

How to generate a fault-resilient network at a lower cost

ALEXANDER MOZEIKA, MOHAMMAD M. JALALZAI, and MARCIN P. PAWLOWSKI, Status Research & Development GmbH, Switzerland

Blockchains facilitate decentralization, security, identity, and data management in cyber-physical systems. However, consensus protocols used in blockchains are prone to high message and computational complexity costs and are not suitable to be used in IoT. One way to reduce message complexity is to randomly assign network nodes into committees or shards. Keeping committee sizes small is then desirable in order to achieve lower message complexity, but this comes with a penalty of reduced reliability as there is a higher probability that a large number of faulty nodes will end up in a committee. In this work, we study the problem of estimating a probability of a failure in randomly sharded networks. We provide new results and improve existing bounds on the failure probability. Thus, our framework also paves the way to reduce committee sizes without reducing reliability.

CCS Concepts: • **Security and privacy** → Security requirements; • **Networks** → *Network reliability*; • **Computer systems organization** → **Peer-to-peer architectures**; • **Computing methodologies** → Distributed algorithms.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Blockchain, Sharding, IoT, Scalability, Reliability, Network, Nodes

ACM Reference Format:

Alexander Mozeika, Mohammad M. Jalalzai, and Marcin P. Pawlowski. 2023. How to generate a fault-resilient network at a lower cost. 1, 1 (March 2023), 21 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 INTRODUCTION

Large-scale applications of Cyber-Physical Systems require a significant amount of coordination of a plethora of interconnected devices. Managing thousands of devices pushes the technology to its limits, and creates one of the most important and not yet solved problems of scaling the solution to myriads of connected devices. There are many approaches that try to address this problem efficiently, some of them are focus on centralized solutions, such as cloud [6, 25, 28, 35, 41], others are introducing novel architectures like mist and fog [10, 16, 24, 35] or leveraging fully decentralized solutions based on blockchain [30]. Each of them has its own merits but in this work, we are focusing on blockchains that have been leveraged to provide decentralized, verifiable, trusted, and traceable IoT-based applications [36].

Similarly, due to the strict requirements of IoT networks, blockchains are suitable to defend against data manipulation attacks by providing immutability and avoiding centralized trusted authority for devices to communicate [33]. Therefore, there have been several research works on leveraging blockchains to provide public safety service [37], smart surveillance for smart cities [31, 38], automotive industry [15] and avionics [4]. Furthermore, blockchain technology has also been leveraged to provide privacy and security in IoT, identity and data management for IoT and monetization for IoT [1].

Authors' address: Alexander Mozeika, alexander.mozeika@status.im; Mohammad M. Jalalzai, moh@status.im; Marcin P. Pawlowski, marcin@status.im, Status Research & Development GmbH, Baarerstrasse 10, Zug, Switzerland.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

© 2023 Association for Computing Machinery.

XXXX-XXXX/2023/3-ART \$15.00

<https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

Blockchain uses distributed consensus mechanism to reach an agreement for a value to be added to the chain. Consensus makes sure every honest node will eventually agree on the same block at the same sequence in the chain. Consensus is used to achieve State Machine Replication (SMR). It makes sure that each participant of the network maintains the same state all the time. Well-constructed blockchains must be fault-resilient in order to survive Byzantine faults [27] which are one of the most powerful groups of faults in distributed systems. A Byzantine Fault Tolerant (BFT) system tolerates arbitrary faults (and adversaries). A BFT SMR system provides SMR services in the presence of Byzantine Faults. The upper bound on tolerating Byzantine faults is $f = \frac{n-1}{3}$ [13]. This means a system can remain *reliable* as long as the number of Byzantine faults is less than one-third.

BFT-based consensus protocols provide BFT SMR services. These services constitute the core layer of blockchains. Due to the high interest in blockchain, its scalability in terms of the number of nodes (participants) has been one of the main research problems [5, 17, 21–23, 29, 39]. One of the limitations of scaling blockchains is the high message complexity and authenticator (cryptographic signatures) complexity. Processing a higher number of messages and/or cryptographic operations in a consensus protocol makes it unsuitable for IoT use cases. This is due to the reason that IoT devices have limited bandwidth and processing capacity. Generally, the number of messages as well as cryptographic operations increase as the number of nodes in the network increases. To scale blockchains (to reduce message and authenticator complexity) different methods were developed to assign nodes randomly in committees [3, 5, 21, 29]. The introduction of committees helps to reduce the message and authenticator complexity from $O(N)$ to $O(n)$ with $n \ll N$, where n is the size of the committee and N is the total number of nodes.

However, randomly assigning nodes into committees is not a straightforward task. One does not want to form a committee with a majority of Byzantine nodes. Therefore, it is paramount to estimate the probability of such an event. Achieving tighter bounds on a committee size for a desired failure probability will allow a protocol to have smaller committees. Smaller committees mean lower message complexity and cryptographic operations, making a protocol more suitable for IoT use cases. Therefore, in this work, we present analytical results of calculating the probability of a failure of a network in an event of network random partition. First, we introduce a very general probabilistic framework of random partitions of N nodes of different “colours” into K committees. This framework allows us to construct joint probability distributions of random partitions. Second, we obtain exact expressions for these probability distributions and use them to study the probability of failure. The latter is the probability of the event that in at least one of the randomly generated committees, the nodes of some colour exceed a fraction A of all nodes. We consider the probability of failure and we obtain exact expressions, bounds, and asymptotic estimates. Finally, we apply our analytical framework to the sharding of blockchains, which is a special case of random partitions with two colours labelling Byzantine and honest nodes, and improve upon known results in this area. In particular, we achieve tighter bounds on committee sizes for a given probability of failure, than the previous known results. Moreover, the term Byzantine and adversarial has been used interchangeably in this document.

1.1 Related work

The number of adversaries in a single committee is usually modeled with the binomial [26, 34] and hypergeometric [9, 40, 42] probability distributions. The probability of failure is estimated by the union bound which multiplies the probability of failure of a single committee, which uses cumulative distribution function of one of these distributions, by the number of committees K . The latter suggests that these univariate distributions are marginals of some joint probability distribution. Recently it was established that in hypergeometric case this joint distribution is the multivariate




Fig. 1. The “urn problem” associated with different sampling scenarios considered for random partitions. Initially, all N nodes of different colours (here only two colours are shown) are in one large committee. The number of nodes of colour α in this committee is $N \times P(\alpha)$ either on *average* or *exactly*. A node is selected in a random and unbiased way from this large committee and is *moved* into one of smaller committees labeled by $\mu \in [K]$, where $K < N$. This step is governed by the probability $P(\mu|\alpha)$, but possibly subject to *constraints* such as committee sizes and the number of nodes $M = N \times P(\alpha)$ of colour α . After N steps *all* nodes will be moved into smaller committees.

hypergeometric [18]. The latter corresponds to a sampling scenario where nodes for committees are selected, without replacement, from a population of N nodes where it is assumed that M nodes in this population are adversarial. However, it is not clear what is this joint distribution for the binomial case. We note that the binomial distribution is quite often chosen as an approximation [40] for the hypergeometric and is expected to be accurate when the committee size n is small, the number of nodes N is large and the number of adversarial nodes M is also large. The probability of failure which uses *full* joint probability distribution, to the best of our knowledge, has not been studied but in one work [18] where intuitive derivation of the multivariate hypergeometric distribution was provided and corresponding probability of failure was studied by simulations. The latter showed advantages of using the joint distribution instead of the union bound but left analytic solution to be an open problem [19]. The main contribution of this work is to provide a solution to this open problem.

2 MODEL OF RANDOM PARTITIONS

We consider N nodes of L “colours” distributed into K shards (or committees). We assume that partition $\mathcal{A} = (\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_N)$ with $\mathbf{a}_i = (a_i(1), a_i(2))$, where $a_i(1) \in [L]$ and $a_i(2) \in [K]$, is observed with the probability

$$P(\mathcal{A}) = \prod_{i=1}^N P(\mathbf{a}_i), \tag{1}$$

¹For $L \in \mathbb{N}$ we use the definition $[L] = \{1, \dots, L\}$.

where $P(\mathbf{a}_i) = P(a_i(1), a_i(2))$ is the probability that the node i of colour $a_i(1)$ is in the committee $a_i(2)$. Let us define² the random variables $N_\mu(\mathcal{A}) = \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{\mu; a_i(2)}$, i.e. the total number of nodes in committee μ , $N_\mu^\alpha(\mathcal{A}) = \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{\alpha; a_i(1)} \delta_{\mu; a_i(2)}$, i.e. the number of nodes of colour α in committee μ , and $M = \sum_{\mu=1}^K N_\mu^\alpha(\mathcal{A})$, i.e. the total number of nodes of colour α . We note that $\sum_{\mu=1}^K N_\mu(\mathcal{A}) = N$ and $N_\mu(\mathcal{A}) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^L N_\mu^\alpha(\mathcal{A})$. The joint probability distribution of these random variables in all of the K committees is given by

$$P(N_1^\alpha, \dots, N_K^\alpha; N_1, \dots, N_K; M) = \sum_{\mathcal{A}} P(\mathcal{A}) \delta_{M; \sum_{\mu=1}^K N_\mu^\alpha(\mathcal{A})} \prod_{\mu=1}^K \delta_{N_\mu^\alpha; N_\mu^\alpha(\mathcal{A})} \delta_{N_\mu; N_\mu(\mathcal{A})}, \quad (2)$$

where $\sum_{\mu=1}^K N_\mu = N$, $N_\mu^\alpha \leq N_\mu$ for all μ and $M \leq N$.

From the probability distribution (2) we construct, by marginalization and application of Bayes' theorem, the joint distribution

$$P(N_1^\alpha, \dots, N_K^\alpha; N_1, \dots, N_K) = \sum_{\mathcal{A}} P(\mathcal{A}) \prod_{\mu=1}^K \delta_{N_\mu^\alpha; N_\mu^\alpha(\mathcal{A})} \delta_{N_\mu; N_\mu(\mathcal{A})} \quad (3)$$

the conditional distribution

$$P(N_1^\alpha, \dots, N_K^\alpha | N_1, \dots, N_K) = \frac{P(N_1^\alpha, \dots, N_K^\alpha; N_1, \dots, N_K)}{P(N_1, \dots, N_K)} \quad (4)$$

and the conditional distribution

$$P(N_1^\alpha, \dots, N_K^\alpha | N_1, \dots, N_K; M) = \frac{P(N_1^\alpha, \dots, N_K^\alpha; N_1, \dots, N_K; M)}{P(N_1, \dots, N_K; M)}. \quad (5)$$

These probability distributions correspond to three different sampling scenarios of random partitions (see Figure 1). In the first scenario, described by (3), each node is assigned randomly to a committee independently from other nodes. The second scenario, described by (4), corresponds to fixed numbers of (randomly selected) nodes being assigned to committees. Finally, the third scenario, described by (5), is similar to the second one but when we have *exactly* M nodes of colour α .

3 STATISTICAL PROPERTIES OF RANDOM PARTITIONS

3.1 Probability distributions

For the probability distributions (3)-(5) we obtain the following results.

LEMMA 3.1. *Assuming that partition \mathcal{A} is generated with the probability (1) the joint distribution (3) is the product*

$$P(N_1, N_1^\alpha, \dots, N_K, N_K^\alpha) = P(N_1, \dots, N_K | N) \prod_{\mu=1}^K P_\mu^\alpha(N_\mu^\alpha | N_\mu) \quad (6)$$

of the multinomial

$$P(N_1, \dots, N_K | N) = \mathbb{1} \left[\sum_{\mu=1}^K N_\mu = N \right] \frac{N!}{\prod_{\mu=1}^K N_\mu!} \prod_{\mu=1}^K P^{N_\mu}(\mu) \quad (7)$$

²We use the definition $\mathbb{1}[\mathcal{E}] \in \{0, 1\}$ for the indicator function of some event \mathcal{E} and $\delta_{x;y}$ is the Kronecker delta function, i.e. $\delta_{x;y} = \mathbb{1}[x = y]$ for $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$.

and the product $\prod_{\mu=1}^K P_{\mu}^{\alpha} \left(N_{\mu}^{\alpha} | N_{\mu} \right)$ of the binomial

$$P_{\mu}^{\alpha} \left(N_{\mu}^{\alpha} | N_{\mu} \right) = \binom{N_{\mu}}{N_{\mu}^{\alpha}} P^{N_{\mu}^{\alpha}}(\alpha | \mu) [1 - P(\alpha | \mu)]^{N_{\mu} - N_{\mu}^{\alpha}} \quad (8)$$

distributions.

PROOF. To show this we consider the moment-generating function

$$\begin{aligned} Z[\mathbf{t}_1, \mathbf{t}_2] &= \sum_{N_1} \sum_{N_1^{\alpha}} \cdots \sum_{N_K} \sum_{N_K^{\alpha}} P(N_1^{\alpha}, N_1, \dots, N_K^{\alpha}, N_K) \\ &\quad \times e^{\sum_{\mu=1}^K \{N_{\mu}^{\alpha} t_1(\mu) + N_{\mu} t_2(\mu)\}}, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where $\mathbf{t}_1, \mathbf{t}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^K$. Now using in above the definition (3) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} Z[\mathbf{t}_1, \mathbf{t}_2] &= \sum_{\mathcal{A}} P(\mathcal{A}) e^{\sum_{\mu=1}^K \{N_{\mu}^{\alpha}(\mathcal{A}) t_1(\mu) + N_{\mu}(\mathcal{A}) t_2(\mu)\}} \\ &= \left[\sum_{\beta=1}^L \sum_{v=1}^K P(\beta, v) e^{\sum_{\mu=1}^K \delta_{\mu, v} \{t_1(\mu) \delta_{\alpha, \beta} + t_2(\mu)\}} \right]^N \\ &= \sum_{N_1=0}^N \cdots \sum_{N_K=0}^N P(N_1, \dots, N_K | N) \prod_{\mu=1}^K P_{\mu}^{\alpha} \left(N_{\mu}^{\alpha} | N_{\mu} \right) \\ &\quad \times e^{\sum_{\mu=1}^K \{t_1(\mu) N_{\mu}^{\alpha} + t_2(\mu) N_{\mu}\}} \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

and hence comparing above with (9) we arrive at (6). \square

The consequence of the *Lemma 3.1* is that the conditional probability distribution (4) is given by

$$P(N_1^{\alpha}, \dots, N_K^{\alpha} | N_1, \dots, N_K) = \prod_{\mu=1}^K P_{\mu}^{\alpha} \left(N_{\mu}^{\alpha} | N_{\mu} \right), \quad (11)$$

where $\sum_{\mu=1}^K N_{\mu} = N$, which follows from the equation (6) and from the property $P(Y, X) = P(Y|X)P(X)$ of a joint probability distribution. Furthermore, the marginal of (3) is the product of distributions

$$P^{\alpha} \left(N_{\mu}, N_{\mu}^{\alpha} | N \right) = P_{\mu} \left(N_{\mu} | N \right) P_{\mu}^{\alpha} \left(N_{\mu}^{\alpha} | N_{\mu} \right), \quad (12)$$

where $P_{\mu} \left(N_{\mu} | N \right)$ is the binomial distribution

$$P_{\mu} \left(N_{\mu} | N \right) = \binom{N}{N_{\mu}} P^{N_{\mu}}(\mu) [1 - P(\mu)]^{N - N_{\mu}}. \quad (13)$$

Finally, we also obtain the following

COROLLARY 3.2. *The conditional probability (5) is the multivariate hypergeometric distribution*

$$P \left(N_1^{\alpha}, \dots, N_K^{\alpha} | N_1, \dots, N_K; M \right) = \frac{\delta_{M; \sum_{\mu=1}^K N_{\mu}^{\alpha}} \prod_{\mu=1}^K \binom{N_{\mu}}{N_{\mu}^{\alpha}}}{\binom{N}{M}}. \quad (14)$$

PROOF. To show this we first rewrite the probability distribution (5) as follows

$$\begin{aligned} P(N_1^\alpha, \dots, N_K^\alpha | N_1, \dots, N_K; M) &= \frac{\delta_{M; \sum_{\mu=1}^K N_\mu^\alpha} P(N_1^\alpha, N_1, \dots, N_K^\alpha, N_K)}{\sum_{\tilde{N}_1^\alpha} \cdots \sum_{\tilde{N}_K^\alpha} \delta_{M; \sum_{\mu=1}^K \tilde{N}_\mu^\alpha} P(\tilde{N}_1^\alpha, N_1, \dots, \tilde{N}_K^\alpha, N_K)} \\ &= \frac{\delta_{M; \sum_{\mu=1}^K N_\mu^\alpha} P(N_1^\alpha, \dots, N_K^\alpha | N_1, \dots, N_K)}{\sum_{\tilde{N}_1^\alpha} \cdots \sum_{\tilde{N}_K^\alpha} \delta_{M; \sum_{\mu=1}^K \tilde{N}_\mu^\alpha} P(\tilde{N}_1^\alpha, \dots, \tilde{N}_K^\alpha | N_1, \dots, N_K)}. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Second, by equation (11) the numerator

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{M; \sum_{\mu=1}^K N_\mu^\alpha} P(N_1^\alpha, \dots, N_K^\alpha | N_1, \dots, N_K) &= \delta_{M; \sum_{\mu=1}^K N_\mu^\alpha} \prod_{\mu=1}^K P_\mu^\alpha(N_\mu^\alpha | N_\mu) \\ &= \delta_{M; \sum_{\mu=1}^K N_\mu^\alpha} P^M(\alpha | \mu) [1 - P(\alpha | \mu)]^{N-M} \prod_{\mu=1}^K \binom{N_\mu}{N_\mu^\alpha} \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

and hence

$$P(N_1^\alpha, \dots, N_K^\alpha | N_1, \dots, N_K; M) = \frac{\delta_{M; \sum_{\mu=1}^K N_\mu^\alpha} \prod_{\mu=1}^K \binom{N_\mu}{N_\mu^\alpha}}{\sum_{N_1^\alpha=0}^{N_1} \cdots \sum_{N_K^\alpha=0}^{N_K} \delta_{M; \sum_{\mu=1}^K \tilde{N}_\mu^\alpha} \prod_{\mu=1}^K \binom{N_\mu}{\tilde{N}_\mu^\alpha}}. \quad (17)$$

Now the denominator, using the integral representation $\delta_{k;n} = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{d\hat{m}}{2\pi} e^{i\hat{m}(k-n)}$, is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{N_1^\alpha=0}^{N_1} \cdots \sum_{N_K^\alpha=0}^{N_K} \delta_{M; \sum_{\mu=1}^K N_\mu^\alpha} \prod_{\mu=1}^K \binom{N_\mu}{N_\mu^\alpha} &= \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{d\hat{m}}{2\pi} e^{i\hat{m}M} \prod_{\mu=1}^K \sum_{N_\mu^\alpha=0}^{N_\mu} \binom{N_\mu}{N_\mu^\alpha} e^{-i\hat{m}N_\mu^\alpha} \\ &= \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{d\hat{m}}{2\pi} e^{i\hat{m}M} \left(1 + e^{-i\hat{m}}\right)^{\sum_{\mu=1}^K N_\mu} = \binom{N}{M} \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

which completes the proof. \square

We note that marginal of the hypergeometric distribution (14) can be derived in a similar way as the sum in (18). In particular, we consider, without loss of generality, the sum

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{N_2^\alpha=0}^{N_2} \cdots \sum_{N_K^\alpha=0}^{N_K} \delta_{M; \sum_{\mu=1}^K N_\mu^\alpha} \prod_{\mu=1}^K \binom{N_\mu}{N_\mu^\alpha} &= \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{d\hat{m}}{2\pi} e^{i\hat{m}M} \binom{N_1}{N_1^\alpha} e^{-i\hat{m}N_1^\alpha} \prod_{\mu=2}^K \sum_{N_\mu^\alpha=0}^{N_\mu} \binom{N_\mu}{N_\mu^\alpha} e^{-i\hat{m}N_\mu^\alpha} \\ &= \binom{N_1}{N_1^\alpha} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{d\hat{m}}{2\pi} e^{i\hat{m}(M-N_1^\alpha)} \left(1 + e^{-i\hat{m}}\right)^{\sum_{\mu=2}^K N_\mu} \\ &= \binom{N_1}{N_1^\alpha} \binom{N-N_1}{M-N_1^\alpha} \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

and hence the marginal of (14) is given by

$$P(N_\mu^\alpha | N_\mu; M) = \frac{\binom{N_\mu}{N_\mu^\alpha} \binom{N-N_\mu}{M-N_\mu^\alpha}}{\binom{N}{M}} = \frac{\binom{M}{N_\mu^\alpha} \binom{N-M}{N_\mu-N_\mu^\alpha}}{\binom{N}{N_\mu}}. \quad (20)$$

3.2 The probability of failure

In random partitions sampled from the probability distributions (3)-(5) we are interested in the event

$$E = \sum_{\mu=1}^K \mathbb{1} \left[N_{\mu}^{\alpha} \geq \lfloor AN_{\mu} \rfloor + 1 \right] > 0, \quad (21)$$

i.e. in at least *one* committee the nodes of colour α exceed a fraction $A \in (0, 1)$ of all nodes in the committee. We will call such event *failure* and define the probability of failure

$$\begin{aligned} \delta &= P(E > 0) \\ &= 1 - P(E = 0). \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

We note that event $E = 0$ is equivalent to the $\prod_{\mu=1}^K \mathbb{1} \left[N_{\mu}^{\alpha} \leq \lfloor AN_{\mu} \rfloor \right] = 1$ and for the probability of failure in random partitions we obtain the following results.

THEOREM 3.3. *For random partitions sampled from the probability distribution (4) when $P(\alpha|\mu) < Q(\mu) < 1$, where $Q(\mu) = \frac{\lfloor AN_{\mu} \rfloor + 1}{N_{\mu}}$, the probability of failure δ is bounded as follows*

$$1 - \prod_{\mu=1}^K \left[1 - \frac{e^{-N_{\mu}D(Q(\mu)||P(\alpha|\mu))}}{\sqrt{8N_{\mu}Q(\mu)(1-Q(\mu))}} \right] \leq \delta \leq 1 - \prod_{\mu=1}^K \left[1 - e^{-N_{\mu}D(Q(\mu)||P(\alpha|\mu))} \right], \quad (23)$$

where $D(Q||P)$ with $Q, P \in (0, 1)$ is the Kullback–Leibler (KL) divergence

$$D(Q||P) = Q \log \frac{Q}{P} + (1-Q) \log \frac{1-Q}{1-P} \quad (24)$$

which is 0 when $Q = P$ and is positive semi-definite when $Q \neq P$ [8].

PROOF. To show this we first, using the probability distribution (11), define the probability³

$$P \left(\left\{ N_{\mu}^{\alpha} \leq \lfloor AN_{\mu} \rfloor \right\} \mid \{N_{\mu}\} \right) = \sum_{N_1^{\alpha}} \cdots \sum_{N_K^{\alpha}} P(N_1^{\alpha}, \dots, N_K^{\alpha} | N_1, \dots, N_K) \prod_{\mu=1}^K \mathbb{1} \left[N_{\mu}^{\alpha} \leq \lfloor AN_{\mu} \rfloor \right] \quad (25)$$

and consider the probability of failure

$$\begin{aligned} \delta = 1 - P \left(\left\{ N_{\mu}^{\alpha} \leq \lfloor AN_{\mu} \rfloor \right\} \mid \{N_{\mu}\} \right) &= 1 - \prod_{\mu=1}^K \sum_{N_{\mu}^{\alpha}=0}^{\lfloor AN_{\mu} \rfloor} P_{\mu}^{\alpha} \left(N_{\mu}^{\alpha} | N_{\mu} \right) \\ &= 1 - \prod_{\mu=1}^K \left[1 - P(N^{\alpha} \geq \lfloor AN_{\mu} \rfloor + 1 | N_{\mu}) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where we defined the probability

$$P(N^{\alpha} \geq \lfloor AN_{\mu} \rfloor + 1 | N_{\mu}) = \sum_{N^{\alpha}=\lfloor AN_{\mu} \rfloor + 1}^{N_{\mu}} P_{\mu}^{\alpha} \left(N^{\alpha} | N_{\mu} \right). \quad (27)$$

Second, the probability distribution $P_{\mu}^{\alpha} \left(N^{\alpha} | N_{\mu} \right)$, which was defined in (8), is the binomial and hence it can be bounded from the above

$$P(N^{\alpha} \geq \lfloor AN_{\mu} \rfloor + 1 | N_{\mu}) \leq e^{-N_{\mu}D(Q(\mu)||P(\alpha|\mu))} \quad (28)$$

³We use the definitions $\left\{ N_{\mu}^{\alpha} \leq \lfloor AN_{\mu} \rfloor \right\} \equiv N_1^{\alpha} \leq \lfloor AN_1 \rfloor, \dots, N_K^{\alpha} \leq \lfloor AN_K \rfloor$ and $\{N_{\mu}\} \equiv N_1, \dots, N_K$.

and from the below

$$P(N^\alpha \geq \lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor + 1 | N_\mu) \geq \frac{e^{-N_\mu D(Q(\mu) | P(\alpha | \mu))}}{\sqrt{8N_\mu Q(\mu) (1 - Q(\mu))}} \quad (29)$$

for $P(\alpha | \mu) < Q(\mu) < 1$, where $Q(\mu) = \frac{\lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor + 1}{N_\mu}$, by the Lemma 4.7.2 in [2]. Using these bounds in (26) gives us the lower and upper bound in (23). \square

We note that a *tighter* upper bound in (23) can be obtained by using the recent result

$$P(N^\alpha \geq \lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor + 1 | N_\mu) \leq \frac{1}{1 - r(\mu)} \frac{e^{-N_\mu D(Q(\mu) | P(\alpha | \mu))}}{\sqrt{2\pi Q(\mu) (1 - Q(\mu)) N_\mu}}, \quad (30)$$

where $P(\alpha | \mu) < Q(\mu) < 1$, of the Theorem 1 in [12]. Here the term $\frac{1}{1 - r(\mu)}$, where $r(\mu) = \frac{P(\alpha | \mu)(1 - Q(\mu))}{Q(\mu)(1 - P(\alpha | \mu))}$, is an upper bound on the sum $\sum_{k=0}^{(1-Q(\mu))N_\mu} r^k(\mu) = (1 - r^{(1-Q(\mu))N_\mu+1}(\mu)) / (1 - r(\mu))$.

3.2.1 Saddle-point method. For random partitions generated by the probability distribution (5), i.e. *exactly* M nodes out of N are of colour α , the probability of failure is given by

$$\delta = 1 - P\left(\{N_\mu^\alpha \leq \lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor\} | \{N_\mu\}, M\right), \quad (31)$$

where the probability

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(\{N_\mu^\alpha \leq \lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor\} | \{N_\mu\}, M\right) &= \sum_{N_1^\alpha=0}^{N_1} \cdots \sum_{N_K^\alpha=0}^{N_K} P(N_1^\alpha, \dots, N_K^\alpha | N_1, \dots, N_K; M) \\ &\times \prod_{\mu=1}^K \mathbb{1}\left[N_\mu^\alpha \leq \lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor\right] \\ &= \frac{\sum_{N_1^\alpha=0}^{N_1} \cdots \sum_{N_K^\alpha=0}^{N_K} \delta_{M; \sum_{\mu=1}^K N_\mu^\alpha} \prod_{\mu=1}^K \binom{N_\mu}{N_\mu^\alpha} \mathbb{1}\left[N_\mu^\alpha \leq \lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor\right]}{\binom{N}{M}} \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

follows from the result (14) for the distribution (5).

We would like to obtain a simpler analytic expression for δ but the challenge here is in computing the sums in (32) efficiently. It is not clear how to do this for any N , M and K , but in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$ with $N_\mu < \infty$ such that $N = \sum_{\mu=1}^K N_\mu$ and $M/N \in (0, 1)$ we can obtain the following result

$$P\left(\{N_\mu^\alpha \leq \lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor\} | \{N_\mu\}, M\right) = \sqrt{\frac{NP(1-P)}{\sum_{\mu=1}^K \left[\langle (N^\alpha)^2 \rangle_{A,Q,N_\mu} - \langle N^\alpha \rangle_{A,Q,N_\mu}^2 \right]}} e^{N\Psi[Q]} + O(1/N), \quad (33)$$

where $P = M/N$ and we defined the function

$$\Psi[Q] = D(P||Q) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mu=1}^K \log \sum_{N^\alpha=0}^{\lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor} \binom{N_\mu}{N^\alpha} Q^{N^\alpha} [1 - Q]^{N_\mu - N^\alpha} \quad (34)$$

and average

$$\langle f(N^\alpha) \rangle_{A,Q,N_\mu} = \frac{\sum_{N^\alpha=0}^{\lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor} \binom{N_\mu}{N^\alpha} Q^{N^\alpha} [1 - Q]^{N_\mu - N^\alpha} f(N^\alpha)}{\sum_{N^\alpha=0}^{\lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor} \binom{N_\mu}{N^\alpha} Q^{N^\alpha} [1 - Q]^{N_\mu - N^\alpha}} \quad (35)$$

for any function $f(N^\alpha)$. In above $Q \in (0, 1)$ is the solution of the equation

$$P = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mu=1}^K \langle N^\alpha \rangle_{A, Q, N_\mu}; \quad (36)$$

for $P \leq A$.

In this work, we will present only a heuristic argument that leads to the equation (33), but we envisage that a more rigorous proof of the latter is also possible. Our approach to computing (32) is to use the *saddle-point* method of integration, which is quite often used in statistical physics [32] and analytic combinatorics [14] to compute moment generating functions, but first in order to apply this method we need to represent the sums in (32) as an integral. To this end, we rewrite the numerator in (32) as follows

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{N_1^\alpha=0}^{N_1} \cdots \sum_{N_K^\alpha=0}^{N_K} \delta_{M; \sum_{\mu=1}^K N_\mu^\alpha} \prod_{\mu=1}^K \binom{N_\mu}{N_\mu^\alpha} \mathbb{1} [N_\mu^\alpha \leq \lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor] \\ &= \sum_{N_1^\alpha=0}^{N_1} \cdots \sum_{N_K^\alpha=0}^{N_K} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{|z|=1} z^{-M-1+\sum_{\mu=1}^K N_\mu^\alpha} dz \prod_{\mu=1}^K \binom{N_\mu}{N_\mu^\alpha} \mathbb{1} [N_\mu^\alpha \leq \lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor] \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{|z|=1} \left\{ \prod_{\mu=1}^K \sum_{N_\mu^\alpha=0}^{N_\mu} \binom{N_\mu}{N_\mu^\alpha} \mathbb{1} [N_\mu^\alpha \leq \lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor] z^{N_\mu^\alpha} \right\} z^{-M-1} dz \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{|z|=1} \left\{ \prod_{\mu=1}^K \phi_A(z|N_\mu) \right\} z^{-M-1} dz, \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

where we used the integral representation $\delta_{n,m} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{|z|=1} z^{-n-1+m} dz$ and defined the function

$$\phi_A(z|N_\mu) = \sum_{N_\mu^\alpha=0}^{\lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor} \binom{N_\mu}{N_\mu^\alpha} z^{N_\mu^\alpha}. \quad (38)$$

Second, the denominator

$$\begin{aligned} \binom{N}{M} &= \sum_{N_1^\alpha=0}^{N_1} \cdots \sum_{N_K^\alpha=0}^{N_K} \delta_{M; \sum_{\mu=1}^K N_\mu^\alpha} \prod_{\mu=1}^K \binom{N_\mu}{N_\mu^\alpha} \\ &= \sum_{N_1^\alpha=0}^{N_1} \cdots \sum_{N_K^\alpha=0}^{N_K} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{|z|=1} z^{-M-1+\sum_{\mu=1}^K N_\mu^\alpha} dz \prod_{\mu=1}^K \binom{N_\mu}{N_\mu^\alpha} \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{|z|=1} \left\{ \prod_{\mu=1}^K \phi_1(z|N_\mu) \right\} z^{-M-1} dz \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

and hence

$$P \left(\{N_\mu^\alpha \leq \lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor\} | \{N_\mu\}, M \right) = \frac{\oint_{|z|=1} \left\{ \prod_{\mu=1}^K \phi_A(z|N_\mu) \right\} z^{-M-1} dz}{\oint_{|z|=1} \left\{ \prod_{\mu=1}^K \phi_1(z|N_\mu) \right\} z^{-M-1} dz}. \quad (40)$$

Let us consider the scenario of $N \rightarrow \infty$ with $N_\mu < \infty$ such that $N = \sum_{\mu=1}^K N_\mu$ and $0 < M/N < 1$. Then for the integral

$$\oint_{|z|=1} \left\{ \prod_{\mu=1}^K \phi_A(z|N_\mu) \right\} z^{-M-1} dz = \oint_{|z|=1} dz e^{N\Psi_A(z) - \log(z)}, \quad (41)$$

where in above we defined $P = M/N$ and

$$\Psi_A(z) = -P \log(z) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mu=1}^K \log \phi_A(z|N_\mu), \quad (42)$$

we can try to use the saddle-point integration method [11]. Applying this method allows us to write

$$\oint_{|z|=1} dz e^{N\Psi_A(z) - \log(z)} = \sqrt{-\frac{2\pi}{N\ddot{\Psi}_A(z_0(A))}} [1/z_0(A) + O(1/N)] e^{N\Psi_A(z_0(A))}, \quad (43)$$

where in above we used the definition $\ddot{\Psi}_A(z) = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} \Psi_A(z)$ and $z_0(A)$ is the solution of the equation $\dot{\Psi}_A(z) = 0$, which is given by

$$P = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mu=1}^K \frac{\sum_{N^\alpha=0}^{\lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor} \binom{N_\mu}{N^\alpha} z^{N^\alpha} N^\alpha}{\sum_{N^\alpha=0}^{\lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor} \binom{N_\mu}{N^\alpha} z^{N^\alpha}}. \quad (44)$$

Thus, for the probability (32) we obtain the following expression

$$P \left(\{N_\mu^\alpha \leq \lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor\} | \{N_\mu\}, M \right) = \frac{1/z_0(A) + O(1/N)}{1/z_0(1) + O(1/N)} \sqrt{\frac{\ddot{\Psi}_1(z_0(1))}{\ddot{\Psi}_A(z_0(A))}} e^{N[\Psi_A(z_0(A)) - \Psi_1(z_0(1))]}. \quad (45)$$

Let us now consider the equation (44). In the latter $0 < P < 1$ and hence for $z > 0$ we can set $z = Q/(1-Q)$, where $0 < Q < 1$, in this equation, giving us

$$P = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mu=1}^K \langle N^\alpha \rangle_{A,Q,N_\mu}; \quad (46)$$

where we defined the average

$$\langle f(N^\alpha) \rangle_{A,Q,N_\mu} = \frac{\sum_{N^\alpha=0}^{\lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor} \binom{N_\mu}{N^\alpha} Q^{N^\alpha} [1-Q]^{N_\mu-N^\alpha} f(N^\alpha)}{\sum_{N^\alpha=0}^{\lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor} \binom{N_\mu}{N^\alpha} Q^{N^\alpha} [1-Q]^{N_\mu-N^\alpha}}. \quad (47)$$

Using $N^\alpha \leq \lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor$ in the equation (36) gives us the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} P &\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mu=1}^K \frac{\sum_{N^\alpha=0}^{\lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor} \binom{N_\mu}{N^\alpha} Q^{N^\alpha} [1-Q]^{N_\mu-N^\alpha} \lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor}{\sum_{N^\alpha=0}^{\lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor} \binom{N_\mu}{N^\alpha} Q^{N^\alpha} [1-Q]^{N_\mu-N^\alpha}} \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mu=1}^K \lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor \leq A \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

and hence equation (36) has a solution only for $P \leq A$.

Furthermore, for $A = 1$ the $Q = P$ is the solution of the equation (36) giving us $z_0(1) = P/(1 - P)$. The latter can be used to compute the function

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_1(z_0(1)) &= -P \log(P/(1 - P)) - \log(1 - P) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mu=1}^K \log \sum_{N^\alpha=0}^{N_\mu} \binom{N_\mu}{N^\alpha} P^{N^\alpha} [1 - P]^{N_\mu - N^\alpha} \\ &= \mathcal{S}(P),\end{aligned}\quad (49)$$

where $\mathcal{S}(P) = -P \log(P) - (1 - P) \log(1 - P)$ is Shannon's entropy. For $\Psi_A(z_0(A))$ with $z_0(A) = Q/(1 - Q)$, where Q is the solution of the equation (36), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_A(z_0(A)) &= -P \log(Q/(1 - Q)) - \log(1 - Q) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mu=1}^K \log \sum_{N^\alpha=0}^{\lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor} \binom{N_\mu}{N^\alpha} Q^{N^\alpha} [1 - Q]^{N_\mu - N^\alpha}\end{aligned}\quad (50)$$

and hence the difference

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_A(z_0(A)) - \Psi_1(z_0(1)) &= -P \log(Q/(1 - Q)) - \log(1 - Q) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mu=1}^K \log \sum_{N^\alpha=0}^{\lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor} \binom{N_\mu}{N^\alpha} Q^{N^\alpha} [1 - Q]^{N_\mu - N^\alpha} - \mathcal{S}(P) \\ &= D(P||Q) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mu=1}^K \log \sum_{N^\alpha=0}^{\lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor} \binom{N_\mu}{N^\alpha} Q^{N^\alpha} [1 - Q]^{N_\mu - N^\alpha}.\end{aligned}\quad (51)$$

Let us consider now the derivative

$$\begin{aligned}\ddot{\Psi}_A(z) &= \frac{P}{z^2} + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mu=1}^K \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} \log \phi_A(z|N_\mu) \\ &= \frac{P}{z^2} + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mu=1}^K \left[\frac{\ddot{\phi}_A(z|N_\mu)}{\phi_A(z|N_\mu)} - \left\{ \frac{\dot{\phi}_A(z|N_\mu)}{\phi_A(z|N_\mu)} \right\}^2 \right],\end{aligned}\quad (52)$$

where

$$\dot{\phi}_A(z|N_\mu) = \sum_{N^\alpha=0}^{\lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor} \binom{N_\mu}{N^\alpha} z^{N^\alpha - 1} N^\alpha.\quad (53)$$

and

$$\ddot{\phi}_A(z|N_\mu) = \sum_{N^\alpha=0}^{\lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor} \binom{N_\mu}{N^\alpha} z^{N^\alpha - 2} N^\alpha (N^\alpha - 1).\quad (54)$$

For $z = Q/(1 - Q)$, where Q is a solution of the equation (36), above gives us

$$\ddot{\Psi}_A(z) = \left(\frac{1 - Q}{Q} \right)^2 \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mu=1}^K \left[\langle (N^\alpha)^2 \rangle_{A,Q,N_\mu} - \langle N^\alpha \rangle_{A,Q,N_\mu}^2 \right]\quad (55)$$

and for $z = P/(1 - P)$ it gives us

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_1(z) &= \left(\frac{1-P}{P}\right)^2 \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mu=1}^K \left[\langle (N^\alpha)^2 \rangle_{1,P,N_\mu} - \langle N^\alpha \rangle_{1,P,N_\mu}^2 \right] \\ &= \left(\frac{1-P}{P}\right)^2 \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mu=1}^K N_\mu P(1-P) = \frac{(1-P)^3}{P}.\end{aligned}\quad (56)$$

Hence using all of the above results in (45) gives us the equation (33).

3.2.2 The union bound. The failure event (21) is equivalent to the union

$$\cup_{\mu=1}^K \left\{ N_\mu^\alpha(\mathcal{A}) \geq \lfloor AN_\mu(\mathcal{A}) \rfloor + 1 \right\}$$

and hence the probability of failure $\delta = \mathbb{P}\left(\cup_{\mu=1}^K \left\{ N_\mu^\alpha \geq \lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor + 1 \right\}\right)$. The latter can be exploited to derive the following

THEOREM 3.4. *For random partitions sampled from the probability distribution (3) when $\mathbb{P}(\alpha|\mu) < Q(\mu) < 1$, where $Q(\mu) = \frac{\lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor + 1}{N_\mu}$, the probability of failure*

$$\delta \leq \sum_{\mu=1}^K e^{-N\Phi(\mathbb{P}(\alpha,\mu),Q(\mu))}, \quad (57)$$

where

$$\Phi(\mathbb{P}(\alpha,\mu),Q(\mu)) = -\log\left(\mathbb{P}(\mu) e^{-D(Q(\mu)|\mathbb{P}(\alpha|\mu))} + 1 - \mathbb{P}(\mu)\right). \quad (58)$$

PROOF. First, by Boole's inequality, also known as the union bound, we have that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\cup_{\mu=1}^K \left\{ N_\mu^\alpha \geq \lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor + 1 \right\}\right) \leq \sum_{\mu=1}^K \mathbb{P}\left(N_\mu^\alpha \geq \lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor + 1\right) \quad (59)$$

and hence the probability of failure

$$\delta \leq \sum_{\mu=1}^K \mathbb{P}\left(N_\mu^\alpha \geq \lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor + 1\right). \quad (60)$$

Second, using the result (6) for the distribution (3) we obtain the probability

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left(N_\mu^\alpha \geq \lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor + 1\right) &= \sum_{N_\mu=0}^N \sum_{N_\mu^\alpha=\lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor + 1}^{N_\mu} \mathbb{P}^\alpha\left(N_\mu, N_\mu^\alpha | N\right) \\ &= \sum_{N_\mu=0}^N \mathbb{P}_\mu(N_\mu | N) \sum_{N_\mu^\alpha=\lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor + 1}^{N_\mu} \mathbb{P}_\mu^\alpha\left(N_\mu^\alpha | N_\mu\right),\end{aligned}\quad (61)$$

where in above we used that $\mathbb{P}^\alpha\left(N_\mu, N_\mu^\alpha | N\right)$, defined in (12), is the marginal of (6).

Now the probability

$$\mathbb{P}\left(N_\mu^\alpha \geq \lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor + 1 | N_\mu\right) = \sum_{N_\mu^\alpha=\lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor + 1}^{N_\mu} \mathbb{P}_\mu^\alpha\left(N_\mu^\alpha | N_\mu\right) \leq e^{-N_\mu D(Q(\mu)|\mathbb{P}(\alpha|\mu))} \quad (62)$$

by the *Lemma* 4.7.2 in [2] for $P(\alpha|\mu) < Q(\mu) < 1$, where $Q(\mu) = \frac{\lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor + 1}{N_\mu}$, and hence we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(N_\mu^\alpha \geq \lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor + 1\right) &\leq \sum_{N_\mu=0}^N P_\mu(N_\mu|N) e^{-N_\mu D(Q(\mu)||P(\alpha|\mu))} \\ &= \left[P(\mu) e^{-D(Q(\mu)||P(\alpha|\mu))} + 1 - P(\mu) \right]^N \\ &= e^{-N\Phi(P(\alpha,\mu),Q(\mu))}, \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

which can be used to bound the sum in (60) and hence giving us the inequality (57). \square

We note that a tighter, but slightly more complicated, upper bound on δ can be obtained if we use (30) instead of (28) in the proof. Furthermore, we obtained a less tight and slightly simpler upper bound in the following

COROLLARY 3.5. *For random partitions generated by the probability distribution (3) when $P(\alpha|\mu) < Q(\mu) < 1$, where $Q(\mu) = \frac{\lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor + 1}{N_\mu}$, the probability of failure*

$$\delta \leq \sum_{\mu=1}^K e^{-N\Phi(P(\alpha,\mu),Q(\mu))} \leq \sum_{\mu=1}^K e^{-NP(\mu)\phi(P(\alpha|\mu),Q(\mu))}, \quad (64)$$

where $\phi(P(\alpha|\mu), Q(\mu)) = 1 - e^{-D(Q(\mu)||P(\alpha|\mu))}$.

PROOF. Using $\log(x) \leq x - 1$ in the function (58) gives us

$$\begin{aligned} -\Phi(P(\alpha,\mu), Q(\mu)) &\leq P(\mu) \left[e^{-D(Q(\mu)||P(\alpha|\mu))} - 1 \right] \\ &= -P(\mu)\phi(P(\alpha|\mu), Q(\mu)) \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

and hence using above in (57) gives us the second inequality in (64). \square

Finally, a slight modification of the above proof also gives us the following

COROLLARY 3.6. *For random partitions generated by the probability distribution (4) when $P(\alpha|\mu) < Q(\mu) < 1$, where $Q(\mu) = \frac{\lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor + 1}{N_\mu}$, the probability of failure*

$$\delta \leq \sum_{\mu=1}^K e^{-N_\mu D(Q(\mu)||P(\alpha|\mu))}. \quad (66)$$

PROOF. To show this we exploit that the marginal of the probability distribution (11), i.e. the result for (4), is the binomial (8). Thus if we replace $P_\mu(N_\mu|N)$ in the proof of *Theorem 3.4* by the $\delta_{N_\mu;\tilde{N}_\mu}$, where $\sum_{\mu=1}^K \tilde{N}_\mu = N$, we obtain (66). \square

We note that for the hypergeometric distribution (14) the probability of failure

$$\delta \leq \sum_{\mu=1}^K \sum_{N_\mu^\alpha = \lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor + 1}^{N_\mu} P\left(N_\mu^\alpha | N_\mu; M\right) \quad (67)$$

$$\leq \sum_{\mu=1}^K e^{-N_\mu D(Q(\mu)||M/N)}, \quad (68)$$

where M is the number of nodes of colour α . The first inequality in above is an application of (60) with the marginal (20) and the second inequality is a consequence of Hoeffding bound [20] [7].

The union bounds (57), (66) and (68) suggest that for $K < \infty$ the probability of failure $\delta \rightarrow 0$ if we assume that $N_\mu/N > 0$ for all μ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. However, it is easy to construct a partition for each of these bounds such that the bound exceeds unity. Here it is interesting to compare the union bound in (66) with the upper bound in (23) which was derived using a different approach. The latter is bounded above by unity, but the former can be above unity suggesting that (66) is a looser bound on δ which is confirmed by the following

LEMMA 3.7. For random partitions generated by the probability distribution (4) when $P(\alpha|\mu) < Q(\mu) < 1$, where $Q(\mu) = \frac{\lfloor AN_\mu \rfloor + 1}{N_\mu}$, the probability of failure

$$\delta \leq 1 - \prod_{\mu=1}^K \left[1 - e^{-N_\mu D(Q(\mu) \| P(\alpha|\mu))} \right] \leq \sum_{\mu=1}^K e^{-N_\mu D(Q(\mu) \| P(\alpha|\mu))}. \quad (69)$$

PROOF. To show this we consider the difference

$$\Delta_K = 1 - \prod_{\mu=1}^K [1 - W(\mu)] - \sum_{\mu=1}^K W(\mu), \quad (70)$$

where we defined the “weight” $W(\mu) = e^{-N_\mu D(Q(\mu) \| P(\alpha|\mu))}$. The latter, because of $D(Q(\mu) \| P(\alpha|\mu)) \geq 0$, belongs to the interval $(0, 1]$ for any finite N_μ . We note that $\Delta_1 = 0$ and $\Delta_2 < 0$. Let us assume that $\Delta_{K-1} \leq 0$ and consider Δ_K as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_K &= 1 - [1 - W(K)] \prod_{\mu=1}^{K-1} [1 - W(\mu)] - \sum_{\mu=1}^{K-1} W(\mu) - W(K) \\ &= \Delta_{K-1} - W(K) \left\{ 1 - \prod_{\mu=1}^{K-1} [1 - W(\mu)] \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

Now from the $\prod_{\mu=1}^{K-1} [1 - W(\mu)] \leq 1$ and $\Delta_{K-1} \leq 0$ follows that $\Delta_K \leq 0$ which, by induction on K , completes the proof. \square

4 APPLICATION

We consider N nodes in the blockchain network where a fraction of nodes, P , is adversarial. We assume that to improve its scalability, this network is split into K shards (or committees). The latter allows the processing of all transactions, encoded in the blockchain, in a distributed way. However, the security of the whole network can be only guaranteed, with *probability* $1 - \delta$, if P is *not* exceeding a certain threshold A in *each* committee. The probability of failure δ considered in section 3.2 corresponds to either the case when the number of adversarial nodes is $N \times P$ on *average*, where δ is given by the equation (26) with $P(\alpha|\mu) = P$, or to the case when it is *exactly* $N \times P$, where δ is given by the equation (31) with $P = M/N$. In the latter case, the probability δ was computed, for $N = nK$ nodes distributed into K committees, only by simulations [18], and the former case, to the best of our knowledge, has not been considered. Here we consider both cases for the number of nodes $N = nK + r$, where $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $r \in \{0, \dots, K - 1\}$, with n and $n + 1$ nodes distributed, respectively, into $K - r$ and r committees.

First, we use the exact equation (26), the asymptotic result (33) for (31), and the upper bound (67) to find the committee size n given the probability of failure δ and number of committees K . We find that n computed from the probability (26) is an upper bound on n computed from the probability (31) as can be seen in Figure 2. The latter is consistent with our observation, that the




Fig. 2. The committee size n as a function of the number of committees K plotted for the probability of failure $\delta = 10^{-3}$ when $A = 1/3$ (fraction of a committee) and $P = 1/4$ (fraction of adversarial nodes). The number of nodes $N = nK$ is increasing from left to right. The black solid line is obtained by solving equation (26), which assumes $N \times P$ adversarial nodes on *average*, numerically. The red and blue solid lines correspond to, respectively, the upper and lower bounds in (23). The red and black dashed lines were obtained from, respectively, the upper bound (67) and asymptotic result (33) for (31). The latter assumes *exactly* $N \times P$ of adversarial nodes.

probability (26) is an upper bound for (31), in simulations as can be seen in the Figures 3 and 4. Furthermore, for $P(\alpha|\mu) = P$ and $N = nK$, using the bounds in (23), we obtain

$$1 - \left[1 - \frac{e^{-nD(Q_n||P)}}{\sqrt{8n Q_n (1 - Q_n)}} \right]^K \leq \delta \leq 1 - \left[1 - e^{-nD(Q_n||P)} \right]^K, \quad (72)$$

where we have defined $Q_n = \frac{\lfloor An \rfloor + 1}{n}$. The above inequalities can be used to obtain bounds on the committee size n , given the probability of failure δ and a number of committees K . The upper bound

$$n < \frac{-\log \left(1 - (1 - \delta)^{1/K} \right)}{D(A||P)} \quad (73)$$

follows from the inequality

$$1 - \left[1 - e^{-nD(Q_n||P)} \right]^K < 1 - \left[1 - e^{-nD(A||P)} \right]^K, \quad (74)$$

where to obtain above we used that $A < Q_n \leq A + 1/n$ and that $D(P + \epsilon||P)$ is monotonic increasing function of ϵ when $2P - 1 < \epsilon \leq 1 - P$. Also the function

$$f(P + \epsilon) = D(P + \epsilon||P) + \frac{1}{2n} \log((P + \epsilon)(1 - P - \epsilon)) \quad (75)$$

is monotonic increasing in ϵ when $2P - 1 < \epsilon < 1/2 - P$ and hence $f(Q_n) \leq f(A + 1/n) \leq \tilde{f}(A)$, where $\tilde{f}(A) = \max_n f(A + 1/n)$. Using the latter in the lower bound in (72) gives us

$$1 - \left[1 - \frac{e^{-n\tilde{f}(A)}}{\sqrt{8n}} \right]^K \leq 1 - \left[1 - \frac{e^{-nD(Q_n||P)}}{\sqrt{8n Q_n (1 - Q_n)}} \right]^K \leq \delta \quad (76)$$




Fig. 3. The probability of failure, δ , as a function of the number of committees, K , computed for the parameters $A = 1/3$ (fraction of a committee) and $P = 1/4$ (fraction of adversarial or Byzantine nodes). Left: The red + and \times symbols are results of simulations, obtained for $N = 10^3$, where $N = nK + r$, nodes over 10^6 random samples, which assume the $N \times P$ adversarial nodes, respectively, on *average* and *exactly*. The black solid line, going through the + symbols, connects exact values computed numerically from the equation (26). The black dashed line corresponds to the asymptotic result (33) for (31). The red dashed line corresponds to the upper bound (67). Right: The red dotted and blue solid lines correspond to, respectively, the upper and lower bounds in (23). The upper bound in the latter was computed using (30).

and from above, using $\log(x) \geq 1 - 1/x$ for $x > 0$, we obtain the lower bound

$$\frac{1 - \log(8) - 2 \log\left(1 - (1 - \delta)^{1/K}\right)}{2\tilde{f}(A) + 1} \leq n. \quad (77)$$

Now for $K \rightarrow \infty$, with $\delta \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} -\log\left(1 - (1 - \delta)^{1/K}\right) &= -\log(-\log(1 - \delta)) + \log(K) \\ &\quad - \frac{\log(1 - \delta)}{2K} - \frac{\log^2(1 - \delta)}{24K^2} \\ &\quad + \frac{\log^4(1 - \delta)}{2880K^4} + O(1/K^6) \end{aligned} \quad (78)$$

and for $\delta \rightarrow 0$, with $K < \infty$, we have

$$-\log\left(1 - (1 - \delta)^{1/K}\right) = \log(K) + \log(1/\delta) - \frac{K-1}{2K}\delta + O(\delta^2). \quad (79)$$

Thus both the upper bound in (73) and the lower bound in (77) grow at most logarithmically in K (or $1/\delta$) as $K \rightarrow \infty$ (or as $\delta \rightarrow 0$). The latter suggests that to sustain the same probability of failure δ (or the same number of committees K) the committee size n has to be increased *logarithmically* with K (or $1/\delta$) as can be seen in Figure 2.

Second, we test our analytic results against numerical experiments and we find, up to statistical variability and numerical accuracy, a good agreement as can be seen in Figures 3 and 4. We also observe that the probability of failure (31) is bounded above by the probability (26). This is expected as in the latter the number of adversarial nodes is a random number and in the former, this number




Fig. 4. The probability of failure, δ , as a function of the number of committees, K , computed for the parameters $A = 1/3$ (fraction of a committee) and $P = 1/4$ (fraction of adversarial or Byzantine nodes). Left: The red + and \times symbols are results of simulations, obtained for $N = 10^4$, where $N = nK + r$, nodes over 10^6 random samples, which assume the $N \times P$ adversarial nodes, respectively, on *average* and *exactly*. The black solid line, going through the + symbols, connects exact values computed numerically from the equation (26). The black dashed line corresponds to the asymptotic result (33) for (31). The red dashed line corresponds to the upper bound (67). Right: The red dotted and blue solid lines correspond to, respectively, the upper and lower bounds in (23). The upper bound in the latter was computed using (30).

is fixed. However the difference between the probabilities (26) and (31) is vanishing (see Figures 3-5) when both probabilities approach unity with increasing K .

Finally, we note that insights drawn from the above results can be used to design an algorithm which for a given number of nodes N finds the *maximum* the number of committees K such that the probability of failure is less than (or equal) to a given δ . The latter will reduce the computational complexity in the sharded blockchain, which is proportional to the size of a committee n , without compromising its safety [19]. The possibly simplest way to implement such an algorithm is to use the probability of failure (26) and $N = nK + r$ nodes with n and $n + 1$ nodes assigned, respectively, to the $K - r$ and r committees. The latter ensures that for any N the optimization problem is essentially one-dimensional, where this dimension is K , and the former allows the computation of a “current” probability of failure, which is an elementary step of this optimization, to be efficient. We note that here we assume that there are $N \times P$ adversarial nodes on average and using this algorithm when there are exactly $N \times P$ of adversarial nodes would give us a larger committee size. However, the difference in committee sizes between the latter and the former becomes negligible as N is increasing as can be seen in Figure 2. The description and pseudocode of one possible variant for such an algorithm are provided in Appendix A.

5 CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

In this work, we have studied random partitions of networks. We introduced a very general probabilistic framework and used this framework to construct probability distributions of random partitions. We showed that these distributions admit exact and explicit expressions which facilitated a study of the probability of failure. For the latter, we obtained exact expressions, bounds, and asymptotic results. For the sharding of blockchains, these results offer significant analytic and algorithmic improvements, but this work still leaves many questions open.




Fig. 5. Comparing analytic results of this work with typical bounds from the literature. Here the same data as in the Figure 4 is used. Left: The red + and \times symbols are results of simulations. The black solid line, going through the + symbols, connects exact values computed numerically from the equation (26). The black dashed line corresponds to the asymptotic result (33) for (31). The red dashed line corresponds to the union bound [40], i.e. the equation (67), which uses hypergeometric distribution. The red solid line corresponds to the union bound which uses binomial distribution [26]. Right: The red dotted and blue solid lines correspond to, respectively, the upper and lower bounds in (23). The upper bound in the latter was computed using (30).

In particular, we have established that the probability of failure (26) is an upper bound on the probability (31) but this was done numerically and we envisage that to show this in a more rigorous way is also possible. The other question is the relation between the asymptotic result (33) for the probability of failure (31) and the upper bound (67). Here, it is surprising that this bound is very accurate when the number of committees K is small but for larger K it also approaches the asymptotic result which has quite a different functional form. We note that the bound (67) uses univariate hypergeometric distribution which can be difficult to compute numerically and hence for practical applications a simpler bound, but much tighter than (68), is more desirable.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank the Nomos team for their invaluable assistance and very enlightening discussions that greatly enriched this work.

REFERENCES

- [1] Muhammad Salek Ali, Massimo Vecchio, Miguel Pincheira, Koustabh Dolui, Fabio Antonelli, and Mubashir Husain Rehmani. 2019. Applications of Blockchains in the Internet of Things: A Comprehensive Survey. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials* 21, 2 (2019), 1676–1717. <https://doi.org/10.1109/COMST.2018.2886932>
- [2] Robert B Ash. 1990. *Information theory*. Dover Publications, New York.
- [3] Alex Baczkowski. 2022. *Fundamentals: What's the Deal With Rotating Committees?* Aleph Zero. Retrieved Feb 19, 2023 from <https://alephzero.org/blog/fundamentals-rotating-committees>
- [4] Erik Blasch, Ronghua Xu, Yu Chen, Genshe Chen, and Dan Shen. 2019. Blockchain Methods for Trusted Avionics Systems. In *2019 IEEE National Aerospace and Electronics Conference (NAECON)*. 192–199. <https://doi.org/10.1109/NAECON46414.2019.9058263>
- [5] Vitalik Buterin, Diego Hernandez, Thor Kamphofner, Khiem Pham, Zhi Qiao, Danny Ryan, Juhyeok Sin, Ying Wang, and Yan X Zhang. 2020. Combining GHOST and Casper. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2003.03052>
- [6] Tien-Dung Cao, Tran-Vu Pham, Quang-Hieu Vu, Hong-Linh Truong, Duc-Hung Le, and Schahram Dustdar. 2016. MARSA: A marketplace for realtime human sensing data. *ACM Transactions on Internet Technology (TOIT)* 16, 3 (2016), 1–21.

- [7] V. Chvátal. 1979. The tail of the hypergeometric distribution. *Discrete Mathematics* 25, 3 (1979), 285–287. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-365X\(79\)90084-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-365X(79)90084-0)
- [8] Thomas M Cover and Joy A Thomas. 2012. *Elements of information theory*. John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- [9] Hung Dang, Tien Tuan Anh Dinh, Dumitrel Loghin, Ee-Chien Chang, Qian Lin, and Beng Chin Ooi. 2019. Towards scaling blockchain systems via sharding. In *Proceedings of the 2019 international conference on management of data*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, 123–140.
- [10] Ibrahim M El-Hasnony, Reham R Mostafa, Mohamed Elhoseny, and Sherif I Barakat. 2021. Leveraging mist and fog for big data analytics in IoT environment. *Transactions on Emerging Telecommunications Technologies* 32, 7 (2021), e4057.
- [11] MV Fedoryuk. 1977. *The saddle-point method*. Nauka, Moscow.
- [12] Guido Carlo Ferrante. 2021. Bounds on Binomial Tails With Applications. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 67, 12 (2021), 8273–8279.
- [13] Michael J. Fischer, Nancy A. Lynch, and Michael S. Paterson. 1985. Impossibility of Distributed Consensus with One Faulty Process. *J. ACM* 32, 2 (April 1985), 374–382. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3149.214121>
- [14] Philippe Flajolet and Robert Sedgewick. 2009. *Analytic combinatorics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- [15] Paula Fraga-Lamas and Tiago M Fernández-Caramés. 2019. A review on blockchain technologies for an advanced and cyber-resilient automotive industry. *IEEE access* 7 (2019), 17578–17598.
- [16] Pedro Garcia Lopez, Alberto Montresor, Dick Epema, Anwitaman Datta, Teruo Higashino, Adriana Iamnitchi, Marinho Barcellos, Pascal Felber, and Etienne Riviere. 2015. Edge-Centric Computing: Vision and Challenges. *SIGCOMM Comput. Commun. Rev.* 45, 5 (sep 2015), 37–42. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2831347.2831354>
- [17] Yangrui Guo, Qiangdong Yang, Hui Zhou, WeiQiang Lu, and Sheng Zeng. 2020. System and Methods for Selection and Utilizing a Committee of Validator Nodes in a Distributed System. Cypherium Blockchain. Patent..
- [18] Abdelatif Hafid, Abdelhakim Senhaji Hafid, and Mustapha Samih. 2020. A novel methodology-based joint hypergeometric distribution to analyze the security of sharded blockchains. *IEEE Access* 8 (2020), 179389–179399.
- [19] Abdelatif Hafid, Abdelhakim Senhaji Hafid, and Mustapha Samih. 2020. Scaling blockchains: A comprehensive survey. *IEEE Access* 8 (2020), 125244–125262.
- [20] Wassily Hoeffding. 1963. Probability Inequalities for Sums of Bounded Random Variables. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* 58, 301 (1963), 13–30.
- [21] M. Jalalzai, C. Feng, C. Busch, G. Richard III, and J. Niu. 5555. The Hermes BFT for Blockchains. *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing* 01 (sep 5555), 1–1. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TDSC.2021.3114310>
- [22] M. M. Jalalzai, C. Busch, and G. G. Richard. 2019. Proteus: A Scalable BFT Consensus Protocol for Blockchains. In *2019 IEEE International Conference on Blockchain (Blockchain)*. 308–313. <https://doi.org/10.1109/Blockchain.2019.00048>
- [23] Mohammad M. Jalalzai, Jianyu Niu, Chen Feng, and Fangyu Gai. 2020. Fast-HotStuff: A Fast and Resilient HotStuff Protocol. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2010.11454>
- [24] Jiawen Kang, Rong Yu, Xumin Huang, and Yan Zhang. 2018. Privacy-Preserved Pseudonym Scheme for Fog Computing Supported Internet of Vehicles. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems* 19 (2018), 2627–2637.
- [25] Farzad Khodadadi, Rodrigo N Calheiros, and Rajkumar Buyya. 2015. A data-centric framework for development and deployment of internet of things applications in clouds. In *2015 IEEE Tenth International Conference on Intelligent Sensors, Sensor Networks and Information Processing (ISSNIP)*. IEEE, 1–6.
- [26] Eleftherios Kokoris-Kogias, Philipp Jovanovic, Linus Gasser, Nicolas Gailly, Ewa Syta, and Bryan Ford. 2018. Omniledger: A secure, scale-out, decentralized ledger via sharding. In *2018 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 583–598.
- [27] Leslie Lamport, Robert Shostak, and Marshall Pease. 1982. The Byzantine Generals Problem. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.* 4, 3 (July 1982), 382–401. <https://doi.org/10.1145/357172.357176>
- [28] Xin Li, Huazhe Wang, Ye Yu, and Chen Qian. 2017. An IoT data communication framework for authenticity and integrity. In *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Internet-of-Things Design and Implementation*. 159–170.
- [29] Loi Luu, Viswesh Narayanan, Chaodong Zheng, Kunal Baweja, Seth Gilbert, and Prateek Saxena. 2016. A Secure Sharding Protocol For Open Blockchains. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (Vienna, Austria) (CCS '16)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 17–30. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2976749.2978389>
- [30] Regio A Michelin, Ali Dorri, Marco Steger, Roben C Lunardi, Salil S Kanhere, Raja Jurdak, and Avelino F Zorzo. 2018. SpeedyChain: A framework for decoupling data from blockchain for smart cities. In *Proceedings of the 15th EAI international conference on mobile and ubiquitous systems: Computing, networking and services*. 145–154.
- [31] Seyed Yahya Nikouei, Ronghua Xu, Deeraj Nagothu, Yu Chen, Alexander Aved, and Erik Blasch. 2018. Real-Time Index Authentication for Event-Oriented Surveillance Video Query using Blockchain. In *2018 IEEE International Smart Cities Conference (ISC2)*. 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISC2.2018.8656668>

- [32] Hidetoshi Nishimori. 2001. *Statistical physics of spin glasses and information processing: an introduction*. Vol. 111. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- [33] Mehrdad Salimitari, Mainak Chatterjee, and Yaser P. Fallah. 2020. A survey on consensus methods in blockchain for resource-constrained IoT networks. *Internet of Things* 11 (2020), 100212. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iot.2020.100212>
- [34] Deepal Tennakoon and Vincent Gramoli. 2022. Dynamic blockchain sharding. In *5th International Symposium on Foundations and Applications of Blockchain 2022 (FAB 2022)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik.
- [35] DR Vasconcelos, RMC Andrade, Valdenir Severino, and JN De Souza. 2019. Cloud, fog, or mist in IoT? That is the question. *ACM Transactions on Internet Technology (TOIT)* 19, 2 (2019), 1–20.
- [36] Ronghua Xu, Deeraj Nagothu, and Yu Chen. 2023. *ECOM: Epoch Randomness-Based Consensus Committee Configuration for IoT Blockchains*. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 135–154. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-10507-4_7
- [37] Ronghua Xu, Seyed Yahya Nikouei, Yu Chen, Erik Blasch, and Alexander Aved. 2019. BlendMAS: A Blockchain-Enabled Decentralized Microservices Architecture for Smart Public Safety. In *2019 IEEE International Conference on Blockchain (Blockchain)*. 564–571. <https://doi.org/10.1109/Blockchain.2019.00082>
- [38] Ronghua Xu, Seyed Yahya Nikouei, Yu Chen, Erik Blasch, and Alexander Aved. 2019. BlendMAS: A Blockchain-Enabled Decentralized Microservices Architecture for Smart Public Safety. In *2019 IEEE International Conference on Blockchain (Blockchain)*. 564–571. <https://doi.org/10.1109/Blockchain.2019.00082>
- [39] Maofan Yin, Dahlia Malkhi, Michael K Reiter, Guy Golan Gueta, and Ittai Abraham. 2018. Hotstuff: Bft consensus in the lens of blockchain. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.05069* (2018).
- [40] Mahdi Zamani, Mahnush Movahedi, and Mariana Raykova. 2018. Rapidchain: Scaling blockchain via full sharding. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security*. 931–948.
- [41] Ivana Podnar Žarko, Krešimir Pripuzić, Martin Serrano, and Manfred Hauswirth. 2014. Iot data management methods and optimisation algorithms for mobile publish/subscribe services in cloud environments. In *2014 European conference on networks and communications (EuCNC)*. IEEE, 1–5.
- [42] Mengqian Zhang, Jichen Li, Zhaohua Chen, Hongyin Chen, and Xiaotie Deng. 2022. An Efficient and Robust Committee Structure for Sharding Blockchain. *IEEE Transactions on Cloud Computing* (2022).

A DESCRIPTION OF THE ALGORITHM

Here we describe the algorithm which given the number of nodes N , assumed fraction of adversarial nodes P , a fraction of a committee A and the probability of failure δ computes the maximum number of committees K and corresponding committee sizes. The algorithm computes the RHS of (26) for the $N = nK + r$ nodes where the n and $n + 1$ nodes are assigned, respectively, to the $K - r$ and r committees. Initially, all N nodes are in one committee, and in subsequent iterations, the number of committees K is increased by one until the probability (26) is equal to or less than δ . The pseudocode for the latter is provided below.

Received 20 February 2007; revised 12 March 2009; accepted 5 June 2009

Algorithm 1: The algorithm to compute minimal sizes of committees resilient to δ failure rate.

```

input :  $N, \delta, A, P$ ;
output:  $K, n, r, Prob$ ;
 $K \leftarrow 1$ ;
 $n \leftarrow N$ ;
 $r \leftarrow 0$ ;
 $Prob \leftarrow 0$ ;
repeat
  /* Save  $K, n, r$  and  $Prob$ . */
   $K_{-1} \leftarrow K$ ;
   $n_{-1} \leftarrow n$ ;
   $r_{-1} \leftarrow r$ ;
   $Prob_{-1} \leftarrow Prob$ ;
  /* Compute next  $K$ . */
   $K \leftarrow K + 1$ ;
  /* Compute remainder,  $r$ , and quotient,  $n$  when  $N$  is divided by  $K$ . */
   $r \leftarrow rem(N, K)$ ;
   $n \leftarrow quot(N, K)$ ;
  if  $r > 0$  then
    /* Compute CDF of the Binomial( $n, P$ ) and Binomial( $n+1, P$ ). */
     $Prob_0 \leftarrow P(X \leq \lfloor An \rfloor | n, P)$ ;
     $Prob_1 \leftarrow P(X \leq \lfloor A(n+1) \rfloor | n+1, P)$ ;
    /* Compute the probability of failure. */
     $Prob \leftarrow 1 - Prob_0^{K-r} Prob_1^r$ 
  else
    /* Compute CDF of the Binomial( $n, P$ ). */
     $Prob_0 \leftarrow P(X \leq \lfloor An \rfloor | n, P)$ ;
    /* Compute the probability of failure. */
     $Prob \leftarrow 1 - Prob_0^K$ 
  end
until  $Prob > \delta$ ;
 $K \leftarrow K_{-1}$ ;
 $n \leftarrow n_{-1}$ ;
 $r \leftarrow r_{-1}$ ;
 $Prob \leftarrow Prob_{-1}$ ;

```
