



# A simple proof of the necessity of the failure detector $\Sigma$ to implement a register in asynchronous message-passing systems

François Bonnet, Michel Raynal

## ► To cite this version:

François Bonnet, Michel Raynal. A simple proof of the necessity of the failure detector  $\Sigma$  to implement a register in asynchronous message-passing systems. [Research Report] PI 1932, 2009, pp.8. inria-00392450

**HAL Id: inria-00392450**

**<https://inria.hal.science/inria-00392450>**

Submitted on 8 Jun 2009

**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.

## A simple proof of the necessity of the failure detector $\Sigma$ to implement a register in asynchronous message-passing systems

François Bonnet<sup>\*</sup>, Michel Raynal<sup>\*\*</sup>  
*francois.bonnet@irisa.fr, raynal@irisa.fr*

**Abstract:** This paper presents a simple proof that the quorum failure detector class (denoted  $\Sigma$ ) is the weakest failure detector class required to implement an atomic read/write register in an asynchronous message-passing system prone to an arbitrary number of process crashes.

**Key-words:** Asynchronous message-passing system, Atomic register, Necessity proof, Process crash, Weakest failure detector.

---

*Une preuve simple de la nécessité du détecteur de fautes  $\Sigma$   
pour implémenter un registre dans un système asynchrone à passage de messages*

**Résumé :** Ce rapport propose une preuve simple de la nécessité du détecteur de fautes  $\Sigma$  pour implémenter un registre dans un système asynchrone à passage de messages.

**Mots clés :** Asynchronisme, Défaillances des processus, Détecteur de fautes, Preuve de nécessité, Registre atomique.

---

---

<sup>\*</sup> Projet ASAP: équipe commune avec l'INRIA, le CNRS, l'université Rennes 1 et l'INSA de Rennes

<sup>\*\*</sup> Projet ASAP: équipe commune avec l'INRIA, le CNRS, l'université Rennes 1 et l'INSA de Rennes

# 1 Introduction

**Atomic register** Among the objects that allow concurrent processes to exchange information and cooperate to a common goal, the atomic register is certainly the most fundamental. Such an object (let us denote it  $REG$ ) provides the processes with two operations  $REG.read()$  and  $REG.write(v)$ . The read operation provides the invoking process with the value of the object, while the write operation associates a new value  $v$  with the object.

Atomicity [10, 11] means that the read and write operations issued on a register appear as if they have been executed sequentially, and this “witness sequence” is (1) legal (a read returns the value written by the closest write that precedes it in this sequence) and (2) respects the real time occurrence order on the operations (if the operation  $op1$  terminates before an operation  $op2$  starts,  $op1$  appears before  $op2$  in the witness sequence).

**Simulating a register in an asynchronous system** In an asynchronous message-passing system, the processes communicate by sending and receiving message through channels, and there are assumptions neither on the speed of processes, nor on message transmission delays.

If the system is reliable, it is easy to build an atomic register on top of an asynchronous message-passing system. This is no longer the case if processes can crash. Let  $n$  be the number of processes that compose the system and  $t$  be a model parameter that defines an upper bound on the number of processes that may crash. Algorithms that build an atomic register object despite asynchrony and up to  $t < n/2$  process crashes are described in [1, 2].

An important result is also shown in [2], namely, there is no algorithm implementing an atomic register in asynchronous message-passing systems where  $t \geq n/2$ . The intuition that underlies this impossibility is that, due to asynchrony and the fact that  $t \geq n/2$ , the system can appear as being partitioned, in such a way that each partition considers that the processes in the other partition have crashed (while they actually have not).

**The failure detector approach to circumvent the “ $t \geq n/2$ ” impossibility** The failure detector approach [4] has been introduced to circumvent impossibility results. It consists in enriching each process of an unreliable asynchronous system with an additional device (sometimes called “oracle”) that provides it with hints on process failures. According to the type and the quality of these hints, several classes of failure detectors can be defined.

The class of *quorum* failure detectors, denoted  $\Sigma$ , has been introduced by Delporte-Gallet, Fauconnier and Guerraoui in [5]. It is shown in [5, 6] that  $\Sigma$  is the weakest class of failure detectors that allows building an atomic register object in asynchronous message passing systems despite any number of process crashes (i.e., in systems where  $t = n - 1$ ). “Weakest” means that  $\Sigma$  captures the minimal information on failures that has to be known by the processes in order to implement a register. The definition of  $\Sigma$  is given below. (A quorum is a set of processes. Quorums have first been introduced by Gifford [9].)

**Content of the paper** Showing that  $\Sigma$  is the weakest class of failure detectors to build a register amounts to show two things, namely, that  $\Sigma$  is sufficient and that it is necessary.

On the “sufficiency” part, designing a  $\Sigma$ -based algorithm that builds a register is relatively easy. It consists in replacing the “majority of non-faulty processes” assumption used in algorithms such as the ones described in [2, 3, 12] by a  $\Sigma$  quorum. From an operational point of view, this amounts to replace the statement “wait for messages from a majority of processes” by the statement “wait for messages from a quorum”. Such  $\Sigma$ -based algorithms are described in [5, 8].

The difficult part is the “necessity” part. Let  $D$  be any failure detector that allows building a register in an asynchronous message-passing system despite any number of process crashes, and  $A$  be any  $D$ -based algorithm that builds a register. The proof of the “necessity” part consists in showing that, given any  $D$ -based algorithm  $A$ , it is possible to build a failure detector of the class  $\Sigma$  (we say that it is possible to “extract”  $\Sigma$  from  $A$ ). The first such extraction algorithm appeared in [5].

We present in this paper a new proof of the “necessity” part, that is particularly simple. This proof is based on a technique totally different from the one used in [5]. Interestingly and in addition to its simplicity, the proposed extraction algorithm does not use sequence numbers and requires only a bounded local memory at each process.

## 2 Computation model and definitions

### 2.1 Asynchronous message-passing Systems

As already indicated, the computation model consists of  $n$  asynchronous processes (denoted  $p_1, \dots, p_n$ ) that communicate by exchanging messages through point-to-point reliable asynchronous channels. The integer  $i$  is the identity of  $p_i$ . Let  $\Pi = \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Up to  $t = n - 1$  processes can crash. A crash is a premature halting: the process stops executing. Until it crashes a process executes correctly the code of its algorithm. Given a run, a process that crashes is said to be *faulty* in that run. Otherwise, it is correct. In the following  $\mathcal{C}$  denote the set of correct processes.

The underlying time model is the set of integers. This time notion is not accessible to the processes. It can only be used from an external observer point of view to state or prove properties. Time instants are denoted by  $\tau, \tau'$ , etc.

## 2.2 The failure detector class $\Sigma$

As indicated previously, the *quorum failure detector* class has been introduced and investigated in [5]. Each process  $p_i$  is provided with a local variable (denoted  $\Sigma_i$ ) that it can only read. At any time, such a variable contains a set of process identities (quorum). Let  $\Sigma_i^\tau$  be the value of  $\Sigma_i$  at time  $\tau$ . The class  $\Sigma$  contains all the failure detectors that satisfy the following properties ( $\mathcal{C}$  denotes the set of identities of the processes that are correct in the considered run):

- Intersection property.  $\forall i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}: \forall \tau, \tau': \Sigma_i^\tau \cap \Sigma_j^{\tau'} \neq \emptyset$ .
- Liveness property.  $\exists \tau: \forall \tau' \geq \tau: \forall i \in \mathcal{C}: \Sigma_i^{\tau'} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ .

The first property states that the values of any two quorums taken at any times do intersect. This property prevent partitioning and is consequently used to maintain the consistency of the atomic register. The second property states that a quorum cannot block the process that uses it. Because two majorities always intersect, it is easy to see that  $\Sigma$  can be implemented in systems where  $t < n/2$ . Differently, it cannot be implemented in pure asynchronous systems when  $t \geq n/2$ .

## 3 $\Sigma$ is necessary to build a register

### 3.1 Principle

**Aim** The aim is to design an algorithm that emulates the output of  $\Sigma$  at each process  $p_i$ . This algorithm uses as a subroutine any algorithm  $A$  and failure detector  $D$  such that  $A$  is a  $D$ -based algorithm that implements an atomic register in an asynchronous message-passing system prone to any number of process crashes.

**A simple task**  $Q$  being any non-empty set of processes, let us consider an array of  $n$  atomic registers  $REG_Q[1..n]$ , initialized to  $[\perp, \dots, \perp]$ , and the task denoted  $WR_Q$  where each process  $p_i$  such that  $i \in Q$  executes the following algorithm (where  $reg_i[1..n]$  is an array local to  $p_i$ ):

**algorithm**  $WR$ :

$REG_Q[i].write(\top)$ ; **for each**  $x \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  **do**  $reg_i[x] \leftarrow REG_Q[x].read()$  **end for**.

The process  $p_i$  first writes the value  $\top$  in its entry of the array  $REG_Q$ , and then reads asynchronously all its entries. The  $REG_Q[i].write(\top)$  and  $REG_Q[x].read()$  operations are provided to the processes by the previous algorithm  $A$ . (Let us notice that the value obtained by a read is irrelevant. As we will see, what is important is the fact that  $REG_Q[x]$  has been written or not.) A corresponding run of  $WR_Q$  is denoted  $E_Q$ . In that run, no process outside  $Q$  sends or receives messages related to the task  $WR_Q$ .<sup>1</sup>

Let us observe that, as the underlying failure detector-based algorithm  $A$  that builds a register is correct, if the set  $Q$  contains all the correct processes (i.e.,  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq Q$ ),  $E_Q$  is such that every correct process terminates the task  $WR_Q$ . In the other cases, i.e., for the tasks  $WR_Q$  such that  $\neg(\mathcal{C} \subseteq Q)$ ,  $E_Q$  is such that a process of  $Q$  either terminates  $WR_Q$ , or blocks forever, or crashes (this depends on the actual failure pattern, the outputs of the underlying failure detector  $D$  used by the algorithm  $A$ , and the code of  $A$ ).

**Running concurrently  $2^n - 1$  tasks** The extraction algorithm considers the  $2^n - 1$  distinct tasks  $WR_Q$  where  $Q$  is a non-empty set of  $2^{\Pi}$ . This means that each process  $p_i$  manages  $2^{n-1}$  threads, one for each subset  $Q$  such that  $i \in Q$ . Let us notice that the crash of a process  $p_i$  entails the crash of all its threads.

Let us finally recall that each register of an array  $REG_Q[1..n]$  is implemented by the algorithm  $A$  executed by  $|Q|$  threads associated with the processes of  $Q$ . Due to the correctness of  $A$ , each  $REG_Q[x]$  is an atomic register.

### 3.2 The extraction algorithm

The algorithm that extracts  $\Sigma$  is described in Figure 1. Let us recall that the aim is to provide each process  $p_i$  with a local variable  $\Sigma_i$  such that the  $(\Sigma_x)_{1 \leq x \leq n}$  variables satisfy the intersection and liveness properties defined in Section 2.2.

To that end, each process  $p_i$  manages two local variables: a set of sets of process identities, denoted  $quorum\_sets_i$ , and a queue denoted  $queue_i$ . The aim of  $quorum\_sets_i$  is to contain all the sets  $Q$  such that  $p_i$  terminates  $WR_Q$  (task  $T1$ ), while  $queue_i$  is managed

<sup>1</sup>When we consider the underlying failure detector-based algorithm  $A$  that implements the registers  $REG_Q[1..n]$ , as the processes that are not in  $Q$  do not participate in  $WR_Q$ , the messages sent by the processes of  $Q$  to these processes are never received, or are delayed for an arbitrarily long period. Alternatively (as in [7]), we could say that, in  $WR_Q$ , the processes of  $Q$  “omit” sending messages to the processes that are not in  $Q$ .

in such a way that eventually the correct processes appear in it before the faulty processes (tasks  $T2$  and  $T3$ ).

The idea is to select a set of  $quorum\_sets_i$  as the current output of  $\Sigma_i$ . As we will see in the proof, given any pair of processes  $p_i$  and  $p_j$ , any quorum in  $quorum\_sets_i$  has a non-empty intersection with any quorum in  $quorum\_sets_j$ , thereby supplying the required intersection property.

The main issue is to ensure the liveness property of  $\Sigma_i$  (eventually  $\Sigma_i$  has to contain only correct processes) while preserving the intersection property. This is realized with the help of the local variable  $queue_i$  as follows: the current output of  $\Sigma_i$  is the set (quorum) of  $quorum\_sets_i$  that appears as being the “first” in  $queue_i$ . The formal definition of “first set of  $quorum\_sets_i$  with respect to  $queue_i$ ” is stated in the task  $T4$ . To make it easy to understand, let us consider the following example. Let  $quorum\_sets_i = \{\{3, 4, 9\}, \{2, 3, 8\}, \{4, 7\}\}$ , and  $queue_i = \langle 4, 8, 3, 2, 7, 5, 9, \dots \rangle$ . The set  $S = \{2, 3, 8\}$  is the first set of  $quorum\_sets_i$  with respect to  $queue_i$  because each of the other sets  $\{3, 4, 9\}$  and  $\{4, 7\}$  includes an element (9 and 7, respectively) that appears in  $queue_i$  after the elements of  $S$ . (In case several sets are “first”, any of them can be selected).

```

Init:  $quorum\_sets_i \leftarrow \{\{1, \dots, n\}\}; queue_i \leftarrow \langle 1, \dots, n \rangle;$ 
for each  $Q \in (2^\Pi \setminus \{\emptyset, \{1, \dots, n\}\})$  do
  if  $(i \in Q)$  then launch a thread associated with the task  $WR_Q$  end if end for.
  % Each process  $p_i$  participates concurrently in all the tasks  $WR_Q$  such that  $i \in Q$  %

Task T1: when  $p_i$  terminates in the task  $WR_Q$ :  $quorum\_sets_i \leftarrow quorum\_sets_i \cup \{Q\}$ .

Task T2: repeat periodically broadcast  $ALIVE(i)$  end-repeat.

Task T3: when  $ALIVE(j)$  is received: suppress  $j$  from  $queue_i$ ; enqueue  $j$  at the head of  $queue_i$ .

Task T4: when  $p_i$  reads  $\Sigma_i$ :
  let  $m = \min_{Q \in quorum\_sets_i} (\max_{x \in Q} (rank[x]))$  where  $rank[x]$  denotes the rank of  $x$  in  $queue_i$ ;
  return (a set  $Q$  such that  $\max_{x \in Q} (rank[x]) = m$ ).

```

Figure 1: Extracting  $\Sigma$  from a failure detector-based algorithm  $A$  that implements a register (code for  $p_i$ )

**Remark** Initially  $quorum\_sets_i$  contains the set  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ . As no set of processes is ever withdrawn from  $quorum\_sets_i$  (task  $T1$ ),  $quorum\_sets_i$  is never empty. Moreover, it is not necessary to launch the task  $WR_{\{1, \dots, n\}}$  in which all the processes participate. This is because, as the underlying failure detector-based algorithm  $A$  (that implements a register) is correct, it follows that all the correct processes decide in the task  $WR_{\{1, \dots, n\}}$ . This case is directly taken into account in the initialization of  $quorum\_sets_i$  (thereby saving the execution of the task  $WR_{\{1, \dots, n\}}$ ).

### 3.3 The necessity theorem

**Theorem 1** *Let  $A$  be any failure detector-based algorithm that implements an atomic register in an asynchronous message-passing system prone to any number of process crashes. Given  $A$ , the algorithm described in Figure 1 is a bounded construction of a failure detector of the class  $\Sigma$ .*

#### Proof

**Proof of the intersection property** The proof is by contradiction. Let us first observe that the set  $\Sigma_i$  returned to a process  $p_i$  is a set of  $quorum\_set_i$  (that contains the set  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  -initial value- plus all the sets  $Q$  such that  $p_i$  terminates  $WR_Q$ ). Let us assume that there are two sets  $Q_1$  and  $Q_2$  such that (1)  $Q_1, Q_2 \in \bigcup_{1 \leq j \leq n} (quorum\_set_j)$ , and (2)  $Q_1 \cap Q_2 = \emptyset$ . The first item means that  $Q_1$  and  $Q_2$  can be returned to some processes as their local value for  $\Sigma$ .

Let  $p_i$  be a process that terminates  $WR_{Q_1}$  and  $p_j$  a process that terminates  $WR_{Q_2}$  (due to the “contradiction” assumption, such processes do exist). Using the fact that the message-passing system is asynchronous, let us construct the runs  $E_{Q_1}$  and  $E_{Q_2}$  associated with  $WR_{Q_1}$  and  $WR_{Q_2}$  as follows. If any (see footnote 1), the messages sent by the processes of  $Q_1$  to the processes of  $Q_2$ , when they execute  $A$  to implement each register of the array  $REG_{Q_1}$ , are delayed for an arbitrarily long period (until  $p_i$  has added  $Q_1$  to  $quorum\_set_i$  and  $p_j$  has added  $Q_2$  to  $quorum\_set_j$ ). And similarly for the messages sent by the processes of  $Q_2$  to the processes of  $Q_1$  when they execute  $A$  for each register of the array  $REG_{Q_2}$ .

Let us observe that, in the concurrent runs  $E_{Q_1}$  and  $E_{Q_2}$ , the algorithm  $A$  that is executed only by (1) the processes of  $Q_1$  in  $E_{Q_1}$  to build the registers  $REG_{Q_1}[1..n]$ , and (2) only the processes of  $Q_2$  in  $E_{Q_2}$  to build the registers  $REG_{Q_2}[1..n]$ , is fed with the same outputs of the underlying failure detector  $D$ . Due to the fact that (if any) the messages from  $Q_1$  to  $Q_2$  and from  $Q_2$  to  $Q_1$  are delayed, we have that  $p_i$  reads  $\perp$  from  $REG_{Q_1}[j]$  in  $E_{Q_1}$ , and  $p_j$  reads  $\perp$  from  $REG_{Q_2}[i]$  in  $E_{Q_2}$ .

Let us construct a run  $E_{Q_{12}}$ , where  $Q_{12} = Q_1 \cup Q_2$ , that is a simple merge of  $E_{Q_1}$  and  $E_{Q_2}$  defined as follows. In this run, the algorithm  $A$  (that involves only the processes in  $Q_{12}$  and implements the array of registers  $REG_{Q_{12}}[1..n]$ ) is fed with the same failure detector outputs as the ones supplied to the concurrent runs  $E_{Q_1}$  and  $E_{Q_2}$ . Moreover, the messages from  $Q_1$  to  $Q_2$  and from  $Q_2$  to  $Q_1$  are delayed as in  $E_{Q_1}$  and  $E_{Q_2}$ . So,  $p_i$  (resp.,  $p_j$ ) receives the same messages and the same outputs from the underlying failure detector in  $E_{Q_{12}}$  and  $E_{Q_1}$  (resp.,  $E_{Q_2}$ ).

- On the one side, we have the following. As the process  $p_i$  receives the same messages and the same failure detector outputs in  $E_{Q_{12}}$  as in  $E_{Q_1}$ , the arrays  $REG_{Q_1}[1..n]$  and  $REG_{Q_{12}}[1..n]$  contains the same values. Consequently,  $p_i$  reads  $\perp$  from  $REG_{Q_{12}}[j]$ . Similarly,  $p_j$  reads  $\perp$  from  $REG_{Q_{12}}[i]$ .
- On the other side we have the following. In  $E_{Q_{12}}$ , the process  $p_i$  writes  $\top$  into  $REG_{Q_{12}}[i]$  and the process  $p_j$  writes  $\top$  into  $REG_{Q_{12}}[j]$ . Moreover, one of these operations terminates before the other. Without loss of generality, let us assume that the write by  $p_i$  terminates before the write by  $p_j$ . Consequently,  $p_j$  reads  $REG_{Q_{12}}[i]$  after it has been written. Due to the atomicity of that register, it follows that  $p_j$  obtains the value  $\top$  when it reads  $REG_{Q_{12}}[i]$ .

The second item contradicts the first one. It follows that the initial assumption (existence of a failure detector-based algorithm  $A$  that builds a register,  $Q_1, Q_2 \in \bigcup_{1 \leq j \leq n} (quorum\_set_j)$  and  $Q_1 \cap Q_2 = \emptyset$ ) is false, from which we conclude that at least one of the assertions  $Q_1, Q_2 \in \bigcup_{1 \leq j \leq n} (quorum\_set_j)$  and  $Q_1 \cap Q_2 = \emptyset$  is false, which completes the proof of the intersection property (Corollary 1 -stated below- is an immediate consequence of that property).

**Proof of the liveness property** As far as the liveness property is concerned, let us consider the task  $WR_{\mathcal{C}}$  (recall that  $\mathcal{C}$  is the set of correct processes). As the underlying failure detector-based algorithm  $A$  that implements the registers  $REG_{\mathcal{C}}[1..n]$  is correct (assumption), each correct process  $p_i$  terminates its  $REG_{\mathcal{C}}[i].write(\top)$  and  $REG_{\mathcal{C}}[x].read()$  operations in  $E_{\mathcal{C}}$ . Consequently, in the extraction algorithm, the variable  $quorum\_set_i$  of each correct process  $p_i$  eventually contains the set  $\mathcal{C}$ .

Moreover, after some finite time, each correct process  $p_i$  receives  $ALIVE(j)$  messages only from correct processes. This means that, at each correct process  $p_i$ , all the correct processes eventually precede the faulty processes in  $queue_i$ . Due to the definition of “first set of  $quorum\_set_i$  with respect to  $queue_i$ ” stated in the task  $T4$ , it follows that, from the time  $\mathcal{C}$  has been added to  $quorum\_set_i$ , the quorum  $Q$  selected by the task  $T4$  is always such that  $Q \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ , which proves the liveness property of  $\Sigma_k$ .

**The construction is bounded** A simple examination of the extraction algorithm shows that (1) both the variables  $queue_i$  and  $quorum\_sets_i$  are bounded, and (2) messages carry bounded values, from which it follows that the construction is bounded.  $\square_{Theorem 1}$

The proof of intersection property shows that it is not possible to have two sets  $Q_1$  and  $Q_2$  such that  $Q_1 \cap Q_2 = \emptyset$  and at least one process of  $Q_1$  terminates  $WR_{Q_1}$  and at least one process of  $Q_2$  terminates  $WR_{Q_2}$ . Hence the following corollary.

**Corollary 1** *Let two sets  $Q_1$  and  $Q_2$  such that  $Q_1 \cap Q_2 = \emptyset$ . Then, no process of  $Q_1$  terminates  $WR_{Q_1}$  or no process of  $Q_2$  terminates  $WR_{Q_2}$  (or both).*

## References

- [1] Attiya H., Efficient and Robust Sharing of Memory in Message-passing Systems. *Journal of Algorithms*, 34(1):109-127, 2000.
- [2] Attiya H., Bar-Noy A. and Dolev D., Sharing Memory Robustly in Message Passing Systems. *Journal of the ACM*, 42(1):121-132, 1995.
- [3] Attiya H. and Welch J., Distributed Computing: Fundamentals, Simulations and Advanced Topics, (2d Edition), Wiley-Interscience, 414 pages, 2004.
- [4] Chandra T. and Toueg S., Unreliable Failure Detectors for Reliable Distributed Systems. *Journal of the ACM*, 43(2):225-267, 1996.
- [5] Delporte-Gallet C., Fauconnier H. and Guerraoui R., Shared memory *vs* Message Passing. *Tech Report IC/2003/77*, EPFL, Lausanne, December 2003.
- [6] Delporte-Gallet C., Fauconnier H., Guerraoui R., Hadzilacos V., Kouznetsov P. and Toueg S., The Weakest Failure Detectors to Solve Certain Fundamental Problems in Distributed Computing. *Proc. 23th ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC'04)*, ACM Press, pp. 338-346, 2004.
- [7] Delporte-Gallet C., Fauconnier H., Guerraoui R. and Tielmann A., The Weakest Failure Detector for Message Passing Set-Agreement. *Proc. 22th Int'l Symposium on Distributed Computing (DISC'08)*, Springer-Verlag LNCS #5218, pp. 109-120, 2008.
- [8] Friedman R., Mostefaoui A. and Raynal M., Asynchronous Bounded Lifetime Failure Detectors. *Information Processing Letters*, 94(2):85-91, 2005.
- [9] Gifford D.K., Weighted Voting for Replicated Data. *Proc. 7th ACM Symposium on Operating System Principles (SOSP'79)*, ACM Press, pp. 150-172, 1979.
- [10] Herlihy M.P. and Wing J.L., Linearizability: a Correctness Condition for Concurrent Objects. *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems*, 12(3):463-492, 1990.
- [11] Lamport L., On Interprocess communication. Part I: Formalism. Part II: Algorithms. *Distributed Computing*, 1-2(2):87-103, 1986.
- [12] Lynch N.A., Distributed Algorithms. *Morgan Kaufmann Pub.*, San Francisco (CA), 872 pages, 1996.