Election algorithms

- Definition of election algorithm, assumptions
- election algorithm on a tree
- rings
 - ◆ LeLann
 - Chang and Roberts
 - ◆ Dolev-Klawe-Rodeh
- arbitrary networks extinction algorithm

Wayes on trees and election

- Use wave tree algorithm
- first phase "wake up" all processes (non-initiators)
 - a wakeup message is propagated from initiators to other processes
- second phase do a wave on the tree
 - leaves start
 - id of lowest process in subtree is attached to token
- message complexity: 4N-4 O(N) (two wakeup messages and two tokens are sent along each channel)
- time complexity 3D+1 (D diameter) O(N)
 - ◆ D to send wakeup messages, in D+1 tree algorithm starts D to make first decision, D to propagate decision

```
wr_p: integer rec_p[q]: boolean for each q \in Neigh_p
             v_p: P

state_p: (sleep, leader, lost)
 \begin{aligned} \mathbf{begin} & \text{ if } p \text{ is initiator then} \\ & \mathbf{begin} & ws_p \coloneqq true \;; \\ & \text{ for all } q \in Neigh_p \text{ do send } \langle \text{ wakeup} \rangle \text{ to } q \end{aligned} 
                    for all q \in r_{r_{r_{2} \cdots p}}

end;

while wr_{p} < \#Neigh_{p} do

begin receive (wakeup); wr_{p} := wr_{p} + 1;

if not ws_{p}, then

begin ws_{p} := true;

for all q \in Neigh_{p} do send (wakeup) to q
```

end end; (*Now start the tree algorithm *) while $\#\{q: \neg rec_p[q]\} > 1$ do begin receive $\{tok, r\}$ from $q: rec_p[q] := true: v_p := \min\{v_p, r\}$ end $\{tok, v_p\}$ to q_0 with $\neg rec_p[q_0]: receive <math>\{tok, r\}$ from $q_0: v_p := \min\{v_p, r\}$; (* decide with answer v_p *) if $v_p := p$ then $state_p := leader$ else $state_p := lost: f$ forall $q \in Neigh_p$, $q \neq q_0$ do send (tok, v_p) to q

What is election algorithm

- Election algorithm satisfies the following properties:
 - (uniformity) each process has the same local algorithm
 - (decentralization) a computation can be initiated by arbitrary subset of processes
 - (termination) each computation terminates
 - (safety) in every terminal state there is one and only one process in the state of leader
- Assumptions
 - system is fully asynchronous not necessary but useful
 - · each process has unique identity (name), process identities are totally ordered (can be compared) - needed to break the symmetry, smallest identity wins (becomes leader)
 - the only operation allowed on identities is comparison in asynchronous systems arbitrary (non-comparison algorithms can do no better)
 - each message may contain up to a constant number of identities - so complexities of algorithms can be compared

```
LeLann's var List, state,
                                                                                               : set of P init \{p\};
algorithm
                                                      begin if p is initiator then begin state_p := cand; send \langle \mathbf{tok}, p \rangle to Next_p; receive \langle \mathbf{tok}, q \rangle; while q \neq p do begin List_p := List_p \cup \{q\}; send \langle \mathbf{tok}, q \rangle to Next_p; receive \langle \mathbf{tok}, q \rangle
                                                                                              \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{end} \ ; \\ \mathbf{if} \ p = \min(List_p) \ \mathbf{then} \ state_p := leader \\ \mathbf{else} \ state_p := lost \end{array}
```

else repeat receive $\langle \mathbf{tok}, q \rangle$; send $\langle \mathbf{tok}, q \rangle$ to $Next_p$:

if $state_p = sleep$ then $state_p := lost$ until false

- . Each initiator sends token with its id around the ring
- a process forwards foreign token and records the identity it carries
- a process decides when it receives its own token
- if processes gets a message before it sends its own it loses
- complexity
 - message O(№)
 - ◆ time O(N)

Chang and Roberts's algorithm (CR)

```
begin if p is initiator then
                                                                                     p is initiator then begin state<sub>p</sub> := cand; send (tok, p) to Next<sub>p</sub>; repeat receive (tok, q); repeat receive (tok, q); q = p then state<sub>p</sub>:= leader else if q = p then begin if state<sub>p</sub> = cand then state<sub>p</sub>:= lost; send (tok, q) to Next<sub>p</sub>
       Process
         propagates
         foreign message
       only when the
                                                                                                 \begin{array}{c} \text{end} \\ \text{until } state_p = leader \end{array}
        original sender
        may become
                                                                               end else repeat receive \langle \mathbf{tok}, q \rangle; send \langle \mathbf{tok}, q \rangle to Next_p; if state_p = sleep then state_p := lost
        a leader
complexity
                                                                                         until false
```

- end (* Only the leader terminates the program. It floods a message to all processes to inform them of the leader's identity and to terminate *) • time - same as LeLanns'
- message worst case - same as LeLann's
 - average O(N log N)

Dolev-Klawe-Rodeh algorithm (DKR)

- Worst case message complexity of Chang-Roberts is still $O(N^2)$ -- in the worst case the identities that are not leaders are allowed to propagate
- idea of DKR eliminate wrong identities as soon as possible
- active/passive processes as in CR
 - active propagates its current identity (stored in variable ci) to downstream processes
- passive forwards messages
- algorithm proceeds in rounds, each round has two phases:
 - propagation each active process sends message <one, ci> to downstream active process, received id stored in acn
 - elimination each active process sends a message <two, acn> to downstream neighbor when < two,. > arrives, the receiver compares it with its can thus the following identity "catches up" with preceding
- when process gets his own identity its is a winner winner sends message < smal,id> informing others

```
\begin{array}{c} \text{var } ci_p & : \mathcal{P} \quad \text{init } p \ ; \quad \text{(* Current identity of } p \ *) \\ acn_p : \mathcal{P} \quad \text{init } udef \ ; \quad \text{(* Id of anticlockwise active neighbor *)} \\ state_p : P \quad \text{init } udef \ ; \quad \text{(* Id of winner *)} \\ state_p : lactive, passive, leader, lost) \ \text{init } active \ ; \\ \text{begin if } p \text{ is initiator then } state_p := active \ \text{else } state_p := passive \ ; \\ \text{while } win_p = udef \ \text{do} \\ \text{begin if } state_p = active \ \text{then} \\ \text{begin send } (\text{one, } ci_p) \ ; \text{receive } (\text{one, } q) \ ; acn_p := q \ ; \\ \text{if } acn_p = ci_p \ \text{then } (\text{* san_p} \text{ is the minimum *)} \\ \text{begin send } (\text{smal, } acn_p) \ ; win_p := acn_p \ ; \\ \text{receive } (\text{* san_q}) \ ; \text{win}_p := acn_p \ ; \\ \text{end} \\ \text{else } (\text{* * } acn_p \text{ is current id of neighbor *)} \\ \text{begin send } (\text{two, } acn_p) \ ; \text{receive } (\text{two, } q) \ ; \\ \text{if } acn_p < ci_p \text{ and } acn_p < q \\ \text{then } ci_p := acn_p \\ \text{end} \\ \text{else } (\text{* * } state_p = passive \ *) \\ \text{begin receive } (\text{one, } q) \ ; \text{send } (\text{one, } q) \ ; \\ \text{receive } m \ ; \text{send } m \ ; \\ \text{(* * m is either } (\text{two, } q) \text{ or } (\text{smal, } q) \ *) \\ \text{if } m \ \text{is a } (\text{smal, } q) \text{ message then } win_p := q \\ \text{end} \\ \text{end} \\ \text{if } p = win_p \ \text{then } state_p := leader \ \text{else } state_p := lost \ \text{end} \\ \text{end} \\ \text{end} \end{array}
```

DKR message complexity estimate

- Claim: if there were k identities at the beginning of the round
 only k/2 survive after the round
 - each process (it it survives round) assumes the identity of the first upstream neighbor
 - out of two neighbor identities only one survives the round
- there can be at most logN rounds, 2N messages are exchanged during round, algorithm completes with N messages informing processes of results
 - thus message complexity of the algorithm is:
 2N log N + N = O (N log N)

Election on arbitrary networks, extinction

- Election can be done on networks of arbitrary topology by using any centralized wave algorithm.
- The technique is called extinction.
- each initiator starts a separate wave. To distinguish waves, initiator's id is attached to token.
- Only the wave of the initiator with the lowest id is allowed to finish
- A process stores the wave with the lowest id that it saw in currently active wave (caw) variable. The process ignores tokens from waves with higher id than caw
- If a process receives a token from a wave with still lower id than caw, the process copies that id into caw
- complexity

DKR

- ◆ message NM where M number of messages used in the base wave algorithm
- ◆ time NT where T- time the wave takes

Extinction applied to Echo

8