in  $\Lambda$ , the edge between  $i$  and  $j$  is labelled  $p_{i,j} \in ]0, 1[$ . Without loss of generality, we assume that  $\sum_{(i,j) \in \Lambda} p_{i,j} = 1$ . Therefore the next pair of agents chosen for an interaction is picked in the graph according to the corresponding probability. This scheduling behavior leads to a memoryless process and is fair. The evolution of the system configurations is represented using the *Markov chain model*.

**On the polynomial convergence (Step 3):** we show that the class of the functions computable by population protocols is equivalent to the ones expressible in the Presburger arithmetic. Based on this characterization, we extract that any Markov chain representing a population protocol is almost-linear (*i.e.* there exists some configurations in which it is impossible to come back in a previous configuration). By analyzing the structural shape of these Markov chains, we prove that any transition in those chains is a linear application on the set of  $p_{i,j}$ . From the two last outcomes of the Markov chain structure, we can infer that the average number of interactions required to reach the stationary configuration is a polynomial on the  $p_{i,j}$ .

**On the lower bound characterization (Step 4):** To find the optimal distribution of  $p_{i,j}$  probabilities in the interaction graph, we look for a minimization of the aforementioned polynomial. As a polynomial is a continuous and derivable function, it admits minima in an open set and its derivate is null at this point. By the Lagrangian principle, the minima of this polynomial corresponds to the minima of  $\sum_{(i,j) \in \Lambda} p_{i,j}$ . Now, this is reached for the equidistributed  $p_{i,j}$  probabilities (*i.e.* for all pair of agents, the probability to be chosen by the scheduler is the same than any others).

So, the minimum mean hitting time corresponds to the uniform distribution of interactions in any PP.  $\square$

From this theorem, we can conclude that, for any population protocol, it is impossible to have a mean convergence speed better than the one obtained using a totally random interaction graph.

## 5.2 Random gossip-based peer sampling is optimal wrt convergence time

Following the spirit of the paper, we leverage the above result, obtained in the context of population protocols in order to draw some conclusion in the context of gossip-based protocols. The previous result shows that the uniform distribution of interactions leads to the best possible convergence time in population protocols. This means that in order to obtain an optimal convergence time with an anonymous gossip-based protocol, the

<sup>3</sup>Due to space constraints, we cannot insert a complete formal proof in this paper, which is fully available in [10].

underlying peer sampling, the black box feeding such a protocol, should implement such a uniform random distribution. It has been shown through extensive simulations and evaluations in [22] that random-like graph topologies could be achieved with a gossip-based peer sampling service. More recently, Bortnikov *et al.* proposed a gossip-based algorithm [8] providing an uniform sample to each participating node over time and proved uniformly random.

Thus as a gossip-based peer sampling service is able to provide a uniform random sample, such a peer sampling is optimal for any anonymous gossip-based protocol with respect to convergence time. Quantifying theoretically the differences in convergence times between such a random peer sampling protocol or a biased one remains an open issue.

Finally, we can compare this outcome with previous results proposed on the convergence of gossip-based protocols. In [21], authors argue that the uniform sample is not the optimal pair scheduler for average computation. In fact, that can be considered as a counter-example of our outcomes. In reality, they explain this result by the fact that the uniform sampling relaxes the periodicity condition, as we introduced above with the remark at the end of Section 4.1. Then, this result opens some new challenging questions: we ever know that the periodicity augments the power of the model, but it has also a significant impact on the convergence.

## 6 Conclusion and future works

The main contribution of this paper is to establish a correlation between population and gossip-based protocols. This parallel between two worlds explored so far independently offers several extremely interesting outcomes. First it enables to provide a first classification of gossip-based protocols, a theoretical framework for such protocols, allowing to specify in a formal way what can and cannot be computed by a gossip-based protocol depending on the nature of the underlying peer sampling. If a gossip-based protocol relies on a peer sampling oblivious to identifiers, it is equivalent to a population protocol. If the peer sampling is identifier-aware, a gossip protocol is equivalent to a community protocol. For example, it is now clear that the multiplication, which does not belong to the Presburger arithmetic, cannot be achieved by an anonymous gossip-based protocol.

Conversely, this equivalence enables to leverage the properties obtained empirically on gossip-based protocols with respect to scalability, practicality and speed of convergence and apply them to population protocols. Apart from exploiting the already known results, this opens the door to leverage any new result in one of these two areas as our case studies demonstrate. We also provide an original result on the speed of convergence of population protocol in this paper. We show that the uniform scheduler is optimal as far as the speed of convergence is concerned. This result can be immediately applied to gossip-based protocols. This is extremely useful as we can conclude that the random peer sampling [22] is the optimal peer sampling service for any gossip-based computations.

Part of the future work is to explore further the classes of population protocol to refine our classification of gossip-based protocols. Quantifying formally the convergence times of such protocols also remains an open issue.

**Acknowledgment** We would like to warmly thank Davide Frey for his comments and most useful suggestions on this work and Vincent Leroy for his help with the simulations.

## References

- [1] D. Angluin, J. Aspnes, Z. Diamadi, M.J. Fischer, and R. Peralta. Computation in networks of passively mobile finite-state sensors. *Distributed Computing (Special Issue: PODC'04)*, 18(4):235–253, March 2006.
- [2] D. Angluin, J. Aspnes, and D. Eisenstat. Fast computation by population protocols with a leader. In *20th International Symposium on Distributed Computing (DISC'06)*, pages 61–75, September 2006.
- [3] D. Angluin, J. Aspnes, and D. Eisenstat. Stably computable predicates are semi-linear. In *25th annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC '06)*, pages 292–299, August 2006.
- [4] D. Angluin, J. Aspnes, D. Eisenstat, and E. Ruppert. The computational power of population protocols. In *21th International Symposium on Distributed Computing (DISC'07)*, volume 20:279–304, November 2007.
- [5] D. Angluin, J. Aspnes, M.J. Fischer, and H. Jiang. Self-stabilizing population protocols. In *9th International Conference Principles of Distributed Systems (OPODIS'05)*, volume LNCS 3974:103–117, December 2005.
- [6] J. Aspnes and E. Ruppert. An introduction to population protocols. *Bulletin of the European Association for Theoretical Computer Science, Distributed Computing Column*, 93:98–117, October 2007.
- [7] F. Bonnet, A.-M. Kermarrec, and M. Raynal. Small-world networks: From theoretical bounds to practical systems. In *11th International Conference Principles of Distributed Systems (OPODIS'07)*, pages 372–385, December 2007.
- [8] E. Bortnikov, M. Gurevich, I. Keidar, Gabriel Kliot, and A. Shaer. Brahms: Byzantine Resilient Random Membership Sampling. In *27th annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC '08)*, pages 145–154, August 2008.
- [9] Y. Busnel, M. Bertier, E. Fleury, and A.-M. Kermarrec. GCP: Gossip-based code propagation for large-scale mobile WSN. In *The First International Conference on Autonomic Computing and Communication Systems (Autonomics'07)*, October 2007.
- [10] Y. Busnel, M. Bertier, and A.-M. Kermarrec. On the Impact of the Mobility on Convergence Speed of Population Protocols. Research Report RR-6580, INRIA, Rennes, France, July 2008.
- [11] C. Delporte-Gallet, H. Fauconnier, R. Guerraoui, and E. Ruppert. When birds die: Making population protocols fault-tolerant. In *Second IEEE International Conference on Distributed Computing in Sensor Systems (DCOSS'06)*, pages 51–66, June 2006.

- 
- [12] A. Demers, D. Greene, C. Hauser, W. Irish, J. Larson, S. Shenker, H. Sturgis, D. Swinehart, and D. Terry. Epidemic algorithms for replicated database maintenance. In *6th ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC 1987)*, 1987.
  - [13] K. Dionysios, D. Psaltoulis, I. Gupta, K. Birman, and A. Demers. Active and passive techniques for group size estimation in large-scale and dynamic distributed systems. In *Elsevier Journal of Systems and Software*, vol.80:1639–1658, October 2007.
  - [14] P. T. Eugster, S. Handurukande, R. Guerraoui, A.-M. Kermarrec, and P. Kouznetsov. Lightweight probabilistic broadcast. *ACM Transactions on Computer Systems*, 21(4):341–374, 2003.
  - [15] P. T. Eugster, R. Guerraoui, A.-M. Kermarrec, and L. Massoulié. Epidemic information dissemination in distributed systems. *IEEE Computer*, 37(5):60–67, May 2004.
  - [16] L. Fribourg, S. Messika, and C. Picaronny. Coupling and self-stabilization. *Distributed Computing (Special Issue: DISC'04)*, 18(3):221–232, February 2006.
  - [17] D. Gavidia, S. Voulgaris, and M. van Steen. Epidemic-style monitoring in large-scale wireless sensor networks. Technical Report IR-CS-012, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, 2005.
  - [18] R. Guerraoui and E. Ruppert. Even small birds are unique: Population protocols with identifiers. Technical Report Technical Report CSE-2007-04, Dept of Computer Science and Engineering, York University, September 2007.
  - [19] M. Jelasity and O. Babaoglu. T-Man: Fast gossip-based construction of large-scale overlay topologies. Technical Report UBLCS-2004-7, University of Bologna, Department of Computer Science, Bologna, Italy, May 2004.
  - [20] M. Jelasity and A.-M. Kermarrec. Ordered slicing of very large-scale overlay networks. In *6th IEEE International Conference on Peer-to-Peer Computing (P2P '06)*, pages 117–124, September 2006.
  - [21] M. Jelasity, A. Montresor, and O. Babaoglu. Gossip-based aggregation in large dynamic networks. *ACM Transactions on Computer Systems*, 23(3):219–252, 2005.
  - [22] M. Jelasity, S. Voulgaris, R. Guerraoui, A.-M. Kermarrec, and M. van Steen. Gossip-based peer sampling. *ACM Transactions on Computer Systems*, 25(3):8, 2007.
  - [23] D. Kempe, A. Dobra, and J. Gehrke. Gossip-based computation of aggregate information. In *44th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS '03)*, pages 482–491, octobre 2003.
  - [24] A.-M. Kermarrec, L. Massoulié, and A. J. Ganesh. Probabilistic reliable dissemination in large-scale systems. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, volume 14(3), March 2003.
  - [25] A.-M. Kermarrec and M. van Steen, ed. *ACM Operating Systems Review on Gossip Potocols*, volume 41(5), October 2007.

- [26] L. Massoulié, E. Le Merrer, A.-M. Kermarrec, and A. Ganesh. Peer counting and sampling in overlay networks: random walk methods. In *25th ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC '06)*, pages 123–132, July 2006.
- [27] R. van Renesse. Power-aware epidemics. In *International Workshop on Reliable Peer-to-Peer Systems*, 2002.
- [28] E. Simonton, B. Kyu Choi, and S. Seidel. Using gossip for dynamic resource discovery. In *35th International Conference on Parallel Processing (ICPP'06)*, pages 319–328, August 2006.
- [29] S. Voulgaris, D. Gavidia, and M. van Steen. Cyclon: Inexpensive membership management for unstructured p2p overlays. *Journal of Network System Management*, 13(2), 2005.





## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Population vs gossip protocols</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1	Background on population protocols . . . . .	4
2.2	Gossip-based protocols: A practical framework . . . . .	6
2.3	Classifying gossip-based protocols: On the power of the peer sampling	7
<b>3</b>	<b>A classification of gossip protocols</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1	Between synchronous and asynchronous . . . . .	8
3.2	On the computational power of gossip protocols . . . . .	9
<b>4</b>	<b>Bridging the gap between population and gossip protocols</b>	<b>10</b>
4.1	Equivalence between basic population and anonymous asynchronous gossip protocols . . . . .	10
4.2	Equivalence between community protocols and NGP . . . . .	12
4.3	A great impact on both protocols . . . . .	14
<b>5</b>	<b>Distribution of interactions versus convergence time</b>	<b>16</b>
5.1	Uniform distribution is best in population protocols . . . . .	16
5.2	Random gossip-based peer sampling is optimal wrt convergence time	17
<b>6</b>	<b>Conclusion and future works</b>	<b>18</b>



---

Unité de recherche INRIA Rennes  
IRISA, Campus universitaire de Beaulieu - 35042 Rennes Cedex (France)

Unité de recherche INRIA Futurs : Parc Club Orsay Université - ZAC des Vignes  
4, rue Jacques Monod - 91893 ORSAY Cedex (France)

Unité de recherche INRIA Lorraine : LORIA, Technopôle de Nancy-Brabois - Campus scientifique  
615, rue du Jardin Botanique - BP 101 - 54602 Villers-lès-Nancy Cedex (France)

Unité de recherche INRIA Rhône-Alpes : 655, avenue de l'Europe - 38334 Montbonnot Saint-Ismier (France)

Unité de recherche INRIA Rocquencourt : Domaine de Voluceau - Rocquencourt - BP 105 - 78153 Le Chesnay Cedex (France)

Unité de recherche INRIA Sophia Antipolis : 2004, route des Lucioles - BP 93 - 06902 Sophia Antipolis Cedex (France)

---

Éditeur  
INRIA - Domaine de Voluceau - Rocquencourt, BP 105 - 78153 Le Chesnay Cedex (France)

<http://www.inria.fr>

ISSN 0249-6399