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**Abstract**

A population protocol can be viewed as a sequence of pairwise interactions of \(n\) agents (nodes). During one interaction, two agents selected uniformly at random update their states by applying a specified deterministic transition function. In a long run, the whole system should stabilize at the correct output property. The main performance objectives in designing population protocols are small number of states per agent and fast stabilization time.

We present a fast population protocol for the exact-majority problem, which uses \(\Theta(\log n)\) states (per agent) and stabilizes in \(O(\log^{5/3} n)\) parallel time (i.e., in \(O(n \log^{5/3} n)\) interactions) in expectation and with high probability. Alistarh *et al.* [SODA 2018] showed that any exact-majority protocol which stabilizes in expected \(O(n^{1-\epsilon})\) parallel time, for any constant \(\epsilon > 0\), requires \(\Omega(\log n)\) states. They also showed an \(O(\log^2 n)\)-time protocol with \(O(\log n)\) states, the currently fastest exact-majority protocol with polylogarithmic number of states. The standard design framework for majority protocols is based on \(O(\log n)\) phases and requires that all nodes are well synchronized within each phase, leading naturally to upper bounds of the order of at least \(\log^2 n\) because of \(\Theta(\log n)\) synchronization time per phase. We show how this framework can be tightened with *weak synchronization* to break the \(O(\log^2 n)\) upper bound of previous protocols.
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1 Introduction

We consider population protocols \[4\] for exact-majority voting. The underlying computation system consists of a population of \(n\) anonymous (i.e. identical) agents, or nodes, and a scheduler which keeps selecting pairs of nodes for interaction. A population protocol specifies how two nodes update their states when they interact. The computation is a (perpetual) sequence of interactions between pairs of nodes. The objective is for the whole system to eventually stabilize in configurations which have the output property defined by the considered problem. In the general case, the nodes can be connected according to a specified graph \(G = (V, E)\) and two nodes can interact only if they are joined by an edge. Following the scenario considered in most previous work on population protocols, we assume the complete communication graph and the random uniform scheduler. That is, each pair of (distinct) nodes has equal probability to be selected for interaction in any step and each selection is independent of the previous interactions.

The model of population protocols was proposed in Angluin et al. \[4\] and has subsequently been extensively studied to establish its computational power and to design efficient solutions for fundamental tasks in distributed computing such as various types of consensus-reaching voting. The survey from Aspnes and Ruppert \[6\] includes examples of population protocols, early computational results and variants of the model. The main design objectives for population protocols are small number of states and fast stabilization time. The original definition of the model assumes that the agents are copies of the same finite-state automaton, so the number of states (per node) is constant. This requirement has been later relaxed by allowing the number of states to increase (slowly) with the population size, to study trade-offs between the memory requirements and the run times.

The (two-opinion) exact-majority voting is one of the basic settings of consensus voting \[3\] \[4\] \[5\]. Initially each node is in one of two distinct states \(q_A\) and \(q_B\), which represent two distinct opinions (or votes) \(A\) and \(B\), with \(a_0\) nodes holding opinion \(A\) (starting in the state \(q_A\)) and \(b_0\) nodes holding opinion \(B\). We assume that \(a_0 \neq b_0\) and denote the initial imbalance between the two opinions by \(\epsilon = |a_0 - b_0|/n \geq 1/n\). The desired output property is that all nodes have the opinion of the initial majority. An exact majority protocol should guarantee that the correct answer is reached, even if the difference between \(a_0\) and \(b_0\) is only 1 (cf. \[3\]). In contrast, approximate majority would require correct answer only if the initial imbalance is sufficiently large. In this paper, when we refer to “majority” (protocol, or voting, or problem) we always mean the exact-majority notion.

We will now give further formalization of a population protocol and its time complexity. Let \(S\) denote the set of states, which can grow with the size \(n\) of the population (but keeping it low remains one of our objectives). Let \(q(v, t) \in S\) denote the state of a node \(v \in V\) at step \(t\) (that is, after \(t\) individual interactions). Two interacting nodes change their states according to a common deterministic transition function \(\delta : S \times S \to S \times S\). A population protocol has also an output function \(\gamma : S \to \Gamma\), which is used to specify the desired output property of the computation. For majority voting, \(\gamma : S \to \{A, B\}\), which means that a node in a state \(q \in S\) assumes that \(\gamma(q)\) is the majority opinion. The system is in an (output) correct configuration at a step \(t\), if for each \(v \in V\), \(\gamma(q(v, t))\) is the initial majority opinion. We consider undirected individual communications, that is, the two interacting nodes are not designated as initiator and responder, so the transition functions must be symmetric. Thus if \(\delta(q', q'') = (r', r'')\), then \(\delta(q'', q') = (r'', r')\), implying, for example, that \(\delta(q, q) = (r, r)\).

We say that the system is in a stable configuration, if no node will ever again change its output. The computation continues (since it is perpetual) and nodes may continue updating
their states, but if a node changes from a state $q$ to another state $q'$, then the output $\gamma(q')$ is the same as $\gamma(q)$. Thus a majority protocol is in a correct stable configuration if all nodes output the correct majority opinion and will do so in all possible subsequent configurations.

Two main types of output guarantee categorize population protocols as either *always correct*, if they reach the correct stable configuration with probability 1, or *w.h.p. correct*. A protocol of the latter type reaches a correct stable configuration *w.h.p.* allowing that with some low but positive probability an incorrect stable configuration is reached or the computation does not stabilize at all.

The notion of the time complexity of population protocols which has been used recently to derive lower bounds on the number of states \cite{11,2}, and the notion which we use also in this paper, is the *stabilization time* $T_S$ defined as the first round when the system enters a correct stable configuration. \footnote{A property $P(n)$, e.g. that a given protocol reaches a stable correct configuration, holds *w.h.p. (with high probability)*, if it holds with probability at least $1 - n^{-\alpha}$, where constant $\alpha > 0$ can be made arbitrarily large by changing the constant parameters in $P(n)$ (e.g. the constant parameters of a protocol).} We follow the common convention of defining the *parallel time* as the number of interactions divided by $n$. Equivalently, we group the interactions in rounds of length $n$, called also *parallel steps*, and take the number of rounds as the measure of time. In our analysis we also use the term *period*, which we define as a sequence of $n$ consecutive interactions, but not necessarily aligned with rounds.

The main result of this paper is a majority protocol with stabilization time $O(\log^{2-\delta} n)$ *w.h.p.* and in expectation, for some constant $\delta > 0$ (here specifically $\delta = 1/3$), while using logarithmically many states. According to \cite{2} this number of states is asymptotically optimal for protocols with $\mathbb{E}(T_S) = O(n^{1-\epsilon})$, and to the best of our knowledge this is the first result that offers stabilization in time $O(\log^{2-\Omega(1)} n)$ with poly-logarithmic state space.

### 1.1 Previous work on population protocols for the majority problem

Draief and Vojnović \cite{11} and Mertzios *et al.* \cite{16} analyzed two similar four-state majority protocols. Both protocols are based on the idea that the two opinions have weak versions $a$ and $b$ in addition to the main strong versions $A$ and $B$. The strong opinions are viewed as tokens moving around the graph. Initially each node $v$ has a strong opinion $A$ or $B$, and during the computation it has always one of the opinions $a$, $b$, $A$ or $B$ (so is in one of these four states). The strong opinions have dual purpose. Firstly, two interacting opposite strong opinions cancel each other and change into weak opinions. Such pairwise canceling ensures that the difference between the number of strong opinions $A$ and $B$ does not change throughout the computation (remaining equal to $a_0 - b_0$) and eventually all strong opinions of the initial minority are canceled out. Secondly, the surviving strong opinions keep moving around the graph, converting the weak opposite opinions.

Mertzios *et al.* \cite{16} call their protocol the 4-state ambassador protocol (the strong opinions are ambassadors) and prove the expected stabilization time $O(n^5)$ for any graph and $O((n \log n)/|a_0 - b_0|)$ for the complete graph. Draief and Vojnović \cite{11} call their 4-state protocol the binary interval consensus, viewing it as a special case of the interval consensus protocol of Bénézit *et al.* \cite{7}, and analyze it in the continuous-time model. For the uniform edge rates (the continuous setting which is roughly equivalent to our setting of one random interaction per one time unit) they show that the expected stabilization time for the complete graph is at most $2n(\log n + 1)/|a_0 - b_0|$. They also derive bounds on the expected stabilization

\footnote{Some previous papers (e.g. \cite{11,10}) refer to this stabilization time as the convergence time.}
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The appealing aspect of the four-state majority protocols is their simplicity and the constant-size local memory, but the downside is polynomially slow stabilization if the initial imbalance is small. The stabilization time decreases if the initial imbalance increases, so the performance would be improved if there was a way of boosting the initial imbalance. Alistarh et al. [3] achieved such boosting by multiplying all initial strong opinions by the integer parameter \( r \geq 2 \). The nodes keep the count of the number of strong opinions they currently hold. When eventually all strong opinions of the initial minority are canceled, \( |a_0 - b_0| r \) strong opinions of the initial majority remain in the system. This speeds up both the canceling of strong opinions and the converting of weak opinions of the initial minority, but the price is the increased number of states. Refining this idea, Alistarh et al. [4] obtained a majority protocol which has the stabilization time \( O(\log^3 n) \) w.h.p. and in expectation and uses \( O(\log^2 n) \) states.

A suite of polylogarithmic-time population protocols for various functions, including the exact majority, was proposed by Angluin et al. [1]. Their protocols are w.h.p. correct and, more significantly, require a unique leader to synchronize the progress of the computation. Their majority protocol w.h.p. reaches a correct stable configuration within \( O(\log^2 n) \) time (with the remaining low probability, it either needs more time to reach the correct output or it stabilizes with an incorrect output) and requires only a constant number of states, but the presence of the leader node is crucial.

The protocols developed in [5] introduced the idea of alternating cancellations and duplications, which has been frequently used in subsequent majority protocols and forms also the basis of our new protocol. This idea has the following interpretation within the framework of canceling strong opinions. The canceling stops when it is guaranteed that w.h.p. the number of remaining strong opinions is less than \( \delta n \), for some small constant \( \delta < 1/2 \). Now the remaining strong opinions duplicate: if a node with a strong opinion interacts with a node which does not hold a strong opinion, then both nodes get the same strong opinion. This duplicating stops when it is guaranteed, again w.h.p., that all initial strong opinions have been duplicated. One phase of (partial) cancellations followed by (complete) duplications takes w.h.p. \( O(\log n) \) time, and \( O(\log n) \) repetitions of this phase increases the difference between the numbers of strong opinions \( A \) and \( B \) to \( \Theta(n) \). With such large imbalance between strong opinions, w.h.p. within additional \( O(\log n) \) time the minority opinion is completely eliminated and the majority opinion is propagated to all nodes.

Bilke et al. [10] showed that the cancellation-duplication framework from [5] can be implemented without a leader if the agents have enough states to count their interactions. They obtained a majority protocol which has stabilization time \( O(\log^2 n) \) w.h.p. and in expectation, and uses \( O(\log^2 n) \) states. Berenbrink et al. [9] considered population protocols for the plurality voting, which generalizes the majority voting to \( k \geq 2 \) opinions. Using the methodology introduced earlier for load balancing [18], they generalized the previous results on majority protocols by working with multiple opinions and arbitrary graphs, showing also only \( O(\log n) \) time w.h.p. for the case of complete graphs and \( k = 2 \). Their protocol, however, requires a polynomial number of states and \( \Omega(n/\text{polylog } n) \) initial advantage of the most common opinion to achieve \( O(\text{polylog } n) \) time. Recently Alistarh et al. [2] have shown that any majority protocol which has expected stabilization time of \( O(n^{1-\epsilon}) \), where \( \epsilon \) is any positive constant, and satisfies technical conditions of monotonicity and output dominance, requires \( \Omega(\log n) \) states. They have also presented a protocol which uses only \( \Theta(\log n) \) states and has stabilization time \( O(\log^2 n) \) w.h.p. and in expectation.

The lower and upper bounds shown in Alistarh et al. [2] raised the following questions.
Can exact majority be computed in poly-logarithmic time with \( o(\log n) \) states, if the time complexity is measured in some other natural and relevant way than the time till (correct) stabilization? Can exact majority be computed in \( o(\log^2 n) \) time with poly-logarithmic states? (The protocol in [2] and all earlier exact majority protocols which use poly-logarithmic number of states have time complexity at least of the order of \( \log^2 n \).) For a random (infinite) sequence \( \omega \) of interaction pairs, let \( T_C = T_C(\omega) \) denote the convergence time, defined as the first round when (at some interaction during this round) the system enters a correct configuration (all nodes correctly output the majority opinion) and remains in correct configurations in all subsequent interactions (of this sequence \( \omega \)). Clearly \( T_C \leq T_S \), since reaching a correct stable configuration implies that whatever the future interactions may be, the system will always remain in correct configurations.

Very recently Kosowski and Uznański [15] and Berenbrink et al. [8] have shown that the convergence time \( T_C \) can be poly-logarithmic while using \( o(\log n) \) states. In [15] the authors design a programming framework and accompanying compilation schemes that provide a simple way of achieving protocols (including majority) which are \( w.h.p. \) correct, use \( O(1) \) states and converge in expected poly-logarithmic time. They can make their protocols always-correct at the expense of having to use \( O(\log \log n) \) states per node, while keeping poly-logarithmic time, or increasing time to \( O(n') \), while keeping a constant bound on the number of states. In [8] the authors design an always-correct majority protocol which converges \( w.h.p. \) in \( O(\log^2 n / \log s) \) time and uses \( \Theta(s + \log \log n) \) states and an always-correct majority protocol which stabilizes \( w.h.p. \) in \( O(\log^2 n / \log s) \) time and uses \( O(s \cdot \log n / \log s) \) states, where parameter \( s \in [2, n] \).

The recent population protocols for majority voting often use similar technical tools (mainly the same efficient constructions of phase clocks) as protocols for another fundamental problem of leader election. There are, however, notable differences in computational difficulty of both problems, so advances in one problem do not readily imply progress with the other problem. For example, leader election admits always-correct protocols with poly-logarithmically fast stabilization and only \( \Theta(\log \log n) \) states (the lower bound here is only \( \Omega(\log \log n) \) [3]). There are some general ideas, recently explored in [13], which indicate that in leader election expected run times of order significantly better than \( \log^2 n \) can be achieved (though the \( w.h.p. \) time would remain \( \Theta(\log^2 n) \)). Those ideas, however, are specific for leader election and not applicable to majority voting.

1.2 Our contributions

We present a majority population protocol with stabilization time \( O(\log^{5/3} n) \) \( w.h.p. \) and in expectation, using asymptotically optimal \( O(\log n) \) states. This is the first state-space optimal protocol for majority with stabilization time \( O(\log^{2-\Omega(1)} n) \). In fact, to the best of our knowledge, there is no other majority protocol with \( O(\polylog n) \) states and time \( O(\log^{2-\Omega(1)} n) \), even for the weaker notions of the convergence time or \( w.h.p. \)-correctness.

All known fast majority population protocols using a polylogarithmic number of states are based in some way on the idea of a sequence of \( \Omega(\log n) \) canceling-duplicating (or canceling-doubling) phases, each of length \( \Omega(\log n) \) (first introduced in [15]), synchronizing the nodes across phase boundaries. In our new protocol we still use the canceling-doubling framework (as explained in Section 2) but with shorter phases of length \( \log^{1-\Omega(1)} n \) each, at the expense of loosing the synchronization. We note that all existing protocols known to us working within the canceling-doubling framework cease to function properly with such short phases. Not only can we no longer guarantee a synchronized transition across phase boundaries (and in order to obtain the correct answer one must not allow opposite opinions from different
phases to cancel each other), but we do not even have the guarantee that every node will be activated at all during a phase (in fact, we know some will not). The existing protocols require each node to be activated at least once (actually at least logarithmically many times) during each phase. Our main technical contributions are mechanisms to deal with nodes advancing too slowly or too quickly through the short phases, that is, nodes which are not in sync with the bulk. We believe that some algorithmic and analytical ideas used for this may be of independent interest.

2 Exact majority: the general idea of canceling-doubling phases, and a protocol with $O(\log^2 n)$ time and $\Theta(\log^2 n)$ states

We view the $A/B$ votes as tokens, which can have different ages and values (magnitudes). Initially each node has one token of type $A$ or $B$, with age 0 and value 1. Throughout the computation, each node either has one token or is empty. In the following we say that two tokens meet if their corresponding nodes interact.

- When two opposite tokens (one $A$ and the other $B$) of the same value meet, then they cancel each other and the nodes become empty. Such an interaction is called canceling.
- When a token of type $X \in \{A, B\}$ and age $g$ interacts with an empty node, then this token splits into two tokens, each of type $X$, age $g + 1$ and half the value, and each of the two involved nodes takes one token. We refer to such splitting of a token also as duplicating or doubling.

Thus the age $g$ of a token is equal to the number of times it has undergone splitting; its value is equal to $1/2^g$. Note that any sequence of canceling and splitting interactions preserves the difference between the sum of the values of all $A$ and $B$ tokens. This difference is always equal to the initial imbalance. The primary objective is to eliminate all minority tokens. When only majority tokens are left in the system, the majority opinion can be propagated to all nodes w.h.p. within additional $O(n \log n)$ interactions via a broadcast process. The final standard process of propagating the outcome will be omitted from our descriptions and analysis. That is, from now on we assume that the objective is to eliminate the minority tokens.

We first, in this section, describe the $O(\log^2 n)$-step $O(\log^2 n)$-state Majority protocol presented in [10]. Then we propose two new protocols, both with a runtime of $O(\log^{5/3} n)$ steps: FastMajority1 with $\Theta(\log^2 n)$ states (described and analyzed in Sections 3 and 4) and FastMajority2 with $\Theta(\log n)$ states (outlined in Section 5). Further details of our protocols, including pseudocodes and detailed proofs, are given in Appendix.

The structure of the $O(\log^2 n)$-step Majority protocol will provide a useful reference in explanations of the computation and the analysis of the faster protocols. From the node’s local point of view, the computation of the Majority protocol consists of at most $\log n + 2$ phases and each phase consists of at most $C \log n$ interactions, where $C$ is a suitably large constant. Each node keeps track of the number of phases and steps (interactions) within the current phase, and maintains further information which indicates the progress of computation. More precisely, each node $v$ keeps the following data, which require $\Theta(\log^2 n)$ states.

- $v.token \in \{A, B, \emptyset\}$ – the type of token held by $v$. If $v.token = \emptyset$ then the node is empty.
- $v.phase \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots, \log n + 2\}$ – the counter of phases.
- $v.phase\_step \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots, (C \log n) - 1\}$ – the counter of steps in the current phase.
- Boolean flags, which are initially false and indicate the following status when set to true:
- \( v.\text{doubled} \) – \( v \) has a token which has already doubled in the current phase;
- \( v.\text{done} \) – the node has made the decision on the final output;
- \( v.\text{fail} \) – the protocol has failed because of some inconsistencies.

If a node \( v \) is in neither of the two special states \( \text{done} \) and \( \text{fail} \), then we say that \( v \) is in a normal state: \( v.\text{normal} \equiv \neg(v.\text{done} \lor v.\text{fail}) \). A node \( v \) is in Phase \( i \) if \( v.\text{phase} = i \). If \( v \) is in Phase \( i \) and is not empty, then the age of the token at \( v \) is either \( i \) if not \( v.\text{doubled} \) (the token has not doubled yet in this phase) or \( i + 1 \) if \( v.\text{doubled} \). Thus the phase of a token (the phase of the node where the token is) and the flag \( \text{doubled} \) indicate the age of this token.

Throughout the whole computation, the pair \((v.\text{phase},v.\text{phase}\_\text{step})\) can be regarded as the (combined) interaction counter \( v.\text{time} \in \{0,1,2,\ldots,2C\log^2 n\} \) of node \( v \). This counter is incremented by 1 at the end of each interaction. Thus, for example, if \( v.\text{phase}\_\text{step} \) is equal to 0 after such an increment, then node \( v \) has just completed a phase.

Each phase is divided into five parts defined below, where \( c \) is a constant discussed later.

- The second part is the canceling stage and the fourth part is the doubling stage, each consisting of \(((C - 3c)/2)\log n \) steps. If two interacting nodes are in the canceling stage of the same phase and have opposite tokens, then the tokens cancel out. If two interacting nodes are in the doubling stage of the same phase, one of them has a token which has not doubled yet in this phase and the other is empty, then this is a doubling interaction.
- The beginning, the middle and the final parts of a phase are buffer zones, consisting of \( c\log n \) steps each. The purpose of these parts is to ensure that the nodes progress through the current phase in a synchronized way.

If nodes were simply incrementing their step counters by 1 at each interaction, then those counters would start diverging too much for the canceling-doubling process to work correctly. An important aspect of the Majority protocol, as well as our new faster protocols, is the following mechanism for keeping the nodes sufficiently synchronized. When two interacting nodes are in different phases, then the node in the lower phase jumps up to (that is, sets its step counter to) the beginning of the next phase. The Majority protocol relies on this synchronization mechanism in the high probability case when all nodes are in two adjacent parts of a phase (that is, either in two consecutive parts of the same phase, or in the final part of one phase and the beginning part of the next phase.) In this case the process of pulling all nodes up to the next phase follows the pattern of broadcast. The node, or nodes, which have reached the beginning of the next phase by way of normal one-step increments broadcast the message “if you are not yet in the same phase as I am, then jump up to the next phase.” By the time the broadcast is completed (that is, by the time when the message has reached all nodes), all nodes are together in the next phase. It can be shown that there is a constant \( \beta \) such that \( \text{w.h.p.} \) the broadcast completes in \( \beta n \log n \) random pairwise interactions (see, for example [3]; other papers may refer to this process as epidemic spreading or rumor spreading).

The constant \( c \) in the definition of the parts of a phase is suitably smaller than the constant \( C \), but sufficiently large to guarantee the following two conditions: (a) the broadcast from a given node to all other nodes completes \( \text{w.h.p.} \) within \( (c/5)n \log n \) interactions; and (b) for a sequence of \( (C/2)n \log n \) consecutive interactions, \( \text{w.h.p.} \) for each node \( v \) and each \( 0 < t \leq (C/2)n \log n \), the number of times \( v \) is selected for interaction within the first \( t \) interactions differs from the expectation (which is equal to \( 2t/n \)) by at most \( (c/5) \log n \). Condition (a) is used when the nodes reaching the end of the current phase \( i \) initiate broadcast to “pull up” the nodes lagging behind. Condition (a) implies that after \( (c/5)n \log n \) interactions, \( \text{w.h.p.} \) all nodes are in the next phase. Using Condition (b) with
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t = (c/5)n \log n, we can also claim that w.h.p. at this point all nodes are within the first
(3/5)c \log n steps of the next phase (all nodes are in the next phase and no node interacted
more than the expected (2/5)c \log n plus (1/5)c \log n times). Finally Condition (b) applied to
all (c/5)n \log n \leq t \leq (C/2)n \log n implies that w.h.p. the differences between the individual
counts of node interactions do not diverge by more than c \log n throughout this phase. We
set c = C^{3/4} and take C large enough so that c \leq C/9 (to have at least 3c \log n steps in the
canceling and doubling stages) and both Conditions (a) and (b) hold. This way we achieve
the following synchronized progress of nodes through a phase: w.h.p. all nodes are in the
same part of the same phase before they start moving on to the next part. Moreover, also
w.h.p., for each canceling or doubling stage there is a sequence of consecutive \Theta(n \log n)
interactions when all nodes remain in this stage and each of them is involved in at least
c \log n interactions.

Thus throughout the computation of the Majority protocol, w.h.p. all nodes are in two
adjacent parts of a phase. In particular, w.h.p. the canceling and doubling activities of
the nodes are separated. This separation ensures that the cancellation of tokens creates a
sufficient number of empty nodes to accommodate new tokens generated by token splitting
in the subsequent doubling stage. If two interacting nodes are not in the same or adjacent
parts of a phase (a low, but positive, probability), then their local times (step counters)
are considered inconsistent and both nodes enter the special fail state. The details of the
Majority protocol are given in pseudocode in Algorithms 1 and 2.

From a global point of view, w.h.p. each new phase \(p\) starts with all nodes in normal states
in the beginning of this phase. We say that this phase completes successfully if all nodes are
in normal states in the beginning part of the next phase \(p + 1\). At this point all tokens have
the same value \(1/2^{p+1}\), and the difference between the numbers of opposite tokens is equal
to \(2^{p+1}|a_0 - b_0|\). The computation w.h.p. keeps successfully completing consecutive phases,
each phase halving the value of tokens and doubling the difference between \(A\) tokens and
\(B\) tokens, until the critical phase \(p_c\), which is the first phase \(0 \leq p_c \leq \log n - 1\) when the
difference between the numbers of opposite tokens is

\[2^{p_c}|a_0 - b_0| > \frac{n}{3}.\tag{1}\]

The significance of the critical phase is that the large difference between the numbers of
opposite tokens means that w.h.p. all minority tokens will be eliminated in this phase, if they
have not been eliminated yet in previous phases. More specifically, at the end of phase \(p_c\),
w.h.p. only tokens of the majority opinion are left and each of these tokens has value either
\(1/2^{p_c+1}\), if the token has split in this phase, or \(1/2^{p_c}\), otherwise. If at least one token has
value \(1/2^{p_c}\), then this token has failed to double during this phase and assumes that the
computation has completed. Such a node enters the done state and broadcasts its (majority)
opinion to all other nodes. In this case phase \(p_c\) is the final phase.

If at the end of the critical phase all tokens have value \(1/2^{p_c+1}\), then no node knows
yet that all minority tokens have been eliminated, so the computation proceeds to the next
phase \(p_c + 1\). Phase \(p_c + 1\) will be the final phase, since it will start with more than \((2/3)n\)
tokens and all of them of the same type, so at least one token will fail to double and will
assume that the computation has completed and will enter the done state. The condition
that a token has failed to double is taken as indication that w.h.p. all tokens of opposite type
have been eliminated. Some tokens may still double in the final phase and enter the next
phase (receiving later the message that the computation has completed) but w.h.p. no node
reaches the end of phase \(p_c + 2 \leq \log n + 1\). Thus the done state is reached w.h.p. within
\(O(\log^2 n)\) parallel time.
The computation may fail w.l.p. when the step counters of two interacting nodes are not consistent, or a node reaches phase $\log n + 2$, or two nodes enter the done state with opposite type tokens. Whenever a node realizes that any of these low probability events has occurred, it enters the fail state and broadcasts this state to all other nodes. (The standard broadcast of done and fail states is not included in the pseudocodes.)

It is shown in [10] that the Majority protocol stabilizes, either in the correct all-done configuration or in the all-fail configuration, within $O(\log^2 n)$ time w.h.p. and in expectation. The standard technique of combining a fast protocol, which w.l.p. may fail, with a slow but always-correct backup protocol gives an extended Majority protocol, which requires $\Theta(\log^2 n)$ states per node and computes the exact majority within $O(\log^2 n)$ time w.h.p. and in expectation. For the slow always-correct protocol take the four-state majority protocol, run both the fast and the slow protocols in parallel and make the nodes in the fail state adopt the outcome of the slow protocol. The slow protocol runs in expected polynomial time, say in $O(n^3)$ time, but its outcome is used only with low probability of $O(n^{-a})$, so it contributes only $O(1)$ to the overall expected time.

We omit the details of using a slow backup protocol (see, for example, [2, 10]), and assume that the objective of a canceling-doubling protocol is to use a small number of states $s$, to compute the majority quickly w.h.p., say within a time bound $T'(n)$, and to have also low expected time of reaching the correct all-done configuration or the all-fail configuration, say within a bound $T''(n)$. If the bounds $T'(n)$ and $T''(n)$ are of the same order $O(T(n))$, then we get a corollary that the majority can be computed with $O(s)$ states in $O(T(n))$ time w.h.p. and in expectation.

### 3 Exact majority in $O(\log^{5/3} n)$ time with $\Theta(\log^2 n)$ states

To improve on the $O(\log^2 n)$ time of the Majority protocol, we shorten the length of a phase to $\Theta(\log^{1-a} n)$, where $a = 1/3$. The new FastMajority1 protocol runs in $O(\log^{1-a} n) \times O(\log n) = O(\log^{5/3} n)$ time and requires $\Theta(\log^2 n)$ states per node. We will show in Section 5 that the number of states can be reduced to asymptotically optimal $\Theta(\log n)$. We keep the term $a$ in the description and the analysis of our fast majority protocols to simplify notation and to make it easier to trace where a larger value of $a$ would break the proofs.

Phases of sub-logarithmic length are too short to ensure that w.h.p. all tokens progress through the phases synchronously and keep up with required canceling and doubling, as they did in the Majority protocol. In the FastMajority1 protocol, we have a small but w.h.p. positive number of out-of-sync tokens, which move to the next phase either too early or too late (with respect to the expectation) or simply do not succeed with splitting within a short phase. Such tokens stop contributing to the regular dynamics of canceling and doubling. The general idea of our solution is to group $\log^a n$ consecutive phases (a total of $\Theta(\log n)$ steps) into an epoch, to attach further $\Theta(\log n)$ steps at the end of each epoch to enable the out-of-sync tokens to reach the age required at the end of this epoch, and to synchronize all nodes by the broadcast process at the boundaries of epochs. When analyzing the progress of tokens through the phases of the same epoch, we consider separately the tokens which remain synchronized and the out-of-sync tokens.

We now proceed to the details of the FastMajority1 protocol. Each epoch consists of $2C \log n$ steps, where $C$ is a suitably large constant, and is divided into two equal-length parts. The first part is a sequence of $\log^a n$ canceling-doubling phases, each of length $C \log^{1-a} n$.

---

4 w.l.p. = with low probability = means that the opposite event happens w.h.p.
The purpose of the second part is to give sufficient time to out-of-sync tokens so that \( w.h.p. \) they all complete all splitting required for this epoch. Each node \( v \) maintains the following data, which can be stored using \( \Theta(\log^2 n) \) states. For simplicity of notation, we assume that expressions like \( \log^a n \) and \( C \log^{1-a} n \) have integer values if they refer to an index (or a number) of phases or steps.

- \( v.\text{token} \in \{A, B, \emptyset\} \) — type of token held by \( v \).
- \( v.\text{epoch} \in \{0, 1, \ldots, \log^{1-a} n + 2\} \) — the counter of epochs.
- \( v.\text{age\_in\_epoch} \in \{0, 1, \ldots, \log^a n\} \) — the age of the token at \( v \) (if \( v \) has a token) with respect to the beginning of the current epoch. If \( v.\text{token} \) is \( A \) or \( B \), then the age of this token is \( g = v.\text{epoch} \cdot \log^a n + v.\text{age\_in\_epoch} \) and the value of this token is \( 1/2^g \).
- \( v.\text{epoch\_part} \in \{0, 1\} \) — each epoch consists of two parts, each part has \( C \log n \) steps. The first part, when \( v.\text{epoch\_part} = 0 \), is divided into \( \log^a n \) canceling-doubling phases.
- \( v.\text{phase} \in \{0, 1, \ldots, (\log^a n) - 1\} \) — counter of phases in the first part of the current epoch.
- \( v.\text{phase\_step} \in \{0, 1, \ldots, (C \log^{1-a} n) - 1\} \) — counter of steps (interactions) in the current phase.
- Boolean flags indicating the status of the node, all set initially to \( false \):
  - \( v.\text{doubled}, v.\text{done}, v.\text{fail} \) — as in the \texttt{Majority} protocol;
  - \( v.\text{out\_of\_sync} \) — \( v \) has a token which no longer follows the expected progress through the phases of the current epoch;
  - \( v.\text{additional\_epoch} \) — the computation is in the additional epoch of \( 3 \log^a n \) phases, with each of these phases consisting now of \( \Theta(\log n) \) steps.

We say that a node \( v \) is in epoch \( j \) if \( v.\text{epoch} = j \), and in phase \( i \) (of the current epoch) if \( v.\text{phase} = i \). We view the triplet \( (v.\text{epoch\_part}, v.\text{phase}, v.\text{phase\_step}) \) as the (combined) counter \( v.\text{epoch\_step} \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots, (2C \log n) - 1\} \) of steps in the current epoch, and the pair \( (v.\text{epoch}, v.\text{epoch\_step}) \) as the counter \( v.\text{time} \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots, 2C \log^{2-a} n + O(\log n)\} \) of the steps of the whole protocol. If a node \( v \) is not in any of the special states \texttt{out\_of\_sync}, \texttt{additional\_epoch}, \texttt{done} or \texttt{fail}, then we say that \( v \) is in a \texttt{normal state}:

\[
\neg (v.\text{out\_of\_sync} \lor v.\text{additional\_epoch} \lor v.\text{done} \lor v.\text{fail}).
\]

A normal token is a token in a normal node. Each phase is split evenly into the canceling stage (the first \( (C/2) \log^{1-a} n \) steps of the phase) and the doubling stage (the remaining \( (C/2) \log^{1-a} n \) steps).

The vast majority of the tokens are normal tokens progressing through the phases of the current epoch in a synchronized fashion. These tokens are at the same time in the beginning part of the same phase \( j \) and have the same age \( j \) (w.r.t. the end of the epoch). They first try to cancel out with tokens of the same age but opposite type during the canceling stage, and if they survive, then they split during the subsequent doubling stage. At some later time most of the tokens will still be normal, but in the beginning part of the next phase \( j + 1 \) and having age \( j + 1 \). Thus the age of a normal token (w.r.t. the beginning of the current epoch) is equal to its phase, if the token has not split yet in this phase, or to its phase plus 1, if the token has split (this is recorded by setting the flag \texttt{doubled}).

As in the \texttt{Majority} protocol, we separate the canceling and the doubling activities to ensure that the canceling of tokens creates first a sufficient number of empty nodes to accommodate the new tokens obtained later from splitting. Unlike in the \texttt{Majority} protocol, the \texttt{FastMajority1} protocol does not have the buffer zones within a phase. Such zones would not be helpful in the context of shorter sublogarithmic phases when anyway we cannot guarantee that \( w.h.p. \) all nodes progress through a phase in a synchronized way.
A token which has failed to split in one of the phases of the current epoch becomes an out-of-sync token (the out_of_sync flag is set). Such a token no longer follows the regular canceling-double phasing of the epoch, but instead tries cascading splitting to breakup into tokens of age \( \log^a n \) (relative to the beginning of the epoch) as expected by the end of this epoch. An out-of-sync token does not attempt canceling out because there would be only relatively few opposite tokens of the same value, so small chance to meet them (too small to make a difference in the analysis). The tokens obtained from splitting out-of-sync tokens inherit the out-of-sync status. A token drops the out-of-sync status if it is in the second part of the epoch and has reached the age \( \log^a n \). (Alternatively, out-of-sync tokens could switch back to the normal status as soon as their age coincides again with their phase, but this would complicate the analysis.) An out-of-sync node is a node with an out-of-sync token. While each normal node and token is in a specific phase of the first part of an epoch or is in work is needed. A node which has failed to reach the required age by the end of the current epoch would complicate the analysis.) An epoch of epoch \( j \) the end of the two previous epochs. (All nodes have to know their tokens from the beginning initialization of the additional epoch, the nodes keep track of the tokens they have had at this final part of the computation follows closely the mechanism at the boundaries of phases in the Appendix. The pseudocodes do not include the details of the additional epoch, since it is not possible to synchronize the nodes at the boundaries of phases.)

When the system completes the final epoch, the task of determining the majority opinion is not fully achieved yet. In contrast to the Majority protocol where on the completion of the final phase w.h.p. only majority tokens are left, in the FastMajority1 protocol there may still be a small number of minority tokens at the end of the final epoch, so some further work is needed. A node which has failed to reach the required age by the end of the current epoch, identifying that way that this is the final epoch, enters the additional_epoch state and propagates this state through the system to trigger an additional epoch of \( \Theta(\log^a n) \) phases. More precisely, the additional epoch consists of at most \( 3 \log^a n \) phases corresponding to epochs \( j_f - 1 \) (if \( j_f > 0 \), \( j_f \) and \( j_f + 1 \), and each phase has now \( \Theta(\log n) \) steps. W.h.p. these phases include the critical phase \( p_c \) and the phase \( p_c + 1 \), defined by \([1]\). The computation of the additional epoch is as in the Majority protocol, taking \( O(\log^{1.5+n}) \) time to reach the correct all-done configuration w.h.p. or the all-fail configuration w.l.p.

Two interacting nodes first check the consistency of their time counters (the counters of interactions) and switch to fail states, if the difference between the counters is greater than \((1/4)C \log n \). If the counters are consistent but the nodes are in different epochs (so one in the end of an epoch, while the other in the beginning of the next epoch), then the node in the lower epoch jumps up to the beginning of the next epoch. This is the synchronization mechanism at the boundaries of epochs, analogous to the synchronization by broadcast at the boundaries of phases in the Majority protocol. In the FastMajority1 protocol, however, it is not possible to synchronize the nodes at the boundaries of (short) phases.

For details of the FastMajority1 protocol, see the pseudocodes given in Algorithms \( [\text{W} \text{O}] \) in the Appendix. The pseudocodes do not include the details of the additional epoch, since this final part of the computation follows closely the Majority protocol. To enable the initialization of the additional epoch, the nodes keep track of the tokens they have had at the end of the two previous epochs. (All nodes have to know their tokens from the beginning of epoch \( j_f - 1 \), but there may be nodes which have already progressed to epoch \( j_f + 1 \)
when they are notified that epoch $j_f$ is the final one.) The additional epoch does not need additional states since it can (re-)use the existing states.

4 Analysis of the $\text{FastMajority1}$ protocol

Ideally, we would like that $w.h.p.$ all tokens progress through the phases of the current epoch in a synchronized way, that is, all tokens are roughly in the same part of the same phase, as in the $\text{Majority}$ protocol. This would mean that $w.h.p.$ at some (global) time all nodes are in the beginning part of the same phase, ensuring that all tokens have the same value $x$, and at some later point all nodes are in the end part of this phase and all surviving tokens have value $x/2$. This ideal behavior is achieved by the $\text{Majority}$ protocol at the cost of having $\Theta(\log n)$-step phases. As discussed in Section 2, the logarithmic length of a phase gives also sufficient time to synchronize $w.h.p.$ the local times of all nodes at the end of a phase so that they all end up together in the beginning part of the next phase.

Now, with phases having only $\Theta(\log^{1-a} n)$ steps, we face the following two difficulties in the analysis. Firstly, while a good number of tokens split during such a shorter phase, $w.h.p.$ there are also some tokens which do not split. Secondly, phases of length $o(\log n)$ are too short to keep the local times of the nodes synchronized. We can show again that a good number of nodes proceed in synchronized manner, but $w.h.p.$ there are nodes falling behind or rushing ahead and our analysis has to account for them.

Counting the phases across the epochs, we define the critical phase $p_c$ as in (1). Similarly as in the $O(\log^2 n)$-time $\text{Majority}$ protocol, the computation proceeds through the phases moving from epoch to epoch until the critical phase $p_c$. Then the computation gets stuck on this phase or on the next phase $p_c + 1$. Some tokens do not split in that final phase or in any subsequent phase of the current epoch because there are not enough empty nodes to accommodate new tokens. Almost all minority tokens have been eliminated, so the creation of empty nodes by cancellations of opposite tokens has all but stopped. This is the final epoch $j_f$ and the nodes which do not split to the value required at the end of this epoch trigger the additional epoch of $O(\log^a n)$ phases, each having $\Theta(\log n)$ steps. The additional epoch is needed because we do not have a high-probability guarantee that all minority tokens are eliminated by the end of the final epoch. The small number of remaining minority tokens may have various values which are inconsistent with the values of the majority tokens, so further cancellations of tokens might not be possible. The additional epoch includes the phases of the three consecutive epochs $j_f - 1, j_f$ and $j_f + 1$ to ensure that $w.h.p.$ both phases $p_c$ and $p_c + 1$ are included. Phase $p_c$ can be as early as the last phase in epoch $j_f - 1$ and phase $p_c + 1$ can be as late as the first phase in epoch $j_f + 1$.

The following conditions describe the regular configuration of the whole system at the beginning of epoch $j$, and the corresponding Lemma 1 summarizes the progress of the computation through this epoch. Recall that the $\text{FastMajority1}$ protocol is parameterized by a suitably large constant $C > 1$ and our analysis refers also to another smaller constant $c = C^{3/4}$. We refer to the first (resp. the last) $c \log^{1-a} n$ steps of a phase or a stage as the beginning (resp. the end) part of this phase or stage. The (global) time steps count the number of interactions of the whole system.

$\text{EpochInvariant}(j)$:
1. At least $n(1 - 1/2^\alpha \log^a n)$ nodes are in normal states, are in epoch $j$, and their $\text{epoch\_step}$ counters are at most $c \log^a n$.
2. For each remaining node $u$,
a. $u$ is in a normal state in epoch $j - 1$ and $u.epoch\_step \geq (3/2)C\log n$ (that is, $u$ is in the last quarter of epoch $j - 1$), or
b. $u$ is in a normal or out-of-sync state in epoch $j$ and $u.epoch\_step \leq 4c\log n$.

Lemma 1. Consider an arbitrary epoch $j \geq 0$ such that phase $p_c$ belongs to an epoch $j' \geq j$ and assume that at some (global) step $t$ the condition EpochInvariant($j$) holds.

1. If phase $p_c$ does not belong to epoch $j$ (that is, phase $p_c$ is in a later epoch $j' > j$), then w.h.p. there is a step $\bar{t} \leq t + 2Cu\log n$ when the condition EpochInvariant($j + 1$) holds.
2. If both phases $p_c$ and $p_c + 1$ belong to epoch $j$, then w.h.p. there is a step $\bar{t} \leq t + 2Cu\log n$ when 

(*): nodes is completing epoch $j$ and enters the additional_epoch state (because it has a token which has not split to the value required at the end of this epoch); and all other nodes are in normal or out-of-sync states in the second part of epoch $j$ or the first part of epoch $j + 1$.
3. Otherwise, that is, if phase $p_c$ is the last phase in epoch $j$ (and $p_c + 1$ is the first phase in epoch $j + 1$), then w.h.p. either there is a step $\bar{t} \leq t + 2Cu\log n$ when the above condition (*) holds at the end of epoch $j$ holds, or all nodes eventually progress to epoch $j + 1$ and there is a step $\bar{t} \leq t + 3C\log n$ when the condition analogous to (*) but for the end of epoch $j + 1$ holds.

The condition PhaseInvariant1($j, i$) given below describes the regular configuration of the whole system at the beginning of phase $0 \leq i \leq \log_a n$ in epoch $j \geq 0$. We note that if the last phase in an epoch is phase $\log_a n - 1$ and the condition PhaseInvariant1($j, \log_a n$) refers in fact to the beginning of the second part of the epoch. A normal token in the beginning phase $i$ in epoch $j$ has (absolute) value $1/2^{i\log_a n + 1}$ and relative values $1, 2, 1/2^i$ and $2^{\log_a n - i}$ w.r.t. (the beginning of) this phase, the end of this phase, the beginning of this epoch and the end of this epoch, respectively. It may also be helpful to recall that for a given node $v$, phase $i$ starts at $v$’s epoch step $C_i \log_2 n$. Observe that EpochInvariant($j$) implies PhaseInvariant1($j, 0$).

PhaseInvariant1($j, i$):

1. The set $W$ of nodes which are normal and in the beginning part of phase $i$ in epoch $j$ has size at least $n(1 - (i + 1)/2^{\log_a n})$. That is, a node $v$ is in $W$ if, and only if, $v.normal$ is true, $v.phase\_step \leq c\log_2 n$, $v.epoch = j$, and either $v.epoch\_part = 0$ and $v.phase = i$, if $i < \log_2 n$, or $v.epoch\_part = 1$ and $v.phase = 0$, if $i = \log_2 n$.
2. Let $U = V \setminus W$ denote the set of the remaining nodes.
   a. For each $u \in U$:
      i. $u$ is a normal node in epoch $j - 1$, $u.epoch\_step \geq (3/2)C\log n$ and $i < (c/C)\log_2 n$; or $u$ is in a normal or out-of-sync state in epoch $j$ and $|u.epoch\_step - C_i \log_2 n| \leq 4c\log n$.
   b. The total value of the tokens in $U$ w.r.t. the end of epoch $j$ is at most $n(i + 1)/2^{\log_a n}$.

For an epoch $0 \leq j$ and a phase $0 \leq i < \log_a n$ in this epoch, let $p(j, i) = j \log_a n + i$ denote the global index of this phase. We show that w.h.p. the condition PhaseInvariant1($j, i$) holds at the beginning of each phase $p(j, i) \leq p_c$.

Lemma 2. For arbitrary $0 \leq j$ and $0 \leq i \leq \log_a n - 1$ such that $p(j, i) \leq p_c$, assume that the condition EpochInvariant($j$) holds at some (global) time step $t$ and the condition PhaseInvariant1($j, i$) holds at the step $t_c = t + (i + 1)(C/2)n\log_2 n$. Then the following conditions hold, where $t_{i+1} = t + (i + 1)(C/2)n\log_2 n$.
1. If $p(j, i) < p_c$, then w.h.p. at step $t_{i+1}$ the condition PhaseInvariant1($j, i + 1$) holds.
Population protocols for exact majority

2. If \( p(j, i) = p_c \), then w.h.p. at step \( t_{i+1} \) the total value, w.r.t. the end of epoch \( j \), of the minority-opinion tokens is \( O(n \log n/2^{2 \log^e n}) \).

Lemma 2 is proven by analyzing the cancellations and duplications of tokens in one phase. Lemma 1 is proven by applying inductively Lemma 2. In turn, Theorem 3 below, which states the \( O(\log^{5/3} n) \) bound on the completion time of the FastMajority1 protocol, can be proven by applying inductively Lemma 1.

\textbf{Theorem 3.} The FastMajority1 protocol uses \( \Theta(\log^2 n) \) states, computes the majority w.h.p. within \( O(\log^{5/3} n) \) time and reaches the correct all-done configuration or the all-fail configuration within the expected \( O(\log^{5/3} n) \) time.

\textbf{Corollary 4.} The majority can be computed with \( \Theta(\log^2 n) \) states in \( O(\log^{5/3} n) \) time w.h.p. and in expectation.

We give now some further explanations of the structure of our analysis, referring the reader to Appendix for the formal proofs. Lemma 5 and Claim 6 show the synchronization of the nodes which we rely on in our analysis. Lemma 5 is used in the proof of Lemma 1 where we analyze the progress of the computation through one epoch consisting of \( O(n \log n) \) interactions \( (O(n \log n) \) parallel steps\). Lemma 5 can be easily proven using first Chernoff bounds for a single node and then the union bound over all nodes. The proof of Claim 6 is considerably more involved, but we need this claim in the proof of Lemma 2, where we look at the finer scale of individual phases and have to consider intervals of \( \Theta(\log^{1-a} n) \) interactions of a given node. This claim shows, in essence, that most of the nodes stay tightly synchronized when they move from phase to phase through one epoch. The epoch_step counters of these nodes stay in a range of size at most \( c \log^{1-a} n \).

\textbf{Lemma 5.} For each sufficiently large constant \( C \) and for \( c = C^{3/4} \), during a sequence of \( t \leq 2Cn \log n \) interactions, w.h.p., the number of interactions of each node is within \( c \log n \) from the expectation of \( 2t/n \) interactions.

\textbf{Claim 6.} For a fixed \( j \geq 0 \), assume that EpochInvariant(\( j \)) holds at a time step \( t \). Let \( W \subseteq V \) be the set of \( n(1 - o(1)) \) nodes which satisfy at this step the condition \( j \) of EpochInvariant(\( j \)) (that is, \( W \) is the set of nodes which are in epoch \( j \) with epoch_step counters at most \( c \log^a n \)). Then at an arbitrary but fixed time step \( t < t' \leq t + (3/4)Cn \log n \), w.h.p. all nodes in \( W \) are in epoch \( j \) and all but \( O(n/2^{b \log^e n}) \) of them have their epoch_step counters within \( c/2 \cdot \log^{1-a} n \) from \( 2(t' - t)/n \).

Lemmas 7 and 8 describe the performance of the broadcast process in the population-protocol model. Lemma 7 has been used before and is proven, for example, in [10]. Lemma 8 is a more detailed view at the dynamics of the broadcast process, which we need it in the context of Lemma 1 to show that the synchronization at the end epoch gives w.h.p. EpochInvariant(j + 1).

\textbf{Lemma 7.} For each sufficiently large constant \( c \), the broadcast completes w.h.p. within \( cn \log n \) interactions.

\textbf{Lemma 8.} Let \( b \) be any constant in \( (0, 1) \) and let \( c_1 \) and \( c \) be sufficiently large constants. Consider the broadcast process and let \( t_1 \) be the first step when \( n/2^{b \log^e n} \) nodes are already informed and \( t_2 = t_1 + c_1 n \log^b n \). Then the following conditions hold.

\footnote{w.h.p.(\( \beta \)) – with probability at least \( 1 - n^{-\alpha(\beta)} \), where \( \alpha(\beta) \) grows to infinity with increasing \( \beta \).}
1. With probability at least $1 - n^{-\omega(1)}$, $n = O(n/2^6 \log^8 n)$ nodes receive the message for the first time within the $c_1 n \log^b n$ consecutive interactions $\{t_1 + 1, t_1 + 2, \ldots, t_2\}$.

2. W.h.p., $t_1 \leq c n \log n$ and no node interacts more than $4c \log n$ times within interval $[1, t_2]$.

3. With probability at least $1 - n^{-\omega(1)}$, there are $n = O(n/2^6 \log^8 n)$ nodes which interact within interval $[t_1 + 1, t_2]$ at least $c_1 \log^b n$ times but not more than $3c_1 \log^b n$ times.

5. **Reducing the number of states to $\Theta(\log n)$**

Our FastMajority1 protocol described in Section 3 requires $\Theta(\log^2 n)$ states per node. Using the idea underlying the constructions of leaderless phase clocks in [14] and [2], we now modify FastMajority1 into the protocol FastMajority2, which still works in $O(\log^{5/3} n)$ time but has only the asymptotically optimal $\Theta(\log n)$ states per node. The general idea is to separate from the whole population a subset of clock nodes, whose only functionality is to keep the time for the whole system. The other nodes work on computing the desired output and check whether they should progress to the next stage of the computation when they interact with clock nodes. We note that while we use similar general structure and terminology as in [2], the meaning of some terms and the dynamics of our phase clock are somewhat different. A notable difference is that in [2] the clock nodes keep their time counters synchronized on the basis of the power of two choices in load balancing: when two nodes meet, only the lower counter is incremented. In contrast, we keep the updates of time counters as in the Majority and FastMajority1 protocols: both interacting clock nodes increment their time counters, with the exception that the slower node is pulled up to the next $\Theta(\log n)$-length phase or epoch, if the faster node is already there.

The nodes in the FastMajority2 protocol are partitioned into two sets with $\Theta(n)$ nodes in each set. One set consists of worker nodes, which may carry opinion tokens and work through canceling-doubling phases to establish the majority opinion. These nodes maintain only information whether they carry any token, and if so, then the value of the token (equivalently, the age of the token, that is, the number of times this token has been split). Each worker node has also a constant number of flags which indicate the current activities of the node (for example, whether it is in the canceling stage of a phase), but it does not maintain a detailed step counter. The other set consists of clock nodes, which maintain their detailed epoch-step counters, counting interactions with other clock nodes modulo $2^C \log n$, for a suitably large constant $C$, and synchronizing with other clocks by the broadcast mechanism at the end of epoch. Thus the clock nodes update their counters in the same way as all nodes would update their counters in the FastMajority1 protocol, so Lemma 8 applies with some obvious adaptation (the number of all nodes $n$ changes to the number of clock nodes $n_c = \Theta(n)$ and only interactions between clock nodes are counted).

The worker nodes interact with each other in a similar way as in FastMajority1, but now to progress orderly through the computation, they rely on the relatively tight synchronization of clock nodes. A worker node $v$ advances to the next part of the current phase (or to the next phase, or the next epoch), when it interacts with a clock node whose clock indicates that $v$ should progress. There is also the third type of nodes, the terminator nodes, which will appear later in the computation. A worker or clock node becomes a terminator node when it enters a done or fail state. The meaning and function of these special states are

6 Note that using the phase clock from [12] would not result in fewer states being needed for our protocol.
as in protocols Majority and FastMajority1. In the Appendix we show how to convert a majority input instance into the required initial workers-clocks configuration.

Referring to the state space of the FastMajority1 protocol, in the FastMajority2 protocol each worker node $v$ maintains data fields $v.token$, $v.epoch$ and $v.age\_in\_epoch$ to carry information about tokens and their ages, and a constant number of flags to keep track of the status of the node and its progress through the current epoch and the current phase. These include the status flags from the FastMajority1 protocol $v.doubled$, $v.out\_of\_sync$ and $v.additional\_epoch$, and flags indicating the progress: the $v.epoch\_part$ flag from FastMajority1 and a new (multi-valued) flag $stage \in \{beginning, canceling, middle, doubling, ending\}$. The clock nodes maintain the $epoch\_step$ counters. The nodes have constant number of further flags, for example to support the initialization to workers and clocks and the implementation of the additional epoch and the slow backup protocol. Thus in total each node has only $\Theta(\log n)$ states.

Further details of FastMajority2, including pseudocodes and outline of the proof of Theorem 9 which summarizes the performance of this protocol, are given in the Appendix.

▶ Theorem 9. The FastMajority2 protocol uses $\Theta(\log n)$ states, computes the exact majority w.h.p. within $O(\log^{5/3} n)$ parallel time and stabilizes (in the correct all-done configuration or in the all-fail configuration) within the expected $O(\log^{5/3} n)$ parallel time.

▶ Corollary 10. The exact majority can be computed with $\Theta(\log n)$ states in $O(\log^{5/3} n)$ parallel time w.h.p. and in expectation.
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A. Appendix

A.1 Pseudocodes for Section 2 – $O(\log^2 n)$-time Majority protocol

This section contains our pseudocodes left out from Section 2 for our Majority protocol.

**Algorithm 1:** Majority protocol – interaction of two nodes $v$ and $u$

```plaintext
1  if $v.\text{normal} \land u.\text{normal}$ then
2      if $\neg\text{Consistent}(v.\text{time}, u.\text{time})$ then $v.\text{fail}, u.\text{fail} \leftarrow \text{true};$
3      else
4          // $\text{Consistent}(v.\text{time}, u.\text{time}) \Rightarrow |v.\text{phase} - u.\text{phase}| \leq 1$
5          if $v.\text{phase} \neq u.\text{phase}$ then
6              let $v$ be the node in the higher phase, that is, $v.\text{phase} = u.\text{phase} + 1;$
7              // $u$ in the final part of a phase and $v$ in the next phase
8              $u.\text{phase}\_\text{step} \leftarrow (2C \log n) - 1;$  // $u$ moves to next phase at
9              $\text{NextStep}(u)$
10         else if $v.\text{phase} = u.\text{phase}$ then
11             if both $v$ and $u$ in the canceling stage and have opposite tokens then
12                $u.\text{token} \leftarrow \emptyset;\ v.\text{token} \leftarrow \emptyset$
13             else if $v$ and $u$ in the doubling stage, exactly one $x \in \{v, u\}$ has a token,
14                and that token hasn’t doubled yet ($\neg x.\text{doubled}$) then
15                let $v$ be the node with a token;
16                $u.\text{token} \leftarrow v.\text{token};\ v.\text{doubled}, u.\text{doubled} \leftarrow \text{true};$
17              for each $x \in \{u, v\}$ do  { $x.\text{time} \leftarrow x.\text{time} + 1;\ \text{NextStep}(x);$  }
18         else if $v.\text{phase} = u.\text{phase}$ then
19            for each $x \in \{v, u\}$ do  { $x.\text{time} \leftarrow x.\text{time} + 1;\ \text{NextStep}(x);$  }
20
```

**Algorithm 2:** Majority protocol - end of interaction, node $x$ progresses to the next step

```plaintext
1  $\text{NextStep}(x)$:
2  if $x.\text{phase} = \log n + 2$ then $x.\text{fail} \leftarrow \text{true};$
3  else if $(x.\text{token} \neq \emptyset \land x.\text{phase}\_\text{step} = 0)$ then
4      // the token at $x$ has completed a phase
5      if $x.\text{doubled}$ then
6          // everything’s OK: the token progresses normally
7          $x.\text{doubled} \leftarrow \text{false};$
8      else
9          // the token has failed to split in the last phase
10         $x.\text{done} \leftarrow \text{true};$
11```

A.2 Pseudocodes for Section 3 – protocol FastMajority1

This section contains our pseudocodes left out from Section 3 for our FastMajority1 protocol.

Algorithm 3: FastMajority1 protocol – interaction of two normal nodes v and u

1. if v.normal ∧ u.normal then
2.   if ¬Consistent(v.time, u.time) then v.fail, u.fail ← true;
3.   else
4.     if v.epoch ≠ u.epoch then
5.       let v be the node in the higher epoch, that is, v.epoch = u.epoch + 1;
6.       // u in the final part of an epoch and v in the next epoch
7.       u.epoch_step ← (2C log n) − 1;
8.     else if ((v.epoch_part = u.epoch_part = 0) ∧ (v.phase = u.phase)) then
9.       if both v and u in the canceling stage and have opposite tokens then
10.      u.token ← ∅; v.token ← ∅
11.     else if both v and u in the doubling stage and exactly one has a token then
12.      let v be the node with a token (the other case is symmetric);
13.      if ¬v.doubled then
14.        u.token ← v.token;
15.        u.age_in_epoch ← v.age_in_epoch; // = v.phase = u.phase
16.        v.doubled, u.doubled ← true;
17.     endif
18.     endif
19.     for each x ∈ {u, v} do { x.time ← x.time + 1; NextStep_normal(x); }
Algorithm 4: FastMajority1 protocol – interaction of an out-of-sync node

1. if $v.out\_of\_sync \lor u.out\_of\_sync$ then
   2. if $\neg\text{Consistent}(v.time, u.time)$ then $v.fail, u.fail \leftarrow \text{true}$;
   3. else
      4. if $v.epoch \neq u.epoch$ then
         5. let $v$ be the node in the higher epoch, that is, $v.epoch = u.epoch + 1$;
            // $u$ in the final part of an epoch and $v$ in the next epoch
         6. $u.epoch\_step \leftarrow (2C \log n) - 1$;
      7. else if $\neg(v.out\_of\_sync \land u.out\_of\_sync)$ then
         8. let $v$ be the node with an out-of-sync token;
            // split the $v$’s token
         9. $u.token \leftarrow v.token$;
            $u.out\_of\_sync \leftarrow \text{true}$;
         10. $v.age\_in\_epoch \leftarrow v.age\_in\_epoch + 1$;
            $u.age\_in\_epoch \leftarrow v.age\_in\_epoch$;
         11. if $v.age\_in\_epoch = \log^a n$ then
            12. for each $x \in \{u, v\}$ do if $x.epoch\_part = 1$ then $x.out\_of\_sync \leftarrow \text{false}$;
         13. NextStep\_outofsync($x$); else NextStep\_normal($x$);
      14. end
   15. for each $x \in \{u, v\}$ do $x.time \leftarrow x.time + 1$;
      16. if $x.out\_of\_sync$ then $\text{NextStep\_outofsync}(x)$; else $\text{NextStep\_normal}(x)$;
A.3 Proofs for Section 4 – protocol FastMajority1

For convenience we assume in the proofs that opinion $A$ is the majority opinion, that is, $a_0 > b_0$.

Proof of Lemma 1 We consider an epoch $j \geq 0$ such that phase $p_c$ belongs to this or a later epoch and assume that the condition $\text{EpochInvariant}(j)$ holds at a (global) step $t$.

Case 1: phase $p_c$ belongs to a later epoch $j' > j$.

Applying Lemma 2 inductively to phases $i = 0, 1, \ldots, \log^a n - 1$ of epoch $j$, we conclude that w.h.p. the condition $\text{PhaseInvariant}1(j, \log^a n)$ holds at step $t' = t + (C/2)n \log n$. (Using the definition of step $t_i$ from Lemma 2, $t' = t_i$, for $i = \log^a n$.)

Assume therefore that the condition $\text{PhaseInvariant}1(j, \log^a n)$ holds at step $t'$. Thus for each node $v \in V$, $v$ is in epoch $j$ and $|v.epoch\_step - C \log n| \leq 4c \log n$. Actually, for most of the nodes $v$, $0 \leq v.epoch\_step - C \log n \leq c \log^{1-a} n$ (from the condition of $\text{PhaseInvariant}1(j, \log^a n)$), but there may be a small number of nodes with their epoch\_step counters outside this range.

At step $t'$, the total value, w.r.t. the end of epoch $j$, of the tokens which are out-of-sync or in nodes with epoch\_step counters outside the interval $C \log n + [0, c \log^{1-a} n]$ is at most
\[ n \log n / 2^{2 \log^* n} \] (from the condition \[2\] of \textit{PhaseInvariant1}(j, \log^* n)). We first wait until the step \( t'' = t' + (5/2)c \log n \) to ensure that \( w.h.p. \) all nodes are in the second part of the epoch. Indeed, the conditions of the system at step \( t' \) and Lemma 5 applied to steps \( t, t + 1, \ldots, t' \) give that at step \( t'' \) \( w.h.p. \) all \textit{epoch_step} counters are within the interval \( C \log n + [0, 10c \log n] \).

At step \( t'' \) most of the tokens are normal, that is, their value is \( 1/2^{(j+1)\log^* n} \) as required at the end of epoch \( j \) (and at the beginning of the next epoch \( j + 1 \)). The \textit{out-of-sync} tokens have values larger than \( 1/2^{(j+1)\log^* n} \), but at most \( 1/2^{j\log^* n} \), and their total value is at most \( n \log n / 2^{2 \log^* n} \) w.r.t. the end of epoch \( j \). We view the set of \textit{out-of-sync} tokens as the set \( T \) of \textit{base tokens} of value \( 1/2^{(j+1)\log^* n} \), which are grouped into larger tokens. That is, an \textit{out-of-sync} token of value \( 1/2^{(j+1)\log^* n-i} \), for some \( 1 \leq i \leq \log^* n \), is a group of \( 2^i \) base tokens. The number of base tokens is at most \( n \log n / 2^{2 \log^* n} \). We consider an arbitrary base token \( b \) and show that \( w.h.p. \) this token interacts in steps \( t'', t'' + 1, \ldots, t''' = t + ((3/4)C + 3e) \log n \) with at least \( \log^* n \) empty nodes. This will imply that by the step \( t''' \) \( w.h.p. \) the base token \( b \) completely splits off from its initial larger token and becomes a separate individual token of value \( 1/2^{(j+1)\log^* n} \) (as required at the end of epoch \( j \)). (If the base token \( b \) is initially part of a token of value \( 1/2^{(j+1)\log^* n-i} \), for some \( 0 \leq i \leq \log^* n - 1 \), then it becomes a separate
Token $b$ interacts w.h.p. with at least $\log^a n$ empty nodes during the interval $[t''', t'']$ because $t''' - t'' \geq (C/4)n \log n$ and w.h.p. there are $n/10$ empty nodes at each step in this interval. This follows from Lemma 11 applied to the last phase of the epoch (phase log$^a n - 1$). This lemma implies that w.h.p. the cancellation stage of this phase reduces the number of normal tokens of value $1/2(j+1)\log^a n$ to at most $(4/10)n$, while the total value, w.r.t. to the end of the epoch, of the other tokens is $o(n)$. This means that w.h.p. during the interval $[t'', t''']$ the number of tokens stays w.h.p. below $(8/10 + o(1))n$, so the number of empty nodes is at least $n/10$. Thus at each step of this interval the probability that token $b$ interacts with an empty node or there are fewer than $n/10$ empty nodes is at least $2 \cdot (1/n) \cdot (1/10) = 5/n$. There are $t''' - t'' = (C/4 + c/2)n \log n$ steps in this interval, so the Chernoff bound [12] implies that for sufficiently large constant $C$, token $b$ interacts w.h.p. with at least $\log n$ empty nodes.

Summarizing what we have established so far, at step $t''' = t + ((3/4)C + 3c)n \log n$ w.h.p. all tokens are normal tokens of value $1/2^{(j+1)}\log^a n$. Moreover, since at step $t''$ w.h.p. all nodes are in epoch $j$ and their epoch_step counters are within the interval $C\log n + [0, 10c \log n]$, then at step $t'''$ w.h.p. all nodes are in epoch $j$ and their epoch_step counters are within the interval $(3/2)C\log n + [0, 12c \log n]$ (using Lemma 5). This implies that w.h.p. at some step $t'' \leq t''' + (1/4)Cn \log n$, the first node enters the next epoch $j + 1$ and initiates the broadcast that pulls up all nodes to epoch $j + 1$. We now use Lemma 6 with $b = a$ and $c_1 = c/3$ to conclude that w.h.p. the condition $\text{EpochInvariant}(j + 1)$ holds at some step $t'''' \leq t''' + 2cn \log n \leq t + (C + 5c)n \log n$. (This step $t''''$ is $t_2$ steps from the beginning of the broadcast, where $t_2$ is defined in Lemma 8)

**Case 2: both phases $p_c$ and $p_c + 1$ belong to epoch $j$.**

Let phase $p_c$ be phase $q$ of epoch $j$, for some $0 \leq q \leq \log^a n - 2$. Applying Lemma 2 inductively to phases $i = 0, 1, \ldots, q$, we conclude that at the step $t_{q+1} = t + (q + 1)(C/2)n \log^{1-a} n \leq t + (C/2)n \log n$ the total value, w.r.t. the end of epoch $j$, of the minority-opinion tokens is w.h.p. $O(n \log n/2^{2\log^a n}) = o(n)$. Thus the total value, w.r.t. the end of epoch $j$, of the tokens which can cancel out after the step $t_{q+1}$ is only $o(n)$. We also know (from the condition $\text{EpochInvariant}(j)$ at step $t$ and using Lemma 5) that w.h.p. at the step $t_{q+1}$ each node is in epoch $j$ or $j - 1$.

At step $t_{q+1}$, the total value, w.r.t. (the beginning of) phase $q$ of epoch $j$, of the majority-opinion tokens is at least $n/3$ (from the definition of phase $p_c$), so this total value is at least $(4/3)n$ w.r.t. to the end of phase $q + 1$ and hence also at least $(4/3)n$ w.r.t. to the end of epoch $j$. Since w.h.p. only $o(n)$ of this total can cancel out after step $t_{q+1}$, w.h.p. from step $t_{q+1}$ on the total value of the majority-opinion tokens remains at least $(4/3 - o(1))n$ (w.r.t. the end of epoch $j$). Thus w.h.p. not all tokens split by the end of epoch $j$ to the value required at the end of this epoch, or otherwise we would have tokens in epoch $j + 1$ of the total value (w.r.t. the beginning of epoch $j + 1$) at least $(4/3 - o(1))n$. This means that there must be out-of-sync tokens which reach the end of epoch $j$ and enter the additional_epoch state. It remains to provide a bound on the step when this happen for the first time.

W.h.p. at the step $t + (3/4)Cn \log n$ all nodes are in the second part of epoch $j$ (from the condition $\text{EpochInvariant}(j)$ at step $t$ and using Lemma 5) and by the step $t + (C + c + o(1))n \log n$ all nodes reach the end of epoch $j$. Indeed, since at step $t$ all but $o(n)$ nodes are
in epoch \( j \), while those remaining \( o(n) \) nodes are in epoch \( j - 1 \), the first node reaches the end of epoch \( j \) within \( (C + o(1))n \log n \) steps and then at most \( cn \log n \) further steps would take all nodes to the end of epoch \( j \) (Lemma 7). Thus for the step \( \hat{t} \) when the first out-of-sync token reaches the end of epoch \( j \), \( w.h.p.\ \ t + (3/4)Cn \log n \leq \hat{t} \leq t + (C + c + o(1))n \log n \).

**Case 3:** phases \( p_e \) is the last phase of epoch \( j \).

Phase \( p_e \) is the last phase \( q = \log^a n - 1 \) in epoch \( j \). Similarly to Case 2, we apply Lemma 2 inductively to phases \( i = 0, 1, \ldots, q \) to conclude that at the step \( t_{q+1} = t + (C/2)n \log n \) the total value, \( w.r.t. \) the end of epoch \( j \), of the minority-opinion tokens is \( w.h.p.\ \ O(n \log n/2^{2 \log^a n}) = o(n) \). The total value of the majority-opinion tokens, \( w.r.t. \) the end of epoch \( j \) or, equivalently, the end of phase \( p_e \), is at least \((2/3)n \) (from the definition of phase \( p_e \)). If the difference between the total value of the majority-opinion tokens and the minority-opinion tokens is greater than \( n \), then, similarly to Case 2, there will have to be an out-of-sync token reaching the end of epoch \( j \) and entering the \textit{additional} epoch state. This may also happen if this difference is less than \( n \) but too close to \( n \), so eventually too few empty nodes to allow sufficient chance for all tokens to split to the value required at the end of epoch \( j \). If there are out-of-sync tokens reaching the end of epoch \( j \), then, as in Case 2, \( w.h.p. \) the first out-of-sync token reaches the end of epoch \( j \) at a step \( \hat{t} \leq t + (C + c + o(1))n \log n \). If all tokens do split by the end of epoch \( j \) to the required value, then all nodes progress to the next epoch \( j + 1 \). The difference between the total value of the majority-opinion tokens and the minority-opinion tokens \( w.r.t. \) the end of epoch \( j + 1 \) is at least \((2/3)n \cdot 2^{\log^a n} > n \), so there must be an out-of-sync token which reaches the end of epoch \( j + 1 \) and enters the \textit{additional} epoch state. \( w.h.p. \) all nodes reach the end of this epoch by the step \( t + (2C + 2c + o(1))n \log n \). Thus \( w.h.p. \) there is a step \( \hat{t} \leq t + (2C + 2c + o(1))n \log n \) when the first out-of-sync node reaches the end of epoch \( j + 1 \) and enters the \textit{additional} epoch state.

**Proof of Lemma 2.** We consider first the case when \( p(j, i) < p_e \). That is, we consider a phase \( i \) of epoch \( j \) such that \( 2^{p(j, i)}|a_0 - b_0| \leq n/3 \), assume that \textit{EpochInvariant}(\( j \)) holds at a step \( t \) and \textit{PhaseInvariant1}(\( j, i \)) holds at step \( t_i = t + i(C/2)n \log \frac{1}{2}^a n \), and show that \( w.h.p. \) \textit{PhaseInvariant1}(\( j, i + 1 \)) holds at step \( t_{i+1} = t_i + (C/2)n \log \frac{1}{2}^a n \).

The assumptions of the lemma imply that at step \( t_i \) all tokens have values at most \( 1/2^j \log^a n \) and at least \( 1/2^{(j+1)} \log^a n \). Furthermore, the set \( W_i \) of nodes which are normal in the beginning part of phase \( i \) (in epoch \( j \)) has size at least \( n(1 - (i + 1)/2^{2 \log^a n}) \). (Set \( W_i \) is the set \( W \) defined in \textit{PhaseInvariant1}(\( j, i \)) at step \( t_i \).) All tokens in \( W_i \) have value \( 1/2^i(\log^a n)^{i+1} = 1/2^i(j, i) \). The total value, \( w.r.t. \) the end of epoch \( j \), of tokens in \( V \setminus W_i \) is at most \( n(i + 1)/2^{2 \log^a n} \).

In Lemma 11 we analyze cancellations of tokens in phase \( i \) by step \( t_i' = t_i + (C/4 - c/2)n \log \frac{1}{2}^a n \). In Lemma 13 we analyze doubling of tokens in this phase by step \( t''_i = t_i + (C/2 - c/2)n \log \frac{1}{2}^a n < t_{i+1} \). More precisely, in Lemma 11 we analyze cancellations of tokens in steps \( t_i, t_i+1, \ldots, t_i' \), when \( w.h.p. \) most of the nodes stay in the cancellation stage of phase \( i \). In Lemma 13 we analyze doubling of tokens in steps \( t''_i, t''_i + 1, \ldots, t''_i \), when \( w.h.p. \) most of the nodes stay in the doubling stage of phase \( i \).

Lemma 11 says that \( w.h.p. \) the token cancellations in steps \( t_i, t_i + 1, \ldots, t_i' \) result in at least \((6/10)n \) empty nodes at step \( t_i' \). Moreover, at step \( t_i' \), the set \( W' \) of nodes which are normal and in the end part of the cancellation stage of phase \( i \) has size \( w.h.p. \) at least
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\(n(1 - (i + 1 + o(1)) / 2^{2 \log^4 n})\), and the total value, w.r.t. the end of epoch \(j\), of tokens in \(U' = V \setminus W'\) is w.h.p. at most \(n(i + 1 + o(1)) / 2^{2 \log^4 n}\).

Lemma 13 assumes the state of the system which Lemma 11 guarantees w.h.p., and shows that w.h.p. by step \(t_i'\) most of the tokens have split to the value \(1 / 2^{p(j,i) + 1}\). More precisely, at step \(t_i'\), the set \(W''\) of nodes which are normal, in the end part of phase \(i\) and either empty or with tokens of value \(1 / 2^{p(j,i) + 1}\) has size w.h.p. at least \(n(1 - (i + 1 + o(1)) / 2^{2 \log^4 n})\).

The total value, w.r.t. the end of epoch \(j\), of the tokens in \(U'' = V \setminus W''\) is w.h.p. at most \(n(i + 1 + o(1)) / 2^{2 \log^4 n}\).

Let \(\bar{W} \subseteq W''\) be the set of nodes in \(W''\) which at step \(t_{i+1}\) are normal and in the beginning part of phase \(i + 1\). Claim 6 implies that w.h.p. \(|W'| \geq |W''| - O(n / 2^{6 \log^4 n}) \geq n(1 - (i + 2) / 2^{2 \log^4 n})\). Let \(W_{i+1}\) be the set defined in the condition 1 of PhaseInvariant1\((j, i + 1)\) at step \(t_{i+1}\). Observing that \(\bar{W} \subseteq W_{i+1}\), we conclude that w.h.p. the condition 1 of PhaseInvariant1\((j, i + 1)\) holds at step \(t_{i+1}\).

We consider now the tokens which are at step \(t_{i+1}\) in \(\bar{U} = V \setminus \bar{W} = U'' \cup (W'' \setminus \bar{W})\). These tokens originate from the tokens which were at step \(t_i'\) in \(U''\) or in \(W'' \setminus \bar{W}\). The total value, w.r.t. the end of epoch \(j\), of these tokens is therefore w.h.p. at most \(n(i + 1 + o(1)) / 2^{2 \log^4 n}\) (the contribution from the tokens in \(U''\)) plus \(2^{2 \log^4 n - 1} \cdot O(n / 2^{6 \log^4 n})\) (the contribution from the tokens in \(W'' \setminus \bar{W}\)). Thus the total value, w.r.t. the end of epoch \(j\), of the tokens which are at step \(t_{i+1}\) in \(\bar{U}\) is w.h.p. at most \(n(i + 2) / 2^{2 \log^4 n}\). Observing that \(V \setminus W_{i+1} \subseteq \bar{U}\), we conclude that w.h.p. the condition 2 of PhaseInvariant1\((j, i + 1)\) holds at step \(t_{i+1}\).

Now we show that at step \(t_{i+1}\) w.h.p. the condition 2 of PhaseInvariant1\((j, i + 1)\) holds as well. Let \(u \in \bar{V}\) be an arbitrary node. W.h.p. the number of interactions of node \(u\) in steps \(t_i, t_i + 1, \ldots, t_{i+1}\) differs from \((2(t_{i+1} - t)) / (n(1 + c(C) \log^4 n))\) by at most \(c \log n\) (from Lemma 5). At step \(t\), node \(u\) was either within its first \(3c \log n\) steps of epoch \(j\) or was a normal node in the final quarter of the previous epoch \(j - 1\). If the former, then w.h.p. at step \(t_{i+1}\), \(u.\text{epoch step}\) differs from \((i + 1)C \log^4 n\) by at most \(4c \log n\). If the latter, that is, if \(u\) was at step \(t\) a normal node in the final quarter of epoch \(j - 1\), then we consider two cases.

If \(t_{i+1} \geq t + cn \log n\) (equivalently, \(i + 1 \geq (c/C) \log^4 n\)), then w.h.p. node \(u\) enters epoch \(j\) at some step \(\tau\), where \(t \leq \tau \leq t + cn \log n\) (from Lemma 7), and the number of \(u\)’s interactions in steps \(\tau + 1, \tau + 2, \ldots, t_{i+1}\) is within \(c \log n\) from \(2(t_{i+1} - \tau) / (n(1 + c \log n))\) (from Lemma 5). Thus at step \(t_{i+1}\), \(u.\text{epoch step}\) differs from \(2(t_{i+1} - \tau) / (n \log n)\) by at most \(c \log n\), so it differs from \((i + 1)C \log^4 n = 2(t_{i+1} - t) / n\) by at most \(2(\tau - t) / n + c \log n \leq 3c \log n\). If \(t_{i+1} < t + cn \log n\) (that is, if \(i + 1 < (c/C) \log^4 n\)), then if node \(u\) enters epoch \(j\) by step \(t_{i+1}\), then it has w.h.p. at most \(2(t_{i+1} - t) / n + c \log n < 3c \log n\) interactions in this epoch, so \(u.\text{epoch step}\) differs from \((i + 1)C \log^4 n = 2(t_{i+1} - t) / n\) by at most \(3c \log n\).

Thus in all cases, w.h.p. at step \(t_{i+1}\) either node \(u\) is still a normal node in the final quarter of epoch \(j - 1\) and \(i + 1 < (c/C) \log^4 n\), or \(u\) is in epoch \(j\) and \(u.\text{epoch step} = (i + 1)C \log^4 n\) \leq 4c \log n\). By the union bound, w.h.p. the condition 2 of PhaseInvariant1\((j, i + 1)\) holds at step \(t_{i+1}\). (We note that the bounds on the epoch_step counters given in this condition are satisfied by all nodes since the bounds in the condition 1 are tighter.)

The second case of the lemma, that is, when phase \(p(j, i)\) is phase \(p_{c_i}\), is covered by Lemma 12. We analyze in this lemma token cancellations in phase \(p_{c_i}\) and show that at step \(t_i' = t_{i+1} + (C/4 - c/2) n \log^4 n < t_{i+1}\), w.h.p. the total value, w.r.t. the end of epoch \(j\), of the minority-opinion tokens is \(O(n \log n / 2^{2 \log^4 n})\).

**Proof of Claim 6** At each interaction two nodes are chosen uniformly at random. We consider the sequence of \(t' - t\) interactions at steps \(t, t + 1, \ldots, t' - 1\), which can be modeled by the balls-into-bins process placing randomly \(2(t' - t)\) balls in \(n\) bins (with bins corresponding
to nodes). There is a restriction that no two consecutive odd-even balls are placed in the same bin, since each interaction is between two distinct nodes. In this balls-into-bins process, the occupancy \( Z_k \) of bin \( k \) has the expected value \( E(Z_k) = 2(t' - t)/n \) and it can be shown using Chernoff bounds that for any constant \( \delta > 0 \),

\[
\Pr(|Z_k - 2(t' - t)/n| \geq \delta \log^{1-a} n) \leq \exp\left[-(\delta^2/(6C)) \cdot \log^a n\right].
\]

(2)

Indeed, \( Z_k = Z_k^{(1)} + \cdots + Z_k^{(t' - t)} \), where \( Z_k^{(\tau)} \) indicates whether any of the \( \tau \)-th pair of balls is placed in bin \( k \), and \( E(Z_k^{(\tau)}) = 2/n \). Denoting \( \mu = 2(t' - t)/n \), if \( \delta \log^{1-a} n \leq \mu \), then applying (10) and noting that \( \mu \leq (3/2)C \log n \) and \( a = 1/3 \), we have

\[
\Pr(|Z_k - \mu| \geq \delta \log^{1-a} n) \leq \exp\left\{\frac{\mu}{4} \cdot \left(\frac{\delta \log^{1-a} n}{\mu}\right)^2\right\} \leq \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{4} \cdot \delta^2 \log^{2-2a} n\right\}
= \exp\left\{-\left(\delta^2/(6C)\right) \cdot \log^a n\right\}.
\]

In the case when \( \delta \log^{1-a} n > \mu \), we apply (11) and get the bound \( \exp\left\{-\left(\delta/3\right) \log^{1-a} n\right\} \), which is smaller than the bound (2).

Inequality (3) with a sufficiently large \( \delta \) implies that the expectation of the number \( X \) of nodes with interaction counts within \( \delta \log^{1-a} n \) from \( 2(t' - t)/n \) (equivalently, the expectation of the number \( X \) of bins with such occupancies) is at least \( n(1 - 1/2^6 \log^a n) \). We show that \( X \) is concentrated around the expectation \( E(X) \), but the argument is not completely straightforward because the counts of interactions are not independent. To deal with these dependencies, we modify the balls-to-bins process so that any bin which reaches the load of \( \sqrt{n} \) balls is not considered in any subsequent selections of bins.

Let \( \tilde{Z}_k \) denote the occupancy of bin \( k \) in the modified process and let \( E \) denote the event that in the original process no bin receives more than \( \sqrt{n} \) balls. By coupling the modified process with the original process for as long as no load of a bin exceeds \( \sqrt{n} \), we have that \( Z_k \neq \tilde{Z}_k \) implies \( E \). Thus using (2) we obtain

\[
\Pr(|\tilde{Z}_k - 2(t' - t)/n| \geq \delta \log^{1-a} n) \leq \Pr(|Z_k - 2(t' - t)/n| \geq \delta \log^{1-a} n \text{ or } \overline{E})
\leq \Pr(|Z_k - 2(t' - t)/n| \geq \delta \log^{1-a} n) + \Pr(\overline{E})
\leq \exp\left\{-\left(\delta^2/(6C)\right) \cdot \log^a n\right\} + \exp\{-\Theta(\sqrt{n})\}
\leq 2^{-6 \log^a n},
\]

(3)

where the last inequality holds for sufficiently large \( \delta \). Therefore the expectation of the number \( \tilde{X} \) of bins in the modified process with load within \( \delta \log^{1-a} n \) from \( 2(t' - t)/n \) is at least \( n - n/2^6 \log^a n \).

We consider random variables \( \tilde{X}_k = E(\tilde{X} \mid \tilde{Z}_1, \ldots, \tilde{Z}_k) \), for \( k = 0, 1, \ldots, n \). The sequence \( (\tilde{X}_0, \tilde{X}_1, \ldots, \tilde{X}_n) \) is a Doob martingale with \( \tilde{X}_0 = E(\tilde{X}) \) and \( \tilde{X}_n = \tilde{X} \) (see, for example, [17]). For each \( 0 \leq k \leq n - 1 \) and any \( z', z'' \in \{0, 1, \ldots, \sqrt{n}\} \), we have

\[
|E(\tilde{X} \mid \tilde{Z}_1, \ldots, \tilde{Z}_k, \tilde{Z}_{k+1} = z') - E(\tilde{X} \mid \tilde{Z}_1, \ldots, \tilde{Z}_k, \tilde{Z}_{k+1} = z'')| \leq \sqrt{n} + 1,
\]

(4)

provided that the conditions in both expectations are feasible (that is, have positive probability). To see this, consider the following coupling of the generation of the two conditional variables above, that is the variable \( \tilde{X} \) under the condition that \( \tilde{Z}_1, \ldots, \tilde{Z}_k, \tilde{Z}_{k+1} = z' \) and the variable \( \tilde{X} \) under the condition that \( \tilde{Z}_1, \ldots, \tilde{Z}_k, \tilde{Z}_{k+1} = z'' \). Assuming \( z' > z'' \), first put \( Z_i \) balls in bin \( i \) for each \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, k \) and \( z'' \) balls in bin \( k + 1 \). Then split the remaining \( y \) balls into two groups of \( y - (z' - z'') \) balls and \( z' - z'' \) balls, distribute the balls from the first group randomly in bins \( k + 2, k + 3, \ldots, n \), observing the \( \sqrt{n} \) bound on the load of
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each bin, and assign (without putting in) the balls from the second group randomly to bins \( k + 2, k + 3, \ldots, n \), again observing the upper bound on the load of each bin. To get the value of the first variable, put the balls from the second group to the bins they were assigned to. To get the value of the second variable, put all balls from the second group to bin \( k + 1 \). The values of the two generated variables differ by at most \( z' - z'' + 1 \leq \sqrt{n} + 1 \).

Inequality \( 4 \) implies that the expectation \( E_{Z_{k+1}}(E(\tilde{X} \mid Z_1, \ldots, \tilde{Z}_k, \tilde{Z}_{k+1})) = \tilde{X}_k \) does not differ from \( E(\tilde{X} \mid Z_1, \ldots, \tilde{Z}_k, \tilde{Z}_{k+1}) = \tilde{X}_{k+1} \) by more than \( \sqrt{n} + 1 \). Thus for each \( 0 \leq k \leq n - 1, |\tilde{X}_{k+1} - \tilde{X}_k| \leq \sqrt{n} + 1 \), so the Azuma-Hoeffding inequality \( 13 \) gives

\[
\Pr(|\tilde{X} - E(\tilde{X})| \geq n/2^{6\log^* n}) \leq 2 \exp \left\{ -\frac{n^2}{2n^3/2^{12\log^* n}} \right\}.
\]

Since there is almost no difference between the original process and the modified process, we obtain the following bound on the probability that the number \( X \) of nodes with their interactions counts within \( \delta \log^{1-a} n \) from \( 2(t' - t)/n \) is less than \( n - 3n/2^{6\log^* n} \). Recall that both \( E(\tilde{X}) \) and \( E(\tilde{X}) \) are at least \( n - n/2^{6\log^* n} \).

\[
\Pr(X < n - 3n/2^{6\log^* n}) \leq \Pr(|X - E(X)| \geq 2n/2^{6\log^* n}) \leq \Pr(|\tilde{X} - E(\tilde{X})| + |\tilde{X} - X| + |E(\tilde{X}) - E(X)| \geq 2n/2^{6\log^* n}) \leq \Pr(|\tilde{X} - E(\tilde{X})| \geq n/2^{6\log^* n} \text{ or } X \neq \tilde{X}) \leq \Pr(|\tilde{X} - E(\tilde{X})| \geq n/2^{6\log^* n}) + \Pr(\overline{\mathcal{Z}}) \leq \exp\{-\Theta(\sqrt{n})\}. \tag{5}
\]

To conclude the proof of the claim, we note that provided that the local times of the nodes remain consistent (a high-probability event; see Lemma \( 5 \)), the epoch_step counter of each node in \( W \) with the number of interaction within \( \delta \log^{1-a} n \) from \( 2(t' - t)/n \) is within \( c \log^* n + \delta \log^{1-a} n \leq (c/2) \log^{1-a} n \) from \( 2(t' - t)/n \). For the last inequality and for \( 6 \) we take \( \delta \) satisfying \( 5C^{1/2} \leq \delta \leq c/3 \), which is possible for sufficiently large \( C \) and \( c = C^{3/4} \).

The proof of Lemma \( 2 \) uses the analysis of one cancellation stage (Lemma \( 11 \) for a phase \( p(i, t) < p_c \) and Lemma \( 12 \) for the phase \( p_c \)) and the analysis of the subsequent doubling stage (Lemma \( 13 \)).

\begin{lemma}
Consider epoch \( j \) and phase \( i \) such that \( p(j, i) < p_c \) and assume that the condition EpochInvariant\((j)\) holds at a (global) time step \( t \) and the condition PhaseInvariant\((i, j, t)\) holds at the step \( t_i \) (defined in Lemma \( 3 \)). That is, in particular, at step \( t_i \) the set \( W \) of nodes which are normal and in the beginning part, that is, within the first \( c \log^{1-a} n \) steps, of the cancellation stage of phase \( i \) in epoch \( j \) has size at least \( n(1 - (i + 1)/2^{2\log^* n}) \). Then w.h.p. at step \( t_i' = t_i + (C/4 - c/2)n \log^{1-a} n \) the following conditions hold.

1. The set \( W' \) of normal nodes in the end part (within the last \( c \log^{1-a} n \) steps) of this cancellation stage has size at least \( n(1 - (i + 1 + o(1))/2^{2\log^* n}) \).
2. The total value, w.r.t. the end of epoch \( j \), of the tokens in \( U' = V \setminus W' \) is at most \( n(i + 1 + o(1))/2^{2\log^* n} \).
3. There are at least \( (6/10)n \) empty nodes.
\end{lemma}

\textbf{Proof.} For the phase \( p(j, i) < p_c \), the difference between the total value of the \( A \) tokens and \( B \) tokens w.r.t. (the beginning of) this phase is \( 2^{p(i,j)}|a_0 - b_0| \leq n/3 \).

We consider the set \( W \) of the normal nodes which are at step \( t_i \) in the beginning of the cancellation stage of phase \( i \) (in epoch \( j \)) and the set \( \mathcal{T} \) of tokens in these nodes. All
tokens in $\mathcal{T}$ have value $1/2^{B(t_i^j)}$ and we analyze how they cancel out each other in steps $t_i, t_i + 1, \ldots, t_i'$. We assume first that tokens from $\mathcal{T}$ cancel out (and are removed from $\mathcal{T}$) when, and only when, two opposite-type tokens from $\mathcal{T}$ interact. We note that in the actual process, these two tokens might not cancel out, if one of them is already outside this cancellation stage, or one of them has canceled out earlier with a token not in $\mathcal{T}$. We view the sequence of steps $t_i, t_i + 1, \ldots, t_i'$ as a sequence of $(C/4 - c/2) \log^{1-\alpha} n$ periods, with each period consisting of $n$ interactions. We consider one of these periods, denote by $z$ the smaller of the count of $B$ tokens and the count of $A$ tokens in $\mathcal{T}$ at the beginning of this period, and show that if $z \geq n/40$, then w.h.p. at the end of the period the smaller of the count of $B$ tokens and the count of $A$ tokens in $\mathcal{T}$ is at most $(41/42)z$.

We call an interaction a success, if two tokens from $\mathcal{T}$ cancel out or the number of $B$ tokens in $\mathcal{T}$ or the number of $A$ tokens in $\mathcal{T}$ is already less than $(41/42)z$. Thus the probability that a given interaction in this period is a success is at least $2 \cdot \left(\frac{1}{41/42} \right)^2$, so the number of successes is at least $2 \cdot \left(\frac{1}{41/42} \right)^2 z \geq (2/42)z$ in expectation and at least $z/42$ w.h.p. (from the Chernoff bound $\ref{eq:chernoff}$). The event that there are at least $z/42$ successes implies that at least $z/42$ pairs of tokens in $\mathcal{T}$ have canceled out, so the smaller of the count of $B$ tokens and the count of $A$ tokens remaining in $\mathcal{T}$ at the end of the period is at most $(41/42)z$. Therefore w.h.p. after a sufficiently large constant number of periods, the smaller of the count of $B$ tokens and the count of $A$ tokens remaining in $\mathcal{T}$ is at most $n/40$.

An interaction of two opposite-type tokens from $\mathcal{T}$ in one of the steps $t_i, t_i + 1, \ldots, t_i'$ is not a cancellation, if one of the two tokens is already beyond this cancellation stage or it has canceled out earlier with a token of value $1/2^{B(t_i^j)}$ not in $\mathcal{T}$. Claim $\ref{claim:claim1}$ implies that w.h.p. the size of the set $W_0 \subseteq W$ of nodes in $W$ which move beyond this cancellation stage by step $t_i'$ is $O(n/2^{\log^a n})$, since the epoch step counters of these nodes at step $t_i'$ are greater than $(iC + C/2) \log^{1-\alpha} n = 2(t_i' - t)/n + (c/2) \log^{1-\alpha} n$. From the assumptions of the lemma (from the condition PhaseInvariant1($j, i$) at step $t_i$), the number of tokens of value $1/2^{B(t_i^j)}$ which appear in steps $t_i, t_i + 1, \ldots, t_i'$ but are not in $\mathcal{T}$ is at most $n(i+1)/2^{2\log^a n}$, since these tokens originate from tokens which were in $U = V \setminus W$ at step $t_i$. Thus w.h.p. the number $X_B$ of $B$-tokens or the number $X_A$ of $A$-tokens remaining in $\mathcal{T}$ at step $t_i'$ is at most $(1/40 + o(1))n$.

We bound now the total number of tokens at step $t_i'$. Let $\mathcal{F}$ denote the set of tokens at step $t_i'$ other than the tokens remaining in $\mathcal{T}$, and let $\mathcal{F}(q)$ and $\mathcal{F}_A(q)$ (resp. $\mathcal{F}_B(q)$) denote the total value of all tokens in $\mathcal{F}$ and the total value of all $A$ tokens (resp. all $B$ tokens) in $\mathcal{F}$ w.r.t. phase $q$ (of epoch $j$). All tokens in $\mathcal{F}$ originate from tokens which were at step $t_i$ in $U = V \setminus W$ or in $W_1$, so their total value $\mathcal{F}(\log^a n)$ w.r.t. the end of epoch $j$ is at most $n(i+1)/2^{2\log^a n}$ (from tokens in $U$ at step $t_i$, since PhaseInvariant1($j, i$) holds at step $t_i$) plus $2^{\log^a n} \cdot O(n/2^{2\log^a n})$ (from tokens in $W_1$ at step $t_i$; see Claim $\ref{claim:claim1}$). Thus

$$\mathcal{F}(\log^a n) \leq n(i+1 + o(1))/2^{2\log^a n} = o(n). \quad (6)$$

For the number $X_B$ of $B$-tokens in $\mathcal{T}$ at step $t_i'$, we have

$$X_B \leq X_B + \mathcal{F}_B(i) < X_A + \mathcal{F}_A(i) \leq X_A + \mathcal{F}_A(\log^a n),$$

where $X_B + \mathcal{F}_B(i)$ (resp. $X_A + \mathcal{F}_A(i)$) is the total value of $B$ tokens (resp. $A$ tokens) at step $t_i'$ and the inequality $X_B + \mathcal{F}_B(i) < X_A + \mathcal{F}_A(i)$ follows from $b_0 < a_0$. Thus at step $t_i'$, $X_B \leq X_A + o(n)$ and we showed earlier that $X_B \leq (1/40 + o(1))n$ or $X_A \leq (1/40 + o(1))n$, so in either case

$$X_B \leq (1/40 + o(1))n. \quad (7)$$
At step $t_i'$, the difference between the total value of $A$ tokens and $B$ tokens w.r.t. phase $i$ is equal to

$$\left( X_A + \mathcal{F}_A(i) \right) - \left( X_B + \mathcal{F}_B(i) \right) = 2p(j,i)\left| a_0 - b_0 \right| \leq \frac{n}{3}. \quad (8)$$

The total values on the left-hand side above are calculated for step $t_i'$, but the difference is invariant throughout the whole protocol. The inequality holds because we consider phase $p(j,i) < p_c$. Summarizing, the number of tokens at step $t_i'$ is w.h.p. at most $X_A + X_B + \mathcal{F}(\log^a n)$ and from (6)–(8),

$$X_A + X_B + \mathcal{F}(\log^a n) \leq \frac{n}{3} + 2X_B + \mathcal{F}_B(i) - \mathcal{F}_A(i) + \mathcal{F}(\log^a n) \leq \frac{n}{3} + 2X_B + 2\mathcal{F}(\log^a n) \leq \frac{4}{10}n.$$

Therefore there are at least $(6/10)n$ empty nodes at step $t_i'$; the claim 3 of the lemma.

Let $W_2 \subseteq W$ be the set of nodes in $W$ which at step $t_i'$ have not reached yet the end part of the cancellation stage. The tokens at step $t_i'$ which are not normal (that is, are out-of-sync) or not in the end part of the cancellation stage of phase $i$ originate from tokens which were in $U \cup W_1 \cup W_2$ at step $t_i$. W.r.t. the end of the epoch, the total value of the tokens originating from $U$ is at most $n(i+1)/2^{2\log^a n}$ (condition PhaseInvariant1($j,i$) at step $t_i$) and the total value of the tokens in $W_1 \cup W_2$ is at most $2\log^a n \cdot O(n/2^{6\log^a n})$ (from Claim 6). Thus the total value, w.r.t. the end of the epoch, of the tokens at step $t_i'$ which are not normal or not in the end part of the cancellation stage of phase $i$ is at most $n(i+1+o(1))/2^{2\log^a n}$; the claim 2 of the lemma.

The nodes which at step $t_i'$ are normal and in the end part of the cancellation stage of phase $i$ are all nodes other than (i) the nodes with tokens which are not normal or not in the end part of this cancellation stage, and (ii) the nodes without token and not in the end part of this cancellation stage. There are at most $n(i+1+o(1))/2^{2\log^a n}$ nodes of type (i) (from the conclusion 2 of the lemma) and at most $O(n/2^{6\log^a n})$ nodes of type (ii) (from Claim 6), implying the claim 1 of the lemma.

**Lemma 12.** Consider epoch $j$ and phase $i$ such that $p(j,i) = p_c$ and assume that the condition EpochInvariant($j$) holds at a (global) time step $t$ and the condition PhaseInvariant1($j,i$) holds at the step $t_i$ (defined in Lemma 3). Then w.h.p. at step $t_i' = t_i + (C/4 - c/2)n \log^{1-a} n$ the total value of the minority-opinion tokens w.r.t. the end of epoch $j$ is $O(n \log n/2^{2\log^a n})$.

**Proof.** The proof is similar to the proof of Lemma 11 and we use the same terminology as in that proof. In particular, we divide the time interval $[t_i, t_i']$ into periods of $n$ interactions and we refer to the terms $\mathcal{T}$, $z$, $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F}(q)$ defined in the proof of Lemma 11. Now, however, since the difference between the total value of the majority-opinion $A$ tokens and the minority-opinion $B$ tokens w.r.t. phase $i$ is at least $n/3$ (by the definition of phase $p_c$), the number of the $A$ tokens in $\mathcal{T}$ remains greater than the number of the $B$ tokens in $\mathcal{T}$ by at least $n/3 - o(n) \geq n/4$. Thus, considering one period of $n$ interactions, $z$ is now the number of $B$ tokens in $\mathcal{T}$ at the beginning of this period (since now guaranteed to be smaller than the number of the $A$ tokens in $\mathcal{T}$), and we show that if $z \geq n/2^{\log^a n}$, then w.h.p. the number of $B$ tokens in $\mathcal{T}$ is at most $(4/5)z$ at the end of the period.

The probability that a given interaction in the current period is a success (that is, a meeting of two opposite-type tokens from $\mathcal{T}$ or the number of $B$ tokens in $\mathcal{T}$ already smaller then $(4/5)z$) is at least $2 \cdot (4/5)z/n - 1/4 = (2/5)z/n$. This implies that the number of successes is at least $(2/5)z$ in expectation and at least $z/5$ w.h.p. (from the Chernoff bound (12)). The event that there are at least $z/5$ successes in this period implies that at least $z/5$ $B$-tokens in $\mathcal{T}$ have canceled out during this period, so at most $(4/5)z$-$B$ tokens remain in $\mathcal{T}$ at the
end of the period. Thus w.h.p. after $\Theta(\log^a n)$ periods, the number of $B$-tokens remaining in $T$ is at most $n^{2\Theta(\log^a n)}$.

As in the proof of Lemma 11 we might have overcounted the number of cancellations of $B$ tokens in $T$, but not more than by $O(n/2^{ \log^a n}) + n(i + 1)/2^{ \log^a n} = n(i + 1 + o(1))/2^{ \log^a n}$.

Therefore the total value of the $B$ tokens at step $t'_i$ w.r.t. the end of the epoch is w.h.p. at most

$$n(i + 1 + o(1))/2^{ \log^a n} \cdot 2^{ \log^a n} + F( \log^a n) = O(n \log n/2^{ \log^a n}).$$

Lemma 13. Consider epoch $j$ and phase $i$ such that $p(j, i) \leq p_c$ and assume that at the (global) time step $t$ the condition Epoch Invariant($j$) holds and at step $t'_i = t_i + (C/4 - c/2)n \log^{1-o} n$ (where $t_i$ defined in Lemma 3) the conditions of Lemma 11 hold. Then w.h.p. at step $t''_i = t_i + (C/2 - c/2)n \log^{1-o} n$ the following conditions hold.

1. Let $W''$ be the set of nodes $v$ such that $v$ is normal and in the end part (within the last $c \log^{1-o} n$ steps) of phase $i$ in epoch $j$, and if $v$ contains a token, then its value is $1/2^{p(j, i) + 1}$ (as expected at the end of this phase). The size of $W''$ is at least $n(1 - (i + 1 + o(1))/2^{ \log^a n})$.

2. The total value, w.r.t. the end of epoch $j$, of the tokens in $U''$ is $V = V \setminus W''$ is at most

$$n(i + 1 + o(1))/2^{ \log^a n}.$$

Proof. For the step $t'_i$, let $W'$ and $U'$ be the sets of nodes defined in the conditions of Lemma 11. In particular, $W'$ is the set of nodes which, step $t'_i$, are normal and in the end part of the cancellation stage of phase $i$ (in epoch $j$). Let $T$ denote the set of tokens in $W'$ and $F$ the set of tokens in $U'$. There are at most $(4/10)n$ tokens in $T$ (from the condition 3 of Lemma 11) and all of them have value $1/2^{p(j, i)}$. At step $t''_i$ most of the nodes should be in the end part of phase $i$ (from Claim 6). We will show that by this step $t''_i$ w.h.p. all but $O(n/2^{ \log^a n})$ tokens in $T$ split to half tokens of value $1/2^{p(j, i) + 1}$. This will imply that at step $t''_i$ w.h.p. the total value (w.r.t. to the end of the epoch) of the tokens which are not normal or have value different than $1/2^{p(j, i) + 1}$ or are in nodes not in the end part of phase $i$ (that is, the total value of the tokens in $U''$) is at most $n(i + 1 + o(1))/2^{ \log^a n}$ (the contribution from the tokens originating from tokens in $T$) plus $2^{ \log^a n} \cdot O(n/2^{ \log^a n})$ (the contribution from the tokens in $T$ which have not split) plus $2^{ \log^a n} \cdot O(n/2^{ \log^a n})$ (the contribution from the nodes in $W'$ which at step $t''_i$ are not in the end part of phase $i$; using Claim 6), so at most $n(i + 1 + o(1))/2^{ \log^a n}$; the claim 2 of the lemma. The claim 1 of the lemma follows by observing that each node $v$ from $W'$ belongs to $W''$ unless $v$ is a node in $U''$ with a token (the claim 2 of the lemma implies that w.h.p. there are at most $n(i + 1 + o(1))/2^{ \log^a n}$ such nodes) or $v$ is not in the end part of the phase $i$ at step $t''_i$ (Claim 6 implies that there are $O(n/2^{ \log^a n})$ such nodes). It remains to show that by step $t''_i$ w.h.p. all but $O(n/2^{ \log^a n})$ tokens in $T$ split.

The assumptions of the lemma, Claim 6 and Lemma 5 imply that w.h.p. in each of the steps $t'_i, t'_i + 1, \ldots, t''_i$ there are at most $(4/5 + o(1))n$ tokens: $2x + o(n)$ tokens obtained from doubling, and possible subsequent further splitting, of $x$ tokens from $T$; at most $(4/10)n - x$ tokens remaining in $T$, for some $x \leq (4/10)n$; and at most $n(i + 1 + o(1))/2^{ \log^a n}$ tokens originated from $F$. Thus w.h.p. there are at least $(1/5 - o(1))/2^{ \log^a n}$ tokens in each of these steps. Let $t'''_i = t_i + (C/4 + c/2)n \log^{1-o} n$. At this step $t'''_i$ most of the nodes should be in the beginning part of the doubling stage of phase $i$. We consider interactions in steps from $t'''_i$ to $t'_i$, when most of the nodes are in the doubling stage of phase $i$.

We assume first that a token in $T$ splits whenever it interacts with an empty node (the original token is then removed from $T$). In the actual process, the splitting would not happen,
The probability on the left-hand side above is maximized for

Proof of Lemma 5

follow the two statements hold.

1. In each period which starts with fewer than $n/2$ informed nodes, the number of informed nodes increases at least by factor $3/2$ or to $n/2$.

2. In each period which starts with the number of informed nodes at least $n/2$ but less than $n - n/2^{6 \log^k n}$, the number of uninformed nodes decreases at least by factor $2/3$ or to $n/2^{6 \log^k n}$.
In order to show the first statement, consider period $\tau$ such that the number $I(\tau)$ of informed nodes at the beginning of this period is less than $n/2$. We say that a given interaction in this period is a success, if a new node becomes informed or the number of informed nodes is already at least $n/2$. Let $X$ denote the number of successes. If $X \geq I(\tau)/2$, then the number of informed nodes increases in this period at least to $(3/2)I(\tau)$ or $n/2$. For a given interaction, if the number of informed nodes is already at least $n/2$, then the probability of success is 1. If the number of informed nodes is still less than $n/2$, then the probability of success is at least $I(\tau)/n$. Indeed, if the first node selected for this interaction is uninformed, then success comes when the second selected node is an informed node, so with probability at least $I(\tau)/n$. If the first selected node is an informed node, then success comes when the second selected node is uninformed, so with probability at least $1/2 > I(\tau)/n$. Thus in all cases the probability of success in a given interaction is at least $I(\tau)/n$, so $\mathbf{E}(X) \geq I(\tau)$ and the Chernoff bound (10) gives

$$\Pr(X \leq I(\tau)/2) \leq \exp \left\{ -\left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^2 \frac{1}{4} I(\tau) \right\} = \frac{1}{n^{\omega(1)}}.$$ 

To show the second statement, consider a period $\tau$ such that at the beginning of this period the number of informed nodes is at least $n/2$ but less than $n - n/2^6 \log^b n$. Equivalently, the number $U(\tau)$ of uninformed nodes is at most $n/2$ but still greater than $n/2^6 \log^b n$. An interaction is a success, if a new node is informed or the number of uninformed nodes is at most $\max\{U(\tau)/2, n/2^6 \log^b n\}$. If the number $X$ of successes is at least $U(\tau)/3$, then the number of uninformed nodes decreases in this period at least to $(2/3)U(\tau)$ or $n/2^6 \log^b n$. Similarly to above, the probability of success in a given interaction is at least $U(\tau)/(2n)$, so $\mathbf{E}(X) \geq U(\tau)/2$ and the Chernoff bound (10) gives

$$\Pr(X \leq U(\tau)/3) \leq \exp \left\{ -\left( \frac{1}{6} \right)^2 \frac{1}{4} U(\tau) \right\} = \frac{1}{n^{\omega(1)}}.$$ 

The two statements imply Condition 1 of the lemma: with probability at least $1 - n^{-\omega(1)}$, all but at most $2n/2^6 \log^b n$ nodes become informed within $c_1 \log^b n$ periods from step $t_1$, that is, in steps $\{t_1 + 1, t_1 + 2, \ldots, t_2\}$, for $c_1 \geq 24$. $(n/2^6 \log^b n)$ nodes were informed before the step $t_1$ and at most $n/2^6 \log^b n$ nodes will be informed after the step $t_2$. Condition 2 follows immediately from Lemmas 5 and 7.

In order to show Condition 3, we consider any sequence of $c_1 n \log^b n$ consecutive interactions, and show that w.h.p. $n - O(n/2^6 \log^b n)$ nodes interact at least $c_1 \log^b n$ times but not more than $3c_1 \log^b n$ times. Denoting $\mu = 2c_1 \log^b n$ the expected number of interactions per node and using the Chernoff bound (10), we get the following bound on the probability that the number $Z_u$ of interactions of a node $u$ deviates from $\mu$ by more than $c_1 \log^b n$.

$$\Pr(|Z_u - \mu| \geq c_1 \log^b n) \leq \exp \left\{ -\frac{c_1 \log^b n}{8} \right\}.$$ 

Thus for sufficiently large $c_1$, the expected number of nodes which interact at least $c_1 \log^b n$ and at most $3c_1 \log^b n$ times is at least $n(1 - 1/2^6 \log^b n)$. By applying the same techniques as in the proof of Claim 6 (that is, by constructing an appropriate martingale and deriving a bound analogous to (5)), we obtain an upper bound of $n^{-\omega(1)}$ on the probability that the number of nodes which interact between $c_1 \log^b n$ and $3c_1 \log^b n$ times is less than $n - 3n/2^6 \log^b n$. 

Algorithm 7: FastMajority2 protocol – a clock-clock interaction

```
if ¬Consistent(v.time, u.time) then v.fail, u.fail ← true;
else
    for each x ∈ {u, v} do x.epoch_step ← x.epoch_step + 1;
    let v.epoch_step ≤ u.epoch_step; // the other case is analogous
    if ((v.epoch_step ≤ (1/4)C log n) ∧ (u.epoch_step ≥ (7/4)C log n)) then
        // assuming u in the final part of an epoch and v in the next
        epoch
        u.epoch_step ← 0;
```

### A.4 Pseudocodes and further details for Section 5 – protocol

**FastMajority2**

During a clock-clock interaction (Algorithm 7), the nodes first check the consistency of their epoch_step counters and switch to fail states, if the difference between the counters modulo $2C\log n$ is greater than $(1/4)C\log n$. If the counters are consistent, then they both are incremented by 1. If one of the counters is in the final quarter of the range while the other in the first quarter, then the former is reset to 0. This is the mechanism of pulling up to the next epoch the clock nodes lagging behind.

During the interaction between a worker node $v$ and a clock node $u$ (Algorithm 8), the worker node first uses the time reading from the clock node to decide whether to progress its computation to the next stage, phase or epoch, and then executes the procedure `NextStep_normal(v)` or `NextStep_autosync(v)`, depending on the type of the worker node. These two `NextStep` procedures are as defined in `FastMajority1`. The clock node $u$ does not change its state during this interaction.

The worker-worker interactions (Algorithm 9) are essentially the same as in the `FastMajority1` protocol (Algorithms 3 and 4) but now without the updates involving step counters.

The exact-majority protocol in [2] relies on the leaderless phase clock which w.h.p. keeps the step counters of all clock nodes synchronized within an interval of length $c\log n$, where $c$ is constant considerably smaller than the constant $C$. In our protocol, we need the clock nodes to stay synchronized within an interval of length $\Theta(\log^{1-a} n)$. This cannot be achieved "w.h.p."*, but we can show that only $n/2^{\Theta(\log^{a} n)}$ clocks fall outside of such tight synchronization. The synchronization of the clock nodes is described in the following lemma, which can be proven using Claim 6 and Lemma 8. We denote by $n_c$ and $n_w$ the number of clock nodes and the number of worker nodes, respectively, and assume that both are $\Theta(n)$.

**Lemma 14.** Assume that the counter of each clock node is at most $c\log n$ or greater than $(7/4)C\log n$, and at least $n_c(1 - 1/2^{\log^a n})$ clock nodes have their counter at most $C\log^a n$. Call these conditions the EpochInvariant_Clocks. Then w.h.p.
1. at the beginning of each of the subsequent $(7/8)C\log n$ periods of $n$ interactions each,
   $n_c(1 - 1/2^{\log^a n})$ clock nodes have counters within $c\log^{1-a} n$ of each other, and
2. within additional $(1/4)C\log n$ periods the EpochInvariant_Clocks condition holds again.

This lemma implies that during each period of $n$ interactions, w.h.p. only $n/2^{\delta_2 \log^a n}$ worker nodes interact with desynchronized clock nodes, for some constant $\delta_2 > 1$. This in turn implies that for some constant $1 < \delta_3 < \delta_1$, $n_w - n/2^{\delta_2 \log^a n}$ worker nodes, progress orderly through all canceling/doubling phases of an epoch as in the `FastMajority1` protocol.
Algorithm 8: FastMajority2 protocol – a worker-clock interaction

1. let v be a worker node and u a clock node;
   // set the default “no progress” for the NextStep(.) procedures
2. “v.phase_step = 0” ← false;
3. “v.epoch_step = 0” ← false;

4. if v.normal then
   5. if v.epoch_part = 0 then
      6. if (v.age_in_epoch < u.(epoch_part, phase)) ∧ (u is not in the end of epoch) then
         7. // v moves to the next phase
            (v.epoch_part, v.phase) ← (v.epoch_part, v.age_in_epoch) + 1; // v.phase
            only for NextStep(.), not for storing
            v.stage ← beginning;
            “v.phase_step = 0” ← true;
      8. else if (v.age_in_epoch = u.phase) then
         9. if u.stage is later than v.stage then advance v.stage to the next stage;
      10. else if (v.epoch_part = 1) ∧ (u is in the beginning of epoch) then
          11. // v moves to the start of the next epoch
          12. v.(epoch, epoch_part) ← v.(epoch, epoch_part) + 1;
          13. NextStep_normal(v);
      14. else
         15. // v has an out-of-sync token
         16. if (v.epoch_part = 0) ∧ (u.epoch_part = 1) ∧ (u is not in the end of epoch) then
            17. // v moves to the second part of epoch
            v.epoch_part ← 1;
            “v.phase_step = 0” ← true;
         18. else if (v.epoch_part = 1) ∧ (u is in the beginning of epoch) then
            19. // v moves to the start of the next epoch
            v.(epoch, epoch_part) ← v.(epoch, epoch_part) + 1;
            “v.epoch_step = 0” ← true;
         20. NextStep_outofsync(v);

The invariant at the beginning of an epoch j is the EpochInvariant_Clocks condition together with the following EpochInvariant_Workers(j).
1. At least \( n_w(1 - 1/2^{1\log^2 n}) \) worker nodes are in normal states, in epoch \( j \), phase 0 and with stage = beginning.
2. For each remaining worker node u,
   a. u is in a normal state in the second part of epoch \( j - 1 \), or
   b. u is in a normal or out-of-sync state in epoch \( j \) and \( u.\text{age_in_epoch} \leq c\log^{1-a} n \).

Lemma 1 holds for the FastMajority2 protocol with the same wording, but with the EpochInvariant(j) condition modified as above. This lemma can be proven for the FastMajority2 protocol by closely following the proofs of Lemmas 2 and 3. The underlying premise is the same: w.h.p. \( n_w(1 - 1/2^{1\log^2 n}) \) worker nodes move through the phases of an epoch in synchronized manner, having the number of interactions close to the expectation. The remaining \( O(n_w/2^{1\log^2 n}) \) out-of-sync workers have enough attempt at splitting to
ensure that \( w.h.p. \) all tokens split to the values required at the end of the epoch.

It remains to show that the \texttt{FastMajority2} protocol can be initialize, so that we have linear-size sets of worker and clock nodes and their states satisfy the \( \text{EpochInvariant}(0) \) condition. Initially, each node has a token, either \( A \) or \( B \), of the initial value 1, and all nodes are declared as workers. We make the first phase special by allowing it to run for \( C \log n \) steps. The nodes count the steps of this phase by themselves, but the required \( \Theta(\log n) \) states for this counting will be reused in the subsequent computation, so we total state count stays within \( \Theta(\log n) \). We allow in this phase only the following operations on tokens. If two value-1 tokens of opposite type interact, then they cancel out, and if this is the first interaction for each of the two nodes, then one node, say the node which has had token \( B \), becomes a clock node while the other node becomes permanently fixed as a worker node. If two value-1 tokens of the same type interact and their step counters have different parity, then the tokens are combined into one token of value 2. The combined token is taken by one node, say by the node with even step counter, which becomes permanently fixed as a worker node, while the other node becomes a clock node.

It can be shown that if the initial size of the minority opinion is at least \( n/4 \), then \( w.h.p. \) \( \Theta(n) \) clock nodes are created and \( \Theta(n) \) nodes are fixed as workers, since each of the first \( n/8 \) interactions has a positive constant probability of being a cancellation, creating one clock and fixing one node as a permanent worker. If the size of the minority opinion is less than \( n/4 \), then \( w.h.p. \) we get \( \Theta(n) \) clock nodes and \( \Theta(n) \) permanent workers by combining majority tokens.

The first node which reaches the end of the initial special phase initiates a broadcast to move the system \( w.h.p. \) into a global configuration which satisfies conditions analogous to \( \text{EpochInvariant}(0) \), but with the base value of tokens changed from 1 to 2. We will have in the beginning of phase 0 a mix of tokens of values 2 and 1. To deal with this we set the flag \textit{doubled} for the tokens of value 1.

Lemma 1 adapted to the \texttt{FastMajority2} protocol and the above discussion leads to our final result stated in Theorem 0, where the “in expectation” part can be argued as in [2].

### A.5 Chernoff bounds and Azuma-Hoeffding inequality

In the proofs we use the following statements of Chernoff bounds and Azuma-Hoeffding inequality (see, for example, [17]).

**Theorem 15.** [Chernoff bound] Let \( S_n = X_1 + X_2 + \cdots + X_n \), where \( X_i \), for \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \), are independent random variables, \( 0 \leq X_i \leq 1 \), \( \mathbb{E}X_i = \mu_i \), and \( \mu = \mu_1 + \mu_2 + \cdots + \mu_m \). Then for \( 0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1 \) and \( \delta \geq 1 \),

\[
\Pr(|S_m - \mu| \geq \varepsilon \mu) \leq \exp \left\{ -\frac{\varepsilon^2 \mu}{4} \right\}, \tag{10}
\]

\[
\Pr(S_m - \mu \geq \delta \mu) \leq \exp \left\{ -\frac{\delta \mu}{3} \right\}. \tag{11}
\]

**Corollary 16.** Let \( S_n = X_1 + X_2 + \cdots + X_n \), where for \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \), \( X_i \) is random variable such that \( X_i \in \{0, 1\} \), and \( \mathbb{E}(X_i|X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_{i-1}) \geq \mu_i \), and let \( \mu = \mu_1 + \mu_2 + \cdots + \mu_m \). Then for \( 0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1 \),

\[
\Pr(S_m \leq (1 - \varepsilon)\mu) \leq \exp \left\{ -\frac{\varepsilon^2 \mu}{4} \right\}. \tag{12}
\]
Algorithm 9: FastMajority2 protocol – a worker-worker interaction

1 if \(v.\text{normal} \land u.\text{normal}\) then
2 \hspace{1em} if \((v.\text{epoch} = u.\text{epoch}) \land (v.\text{epoch}_\text{part} = u.\text{epoch}_\text{part} = 0) \land (v.\text{age}_\text{in}_\text{epoch} = u.\text{age}_\text{in}_\text{epoch})\) then
3 \hspace{2em} if \(v\) and \(u\) have opposite tokens and are in the canceling stage then
4 \hspace{3em} \(u.\text{token} \leftarrow \emptyset; \ v.\text{token} \leftarrow \emptyset\)
5 \hspace{2em} else if exactly one of \(v\) and \(u\) has a token and both nodes in the doubling stage then
6 \hspace{3em} say \(v\) is the node with a token;
7 \hspace{2em} if \(!v.\text{doubled}\) then \{ \(u.\text{token} \leftarrow v.\text{token};\ v.\text{doubled}, u.\text{doubled} \leftarrow \text{true};\}\)
8 else
9 \hspace{1em} // \(v\) or \(u\) has an out-of-sync token; attempt splitting
10 \hspace{2em} if \(!v.\text{out}_\text{of}_\text{sync} \land u.\text{out}_\text{of}_\text{sync}\) then
11 \hspace{3em} let \(v\) be the node with an out-of-sync token;
12 \hspace{4em} if \((v.\text{age}_\text{in}_\text{epoch} < \log^a n) \land (u.\text{token} = \emptyset)\) then
13 \hspace{5em} // split the \(v\)'s token
14 \hspace{6em} \(u.\text{token} \leftarrow v.\text{token}; \ u.\text{out}_\text{of}_\text{sync} \leftarrow \text{true};\)
15 \hspace{6em} \(v.\text{age}_\text{in}_\text{epoch} \leftarrow v.\text{age}_\text{in}_\text{epoch} + 1; \ u.\text{age}_\text{in}_\text{epoch} \leftarrow v.\text{age}_\text{in}_\text{epoch};\)
16 \hspace{5em} if \(v.\text{age}_\text{in}_\text{epoch} = \log^a n\) then
17 \hspace{6em} for each \(x \in \{u, v\}\) do if \(x.\text{epoch}_\text{part} = 1\) then
18 \hspace{7em} \(x.\text{out}_\text{of}_\text{sync} \leftarrow \text{false};\)

\[\text{Theorem 17. [Azuma-Hoeffding inequality]}\] Let a sequence of random variables \((S_0, S_1, \ldots, S_n)\) be a martingale such that \(|S_{k+1} - S_k| \leq c\), for each \(0 \leq k < n\). Then

\[
\Pr(|S_n - S_0| \geq \Delta) \leq 2 \exp\left\{-\frac{\Delta^2}{2nc^2}\right\}.
\]