

Population Protocols for Exact Plurality Consensus

How a small chance of failure helps to eliminate insignificant opinions

GREGOR BANKHAMER, University of Salzburg, Austria

PETRA BERENBRINK, Universität Hamburg, Germany

FELIX BIERMEIER, Universität Hamburg, Germany

ROBERT ELSÄSSER, University of Salzburg, Austria

HAMED HOSSEINPOUR, Universität Hamburg, Germany

DOMINIK KAASER, TU Hamburg, Germany

PETER KLING, Universität Hamburg, Germany

We consider the *plurality consensus* problem for *population protocols*. Here, n anonymous agents start each with one of k opinions. Their goal is to agree on the initially most frequent opinion (the *plurality opinion*) via random, pairwise interactions. *Exact* plurality consensus refers to the requirement that the plurality opinion must be identified even if the *bias* (difference between the most and second most frequent opinion) is only 1.

The case of $k = 2$ opinions is known as the *majority problem*. Recent breakthroughs led to an always correct, exact majority population protocol that is both time- and space-optimal, needing $O(\log n)$ states per agent and, with high probability, $O(\log n)$ time [Doty, Eftekhari, Gasieniec, Severson, Stachowiak, and Uznanski; 2021]. Meanwhile, results for general plurality consensus are rare and far from optimal. We know that any always correct protocol requires $\Omega(k^2)$ states, while the currently best protocol needs $O(k^{11})$ states [Natale and Ramezani; 2019]. For ordered opinions, this can be improved to $O(k^6)$ [Gasieniec, Hamilton, Martin, Spirakis, and Stachowiak; 2016].

We design protocols for plurality consensus that beat the quadratic lower bound by allowing a negligible failure probability. While our protocols might fail, they identify the plurality opinion with high probability even if the bias is 1. Our first protocol achieves this via $k - 1$ tournaments in time $O(k \cdot \log n)$ using $O(k + \log n)$ states. While it assumes an ordering on the opinions, we remove this restriction in our second protocol, at the cost of a slightly increased time $O(k \cdot \log n + \log^2 n)$. By efficiently pruning insignificant opinions, our final protocol reduces the number of tournaments at the cost of a slightly increased state complexity $O(k \cdot \log \log n + \log n)$. This improves the time to $O(n/x_{\max} \cdot \log n + \log^2 n)$, where x_{\max} is the initial size of the plurality. Note that n/x_{\max} is at most k and can be much smaller (e.g., in case of a large bias or if there are many small opinions).

1 INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we design and analyze a new population protocol for *plurality consensus*, a fundamental problem in distributed computing. There are n agents, each starting with one of k opinions. The goal is that all agents eventually agree on the initially most frequent opinion.

The *population protocol model* [3] has become a popular way to study distributed systems formed by many simple, resource-limited agents. A key feature of the model is that communication is erratic: agents cannot choose their communication partners, but instead each time step one (typically random) pair of agents is chosen to interact. During such an *interaction*, both agents observe each other's state and use a common transition function to update their

Authors' addresses: Gregor Bankhamer, gbank@cs.sbg.ac.at, University of Salzburg, Salzburg, Austria; Petra Berenbrink, petra.berenbrink@uni-hamburg.de, Universität Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany; Felix Biermeier, felix.biermeier@uni-hamburg.de, Universität Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany; Robert Elsässer, elsa@cs.sbg.ac.at, University of Salzburg, Salzburg, Austria; Hamed Hosseinpour, hamed.hosseinpour@uni-hamburg.de, Universität Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany; Dominik Kaaser, dominik.kaaser@tuhh.de, TU Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany; Peter Kling, peter.kling@uni-hamburg.de, Universität Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany.

respective states. The random communication and simple state updates make the model particularly suitable for systems of many, simple entities whose communication patterns seem unpredictable, like chemical reactions [15, 18, 30], gene regulatory networks [14], animal populations [31], or opinion formation in social groups [17].

Population protocols are compared with respect to their *space complexity* (measured in states per agent) and *how many interactions* they require to reach and stay in a desired *configuration* (a global system state, like all agents agreeing on one opinion or one agent being in a leader state). We express time bounds in the standard notion *parallel time*, which is the number of interactions divided by n . Thus, in expectation each agent takes part in $\Theta(1)$ interactions per time unit.

The original model [3] restricts the number of states per agent to a constant with respect to the population size n . The computational power and limits of such constant-state population protocols are well understood [6], at least for *stable* protocols (which must *always*, with probability 1, reach and stay in a desired configuration). While the picture is less clear for protocols whose state space grows with n , recent breakthrough results managed to design stable protocols for “benchmark” problems like *leader election* and *majority* that are simultaneously time- and space-optimal [13, 19].

Plurality Consensus in Population Protocols. In the following, *plurality opinion* refers to the opinion with the initially largest support (assuming it is unique) and *bias* denotes the difference of that opinion’s initial support to that of the second largest opinion. A major part of research seeks to identify this plurality opinion for *any* initial bias, even if it is only 1. This is often referred to as the *exact* plurality problem. In contrast, the *approximate* plurality problem requires to identify the plurality opinion only if the initial bias is large enough (typically of order $\omega(\sqrt{n})$).

The *majority problem* is a special case of plurality consensus, considering only $k = 2$ initial opinions. As a fundamental problem in distributed computing, a lot of work has been invested to find an (asymptotically) optimal, stable population protocol for exact majority [1, 2, 8, 10, 11], culminating in [19], which solves majority using both $O(\log n)$ states and expected parallel time. This is optimal, in that no stable protocol can solve majority faster ($\Omega(\log n)$ is the time until each agent interacted at least once) and any polylogarithmic-time stable majority protocol requires $\Omega(\log n)$ states (under two natural conditions, see [1]). Note that the difficulty here stems from requiring *exactness*; for *approximate* majority, a simple 3-state protocol identifies the majority w.h.p. in parallel time $O(\log n)$ if the initial bias is $\Omega(\sqrt{n \log n})$ [4, 16]. Focusing on constant-state protocols that might fail, [25] mentions a protocol with constant state space and which w.h.p. determines the exact majority in time $O(\log^3 n)$.

Population protocols for general plurality consensus are scarce. One line of research studies the state complexity (ignoring time) required to *always* identify the plurality opinion. While one needs at least k states to represent k opinions, Natale and Ramezani [29] show that always correct plurality consensus requires even $\Omega(k^2)$ states. The currently best always correct protocol needs $O(k^{11})$ states, which can be reduced to $O(k^6)$ if there is a total ordering on the opinions [22]. The quadratic lower bound makes it apparent that *always* guaranteeing a correctly identified plurality opinion comes at the cost of high space complexity. Sacrificing these strong guarantees, [7] reaches consensus w.h.p. in $O(\log^2 n)$ parallel time using only $k \cdot O(\log n)$ states. However, they only consider *approximate* plurality consensus, requiring an initial bias of order $\Omega(\sqrt{n \log n})$.

Our Results in a Nutshell. We present new population protocols for plurality consensus. Our protocols may fail with negligible probability, allowing us to beat the quadratic lower bound on the state space [29] (our bounds are almost linear in k). In contrast to [7] our protocols remain exact: w.h.p.¹ they identify the plurality opinion, even if the initial bias is 1. Our first protocol relies on ordered opinions to eliminate non-plurality opinions in $k - 1$ tournaments. The second protocol works similarly but removes the need for ordered opinions at the cost of a slightly larger runtime. Our

¹The expression *with high probability (w.h.p.)* refers to a probability of $1 - n^{-\Omega(1)}$.

final protocol allows for a significant speedup by quickly removing insignificant opinions before the tournaments start.

2 MODEL AND RESULTS

We consider a system of n identical, anonymous *agents* (finite state machines) with state space Q (whose size may depend on n). In every time step, one pair of agents (u, v) is chosen independently and uniformly at random to interact. During such an *interaction*, both agents update their states according to a common transition function $\delta: Q \times Q \rightarrow Q \times Q$.

In the *plurality consensus* problem, each agent starts with one opinion out of a set O of k *opinions*, which may or may not be totally ordered. If O is ordered, we assume w.l.o.g. that $O = \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$. The *bias* is the difference between the support of the most and second most frequent opinion. Assuming that the initial bias is at least 1, we call the initially most frequent opinion the *plurality opinion*. The goal is for all agents to output the initial plurality opinion.

We represent the initial *distribution of opinions* as a vector $\mathbf{x} = (x_i)_{i \in O}$, where x_i denotes the number of agents that initially have opinion i . Additionally, $x_{\max} = \max_{i \in O} \{x_i\}$ is the initial support of the plurality opinion. A *configuration* describes the global system state at a given time (e.g., by stating how many agents are in each possible state).

We design protocols that, w.h.p., identify the plurality opinion quickly and have an almost optimal space complexity, even if the initial bias is only 1 (hence we solve *exact* plurality consensus). With this goal, allowing a negligible failure probability is essential, as otherwise – independently of the runtime – any protocol requires $\Omega(k^2)$ states [29].

Our first protocol uses $O(k + \log n)$ states. It consists of $k - 1$ tournaments, during each of which a *defender* and *challenger* opinion compete. W.h.p., the plurality opinion emerges victorious from all tournaments in time $O(k \cdot \log n)$. This protocol relies on an ordering of the opinions to determine the next challenger opinion. Our second protocol avoids the requirement of such an order by using instead a *leader election* subprotocol to determine the next challenger opinion. Using the leader election protocol from [23] for this,² our protocol for unordered opinions still uses $O(k + \log n)$ states but has a slightly increased runtime of $O(k \cdot \log n + \log^2 n)$. By itself, avoiding such an ordering might seem like an esoteric challenge, but this approach plays a crucial role in our third protocol (see below), where it is used to perform tournaments only for a subset of a priori unknown (significant) opinions that remain after an initial pruning phase. The following theorem states the properties of our first two protocols.

Theorem 1. *Assume we have a population of size n with $k \leq n/40$ initial opinions.*

- (1) *If the opinions are numbered $1, \dots, k$ then SIMPLEALGORITHM converges w.h.p. to the plurality opinion in $O(k \cdot \log n)$ parallel time using $O(k + \log n)$ states.*
- (2) *If there is no order among the opinions, SIMPLEALGORITHM can be modified to converge w.h.p. to the initial plurality opinion in $O(k \cdot \log n + \log^2 n)$ parallel time using $O(k + \log n)$ states.*

Note, by tightening the analysis and slightly modifying Algorithm 1 our Theorem 1 also holds for $k \leq n - 1$. These extensions are given in Appendix C. For constant values of k , the unmodified SIMPLEALGORITHM converges w.h.p. in optimal $O(\log n)$ parallel time and requires only $O(\log n)$ states. This matches state and time complexities of the state-of-the-art exact majority protocol [20]. Note that the protocol from [20] is stable but ours gives w.h.p. guarantees only. A detailed description and analysis of the theorem’s first statement can be found in Section 3. Details for the theorem’s second statement are given in Appendix B.

Our main contribution is the third protocol, which uses a pruning process to remove *insignificant* opinions before the tournaments start, reducing their number from $k - 1$ to n/x_{\max} (remember that x_{\max} denotes the initial size of the

²W.h.p., that protocol finishes in $O(\log^2 n)$ time, leading to the corresponding term in our increased runtime. While there is a $O(\log n)$ time leader election protocol [13], that runtime holds only in expectation, which is too weak for our purpose.

plurality opinion). An opinion j is called insignificant if $x_j \leq x_{\max}/c_s$, where $c_s > 1$ is a suitable constant. If x_{\max} is of order $n^{1/2+\Omega(1)}$, the resulting protocol w.h.p. identifies the plurality opinion in parallel time $O(n/x_{\max} \cdot \log n + \log^2 n)$, using a slightly larger state space of size $O(k \cdot \log \log n + \log n)$. Note that n/x_{\max} is always at most k but it may be much smaller (e.g., if one opinion is very large or if there are many small opinions).

The idea of the pruning process is to have each *subpopulation of opinions* run through a few *preprocessing phases* controlled by their own, dedicated *phase clock*. Phase clocks [1, 5, 11, 23] are a common tool in population protocols to synchronize agents into phases. We will show that larger subpopulations finish their preprocessing phases earlier than smaller subpopulations. Once the first subpopulation finished their preprocessing phases, we use a broadcast to prune any subpopulation (opinion) whose agents have not progressed far enough and then start the actual tournaments with the remaining opinions. Since we cannot know which and how many opinions remain after this pruning phase, we rely on the approach of our second protocol to select the next challenger opinion via a leader election subprotocol.

The following theorem states the results for our final population protocol formally.

Theorem 2. *Assume we have a population of size n with k initial opinions where $x_{\max} > n^{1/2+\varepsilon}$ for some small constant $1/2 > \varepsilon > 0$. `IMPROVEDALGORITHM` converges w.h.p. to the plurality opinion in $O(n/x_{\max} \cdot \log n + \log^2 n)$ parallel time using $O(k \cdot \log \log n + \log n)$ states.*

A description of the corresponding protocol and its analysis is given in Section 4. Note that if $k < n^{1/2-\varepsilon}$, the requirement $x_{\max} > n^{1/2+\varepsilon}$ is always fulfilled (this follows from $x_{\max} \geq n/k$).

3 THE SIMPLE ALGORITHM

In this section we present our first algorithm called `SIMPLEALGORITHM` where each agent has one of k possible opinions numbered from 1 to k . The main idea of the protocol is as follows. It performs a sequence of *tournaments* of length $O(\log n)$ synchronized by a *phase clock* [1]. In each tournament two fixed opinions are chosen, and an exact majority protocol [20] is used to determine the majority opinion among the two of them. In the first tournament opinions 1 and 2 compete. In tournament $i > 1$ the winner of tournament $i - 1$ (called *defender*) competes against opinion $i + 1$ (called *challenger*). The winner of tournament i has the largest support among the first $i + 1$ opinions, and the winner of the last tournament is the plurality opinion.

In order to reach our state bound of $O(k + \log n)$, our protocol has to be very economical with the states. For example, it is not possible for an agent to store two different opinions which would already require $\Omega(k^2)$ states. Our protocol starts with an initialization phase which splits the agents into four *roles*: collector, player, clock, and tracker. Every agent u has a variable `role[u]` to store its role in the protocol. The protocol consists of an initialization part (see Algorithm 3) and three different subprotocols that are specific to the corresponding roles.

We already argued that every agent cannot store two different opinions. Hence, the initialization phase is used to “collect” opinions: Initially each agent is a collector-agent for its initial opinion. Each agent has a variable `tokens` which can take on values between 1 and 10. For every opinion, the total number of tokens of that opinion equals the number of agents initially supporting that opinion. When a collector-agent meets another agent with the same opinion it increases the token counter accordingly. This frees up the other agent which takes on a role in $\{\text{clock, tracker, player}\}$. During the tournament the collector-agents have the responsibility to initiate the majority protocols between the actual challenger and defender. To this end they have two Boolean variables `defender` and `challenger` which indicate that their opinion participates in the match as defender or challenger, respectively. Additionally, all collector-agents have a bit `winner` which indicates the majority opinion of the last tournament. This bit is used to broadcast the final

$$\mathcal{S} = \underbrace{\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{collector,} \\ \text{player,} \\ \text{clock,} \\ \text{tracker} \end{array} \right\}}_{\text{role}} \times \underbrace{[-1; 9]}_{\text{phase}} \times \underbrace{[\Theta(\log n)]}_{\text{count}} \times \underbrace{[k]}_{\text{tcnt}} \times \underbrace{[k]}_{\text{opinion}} \times \underbrace{[10]}_{\text{tokens}} \times \underbrace{\{0, 1\}^3}_{\substack{\text{defender,} \\ \text{challenger,} \\ \text{winner}}} \times \underbrace{[-10; 10]}_{\ell} \times \underbrace{\{A, B, U\}}_{\text{playeropinion}} \times \mathcal{S}_{\text{maj}}$$

Fig. 1. State Space \mathcal{S} . Note that $[i] = \{1, \dots, i\}$ and $[-i; j] = \{-i, \dots, j\}$.

majority opinion. Finally, a value $\ell \in [-10, 10]$ is used to cancel opposing opinions before a match.

Internally the `clock` agents run the leaderless phase `clock` from [1] on a local counter `count` (see Section 3.1). Whenever the local counter passes through zero the agent increases a variable `phase` modulo 10. The new value is disseminated to all other agents via one-way epidemics. The role of the `tracker`-agents is to store the number of the current challenger in a variable `tcnt` (short for *tournament counter*). Whenever one of the tournaments is over this variable is increased by one. This is used by the `collector`-agents to set the challenger bit at the beginning of a new tournament. The `player`-agents are the ones performing the $k - 1$ tournaments. At the beginning of a tournament these agents adopt the opinions from `collector`-agents which have either the *defender* or *challenger* bit set and set their `playeropinion` to A or B , respectively.

Overview of the State Space. We use \mathcal{S}_{maj} to denote the set of states used by the exact majority protocol. Figure 1 gives an overview of the variables used by our protocol and how some of them can be attributed to the different roles. Note that \mathcal{S} is *not* the actual state space used by our protocol. Our actual state space is much smaller, since the role-specific variables must only be kept track of by the corresponding roles. We describe this more thoroughly in the corresponding proof of the state complexity in Section 3.4.

Simplifications for the Pseudocode. In our formal algorithms we define how both involved agents (u, v) update their states in an interaction: u is the initiator and v is the responder of that interaction. To simplify the exposition of our protocols, we allow the use of a “do once” statement in the pseudocode for state transitions that are to be executed *only once* in a given phase. For example, consider the scenario where the challenger wins the match. In the subsequent conclusion phase, all defender agents remove and all challenger agents set the defender bit. This must be done exactly once, since otherwise all bits are lost. See Line 17 to Line 19 in Algorithm 4 for the corresponding pseudocode using a “do once” statement. Similarly to the “do once” statements we assume that agents can determine whether they interact for the “first time” in a phase. Note that these statements can be implemented using constantly many bits, such that the overall state space size increases only by a constant factor.

Outline. In Section 3.1 we first describe the protocol for the `clock`- and `tracker`-agents. In Section 3.2 we describe the initialization routine in more detail and present an analysis for the initialization phase. In Section 3.3 we present a formal definition of the protocol used by the `collector`-agents and `player`-agents. A sketch of the proof of the first statement of Theorem 1 can be found in Section 3.4 and the complete proof can be found in Appendix A.

3.1 Clock and Tracker Agents

The `clock`-agents have two different tasks (see Algorithm 1). First they decide when the initialization phase is over. For that they use their local counter `count` (initialized to zero). Whenever they interact with a non-`collector`-agent they increase `count` by one. If they interact with a `collector`-agent `count` is decreased by one as long as it is larger than

zero. As soon as count reaches $5 \log n$ the agent decides that the initialization phase is over (constant fraction of non-collector-agents is reached) and sets $\text{phase} = 0$ which is then spread via broadcast (phase is initialized at the beginning of the whole protocol to -1). From there on the clock -agents use count to run the leaderless phase clock from [1] for the synchronization which works as follows. The counter count is used modulo $\Psi = \Theta(\log n)$. Whenever two clock -agents interact, the one with the lower counter value (w.r.t. the circular order modulo Ψ) increments its count. If both clock -agents have the same count value ties are broken arbitrarily. When $\text{count} = 0$ the variable phase is increased by one (modulo 10). Note that, alternatively to this simple clock, any phase clock that requires $O(\log n)$ states can be used.

```

1 if  $\text{phase}[u] = -1$  then
2    $\text{count}[u] \leftarrow \begin{cases} \text{count}[u] + 1 & \text{if } \text{role}[v] \neq \text{collector} \\ \text{count}[u] - 1 & \text{if } \text{role}[v] = \text{collector and } \text{count}[u] > 0 \end{cases}$ 
3   if  $\text{count}[u] = 5 \cdot \log n$  then
4      $\text{phase}[u] \leftarrow 0$ 
5 if  $\text{phase}[u] \neq -1$  and  $\text{phase}[v] \neq -1$  then
6    $\text{leaderless\_phase\_clock}(\text{count}[u], \text{count}[v])$  ▷ execute the leaderless phase clock from [1]
7   if  $\text{count}[u]$  passes through zero then
8      $\text{phase}[u] \leftarrow \text{phase}[u] + 1 \pmod{10}$ 

```

Algorithm 1. Clock Synchronization. We assume that u is a clock agent.

The tracker-agents determine which opinion has to take over the role as a challenger (see Algorithm 2). The state variable tcnt is initialized (see initialization phase) with 1 and incremented by one (modulo k) whenever phase switches over to zero. Note that during the first tournament $\text{tcnt} = 2$. This holds due to the initialization of tcnt with one and the fact that it is incremented as soon as phase is incremented from -1 to 0 when the initialization phase ends.

```

1 if  $\text{phase}[u] = 0$  and  $u$  interacts for the first time in this phase then
2    $\text{tcnt}[u] \leftarrow \text{tcnt}[u] + 1$ .

```

Algorithm 2. We assume that u is a tracker-agent.

3.2 Initialization

The objective of this phase is to partition the population into the four different roles collector , player , tracker and clock . Initially every agent has the collector role storing one token of its initial opinion. Whenever two collector -agents with the same opinion and at most 10 tokens in total interact, the responder sets its tokens variable to the sum of the tokens of both agents, and the initiator switches to a roles in $\{\text{clock}, \text{tracker}, \text{player}\}$ uniformly at random. Agents with opinion 1 set $\text{defender} = 1$ during their first interactions. As soon as agent u becomes clock -agent it uses the state variable count to determine when the initialization is over by setting $\text{phase}[u]$ equals to 0 which is then spread via broadcast. At this point, the first tournament starts with the setup phase.

Lemma 3. *Let \hat{t} denote the interaction, in which the first agent sets $\text{phase} = 0$. Then, the following statements hold w.h.p.:*

- (1) $\hat{t} = O(n \cdot (k + \log n))$.
- (2) After interaction \hat{t} each of the roles collector , clock , tracker , and player are held by at least $n/10$ agents.
- (3) After interaction \hat{t} all collector -agents of opinion 1 have their defender bit set.

PROOF. We consider a modified process, which mimics the original process. The only difference is that in this process, we prevent clock -agents from setting their phase to 0 by removing Line 4 of Algorithm 1. This causes all agents to remain in the init phase, i.e., they have phase set to -1 indefinitely. In this setting all agents keep performing according to Algorithm 3. This simplifies the analysis as we do not have to deal with some agents that already started

```

1 if  $u$  is the initiator for the first time and  $\text{opinion}[u] = 1$  then
2    $\text{defender}[u] = \text{TRUE}$ 
3 if  $\text{role}[u] = \text{role}[v] = \text{collector}$  and  $\text{opinion}[u] = \text{opinion}[v]$ 
4 and  $\text{tokens}[u] + \text{tokens}[v] \leq 10$  then
5    $(\text{tokens}[u], \text{tokens}[v]) \leftarrow (0, \text{tokens}[u] + \text{tokens}[v])$ 
6   with probability  $1/3$ :  $\begin{cases} (\text{role}[u], \text{count}[u]) & \leftarrow (\text{clock}, 0) \\ (\text{role}[u], \text{tcnt}[u]) & \leftarrow (\text{tracker}, 1) \\ (\text{role}[u], \text{playeropinion}[u]) & \leftarrow (\text{player}, U) \end{cases}$ 
7 if  $\text{phase}[v] = 0$  then
8    $\text{phase}[u] \leftarrow 0$ 

```

Algorithm 3. Initialization Phase. We assume that u and v are initially in $\text{phase}[u] = \text{phase}[v] = -1$.

the tournament. In the following we assume that this modified process runs alongside the original process and that the same random choices are made in both processes. Let now $\tau_m(x)$ denote the first interaction in which at most $x \cdot n$ collector-agents remain in the modified process. Similar, let \hat{t}_m denote the first interaction in which some clock-agent counts to $5 \log n$. Additionally, we define the same notation with subscript o with respect to the original process. Observe that $\hat{t}_m = \hat{t}_o$ as until this interaction occurs, both processes are identical.

We start by establishing that, in the modified process, $\tau_m(1/3)$ is reached quickly. That is, the number of remaining collector-agents decreases fast as long as all nodes follow Algorithm 3.

Claim 4. It holds that $\tau_m(1/3) = O(n \cdot k)$ w.h.p.

PROOF. In order to reach interaction $\tau_m(1/3)$ exactly $\lceil 2n/3 \rceil$ agents need to leave their collector role due to the token transfer in Line 5 of Algorithm 3. In the following we say that an interaction is *good* if two agents interact that both are collector-agents, have the same opinion, and have at most 10 tokens in total. Such an interaction decreases the number of collector-agents by one. Let $z_i(t)$ denote the number collector-agents of opinion i which have at most 5 tokens before interaction t is executed. If two such agents of the same opinion interact, then the interaction is guaranteed to be good. Fix now some interaction $t < \tau(1/3)$, i.e., an interaction before which more than $n/3$ collector-agents are still present. Then, the probability for interaction t to be *good* is

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{z_i(t)}{n} \cdot \frac{z_i(t) - 1}{n - 1} \geq \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^k z_i(t)^2 - \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^k z_i(t) \\
& \stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \frac{1}{n^2} \frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^k z_i(t)\right)^2}{k} - \frac{1}{n} \stackrel{(b)}{\geq} \frac{1}{n^2} \frac{n^2}{36 \cdot k} - \frac{1}{n} \stackrel{(c)}{\geq} \frac{1}{500k}
\end{aligned}$$

For the third inequality (b) we apply the following counting argument to bound $\sum_{i=1}^k z_i(t)$: only $n/6$ agents may have at least 6 tokens as the number of tokens sums to n at all times. Observe that we assume that at time t there are still $n/3$ total collector-agents remaining. Hence, $\sum_{i=1}^k z_i(t) \geq n/3 - n/6 = n/6$. For the last inequality (c), we use that $k \leq n/40$ as assumed in Theorem 1. As each interaction is good with probability at least $1/500k$, independently, we consider a sequence of $500nk$ interactions and apply Chernoff bounds. This yields that, w.h.p., there will be at least $\lceil 2n/3 \rceil$ good interaction in this sequence, reducing the number of collector-agents below $n/3$. In other words: $\tau(1/3) < 500nk$ w.h.p. \square

In the following claim we bound the time for the first clock-agent to count until $5 \log n$ in the modified process.

Claim 5. It holds that $\tau_m(2/3) < \hat{t}_m$ and $\hat{t}_m = O(n \cdot (k + \log n))$ w.h.p.

PROOF. We consider the modified process and couple the counting procedures of any fixed clock-agent with a biased random walk on the non-negative line. The current value of the counter variable corresponds to the position of the walk on the line. Each time the clock-agent interacts as initiator with a non-collector-agent, the random walk process moves to the right. Similarly, when interacting with a collector-agent the random walk moves to the left (or remains at 0 if its current position is 0). We are interested in the interactions required for the random walk to hit then value $5 \log n$ as this corresponds to the clock-agent counting until $5 \log n$. Until $\tau_m(2/3)$ is reached, this hitting time may be minorized with the hitting time of a random walk that has probability exactly $q = 2/3$ to move to the left and probability $p = 1/3$ to move to the right. Due to the strong drift towards 0, it is known that such a random walk takes $\text{poly}(n)$ steps w.h.p. to hit $5 \log n$. To determine the constant hidden in $\text{poly}(n)$ we utilize a variant of a known random walk result. It implies that this hitting time is at least $n^{2.5}$ with probability at least $1 - n^{-2.5}$. More details are given in Lemma 16 in Appendix D. Therefore, w.h.p., the clock-agent will *not* reach a counter value of $5 \log n$ before, either, $\tau_m(2/3)$ is reached or $n^{2.5}$ interactions have passed. Now, observe that $\tau_m(2/3) < \tau_m(1/3)$ as the number of collector-agents can only decrease over time. This implies by Claim 4 that $\tau_m(2/3) < n^{2.5}$ w.h.p. for large enough n . Hence, $\hat{t}_m(2/3)$ precedes $n^{2.5}$ w.h.p. and $\hat{t}_m > \tau_m(2/3)$ follows.

To show the upper bound on \hat{t}_m , we first argue that soon after $\tau_m(1/3)$ some clock-agents increases its counter to $5 \log n$. We follow a similar approach and fix the modified process at some interaction $t \geq \tau_m(1/3)$ together with a clock-agent and its corresponding random walk. This time, we majorize the time for the counter to reach $5 \log n$ with the hitting time of a random walk with $p = 2/3$ and $q = 1/3$. Such a random walks is known (e.g Theorem 18.2 of [26]) to have a hitting time of $O(\log n)$ w.h.p. For convenience we included a similar statement in Lemma 16 in Appendix D. Each movement of the random walk corresponds to one interaction as initiator of the clock-agent. As the agent is selected as an initiator with probability $1/n$ in each interaction, it follows from a Chernoff bound that $O(n \log n)$ interactions guarantee sufficient movements of the random walk w.h.p. Therefore, some clock-agents hits $5 \log n$ before time $\tau_m(1/3) + O(n \log n)$ w.h.p. From Claim 4 we know that $\tau_m(1/3) = O(n \cdot k)$ w.h.p., allowing us to simplify this upper bound to $O(n \cdot (k + \log n))$. \square

In order to show the first two statements of the lemma we need the guarantees of Claim 5 in terms of the original process. Initially we established that $\hat{t}_o = \hat{t}_m$ and that until this interaction both processes act identically per definition. Additionally, note that $\Pr[\tau_o(2/3) = \tau_m(2/3)] \geq \Pr[\tau_m(2/3) \leq \hat{t}_m]$. This inequality holds because, if the event $\tau_m(2/3) \leq \hat{t}_m$ occurs, then both processes acted identically until interaction $\tau_m(2/3)$. Therefore, the amount of collector-agents is the same in both processes until this interaction, implying that $\tau_m(2/3) = \tau_o(2/3)$. By Claim 5 we have that $\tau_m(2/3) \leq \hat{t}_m$ w.h.p. and therefore $\tau_m(2/3) = \tau_o(2/3)$ is also a high probability event. Hence, w.h.p., Claim 5 also holds when exchanging \hat{t}_m by \hat{t}_o and $\tau_m(2/3)$ by $\tau_o(2/3)$, leading to the statement: $\tau_o(2/3) < \hat{t}_o = O(n \cdot (k + \log n))$ w.h.p. This inequality immediately yields the first statement of the lemma. We also use this inequality to show the second statement of the lemma as it implies that at \hat{t}_o at most $2n/3$ collector-agents remain w.h.p. Therefore, at time \hat{t}_o , there must be at least $n/3$ collector-agents that have left their role. Every agent which switches its role selects a new role uniformly and independently at random. Hence, it follows from Chernoff bounds that each non-collector role consists of at least $(n/3) \cdot (1/3)(1 - o(1)) > n/10$ agents. Additionally, note that there must be at least $n/10$ collector-agents at all times. This follows since there are n tokens in total, and only collector-agents can hold up to 10 tokens each.

The proof for the final statement of the lemma is straightforward. It suffices to show that every agent interacts at least once before the first clock-agent sets phase to 0. Even if a clock-agent interacts with a non-collector-agent


```

1 if phase[u] = phase[v] = 0 then                                     ▷ Setup Phase
2   if role[u] = collector and role[v] = tracker and opinion[u] = tcnt[v] then
3     challenger[u] ← TRUE
4   if role[u] = collector then
5     ℓ[u] ←  $\begin{cases} \text{tokens}[u] & \text{if defender}[u] \\ -\text{tokens}[u] & \text{if challenger}[u] \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$ 
6 if phase[u] = phase[v] = 2 then                                     ▷ Cancellation Phase
7   if role[u] = role[v] = collector then
8     (ℓ[u], ℓ[v]) ←  $\left( \left\lfloor \frac{\ell[u] + \ell[v]}{2} \right\rfloor, \left\lceil \frac{\ell[u] + \ell[v]}{2} \right\rceil \right)$ 
9 if phase[u] = phase[v] = 4 then                                     ▷ Lineup Phase
10  if role[u] = collector and role[v] = player and playeropinion[v] = U then
11    playeropinion[v] ←  $\begin{cases} A & \text{if } \ell[u] > 0 \\ U & \text{if } \ell[u] = 0 \\ B & \text{if } \ell[u] < 0. \end{cases}$ 
12    ℓ[u] ← sign(ℓ[u]) · (|ℓ[u]| - 1)
13 if phase[u] = phase[v] = 6 then                                     ▷ Match Phase
14  if role[u] = role[v] = player then
15    execute majority(Smaj)                                         ▷ execute the exact majority protocol from [20]
16 if phase[u] = phase[v] = 8 then                                     ▷ Conclusion Phase
17  if role[u] = collector and role[v] = player and playeropinion[v] = B do once
18    defender[u] ← challenger[u]
19    challenger[u] ← FALSE
20  if role[u] = collector and role[v] = player and playeropinion[v] ∈ {A, U} do once
21    challenger[u] ← FALSE
22 if phase[v] >(10) phase[u] then
23  phase[u] ← phase[v]

```

Algorithm 4. Tournament Algorithm

each time it is selected as initiator, it takes at least $5 \log n$ such interactions for it to set phase to 0. From Chernoff bounds it follows w.h.p. that it requires more than $2n \log n$ overall interactions for any clock-agent to be selected as initiator sufficiently many times. However, any fixed agent manages to act as initiator at least once within $2n \log n$ interactions w.h.p. As each node is selected with probability $1/n$ as an initiator, the probability that an arbitrary but fixed agent is not selected is at most $(1 - 1/n)^{2n \log n} \leq \exp(-2 \log n) \leq n^{-2}$. A union bound over all agents shows that this is enough time for every agent to act as initiator at least once w.h.p. \square

3.3 Player and Collector Agents

The tournaments are performed by both player- and collector-agents. Each tournament is divided into the five phases setup, cancellation, lineup, match, and conclusion. To synchronize the beginning of the phases we assume that there are phases (numbered with odd numbers) in which non of the player- and collector-agents is activated.

In setup collector-agents determine if their opinion is the challenger (in the i -th tournament Opinion $i + 1$ is the challenger opinion and $\text{tcnt} = i$). Furthermore, all challenger and defender agents initialize a variable $\ell[u]$ with the (positive or negative) amount of tokens they store. In cancellation the agents use the load balancing protocol from [12, 28]. At the end of the protocol each agent u will have $\ell[u] \in \{\bar{\ell} - 1, \bar{\ell}, \bar{\ell} + 1\}$ where $\bar{\ell}$ is the average of all the $\ell[u]$ values from challengers and defender agents rounded to the nearest integer. This phase is used to reduce the number of tokens such that each token can be assigned to a different player-agent. This will be done in the lineup phase. The load balancing protocol can be used (see [20]) to calculate the majority opinion for the case of $k = 2$ and large bias. In that case the majority opinion is the opinion for which a collector-agent exists with $\ell[u] \leq -2$ or $\ell[u] \geq 2$. For the ease of presentation of our protocol we do not distinguish between the case that the majority is already determined after this phase or not.

In the match phase the player-agents, now having opinions A (defender opinion), B (challenger opinion) or U (undecided, held by player-agents which do not receive any opinion) determine the majority opinion using the majority protocol of [20]. We assume that the protocol returns the result in the state `playeropinion` which takes the values of the majority opinion. Note that the protocol from [20] assumes that each agent has one of the two opinions. In Appendix A describe in more detail how this protocol can be applied in our setting. In the conclusion phase collector-agents holding the majority opinion set their defender bit. They have to participate in the next tournament. In Lines 22 and 23 agents broadcast phase to remain synchronized.

3.4 Aftermath

This subsection provides a short description of how our protocol finishes after the last tournament.

Final Broadcast. After the final tournament the agents still need to ensure that the ultimate defender – w.h.p. the initial plurality opinion – is disseminated to all agents.

The tracker-agents initiate this final broadcast. Recall that the tracker-agents have a variable `tcnt` that keeps track of the challenger in each tournament. Once this variable reaches $k + 1$, all opinions have participated in a tournament, and those collector-agents that have the defender bit set have w.h.p. the initial plurality opinion. Now when a tracker-agent u with $\text{tcnt}[u] = k + 1$ interacts with a collector-agent v with `defender[v] = TRUE`, the defender agent sets its *winner* bit $\text{winner}[v] \leftarrow \text{TRUE}$. This winner bit and the corresponding opinion is disseminated to all agents: any agent w for which $\text{winner}[w] = \text{FALSE}$ sets $(\text{role}[w], \text{opinion}[w], \text{winner}[w])$ to $(\text{collector}, \text{opinion}[v], \text{TRUE})$ when it interacts with such a winner agent v (with $\text{winner}[v] = \text{TRUE}$).

Proof of Theorem 1. Next we provide a brief proof sketch for the runtime from the first statement in Theorem 1 (see Appendix A for the full proof). Afterward, we prove the bound on the size of the state space from the first statement in Theorem 1.

PROOF SKETCH: RUNTIME FOR STATEMENT (1) OF THEOREM 1. The proof is done inductively using an invariant (see Lemma 11 in Appendix A). The invariant states that the collector and defender bits are set correctly and that the number of player-agents is sufficiently large for the number of tokens of the (defender and challenger) collector-agents. The rest follows from [12, 28] and [20]. \square

PROOF: SPACE COMPLEXITY FOR STATEMENT (1) OF THEOREM 1. Figure 1 shows a *superset* \mathcal{S} of our protocol’s state space. Depending on their role, the agents only use a much smaller portion of \mathcal{S} as described below.

Each agent’s state space consists of a set of *shared* variables, which any agent keeps track of, and of *role-specific*

variables, which only agents of that role keeps track of. We use $\mathcal{S}_{\text{shared}}$ to denote the state set represented by all shared variables and \mathcal{S}_r to denote the variables required for role $r \in \{\text{clock}, \text{tracker}, \text{collector}, \text{player}\}$.

Note that $|\mathcal{S}_{\text{shared}}| = \Theta(1)$. Indeed, the shared variables encompass the constant size role variable, the constant size phase variable, and the constantly many bits required for the do-once statements (see overview of the state space at the beginning of Section 3). The role-specific variables are indicated by the gray boxed in Figure 1. Specifically:

- clock-agents use count variable ($\Theta(\log n)$ values).
- tracker-agents use the tcnt variable (k values).
- collector-agents use the opinion variable (k values), the tokens variable (10 values), the defender, challenger, winner bits, and the load balancing values ℓ (21 values).
- player-agents use the playeropinion variable (3 values) and $O(\log n)$ states for the majority protocol from [20].

The maximum number of states required by any agent then calculates as

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathcal{S}_{\text{shared}}| \cdot \max \{ |\mathcal{S}_{\text{clock}}, \mathcal{S}_{\text{tracker}}, \mathcal{S}_{\text{collector}}, \mathcal{S}_{\text{player}} \} \\ &= \Theta(1) \cdot \max \{ \Theta(\log n), k, k \cdot 10 \cdot 2^3 \cdot 21, 3 \cdot O(\log n) \} \\ &= \Theta(k + \log n), \end{aligned}$$

finishing the proof of the first protocol's state complexity. \square

4 THE IMPROVED ALGORITHM

The goal in this section is to remove *insignificant* opinions before they even participate in the tournament. For the moment let us assume that every agent u has a counter $c[u]$ which is used to count the number of interactions with the same opinion. As soon as the first counter reaches a fixed value $t \in O(\log n)$ the agent sets $\text{phase}[u] = 0$ which triggers the beginning of the tournaments. Only agents with a counter of at least $t/2$ will participate in the tournament. *Insignificant* opinions (those of support $x_i < x_{\max}/c_s$ for some constant $c_s > 1$) are effectively out of the race. This reduces the amount of required tournaments to $O(n/x_{\max})$ and therefore improves the runtime. To show the correctness of this approach it remains to show that w.h.p. every agent of the initial plurality opinion is among these remaining agents, while no agents of insignificant opinions participate in the tournament. The rest of the analysis follows along the lines of Statement (2) of Theorem 1. Unfortunately, this simple approach requires an additional counter per agent which exceeds the state space bounds of Theorem 2.

Our main idea to save on states is to use phase clocks instead of the counters, one per opinion. In the following we call interactions *meaningful* if an agent interacts with another agent of the same opinion. We split the agents into *subpopulations*; agents with opinion i belong to subpopulation i . Every subpopulation runs its own phase clock as follows. Every agent u has all states of the *junta-driven* phase clock (see [5, 11, 23]), which requires only $O(\log \log n)$ states compared to the $\Theta(\log n)$ used by the simple counter. The clocks work as follows. First, in every subpopulation so-called *junta* agents are selected in meaningful interactions. Then the phase clock runs on a counter, again in meaningful interactions only. Note that phase clocks of large subpopulations run faster than phase clocks of small ones. Whenever a phase clock passes through 0 the agents increment phase, which is initialized to $-c$ (we assume that the value $c \in \mathbb{N}$ is a sufficiently large constant). Once $\text{phase}[u]$ becomes 0 for some agent u this value is broadcasted to all agents as before. All agents u for which $\text{phase}[u]$ is still stuck at the initial value $\text{phase}[u] = -c$ will not participate in any tournament. Instead, they change their role (with probability $1/3$ each) from collector to clock, tracker, or

player. Note that in contrast to before an agent u does not immediately adopt a new role when it sets $\text{tokens}[u] = 0$ in an interaction with another collector-agent (see Line 7 of Algorithm 5). Instead, agent u waits until $\text{phase}[u] = 0$. Then, agent u adopts a new role iff. it either has no tokens ($\text{tokens}[u] = 0$) or its $\text{phase}[u] = -c$ (the latter implies that the clock of agent u did not pass through zero even once).

It is now easy to see that this results in a faster convergence time. Indeed, this follows from how `SIMPLEALGORITHM` selects the next challenger opinion if there is no order among the opinions (see description in Appendix B): In a modified setup phase, a leader selects an opinion as challenger randomly from the collector agents which have not yet been defeated in a tournament (using a cascade of one-way epidemic processes on the way). Hence if there are no collector agents left for some of the opinions, there will not be a tournament involving that opinion, and thus the total runtime will be reduced accordingly.

As soon as the first agent reaches $\text{phase}[u] = 0$ all agents proceed with the modified version of `SIMPLEALGORITHM`. We remark that it can happen that only $o(n)$ collector-agents remain after removing all insignificant opinions. In this case, the cancellation phase will not achieve a balanced state. However, all tokens will fit into the player agents nonetheless, as we will show in Statement (3) of Lemma 10 that there will be a constant fraction of agents for each role in $\{\text{clock}, \text{tracker}, \text{player}\}$.

While the overall approach sounds very easy, the crux lies in the analysis. First of all, we have to analyze the *speed* of the clocks running via meaningful interactions only (Lemma 7) Then we have to show that all agents of the plurality opinion pass through 0 at least once, meaning they will participate in the tournament (Lemma 10). Finally, we have to show that all agents with insignificant opinions will not participate in any tournament, either because they did not finish the `FORMJUNTA` protocol (Lemma 9) or because their phase clock runs too slow (Lemma 10).

Junta-Driven Phase Clock. We use the phase clock implementation from [11] which starts by electing a junta. We select the junta in exactly the same way but using meaningful interactions only. Each agent is equipped with a level variable, which is initially 0, and a bit which indicates whether the agent is still active. Agents progress through levels: They are initially active, and they remain active and increase their level as long as they interact (as initiators) with another agent on the same or on a higher level. If they initiate an interaction with another agent on a lower level, they become inactive. Finally, agents become also inactive if they hit the maximum level $\ell_{\max} = \lfloor \log \log n \rfloor - 3$. All agents that reach this maximum level form the junta and start the phase clock protocol.

In the phase clock every agent is equipped with a phase counter $p[u]$ (initially 0). Whenever a junta agent u initiates an interaction with an agent v it sets $p[u] = \max\{p[u], p[v] + 1\}$. If the initiating agent u is not a junta agent, then u sets $p[u] = \max\{p[u], p[v]\}$. For $i > 0$, we say that an agent u *passes through zero* for the i -th time if its phase counter $p[u]$ fulfills $\lfloor p[u]/m \rfloor \geq i$ for the first time ($m \in \mathbb{N}$ is a fitting large enough constant). Note that in [11] the same property is referred to as u reaching hour i for the first time.

In our protocol we set the maximum level to $\ell_{\max} = \lfloor \log \log n \rfloor - 2$. We show in the proof of Lemma 7 that this modified maximum level still allows the election of a junta w.h.p. as long as the subpopulation has size at least \sqrt{n} .

We denote by \mathcal{S}_c the $\Theta(\log \log n)$ states that are required to execute the junta election and phase clock protocols. We assume that all agents are initially equipped with sufficiently many additional states to run this clock. As soon as an agent u sets $\text{phase}[u]$ to 0 it may reuse these states. The following lemma states properties of this phase clock.

Lemma 6. *Assume that we run the junta-election process and phase clock from [11] on a population of n agents. Let $s(0)$ ($e(0)$, resp.) be the interaction when the first (last, resp.) junta agent is elected and let $s(i)$ ($e(i)$, resp.) be the interaction when the first (last, resp.) agent passes through zero for the i -th time. Then, for any constant $a > 0$, there exist two properly*

```

1 if opinion[u] = opinion[v] and phase[v] < 0 then
2   form_junta_protocol( $\mathcal{S}_c$ )                                ▷ execute the junta-election protocol from [11]
3   loglog_phase_clock( $\mathcal{S}_c$ )                                ▷ execute the phase clock protocol from [11]
4   if phase clock of  $u$  passes through zero then
5     phase[u] ← phase[u] + 1
6   if tokens[u] + tokens[v] ≤ 10 then
7     (tokens[u], tokens[v]) ← (0, tokens[u] + tokens[v])
8 if phase[u] = 0 or phase[v] = 0 then
9   if phase[u] = -c or tokens[u] = 0
10    with probability 1/3: { (role[u], count[u])           ← (clock, 0)
11    (role[u], tcnt[u])           ← (tracker, 1)
    (role[u], playeropinion[u]) ← (player, U)
    phase[u] ← 0

```

Algorithm 5. Modified Initialization. We assume that $\text{phase}[u] < 0$.

chosen constants c'_1 and c'_2 , such that we have with probability at least $1 - n^{-a}$,

- (1) The protocol elects a non-empty junta of size at most $n^{0.98}$.
- (2) $s(0) \leq c'_2 \cdot n \log(n)$.
- (3) $c'_1 \cdot n \log n \leq s(i+1) - s(i) \leq c'_2 \cdot n \log n$ for any $i = O(\text{poly}(n))$,
- (4) $s(i+1) > e(i)$ for any $i = O(\text{poly}(n))$.

PROOF. Follows from Theorem 1 and Lemma 6 in [11]. \square

We denote by $s_j(0)$ ($e_j(0)$) be the interaction at which the first (last, respectively) junta agent is elected in subpopulation j . For $i > 0$ we denote by $s_j(i)$ ($e_j(i)$) the time when the first (last, respectively) agent of opinion j passes through zero for the i -th time. The following lemma adjusts the results of Lemma 6 to subpopulations.

Lemma 7. Fix a subpopulation j and assume that $x_j \geq n^{1/2}$. Consider the phase clock driven by subpopulation j . Then, for any constant $a > 0$, there exist constants $c_1 \leq c_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the following statements hold with probability $1 - x_j^{-a}$.

- (1) Subpopulation j elects a non-empty junta with at most $(x_j)^{0.98}$ agents.
- (2) $s_j(0) \leq c_2 \cdot \frac{n^2}{x_j} \log(n)$.
- (3) $c_1 \cdot \frac{n^2}{x_j} \log(n) \leq s_j(i+1) - s_j(i) \leq c_2 \cdot \frac{n^2}{x_j} \log(n)$ for any $i = O(\text{poly}(n))$.
- (4) $s_j(i+1) > e_j(i)$ for any $i = O(\text{poly}(n))$.

PROOF. The statements of this lemma would directly follow from Lemma 6 by replacing n with x_j . However, the junta-election mentioned in Lemma 6 assumes that a maximum level $\lfloor \log \log x_j \rfloor - 3$ is set. As our agents do not know the value x_j , we set this level to $\ell_{\max} = \lfloor \log \log n \rfloor - 2$ instead. With the following claim we show that this modification still leads to a junta of desired size if $x_j \geq \sqrt{n}$.

Claim 8. If $x_j \geq \sqrt{n}$ then the FORMJUNTA protocol [11] configured with maximum level $\ell_{\max} = \lfloor \log \log n \rfloor - 2$ elects a non-empty junta of $\leq x_j^{0.98}$ agents within $O(x_j \log(x_j))$ meaningful interactions and with probability at least $1 - x_j^{-a}$ (for any constant $a > 0$).

PROOF. We start by showing the bounds on the junta size. Depending on the size $x_j \geq \sqrt{n}$ of the subpopulation j , we can express ℓ_{\max} as either (i) $\lfloor \log \log x_j \rfloor - 3$, or (ii) $\lfloor \log \log x_j \rfloor - 2$. Consider the first case. In this case, ℓ_{\max}

matches the maximum level in specification of the FORMJUNTA [11] protocol for populations of size x_j . Therefore, we can apply the corresponding Theorem 1, which states that a non-empty junta of size $\leq x_j^{0.98}$ is formed with probability $1 - x_j^{-a}$ (for any constant $a > 0$).

In the other case $\ell_{\max} = \lfloor \log \log x_j \rfloor - 2$. Throughout the FORMJUNTA process, only active agents may modify their level. That is, if an active agent u initiates a meaningful interaction with a node v , then (i) it becomes inactive if v has a level lower than u , or (ii) it remains active otherwise.³ Just as in [11], we denote by B_ℓ the number of agents that reach at least level i . Per definition, it must hold that $B_\ell \geq B_{\ell+1}$ for any level $\ell \geq 0$. First, we show that between 1 and $x_j^{0.98}$ agents make it to level ℓ_{\max} with probability $1 - x_j^{-a}$ (for any constant $a > 0$). The upper-bound on this number follows directly from Lemma 5 of [11]. It states that $B_{\lfloor \log \log x_j \rfloor - 3} < x_j^{0.98}$ with probability $1 - x_j^{-a}$ (again for arbitrary constants $a > 0$). Due to the monotonicity of B_ℓ , it follows that $B_{\ell_{\max}} < x_j^{0.98}$ as well. In order to show the lower-bound $B_{\ell_{\max}} > 1$ we would like to use Lemma 4 of [11]. Unfortunately, it only yields that $B_{\ell_{\max}-1} > 1$. Fortunately, in the proof of Lemma 4 they show the slightly stronger statement of $B_{\ell_{\max}-1} > x_j^{2/3}$ with probability at least $1 - x_j^{-a}$. We argue that this implies that $B_{\ell_{\max}} > 1$ with probability $1 - x_j^{-a}$. To show this, we rely on the coupling idea described in Footnote 6 on page 100 of [11]. That is, we serialize the points in time $\{t(l)\}_{l=1}^{x_j^{2/3}}$ at which the first $x_j^{2/3}$ agents that entered level $\ell_{\max} - 1$ make their first interaction as an initiator. At time $t(l)$, the l -th such agent decides whether it stays active and progresses to level ℓ_{\max} or becomes inactive (according to (i) and (ii) above). Observe that for any such agent that makes its decision after $t(x_j^{2/3}/2)$, the probability to remain active is at least $x_j^{2/3}/(2x_j)$ (as at this time already $x_j^{2/3}/2$ agents entered level $\ell_{\max} - 1$). Hence, in expectation, at least $x_j^{2/3}/(2x_j) \cdot x_j^{2/3} = x_j^{1/3}/2$ agents progress to level ℓ_{\max} . From Chernoff bounds it follows that at least $x_j^{1/3}(1 - o(1))/2$ agents reach ℓ_{\max} with probability $1 - x_j^{-\omega(1)}$.

It remains to show that $O(x_j \log(x_j))$ meaningful interactions suffice for the first agent to reach level ℓ_{\max} . This follows from Lemma 3 of [11]. There it is shown that even if the maximum level is unbounded, all nodes become inactive within $O(x_j \log(x_j))$ interactions and with probability at least $1 - x_j^{-a}$. \square

Statement (1) now follows directly from this claim. For Statement (2) we also refer to this claim and note that the junta-election is driven in the subpopulation. Hence, the $O(x_j \log(x_j))$ meaningful interactions need to be converted into global interactions. To that end, observe that $(n^2/x_j) \cdot (1 + o(1))$ global interactions suffice for x_j meaningful interactions to occur with probability $1 - x_j^{-\omega(1)}$. Because the probability for any fixed interaction to be meaningful is x_j^2/n^2 , this immediately follows from Chernoff bounds. A symmetric approach also yields that at least $(n^2/x_j) \cdot (1 - o(1))$ global interactions are required for x_j many meaningful interactions to occur. This implies that $s_j(0) = O((n^2/x_j) \cdot \log x_j)$. Due to the constraint on x_j , it holds that $\log(n) \geq \log(x_j) \geq \log(n)/2$ and Statement (2) follows.

The proof of Statement (3) follows from Statement (3) of Lemma 6 and a conversion to global interactions. Additionally, observe that due to the constraint on x_j we have $\text{poly}(n) = \text{poly}(x_j)$ and note that the constant hidden in the exponent of $\text{poly}(n)$ in Lemma 6 can be made arbitrary large. The proof of Statement (4) again directly follows from Lemma 6 together with above observation of $\text{poly}(n) = \text{poly}(x_j)$. \square

Lemma 9. Fix a subpopulation j of $x_j \leq \sqrt{n}$ agents. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be an arbitrary small constant. Then, subpopulation j will not elect a junta agent before interaction $n^{1.5-\varepsilon}$ with probability $1 - n^{-\omega(1)}$.

PROOF. In order to join the junta, agents need to increase their level from 0 to $\ell_{\max} = \lfloor \log \log n \rfloor - 2$. Per definition of the junta election [11], an agent u may only increase its level if it interacts as an initiator (and some additional

³Note that the state transitions for agents on the first level 0 are slightly different but not relevant for this proof.

conditions hold). Furthermore, this increase is at most an increment of 1. Therefore, any fixed agent u of subpopulation j requires at least ℓ_{\max} meaningful interactions as an initiator to join the junta. In the following we call such an interaction *bad*. The probability that any fixed interaction is bad is $(1/n) \cdot x_j/n \leq n^{-1.5}$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be an arbitrary small constant. We show that in a sequence of $n^{1.5-\varepsilon}$ there will be less than ℓ_{\max} bad interactions with probability $1 - n^{-\omega(1)}$. The lemma's statement then follows from a union bound over all agents in subpopulation i .

The number of bad interactions of u in this may be majorized by $\text{Bin}(n^{1.5-\varepsilon}, n^{-1.5})$. It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr[\text{Bin}(n^{1.5-\varepsilon}, n^{-1.5}) \geq \ell_{\max}] \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{n^{1.5-\varepsilon}-\ell_{\max}} \Pr[\text{Bin}(n^{1.5-\varepsilon}, n^{-1.5}) = \ell_{\max} + i] \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} n^{1.5-\varepsilon} \cdot \Pr[\text{Bin}(n^{1.5-\varepsilon}, n^{-1.5}) = \ell_{\max}] \end{aligned}$$

In step (a) we use that ℓ_{\max} is much larger than the expected value of this distribution. Hence, the terms in the sum decline with further i . This allows us to upper-bound each term in the sum by $p = \Pr[\text{Bin}(n^{1.5-\varepsilon}, n^{-1.5}) = \ell_{\max}]$. Using the PDF of the binomial distribution we can further bound p .

$$\begin{aligned} p &= \binom{n^{1.5-\varepsilon}}{\ell_{\max}} \cdot (n^{-1.5})^{\ell_{\max}} \cdot (1 - n^{-1.5})^{n^{1.5-\varepsilon}-\ell_{\max}} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{e \cdot n^{1.5-\varepsilon}}{\ell_{\max}} \right)^{\ell_{\max}} (n^{-1.5})^{\ell_{\max}} = \left(\frac{e}{\ell_{\max}} \right)^{\ell_{\max}} \cdot \frac{1}{n^{\varepsilon \cdot \ell_{\max}}} \end{aligned}$$

Since $\ell_{\max} = \Theta(\log \log n)$, this implies that $p = n^{-\omega(1)}$. Hence, $\Pr[\text{Bin}(n^{1.5-\varepsilon}, n^{-1.5}) \geq \ell_{\max}] = n^{1.5-\varepsilon} \cdot n^{-\omega(1)} = n^{-\omega(1)}$ for sufficiently large n and the result follows. \square

In the following we define $T_i(t)$ as the total number of tokens for opinion i at interaction t , i.e.,

$$T_i(t) := \sum_{\{u \mid \text{opinion}[u](t)=i\}} \text{tokens}[u](t)$$

where $\text{opinion}[u](t)$ and $\text{tokens}[u](t)$ denote the values of the variables $\text{opinion}[u]$ and $\text{tokens}[u]$, respectively, in interaction t . Note that $T_i(0)$ is the initial support of opinion i .

Lemma 10. *Assume that $x_{\max} > n^{1/2+\varepsilon}$ for a small constant $\varepsilon > 0$. Let i be the initial plurality opinion and let \hat{t} denote the first interaction in which phase = 0 for all agents. Then, w.h.p., $\hat{t} = \Theta((n^2/x_{\max}) \cdot \log n)$ and the following holds after interaction \hat{t} w.h.p.:*

- (1) *There are at most $O(n/x_{\max})$ distinct opinions left.*
- (2) *For the initial plurality opinion i it holds that $T_i(\hat{t}) = T_i(0)$.*
- (3) *Each of the roles clock, tracker, and player is held by at least $n/10$ agents.*

PROOF. We first show the bound on \hat{t} . Recall that $s_i(0)$ is defined as the interaction when the first junta agent in subpopulation i is elected, and $s_i(c)$ is defined as the interaction when the clock of the first agent of opinion i ticks for the c -th time. We will prove upper and lower bounds for \hat{t} based on $s_i(c)$.

From Statements (1) and (3) of Lemma 7 (with $a = 4$) it follows that $s_i(c) \leq (c+1)c_2 \cdot \frac{n^2}{x_{\max}} \log n$ with probability at least $1 - (1+c) \cdot x_{\max}^{-4} \geq 1 - (1+c) \cdot n^{-2-4\varepsilon}$ (since we assume that $x_i \geq n^{1/2+\varepsilon}$). Once an agent u has reached phase $[u] = 0$, this phase value is disseminated to all other agents via one-way epidemics. It follows that, w.h.p., $\hat{t} \leq s_i(c) + \tau_{BC}$,

where τ_{BC} is the *broadcast time* with $\tau_{BC} \leq c_2 \cdot n^2/x_{\max} \log n$ w.h.p. [5]. Ultimately, $\hat{t} \leq c_2 \cdot (c+2) \cdot n^2/x_{\max} \cdot \log n$ w.h.p.

For the lower bound, we observe that $\hat{t} \geq s_j(c) \geq c \cdot c_1 \cdot n^2/x_j \cdot \log n \geq c \cdot c_1 \cdot n^2/x_{\max} \cdot \log n$ with probability at least $1 - c \cdot n^{-2-4\epsilon}$. A union bound over all opinions yields $\hat{t} \geq c \cdot c_1 \cdot n^2/x_{\max} \cdot \log n$ w.h.p. Together with the upper bound, the result for \hat{t} follows. Next, we show the three statements individually.

Statement (1). Let $c^* = (c+2) \cdot c_2$ be the constant from the upper bound on \hat{t} and define $c_s = c^*/c_1$. In the following, we show that any insignificant opinion j vanishes. For this, let j be an arbitrary but fixed opinion with $x_j < x_{\max}/c_s$. We distinguish two cases.

Case 1: $x_j \geq \sqrt{n}$. From Lemma 7 we get that w.h.p.

$$\hat{t} \leq c^* \cdot \frac{n^2}{x_{\max}} \log n \quad , \quad s_j(1) \geq c_1 \cdot \frac{n^2}{x_j} \log n > c^* \cdot \frac{n^2}{x_{\max}} \log n,$$

where the last inequality uses the definition of c_s and $x_j < x_{\max}/c_s$. Together with a union bound this implies that w.h.p. the clocks of all agents of opinion j do not tick even once. Hence, opinion j vanishes at latest in interaction \hat{t} w.h.p.

Case 2: $x_j < \sqrt{n}$. Similarly to before, we get from above bounds on \hat{t} and from Lemma 9 that w.h.p.

$$\hat{t} = O(n^{3/2-\epsilon} \cdot \log n) \quad \text{and} \quad s_j(1) \geq s_j(0) \geq n^{3/2-\epsilon'}.$$

Together with $\epsilon' < \epsilon$ and a union bound this again implies that w.h.p. the clocks of all agents of opinion j do not tick even once. Hence, also in this case opinion j vanishes at latest in interaction \hat{t} w.h.p.

Together the two cases show that any opinion j with $x_j < x_{\max}/c_s$ w.h.p. does not compete in the tournaments. Since we have n agents, at most $n \cdot c_s/x_{\max} = O(n/x_{\max})$ opinions remain after \hat{t} interactions w.h.p.

Statement (2). To show the statement we need to show that the clocks of any agent of the initial plurality opinion i pass through zero at least once before the first agent u hits $\text{phase}[u] = 0$. Recall that $s_j(c)$ is the interaction when the clock of any agent with opinion j passes through zero for the c -th time (this is the first interaction when any agent u sets $\text{phase}[u] = 0$).

In the following we only consider opinions j with $x_j = \Omega(x_i)$. The statement for smaller opinions follows from the above proof of Statement (1). There we have shown that the clocks of agents of smaller opinions will not pass through zero even once before interaction \hat{t} . For significant opinions j , we observe $s_j(c) \geq c \cdot c_1 \cdot n^2/x_{\max}$ w.h.p. as shown in the beginning of the proof. From the bound on $s_j(c)$ and from Lemma 7 we get that w.h.p.

$$s_j(c) \geq c \cdot c_1 \cdot \frac{n^2}{x_{\max}} \log n \quad \text{and} \quad e_i(1) \leq s_i(2) \leq 3c_2 \cdot \frac{n^2}{x_{\max}} \log n.$$

By choosing a sufficiently large constant $c > 3c_2/c_1$ in Algorithm 5, this yields $s_j(c) > s_i(2)$ w.h.p. In other words, at the time when the first agent's clock has passed through zero for the c -th time, the clocks of all agents of opinion i have passed through zero at least once. In particular, $\text{phase}[u] \neq -c$ for any agent u with opinion i in that interaction.

The total number of tokens $T_i(t)$ of opinion i can only change in some interaction t if an agent u of opinion i adopts another role in Line 10 of Algorithm 5 while $\text{tokens}[u] > 0$. However, we have just shown that when the first agent v sets $\text{phase}[v] = 0$, any agent u of opinion i has $\text{phase}[u] \neq -c$. Hence it follows that agent u can adopt a different role in Line 10 of Algorithm 5 only if agent u had $\text{tokens}[u] = 0$ in Line 9 of Algorithm 5. Therefore, such an interaction does not change the total number of tokens for opinion i and the statement follows.

Statement (3). The proof follows from similar arguments as the proof of Statement (2) of Lemma 3. □

4.1 Proof of Theorem 2.

We split the proof of Theorem 2 into three parts, the proof of the correctness of the result, the proof of the runtime, and the proof of the state space requirements. Essentially, the theorem follows from Lemma 10 for the correctness of the modified initialization phase (Algorithm 5) and from Statement (2) of Theorem 1 for the correctness of SIMPLEALGORITHM.

PROOF OF THEOREM 2, CORRECTNESS OF THE RESULT.

In IMPROVEDALGORITHM, all agents start with the modified initialization phase defined in Algorithm 5. After this initialization, they execute the tournament according to the variant of SIMPLEALGORITHM which does not need an order among the opinions (see Appendix B). By Statement (3) of Lemma 10 we get that all roles in { clock, tracker, player } are held by at least a constant fraction of agents at time \hat{t} . The number of agents with role collector may be asymptotically much smaller, however, their number does not affect the outcome of SIMPLEALGORITHM. Statement (2) of Lemma 10 guarantees that at the beginning of the tournaments the initial plurality still has all of its initial tokens. It follows along the lines of the proof of Statement (1) of Theorem 1 that this opinion will be the defender at the end of the tournament, and all agents will output this opinion after the final broadcast as described in Section 3.4. \square

PROOF OF THEOREM 2, RUNTIME OF THE ALGORITHM.

From Lemma 10 we get that, w.h.p., after $\hat{t} = O(n^2/x_{\max} \cdot \log n)$ interactions all agents u have $\text{phase}[u] = 0$ in Algorithm 5. The protocol then proceeds according to the variant of SIMPLEALGORITHM which does not require an order among the opinions described in Appendix B. By Statement (2) of Lemma 10, at most $O(n/x_{\max})$ opinions have at least one collector agent each, w.h.p. If there is not a single collector agent left for some opinion, this opinion cannot become a challenger in any of the tournaments. Therefore, the total number of tournaments executed in SIMPLEALGORITHM is bounded w.h.p. by $O(n/x_{\max})$. As argued in the proof of Statement (1) of Theorem 1, each tournament takes $O(n \log n)$ interactions w.h.p., and the modified SIMPLEALGORITHM also needs to perform a leader election, which takes $O(n \log^2 n)$ interactions [23]. Together, we conclude that IMPROVEDALGORITHM has a runtime of $O(n^2/x_{\max} \cdot \log n + n \log^2 n)$ interactions w.h.p. \square

PROOF OF THEOREM 2, STATES OF THE ALGORITHM.

IMPROVEDALGORITHM requires the states used in the modified initialization (Algorithm 5) and the states used by SIMPLEALGORITHM (Statement (2) of Theorem 1). In Algorithm 5, all collector agents need to store the set of states \mathcal{S}_c of size $\Theta(\log \log n)$ required to run the junta-based phase clocks. Additionally, the size of the phase variable is increased by a constant, starting now at $-c$. The remaining states have the same size as in SIMPLEALGORITHM. Together, this gives us the claimed state space size of $\Theta(k \cdot \log \log n + \log n)$. \square

5 CONCLUSIONS

We present population protocols that efficiently solve exact plurality consensus with high probability. While it is known that always correct, exact plurality with k opinions needs $\Omega(k^2)$ states per agent, we show that a small failure probability leads to efficient exact plurality consensus with $O(k + \log n)$ states, w.h.p. The runtime can further be reduced at the cost of a small additional factor of $O(\log \log n)$ states.

Our protocols use majority, leader election, and junta election protocols as a black box. Improving the guarantees of these black boxes would also carry over to our protocols. For example, a leader election protocol that has a *with high probability* runtime of $O(\log n)$ would immediately improve our runtime. Similarly, both a constant state majority protocol and a constant state junta election protocol (that work *with high probability*) would immediately improve our

state space bounds. Furthermore, we believe that $\Omega(n/x_{\max})$ is a natural lower bound for the runtime, and thus the possible improvements mentioned above would lead to a state- and time-optimal exact plurality consensus protocol.

In our main result we prune small opinions in order to reduce the number of tournaments. We conjecture that this yields almost optimal protocols. In order to further improve the runtime (possibly at the expense of a slightly increased state complexity) we believe that additional techniques are required. In particular, it would be interesting to find another, more efficient way than pairwise comparison of opinions via tournaments to identify the plurality opinion.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Alistarh, J. Aspnes, and R. Gelashvili. “Space-Optimal Majority in Population Protocols.” In: *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2018*. SIAM, 2018, pp. 2221–2239. doi: 10.1137/1.9781611975031.144.
- [2] D. Alistarh, R. Gelashvili, and M. Vojnovic. “Fast and Exact Majority in Population Protocols.” In: *Proceedings of the 2015 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing, PODC 2015*. ACM, 2015, pp. 47–56. doi: 10.1145/2767386.2767429.
- [3] D. Angluin, J. Aspnes, Z. Diamadi, M. J. Fischer, and R. Peralta. “Computation in networks of passively mobile finite-state sensors.” In: *Distributed Comput.* 18.4 (2006), pp. 235–253. doi: 10.1007/s00446-005-0138-3.
- [4] D. Angluin, J. Aspnes, and D. Eisenstat. “A simple population protocol for fast robust approximate majority.” In: *Distributed Comput.* 21.2 (2008), pp. 87–102. doi: 10.1007/s00446-008-0059-z.
- [5] D. Angluin, J. Aspnes, and D. Eisenstat. “Fast computation by population protocols with a leader.” In: *Distributed Comput.* 21.3 (2008), pp. 183–199. doi: 10.1007/s00446-008-0067-z.
- [6] D. Angluin, J. Aspnes, D. Eisenstat, and E. Ruppert. “The computational power of population protocols.” In: *Distributed Comput.* 20.4 (2007), pp. 279–304. doi: 10.1007/s00446-007-0040-2.
- [7] G. Bankhamer, P. Berenbrink, F. Biermeier, R. Elsässer, H. Hosseinpour, D. Kaaser, and P. Kling. “Fast Consensus via the Unconstrained Undecided State Dynamics.” In: *Proceedings of the 2022 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2022*. 2022, pp. 3417–3429. doi: 10.1137/1.9781611977073.135.
- [8] S. Ben-Nun, T. Kopelowitz, M. Kraus, and E. Porat. “An $O(\log^{3/2} n)$ Parallel Time Population Protocol for Majority with $O(\log n)$ States.” In: *PODC ’20: ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing, Virtual Event*. ACM, 2020, pp. 191–199. doi: 10.1145/3382734.3405747.
- [9] P. Berenbrink, A. Czumaj, A. Steger, and B. Vöcking. “Balanced Allocations: The Heavily Loaded Case.” In: *SIAM J. Comput.* 35.6 (2006), pp. 1350–1385. doi: 10.1137/S009753970444435X.
- [10] P. Berenbrink, R. Elsässer, T. Friedetzky, D. Kaaser, P. Kling, and T. Radzik. “A Population Protocol for Exact Majority with $O(\log^{5/3} n)$ Stabilization Time and $\Theta(\log n)$ States.” In: *32nd International Symposium on Distributed Computing, DISC 2018*. Vol. 121. LIPIcs. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2018, 10:1–10:18. doi: 10.4230/LIPIcs.DISC.2018.10.
- [11] P. Berenbrink, R. Elsässer, T. Friedetzky, D. Kaaser, P. Kling, and T. Radzik. “Time-space trade-offs in population protocols for the majority problem.” In: *Distributed Comput.* 34.2 (2021), pp. 91–111. doi: 10.1007/s00446-020-00385-0.
- [12] P. Berenbrink, T. Friedetzky, D. Kaaser, and P. Kling. “Tight & Simple Load Balancing.” In: *2019 IEEE International Parallel and Distributed Processing Symposium, IPDPS 2019*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 718–726. doi: 10.1109/IPDPS.2019.00080.
- [13] P. Berenbrink, G. Giakkoupis, and P. Kling. “Optimal time and space leader election in population protocols.” In: *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2020*. ACM, 2020, pp. 119–129. doi: 10.1145/3357713.3384312.
- [14] J. M. Bower and H. Bolouri, eds. *Computational modeling of genetic and biochemical networks*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2001.
- [15] H. Chen, R. Cummings, D. Doty, and D. Soloveichik. “Speed faults in computation by chemical reaction networks.” In: *Distributed Comput.* 30.5 (2017), pp. 373–390. doi: 10.1007/s00446-015-0255-6.

- [16] A. Condon, M. Hajiaghayi, D. G. Kirkpatrick, and J. Manuch. “Approximate majority analyses using tri-molecular chemical reaction networks.” In: *Nat. Comput.* 19.1 (2020), pp. 249–270. doi: 10.1007/s11047-019-09756-4.
- [17] Z. Diamadi and M. J. Fischer. “A simple game for the study of trust in distributed systems.” In: *Wuhan University Journal of Natural Sciences* 6.1–2 (2001), pp. 72–82. doi: 10.1007/BF03160228.
- [18] D. Doty. “Timing in chemical reaction networks.” In: *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2014*. SIAM, 2014, pp. 772–784. doi: 10.1137/1.9781611973402.57.
- [19] D. Doty, M. Eftekhari, L. Gasieniec, E. E. Severson, G. Stachowiak, and P. Uznanski. “A time and space optimal stable population protocol solving exact majority.” In: *CoRR abs/2106.10201* (2021). FOCS 2021, to appear. arXiv: 2106.10201.
- [20] D. Doty, M. Eftekhari, L. Gasieniec, E. E. Severson, P. Uznanski, and G. Stachowiak. “A time and space optimal stable population protocol solving exact majority.” In: *62nd IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2021*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 1044–1055. doi: 10.1109/FOCS52979.2021.00104.
- [21] W. Feller. *An introduction to probability theory and its applications*. 3rd edition, revised printing. Wiley series in probability and mathematical statistics: Probability and mathematical statistics. Wiley, 1968.
- [22] L. Gasieniec, D. D. Hamilton, R. Martin, P. G. Spirakis, and G. Stachowiak. “Deterministic Population Protocols for Exact Majority and Plurality.” In: *20th International Conference on Principles of Distributed Systems, OPODIS 2016*. Vol. 70. LIPIcs. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2016, 14:1–14:14. doi: 10.4230/LIPIcs.OPODIS.2016.14.
- [23] L. Gasieniec and G. Stachowiak. “Enhanced Phase Clocks, Population Protocols, and Fast Space Optimal Leader Election.” In: *J. ACM* 68.1 (2021), 2:1–2:21. doi: 10.1145/3424659.
- [24] S. Janson. “Tail bounds for sums of geometric and exponential variables.” In: *Statistics & Probability Letters* 135 (2018), pp. 1–6. doi: 10.1016/j.spl.2017.11.017.
- [25] A. Kosowski and P. Uznanski. “Brief Announcement: Population Protocols Are Fast.” In: *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing, PODC 2018*. ACM, 2018, pp. 475–477.
- [26] D. Levin and Y. Peres. *Markov Chains and Mixing Times*. 2nd edition. American Mathematical Society, 2017.
- [27] M. Mitzenmacher and E. Upfal. *Probability and Computing: Randomized Algorithms and Probabilistic Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 2005. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511813603.
- [28] Y. Mocquard, F. Robin, B. Sericola, and E. Anceaume. “Stochastic analysis of average-based distributed algorithms.” In: *J. Appl. Probab.* 58.2 (2021), pp. 394–410. doi: 10.1017/jpr.2020.97.
- [29] E. Natale and I. Ramezani. “On the Necessary Memory to Compute the Plurality in Multi-agent Systems.” In: *Algorithms and Complexity - 11th International Conference, CIAC 2019*. Vol. 11485. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer, 2019, pp. 323–338. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-17402-6_27.
- [30] D. Soloveichik, M. Cook, E. Winfree, and J. Bruck. “Computation with finite stochastic chemical reaction networks.” In: *Nat. Comput.* 7.4 (2008), pp. 615–633. doi: 10.1007/s11047-008-9067-y.
- [31] V. Volterra. “Variations and Fluctuations of the Number of Individuals in Animal Species living together.” In: *ICES Journal of Marine Science* 3.1 (Apr. 1928), pp. 3–51. doi: 10.1093/icesjms/3.1.3.

APPENDIX

A TECHNICAL DETAILS OF THE SIMPLEALGORITHM ANALYSIS

Application of the Majority Protocol. In this paragraph, we present how the exact majority protocol from [20] is integrated into our SIMPLEALGORITHM. That protocol determines the majority between n agents having either opinions A or B . Every agent u has a variable called $\text{output}[u]$ which finally stores (unless there is a tie) the majority opinion. The initial opinion is stored in $\text{input}[u]$. The algorithm uses a variable $\text{bias}[u]$ and sets $\text{bias}[u] = +1$ if $\text{input}[u] = A$ and $\text{bias}[u] = -1$ if $\text{input}[u] = B$. In our protocol we execute the exact majority protocol among the player-agents only. Hence, each player-agent needs the same set of states (additionally to the ones given in Section 3) as the exact majority protocol from [20]. SIMPLEALGORITHM now is initialized as follows. A player-agent u with $\text{playeropinion}[u] \neq U$ sets $\text{input}[u] = \text{playeropinion}[u]$. A player-agent u with $\text{playeropinion}[u] = U$ sets $\text{bias}[u] = 0$. With this initialization the protocol determines the majority in time $O(n \log n)$, since the number of player-agents is at least $\Omega(n)$. Note that in contrast to [20] we do not need the slow and always correct algorithm used since we are only interested in results that hold with high probability. We assume for every player-agent u that $\text{playeropinion}[u]$ stores the output of the protocol.

Proof of Theorem 1, Runtime of Statement (1). We prove Theorem 1 via an induction using the following lemma which provides an invariant for our algorithm. In the following we assume that the phase clocks are synchronized, the length of the phases is sufficient, and that the even phases are separated from each other. This follows from [1]. For $1 \leq j < k, 0 \leq i \leq 9$ let $t_i(j)$ be the interaction in which the first agent enters phase i for the j -th time. Let ℓ_j be the plurality opinion ℓ among $1, \dots, j$.

Lemma 11. *Fix a j with $1 \leq j < k$ and assume that the first $j - 1$ tournaments worked correctly. Then we have w.h.p.*

- (1) *At time $t_2(j)$ all collector-agents u with opinion $j + 1$ have $\text{challenger}[u] = \text{TRUE}$. All other collector-agents have $\text{challenger}[u] = \text{FALSE}$. Furthermore, all collector-agents v not having opinion ℓ_j have $\text{defender}[v] = \text{FALSE}$.*
- (2) *Let \mathcal{A} be the set of agents u with $\text{playeropinion}[u] = A$ and let \mathcal{B} be the set of agents with $\text{playeropinion}[u] = B$. At time $t_6(j)$ we have $|\mathcal{A}| \geq |\mathcal{B}|$ iff $x_{\ell_j}(0) \geq x_{j+1}(0)$.*
- (3) *If $|\mathcal{A}| \geq |\mathcal{B}|$ ($|\mathcal{A}| < |\mathcal{B}|$) at time $t_8(j)$ we have $\text{playeropinion}[u] \in \{A, U\}$ ($\text{playeropinion}[u] = B$) for all player-agents u .*
- (4) *At time $t_0(j + 1)$ all collector-agents u with opinion ℓ_{j+1} have $\text{defender}[u] = \text{TRUE}$.*

PROOF. From Lemma 3 it follows that each role collector, player, clock, and tracker is held by at least $n/10$ agents, w.h.p. We denote the set of player-agents by P and the set of collector-agents by C . In the following we prove the statements one after the other.

Statement (1). First we show that in Phase 0 of tournament j each agent interacts at least twice with a tracker-agent. w.h.p. we have at least $n/10$ tracker-agents, hence the probability to interact in a fixed step with a tracker-agent is at least $1/10$. The claim now follows from Chernoff bounds.

Fix an agent u with opinion $j + 1$. Since agent u interacts at least once with a tracker-agent in Phase 0, u sets $\text{challenger}[u] = \text{TRUE}$ in Line 3 of Algorithm 4. $\text{defender}[u] = \text{FALSE}$ follows from the initialization phase (see Algorithm 3). Now consider an agent u with opinion $\ell \notin \{\ell_j, j + 1\}$. If $\ell > j + 1$ $\text{challenger}[u] = \text{defender}[u] = \text{FALSE}$ follows from the initialization phase (see Algorithm 3). Now assume that $\ell < j + 1$. If opinion $\ell > 1$ the opinion was challenger opinion in tournament $\ell - 1$. If $\ell = 1$ the opinion was the defender in the first tournament. In either case,

challenger[u] and defender[u] are set to = FALSE in Line 17 – 21 of Algorithm 4 or in Line 5 of Algorithm 3.

Statement (2). In this proof we assume w.l.o.g. that $x_{\ell_j}(0) \geq x_{j+1}(0)$. Fix a collector-agent u . From Statement (1) and Statement (4) of the previous tournament it follows that in Line 5 of Algorithm 4 $\ell[u]$ is set to tokens[u] if u is a defender agent and to $-\text{tokens}[u]$ if u is a challenger agent. In Line 8 of Algorithm 4 the defender and challenger agents perform a load balancing protocol for the rest of Phase 2. The protocol is analyzed in [12, 28]). We define $L = \sum_{u:\text{collector}} \ell[u]$ as the total load at the end of Phase 2 and $\hat{L} = \sum_{u:\text{collector}} |\ell[u]|$ as the total remaining load. From [12, 28] it follows that at the end of Phase 2 we have w.h.p. (a) $L = x_{\ell_j}(0) - x_{j+1}(0)$ and (b) for every collector-agent u it holds either $\ell[u] \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ if $x_{\ell_j}(0) - x_{j+1}(0) \geq |C|/2$ or $\ell[u] \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$, otherwise.

In Phase 2 of Algorithm 4 every collector-agent u recruits $|\ell[u]|$ many undecided player-agents v . If $\ell[u] > 0$ it sets playeropinion[v] = A and $\ell[u] = \ell[u] - 1$. If $\ell[u] < 0$ it sets playeropinion[v] = B and $\ell[u] = \ell[u] + 1$. For rest of the player-agents it remains playeropinion[v] = U . This is done in Lines 10 – 12 of Algorithm 4. It remains to show that each of these agents can recruit the sufficient amount of player-agents. We will show the following claim.

Claim 12. Assume $|P|$ is the number of player-agents. Fix the configuration at time the end of Phase 2. W.h.p. we have either

- (i) $\hat{L} \leq |P|/2$, or
- (ii) for every collector-agent u we have $\ell[u] \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ and then there exists a collector-agent u with $\ell[u] > 0$.

PROOF. Statement (i) follows directly for $x_{\ell_j} + x_{j+1} \leq |P|/2$. Hence, for the rest of the proof we can assume that $\hat{L} > |P|/2$. (Note that (i) would immediate follow if $|P| \geq 2|C|$ which is, unfortunately, quite unlikely). From the analysis in [12] it follows that w.h.p. at least $|C|/4$ agents u have $\ell[u] = 0$ (this holds due to the length of the phase and the fact that in Line 8 of Algorithm 4 “+1”-s are canceled against “-1”-s). From Chernoff bounds it follows that w.h.p. $|P| \geq |C|/2$. Statement (ii) follows directly for $x_{\ell_j}(0) - x_{j+1}(0) \geq |C|/2$ and the fact that $L = x_{\ell_j}(0) - x_{j+1}(0)$. The claim follows from a union bound over both statements. \square

At last it remains to show that Statement (2) follows by the claim and the fact that $L = x_{\ell_j}(0) - x_{j+1}(0)$. Assume Statement (i) holds. Chernoff bounds show that every collector-agent u is able to recruit $|\ell[u]|$ many player-agents in $O(n \log n)$ interactions w.h.p.

Now assume Statement (ii) holds instead. That is, no player-agent u is able to sets playeropinion[u] = B in Line 11 of Algorithm 4 and hence, it is sufficient that at least a collector-agent u with $\ell[u] > 0$ is able to recruit a player-agent. Again, this follows from Chernoff bounds for $O(n \log n)$ interactions w.h.p. Then Statement (2) follows from a union bound.

Statement (3). We execute the exact majority protocol from [20] among the player-agents in Phase 6. (The detailed explanation can be found at the beginning of Appendix A.) Since the player size is at least $n/10$, Chernoff bounds provide sufficiently many meaningful interactions in $\Theta(n \log n)$ interactions w.h.p. Together with Statement (2) this implies the claim.

Statement (4). Similarly to the proof of Statement (1) we can argue that in Phase 8 of tournament j each agent interacts at least twice with a player-agent. From Statement (3) it follows that every player-agent v has playeropinion[v] = A (playeropinion[v] = B , respectively) if the defender (challenger, respectively) opinion won the majority protocol in Phase 6. Note that the competition in the j -th tournament is between opinion $j + 1$ and ℓ_j .

First let us assume that for each player-agent v we have playeropinion[v] = B , i.e., the challenger opinion won. Consider collector-agent u . In Phase 8 *Algorithm 4* sets (see Line 17-19) defender[u] = challenger[u], i.e.,

every collector-agent u with the challenger opinion has $\text{defender}[u] = \text{TRUE}$, and afterwards Algorithm 4 sets $\text{challenger}[u] = \text{FALSE}$.

Now we assume that for each player-agent v we have $\text{playeropinion}[v] \in \{A, U\}$. In that case the defender opinion won the competition and we have $\text{defender}[u] = \text{TRUE}$ for all collector-agents with the defender opinion, as before. \square

PROOF OF RUNTIME FOR STATEMENT (1) OF THEOREM 1. We first apply Lemma 3. Then it holds that $t_0(1) = O(n \cdot (k + \log n))$ and the population is partitioned into the roles `player`, `tracker`, `clock` and `collector` where each role consists of at least $n/10$ agents w.h.p. The `clock`-agents run the phase `clock` from [1] that provides synchronized phases of length $\Theta(n \log n)$ w.h.p. In particular, the separation between even phases is sufficiently large, i.e., it last longer than the time to broadcast a message via one-way epidemic (see [5]). Now we do an induction over $k - 1$ tournaments in order to show that opinion ℓ_k is the defender at the end of the tournaments. At the beginning of the first tournament at time $t_0(1)$ Lemma 3 implies that opinion 1 is the initial defender w.h.p., i.e., $\ell_1 = 1$. The induction step from tournament j to $j + 1$ follows by Lemma 11 w.h.p. Thus, the initial plurality opinion is the defender at the end of the last tournament w.h.p. At last all agents agree on the unique defender opinion which follows by a final broadcast in $O(n \log n)$ interactions w.h.p. Summing up over the initialization phase and all tournaments, `SIMPLEALGORITHM` requires $O(n \cdot k \cdot \log n)$ interactions in total. \square

B REMOVING THE ORDER

In this section we explain how to remove the assumption that there is an order among the k opinions. Recall that in `SIMPLEALGORITHM` we let opinion 1 be the first defender and opinion $i + 1$ be the challenger of the i -th tournament. The number of tournaments was counted in the `tcnt` variable of `tracker`-agents. Instead, we now assign the `tracker` agent a slightly different task, and we use a unique leader agent (from the set of `tracker` agents) that randomly *samples* the next challenger before each match.

The leader agent interacts until it encounters an opinion that has not yet participated in a tournament. Then the leader agent informs all collector-agents u with that opinion that they are the next challenger. Unfortunately, this cannot be done efficiently for each opinion: if $x_j = o(n)$ for some opinion j , it takes too long for the leader to interact with an agent of that opinion. To solve this we use the remaining `tracker`-agents. `tracker` agents copy opinions that have not yet competed in a tournament (using the same number of states as for the counter `tcnt` before). This effectively amplifies the number of agents having an opinion that has not yet participated in a tournament, making this opinion *visible* to the leader agent.

Challenger and Defender Selection. Assume for now that we have a unique leader agent. At the beginning of each tournament ℓ in Phase 0 the leader agent and `tracker`-agents sample until they meet a collector-agent with an opinion j that has not yet participated in a tournament. As soon as the leader agent has sampled such an opinion j (either from a collector-agent directly or from a `tracker`-agent) it starts to broadcast among the `tracker`-agents and the collector-agents that opinion j is the challenger of tournament ℓ . (This broadcast is done on a constant fraction of all agents and thus concludes w.h.p. within one phase.) Now when a collector-agent u with $\text{opinion}[u] = j$ interacts with an agent v that knows the challenger opinion, it sets $\text{challenger}[u] \leftarrow \text{TRUE}$ and becomes a challenger agent. Note that we can implement this broadcast using one additional bit in the state space. Note that we can use the same procedure to select the initial defender before the tournament starts.

Lemma 13. *Assume a unique leader agent exists. Then a challenger (defender) opinion is selected in $O(n \log n)$ interactions w.h.p.*

PROOF. The lemma follows essentially from the following observation. Let u be an arbitrary but fixed agent and let A be a set of agents with $|A| = \Omega(n)$. Then it follows from Chernoff bounds that in $O(n \log n)$ interactions u interacts with an agent $v \in A$ at least once.

We now give the detailed proof for the correctness of the challenger selection. The defender selection follows by the same arguments. We call an opinion j *remaining challenger candidate* if the opinion has not participated in a tournament yet. First we show that the leader agent selects one of the remaining challenger candidates in $O(n \log n)$ interactions w.h.p. Then we show that every collector-agent with opinion j sets its challenger bit in $O(n \log n)$ interactions w.h.p.

Let agent w be the leader and let R be the set of agents whose opinions are among the remaining challenger candidates. If $|R| \geq n/10$ then the probability that the leader w interacts in a fixed step with an agent $v \in R$ is at least constant. It follows from Chernoff bounds that the leader agent selects a challenger candidate in $O(n \log n)$ interactions w.h.p. Assume $|R| < n/10$. In this case we first argue that every tracker-agent u stores the opinion of one of the remaining challenger candidates w.h.p. This follows from the one-way epidemic process [5] where R is the set of infected agents and the tracker-agents are susceptible. By Lemma 3 it follows that the number of tracker-agents is at least $n/10$ w.h.p. and hence, the first claim holds.

For the second claim we argue in a similar way. From the first claim we know that the leader has chosen a challenger opinion j w.h.p. The one-way epidemic provides that every tracker-agent learns the identity of opinion j within $O(n \log n)$ interactions w.h.p. Note that we utilize an additional Boolean flag to determine whether a tracker-agent has already stored the challenger opinion j . It now remains to show every collector-agent with opinion j interacts at least once with a tracker-agent w.h.p. Again this follows from Chernoff bounds and hence, the second claim holds.

The statement follows from a union bound over both claims. \square

Regarding the leader agent we use the leader election protocol from [23] with the phase clock from [11]. We run this protocol among the tracker agents. It requires $O(\log \log n)$ states and computes a unique leader agent in $O(n \log^2 n)$ interactions w.h.p. Note that the unique leader recognizes when the leader election protocol is concluded. This allows us to reuse the states from leader-election and integrate the leader election protocol in an additional, special phase before the tournaments start.

We now describe how we modify `SIMPLEALGORITHM`. The leader election protocol from [23] determines a unique leader agent as follows. We execute this protocol among the tracker-agents in a special phase as part of the preprocessing before the first tournament starts. When a unique leader is elected (w.h.p.), it broadcasts the end of the leader election and initiates the initial defender selection. The `clock`-agents wait in phase 0 until they receive the signal that a unique leader exists. The challenger selection is executed at the beginning of a tournament j in Phase 0 and replaces the original challenger selection of `SIMPLEALGORITHM` in Lines 2-3 of Algorithm 4.

PROOF OF STATEMENT (2) OF THEOREM 1. The result mostly follows from the correctness of `SIMPLEALGORITHM` (Statement (1) of Theorem 1). Again by Lemma 3 it holds that the population is partitioned into the roles `player`, `tracker`, `clock` and `collector`, where each role consists of at least $n/10$ agents w.h.p. The key modification affects the selection of a unique leader agent, the initial defender opinion, and the challenger opinion for each tournament.

Since the number of tracker-agents is at least $n/10$, the unique leader agent is computed in $O(n \log^2 n)$ interactions w.h.p. by the leader election protocol from [23]. Then by Lemma 13 it follows that we have a defender opinion

at the beginning of the first tournament w.h.p. Similarly to the proof of Statement (1) of Lemma 11 we can argue with Lemma 13 that Statement (1) holds. It remains to show that the number of states is at most $O(k + \log n)$. The tracker-agents require $O(\log \log n)$ states to execute the leader election protocol. Until the end of this protocol they do not store any other values. Once the leader election has concluded, they disregard the $O(\log \log n)$ states used for that protocol and use their states to store an opinion instead. Hence, $O(k + \log n)$ many states are sufficient.

The overall state complexity follows from the proof of Statement (1) of Theorem 1 along with the observation that the broadcasts can be implemented using constantly many additional bits. \square

C EXTENDING THE ALGORITHMS TO LARGE VALUES OF k

In this section we sketch how `SIMPLEALGORITHM` can be adapted to support up to $k < n$ opinions instead of requiring that $k < n/40$. As a first step, we describe the modification required to support $k < (1 - \epsilon)n$, for any arbitrary small constant $\epsilon > 0$. The resulting algorithm still respects the number of states and running time stated in Theorem 1. For this, we modify the algorithm at two places: in Line 3 of Algorithm 1, we decrease `count[u]` by $1/c$ for some large c if u interacts with a collector, and in Line 5 of Algorithm 3, we replace 10 by some large constant c' . This way, there will be a clock agent counting to $5 \log n$ even if only a small (constant) fraction of the collectors has converted its role to a clock, tracker or player node. Furthermore, in the chain of inequalities in Claim 4, we can guarantee that

$$\frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{z_i(t)}{n} \cdot \frac{z_i(t) - 1}{n - 1} = \Omega\left(\frac{1}{k}\right).$$

for $t < \tau(1 - \epsilon')$, where ϵ' is some properly chosen small constant. Then, we obtain the following adapted statements of Lemma 3:

- (1) $\hat{t} = O(n \cdot (k + \log n))$.
- (2) After interaction \hat{t} each of the roles collector, clock, tracker, and player are held by at least n/C agents, for some constant C .
- (3) After interaction \hat{t} all collector-agents of opinion 1 have their defender bit set.

Adapting now the constants in the proof of Theorem 1 accordingly, we obtain the result for $k < (1 - \epsilon)n$, where $\epsilon > 0$ can be an arbitrarily small constant.

In order to guarantee the result for any $k < n$, we have to further modify the algorithm. That is, whenever two agents u and v interact, and each of them has exactly one token of the same opinion, then one of them will have two tokens of the same opinion, and the other loses its opinion and becomes a so-called counting agent. The rest of state transitions remain the same for all collector, clock, tracker, and player-agents being in phase -1 . The counting agents start with a counter set to 0, and every such agent increments its counter if it initiates an interaction with itself (this event occurs with probability $1/n$). If the counter of such an agent hits $C \log n$ for some large C , then it broadcasts a message to all agents in the system by converting the phase of any agent to 0. Additionally, any collector-agent u , which has not interacted with any other agent having the same opinion as u , will lose its opinion and is converted to a clock, tracker, and player-agent, each with probability $1/3$. The counting agents convert their role to clock, tracker, and player-agents, each with probability $1/3$. If, however, a clock-agent switches to phase 0 first and converts all other agents to phase 0 as well, then all counting agents will switch their role to clock, tracker, and player-agents with probability $1/3$ each. After an agent enters phase 0, it follows the transitions given in the algorithms in Section 3.

In order to argue that this modified algorithm selects the initial majority w.h.p., we consider three cases. First, assume that $k < n/40$. We know that the number of counting agents can be at most $n/2$. Assume that after $\log^2 n$

rounds, there are no clock-agents in the system. However, there are at least $n/2$ non-counting agents, and out of these agents, $n/2 - \log^2 n$ must be collector-agents, as otherwise, at least one collector-agent has converted its role to clock-agent w.h.p. Now, we assign each collector-agent u a matching collector-agent v having the same opinion as u . As there are at most $n/40$ different opinions, we can create $(n/2 - \log^2 n - n/40)/2$ matching pairs. Since within n interactions, an agent selects another agent with constant probability, at least one collector-agent selects its matching collector-agent with constant probability. Thus, in n consecutive interactions, a clock-agent is created with constant probability. Repeating this argument over $\log n$ rounds consisting of n interactions each, we obtain that w.h.p. a clock-agent is created. Since we know that an algorithm exists that guarantees the bounds of Theorem 1 for $k < (1 - \epsilon)n$, the clock-agent will trigger phase 0 after $O(n(k + \log n))$ interactions w.h.p.

In the second case, we assume that $n/40 \leq k \leq 6n/10$. Here, we consider two subcases. First, assume that there are initially at most $\log^2 n$ agents, which have opinions supported by at least 3 agents initially. This, however, implies that more than $n/10$ agents have opinions supported by exactly 2 agents initially. Out of these agents, either at least $n/40$ will convert to counting agents within $O(n \log n)$ rounds or a clock-agent triggers phase 0 before that (at that point in time, at least a constant fraction of the initial collector-agents had to switch their roles). If the first case occurs, then after additional $O(n \log n)$ rounds one of the counting agents triggers phase 0, and every counting agent is converted to a clock, tracker, and player-agent. Thus, each of these roles is present in a constant fraction of agents w.h.p.

In the second subcase, we assume that there are more than $\log^2 n$ agents, which have opinions supported by at least 3 agents initially. Out of these agents, there will be created at least one clock-agent in $O(n \log n)$ rounds. Since the algorithm ensures that this clock-agent switches to phase 0 within additional $O(n)$ rounds, if $k < (1 - \epsilon)n$, the claim follows.

In the third case, we assume that $k > 6n/10$. Since there is at least 1 opinion with support at least 2, and the number of opinions with support 1 is at least $n/10$, we obtain that within $O(n \log n)$ rounds at least one counting agent is created. This counting agent triggers phase 0 after additional $O(n \log n)$ rounds, and all agents with opinions having support 1 switch their role to clock, tracker, and player-agents. All these roles are supported by at least a constant fraction of the agents w.h.p. Thus, the algorithm will select the initial majority w.h.p.

D AUXILIARY RESULTS

In this appendix we present known results used in our analysis. We start with classical Chernoff bounds.

Theorem 14 ([27, Theorems 4.4, 4.5]). *Let X_1, \dots, X_n be independent Poisson trials with $\Pr[X_i = 1] = p_i$ and let $X = \sum X_i$ with $\mathbb{E}[X] = \mu$. Then the following Chernoff bounds hold for $0 < \delta \leq 1$:*

$$\Pr[X > (1 + \delta) \cdot \mu] \leq e^{-\mu \cdot \delta^2 / 3}, \quad \text{and}$$

$$\Pr[X < (1 - \delta) \cdot \mu] \leq e^{-\mu \cdot \delta^2 / 2}.$$

Next we consider tail bounds for sums of geometrically distributed random variables.

Theorem 15 ([24, Theorem 2.1]). *Let $X = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ where $X_i, i = 1, \dots, n$, are independent geometric random variables with $X_i \sim \text{Geo}(p_i)$ for $p_i \in (0, 1]$. For any $\lambda \geq 1$,*

$$\Pr[X \geq \lambda \cdot \mathbb{E}[X]] \leq \exp(-\min_i \{p_i\} \cdot \mathbb{E}[X] \cdot (\lambda - 1 - \ln \lambda)).$$

The following statement bounds the hitting time for biased random walks. Similar results have already been shown, e.g., in [9, 21, 26]. For convenience, we give here a combined version of these standard results that fits our needs.

Lemma 16 (Random Walk Hitting Time). *Let $(W_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a biased random walk on state space \mathbb{N}_0 , initially at 0. Let $0 < p < 1$ denote the probability for the walk to move to the right (increase its current position by 1). Conversely, let $q = (1 - p)$ denote the probability that it moves to the left (or stays in position in case it currently resides at position 0). Then, for any $N > 0$ and hitting time $\tau_N = \min\{t \mid W_t = N\}$ the following holds:*

- (1) *If $p > q$ then $\tau_N \leq (\frac{2}{p-q})^2 \cdot N$ with probability at least $1 - \exp(-N)$.*
- (2) *If $p < q$ then $\tau_N \geq (q/p)^{N/2}$ with probability at least $1 - (p/q)^{N/2}$.*

PROOF. We start with the first statement and assume $p > q$. We use a similar idea as in Lemma 3.3 of [9]. That is, we let X_i denote a random variable with $X_i = -1$ if the random walk moves to the left, and $X_i = 1$ if it moves to the right in step i . Observe that $S_m = \sum_{i=1}^m X_i$ minorizes the position W_m of the random walk for any $m \geq 0$. We set $m = (2/p - q)^2 N$ and apply Hoeffding's bound (Theorem 4.12 of [27]). As $-1 \leq X_i \leq 1$ this yields for any $t \geq 0$ that

$$\Pr[S_m \leq \mathbb{E}[S_m] - t] \leq \exp(-2t^2/4m).$$

Setting $t = \mathbb{E}[S_m] - N = m(p - q) - N \geq 0$ this yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[S_m \leq N] &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{(m(p-q) - N)^2}{2m}\right) = \exp\left(-\frac{m(p-q)^2}{2} + N(p-q) - \frac{N^2}{2m}\right) \\ &= \exp\left(-2N + N(p-q) - \frac{N^2}{2m}\right) \leq \exp(-N). \end{aligned}$$

As S_m minorizes W_m , this implies that the random walk must have hit N before step m with probability at least $1 - \exp(-N)$.

In order to show the second statement, we assume $q < p$ and couple our process with a sequence of gamblers ruin instances. The gambler starts with 1 money and repeatedly gambles: either it wins 1 money with probability p or loses 1 money with probability q . The gambler continues until it either runs out of money or reaches a budget of $N + 1$. Assume our random walk currently resides at position 0. We couple its next moves with a gamblers ruin process as follows: the random walk moves to the right each time the gambler wins, otherwise it moves to the left. If the gambler reaches budget $N + 1$, then this implies that the random walk hit N before going back to 0. Otherwise, the gambler runs broke which implies that the random walk is again back at 0. Hence, we may lower-bound τ_N by the number of gamblers ruin instances required for the gambler to hit $N + 1$ for the first time. According to [21] the player reaches the desired budget with probability

$$\frac{\frac{q}{p} - 1}{(\frac{q}{p})^{N+1} - 1} \leq (\frac{p}{q})^N.$$

We now apply union bounds, which implies that the gambler wins in any of the first $(q/p)^{N/2}$ instances with probability at most

$$(q/p)^{N/2} \cdot (\frac{p}{q})^N = \frac{p^{N/2}}{q}. \quad \square$$

Each gamblers ruin instance corresponds to at least one move of the random walk. Therefore, the number of required gamblers ruin instances serves as a lower bound for the hitting time.