6.1 Atomic Register Execution

Let processes $\{p, q, r, s, t\}$ have **ranks** $\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ respectively.

(a) $read_r() \rightarrow x$ and $read_s() \rightarrow y$

First we can say that x has been written immediately after $write_p(x)$ has started. Therefore r, s and t have stored x when the $read_r()$ operation terminates hence it returns x. Before $read_s()$ operation is executed the process s will store the value of y because although the timestamps of both write operation is equal to the \mathbf{rank} of q is higher. Therefore process s can return s. Because the $read_t()$ operation is called after the write operations have finished and process s has a higher rank than process s it will also return s.

(b) $read_r() \rightarrow y$ and $read_s() \rightarrow x$

First we can say that x has been written immediately after $write_p(x)$ has started. Therefore r, s and t have stored x when the $read_s()$ operation terminates hence it returns x. Before $read_r()$ operation is executed the process r will store the value of y because although the timestamps of both write operation is equal to the rank of q is higher. Therefore process r can return y. Because the $read_t()$ operation is called after the write operations have finished and process q has a higher rank than process p it will also return y (same argumentation as above, just switched r and s).

6.2 Erasure-Coded Storage

(a) Erasure Code Picking

A suitable erasure code for a distributed storage system with at most $\frac{n}{2}$ crashed nodes could be any $(\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil, n)$ erasure code. A good abstraction of such an erasure code could be the following Reed-Solomon code:

Let $k := \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$. The message m which should be stored is split up into bit-strings m_i of length k. For each of these bit-strings $m_i := (x_1, x_2, \dots x_k)$ we compute the Lagrange polynomial p such that $p(i-1) = x_i$. These values p(i) are then stored at node number $i \mid 0 \le i \le n-1$.

An erasure code implemented like this with $(int)f < \frac{n}{2}$ failed nodes, it holds that $n - f \ge \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$, which is a sufficient number of fragments to reconstruct m_i . The storage efficiency of any $(\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil, n)$ erasure code is $\approx 50\%$.

(b) Modify majority voting REGULAR register to an erasure-coded SAFE register

The Algorithm 4.2 can be adjusted as the following. Not changed event handlings are left out and are similar as in the algorithm. Furthermore we assume that a suitable lagrange interpolation is available from an external source.

```
Implements:
 (1, N) SAFE register, instance onsr
upon \langle onsr, WRITE | v \rangle do
 v = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k), whereas k = \frac{N}{2}
 wts := wts + 1
 acks := 0
 p := lagrange interpolation((0, v_1), \dots, (k-1, v_k))
 for i = 1 to N:
   trigger \langle pl, \text{SEND} \mid p_i, [\text{WRITE}, wts, ((i-1), p(i-1))] \rangle
upon \langle pl, \text{Deliver} \mid q, [\text{Value}, r, ts', v'] \rangle s.t. r = rid \underline{do}
 \overline{rea}dlist[q] := (ts', v')
 if | readlist | > N/2 then
   p := reconstruct \ polynom(readlist)
   for i := 1 to N/2:
     v_i := p(i-1)
 trigger \langle onsr, ReadReturn \mid (v_1 || \cdots || v_k) \rangle
```

(c) Why is it difficult to extend this protocol to regular semantics?

REGULAR: A read() not concurrent with a write returns the most recently written value. Otherwise read() returns the most recently written value or the concurrently written value.

For the erasure code register the information of any value v is spread across n different registers, whereas none of these alone has sufficient information to reconstruct that value v. Becuase of the need of information from multiple different registers to reconstruct v, it is not trivial to ensure that the read is consistent, which would lead to a REGULAR behaviour.