Sharing Memory Robustly in Message-Passing Systems

(EXTENDED ABSTRACT)

Hagit Attiya* Amotz Bar-Noy† Danny Dolev‡

Abstract

Emulators that translate algorithms from the shared-memory model to two different message-passing models are presented. Both are achieved by implementing a wait-free, atomic, single-writer multi-reader register in unreliable, asynchronous networks. The two message-passing models considered are a complete network with processor failures and an arbitrary network with dynamic link failures.

These results make it possible to view the shared-memory model as a higher-level language for designing algorithms in asynchronous distributed systems. Any wait-free algorithm based on atomic, single-writer multi-reader registers can be automatically emulated in message-passing systems. The overhead introduced by these emulations is polynomial in the number of processors in the systems.

Immediate new results are obtained by applying the emulators to known shared-memory algorithms. These include, among others, protocols to solve the following problems in the message-passing model in the presence of processor or link failures: multi-writer multi-reader registers, concurrent time-stamp systems, ℓ-exclusion, atomic snapshots, randomized consensus, and implementation of a class of data structures.

*Laboratory for Computer Science, MIT, Cambridge, MA 02139. Supported by NSF grants CCR-8611442 and CCR-8915206, by ONR contract no N00014-85-K-0168, and by DARPA contracts no N00014-83-K-0125 and N00014-89-J-1988.

†IBM T. J. Watson Research Center, P. O. Box 704, Yorktown Heights, NY 10598. Part of the work was done while the author was at the Computer Science Department, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305. Supported in part by a Weizmann fellowship, by contract ONR N00014-88-K-0166 and a grant of Stanford's Center for Integrated Systems.

‡IBM Almaden Research Center, 650 Harry Road, San Jose, CA 95120, and the Computer Science Department, Hebrew University, Jerusalem.

1 Introduction

Two major interprocessor communication models in distributed systems have attracted much attention and study: the *shared-memory* model and the *message-passing* model. In the shared-memory model, n processors communicate by writing and reading to shared atomic registers. In the message-passing model, n processors are located at the nodes of a network and communicate by sending messages over communication links.

In both models we consider asynchronous unreliable systems in which failures may occur. In the shared-memory model, processors may fail by stopping (and a slow processor cannot be distinguished from a failed processor). In the message-passing model failures may occur in either of two ways. In the *complete network* model, processors may fail by stopping (without being detected). In the *arbitrary network* model, links fail and recover dynamically, possibly disconnecting the network for some periods.

The design of fault-tolerant (or *wait-free*) algorithms in either of these models is a delicate and error-prone task. However, this task is somewhat easier in shared-memory systems, where processors enjoy a more global view of the system. A

shared register guarantees that once a processor reads a particular value, then, unless the value of this register is changed by a write, every future read of this register by any other processor will obtain the same value. Furthermore, the value of a shared register is always available, regardless of processor slow-down or failure. These properties permit us to ignore issues that must be addressed in message-passing systems. For example, there are discrepancies in the local views of different processors that are not necessarily determined by the relative order at which processors execute their operations.

An interesting example is provided by the problem of achieving *randomized consensus*. Several solutions for this problem exist in the message-passing model, e.g., [15, 18, 24], and in the shared-memory model, e.g., [17, 1, 8, 11]. However, the algorithm of [8] is the first to have polynomial expected running time and still overcome an "omnipotent" adversary—one that has access to the outcomes of local coin-flips. The difficulty of overcoming messages' asynchrony in the message-passing model made it hard to come up with algorithms that tolerate such omnipotent adversary with polynomial expected running time.[1]

This paper presents *emulators* of shared-memory systems in message-passing systems (networks), in the presence of processor or link failures. Any wait-free algorithm in the shared-memory model that is based on atomic, single-writer multi-reader registers can be emulated in both message-passing models. The overhead for the emulations is polynomial in the number of processors. The complexity measures considered are the number of messages and their size, the time and the local memory size for each read or write operation.

Thus, shared-memory systems may serve as a "laboratory" for designing resilient algorithms. Once a problem is solved in the shared-memory model, it is automatically solved in the message-passing model, and only optimization issues remain to be addressed.

Among the immediate new results obtained by applying the emulators to existing shared-memory algorithms, are network protocols that solve the following problems in the presence of processor or link failures:

- Atomic, multi-writer multi-reader registers ([35, 33]).
- Concurrent time-stamp systems ([30, 23]).
- Variants of ℓ-exclusion ([21, 16, 4]).
- Atomic snapshot scan ([2, 7]).
- Randomized consensus ([8, 11]).[2]
- Implementation of a class of data structures ([9]).

First we introduce the basic communication primitive which is used in our algorithms. We then present an *unbounded* emulator for the complete network in the presence of processor failures. This implementation exposes some of the basic ideas underlying our constructions. Moreover, part of the correctness proof for this emulator can be carried over to the other models. We then describe the modifications needed in order to obtain the *bounded* emulator for the complete network in the presence of processor failures. Finally, we modify this emulator to work in an arbitrary network in the presence of link failures. We present two ways to do so. The first modification is based on replacing each physical link of the complete network with a "virtual viable link" using an *end-to-end* protocol ([5, 13, 6]). The second modification results in a more efficient emulation. It is based on implementing our communication primitive as a diffusing computation using the *resynchronization* technique of [6].

We consider systems that are completely asynchronous since this enables us to isolate the study from any model-dependent synchronization assumptions. Although many "real" shared-memory systems are at least partially synchronous, asynchrony allows us to provide an

[1] The asynchronous message-passing algorithm of [25] is resilient to Byzantine faults, but requires private communication links and thus is not resilient to an omnipotent adversary.

[2] This result also follows from the transformation of [14].

abstract treatment of systems in which different processors have different priorities.

Wait-free protocols in shared-memory systems enable a processor to complete any operation regardless of the speed of other processors. In message-passing systems, it can be shown, following the proof in [10], that for many problems requiring global coordination, there is no solution that can prevail over a "strong" adversary– an adversary that can stop a majority of the processors or disconnect large portions of the network. Such an adversary can cause two groups of fewer than majority of the processors to operate separately by suspending all the messages from one group to the other. For many global coordination problems this leads to contradicting and inconsistent operations by the two groups. As mentioned in [10], similar arguments show that processors cannot halt after deciding. Thus, in our emulators a processor which is disconnected (permanently) from a majority of the processors is considered *faulty* and is blocked.[3] Our solutions do not depend on connection with a *specific* majority at any time. Moreover, it might be that at no time there exists a full connection to any party. The only condition is that messages will eventually reach some majority which will acknowledge them.

Although the difficult construction is the solution in the complete network with bounded size messages, the unbounded construction is not straightforward. In both cases, to avoid problems resulting from processors having old values we attach time-stamps to the values written by the writer. In the unbounded construction, the time-stamps are the integer numbers. In the bounded construction, we use a nontrivial method to let the writer keep track of old time-stamps that are still in the system. This allows us to employ a *bounded sequential time-stamp system* ([30]).

Some of the previous research on dynamic networks (e.g., [27, 3]) assumed a "grace period" during which the network stabilizes for long enough time in order to guarantee correctness. Our results do not rely on the existence of such a period, and follow the approach taken in, e.g., [34, 5, 13, 6].

There are two related studies on the relationships between shared-memory and message-passing systems. Bar-Noy and Dolev ([14]) provide translations between protocols in the shared-memory and the message-passing models. These translations apply only to protocols that use a very restricted form of communication. Chor and Moscovici ([19]) present a hierarchy of resiliency for problems in shared-memory systems and complete networks. They show that the wait-free shared-memory model is not equivalent to complete network, where up to half of the processors may fail. This result does not contradict our emulations since it is based on the assumption that processors *halt* after deciding.

[3] Such a processor will not be able to terminate its operation but will never produce erroneous results.

2 Preliminaries

In this section we discuss the models addressed in this paper. Our definitions follow [31] for shared-memory systems, [28] for complete networks with processor failures, and [13] for arbitrary networks with link failures. In all models we consider, a system consists of n independent and asynchronous processors, which we number $1, \ldots, n$.

A formal definition of an atomic, single-writer multi-reader register can be found in [31], the definition presented here is an equivalent one (see [31, Proposition 3]) which is simpler to use. An *atomic, single-writer multi-reader register* is an abstract data structure. Each register is accessed by two procedures, $\mathsf{write}_w(v)$ which is executed only by some specific processor w, called the *writer*, and $\mathsf{read}_r(v)$ which may be executed by any processor $1 \leq r \leq n$, called a *reader*. It is assumed that the values of these procedures satisfy the following two properties:

1. Every read operation returns either the last value written or a value that is written concurrently with this read.

2. If a read operation $\mathcal{R}_2$ started after a read operation $\mathcal{R}_1$ has finished, then the value

$\mathcal{R}_2$ returns cannot be older than the value returned by $\mathcal{R}_1$.

In message-passing systems, processors are located at the nodes of a network and communicate by sending messages along communication links. Communication is completely *asynchronous* and messages may incur an unknown delay. At each atomic step, a processor may receive some set of messages that were sent to it, perform some local computation and send some messages.

In the complete network model we assume that the network formed by the communication links is *complete*, and that processors might be *faulty*. A faulty processor simply stops operating. A *nonfaulty* processor is one that takes an infinite number of steps, and all of its messages are delivered after a finite delay. We assume that at most $\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor$ processors are faulty in any execution of the system.

In dynamic networks communication links might become *non-viable*. A link is non-viable, if, starting from some message and on, it will not deliver any further messages to the other endpoint. For those messages the delay is considered to be infinite. Otherwise, the link is *viable*. This model is called the *∞-delay model* in [5]. Afek and Gafni ([5]) point out that the standard model of dynamic message-passing systems, where communication links alternate between periods of operation and non-operation, can be reduced to this model. A processor that is permanently disconnected from $\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$ processors or more is considered *faulty*. We assume there are $\lceil \frac{n+1}{2} \rceil$ processors that are eventually in the same connected component. Thus, at most $\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor$ processors are faulty.

The complexity measures we consider are: *(a)* The number of messages sent in an execution of a **write** or **read** operation, *(b)* the size of the messages, *(c)* the time it takes to execute a **write** or **read** operation, under the assumption that any message is either delivered within one time unit, or never at all (cf. [12]), and *(d)* the amount of the overhead local memory used by a processor. In all cases we are interested in the worst case complexity.

3 Procedure communicate

In this section we present the basic primitive used for communication in our algorithms, called **communicate**. This primitive operates in complete networks. It enables a processor to send a message and get acknowledgements (possibly carrying some information) from a majority of the processors.

Because of possible processors' crash failures, a processor cannot wait for acknowledgements from all the other processors or from any particular processor. However, at least a majority of the processors will not crash and thus a processor can wait to get acknowledgements from them. Notice that processors want to communicate with any majority of the processors, not necessarily the same majority each time. A processor utilizes the primitive to broadcast a message $\langle M \rangle$ to all the processors and then to collect a corresponding $\langle ACK \rangle$ message from a majority of them. In some cases, information will be added to the $\langle ACK \rangle$ messages.

For simplicity, we assume that each edge (i, j) is composed of two distinct "virtual" directed edges $\langle i, j \rangle$ and $\langle j, i \rangle$. The communication on $\langle i, j \rangle$ is independent of the communication on $\langle j, i \rangle$.

Procedure **communicate** uses a simple *ping-pong* mechanism. This mechanism ensures FIFO communication on each directed link in the network, and guarantees that at any time only one message is in transit on each link. Informally, this is achieved by the following rule: i sends the first message on $\langle i, j \rangle$ and then i and j alternate turns in sending further messages and acknowledgements on $\langle i, j \rangle$.

For simplicity, a processor sends each message also to itself and responds with the appropriate acknowledgement.

Procedure **communicate** gets as an input a message M and returns as an output a vector *info*, of length n. The jth entry in this vector contains information received with j's acknowledgement (or $\perp$ if no acknowledgement was received from j). The precise code of the procedure is omitted from this version. We note that whenever this procedure is employed we

also specify its companion procedure, ack, which specifies the information sent with the acknowledgement for each message and the local computation triggered by receiving a particular message.

The ping-pong mechanism guarantees the following two properties of the communicate procedure. First, the acknowledgements stored in the output vector *info* were indeed sent as acknowledgements to the message M, and, in particular, at least $\lceil \frac{n+1}{2} \rceil$ processors received the message M. Second, the number of messages sent during each execution of the procedure is at most $2n$. Also, it is not hard to see that the procedure terminates under our assumptions. The next lemma summarizes the properties and the complexity of procedure communicate.

Lemma 3.1 *The following all hold for each execution of procedure* communicate *by processor i with the message $\langle M \rangle$:*

1. *if i is connected to at least a majority of the processors then the execution terminates,*
2. *at least $\lceil \frac{n+1}{2} \rceil$ processors receive $\langle M \rangle$ and return the corresponding acknowledgement,*
3. *at most $2n$ messages are sent during this execution,*
4. *the procedure terminates after at most two time units, and*
5. *the size of i's local memory is $O(n)$ times the size of the acknowledgements to $\langle M \rangle$.*

4 The unbounded implementation – complete network

Informally, in order to write a new value, the writer executes communicate to send its new value to a majority of the processors. It completes the write operation only after receiving acknowledgements from a majority of the processors. In order to read a value, the reader sends a request to all processors and gets in return the latest values known to a majority of the processors (using communicate). Then it *adopts* (returns) the maximal among them. Before finishing the read operation, the reader announces the value it intends to adopt to at least a majority of the processors (again by using communicate).

The writer appends a label to every new value it writes. In the unbounded implementation this is an integer. For simplicity, we ignore the value itself and identify it with the label.

Processor i stores in its local memory a variable val_i, holding the most recent value of the register known to i. This value may be acquired either during i's read operations, from messages sent during other processors' read operations, or directly from the writer. In addition, i holds a vector of length n of the most recent values of the register sent to i by other processors.

In the implementation, there are three procedures: read for the reader, write for the writer, and ack, used by all processors to respond to messages. These procedures utilize six types of messages, arranged in three pairs, each consisting of a message and a corresponding acknowledgement.

1. The pair of write messages.
   - $\langle W, val \rangle$: sent by the writer in order to write *val* in its register.
   - $\langle ACK\text{-}W \rangle$: the corresponding acknowledgement.
2. The first pair of read messages.
   - $\langle R_1 \rangle$: sent by the reader to request the recent value of the writer.
   - $\langle val \rangle$: the corresponding acknowledgement, contains the sender's most updated value of the register.
3. The second pair of read messages.
   - $\langle R_2, val \rangle$: sent by the reader before terminating in order to announce that it is going to return *val* as the value of the register.
   - $\langle ACK\text{-}R_2 \rangle$: the corresponding acknowledgement.

```
Procedure read_i(val_i); (* executed by processor i and returns val_i *)
        communicate(⟨R_1⟩, info);
        val_i := max_{1≤j≤n}{info(j) | info(j) ≠ ⊥};
        communicate(⟨R_2, val_i⟩, void);
end procedure read_i ;

Procedure write_w; (* for the writer w *)
        val_w := val_w + 1; (* the new value of the register *)
        communicate(⟨W, val_w⟩, void);
end procedure write_w;

Procedure ack_j; (* executed by processor j *)
        case received from w
            ⟨W, val_w⟩:  val_j := max{val_w, val_j} ;
                         send ⟨ACK-W⟩ to w;
        case received from i
            ⟨R_1⟩:       send ⟨val_j⟩ to i;
            ⟨R_2, val_i⟩: val_j := max{val_i, val_j} ;
                         send ⟨ACK-R_2⟩ to i;
end procedure ack_j;
```

Figure 1: *The* read, write *and* ack *procedures of the unbounded emulator.*

The descriptions of procedures write, read and ack appear in Figure 1. Procedure ack instructs each processor what to do upon receiving a message (as explained in Section 3). We use *void* to emphsis that the information sent with the acknowledgements to a particular message is ignored. Since communication is done only by communicate, Lemma 3.1 (part 1) implies:

Lemma 4.1 *Each execution of a* read *operation or a* write *operation terminates.*

The value contained in the first write message and the second read message is called the value *communicated* by the communicate procedure execution. The maximum value among the values contained in the acknowledgements of the first read message is called the value *acknowledged* by the communicated procedure execution. The following lemma deals with the ordering of these values, and is the crux of the correctness proof.

Lemma 4.2 *Assume a* communicate *procedure execution C_1 communicated x, and a* communicate *procedure execution C_2 acknowledged y. Assume that C_1 has completed before C_2 has started. Then $x \leq y$.*

Since a write operation completes only after its communicate procedure completes, Lemma 4.2 implies:

Lemma 4.3 *Assume a* read *operation, $\mathcal{R}$, returns the value y. Then y is either the value of the last* write *operation that was completed before $\mathcal{R}$ started or it is the value of a concurrent* write *operation.*

In a similar manner, since a read operation completes only after its second execution of communicate is completed, Lemma 4.2 implies:

Lemma 4.4 *Assume some* read *operation, $\mathcal{R}_1$, returns the value x, and that another* read *operation, $\mathcal{R}_2$, that started after $\mathcal{R}_1$ completed, returns y. Then $x \leq y$.*

The next theorem summarizes the above discussion. The complexity propositions follow from Lemma 3.1 (parts 3 and 4), since processors communicate only by using the communicate procedure.

Theorem 4.5 *There exists an unbounded emulator of an atomic, single-writer multi-reader register in a complete network, in the presence of at most* $\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor$ *processor failures. Each execution of a* read *operation or a* write *operation requires* $O(n)$ *messages and* $O(1)$ *time.*

5 The bounded implementation – complete network

5.1 Informal Description

The only source of unboundedness in the above emulation is the integer labels utilized by the writer. In order to eliminate this, we use an idea which was employed previously in [30, 13]. The integer labels are replaced by *bounded sequential time-stamp system* ([30]), which is a finite domain $\mathcal{L}$ of label values together with a total order relation $\prec$. Whenever the writer needs a new label it produces a new one, larger (with respect to the $\prec$ order) than all the labels that exist in the system. Thus, instead of just adding one to the label, as in the unbounded emulation, here the writer invokes a special procedure called LABEL. The input for this procedure is a set of labels and the output is a new label which is greater than all the labels in this set. This can be achieved by the constructions presented in [30, 22] for bounded sequential time-stamp systems.

The main difficulty in carrying this idea over to the message-passing model is in maintaining the set of labels existing in the system, a task which need not be addressed in the shared-memory model (cf. [30, 32]). Notice that in order to assure correctness, it suffices to guarantee that the set of labels that exist in the system is contained in the input set of labels of procedure LABEL. The key idea is as follows.

Whenever a processor adopts a label (as the maximum value of the writer it knows about), it *records* this fact in the system. This is done by broadcasting an appropriate message and waiting for acknowledgements from a majority of the processors (using communicate). Upon receiving a recording message, a processor stores the information it contains in its local memory, but ignores the values it carries. This process guarantees that labels do not get lost as a majority of the processors have recorded them.

To avoid inconsistencies that might occur, a processor blocks all computation that is related to new labels during the recording process. It does not adopt new labels and does not send non-recording messages containing new labels. An independent ping-pong mechanism is employed for each type of messages, e.g., i may send a recording message to j although j did not acknowledge a read message of i. Since recording messages do not cause a processor to adopt a label, deadlock is avoided.

5.2 Data Structures and Messages

To implement the recording process, each processor i maintains an $n \times n$ matrix L_i of labels. The ith row vector $L_i(i)$ is updated dynamically by i according to messages i sends. The jth row vector $L_i(j)$ is updated by the messages i receives from j during a recording process initiated by j. Each entry, $L_i(i,k)$, is composed of two fields: *sent* and *ack*. The field $L_i(i,k).sent$ contains the last label i sent to k and the field $L_i(i,k).ack$ is the last label i sent to k as an acknowledgement to a read request of k. In particular, $L_i(i,i)$ is the current maximum label of the writer known to i. The writer starts each write operation by obtaining from a majority of the processors their most updated values for the matrix L (using communicate). The union of the labels that appear in its own matrix and these matrices is the input to procedure LABEL.

Procedures read and write use five pairs of messages and corresponding acknowledgements.

1. The first pair of write messages.

   $\langle W_1 \rangle$: sent by the writer at the beginning of its operation in order to collect information about existing labels.

   $\langle L \rangle$: the corresponding acknowledgement, L is the sender's updated value of the labels' matrix.

2. The second pair of write messages, $\langle W_2, val \rangle$ and $\langle ACK\text{-}W_2 \rangle$, the first pair of read messages, $\langle R_1 \rangle$ and $\langle val \rangle$, and the second pair

of read messages, $\langle R_2, val\rangle$ and $\langle ACK\text{-}R_2\rangle$, are the same as the corresponding messages in the unbounded algorithm.

3. The pair of recording messages.

   $\langle REC, L(i)\rangle$: before adopting any new value for the register, processor i sends $L_i(i)$ to other processors. The vector $L_i(i)$ contains this new value and all the recent values that i sent on its links to other processors.

   $\langle ACK\text{-}REC\rangle$: the corresponding acknowledgement.

Let $\mathcal{V}$ denote the number of bits needed to represent any label value from $\mathcal{L}$ ($\mathcal{V} = \log|\mathcal{L}|$). Since the longest message is $\langle L\rangle$, it follows that the maximum size of a message is $O(n^2 \cdot \mathcal{V})$. Recall that during the recording process, processors do not reply to nonrecording messages. Therefore, messages are accumulated in the local memory of the processor and are ordered in a queue. As soon as the recording process ends, the processor first handles the messages on the queue.[4] Due to the ping-pong mechanism the length of this queue is at most $O(n)$. Hence, the size of the local memory is at most $O(n^3 \cdot \mathcal{V})$.

5.3 The Algorithm

The pseudo-code for the algorithm appears in Figure 2. Procedure **update** and the first part of procedure **recording** update dynamically the vector $L_i(i)$. Therefore, in procedure **read**, it is enough to take val_i as $L_i(i,i)$. The flag *blocked* is set to *true* during the recording process and prevents the processor from receiving or sending some messages as described in procedure **ack**. As mentioned before, in order to prevent deadlocks a separate ping-pong mechanism is employed for each type of message. In order to distinguish between the different mechanisms, calls to **communicate** are subscripted with the message type.

[4] The details of how this queue is handled are omitted.

5.4 Correctness and Complexity

Atomicity of the bounded emulator follow from the same reasoning as in the unbounded case (Lemma 4.3 and Lemma 4.4). The following lemma is the core of the correctness proof for the bounded emulator—it assures that the writer always obtain a superset of the labels that might be adopted as the register's value by some processor. We call a label x *viable*, if in some system state, at some possible extension from this state, for some processor i, $val_i = x$. Intuitively, a viable label is held by some processor as the current register's value or it will become the current register's value for some processor.

Lemma 5.1 *Each viable label is stored either in the writer matrix or in the matrices of at least a majority of the processors.*

Proof: We say that processor i is *responsible* for label x, if x is stored in $L_i(i)$, i.e., if either $L_i(i,i) = x$, $L_i(i,j).sent = x$ or $L_i(i,j).ack = x$. We first claim that for any viable label there exists a processor that is responsible for it. Assume that x is a label that is held by i as the current register's value, then by the code of the algorithm $L_i(i,i) = x$ and by definition i is responsible for x. Assume x will become the current register's value for processor j in the future, then it must be that some processor i has sent it to j (either by R_2 (W_2) messages of i or in response to an R_1 request message by j) thus $x \in L_i(i,j)$.

Now assume that i is responsible for x. Look at a simple path on which the label x has arrived at i, i.e., a sequence $i_0, i_1, \ldots, i_m$, where i_0 is the writer and $i_m = i$. In this sequence, for any ℓ, $1 \leq \ell \leq m$, processor i_ℓ adopted x as a result of a message from $i_{\ell-1}$.

The claim is proved by induction on m, the length of this path. The base case, $m = 0$, occurs when i is the writer. Then the codes of procedures **update** and **write** imply that x is stored in i's matrix. For the induction step, assume that $m > 0$, and that the induction hypothesis holds for any ℓ, $0 \leq \ell < m$. We have two cases.

Case 1: Processor i has not finished the recording process for x. It follows from the code of procedure **recording** that $L_i(i,i) = x$. We show

```
Procedure read_i(val_i) ; (* executed by processor i and returns val_i *)
        communicate_R(⟨R_1⟩, info) ;
        val_i := L_i(i, i) ;
        communicate_R(⟨R_2, val_i⟩, void) ;
end procedure read_i ;

Procedure write_w; (* for the writer w *)
        communicate_W(⟨W_1⟩, L) ;
        L_w(w, w) := LABEL(⋃ L) ; (* all the non-empty entries in L *)
        communicate_W(⟨W_2, L_w(w, w)⟩, void) ;
end procedure write_w;

Procedure recording_i ; (* executed by processor i *)
        upon receiving new label x > L_i(i, i):
                blocked := true ;
                L_i(i, i) := x;
                communicate_REC(⟨REC, L_i(i)⟩, void) ;
                blocked := false ;
end procedure recording_i ;

Procedure update_i ; (* executed by processor i *)
        upon sending label x to j in i's read operation:
        L_i(i, j).sent := x ;
        upon sending label x to j in j's read operation:
        L_i(i, j).ack := x ;
end procedure update_i ;

Procedure ack_j; (* executed by processor j *)
        case received from w
                ⟨W_1⟩:          send ⟨L_j⟩ to w;
                ⟨W_2, val_w⟩:   if val_w > L_j(j, j) then wait until blocked = false ;
                                send ⟨ACK-W_2⟩ to w ;
        case received from i
                ⟨R_1⟩:          wait until blocked = false ;
                                send ⟨L_j(j, j)⟩ to i;
                ⟨R_2, val_i⟩:   if val_i > L_j(j, j) then wait until blocked = false ;
                                send ⟨ACK-R_2⟩ to i;
                ⟨REC, L_i(i)⟩:  L_j(i) := L_i(i) ;
                                send ⟨ACK-REC⟩ to i;
end procedure ack_j;
```

Figure 2: *The* read, write, recording, update *and* ack *procedures of the bounded emulator.*

that $k = i_{m-1}$ is responsible for x, and the lemma follows from the induction hypothesis.

If i received x from k through an R_2 (W_2) message, then since i is blocked during the recording process it would not reply until the recording process of x is done. Consequently, $L_k(k,i).sent = x$.

If i received x from k through an $ACK\text{-}R_1$ message, then since i would not terminate a **read** operation until it finishes the recording process of x, it would not start a new **read** operation. Consequently, $L_k(k,i).ack = x$.

Case 2: Processor i has finished the recording process for x. If $L_i(i,i) = x$, i.e., x is still the current value that i holds, then the code for procedure **record**, and the properties of procedure **communicate** (Lemma 3.1, part 2) imply that x is stored in the matrices of at least a majority of the processors.

If $L_i(i,i) \neq x$, then since i is responsible for x there must exist a j such that $x \in L_i(i,j)$. Furthermore, since i has a more recent value for the register it must be that $L_i(i,i) = y \succ x$. By the code for procedure **recording** and the properties of procedure **communicate** (Lemma 3.1), at the end of the recording process for x, x is stored as $L(i,i)$ in the matrices of at least a majority of the processors. Let k be some processor that recorded x for i, i.e., such that $L_k(i,i) = x$ at the end of the recording process for x.

If currently, $L_k(i,i) = z \neq x$ then it must be that $x \prec z$. Since forwarding a new value is blocked during the recording process, it must be that x was sent by i to j before the recording process for z started. Thus $x \in L_i(i,j)$ during the recording process for z, and consequently $x \in L_k(i,j)$. Therefore, x appears in the matrices of a majority of the processors. ■

Lemma 5.1 and the constructions of bounded sequential time-stamp systems of [30, 22] imply:

Corollary 5.2 *The new label generated by procedure* LABEL *is greater than any viable label in the system.*

Recording messages are acknowledged immediately and are never blocked. Thus, a processor never deadlocks during a recording process and will eventually acknowledge all the messages it receives. The next lemma follows since during a **read** or a **write** operation, at most $2n$ recording processes could occur.

Lemma 5.3 *Each execution of a* **read** *operation or a* **write** *operation terminates.*

Each acknowledgement the reader receives might cause it to initiate a recording process. By Lemma 3.1, part 3, at most $2n$ messages are sent during each of these recording processes. In addition, each message of type W_2 or R_2 might cause other processors to initiate a recording process. Thus, at most $O(n^2)$ messages are sent during each execution of an operation, and it takes at most $O(1)$ time units.

The constructions of bounded sequential time-stamp system ([30, 22]) imply that a label can be represented using $O(n)$ bits. The next theorem summarizes the above discussion.

Theorem 5.4 *There exists a bounded emulator of an atomic, single-writer multi-reader register in a complete network, in the presence of at most* $\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor$ *processor failures. Each execution of a* **read** *operation or a* **write** *operation requires* $O(n^2)$ *messages each of size* $O(n^3)$, $O(1)$ *time, and* $O(n^4)$ *local memory.*

6 The bounded implementation – arbitrary network

In an arbitrary network a processor is considered faulty if it cannot communicate with a majority of the processors, and a correctly functioning processor is guaranteed to be eventually in the same connected component with a majority of the processors. The first construction in this section is achieved by replacing every **send** operation from i to j by an execution of an end-to-end protocol between i and j. Implementations of such a protocol are known (see [5, 13, 6]). An end-to-end protocol establishes traffic between i and j if there is eventually a path between them. In our case, eventually there will be a path between any nonfaulty processor and a majority of

the processors, thus the system behaves as in the case of complete network with processor failures.

Note that there are labels in the system that will not appear in the input of procedure LABEL. However, these are not viable labels because the end-to-end protocol will prevent processors from adopting them as the writer's label and hence correctness is preserved.

The complexity claims in the next theorem are implied by the end-to-end protocol of [6].[5]

Theorem 6.1 *There exists a bounded emulator of an atomic, single-writer multi-reader register in an arbitrary network in the presence of link failures the do not disconnect a majority of the processors. Each execution of a* read *operation or a* write *operation requires $O(n^5)$ messages, each of size $O(n^3)$, and $O(n^2)$ time.*

Instead of implementing each virtual link separately we can achieve improved performance by implementing communicate directly. We make use of the fact that Afek and Gafni ([6]) show how to resynchronize *any diffusing computation* ([20]), not only an end-to-end protocol. Although the task achieved by communicate is not exactly a diffusing computation, we can modify the algorithm of [6], by "piggybacking" acknowledgement information. The resulting implementation requires $O(n^3)$ messages and $O(n^2)$ time for each invocation of communicate. Thus, we have:

Theorem 6.2 *There exists a bounded emulator of an atomic, single-writer multi-reader register in an arbitrary network in the presence of link failures the do not disconnect a majority of the processors. Each execution of a* read *operation or a* write *operation requires $O(n^4)$ messages, each of size $O(n^3)$, and $O(n^2)$ time.*

[5] Any improvement in the complexity of the end-to-end protocol will immediately result in an improvement to the complexity of our implementation.

7 Discussion and further research

We have presented emulators of atomic, single-writer multi-reader registers in message-passing systems (networks), in the presence of processor or link failures. In the complete network, in the presence of processor failures, each operation to the register requires $O(n^2)$ messages, each of size $O(n^3)$, and constant time. In an arbitrary network, in the presence of link failures, each operation to the register requires $O(n^4)$ messages, each of size $O(n^3)$, and $O(n^2)$ time.

It is interesting to improve the complexity of the emulations, in either of the message-passing systems. Alternatively, it might be possible to prove lower bounds on the cost of such emulations.

An interesting direction is to emulate stronger shared memory primitives in message-passing systems in the presence of failures. Any primitive that can be implemented from wait-free, atomic, single-writer multi-reader registers, can be also implemented in message-passing systems, using the emulators we have presented. This includes wait-free, atomic, multi-writer multi-reader registers, atomic snapshots, and many others. However, there are shared memory data-structures that cannot be implemented from wait-free, atomic, single-writer multi-reader registers ([29]). Some of these primitives, such as Read-Modify-Write, can be used to solve consensus ([29]), and thus any emulation of them in the presence of failures will imply a solution to consensus in the presence of failures. It is known ([28]) that consensus cannot be solved in asynchronous message-passing systems even in the presence of *one* failure. Thus, we need to strengthen the message-passing model in order to emulate primitive such as Read-Modify-Write. Additional power can be added to the message-passing model considered in this paper by, e.g., failure detection mechanisms or automatic acknowledgement mechanisms (cf. [26]). We leave all of this as a subject for future work.

Acknowledgements:

We would like to thank Baruch Awerbuch and Yishay Mansour for helpful discussions.

References

[1] K. Abrahamson, On Achieving Consensus Using a Shared Memory, *Proc. 7th ACM Symp. on Principles of Dist. Computing*, pp. 291–302, 1988.

[2] Y. Afek, H. Attiya, D. Dolev, E. Gafni, M. Merritt and N. Shavit, Atomic Snapshots of Shared Memory, to appear, *Proc. 9th ACM Symp. on Principles of Distr. Computing*, 1990.

[3] Y. Afek, B. Awerbuch and E. Gafni, Applying Static Network Protocols to Dynamic Networks, *Proc. 28th IEEE Symp. on Foundations of Comp. Science*, pp. 358–369, 1987.

[4] Y. Afek, D. Dolev, E. Gafni, M. Merritt and N. Shavit, A Bounded First-In First-Enabled-Solution to the ℓ-Exclusion Problem, *manuscript*.

[5] Y. Afek and E. Gafni, End-to-End Communication in Unreliable Networks, *Proc. 7th ACM Symp. on Principles of Dist. Computing*, pp. 131–147, 1983.

[6] Y. Afek and E. Gafni, Bootstrap Network Resynchronization: An Efficient Technique for End-to-End Communication, *manuscript*.

[7] J. H. Anderson, Composite Registers, to appear in *Proc. 9th ACM Symp. on Principles of Distr. Computing*, 1990.

[8] J. Aspnes and M. Herlihy, Fast Randomized Consensus Using Shared Memory, *Journal of Algorithms*, September 1990, to appear.

[9] J. Aspnes and M. P. Herlihy, Wait-Free Data Structures in the Asynchronous PRAM model, to appear in *Proc. 2nd ACM Symp. on Parallel Algorithms and Architectures*, July 1990, Crete, Greece.

[10] H. Attiya, A. Bar-Noy, D. Dolev, D. Koller, D. Peleg and R. Reischuk, Achievable Cases in an Asynchronous Environment, *Proc. 28th IEEE Symp. on Foundations of Comp. Science*, pp. 337–346, 1987.

[11] H. Attiya, D. Dolev and N. Shavit, Bounded Polynomial Randomized Consensus, *Proc. 8th ACM Symp. on Principles of Dist. Computing*, pp. 281–293, 1989.

[12] B. Awerbuch, Optimal Distributed Algorithms for Minimum Weight Spanning Tree, Counting, Leader Election and Related Problems, *Proc. 19th ACM Symp. on Theory of Computing*, pp. 230–240, 1987.

[13] B. Awerbuch, Y. Mansour and N. Shavit, Polynomial End-To-End Communication, *Proc. 30th IEEE Symp. on Foundations of Comp. Science*, pp. 358–363, 1989.

[14] A. Bar-Noy and D. Dolev, Shared-Memory vs. Message-Passing in an Asynchronous Distributed Environment, *Proc. 8th ACM Symp. on Principles of Dist. Computing*, pp. 307–318, 1989.

[15] M. Ben-Or, Another Advantage of Free Choice: Completely Asynchronous Agreement Protocols, *Proc. 2nd ACM Symp. on Principles of Dist. Computing*, pp. 27–30, 1983.

[16] J. E. Burns and G. L. Peterson, The Ambiguity of Choosing, *Proc. 8th ACM Symp. on Principles of Dist. Computing*, pp. 145–157, 1989.

[17] B. Chor, A. Israeli and M. Li, On Processor Coordination Using Asynchronous Hardware, *Proc. 6th ACM Symp. on Principles of Dist. Computing*, pp. 86–97, 1987.

[18] B. Chor, M. Merritt and D. Shmoys, Simple Constant-Time Consensus Protocols in Realistic Failure Models, *Proc. 4th ACM Symp. on Principles of Dist. Computing*, pp. 152–160, 1985.

[19] B. Chor and L. Moscovici, Solvability in Asynchronous Environments, *Proc. 30th IEEE Symp. on Foundations of Comp. Science*, pp. 422–427, 1989.

[20] E. W. Dijkstra and C. S. Scholten, Termination Detection for Diffusing Computations, *Information Processing Letters*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 1–4, August 1980.

[21] D. Dolev, E. Gafni and N. Shavit, Toward a Non-Atomic Era: ℓ-Exclusion as a Test Case, *Proc. 20th ACM Symp. on Theory of Computation*, pp. 78–92, 1988.

[22] D. Dolev and N. Shavit, *unpublished manuscript*, July 1987. Appears in [13].

[23] D. Dolev and N. Shavit, Bounded Concurrent Time-Stamp Systems are Constructible, *Proc. 21st ACM Symp. on Theory of Computing*, pp. 454–466, 1989.

[24] C. Dwork, D. Shmoys and L. Stockmeyer, Flipping Persuasively in Constant Expected Time, *Proc. 27th IEEE Symp. on Foundations of Computer Science*, pp. 222–232, 1986.

[25] P. Feldman, *private communication.*

[26] J. A. Feldman and A. Nigam, A Model and Proof Technique for Message-Based Systems, *SIAM J. on Computing*, Vol. 9, No. 4 (November 1980), pp. 768–784.

[27] S. G. Finn, Resynch Procedures and a Fail-Safe Network Protocol, *IEEE Trans. Comm.*, COM-27 pp. 840–845, 1979.

[28] M. J. Fischer, N. A. Lynch and M.S. Paterson, Impossibility of Distributed Consensus with one Faulty Processor, *Journal of the ACM*, Vol. 32, pp. 374–382, 1985.

[29] M. P. Herlihy, Impossibility and Universality Results for Wait-Free Synchronization, in *Proc. 7th ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*, pages 276–290, August 1988.

[30] A. Israeli and M. Li, Bounded Time-stamps, *Proc. 28th IEEE Symp. on Foundations of Comp. Science*, pp. 371–382, 1987.

[31] L. Lamport, On Interprocess Communication, Part I and II, *Distributed Computing*, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 77–101, 1986.

[32] M. Li, J. Tromp and P. Vitanyi, How to Share Concurrent Wait-Free Variables, Report CS-R8916, CWI, Amsterdam, April 1989. Earlier version in *proc. 16th International Col. on Automata, Languages and Programming*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science #372, pp. 488–505, 1989.

[33] G. L. Peterson and James E. Burns, Concurrent Reading While Writing II: The Multi-writer Case, *Proc. 28th IEEE Symp. on Foundations of Comp. Science*, pp. 383–392, 1987.

[34] U. Vishkin, A Distributed Orientation Algorithm, *IEEE Trans. on Information Theory*, June 1983.

[35] P. Vitanyi and B. Awerbuch, Atomic Shared Register Access by Asynchronous Hardware, *Proc. 27th IEEE Symp. on Foundations of Comp. Science*, pp. 233–243, 1986.