

On implementing SWMR registers from SWSR registers in systems with Byzantine failures

Xing Hu Sam Toueg

Department of Computer Science, University of Toronto, Canada

Abstract

The implementation of registers from (potentially) weaker registers is a classical problem in the theory of distributed computing. Since Lamport’s pioneering work [13], this problem has been extensively studied in the context of asynchronous processes with crash failures. In this paper, we investigate this problem in the context of Byzantine process failures, with and without process signatures.

We first prove that, without signatures, there is no wait-free linearizable implementation of a 1-writer n -reader register from atomic 1-writer 1-reader registers. In fact, we show a stronger result, namely, even under the assumption that the writer can only crash and at most one reader can be malicious, there is no linearizable implementation of a 1-writer n -reader register from atomic 1-writer $(n - 1)$ -reader registers that ensures that every correct process eventually completes its operations.

In light of this impossibility result, we give two implementations of a 1-writer n -reader register from atomic 1-writer 1-reader registers that work under different assumptions. The first implementation is linearizable (under any combination of process failures), but it guarantees that every correct process eventually completes its operations only under the assumption that the writer is correct or no reader is malicious — thus matching the impossibility result. The second implementation assumes process signatures; it is bounded wait-free and linearizable under any combination of process failures.

Finally, we show that without process signatures, even if we assume that the writer is correct and at most one of the readers can be malicious, it is impossible to guarantee that every correct reader completes each read operation in a *bounded* number of steps.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation → Distributed computing models; Theory of computation → Distributed algorithms

Keywords and phrases distributed computing, concurrency, linearizability, shared registers

1 Introduction

We consider the basic problem of implementing a single-writer *multi*-reader register from atomic single-writer *single*-reader registers in a system where processes are subject to *Byzantine failures*. In particular, (1) we give an implementation that works under some failure assumptions, and (2) we prove a matching impossibility result for the case when these assumptions do not hold. We also consider systems where processes can use unforgeable signatures, and give an implementation that works for any number of faulty processes. We now describe our motivation and results in detail.

1.1 Motivation

Implementing shared registers from weaker primitives is a fundamental problem that has been thoroughly studied in distributed computing [2, 3, 4, 8, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21]. In particular, it is well-known that in systems where processes are subject to *crash* failures, it is possible to implement a m -writer n -reader register (henceforth denoted $[m, n]$ -register) from atomic 1-writer 1-reader registers (denoted $[1, 1]$ -registers).

In this paper, we consider the problem of implementing *multi*-reader registers from *single*-reader registers in systems where processes are subject to *Byzantine* failures. In particular,

we consider the following basic questions:

- Is it possible to implement a $[1, n]$ -register from atomic $[1, 1]$ -registers in systems with Byzantine processes?
- If so, under which assumption(s) such an implementation exist?

The above questions are also motivated by the growing interest in shared-memory or hybrid systems where processes are subject to Byzantine failures. For example, Cohen and Keidar [5] give f -resilient implementations of several objects (namely, *reliable broadcast*, *atomic snapshot*, and *asset transfer* objects) using atomic $[1, n]$ -registers in systems with Byzantine failures where at most $f < n/2$ processes are faulty. As another example, Aguilera *et al.* use atomic $[1, n]$ -registers to solve some agreement problems in hybrid systems with Byzantine process failures [1]. Moreover, Mostéfaoui *et al.* [14] prove that, in *message-passing* systems with Byzantine process failures, there is a f -resilient implementation of a $[1, n]$ -register if and only if at most $f < n/3$ processes are faulty.

1.2 Description of the results

In this section, when we write “implementation”, we mean an implementation that is both: (a) “safe”, i.e., it is linearizable [5, 10, 14], and (b) “live”, i.e., it ensures that every correct process eventually completes its operations (possibly under some failure assumptions).

To simplify the exposition of our results, we first state them in terms of two process groups: *correct* processes that do not fail and *faulty* ones. We show that in a system with Byzantine failures the following matching impossibility and possibility results hold. For all $n \geq 3$:

- (A) If the writer *and* some readers (even if only one reader) can be faulty, then there is no implementation of a $[1, n]$ -register from atomic $[1, n - 1]$ -registers.
- (B) If the writer *or* some readers (any number of readers), but *not both*, can be faulty, then there is an implementation of a $[1, n]$ -register from atomic $[1, 1]$ -registers.

Note that result (A) implies that there is no *wait-free* implementation of a $[1, n]$ -register from atomic $[1, n - 1]$ -registers.¹

This simple version of the results, however, leaves some questions open. One reason is because these results do not distinguish between the different types of faulty processes (recall that Byzantine failures encompass all the possible failure behaviours, from simple crash to “malicious” behaviour). For example we may ask: what happens if we can assume that some processes (say the writer) are subject to crash failures *only*, while some other processes (say the readers) can fail in “malicious” ways? Is an implementation of a $[1, n]$ -register from atomic $[1, 1]$ -registers now possible?

To answer this and similar questions, we partition processes into *three* separate groups: (a) those that do not fail, called *correct* processes, (b) those that fail *only* by crashing, and (c) those that fail in any other way, called *malicious* processes. In systems with a mix of such process failures, we prove the following:

- (1) For all $n \geq 3$, there is no implementation \mathcal{I}_n of a $[1, n]$ -register from atomic $[1, n - 1]$ -registers, even if we assume that the writer can only crash and at most one of the readers can be malicious.

In fact, we show that this impossibility result holds even if *every* reader is given atomic $[1, n]$ -registers that it can write and *all* processes can read, and the writer is the only process that does not have atomic $[1, n]$ -registers.

Note that the above results consider safety and liveness as an *indivisible* requirement of a register implementation. But it could be useful to consider each requirement separately. For example, what happens if we want to implement a $[1, n]$ -register with the following properties: (a) it is *always* safe (i.e., linearizable) and (b) it may lose its liveness (i.e., it may

¹ Recall that a wait-free implementation guarantees that every correct process eventually completes its operations, *regardless of the execution speeds or failures of the other processes* [9].

block some read or write operations) *only if* some specific “pattern/types” of failures occur? We prove that in systems with a mix of process failures:

- (2) For all $n \geq 3$, there is an implementation \mathcal{I}_n of a $[1, n]$ -register from atomic $[1, 1]$ -registers such that:
- \mathcal{I}_n is linearizable, and
 - In every run of \mathcal{I}_n where the writer is correct or no reader is malicious, every correct process completes all its operations.

So this register implementation is linearizable regardless of which processes fail and how they fail, i.e., it is always “safe”. But it guarantees “liveness” only if the writer is correct or no reader is malicious. If the writer is correct, it tolerates any number of malicious readers.

Note that (1) and (2) are matching impossibility and possibility results. They imply the simpler results (A) and (B) that we stated earlier for processes that are coarsely characterized as either correct or faulty.

If we assume that the writer is correct, the linearizable implementation of result (2) above ensures that every correct reader completes each read in a *finite* number of steps. This raises the question of whether, if we assume that the writer is correct, there is a linearizable implementation such that every reader completes each read in a *bounded* number of steps. We prove that the answer is “No”. More precisely:

- (3) For all $n \geq 3$, even if we assume that the writer is correct and at most one reader can be malicious, there is *no* linearizable implementation of a $[1, n]$ -register from atomic $[1, n - 1]$ -registers that ensures that every correct reader completes every read in a *bounded* number of steps.

The above results are for the case that the implemented register has at least $n = 3$ readers. For the special case that $n = 2$, we give a simple implementation of a $[1, 2]$ -register from atomic $[1, 1]$ -registers that is *bounded wait-free*: all correct processes are guaranteed to complete their operations in a bounded number of steps regardless of which processes fail and how they fail.

We also consider the problem of implementing a $[1, n]$ -register from atomic $[1, 1]$ -registers in systems where processes are subject to Byzantine failures, but they can use *unforgeable signatures*. In sharp contrast to the impossibility result (1), we show that with signatures for all $n \geq 2$, there is an implementation of $[1, n]$ -register from atomic $[1, 1]$ -registers that is bounded wait-free.

We conclude the paper with a result about implementations from *regular* registers [13]. Recall that, in contrast to atomic registers, regular registers allow “new-old” inversions in the values that processes read. It is well-known that in systems with crash failures, it is easy to implement a *wait-free* linearizable $[1, n]$ -register from regular $[1, n]$ -registers. Here we show that in systems with Byzantine failures, such an implementation is impossible: for $n \geq 3$, even if we assume that the writer can only crash and at most one reader can be malicious, there is *no* linearizable implementation of a $[1, n]$ -register from regular $[1, n]$ -registers² that ensures that every correct process eventually completes its operations.

2 Result techniques

The techniques that we used to obtain our main possibility and impossibility results are also a significant contribution of this paper.

To prove the impossibility result (1), one cannot use a standard partitioning argument: all the processes except the writer are given atomic $[1, n]$ -registers that all processes can read, and the writer is given a $[1, n - 1]$ -register that all the readers except one can read; thus it is clear that the system cannot be partitioned.

² So all processes, *including the writer*, are given regular registers that all the n readers can read.

So to prove this result we use an interesting *reductio ad absurdum* technique. Starting from an alleged implementation of $[1, n]$ -register from $[1, n - 1]$ -registers, we consider a run where the implemented register is initialized to 0, the writer completes a write of 1, and then a reader reads 1. By leveraging the facts that: (1) in each step the writer can read or write only $[1, n - 1]$ -registers, (2) the writer may crash, (3) one of the readers may be malicious, and (4) there are at least 3 readers, we are able to successively remove every read or write step of the writer (one by one, starting from its last step) in a way that maintains the property that some correct reader reads 1 and at most one reader in the run is malicious. As we successively remove the steps of the writer, the identity of the reader that reads 1, and the identity of the reader that may be malicious, keep changing. By continuing this process, we end up with a run in which the writer takes no steps, and yet a correct reader reads 1.

Note that this proof is reminiscent of the impossibility proof for the “Two generals’ Problem” in message-passing systems [7]. In that proof, one leverages the possibility of message losses to successively remove one message at a time. The proof given here is much more elaborate because it leverages the subtle interaction between crash *and* malicious failures that may occur at different processes.

For the matching possibility result (2), we solve the problem of implementing a $[1, n]$ -register from $[1, 1]$ -registers with a *recursive* algorithm: intuitively, we first give an algorithm to implement a $[1, n]$ -register using $[1, n - 1]$ -registers, rather than only $[1, 1]$ -registers, and then recurse till $n = 2$. We do so because the recursive step of implementing a $[1, n]$ -register using $[1, n - 1]$ -registers is significantly easier than implementing a $[1, n]$ -register using only $[1, 1]$ -registers. This is explained in more detail in Section 5.1.

3 Model Sketch

We consider systems with asynchronous processes that communicate via single-writer registers and are subject to Byzantine failures. Recall that a single-writer n -reader register is denoted as a $[1, n]$ -register; the n readers are distinct from the writer.

3.1 Process failures

A process that is subject to Byzantine failures can behave arbitrarily. In particular, it may deviate from the algorithm it is supposed to execute, or just stop this execution prematurely, i.e., crash. To distinguish between these two types of failures, we partition processes as follows:

- Processes that do not fail, i.e., *correct* processes.
- Processes that fail, i.e., *faulty* processes. Faulty processes are divided into two groups:
 - processes that just *crash*, and
 - the remaining processes, which we call *malicious*.

3.2 Atomic and implemented registers

A register is *atomic* if its read and write operations are *instantaneous* (i.e., indivisible); each read must return the value of the last write that precedes it, or the initial value of the register if no such write exists.

Roughly speaking, the *implementation* of a register from a set of “base” registers is given by read/write procedures that each process can execute to read/write the implemented register; these procedures can access the given base registers (which, intuitively, may be less “powerful” than the implemented register). So each operation on an implemented register *spans an interval* that starts with an *invocation* (a procedure call) and completes with a corresponding *response* (a value returned by the procedure). Note that a process executes steps of a register implementation only when it executes its *own* operations on the register, i.e., only within

the intervals of these operations.

3.3 Implementation liveness properties

All the register implementations that we consider satisfy the following liveness property:

► **Definition 1 (Termination).** *Every correct process completes every operation in a finite number of its own steps.*

As we will see, termination may rely on some failure assumptions. For example, the register implementation that we give in Section 5.4 (Algorithm 1, Theorem 48) satisfies the Termination property under the assumption that either the writer is correct or no reader is malicious. In contrast to the Termination property, *wait-freedom* and *bounded wait-freedom* are liveness properties that do not rely on any failure assumptions [9]:

► **Definition 2 (Wait-freedom).** *Every correct process completes every operation in a finite number of its own steps, regardless of the execution speeds or failures of the other processes.*³

► **Definition 3 (Bounded wait-freedom).** *Every correct process completes every operation in a bounded number of its own steps, regardless of the execution speeds or failures of the other processes.*

3.4 Linearizability of register implementations

Roughly speaking, linearizability requires that every operation on an implemented object appears as if it took effect instantaneously at some point (the “linearization point”) in its execution interval [10].⁴ As noted by [5, 14], however, the precise definition of linearizability depends on whether we assume that processes can only crash (as it was assumed in [10]), or they can also fail in a “Byzantine way”. We now explain this for the special case of *register* implementations.

In systems with only crash failures. It is well-known that a *single-writer multi-reader* register implementation is linearizable if and only if it satisfies two simple properties: intuitively, (1) every read operation reads the value written by a concurrent or immediately preceding write operation, and (2) there are no “new-old” inversions in the values read. To define these properties precisely, we first define what it means for two operations to be concurrent or for one to precede the other.

► **Definition 4.** *Let o and o' be any two operations.*

- o precedes o' if the response of o occurs before the invocation of o' .
- o is concurrent with o' if neither precedes the other.

We say that a write operation w *immediately precedes* a read operation r if w precedes r , and there is no write operation w' such that w precedes w' and w' precedes r .

Let v_0 be the *initial value* of the implemented register, and v_k be the value written by the k -th write operation of the writer w of the implemented register (this is well-defined because each process, including the writer, applies its operations sequentially).

► **Definition 5 (Register Linearizability).** *In a system with crash failures, an implementation of a $[1, n]$ -register is linearizable if and only if it satisfies the following two properties:*

³ In a preliminary version of this paper [11], an implementation that satisfies the Termination property (under some failure assumption) was said to be wait-free (under this failure assumption). In particular, the register implementation given in Section 5.4 was said to be wait-free under the assumption that the writer is correct or no reader is malicious. But this use of the term “wait-free” is not conventional and can be misleading. Here we reserve the term “wait-free” for implementations that satisfy the Termination property *unconditionally*, as in [9].

⁴ Linearizable (implementations of) registers, however, are *not* equivalent to atomic registers. In fact, Golab, Higham and Woelfel have shown that with a strong adversary, some randomized algorithms that “work correctly” under the assumption that processes use atomic registers, do not work if they use linearizable register implementations instead of atomic registers [6].

- **Property 1** [Reading a “current” value] *If a read operation R returns the value v then:*
 - *there is a write v operation that immediately precedes R or is concurrent with R , or*
 - *$v = v_0$ and no write operation precedes R .*
- **Property 2** [No “new-old” inversion] *If two read operations R and R' return values v_k and $v_{k'}$, respectively, and R precedes R' , then $k \leq k'$.*

In systems with Byzantine failures. The above definitions do not quite work for systems with Byzantine failures. For example, it is not clear what it means for a writer w of an implemented register to “write a value v ” if w is malicious, i.e., if w *deviates* from the write procedure that it is supposed to execute; similarly, if a reader r is malicious it is not clear what it means for r to “read a value v ”. The definition of linearizability for systems with Byzantine failures avoids the above issues by restricting the linearization requirements to processes that are *not* malicious. More precisely:

► **Definition 6** (Register Linearizability). *In a system with Byzantine process failures, an implementation of a $[1, n]$ -register is linearizable if and only if the following holds. If the writer is not malicious, then:*

- **Property 1** [Reading a “current” value] *If a read operation R by a process that is not malicious returns the value v then:*
 - *there is a write v operation that immediately precedes R or is concurrent with R , or*
 - *$v = v_0$ and no write operation precedes R .*
- **Property 2** [No “new-old” inversion] *If two read operations R and R' by processes that are not malicious return values v_k and $v_{k'}$, respectively, and R precedes R' , then $k \leq k'$.*

Note that if the writer is correct or only crashes, then readers that are correct or only crash are required to read “current” values and also avoid “new-old” inversions. So in systems where faulty processes can only crash, Definition 6 reduces to Definition 5.

Cohen and Keidar were the first to define linearizability for *arbitrary* objects in systems with Byzantine failures [5], and their definition generalizes the definition of *register* linearizability in such systems given by Mostéfaoui *et al.* in [14]. Definition 6 above (which is also for register linearizability) is consistent with both.⁵

4 Impossibility result

We now prove that there is no wait-free linearizable implementation of a $[1, n]$ -register from atomic $[1, n - 1]$ -registers. In fact, we show a stronger result: even under the assumption that the writer can only crash and at most one reader can be malicious, there is no linearizable implementation of a $[1, n]$ -register from atomic $[1, n - 1]$ -registers that ensures that every correct process eventually completes its operations.

► **Theorem 7.** *For all $n \geq 3$, in a system with $n+1$ processes that are subject to Byzantine failures, there is no linearizable implementation of a $[1, n]$ -register from atomic $[1, n - 1]$ -registers that satisfies the Termination property, even if we assume that the writer of the implemented $[1, n]$ -register can only crash and at most one reader can be malicious.*

Proof. Let $n \geq 3$. Suppose, for contradiction, that there is an implementation \mathcal{I} of a $[1, n]$ -register \mathbf{R} from atomic $[1, n - 1]$ -registers that is linearizable (i.e., it satisfies the Register Linearizability property) and ensures that all correct processes complete their operations (i.e., it satisfies the Termination property), under the assumption that the writer w of \mathbf{R} can only crash and at most one of the n readers of \mathbf{R} can be malicious.

⁵ In [5, 14], however, processes that are subject to Byzantine failures are partitioned into only two groups, namely, correct processes and faulty processes. Thus the reader of a register that just crashes is, by definition, faulty. So, as with all other faulty processes, by the linearizability definitions in [5, 14] it is exempt from any requirement, e.g., it is allowed to read a stale value. Definition 3 avoids this by leveraging our subdivision of faulty processes into those that only crash and those that are malicious.




Figure 1 Run A'_m




Figure 2 Run A_m




Figure 3 A run with property P_k




Figure 4 Run A_k




Figure 5 Run B_{k-1}




Figure 6 Run C_{k-1}^r




Figure 7 Run D_{k-1}^r




Figure 8 Run E_{k-1}^r




Figure 9 Run F_{k-1}^r




Figure 10 Run A_1



Figure 11 Run A_0

We now construct a sequence of runs of \mathcal{I} that leads to a contradiction. In all these runs, the initial value of the implemented \mathbf{R} is 0, the writer w invokes only one operation into \mathbf{R} , namely a write of 1, and each reader reads \mathbf{R} at most once (i.e., \mathbf{R} is only a “one-shot” binary register). Moreover, in each of these runs the writer crashes (but it is not malicious) and there is at most one malicious reader; the other $n - 1$ readers are correct. Thus, these runs of \mathcal{I} must satisfy the linearizability Properties 1 and 2 of Register Linearizability (Definition 6), and every correct reader must complete any read operation that it invokes.

► **Definition 8.** *Let s be any step that the writer w takes when executing the implementation \mathcal{I} of \mathbf{R} . Step s is invisible to a reader p if s is either a local step of w , or the reading or the writing of an atomic $[1, n - 1]$ -register that is not readable by p .*

Since there are n readers, and the registers that w can write are atomic $[1, n - 1]$ -registers, every write by w into one of these registers is invisible to one of the readers. So:

► **Observation 9.** *Let s be any step that the writer w takes when executing the implementation \mathcal{I} of \mathbf{R} . Step s is invisible to at least one of the n readers.*

Let A'_m be the following run of \mathcal{I} (see Figure 1):

- The readers do not invoke any read operations, and so they take no steps.
- The writer w invokes an operation to write 1 on \mathbf{R} . By the Termination property of the implementation, it completes this operation in a finite number of steps. During this write operation, w takes a sequence of steps s^1, \dots, s^m such that each s^i is either a local step, or the reading or the writing of an atomic $[1, n - 1]$ -register (s^0 is the invocation step of the write operation, and s^m is the response step of this operation). Let t_w^i be the time when step s^i occurs.
- After the time t_w^m when w completes its write operation, w crashes.

From the run A'_m of \mathcal{I} , it is clear that the following run is also a run of \mathcal{I} (see Figure 2):

• **RUN A_m :**

- The writer w behaves exactly as in A'_m .
- All the readers are correct.
- Let q be a reader such that step s^m is invisible to q (by Observation 9, this reader exists). After the writer w crashes at time t_w^m , q invokes a read operation on \mathbf{R} . By the Termination property of the implementation, q completes its read operation. By the linearizability properties of \mathcal{I} , this read operation on \mathbf{R} returns 1.
- All the other readers do not invoke any read operations, and so they take no steps.

► **Definition 10.** *For every k , $1 \leq k \leq m$, a run of \mathcal{I} has property P_k if the following holds:*

1. *Up to and including time t_w^k , all processes behave exactly as in A_m , that is:*
 - *w takes steps s^0, s^1, \dots, s^k*
 - *All the readers take no steps.*
2. *After taking step s^k at time t_w^k , w crashes before taking further steps.*
3. *There is a reader x that is correct such that step s^k is invisible to x . After time t_w^k , reader x starts and completes a read operation on \mathbf{R} that returns 1.*
4. *There is a reader $y \neq x$ that may be correct or malicious. After time t_w^k , reader y may or may not take steps.*
5. *There is a set Z of $n - 2$ distinct readers other than x and y that are correct and take no steps.*

Note that since $n \geq 3$, the set Z contains at least one reader. Furthermore, all the readers that take steps do so after time t_w^k .

A run of \mathcal{I} with property P_k is shown in Figure 3. In this figure and all the subsequent ones, correct readers are in black font, while the reader that may be malicious is colored **red** (this reader may have taken some steps after time t_w^k , but these are *not* shown in the figure). The “ $\notin x$ ” on top of a step s^i means that s^i is invisible to the reader x . The symbol **✘** indicates where the crash of the writer w occurs.

Note that the run A_m of \mathcal{I} satisfies property P_m : the reader denoted x in property P_m is the reader q of run A_m , the reader y of P_m is an arbitrary reader other than q in A_m , and the set Z of P_m is the set of the remaining $n - 2$ readers in A_m . So we have:

► **Observation 11.** *Run A_m of \mathcal{I} has property P_m .*

▷ **Claim 12.** For every k , $1 \leq k \leq m$, there is a run of \mathcal{I} that has property P_k .

Proof. We prove the claim by a backward induction on k , starting from $k = m$.

Base Case: $k = m$. This follows directly from Observation 11.

Induction Step: Let k be such that $1 < k \leq m$.

• **RUN A_k .** Suppose there is a run A_k of \mathcal{I} that has property P_k (this is the induction hypothesis). We now show that there is a run A_{k-1} of \mathcal{I} that has property P_{k-1} .

Since run A_k of \mathcal{I} satisfies P_k , the following holds in A_k (see Figure 4):

- Up to and including time t_w^k , all processes behave exactly as in A_m .
- After taking step s^k at time t_w^k , w crashes before taking further steps.
- There is a reader q that is correct such that step s^k is invisible to q . After time t_w^k , reader q starts and completes a read operation on \mathbf{R} that returns 1.
- There is a reader $p \neq q$ that may be correct or malicious. After time t_w^k , reader p may or may not take steps.⁶
- There is a set Z of $n-2$ distinct readers other than p and q that are correct and take no steps.

• **RUN B_{k-1} .** From the run A_k of \mathcal{I} we construct the following run B_{k-1} of \mathcal{I} (Figure 5). Intuitively, B_{k-1} is exactly like A_k except that w crashes just before taking step s^k (so B_{k-1} is just A_k with the step s^k “removed”). Run B_{k-1} is possible because: (1) even though p may have “noticed” the removal of step s^k , p may be malicious (all the other readers are correct in this run), and p behaves exactly as in A_k , and (2) q cannot distinguish between A_k and B_{k-1} because s^k is invisible to q , and p and all the readers in Z behave as in A_k ; so q behaves as in A_k , and in particular q reads 1 in B_{k-1} as in A_k .

More precisely in B_{k-1} :

- All processes behave exactly as in A_k up to and including time t_w^{k-1} .
- After taking step s^{k-1} at time t_w^{k-1} , the writer w crashes before taking step s^k .
- All the readers in Z are correct and take no steps, exactly as in A_k .
- p behaves exactly as in A_k . This is possible because even though p may have “noticed” the removal of step s^k , p may be malicious (all the other readers are correct in this run).
- q behaves exactly as in A_k . In particular, after time t_w^k , q starts and completes a read operation on \mathbf{R} that returns 1. This is possible because q cannot distinguish between A_k and B_{k-1} : s^k is invisible to q , and p and all the readers in Z behave exactly as in A_k .

Note that in B_{k-1} all processes behave exactly as in A_m up to and including time t_w^{k-1} .

There are two cases:

Case 1: s^{k-1} is invisible to q . Then B_{k-1} is a run of \mathcal{I} that has the property P_{k-1} , as we wanted to show.

Case 2: s^{k-1} is visible to q . Then, by Observation 9, s^{k-1} is invisible to p or to some $r' \in Z$.

• **RUN C_{k-1}^r .** Let r be any reader in Z . From the run B_{k-1} of \mathcal{I} we construct the following run C_{k-1}^r of \mathcal{I} (Figure 6). C_{k-1}^r is a continuation of B_{k-1} where, after the correct reader q reads 1, malicious p wipes out any trace of the write steps that it may have taken so far, and then correct reader $r \in Z$ reads 1 (this is the only value that r can read, since correct q previously read 1). More precisely:

- C_{k-1}^r is an extension of B_{k-1} : all processes behave exactly as in B_{k-1} up to and including the time when q completes its read operation on \mathbf{R} .

⁶ These steps are not shown in Figure 4.

- All the readers in $Z - \{r\}$ are correct and take no steps⁷.
- After the correct reader q completes its read operation on \mathbf{R} :
 - q takes no steps.
 - p resets all the atomic registers that it can write to their initial values. Process p can do so because it may be malicious (all the other readers are correct in this run). Let t_p^r be the time when p completes all the register resettings.
 - Correct reader r starts a read operation on \mathbf{R} after time t_p^r . It takes no steps before this read. By the Termination property of the implementation, r completes its read operation. Since w is not malicious, and the read operation by correct q precedes the read operation by r and returns 1, by the linearizability of \mathcal{I} , the read operation by correct reader r also returns 1.

Note that in C_{k-1}^r all processes behave exactly as in A_m up to and including time t_w^{k-1} .

• **RUN D_{k-1}^r .** We can now construct the following run D_{k-1}^r of \mathcal{I} (Figure 7). Intuitively, we obtain D_{k-1}^r from C_{k-1}^r by removing all the steps of p . So reader p (which was malicious in C_{k-1}^r) is now a correct process that takes no steps. Despite this removal, q behaves exactly as in C_{k-1}^r because q (which was correct in C_{k-1}^r) may now be malicious. The writer w also behaves exactly as in C_{k-1}^r because it cannot see the removal of p 's steps: they all occur after time t_w^{k-1} . Correct reader r behaves exactly as in C_{k-1}^r because it also cannot see the removal of p 's steps: in both C_{k-1}^r and D_{k-1}^r , r does not “see” any steps of p . So r reads 1 in D_{k-1}^r as in C_{k-1}^r .

More precisely in D_{k-1}^r :

- w behaves exactly as in C_{k-1}^r .
- All the readers in $Z - \{r\}$ are correct and take no steps, as in C_{k-1}^r .
- p is correct and it takes no steps. So all the atomic registers that it can write retain their initial values.
- q behaves exactly as in C_{k-1}^r . This is possible because even though q may have “noticed” the removal of p 's steps, q may be malicious (all the other readers are correct in this run).
- r behaves exactly as in C_{k-1}^r . In particular, after time t_p^r reader r starts and completes a read operation on \mathbf{R} that returns 1. This is possible because r cannot distinguish between C_{k-1}^r and D_{k-1}^r : r cannot see the removal of p 's steps, and q and all the readers in $Z - \{r\}$ behave exactly as in C_{k-1}^r .

Note that in D_{k-1}^r all processes behave exactly as in S up to and including time t_w^{k-1} .

If s^{k-1} is invisible to reader r , it is clear that the run D_{k-1}^r of \mathcal{I} has property P_{k-1} .

Recall that (1) the reader r above is an *arbitrary* reader in Z , and (2) s^{k-1} is invisible to p or to some reader $r' \in Z$. So there are two cases:

Subcase 2a: s^{k-1} is invisible to some reader $r' \in Z$. In the above we proved that the run $D_{k-1}^{r'}$ of \mathcal{I} has property P_{k-1} , as we wanted to show.

Subcase 2b: s^{k-1} is invisible to p .

• **RUN E_{k-1}^r .** We construct the continuation E_{k-1}^r of D_{k-1}^r shown in Figure 8: after r reads 1, malicious process q wipes out any trace of the write steps that it has taken so far, and then correct reader p starts a read operation on \mathbf{R} . By the Termination property of the implementation, this read operation by p must complete. Since correct r previously read 1, by the linearizability of \mathcal{I} , p must also read 1.

More precisely in E_{k-1}^r :

- E_{k-1}^r is an extension of the run D_{k-1}^r : all processes behave exactly as in D_{k-1}^r up to and including the time when r completes its read operation on \mathbf{R} .
- All the readers in $Z - \{r\}$ are correct and take no steps, as in D_{k-1}^r .
- After the correct reader r completes its read operation on \mathbf{R} :
 - r takes no steps.

⁷ If $n = 3$, then the set $Z - \{r\}$ is empty.

- q resets all the atomic registers that it can write to their initial values. Process q can do so because it may be malicious (all the other readers are correct in this run). Let t_q^r be the time when q completes all the register resettings.
- Correct reader p starts a read operation on \mathbf{R} after time t_q^r . It takes no steps before this read. By the Termination property of the implementation, p completes its read operation. Since w is not malicious, and the read operation by correct r precedes the read operation by p and returns 1, by the linearizability of \mathcal{I} , the read operation by correct reader p also returns 1.

Note that in E_{k-1}^r all processes behave exactly as in A_m up to and including time t_w^{k-1} .

• **RUN F_{k-1}^r .** Finally, we construct the run F_{k-1}^r of \mathcal{I} by removing all the steps of q from E_{k-1}^r (see Figure 9); so q (which was malicious in E_{k-1}^r) is now a correct process that takes no steps. Despite this removal, r behaves exactly as in E_{k-1}^r because r (which was correct in E_{k-1}^r) may now be malicious. The writer w also behaves exactly as in E_{k-1}^r because it cannot see the removal of q 's steps: they all occur after time t_w^{k-1} . Finally, correct p behaves exactly as in E_{k-1}^r because it also cannot see the removal of q 's steps: in both E_{k-1}^r and F_{k-1}^r , p does not “see” any steps of q . So p reads 1 in F_{k-1}^r as in E_{k-1}^r .

More precisely in F_{k-1}^r :

- w behaves exactly as in E_{k-1}^r .
- All the readers in $Z - \{r\}$ are correct and take no steps, as in E_{k-1}^r .
- q is correct and it takes no steps. So all the atomic registers that it can write retain their initial values.
- r behaves exactly as in E_{k-1}^r . This is possible because even though r may have “noticed” the removal of q 's steps, r may be malicious (all the other readers are correct in this run).
- p behaves exactly as in E_{k-1}^r . In particular, after time t_q^r reader p starts and completes a read operation on \mathbf{R} that returns 1. This is possible because p cannot distinguish between E_{k-1}^r and F_{k-1}^r : p cannot see the removal of q 's steps, and r and all the readers in $Z - \{r\}$ behave exactly as in E_{k-1}^r .

Note that in F_{k-1}^r all processes behave exactly as in A_m up to and including time t_w^{k-1} .

Since s^{k-1} is invisible to p , it is clear that the run F_{k-1}^r of \mathcal{I} has property P_{k-1} .

The above concludes the proof of the Induction Step of Claim 12: we proved that, in all possible cases, there is a run of \mathcal{I} that has property P_{k-1} , as we needed to show. ◀

By the Claim 12 that we just proved, the implementation \mathcal{I} of \mathbf{R} has a run A_1 with property P_1 . By this property, the following holds in A_1 (see Figure 10):

- Up to and including time t_w^1 , all processes behave exactly as in A_m .
- After taking step s^1 at time t_w^1 , w crashes before taking further steps.
- There is a reader q that is correct such that step s^1 is invisible to q . After time t_w^1 , reader q starts and completes a read operation on \mathbf{R} that returns 1.
- There is a reader $p \neq q$ that may be correct or malicious. After time t_w^1 , reader p may or may not take steps.
- There is a set Z of $n-2$ distinct readers other than p and q that are correct and take no steps.

From the run A_1 of \mathcal{I} we construct the following run A_0 of \mathcal{I} (Figure 11). Intuitively, A_0 is the same as A_1 except that the writer is correct and does not take any steps (i.e., w does not invoke a write 1 operation on \mathbf{R}), but all the readers behave the same as in A_1 and so q still reads 1. This run of \mathcal{I} is possible because: (1) even though p may have “noticed” that w does not take the step s^1 , p may be malicious (all the other readers are correct in this run), and p behaves exactly as in A_1 , and (2) q cannot distinguish between A_1 and A_0 because s^1 is invisible to q , and p and all the readers in Z behave as in A_1 . So q reads 1 from \mathbf{R} in A_0 exactly as in A_1 . Since the initial value of the implemented register \mathbf{R} is 0, run A_0 of the implementation \mathcal{I} of \mathbf{R} violates the linearizability of \mathcal{I} — a contradiction that concludes the proof of Theorem 7. ◀

It is easy to verify that the above proof holds (without any change) even if every reader is given atomic $[1, n]$ -registers that it can write and *all* other processes can read, and the writer is the only process that does not have an atomic $[1, n]$ -register. Thus:

► **Theorem 13.** *For all $n \geq 3$, in a system with $n + 1$ processes that are subject to Byzantine failures, there is no linearizable implementation of a $[1, n]$ -register that satisfies Termination, even under the assumption that:*

- *the writer w of the implemented $[1, n]$ -register can only crash and at most one reader can be malicious, and*
- *w has atomic $[1, n - 1]$ -registers, and every reader has atomic $[1, n]$ -registers.*

5 Register implementation algorithm

We now give an implementation of a $[1, n]$ -register from atomic $[1, 1]$ -registers in systems with Byzantine process failures; this implementation is linearizable, and it satisfies the Termination property provided the writer of the register *or* any number of the readers, *but not both*, can be faulty. More precisely, it is a *valid* implementation, as we define below.

► **Definition 14.** *A register implementation is valid if the following holds:*

- It is linearizable.
- If the writer is correct or no reader is malicious, it satisfies the Termination property.

Note that, when executed in a system where processes can only crash, a valid register implementation is linearizable and “terminating” (unconditionally).

5.1 Some difficulties to overcome

Note that in a system with Byzantine process failures, implementing a $[1, n]$ -register from $[1, 1]$ -registers is non-trivial, even if the writer can only crash. To see this, we now illustrate some of the issues that arise. First note that with $[1, 1]$ -registers the writer cannot *simultaneously* inform all the readers about a new write. So different readers may have different views of whether there is a write in progress: some readers may not see it, some readers may see it as still in progress, while other readers may see it as having completed. Thus readers must communicate with each other to avoid “new-old” inversions in the values they read. With non-Byzantine failures, readers can easily coordinate their reads because they can trust the information they pass to each other. With Byzantine failures, however, readers cannot blindly trust what other readers tell them.

For example, suppose a reader q is aware that a write v operation is in progress (say because the writer w directly “told” q about it via the register that they share). To avoid a “new-old” inversion, q checks whether any other reader q' has already read v (because it is possible that from q' 's point of view, the write of v already completed). Suppose some q' “warns” q that it has already read the new value v , and so q also reads v . But what if q' is malicious and “lied” to q (and only to q) about having read v ? Note that q may be the *only* correct reader currently aware that the write of v is in progress (say because w is slow). Now suppose that a reader q'' that is *not* aware of the write of v also wants to read: if q'' reads the old value of the register this creates a “new-old” inversion with the newer value v that q previously read; but if q'' reads v because q warns q'' that it had read v , then q'' may be reading a value v *that was never written by the correct writer w* : q itself could be malicious and could have “lied” about reading v !

The above is only one of many possible scenarios illustrating why it is not easy to implement a $[1, n]$ -register from $[1, 1]$ -registers when some readers can be malicious, even if the writer itself is not malicious.

5.2 A recursive solution

To simplify this task, we do not *directly* implement a $[1, n]$ -register using *only* $[1, 1]$ -registers. Instead, we first give an implementation I_n of a $[1, n]$ -register that uses some $[1, n - 1]$ -registers together with some $[1, 1]$ -registers. Then, by replacing the $[1, n - 1]$ -registers with I_{n-1} implementations, we get an implementation of the $[1, n]$ -register that uses some $[1, n - 2]$ -registers and some $[1, 1]$ -registers. By recursing down to $n = 2$, this gives an implementation of the $[1, n]$ -register that uses only $[1, 1]$ -registers. In other words, we can implement a $[1, n]$ -register from $[1, 1]$ -registers with a *recursive* construction that gradually reduces the number of readers of the base registers that it uses (all the way down to 1). We now describe this recursive implementation and prove its correctness.

5.3 Implementing a $[1, n]$ -register from $[1, n - 1]$ -registers

Algorithm 1 is an implementation I_n of a $[1, n]$ -register that is writable by a process w and readable by every process in $\{p\} \cup Q$, where p is an arbitrary reader and all remaining $n - 1$ readers are in Q . We distinguish p from the other readers in Q because p and $q \in Q$ use different procedures for reading the implemented $[1, n]$ -register. I_n uses two kinds of registers: *atomic* $[1, 1]$ -registers and *implemented* $[1, n - 1]$ -registers. We will show that I_n is *valid* under the assumption that the $[1, n - 1]$ -register implementations that it uses are also *valid*.

Notation. Recall that if R is an atomic register, all operations applied to R are instantaneous, whereas if R is an implemented register, each operation spans an interval of time, from an invocation to a response. However, since we assume that the $[1, n - 1]$ -register implementations that I_n uses are valid and therefore *linearizable*, we can think of each operation on an implemented $[1, n - 1]$ -register as being atomic, i.e., as if it takes effect instantaneously at some point during its execution interval [10]. Thus to read or write a register R we use the same notation, irrespective of whether R is atomic or implemented. In particular, in our implementation algorithm (shown in Figure 1) we use the following notation:

- “ $R \leftarrow v$ ” denotes the operation that writes v into R .
- “**if** $R = val$ **then** . . .” means “read register R and if the value read is equal to val then . . .”

The shared registers used by the implementation are as follows:

- $R_{ss'}$ is an atomic $[1, 1]$ -register writable by process s and readable by process s' .⁸
- R_{wQ} is an implemented $[1, n - 1]$ -register writable by w and readable by every $q \in Q$.
- R_{pQ} is an implemented $[1, n - 1]$ -register writable by p and readable by every $q \in Q$.

Algorithm description. The implementation I_n of a $[1, n]$ -register from $[1, n - 1]$ -registers consists of two procedures, namely WRITE() for the writer w , and READ() for each reader r in $\{p\} \cup Q$. To write a value u , the writer w executes WRITE(u). If u is the k -th value written by w , WRITE(u) first forms the unique tuple $\langle k, u \rangle$ and then it calls the lower-level write procedure $w(\langle k, u \rangle)$ to write this tuple. Intuitively, WRITE() tags the values that it writes with a counter value to make them unique and to indicate in which order they are written. To read a value, a reader $r \in \{p\} \cup Q$ calls READ(), and this in turn calls a lower-level read procedure $R_r()$ that reads tuples written by $w()$. There are two version of the procedure $R_r()$: one used when $r = p$ and one used when $r \in Q$. If $R_r()$ returns a tuple of the form $\langle j, v \rangle$, then READ() strips the counter j from the tuple and returns the value v as the value read (otherwise READ() returns \perp to indicate a read failure).

Thus the lower-level procedures $w()$, $R_p()$, and $R_q()$ for each $q \in Q$, are executed to write and read unique tuples of the form $\langle k, u \rangle$. We now describe how these procedures work.

- To execute $w(\langle k, u \rangle)$, process w first writes (PREPARE, *last_written*, $\langle k, u \rangle$) in the R_{wp} register that p can read, and then in the R_{wQ} register that every process in Q can read;

⁸ If $s = s'$, this “shared register” is actually just a local register of process s .

■ **Algorithm 1** Implementation I_n of a $[1, n]$ -register writable by (an arbitrary) process w and readable by the n processes in $\{p\} \cup Q$, for $n \geq 2$. It uses two $[1, n - 1]$ -registers and some $[1, 1]$ -registers.

<p>ATOMIC REGISTERS</p> <p>R_{wp}: $[1, 1]$-register; initially $(\text{COMMIT}, \langle 0, u_0 \rangle)$</p> <p>For all processes q and q' in Q:</p> <p>$R_{qq'}$: $[1, 1]$-register; initially $\langle 0, u_0 \rangle$</p>	<p>LOCAL VARIABLES</p> <p>c: variable of w; initially 0</p> <p>$last_written$: variable of w; initially $\langle 0, u_0 \rangle$</p> <p>$previous_k$: variable of p; initially 0</p>
--	---

<p>IMPLEMENTED REGISTERS</p> <p>R_{wQ}: $[1, n - 1]$-register; initially $(\text{COMMIT}, \langle 0, u_0 \rangle)$</p> <p>$R_{pQ}$: $[1, n - 1]$-register; initially $\langle 0, u_0 \rangle$</p>	
---	--

<p>WRITE(u): ▷ executed by the writer w</p> <p>1: $c \leftarrow c + 1$</p> <p>2: call $W(\langle c, u \rangle)$</p> <p>3: return done</p>	<p>READ(): ▷ executed by any reader r in $\{p\} \cup Q$</p> <p>4: call $R_r()$</p> <p>5: if this call returns some tuple $\langle k, u \rangle$ then</p> <p>6: return u</p> <p>7: else return \perp</p>
---	---

$W(\langle k, u \rangle)$: ▷ executed by w to do its k -th write

8: $R_{wp} \leftarrow (\text{PREPARE}, last_written, \langle k, u \rangle)$

9: $R_{wQ} \leftarrow (\text{PREPARE}, last_written, \langle k, u \rangle)$

10: $R_{wp} \leftarrow (\text{COMMIT}, \langle k, u \rangle)$

11: $R_{wQ} \leftarrow (\text{COMMIT}, \langle k, u \rangle)$

12: $last_written \leftarrow \langle k, u \rangle$

13: **return done**

$R_p()$: ▷ executed by reader p

14: **if** $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, \langle k, u \rangle)$ for some $\langle k, u \rangle$ with $k \geq previous_k$ **then**

15: $R_{pQ} \leftarrow \langle k, u \rangle$

16: $previous_k \leftarrow k$

17: **return** $\langle k, u \rangle$

18: **elseif** $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, last_written, -)$ for some $last_written$ **then**

19: **return** $last_written$

20: **else return** \perp

$R_q()$: ▷ executed by any reader q in Q

21: **if** $R_{wQ} = (\text{COMMIT}, \langle k, u \rangle)$ for some $\langle k, u \rangle$ **then**

22: **return** $\langle k, u \rangle$

23: **elseif** $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, last_written, \langle k, u \rangle)$ for some $last_written$ and some $\langle k, u \rangle$ **then**

24: **cobegin**

 // THREAD 1

25: **repeat forever**

26: **if** $R_{wQ} = (\text{COMMIT}, \langle k', - \rangle)$ for some $k' \geq k$ **then**

27: **return** $\langle k, u \rangle$

28: **if** $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, -, \langle k', - \rangle)$ for some $k' > k$ **then**

29: **return** $\langle k, u \rangle$

 // THREAD 2

30: **if** $R_{pQ} = \langle k', - \rangle$ for some $k' \geq k$ **then**

31: **for every** process $q' \in Q$ **do** $R_{qq'} \leftarrow \langle k, u \rangle$

32: **return** $\langle k, u \rangle$

33: **elseif** $R_{q'q} = \langle k', - \rangle$ for some $q' \in Q$ and some $k' \geq k$ **then**

34: **if** $R_{pQ} = \langle k', - \rangle$ for some $k' \geq k$ **then**

35: **for every** process $q' \in Q$ **do** $R_{qq'} \leftarrow \langle k, u \rangle$

36: **return** $\langle k, u \rangle$

37: **else exit** THREAD 2

38: **else return** $last_written$

39: **coend**

40: **else return** \perp

$last_written$ is the *last* tuple written by w before $\langle k, u \rangle$ (so $last_written = \langle k - 1, u' \rangle$ for some u'). Then, w writes $(\text{COMMIT}, \langle k, u \rangle)$ into R_{wp} and then into R_{wQ} .

- To execute $R_p()$, process p reads R_{wp} (line 14). If p reads $(\text{COMMIT}, \langle k, u \rangle)$ with a k at least as big as those it saw before, it returns $\langle k, u \rangle$ as the tuple read (line 17); just before doing so, however, it writes $\langle k, u \rangle$ in the R_{pQ} register that every process $q \in Q$ can read (line 15): intuitively, this is to “warn” them that p read a “new” tuple, to help avoid “new-old” inversions in the tuples read.

If p reads $(\text{PREPARE}, \text{last_written}, -)$ (line 18), then it returns last_written as the tuple read (without giving any “warning” about this to processes in Q).

If p reads anything else from R_{wp} , then it returns \perp (the writer is surely malicious).

- To execute $R_q()$, process $q \in Q$ reads R_{wQ} . If q reads $(\text{COMMIT}, \langle k, u \rangle)$ (line 21), it just returns $\langle k, u \rangle$ as the tuple read in line 22 (without “warning” other processes).

If q reads $(\text{PREPARE}, \text{last_written}, \langle k, u \rangle)$ (line 23), then q *cannot* simply return last_written as the tuple read: this is because p could have already read $(\text{COMMIT}, \langle k, u \rangle)$ from R_{wp} and so p could have already read the “newer” tuple $\langle k, u \rangle$ with $R_p()$. So q must determine whether to return last_written or $\langle k, u \rangle$. To do so, q forks two threads and executes them in parallel (we will explain why below).

If q does not read values of the form $(\text{PREPARE}, \text{last_written}, \langle k, u \rangle)$ or $(\text{COMMIT}, \langle k, u \rangle)$ from R_{wQ} , then q just returns \perp in line 40 (w is surely malicious).

In THREAD 1, process q keeps reading R_{wQ} : if it ever reads $(\text{COMMIT}, \langle k', - \rangle)$ with $k' \geq k$, or $(\text{PREPARE}, -, \langle k', - \rangle)$ with $k' > k$, it simply returns $\langle k, u \rangle$ as the tuple read. Note that *if the writer w is correct*, then q *cannot* spin forever in this thread without returning $\langle k, u \rangle$.

In THREAD 2, process q first reads the register R_{pQ} to see whether p “warned” processes in Q that it read a tuple at least as “new” as $\langle k, u \rangle$.

- If q sees that R_{pQ} contains a tuple at least as “new” as $\langle k, u \rangle$ (line 30), then q returns $\langle k, u \rangle$ as the tuple read (line 32); but before doing so, q successively writes $\langle k, u \rangle$ in each register $R_{qq'}$ such that $q' \in Q$ (line 31): intuitively, this is to “warn” each process in Q that q read this “new” tuple.

- Otherwise, q reads every $R_{q'q}$ register to avoid a new-old inversion with any tuple read by any process $q' \in Q$: if q sees that some $R_{q'q}$ contains a tuple at least as “new” as $\langle k, u \rangle$ (line 33), then q reads R_{pQ} *again* (line 34) (so q does *not* simply “trust” q' and return $\langle k, u \rangle$!). If q sees that R_{pQ} contains a tuple at least as “new” as $\langle k, u \rangle$ (line 34), then q successively writes $\langle k, u \rangle$ to every register $R_{qq'}$ such that $q' \in Q$ (line 35), and it returns $\langle k, u \rangle$ as the tuple read (line 36); else q exits THREAD 2 (so in this case only THREAD 1 remains).

- Finally, if q does not see that R_{pQ} or any $R_{qq'}$ contains a tuple at least as “new” as $\langle k, u \rangle$ (in lines 30 and 33), then q returns last_written (line 38).

Why two parallel threads? In a nutshell, this is to guarantee the Termination property of I_n in runs where the writer is correct or no reader is malicious (this property is required for the implementation to be valid). It turns out that:

- (A) if only THREAD 1 is executed, then a faulty writer can block correct readers even if no reader is malicious, and
- (B) if only THREAD 2 is executed, then malicious readers can block correct readers from returning any value in this thread even if the writer is correct.

But if the writer is correct or no reader is malicious, we can show that every read operation by a correct reader is guaranteed to complete with a return value *in one of the two threads*.

It is easy to see why a faulty writer (even one that just crashes) may block a correct reader in THREAD 1. We now explain how malicious readers may impede correct readers in THREAD 2.

In THREAD 2 readers must read R_{pQ} at least once (in line 30). Recall that (a) R_{pQ} is an *implemented* $[1, n - 1]$ -register, and (b) we are *only* assuming that this implementation is *valid*. In particular, if the writer p of R_{pQ} crashes *and* some readers of R_{pQ} are malicious, the implementation of R_{pQ} does *not* guarantee that correct readers complete their operations. In other words, if p crashes *and* some readers of R_{pQ} are malicious, a correct reader q may block while trying to read R_{pQ} !

Malicious readers can also prevent a correct reader q from reading any tuple in THREAD 2 as follows. When q executes $R_q()$ the following can occur: (1) in line 33, q sees that some $R_{q'q}$ contains $\langle k', - \rangle$ with $k' \geq k$, but (2) in line 34 q sees that R_{pQ} does *not* contain $\langle k', - \rangle$ with $k' \geq k$. We can show that this can occur *only if* at least one of p or q' is malicious. Note that if (1) and (2) indeed occur, then q exits THREAD 2 *without returning any tuple*.

We now prove the correctness of the $[1, n]$ -register implementation I_n given in Figure 1, more precisely, we show that if the $[1, n - 1]$ -registers that I_n uses are valid, then I_n is valid (Theorem 47). Since this proof may be distracting, in a first reading of the paper a reader may want to skip this proof and go directly to Theorem 47.

Correctness of the implementation I_n .

We must show that I_n is *valid* under the assumption that the $[1, n - 1]$ -register implementations that it uses, namely R_{wQ} and R_{pQ} , are also valid. So in this proof we assume:

► **Assumption 1.** *The implementations of the $[1, n - 1]$ -registers R_{wQ} and R_{pQ} that I_n uses are valid.*

We show that under this assumption, the implementation I_n of the $[1, n]$ -register is also valid, that is:

- I_n is linearizable, and
- If the writer is correct or no reader is malicious, I_n satisfies the Termination property.

Henceforth, we consider an arbitrary run E of the implementation I_n given in Figure 1.

By Assumption 1, the implemented registers R_{wQ} and R_{pQ} that I_n uses are linearizable; moreover, the atomic registers that I_n uses are also (trivially) linearizable. So operations on these registers appear to take effect instantaneously at some point (the “linearization point”) in their execution intervals. Therefore, without loss of generality, we can assume that in the run E the operations on the registers that I_n uses are sequential.

In the proof, we use the following notation (where R is any atomic or implemented register used by I_n):

- “process x reads $R = v$ in line ℓ of $R()$ ” means that process x reads register R , this read returns the value v , and both occur in line ℓ of the read procedure $R()$.
- “process x reads $R = u$ before process y reads $R' = v$ ” means that the read operation by x (which returns u) *precedes* the read operation by y (which returns v).
- “process x writes u in R before process y writes v in R' ” means that the write u operation by x *precedes* the write v operation by y .

We first show that I_n is linearizable. Then we prove that it satisfies the Termination property if the writer is correct or no reader is malicious.

Linearizability of I_n . We consider two cases:

CASE 1: *The writer w of the register implemented by I_n is malicious.* By Definition 6, I_n is (trivially) linearizable in this case.

CASE 2: *The writer w of the register implemented by I_n is not malicious.*

For this case, we now prove that the read and write operations of the implemented register satisfy the linearizability Properties 1 and 2 of Definition 6. In the following:

- u_0 is the initial value of the register that I_n implements.
- For $k \geq 1$, u_k denotes the k -th value written by w using the procedure $WRITE()$. More precisely, if w calls $WRITE()$ with a value u and this is its k -th call of $WRITE()$, then u_k is u .
- v_0 is $\langle 0, u_0 \rangle$.
- For $k \geq 1$, v_k denotes the k -th value written by w using the procedure $W()$.

► **Observation 15.** *For all $k \geq 0$, $v_k = \langle k, u_k \rangle$.*

By a slight abuse of notation:

- a *write operation* performed by executing the $\text{WRITE}()$ or $\text{W}()$ procedures with a value x is denoted $\text{WRITE}(x)$ or $\text{W}(x)$, respectively.
- A *read operation* performed by executing the $\text{READ}()$ or $\text{R}()$ procedures that return a value x is denoted $\text{READ}(x)$ or $\text{R}(x)$, respectively.

► **Observation 16.** *Let $w(v)$ be any write operation by w . Then there is a $k \geq 1$ such that $v = v_k$.*

► **Observation 17.** *Let $R \in \{R_{wp}, R_{wQ}\}$. If w writes x in R , then $x = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ for some $k \geq 1$ or $x = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ for some $k \geq 0$.*

► **Observation 18.** *Suppose p is not malicious. If p reads $R_{wp} = x$, then $x = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ or $x = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$, for some $k \geq 0$.*

► **Observation 19.** *Suppose $q \in Q$ is not malicious. If q reads $R_{wQ} = x$, then $x = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ or $x = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$, for some $k \geq 0$.*

► **Lemma 20.** *Suppose p is not malicious. Let $R_p(v)$ be any read operation by p . Then there is a $k \geq 0$ such that $v = v_k$, and*

- p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in line 14 of $R_p(v)$,⁹ or
- p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ in line 18 of $R_p(v)$.

Proof. Suppose p is not malicious. Let $R_p(v)$ be any read operation by p . Note that p reads R_{wp} in $R_p(v)$. When it does so, by Observation 18, there are two possible cases:

1. p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ for some $k \geq 0$ in line 14 of $R_p(v)$. Then $R_p(v)$ returns v_k in line 17, i.e., $v = v_k$.
2. p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ for some $k \geq 0$ in line 18 of $R_p(v)$. Then $R_p(v)$ returns v_k in line 19, i.e., $v = v_k$.

◀

► **Lemma 21.** *Suppose $q \in Q$ is not malicious. Let $R_q(v)$ be any read operation by q . Then there is a $k \geq 0$ such that $v = v_k$, and*

- q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in line 21 of $R_q(v)$,
- q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in line 23 of $R_q(v)$, or
- q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ in line 23 of $R_q(v)$.

Proof. Suppose $q \in Q$ is not malicious. Let $R_q(v)$ be any read operation by q . Note that q reads R_{wQ} in $R_q(v)$. When it does so, by Observation 19, there are two possible cases:

1. q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ for some $k \geq 0$ in line 21 of $R_q(v)$. Then $R_q(v)$ returns v_k in line 22, i.e., $v = v_k$.
2. q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ for some $k \geq 0$ in line 23 of $R_q(v)$. Then there are two subcases:
 - a. $R_q(v)$ returns v_{k+1} in line 27, 29, 32, or 36, i.e., $v = v_{k+1}$. Let $k' = k + 1$. Then in this case, q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$ in line 23 of $R_q(v)$ and $v = v_{k'}$.
 - b. $R_q(v)$ returns v_k in line 38, i.e., $v = v_k$.

◀

► **Observation 22.** *Let R be any register in $\{R_{wp}, R_{wQ}\}$.*

(1) *If w writes $(\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in R before w writes $(\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in R , then $k \leq k'$.*

⁹ For brevity, we say that “a process r reads or writes a register in line x of a $R_r(-)$ or a $W(-)$ operation”, if it reads or writes this register in line x of the $R_r()$ or $W()$ procedure executed to do this $R_r(-)$ or $W(-)$ operation.

- (2) If w writes $(\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in R before w writes $(\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$ in R , then $k < k'$.
- (3) If w writes (COMMIT, v_k) in R before w writes $(\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in R , then $k < k'$.
- (4) If w writes (COMMIT, v_k) in R before w writes $(\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$ in R , then $k < k'$.

► **Observation 23.** Let R be any register in $\{R_{wp}, R_{wQ}\}$. Suppose $r \in \{p\} \cup Q$ is not malicious.

- (1) If w writes $(\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in R before r reads $(\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in R , then $k \leq k'$.
- (2) If w writes $(\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in R before r reads $(\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$ in R , then $k \leq k'$.
- (3) If w writes (COMMIT, v_k) in R before r reads $(\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in R , then $k \leq k'$.
- (4) If w writes (COMMIT, v_k) in R before r reads $(\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$ in R , then $k < k'$.

► **Observation 24.** Let R be any register in $\{R_{wp}, R_{wQ}\}$. Suppose r and r' are non-malicious processes in $\{p\} \cup Q$.

- (1) If r reads $R = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ before r' reads $R = (\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$, then $k \leq k'$.
- (2) If r reads $R = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ before r' reads $R = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$, then $k \leq k'$.
- (3) If r reads $R = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ before r' reads $R = (\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$, then $k \leq k'$.
- (4) If r reads $R = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ before r' reads $R = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$, then $k < k'$.

PROOF OF LINEARIZABILITY PROPERTY 1. We now prove that the write and read operations of the register that I_n implements satisfy Property 1 of Definition 6, i.e., processes read the “current” value of the register. To do so, we first prove this for the writes and reads of the lower-level procedures $w()$ and $R_r()$ for all readers r (Lemma 25), and then prove it for the writes and reads of the high-level procedures $\text{WRITE}()$ and $\text{READ}()$ (Lemma 29).

► **Lemma 25.** If $R_r(v)$ is a read operation by a non-malicious process $r \in \{p\} \cup Q$ then:

- there is a $w(v)$ operation that immediately precedes $R_r(v)$ or is concurrent with $R_r(v)$, or
- $v = v_0$ and no $w(-)$ operation precedes $R_r(v)$.

Proof. Suppose $r \in \{p\} \cup Q$ is not malicious. Let $R_r(v)$ be any read operation by r .

By Lemmas 20 and 21, $v = v_k$ for some $k \geq 0$. We now show that:

- if $k = 0$ then no $w(-)$ operation precedes $R_r(v_k)$, and
- if $k > 0$ then a $w(v_k)$ operation immediately precedes $R_r(v_k)$ or is concurrent with $R_r(v_k)$.

There are two cases: $r = p$ or $r \in Q$.

- Case 1: $r = p$. By Lemma 20, there are two cases:

- 1) p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in line 14 of $R_p(v_k)$. There are two cases:
 - i. $k = 0$. Suppose, for contradiction, that there is a $w(v)$ operation that precedes $R_p(v_0)$. By Observation 16, $v = v_i$ for some $i \geq 1$. So w writes (COMMIT, v_i) into R_{wp} in line 10 of $w(v_i)$ before p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_0)$ in line 14 of $R_p(v_k)$. By Observation 23(3), $i \leq 0$ — a contradiction. So no $w(-)$ operation precedes $R_p(v_0)$.
 - ii. $k > 0$. Then w writes (COMMIT, v_k) into R_{wp} in line 10 of $w(v_k)$ before p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in $R_p(v_k)$. So the $w(v_k)$ operation precedes $R_p(v_k)$ or is concurrent with $R_p(v_k)$. We now show that if $w(v_k)$ precedes $R_p(v_k)$, then $w(v_k)$ immediately precedes $R_p(v_k)$. Suppose, for contradiction, that $w(v_k)$ precedes $R_p(v_k)$ but does not immediately precede $R_p(v_k)$. Then there is a $w(v_i)$ operation that immediately precedes $R_p(v_k)$. Clearly, the $w(v_k)$ operation precedes the $w(v_i)$ operation, and so $i > k$. Furthermore, w writes (COMMIT, v_i) into R_{wp} in line 10 of $w(v_i)$ before p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in line 14 of $R_p(v_k)$. By Observation 23(3), $i \leq k$ — a contradiction. Therefore the $w(v_k)$ operation immediately precedes $R_p(v_k)$ or is concurrent with $R_p(v_k)$.

- 2) p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ in line 18 of $R_p(v_k)$. Then this read occurs *after* w writes $(\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ in R_{wp} in line 8 of the $w(v_{k+1})$ operation. Furthermore, by Observation 23(4), this read occurs *before* w writes (COMMIT, v_{k+1}) in R_{wp} in line 10 of the $w(v_{k+1})$ operation. Therefore the $w(v_{k+1})$ operation is concurrent with $R_p(v_k)$. There are two cases:
- i. $k = 0$. Since $w(v_1)$ is concurrent with $R_p(v_0)$, no $w(-)$ operation precedes $R_p(v_0)$.
 - ii. $k > 0$. Since $w(v_{k+1})$ is concurrent with $R_p(v_k)$, $w(v_k)$ immediately precedes $R_p(v_k)$ or is concurrent with $R_p(v_k)$.
- Case 2: $r = q \in Q$. By Lemma 21, there are three cases:
- 1) q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in line 21 of $R_q(v_k)$. There are two cases:
 - i. $k = 0$. Suppose, for contradiction, that there is a $w(v)$ operation that precedes $R_p(v_0)$. By Observation 16, $v = v_i$ for some $i \geq 1$. So w writes (COMMIT, v_i) into R_{wQ} in line 11 of $w(v_i)$ before q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_0)$ in line 21 of $R_q(v_0)$. By Observation 23(3), $i \leq 0$ — a contradiction. So no $w(-)$ operation precedes $R_q(v_0)$.
 - ii. $k > 0$. Then w writes (COMMIT, v_k) into R_{wQ} in line 11 of $w(v_k)$ before q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in line 21 of $R_q(v_k)$. So the $w(v_k)$ operation precedes $R_q(v_k)$ or is concurrent with $R_q(v_k)$. We now show that if $w(v_k)$ precedes $R_q(v_k)$, then $w(v_k)$ immediately precedes $R_q(v_k)$. Suppose, for contradiction, that $w(v_k)$ precedes $R_q(v_k)$ but does not immediately precede $R_q(v_k)$. Then there is a $w(v_i)$ operation that immediately precedes $R_p(v_k)$. Clearly, the $w(v_k)$ operation precedes the $w(v_i)$ operation, and so $i > k$. Furthermore, w writes (COMMIT, v_i) into R_{wQ} in line 11 of $w(v_i)$ before q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in line 21 of $R_q(v_k)$. By Observation 23(3), $i \leq k$ — a contradiction. Therefore the $w(v_k)$ operation immediately precedes $R_q(v_k)$ or is concurrent with $R_q(v_k)$.
 - 2) q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in line 23 of $R_q(v_k)$. Then this read occurs *after* w writes $(\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in R_{wQ} in line 9 of the $w(v_k)$ operation. Furthermore, by Observation 23(4), this read occurs *before* w writes (COMMIT, v_k) in R_{wQ} in line 11 of the $w(v_k)$ operation. Therefore the $w(v_k)$ operation is concurrent with $R_q(v_k)$.
 - 3) q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ in line 23 of $R_q(v_k)$. Then this read occurs *after* w writes $(\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ in R_{wQ} in line 9 of the $w(v_{k+1})$ operation. Furthermore, by Observation 23(4), this read occurs *before* w writes (COMMIT, v_{k+1}) in R_{wQ} in line 11 of the $w(v_{k+1})$ operation. Therefore the $w(v_{k+1})$ operation is concurrent with $R_q(v_k)$. There are two cases:
 - i. $k = 0$. Since $w(v_1)$ is concurrent with $R_q(v_0)$, no $w(-)$ operation precedes $R_q(v_0)$.
 - ii. $k > 0$. Since $w(v_{k+1})$ is concurrent with $R_q(v_k)$, $w(v_k)$ is concurrent with $R_q(v_k)$ or immediately precedes $R_q(v_k)$.

◀

We now prove that the write and read operations of the high-level procedures $\text{WRITE}()$ and $\text{READ}()$ satisfy Property 1 of Definition 6.

By Observation 15, Lemmas 20 and 21, and the code of the procedure $\text{READ}()$, we have:

► **Observation 26.** *If $\text{READ}(u)$ is an operation by a non-malicious process $r \in \{p\} \cup Q$, then $u = u_k$ for some $k \geq 0$.*

► **Observation 27.** *If $\text{READ}(u_k)$ is an operation by a non-malicious process $r \in \{p\} \cup Q$, then r invokes and completes a $R_r(v_k)$ operation in $\text{READ}(u_k)$.*

► **Observation 28.** *If $\text{WRITE}(u_k)$ is a completed operation by w , then w invokes and completes a $w(v_k)$ operation in $\text{WRITE}(u_k)$.*

We now prove that the $\text{WRITE}(-)$ and $\text{READ}(-)$ operations satisfy Property 1 of Definition 6.

► **Lemma 29.** [Property 1: Reading a “current” value]

If $READ(u)$ is a read operation by a non-malicious process $r \in \{p\} \cup Q$ then:

- there is a $WRITE(u)$ operation that immediately precedes $READ(u)$ or is concurrent with $READ(u)$, or
- $u = u_0$ and no $WRITE(-)$ operation precedes $READ(u)$.

Proof. Let $READ(u)$ be any read operation by a non-malicious process $r \in \{p\} \cup Q$. By Observation 26, $u = u_k$ for some $k \geq 0$. There are two cases:

- (1) $k = 0$. Suppose, for contradiction, that a $WRITE(u_i)$ operation precedes $READ_r(u_0)$. Note that $i \geq 1$. By Observations 28 and 27, a $w(v_i)$ operation precedes a $R_r(v_0)$ operation. Since process r is not malicious, by Lemma 25, there is no $w(-)$ operation that precedes $R_r(v_0)$ — a contradiction.
- (2) $k > 0$. By Observation 27, r invokes and completes a $R_r(v_k)$ operation in $READ(u_k)$. Since $k > 0$, by Lemma 25, there is a $w(v_k)$ operation that immediately precedes $R_r(v_k)$ or is concurrent with $R_r(v_k)$. Let $WRITE(u_k)$ be the operation in which w invokes the $w(v_k)$ operation. Since $w(v_k)$ immediately precedes $R_r(v_k)$ or is concurrent with $R_r(v_k)$, the $WRITE(u_k)$ operation immediately precedes $READ(u_k)$ or is concurrent with $READ(u_k)$.

◀

PROOF OF LINEARIZABILITY PROPERTY 2. We now prove that the write and read operations of the register that I_n implements satisfy Property 2 of Definition 6, i.e., we prove that there are no “new-old” inversions in the values that processes read. To do so, we first prove this for the writes and reads of the lower-level procedures $w()$ and $R_r()$ for all readers r (Lemma 40), and then prove it for the writes and reads of the high-level procedures $WRITE()$ and $READ()$ (Lemma 41).

We first show that there are no “new-old” inversions in the consecutive reads of process p .

► **Lemma 30.** Suppose p is not malicious. If $R_p(v_k)$ and $R_p(v_{k'})$ are read operations by p , and $R_p(v_k)$ precedes $R_p(v_{k'})$, then $k \leq k'$.

Proof. Suppose p is not malicious. Let $R_p(v_k)$ and $R_p(v_{k'})$ be read operations by p such that $R_p(v_k)$ precedes $R_p(v_{k'})$. By Lemma 20, the following occurs:

1. p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in line 14 of $R_p(v_k)$, or
2. p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ in line 18 of $R_p(v_k)$,

before the following occurs:

1. p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in line 14 of $R_p(v_{k'})$, or
2. p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'}, v_{k'+1})$ in line 18 of $R_p(v_{k'})$.

So there are four possible cases:

1. p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in $R_p(v_k)$ before p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in $R_p(v_{k'})$. By Observation 24(3), $k \leq k'$.
2. p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in $R_p(v_k)$ before p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'}, v_{k'+1})$ in $R_p(v_{k'})$. By Observation 24(4), $k < k' + 1$. So $k \leq k'$.
3. p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ in $R_p(v_k)$ before p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in $R_p(v_{k'})$. By Observation 24(1), $k + 1 \leq k'$. So $k \leq k'$.
4. p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ in $R_p(v_k)$ before p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'}, v_{k'+1})$ in $R_p(v_{k'})$. By Observation 24(2), $k + 1 \leq k' + 1$. So $k \leq k'$.

◀

To prove that there are no “new-old” inversions between the reads of p and those of any reader $q \in Q$, and also between the reads of any pair of readers $q, q' \in Q$, we first make some straightforward observations that are clear from the code of I_n . We first note that the counters of the tuples in registers R_{pQ} and $R_{qq'}$ do not decrease.

► **Observation 31.** *Suppose p is not malicious. If p writes v_k in R_{pQ} before p writes $v_{k'}$ in R_{pQ} , then $k \leq k'$.*

► **Observation 32.** *Suppose p and $q \in Q$ are not malicious. If p writes v_k in R_{pQ} before q reads $R_{pQ} = v_{k'}$, then $k \leq k'$.*

► **Observation 33.** *Suppose $q \in Q$ is not malicious. For all processes $q' \in Q$, if q writes v_k in $R_{qq'}$ before q writes $v_{k'}$ in $R_{qq'}$, then $k \leq k'$.*

► **Observation 34.** *Suppose $q \in Q$ and $q' \in Q$ are not malicious. If q writes v_k in $R_{qq'}$ before q' reads $R_{qq'} = v_{k'}$, then $k \leq k'$.*

The following observations relate the counters of the tuples that w successively writes in registers R_{wp} and R_{wQ} .

► **Observation 35.** (1) *If w writes $(\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in R_{wp} before w writes $(\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$ in R_{wQ} , then $k \leq k'$.*

(2) *If w writes $(\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in R_{wp} before w writes $(\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in R_{wQ} , then $k \leq k'$.*

(3) *If w writes (COMMIT, v_k) in R_{wp} before w writes $(\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$ in R_{wQ} , then $k < k'$.*

(4) *If w writes (COMMIT, v_k) in R_{wp} before w writes $(\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in R_{wQ} , then $k \leq k'$.*

(5) *If w writes $(\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in R_{wQ} before w writes $(\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$ in R_{wp} , then $k < k'$.*

(6) *If w writes $(\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in R_{wQ} before w writes $(\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in R_{wp} , then $k \leq k'$.*

(7) *If w writes (COMMIT, v_k) in R_{wQ} before w writes $(\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$ in R_{wp} , then $k < k'$.*

(8) *If w writes (COMMIT, v_k) in R_{wQ} before w writes $(\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in R_{wp} , then $k < k'$.*

The next observations relate the counters of the tuples that p and processes $q \in Q$ read from R_{wp} and R_{wQ} , respectively.

► **Observation 36.** *Suppose p and $q \in Q$ are not malicious.*

(1) *If p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ before q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$, then $k \leq k'$.*

(2) *If p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ before q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$, then $k - 1 \leq k'$.*

(3) *If p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ before q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$, then $k \leq k'$.*

(4) *If p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ before q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$, then $k \leq k'$.*

(5) *If q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ before p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$, then $k \leq k'$.*

(6) *If q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ before p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$, then $k \leq k'$.*

(7) *If q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ before p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$, then $k + 1 \leq k'$.*

(8) *If q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ before p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$, then $k \leq k'$.*

Now we prove that there is no “new-old” inversion for a read by p that precedes a read by a process $q \in Q$.

► **Lemma 37.** *If $R_p(v_k)$ and $R_q(v_{k'})$ are read operations by non-malicious processes p and $q \in Q$ respectively, and $R_p(v_k)$ precedes $R_q(v_{k'})$, then $k \leq k'$.*

Proof. Suppose processes p and $q \in Q$ are not malicious. Let $R_p(v_k)$ and $R_q(v_{k'})$ be read operations by p and q respectively, such that $R_p(v_k)$ precedes $R_q(v_{k'})$. By Lemmas 20 and 21, the following occurs:

1. p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in line 14 of $R_p(v_k)$, or
2. p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ in line 18 of $R_p(v_k)$

before the following occurs:

1. q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in line 21 of $R_q(v_{k'})$, or
2. q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$ in line 23 of $R_q(v_{k'})$, or
3. q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'}, v_{k'+1})$ in line 23 of $R_q(v_{k'})$.

So there are six possible cases:

1. p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in $R_p(v_k)$ before q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in $R_q(v_{k'})$. By Observation 36(4), $k \leq k'$.
2. p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in $R_p(v_k)$ before q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$ in $R_q(v_{k'})$. By Observation 36(3), $k \leq k'$.
3. p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in $R_p(v_k)$ before q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'}, v_{k'+1})$ in $R_q(v_{k'})$. By Observation 36(3), $k \leq k' + 1$.
 - i. $k < k' + 1$. Then $k \leq k'$.
 - ii. $k = k' + 1$. We now show that this case is impossible. Since $k = k' + 1$, q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in line 23 of $R_q(v_{k-1})$, and $R_q(v_{k-1})$ returns in line 38. So q read R_{pQ} in line 30 of $R_q(v_{k-1})$ before $R_q(v_{k-1})$ returns in line 38. Since p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in $R_p(v_k)$, p writes v_k in R_{pQ} in line 15 of $R_p(v_k)$. Since $R_p(v_k)$ precedes $R_q(v_{k-1})$, p writes v_k in R_{pQ} in $R_p(v_k)$ before q reads R_{pQ} in line 30 of $R_q(v_{k-1})$. By Observation 32, q reads $R_{pQ} = v_\ell$, for some $\ell \geq k$, in line 30 of $R_q(v_{k-1})$. So $R_q(v_{k-1})$ returns v_k in line 32, rather than in line 38 — a contradiction.
4. p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ in $R_p(v_k)$ before q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in $R_q(v_{k'})$. By Observation 36(2), $(k + 1) - 1 \leq k'$. So $k \leq k'$.
5. p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ in $R_p(v_k)$ before q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$ in $R_q(v_{k'})$. By Observation 36(1), $k + 1 \leq k'$. So $k \leq k'$.
6. p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ in $R_p(v_k)$ before q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'}, v_{k'+1})$ in $R_q(v_{k'})$. By Observation 36(1), $k + 1 \leq k' + 1$. So $k \leq k'$.

◀

Now we prove that there is no “new-old” inversion for a read by a process $q \in Q$ that precedes a read by p .

► **Lemma 38.** *If $R_q(v_k)$ and $R_p(v_{k'})$ are read operations by non-malicious processes $q \in Q$ and p respectively, and $R_q(v_k)$ precedes $R_p(v_{k'})$, then $k \leq k'$.*

Proof. Suppose processes $q \in Q$ and p are not malicious. Let $R_q(v_k)$ and $R_p(v_{k'})$ be two read operations by q and p respectively, such that $R_q(v_k)$ precedes $R_p(v_{k'})$. By Lemmas 20 and 21, the following occurs:

1. q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in line 21 of $R_q(v_k)$, or
2. q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in line 23 of $R_q(v_k)$, or
3. q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ in line 23 of $R_q(v_k)$

before the following occurs:

1. p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in line 14 of $R_p(v_{k'})$, or
2. p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'}, v_{k'+1})$ in line 18 of $R_p(v_{k'})$.

So there are six possible cases:

1. q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in $R_q(v_k)$ before p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in $R_p(v_{k'})$. By Observation 36(8), $k \leq k'$.
2. q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in $R_q(v_k)$ before p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'}, v_{k'+1})$ in $R_p(v_{k'})$. By Observation 36(7), $k + 1 \leq k' + 1$. So $k \leq k'$.
3. q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in $R_q(v_k)$ before p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in $R_p(v_{k'})$. By Observation 36(6), $k \leq k'$.

4. q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in $R_q(v_k)$ before p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'}, v_{k'+1})$ in $R_p(v_{k'})$. By Observation 36(5), $k \leq k' + 1$.
 - i. $k < k' + 1$. Then $k \leq k'$.
 - ii. $k = k' + 1$. We now show that this case is impossible. Since $k = k' + 1$, p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in $R_p(v_{k-1})$, and $R_p(v_{k-1})$ returns in line 19. Since q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in line 23 of $R_q(v_k)$, $R_q(v_k)$ returns in line 27, 29, 32, or 36. We now consider each one of these cases.
 - a. $R_q(v_k)$ returns in line 27. Then q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_\ell)$ for some $\ell \geq k$ in line 26 of $R_q(v_k)$. Since $R_q(v_k)$ precedes $R_p(v_{k-1})$, q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_\ell)$ before p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in $R_p(v_{k-1})$. By Observation 36(7), $\ell < k$ — a contradiction.
 - b. $R_q(v_k)$ returns in line 29. So q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, -, v_\ell)$ for some $\ell > k$ in line 28 of $R_q(v_k)$. Since $R_q(v_k)$ precedes $R_p(v_{k-1})$, q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, -, v_\ell)$ in $R_q(v_k)$ before p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in $R_p(v_{k-1})$. By Observation 36(5), $\ell \leq k$ — a contradiction.
 - c. $R_q(v_k)$ returns in line 32 or 36. Then q reads $R_{pQ} = v_\ell$ for some $\ell \geq k$ in line 30 or 34 of $R_q(v_k)$. So p writes v_ℓ to R_{pQ} in line 15 of some $R_p(-)$ operation before q reads R_{pQ} in $R_q(v_k)$. Thus, p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_\ell)$ in line 14 before q reads R_{pQ} in $R_q(v_k)$. Since $R_q(v_k)$ precedes $R_p(v_{k-1})$, q reads R_{pQ} in $R_q(v_k)$ before p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in $R_p(v_{k-1})$. So p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_\ell)$ before p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in $R_p(v_{k-1})$. By Observation 36(7), $\ell < k$ — a contradiction.
5. q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ in $R_q(v_k)$ before p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in $R_p(v_{k'})$. By Observation 36(6), $k + 1 \leq k'$. So $k \leq k'$.
6. q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ in $R_q(v_k)$ before p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'}, v_{k'+1})$ in $R_p(v_{k'})$. By Observation 36(5), $k + 1 \leq k' + 1$. So $k \leq k'$.

◀

Finally, we prove that there are no “new-old” inversions between the reads of processes in Q .

► **Lemma 39.** *If $R_q(v_k)$ and $R_{q'}(v_{k'})$ are read operations by non-malicious processes $q \in Q$ and $q' \in Q$ respectively, and $R_q(v_k)$ precedes $R_{q'}(v_{k'})$, then $k \leq k'$.*

Proof. Suppose processes $q \in Q$ and $q' \in Q$ are not malicious. Let $R_q(v_k)$ and $R_{q'}(v_{k'})$ be read operations by q and q' respectively, such that $R_q(v_k)$ precedes $R_{q'}(v_{k'})$. By Lemma 21, the following occurs:

1. q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in line 21 of $R_q(v_k)$, or
2. q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in line 23 of $R_q(v_k)$, or
3. q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ in line 23 of $R_q(v_k)$

before the following occurs:

1. q' reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in line 21 of $R_{q'}(v_{k'})$, or
2. q' reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$ in line 23 of $R_{q'}(v_{k'})$, or
3. q' reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'}, v_{k'+1})$ in line 23 of $R_{q'}(v_{k'})$.

So there are nine possible cases:

1. q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in $R_q(v_k)$ before q' reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in $R_{q'}(v_{k'})$. By Observation 24(3), $k \leq k'$.
2. q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in $R_q(v_k)$ before q' reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$ in $R_{q'}(v_{k'})$. By Observation 24(4), $k < k'$. So $k \leq k'$.
3. q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in $R_q(v_k)$ before q' reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'}, v_{k'+1})$ in $R_{q'}(v_{k'})$. By Observation 24(4), $k < k' + 1$. So $k \leq k'$.
4. q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in $R_q(v_k)$ before q' reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in $R_{q'}(v_{k'})$. By Observation 24(1), $k \leq k'$.

5. q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in $R_q(v_k)$ before q' reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$ in $R_{q'}(v_{k'})$. By Observation 24(2), $k \leq k'$.
6. q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in $R_q(v_k)$ before q' reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'}, v_{k'+1})$ in $R_{q'}(v_{k'})$. By Observation 24(2), $k \leq k' + 1$.
 - i. $k < k' + 1$. Then $k \leq k'$.
 - ii. $k = k' + 1$. We now show that this case is impossible. Since $k = k' + 1$, q' reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in $R_{q'}(v_{k-1})$, and $R_{q'}(v_{k-1})$ returns in line 38. So q' reads $R_{qq'}$ in line 33 of $R_{q'}(v_{k-1})$ before $R_{q'}(v_{k-1})$ returns in line 38. Since q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in $R_q(v_k)$, $R_q(v_k)$ returns in line 27, 29, 32, or 36. We now consider each one of these cases.
 - a. $R_q(v_k)$ returns in line 27. Then q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_\ell)$ for some $\ell \geq k$ in line 26 of $R_q(v_k)$. Since $R_q(v_k)$ precedes $R_{q'}(v_{k-1})$, q read $R_{wQ} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_\ell)$ in $R_q(v_k)$ before q' reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in $R_{q'}(v_{k-1})$. By Observation 24(4), $\ell < k$ — a contradiction.
 - b. $R_q(v_k)$ returns in line 29. Then q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, -, v_\ell)$ for some $\ell > k$ in line 28 of $R_q(v_k)$. Since $R_q(v_k)$ precedes $R_{q'}(v_{k-1})$, q read $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, -, v_\ell)$ in $R_q(v_k)$ before q' reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in $R_{q'}(v_{k-1})$. By Observation 24(2), $\ell \leq k$ — a contradiction.
 - c. $R_q(v_k)$ returns in line 32 or 36. Then q writes v_k in $R_{qq'}$ in line 31 or 35 of $R_q(v_k)$. Since $R_q(v_k)$ precedes $R_{q'}(v_{k-1})$, q writes v_k in $R_{qq'}$ in $R_q(v_k)$ before q' reads $R_{qq'}$ in line 33 of $R_{q'}(v_{k-1})$. Thus, by Observation 34, q' reads $R_{qq'} = v_\ell$ for some $\ell \geq k$ in line 33 of $R_{q'}(v_{k-1})$. So $R_{q'}(v_{k-1})$ returns in line 36, rather than in line 38 — a contradiction.
7. q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ in $R_q(v_k)$ before q' reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in $R_{q'}(v_{k'})$. By Observation 24(1), $k + 1 \leq k'$. So $k \leq k'$.
8. q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ in $R_q(v_k)$ before q' reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$ in $R_{q'}(v_{k'})$. By Observation 24(2), $k + 1 \leq k'$. So $k \leq k'$.
9. q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ in $R_q(v_k)$ before q' reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'}, v_{k'+1})$ in $R_{q'}(v_{k'})$. By Observation 24(2), $k + 1 \leq k' + 1$. So $k \leq k'$.

◀

We now prove that the writes and reads of the lower-level procedures $w()$ and $R_r()$ for all readers r satisfy Property 2 of Definition 6.

► **Lemma 40.** *Let $R_r(v_k)$ and $R_{r'}(v_{k'})$ be any read operations by some non-malicious processes r and r' in $\{p\} \cup Q$. If $R_r(v_k)$ precedes $R_{r'}(v_{k'})$ then $k \leq k'$.*

Proof. Immediate from Lemmas 30, 37, 38, 39. ◀

Finally, we prove that the write and read operations of the high-level procedures $\text{WRITE}()$ and $\text{READ}()$ satisfy Property 2 of Definition 6.

► **Lemma 41.** [**Property 2:** No “new-old” inversion]

Let $\text{READ}(u_k)$ and $\text{READ}(u_{k'})$ be any read operations by some non-malicious processes in $\{p\} \cup Q$. If $\text{READ}(u_k)$ precedes $\text{READ}(u_{k'})$ then $k \leq k'$.

Proof. Let $\text{READ}(u_k)$ and $\text{READ}(u_{k'})$ be any read operations by some non-malicious processes r and r' in $\{p\} \cup Q$. Suppose $\text{READ}(u_k)$ precedes $\text{READ}(u_{k'})$. By Observation 27, in the $\text{READ}(u_k)$ and $\text{READ}(u_{k'})$ operations, processes r and r' invoke and complete a $R_r(v_k)$ and $R_{r'}(v_{k'})$ operation, respectively. Since $\text{READ}(u_k)$ precedes $\text{READ}(u_{k'})$, $R_r(v_k)$ precedes $R_{r'}(v_{k'})$. By Lemma 40, $k \leq k'$. ◀

By Lemmas 29 and 41, the $\text{WRITE}(-)$ and $\text{READ}(-)$ operations of the register implementation I_n satisfy the linearizability Properties 1 and 2 of Definition 6. Therefore:

► **Theorem 42.** *For all $n \geq 2$, the implementation I_n is linearizable.*

Termination of I_n . We now prove the Termination property of the implementation I_n . As in the previous section, we assume that the implementations of the registers R_{wQ} and R_{pQ} that I_n uses are valid (so they are linearizable).

Note that if w is malicious, it could write $(\text{COMMIT}, \langle k, - \rangle)$ followed by $(\text{COMMIT}, \langle k', - \rangle)$ in R_{wp} such that $k' < k$. To prevent p from “acting on” a COMMIT tuple that is out of order, p remembers in the variable `previous_k` the value k of the last $(\text{COMMIT}, \langle k, - \rangle)$ tuple that it accepted. Using this variable in the guard of line 14 ensures that the $\langle k, - \rangle$ tuples that p writes in R_{pQ} in line 15 have non-decreasing values of k even if the writer w is malicious. So if p is not malicious, correct processes that read R_{pQ} , read tuples $\langle k, - \rangle$ with non-decreasing values of k . More precisely:

► **Observation 43.** *Suppose $p, q \in Q$, and $q' \in Q$ are not malicious. If q reads $R_{pQ} = \langle k, - \rangle$ before q' reads $R_{pQ} = \langle k', - \rangle$, then $k \leq k'$.*

► **Theorem 44.** *For all $n \geq 2$, the implementation I_n satisfies the Termination property if the writer is correct or no reader is malicious.*

Proof. We must show that if the writer is correct or no reader is malicious, then every correct process completes each operation that it invokes in a finite number of steps. If the writer w is correct, it is clear from the code of the write procedures $\text{WRITE}()$ and $\text{w}()$ that w completes every $\text{WRITE}()$ invocation with a response. If the reader p is correct, it is also clear from the code of the procedures $\text{READ}()$ and $\text{r}_p()$ that p completes every $\text{READ}()$ invocation with a response. Let q be a correct process in Q . It remains to show that if the writer is correct or no reader is malicious then q completes every $\text{READ}()$ invocation with a response. Consider any execution of $\text{READ}()$ by q . Note that in line 4 of $\text{READ}()$ process q calls $\text{R}_q()$, and if $\text{R}_q()$ returns a response then $\text{READ}()$ also returns a response. We now show that $\text{R}_q()$ returns a response. To do so we first show the following.

▷ **Claim 45.** If the writer w is correct, then q does not loop forever in **THREAD 1** (lines 25-29).

Proof. Suppose, for contradiction, that the writer w is correct but q loops forever in lines 25-29. Thus, q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, \text{last_written}, \langle k, u \rangle)$ for some `last_written` and some $\langle k, u \rangle$ in line 23. Since w is correct: (1) w previously wrote $(\text{PREPARE}, \text{last_written}, \langle k, u \rangle)$ into R_{wQ} , and (2) w eventually writes $(\text{COMMIT}, \langle k, u \rangle)$ into R_{wQ} . Furthermore, by Observation 22, if w writes into R_{wQ} after writing $(\text{COMMIT}, \langle k, u \rangle)$ into R_{wQ} , then it writes $(\text{PREPARE}, -, \langle k', - \rangle)$ or $(\text{COMMIT}, \langle k', - \rangle)$ into R_{wQ} with $k' > k$. Since q spins forever in the loop of lines 25-29, q reads R_{wQ} infinitely many times. From the above, it is clear that eventually q reads $R_{wQ} = (\text{COMMIT}, \langle k', - \rangle)$ for some $k' \geq k$ in lines 26 or $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, -, \langle k', - \rangle)$ for some $k' > k$ in lines 28, and then q exits the loop by returning a tuple in lines 27 or 29 — a contradiction. ◀

▷ **Claim 46.** Suppose no reader is malicious. Then (1) q does not block in **THREAD 2**, and (2) if q evaluates the condition of line 34 in **THREAD 2**, then q finds that this condition holds.

Proof. Suppose no reader is malicious. So in particular no reader in Q is malicious. Thus, since the implementation of R_{pQ} is valid, q 's read operations of R_{pQ} in lines 30 and 34 do not block. So q cannot block in **THREAD 2**.

Suppose q evaluates the condition of line 34 in **THREAD 2**. Since q reaches line 34 in **THREAD 2**, process q previously read: (1) $R_{wQ} = (\text{PREPARE}, \text{last_written}, \langle k, u \rangle)$ for some `last_written` and some $\langle k, u \rangle$ in line 23, and (2) $R_{q'q} = \langle k', - \rangle$ for some $q' \in Q$ and some $k' \geq k$ in line 33. Thus, since reader q' is not malicious, q' writes $\langle k', - \rangle$ into $R_{q'q}$ before q reached line 34. Note that q' can write $\langle k', - \rangle$ into $R_{q'q}$ only in line 31 or 35 in some execution of $\text{R}_{q'}()$ by q' . Before doing so, q' must have read $R_{pQ} = \langle k'', - \rangle$ in line 30 or 34 for some $k'' \geq k'$ (in that execution of $\text{R}_{q'}()$). So this reading of $\langle k'', - \rangle$ from register R_{pQ} occurred before q reached line 34. Thus, by Observation 43, when q reads R_{pQ} in line 34,

q must read $R_{pQ} = \langle k''', - \rangle$ for some $k''' \geq k'' \geq k' \geq k$. So, q finds that the condition of line 34 holds. ◀

We now prove that if the writer is correct or no reader is malicious, then the execution of $R_q()$ by the correct process q returns. Suppose, for contradiction, that: (1) writer is correct or no reader is malicious, but (2) the execution of $R_q()$ by q does not return. So q does not return in line 22 or line 40 of $R_q()$. Thus q enters the cobegin-coend section of the code of $R_q()$, and it executes THREAD 1 and THREAD 2 in parallel.

Consider the forever loop in THREAD 1. From the code of $R_q()$, it is clear that q stops executing this loop if and only if either q returns a value in lines 27 or 29 of this loop, or q exits $R_q()$ altogether by returning some value in THREAD 2. Thus, since the execution of $R_q()$ by q does not return, q loops forever in THREAD 1.

By Claim 45, this implies that the writer w is not correct. So, by the assumption (1) on process failures, no reader is malicious. By Claim 46, q does not block inside THREAD 2. By the code of THREAD 2, either q returns a value in line 32 or 38 of THREAD 2, or q reaches line 34 and evaluates the condition in this line. In the latter case, by Claim 46, the condition in line 34 evaluates to TRUE, and so q returns a value in line 36 of THREAD 2. So in all cases, q exits $R_q()$ by returning a value in THREAD 2 — a contradiction to assumption (2). ◀

By Theorems 42 and 44, we have that if the implementations of R_{wQ} and R_{pQ} are valid (Assumption 1), then the implementation I_n is also valid. So we have:

► **Theorem 47.** *For all $n \geq 2$, I_n is a valid implementation of a $[1, n]$ -register from implemented $[1, n - 1]$ -registers and atomic $[1, 1]$ -registers, provided that the implementations of the $[1, n - 1]$ -registers that it uses (namely, R_{wQ} and R_{pQ}) are also valid.*

5.4 Implementing a $[1, n]$ -register from atomic $[1, 1]$ -registers

We now prove that in a system with Byzantine process failures, there is an implementation of a $[1, n]$ -register from atomic $[1, 1]$ -registers that is linearizable (always) and satisfies the Termination property if the writer *or* any number of readers, but *not both*, can fail. This matches the impossibility result given by Theorem 7 in Section 4. More precisely:

► **Theorem 48.** *For all $n \geq 2$, in a system of $n + 1$ processes that are subject to Byzantine failures, there is an implementation \mathcal{I}_n of a $[1, n]$ -register from atomic $[1, 1]$ -registers such that:*

- \mathcal{I}_n is linearizable.
- if the writer is correct or no reader is malicious, \mathcal{I}_n satisfies the Termination property.

Proof. We must show that for all $n \geq 2$, there is a *valid* implementation \mathcal{I}_n of a $[1, n]$ -register from atomic $[1, 1]$ -registers. We prove this by induction on n .

BASE CASE. Let $n = 2$. Consider the implementation I_2 of Theorem 47. Since $n = 2$, the set Q now contains only one process. So each register R_{wQ} and R_{pQ} in I_2 can be implemented directly by an *atomic* $[1, 1]$ -register. Since these are *valid* implementations of R_{wQ} and R_{pQ} , there is a valid implementation \mathcal{I}_2 of a $[1, 2]$ -register from atomic $[1, 1]$ -registers.

INDUCTION STEP. Let $n > 2$. Suppose there is a valid implementation \mathcal{I}_{n-1} of a $[1, n - 1]$ -register that uses only atomic $[1, 1]$ -registers. We must show there is a valid implementation \mathcal{I}_n of a $[1, n]$ -register that uses only atomic $[1, 1]$ -registers.

By Theorem 47, there is an implementation I_n of a $[1, n]$ -register that uses:

1. two implemented $[1, n - 1]$ -registers (namely, registers R_{wQ} and R_{pQ}), and
2. some atomic $[1, 1]$ -registers

such that I_n is valid if the implementations of the $[1, n - 1]$ -registers R_{wQ} and R_{pQ} are valid. Implement R_{wQ} and R_{pQ} in I_n using the valid implementation \mathcal{I}_{n-1} (\mathcal{I}_{n-1} exists by our induction hypothesis). This gives an implementation \mathcal{I}_n of a $[1, n]$ -register that uses only atomic

The lower-level procedures $w()$ and $r()$ work as follows (in these procedures, R_{ij} denotes an atomic $[1, 1]$ -register that is writable by process i and readable by process j):

- To execute $w(\langle k, u \rangle_w)$, the writer w simply writes $\langle k, u \rangle_w$ in R_{wi} for every process $i \in P$.
- To execute $r()$, a reader $p \in P$ first reads the $[1, 1]$ -register R_{ip} for every process $i \in \{w\} \cup P$ to form the set *tuples* of all the tuples validly signed by w that it reads. Then p selects the tuple $\langle k, u \rangle_w$ with the maximum sequence number k in *tuples*, and returns this tuple; but before doing so p writes $\langle k, u \rangle_w$ into the $[1, 1]$ -register R_{pi} for every reader $i \in P$ to notify them that it read $\langle k, u \rangle_w$.

We now prove that the implementation \mathcal{I}_n^s given by Algorithm 2 is wait-free and linearizable.

Wait-freedom. This is trivial: the code of Algorithm 2 does not contain any loop or wait statement, so every call to the $\text{WRITE}()$ and $\text{READ}()$ procedures by any correct process terminates with a return value in a bounded number of its own steps. Thus:

► **Observation 50.** *For all $n \geq 2$, the implementation \mathcal{I}_n^s is bounded wait-free.*

Linearizability. To prove that the implementation \mathcal{I}_n^s given by Algorithm 2 is linearizable, we must show that *if the writer w of the register implemented by \mathcal{I}_n^s is not malicious* then Properties 1 and 2 of Definition 6 hold. So for the rest of this section we assume that the writer w is not malicious, and henceforth we omit to repeat this assumption in our observations, lemmas, and theorem.

As in the previous section:

- u_0 is the initial value of the register that Algorithm 2 implements.
- For $k \geq 1$, u_k denotes the k -th value written by w using the procedure $\text{WRITE}()$. More precisely, if w calls $\text{WRITE}()$ with a value u and this is its k -th call of $\text{WRITE}()$, then u_k is u .
- v_0 is $\langle 0, u_0 \rangle_w$.
- For $k \geq 1$, v_k denotes the k -th value written by w using the procedure $w()$.

We first prove the linearizability Properties 1 and 2 of Definition 6 are satisfied by the writes and reads of the lower-level procedures $w()$ and $r()$ (Lemmas 60 and 64), and then prove they are also satisfied by the writes and reads of the high-level procedures $\text{WRITE}()$ and $\text{READ}()$ (Lemmas 65 and 66).

► **Observation 51.** *For all $k \geq 0$, $v_k = \langle k, u_k \rangle_w$.*

► **Observation 52.** *Let $w(v)$ be any write operation by w . Then there is a $k \geq 1$ such that $v = v_k$.*

Note that a correct reader enters a value v into its set *tuples* only if v is a tuple $\langle \ell, val \rangle$ validly signed by w , i.e., $\langle \ell, val \rangle_w$. Since w is not malicious, and signatures are unforgeable, it must be that $\langle \ell, val \rangle_w$ is v_ℓ . So we have:

► **Observation 53.** *For every non-malicious reader $p \in P$, if $v \in \text{tuples}$ then $v = v_k$ for some $k \geq 0$.*

► **Observation 54.** *For every non-malicious reader $p \in P$, if $r(v)$ is an operation by p , then $v = v_k$ for some $k \geq 0$. Furthermore, if $k > 0$ then w invokes $w(v_k)$ before $r(v_k)$ returns. So the operation $w(v_k)$ precedes $r(v_k)$ or is concurrent with $r(v_k)$.*

From Observation 53 and lines 15-17 of the procedure $r()$, if a non-malicious reader $p \in P$ writes a value v in R_{pi} , then $v = v_k$ for some $k \geq 0$. Furthermore, By Observation 52, if the non-malicious writer w writes a value v in R_{wi} , then $v = v_k$ for some $k \geq 1$. So:

► **Observation 55.** *Suppose a process $i \in \{w\} \cup P$ is not malicious. For every process $j \in \{w\} \cup P$, if i writes v in R_{ij} , then $v = v_k$ for some $k \geq 0$.*

► **Observation 56.** *Suppose processes $i \in \{w\} \cup P$ and $j \in \{w\} \cup P$ are not malicious. If j reads $R_{ij} = v$, then $v = v_k$ for some $k \geq 0$.*

► **Observation 57.** *Suppose a process $i \in \{w\} \cup P$ is not malicious. For every process $j \in \{w\} \cup P$, if i writes v_k in R_{ij} before i writes $v_{k'}$ in R_{ij} , then $k \leq k'$.*

► **Observation 58.** *Suppose processes $i \in \{w\} \cup P$ and $j \in \{w\} \cup P$ are not malicious. If i writes v_k in R_{ij} before j reads $R_{ij} = v_{k'}$, then $k \leq k'$.*

► **Lemma 59.** *Suppose a reader $p \in P$ is not malicious. If a $w(v_k)$ operation precedes a $R(v_{k'})$ operation by p , then $k' \geq k$.*

Proof. Suppose a $w(v_k)$ operation precedes a $R(v_{k'})$ operation by some non-malicious reader p . So w writes v_k into R_{wp} in line 9 of $w(v_k)$ before p reads R_{wp} in line 13 of $R(v_{k'})$. Note that $k \geq 1$. By Observations 56 and 58, p reads $R_{wp} = v_{k''}$ for some $k'' \geq k$ in line 13 of $R(v_{k'})$. Then p adds $v_{k''}$ to *tuples* in line 14 of $R(v_{k'})$. By line 15 of $R(v_{k'})$, $v_{k'}$ is the tuple with the maximum sequence number in *tuples* and so $k' \geq k''$. Since $k'' \geq k$, $k' \geq k$. ◀

► **Lemma 60.** *If $R(v)$ is an operation by a non-malicious reader $p \in P$ then*

- *there is a $w(v)$ operation that immediately precedes $R(v)$ or is concurrent with $R(v)$, or*
- *$v = v_0$ and no $w(-)$ operation precedes $R(v)$.*

Proof. Suppose $p \in P$ is not malicious. Let $R(v)$ be any read operation by p . By Observation 54, $v = v_k$ for some $k \geq 0$. There are two cases:

Case $k = 0$. Suppose, for contradiction, that there is a $w(v)$ operation that precedes $R(v_0)$. By Observation 52, $v = v_i$ for some $i \geq 1$. Since $w(v_i)$ precedes $R(v_0)$, by Lemma 59, $i \leq 0$ — a contradiction. So no $w(-)$ operation precedes $R(v_0)$.

Case $k > 0$. By Observation 54, the operation $w(v_k)$ precedes $R(v_k)$ or is concurrent with $R(v_k)$. We now show that if $w(v_k)$ precedes $R(v_k)$, then $w(v_k)$ immediately precedes $R(v_k)$. Suppose, for contradiction, that $w(v_k)$ precedes $R(v_k)$ but does not immediately precede $R(v_k)$. Then there is a $w(v_i)$ operation that immediately precedes $R(v_k)$. Clearly, the $w(v_k)$ operation precedes the $w(v_i)$ operation, and so $i > k$. Since $w(v_i)$ precedes $R(v_k)$, by Lemma 59, $i \leq k$ — a contradiction. Therefore the $w(v_k)$ operation immediately precedes $R(v_k)$ or is concurrent with $R(v_k)$. ◀

By Observations 51 and 54, and the code of procedure `READ()`:

► **Observation 61.** *If $READ(u)$ is an operation by a non-malicious process $p \in P$, then $u = u_k$ for some $k \geq 0$.*

► **Observation 62.** *If $READ(u_k)$ is an operation by a non-malicious process $p \in P$, then p invokes and completes a $R(v_k)$ operation in $READ(u_k)$.*

► **Observation 63.** *If $WRITE(u_k)$ is a completed operation by w , then w invokes and completes a $w(v_k)$ operation in $WRITE(u_k)$.*

► **Lemma 64.** [**Property 1:** Reading a “current” value]

If $READ(u)$ is an operation by a non-malicious process $p \in P$ then:

- *there is a $WRITE(u)$ operation that immediately precedes $READ(u)$ or is concurrent with $READ(u)$, or*
- *$u = u_0$ and no $WRITE(-)$ operation precedes $READ(u)$.*

Proof. Let $READ(u)$ be any read operation by a non-malicious process $p \in P$. By Observation 61, $u = u_k$ for some $k \geq 0$. There are two cases:

Case $k = 0$. Suppose, for contradiction, that a $WRITE(u_i)$ operation precedes $READ(u_0)$. Note that $i \geq 1$. By Observations 62 and 63, a $w(v_i)$ operation precedes a $R(v_0)$ operation. Since process p is not malicious, by Lemma 60, there is no $w(-)$ operation that precedes $R(v_0)$ — a contradiction.

Case $k > 0$. By Observation 62, p invokes and completes a $R(v_k)$ operation in $READ(u_k)$. Since $k > 0$, $v_k \neq v_0$. So, by Lemma 60, there is a $w(v_k)$ operation that immediately precedes

$R(v_k)$ or is concurrent with $R(v_k)$. Let $WRITE(u_k)$ be the operation in which w invokes the $W(v_k)$ operation. Since $W(v_k)$ operation immediately precedes $R(v_k)$ or is concurrent with $R(v_k)$, the $WRITE(u_k)$ operation immediately precedes $READ(u_k)$ or is concurrent with $READ(u_k)$. ◀

► **Lemma 65.** *Let $R(v_k)$ and $R(v_{k'})$ be any read operations by non-malicious processes p and p' in P , respectively. If $R(v_k)$ precedes $R(v_{k'})$, then $k \leq k'$.*

Proof. Let $R(v_k)$ and $R(v_{k'})$ be any read operations by non-malicious processes p and p' in P , respectively. Suppose that $R(v_k)$ precedes $R(v_{k'})$. Then p writes v_k in $R_{pp'}$ in line 17 of $R(v_k)$ before p' reads $R_{pp'}$ in line 13 of $R(v_{k'})$. By Observations 56 and 58, p' reads $R_{pp'} = v_{k''}$ for some $k'' \geq k$ in line 13 of $R(v_{k'})$. Then p' adds $v_{k''}$ to *tuples* in line 14 of $R(v_{k'})$. By line 15 of $R(v_{k'})$, $v_{k'}$ is the tuple with the maximum sequence number in *tuples* and so $k' \geq k''$. Since $k'' \geq k$, $k' \geq k$. ◀

► **Lemma 66.** [Property 2: No “new-old” inversion]

Let $READ(u_k)$ and $READ(u_{k'})$ be any read operations by non-malicious processes in P . If $READ(u_k)$ precedes $READ(u_{k'})$ then $k \leq k'$.

Proof. Let $READ(u_k)$ and $READ(u_{k'})$ be any read operations by non-malicious processes p and p' in P . Suppose $READ(u_k)$ precedes $READ(u_{k'})$. By Observation 62, in the $READ(u_k)$ and $READ(u_{k'})$ operations, processes p and p' invoke and complete a $R(v_k)$ and $R(v_{k'})$ operation, respectively. Since $READ(u_k)$ precedes $READ(u_{k'})$, $R(v_k)$ precedes $R(v_{k'})$. By Lemma 65, $k \leq k'$. ◀

By Lemmas 64 and 66, the $WRITE(-)$ and $READ(-)$ operations of the register implementation \mathcal{I}_n^s satisfy the linearizability Properties 1 and 2 of Definition 6. This proves:

► **Theorem 67.** *For all $n \geq 2$, the implementation \mathcal{I}_n^s is linearizable.*

By Observation 50 and Theorem 67, we have the following:

► **Theorem 68.** *Consider a system where processes are subject to Byzantine failures and can use unforgeable signatures. For every $n \geq 2$, \mathcal{I}_n^s is a bounded wait-free linearizable implementation of a $[1, n]$ -register from atomic $[1, 1]$ -registers.*

7 Register implementations with bounded termination

The linearizable register implementations given in Section 6 (Algorithm 2, Theorem 68) and in Appendix A (Algorithm 3, Theorem 49) guarantee that every correct process completes every operation in a *bounded* number of steps (regardless of which processes fail or how they fail).

In contrast, the linearizable register implementation given in Section 5.4 (Algorithm 1, Theorem 48) satisfies the Termination property, namely every correct process completes every operation in a *finite* number of steps, and it does so under the assumption that the writer of the register is correct or no reader is malicious. This raises the question of whether, under the same failure assumption, there is a register implementation that satisfies the following stronger termination property:

► **Definition 69** (Bounded Termination). *Every correct process completes every operation in a bounded number of its steps.*

It turns out that the answer is “No”, even if we assume that the writer is not faulty and at most one of the readers can fail. More precisely:

► **Theorem 70.** *For all $n \geq 3$, in a system with $n + 1$ processes that are subject to Byzantine failures, there is no linearizable implementation of a $[1, n]$ -register from atomic $[1, n - 1]$ -registers that satisfies the Bounded Termination property, even if we assume that the writer of the implemented $[1, n]$ -register is correct and at most one reader can be malicious.*

This is in sharp contrast to Theorem 48 which implies that, if we assume that the writer is correct, there *is* a linearizable implementation of a $[1, n]$ -register from atomic $[1, 1]$ -registers that satisfies the Termination property and tolerates any number of malicious readers. Thus, Theorems 48 and 70 imply that there is an inherent difference between achieving Termination and achieving Bounded Termination in systems with Byzantine failures.

To prove Theorem 70, it is easy to modify the impossibility proof of Theorem 7 given in Section 4, as we now explain. First note that in the successive runs that we construct in the proof of Theorem 7, we leverage the fact that a correct reader that starts a read operation cannot wait for the writer to complete a concurrent write, *even if the reader is aware that this write is in progress*: in our runs, the writer actually crashes so such waiting is not possible. So a correct reader must complete its read operation even if the writer stops taking steps.

However, if *the writer is assumed to be correct* and we require “only” Termination, a reader that is aware that a write operation is in progress *can* wait for the writer to complete this operation to determine what value to read (so the impossibility proof breaks down in this case, as it should). But if we require the register implementation to satisfy Bounded Termination, then we are back to a situation where a reader must complete its operation without waiting for the writer to take steps. So the proof of Theorem 70 can use this fact exactly as the proof of Theorem 7 does.

Thus, we can modify the proof of Theorem 7 to obtain one for Theorem 70 as follows. Roughly speaking, whenever the writer w crashes in the proof of Theorem 7, the writer is correct but just *pauses* in the proof of Theorem 70; the writer later resumes taking steps and completes its write operation, but it does so only *after* the readers complete their read operations. Since the delayed steps of the writer are not seen by the readers, they behave as in the proof of Theorem 7.

More precisely, in the successive runs that we construct in the proof:

- If, in the proof of Theorem 7, the writer w crashes after taking a step s^k and before taking further steps,
- then, in the proof of Theorem 70, the correct writer w *temporarily* stops taking steps after taking a step s^k and before taking further steps.

The readers behave the same in the corresponding runs of both proofs. After the reads by correct readers are completed, the writer resumes taking steps and completes its operation. Since the proof of Theorem 70 is mostly a verbatim repetition of the proof of Theorem 7, we relegate it to Appendix B.

8 Implementations from regular registers

In a seminal work [13], Lamport considered the problem of implementing “atomic” registers from *regular* registers, in systems where processes may *crash*. Recall that, as with an atomic register, a regular register ensures that a reader reads the “current” value of the register, but in contrast to an atomic register, a regular register allows “new-old” inversions in the values read. In other words, a regular register must satisfy only Property 1 of the register linearizability Definition 5.

We now consider this problem for systems where processes are subject to Byzantine failures. To do so, we must first define what it means for a register implementation to be an implementation of a *regular* register in systems where processes can be malicious. Intuitively, we require that if the writer is not malicious then non-malicious readers must read the “current” value of the register (this is Property 1 of Definition 6):

► **Definition 71** (Register Regularity). *In a system with Byzantine process failures, an implementation of a $[1, n]$ -register is a regular register implementation if and only if, when the writer is not malicious, the following property holds:*

[Reading a “current” value] *If a read operation R by a process that is not malicious returns*

the value v then:

- there is a write v operation that immediately precedes R or is concurrent with R , or
- $v = v_0$ and no write operation precedes R .¹⁰

An impossibility result. Recall that, by Theorem 4, in a system with Byzantine failures there is no linearizable implementation of a $[1, n]$ -register from *atomic* $[1, n - 1]$ -registers that satisfies Termination. This raises the following question: What happens if all processes, *including the writer*, are given regular $[1, n]$ -registers instead of atomic $[1, n - 1]$ -registers? Note that these regular registers *can be read by all the n readers*, as in the desired register implementation, but they are “only” regular. This question is answered by the following:

► **Theorem 72.** *For all $n \geq 3$, in a system with $n + 1$ processes that are subject to Byzantine failures, there is no linearizable implementation of a $[1, n]$ -register from regular $[1, n]$ -registers that satisfies the Termination property, even if we assume that the writer of the implemented $[1, n]$ -register can only crash and at most one reader can be malicious.*

The above impossibility result is in sharp contrast to a corresponding possibility result in the case of systems with only crash failures: in such systems it is easy to implement a wait-free linearizable $[1, n]$ -register from regular $[1, n]$ -registers.

Proof. Let $n \geq 3$. Consider a system with $n + 1$ processes with Byzantine failures.

▷ **Claim 73.** For every process x , there is a wait-free implementation of a *regular* $[1, n]$ -register R_{xn} , writable by x and readable by the other n processes, from atomic $[1, 1]$ -registers.

Proof. The implementation of R_{xn} is very simple. For each reader p , the writer x has an atomic $[1, 1]$ -register R_{xp} that x can write and p can read.

- To write a value v into R_{xn} , the writer x successively writes v into R_{xp} for every reader p .
- To read a value from R_{xn} , a reader p reads register R_{xp} and returns the value read.

It is clear that if the writer x is not malicious, then any non-malicious reader p that reads R_{xn} , reads the value written into R_{xn} by a write operation by x that immediately precedes the read of R_{xn} or is concurrent with this read; more precisely, this implementation of R_{xn} satisfies the property of regular registers, namely, Property 1 of Definition 71. ◀

Let w be any process. Assume w can only crash and at most one of the remaining n processes can be malicious. For contradiction, suppose that using regular $[1, n]$ -registers there is an implementation \mathcal{I}_n of a $[1, n]$ -register, writable by w and readable by the other n processes, such that: (1) \mathcal{I}_n is linearizable, and (2) \mathcal{I}_n satisfies the Termination property.

By Claim 73, every regular $[1, n]$ -register used by \mathcal{I}_n has a *wait-free* implementation from atomic $[1, 1]$ -registers. Thus, by replacing every regular $[1, n]$ -register used by \mathcal{I}_n with its corresponding wait-free implementation, we obtain an implementation \mathcal{I}'_n of a $[1, n]$ -register, writable by w and readable by the other n processes, *from atomic* $[1, 1]$ -registers. It is clear that like \mathcal{I}_n : (1) \mathcal{I}'_n is linearizable, and (2) \mathcal{I}'_n satisfies the Termination property. Therefore \mathcal{I}'_n contradicts Theorem 7. ◀

9 Concluding remarks

The implementation of registers from weaker registers is a basic problem in distributed computing that has been extensively studied in the context of processes with crash failures. In this paper, we investigated this problem in the context of Byzantine processes failures, with and without process signatures.

We first proved that, without signatures, there is no wait-free linearizable implementation of a $[1, n]$ -register from atomic $[1, n - 1]$ -registers. In fact, we showed a stronger result,

¹⁰Recall that v_0 is the initial value of the implemented register.

namely, even under the assumption that the writer can only crash and at most one reader can be malicious, there is no linearizable implementation of a $[1, n]$ -register from atomic $[1, n - 1]$ -registers that ensures that every correct process eventually completes its operations. In light of this strong impossibility result, we gave an implementation of a $[1, n]$ -register from atomic $[1, 1]$ -registers that is “safe” (i.e, it is linearizable) under any combination of Byzantine process failures, but it is “live” (i.e., it ensures that every correct process eventually completes its operations) only under the assumption that the writer is correct or no reader is malicious; this matches the impossibility result.

If we assume that the writer is correct, with the above implementation (which tolerates any number of malicious readers) every reader completes each read in a *finite* number of steps. We showed that is impossible to ensure they do so in a *bounded* number of steps, even if we make the additional assumption that at most one reader can be malicious.

In sharp contrast with the above results, for the case that processes can use signatures, we gave a *bounded wait-free* linearizable implementation of a $[1, n]$ -register from atomic $[1, 1]$ -registers which does not rely on any failure assumptions.

Perhaps surprisingly, none of the above results refers to a ratio of faulty vs. correct processes, such as $n/3$ or $n/2$, that we typically encounter in results that involve Byzantine processes. For example, Mostéfaoui *et al.* [14] prove that one can implement a linearizable f -resilient $[1, n]$ -register in *message-passing* systems with Byzantine process failures if and only if $f < n/3$. As an other example, Cohen and Keidar [5] show that if $f < n/2$, one can use atomic $[1, n]$ -registers to get a linearizable f -resilient implementations of reliable broadcast, atomic snapshot, and asset transfer objects in systems with Byzantine process failures.

It is worth noting that, since atomic $[1, 1]$ -registers can simulate message-passing channels, one can use the f -resilient implementation of a $[1, n]$ -register for *message-passing* systems given in [14], to obtain an f -resilient implementation of a $[1, n]$ -register using atomic $[1, 1]$ -registers. But f -resilient implementations (such as the ones given in [5, 14]) require every correct process to help the execution of every operation, even the operations of *other* processes. In contrast, with object implementations in shared-memory systems, a common assumption is that processes that do not have ongoing operations take no steps; so a process that executes an operation cannot count on getting help from any process that is *not* currently executing its own operation.

Acknowledgments

We thank Vassos Hadzilacos for his helpful comments on this paper. This work was partially funded by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (Grant number: RGPIN-2014-05296).

References

- 1 Marcos K. Aguilera, Naama Ben-David, Rachid Guerraoui, Virendra Marathe, and Igor Zablotchi. The impact of RDMA on agreement. In *Proceedings of the 38th Annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*, PODC '19, page 409–418, 2019.
- 2 Hagit Attiya, Amotz Bar-Noy, and Danny Dolev. Sharing memory robustly in message-passing systems. *Journal of the ACM*, 42(1):124–142, 1995.
- 3 B. Bloom. Constructing two-writer atomic registers. *IEEE Trans. Comput.*, 37(12):1506–1514, dec 1988.
- 4 James E. Burns and Gary L. Peterson. Constructing multi-reader atomic values from non-atomic values. In *Proceedings of the 6th Annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*, PODC '87, page 222–231, 1987.
- 5 Shir Cohen and Idit Keidar. Tame the Wild with Byzantine Linearizability: Reliable Broadcast, Snapshots, and Asset Transfer. In *35th International Symposium on Distributed Computing*, DISC '21, pages 18:1–18:18, 2021.
- 6 Wojciech Golab, Lisa Higham, and Philipp Woelfel. Linearizable implementations do not suffice for randomized distributed computation. In *Proceedings of the Forty-Third Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '11, page 373–382, 2011.
- 7 Jim Gray. Notes on data base operating systems. In *Operating Systems, An Advanced Course*, page 393–481, 1978.
- 8 S. Haldar and K. Vidyasankar. Constructing 1-writer multireader multivalued atomic variables from regular variables. *J. ACM*, 42(1):186–203, jan 1995.
- 9 Maurice Herlihy. Wait-free synchronization. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.*, 13(1):124–149, 1991.
- 10 Maurice P. Herlihy and Jeannette M. Wing. Linearizability: A correctness condition for concurrent objects. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.*, 12(3):463–492, 1990.
- 11 Xing Hu and Sam Toueg. On Implementing SWMR Registers from SWSR Registers in Systems with Byzantine Failures. In *36th International Symposium on Distributed Computing*, DISC '22, pages 36:1–36:19, 2022.
- 12 Amos Israeli and Amnon Shoham. Optimal multi-writer multi-reader atomic register. In *Proceedings of the 11th Annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*, PODC '92, page 71–82, 1992.
- 13 Leslie Lamport. On interprocess communication Parts I–II. *Distributed Computing*, 1(2):77–101, 1986.
- 14 Achour Mostéfaoui, Matoula Petrolia, Michel Raynal, and Claude Jard. Atomic read/write memory in signature-free byzantine asynchronous message-passing systems. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 60, 05 2017. doi:10.1007/s00224-016-9699-8.
- 15 Richard Newman-Wolfe. A protocol for wait-free, atomic, multi-reader shared variables. In *Proceedings of the 6th Annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*, PODC '87, page 232–248, 1987.
- 16 Gary L. Peterson. Concurrent reading while writing. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.*, 5(1):46–55, jan 1983.
- 17 Gary L. Peterson and James E. Burns. Concurrent reading while writing ii: The multi-writer case. In *28th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, SFCS '87, page 383–392, 1987.
- 18 Ambuj K. Singh, James H. Anderson, and Mohamed G. Gouda. The elusive atomic register revisited. In *Proceedings of the 6th Annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*, PODC '87, page 206–221, 1987.
- 19 K. Vidyasankar. Converting Lamport's regular register to atomic register. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 28(6):287–290, aug 1988.
- 20 K. Vidyasankar. A very simple construction of 1-writer multireader multivalued atomic variable. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 37(6):323–326, mar 1991.
- 21 Paul M. B. Vitanyi and Baruch Awerbuch. Atomic shared register access by asynchronous hardware. In *27th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, SFCS '86, pages 233–243, 1986.

■ **Algorithm 3** Implementation \mathcal{I}'_2 of a $[1, 2]$ -register writable by w and readable by p and q . \mathcal{I}_2 uses atomic $[1, 1]$ -registers.

ATOMIC REGISTERS	LOCAL VARIABLES
R_{wp} : $[1, 1]$ -register; initially $(\text{COMMIT}, \langle 0, u_0 \rangle)$	c : variable of w ; initially 0
R_{wq} : $[1, 1]$ -register; initially $(\text{COMMIT}, \langle 0, u_0 \rangle)$	$last_written$: variable of w ; initially $\langle 0, u_0 \rangle$
R_{pq} : $[1, 1]$ -register; initially $\langle 0, u_0 \rangle$	$last_read$: variable of q initially $\langle 0, u_0 \rangle$

<p>WRITE(u): ▷ executed by the writer w</p> <p>1: $c \leftarrow c + 1$</p> <p>2: call $W(\langle c, u \rangle)$</p> <p>3: return done</p>	<p>READ(): ▷ executed by any reader $r \in \{p, q\}$</p> <p>4: call $R_r()$</p> <p>5: if this call returns some tuple $\langle k, u \rangle$ then</p> <p>6: return u</p> <p>7: else return \perp</p>
---	---

<p>$W(\langle k, u \rangle)$: ▷ executed by w to do its k-th write</p> <p>8: $R_{wp} \leftarrow (\text{PREPARE}, last_written, \langle k, u \rangle)$</p> <p>9: $R_{wq} \leftarrow (\text{PREPARE}, last_written, \langle k, u \rangle)$</p> <p>10: $R_{wp} \leftarrow (\text{COMMIT}, \langle k, u \rangle)$</p> <p>11: $R_{wq} \leftarrow (\text{COMMIT}, \langle k, u \rangle)$</p> <p>12: $last_written \leftarrow \langle k, u \rangle$</p> <p>13: return done</p>	<p>$R_p()$: ▷ executed by reader p</p> <p>14: if $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, \langle k, u \rangle)$ for some $\langle k, u \rangle$ then</p> <p>15: $R_{pq} \leftarrow \langle k, u \rangle$</p> <p>16: return $\langle k, u \rangle$</p> <p>17: elseif $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, last_written, -)$ for some $last_written$ then</p> <p>18: return $last_written$</p> <p>19: else return \perp</p>
<p>$R_q()$: ▷ executed by reader q</p> <p>20: if $R_{wq} = (\text{COMMIT}, \langle k, u \rangle)$ for some $\langle k, u \rangle$ then</p> <p>21: return $\langle k, u \rangle$</p> <p>22: elseif $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, last_written, \langle k, u \rangle)$ for some $last_written$ and some $\langle k, u \rangle$ then</p> <p>23: if $R_{pq} = \langle k', - \rangle$ for some $k' \geq k$ then</p> <p>24: $last_read \leftarrow \langle k, u \rangle$</p> <p>25: return $\langle k, u \rangle$</p> <p>26: elseif $last_read = \langle k', - \rangle$ and some $k' \geq k$ then</p> <p>27: return $\langle k, u \rangle$</p> <p>28: else</p> <p>29: return $last_written$</p> <p>30: else return \perp</p>	

A A wait-free linearizable implementation of a $[1, 2]$ -register from atomic $[1, 1]$ -registers

Algorithm 3 gives a wait-free linearizable implementation \mathcal{I}'_2 of a $[1, 2]$ -register from atomic $[1, 1]$ -registers. This algorithm is a simpler version of Algorithm 1 for the *valid* implementation I_n of a $[1, n]$ -register (Section 5.3): \mathcal{I}'_2 has only two readers, namely p and q , so preventing new-old inversions among readers is easier. In contrast to Algorithm 1, the code of Algorithm 3 has no parallel threads. We now prove the correctness of \mathcal{I}'_2 .

Since the code of Algorithm 3 does not contain any loop or wait statement, it is clear that every call to the WRITE() and READ() procedures by any correct process terminates with a return value in a bounded number of its own steps. Thus:

► **Observation 74.** *The implementation \mathcal{I}'_2 is bounded wait-free.*

The proof that \mathcal{I}'_2 is linearizable is in many parts similar (or even identical) to the proof that the register implementation I_n is linearizable (Theorem 42 in Section 5.3). It is given here for completeness.

To prove that \mathcal{I}'_2 is linearizable, we consider two cases:

CASE 1: *The writer w of the register implemented by \mathcal{I}'_2 is malicious.* By Definition 6, \mathcal{I}'_2 is (trivially) linearizable in this case.

CASE 2: *The writer w of the register implemented by \mathcal{I}'_2 is not malicious.*

For this case, we now prove that the read and write operations of the implemented register satisfy the linearizability Properties 1 and 2 of Definition 6.

In the following:

- u_0 is the initial value of the register that \mathcal{I}'_2 implements.
- For $k \geq 1$, u_k denotes the k -th value written by w using the procedure $\text{WRITE}()$. More precisely, if w calls $\text{WRITE}()$ with a value u and this is its k -th call of $\text{WRITE}()$, then u_k is u .
- v_0 is $\langle 0, u_0 \rangle$.
- For $k \geq 1$, v_k denotes the k -th value written by w using the procedure $w()$.

► **Observation 75.** *For all $k \geq 0$, $v_k = \langle k, u_k \rangle$.*

► **Observation 76.** *Let $w(v)$ be any write operation by w . Then there is a $k \geq 1$ such that $v = v_k$.*

► **Observation 77.** *Let $R \in \{R_{wp}, R_{wq}\}$. If w writes x in R , then $x = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ for some $k \geq 1$ or $x = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ for some $k \geq 0$.*

► **Observation 78.** *Suppose p is not malicious. If p reads $R_{wp} = x$, then $x = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ or $x = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$, for some $k \geq 0$.*

► **Observation 79.** *Suppose q is not malicious. If q reads $R_{wq} = x$, then $x = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ or $x = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$, for some $k \geq 0$.*

► **Lemma 80.** *Suppose p is not malicious. Let $R_p(v)$ be any read operation by p . Then there is a $k \geq 0$ such that $v = v_k$, and*

- p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in line 14 of $R_p(v)$,¹¹ or
- p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ in line 17 of $R_p(v)$.

Proof. Suppose p is not malicious. Let $R_p(v)$ be any read operation by p . Note that p reads R_{wp} in $R_p(v)$. When it does so, by Observation 78, there are two possible cases:

1. p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ for some $k \geq 0$ in line 14 of $R_p(v)$. Then $R_p(v)$ returns v_k in line 16, i.e., $v = v_k$.
2. p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ for some $k \geq 0$ in line 17 of $R_p(v)$. Then $R_p(v)$ returns v_k in line 18, i.e., $v = v_k$.

◀

► **Lemma 81.** *Suppose q is not malicious. Let $R_q(v)$ be any read operation by q . Then there is a $k \geq 0$ such that $v = v_k$, and*

- q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in line 20 of $R_q(v)$,
- q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in line 22 of $R_q(v)$, or
- q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ in line 22 of $R_q(v)$.

Proof. Suppose q is not malicious. Let $R_q(v)$ be any read operation by q . Note that q reads R_{wq} in $R_q(v)$. When it does so, by Observation 79, there are two possible cases:

¹¹ For brevity, we say that “a process r reads or writes a register in line x of a $R_r(-)$ or a $w(-)$ operation”, if it reads or writes this register in line x of the $R_r()$ or $w()$ procedure executed to do this $R_r(-)$ or $w(-)$ operation.

1. q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ for some $k \geq 0$ in line 20 of $R_q(v)$. Then $R_q(v)$ returns v_k in line 21, i.e., $v = v_k$.
2. q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ for some $k \geq 0$ in line 22 of $R_q(v)$. Then there are two subcases:
 - a. $R_q(v)$ returns v_{k+1} in line 25 or 27, i.e., $v = v_{k+1}$. Let $k' = k + 1$. Then in this case, q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$ in line 22 of $R_q(v)$ and $v = v_{k'}$.
 - b. $R_q(v)$ returns v_k in line 29, i.e., $v = v_k$.

◀

► **Observation 82.** Let R be any register in $\{R_{wp}, R_{wq}\}$.

- (1) If w writes $(\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in R before w writes $(\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in R , then $k \leq k'$.
- (2) If w writes $(\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in R before w writes $(\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$ in R , then $k < k'$.
- (3) If w writes (COMMIT, v_k) in R before w writes $(\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in R , then $k < k'$.
- (4) If w writes (COMMIT, v_k) in R before w writes $(\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$ in R , then $k < k'$.

► **Observation 83.** Let R be any register in $\{R_{wp}, R_{wq}\}$. Suppose $r \in \{p, q\}$ is not malicious.

- (1) If w writes $(\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in R before r reads $(\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in R , then $k \leq k'$.
- (2) If w writes $(\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in R before r reads $(\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$ in R , then $k \leq k'$.
- (3) If w writes (COMMIT, v_k) in R before r reads $(\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in R , then $k \leq k'$.
- (4) If w writes (COMMIT, v_k) in R before r reads $(\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$ in R , then $k < k'$.

► **Observation 84.** Let R be any register in $\{R_{wp}, R_{wq}\}$. Suppose r and r' are non-malicious processes in $\{p, q\}$.

- (1) If r reads $R = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ before r' reads $R = (\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$, then $k \leq k'$.
- (2) If r reads $R = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ before r' reads $R = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$, then $k \leq k'$.
- (3) If r reads $R = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ before r' reads $R = (\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$, then $k \leq k'$.
- (4) If r reads $R = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ before r' reads $R = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$, then $k < k'$.

PROOF OF LINEARIZABILITY PROPERTY 1. We now prove that the write and read operations of the register that \mathcal{I}'_2 implements satisfy Property 1 of Definition 6, i.e., processes read the “current” value of the register. To do so, we first prove this for the writes and reads of the lower-level procedures $w()$ and $R_r()$ for all readers $r \in \{p, q\}$ (Lemma 85), and then prove it for the writes and reads of the high-level procedures $\text{WRITE}()$ and $\text{READ}()$ (Lemma 89).

► **Lemma 85.** If $R_r(v)$ is a read operation by a non-malicious process $r \in \{p, q\}$ then:

- there is a $w(v)$ operation that immediately precedes $R_r(v)$ or is concurrent with $R_r(v)$, or
- $v = v_0$ and no $w(-)$ operation precedes $R_r(v)$.

Proof. Let $R_r(v)$ be any read operation by a non-malicious process $r \in \{p, q\}$. By Lemmas 80 and 81, $v = v_k$ for some $k \geq 0$. We now show that:

- if $k = 0$ then no $w(-)$ operation precedes $R_r(v_k)$, and
- if $k > 0$ then a $w(v_k)$ operation immediately precedes $R_r(v_k)$ or is concurrent with $R_r(v_k)$.

There are two cases: $r = p$ or $r = q$.

- Case 1: $r = p$. By Lemma 80, there are two cases:

- 1) p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in line 14 of $R_p(v_k)$. There are two cases:

- i. $k = 0$. Suppose, for contradiction, that there is a $w(v)$ operation that precedes $R_p(v_0)$. By Observation 76, $v = v_i$ for some $i \geq 1$. So w writes (COMMIT, v_i) into R_{wp} in line 10 of $w(v_i)$ before p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_0)$ in line 14 of $R_p(v_k)$. By Observation 83(3), $i \leq 0$ — a contradiction. So no $w(-)$ operation precedes $R_p(v_0)$.
 - ii. $k > 0$. Then w writes (COMMIT, v_k) into R_{wp} in line 10 of $w(v_k)$ before p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in $R_p(v_k)$. So the $w(v_k)$ operation precedes $R_p(v_k)$ or is concurrent with $R_p(v_k)$. We now show that if $w(v_k)$ precedes $R_p(v_k)$, then $w(v_k)$ immediately precedes $R_p(v_k)$. Suppose, for contradiction, that $w(v_k)$ precedes $R_p(v_k)$ but does not immediately precede $R_p(v_k)$. Then there is a $w(v_i)$ operation that immediately precedes $R_p(v_k)$. Clearly, the $w(v_k)$ operation precedes the $w(v_i)$ operation, and so $i > k$. Furthermore, w writes (COMMIT, v_i) into R_{wp} in line 10 of $w(v_i)$ before p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in line 14 of $R_p(v_k)$. By Observation 83(3), $i \leq k$ — a contradiction. Therefore the $w(v_k)$ operation immediately precedes $R_p(v_k)$ or is concurrent with $R_p(v_k)$.
 - 2) p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ in line 17 of $R_p(v_k)$. Then this read occurs *after* w writes $(\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ in R_{wp} in line 8 of the $w(v_{k+1})$ operation. Furthermore, by Observation 83(4), this read occurs *before* w writes (COMMIT, v_{k+1}) in R_{wp} in line 10 of the $w(v_{k+1})$ operation. Therefore the $w(v_{k+1})$ operation is concurrent with $R_p(v_k)$. There are two cases:
 - i. $k = 0$. Since $w(v_1)$ is concurrent with $R_p(v_0)$, no $w(-)$ operation precedes $R_p(v_0)$.
 - ii. $k > 0$. Since $w(v_{k+1})$ is concurrent with $R_p(v_k)$, $w(v_k)$ immediately precedes $R_p(v_k)$ or is concurrent with $R_p(v_k)$.
- Case 2: $r = q$. By Lemma 81, there are three cases:
- 1) q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in line 20 of $R_q(v_k)$. There are two cases:
 - i. $k = 0$. Suppose, for contradiction, that there is a $w(v)$ operation that precedes $R_q(v_0)$. By Observation 76, $v = v_i$ for some $i \geq 1$. So w writes (COMMIT, v_i) into R_{wq} in line 11 of $w(v_i)$ before q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_0)$ in line 20 of $R_q(v_k)$. By Observation 83(3), $i \leq 0$ — a contradiction. So no $w(-)$ operation precedes $R_q(v_0)$.
 - ii. $k > 0$. Then w writes (COMMIT, v_k) into R_{wq} in line 11 of $w(v_k)$ before q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in line 20 of $R_q(v_k)$. So the $w(v_k)$ operation precedes $R_q(v_k)$ or is concurrent with $R_q(v_k)$. We now show that if $w(v_k)$ precedes $R_q(v_k)$, then $w(v_k)$ immediately precedes $R_q(v_k)$. Suppose, for contradiction, that $w(v_k)$ precedes $R_q(v_k)$ but does not immediately precede $R_q(v_k)$. Then there is a $w(v_i)$ operation that immediately precedes $R_q(v_k)$. Clearly, the $w(v_k)$ operation precedes the $w(v_i)$ operation, and so $i > k$. Furthermore, w writes (COMMIT, v_i) into R_{wq} in line 11 of $w(v_i)$ before q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in line 20 of $R_q(v_k)$. By Observation 83(3), $i \leq k$ — a contradiction. Therefore the $w(v_k)$ operation immediately precedes $R_q(v_k)$ or is concurrent with $R_q(v_k)$.
 - 2) q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in line 22 of $R_q(v_k)$. Then this read occurs *after* w writes $(\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in R_{wq} in line 9 of the $w(v_k)$ operation. Furthermore, by Observation 83(4), this read occurs *before* w writes (COMMIT, v_k) in R_{wq} in line 11 of the $w(v_k)$ operation. Therefore the $w(v_k)$ operation is concurrent with $R_q(v_k)$.
 - 3) q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ in line 22 of $R_q(v_k)$. Then this read occurs *after* w writes $(\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ in R_{wq} in line 9 of the $w(v_{k+1})$ operation. Furthermore, by Observation 83(4), this read occurs *before* w writes (COMMIT, v_{k+1}) in R_{wq} in line 11 of the $w(v_{k+1})$ operation. Therefore the $w(v_{k+1})$ operation is concurrent with $R_q(v_k)$. There are two cases:
 - i. $k = 0$. Since $w(v_1)$ is concurrent with $R_q(v_0)$, no $w(-)$ operation precedes $R_q(v_0)$.
 - ii. $k > 0$. Since $w(v_{k+1})$ is concurrent with $R_q(v_k)$, $w(v_k)$ is concurrent with $R_q(v_k)$ or immediately precedes $R_q(v_k)$.



We now prove that the write and read operations of the high-level procedures $\text{WRITE}()$ and $\text{READ}()$ satisfy Property 1 of Definition 6.

By Observation 75, Lemmas 80 and 81, and the code of the procedure $\text{READ}()$, we have:

► **Observation 86.** *If $\text{READ}(u)$ is an operation by a non-malicious process $r \in \{p, q\}$, then $u = u_k$ for some $k \geq 0$.*

► **Observation 87.** *If $\text{READ}(u_k)$ is an operation by a non-malicious process $r \in \{p, q\}$, then r invokes and completes a $R_r(v_k)$ operation in $\text{READ}(u_k)$.*

► **Observation 88.** *If $\text{WRITE}(u_k)$ is a completed operation by w , then w invokes and completes a $W(v_k)$ operation in $\text{WRITE}(u_k)$.*

We now prove that the $\text{WRITE}(-)$ and $\text{READ}(-)$ operations satisfy Property 1 of Definition 6.

► **Lemma 89.** [Property 1: Reading a “current” value]

If $\text{READ}(u)$ is a read operation by a non-malicious process $r \in \{p, q\}$ then:

- *there is a $\text{WRITE}(u)$ operation that immediately precedes $\text{READ}(u)$ or is concurrent with $\text{READ}(u)$, or*
- *$u = u_0$ and no $\text{WRITE}(-)$ operation precedes $\text{READ}(u)$.*

Proof. Let $\text{READ}(u)$ be any read operation by a non-malicious process $r \in \{p, q\}$. By Observation 86, $u = u_k$ for some $k \geq 0$. There are two cases:

- (1) $k = 0$. Suppose, for contradiction, that a $\text{WRITE}(u_i)$ operation precedes $\text{READ}_r(u_0)$. Note that $i \geq 1$. By Observations 88 and 87, a $W(v_i)$ operation precedes a $R_r(v_0)$ operation. Since process r is not malicious, by Lemma 85, there is no $W(-)$ operation that precedes $R_r(v_0)$ — a contradiction.
- (2) $k > 0$. By Observation 87, r invokes and completes a $R_r(v_k)$ operation in $\text{READ}(u_k)$. Since $k > 0$, by Lemma 85, there is a $W(v_k)$ operation that immediately precedes $R_r(v_k)$ or is concurrent with $R_r(v_k)$. Let $\text{WRITE}(u_k)$ be the operation in which w invokes the $W(v_k)$ operation. Since $W(v_k)$ immediately precedes $R_r(v_k)$ or is concurrent with $R_r(v_k)$, the $\text{WRITE}(u_k)$ operation immediately precedes $\text{READ}(u_k)$ or is concurrent with $\text{READ}(u_k)$.



PROOF OF LINEARIZABILITY PROPERTY 2. We now prove that the write and read operations of the register that \mathcal{I}'_2 implements satisfy Property 2 of Definition 6, i.e., we prove that there are no “new-old” inversions in the values that processes read. To do so, we first prove this for the writes and reads of the lower-level procedures $W()$, $R_p()$, and $R_q()$, and then prove it for the writes and reads of the high-level procedures $\text{WRITE}()$ and $\text{READ}()$ (Lemma 104).

We first show that there are no “new-old” inversions in the consecutive reads of process p .

► **Lemma 90.** *Suppose p is not malicious. If $R_p(v_k)$ and $R_p(v_{k'})$ are read operations by p , and $R_p(v_k)$ precedes $R_p(v_{k'})$, then $k \leq k'$.*

Proof. Suppose p is not malicious. Let $R_p(v_k)$ and $R_p(v_{k'})$ be read operations by p such that $R_p(v_k)$ precedes $R_p(v_{k'})$. By Lemma 80, the following occurs:

1. p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in line 14 of $R_p(v_k)$, or
2. p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ in line 17 of $R_p(v_k)$

before the following occurs:

1. p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in line 14 of $R_p(v_{k'})$, or
2. p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'}, v_{k'+1})$ in line 17 of $R_p(v_{k'})$.

So there are four possible cases:

1. p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in $R_p(v_k)$ before p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in $R_p(v_{k'})$. By Observation 84(3), $k \leq k'$.
2. p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in $R_p(v_k)$ before p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'}, v_{k'+1})$ in $R_p(v_{k'})$. By Observation 84(4), $k < k' + 1$. So $k \leq k'$.
3. p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ in $R_p(v_k)$ before p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in $R_p(v_{k'})$. By Observation 84(1), $k + 1 \leq k'$. So $k \leq k'$.
4. p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ in $R_p(v_k)$ before p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'}, v_{k'+1})$ in $R_p(v_{k'})$. By Observation 84(2), $k + 1 \leq k' + 1$. So $k \leq k'$.

◀

To prove that there are no “new-old” inversions between the reads of p and q , and also between the reads of q itself, we first make some straightforward observations that are clear from the code of \mathcal{I}'_2 . We first note that the counters of the tuples in the register R_{pq} do not decrease.

► **Observation 91.** *Suppose p is not malicious. If p writes v_k in R_{pq} before p writes $v_{k'}$ in R_{pq} , then $k \leq k'$.*

► **Observation 92.** *Suppose p and q are not malicious. If p writes v_k in R_{pq} before q reads $R_{pq} = v_{k'}$, then $k \leq k'$.*

The following observations relate the counters of the tuples that w successively writes in registers R_{wp} and R_{wq} .

- **Observation 93.** (1) *If w writes $(\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in R_{wp} before w writes $(\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$ in R_{wq} , then $k \leq k'$.*
- (2) *If w writes $(\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in R_{wp} before w writes $(\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in R_{wq} , then $k \leq k'$.*
- (3) *If w writes (COMMIT, v_k) in R_{wp} before w writes $(\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$ in R_{wq} , then $k < k'$.*
- (4) *If w writes (COMMIT, v_k) in R_{wp} before w writes $(\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in R_{wq} , then $k \leq k'$.*
- (5) *If w writes $(\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in R_{wq} before w writes $(\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$ in R_{wp} , then $k < k'$.*
- (6) *If w writes $(\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in R_{wq} before w writes $(\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in R_{wp} , then $k \leq k'$.*
- (7) *If w writes (COMMIT, v_k) in R_{wq} before w writes $(\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$ in R_{wp} , then $k < k'$.*
- (8) *If w writes (COMMIT, v_k) in R_{wq} before w writes $(\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in R_{wp} , then $k < k'$.*

The next observations relate the counters of the tuples that p and q read from R_{wp} and R_{wq} , respectively.

► **Observation 94.** *Suppose p and q are not malicious.*

- (1) *If p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ before q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$, then $k \leq k'$.*
- (2) *If p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ before q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$, then $k - 1 \leq k'$.*
- (3) *If p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ before q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$, then $k \leq k'$.*
- (4) *If p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ before q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$, then $k \leq k'$.*
- (5) *If q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ before p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$, then $k \leq k'$.*
- (6) *If q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ before p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$, then $k \leq k'$.*
- (7) *If q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ before p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$, then $k + 1 \leq k'$.*
- (8) *If q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ before p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$, then $k \leq k'$.*

Now we prove that there is no “new-old” inversion for a read by p that precedes a read by q .

► **Lemma 95.** *If $R_p(v_k)$ and $R_q(v_{k'})$ are read operations by non-malicious processes p and q respectively, and $R_p(v_k)$ precedes $R_q(v_{k'})$, then $k \leq k'$.*

Proof. Suppose processes p and q are not malicious. Let $R_p(v_k)$ and $R_q(v_{k'})$ be read operations by p and q respectively, such that $R_p(v_k)$ precedes $R_q(v_{k'})$. By Lemmas 80 and 81, the following occurs:

1. p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in line 14 of $R_p(v_k)$, or
2. p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ in line 17 of $R_p(v_k)$

before the following occurs:

1. q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in line 20 of $R_q(v_{k'})$, or
2. q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$ in line 22 of $R_q(v_{k'})$, or
3. q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'}, v_{k'+1})$ in line 22 of $R_q(v_{k'})$.

So there are six possible cases:

1. p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in $R_p(v_k)$ before q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in $R_q(v_{k'})$. By Observation 94(4), $k \leq k'$.
2. p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in $R_p(v_k)$ before q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$ in $R_q(v_{k'})$. By Observation 94(3), $k \leq k'$.
3. p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in $R_p(v_k)$ before q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'}, v_{k'+1})$ in $R_q(v_{k'})$. By Observation 94(3), $k \leq k' + 1$.
 - i. $k < k' + 1$. Then $k \leq k'$.
 - ii. $k = k' + 1$. We now show that this case is impossible. Since $k = k' + 1$, q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in line 22 of $R_q(v_{k-1})$, and $R_q(v_{k-1})$ returns in line 29. So q read R_{pq} in line 23 of $R_q(v_{k-1})$ before $R_q(v_{k-1})$ returns in line 29. Thus, since p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in $R_p(v_k)$, p writes v_k in R_{pq} in line 15 of $R_p(v_k)$. Since $R_p(v_k)$ precedes $R_q(v_{k-1})$, p writes v_k in R_{pq} in $R_p(v_k)$ before q reads R_{pq} in line 23 of $R_q(v_{k-1})$. By Observation 92, q reads $R_{pq} = v_\ell$, for some $\ell \geq k$, in line 23 of $R_q(v_{k-1})$. So $R_q(v_{k-1})$ returns v_k in line 25 — a contradiction.
4. p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ in $R_p(v_k)$ before q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in $R_q(v_{k'})$. By Observation 94(2), $(k + 1) - 1 \leq k'$. So $k \leq k'$.
5. p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ in $R_p(v_k)$ before q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$ in $R_q(v_{k'})$. By Observation 94(1), $k + 1 \leq k'$. So $k \leq k'$.
6. p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ in $R_p(v_k)$ before q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'}, v_{k'+1})$ in $R_q(v_{k'})$. By Observation 94(1), $k + 1 \leq k' + 1$. So $k \leq k'$.

◀

Now we prove that there is no “new-old” inversion for a read by q that precedes a read by p .

► **Lemma 96.** *If $R_q(v_k)$ and $R_p(v_{k'})$ are read operations by non-malicious processes q and p respectively, and $R_q(v_k)$ precedes $R_p(v_{k'})$, then $k \leq k'$.*

Proof. Suppose processes q and p are not malicious. Let $R_q(v_k)$ and $R_p(v_{k'})$ be two read operations by q and p respectively, such that $R_q(v_k)$ precedes $R_p(v_{k'})$. By Lemmas 80 and 81, the following occurs:

1. q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in line 20 of $R_q(v_k)$, or
2. q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in line 22 of $R_q(v_k)$, or
3. q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ in line 22 of $R_q(v_k)$

before the following occurs:

1. p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in line 14 of $R_p(v_{k'})$, or
2. p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'}, v_{k'+1})$ in line 17 of $R_p(v_{k'})$.

So there are six possible cases:

1. q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in $R_q(v_k)$ before p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in $R_p(v_{k'})$. By Observation 94(8), $k \leq k'$.
2. q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in $R_q(v_k)$ before p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'}, v_{k'+1})$ in $R_p(v_{k'})$. By Observation 94(7), $k + 1 \leq k' + 1$. So $k \leq k'$.
3. q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in $R_q(v_k)$ before p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in $R_p(v_{k'})$. By Observation 94(6), $k \leq k'$.
4. q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in $R_q(v_k)$ before p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'}, v_{k'+1})$ in $R_p(v_{k'})$. By Observation 94(5), $k \leq k' + 1$.
 - i. $k < k' + 1$. Then $k \leq k'$.
 - ii. $k = k' + 1$. We now show that this case is impossible. Since $k = k' + 1$, p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in $R_p(v_{k-1})$, and $R_p(v_{k-1})$ returns in line 18. Note that q reads R_{pq} in line 23 of $R_q(v_k)$.

▷ **Claim 97.** Process p writes v_ℓ into R_{pq} with some $\ell \geq k$ before q reads R_{pq} in $R_q(v_k)$.

Proof. Since q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in line 22 of $R_q(v_k)$, $R_q(v_k)$ returns in line 25 or 27. So there are two cases:

- a. $R_q(v_k)$ returns in line 25. Then q reads $R_{pq} = v_\ell$ for some $\ell \geq k$ in line 23 of $R_q(v_k)$. Thus, since $k \geq 1$ and R_{pq} is initialized to v_0 , p wrote v_ℓ into R_{pq} before q reads R_{pq} in $R_q(v_k)$.
- b. $R_q(v_k)$ returns in line 27. Then q reads $last_read = v_{\ell'}$ for some $\ell' \geq k$ in line 26 of $R_q(v_k)$. Thus, since $k \geq 1$ and $last_read$ is initialized to v_0 , q wrote $v_{\ell'}$ into $last_read$ in line 24 of some $R_q(v_{\ell'})$ operation that precedes $R_q(v_k)$. So q read $R_{pq} = v_\ell$ for some $\ell \geq \ell' \geq k$ in line 23 of this $R_q(v_{\ell'})$ operation that precedes $R_q(v_k)$. Thus p wrote v_ℓ into R_{pq} before q reads R_{pq} in $R_q(v_k)$. ◀

From the code of $R_p()$ it is clear that if p writes v_ℓ to R_{pq} (this can occur only in line 15 of some $R_p(-)$ operation) then p previously reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_\ell)$ (in line 14 of that $R_p(-)$ operation). Thus, by Claim 97, p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_\ell)$ with $\ell \geq k$ before q reads R_{pq} in $R_q(v_k)$. Since $R_q(v_k)$ precedes $R_p(v_{k-1})$, p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_\ell)$ before p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in $R_p(v_{k-1})$. By Observation 94(7), $\ell < k$ — a contradiction.

5. q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ in $R_q(v_k)$ before p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in $R_p(v_{k'})$. By Observation 94(6), $k + 1 \leq k'$. So $k \leq k'$.
6. q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ in $R_q(v_k)$ before p reads $R_{wp} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'}, v_{k'+1})$ in $R_p(v_{k'})$. By Observation 94(5), $k + 1 \leq k' + 1$. So $k \leq k'$. ◀

Finally, we show that there are no “new-old” inversions in the successive reads of q .

To do so, we first observe that the counters of the tuples in the variable $last_read$ of q do not decrease. To see this, note that if q writes v_k in $last_read$ (this occurs in line 24 of $R_q(v_k)$) then q previously read $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, -, v_k)$ (in line 22 of $R_q(v_k)$). So, by Observation 84(2), we have:

► **Observation 98.** Suppose q is not malicious. If q writes v_k in $last_read$ before q writes $v_{k'}$ in $last_read$, then $k \leq k'$.

► **Observation 99.** Suppose q is not malicious. If q writes v_k in $last_read$ before q reads $last_read = v_{k'}$, then $k \leq k'$.

► **Observation 100.** Suppose q is not malicious. If q reads $last_read = v_k$ before q reads $last_read = v_{k'}$, then $k \leq k'$.

► **Lemma 101.** If $R_q(v_k)$ and $R_q(v_{k'})$ are read operations by non-malicious process q , and $R_q(v_k)$ precedes $R_q(v_{k'})$, then $k \leq k'$.

Proof. Suppose process q is not malicious. Let $R_q(v_k)$ and $R_q(v_{k'})$ be read operations by q , such that $R_q(v_k)$ precedes $R_q(v_{k'})$. By Lemma 81, the following occurs:

1. q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in line 20 of $R_q(v_k)$, or
2. q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in line 22 of $R_q(v_k)$, or
3. q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ in line 22 of $R_q(v_k)$

before the following occurs:

1. q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in line 20 of $R_q(v_{k'})$, or
2. q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$ in line 22 of $R_q(v_{k'})$, or
3. q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'}, v_{k'+1})$ in line 22 of $R_q(v_{k'})$.

So there are nine possible cases:

1. q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in $R_q(v_k)$ before q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in $R_q(v_{k'})$. By Observation 84(3), $k \leq k'$.
2. q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in $R_q(v_k)$ before q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$ in $R_q(v_{k'})$. By Observation 84(4), $k < k'$. So $k \leq k'$.
3. q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_k)$ in $R_q(v_k)$ before q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'}, v_{k'+1})$ in $R_q(v_{k'})$. By Observation 84(4), $k < k' + 1$. So $k \leq k'$.
4. q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in $R_q(v_k)$ before q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in $R_q(v_{k'})$. By Observation 84(1), $k \leq k'$.
5. q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in $R_q(v_k)$ before q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$ in $R_q(v_{k'})$. By Observation 84(2), $k \leq k'$.
6. q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in $R_q(v_k)$ before q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'}, v_{k'+1})$ in $R_q(v_{k'})$. By Observation 84(2), $k \leq k' + 1$.
 - i. $k < k' + 1$. Then $k \leq k'$.
 - ii. $k = k' + 1$. We now show that this case is impossible. Since $k = k' + 1$, q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in $R_q(v_{k-1})$, and $R_q(v_{k-1})$ returns in line 29. Note that q reads $last_read$ in line 26 of $R_q(v_{k-1})$ before $R_q(v_{k-1})$ returns in line 29.

▷ **Claim 102.** Process q reads $last_read = v_\ell$ for some $\ell \geq k$ in line 26 of $R_q(v_{k-1})$.

Proof. Since q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k-1}, v_k)$ in $R_q(v_k)$, $R_q(v_k)$ returns in line 25 or 27. There are two cases:

- a. $R_q(v_k)$ returns in line 25 of $R_q(v_k)$. So q writes v_k in $last_read$ in line 24 of $R_q(v_k)$. Since $R_q(v_k)$ precedes $R_q(v_{k-1})$, by Observations 99, when q reads $last_read$ in line 26 of $R_q(v_{k-1})$, q reads $last_read = v_\ell$ for some $\ell \geq k$.
- b. $R_q(v_k)$ returns in line 27 of $R_q(v_k)$. So q reads $last_read = v_{\ell'}$ with some $\ell' \geq k$ in line 26 of $R_q(v_k)$. Since $R_q(v_k)$ precedes $R_q(v_{k-1})$, by Observations 100, when q reads $last_read$ in line 26 of $R_q(v_{k-1})$, q reads $last_read = v_\ell$ for some $\ell \geq \ell' \geq k$. ◀

By Claim 102 and the code of $R_q()$, it is clear that $R_q(v_{k-1})$ returns v_k in line 27 — a contradiction.

7. q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ in $R_q(v_k)$ before q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{COMMIT}, v_{k'})$ in $R_q(v_{k'})$. By Observation 84(1), $k + 1 \leq k'$. So $k \leq k'$.
8. q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ in $R_q(v_k)$ before q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'-1}, v_{k'})$ in $R_q(v_{k'})$. By Observation 84(2), $k + 1 \leq k'$. So $k \leq k'$.
9. q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_k, v_{k+1})$ in $R_q(v_k)$ before q reads $R_{wq} = (\text{PREPARE}, v_{k'}, v_{k'+1})$ in $R_q(v_{k'})$. By Observation 84(2), $k + 1 \leq k' + 1$. So $k \leq k'$. ◀

We now prove that the writes and reads of the lower-level procedures $w()$, $R_p()$, and $R_q()$ satisfy Property 2 of Definition 6.

► **Lemma 103.** Let $R_r(v_k)$ and $R_{r'}(v_{k'})$ be any read operations by non-malicious processes r and r' in $\{p, q\}$. If $R_r(v_k)$ precedes $R_{r'}(v_{k'})$ then $k \leq k'$.

Proof. Immediate from Lemmas 90, 95, 96, 101. ◀

Finally, we prove that the write and read operations of the high-level procedures $\text{WRITE}()$ and $\text{READ}()$ satisfy Property 2 of Definition 6.

► **Lemma 104.** [Property 2: No “new-old” inversion]

Let $\text{READ}(u_k)$ and $\text{READ}(u_{k'})$ be any read operations by non-malicious processes in $\{p, q\}$. If $\text{READ}(u_k)$ precedes $\text{READ}(u_{k'})$ then $k \leq k'$.

Proof. Let $\text{READ}(u_k)$ and $\text{READ}(u_{k'})$ be any read operations by non-malicious processes r and r' in $\{p, q\}$. Suppose $\text{READ}(u_k)$ precedes $\text{READ}(u_{k'})$. By Observation 87, in the $\text{READ}(u_k)$ and $\text{READ}(u_{k'})$ operations, processes r and r' invoke and complete a $R_r(v_k)$ and $R_{r'}(v_{k'})$ operation, respectively. Since $\text{READ}(u_k)$ precedes $\text{READ}(u_{k'})$, $R_r(v_k)$ precedes $R_{r'}(v_{k'})$. By Lemma 103, $k \leq k'$. ◀

By Lemmas 89 and 104, the $\text{WRITE}(-)$ and $\text{READ}(-)$ operations of the register implementation \mathcal{I}'_2 satisfy the linearizability Properties 1 and 2 of Definition 6, so \mathcal{I}'_2 is linearizable. By Observation 74, \mathcal{I}'_2 is also bounded wait-free. Thus:

► **Theorem 49.** *The implementation \mathcal{I}'_2 (given by Algorithm 3 in Appendix A) is a bounded wait-free linearizable implementation of a $[1, 2]$ -register from atomic $[1, 1]$ -registers.*

B Bounded Termination: impossibility proof

We now prove that in a system with $n + 1$ Byzantine processes, there is no linearizable implementation of a $[1, n]$ -register from atomic $[1, n - 1]$ -registers that satisfies the Bounded Termination property even if we assume that *only the readers can be faulty, and at most one of them can fail*. More precisely:

► **Theorem 70.** *For all $n \geq 3$, in a system with $n + 1$ processes that are subject to Byzantine failures, there is no linearizable implementation of a $[1, n]$ -register from atomic $[1, n - 1]$ -registers that satisfies the Bounded Termination property, even if we assume that the writer of the implemented $[1, n]$ -register is correct and at most one reader can be malicious.*

Proof. Let $n \geq 3$. Suppose, for contradiction, that there is an implementation \mathcal{I}_B of a $[1, n]$ -register \mathbf{R} from atomic $[1, n - 1]$ -registers that is linearizable (i.e., it satisfies the Register Linearizability property) and satisfies the Bounded Termination property in a system where the writer w of \mathbf{R} is correct and at most one of the n readers of \mathbf{R} can be malicious.

We now construct a sequence of runs of \mathcal{I}_B that leads to a contradiction. In all these runs, the initial value of the implemented \mathbf{R} is 0, the writer w invokes only one operation into \mathbf{R} , namely a write of 1, and each reader reads \mathbf{R} at most once (i.e., \mathbf{R} is only a “one-shot” binary register).

In all these runs: (a) the writer is correct and (b) there is at most one malicious reader (the other $n - 1$ readers are correct). Thus, these runs of \mathcal{I}_B must satisfy the linearizability Properties 1 and 2 of Register Linearizability (Definition 6), and Bounded Termination (Definition 69), i.e., every correct reader must complete any read operation that it invokes in a bounded number of steps.

► **Definition 105.** *Let s be any step that the writer w takes when executing the implementation \mathcal{I}_B of \mathbf{R} . Step s is invisible to a reader p if s is either a local step of w , or the reading or the writing of an atomic $[1, n - 1]$ -register that is not readable by p .*

Since there are n readers, and the registers that w can write are atomic $[1, n - 1]$ -registers, every write by w into one of these registers is invisible to one of the readers. So:

► **Observation 106.** *Let s be any step that the writer w takes when executing the implementation \mathcal{I}_B of \mathbf{R} . Step s is invisible to at least one of the n readers.*




Figure 12 Run A_m




Figure 13 A run with property P_k




Figure 14 Run A_k




Figure 15 Run B_{k-1}




Figure 16 Run C_{k-1}^r




Figure 17 Run D_{k-1}^r




Figure 18 Run E_{k-1}^r




Figure 19 Run F_{k-1}^r




Figure 20 Run A_1




Figure 21 Run A_0

Let A_m be the following run of \mathcal{I}_B (see Figure 12):

- The writer w and all the readers are correct.
- The writer w invokes an operation to write 1 on \mathbf{R} . By the Bounded Termination property of \mathcal{I}_B , w completes this operation. During this write operation, w takes a sequence of steps s^1, \dots, s^m such that each s^i is either a local step, or the reading or the writing of an atomic $[1, n - 1]$ -register (s^0 is the invocation step of the write operation, and s^m is the response step of this operation). Let t_w^i be the time when step s^i occurs.
- After taking the step s^m at time t_w^m , the writer w stops taking steps (it has completed its write operation on \mathbf{R}).

- Let q be a reader such that step s^m is invisible to q (by Observation 106, this reader exists).
After the time t_w^m , correct reader q invokes a read operation on \mathbf{R} . By the Bounded Termination property of \mathcal{I}_B , q completes its read operation. By the linearizability properties of \mathcal{I}_B , this read operation on \mathbf{R} returns 1.
- All the other readers take no steps.

► **Definition 107.** For every k , $1 \leq k \leq m$, a run of \mathcal{I}_B has property P_k if the following holds:

1. Up to and including time t_w^k , all processes behave exactly as in A_m , that is:
 - w takes steps s^0, s^1, \dots, s^k
 - All the readers take no steps.
2. After taking the step s^k at time t_w^k , the correct writer w behaves as follows:
 - If $k = m$, w stops taking steps: it has completed its write operation on \mathbf{R} .
 - If $k < m$, w temporarily stops taking steps.
3. There is a reader x that is correct such that step s^k is invisible to x . After time t_w^k , reader x starts and completes a read operation on \mathbf{R} that returns 1.
4. There is a reader $y \neq x$ that may be correct or malicious. After time t_w^k , reader y may or may not take steps.
5. There is a set Z of $n-2$ distinct readers other than x and y that are correct and take no steps.
6. If $k < m$, after the reader x reads 1 from \mathbf{R} , the correct writer w resumes taking steps and completes its write operation on \mathbf{R} .

Note that since $n \geq 3$, the set Z contains at least one reader. Furthermore, all the readers that take steps do so after time t_w^k .

A run of \mathcal{I}_B with property P_k is shown in Figure 13. In this figure and all the subsequent ones, correct readers are in black font, while the reader that may be malicious is colored **red** (this reader may have taken some steps after time t_w^k , but these are *not* shown in the figure). The “ $\notin x$ ” on top of a step s^i means that s^i is invisible to the reader x .

Note that the run A_m of \mathcal{I}_B satisfies property P_m : the reader denoted x in property P_m is the reader q of run A_m , the reader y of P_m is an arbitrary reader other than q in A_m , and the set Z of P_m is the set of the remaining $n-2$ readers in A_m . So we have:

► **Observation 108.** Run A_m of \mathcal{I}_B has property P_m .

▷ **Claim 109.** For every k , $1 \leq k \leq m$, there is a run of \mathcal{I}_B that has property P_k .

Proof. We prove the claim by a backward induction on k , starting from $k = m$.

Base Case: $k = m$. This follows directly from Observation 108.

Induction Step: Let k be such that $1 < k \leq m$.

• **RUN A_k .** Suppose there is a run A_k of \mathcal{I}_B that has property P_k (this is the induction hypothesis). We now show that there is a run A_{k-1} of \mathcal{I}_B that has property P_{k-1} .

Since run A_k of \mathcal{I}_B satisfies P_k , the following holds in A_k (see Figure 14):

- Up to and including time t_w^k , all processes behave exactly as in A_m .
- After taking the step s^k at time t_w^k , the correct writer w behaves as follows:
 - If $k = m$, w stops taking steps: it has completed its write operation on \mathbf{R} .
 - If $k < m$, w temporarily stops taking steps.
- There is a reader q that is correct such that step s^k is invisible to q . After time t_w^k , reader q starts and completes a read operation on \mathbf{R} that returns 1.
- There is a reader $p \neq q$ that may be correct or malicious. After time t_w^k , reader p may or may not take steps.¹²

¹²These steps are not shown in Figure 14.

- There is a set Z of $n-2$ distinct readers other than p and q that are correct and take no steps.
- If $k < m$, after q reads 1 from \mathbf{R} , the correct writer w resumes taking steps and completes its write operation on \mathbf{R} .
- **RUN B_{k-1} .** From the run A_k of \mathcal{I}_B we construct the following run B_{k-1} of \mathcal{I}_B (Figure 15). Intuitively, B_{k-1} is the same as A_k except that: (a) after taking step s_{k-1} at time t_w^{k-1} , the writer w temporarily stops taking steps, and (b) w resumes taking steps only after the reader q completes its read of 1. This run is possible because even though p may have “noticed” that w “pauses” after taking step s^{k-1} , p may be malicious (all the other readers are correct in this run), and p behaves exactly as in A_k , and (2) q cannot distinguish between A_k and B_{k-1} because step s^k is invisible to q , and p and all the readers in Z behave as in A_k ; so q behaves as in A_k , and in particular q reads 1 in B_{k-1} as in A_k . After q reads 1, w completes its write operation on \mathbf{R} .

More precisely in B_{k-1} :

- All processes behave exactly as in A_k up to and including time t_w^{k-1} .
- After taking step s^{k-1} at time t_w^{k-1} , w temporarily stops taking steps.
- All the readers in Z are correct and take no steps, exactly as in A_k .
- p behaves exactly as in A_k . This is possible because even though p may have “noticed” that w temporarily stops taking steps after step s^{k-1} , p may be malicious (all the other readers are correct in this run).
- q behaves exactly as in A_k . In particular, after time t_w^k , q starts and completes a read operation on \mathbf{R} that returns 1. This is possible because q cannot distinguish between A_k and B_{k-1} : s^k is invisible to q , and p and all the readers in Z behave exactly as in A_k .
- After q reads 1 from \mathbf{R} , the correct writer w resumes taking steps and completes its write operation on \mathbf{R} .

Note that in B_{k-1} all processes behave exactly as in A_m up to and including time t_w^{k-1} .

There are two cases:

Case 1: s^{k-1} is invisible to q . Then B_{k-1} is a run of \mathcal{I}_B that has the property P_{k-1} , as we wanted to show.

Case 2: s^{k-1} is visible to q . Then, by Observation 106, s^{k-1} is invisible to p or to some $r' \in Z$.

• **RUN C_{k-1}^r .** Let r be any reader in Z . From the run B_{k-1} of \mathcal{I}_B we construct the following run C_{k-1}^r of \mathcal{I}_B (Figure 16). C_{k-1}^r is the same as B_{k-1} up to the time when q completes its read operation on \mathbf{R} . After the correct reader q reads 1, malicious process p wipes out any trace of the write steps that it may have taken so far, and then correct reader $r \in Z$ starts a read operation on \mathbf{R} . By the Bounded Termination property of \mathcal{I}_B , this read operation by r must complete (without waiting for the correct writer w to complete its write operation¹³). Since q previously read 1, by the linearizability of \mathcal{I}_B , r also reads 1. After r reads 1, w completes its write operation on \mathbf{R} .

More precisely in C_{k-1}^r :

- All processes behave exactly as in B_{k-1} up to and including the time when q completes its read operation on \mathbf{R} .
- All the readers in $Z - \{r\}$ are correct and take no steps¹⁴.
- After the correct reader q completes its read operation on \mathbf{R} :
 - q takes no steps.
 - p resets all the atomic registers that it can write to their initial values. Process p can do so because it may be malicious (all the other readers are correct in this run). Let t_p^r be the time when p completes all the register resettings.
 - Correct reader r starts a read operation on \mathbf{R} after time t_p^r . It takes no steps

¹³Even though r “knows” that w is correct and so w will eventually take all the steps necessary to complete its write operation, r cannot wait for them: this would violate the *Bounded Termination* property of \mathcal{I}_B .

¹⁴If $n = 3$, then the set $Z - \{r\}$ is empty.

before this read. By the Bounded Termination property of \mathcal{I}_B , r completes its read operation (without waiting for correct w to resume taking its steps). Since w is correct, and the read operation by correct q precedes the read operation by r and returns 1, by the linearizability of \mathcal{I}_B , the read operation by correct reader r also returns 1.

- After r reads 1 from \mathbf{R} , the correct writer w resumes taking steps and completes its write operation on \mathbf{R} .

Note that in C_{k-1}^r all processes behave exactly as in A_m up to and including time t_w^{k-1} .

• **RUN D_{k-1}^r .** We can now construct the following run D_{k-1}^r of \mathcal{I}_B (Figure 17). Intuitively, we obtain D_{k-1}^r from C_{k-1}^r by removing all the steps of p . So reader p (which was malicious in C_{k-1}^r) is now a correct process that takes no steps. Despite the removal of p 's steps, q behaves exactly as in C_{k-1}^r because q (which was correct in C_{k-1}^r) may now be malicious. Up to and including time t_w^{k-1} , the writer w also behaves exactly as in C_{k-1}^r because it cannot see the removal of p 's steps: they all occur after time t_w^{k-1} . Correct reader r behaves exactly as in C_{k-1}^r because it also cannot see the removal of p 's steps: in both C_{k-1}^r and D_{k-1}^r , r does not “see” any steps of p . So r reads 1 in D_{k-1}^r as in C_{k-1}^r . After r reads 1, w completes its write operation on \mathbf{R} .

More precisely in D_{k-1}^r :

- After taking step s^{k-1} at time t_w^{k-1} , w temporarily stops taking steps, as in C_{k-1}^r .
- All the readers in $Z - \{r\}$ are correct and take no steps, as in C_{k-1}^r .
- p is correct and it takes no steps. So all the atomic registers that it can write retain their initial values.
- q behaves exactly as in C_{k-1}^r . This is possible because even though q may have “noticed” the removal of p 's steps, q may be malicious (all the other readers are correct in this run).
- r behaves exactly as in C_{k-1}^r . In particular, after time t_p^r reader r starts and completes a read operation on \mathbf{R} that returns 1. This is possible because r cannot distinguish between C_{k-1}^r and D_{k-1}^r : r cannot see the removal of p 's steps, and q and all the readers in $Z - \{r\}$ behave exactly as in C_{k-1}^r .
- After r reads 1 from \mathbf{R} , the correct writer w resumes taking steps and completes its write operation on \mathbf{R} .

Note that in D_{k-1}^r all processes behave exactly as in A_m up to and including time t_w^{k-1} .

If s^{k-1} is invisible to reader r , it is clear that the run D_{k-1}^r of \mathcal{I}_B has property P_{k-1} .

Recall that (1) the reader r above is an *arbitrary* reader in Z , and (2) s^{k-1} is invisible to p or to some reader $r' \in Z$. So there are two cases:

Subcase 2a: s^{k-1} is invisible to some reader $r' \in Z$. In the above we proved that the run $D_{k-1}^{r'}$ of \mathcal{I}_B has property P_{k-1} , as we wanted to show.

Subcase 2b: s^{k-1} is invisible to p .

• **RUN E_{k-1}^r .** From the run D_{k-1}^r of \mathcal{I}_B we construct the following run E_{k-1}^r of \mathcal{I}_B (Figure 18). E_{k-1}^r is the same as D_{k-1}^r up to the time when r completes its read operation on \mathbf{R} . After r reads 1, malicious process q wipes out any trace of the write steps that it may have taken so far, and then correct reader p starts a read operation on \mathbf{R} . By the Bounded Termination property of \mathcal{I}_B , this read operation by p must complete (without waiting for the correct writer w to complete its write operation). Since r previously read 1, by the linearizability of \mathcal{I}_B , p also reads 1. After p reads 1, w completes its write operation on \mathbf{R} .

More precisely in E_{k-1}^r :

- All processes behave exactly as in D_{k-1}^r up to and including the time when r completes its read operation on \mathbf{R} .
- All the readers in $Z - \{r\}$ are correct and take no steps, as in D_{k-1}^r .
- After the correct reader r completes its read operation on \mathbf{R} :
 - r takes no steps.
 - q resets all the atomic registers that it can write to their initial values. Process q can do so because it may be malicious (all the other readers are correct in this run).

Let t_q^r be the time when q completes all the register resettings.

- Correct reader p starts a read operation on \mathbf{R} after time t_q^r . It takes no steps before this read. By the Bounded Termination property of \mathcal{I}_B , p completes its read operation (without waiting for correct w to resume taking its steps). Since w is correct, and the read operation by correct r precedes the read operation by p and returns 1, by the linearizability of \mathcal{I}_B , the read operation by correct reader p also returns 1.
- After p reads 1 from \mathbf{R} , the correct writer w resumes taking steps and completes its write operation on \mathbf{R} .

Note that in E_{k-1}^r all processes behave exactly as in A_m up to and including time t_w^{k-1} .

• **RUN F_{k-1}^r .** Finally, we construct the run F_{k-1}^r of \mathcal{I}_B by removing all the steps of q from E_{k-1}^r (see Figure 19). So q (which was malicious in E_{k-1}^r) is now a correct process that takes no steps. Despite the removal of q 's steps, r behaves exactly as in E_{k-1}^r because r (which was correct in E_{k-1}^r) may now be malicious. Up to and including time t_w^{k-1} , the writer w also behaves exactly as in E_{k-1}^r because it cannot see the removal of q 's steps: they all occur after time t_w^{k-1} . Correct reader p behaves exactly as in E_{k-1}^r because it also cannot see the removal of q 's steps: in both E_{k-1}^r and F_{k-1}^r , p does not “see” any steps of q . So p reads 1 in F_{k-1}^r as in E_{k-1}^r . After p reads 1, w completes its write operation on \mathbf{R} .

More precisely in F_{k-1}^r :

- After taking step s^{k-1} at time t_w^{k-1} , w temporarily stops taking steps, as in E_{k-1}^r .
- All the readers in $Z - \{r\}$ are correct and take no steps, as in E_{k-1}^r .
- q is correct and it takes no steps. So all the atomic registers that it can write retain their initial values.
- r behaves exactly as in E_{k-1}^r . This is possible because even though r may have “noticed” the removal of q 's steps, r may be malicious (all the other readers are correct in this run).
- p behaves exactly as in E_{k-1}^r . In particular, after time t_q^r reader p starts and completes a read operation on \mathbf{R} that returns 1. This is possible because p cannot distinguish between E_{k-1}^r and F_{k-1}^r : p cannot see the removal of q 's steps, and r and all the readers in $Z - \{r\}$ behave exactly as in E_{k-1}^r .
- After p reads 1 from \mathbf{R} , the correct writer w resumes taking steps and completes its write operation on \mathbf{R} .

Note that in F_{k-1}^r all processes behave exactly as in A_m up to and including time t_w^{k-1} .

Since s^{k-1} is invisible to p , it is clear that the run F_{k-1}^r of \mathcal{I}_B has property P_{k-1} .

The above concludes the proof of the Induction Step of Claim 109: we proved that, in all possible cases, there is a run of \mathcal{I}_B that has property P_{k-1} , as we needed to show. ◀

By the Claim 109 that we just proved, the implementation \mathcal{I}_B of \mathbf{R} has a run A_1 with property P_1 . By this property, the following holds in A_1 (see Figure 20):

- Up to and including time t_w^1 , all processes behave exactly as in A_m .
- After taking the step s^1 at time t_w^1 , the correct writer w temporarily stops taking steps.
- There is a reader q that is correct such that step s^1 is invisible to q . After time t_w^1 , reader q starts and completes a read operation on \mathbf{R} that returns 1.
- There is a reader $p \neq q$ that may be correct or malicious. After time t_w^1 , reader p may or may not take steps.
- There is a set Z of $n-2$ distinct readers other than p and q that are correct and take no steps.
- After q reads 1 from \mathbf{R} , the correct writer w resumes taking steps and completes its write operation on \mathbf{R} .

From the run A_1 of \mathcal{I}_B we construct the following run A_0 of \mathcal{I}_B (Figure 21). Intuitively, A_0 is the same as A_1 except that the correct writer w does not take any steps (i.e., w does not invoke a write 1 operation on \mathbf{R}), but all the readers behave the same as in A_1 and so q still reads 1. This run of \mathcal{I}_B is possible because: (1) even though p may have “noticed” that w does not take any steps, p may be malicious (all the other readers are correct in this run), and p behaves exactly as in A_1 , and (2) q cannot distinguish between A_1 and A_0 because s^1

50:50 On implementing SWMR registers from SWSR registers in systems with Byzantine failures

is invisible to q , and p and all the readers in Z behave as in A_1 . So q reads 1 from \mathbf{R} in A_0 exactly as in A_1 . Since the initial value of the implemented register \mathbf{R} is 0, run A_0 of the implementation \mathcal{I}_B of \mathbf{R} violates the linearizability of \mathcal{I}_B — a contradiction that concludes the proof of Theorem 70. ◀

It is easy to verify that the above proof holds (without any change) even if all the readers have atomic $[1, n]$ -registers that they can write and all processes can read. Thus:

► **Theorem 110.** *For all $n \geq 3$, in a system with $n+1$ processes that are subject to Byzantine failures, there is no linearizable implementation of a $[1, n]$ -register that satisfies Bounded Termination, even under the assumption that:*

- *The writer w of the implemented $[1, n]$ -register is correct and at most one reader can be malicious, and*
- *w has atomic $[1, n-1]$ -registers, and every reader has atomic $[1, n]$ -registers.*