

Stable leader election in population protocols requires linear time: Preliminary version

David Doty*

California Institute of Technology
ddoty@caltech.edu

David Soloveichik†

University of California, San Francisco
david.soloveichik@ucsf.edu

Abstract

A population protocol *stably elects a leader* if, for all n , starting from an initial configuration with n agents each in an identical state, with probability 1 it reaches a configuration \mathbf{y} that is *correct* (exactly one agent is in a special leader state ℓ) and *stable* (every configuration reachable from \mathbf{y} also has a single agent in state ℓ). We show that any population protocol that stably elects a leader requires $\Omega(n)$ expected “parallel time” — $\Omega(n^2)$ expected total pairwise interactions — to reach such a stable configuration. Our result also informs the understanding of the time complexity of chemical self-organization by showing an essential difficulty in generating exact quantities of molecular species quickly.

1 Introduction

Background. Population protocols (PPs) were introduced by Angluin, Aspnes, Diamadi, Fischer, and Peralta [1] as a model of distributed computing in which the agents have very little computational power and no control over their schedule of interaction with other agents. They also can be thought of as a special case of Petri nets/vector addition systems [14, 15], which were introduced in the 1960s as a model of concurrent processing. In addition to being an appropriate model for electronic computing scenarios such as mobile sensor networks, they are a useful abstraction of “fast-mixing” physical systems such as animal populations [17], chemical reaction networks, and gene regulatory networks [6].

A PP is defined by a finite set Λ of *states* that each agent may have, together with a *transition function* $\delta : \Lambda \times \Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda \times \Lambda$.¹ Given states $r_1, r_2, p_1, p_2 \in \Lambda$, if $\delta(r_1, r_2) = (p_1, p_2)$ (denoted $r_1, r_2 \rightarrow p_1, p_2$ when δ is understood from context) and a pair of agents in respective states r_1 and r_2 interact, then their states become p_1 and p_2 .² A *configuration* of a PP is a vector $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{N}^\Lambda$ describing, for each state $s \in \Lambda$, the *count* $\mathbf{c}(s)$ of how many agents are in state s . Executing a transition $r_1, r_2 \rightarrow p_1, p_2$ alters the configuration by decrementing the counts of states r_1 and r_2 by 1 each and incrementing p_1 and p_2 by 1 each.³

*This author was supported by NSF grants CCF-1049899, CCF-1217770, CCF-1442454, and the Molecular Programming Project under NSF grant 1317694.

†This author was supported by an NIGMS Systems Biology Center grant P50 GM081879 and NSF grant CCF-1442454.

¹Some work on PPs allows “non-deterministic” transitions, in which the transition function maps to subsets of $\Lambda \times \Lambda$. Our results are independent of whether the PP is deterministic or nondeterministic in this manner.

²In the most generic model, there is no restriction on which agents are permitted to interact. If one prefers to think of the agents as existing on nodes of a graph, then it is the complete graph K_n for a population of n agents.

³Possibly some of r_1, r_2, p_1, p_2 are equal to each other, so the count of a state could change by 0, 1, or 2.

Associated with a PP is a set of *valid initial configurations* that we expect the PP to be able to handle.⁴ Agents interact in a pairwise manner and change state based on the transition function. The next pair of agents to interact is chosen uniformly at random among the n agents. (An interaction may be a “null transition” $r_1, r_2 \rightarrow r_1, r_2$.) We count the expected number of *interactions* until some event occurs, and then define the “parallel time” until this event as the expected number of interactions divided by the number of agents n . This measure of time is based on the natural parallel model where each agent participates in a constant number of interactions in one unit of time, hence $\Theta(n)$ total interactions are expected per unit time [3].

In order to define error-free computation in PPs, we rely on to the notion of *stable* computation [4]. The PP must get to a configuration that is correct⁵ and “stable” in the sense that no subsequent sequence of transitions can take the PP to an incorrect configuration. Error-free computation must be correct in an “adversarial” schedule of transitions: we require that from every configuration reachable by *any* sequence of transitions from the initial configuration, it is possible to reach to a correct stable configuration. Since the configuration space is finite, requiring stability is equivalent to requiring, under the randomized model, that a correct stable configuration is reached with probability 1.⁶

A PP works “with a leader” if there is a special “leader” state ℓ , and every valid initial configuration \mathbf{i} satisfies $\mathbf{i}(\ell) = 1$. The presence of a initial leader seems to give PPs more computational power than if they have a uniform initial configuration ($\mathbf{i}(x) = n$ for some state x and $\mathbf{i}(y) = 0$ for all states $y \neq x$) or an initial configuration only encoding the input ($\mathbf{i}(x_i) = n_i$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ to represent any input $(n_1, n_2, \dots, n_k) \in \mathbb{N}^k$). It is known that the predicates $\phi : \mathbb{N}^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ stably computable by PPs are exactly the semilinear predicates, whether an initial leader is allowed or not [4]. The fastest known PP to stably compute an arbitrary semilinear predicate without a leader takes expected time $\Theta(n)$.⁷ However, with a leader, it is known [3] that any semilinear predicate can be stably computed in expected time $O(\log^5 n)$. Angluin, Aspnes, and Eisenstat [3] asked whether polylogarithmic time stable computation of semilinear predicates is possible without a leader; absent a positive answer, the presence of a leader appears to add power to the model.

Statement of main result. Motivated by the speedup possible with an initial leader, we ask how quickly a leader may be elected from a configuration lacking one. We pose the problem as follows: design a PP \mathcal{P} with two special states x (the initial state) and ℓ (the leader state, which may or may not be equal to x) such that, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, from the initial configuration \mathbf{i}_n defined as $\mathbf{i}_n(x) = n$ and $\mathbf{i}_n(y) = 0$ for all states $y \neq x$, has the following property. For every configuration \mathbf{c} reachable from \mathbf{i}_n , there is a configuration \mathbf{y} reachable from \mathbf{c} that *has a stable leader*. By this we mean that in all configurations \mathbf{y}' reachable from \mathbf{y} (including \mathbf{y} itself), $\mathbf{y}'(\ell) = 1$.⁸

⁴The set of valid initial configurations for a “self-stabilizing” PP is \mathbb{N}^Λ , where it is known that leader election is impossible [5]. We don’t require the PP to work if started in any possible configuration, but rather allow “helpful” initial configurations as long as they don’t already have small count states (see “ α -dense” below).

⁵What “correct” means depends on the task. For computing a predicate, for example, Λ is partitioned into “yes” and “no” voters, and a “correct” configuration is one in which every state present has the correct vote.

⁶It is also equivalent to requiring that every *fair* sequence of transitions reaches a correct stable configuration, where “fair” means that every configuration infinitely often reachable is infinitely often reached [4].

⁷Note that, if we represent configurations in binary, $O(\log n)$ bits are required to represent n agents. Therefore, the distinction between $O(\text{polylog}(n))$ (fast) and $O(n)$ (slow) corresponds to the distinction between polynomial and exponential in the length of a binary string representing the configuration.

⁸Note that this problem abstracts away the idea that the leader might be *useful* for something (such as computing predicates quickly). In particular, if a certain PP requires an initial leader, and the correctness of the PP depends on the count of the leader never exceeding 1, prior to the conclusion of the leader election, the presence of multiple leaders may result in unintended transitions. However, our main result is a impossibility theorem, showing that even if the objective is simplified to stable leader election, without requiring the leader to be useful for any subsequent

There is a simple $O(n)$ expected time PP for stable leader election, with (assuming $x = \ell$) the single transition $\ell, \ell \rightarrow \ell, f$. Our main theorem shows that *every* PP that stably elects a leader requires time $\Omega(n)$; thus the previous PP is asymptotically optimal.

Multiple leader states, multiple leaders, and other initial configurations. A more general notion of leader election is to identify a subset $\Psi \subset \Lambda$ of states that are all considered leader states, and to require the PP to eventually reach a configuration \mathbf{y} in which $\sum_{\ell \in \Psi} \mathbf{y}(\ell) = 1$, and this sum is 1 in every configuration reachable from \mathbf{y} . This corresponds more appropriately to how leader states actually coordinate computation in PPs: a leader agent must remember some state information in between transitions (hence it changes state while remaining the unique leader). Our techniques actually show this stronger result as well (as explained in Section 3.2). Further, our result implies that a PP cannot elect any fixed quantity of leaders (e.g. exactly 256) or variable quantity of leaders under a fixed bound (e.g. at most 256) in sublinear expected time.

In the simplest formulation of the task of leader election, we always start with n agents in state x (as described above). Can we capture more generally leader election from a configuration “without a pre-existing leader”? Intuitively, we want to exclude initial configurations with states present in small but non-zero count. We can exclude such initial configurations, but allow otherwise deliberately prepared starting conditions, using the notion of α -dense configurations: any state present in the initial configuration has count $\geq \alpha n$. Our general negative result (Theorem 3.7) implies that even starting with best-case initial configurations, as long as, for some constant $\alpha > 0$, they are all α -dense, sublinear time leader election is impossible. An open question relates to weakening the notion of α -dense (see below).

Chemical reaction networks. The main result and proof are stated in the language of PPs; however, the result holds for more general systems that have PPs as a special case. The discrete, stochastic chemical reaction network (CRN) model has been extensively used in the natural sciences to model chemical kinetics in a well-mixed solution [13]. The CRN model is also used prescriptively for specifying the behavior of synthetic chemical systems [9, 16]. A CRN is a finite set of *species* (corresponding to PP states) such as X, Y, Z , and *reactions* (corresponding to PP transitions) such as $X + Y \xrightarrow{k_1} Z$ or $Y \xrightarrow{k_2} 2X + Z$. CRNs can be thought of as a generalization of PPs in which spontaneous transitions are possible (unimolecular reactions), the transition may cause the number of agents to change (if the reaction has a different number of products than reactants), and each transition has an associated constant k that affects its probability of being selected.

As an essential form of self-organization, biological cells seem able to precisely control the count of certain molecules (centriole number [10] is a well studied example). How chemical systems transform relatively uncontrolled initial conditions to precisely controlled amounts of desired species is still not well understood. Our negative result applied to CRNs⁹ implies that generating with probability 1 an exact count of a certain species, whether 1 or 256, is *necessarily* slower ($\Omega(n)$ time) than, for example, destroying all molecules of the species (through the reaction $X \rightarrow \emptyset$), which requires $\log(n)$ time.

Open questions. We are motivated by the open question of Angluin, Aspnes, and Eisenstat [3], who asked whether their efficient high-probability simulation of a space-bounded Turing machine by a PP could remove the assumption of an initial leader. That simulation has some small probability

task, this *still* requires $\Omega(n)$ time.

⁹Our result holds for any CRN that obeys Theorem 4.3, the precise constraints of which are specified in [12] (those constraints automatically apply to all PPs).

$\epsilon > 0$ of failure, so if one could elect a leader with a small probability $\epsilon' > 0$ of error and subsequently use it to drive the simulation,¹⁰ by the union bound the total probability of error would be at most $\epsilon + \epsilon'$ (i.e., still close to 0). Our main result implies that if a PP elects a leader in sublinear time then it must have a positive probability of error. However, it remains an open question whether such a PP exists.

Our general negative result applies to α -dense initial configurations. However, is sublinear time stable leader election possible from other kinds of initial configurations that satisfy our intuition of not having preexisting leaders — for example, count $\Theta(n)$ of one state and count $\Theta(n^{1/2})$ of another? It is known, for example, that for each $0 < \epsilon < 1$, an initial configuration with $\Theta(n)$ agents in one state and $\Theta(n^\epsilon)$ in another state can elect a leader in expected time $O(\log^2 n)$ with high probability [3], although this protocol has a positive probability of failure. In general we would like to better characterize the class of initial configurations for which sublinear time leader election is possible or impossible.

Another open question concerns the contrast between *convergence* and *stabilization*. We say a PP electing a leader *converges* when it stops changing the count of the leader (if it is correct, this count should be 1), and we say it *stabilizes* when it first enters a configuration from which the count of the leader *cannot* change. In many PPs these two events coincide, but it is possible to converge strictly before stabilizing. Our proof shows only that stabilization must take expected $\Omega(n)$ time. We leave as an open question whether there is a PP that stably elects a leader and converges in expected $o(n)$ time. It is similarly open to determine the optimal stabilization time for computing semilinear predicates and functions. Allowing an initial leader, the convergence time for each has been shown to be at most $O(\log^5 n)$ [3, 8], but these PPs provably require expected time $\Omega(n)$ to stabilize, and it is unknown whether faster stabilization is possible even with an initial leader.

2 Preliminaries

If Λ is a finite set (in this paper, of *states*), we write \mathbb{N}^Λ to denote the set of functions $\mathbf{c} : \Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. Equivalently, we view an element $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{N}^\Lambda$ as a vector of $|\Lambda|$ nonnegative integers, with each coordinate “labeled” by an element of Λ . Given $s \in \Lambda$ and $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{N}^\Lambda$, we refer to $\mathbf{c}(s)$ as the *count of s in \mathbf{c}* . Let $\|\mathbf{c}\| = \|\mathbf{c}\|_1 = \sum_{s \in \Lambda} \mathbf{c}(s)$. We write $\mathbf{c} \leq \mathbf{c}'$ to denote that $\mathbf{c}(s) \leq \mathbf{c}'(s)$ for all $s \in \Lambda$. Since we view vectors $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{N}^\Lambda$ equivalently as multisets of elements from Λ , if $\mathbf{c} \leq \mathbf{c}'$ we say \mathbf{c} is a *subset* of \mathbf{c}' . Given $\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{c}' \in \mathbb{N}^\Lambda$, we define the vector component-wise operations of addition $\mathbf{c} + \mathbf{c}'$, subtraction $\mathbf{c} - \mathbf{c}'$, and scalar multiplication $n\mathbf{c}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For a set $\Delta \subset \Lambda$, we view a vector $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{N}^\Delta$ equivalently as a vector $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{N}^\Lambda$ by assuming $\mathbf{c}(s) = 0$ for all $s \in \Lambda \setminus \Delta$. Given $s_1, \dots, s_k \in \Lambda$, $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{N}^\Lambda$, and $n_1, \dots, n_k \in \mathbb{Z}$, we write $\mathbf{c} + \{n_1 s_1, \dots, n_k s_k\}$ to denote vector addition of \mathbf{c} with the vector $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{Z}^{\{s_1, \dots, s_k\}}$ defined by $\mathbf{v}(s_i) = n_i$.

¹⁰It is not obvious that one can compose these two tasks. Simply including all the transitions for leader election and for simulating a Turing machine does not work, because the Turing machine simulation assumes there is only one leader, but prior to the conclusion of the leader election, there will be many leaders present, causing errors in the Turing machine simulation. Angluin, Aspnes, and Eisenstat [3] informally describe a way to detect whenever the number of leaders changes and to restart the simulation from the beginning, cancelling the effect of such errors.

2.1 Population protocols

A *population protocol (PP)* is a pair $\mathcal{P} = (\Lambda, \delta)$,¹¹ where Λ is a finite set of *states*, and $\delta : \Lambda \times \Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda \times \Lambda$ is the (symmetric) *transition function*. A *configuration* of a PP is a nonzero vector $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{N}^\Lambda \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, with the interpretation that $\mathbf{c}(s)$ agents are in state s (by convention, the value $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ always represents the total number of agents $\|\mathbf{c}\|$). A *transition* is a 4-tuple $\alpha = (r_1, r_2, p_1, p_2) \in \Lambda^4$ such that $\delta(r_1, r_2) = (p_1, p_2)$; this paper typically makes reference to individual transitions, with δ implicit. The semantics are that if an agent in state r_1 interacts with an agent in state r_2 , then they transition to states p_1 and p_2 . Write $\alpha : r_1, r_2 \rightarrow p_1, p_2$ to denote the transition $\alpha = (r_1, r_2, p_1, p_2)$.

Given a configuration \mathbf{c} and transition $\alpha : r_1, r_2 \rightarrow p_1, p_2$, we say that α is *applicable* to \mathbf{c} if $r_1 \neq r_2$ and $\mathbf{c}(r_1) \geq 1$ and $\mathbf{c}(r_2) \geq 1$, or if $r_1 = r_2$ and $\mathbf{c}(r_1) \geq 2$ (i.e., \mathbf{c} contains 2 agents, one in state r_1 and one in state r_2). Associate with α the *transition vector* $\mathbf{v}_\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^\Lambda$, with $\mathbf{v}_\alpha(s) = 1$ if $s = p_1 \neq p_2$ or $s = p_2 \neq p_1$, $\mathbf{v}_\alpha(s) = 2$ if $s = p_1 = p_2$, $\mathbf{v}_\alpha(s) = -1$ if $s = r_1 \neq r_2$ or $s = r_2 \neq r_1$, $\mathbf{v}_\alpha(s) = -2$ if $s = r_1 = r_2$, and $\mathbf{v}_\alpha(s) = 0$ otherwise. In other words, \mathbf{v}_α represents the amount by which state counts change if transition α is applied. If α is applicable to \mathbf{c} , then write $\alpha(\mathbf{c})$ to denote the configuration $\mathbf{c} + \mathbf{v}_\alpha$; otherwise $\alpha(\mathbf{c})$ is undefined. A finite or infinite sequence of transitions (α_i) is a *transition sequence*. Given an initial configuration \mathbf{c}_0 and a transition sequence (α_i) , the induced *execution sequence* (or *path*) is a finite or infinite sequence of configurations $(\mathbf{c}_0, \mathbf{c}_1, \mathbf{c}_2, \dots)$ such that, for all \mathbf{c}_i ($i \geq 1$), $\mathbf{c}_i = \alpha_{i-1}(\mathbf{c}_{i-1})$.¹² If a finite execution sequence, with associated transition sequence q , starts with \mathbf{c} and ends with \mathbf{c}' , we write $\mathbf{c} \Longrightarrow_q \mathbf{c}'$. We write $\mathbf{c} \Longrightarrow \mathbf{c}'$ if such a transition sequence exists and we say that \mathbf{c}' is *reachable* from \mathbf{c} . If it is understood from context what is the initial configuration \mathbf{i} , then say \mathbf{c} is simply *reachable* if $\mathbf{i} \Longrightarrow \mathbf{c}$. Note that this notation omits mention of \mathcal{P} ; we only ever deal with a single PP at a time, so it is always clear from context which PP is defining the transitions.

We will find ourselves frequently dealing with infinite sequences of configurations.¹³ The following lemma shows that we can always take a nondecreasing subsequence.

Lemma 2.1 (Dickson’s Lemma [11]). *Every infinite sequence $\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{x}_1, \dots \in \mathbb{N}^k$ has an infinite nondecreasing subsequence $\mathbf{x}_{i_0} \leq \mathbf{x}_{i_1} \leq \dots$, where $i_0 < i_1 < \dots \in \mathbb{N}$.*

2.2 Time complexity

We aim to establish a time lower bound, so we must define the time complexity model. As mentioned in Section 1, we count the expected total number of pairwise interactions (when each interaction is chosen by selecting a pair of agents uniformly at random) and divide by the number of agents n (effectively calling n interactions among a population of n agents one “second” of time). Let $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{N}^\Lambda$ and $C \subseteq \mathbb{N}^\Lambda$. Denote the probability that the PP reaches from \mathbf{c} to some configuration $\mathbf{c}' \in C$ by $\Pr[\mathbf{c} \Longrightarrow C]$. If $\Pr[\mathbf{c} \Longrightarrow C] = 1$,¹⁴ define the *expected time to reach from \mathbf{c} to C* , denoted $T[\mathbf{c} \Longrightarrow C]$, to be the expected number of interactions to reach from \mathbf{c} to some $\mathbf{c}' \in C$, divided by the number of agents (which by convention will always be denoted n in this paper).

¹¹We give a slightly different formalism than that of [4] for population protocols. The main difference is that since we are not deciding a predicate, there is no notion of inputs being mapped to states or states being mapped to outputs. Another difference is that we assume (for the sake of brevity in some explanations, not because the difference is essential to the proof) the transition function is symmetric (so there is no notion of a “sender” and “receiver” agent as in [4]; the unordered pair of states completely determines the next pair of states).

¹²When the initial configuration to which a transition sequence is applied is clear from context, we may overload terminology and refer to a transition sequence and an execution sequence interchangeably.

¹³Typically none of them are reachable from any others; they are configurations with increasing numbers of agents.

¹⁴Since PP’s have a finite reachable configuration space, this is equivalent to requiring that for all \mathbf{x} reachable from \mathbf{c} , there is a $\mathbf{c}' \in C$ reachable from \mathbf{x} .

3 Main results

3.1 Impossibility of sublinear time stable leader election

We consider the following *stable leader election* problem. Suppose that each PP $\mathcal{P} = (\Lambda, \delta)$ we consider has a specially designated state $\ell \in \Lambda$, which we call the *leader state*. Informally, the goal of stable leader election is to be guaranteed to reach a configuration with count 1 of ℓ (a leader has been “elected”), from which no transition sequence can change the count of ℓ (the leader is “stable”). We also assume there is a special state x (it could be that $x = \ell$ but it is not required), such that the only “valid” initial configurations \mathbf{i} are of the form $\mathbf{i}(x) > 0$ and $\mathbf{i}(y) = 0$ for all states $y \in \Lambda \setminus \{x\}$. We write \mathbf{i}_n to denote such an initial configuration with $\mathbf{i}_n(x) = n$.

Definition 3.1. A configuration \mathbf{y} is *stable* if, for all \mathbf{y}' such that $\mathbf{y} \Longrightarrow \mathbf{y}'$, $\mathbf{y}'(\ell) = \mathbf{y}(\ell)$; \mathbf{y} is said to have a *stable leader* if it is stable and $\mathbf{y}(\ell) = 1$.

Definition 3.2. We say a PP elects a leader *stably* if, for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, for all \mathbf{c} such that $\mathbf{i}_n \Longrightarrow \mathbf{c}$, there exists \mathbf{y} with a stable leader such that $\mathbf{c} \Longrightarrow \mathbf{y}$.

It is well-known [4] that the above definition is equivalent to requiring that the PP reaches a configuration with a stable leader with probability 1.

Definition 3.3. Let $t : \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$, and let Y be the set of all configurations with a stable leader. We say a PP elects a leader stably *in time* $t(n)$ if, for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $\mathbb{T}[\mathbf{i}_n \Longrightarrow Y] \leq t(n)$.

Our main theorem says that stable leader election requires at least linear time to stabilize:

Theorem 3.4. *If a PP stably elects a leader in time $t(n)$, then $t(n) = \Omega(n)$.*

Thus a PP that elects a leader in sublinear time cannot do so stably, i.e., it must have a positive probability of failure.

The high-level strategy to prove Theorem 3.4 is as follows. With high probability the PP initially goes from configuration \mathbf{i}_n to configuration \mathbf{x}_n , such that in the sequence (\mathbf{x}_n) every state count grows without bound as $n \rightarrow \infty$ (indeed $\Omega(n)$); this follows from Theorem 4.3. We then show that any such configuration must have an “ $O(1)$ -bottleneck transition” before reaching a configuration with a stable leader (informally this means that every transition sequence from \mathbf{x}_n to a configuration \mathbf{y} with a stable leader must have a transition in which both input states have count $O(1)$, depending on the PP but not on n). Since it takes expected time $\Omega(n)$ to execute a transition when both states have constant count, from any such configuration it requires linear time to stably elect a leader. Since one of these configurations is reached from the initial configuration with high probability, those configurations’ contribution to the overall expected time dominates, showing that the expected time to stably elect a leader is linear.

3.2 More general result in terms of locking and dense configurations

Rather than proving Theorem 3.4 using the notion of leader stability directly, we prove a more general result concerning the notion of a set of inapplicable transitions.

Definition 3.5. Let Q be a set of transitions. A configuration $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{N}^\Lambda$ is said to be *Q -stable* if no transition in Q is applicable in any configuration reachable from \mathbf{y} . For $I \subseteq \mathbb{N}^\Lambda$, let $Y_{I,Q}$ denote the set of Q -stable configurations reachable from some configuration in I .

If we let Q be the set of transitions that alter the count of the leader state ℓ , then a Q -stable configuration \mathbf{y} with $\mathbf{y}(\ell) = 1$ exactly corresponds to the property of having a stable leader.

Let $I \subseteq \mathbb{N}^\Lambda$ and Q be a set of transitions.¹⁵ We say that a PP $\mathcal{P} = (\Lambda, \delta)$ Q -stabilizes from I if, for any $\mathbf{i} \in I$, $\Pr[\mathbf{i} \implies Y_{I,Q}] = 1$.¹⁶ If I and Q are understood from context, we say that \mathcal{P} stabilizes. For a time bound $t(n)$, we say that \mathcal{P} stabilizes in expected time $t(n)$ if, for all $\mathbf{i} \in I$ such that $\|\mathbf{i}\| = n$, $\mathbb{T}[\mathbf{i} \implies Y_{I,Q}] \leq t(n)$.

Definition 3.6. For an (infinite) set/sequence of configurations C , let $\text{bdd}(C)$ be the set of states $\{s \in \Lambda \mid (\exists b \in \mathbb{N})(\forall \mathbf{c} \in C) \mathbf{c}(s) < b\}$. Let $\text{unbdd}(C) = \Lambda \setminus \text{bdd}(C)$.

Remark. Note that if $C = (\mathbf{c}_m)$ is a nondecreasing sequence, then for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there is \mathbf{c}_m such that for all $s \in \text{unbdd}(\mathbf{c}_m)$, $\mathbf{c}_m(s) \geq k$.

Let $\alpha > 0$. We say that a configuration \mathbf{c} is α -dense if for all $s \in \Lambda$, $\mathbf{c}(s) > 0$ implies that $\mathbf{c}(s) \geq \alpha \|\mathbf{c}\|$, i.e., all states present in \mathbf{c} occupy at least an α fraction of the total count of agents.

Theorem 3.4 is implied by the next theorem, which the rest of the paper is devoted to proving.

Theorem 3.7. Let $\mathcal{P} = (\Lambda, \delta)$, let Q be any subset of transitions of \mathcal{P} , let $\alpha > 0$, and let $I \subseteq \mathbb{N}^\Lambda$ be a set of α -dense configurations such that, for infinitely many $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{i}' \in I$, $\mathbf{i} + \mathbf{i}' \in I$. Suppose \mathcal{P} Q -stabilizes from I in expected time $o(n)$. Then $Y_{I,Q} \cap \mathbb{N}^\Gamma \neq \emptyset$, where $\Gamma = \text{unbdd}(Y_{I,Q})$.

In other words, if some states have “small” count in all reachable stable configurations, then there is a reachable stable configuration in which those states have count 0. A PP \mathcal{P} that stably elects a leader is a PP in which Q is the set of transitions that alter the count of ℓ , $I = \{\mathbf{i}_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ (note all \mathbf{i}_n are 1-dense), $Y_{I,Q}$ is the set of configurations reachable from I with a stable leader, and \mathcal{P} Q -stabilizes from I . Recall that $\mathbf{y}(\ell) = 1$ for all $\mathbf{y} \in Y_{I,Q}$. Hence $\ell \notin \text{unbdd}(Y_{I,Q})$, so by Theorem 3.7, if \mathcal{P} stabilizes in expected time $o(n)$, there is a stable reachable \mathbf{y} where $\mathbf{y}(\ell) = 0$, a contradiction. Thus Theorem 3.4 follows from Theorem 3.7.

We can also use Theorem 3.7 to prove that stable leader election requires linear time under the more relaxed requirement that there is a set $\Psi \subset \Lambda$ of “leader states,” and the goal of the PP is to reach a configuration \mathbf{y} in which $\sum_{\ell \in \Psi} \mathbf{y}(\ell) = 1$ and stays 1 in any configuration reachable from \mathbf{y} . Choosing Q as the set of transitions that alter that sum, Theorem 3.7 implies this form of stable leader election also requires $\Omega(n)$ expected time.

Throughout the rest of this paper, fix $\mathcal{P} = (\Lambda, \delta)$, α , I , and Q as in the statement of Theorem 3.7.

4 Technical tools

4.1 Bottleneck transitions take linear time

Let $b \in \mathbb{N}$. We say that transition $\alpha : r_1, r_2 \rightarrow p_1, p_2$ is a b -bottleneck for configuration \mathbf{c} if $\mathbf{c}(r_1) \leq b$ and $\mathbf{c}(r_2) \leq b$. Let $\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{c}' \in \mathbb{N}^\Lambda$. We say that \mathbf{c} and \mathbf{c}' are b -bottleneck separated if every execution sequence $(\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{c}_0, \mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_{m-1}, \mathbf{c}_m = \mathbf{c}')$, with associated transition sequence $(\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{m-1})$, has the property that there exists $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, m-1\}$ such that α_i is a b -bottleneck for \mathbf{c}_i . (Note that if $\mathbf{c} \not\Rightarrow \mathbf{c}'$, then they are trivially b -bottleneck separated.) Let $X, Y \subseteq \mathbb{N}^\Lambda$. We say that X and Y are b -bottleneck separated if, for every $\mathbf{x} \in X$ and $\mathbf{y} \in Y$, \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} are b -bottleneck-separated. Note that if X and Y are b -bottleneck separated, then they are also b' -bottleneck separated for all $b' > b$. Our $\Omega(n)$ time lower bound relies on the following straightforward observation.

¹⁵For the problem of stably electing a leader, $I = \{\mathbf{i}_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, where $\mathbf{i}_n(x) = n$ and $\mathbf{i}_n(y) = 0$ for all $y \in \Lambda \setminus \{x\}$.

¹⁶Recall that the condition $\Pr[\mathbf{i} \implies Y_{I,Q}] = 1$ is equivalent to $[(\forall \mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{N}^\Lambda) \mathbf{i} \implies \mathbf{c} \implies (\exists \mathbf{y} \in Y_{I,Q}) \mathbf{c} \implies \mathbf{y}]$.

Observation 4.1. Let $b \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{N}^\Lambda$, and $Y \subseteq \mathbb{N}^\Lambda$ such that $\Pr[\mathbf{x} \Longrightarrow Y] = 1$. If $\{\mathbf{x}\}$ and Y are b -bottleneck separated, then $\mathsf{T}[\mathbf{x} \Longrightarrow Y] \geq \frac{n-1}{2(b \cdot |\Lambda|)^2}$.

Proof. Because $\{\mathbf{x}\}$ and Y are b -bottleneck separated, it suffices to show that the expected time of the first b -bottleneck transition to occur from configuration \mathbf{x} is at least $\frac{n-1}{2(b \cdot |\Lambda|)^2}$, since the definition of b -bottleneck separated implies that no configuration in Y can appear before that event. In any configuration \mathbf{c} reachable from \mathbf{x} , for any pair of states $r_1, r_2 \in \Lambda$ such that $r_1, r_2 \rightarrow p_1, p_2$ is a b -bottleneck transition in \mathbf{c} , the definition implies that $\mathbf{c}(r_1), \mathbf{c}(r_2) \leq b$. Thus the probability that the next pair of agents selected to interact are in states r_1 and r_2 , respectively is at most $\frac{2b^2}{n(n-1)}$.¹⁷ There are at most $|\Lambda|^2$ such transitions,¹⁸ so the union bound implies that the probability that any of them is the next transition is at most $|\Lambda|^2 \frac{2b^2}{n(n-1)}$. Thus we can bound the number of interactions until the first b -bottleneck transition occurs by a geometric random variable with success probability at most $\frac{2(b \cdot |\Lambda|)^2}{n(n-1)}$, whence the expected number of interactions until the first b -bottleneck is at least $\frac{n(n-1)}{2(b \cdot |\Lambda|)^2}$. Since the parallel time is defined as the number of interactions divided by n , this gives the stated expected time bound. \square

Corollary 4.2. Let $\gamma > 0$, $b \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{N}^\Lambda$, and $X, Y \subseteq \mathbb{N}^\Lambda$ such that $\Pr[\mathbf{c} \Longrightarrow X] \geq \gamma$, $\Pr[\mathbf{c} \Longrightarrow Y] = 1$, and X and Y are b -bottleneck separated. Then $\mathsf{T}[\mathbf{c} \Longrightarrow Y] \geq \gamma \frac{n-1}{2(b \cdot |\Lambda|)^2}$.

4.2 Sublinear time from dense initial configurations implies bottleneck free path from configurations with every state “populous”

The following theorem, along with Corollary 4.2, fully captures the probability theory necessary to prove our main theorem.¹⁹ Given it and Corollary 4.2, Theorem 3.7 is provable (through Lemma 4.4) using only combinatorial arguments about reachability between configurations.

For ease of notation, we assume throughout this paper that all states in Λ are *producible*, meaning they have positive count in some reachable configuration. Otherwise the following theorem applies only to states that are actually producible. Recall that for $\alpha > 0$, a configuration \mathbf{c} is α -dense if for all $s \in \Lambda$, $\mathbf{c}(s) > 0$ implies that $\mathbf{c}(s) \geq \alpha \|\mathbf{c}\|$. Say that $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{N}^\Lambda$ is *full* if $(\forall s \in \Lambda) \mathbf{c}(s) > 0$.

Theorem 4.3 (adapted from [12]). Let $\mathcal{P} = (\Lambda, \delta)$ be a PP and $\alpha > 0$. Then there are constants $\epsilon, \beta > 0$ such that, letting $X = \{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{N}^\Lambda \mid \mathbf{x} \text{ is full and } \beta\text{-dense} \}$, for all α -dense configurations \mathbf{i} , $\Pr[\mathbf{i} \Longrightarrow X] \geq 1 - 2^{-\epsilon \|\mathbf{i}\|}$.

In [12], the theorem is stated for “sufficiently large” $\|\mathbf{i}\|$, but of course one can always choose ϵ to be small enough to make it true for all \mathbf{i} .

The following lemma reduces the problem of proving Theorem 3.7 to a combinatorial statement involving only reachability among configurations (and the lack of bottleneck transitions between them). In Section 5 we will prove Theorem 3.7 by showing that the existence of the configurations

¹⁷If $r_1 \neq r_2$ and $\mathbf{c}(r_1) = \mathbf{c}(r_2) = b$, then the probability to pick the first agent in one of the states r_1 or r_2 is $\frac{2b}{n}$, and the probability to pick the second agent in the other state is $\frac{b}{n-1}$, so the total probability of both is $\frac{2b^2}{n(n-1)}$. The case for $r_1 = r_2$ gives $\frac{b}{n}$ for the first times $\frac{b-1}{n-1}$ for the second, resulting in lower total probability $\frac{b^2-b}{n(n-1)}$.

¹⁸With a nondeterministic transition function, the total number of transitions would replace the quantity $|\Lambda|^2$ in the conclusion, but it would remain a constant independent of the size of the initial configuration.

¹⁹Theorem 4.3 was proven for a more general model called Chemical Reaction Networks (CRNs) that obey a certain technical condition [12]; as observed in that paper, the class of CRNs obeying that condition includes all PPs, so the theorem holds unconditionally for PPs. The theorem proved in [12] is more general than Theorem 4.3, but we have stated a corollary of it here. A similar statement is implicit in the proof sketch of Lemma 5 of a technical report on a variant model called “urn automata” that has PPs as a special case [2].

\mathbf{x}_m and \mathbf{y}_m and the transition sequence p_m in the following lemma implies that we can reach a Q -stable configuration $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{N}^\Gamma$, where $\Gamma = \text{unbdd}(Y_{I,Q})$.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $\alpha > 0$. Let $\mathcal{P} = (\Lambda, \delta)$ be a PP such that, for some set of transitions Q and infinite set of α -dense initial configurations I , \mathcal{P} Q -stabilizes from I in expected time $o(n)$. Then for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a configuration \mathbf{x}_m reachable from some $\mathbf{i} \in I$ and transition sequence p_m such that (1) $\mathbf{x}_m(s) \geq m$ for all $s \in \Lambda$, (2) $\mathbf{x}_m \Longrightarrow_{p_m} \mathbf{y}_m$, where $\mathbf{y}_m \in Y_{I,Q}$, and (3) p_m has no m -bottleneck transition.*

Conditions (2) and (3) are equivalent to saying that \mathbf{x}_m and $Y_{I,Q}$ are not m -bottleneck separated.

Proof. For any configuration \mathbf{x}_m reachable from some configuration in I , there is a transition sequence p_m satisfying condition (2) by the fact that \mathcal{P} Q -stabilizes from I . It remains to show we can find \mathbf{x}_m and p_m satisfying conditions (1) and (3).

By Theorem 4.3 there exist ϵ, β (which depend only on \mathcal{P} and α) such that, starting in any configuration \mathbf{i} , with probability at least $1 - 2^{\epsilon n}$, \mathcal{P} reaches a configuration \mathbf{x} where all states $s \in \Lambda$ have count at least βn , where $n = \|\mathbf{i}\|$. Choose n to be large enough that $1 - 2^{\epsilon n} \geq \frac{1}{2}$ and there is $\mathbf{i}_n \in I$ such that $\|\mathbf{i}_n\| = n$. Then by Theorem 4.3, $\Pr[\mathbf{i}_n \Longrightarrow X_n] \geq \frac{1}{2}$ where $X_n = \{ \mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{i}_n \Longrightarrow \mathbf{x} \text{ and } (\forall s \in \Lambda) \mathbf{x}(s) \geq \beta n \}$.

What can we infer about the b -bottleneck separation of X_n and $Y = Y_{I,Q}$ given our assumption that $\mathbb{T}[\mathbf{i}_n \Longrightarrow Y] = o(n)$? Corollary 4.2 tells us that if X_n and Y were b -bottleneck separated, then $\mathbb{T}[\mathbf{i}_n \Longrightarrow Y] \geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{n-1}{(b \cdot \Lambda)^2}$. For this expected time to be $o(n)$, it must be that X_n and Y are not $b(n)$ -bottleneck separated where $b(n) = \omega(1)$. Let \mathbf{x}_m be a configuration in X_n that can reach Y by a path without a $b(n)$ -bottleneck transition, where the indexing m satisfies $m \leq \min\{\lfloor \beta n \rfloor, b(n)\}$. Since $\min\{\lfloor \beta n \rfloor, b(n)\} = \omega(1)$, we have an appropriate configuration for all indexes $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $m \leq \lfloor \beta n \rfloor$, condition (1) is satisfied. Finally, since $m \leq b(n)$, condition (3) is satisfied. \square

4.3 Transition ordering lemma

The following lemma was first proven (in the more general model of Chemical Reaction Networks) in [7]. We provide a proof for the sake of self-containment. Intuitively, the lemma states that a “fast” transition sequence (meaning one without a bottleneck transition) that decreases certain states from high counts to low counts must contain transitions of a certain restricted form. These transitions will later be used to do “surgery” on fast transition sequences, because they give a way to alter the count of certain states, by inserting or removing those transitions, while carefully controlling the effect these insertions and removals have on counts of other states.

Lemma 4.5 (Adapted from [7]). *Let $b_1, b_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $b_2 > |\Lambda| \cdot b_1$. Let $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{N}^\Lambda$ such that $\mathbf{x} \Longrightarrow \mathbf{y}$ via transition sequence q that does not contain a b_2 -bottleneck. Define*

$$\Delta = \{ d \in \Lambda \mid \mathbf{x}(d) \geq b_2 \text{ and } \mathbf{y}(d) \leq b_1 \}.$$

Then there is an order on Δ , so that we may write $\Delta = \{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_k\}$, such that, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, there is a transition α_i of the form $d_i, s_i \rightarrow o_i, o'_i$, such that $s_i, o_i, o'_i \notin \{d_1, \dots, d_i\}$, and α_i occurs at least $(b_2 - |\Lambda| \cdot b_1) / |\Lambda|^2$ times in q .

Proof. We define the ordering based on increasing sets $\emptyset = \Delta_0 \subset \Delta_1 \subset \Delta_2 \subset \dots \Delta_{k-1} \subset \Delta_k = \Delta$, where for each $1 \leq i \leq k$, $\Delta_i = \Delta_{i-1} \cup \{d_i\}$.

We define the ordering inductively “in reverse,” by first defining d_k , then d_{k-1} , etc. For all $1 \leq i \leq k$, define $\Phi_i : \mathbb{N}^\Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ for all configurations \mathbf{c} by $\Phi_i(\mathbf{c}) = \sum_{d \in \Delta_i} \mathbf{c}(d)$. Φ_k is well-defined since $\Delta_k = \Delta$, and Φ_i is well-defined once we have defined d_{i+1}, \dots, d_k , because $\Delta_i = \Delta \setminus \{d_{i+1}, \dots, d_k\}$.

Because $\mathbf{y}(d) \leq b_1$ for all $d \in \Delta$, it follows that $\Phi_i(\mathbf{y}) \leq i \cdot b_1 \leq |\Lambda| \cdot b_1$. Recall that $\mathbf{x}(d) \geq b_2$ for all $d \in \Delta$. Let r be the suffix of q after the last configuration \mathbf{c}' along q such that $\Phi_i(\mathbf{c}') \geq b_2$. Then in all configurations \mathbf{c} in r , $\mathbf{c}(d) < b_2$ for all $d \in \Delta_i$. Because $\Phi_i(\mathbf{c}') \geq b_2$ but $\Phi_i(\mathbf{y}) \leq |\Lambda| \cdot b_1$, r contains a subsequence u of transitions, each of which strictly decreases Φ_i , and the total decrease in Φ_i over all of u is at least $(b_2 - |\Lambda| \cdot b_1)$ between configurations \mathbf{c}' and \mathbf{y} .

Let $\alpha : r_1, r_2 \rightarrow p_1, p_2$ be a transition in u . Since α strictly decreases Φ_i , $r_1 \in \Delta_i$ or $r_2 \in \Delta_i$; assume without loss of generality that $r_1 \in \Delta_i$. Further, since u does not contain a b_2 -bottleneck, and all configurations \mathbf{c} along u have $\mathbf{c}(d) < b_2$ for all $d \in \Delta_i$, for α not to be a b_2 -bottleneck, we must have $r_2 \notin \Delta_i$. Since exactly one state in Δ_i decreases its count, $p_1 \notin \Delta_i$ and $p_2 \notin \Delta_i$, or else α would not decrease Φ_i . Let $d_i = r_1, s_i = r_2, o_i = p_1$, and $o'_i = p_2$.

Then α decreases Φ_i by exactly 1. Since there are at least $b_2 - |\Lambda| \cdot b_1$ instances of such transitions in u , and there are at most $|\Lambda|^2$ total types of transitions, by the pigeonhole principle at least one transition type must repeat in u at least $(b_2 - |\Lambda| \cdot b_1)/|\Lambda|^2$ times. \square

5 Proof of Theorem 3.7

By Lemma 4.4, there are sequences (\mathbf{x}_m) and (\mathbf{y}_m) of configurations, and a sequence (p_m) of transition sequences, such that, for all m , (1) $\mathbf{x}_m(s) \geq m$ for all $s \in \Lambda$ (thus $\text{unbdd}(\mathbf{x}_m) = \Lambda$), and for some $\mathbf{i} \in I$, $\mathbf{i} \implies \mathbf{x}_m$, (2) \mathbf{y}_m is Q -stable, and (3) $\mathbf{x}_m \implies_{p_m} \mathbf{y}_m$ and p_m does not contain an m -bottleneck.

By Dickson's Lemma there is an infinite subsequence of (\mathbf{x}_m) for which both (\mathbf{x}_m) and (\mathbf{y}_m) are nondecreasing. Without loss of generality, we take (\mathbf{x}_m) and (\mathbf{y}_m) to be these subsequences. Let $\Delta = \text{bdd}(\mathbf{y}_m)$ and $\Gamma = \text{unbdd}(\mathbf{y}_m)$.

If a transition $\alpha : r_1, r_2 \rightarrow p_1, p_2$ has the property that for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $r_i \notin \{p_1, p_2\}$, or if $(r_1 = r_2$ and $(r_i \neq p_1$ or $r_i \neq p_2))$, then we say that α *consumes* r_i . In other words, applying α reduces the count of r_i in the population. We similarly say that α *produces* p_i if it increases the count of p_i .

To prove Theorem 3.7 we need to show that there is a configuration in $Y_{I,Q}$ that contains states only in Γ . Recall the path $\mathbf{x}_m \implies_{p_m} \mathbf{y}_m$ from Lemma 4.4. Intuitively, Claim 5.1 below says that because this path is m -bottleneck free, we can modify it to consume all states in Δ from \mathbf{y}_m , resulting in a configuration \mathbf{z}_m^Γ that contains only states in Γ . The ‘‘cost’’ of this manipulation is that we have to add with extra agents in specific states corresponding to $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{N}^\Lambda$. Claim 5.1 is not sufficient to prove Theorem 3.7 because of this additional \mathbf{e} ; the subsequent Claim 5.2 will give us the machinery to handle it.

Claim 5.1. *There is $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{N}^\Lambda$ such that for all large enough m , there is $\mathbf{z}_m^\Gamma \in \mathbb{N}^\Gamma$, such that $\mathbf{x}_m + \mathbf{e} \implies \mathbf{z}_m^\Gamma$.*

Proof. Intuitively, the proof works as follows. Recall that $\mathbf{x}_m \implies_{p_m} \mathbf{y}_m$ and p_m does not contain an m -bottleneck. The goal is to get from configuration \mathbf{y}_m (which may be positive on some elements of Δ) to \mathbf{z}_m^Γ (which is 0 on all elements of Δ). We will show that we can append to the end of p_m transitions $\alpha_i : d_i, s_i \rightarrow o_i, o'_i$, for $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ — in that order — such that for all i , $d_i \in \Delta$ and $s_i, o_i, o'_i \notin \{d_1, \dots, d_i\}$. We use Lemma 4.5 to find the necessary transitions. We add enough α_i transitions to consume all copies of d_i . However, this will also consume copies of s_i , so we add more copies of s_i to \mathbf{e} to account for this. Once we have added enough α_i transitions to make the count of d_i equal to 0, by the fact that for all j , $s_j, o_j, o'_j \notin \{d_1, \dots, d_j\}$, subsequently added transitions α_j for $j > i$ will not produce d_i (so its count will stay 0), nor will it require consuming d_i (so the transitions will be applicable). However, prior to reaching the point where we add α_i transitions, if $d_i = o_j$ or o'_j for $j < i$, then the excess copies of d_i generated by the extra α_j transitions mean that

we may need to add more than $\mathbf{y}_m(d_i)$ copies of α_i to consume all the copies of d_i . The resulting configuration will be $\mathbf{z}_m^\Gamma \in \mathbb{N}^\Gamma$.

More formally, we choose large enough m such that the counts of species in Δ are no longer changing with m in (\mathbf{y}_m) . Recall that $\mathbf{x}_m \xrightarrow{p_m} \mathbf{y}_m$ and p_m does not contain an m -bottleneck. We'll apply Lemma 4.5 on this path with $b_2 = m$ and let b_1 be the largest count of any species in Δ anywhere in the sequence (\mathbf{y}_m) . (If necessary, increase m further to ensure $b_2 > |\Lambda| \cdot b_1$.) Note that with these parameters, $\Delta = \text{bdd}(\mathbf{y}_m)$ exactly matches the set of states " Δ " defined in the statement of Lemma 4.5. Then this lemma tells us that there is an ordering on Δ , so that we can write $\Delta = \{d_1, \dots, d_k\}$, such that for each $1 \leq i \leq k$, there is a transition $\alpha_i : d_i, s_i \rightarrow o_i, o'_i$ such that $d_i \in \Delta$ and $s_i, o_i, o'_i \notin \{d_1, \dots, d_i\}$.

We determine \mathbf{e} and show how to consume all states in Δ using the above transitions in the following iterative procedure. Start with $\mathbf{e}_0 = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{o}_0 = \mathbf{0}$. Intuitively, \mathbf{e}_i represents the total number of transitions, among $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{i-1}$, that we add that have d_i as an input state. Therefore, that many extra copies of d_i must be present in \mathbf{e} to allow us to execute all of those transitions starting at the configuration $\mathbf{y}_m + \mathbf{e}$. \mathbf{o}_i represents the total number of transitions, among $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{i-1}$, that we add that have d_i as an *output* state (counting twice each time a transition has d_i as both output states). Therefore, when we apply reaction α_i in order to consume all of d_i , we need to consume not just $\mathbf{y}_m(d_i)$, but $\mathbf{y}_m(d_i) + \mathbf{o}(d_i)$, since the previous added transitions that produce d_i increased its count.

For all $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, let

- $c_i = \mathbf{y}_m(d_i) + \mathbf{o}_{i-1}(d_i)$
- $\mathbf{e}_i = \mathbf{e}_{i-1} + \{c_i s_i\}$
- $\mathbf{o}_i = \mathbf{o}_{i-1} + \{c_i o_i, c_i o'_i\}$ (note that if $o_i = o'_i$, this is the same as writing $\{2c_i o_i\}$).

Given transition sequences p and q , let $p \oplus q$ denote q appended to the end of p , and given a single transition α and $j \in \mathbb{N}$, let $j \cdot \alpha$ denote the transition sequence consisting of j copies of α .

Let $\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{e}_k$. For all $i \in \{0, \dots, k\}$, define $p_{m,i}$ inductively to be $p_{m,i-1} \oplus (c_i \cdot \alpha_i)$, where the base case is $p_{m,0} = p_m$, and define $\mathbf{z}_{m,i}$ inductively to be such that $\mathbf{x}_m + \mathbf{e}_i \xrightarrow{p_{m,i}} \mathbf{z}_{m,i}$, where the base case is $\mathbf{z}_{m,0} = \mathbf{y}_m$. Then \mathbf{z}_m^Γ in the statement of the claim will be $\mathbf{z}_{m,k}$.

We prove by induction on i that

1. for all $j \in \{1, \dots, i\}$, $\mathbf{z}_{m,i}(d_j) = 0$,
2. $p_{m,i}$ is a valid transition sequence for $\mathbf{x}_m + \mathbf{e}_i$ (i.e., it never has a transition in a configuration in which the input states are not present), and
3. for all $j \in \{i+1, \dots, k\}$, $\mathbf{z}_{m,i}(d_j) = \mathbf{y}_m(d_j) + \mathbf{o}_i(d_j)$ (in particular, $\mathbf{z}_{m,i}(d_{i+1}) = c_{i+1}$).

The base case is vacuous for 1 and immediate for 2 and 3 from the fact that p_m is a valid transition sequence to apply to \mathbf{x}_m and the definition of $c_1 = \mathbf{y}_m(d_1) + \mathbf{o}_0(d_1) = \mathbf{y}_m(d_1)$.

Assume the inductive case for $i-1$. Then by induction hypothesis 1, $\mathbf{z}_{m,i-1}(d_j) = 0$ for all $j \in \{1, \dots, i-1\}$. Since $c_i \cdot \alpha_i$ does not have d_j as an input or output state, and because $\mathbf{e}_i - \mathbf{e}_{i-1} = \{c_i s_i\}$ is 0 on d_j (since $s_i \notin \{d_1, \dots, d_{i-1}\}$), it follows that $\mathbf{z}_{m,i}(d_j) = 0$ for all $j \in \{1, \dots, i-1\}$. By induction hypothesis 3, $\mathbf{z}_{m,i-1}(d_i) = c_i$, and since $c_i \alpha_i$ consumes exactly c_i copies of d_i , this shows that $\mathbf{z}_{m,i}(d_i) = 0$, establishing the inductive case for 1.

Induction hypothesis 2 implies that $p_{m,i-1}$ is a valid transition sequence for $\mathbf{x}_m + \mathbf{e}_i$, since it is valid for $\mathbf{x}_m + \mathbf{e}_{i-1}$ by the hypothesis and $\mathbf{x}_m + \mathbf{e}_i \geq \mathbf{x}_m + \mathbf{e}_{i-1}$. We must show that all of $p_{m,i}$ is valid for $\mathbf{x}_m + \mathbf{e}_i$ by showing the final $c_i \cdot \alpha_i$ transitions on $p_{m,i}$, which apply to configuration $\mathbf{z}_{m,i-1}(d_i)$,

are valid. By induction hypothesis 3, there is sufficient count of d_i to apply the transitions. By the fact that $\mathbf{e}_i - \mathbf{e}_{i-1} = \{c_i s_i\}$, there is sufficient count of the other input state s_i to apply the transitions. This establishes the inductive case for 2.

Let $j \in \{i, \dots, k\}$. Induction hypothesis 3 gives that $\mathbf{z}_{m,i-1}(d_j) = \mathbf{y}_m(d_j) + \mathbf{o}_{i-1}(d_j)$. $\mathbf{o}_i(d_j) - \mathbf{o}_{i-1}(d_j)$ is 0 if d_j is not an output state of α_i , is c_i if d_j is exactly one output state, and is $2c_i$ if d_j is both output states. Thus after applying c_i copies of α_i to $\mathbf{z}_{m,i-1}$ to result in configuration $\mathbf{z}_{m,i}$, we have increased the count of d_j by exactly $\mathbf{o}_i(d_j) - \mathbf{o}_{i-1}(d_j)$, resulting in $\mathbf{z}_{m,i}(d_j) = \mathbf{y}_m(d_j) + \mathbf{o}_{i-1}(d_j) + (\mathbf{o}_i(d_j) - \mathbf{o}_{i-1}(d_j)) = \mathbf{y}_m(d_j) + \mathbf{o}_i(d_j)$, proving the inductive case for 3.

Since inductive case 1 for the final value k shows that, for all $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, $\mathbf{z}_{m,k}(d_j) = \mathbf{z}_m^\Gamma(d_j) = 0$, this proves that $\mathbf{z}_m^\Gamma \in \mathbb{N}^\Gamma$. \square

Intuitively, Claim 5.2 below works toward generating the vector of states \mathbf{e} that we needed for Claim 5.1. The vector \mathbf{e} can be split into the Δ component and the Γ component; we will handle the Γ component later. The “cost” for Claim 5.2 is that the path must be taken “in the context” of additional agents in states captured by \mathbf{p} . Importantly, the net effect of the path preserves \mathbf{p} , which will give us a way to “interleave” Claims 5.1 and 5.2 as shown in Claim 5.3.

Claim 5.2. *For all $\mathbf{e}^\Delta \in \mathbb{N}^\Delta$, there is $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{N}^\Delta$, such that for all large enough m , there is $\mathbf{w}_m^\Gamma \in \mathbb{N}^\Gamma$, such that $\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{x}_m \implies \mathbf{p} + \mathbf{w}_m^\Gamma + \mathbf{e}^\Delta$, and $\text{unbdd}(\mathbf{w}_m^\Gamma) = \Gamma$.*

Proof. Recall that $\mathbf{x}_m \implies_{p_m} \mathbf{y}_m$ and p_m does not contain an m -bottleneck. Intuitively, we will try to modify p_m so that in the end we get exactly \mathbf{e}^Δ of Δ . As in the proof of Claim 5.1, we will use the fact that p_m does not contain an m -bottleneck and Lemma 4.5 to find transitions affecting Δ in a non-circular manner. However, unlike in Claim 5.1, we cannot simply consume an additional $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{N}^\Delta$ to ensure that the count of the “other input state s_i ” does not become negative. Rather, to increase the amounts of s_i we will remove certain transition instances originally in p_m . It turns out that even with removing transitions, our modification to p_m may still *temporarily* take certain species negative if we start from \mathbf{x}_m . However, executing the path in the context of \mathbf{p} provides “buffer room” to ensure that no counts ever go below zero.

More formally, as in the proof of Claim 5.1 (see Appendix) apply Lemma 4.5 with $b_2 = m$ and let b_1 be the largest count of any species in Δ anywhere in the sequence (\mathbf{y}_m) . The lower bound on $b_2 = m$ is determined below (“bound on the amount of fixing”). Lemma 4.5 tells us that there is an ordering on Δ , so that we can write $\Delta = \{d_1, \dots, d_k\}$, such that for each $1 \leq i \leq k$, there is a transition $\alpha_i : d_i, s_i \rightarrow o_i, o'_i$ such that $d_i \in \Delta$ and $s_i, o_i, o'_i \notin \{d_1, \dots, d_i\}$, and α_i occurs at least $(b_2 - |\Lambda| \cdot b_1)/|\Lambda|^2$ times in p_m . Note that the final condition was not necessary to prove Claim 5.1 since its proof only added transitions to p_m . However, since this proof removes transitions as well, we require the condition to ensure that there are sufficiently many existing instances to be removed.

We iteratively fix the counts of states in Δ one by one, in the ordering given, i.e. we first adjust p_m to fix d_1 , then we fix d_2 (while showing that the fixing of d_2 cannot affect the count of d_1 in any configuration, so it remains fixed), etc. We start with $\mathbf{e}_0^\Delta(s) = \mathbf{y}_m(s)$ for $s \in \Delta$ and $\mathbf{e}_0^\Delta(s) = 0$ for $s \in \Gamma$, and $\mathbf{w}_{m,0}^\Gamma(s) = \mathbf{y}_m(s)$ for $s \in \Gamma$ and $\mathbf{w}_{m,0}^\Gamma(s) = 0$ for $s \in \Delta$. Having fixed d_1, \dots, d_{i-1} , and obtaining new $\mathbf{e}_{i-1}^\Delta, \mathbf{w}_{m,i-1}^\Gamma$ (which could now be negative) such that \mathbf{e}_{i-1}^Δ agrees with the desired \mathbf{e}^Δ over d_1, \dots, d_{i-1} , we process d_i as follows. If $\delta_i = \mathbf{e}^\Delta(d_i) - \mathbf{e}_{i-1}^\Delta(d_i) < 0$: add δ_i instances of transition α_i at the end of the transition sequence. If $\delta_i > 0$: remove δ_i instances of α_i where they occur in the transition sequence; property (3) ensures that q contains enough instances of α_i (see below). Let \mathbf{e}_i^Δ be the counts of the species in Δ at the end of this path. By property (2) and (3), adding or removing instances of α_i affects only the counts of states in Γ and d_{i+1}, \dots, d_k . Since we fix these counts in the prescribed order, when we are done, the counts of each d_i is equal to its count in \mathbf{e}^Δ (ie $\mathbf{e}^\Delta = \mathbf{e}_k^\Delta$), while counts of elements of Γ have been altered (letting $\mathbf{w}_m^\Gamma = \mathbf{w}_{m,k}^\Gamma$).

We now claim that for large enough m , $\mathbf{w}_{m,k}^\Gamma$ is nonnegative, and that \mathbf{p} can be independent of m . Finally, we derive a bound on the number of transition instances that we may need to remove, which determines another bound on m (ie b_2) to ensure that there are enough instances by property (4) above.

Note that the amount of fixing we need to do only depends on the desired \mathbf{e}^Δ as well as on the counts of Δ states in \mathbf{y}_m . Because \mathbf{y}_m are nondecreasing, and $\Delta = \text{bdd}(\mathbf{y}_m)$, for large enough m , the counts of Δ states in \mathbf{y}_m stop changing, and the amount of fixing depends only on the desired \mathbf{e}^Δ . This implies that the \mathbf{p} we need to add to ensure that no counts go negative can be independent of m . Further, for large enough m , the difference between \mathbf{w}_m^Γ and \mathbf{y}_m is independent of m , and thus $\text{unbdd}(\mathbf{w}_m^\Gamma) = \text{unbdd}(\mathbf{y}_m) = \Gamma$. This also implies that for large enough m , $\mathbf{w}_{m,k}^\Gamma$ is nonnegative.

Bound on the amount of fixing: Let $c_b = \max_{m \in \mathbb{N}, d \in \Delta} |\mathbf{y}_m(d) - \mathbf{e}^\Delta(d)|$ be the maximum amount that any state in Δ deviates from its desired count. We add or remove at most $|\delta_1| \leq c_b$ instances of α_1 , which affects the count of states in $\Gamma \cup \{d_2, \dots, d_k\}$ by at most $2c_b$ (it could be 2 per transition if the transition is $\alpha_1 : d_1, s \rightarrow s', s'$ for some state $s' \in \Lambda$). Thus, $|\delta_2| \leq c_b + 2|\delta_1|$ (the original c_b error plus the additional error from altering the number of α_1 transitions). In general, $|\delta_i| \leq c_b + 2(|\delta_1| + \dots + |\delta_{i-1}|) \leq 3^{i-1}c_b$. Thus if we let $m = b_2 \geq k \cdot b_1 + 3^{k-1}c_b|\Lambda|^2$, we will have enough transition instances by property (4) to remove $((b_2 - |\Lambda| \cdot b_1)/|\Lambda|^2 = 3^{i-1}c_b)$. \square

Claim 5.3. *For infinitely many $\mathbf{i} \in I$, $\mathbf{i} \implies \mathbf{v}^\Gamma$ where $\mathbf{v}^\Gamma \in \mathbb{N}^\Gamma$.*

Proof. By the hypothesis of Theorem 3.7, there are infinitely many pairs $\mathbf{i}_1, \mathbf{i}_2 \in I$ such that $\mathbf{i} = \mathbf{i}_1 + \mathbf{i}_2 \in I$. Let m_1, m_2 be such that $\mathbf{i}_1 \implies \mathbf{x}_{m_1}$ and $\mathbf{i}_2 \implies \mathbf{x}_{m_2}$, hence $\mathbf{i} \implies \mathbf{x}_{m_1} + \mathbf{x}_{m_2}$; choose m_1 and m_2 large enough to satisfy the conditions stated below as they are needed. By Claim 5.1 (with \mathbf{x}_{m_1}), there is $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{N}^\Lambda$, and $\mathbf{z}^\Gamma \in \mathbb{N}^\Gamma$ such that $\mathbf{x}_{m_1} + \mathbf{e} \implies_{p_{m_1}} \mathbf{z}^\Gamma$. Write \mathbf{e} as $\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{e}^\Delta + \mathbf{e}^\Gamma$ where $\mathbf{e}^\Delta \in \mathbb{N}^\Delta$ and $\mathbf{e}^\Gamma \in \mathbb{N}^\Gamma$. Then apply Claim 5.2 (with \mathbf{x}_{m_2}) on \mathbf{e}^Δ (making sure m_2 is large enough to satisfy the claim on \mathbf{e}^Δ). Thus, there is $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{N}^\Lambda$ and $\mathbf{w}^\Gamma \in \mathbb{N}^\Gamma$ such that $\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{x}_{m_2} \implies_{p_{m_1}} \mathbf{p} + \mathbf{w}^\Gamma + \mathbf{e}^\Delta$. If m_1 is large enough that $\mathbf{x}_{m_1} \geq \mathbf{p}$, then $\mathbf{x}_{m_1} + \mathbf{x}_{m_2} \implies_{p_{m_2}} \mathbf{x}_{m_1} + \mathbf{w}^\Gamma + \mathbf{e}^\Delta$. If further m_2 is large enough that $\mathbf{w}^\Gamma \geq \mathbf{e}^\Gamma$ (recall $\text{unbdd}(\mathbf{w}^\Gamma) = \Gamma$), then we can rewrite the right hand side as $\mathbf{x}_{m_1} + (\mathbf{w}^\Gamma - \mathbf{e}^\Gamma) + \mathbf{e}$. Then, by Claim 5.1, $\mathbf{x}_{m_1} + (\mathbf{w}_m^\Gamma - \mathbf{e}^\Gamma) + \mathbf{e} \implies_{p_{m_1}} (\mathbf{w}^\Gamma - \mathbf{e}^\Gamma) + \mathbf{z}^\Gamma$. Since the right hand side is only over Γ , we let $\mathbf{v}^\Gamma = (\mathbf{w}^\Gamma - \mathbf{e}^\Gamma) + \mathbf{z}^\Gamma$. \square

Note that $\mathbf{v}^\Gamma \leq \mathbf{y}_{m'}$ for sufficiently large m' , by the definition of Γ . Since stability is closed downward (subsets of a Q -stable configuration are Q -stable), $\mathbf{v}^\Gamma \in Y_{I,Q} \cap \mathbb{N}^\Gamma$, proving Theorem 3.7.

Acknowledgements. The authors thank Anne Condon and Monir Hajiaghayi for several insightful discussions. We also thank the attendees of the 2014 Workshop on Programming Chemical Reaction Networks at the Banff International Research Station, where the first incursions were made into the solution of the problem of PP stable leader election.

References

- [1] Dana Angluin, James Aspnes, Zoë Diamadi, Michael Fischer, and René Peralta. Computation in networks of passively mobile finite-state sensors. *Distributed Computing*, 18:235–253, 2006. Preliminary version appeared in PODC 2004.
- [2] Dana Angluin, James Aspnes, Zoë Diamadi, Michael J. Fischer, and René Peralta. Urn automata. Technical Report YALEU/DCS/TR-1280, Yale University, November 2003.

- [3] Dana Angluin, James Aspnes, and David Eisenstat. Fast computation by population protocols with a leader. *Distributed Computing*, 21(3):183–199, September 2008. Preliminary version appeared in DISC 2006.
- [4] Dana Angluin, James Aspnes, David Eisenstat, and Eric Ruppert. The computational power of population protocols. *Distributed Computing*, 20(4):279–304, 2007.
- [5] Dana Angluin, James Aspnes, Michael J Fischer, and Hong Jiang. Self-stabilizing population protocols. In *Principles of Distributed Systems*, pages 103–117. Springer, 2006.
- [6] James M Bower and Hamid Bolouri. *Computational modeling of genetic and biochemical networks*. MIT press, 2004.
- [7] Ho-Lin Chen, Rachel Cummings, David Doty, and David Soloveichik. Speed faults in computation by chemical reaction networks. In *DISC 2014: Proceedings of the 28th International Symposium on Distributed Computing, Austin, TX, USA, October 12-15, 2014*, pages 16–30, 2014.
- [8] Ho-Lin Chen, David Doty, and David Soloveichik. Deterministic function computation with chemical reaction networks. *Natural Computing*, 13(4):517–534, 2014. Preliminary version appeared in DNA 2012.
- [9] Yuan-Jyue Chen, Neil Dalchau, Niranjana Srinivas, Andrew Phillips, Luca Cardelli, David Soloveichik, and Georg Seelig. Programmable chemical controllers made from DNA. *Nature Nanotechnology*, 8(10):755–762, 2013.
- [10] Inês Cunha-Ferreira, Inês Bento, and Mónica Bettencourt-Dias. From zero to many: control of centriole number in development and disease. *Traffic*, 10(5):482–498, 2009.
- [11] Leonard E. Dickson. Finiteness of the odd perfect and primitive abundant numbers with n distinct prime factors. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 35(4):413–422, October 1913.
- [12] David Doty. Timing in chemical reaction networks. In *SODA 2014: Proceedings of the 25th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 772–784, January 2014.
- [13] Daniel T. Gillespie. Exact stochastic simulation of coupled chemical reactions. *Journal of Physical Chemistry*, 81(25):2340–2361, 1977.
- [14] Richard M Karp and Raymond E Miller. Parallel program schemata. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 3(2):147–195, 1969.
- [15] Carl A Petri. Communication with automata. Technical report, DTIC Document, 1966.
- [16] David Soloveichik, Georg Seelig, and Erik Winfree. DNA as a universal substrate for chemical kinetics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 107(12):5393, 2010. Preliminary version appeared in DNA 2008.
- [17] Vito Volterra. Variazioni e fluttuazioni del numero dindividui in specie animali conviventi. *Mem. Acad. Lincei Roma*, 2:31–113, 1926.