

Power of Finite Memory and Finite Communication Robots under Asynchronous Scheduler

Archak Das, Avisek Sharma, and Buddhadeb Sau

Department of Mathematics, Jadavpur University, Kolkata, India
{archakdas.math.rs, aviseks.math.rs, buddhadeb.sau}@jadavpuruniversity.in

Abstract. In swarm robotics, a set of robots has to perform a given task with specified internal capabilities (model) and under a given adversarial scheduler. Relation between a model M_1 under scheduler S_1 , and that of a model M_2 under scheduler S_2 can be of four different types: not less powerful, more powerful, equivalent and orthogonal. In literature there are four main models of robots with lights: *LUMI*, where robots have the power of observing the lights of all the robots, *FSTA*, where each robot can see only its own light, *FCOM*, where each robot can observe the light of all other robots except its own and *OBLLOT*, where the robots do not have any light. In this paper, we investigate the computational power of *FSTA* and *FCOM* model under asynchronous scheduler by comparing it with other model and scheduler combinations. Our main focus is to understand and compare the power of persistent memory and explicit communication in robots under asynchronous scheduler.

Keywords: Look-Compute-Move, Oblivious Mobile Robots, Robots with Lights, Memory versus Communication

1 Introduction

A large amount of research in the area of distributed computing has been devoted to the study of computational capabilities of autonomous mobile entities called *robots* operating in an Euclidean plane. Each of the robots can freely move through out the space, and each are endowed with its individual co-ordinate system and operate in *Look – Compute – Move* (LCM) cycles. One of the main research focus has been to understand the extent of computational power of robots with minimum possible internal capabilities such as memory or communication. Some of the most notable tasks are Gathering [4, 7, 9], Pattern Formation [9–11], etc.

An external factor which plays a fundamental role in determining the computational power of a swarm of mobile robots is the *activation schedule*. With respect to this factor there are three different settings: *fully – synchronous* or *FSYNCH*, *semi–synchronous* or *SSYNCH*, and *asynchronous* or *ASYNCH*. In *asynchronous* setting there is no common notion of time, while *synchronous*

setting time is divided into discrete intervals called *rounds*. Among the synchronous schedulers if in each round all the robots are activated then the scheduler is said to be *fully-synchronous*. If there is no such constraint, the scheduler is said to be *semi-synchronous*.

In addition to external capabilities the robots can be further differentiated based on the presence and absence of internal capabilities such as memory or communication. Our main focus in this paper are *robots with light*, where the lights act as a basis of memory or communication. There are four main models based on different labels of internal capabilities of memory and communication of the robots: *OBLLOT*, *LUMI*, *FSTA*, and *FCOM*. In *OBLLOT* model robots neither have persistent memory nor have the power of communication. In the *LUMI* model the robots are equipped with a constant-sized memory (called *light*), whose value can be set in the *Compute* phase. The light is visible to all the robots and is persistent. Hence, the robots are able to remember and communicate a constant number of bits through the light. Now *FSTA* and *FCOM* are two sub-models of *LUMI* where in the former each robot can see only its own light and in the latter, the robot can see the lights of all the other robot except its own. Thus in *FSTA* the robots are *silent* but has a constant amount of persistent memory, while in *FCOM* the robots are *oblivious* but can communicate a constant number of bits. \mathcal{X}^Y denotes model \mathcal{X} under scheduler Y . $A > B$ indicates that model A is computationally more powerful than model B , $A \equiv B$ denotes that they are computationally equivalent, $A \perp B$ denotes that they are computationally incomparable.

Previous Works It has been shown in [9] that within *OBLLOT*, robots in *FSYNCH* are strictly more powerful than those in *SSYNCH*. In [1] it has been shown that within *LUMI*, robots in *ASYNCH* has the computational power as the robots in *SSYNCH*, and that asynchronous luminous robots are strictly more powerful than oblivious synchronous robots. Recently in [6], the authors provided a complete exhaustive map of computational relationships among various models given in the tables 1, 2, 3, but only under *FSYNCH* and *SSYNCH* scheduler. In addition to that they considered the question that which of the internal capabilities is more important, memory or communication. The authors examined this question through the lens of various computational results they obtained and came to the conclusion that the answer depends on the type of scheduler, i.e., communication is more powerful than persistent memory if the scheduler is fully synchronous and are incomparable under the semi-synchronous. In [8] the author further expanded the work of [6]. The author investigated how the models relate to each other in a single robot system and also showed that the results obtained for rigid robots with same chirality in tables 1 and 2 are the same if non-rigid robots are considered. The author also investigated the point between *SSYNCH* and *FSYNCH* where the strict dominance of *LUMI* over *FCOM* turns into equivalence.

| | \mathcal{FCOM}^F | \mathcal{FSTA}^F | \mathcal{OBLOT}^F |
|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| \mathcal{LUMI}^F | \equiv | $>$ | $>$ |
| \mathcal{FCOM}^F | $-$ | $>$ | $>$ |
| \mathcal{FSTA}^F | $-$ | $-$ | $>$ |

Table 1: Relationships within FSYNCH [6]

| | \mathcal{FCOM}^S | \mathcal{FSTA}^S | \mathcal{OBLOT}^S |
|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| \mathcal{LUMI}^S | $>$ | $>$ | $>$ |
| \mathcal{FCOM}^S | $-$ | \perp | $>$ |
| \mathcal{FSTA}^S | $-$ | $-$ | $>$ |

Table 2: Relationships within SSYNCH [6]

| | \mathcal{LUMI}^S | \mathcal{FCOM}^S | \mathcal{FSTA}^S | \mathcal{OBLOT}^S |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| $\mathcal{LUMI}^F \equiv \mathcal{FCOM}^F$ | $>$ | $>$ | $>$ | $>$ |
| \mathcal{FSTA}^F | \perp | \perp | $>$ | $>$ |
| \mathcal{OBLOT}^F | \perp | \perp | \perp | $>$ |

Table 3: Relationship between FSYNCH and SSYNCH [6]

Our Contributions In this paper, we partially extend the work of [6] under *ASYNCH* scheduler as well. We first observe that, when we consider the four models under asynchronous scheduler, some of the results follow in a straightforward manner from the previous results established in the papers [1, 5, 6]. For, some of the remaining cases which requires a deeper investigation we give non-trivial proofs. For example we prove that $\mathcal{FSTA}^A \perp \mathcal{OBLOT}^F$, and we prove that $\mathcal{FCOM}^A \perp \mathcal{OBLOT}^F$, which is a clear refinement of the recently established result that $\mathcal{LUMI}^A \perp \mathcal{OBLOT}^F$ [6]. To prove $\mathcal{FSTA}^A \perp \mathcal{OBLOT}^F$ we introduce a new problem *Oscillating Configurations* while to prove $\mathcal{FCOM}^A \perp \mathcal{OBLOT}^F$, we provide a new asynchronous algorithm for the problem $-IL$ introduced in [6]. By designing an algorithm for $-IL$ in \mathcal{FCOM}^A we also prove that $\mathcal{FCOM}^A \perp \mathcal{FSTA}^F$, which is in contrast to the fact that $\mathcal{FCOM}^F > \mathcal{FSTA}^A$, which is easily deduced from some previous results. We introduce a new problem *Independent Oscillating Problem* and prove that $\mathcal{FCOM}^S \perp \mathcal{FSTA}^A$ which in turn implies that $\mathcal{FCOM}^A \perp \mathcal{FSTA}^A$. In [6], the question was raised that whether “*it was better to remember or to communicate?*”. Thus we have shown here that in the case of asynchronous scheduler, finite memory model is incomparable to finite communication model.

2 Model and Technical Preliminaries

The model and setting in this paper is same as that of [6]. The System considered in this paper consists of a team R of computational entities called *robots* moving and operating in the Euclidean plane \mathbb{R}^2 . The robots are viewed as points in the Euclidean plane and has its own local co-ordinate system which may not agree with other robots. It always perceives itself at the origin. The robots are *identical* (indistinguishable) and *autonomous* (lacks a central control). At any point in time, a robot is either *active* or *inactive*. When active, a robot executes a *Look-Compute-Move (LCM)* cycle performing the following three operations:

1. *Look*: The robot activates its sensors to obtain a snapshot of the positions occupied by robots with respect to its own co-ordinate system.
2. *Compute*: The robot executes its algorithm using the snapshot as input. The result of the computation is a destination point.
3. *Move*: The robot moves to the computed destination, i.e., we assume a *rigid mobility*. If the destination is the current location, the robot stays still.

When inactive, a robot is idle. All robots are initially idle. The amount of time to complete a cycle is assumed to be finite, and the *Look* operation is assumed to be instantaneous. We assume that the robots agree on the same circular orientation of the plane, i.e., there is *chirality*.

In the *OBLLOT* model, the robots are *silent* and *oblivious*. By *silent* we mean that the robots have no explicit means of communication, and by *oblivious* we mean that, at the start of a cycle, a robot has no memory of observations and computations performed in previous cycles.

In the *LUMI* model, each robot r is equipped with a persistent visible state variable $Light[r]$, called *light*, whose values are taken from a finite set C of states called colors. The colors of the lights can be set in each cycle by r at the end of its *Compute* operation. A light is persistent from one computational cycle to the next and can be seen by all the robots. The robot is otherwise oblivious forgetting all other information from previous cycles. In *LUMI*, the *Look* operation produces the set of pairs (*position, color*) of the other robots. It can be clearly understood that the lights simultaneously provide persistent memory and direct means of communication.

FSTA is a sub-model of *LUMI* having only the property of persistent memory. Here the robots can only see the color of its own light i.e. the light is an *internal light*. As a result the robots are *silent* as in *OBLLOT* but *finite-state*.

FCOM is a sub-model of *LUMI* having only the property of external communication. Here the lights of the robot are *external light* i.e. a robot cannot see the color of its own light but can see the color of the lights of the other robots. As a result the robots are *oblivious* as in *OBLLOT* but are *finite-communication*.

With respect to the activation schedule of the robots, there are three kind of schedulers. In the *asynchronous* (ASYNCH) scheduler, there is no common notion of time, each robot is activated independently of others, the duration of each phase is finite but unpredictable and might be different in different cycles. In the *semi-synchronous* (SSYNCH) setting, time is divided into discrete intervals, called *rounds*, in each round some robots are activated simultaneously, and perform their *LCM* cycles in perfect synchronization. The *fully-synchronous* (FSYNCH) setting, is same as SSYNCH except the fact that each robot is activated in every round. In all of these settings, the selection of which robots are activated at a round is made by an *adversarial scheduler*, which must be *fair*, i.e., every robot must be activated infinitely often.

The Computational Relationships we now define below are exactly the same as [6]. For the sake of completion of the paper we re-write it.

Let $\mathcal{M} = \{\mathcal{LUMI}, \mathcal{FSTA}, \mathcal{FCOM}, \mathcal{OBLLOT}\}$ be the set of models, and $\mathcal{S} = \{\mathcal{FSYNCH}, \mathcal{SSYNCH}, \mathcal{ASYNCH}\}$ the set of schedulers. \mathcal{R} denotes the

set of all team of robots satisfying core assumptions (i.e, they are identical, autonomous and operate in *LCM* cycles) and $R \in \mathcal{R}$, a team of robots having identical capabilities. By $\mathcal{R}_n \in \mathcal{R}$ we denote the set of all teams of size n .

Given a model $M \in \mathcal{M}$, a scheduler $S \in \mathcal{S}$, and a team of robots $R \in \mathcal{R}$, let $Task(M, S; R)$ denote the set of problems solvable by R in M under adversarial scheduler S .

Let $M_1, M_2 \in \mathcal{M}$ and $S_1, S_2 \in \mathcal{S}$. We define the relationships between model M_1 under scheduler S_1 and model M_2 under scheduler S_2 :

- *computationally not less powerful* ($M_1^{S_1} \geq M_2^{S_2}$), if $\forall R \in \mathcal{R}$ we have $Task(M_1, S_1; R) \supseteq Task(M_2, S_2; R)$;
- *computationally more powerful* ($M_1^{S_1} > M_2^{S_2}$), if $M_1^{S_1} \geq M_2^{S_2}$ and $\exists R \in \mathcal{R}$ such that $Task(M_1, S_1; R) \setminus Task(M_2, S_2; R) \neq \emptyset$;
- *computationally equivalent* ($M_1^{S_1} \equiv M_2^{S_2}$), if $M_1^{S_1} \geq M_2^{S_2}$ and $M_1^{S_1} \leq M_2^{S_2}$;
- *computationally orthogonal or incomparable*, ($M_1^{S_1} \perp M_2^{S_2}$), if $\exists R_1, R_2 \in \mathcal{R}$ such that $Task(M_1, S_1; R_1) \setminus Task(M_2, S_2; R_1) \neq \emptyset$ and $Task(M_2, S_2; R_2) \setminus Task(M_1, S_1; R_2) \neq \emptyset$.

For simplicity of notation, for a model $M \in \mathcal{M}$, let M^F and M^S denote M^{Fsynch} and M^{Ssynch} , respectively; and let $M^F(R)$ and $M^S(R)$ denote the sets $Task(M, FSYNCH; R)$ and $Task(M, SSYNCH; R)$, respectively.

Trivially, for any $M \in \mathcal{M}$, $M^F \geq M^S \geq M^A$; also for any $S \in \mathcal{S}$, $LUMI^S \geq FSTA^S \geq OBLOT^S$ and $LUMI^S \geq FCOM^S \geq OBLOT^S$.

3 Obvious Deductions from previous algorithms

A number of results has been established previously in the papers [1, 5, 6] but a most of them are considering *FSYNCH* and *SSYNCH* schedulers only. When we change the scheduler to *asynchronous* many new results follow easily :

- (D1) $FSTA^F > OBLOT^A$
- (D2) $FCOM^F > OBLOT^A$
- (D3) $LUMI^F > OBLOT^A$
- (D4) $LUMI^S > OBLOT^A$
- (D5) $FCOM^F > FSTA^A$
- (D6) $FSTA^F > FSTA^A$
- (D7) $LUMI^A > FSTA^A$
- (D8) $LUMI^S > FSTA^A$
- (D9) $LUMI^F > FSTA^A$
- (D10) $FCOM^F > FCOM^A$
- (D11) $LUMI^A > FCOM^A$
- (D12) $LUMI^S > FCOM^A$
- (D13) $LUMI^F > FCOM^A$
- (D14) $FCOM^F > LUMI^A$
- (D15) $LUMI^F > LUMI^A$
- (D16) $FSTA^S < LUMI^A$

– (D17) $\mathcal{FCOM}^S < \mathcal{LUMI}^A$

Proof. 1. (D1) and (D2) follows from the fact that $\mathcal{FSTA}^F > \mathcal{OBLOT}^F$ and $\mathcal{FCOM}^F > \mathcal{OBLOT}^F$ [6] and $\mathcal{OBLOT}^F > \mathcal{OBLOT}^A$ [9]
2. (D3) and (D4) follows from the fact that $\mathcal{LUMI}^A > \mathcal{OBLOT}^A$ [1]
3. (D5) follows from the fact that $\mathcal{FCOM}^F > \mathcal{FSTA}^S$ [6]. (D6) follows from the fact that $\mathcal{FSTA}^F > \mathcal{FSTA}^S$ [6].
4. (D7) follows from $\mathcal{LUMI}^S \equiv \mathcal{LUMI}^A$ and $\mathcal{LUMI}^S > \mathcal{FSTA}^S$ [6]. (D8) and (D9) follows from (D7).
5. (D10) follows from the fact that $\mathcal{FCOM}^F > \mathcal{FCOM}^S$ [6].
6. (D12) follows from $\mathcal{LUMI}^S > \mathcal{FCOM}^S$ [6]. (D11) follows from $\mathcal{LUMI}^S \equiv \mathcal{LUMI}^A$ and (D12). (D13) follows from (D11) and (D12).
7. (D14), (D15) follows from $\mathcal{FCOM}^F \equiv \mathcal{LUMI}^F$ and $\mathcal{LUMI}^F > \mathcal{LUMI}^S$ [6].
8. (D16), (D17) follows from the fact that $\mathcal{LUMI}^S \equiv \mathcal{LUMI}^A$ and $\mathcal{LUMI}^S > \mathcal{FSTA}^S$, $\mathcal{LUMI}^S > \mathcal{FCOM}^S$ [6].

□

There are still some non-trivial relationships whose nature still remained unresolved and which cannot be deduced from results of the previous papers. In the next section, in sub-section 4.1 we prove that \mathcal{FSTA}^A is orthogonal to \mathcal{OBLOT}^F , and strictly powerful than \mathcal{OBLOT}^A . In sub-section 4.2 we prove that \mathcal{FCOM}^A is orthogonal to \mathcal{OBLOT}^F , \mathcal{FSTA}^F and \mathcal{FSTA}^S .

4 Computational Power of \mathcal{FSTA} and \mathcal{FCOM} in Asynch

4.1 Problem Oscillating Configurations

We first investigate the computational relationship between \mathcal{OBLOT}^F and \mathcal{FSTA}^A . It has already been shown in [6] that the *SRO* (Shrinking Rotation) problem can be solved in \mathcal{OBLOT}^F but not in \mathcal{FSTA}^S . Hence *SRO* problem cannot be solved in \mathcal{FSTA}^A . Now we show that, there exists a problem which can be solved in \mathcal{FSTA}^A but not in \mathcal{OBLOT}^F . We now define the problem:

Definition 1. *Problem OC (Oscillating Configurations):* Four robots x, y, z and t are placed initially in Configuration-I represented by Figure (I). The problem *OC* requires the robots to move to continuously alternate the configuration of the robots in the sequence I-II-III-II-I-II-..., i.e. the robots start at Configuration-I, form Configuration-II, then forms Configuration-III, then again forms Configuration-II,... and the process is continuous.




Fig. 1

Algorithm 1: Algorithm *AlgOC* for *OC* in \mathcal{FSTA}^A executed by each robot r , initially $r.light \leftarrow NIL$

```

1 if  $r.light = NIL$  then
2   if visible configuration is not I then
3     do nothing
4   else
5     if  $r.position \neq C$  then
6       do nothing
7     else
8        $r.light \leftarrow RED$ 
9       Move to  $C'$ 
10 if  $r.light = RED$  then
11   if location is  $C'$  then
12      $r.light \leftarrow BLUE$ 
13     Move to  $C''$ 
14 if  $r.light = BLUE$  then
15   if location is  $C''$  then
16     Move to  $C'$ 
17   if location is  $C'$  then
18      $r.light \leftarrow NIL$ 
19     Move to  $C$ 

```

We claim that the problem can be solved in \mathcal{FSTA}^A but cannot be solved in \mathcal{OBLLOT}^F . We prove our claim by providing an algorithm *AlgOC* to solve *OC* in \mathcal{FSTA}^A and then proving that *OC* cannot be solved in \mathcal{OBLLOT}^F .

Description of the Algorithm *AlgOC*

The internal light used by the robots can have three colors: *NIL*, *RED*, *BLUE*. Initially all the robots start from Configuration-I and have their internal lights set to *NIL*. A robot r when activated takes a snapshot of its surrounding in the *Look* phase and tries to understand the current configuration. The robot r then performs the following actions based on the dual information about its position in the current configuration and the color of its internal light:

1. If the color of the internal light of r is *NIL*, and the visible configuration is not I, then it does nothing in that phase, i.e., there is no change of internal

light or movement on the part of r in that phase. If the configuration is I , but the location of r is not at C then also it does nothing in that phase. But if the location of r is at C , then it changes the color of its internal light to RED and moves to the point C' .

2. If the color of the internal light of r is RED , the visible configuration is II and it is at C' , then r changes the color of its internal light to $BLUE$, and moves to the point C'' .
3. If the color of the internal light of r is $BLUE$, then if the location of r is at C'' then r moves to the point C' , and if the location of r is at C' then r changes the color of its internal light to NIL and moves to the point C .

Correctness of the Algorithm AlgOC

Lemma 1. $\forall R \in \mathcal{R}_4, OC \in FSTA^A(R)$.

Proof. A robot's internal light can take three possible colors: $NIL, RED, BLUE$. Initially each robot has its initialized to NIL . In our algorithm, we ensure that the robot placed at position C in the initial configuration, i.e z , is the only robot that makes any movement throughout the execution. We denote the position where robot z must move to make the configuration II and III as C' and C'' respectively. Initially a robot wakes up to find its colour NIL , and if it is at C it can clearly distinguish its position from other robots, since it is the only robot in the whole configuration which is equidistant from the other three robots . So, at that point the robot changes its colour to RED and move to position C' such that the resulting configuration is II. At this point z is the only robot with colour RED . When again z is activated by the adversary it wakes to find its internal light having colour RED and configuration II, so it changes the color of its internal light to $BLUE$ and moves to the position C'' such that the resulting configuration becomes III. Next again when z is activated it finds it internal light having the colour $BLUE$, and visible configuration to be III. It then moves to the position C' forming configuration II. Now when again z is activated it finds the visible configuration to be configuration II and internal light $BLUE$, it then changes the color of its internal light to NIL and moves to the point C forming configuration I . When z is activated again, in this position, it finds its internal light having colour NIL and configuration I, then r repeats its moves and the algorithm continues like this.

Note that, after the execution of the algorithm has started, if any robot other than z is activated, they do not do anything, as a robot with light NIL makes a movement only when the visible configuration is I and it is in C , and according to our algorithm only robot z satisfy this criteria, throughout the execution of the algorithm. \square

Lemma 2. $\exists R \in \mathcal{R}_4, OC \notin OBLOT^F(R)$.

Proof. Let there exists an algorithm A which solves problem OC in $OBLOT^F$. Now let us consider two different scenarios:

Case-1: The robots have just changed their configuration to II from I, and the

configuration is currently II.

Case-2: The robots have just changed their configuration to II from III, and the configuration is currently II.

In Case-1 the next configuration that the robots must form is III, and in Case-2 the next configuration robots have to form is I. But in both the cases, the view of the robots are same. And as in $OBL\mathcal{O}T^F$ setting the robot has to decide its next destination based on its present view as the robots neither have any internal memory nor they have the power of external communication. As a result, the robots cannot distinguish between Case-1 and Case-2, hence they will perform the same move in both the cases. Hence, problem OC cannot be solved in $OBL\mathcal{O}T^F$. \square

Theorem 1. $OBL\mathcal{O}T^F \perp FSTA^A$

Proof. Problem OC can be solved in $FSTA^A$, but cannot be solved in $OBL\mathcal{O}T^F$, and in [6] it has been proved that the problem SRO or Shrinking Rotation can be solved in $OBL\mathcal{O}T^F$ but cannot be solved in $FSTA^S$, hence not in $FSTA^A$. Hence our theorem is proved. \square

Theorem 2. $OBL\mathcal{O}T^A < FSTA^A$

Proof. Problem OC cannot be solved in $OBL\mathcal{O}T^F$, hence obviously not in $OBL\mathcal{O}T^A$. But problem OC as proved in Theorem 1 can be solved in $FSTA^A$. Also, trivially $OBL\mathcal{O}T^A \leq FSTA^A$. Hence, the theorem follows. \square

4.2 An Asynchronous Algorithm in \mathcal{FCOM} for Problem $-IL$

We consider the problem $-IL$ defined in [6].




Fig. 2

Definition 2. Three robots a , b , and c , starting from the initial configuration shown in Figure 2(a), must form first the pattern of Figure 2(b) and then move to form the pattern of Figure 2(c).

It has been already proved in [6] that $-IL$ cannot be solved in \mathcal{FSTA}^F . In this paper, we provide an algorithm for $-IL$ in \mathcal{FCOM}^A . We re-name Figure-2(a),2(b),2(c) in our Figure-2 as Configuration I,II and III respectively. Also we call the point where robot a must move from configuration-I to form configuration-II to be P_1 , and the point where the robot b must move from configuration-II to form configuration-III to be P_2 .

Algorithm 2: Algorithm *COMIL* for $-IL$ in \mathcal{FCOM}^A executed by each robot r , initially $r.light \leftarrow NIL$

```

1 if there exists a robot with light F then
2   do not do anything
3 else
4   if there exists a robot with light M then
5     if Visible Configuration is not II then
6       do not do anything
7     else
8       if position is in the line segment joining the other two robots then
9         r.light  $\leftarrow$  F
10        Move to the  $P_2$ 
11      else
12        do nothing
13  else
14    if Visible Configuration is II then
15      do nothing
16    else
17      if I can form II with least clockwise rotation then
18        r.light  $\leftarrow$  M
19        Move to  $P_1$ 
20      else
21        do nothing

```

Description of Algorithm COMIL

Here the robots are equipped with an external light whose color can only be seen by other robots. The external light can take one of the following three colors: NIL, M, F . Initially, all robots start at Configuration-I and have their external light set to NIL . A robot r when activated takes a snapshot of its surrounding in the *Look* phase. The snapshot provides r with the location of the robots according to its own local co-ordinate system and the current color of the light of the robots except itself. The robot r then performs the following actions based on the dual information about its position in the current configuration and the colors of the external lights of the robots except itself:

1. If r observes any robot or robots in the snapshot obtained having external light F it does nothing, i.e, it neither changes the color of its external light nor it executes any movement, irrespective of the present configuration and any other light attained in the snapshot.
2. If r does not observe any robot having external light F , but observes a robot having external light M , then there can be two cases: either the visible configuration is Configuration-II, or the visible configuration is not Configuration-II. If the configuration is not Configuration-II r does not do anything. Further

if the current configuration is Configuration-II, there can be two cases. If r does not lie in the line segment joining the other two robots it does nothing. Otherwise if r lies in the line segment joining the location of the other two robots, then r changes the color of the external light to F and moves to the point P_2 .

3. If r does not observe any visible light, then there can be two cases, either the observed configuration is Configuration I or the observed configuration is Configuration II, i.e. r is a . If the observed configuration is Configuration I, then if r is a (the robot which can form Configuration II with least clockwise angular movement), then r changes the color of the external light to M and moves to the point P_1 . Otherwise if the observed configuration is Configuration II, r does nothing.

Correctness of the Algorithm COMIL

Lemma 3. $\forall R \in \mathcal{R}_3, -IL \in FCOM^A(R)$.

Proof. Initially all robots have colour NIL and are arranged in Configuration-I. Here the robot a can uniquely identify its position, as it is the only robot whose ninety degree clockwise rotation around the robot b results in Configuration-II. According to our algorithm, at this position only robot a is allowed to move, a changes its colour to M and moves to position P_1 forming Configuration-II. While a is moving towards the point P_1 , if b or c is activated, their snapshot in the *Look* returns a configuration where there is one robot with light set to M , and the configuration is not yet Configuration II. Hence at this point neither b , nor c makes any movement. When a is at the point P_1 , if a or c is activated neither of them changes their color or make any movement. If a is activated a observes the color of the other two robots to be set to NIL and the visible configuration is Configuration II. Hence a does not do anything. If c is activated it observes one robot (a) having external light set to M and the visible configuration to be Configuration II, but c does not lie in the line segment joining the other two robots, i.e., a and b . Hence in this case c also does not do anything. If b is activated, it observes one robot with its external light set to M , visible configuration to be Configuration II, and also it lies on the line segment joining the other two robots. As the external light of a is still set to M , b clearly identifies the position P_2 where it must move to form Configuration III. Now it turns its light to F and moves to P_2 which results in Configuration III. Now while b is moving towards the P_2 , if either a or c is activated they observe a robot with its external light set to F and hence does not do anything. Once b reaches P_2 the resulting configuration is Configuration III. If again at this point if a or c is activated they observe a robot with its external light set to F , and hence again, neither of them do anything. If b is activated, b observes a robot having its external light set to M and the configuration is not Configuration II. Hence b does not make any movement. As a result the robots do not make any further movement and remain at Configuration III permanently according to our algorithm and the problem is solved. It must be noted that as we have assumed

rigid movement of the robots, so the robots a and b do not stop in between their movement. Hence our algorithm solves problem $-IL$. \square

Theorem 3. $\mathcal{FCOM}^A \perp \mathcal{FSTA}^F$

Proof. It has been proved earlier in [6] that Problem $-IL$ cannot be solved in \mathcal{FSTA}^F , and we have proved in Lemma 3 that the Algorithm $COMIL$ solves $-IL$ in \mathcal{FCOM}^A . Also in [6], it has been proved that there exists a problem, i.e., Problem CGE or Center of Gravity Expansion which can be solved in \mathcal{FSTA}^F but cannot be solved in \mathcal{LUMI}^S .

Now, $\mathcal{LUMI}^S \equiv \mathcal{LUMI}^A > \mathcal{FCOM}^A$ (Section 3), and hence Problem CGE cannot be solved in \mathcal{FCOM}^A as well. Hence, the theorem follows. \square

Theorem 4. $\mathcal{FCOM}^A \perp \mathcal{FSTA}^S$

Proof. Problem $-IL$ can be solved in \mathcal{FCOM}^A , but cannot be solved in \mathcal{FSTA}^F and as we know that, $\mathcal{FSTA}^S \leq \mathcal{FSTA}^F$, hence $-IL$ cannot be solved in \mathcal{FSTA}^S . Also in [6] it has been shown that the Problem $TAR(d)$ or Triangle Rotation can be solved in \mathcal{FSTA}^S , but not in \mathcal{FCOM}^S . Now as $\mathcal{FCOM}^A \leq \mathcal{FCOM}^S$, so Problem $TAR(d)$ cannot be solved in \mathcal{FCOM}^A . Hence the theorem follows. \square

Theorem 5. $\mathcal{FCOM}^A \perp \mathcal{OBLOT}^F$

Proof. We know that $\mathcal{OBLOT}^F < \mathcal{FSTA}^F$ [6]. Now it has been proved in [6] that the problem $-IL$ cannot be solved in \mathcal{FSTA}^F . Hence the problem $-IL$ cannot be solved in \mathcal{OBLOT}^F as well. Hence $-IL$ can be solved in \mathcal{FCOM}^A but not in \mathcal{OBLOT}^F .

Again in [6], the authors gave a problem SRO or Shrinking Rotation which is solvable in \mathcal{OBLOT}^F , but not solvable in \mathcal{FCOM}^S hence in \mathcal{FCOM}^A . Hence our theorem is proved. \square

4.3 Independent Oscillating Problem

It has already been proved that there exists a problem which is not solvable in \mathcal{FSTA}^F , hence in \mathcal{FSTA}^A but solvable in \mathcal{FCOM}^S , i.e., $-IL$ problem. In this section we introduce the *Independent Oscillating Problem* defined in Definition 3 which is solvable in \mathcal{FSTA}^A but not in \mathcal{FCOM}^S .



Fig. 3: Initial configuration of *Independent Oscillating Problem*

Definition 3. Independent Oscillating Problem (IOP): Let three robots be placed initially on a straight line L at different positions on the plane arbitrarily.

Let r_m be the robot that lie in between the remaining two terminal robots r_1 and r_2 (Figure 3). For $i=1,2$, let x_i be the initial distance between r_i and r_m . The problem requires that for each $i=1,2$, whenever r_i is activated, then if it is at distance x_i from r_m , it moves away x_i distance from r_m along L and, if it is at distance $2x_i$ from r_m , it moves closer x_i distance towards r_m along L . More precisely, for $i=1,2$, let $d_i(t)$ denote the distance between robots r_m and r_i at time t . The Independent Oscillating Problem requires each robot r_i , starting from an arbitrary distance $d_i(t_0) > 0$ at time t_0 , to move so that there exists a monotonically increasing infinite sequence of time instances $t_0^i, t_1^i, t_2^i, \dots$ such that $d_i(t_{2k}^i) = d_i(t_0^i)$ and $d_i(t_{2k-1}^i) = 2d_i(t_0^i)$ for all $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, and $\forall h', h'' \in [t_{2k}^i, t_{2k+1}^i]$ and $h' < h''$, $d_i(h') \leq d_i(h'')$ and $\forall h', h'' \in [t_{2k-1}^i, t_{2k}^i]$ and $h' < h''$, $d_i(h') \geq d_i(h'')$.

Algorithm 3: Algorithm *AlgoIOP* for *IOP* in \mathcal{FSTA}^A executed by each robot r , initially $r.light \leftarrow NIL$;

```

1  $M$  = position of the robot  $r_m$ ;
2  $C$  = position of the robot  $r$ ;
3 if  $r = r_m$  then
4   | do not do anything
5 else
6   if  $r.light = NIL$  then
7     | Set the  $r.light$  to  $RED$ ;
8     | Move away  $CM$  distance along  $L$  from the closest robot;
9   if  $r.light = RED$  then
10    | Set the  $r.light$  to  $NIL$ ;
11    | Move closer  $\frac{CM}{2}$  distance along  $L$  to the closest robot;
```




Fig. 4: Illustration of Algorithm *AlgoIOP*

Description and Correctness of the Algorithm *AlgoIOP* The internal light used by the robots can take two colors: NIL , RED . Initially all robots have their internal lights set to NIL . A robot r when activated takes a snapshot of its surrounding in the *LOOK* phase and recognises itself either as the middle robot r_m or as a terminal robot r_i . If it recognises itself as r_m then it does nothing. Moreover, at any time instance this robot stays in the middle according to the algorithm. So whenever r_m gets activated, it neither changes its position nor its internal color. When a terminal robot gets activated for the first time

then it recognises itself as a terminal robot from the snapshot taken in *LOOK* phase. From the internal light it decides whether to move closer to the middle robot or move away from the middle robot. Let C, M be the position of the current terminal robot and r_m in a snapshot. If the internal light is *NIL* then it determines that in this round it has to move away CM distance from the middle robot along L , and if the internal light is *RED* then it determines that in this round it has to move closer $\frac{CM}{2}$ distance towards the middle robot along L .

From the above discussion it is easy to observe that *IOP* is solvable by algorithm *AlgoIOP* in \mathcal{FSTA}^A . We record this result in Lemma 4 .

Lemma 4. $\forall R \in \mathcal{R}_3, IOP \in \mathcal{FSTA}^A(R)$.

Lemma 5. $\exists R \in \mathcal{R}_3, IOP \notin \mathcal{FCOM}^S(R)$.

Proof. If possible let there be an algorithm **A** which solves the *IOP* in \mathcal{FCOM}^S . If both of the terminal robots do not move ever, then it contradicts the correctness of the algorithm **A**. Let at k^{th} round r_1 makes the first non null movement, according to the problem that is, to move x_1 distance away from r_m along L . If the scheduler activates only r_1 at both the k^{th} and $(k+1)^{th}$ round, then r_1 will not be able to differentiate between the situation in k^{th} round and $(k+1)^{th}$ round and in round $k+1$, it moves $2x_1$ distance away from r_m along L , because the distances of the robots from each other at any particular round is arbitrary and external lights of r_2 and r_m are same in the both k and $(k+1)^{th}$ round. This contradicts the correctness of **A**. \square

Lemma 6. [6] $\exists R \in \mathcal{R}_3, -IL \notin \mathcal{FSTA}^F(R)$.

Lemma 7. [6] $\forall R \in \mathcal{R}_3, -IL \in \mathcal{FCOM}^S(S)$.

Next in [6] Lemma 6 and 7 are shown regarding the *-IL* problem which prove that *-IL* problem can not be solved in \mathcal{FSTA}^F , hence in \mathcal{FSTA}^A but can be solved in \mathcal{FCOM}^S . Also in this paper we have shown that *-IL* is solvable in \mathcal{FCOM}^A . Therefore from Lemmas 4-5 and 6-7, we can conclude:

Theorem 6. $\mathcal{FCOM}^S \perp \mathcal{FSTA}^A$.

Also, given the fact that *IOP* cannot be solved in \mathcal{FCOM}^S implies that *IOP* cannot be solved in \mathcal{FCOM}^A , we get the following result:

Theorem 7. $\mathcal{FCOM}^A \perp \mathcal{FSTA}^A$.

5 Conclusion

In this paper we have extended the study of computational relationship between models of [6] under asynchronous scheduler. It has only been recently proved in [6] that $\mathcal{LUMI}^A \perp \mathcal{OBLOT}^F$, which had been an long-standing open problem. In this paper we have further refined that result by proving that $\mathcal{FCOM}^A \perp \mathcal{OBLOT}^F$, and $\mathcal{FSTA}^A \perp \mathcal{OBLOT}^F$, as \mathcal{FCOM}^A and \mathcal{FSTA}^A are sub-models

of \mathcal{LUMI}^A , with either only the power of communication or memory compared to the power of both communication and memory of \mathcal{LUMI}^A . In fact we have gone one step further and even proved that $\mathcal{FCOM}^A \perp \mathcal{FSTA}^F$. This is in contrast to the result $\mathcal{FCOM}^F > \mathcal{FSTA}^A$. Perhaps the most significant contribution of our paper is to find out the exact computational relationship between \mathcal{FSTA}^A and \mathcal{FCOM}^A . In this paper we have proved that, $\mathcal{FSTA}^A \perp \mathcal{FCOM}^A$, proving that the finite memory model and the finite communication model are incomparable under asynchronous scheduler. Still there are many relations whose nature is still yet to be resolved. The relations that are yet to be resolved are:

1. \mathcal{OBLOT}^S Vs. \mathcal{OBLOT}^A
2. \mathcal{FSTA}^S Vs. \mathcal{FSTA}^A
3. \mathcal{FSTA}^A Vs. \mathcal{OBLOT}^S
4. \mathcal{FCOM}^S Vs. \mathcal{FCOM}^A
5. \mathcal{FCOM}^A Vs. \mathcal{OBLOT}^S

The first of these questions is answered as $\mathcal{OBLOT}^S > \mathcal{OBLOT}^A$ in graph domain [3]. But in the background of continuous setting, where the robots can detect multiplicity, the question is yet to be resolved. The rest of the questions remain open for future investigations. Also we assumed in our setting rigid movements and the presence of chirality. It would be interesting to explore the nature of the relations by changing one or both the assumptions. In the papers [2] and [3] characterization of some of the relations have been done in graph environment or discrete setting. Also, it would be interesting to characterize the remaining relations of the model in discrete setting.

Acknowledgement Partial work of this paper was communicated to the conference *CALDAM, 2021*, so the authors would like to thank the anonymous reviewers of that conference for their valuable comments which have helped us to improve this work.

References

1. Shantanu Das, Paola Flocchini, Giuseppe Prencipe, Nicola Santoro, and Masafumi Yamashita. Autonomous mobile robots with lights. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 609:171–184, 2016.
2. Mattia D’Emidio, Daniele Frigioni, and Alfredo Navarra. Synchronous robots vs asynchronous lights-enhanced robots on graphs. *Electron. Notes Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 322:169–180, 2016.
3. Mattia D’Emidio, Gabriele Di Stefano, Daniele Frigioni, and Alfredo Navarra. Characterizing the computational power of mobile robots on graphs and implications for the euclidean plane. *Inf. Comput.*, 263:57–74, 2018.
4. Paola Flocchini, Giuseppe Prencipe, Nicola Santoro, and Peter Widmayer. Gathering of asynchronous robots with limited visibility. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 337(1-3):147–168, 2005.
5. Paola Flocchini, Nicola Santoro, Giovanni Viglietta, and Masafumi Yamashita. Rendezvous with constant memory. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 621:57–72, 2016.

6. Paola Flocchini, Nicola Santoro, and Koichi Wada. On memory, communication, and synchronous schedulers when moving and computing. In *23rd International Conference on Principles of Distributed Systems, OPODIS 2019, December 17-19, 2019, Neuchâtel, Switzerland*, pages 25:1–25:17. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2019.
7. Taisuke Izumi, Samia Souissi, Yoshiaki Katayama, Nobuhiro Inuzuka, Xavier Défago, Koichi Wada, and Masafumi Yamashita. The gathering problem for two oblivious robots with unreliable compasses. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 41(1):26–46, 2012.
8. Tom Peters. Comparison of scheduler models for distributed systems of luminous robots.
9. Ichiro Suzuki and Masafumi Yamashita. Distributed anonymous mobile robots: Formation of geometric patterns. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 28(4):1347–1363, 1999.
10. Masafumi Yamashita and Ichiro Suzuki. Characterizing geometric patterns formable by oblivious anonymous mobile robots. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 411(26-28):2433–2453, 2010.
11. Yukiko Yamauchi, Taichi Uehara, Shuji Kijima, and Masafumi Yamashita. Plane formation by synchronous mobile robots in the three-dimensional euclidean space. *J. ACM*, 64(3):16:1–16:43, 2017.