

Loosely-Stabilizing Phase Clocks and the Adaptive Majority Problem

Petra Berenbrink ✉

Universität Hamburg, Germany

Felix Biermeier ✉

Universität Hamburg, Germany

Christopher Hahn ✉

Universität Hamburg, Germany

Dominik Kaaser ✉ 

Universität Hamburg, Germany

Abstract

We present a loosely-stabilizing phase clock for population protocols. In the population model we are given a system of n identical agents which interact in a sequence of randomly chosen pairs. Our phase clock is leaderless and it requires $O(\log n)$ states. It runs forever and is, at any point of time, in a synchronous state w.h.p. When started in an arbitrary configuration, it recovers rapidly and enters a synchronous configuration within $O(n \log n)$ interactions w.h.p. Once the clock is synchronized, it stays in a synchronous configuration for at least $\text{poly} n$ parallel time w.h.p.

We use our clock to design a loosely-stabilizing protocol that solves the comparison problem introduced by Alistarh et al., 2021. In this problem, a subset of agents has at any time either A or B as input. The goal is to keep track which of the two opinions is (momentarily) the majority. We show that if the majority has a support of at least $\Omega(\log n)$ agents and a sufficiently large bias is present, then the protocol converges to a correct output within $O(n \log n)$ interactions and stays in a correct configuration for $\text{poly} n$ interactions, w.h.p.

1 Introduction

In this paper we introduce a loosely-stabilizing leaderless phase clock for the population model and demonstrate its usability by applying the clock to the comparison problem introduced in [3]. Population protocols have been introduced by Angluin et al. [5]. A population consists of n anonymous agents. A random scheduler selects in discrete time steps pairs of agents to interact. The interacting agents execute a state transition, as specified by the *algorithm* of the population protocol. Angluin et al. [5] gave a variety of motivating examples for the population model, including averaging in sensor networks, or modeling a disease monitoring system for a flock of birds. In [28] the authors introduce the notion of loose-stabilization. A population protocol is loosely-stabilizing if, from an arbitrary state, it reaches a state with correct output fast and remains in such a state for a polynomial number of interactions. In contrast, self-stabilizing protocols are required to converge to the correct output state from any possible initial configuration and stay in a correct configuration indefinitely. Many population protocols heavily rely on so-called *phase clocks* which divide the interactions into blocks of $O(n \log n)$ interactions each. The phase clocks are used to synchronize population protocols. For example, in [23, 16] they are used to efficiently solve leader election and in [15] they are used to solve the majority problem.

In the first part of this paper we present a loosely-stabilizing and leaderless phase clock with $O(\log n)$ many states per agent. We show that this clock can run forever and that, at any point of time, it is synchronized w.h.p.¹ In contrast to related work [1, 7, 15, 23], our clock protocol *re-*

¹ The expression *with high probability* (w.h.p.) refers to a probability of $1 - n^{-\Omega(1)}$.

covers rapidly in case of an error: from an arbitrary configuration it always enters a synchronous configuration within $O(n \log n)$ interactions w.h.p. Once synchronized it stays in a synchronous configuration for at least polyn interactions, w.h.p. Our phase clock can be used to synchronize population protocols into phases of $O(n \log n)$ interactions, guaranteeing that there is a big overlap between the phases of any pair of agents. Our clock protocol is simple, robust and easy to use.

In the second part of this paper we demonstrate how to apply our phase clock by solving an *adaptive majority* problem motivated by the work of [3, 4]. Our problem is defined as follows. Each agent has either opinion A , B , or U for being neutral. We say that agents change their input with rate r if in every time step an arbitrary agent can change its opinion with probability r . The goal is to output, at any time, the actual majority opinion. The idea of our approach is as follows. Our protocol simply starts, at the beginning of each phase, a *static* majority protocol as a black box. This protocol takes as an input the set of opinions at that time and calculates the majority opinion over these inputs. The outcome of the protocol is then used during the whole next phase as majority opinion. In order to highlight the simplicity of our phase clock, we first use the very natural protocol based solely on canceling opposing opinions introduced in [7]. Then we present a variant based on the undecided state dynamics from [8] which works as follows. The agents have one of two opinions A or B , or they are undecided. Whenever two agents with the same opinion interact, nothing happens. When two agents with an opposite opinion interact they will become undecided. Undecided agents interacting with an agent with either opinion A or opinion B adopt that opinion.

Without loss of generality we assume that A is the majority opinion in the following. When at least $\Omega(\log n)$ agents have opinion A , there is a constant factor bias between A and B , and the opinions change at most at rate $1/n$ per interaction, the system outputs A w.h.p. Our protocol requires only $O(\log n)$ many states. For the setting where all agents have either opinion A or B (none of the agent is in the neutral state U) and we have an additive bias of $n^{3/4+\varepsilon}$ for some constant $\varepsilon > 0$ is present, the system again converges to A w.h.p. In the latter setting we can tolerate a rate of order $r = \Omega(n^{-1/4+\varepsilon})$.

Related Work. Population protocols have been introduced by Angluin et al. [5]. Many of the early results focus on characterizing the class of problems which are solvable in the population model. For example, population protocols with a constant number of states can exactly compute predicates which are definable in Presburger arithmetic [5, 6, 9]. There are many results for majority and leader election, see [20] and [16] for the latest results. In [28] the authors introduce the notion of *loose*-stabilization to mitigate the fact that self-stabilizing protocols usually require some global knowledge on the population size (or a large amount of states). See [17] for an overview of self-stabilizing population protocols.

In [7] the authors present and analyze a phase clocks which divides the time into phases of $O(n \log n)$ interactions assuming that a unique leader exists. They also present a generalization of the clock using a junta of size n^ε (for constant ε) instead of a unique leader and analyze the process empirically. In [23] the authors show that the junta-driven phase clock needs $O(\log \log n)$ many states and it ticks for a polynomial number of interactions. The protocol can easily be modified such that it requires only a constant number of states after the junta election [15]. In the brief announcement [26] the authors suggest a phase clocks which, similarly to [23], relies on a junta of size at most n^ε . Their clocks are based on the oscillatory dynamics from [22] and need constantly many states in the case that the junta is already selected. In [1] the authors present a leaderless phase clock with $O(\log n)$ states. In contrast to our leaderless phase clock, the clock from [1] is not self-stabilizing: it runs only for a polynomial number of interactions. The analysis is based on the potential function analysis introduced in [29] for the greedy balls-into-bins strategy where each ball has to be allocated into one out of

two randomly chosen bins. This analysis assumes an initially balanced configuration and it cannot be adopted to an arbitrary unbalanced state, which would be required to deal with unsynchronized clock configurations. In [10] the authors consider a variant of the population model, so-called clocked population protocols, where agents have an additional flag for clock ticks. The clock signal indicates when the agents have waited sufficiently long for a protocol to have converged. They show that a clocked population protocol running in less than ω^k time for fixed $k \geq 2$ is equivalent in power to nondeterministic Turing machines with logarithmic space.

Another line of related work considers the problem of *exact majority*, where one seeks to achieve (guaranteed) majority consensus, even if the additive bias is as small as one [21, 1, 14, 13]. The currently best protocol [20] solves exact majority with $O(\log n)$ states and $O(\log n)$ stabilization time, both in expectation and w.h.p. The authors of [8] solve the approximate majority problem. They introduce the undecided state dynamics in the population model and consider two opinions. They show that their 3-state protocol reaches consensus w.h.p. in $O(n \log n)$ interactions. If the bias is of order $\omega(\sqrt{n} \cdot \log n)$ the undecided state dynamics converges towards the initial majority w.h.p. In [18] this required bias is reduced to $\Omega(\sqrt{n \log n})$.

In [2] the authors develop an algorithm to detect whether there is an agent in a given state Y or not. They introduce so-called *leak* transitions and *catalyst* transitions. A catalyst transition for a state X is a transition which does not change the number of agents in state X . Leak transitions are spurious reactions which can consume and create arbitrary non-catalytic agents. In [3] the authors introduce the *robust comparison problem* where the goal is to decide which of the two states A and B have the larger support. The authors adopt the model of [2] with leak transitions and catalyst transitions. For the case that the initial support of A and B is at least $O(\log n)$ the authors present a loosely-stabilizing dynamics. If at least $\Omega(\log n)$ agents are in either A or B and the ratio between the numbers of agents supporting A and B is at least a constant, their protocol solves the problem with $O(\log n \cdot \log \log n)$ states per agent. It converges in $O(n \log n)$ interactions such that every agent outputs the majority w.h.p. If the initial support of A and B states is $\Omega(\log^2 n)$ the authors can strengthen their results such that a ratio between the two base states of $1 + o(1)$ is sufficient. The results also hold with leak transitions not affecting agents in state A or B with rate $1/n$. In this case the authors show that most of the agents output the correct majority.

In [4] the authors use the *catalytic input model* (CI model) where they have two types of agents: n catalysts and m worker agents ($N = n + m$). They solve the approximate majority problem for two opinions w.h.p. in $O(N \log N)$ interactions in the CI model when the initial bias among the catalysts is $\Omega(\sqrt{N \log N})$ and $m = \Theta(n)$. They show that the size of the initial bias is tight up to a $O(\sqrt{\log N})$ factor. Additionally, they consider the approximate majority problem in the CI model and in the population model with leaks. Their protocols tolerate a leak rate of at most $\beta = O(\sqrt{N \log N}/N)$ in the CI model and a leak rate of at most $\beta = O(\sqrt{n \log n}/n)$ in the population model. They also show a separation between the computational power of the CI model and the population model.

2 Population Model and Problem Definitions

In the population model we are given a set V of n anonymous *agents*. At each time step two agents are chosen independently and uniformly at random randomly to *interact*. We assume that interactions between two agents (u, v) are ordered and call u the *initiator* and v the *responder*. The interacting agents update their states according to a common transition function of their previous states. Formally, a *population protocol* is defined as a tuple of a finite set of *states* Q , a *transition function* $\delta: Q \times Q \rightarrow Q \times Q$, a finite set of *output symbols* Σ , and an *output function* $\omega: Q \rightarrow \Sigma$ which maps every state to an output. A *configuration*

is a mapping $C : V \rightarrow Q$ which specifies the state of each agent. An execution of a protocol is an infinite sequence C_0, C_1, \dots such that for all C_i there exist two agents v_1, v_2 and a transition $(q_1, q_2) \rightarrow (q'_1, q'_2)$ such that $C_i(v_1) = q_1, C_i(v_2) = q_2, C_{i+1}(v_1) = q'_1, C_{i+1}(v_2) = q'_2$ and $C_i(w) = C_{i+1}(w)$ for all $w \neq v_1, v_2$. The main quality criteria of a population protocol are the required number of states and the running time. The required number of states is given by the size of the state space Q , and the running time is given by the number of interactions.

Phase Clocks. Phase clocks are used to synchronize population protocols. We assume a phase clock is implemented by simple counters $\text{clock}[u_1], \dots, \text{clock}[u_n]$ modulo $|Q|$ (see, e.g., [1, 7, 15, 19, 23]). Whenever $\text{clock}[u]$ crosses zero, agent u receives a so-called *signal*. These signals divide the time into *phases* of $\Theta(n \log n)$ interactions each. We say that a (τ, w) -phase clock is synchronous in the time interval $[t_1, t_2]$ if every agent gets a signal every $\Theta(n \log n)$ interactions. More formally:

- Every agent receives a signal in the first $2 \cdot (w+1) \cdot \tau \cdot n$ steps of the interval.
- Assume an agent u receives a signal at time $t \in [t_1, t_2]$.
 - For all $v \in V$, agent v receives a signal at time t_v with $|t - t_v| \leq \tau \cdot n$.
 - Agent u receives the next signal at time t' with $(w+1) \cdot \tau \cdot n \leq |t - t'| \leq 2 \cdot (w+1) \cdot \tau \cdot n$.

The above definition divides the time interval $[t_1, t_2]$ into a sequence of subintervals that alternates between so-called burst-intervals and overlap-intervals.

- A burst-interval has length at most $\tau \cdot n$ and every agent gets exactly one signal.
- An overlap-interval consists of those time steps between two burst-intervals where none of the agents gets a signal. It has length at least $w \cdot \tau \cdot n$.

A burst-interval together with the subsequent overlap-interval forms a *phase*.

The goal of this paper is to develop a phase clock that is *loosely-stabilizing* according to the definitions of [28]. To formally define loosely-stabilizing phase clocks, we first define the set of *synchronous* configurations \mathcal{C} . Intuitively, we call a state C_t of a (τ, w) -phase clock at time t synchronous if the counters of all pairs of agents do not deviate much. More precisely, $\text{clock}[u](t) - \text{clock}[v](t) \leq_{|Q|} (7 + 2 \cdot \sqrt{10 + w}) \cdot \tau$ for all pairs of agents (u, v) (Here, “ $\leq_{|Q|}$ ” denotes smaller w.r.t. the circular order modulo $|Q|$.) We give the formal definition of a synchronous configuration in the next section.

We now define loosely-stabilizing phase clocks as follows. Consider an infinite sequence of configurations C_0, C_1, \dots . For an arbitrary configuration $C_i \notin \mathcal{C}$ the *convergence time* is defined as the smallest t such that $C_{i+t_1} \in \mathcal{C}$. Intuitively, the convergence time bounds the time it takes the clock to reach a synchronous configuration when starting from an asynchronous configuration. For an arbitrary configuration $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$ the *holding time* t_2 is defined as the largest t such that $C_{i+t_2} \in \mathcal{C}$. Intuitively, the holding time bounds the time during which the clock remains in a synchronous configuration when starting from a synchronous configuration. We say that a phase clock is (t_1, t_2) -loosely-stabilizing if the maximum convergence time over all possible configurations is w.h.p. less than t_1 and the minimum holding time over all synchronous configurations is w.h.p. at least t_2 . Note that the probabilities in our bounds are only a function of the randomly selected interaction sequence.

3 Clock Algorithm

In this section we introduce our phase clock protocol. Our (τ, w) -phase clock has a state space $Q = \{0, \dots, (21 + w + 6 \cdot \sqrt{10 + w}) \cdot \tau - 1\}$. The clock states are divided into $(21 + w + 6 \cdot \sqrt{10 + w})$ hours, and each hour consists of $\tau = 36 \cdot (c + 4) \cdot \ln n$ minutes. The parameter $c \geq 0$ is a constant that is defined in Theorem 1. As we will see, τ is a multiple of the running time of the *one-way epidemic* (see Lemma 3) and $w \cdot \tau \cdot n$ is the number of interactions in which our clocks are synchronized.

We divide the hours into three consecutive intervals (see Figure 1): the launching interval I_{launch} (first hour), the working interval I_{work} ($14 + w + 4 \cdot \sqrt{10 + w}$ hours) and the gathering interval I_{gather} (last $6 + 2 \cdot \sqrt{10 + w}$ hours). We say that agent u is in one of the intervals whenever its clock counter $\text{clock}[u]$ is in that interval. If the agents are either all in I_{gather} , all in I_{work} , or all in I_{launch} , we say the configuration is *homogeneous*. Finally, for two agents u and v we define a *distance* $d(u, v) = \min\{|\text{clock}[u] - \text{clock}[v]|, |Q| - |\text{clock}[u] - \text{clock}[v]|\}$ that takes the cyclic nature of the clock into account. This allows us to formally define synchronous configurations as follows.

► **Definition (Synchronous Configuration).** A configuration C is called *synchronous* if and only if for all pairs of agents (u, v) we have $d(u, v) < (7 + 2 \cdot \sqrt{10 + w}) \cdot \tau$.

Our clock works as follows. Assume agents (u, v) interact. With two exceptions, agent u increments its counter $\text{clock}[u]$ by one minute modulo $|Q|$ (Rules 1 and 2). If, however, u is in I_{gather} and v is in I_{launch} then agent u adopts $\text{clock}[v]$ (Rule 3): we say the agent *hops*. If u is in I_{gather} and v is in I_{work} then agent u returns to the beginning of the I_{gather} interval (Rule 4): we say that the agent *resets* itself. We define that agent u receives a *signal* whenever its clock crosses the wrap-around from I_{gather} to I_{launch} . Formally, our clock uses the following state transitions.

$$(q_1, q_2) \in (Q \setminus I_{\text{gather}}) \times Q: \quad (q_1, q_2) \rightarrow (q_1 + 1, q_2) \quad (\text{step forward}) \quad (1)$$


$$(q_1, q_2) \in I_{\text{gather}} \times I_{\text{gather}}: \quad (q_1, q_2) \rightarrow (q_1 + 1 \bmod |Q|, q_2) \quad (\text{step forward}) \quad (2)$$

$$(q_1, q_2) \in I_{\text{gather}} \times I_{\text{launch}}: \quad (q_1, q_2) \rightarrow (q_2, q_2) \quad (\text{hopping}) \quad (3)$$

$$(q_1, q_2) \in I_{\text{gather}} \times I_{\text{work}}: \quad (q_1, q_2) \rightarrow (|I_{\text{launch}}| + |I_{\text{work}}|, q_2) \quad (\text{reset}) \quad (4)$$

On an intuitive level, the clock works as follows. Assume the clock is synchronized and all agents are in I_{launch} . Now consider the next $k = \Theta(n \cdot |Q|)$ interactions. All agents step forward according to Rule 1 until they reach I_{gather} . The maximum distance between any agents grows during the k interactions but it is still bounded by $O(\sqrt{k/n}) = O(\sqrt{w \cdot \log n})$, w.h.p. Hence, due to the choice of w there is no agent left behind in I_{launch} when the first agent reaches I_{gather} . Additionally, due to the size of I_{gather} when the last agent enters I_{gather} all of the other agents are still in I_{gather} . As soon as the first agent reaches I_{launch} , Rule 3 (agents hop onto agents in I_{launch}) ensures that all agents start the next phase without a large gap. Hence, there is an interaction after which all agents are in I_{launch} which brings us back to our initial configuration (all agents in I_{launch}).

Now we consider an asynchronous configuration C_t where the agents can be arbitrarily distributed over the $|Q|$ states of the clock. The main idea for the recovery of our clock is as follows. We show that after $O(n \log n)$ interactions there is a time t where I_{launch} is empty. After $O(n \log n)$ additional steps most of the agents are in I_{gather} : agents cannot hop since I_{launch} is empty, and they reset as soon as they interact with an agent in I_{work} . They enter I_{launch} as soon as the first agent crosses 0 by increasing its clock counter.



■ **Figure 1** Schematic representation of the clock states.

We will show that the following two properties hold for our clock.

► **Theorem 1.** *Let t_1, t_2 with $t_1 \leq t_2$ be two points in time and assume that the configuration C_{t_1} at time t_1 is a homogeneous launching configuration and $t_2 - t_1 \leq n^c$. Then the clock counters of the agents implement a synchronous (τ, w) -phase clock in the time interval $[t_1, t_2]$ w.h.p.*

► **Theorem 2.** *The clock counters of the agents implement a $(O(n \cdot \log n), \Omega(\text{poly } n))$ -loosely-stabilizing $(\Theta(\log n), w)$ -phase clock.*

We prove Theorem 1 in Section 4 and Theorem 2 in Section 5.

Auxiliary Results. The one-way-epidemic is a population protocol with state space $\{0, 1\}$ and transitions $(q_1, q_2) \rightarrow (\max(q_1, q_2), q_2)$. An agent in state 0 is called *susceptible* and an agent in state 1 is called *infected*. We say agent u infects agent v if u is infected and initiates an interaction with v . The following result is folklore, see, e.g., [7]. Additional details can be found in Appendix A.2.

► **Lemma 3 (One-way-epidemic).** *Assume an agent starts the one-way epidemic in step 1. All agents are infected after $t = \tau/4 \cdot n$ many steps with probability at least $1 - n^{-(7+2c)}$.*

The following lemma bounds the number of interactions initiated by some fixed agent u among a sequence of t interactions. It is used throughout Sections 4 and 5 and follows immediately from Chernoff bounds (see Theorem 18).

► **Lemma 4.** *Consider an arbitrary sequence of t interactions and let X_u be the number of interactions initiated by agent u within this sequence. Then*

$$\Pr[X_u < (1-\delta) \cdot t/n] \geq 1 - n^{-\frac{12 \cdot (c+4) \cdot t \cdot \delta^2}{n \cdot \tau}} \quad \text{and} \quad \Pr[X_u > (1+\delta) \cdot t/n] \geq 1 - n^{-\frac{18 \cdot (c+4) \cdot t \cdot \delta^2}{n \cdot \tau}}.$$

4 Maintenance: Proof of Theorem 1

In this section we first show the following main result. At the end of the section we show how Theorem 1 follows from this proposition.

► **Proposition 5 (Maintenance).** *Consider our (τ, w) -phase clock for n agents with $\tau = 12 \cdot (c+4) \cdot \ln n$ for any $c \geq 6$ and sufficiently large w . Let configuration C_{t_1} be a homogeneous launching configuration. Then, with probability at least $1 - n^{-(c+1)}$, there exists a $t_2 = \Theta(n \cdot w \cdot \log n)$ such that the following holds:*

1. $C_{t_1+t_2}$ is a homogeneous launching configuration,
2. $\forall t \in [t_1, t_1+t_2]: C_t$ is synchronous,
3. in the time interval $[t_1, t_1+t_2]$ there exists a contiguous sequence of homogeneous working configurations of length $w \cdot \tau \cdot n$.

We split the proof of Proposition 5 into two parts, Lemmas 6 and 7. The formal proof follows.

Proof. Assume the configuration C_{t_1} at time t_1 is a homogeneous launching configuration. Statements 1 and 2 of Proposition 5 follow immediately from Lemmas 6 and 7:

- It follows from Lemma 6 that the agents transition via a sequence of synchronous configurations into a homogeneous gathering configuration within $\Theta(n \cdot w \cdot \log n)$ time w.h.p.
- It follows from Lemma 7 that the agents transition via a sequence of synchronous configurations back into a homogeneous launching configuration within $\Theta(n \cdot w \cdot \log n)$ further time w.h.p.

It remains to show Statement 3. Recall that in a synchronous configuration all pairs of agents have distance (w.r.t. the circular order modulo $|Q|$) at most $\Delta = (7 + 2 \cdot \sqrt{10+w}) \cdot \tau$. Since $|I_{\text{work}}| = w \cdot \tau + 2\Delta$ it immediately follows that there must be $w \cdot \tau \cdot n$ interactions where all agents are in I_{work} . This concludes the proof. \blacktriangleleft

The following lemma establishes that w.h.p. all agents transition from a homogeneous launching configuration into a homogeneous gathering configuration via a sequence of synchronous configurations.

► **Lemma 6.** *Let C_t be a homogeneous launching configuration. Let $t' = n \cdot \frac{|I_{\text{launch}}| + |I_{\text{work}}|}{1 - (2 \cdot \sqrt{|I_{\text{work}}|/\tau})^{-1}}$. Then the following holds with probability at least $1 - n^{-(c+1)}/2$:*

1. $C_{t+t'}$ is a homogeneous gathering configuration and
2. $\forall t'' \in [t, t+t'] : C_{t''}$ is synchronous.

Proof. In the following we assume w.l.o.g. $t=0$. We prove the two statements separately.

Statement 1. Our goal is to show that after t' interactions all agents are in I_{gather} when we start from a homogeneous launching configuration C_0 at time $t=0$. We first show that there is no agent left in I_{launch} when the first agent enters I_{gather} . Let t_a be the first interaction in which an agent enters I_{gather} . Note that before t_a all agents are either in I_{launch} or in I_{work} and thus the agents increase their counter by one whenever they initiate an interaction.

First we show that w.h.p. $t_a \geq 2 \cdot \tau \cdot n$. Let $X_u(2 \cdot \tau \cdot n)$ denote the number of interactions agent u initiates before time $2 \cdot \tau \cdot n$. From Lemma 4 it follows with $\delta = 1$ that $X_u(2 \cdot \tau \cdot n) < 4 \cdot \tau$ with probability at least $1 - n^{-24 \cdot (c+4)}$. Since $4 \cdot \tau < |I_{\text{work}}|$, it holds that $\text{clock}[u](2 \cdot \tau \cdot n) < |I_{\text{launch}}| + |I_{\text{work}}|$ in this case. Hence, agent u has not yet reached I_{gather} with probability at least $1 - n^{-24 \cdot (c+4)}$ at time t_a . It follows from a union bound over all agents that no agent has reached I_{gather} with probability at least $1 - n^{-24 \cdot (c+4)+1}$ at time t_a .

Next we show that w.h.p. at time $2 \cdot \tau \cdot n$ all agents have left I_{launch} . As before, let $X_u(2 \cdot \tau \cdot n)$ denote the number of interactions agent u initiates before time $2 \cdot \tau \cdot n$. From Lemma 4 it follows with $\delta = 1$ that $X_u(2 \cdot \tau \cdot n) > \tau$ with probability at least $1 - n^{-36 \cdot (c+4)}$. Since $\tau = |I_{\text{launch}}|$, it holds that $\text{clock}[u](2 \cdot \tau \cdot n) \geq |I_{\text{launch}}|$ in this case. Hence, agent u has left I_{launch} with probability at least $1 - n^{-36 \cdot (c+4)}$ at time t_a . Again, it follows from a union bound over all agents that all agents have left I_{launch} with probability at least $1 - n^{-36 \cdot (c+4)+1}$ at time t_a .

Let now t_b be the first interaction in which an agent enters the last minute of I_{gather} and observe that $t_b > t_a$. Then, w.h.p. no agent is in I_{launch} during the time interval $[t+t_a, t+t_b]$. Therefore, agents cannot hop. Thus, by definition of t_b , no agent can leave I_{gather} before time t_b . Agents that initiate an interaction must therefore either increase their counter by one or reset.

First we show that w.h.p. $t_b > t'$. From Lemma 4 it follows with $\delta = (2 \cdot \sqrt{|I_{\text{work}}|/\tau})^{-1}$ that $X_u(t') < |I_{\text{work}}| + |I_{\text{gather}}|$ with probability at least $1 - n^{-3(c+4)}$. (Note that we use $(1+\delta)/(1-\delta) < 1/(1-2\delta)$ for $\delta < 0.5$ and $(|I_{\text{launch}}| + |I_{\text{work}}|)/(1-2\delta) = |I_{\text{work}}| + \frac{w+5 \cdot \sqrt{10+w+16}}{\sqrt{10+w+16}} \cdot \tau < |I_{\text{work}}| + |I_{\text{gather}}|$.) Thus, $\text{clock}[u](t') \leq \text{clock}[u](0) + X_u(t') < |I_{\text{launch}}| - 1 + |I_{\text{work}}| + |I_{\text{gather}}|$ (which is the last state of I_{gather}) with probability at least $1 - n^{-3(c+4)}$. By a union bound, this holds for all agents with probability at least $1 - n^{-(3c+11)}$.

Next we show that w.h.p. at time t_b all agents have reached I_{gather} . From Lemma 4 it follows with $\delta = (2 \cdot \sqrt{|I_{\text{work}}|/\tau})^{-1}$ that $X_u(t') > |I_{\text{launch}}| + |I_{\text{work}}|$ with probability at least $1 - n^{-9 \cdot (c+4)/2}$. Thus, $\text{clock}[u](t') \geq \text{clock}[u](0) + X_u(t') > 0 + |I_{\text{launch}}| + |I_{\text{work}}|$, with probability at least $1 - n^{-9 \cdot (c+4)/2}$. By a union bound, this holds for all agents with probability at least $1 - n^{-(17+9/2 \cdot c)}$.

Together it follows that at time t' no agent has left I_{gather} but all agents have entered it with probability at least $1 - n^{-(c+3)}$. Therefore, $C_{t'}$ is a homogeneous gathering configuration.

Statement 2. Recall that a synchronous configuration C is defined as a configuration where $\max_{(u,v)} \{d(u,v)\} < |I_{\text{launch}}| + |I_{\text{gather}}|$. As before, let $X_u(i)$ denote the number of interactions agent u initiates before time i . Now fix a time $t \leq t'$ and a pair of agents (u,v) with $X_u(t) < X_v(t)$. We use Lemma 4 to bound the deviation of $X_u(t)$ and $X_v(t)$ at time t as follows: $\Pr[X_u(t) > t/n - |I_{\text{gather}}|/2] \geq 1 - n^{-6(c+4)}$ and $\Pr[X_v(t) < t/n + |I_{\text{gather}}|/2] \geq 1 - n^{-4(c+4)}$. Therefore, $|X_v(t) - X_u(t)| < |I_{\text{gather}}|$ with probability at least $1 - n^{-4(c+4)} - n^{-6(c+4)}$.

Note that Lemma 4 allows us to bound the deviation in the numbers of interactions initiated by agents u and v . However, this does not immediately give a bound on the difference of the clock counters $|\text{clock}[v](t) - \text{clock}[u](t)|$. To bound the deviation of clock counters (by $|I_{\text{launch}}| + |I_{\text{gather}}|$), we therefore distinguish three cases.

First, assume that neither u nor v have reached I_{gather} at time t . Then $\text{clock}[u](t) = \text{clock}[u](0) + X_u(t)$ and $\text{clock}[v](t) = \text{clock}[v](0) + X_v(t)$. Observe that by the assumption of the lemma, both u and v are in I_{launch} at time $t=0$ and thus $|\text{clock}[v](0) - \text{clock}[u](0)| < |I_{\text{launch}}|$. Together with the above bound on $|X_v(t) - X_u(t)|$ we get $|\text{clock}[v](t) - \text{clock}[u](t)| < |I_{\text{launch}}| + |I_{\text{gather}}|$.

Secondly, assume that u has not reached I_{gather} but v has reached I_{gather} at time t . Then $\text{clock}[u](t) = \text{clock}[u](0) + X_u(t)$. For $\text{clock}[v](t)$, however, it might have occurred that v has reset in some interactions before time t . Nevertheless, the clock counter of v is bounded by the number of initiated interactions such that $\text{clock}[v](t) \leq \text{clock}[v](t) + X_v(t)$. (Note that v can only increment its $\text{clock}[v]$ counter or reset its value; hopping is not possible since we have shown in the proof of the first statement that I_{launch} is empty when the first agent enters I_{gather} .) Therefore, we get again $|\text{clock}[v](t) - \text{clock}[u](t)| < |I_{\text{launch}}| + |I_{\text{gather}}|$.

Finally, assume that both u and v are in I_{gather} at time t . Then $|\text{clock}[v](t) - \text{clock}[u](t)| \leq |I_{\text{gather}}| < |I_{\text{launch}}| + |I_{\text{gather}}|$ is trivially true.

There are no further cases: in the proof of the first statement we have shown that all agents transition from a homogeneous launching configuration to a homogeneous gathering configuration during the time interval $[0, t']$. The result now follows from a union bound over all $o(n^2)$ points in time $t \leq t'$ and all $n \cdot (n-1)$ pairs of agents. \blacktriangleleft

The following lemma is the main technical contribution of this section. It establishes that w.h.p. all agents transition from a homogeneous gathering configuration into a homogeneous launching configuration via a sequence of synchronous configurations. Consider a homogeneous gathering configuration and recall that whenever an agent hops from I_{gather} into I_{launch} it adopts the state of the responder. The main difficulty is to show that all agents hop into I_{launch} before the first agent leaves I_{launch} .

► Lemma 7. *Let C_t be a homogeneous gathering configuration. Then with probability at least $1 - n^{-(c+1)}/2$ the following holds:*

1. *there exists a $t_0 = O(n \cdot \sqrt{w} \cdot \log n)$ such that the first agent enters I_{launch} at time $t + t_0$,*
2. *there exists a $t' \leq \tau/4 \cdot n$ such that $C_{t+t_0+t'}$ is a homogeneous launching configuration,*
3. *$\forall t'' \in [t, t+t'] : C_{t''}$ is synchronous.*

Proof. First we prove that w.h.p. there exists a homogeneous launching configuration $C_{t'}$.

Statement 1. Let t_0 be defined such that the first agent u leaves I_{gather} at time $t + t_0$. Since C_t is a homogeneous gathering configuration, I_{launch} is empty at time t and hence agent u can only leave I_{gather} by increasing its counter. In every interaction before time $t + t_0$ some agent has to increase its state by one. Thus $t_0 \leq n \cdot |I_{\text{gather}}| = O(n \cdot \sqrt{w} \cdot \log n)$.

Statement 2. We continue our analysis at time t_0 and again assume w.l.o.g. for the sake of brevity of notation that $t_0 = 0$. Note that at that time exactly one agent is in state 0 and all remaining agents are still in I_{gather} . We show the following: there exists a time $\tilde{t} = \tau/4 \cdot n$ such that at time \tilde{t} all agents are in I_{launch} (Recall that $|I_{\text{launch}}| = \tau \cdot n$). To do so we first define a simplified process with the same state space Q , however, we refer to the last state of I_{launch} as **stop**. Agents in **stop** never change their state (which renders the states of I_{work} unreachable). The formal definition of the simplified process is as follows.

$$\begin{array}{lll}
(q_1, q_2) \in (I_{\text{launch}} \setminus \{\text{stop}\}) \times Q: & (q_1, q_2) \rightarrow (q_1 + 1, q_2) & (\text{step forward}) \\
(q_1, q_2) \in I_{\text{gather}} \times I_{\text{gather}}: & (q_1, q_2) \rightarrow (q_1 + 1, q_2) \bmod |Q| & (\text{step forward}) \\
(q_1, q_2) \in I_{\text{gather}} \times I_{\text{launch}}: & (q_1, q_2) \rightarrow (q_2, q_2) & (\text{hopping}) \\
(q_1, q_2) \in \{\text{stop}\} \times Q: & (q_1, q_2) \rightarrow (q_1, q_2) & (\text{stopping})
\end{array}$$

For this simplified process we show a lower bound: after $\tilde{t} = \Theta(n \cdot \log n)$ interactions all agents are in I_{launch} . Then we show (for the simplified process) an upper bound: in $C_{\tilde{t}}$ none of the agents are in state **stop**. A simple coupling of the simplified process and the original process shows that under these circumstances none of the agents entered I_{work} for our original process. This finishes the proof with $t' = \tilde{t}$.

Lower Bound. In the simplified process agents can enter I_{launch} either via hopping or by making enough steps forward on their own. From Lemma 3 it follows that all agents enter I_{launch} after at most $\tilde{t} = \tau/4 \cdot n$ interactions with probability at least $1 - n^{-(5+c)}$. (For the upper bound, one can simply discard setting the clock counter to zero when an agent enters I_{launch} by increasing its counter.) Showing that none of the agents are in state **stop** is much harder. Due to the hopping the clock counters of agents in I_{launch} are highly correlated. Nevertheless, we can show that the clock counters of each agent can be majorized by independent binomially distributed random variables as follows.

Upper Bound. Let u_i be the i 'th agent that enters I_{launch} and let t_i be the time when u_i enters I_{launch} . Let furthermore $X_i(t)$ be a random variable for the clock counter of agent u_i in I_{launch} in the time interval $[0, t]$. Formally, we define for a time step t that $X_i(t) = 0$ if u_i is in I_{gather} and $X_i(t) = \text{clock}[u_i](t)$ if u_i is in I_{launch} . We show by induction on i that $X_i(t)$ is majorized by a random variable $Z_i(t)$ with binomial distribution $Z_i(t) \sim \text{Bin}(t, 1/n \cdot (1 + 1/(n-1))^{i-1})$. Ultimately, our goal is to apply Chernoff bounds to $Z_i(\tilde{t})$ which shows that agent u_i does not reach **stop** w.h.p. The statement for the simplified process then follows from a union bound over all agents w.h.p.

Base Case. For the base case we consider all agents that enter I_{launch} on their own by incrementing their counters to 0 (modulo $|Q|$) in I_{gather} . Fix such an agent u_i . It holds that $X_i(t)$ for $t \geq t_i$ has binomial distribution $X_i(t) \sim \text{Bin}(t - t_i, 1/n)$. Therefore, $X_i(t) \prec Z_i(t)$ as claimed.² (Intuitively, this means that the clock counter of any other agent u_i with $i > 1$ that enters I_{launch} at time $t_i > 0$ is majorized by the clock counter of an agent which enters I_{launch} at time $t_1 = 0$ and increments its counter with probability $1/n$.)

Induction Step. For the induction step we now consider all agents that enter I_{launch} by hopping onto some other agent in I_{launch} . Fix such an agent u_i . Let S_i be the event that agent u_i is the i 'th agent that enters I_{launch} . Let furthermore t_i be the time when u_i enters I_{launch} . We condition on S_i and observe that agent u_i enters I_{launch} by hopping onto some other agent $u_j \in \{u_1, \dots, u_{i-1}\}$. Intuitively, we would now like to exploit the fact that the counter of agent u_i is

² The expression $X \prec Y$ means that the random variable X is majorized by the random variable Y .

copied at time t_i from agent u_j such that $X_i(t_i) = X_j(t_i)$. Unfortunately, we must be extremely careful here: conditioning on S_i alters the probability space! (For example, under S_i the agent u_i with $i \geq 3$ cannot initiate an interaction with agent u_1 before agent u_2 does, since S_i rules out that u_i enters I_{launch} before agent u_2 .) We account for the modified probability space as follows.

Let $\Omega_{S_i}(t)$ be the probability space of possible interactions conditioned on S_i at time $t \leq \tilde{t}$. Without the conditioning on S_i , the probability space $\Omega(t)$ at time t contains all (ordered) pairs of agents with $|\Omega(t)| = n \cdot (n-1)$. When conditioning on S_i , the event S_i rules out that agent u_i interacts with any other agent $u_j \in I_{\text{launch}}$ before time t_i . In particular, agent u_i cannot interact with another agent u_j with $j < i$ during the time interval $[t_j, t_i]$. In order to give a lower bound on $|\Omega_{S_i}(t)|$, we exclude all $(n-1)$ interactions (u_i, u_j) for $j \in [n]$ from $\Omega(t)$. Hence $|\Omega_{S_i}(t)| \geq n \cdot (n-1) - (n-1) = (n-1)^2$ for any time $t \leq t_i$. (The probability space after time t_i is not affected by conditioning on S_i , but the majorization holds nonetheless.) We now consider the event $E_{\hat{t}}$ for $\hat{t} \leq t_i$ that the interaction at time \hat{t} increments $X_j(t)$ by 1 (recall that u_j is the agent onto which u_i hopped). It then holds for the reduced probability space Ω_{S_i} that $\Pr[E_{\hat{t}} | S_i] \leq \Pr[E_{\hat{t}}] \cdot |\Omega(t)| / |\Omega_{S_i}(t)|$. (Note that Ω_{S_i} is still a uniform probability space.) We calculate

$$\frac{|\Omega(t)|}{|\Omega_{S_i}(t)|} = \frac{n \cdot (n-1)}{(n-1)^2} = 1 + \frac{1}{n-1}$$

and get $\Pr[E_{\hat{t}} | S_i] \leq \Pr[E_{\hat{t}}] \cdot (1 + 1/(n-1))$ for $\hat{t} \leq t_i$. Therefore, we use the induction hypothesis (that describes $X_j(t_i)$) and get $X_i(t_i) \prec Z_i(t_i)$, where $Z_i(t_i) \sim \text{Bin}\left(t_i, 1/n \cdot (1 + 1/(n-1))^{i-1}\right)$. Similarly, we define $E_{\hat{t}}$ for $\hat{t} \geq t_i$ to be the event that u_i increments its counter in I_{launch} . Observe that $\Pr[E_{\hat{t}}] \leq 1/n$ for $\hat{t} > t_i$. It follows that $X_i(t) \prec Z_i(t)$ with distribution $Z_i(t) \sim \text{Bin}(\tilde{t}, 1/n \cdot (1 + 1/(n-1))^{i-1})$ for $t \leq \tilde{t}$ as claimed. This concludes the induction.

Conclusions. From the induction it follows that for each agent u_i the clock counter $\text{clock}[u_i](\tilde{t})$ at time \tilde{t} is majorized by a random variable $Z(\tilde{t})$ with binomial distribution $Z(\tilde{t}) \sim \text{Bin}(\tilde{t}, e/n)$. (Note that we used the inequality $(1 + 1/(n-1))^{(n-1)} < e$.) From Theorem 18 it follows that $\Pr[Z(\tilde{t}) \geq \tau - 1] \leq n^{-(c+4)}$. Finally, the proof for the simplified process follows from a union bound over all agents.

It is now straightforward to couple the actual phase clock process with the simplified process. Assume that we start both processes at time 0 when exactly one agent is in state 0. In the simplified process no agent reaches state τ in $\tau/4 \cdot n$ interactions with probability at least $1 - n^{-(c+3)}$. In this case, however, the simplified process and the actual phase clock process do not deviate and, in particular, no agent reaches the beginning of I_{work} in $\tau/4 \cdot n$ many interactions. Thus, the configuration $C_{t'}$ is a homogeneous launching configuration with probability at least $1 - n^{-(c+3)}$.

Statement 3. By definition, all configurations where all agents are in $I_{\text{gather}} \cup I_{\text{launch}}$ are synchronous. \blacktriangleleft

We are now ready to put everything together and prove our first theorem.

Proof of Theorem 1. The proof of Theorem 1 follows readily from the main result of this section, Proposition 5.

Assume the configuration at time t_1 is a synchronous launching configuration. Then from Proposition 5 it follows w.h.p. that after $t_2 = \Theta(n \cdot w \cdot \log n)$ interactions the configuration C_{t_2} is again a homogeneous launching configuration, and all configurations in $[t_1, t_2]$ are synchronous. From Statement 3 it follows that no agent receives a signal in a contiguous subinterval $[t'_1, t'_2] \subset [t_1, t_2]$ of length $t'_2 - t'_1 = w \cdot \tau \cdot n$. This shows that we have w.h.p. the required *overlap* according to the definition of synchronous (τ, w) -phase clocks.

From Lemma 7 it follows w.h.p. that all agents transition from a homogeneous gathering configuration into a homogeneous launching configuration within $\tau/4 \cdot n$ interactions. Recall that whenever an agent crosses zero, it receives a signal. Therefore, when all agents transition from a homogeneous gathering configuration into a homogeneous launching configuration via a sequence of synchronous configurations, all agents receive exactly one signal, and the time between two signals of two agents (u, v) is w.h.p. at most $\tau/4 \cdot n$. This shows that we have w.h.p. the required *bursts* according to the definition of synchronous (τ, w) -phase clocks.

Together, the counters of our clock implement a synchronous (τ, w) -phase clock in $[t_1, t_2]$ with probability n^{-c} . It follows from an inductive argument that the clock counters implement a synchronous (τ, w) -phase clock during the n^c interactions that follow time t_1 w.h.p. ◀

5 Recovery: Proof of Theorem 2

In this section we first show the following main result. At the end of the section we show how Theorem 2 follows from this proposition.

► **Proposition 8 (Recovery).** *Consider our (τ, w) -phase clock with n agents and sufficiently large c and w . Let C_{t_1} be an arbitrary configuration. Then with probability at least $1 - 1/n$, there exists a $t_2 = O(n \cdot w \cdot \log n)$ such that $C_{t_1+t_2}$ is a homogeneous launching configuration.*

We say a configuration is an *almost homogeneous gathering configuration* if no agent is in I_{launch} and at least $0.9 \cdot n$ many agents are in I_{gather} . We start our analysis by showing that within $t = O(n \cdot w \cdot \log n)$ interactions, we reach an almost homogeneous gathering configuration C_{t_1+t} .

► **Lemma 9.** *Let C_t be an arbitrary configuration. Then with probability at least $1 - 1/(3n)$, there exists a $t' = O(n \cdot w \cdot \log n)$ such that $C_{t+t'}$ is an almost homogeneous gathering configuration.*

Proof Sketch. The main idea of the proof is as follows. If there are not too many agents in I_{gather} , the reset rule prevents agents from reaching the end of I_{gather} . Agents may still enter I_{launch} by hopping, but if no agent enters state 0, eventually there is no agent left in state 0 to hop on. Then the same argument applies to state 1, and so on. Eventually, there are no agents left in I_{launch} to hop onto. This means the agents are *trapped* in I_{gather} until a sufficiently large number of agents enters I_{gather} which renders resetting quite unlikely again. The resulting configuration is what we call an almost homogeneous gathering configuration. ◀

Next, we show that from an almost homogeneous gathering configuration we reach a homogeneous gathering configuration in $O(n \cdot w \cdot \log n)$ interactions. From Lemma 7 in Section 4 it then follows that we reach a homogeneous launching configuration in an additional number of $O(n \cdot \log n)$ interactions.

► **Lemma 10.** *Let C_t be an almost homogeneous gathering configuration. Then with probability at least $1 - 1/(3n)$, there exists a $t' = \Theta(n \cdot w \cdot \log n)$ such that $C_{t+t'}$ is a homogeneous gathering configuration.*

Proof Sketch. If C_t is an almost homogeneous gathering configuration, then there are no agents in I_{launch} and at least $0.9 \cdot n$ many agents in I_{gather} . Thus, agents cannot hop until an agent enters I_{launch} on its own. Now there are two cases. If no agent enters I_{launch} on its own before the last agent enters I_{gather} , we are done: this is by definition of a homogeneous gathering configuration. Otherwise, we will show that a large fraction of agents leave I_{gather} together. This large fraction behaves similar as in the proof of the maintenance. The remaining agents have a small *head start* but then they are again *trapped* in I_{gather} until the bulk of agents arrives. Once the bulk of agents enters I_{gather} we have reached a homogeneous gathering configuration and all agents start to run through the clock synchronously. ◀

We are now ready to put everything together and show our second main theorem.

Proof of Theorem 2. The proof of Theorem 2 follows readily from the main result of this section, Proposition 8. Observe that $\tau = \Theta(\log n)$. According to Proposition 8, our clock recovers to a homogeneous launching configuration in $O(n \cdot \log n)$ interactions. By Theorem 1, this marks the beginning of a time interval in which the agents implement a synchronous (τ, w) -phase clock. It follows immediately from Theorem 1 that this interval has length n^c . Together, this implies that our (τ, w) -phase clock is a $(O(n \cdot \log n), \Omega(\text{polyn}))$ -loosely-stabilizing $(\Theta(\log n), w)$ -phase clock. \blacktriangleleft

6 Adaptive Majority Problem

In this section we consider the *adaptive majority problem* introduced in [3] under the name *robust comparison* and defined as follows. At any time, every agent has as input either an *opinion* (A or B) or it has no input, in which case we say it is *undecided* (U). During the execution of the protocol, the inputs to agents can change. In the adaptive majority problem, the goal is that all agents output the opinion which is dominant among all inputs. In this setting we present a *loosely-stabilizing* protocol that solves the adaptive majority problem.

Recall that the performance of a loosely-stabilizing protocol is measured in terms of the *convergence time* and the *holding time*. Note that the loose-stabilization comes from an application of our phase clock (see Section 3). The phase clocks guarantee synchronized phases for polynomial time. During this time we say a configuration C is *correct* w.r.t. the adaptive majority problem if the following conditions hold. Suppose there is a sufficiently large bias towards one opinion. Then every agent in a correct configuration outputs the majority opinion. Otherwise, if there is no sufficiently large bias, we consider any output of the agents as correct. In this setting, we show the following result: We show that a $(O(\log n), \text{polyn})$ -loosely-stabilizing algorithm exists that solves adaptive majority, using $O(\log n)$ states per agent.

6.1 Our Protocol

Our protocol is based on the (τ, w) -phase clock defined in Section 3 with $w = 566$. In addition to the states required by the clock, every agent v has three variables $\text{input}[v]$, $\text{opinion}[v]$, and $\text{output}[v]$. The variable $\text{input}[v]$ always reflects the current input to the agent, $\text{opinion}[v]$ holds the current opinion of agent v , and $\text{output}[v]$ defines the current output value of agent v . All three variables take on values in $\{A, B, U\}$, where A and B stand for the corresponding opinions and U stands for *undecided*.

We use the (τ, w) -phase clock to synchronize the agents. Then it follows from Proposition 5 that all configurations are synchronous w.h.p. Observe that in a synchronous configuration for our choice of parameters the clock counters of agents do not deviate by more than $\Delta = 55 \cdot \tau$. This allows us to define three *subphases* of I_{work} , where agents execute three different protocols, as follows. We split the working interval I_{work} into six contiguous subintervals of equal length. The clock counters $\text{clock}[u]$ allows us to define a simple interface to the phase clock for each agent u as follows. The variable $\text{subphase}[u]$ for each agent u is then defined as follows. We set $\text{subphase}[u] = 1$ if $\text{clock}[u]$ is in the first subinterval of I_{work} , $\text{subphase}[u] = 2$ if $\text{clock}[u]$ is in the third subinterval of I_{work} , and $\text{subphase}[u] = 3$ if $\text{clock}[u]$ is in the fifth subinterval of I_{work} . Otherwise, $\text{subphase}[u] = \perp$. The clock now assures a clean separation into these subphases such that no two agents perform a different protocol at any time w.h.p. Additionally, we will show the overlap within each subphase is long enough such that the subprotocols for the corresponding subphases succeed w.h.p.

On an intuitive level, our protocol works as follows. At the beginning of the phase, the input is copied to the opinion variable. In the first protocol, the support of opinions A and B is amplified until no undecided agents are left. We call this the Pólya Subphase. In the second protocol, agents with opposite opinions cancel each other out, becoming undecided. We call this the Cancellation Subphase. Finally, in the third protocol the single remaining opinion is amplified again. We call this the Broadcasting Subphase. The resulting opinion is copied to the output variable after the working interval I_{work} . Formally, our protocol is specified in Algorithm 1.

■ **Algorithm 1** Interaction of agents (u, v) in the adaptive majority protocol.

```

1  update clock[u] according to Rules 1–4 with  $w = 566$ 
2  if Agent  $u$  receives a signal then
3    opinion[u]  $\leftarrow$  input[u]
4  if subphase[u] = 1  $\wedge$  opinion[u] =  $U$  then
5    opinion[u]  $\leftarrow$  opinion[v]
6  if subphase[u] = 2  $\wedge$  opinion[u]  $\neq$  opinion[v]  $\wedge$  opinion[u], opinion[v]  $\neq U$  then
7    opinion[u], opinion[v]  $\leftarrow U$ 
8  if subphase[u] = 3  $\wedge$  opinion[u] =  $U$  then
9    opinion[u]  $\leftarrow$  opinion[v]
10 if clock[u]  $\geq |I_{\text{launch}}| + |I_{\text{work}}|$  then
11   output[u]  $\leftarrow$  opinion[u]

```

Result and Notation. In the remainder of this section, we let A_t and B_t denote the number of agents u with $\text{opinion}[u] = A$ and $\text{opinion}[u] = B$, respectively, at time t . Analogously, we let A_t^{IN} and B_t^{IN} denote the number of agents u with $\text{input}[u] = A$ and $\text{input}[u] = B$, respectively, at time t . We now state our main result for this section, where we assume w.l.o.g. that A is the majority and B is the minority opinion.

► **Theorem 11.** *Algorithm 1 is a $(O(n \log n), \Omega(\text{polyn}))$ -loosely stabilizing adaptive majority protocol.*

6.2 Analysis

In the following analysis, we consider an arbitrary but fixed phase. We condition on the event that the clock is synchronized according to Proposition 5 during that phase. We show the following main result, and later in this section we describe how Theorem 11 follows from it this proposition. The proofs for the statements in this section can be found in Appendix C.

► **Proposition 12.** *Assume that at time t_1 the clocks are in a homogeneous launching configuration and we have $A_{t_1} \geq \alpha \cdot \log n$ and $A_{t_1} \geq (1 + \beta) \cdot B_{t_1}$. If α and β are large enough constants, then there exists a $t_2 = \Theta(n \cdot w \cdot \log n)$ such that all agents output A in configuration $C_{t_1+t_2}$ with probability $1 - n^{-c}$.*

The analysis is split into three parts, one for the *Pólya Subphase*, one for the *Cancellation Subphase*, and one for the *Broadcasting Subphase*. First, we assume that no changes in the input occur. This highlights the simplicity of the application of our phase clock. Then we generalize our results: we adopt the undecided state dynamics introduced in [8], and show how we can tolerate input changes at various rates.

Observe that from the guarantees of the phase clock in Theorem 1 we get a strict separation between the subphases: no two agents can be more than $1/6$ of I_{work} apart. Furthermore we

know that every agent has copied its input at the beginning of the phase before the first agent enters the first subphase. At last the total time for the three subphases (including the separation time) is sufficiently large such that every agent has finished its work before the next phase starts.

When we refer to a distribution *before a subphase*, we mean the distribution at the time just before the first agent performs an interaction in that subphase. Analogously, when we refer to a distribution *after a subphase*, we mean the distribution at the time when the last agent has performed an interaction in that subphase. Recall that in the following analysis, we let A_t and B_t denote the number of agents u with $\text{opinion}[u] = A$ and $\text{opinion}[u] = B$, respectively, at time t . Furthermore, we let s_i and e_i (for *start* and *end*) be the first and the last time, respectively, when an agent performs an interaction in the i 'th subphase.

Subphases. We first consider the Pólya Subphase, where we model the process by means of so-called Pólya urns. Pólya urns are defined as follows. Initially, the urn contains a red balls and b blue balls. In each step, a ball is drawn uniformly at random from the urn. The ball's color is observed, and it is returned into the urn along with an additional ball of the same color. The Pólya-Eggenberger distribution $\text{PE}(a, b, m)$ describes the total number of red balls after m steps of this urn process.

This observation allows us to apply concentration bounds to the opinion distribution after the Pólya Subphase. Recall that s_1 and e_1 are the first and the last time steps, respectively, when an agent performs an interaction in the Pólya Subphase. We get the following lemma.

► **Lemma 13.** *Let $a = A_{s_1-1}$ and $b = B_{s_1-1}$. For any constant $\beta > 0$ there exists a constant α such that if $a > \alpha \cdot \log n$ and $a > (1 + \beta) \cdot b$ then $A_{e_1} - B_{e_1} = \Omega(n)$ with probability at least $1 - n^{-(c+2)}$.*

Next we consider the Cancellation Subphase. The goal is to remove any occurrence of the minority opinion. Whenever an agent with opinion A interacts with another agent with opinion B , both agents become undecided. Formally, we show the following lemma.

► **Lemma 14.** *If $A_{s_2-1} - B_{s_2-1} = \Omega(n)$ then $A_{e_2} = \Omega(n)$ and $B_{e_2} = 0$ with probability at least $1 - n^{-(c+2)}$.*

Finally we consider the Broadcasting Subphase. The goal is to spread the (unique) remaining opinion to all other agents. Whenever an undecided agent u interacts with another agent v that has an opinion, agent u adopts the opinion of agent v . This leads to a configuration where every agent has the majority opinion w.h.p. Formally, we show the following lemma.

► **Lemma 15.** *If $A_{e_2} = \Omega(n)$ and $B_{e_2} = 0$, then $A_{e_3} = n$ and $B_{e_3} = 0$ with probability at least $1 - n^{-(c+2)}$.*

We have now everything we need to prove Proposition 12.

Proof of Proposition 12. We assume the configuration at time t_1 is a homogeneous launching configuration. From Proposition 5 it follows that all configurations in the time interval $[t_1, t_1 + t_2]$ for some $t_2 = \Theta(n \cdot w \cdot \log n)$ are synchronous with probability at least $1 - n^{-(c+1)}$. This means that the three subphases are strictly separated as explained above. It therefore follows, each with probability at least $1 - n^{-(c+2)}$,

- from Lemma 13 that after the Pólya Subphase no agent is undecided,
- from Lemma 14 that after the Cancellation Subphase no agent has opinion B , and
- from Lemma 15 that after the Broadcasting Subphase all agents have opinion A .

Once all agents have opinion A , this becomes the output when the agents enter I_{gather} . Together, this shows that all agents output the majority opinion after $\Theta(n \cdot w \cdot \log n)$ interactions with probability at least $1 - n^{-c}$. ◀

With Proposition 12 we can now prove Theorem 11 as follows.

Proof of Theorem 11. We first show recovery. Note that we do not (yet) consider input changes. Fix a time t_1 and assume the agents are in an arbitrary configuration at time t_1 . From Theorem 2 it follows the clocks enter a synchronous configuration within $O(n \log n)$ interactions and stay in synchronous configurations for polyn time w.h.p.

Fix a synchronized phase $i < \text{polyn}$. It follows from Proposition 12 that all agents enter a correct configuration at the end of phase i with probability at least $1 - n^{-c}$. (Recall that in a correct configuration all agents have to output the majority opinion if there is a sufficiently large bias. Without a bias, any output constitutes a correct configuration.)

From the guarantees of the phase clock it follows that the first synchronized phase starts within $O(n \log n)$ time after time t_1 w.h.p. This shows a convergence time of $O(n \log n)$. From a union bound over at most n^{c-1} phases it follows that the protocol is in a correct configuration for polyn interactions w.h.p. This shows a holding time of polyn . Together, this concludes the proof. \blacktriangleleft

Improving the Bound. In order to show-case the simplicity of the application of our phase clock, we have presented a simplistic protocol, where we assumed a constant factor bias towards the majority opinion. We now show how to obtain a tighter result: we replace the Cancellation Subphase and the Broadcasting Subphase (lines 6 to 9 in Algorithm 1) with the *undecided state dynamics* introduced in [8].

The undecided state dynamics is defined as follows. Each agent is in one of three states, x , y , or b . If an agent u with opinion x (y , resp.) interacts with another agent v with opinion y (x , resp.), agent u enters the *blank* state b . If an agent u in state b interacts with another agent v in state x or y , u adopts v 's state. When adopted to our problem, the values A , B , U of variable `opinion`[u] at agent u translate directly to states x , y , and b , respectively. The undecided state dynamics converge to the correct majority w.h.p. even if the multiplicative bias is much smaller than a constant fraction. Formally, we show the following statement.

► **Observation 16.** If we use the undecided state dynamics, Proposition 12 also holds for $\alpha = \Omega(\beta^{-2})$ provided that $\beta = \Omega(n^{-1/4+\epsilon})$.

This means that we can solve the adaptive majority problem with a multiplicative bias of $1 + \beta = 1 + 1/\log n = 1 + o(1)$ and asymptotically at least $\Omega(\log^2 n)$ many agents (assuming sufficiently large constants). Hence we match the results of [3].

Robustness Against Input Changes. We finally investigate the effect of *input changes*, introduced in [3] as *leak transitions*. Input changes affect the `input`[u] variable of an agent u : they convert an agent u with majority input `input`[u] = A to an agent u with minority input `input`[u] = B . (Recall that we assume w.l.o.g. that A is the majority and B is the minority opinion.) Our main observation is the following. Let r be the rate of input changes such that in each interaction an input changes with probability r . Assume that r bounded and a sufficiently large bias β towards the majority opinion is present. Then we show the following result.

► **Proposition 17.** Assume that at time t_1 the clocks are in a homogeneous launching configuration and we have $A_{t_1} \geq \alpha \cdot \log n$ and $A_{t_1} \geq (1 + \beta) \cdot B_{t_1}$. Assume that the inputs change at rate r . If

$$\alpha = \Omega(\beta^{-2}), \quad \beta = \Omega(n^{-1/4+\epsilon}), \quad \text{and} \quad r \leq \frac{\beta \cdot \alpha}{n}$$

then there exists a $t_2 = \Theta(n \cdot w \cdot \log n)$ such that all agents output A in configuration $C_{t_1+t_2}$ with probability $1 - n^{-c}$.

Proof Sketch. The main idea in the proof of Proposition 17 is that we bound the number of input changes in $[t_1, t_2]$ by a simple application of Chernoff bounds. Intuitively, if this number of input changes is at most a constant factor of the bias, we are done. Hence the result follows from the observation that the input configuration does not change quickly enough to turn over the bias: the output of the agents at the end of the phase, even though its calculation is based on an *old* configuration from the beginning of the phase, is still correct. The formal statement then follows from the previous analysis without input changes. ◀

Finally, observe that also under presence of input changes we match the results of [3] for $r = 1/n$, a multiplicative bias of $1 + \beta = 1 + 1/\log n$ and $\Omega(\log^2 n)$ many agents ($\alpha \geq \log n$).

References

- 1 Dan Alistarh, James Aspnes, and Rati Gelashvili. Space-optimal majority in population protocols. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA*, pages 2221–2239. SIAM, 2018. doi:10.1137/1.9781611975031.144.
- 2 Dan Alistarh, Bartłomiej Dudek, Adrian Kosowski, David Soloveichik, and Przemysław Uznanski. Robust detection in leak-prone population protocols. In *DNA Computing and Molecular Programming - 23rd International Conference, DNA*, volume 10467 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 155–171. Springer, 2017. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-66799-7_11.
- 3 Dan Alistarh, Martin Töpfer, and Przemysław Uznanski. Comparison dynamics in population protocols. In Avery Miller, Keren Censor-Hillel, and Janne H. Korhonen, editors, *PODC '21: ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing, Virtual Event, Italy, July 26-30, 2021*, pages 55–65. ACM, 2021. doi:10.1145/3465084.3467915.
- 4 Talley Amir, James Aspnes, and John Lazarsfeld. Approximate majority with catalytic inputs. In Quentin Bramas, Rotem Oshman, and Paolo Romano, editors, *24th International Conference on Principles of Distributed Systems, OPODIS 2020, December 14-16, 2020, Strasbourg, France (Virtual Conference)*, volume 184 of *LIPICs*, pages 19:1–19:16. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2020. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.OPODIS.2020.19.
- 5 Dana Angluin, James Aspnes, Zoë Diamadi, Michael J. Fischer, and René Peralta. Computation in networks of passively mobile finite-state sensors. *Distributed Comput.*, 18(4):235–253, 2006. doi:10.1007/s00446-005-0138-3.
- 6 Dana Angluin, James Aspnes, and David Eisenstat. Stably computable predicates are semilinear. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing, PODC*, pages 292–299. ACM, 2006. doi:10.1145/1146381.1146425.
- 7 Dana Angluin, James Aspnes, and David Eisenstat. Fast computation by population protocols with a leader. *Distributed Comput.*, 21(3):183–199, 2008. doi:10.1007/s00446-008-0067-z.
- 8 Dana Angluin, James Aspnes, and David Eisenstat. A simple population protocol for fast robust approximate majority. *Distributed Comput.*, 21(2):87–102, 2008. doi:10.1007/s00446-008-0059-z.
- 9 Dana Angluin, James Aspnes, David Eisenstat, and Eric Ruppert. The computational power of population protocols. *Distributed Comput.*, 20(4):279–304, 2007. doi:10.1007/s00446-007-0040-2.
- 10 James Aspnes. Clocked population protocols. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 121:34–48, 2021. doi:10.1016/j.jcss.2021.05.001.
- 11 Gregor Bankhamer, Petra Berenbrink, Felix Biermeier, Robert Elsässer, Hamed Hosseinpour, Dominik Kaaser, and Peter Kling. Fast consensus via the unconstrained undecided state dynamics, 2022. SODA 2022, to appear. arXiv:2103.10366.
- 12 Gregor Bankhamer, Robert Elsässer, Dominik Kaaser, and Matjaz Krnc. Positive aging admits fast asynchronous plurality consensus. In *PODC '20: ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*, pages 385–394. ACM, 2020. doi:10.1145/3382734.3406506.

- 13 Stav Ben-Nun, Tsvi Kopelowitz, Matan Kraus, and Ely Porat. An $o(\log^{3/2} n)$ parallel time population protocol for majority with $o(\log n)$ states. In *Proceedings of the ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing, PODC 2020, Virtual Event, Italy, August 3-7, 2020*, page to appear, 2020.
- 14 Petra Berenbrink, Robert Elsässer, Tom Friedetzky, Dominik Kaaser, Peter Kling, and Tomasz Radzik. Time-space trade-offs in population protocols for the majority problem. *Distributed Computing*, 2020. doi:[10.1007/s00446-020-00385-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00446-020-00385-0).
- 15 Petra Berenbrink, Robert Elsässer, Tom Friedetzky, Dominik Kaaser, Peter Kling, and Tomasz Radzik. Time-space trade-offs in population protocols for the majority problem. *Distributed Comput.*, 34(2):91–111, 2021. doi:[10.1007/s00446-020-00385-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00446-020-00385-0).
- 16 Petra Berenbrink, George Giakkoupis, and Peter Kling. Optimal time and space leader election in population protocols. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC*, pages 119–129. ACM, 2020. doi:[10.1145/3357713.3384312](https://doi.org/10.1145/3357713.3384312).
- 17 Janna Burman, Ho-Lin Chen, Hsueh-Ping Chen, David Doty, Thomas Nowak, Eric E. Severson, and Chuan Xu. Time-optimal self-stabilizing leader election in population protocols. In Avery Miller, Keren Censor-Hillel, and Janne H. Korhonen, editors, *PODC '21: ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing, Virtual Event, Italy, July 26-30, 2021*, pages 33–44. ACM, 2021. doi:[10.1145/3465084.3467898](https://doi.org/10.1145/3465084.3467898).
- 18 Anne Condon, Monir Hajiaghayi, David G. Kirkpatrick, and Ján Manuch. Approximate majority analyses using tri-molecular chemical reaction networks. *Nat. Comput.*, 19(1):249–270, 2020. doi:[10.1007/s11047-019-09756-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11047-019-09756-4).
- 19 Shlomi Dolev and Jennifer L. Welch. Self-stabilizing clock synchronization in the presence of byzantine faults. *J. ACM*, 51(5):780–799, September 2004. doi:[10.1145/1017460.1017463](https://doi.org/10.1145/1017460.1017463).
- 20 David Doty, Mahsa Eftekhari, Leszek Gąsieniec, Eric Severson, Grzegorz Stachowiak, and Przemysław Uznański. A time and space optimal stable population protocol solving exact majority, 2022. FOCS 2022, to appear. [arXiv:2106.10201](https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.10201).
- 21 David Doty and David Soloveichik. Stable leader election in population protocols requires linear time. *Distributed Computing*, 31(4):257–271, 2018. doi:[10.1007/s00446-016-0281-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00446-016-0281-z).
- 22 Bartłomiej Dudek and Adrian Kosowski. Universal protocols for information dissemination using emergent signals. In *Proceedings of the 50th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC*, pages 87–99. ACM, 2018. doi:[10.1145/3188745.3188818](https://doi.org/10.1145/3188745.3188818).
- 23 Leszek Gąsieniec and Grzegorz Stachowiak. Fast space optimal leader election in population protocols. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA*, pages 2653–2667. SIAM, 2018. doi:[10.1137/1.9781611975031.169](https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611975031.169).
- 24 Svante Janson. Tail bounds for sums of geometric and exponential variables. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 135, 09 2017. doi:[10.1016/j.spl.2017.11.017](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spl.2017.11.017).
- 25 Norman Lloyd Johnson and Samuel Kotz. *Urn Models and Their Application: An Approach to Modern Discrete Probability Theory*. Wiley, 1977.
- 26 Adrian Kosowski and Przemysław Uznański. Brief announcement: Population protocols are fast. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing, PODC*, pages 475–477. ACM, 2018. doi:[10.1145/3212734.3212788](https://doi.org/10.1145/3212734.3212788).
- 27 Michael Mitzenmacher and Eli Upfal. *Probability and Computing: Randomized Algorithms and Probabilistic Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 2005. doi:[10.1017/CB09780511813603](https://doi.org/10.1017/CB09780511813603).
- 28 Yuichi Sudo, Junya Nakamura, Yukiko Yamauchi, Fukuhito Ooshita, Hirotsugu Kakugawa, and Toshimitsu Masuzawa. Loosely-stabilizing leader election in a population protocol model. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 444:100–112, 2012. doi:[10.1016/j.tcs.2012.01.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2012.01.007).
- 29 Kunal Talwar and Udi Wieder. Balanced allocations: A simple proof for the heavily loaded case. In *Automata, Languages, and Programming - 41st International Colloquium, ICALP*, volume 8572 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 979–990. Springer, 2014. doi:[10.1007/978-3-662-43948-7_81](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-43948-7_81).

Appendix

A Auxiliary Results

In this appendix we state a number of auxiliary results used in our analysis for completeness.

A.1 Concentration Inequalities

We start with classical Chernoff bounds.

► **Theorem 18** ([27], Theorem 4.4, 4.5). *Let X_1, \dots, X_n be independent Poisson trials with $\Pr[X_i = 1] = p_i$ and let $X = \sum X_i$ with $\mathbb{E}[X] = \mu$. Then the following Chernoff bounds hold for $0 < \delta \leq 1$:*

$$\Pr[X > (1 + \delta) \cdot \mu] \leq e^{-\mu \cdot \delta^2 / 3}, \quad \text{and} \\ \Pr[X < (1 - \delta) \cdot \mu] \leq e^{-\mu \cdot \delta^2 / 2}.$$

Next we consider tail bounds for sums of geometrically distributed random variables.

► **Theorem 19** ([24], Theorem 2.1). *Let $X = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ where $X_i, i = 1, \dots, n$, are independent geometric random variables with $X_i \sim \text{Geo}(p_i)$ for $p_i \in (0, 1]$. For any $\lambda \geq 1$,*

$$\Pr[X \geq \lambda \cdot \mathbb{E}[X]] \leq \exp(-\min_i \{p_i\} \cdot \mathbb{E}[X] \cdot (\lambda - 1 - \ln \lambda)).$$

The following theorem considers Pólya urns. Recall that Pólya urns are defined as follows. Initially, the urn contains a red balls and b blue balls. In each step, a ball is drawn uniformly at random from the urn. The ball's color is observed, and it is returned into the urn along with an additional ball of the same color. The *Pólya-Eggenberger distribution*, denoted by $\text{PE}(a, b, n)$, describes the *total number* of red balls that are contained in the urn after n steps. Note that in some related works the distribution describes the number of additional red balls (instead of the total number).

► **Theorem 20** ([12], Theorem 1). *Let $A \sim \text{PE}(a, b, n - (a + b))$, $\mu = (a / (a + b))n$ and $a + b \geq 1$. Then, for any δ with $0 < \delta < \sqrt{a}$ and some small constant $1 > \varepsilon_p > 0$ it holds that*

$$\Pr\left(A < \mu - \sqrt{a} \cdot \frac{n}{a+b} \cdot \delta\right) < 4\exp(-\varepsilon_p \cdot \delta^2) \\ \Pr\left(A > \mu + \sqrt{a} \cdot \frac{n}{a+b} \cdot \delta\right) < 4\exp(-\varepsilon_p \cdot \delta^2)$$

Finally, we state a result regarding the undecided dynamics introduced in [8].

► **Theorem 21** ([8], Theorem 3). *Let $\varepsilon > 0$. If the difference between the initial majority and initial minority populations is $\Omega(n^{3/4+\varepsilon})$ and there is exactly one active agent, then with high probability, the epidemic-triggered approximate majority protocol converges to the initial majority value.*

A.2 Simple Analysis of the One-Way Epidemic

In this appendix we give a simple proof of the one-way epidemic that is based on the analysis in [7]. Assume that at time 0 one agent is infected. Let T_i denote the random variable counting the number of interactions until one of the $n - i$ susceptible agents initiate an interaction with one of the i informed agents. T_i is geometrically distributed with success probability

$p_i = i \cdot (n-i)/n^2$. We calculate the expected number of interactions until all agents are infected, i.e., until there are $n-1$ successes. First, a simple calculation yields a lower and upper bound on the expected value of the sum of T_i 's.

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} T_i\right] &= \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{p_i} = n^2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{i \cdot (n-i)} \leq 2 \cdot n^2 \sum_{i=1}^{\lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \rceil} \frac{1}{i \cdot (n - \lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \rceil)} \leq 4 \cdot n \cdot \log n \\ \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} T_i\right] &= n^2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{i \cdot (n-i)} \geq n \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{i} \geq n \cdot \ln(n)\end{aligned}$$

Since all trials are independent, we can also calculate an upper bound. An application of Theorem 19 with $\lambda = 9(c+4)/(4\log(e))$ and $\min_i\{p_i\} = (n-1)/n^2$ yields (for sufficiently large n)

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} T_i > 6(c+4) \cdot n \cdot \ln n\right] &\leq \Pr\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} T_i > \lambda \cdot \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} T_i\right]\right] \\ &< \exp\left(-\frac{n-1}{n^2} \cdot n \cdot \ln n \cdot (\lambda - 1 - \ln \lambda)\right) \leq n^{-(1-\frac{1}{n})(\lambda-1-\ln \lambda)} \leq n^{-(5+c)}.\end{aligned}$$

B Omitted Proofs for the Loosely-Stabilizing Phase Clocks

In this appendix we give additional details and the full proofs for the loosely-stabilizing phase clock that have been omitted from Sections 4 and 5.

► **Lemma 9.** *Let C_t be an arbitrary configuration. Then with probability at least $1 - 1/(3n)$, there exists a $t' = O(n \cdot w \cdot \log n)$ such that $C_{t+t'}$ is an almost homogeneous gathering configuration.*

Proof. Recall the main idea of the proof: If there are not too many agents in I_{gather} , the reset rule prevents agents from reaching the end of I_{gather} . Agents may still enter I_{launch} by hopping, but if no agent enters state 0, eventually there is no agent left in state 0 to hop onto. This applies to all other states of I_{launch} as well. Eventually, there are no agents left in I_{launch} to hop onto. Then, no agent leaves I_{gather} until a reset is sufficiently unlikely such that an agent can reach the end of the interval. We use the rather arbitrary threshold of $0.9n$ agents in the definition of an *almost homogeneous gathering configuration*.

Formally, we divide time into *stages* of $2\tau n$ consecutive interactions as follows. W.l.o.g. assume that $t=0$. For $i \geq 0$, we define the i 'th stage as $\mathbb{T}_i = [i \cdot 2\tau n, (i+1) \cdot 2\tau n - 1]$. Our proof is based on a case distinction over the following two predicates:

- $A(\mathbb{T}_i)$ holds if for all configurations C_t , $t \in \mathbb{T}_i$ there are less than $0.9 \cdot n$ agents in I_{gather} .
- $B(\mathbb{T}_i)$ holds if none of the interactions in \mathbb{T}_i is of the type $(|Q|-1, q_2) \rightarrow (0, q_2)$, $q_2 \in I_{\text{gather}}$, i.e., no agent enters I_{launch} without hopping.

We divide the proof into three parts. We show that the following statements each hold with probability at least $1 - 1/(9n)$.

1. $\exists i \in [0, 5] : B(\mathbb{T}_i) \wedge B(\mathbb{T}_{i+1})$.
2. for any fixed $i \geq 0$: $B(\mathbb{T}_i) \wedge B(\mathbb{T}_{i+1}) \wedge A(\mathbb{T}_{i+1}) \implies \exists j \in O(w) : B(\mathbb{T}_{i+j}) \wedge B(\mathbb{T}_{i+j+1}) \wedge \overline{A}(\mathbb{T}_{i+j+1})$
3. for any fixed $i \geq 0$: $B(\mathbb{T}_i) \wedge B(\mathbb{T}_{i+1}) \wedge \overline{A}(\mathbb{T}_{i+1}) \implies \exists t \in \mathbb{T}_{i+1} : C_t$ is an almost homogeneous gathering configuration.

Throughout the proof we need a bound on the number of initiated interactions per agent during a stage. Let $X_u(i)$ denote the number of interactions agent u initiates in \mathbb{T}_i . From Lemma 4 it follows with $\delta=1$ that $X_u(i) > \tau$ with probability at least $1 - n^{-36 \cdot (c+4)}$ and that $X_u(i) < 4 \cdot \tau$ with probability at least $1 - n^{-24 \cdot (c+4)}$. By a union bound, we get for any fixed \mathbb{T}_i that

$$\forall u \in V : \tau < X_u(i) < 4 \cdot \tau \text{ with probability at least } 1 - n^{-36 \cdot (c+4)+1} - n^{-24 \cdot (c+4)+1}. \quad (5)$$

Statement 1. We first show that w.h.p. there exists an $i \in [0, 3]$ such that $A(\mathbb{T}_i) \vee B(\mathbb{T}_1)$. Then, we repeat the argument for $i \in [1, 4]$. Finally, we show that $A(\mathbb{T}_i) \implies B(\mathbb{T}_{i+1}) \wedge B(\mathbb{T}_{i+2})$.

For the sake of the argument, assume that $\bar{A}(\mathbb{T}_0) \wedge \bar{A}(\mathbb{T}_1) \wedge \bar{A}(\mathbb{T}_2) \wedge \bar{A}(\mathbb{T}_3) \wedge \bar{B}(\mathbb{T}_1)$ holds. We show that w.h.p. this can not happen. The case for $\bar{A}(\mathbb{T}_1) \wedge \bar{A}(\mathbb{T}_2) \wedge \bar{A}(\mathbb{T}_3) \wedge \bar{A}(\mathbb{T}_4) \wedge \bar{B}(\mathbb{T}_2)$ is very similar.

From $\bar{A}(\mathbb{T}_i)$ it follows that there exists a configuration C_{t_i} ($0 \leq i \leq 3$), $t_i \in \mathbb{T}_i$ where there are $\geq 0.9 \cdot n$ agents in I_{gather} . Any agent that leaves I_{gather} during \mathbb{T}_i does not return to I_{gather} within the next three stages w.h.p. This follows from Equation (5) and $|I_{\text{work}}| > 16\tau$. Therefore, no more than $0.1n$ agents may leave I_{gather} during $\mathbb{T}_i \cup \mathbb{T}_{i+1} \cup \mathbb{T}_{i+2}$. Thus, w.h.p. there are always at least $0.8 \cdot n$ agents in I_{gather} for all $t \in \mathbb{T}_0 \cup \mathbb{T}_1 \cup \mathbb{T}_2$.

Let us fix configuration $C_{t'}$ in \mathbb{T}_1 with an agent v_1 in state 0. By our assumption such a configuration exists, otherwise $B(\mathbb{T}_1)$ holds. From above it follows that at least $0.8n$ agents are in I_{gather} in $C_{t'}$. In the following, we will show that w.h.p. at least $0.1 \cdot n$ agents leave I_{gather} in $[t', t' + \tau/4 \cdot n]$. Note that this contradicts our assumption.

The proof that at least $0.1 \cdot n$ agents leave I_{gather} is similar to the one of Lemma 7. The main difference is that some agents are already in I_{launch} and can leave I_{launch} during that time. Fix an arbitrary set of agents that contains $0.7n - 1$ agents in I_{gather} and v_1 . We label these agents as *relevant*. An interaction between two relevant agents occurs with probability at least $p = 0.7^2 - 0.21/(n-1)$. Let $\tilde{t} = n\tau/4$. By Theorem 18, with probability at least $1 - n^{-3(c+4)}$ there are at least $\tilde{t}/2$ such interactions within the time interval $[t, \tilde{t}]$. From Lemma 3 (with $\lambda = 9(c+4)/(8\log(e))$) it follows (for sufficiently large c) that with probability at least $1 - n^{-(c/2+2)}$ all relevant agents enter I_{launch} in $\tilde{t}/2$ interactions. The remainder of the proof (that w.h.p. these agents do not leave I_{launch} during $[0, \tilde{t}]$) is identical to that of Statement 2 of Lemma 7. This holds regardless of the choice of the relevant agents.

In conclusion, our assumption must be false. Thus, no agent leaves I_{gather} on its own in $\mathbb{T}_2 \cup \mathbb{T}_3$ or in at least one of the five stages there are always less than $0.9 \cdot n$ agents in I_{gather} .

We complete the proof by showing the following for any fixed $i \geq 0$:

$$A(\mathbb{T}_i) \implies B(\mathbb{T}_{i+1}) \wedge B(\mathbb{T}_{i+2}) \text{ with probability at least } 1 - n^{-113(c+4)+1}. \quad (6)$$

We show that if $A(\mathbb{T}_i)$ holds, all agents either hop or reset and that any agent such agent does not reach the end of I_{gather} . Recall that agents in I_{gather} reset to the beginning of I_{gather} when they interact with agents in I_{work} , and they hop into I_{launch} when they interact with agents in I_{launch} . Consider \mathbb{T}_i where $A(\mathbb{T}_i)$ holds, i.e., there are less than $0.9 \cdot n$ agents in I_{gather} . It follows that, with probability at least 0.1 per initiated interaction, an agent in I_{gather} resets or leaves I_{gather} . We will call this a *success*. It is easy to see that each agent has w.h.p. at least one success in \mathbb{T}_i . From Equation (5) it follows that each agent initiates at least τ interactions in \mathbb{T}_i with probability at least $1 - n^{-12 \cdot (c+4)+1} - n^{-8 \cdot (c+4)+1}$. For any agent in I_{gather} , the probability that it has at least one success in τ interactions is at least $1 - (1 - 0.1)^\tau = 1 - n^{-113(c+4)}$. It follows from the union bound that all agents that are initially in I_{gather} during \mathbb{T}_i have a success with probability at least $1 - 3n^{-8(c+4)+1}$. It remains to show that an agent that resets is unlikely to leave I_{gather} without hopping. Note that it is even more unlikely for agents which hop into I_{launch} since they have to walk around the whole clock. From Equation (5) it follows that

each agent initiates at most $12 \cdot \tau$ interactions in three stages w.h.p. Since $|I_{\text{gather}}| > 12 \cdot \tau$, no successful agent leaves I_{gather} on its own in \mathbb{T}_i , \mathbb{T}_{i+1} , and \mathbb{T}_{i+2} . This implies $B(\mathbb{T}_{i+1}) \wedge B(\mathbb{T}_{i+2})$.

As we have shown above, w.h.p. $B(\mathbb{T}_2) \wedge B(\mathbb{T}_3)$ holds or there exists $i \leq 4$ such that $A(\mathbb{T}_i)$ holds. Statement 1 then follows from Equation (6).

Statement 2. We begin with the following observation. Let L be the set of agents at time $i \cdot 2\tau n$ in I_{launch} . By Lemma 4 (with $\delta = 1$) we know that each agent initiates at least τ interactions in \mathbb{T}_i with probability at least $1 - n^{-12 \cdot (c+4)}$. Thus, if $B(\mathbb{T}_i)$ holds, no agent initially in I_{launch} stays in that interval until the beginning of the next phase. We will show that this also holds for all other agents that hop. Consider an agent $u \in V \setminus L$ that hops on agent $v \in L$ during \mathbb{T}_i . The agents u and v start from the same state once u has hopped, thus they have the same probability to leave I_{launch} . Since all agents in L leave I_{launch} w.h.p., this holds for u as well. This argument extends to all agents $u \in V \setminus L$ via induction.

We use this fact to prove Statement 2 as follows. $B(\mathbb{T}_i)$ holds, thus there is no agent in I_{launch} in \mathbb{T}_{i+1} w.h.p. Thus, an agent must leave I_{gather} before agents can hop. If $A(\mathbb{T}_{i+1})$ holds, the agents reset and do not leave I_{gather} (see Equation (6)). Therefore, in $B(\mathbb{T}_{i+2}) \wedge B(\mathbb{T}_{i+3})$ holds and no agent leaves during $\mathbb{T}_{i+2} \cup \mathbb{T}_{i+3}$ at all.

We can repeat the argument until we reach a configuration for some stage $i+j$ where the number of agents in I_{gather} reaches $0.9 \cdot n$ agents. We have seen in the proof of Statement 1 of Lemma 6 that all agents reach I_{gather} in $O(n \cdot w \cdot \tau)$ interactions, i.e., it takes $O(w)$ stages, until sufficiently many agents have returned. Therefore, the statement holds for sufficiently large c .

Statement 3. $B(\mathbb{T}_i)$ implies that w.h.p. no agent is in I_{gather} at the beginning of \mathbb{T}_{i+1} (see Statement 2). Thus, agents cannot hop. $B(\mathbb{T}_{i+1})$ then implies that no agent leaves I_{gather} at all during \mathbb{T}_{i+1} . Therefore, there is no agent in I_{launch} for all $t \in \mathbb{T}_{i+1}$. $\bar{A}(\mathbb{T}_{i+1})$ implies the existence of a configuration C_t with at least $0.9n$ agents in I_{gather} . Then, C_t is an almost homogeneous gathering configuration. \blacktriangleleft

► **Lemma 10.** *Let C_t be an almost homogeneous gathering configuration. Then with probability at least $1 - 1/(3n)$, there exists a $t' = \Theta(n \cdot w \cdot \ln n)$ such that $C_{t+t'}$ is a homogeneous gathering configuration.*

Proof. Recall that in C_t no agent is in I_{launch} and at least $0.9 \cdot n$ many agents are in I_{gather} by definition. Thus, agents cannot hop until an agent enters I_{launch} on its own. If no agent enters I_{launch} on its own before the last agent enters I_{gather} , we are in a homogeneous gathering configuration. Otherwise, we will show that all agents leave I_{gather} at most once before we reach a homogeneous gathering configuration.

Formally, let $t+t''$ be the first time after t where an agent in I_{gather} reaches state 0 without hopping. Then, no agent has left I_{gather} during $[t, t+t'']$ since there is no agent in I_{launch} to hop on. Let $t' = n \cdot (|I_{\text{launch}}| + |I_{\text{work}}|) / (1 - (2 \cdot \sqrt{|I_{\text{work}}|/\tau})^{-1})$. Any agent not in I_{gather} needs at most t' interactions to reach I_{gather} with probability at least $1 - n^{-(c+4)}$ (see Statement 1 of Lemma 6). If $t'' > t'$, the proof is complete. Therefore, for the remainder of this proof, we assume that $t'' \leq t'$ and w.l.o.g. for the sake of brevity of notation that $t+t'' = 0$. We know for $C_{t+t''}$ that there are at least $0.9n - 1$ agents in I_{gather} , one agent is in state 0 and the remaining agents are in I_{work} . W.l.o.g. we assume that v_1 is in state 0.

We split the remainder of the proof into two parts.

1. W.h.p., after $\tau/4 \cdot n$ interactions there are at least $0.9 \cdot n$ agents in I_{launch} and no agent is in a state $> |I_{\text{launch}}| + |I_{\text{work}}| + \tau$.

2. Let C_t be a configuration where there are at least $0.9 \cdot n$ agents in I_{launch} and no agent in a state $\geq |I_{\text{launch}}| + |I_{\text{work}}| + \tau$. Then w.h.p., no agent leaves I_{gather} before all agents have reached I_{gather} .

Statement 1. We label v_1 and all agents that are in I_{gather} at time 0 as *relevant*. An interaction between two relevant agents occurs with probability at least $p = 0.81 - 0.09/(n-1)$. Let $\tilde{t} = n\tau/4$. By Theorem 18, w.h.p. there are at least $\tilde{t}/2$ such interactions within the time interval $[t, \tilde{t}]$. From Lemma 3 (with $\lambda = 9(c+4)/(\log(e))$) it follows (for sufficiently large c) that with probability at least $1 - n^{-(c/2+2)}$ all relevant agents enter I_{launch} in $\tilde{t}/2$ interactions. The remainder of the proof (that w.h.p. these agents do not leave I_{launch} during $[0, \tilde{t}]$) is identical to that of Statement 2 of Lemma 7.

Now we consider the remaining not relevant agents. Fix such an agent u . If u hops, we have shown that at time \tilde{t} u is in I_{launch} . Otherwise, from Lemma 4 it follows with $\delta = 1$ that agent u initiates less than τ interactions in $[0, \tilde{t}]$ with probability at least $1 - n^{-2 \cdot (c+4)}$. Therefore, u does not reach a state $> |I_{\text{launch}}| + |I_{\text{work}}| + \tau$. The first statement follows from the union bound over the remaining agents.

Statement 2. In the following, we generalize the proof of Statement 1 of Lemma 6. Consider a configuration C_t where there are at least $0.9 \cdot n$ agents in I_{launch} and no agent is in a state $> |I_{\text{launch}}| + |I_{\text{work}}| + \tau$ and for the sake of brevity assume w.l.o.g. that $t = 0$. For the analysis, we split the agents in two sets L and G . Let $L \subset V$ be the set of all agents that start in I_{launch} or hop during the first $2\tau n$ interactions and let $G = V \setminus L$. We will show that the agents in L arrive in I_{gather} closely together. The analysis of this part is almost identical to the original proof. Additionally, we will show that the agents in G remain within the first τ states of I_{gather} until the first agent of L enters I_{gather} . The size of I_{gather} is sufficiently large such that this 'head start' is not enough for these agents to reach the end of I_{gather} before the last agent enters I_{gather} .

First we consider the agents in L . Let t_a be the first interaction in which an agent of L enters I_{gather} . We have seen in Lemma 6 that w.h.p. $t_a > 2\tau n$ and that no agent $u \in L$ is still in I_{launch} after $2\tau n$ interactions. Furthermore, we have seen that after $t' = n \cdot (|I_{\text{launch}}| + |I_{\text{work}}|) / (1 - (2 \cdot \sqrt{|I_{\text{work}}|/\tau})^{-1})$ all agents $u \in L$ have reached I_{gather} . Let t_b be the first interaction in which an agent of L enters state $|I_{\text{launch}}| + |I_{\text{work}}| + |I_{\text{gather}}| - \tau$. We show that w.h.p. $t_b > t'$. Let $X_u(t')$ denote the number of interactions agent $u \in L$ initiates before time t' . From Lemma 4 it follows with $\delta = (|I_{\text{launch}}| + |I_{\text{work}}| - \tau) \cdot (1 - 1/(4 + 2 \cdot \sqrt{10 + w})) / (|I_{\text{launch}}| + |I_{\text{work}}|) > 3/4$ that $X_u(t') < |I_{\text{work}}| + |I_{\text{gather}}| - \tau$ with probability at least $1 - n^{-9(1+c/4)}$. Thus, $\text{clock}[u](t') \leq \text{clock}[u](0) + X_u(t') < |I_{\text{launch}}| + |I_{\text{work}}| + |I_{\text{gather}}| - \tau - 1$ with probability at least $1 - n^{-9(1+c/4)}$. By a union bound, this holds for all agents in L with probability at least $1 - n^{-(8+9c/4)}$.

The remaining agents start in a state $< |I_{\text{launch}}| + |I_{\text{work}}| + \tau$. To leave I_{gather} on their own, they must increase their counter at least $|I_{\text{gather}}| - \tau$ times without resetting or hopping. Each agent initiates at most $4 \cdot \tau$ interactions during $2\tau n$ w.h.p. (see Equation (5)). Therefore, no agent increase their state by more than 4τ before t_a w.h.p., i.e., they remain in I_{gather} .

On the other hand, there are less than $0.1n$ agents in I_{gather} . Thus, with probability at least 0.9 per interaction, an agent $u \in I_{\text{gather}}$ resets. We will call this a *success*. It is easy to see that w.h.p. u has at least one success in $t = \tau/2 \cdot n$ interactions. From Lemma 4 with $\delta = 1$ it follows that u initiates at least $\tau/4$ interactions in t interactions with probability at least $1 - n^{-2 \cdot (c+4)}$. For any agent in I_{gather} , the probability that in $\tau/2 \cdot n$ interactions is at least $p = 1 - (1 - 0.9)^{\tau/4} = 1 - n^{-3 \cdot \log(10) \cdot (c+4)}$. We now extend this to all agents and t_a interactions. Recall that the first agent in L enters I_{gather} at time $t_a < t'$. Agent u resets at least once during each $\tau/2 \cdot n$ interactions during t' interactions with probability at least $p^{2t'/(\tau \cdot n)} \geq 1 - \Theta(w) \cdot n^{-3 \cdot \log(10) \cdot (c+4)}$. For sufficiently large c that u is the first τ states of

I_{gather} when the first agent of L enters I_{gather} . A simple exchange argument yields that the probability for u to not leave I_{gather} before t' is majorized by the probability of an agent $v \in L$ to not reach state $|Q| - \tau$ before t' . A union bound over all agents completes the proof. \blacktriangleleft

C Additional Details for the Adaptive Majority Protocol

Finally, in this appendix we give the omitted details and full proofs for our adaptive majority protocol from Section 6.

Additional Details for the Pólya Subphase. The main observation for this subphase is that we can model the opinion distribution after the Pólya Subphase by the Pólya-Eggenberger distribution. Formally,

► **Observation 22.** Assume the configuration at time $s_1 - 1$ is fixed and let $a = A_{s_1-1}$ and $b = B_{s_1-1}$. Then $A_{e_1} \sim \text{PE}(a, b, n - a - b)$ and $B_{e_1} \sim \text{PE}(b, a, n - a - b)$, w.h.p.

Proof. The observation follows from a coupling of the Pólya Subphase with the Pólya urn process. Note that a similar observation has been previously used in [11]. Let $\ell_0 = a + b$ be the number of agents that have an opinion at time $s_1 - 1$. In step i , the Pólya urn process picks an arbitrary undecided agent. This agent chooses one of the ℓ_{i-1} agents that have an opinion uniformly at random and adopts its opinion, resulting in $\ell_i = \ell_{i-1} + 1$. It is now straightforward to couple the Pólya urn process with the Pólya Subphase: we simply discard all interactions that do not change the number of agents that have an opinion.

It remains to show that at time e_1 no undecided agents are left. This follows from the result on the one-way epidemic Lemma 3 (see also [7]), together with the following observations: By definition, all agents perform the Pólya Subphase during subphase 0. From the phase clock we get that there is at least an overlap of length $\Theta(n \cdot \log n)$ interactions where all agents are in the Pólya Subphase together. This overlap is long enough for the one-way epidemic to conclude with probability $1 - n^{-(c+2)}$. \blacktriangleleft

Observation 22 now allows us to apply Theorem 20 in order to prove concentration of A_{e_1} . For convenience, the lemma is restated as follows.

► **Lemma 13.** Let $a = A_{s_1-1}$ and $b = B_{s_1-1}$. For any constant $\beta > 0$ there exists a constant α such that if $a > \alpha \cdot \log n$ and $a > (1 + \beta) \cdot b$ then $A_{e_1} - B_{e_1} = \Omega(n)$ with probability at least $1 - n^{-(c+2)}$.

Proof. Recall that according to Observation 22 we have $A_{e_1} \sim \text{PE}(a, b, n - a - b)$ and $B_{e_1} = n - A_{e_1}$, w.h.p., and $A_{e_1} + B_{e_1} = n$ w.h.p. Let ε_p be the small constant from Theorem 20 (see Appendix A). We apply Theorem 20 to A_{e_1} and get for $\delta = \sqrt{((2+c)/\varepsilon_p) \cdot \ln n}$ that

$$\Pr \left[A_{e_1} \leq \frac{n}{a+b} \cdot a \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{a}} \right) \right] \leq 4 \cdot \exp(\varepsilon_p \cdot \delta^2) \leq 4 \cdot n^{-(c+2)}.$$

In this case we have w.h.p. that

$$\begin{aligned} A_{e_1} - B_{e_1} &= 2 \cdot A_{e_1} - n \geq 2 \cdot \frac{n}{a+b} \cdot a \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{a}} \right) - n \\ &\geq n \cdot \left(\frac{2+2\beta}{2+\beta} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{a}} \right) - 1 \right) \\ &= n \cdot \left(\frac{\beta}{2+\beta} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{a}} \right) - \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{a}} \right) \\ &\geq n \cdot \left(\frac{\beta}{2+\beta} - 2 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{(2+c)}{\varepsilon_p \cdot \alpha \cdot \log e}} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Hence $A_{e_1} - B_{e_1} = \Omega(n)$ for a sufficiently large constant α and given constant $\beta > 0$ with probability $1 - n^{-(c+2)}$. ◀

Additional Details for the Cancellation Subphase. Recall that in the cancellation subphase whenever an A agent interacts with a B agent, both become undecided. Analogously to before, s_2 and e_2 are the first and the last time, respectively, when an agent performs an interaction in the Cancellation Subphase. We now prove Lemma 14, which is restated here for convenience.

► **Lemma 14.** *If $A_{s_2-1} - B_{s_2-1} = \Omega(n)$ then $A_{e_2} = \Omega(n)$ and $B_{e_2} = 0$ with probability at least $1 - n^{-(c+2)}$.*

Proof. Every agent with opinion B can cancel out at most one other agent with opinion A , hence there are always at least $A_{s_2} - B_{s_2} = \Omega(n)$ many agents with opinion A during the entire subphase. Suppose an agent u with opinion B interacts with another agent v chosen uniformly at random. Then the probability that agent v holds opinion A is at least $\Omega(1)$. All agents (including those that hold opinion B) initiate at least $\Theta(\log n)$ interactions in the Cancellation Subphase. Hence, for sufficiently large length of the subphase, every agent with opinion B becomes undecided with probability at least $1 - n^{-c+3}$. The statement then follows via a union bound over all agents. ◀

Additional Details for the Broadcasting Subphase. We prove the following lemma for the Broadcasting Subphase. Recall that s_3 and e_3 are the first and the last time, respectively, when an agent performs an interaction in the Broadcasting Subphase.

► **Lemma 15.** *If $A_{e_2} = \Omega(n)$ and $B_{e_2} = 0$, then $A_{e_3} = n$ and $B_{e_3} = 0$ with probability at least $1 - n^{-(c+2)}$.*

Proof. The Broadcasting Subphase can be regarded as an epidemic spreading process, where the remaining opinion spreads to all other agents. The proof follows immediately from Lemma 3 along with the observation that there is a sufficiently long overlap in that subphase. ◀

Full Proof of Observation 16. We now give the full proof of Observation 16 which is restated here for convenience.

► **Observation 16.** If we use the undecided state dynamics, Proposition 12 also holds for $\alpha = \Omega(\beta^{-2})$ provided that $\beta = \Omega(n^{-1/4+\varepsilon})$.

Proof. In order to show Observation 16 we need a slightly more careful calculation in the proof of Lemma 13 that gives us a better bound on $A_{e_1} - B_{e_1}$, the bias after the Pólya Subphase.

Consider Equation (7) in the proof of Lemma 13. In order to achieve the bias of $\Theta(n^{3/4+\varepsilon})$ required by Theorem 21, we require for some constant $\varepsilon > 0$ that

$$A_1 - B_1 \stackrel{(7)}{\geq} n \cdot \left(\frac{\beta}{2+\beta} - 2\sqrt{2} \cdot (\varepsilon_p \cdot \alpha \cdot \log e)^{-1} \right) \geq n^{3/4+\varepsilon}.$$

When we solve the expression in parentheses for α we obtain

$$\alpha = \Omega(\beta^{-2}) \quad \text{provided that} \quad \beta = \Omega(n^{-1/4+\varepsilon}).$$

which gives the claimed bounds on α and β , provided the constants in the asymptotic notation are large enough. ◀

Full Proof of Proposition 17. Finally, we give the full proof of Proposition 17 which is restated here for convenience.

► **Proposition 17.** *Assume that at time t_1 the clocks are in a homogeneous launching configuration and we have $A_{t_1} \geq \alpha \cdot \log n$ and $A_{t_1} \geq (1+\beta) \cdot B_{t_1}$. Assume that the inputs change at rate r . If*

$$\alpha = \Omega(\beta^{-2}), \quad \beta = \Omega(n^{-1/4+\varepsilon}), \quad \text{and} \quad r \leq \frac{\beta \cdot \alpha}{n}$$

then there exists a $t_2 = \Theta(n \cdot w \cdot \log n)$ such that all agents output A in configuration $C_{t_1+t_2}$ with probability $1 - n^{-c}$.

Proof. Recall that each phase of the clock consists of $\Theta(n \log n)$ interactions. Hence $t_2 - t_1 = \Theta(n \log n)$. Let $X_{[t_1, t_2]}$ be the random variable for input changes in $[t_1, t_2]$ and observe that $\mathbb{E}[X_{[t_1, t_2]}] = r \cdot (t_2 - t_1) = \Theta(r \cdot n \log n)$. We apply Chernoff bounds to $X_{[t_1, t_2]}$ and obtain for a sufficiently large constant c' that $\Pr[X_{[t_1, t_2]} > c' \cdot r \cdot n \log n] \leq n^{-(c+1)}$. This means that at most $c' \cdot r \cdot n \log n$ agents change their input to the minority opinion in $[t_1, t_2]$ w.h.p.

We now distinguish two cases.

Case 1: $\beta \leq 1/(2c')$. In the first case we have only a small bias. We therefore have to revisit the Pólya Subphase once again. Consider a modified process where all input changes that would originally occur during the Pólya Subphase take place before the Pólya Subphase starts. We will now show via a coupling that handling input changes *early* at the beginning of the phase does not alter the outcome of the protocol. A straight-forward coupling shows that the number of agents that have the majority opinion in the modified process minorizes the same number in the original process. (See [25] for additional details on the Pólya-Eggenberger distribution). In the modified process, we initially have $A'_{s_1} = A_{s_1} - c' \cdot r \cdot n \log n$ agents with opinion A . Therefore, we have $A'_{s_1} \geq \alpha \log n - c' \cdot \beta \alpha \cdot \log n = \alpha \log n (1 - c' \beta)$ agents with opinion A . If $\beta \leq 1/(2c')$ the statement immediately holds (provided α is sufficiently large) for $\alpha \geq \Omega(\beta^{-2})$. A similar calculation shows that in this setting the (additive) bias drops only by a constant factor. The statement then follows in this case analogously to the result without input changes.

Case 2: $\beta \geq 1/(2c')$. In this case the additive bias $A_{s_1} - B_{s_1}$ is at least $\beta \cdot \alpha \cdot \log n$. It follows that $A'_{s_1} - B'_{s_1} \geq \alpha \cdot \log n$. This means that at the beginning of the Pólya Subphase we have at least $\Omega(\log n)$ agents with opinion A and a constant (multiplicative) bias towards A . Again, the statement then follows in this case analogously to the result without input changes.

In both cases the remaining bias and the number of agents with opinion A is large enough such that the previous analysis (Proposition 12) after the Pólya Subphase can be applied without further modifications. ◀