

Agent-based MST Construction

Ajay D. Kshemkalyani*, Manish Kumar†, Anisur Rahaman Molla‡ and Gokarna Sharma§

Abstract

Minimum-weight spanning tree (MST) is one of the fundamental and well-studied problems in distributed computing. In this paper, we initiate the study of constructing MST using mobile agents (aka robots). Suppose n agents are positioned initially arbitrarily on the nodes of a connected, undirected, arbitrary, anonymous, port-labeled, weighted n -node, m -edge graph G of diameter D and maximum degree Δ . The agents relocate themselves autonomously and compute an MST of G such that exactly one agent positions on a node and tracks in its memory which of its adjacent edges belong to the MST. The objective is to minimize time and memory requirements. Following the literature, we consider the synchronous setting in which each agent performs its operations synchronously with others and hence time can be measured in rounds. We first establish a generic result: if n and Δ are known a priori and memory per agent is as much as node memory in the message-passing model (of distributed computing), agents can simulate any $O(T)$ -round deterministic algorithm for any problem in the message-passing model to the agent model in $O(\Delta T \log n + n \log^2 n)$ rounds. As a corollary, MST can be constructed in the agent model in $O(\max\{\Delta\sqrt{n} \log n \log^* n, \Delta D \log n, n \log^2 n\})$ rounds simulating the celebrated $O(\sqrt{n} \log^* n + D)$ -round GKP algorithm for MST in the message-passing model. We then establish that, without knowing any graph parameter a priori, there exists a deterministic algorithm to construct MST in the agent model in $O(m + n \log n)$ rounds with $O(n \log n)$ bits memory at each agent. The presented algorithm needs to overcome highly non-trivial challenges on how to synchronize agents in computing MST as they may initially be positioned arbitrarily on the graph nodes. The challenges were overcome by developing a technique of *dispersion with election* which positions n agents at n nodes and elects one agent as a leader, which may be of independent interest in distributed robotics.

Keywords: Distributed algorithms, Multi-agent systems, Mobile agents, Local communication, Minimum Spanning Tree, Leader Election, Time and memory complexity

1 Introduction

Given a connected, weighted, undirected graph G , a *minimum-weight spanning tree* (MST) (or simply minimum spanning tree) is a subset of the edges of G that connects all the vertices of G avoiding any cycles and with the minimum possible total edge weight, i.e., it is a spanning tree whose sum of edge weights is the minimum. If G has n nodes, then an MST has precisely $n - 1$ edges. MST construction is a fundamental problem in graph theory due to its many applications and there is a vast literature in centralized, parallel, and distributed computing models [2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 16, 19].

*University of Illinois at Chicago, USA, ajay@uic.edu

†IIT Madras, India, manishsky27@gmail.com

‡ISI Kolkata, India, anisurpm@gmail.com

§Kent State University, USA, gsharma2@kent.edu

In the centralized computing model, many MST construction algorithms exist, e.g. [5, 7, 10, 11, 12]. These algorithms assume that G is known including edge weights and the analysis mostly concerns *time* – the number of steps of computation. In the parallel computing model, the focus is on improving time using multiple processors [2, 6, 19], instead of a single processor in the centralized computing model. Parallel algorithms also assume that G is known including the edge weights.

The (message-passing) distributed computing model (which we simply call the message-passing model throughout this paper hereafter) lifts the assumption of known G . It only considers that each node (processor) knows its neighboring processors and the weights of the communication links (edges) connecting it to those neighboring processors. Further, only an $O(\log n)$ -size message (the *CONGEST* model) can be sent on each edge in each time step. For computing MST in this model, as the output, every processor knows which of its adjacent edges belong to MST. MST construction is an active field of research in the message-passing model. The best known algorithms are [9, 16] with time complexity $O(\sqrt{n} \log^* n + D)$, where D is the diameter of G . Furthermore, the best-known time lower bound is $\Omega(\sqrt{n}/\log n + D)$ [18]. These bounds were achieved considering the synchronous setting (also ours) in which each processor performs its operations synchronously with all others.

In this paper, we initiate the study of MST construction using mobile agents (aka robots). Suppose we are given n agents positioned initially arbitrarily on the nodes of G . Any algorithm run by agents should output an MST such that (i) each of the n agents is positioned on a different node of G and (ii) an agent positioned at a node knows which of its adjacent edges are the MST edges.

The agent model has two major differences with the message-passing model.

- I. In the agent model, agents but not the graph nodes are assumed to have memory and processing power, whereas the message-passing model assumes each graph node is a processor having both unrestricted memory and processing power.
- II. In the agent model, an agent positioned at a graph node does not have message send/receive capability to/from an agent positioned at its neighboring node, whereas a processor (at a node) in the message-passing model has message send/receive capability to/from a processor positioned at its neighbor node.

Difference II is problematic for the agent model since if an agent (at a node) needs to deliver a message to its neighbor(s), it has to relocate to that neighbor and there has to be an agent positioned on that neighbor.

Let us discuss why it is important to study MST in the agent model. First, since the agent model is different from the message-passing model, it demands new techniques for computation. Second, the agent model has been gaining significant attention recently in computing. For example, Pattanayak *et al.* [17] considered computing Maximal Independent Set (MIS) of G . Chand *et al.* [4] considered computing small dominating sets of G . Both of these results assume that graph parameters (such as n and Δ) are known to agents a priori. Triangle counting by agents is studied and applied to other problems in Chand *et al.* [3]. Given these recent developments, MST is a natural, fundamental problem to investigate in the agent model.

Contributions. Consider an *anonymous* connected, undirected, arbitrary, weighted n -node, m -edge graph G of diameter D and maximum degree Δ with n robots with unique identifiers being initially positioned arbitrarily on the graph nodes (possibly multiple agents at a node). One might immediately think of constructing MST in the agent model simulating existing MST algorithms developed in the message-passing model. We show that this is indeed possible under certain as-

sumptions by establishing the following general theorem that applies to any problem solved in the message-passing model.

Theorem 1 (Simulation). *Any deterministic algorithm \mathcal{A} for a problem that takes $O(T)$ rounds in the message-passing model can be converted to a deterministic algorithm \mathcal{A}' that takes $O(\Delta T \log n + n \log^2 n)$ rounds in the agent model, provided that parameters n and Δ are known a priori and memory at each agent is as much as the node memory used in the message-passing model.*

Plugging in in Theorem 1 the MST algorithm \mathcal{A} of [9, 16], famously known as GKP algorithm, that takes $T = O(\sqrt{n} \log^* n + D)$ rounds in the message-passing model, we obtain as a corollary the MST algorithm \mathcal{A}' that takes $O(\max\{\Delta\sqrt{n} \log n \log^* n, \Delta D \log n, n \log^2 n\})$ rounds in the agent model.

The immediate question is whether an MST can be constructed in the agent model removing the assumption of known graph parameters (such as n and Δ), and with a bound on memory per agent. We show that this is indeed possible in the agent model. We first establish the following theorem which concerns with (i) dispersing agents so that graph nodes have an agent each positioned and (ii) electing an agent at a node as a leader.

Theorem 2 (Dispersion with election). *There is a deterministic algorithm in the agent model for (i) dispersing agents so that a graph node contains one agent and (ii) electing one agent at a node as a leader, which terminates in $O(m)$ rounds with $O(n \log n)$ bits at each agent, without agents knowing any graph parameter a priori.*

Given a leader and agents dispersed, we establish the following theorem for MST.

Theorem 3 (MST). *Given one agent as a leader and n agents positioned on n nodes of G , there is a deterministic algorithm for constructing MST that takes $O(m + n \log n)$ rounds and $O(\Delta \log n)$ bits at each agent, without agents knowing any graph parameter a priori.*

Compared to the time bound obtained through simulation (Theorem 1), our MST result (Theorem 3) is better for any graph with $m < \max\{\Delta\sqrt{n} \log^* n, \Delta D, n \log n\}$, even without knowing any graph parameter a priori. Additionally, the MST construction time can be compared to the lower bound of $O(\max\{\sqrt{n}/\log n + D, n\})$ rounds in the agent model we prove in which the first part comes from the lower bound in the message-passing model and the second part comes from the lower bound of dispersing n robots to n nodes. Furthermore, the time complexity of our MST algorithm in the agent model matches that of Prim's algorithm (using Fibonacci heap) [7]. The memory of $O(n \log n)$ bits is within $O(n)$ factor from optimal $O(\log n)$ bits for solving any problem in the agent model. Notice that the results in the message-passing model do not explicitly bound the memory requirement per node. The above results we establish are the first results for MST in the agent model. The result for dispersion with election (Theorem 2) plays a crucial role in establishing the MST result (Theorem 3) and hence it may be of independent interest in distributed robotics.

Challenges and Techniques. The message-passing model allows the nodes (processors) to send/receive messages to/from their neighbors, i.e., in a single round, a node can send a message to all its neighbors and receive messages from all its neighbors. In contrast, in the agent model, the messages from an agent, if any, that are to be sent to the other agents in the neighboring nodes have to be delivered by the agent visiting those neighbors. Furthermore, it might be the case that when the agent reaches that node, the agent at that node may have already moved to some other node. Therefore, any algorithm in the agent model needs to guarantee message delivery by synchronizing sender and receiver agents to be co-located at a node.

Additionally, to be able to construct MST of G , each node of G must have an agent positioned on it, which may not be the case initially since one or more nodes may have possibly multiple agents positioned and some nodes may have no agent positioned. Surprisingly, even when there is a single agent at each node initially, the agent at a node does not know it. Therefore, irrespective of whether the nodes have zero, single, or multiple agents initially, we want to reach to configuration where each node has an agent positioned.

Suppose we have a single agent positioned at a node. The question is the agent from which node starts MST construction and when. To overcome this challenge, we elect a single agent at a node as a (global) leader which gets the authority to start MST construction. The remaining agents do not participate in MST construction until the leader grants them authority to do so.

Although having a leader makes MST construction easier, electing a leader itself turned out to be a difficult task. Therefore, we elect a leader in two steps. In the first step, the agents compete to become ‘local leader’. In the second step, the local leaders compete to become a global ‘leader’. The agent becoming a local leader can immediately run the second step.

On becoming a local leader, each local leader can run the same leader election procedure to become a global leader. However, in the first step, how an agent competes to become a ‘local leader’ is different based on whether an agent positioned at a node is alone or not. Additionally an agent positioned at a node does not know whether the agents positioned at other nodes are alone (*dispersed*), all at a single node (*rooted*), or at multiple nodes (*general*). This creates a difficulty for agents on what approach to use in the first step to become local leaders. Therefore, we use the following idea. For the agents that are initially alone, we ask them to run a *singleton election* procedure to check whether they can become local leaders. The singleton election procedure run by an agent r_v at a node v visits the neighbors of v (possibly repeatedly). For the agents that are not initially alone, we ask them to run a *dispersion with election* procedure which serves two purposes: (i) place an agent each on empty nodes and (ii) elect one agent among the initially co-located a local leader. The singleton election procedure elects an agent r_v at node v as a local leader if and only if all the neighbors of v have a singleton agent positioned initially. That is, if the procedure finds at least a neighbor of v is empty or an agent from a dispersion with election procedure positioned, it will not elect r_v as a leader. We guarantee that starting from any initial configuration, at least an agent becomes a local leader.

For the dispersed initial cases, only the singleton election procedure runs. For the rooted initial cases, only the dispersion with election procedure runs. For the general initial cases, the singleton election and dispersion with election procedures run concurrently. Once all dispersion with election procedures finish, there is a guarantee that the n agents disperse to n nodes of G (one per node).

As soon as some agent becomes a local leader, it tries to elect itself as a (global) leader. For this, it runs a verification procedure to check whether it will be able to traverse all the edges of G . If the agent is indeed able to traverse all the edges, then it returns to the node (which we call its *home* node) and elects itself as a (global) leader. We prove that if an agent elects itself as a leader, there is no other agent that can satisfy the conditions to be elected as a leader, i.e., the global leader is unique. This dispersion with election technique may be of independent interest in distributed robotics.

Since there might be multiple local leaders elected, there might be multiple verification procedures running concurrently. Each verification procedure p has tuple $(roundNo_p, ID_p)$ such that if it meets another verification procedure $(roundNo_q, ID_q)$ then p continues and q stops if p ’s tuple is lexicographically greater than q ’s, otherwise q continues and p stops. Here $roundNo_*$ is a round number at which the procedure started and ID_* is the ID of the agent that runs this procedure.

Consider the nodes of the graph where local leaders were positioned (the home nodes) before they run the verification procedure. While local leaders run the verification procedure, these nodes

become empty since they are traversing the graph. When some other verification procedure or dispersion with election procedure encounters an empty node, it needs to confirm whether that node is in fact empty or it is a home node of some local leader not home at that time. This is done by asking the local leaders to keep that information about an agent positioned at a neighbor and the verification procedure to visit the neighbors to see whether such information exists at a neighbor. We prove that if an empty node is indeed a home node then there exists a neighbor holding that information. Additionally, we prove that the local leader can return to its home node whenever needed.

After a leader is elected, we synchronize agents to construct MST. The MST construction begins with the leader. The leader provides ranking to the agents from 2 to n with it being rank 1. After ranking, each agent r_v (at node v) considers itself as a *component* C_{r_v} and assigns the rank to its component $\text{rank}(C_{r_v})$ its rank $\text{rank}(r_v)$, i.e., $\text{rank}(C_{r_v}) \leftarrow \text{rank}(r_v)$. Let *minimum-weight outgoing edge* (MOE) of a node $u \in G$ be the neighboring edge of u with the minimum weight (ties broken arbitrarily). The agent r_u with token (initially the leader) picks the MOE. Let the other end of MOE be node w (with agent r_w positioned on it) in component C_{r_w} . If $\text{rank}(C_{r_u}) < \text{rank}(C_{r_w})$, then r_u forms a merged component $C_{r_u}^{\text{new}}$ merging C_{r_w} with C_{r_u} and assigns to $C_{r_u}^{\text{new}}$ the rank $\text{rank}(C_{r_u}^{\text{new}}) \leftarrow \text{rank}(C_{r_u})$ ¹. Notice that the way components are grown, they are always rooted trees. Some parent-child pointer adjustments are done to make sure that the newly formed merged components (such as $C_{r_u}^{\text{new}}$) remain a rooted tree. After merging is done, r_u passes the token to agent r_v with $\text{rank}(r_v) = \text{rank}(r_u) + 1$. If $\text{rank}(C_{r_v}) < \text{rank}(r_v)$, then r_v simply passes the token to the agent with rank $\text{rank}(r_v) + 1$, otherwise r_v includes the MOE to C_{r_v} as discussed above which forms a merged component and passes the token to the agent with rank $\text{rank}(r_v) + 1$. The process is repeated till the agent r_z with $\text{rank}(r_z) = n$ gets the token. After r_z finishes with its process, it passes the token back to the leader, which implies that one phase of MST construction is finished. We guarantee that at the end of this phase, the number of initial components reduces to at most half. We further show that repeating this process for $O(\log n)$ phases, we have a single component of MOE edges, giving an MST, since initially we have n single-node components. Finally, we show that, given a leader and the n robots positioned at n nodes, constructing an MST takes $O(m + n \log n)$ time and needs memory of $O(n \log n)$ bits per agent. Interestingly, this time bound is already better than simulating the message-passing algorithm knowing n, Δ in graphs with number of edges $m < \max\{\Delta\sqrt{n} \log^* n, \Delta D, n \log n\}$.

Remark on the Memory Requirement of $O(n \log n)$ Bits per Agent in the Proposed Algorithm: If n and Δ are known, we can use the dispersion algorithm of Sudo *et al.* [20] that finishes in $O(n \log^2 n)$ rounds or of Kshemkalyani and Sharma [15] that finishes in $O(m)$ rounds. Both these algorithms need $O(\log n)$ bits per agent. The initially singleton agents do nothing until dispersion is achieved. After that the singleton election procedure can finish in $O(\Delta \log^2 n)$ rounds with $O(\log n)$ bits per agent. Then finally the local leaders can run leader election procedure to elect a unique global leader among the local leaders in $O(m)$ rounds with $O(\log n)$ bits per agent. Therefore, the dispersion with election takes $O(m)$ rounds (same as our algorithm) and memory becomes $O(\log n)$ bits per agent (n factor improvement compared to our algorithm). For the MST construction, a node may need to remember multiple of its neighboring edges as a part of MST and hence the total memory needed in our algorithm becomes $O(\Delta \log n)$ bits per agent. Notice that this memory improvement is achieved knowing n and Δ . Our algorithm achieves our claimed bounds without knowing any graph parameter a priori and there are agent coordination

¹However, if $\text{rank}(C_{r_u}) > \text{rank}(C_{r_w})$, r_u simply passes the token to the next agent with rank $\text{rank}(r_u) + 1$. When r_w gets the token, then r_w forms the merged component $C_{r_w}^{\text{new}}$ merging C_{r_u} with C_{r_w} through the MOE connecting C_{r_w} with C_{r_u} .

and synchronization challenges to overcome as described in challenges and techniques. Additionally, being able to design algorithm without knowing any graph parameter a priori has its own merits in distributed robotics.

Related Work. There is a vast literature on MST construction in centralized, parallel, and message-passing models. In the centralized computing model, the first algorithm for MST due to Borůvka [10] proceeds in stages. In each stage, it identifies a forest F consisting of the MOE incident to each vertex in G , then forms the graph $G_1 = G \setminus F$ as the input to the next step. Each stage takes $O(m)$ time and the number of vertices remaining to be processed is reduced by half in each step. Therefore, this algorithm constructs MST in $O(m \log n)$ time. Prim’s algorithm [7] grows the MST one edge at a time. The algorithm initially starts from a vertex in G which is selected arbitrarily. In each step, the MST is augmented with a MOE, say (x, y) , such that node x is already in MST but not node y . This algorithm finishes in time $O(m \log n)$ using binary heap and in time $O(m + n \log n)$ using Fibonacci heap. Kruskal’s algorithm [12] also grows the MST at most one edge at a time. It picks the smallest edge at each step and adds it to MST if it does not create a cycle in the MST constructed so far. This algorithm finishes in $O(m \log n)$ time. The reverse-delete algorithm, a reverse of Kruskal’s algorithm [12], finishes in $O(m \log n (\log \log n)^3)$ time. All these algorithms are greedy. Later studies focused on improving runtime [5, 11].

In the parallel computing model, with $O(n)$ processors, [2, 6, 19] show that MST can be computed in $O(\log n)$ time. In the message-passing model, the GHS algorithm [8] constructs MST in $O(n \log n)$ time. Time was improved to $O(n)$ in [1] and to $O(\sqrt{n} \log^* n + D)$ in [9, 16], where D is the diameter of G . Furthermore, a time lower bound of $\Omega(\sqrt{n}/\log n + D)$ was given in [18].

Paper Organization. We discuss preliminaries in Section 2 with some immediate lower bounds. We establish our general simulation result (Theorem 1) in Section 3. We then discuss our approach to disperse n agents to n graph nodes as well as elect an agent at a node as a leader in Section 4 (Theorem 2) and our MST construction algorithm proving our main contribution (Theorem 3) in Section 5. Finally, we conclude in Section 6 with a short discussion.

2 Model and Preliminaries

Graph. We consider an anonymous, connected, undirected, port-labeled weighted graph $G = (V, E, w)$ with $|V| = n$ and $|E| = m$, where V is the set of nodes, E is the set of edges, and w is the weights corresponding to each edge $e_i \in E$. Each node $v_i \in V$ has δ_i ports corresponding to each edge incident to it labeled in $[1, \dots, \delta_i]$. We assume that the weights are (i) positive, i.e., $w(e_i) > 0, \forall e_i \in E$, and (ii) distinct meaning that for two edges e_i, e_j , $w(e_i) \neq w(e_j)$ ².

Agents. The set $\mathcal{R} = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n\}$ of n agents are initially located on the nodes of G . No agent can reside on the edges of G , but one or more agents can occupy the same node of G , which we call co-located agents. The agents take their IDs from the interval $[1, n^{O(1)}]$. An agent can move from node v to node u along the edge e_{vu} . Following the message-passing literature, e.g. [9], we assume that an agent can traverse an edge in a round, irrespective of its (edge) weight. An agent that moves from v along the port p_{vu} is aware of port p_{uv} when it arrives at u . Additionally, at any node v , it is aware of the weight $w(e)$ of the edge e_{vu} that connects v to its neighbor u . We assume that there is no correlation between two port numbers of an edge. Any number of agents are allowed to move along an edge at any time, that is our model is not congest in terms of how many agents can traverse an edge at a time. Two agents r_i, r_j can exchange information iff they are co-located, i.e., they do not have message send/receive capability when they not co-located.

²This requirement can be removed if there is a consistent way of breaking ties.

Time Cycle. An active agent r_i performs the “Communicate-Compute-Move” (CCM) cycle as follows. (i) *Communicate*: Let r_i be on node v_i . For each agent $r_j \in \mathcal{R}$ that is co-located at v_i , r_i can observe the memory of r_j , including its own memory; (ii) *Compute*: r_i may perform an arbitrary computation using the information observed during the “communicate” portion of that cycle. This includes determination of a (possibly) port to use to exit v_i , the information to carry while exiting, and the information to store in the agent(s) r_j that stays at v_i ; (iii) *Move*: r_i writes new information (if any) in the memory of an agent r_j at v_i , and exits v_i using the computed port to reach to a neighbor node of v_i .

Agent Activation, Time, and Memory Complexity. In the *synchronous* setting, every agent is active in every CCM cycle. Therefore, time is measured in *rounds*. Memory is measured as the number of bits stored in persistent memory at each agent.

2.1 Some Lower Bounds

These immediate time and memory lower bounds for constructing MST in the agent model show the difficulty in obtaining fast time and low memory algorithms. Suppose n agents are positioned on the nodes of an arbitrary graph G . To construct an MST, n agents need to be dispersed to n nodes of G . There is a time lower bound of $\Omega(n)$ for dispersion. Additionally, since the agent model is more restrictive compared to the message-passing model, the time lower bound for MST in the message-passing model [18] directly extends. Therefore, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 4 (Time lower bound). *Any algorithm for MST takes $\Omega(\max\{\sqrt{n}/\log n + D, n\})$ rounds in the agent model, where D is the diameter of G .*

We have the lower bound of $\Omega(\log n)$ bits at each agent for any deterministic algorithm for MST in the agent model. The proof is immediate since, from the agent model, n agents must have a unique ID in the range $[1, n^{O(1)}]$ and we count this memory space for the ID which must survive across rounds as the space complexity.

Theorem 5 (Memory lower bound). *Any deterministic algorithm for MST on an n -node anonymous G using n agents requires $\Omega(\log n)$ bits at each agent.*

3 Simulating Message-Passing Algorithm in the Agent Model

In this section, we prove Theorem 1 which establishes a time bound of a solution to a problem in the agent model simulating a deterministic solution to that problem from the message-passing model. Before we do that, we prove Lemma 6 which is crucial in the proof of Theorem 1.

Lemma 6. *Given a dispersion configuration of n agents on a n -node graph G and n and Δ are known to the agents, an agent at a node takes at most $O(\Delta \log n)$ rounds to meet all its neighbors.*

Proof. Since n is known and the agent IDs are in the range $[1, n^{O(1)}]$, each agent ID can be encoded by $c \cdot \log n = O(\log n)$ bits, for some constant c . If the length of agent ID $x < c \cdot \log n$ bits, then all the $c \cdot \log n - x$ bits preceding the most significant bit (MSB) are filled with bit 0. Additionally, pad the least significant bit (LSB) of each agent ID with the bit 1. Each agent r_v at node v then runs a neighbor probe procedure, knowing Δ , as follows. Start from MSB and end at the padded bit one by one at the interval of 2Δ rounds. Agent r_v stays at v for 2Δ rounds when the bit accessed is 0, otherwise (i.e., bit accessed is 1) r_v visits all the neighbors of v one by one. We know that r_v can visit all its neighbors in 2Δ rounds since visiting a neighbor needs 2 rounds. Notice that visiting

all neighbors does not necessarily mean it visits all the agents positioned on them since they might again be doing the neighbor probe.

Recall that each agent has a unique ID, therefore, the IDs of two agents r_v, r_u possess at least one-bit difference in their IDs. This bit difference ensures two neighbors meet each other when their ID bits differ. Since IDs of all the agents are of length $O(\log n)$ bits, the IDs of each of the neighbors must differ by at least a bit when r_v visits all its neighbors for $O(\log n)$ time. Therefore, each agent meets all of its neighbors in $O(\Delta \log n)$ rounds. \square

Proof of Theorem 1:

Proof. To simulate an algorithm in the message-passing model to the agent model, n agents need to disperse to n nodes of G , if they were not already dispersed. The known time complexity of achieving dispersion configuration, starting from any initial general configuration, is $O(n \log^2 n)$ rounds due to Sudo *et al.* [20]. The algorithm of Sudo *et al.* [20] is non-terminating meaning that each agent may not know when the dispersion configuration is achieved since n is not known. Additionally, if Δ is not known, a agent may not be able to be co-located with its neighbor agent to deliver a message. Therefore, knowing n would help to transition from the dispersion procedure to algorithm simulation procedure. Knowing Δ would help to prove Lemma 6 which is essential for the simulation.

Consider memory at each agent the same as it has been used at a node in the message-passing model, so that, for the received message at the node or agent, both models can perform the required computation. We would like to show that, after $O(\Delta \log n)$ rounds, the agents in the agent model have the same information as in the nodes in the message-passing model after executing any deterministic algorithm \mathcal{A} for a round. The proof is as follows. In any single round of the message-passing model, a node passes the message/information to its all (or fewer) neighbors. To perform the same operation in the agent model, it is essential that an agent meets all its neighbors and passes the message based on the algorithm. Since each agent meets all its neighbors in $O(\Delta \log n)$ rounds as shown in Lemma 6, a round in the message-passing model can be simulated in $O(\Delta \log n)$ rounds in the agent model. Thus, the total rounds required to simulate a deterministic algorithm \mathcal{A} that runs for $O(T)$ rounds in the message passing model is $O(\Delta T \log n)$ rounds in the agent model. Combining the time bounds for dispersion and the algorithm simulation, we have the claimed bound of $O(\Delta T \log n + n \log^2 n)$ rounds. \square

As a corollary, we obtain an algorithm solving MST in the agent model plugging in in Theorem 1 the MST result of [9, 16] (the GKP algorithm) that takes $T = O(\sqrt{n} \log^* n + D)$ rounds.

Corollary 7. *There is a deterministic algorithm for MST in the agent model that takes $O(\max\{\Delta\sqrt{n} \log n \log^* n, \Delta D \log n, n \log^2 n\})$ rounds, when n and Δ are known to agents a priori and memory at each agent is as much as node memory in the message-passing model.*

4 Dispersion with Leader Election

In this section, we present our dispersion with election algorithm which, starting from any initial configuration (dispersed, rooted, or general) of n agents in an n -node graph G , ensures the following:

- If agents are not initially dispersed, they disperse so that n agents are on n nodes of G .
- One agent among the n agents is elected as a (global) leader.

Algorithm 1: Leader Election Pseudocode for Agent r_u

Input: A set \mathcal{R} of n agents with unique IDs positioned initially arbitrarily on the nodes of an n -node, m -edge anonymous graph G .

Ensure: An agent in \mathcal{R} is elected as a leader with status *leader*.

States: Initially, each agent r_u positioned at node u has $r_u.status \leftarrow candidate$, $r_u.init_alone \leftarrow true$ if alone at u , $r_u.init_alone \leftarrow false$ otherwise, and $r_u.all_edges_visited \leftarrow false$. The *init_alone* variable is never updated for r_u throughout the algorithm but the *status* variable can take values $\in \{non_candidate, local_leader, leader\}$ and the *all_edges_visited* variable can take value *true*.

```
1 if  $r_u.status = candidate$  then
2   if  $r_u.init\_alone = True$  then
3      $\lfloor Singleton\_Election(r_u)$ 
4   if  $r_u.init\_alone = false$  then
5     if  $r_u$  is the minimum ID agent at  $u$  then
6        $\lfloor Dispersion\_With\_Election(r_u)$ 
7 if  $r_u.status = local\_leader$  then
8   if  $r_u$  became local leader through  $Dispersion\_With\_Election(r_u)$  then
9      $\lfloor$  Ask the parent node, say  $w$ , in the DFS tree built while running  $Dispersion\_With\_Election(r_u)$  to
10     $\lfloor$  keep the information that node  $u$  is the home node of the local leader  $r_u$ .
11 if  $r_u$  became local leader through  $Singleton\_Election(r_u)$  then
12    $\lfloor$  Inform all neighbors that  $r_u$  is a local leader.
13    $\lfloor$  Ask the port-1 neighbor, say  $w$ , to keep the information that node  $u$  is the home node of the local
14    $\lfloor$  leader  $r_u$ .
15  $Leader\_Election(r_u)$ 
16 if  $r_u$  is at the home (or root) node from where  $Leader\_Election(r_u)$  started with
17    $r_u.all\_edges\_visited = true$  then
18    $\lfloor r_u.status \leftarrow leader$ 
```

Algorithm 2: $Singleton_Election(r_u)$

```
1  $\delta_u \leftarrow$  degree of node  $u$ .
2  $N(r_u) \leftarrow$  neighbors of agent  $r_u$ .
3  $r_u$  visits neighbors in  $N(r_u)$  (in order of increasing port numbers) one by one starting from and ending at  $u$ 
4 while  $r_u.status == candidate$  do
5   if  $\exists$  neighbor  $v, \delta_u > \delta_v$  or at least a neighbor agent found belongs to  $Dispersion\_With\_Election()$  or has
6    $\lfloor$  status local_leader or ( $\exists$  neighbor  $v, \delta_u = \delta_v$  such that  $r_v.ID > r_u.ID$ ) then
7      $\lfloor r_u.status \leftarrow non\_candidate$ 
8   else if  $\exists$  neighbor  $v, \delta_u = \delta_v$  and  $v$  is empty then
9      $\lfloor Neighbor\_Exploration\_with\_Padding(r_u)$ 
10  else if  $\forall$  neighbor  $v, \delta_v > \delta_u$  but  $\exists$  (at least) a neighbor  $v'$  which is empty then
11     $\lfloor$   $r_u$  visits the empty neighbors in the interval of  $2\delta_{v'}$  rounds starting from and ending at  $u$ .
12    if a robot  $r_{v'}$  is found at  $v'$  and  $r_{v'}$  belongs to  $Dispersion\_With\_Election()$  or has status local_leader
13    then
14       $\lfloor r_u.status \leftarrow non\_candidate$ 
15  if  $\forall$  neighbor  $v, \delta_u < \delta_v$  and all neighboring agent were initially singleton and no neighbor has status
16   $\lfloor$  local_leader and ( $\forall$  neighbor  $v$ , if  $\delta_u = \delta_v$  then  $r_v.ID < r_u.ID$ ) then
17     $\lfloor r_u.status \leftarrow local\_leader$ 
```

We start with discussion on the high-level overview of the algorithm, then specific details, and finally the correctness and complexity proofs on the algorithm guarantees.

Algorithm 3: Neighbor_Exploration_with_Padding()

- 1 $b \leftarrow$ number of bits in the ID of r_u
 - 2 $b + 2b^2 \leftarrow$ number of bits in the ID of r_u after padding a sequence of ‘10’ bits b^2 times to the LSB in the original b -bit ID.
 - 3 Starting from MSB and ending on LSB, if the bit is ‘1’ visit the $N(r_u)$ one by one which finishes in $2\delta_u$ rounds. If bit is ‘0’ stay at u for $2\delta_u$ rounds.
 - 4 r_u explores $N(r_u)$ based on padding for $2\delta_u(b + 2b^2)$ rounds
 - 5 **if** r_u meets an agent r_v running Algorithm 4 (*Dispersion_With_Election*) or Algorithm 6 (*Leader_Election*) or (\exists neighbor v , $\delta_u = \delta_v$ such that $r_v.ID > r_u.ID$) **then**
 - 6 $r_u.status \leftarrow non_candidate.$
 - 7 **if** \exists neighbor v , $\delta_u = \delta_v$ and v is empty **then**
 - 8 $r_u.status \leftarrow non_candidate.$
-

Algorithm 4: Dispersion_With_Election(r_u)

- 1 Run Depth First Search (DFS) traversal in forward and backtrack phases. The DFS has ID r_u and can be denoted as $DFS(r_u)$. The agents initially co-located with r_u move with r_u as a group. In each empty node, say v , visited, $DFS(r_u)$ waits for a round. If v is still empty after the (waited) round, $DFS(r_u)$ runs the *Confirm_Empty()* procedure (Algorithm 5) to verify v is in fact empty. If the *Confirm_Empty()* procedure verifies v empty, $DFS(r_u)$ asks the largest ID agent, say r_v , in its group to stay at v setting $r_v.status \leftarrow non_candidate$. $DFS(r_u)$ runs until r_u reaches to a confirmed empty node w alone where it can change its status from candidate to local leader setting $r_u.status \leftarrow local_leader$ (the node w becomes the *home* node for local leader r_u). If the head of $DFS(r_x)$ meets the head of $DFS(r_y)$ at a node w , then the highest ID agent in the group belonging to $DFS(r_x)$ stays at w (and becomes *non_candidate*) if $r_x > r_y$, otherwise the highest ID agent in the group belonging to $DFS(r_y)$ stays at w (and becomes *non_candidate*). Both $DFS(r_x)$ and $DFS(r_y)$ continue their traversal until their respective heads become singleton at empty nodes and the heads elected as local leaders.
 - 2 **Remark:** *There might be a situation in which when Dispersion_With_Election() finishes for an agent r_w at a node w , the parent node w' of w in the DFS tree built by r_w may be empty (this is because the parent node happened to be a home node of a local leader $r_{w'}$ that is currently running Leader_Election). In this case, r_w returns to w' from w and waits there until $r_{w'}$ returns to w' . Once r_w meets $r_{w'}$ (at w'), r_w becomes “non-candidate” and stays at w' . r_w goes to node w from w' and becomes a local leader if it finds no waiting robot at w . If there is a waiting robot at w , r_w becomes a “non-candidate” and the waiting robot leaves w . This process continues until an waiting robot can become a local leader with the parent node in its DFS tree non-empty.*
-

Algorithm 5: Confirm_Empty()

- 1 This procedure is to verify whether the empty node, say x , encountered by procedure *Dispersion_With_Election()* (Algorithm 4) or *Leader_Election()* (Algorithm 6) is in fact empty, is the *home* node of a local leader, or a possible home node of an agent waiting to become a local leader (see Line 2 of Algorithm 4). This is done as follows. The agent running this procedure at an empty node x visits the neighbors $N(x)$ of x and collects information on whether one of the neighbors has the information that x is the (home) node of a (possible) local leader. If no neighbor has the information that x is a (possible) home node, it is verified that x is empty, otherwise, it is a (possible) home node.
 - 2 **Remark:** *There may be the case that procedure (*Dispersion_With_Election()* or *Leader_Election()*) from a different agent may reach x while one agent is running this procedure at x . These procedures may simply wait at x for the ongoing *Confirm_Empty()* procedure to finish.*
-

Algorithm 6: *Leader_Election*(r_u)

- 1 Run DFS traversal in forward and backtrack phases as in *Dispersion_With_Election*(r_u) (Algorithm 4). The DFS has ID as a tuple ($roundNo_u, r_u$) and it can be denoted as $DFS(roundNo_u, r_u)$, where $roundNo_u$ denotes the round at which this DFS has started. $DFS(roundNo_u, r_u)$ starts at the home node of r_u where it becomes a local leader and ends at the home node (the home node is also the root node of $DFS(roundNo_u, r_u)$). The goal of $DFS(roundNo_u, r_u)$ is to see whether it can visit each and every edge of G . $DFS(roundNo_u, r_u)$ keeps a boolean variable *allegdvisited* initially set to *False*. As soon as no edge is left to be visited, *allegdvisited* becomes *True* and if r_u is not on the home (or root) node from where $DFS(roundNo_u, r_u)$ started, it comes back to that node following the parent pointers.
 - 2 While running $DFS(roundNo_u, r_u)$, if r_u reaches a node in which it meets an agent running *Dispersion_With_Election*(r_v), $DFS(roundNo_u, r_u)$ continues. However, if $DFS(roundNo_u, r_u)$ meets another $DFS(roundNo_v, r_v)$ at a node w (not necessarily the head of $DFS(roundNo_v, r_v)$), $DFS(roundNo_u, r_u)$ continues if and only if either (i) $roundNo_u > roundNo_v$ or (ii) $roundNo_u = roundNo_v$ but $r_u > r_v$, otherwise $DFS(roundNo_u, r_u)$ stops and $DFS(roundNo_v, r_v)$ continues. If $DFS(roundNo_u, r_u)$ stops, then agent r_u follows its parent pointers to reach its home (root) node.
 - 3 While running $DFS(roundNo_u, r_u)$, if r_u reaches an empty node, it waits at that node for a round, and if the node is still empty after the (waited round), runs procedure *Confirm_Empty*(r_u) as in *Dispersion_With_Election*(r_u) (Algorithm 4) to verify whether the empty node is a home node (of a local leader). If so, $DFS(roundNo_u, r_u)$ continues, otherwise $DFS(roundNo_u, r_u)$ stops and r_u returns to its home node.
-

4.1 High-Level Overview of the Algorithm

Initially, a node may have zero, one, or multiple agents. All these agents are “candidates” to become leader. A candidate needs to first become a “local leader” before becoming a “leader”. Each candidate that cannot become a “local leader” (also each “local leader” that cannot become a “leader”) will become a “non_candidate”. Lines 2-6 of Algorithm 1 (Leader Election Procedure) show what procedure an agent runs to contend to become a local leader.

As depicted in Lines 2-3 of Algorithm 1, if an agent is initially alone at a node, then it runs Algorithm 2 (*Singleton_Election*) to compete to become a local leader. As depicted in Lines 4-6 of Algorithm 1, if an agent is not alone initially and the minimum ID among the co-located, then it runs Algorithm 4 (*Dispersion_With_Election*) to become a local leader. If an agent is successful in becoming a local leader through either of Algorithm 2 or Algorithm 4, it contends to become a (global) leader running Algorithm 6 (*Leader_Election*). Algorithm 6 by an agent essentially tries to verify whether it will be able to traverse all the edges of G . If it is successful in traversing all the edges, then it declares itself as a leader and we prove that there will be one and only one agent which will be able to do so, giving us a unique (global) leader.

An agent r_u running Algorithm 2 (*Singleton_Election*) at a node u will be successful in becoming a local leader if and only if all u 's neighbors have initially a single agent positioned on them and u has the smallest degree compared to the neighboring nodes. Each initially singleton agent r_u at node u running *Singleton_Election* visits the neighbors of u one by one which finishes in $2\delta_u$ rounds, where δ_u is the degree of u . If a subsequent visit is needed, then it will take again $2\delta_u$ rounds. If not all neighbors have initially singleton agents positioned, the agent gets to know it cannot become a local leader while running Algorithm 2 (*Singleton_Election*). It then stops the algorithm and becomes “non_candidate”.

An agent r_u initially at node u running Algorithm 4 (*Dispersion_With_Election*) will be successful in becoming a local leader if and only if it has the smallest ID among the ones positioned with it initially at u . As soon as the smallest ID agent becomes a singleton at node w , it declares itself as a local leader if the parent node in its DFS tree built while running *Dispersion_With_Election*

is non-empty (see Line 2 - Remark in Algorithm 4). If such parent is empty, it waits at that parent until that local leader is met to decide on whether to become a local leader or a non-candidate. Algorithm 4 (*Dispersion_With_Election*) for an initially non-singleton agent r_u with α co-located agents is a *Depth First Search* (DFS) traversal with the goal to visit $\alpha - 1$ other empty nodes of G on which $\alpha - 1$ robots can stay and r_u becomes a local leader. All other agents initially co-located with r_u at node u stay one by one on the empty nodes of G visited by Algorithm 4 (*Dispersion_With_Election*) and become “non_candidate”.

To make sure that *Dispersion_With_Election* meets *Singleton_Election* (if it is running), *Dispersion_With_Election* waits at a node for a round so that if it does not meet agent doing *Singleton_Election* at the current round, it finds that out in the next round. *Singleton_Election* stops and the agent becomes non_candidate when it knows about *Dispersion_With_Election*.

After becoming a local leader (irrespective of whether through procedure *Singleton_Election* or *Dispersion_With_Election*), the local leader agent initiates Algorithm 6 (*Leader_Election*) to become a unique (global) leader. Algorithm 6 (*Leader_Election*) is a DFS traversal as in Algorithm 4 (*Dispersion_With_Election*) with the goal to visit all the edges of G . We denote by *home* node the node of G on which an agent becomes a “local leader”. To make it easier for other local leaders or *Dispersion_With_Election* to not mistakenly put an agent on the home node of a local leader (when it is empty since the local leader has left its home node running Algorithm 6), the neighbor nodes are asked to store the information about a home node. The agents running Algorithms 4 and 6 check the neighbors to confirm whether the visited empty node is in fact a home node of a local leader (or a node of an agent that is waiting at a parent node to possibly become a local leader, see Line 2 of Algorithm 4). The confirmation procedure is described in Algorithm 5 (*Confirm_Empty*). If an empty node is a home node (possible home node of an agent waiting to possibly become a local leader), Algorithms 4 and 6 continue leaving that node empty as is. Otherwise, Algorithm 4 puts an agent and continues and Algorithm 6 stops as it knows that *Dispersion_With_Election* from at least one agent has not yet finished. This is because since there are n agents and n nodes in G , no node of G should be empty except the home nodes if all *Dispersion_With_Election* procedures started in the beginning to finish.

There may be the case that while running Algorithm 6, $DFS(roundNo_i, r_i)$ of local leader r_i may meet $DFS(roundNo_j, r_j)$ of local leader r_j . In this case, $DFS(roundNo_i, r_i)$ continues if $roundNo_i > roundNo_j$ (if same round number, use agent IDs), otherwise $DFS(roundNo_j, r_j)$. If $DFS(roundNo_j, r_j)$ stops, then r_j becomes “non_candidate” and returns to its home node following parent pointers in $DFS(roundNo_j, r_j)$.

4.2 Detailed Description of the Algorithm

We discuss *Singleton_Election* (Algorithm 2), *Dispersion_With_Election* (Algorithm 4), and *Leader_Election* (Algorithm 6) procedures, including how they synchronize even when they meet the same or different procedure running concurrently by other agents (local leader or candidates) to decide on when to proceed and when to stop.

Singleton_Election (Algorithm 2). This procedure is run by agents that were initially singleton on a node. They set status *candidate* and run the *Singleton_Election* algorithm. The agent r_u at node u visits the δ_u neighbors of u one by one starting from the minimum ID port to the maximum ID port. Agent r_u finishes visiting all δ_u neighbors in $2\delta_u$ rounds. If r_u finds there is a neighboring node v such that $\delta_u > \delta_v$, r_u becomes *non_candidate* (Lines 5 and 6 of Algorithm 2). If r_u finds there is at least a neighboring agent settled through *Dispersion_With_Election*() or has status *local_leader*, r_u cannot become a *local_leader* and hence it does not contend further to become a

local leader, setting status *non_candidate* (Lines 5 and 6 of Algorithm 2).

If all neighbors have an agent positioned that was initially singleton, then r_u becomes a local leader if u has the smallest degree among the neighbors (Lines 13 and 14 of Algorithm 2). If there is at least one same degree neighbor, u has to have a higher ID than that same degree neighbor to become a local leader, otherwise r_u becomes *non_candidate* (Lines 5 and 6 of Algorithm 2).

If not all neighbors have agent positioned and r_u does not have neighbour of higher degree and does not find any agent belonging to *Dispersion-With-Election* or status local leader, then r_u explores neighbors after $2\delta_v$ rounds iff $\delta_u < \delta_v$, where v is a neighboring node. \forall neighbor $v, \delta_v > \delta_u$ case simply demands visiting the neighbors after $2\delta_v$ rounds. In $2\delta_v$ rounds, if there was an agent r_v at v initially then r_v will become the *non_candidate* agent after finding the $\delta_u < \delta_v$ (Lines 9-11 of Algorithm 2). Otherwise, if there is no such agent, initially, then the robot at node v would come from *Dispersion-With-Election*. This ensure that there exist a *local_leader*, therefore, r_u becomes *non_candidate* with or without finding r_v after $2\delta_v$ rounds. For $\delta_v = \delta_u$, we need a guarantee that r_u meets r_v if an initially singleton agent r_v is present at v . This is a challenging situation in Algorithm 2 (*Singleton-Election*) which is handled through Algorithm 3 (*Neighbor-Exploration-with-Padding*) providing a guarantee that r_u meets r_v and vice-versa (Lines 7 and 8 of Algorithm 2).

Algorithm 3 (*Neighbor-Exploration-with-Padding*) works as follows. Suppose an agent r_u has an ID of b bits; note that $b \leq c \cdot \log n$ for some constant $c > 1$. We pad a sequence of ‘10’ bits b^2 times to the LSB (least significant bit) of the r_u ’s ID, i.e.,

$$b \underbrace{10}_1 \underbrace{10}_2 \dots \underbrace{10}_{b^2}.$$

Now the ID of b bits becomes the ID of $b + 2b^2$ bits. This padding will be helpful in making the same degree neighboring agents meet each other. Algorithm 3 (*Neighbor-Exploration-with-Padding*) ran by agent r_u starts from its MSB (most significant bit) and ends at LSB. If a bit is 1, then r_u explores all neighbors which finishes in $2\delta_u$ rounds, however, when a bit is 0, it remains at its position for $2\delta_u$ rounds. We will show that using this padding approach the agents at the same degree neighbors meet each other in $O(\delta_u \log^2 n)$ rounds, a crucial component in Algorithm 2 (*Singleton-Election*).

Dispersion-With-Election (Algorithm 4). This procedure is run by agents which were not initially singleton. Let u be a node where r_u is positioned and it is the minimum ID agent among the co-located (say, group- r_u). r_u is responsible for running *Dispersion-With-Election*, others follow r_u . *Dispersion-With-Election* is essentially a DFS traversal procedure (denoted as $DFS(r_u)$) to visit the nodes of G in forward and backtrack phases [14]. At u , the largest ID agent in group- r_u settles and it tracks parent and child pointers for the $DFS(r_u)$. Each node visited by $DFS(r_u)$ may be occupied (has an agent positioned) or empty. If an agent is positioned on a newly visited node, it writes ID and parent and child pointer information about $DFS(r_u)$ and continues. If an empty node, it positions the largest ID agent in group- r_u and continues. At some point in time, $DFS(r_u)$ reaches an empty node such that r_u is the only agent on it and the parent node of r_u in $DFS(r_u)$ is non-empty. r_u elects itself as a local leader and *Dispersion-With-Election* is finished for r_u . If r_u finds the parent node of r_u in $DFS(r_u)$ is empty when becoming singleton, it waits to either become a local leader or non-candidate by going to the parent in $DFS(r_u)$ and waiting there until it meets the agent which has this parent node as its home node (Line 2 of Algorithm 4).

While running $DFS(r_u)$, we call the node where r_u is currently positioned the *head* node of $DFS(r_u)$. $DFS(r_u)$ may meet $DFS(r_v)$ from another agent r_v . We differentiate two cases. If the meeting happens at a node w such that w is the head node of both $DFS(r_u)$ and $DFS(r_v)$ and w is

an empty node, then an agent from $DFS(r_u)$ settles if $r_u < r_v$, otherwise an agent from $DFS(r_v)$ settles at w . Both write their DFS information on the agent positioned on w and continue their traversal. If w is a non-empty node, they both continue without settling any agent but just write their DFS information at the agent positioned on w . However, if $DFS(r_u)$ meets $DFS(r_v)$ at a node w which is not a head node of $DFS(r_v)$ (w is a head node of $DFS(r_u)$ since $DFS(r_u)$ is meeting $DFS(r_v)$ at w), then $DFS(r_u)$ simply continues writing its DFS information on the agent positioned at w .

To deal with the situation that $DFS(r_u)$ does not miss meeting an agent doing *Singleton_Election*, $DFS(r_u)$ waits at every node it visits for a round before exiting. This is enough since an agent doing *Singleton_Election* returns to its node every second round. If the node is still empty after the (waited) round, it runs *Confirm_Empty()* (Algorithm 5) to verify whether it is a (possible) home node of a local leader (an agent waiting to become a local leader, see Remark in Algorithm 4), or indeed an empty node.

Leader_Election (Algorithm 6). This procedure is run by agents who become local leaders. Notice that an agent may become a local leader running either Algorithm 2 (*Singleton_Election*) or Algorithm 4 (*Dispersion_With_Election*). As soon as an agent becomes a local leader, it contends to become a unique (global) leader. Let r_u becomes a local leader at node u (we call u the home node of r_u) at round $roundNo_u$. It then starts a DFS traversal denoted by tuple $DFS(roundNo_u, r_u)$, the goal of which is to see whether it can visit all the edges of G and return to u , its home node. If r_u can do so, it declares itself as a global leader. While running $DFS(roundNo_u, r_u)$, it might meet $DFS(roundNo_v, r_v)$. $DFS(roundNo_u, r_u)$ continues if its ID is lexicographically larger than $DFS(roundNo_v, r_v)$, otherwise it stops and becomes a *non_candidate* and returns to node u (its home node). Additionally, $DFS(roundNo_u, r_u)$ might meet *Dispersion_With_Election* and if the meeting happens at the head node of *Dispersion_With_Election*, it stops, otherwise it continues. Additionally, if $DFS(roundNo_u, r_u)$ reaches a confirmed empty node (i.e., it is not a empty home node) then it also stops as it knows that *Dispersion_With_Election* from some other initially non-singleton node is still going on since the node is still empty. This confirmation of empty node being empty home node or a confirmed empty node is done through *Confirm_Empty()* (Algorithm 5).

4.3 Analysis of the Algorithm

We analyze Algorithm 1 for correctness and its complexity guarantees. We start with *Singleton_Election* (Algorithm 2).

Lemma 8. *In Singleton_Election (Algorithm 2) run by agent r_u at node u , if there is a neighboring agent r_v positioned on the neighbor node v such that $\delta_u = \delta_v$ and δ_u, δ_v both being the minimum, r_u meet r_v in $O(\delta_u \log^2 n)$ rounds, running Neighbor_Exploration_with_Padding (Algorithm 3).*

Proof. Since agent IDs are from the interval $[1, n^{O(1)}]$, each agent has ID of size $\leq c \cdot \log n$ for some constant c . Therefore, for any two agents r_u, r_v , two cases exist for the number of bits on their IDs: either equal or unequal. Consider the equal case first. If r_u and r_v have an equal number of bits (say, b) then their IDs must be different in at least one bit since IDs are unique, i.e., if one has bit '1' at β -th place from MSB, another must have bit '0' at β -th place from MSB. Since an agent explores neighbors while the bit is '1' and stays at its place when the bit is '0', r_u finds r_v within $2 \cdot \delta_u \cdot b$ rounds. Since the bit may be different at the b -th place from MSB, the total time taken for r_u to meet r_v is $O(\delta_u \log n)$ rounds.

Now consider the case of an unequal number of bits. Let r_u and r_v , respectively, have b and d bits in their IDs with $b \neq d$. W.l.o.g., $b > d$, i.e., $b = d + c_1$, where $d, c_1 \geq 1$. Therefore, the total

number of bits after padding in the agent r_u 's ID is $b + 2b^2$. We have that

$$b + 2b^2 = (d + c_1) + 2(d + c_1)^2 = 2d^2 + 2c_1^2 + 4 \cdot d \cdot c_1 + d + c_1.$$

Similarly, the total number of bits in the agent r_v after padding is $d + 2d^2$. Therefore, after padding, the difference in the number of bits of the IDs of r_u and r_v is

$$2c_1^2 + 4 \cdot d \cdot c_1 + c_1.$$

Since $d, c_1 \geq 1$, the difference is at least 7 bits in the overall length of the IDs of r_u and r_v after padding. Additionally, out of these 7 bits, at least 3 bits are '1's during which agent r_u can explore the node v with r_v positioned at node v . What that means is, if r_v (the smaller ID than r_u) stops after $\delta_v(d + 2d^2)$ rounds, then there are at least 3 chances for r_u to meet r_v at its node v since r_u with bit '1' will be visiting its neighbors and r_v is at v not moving anymore since it finished visiting its neighbors. Therefore, the round complexity becomes $O(\delta_u(b + 2b^2)) = O(\delta_u \log^2 n)$ rounds, since $b \leq c \cdot \log n$. \square

Lemma 9. *In Lemma 8, $O(\delta_u \log^2 n) < O(m)$.*

Proof. Notice that $\delta_u = \delta_v$ and δ_u is the minimum among the neighbor degrees of node u . Therefore, it must be the case that there are at least $\delta_u(\delta_u - 1)/2$ edges in G . We now relate this to m .

We consider two cases and show that in both the cases $O(\delta_u \log^2 n) < O(m)$.

- $\delta_u(\delta_u - 1)/2 \leq O(\delta_u \log^2 n)$. This implies that $\delta_u \leq O(\log^2 n)$. Which means

$$\delta_u(\delta_u - 1)/2 \leq O(\log^4 n) < O(n) < O(m).$$

- $\delta_u(\delta_u - 1)/2 > O(\delta_u \log^2 n)$. This implies that $m \geq \delta_u(\delta_u - 1)/2 > O(\delta_u \log^2 n)$. Which means

$$O(m) > O(\delta_u \log^2 n).$$

Therefore, in Lemma 8, $O(\delta_u \log^2 n) < O(m)$. \square

Lemma 10. *An initially singleton agent r_u at node u running `Singleton_Election` (Algorithm 2) either becomes a local leader or a non-candidate within $O(m)$ rounds.*

Proof. We consider two cases: (A) all δ_u neighbors of node u where r_u is positioned have agents positioned initially, (B) at least 1 neighbor of u was initially empty.

We first consider Case A. We have two sub-cases: (A1) all δ_u neighbors have a singleton agent initially, (A2) at least a neighbor has multiple agents initially. In Case A1, we prove that r_u either becomes a local leader or non-candidate in $O(\delta_u \log^2 n + \max_{v \in N(r_u)} \delta_v)$ rounds. The proof is as follows. If there is a neighbor node v , such that $\delta_u > \delta_v$, then r_u becomes a non-candidate in $2\delta_u$ rounds. If u is the smallest degree node in $N(r_u) \cup \{u\}$ and there is a node $v' \in N(r_u)$ with $\delta_u = \delta_{v'}$ then either u becomes a local leader or a non-candidate in $O(\delta_u \log^2 n)$ rounds (Lemma 8). If u is the smallest degree node in $\{u\} \cup N(r_u)$ and there is no neighbor v' with $\delta_u = \delta_{v'}$, then to become a local leader, it needs to know that the largest degree neighbor, say v , in fact, has an agent positioned. r_u gets to know there is an agent r_v at node v when r_v finishes visiting all its neighbors which takes $2\delta_v$ rounds. After that r_v becomes non-candidate (since it knows of u with $\delta_u < \delta_v$) and stays at v . Therefore, combining the times for all the above cases, we have the time complexity for Case A1 $O(\delta_u \log^2 n + \max_{v \in N(r_u)} \delta_v)$ rounds.

In Case A2, r_u gets to know the neighbor(s) with multiple agents is going to run *Dispersion_With_Election* (Algorithm 4) and become a local leader. This information can be collected by r_u within $2\delta_u$ rounds since one agent at the multiplicity neighbor node does not move during Leader Election Pseudocode (Algorithm 1).

We now consider Case B. We have two sub-cases: (B1) all the neighbors that have agents positioned are all singleton agents, (B2) at least one neighbor has multiple agents. In Case B1, r_u cannot become a local leader in $O(\delta_u \log^2 n + \max_{v \in N(r_u)} \delta_v)$ rounds if it does not meet any agent at (at least) a neighbor in those $O(\delta_u \log^2 n + \max_{v \in N(r_u)} \delta_v)$ rounds. r_u remains at u as a candidate until it gets to know of *Dispersion_With_Election* or *Leader_Election* and when it knows of one such procedure, it becomes a non-candidate. Since *Dispersion_With_Election* and *Leader_Election* finish in $O(m)$ time, r_u becomes a non-candidate in $O(m)$ rounds (Lemmas 12 and 17). However, if it meets an agent within $O(\delta_u \log^2 n + \max_{v \in N(r_u)} \delta_v)$ rounds, then that must be from *Dispersion_With_Election* since a neighbor was initially empty, and hence r_u becomes non-candidate in $O(\delta_u \log^2 n + \max_{v \in N(r_u)} \delta_v)$ rounds. In Case B2, r_u knows it cannot become a local leader in $2\delta_u$ round as in Case A2. Therefore, the total time for both cases A and B is $O(m)$ rounds. \square

For the dispersed initial configurations, we prove below that at least one agent at a node (despite being singleton initially) becomes a local leader.

Lemma 11. *Starting from a dispersed initial configuration, at least one agent becomes a local leader running Algorithm 2 (Singleton_Election).*

Proof. Let node u be the smallest degree node in G , i.e., $\delta_u = \min_{v \in G} \delta_v$. We have two cases: (i) u is the unique smallest degree node in G , i.e., there is no other node v' such that $\delta_u = \delta_{v'}$ (ii) there is at least a node $v' \in G$ with $\delta_{v'} = \delta_u$. We first consider Case (i). Since u is the unique smallest degree node, r_u meets all its neighbors in $O(\delta_u \log^2 n + \max_{v \in N(r_u)} \delta_v)$ rounds (Case A1 in Lemma 10). Since each neighbor of u is of a higher degree than u , they all become non-candidate and r_u becomes a local leader. Now consider Case (ii). We have two sub-cases: (ii.A) u and v' are neighbors (ii.B) u and v' are not neighbors. In Case (ii.B) r_u is elected as a local leader as discussed in Case (i). For Case (ii.A), we have from Lemma 8 that r_u meets $r_{v'}$ in $O(\delta_u \log^2 n)$ rounds. After that, either r_u or $r_{v'}$ becomes a non-candidate. If $r_{v'}$ becomes non-candidate, r_u becomes a local leader and we are done. Otherwise, if $r_{v'}$ becomes a non-candidate, then it has a neighbor v'' with $\delta_{v''} = \delta_{v'} = \delta_u$ and $r_{v''}$ remains as a candidate to become a local leader. This chain stops at the first node v^* with the same degree neighbor v''' such that $r_{v'''.ID} < r_{v^*.ID} > \dots > r_{v''.ID} > r_{v'.ID} > r_u.ID$ and v^* becomes a local leader. \square

We now consider rooted and general initial configurations.

Lemma 12. *Dispersion_With_Election (Algorithm 4) run by an initially non-singleton agent r_u of minimum ID among the $x > 1$ co-located agents finishes positioning those co-located agents on x different nodes of G in $O(m)$ rounds with $O(n \log n)$ bits memory per agent.*

Proof. Consider the case of $x = n$, i.e., there is a single node of G on which all n agent were co-located initially (rooted initial configuration). Since there is no singleton agent initially, *Singleton_Election* does not run. We have from Kshemkalyani *et al.* [14] that the DFS traversal $DFS(r_u)$ run by the minimum ID agent finishes dispersing agents to n nodes (one agent per node) in $\min(4m - 2n + 2, 4n\Delta) = 4m - 2n + 2 = O(m)$ rounds using $O(\log(n + \Delta)) = O(\log n)$ bits per agent, since $m \leq n\Delta$ and $\Delta \leq n$. Now consider the case of ℓ DFSs ran by ℓ minimum ID agents from ℓ non-singleton nodes of G with multiple agents positioned. Notice that $\ell \leq n/2$. We have two situations:

- (i) there is no singleton node initially, i.e. n agents are on ℓ non-singleton nodes
- (ii) there is at least a singleton node, i.e., n agents are on ℓ non-singleton nodes and at least one singleton node.

Consider the first situation. Since there is no singleton node initially, *Singleton_Election* does not run and hence the synchronization is only between *Dispersion_With_Election* procedures. A DFS with x initially co-located agents need to visit $x - 1$ other empty nodes to settle all its co-located agents. When an empty node is visited by a single DFS, then an agent from it settles. If an empty node is visited by the heads of two or more DFSs, an agent from one DFS settles. Therefore, since there are ℓ DFSs with $n - \ell$ empty nodes and $n - \ell$ agents to find the empty nodes to settle and in each empty node visited by one or more DFSs an agent settles, a DFS may need to traverse all the edges of G to be able to settle all its agents at empty nodes. We know that traversing all the edges of G finishes in $4m - 2n + 2$ rounds since each DFS continues until it settles all its agents. Regarding memory, since each DFS continues until it is able to settle all its agents, an agent positioned at a node may need to store the information about all the ℓ DFSs. Since $\ell \leq n/2$ and for a DFS a node needs to store $O(\log n)$ bits, the total memory needed at an agent is $O(n \log n)$ bits.

Now consider the second situation, i.e., there is at least an agent that runs *Singleton_Election*. If a DFS visits an empty node, say u , then it has to confirm whether:

- (i) it is in fact an empty node,
- (ii) a node of agent running *Singleton_Election*,
- (iii) a home node of an agent running *Leader_Election* after becoming a local leader through *Singleton_Election*, or
- (iv) a home node of agent running *Leader_Election* after becoming a local leader through *Dispersion_With_Election*.

In the first case, the waiting for a round results u to be empty. The DFS then runs procedure *Confirm_Empty()* (Algorithm 5) which confirms it to be indeed an empty node. The second case is confirmed since DFS waits at a node for a round and an agent running *Singleton_Election* returns to its node every two rounds. For the third case, the head of DFS needs to visit the port-1 neighbor of u to find out whether it is a home node of the local leader. The fourth case demands the head of DFS to visit all the neighbors of that node. Therefore, for each empty node u reached, this confirmation needs at most $2\delta_u + 1$ rounds, $2\delta_u$ rounds to visit all neighbors running *Confirm_Empty()* (Algorithm 5), and 1 round wait at u by DFS before running *Confirm_Empty()* (Algorithm 5). After a home node (which is empty) is confirmed then that agent running DFS can store this information for future use. That is, if the agent running the DFS visits u again and finds it to be empty, it can simply use the stored information to decide whether it is a home node. Since there are n nodes, total $O(n \log n)$ bits is enough for an agent running DFS to store this home node information for future use. Therefore, *Dispersion_With_Election* has the additional overhead of at most $O(\sum_{i=1}^n \delta_i) = O(m)$ due to *Confirm_Empty* (Algorithm 5).

Combining the above costs, *Dispersion_With_Election* (Algorithm 4) for each initially non-singleton agent r_u finishes in $O(m)$ rounds with memory per agent $O(n \log n)$ bits. \square

Lemma 13. *Suppose there were $\ell \geq 1$ multiplicity nodes in the initial configuration.*

- *If $\ell = 1$, an initially non-singleton agent r_u of minimum ID becomes a local leader running Algorithm 4 (*Dispersion_With_Election*).*

- If $\ell \geq 2$, at least 2 initially non-singleton agents of minimum ID among the $x > 1$ co-located agents in their multiplicity respective nodes become local leaders running Algorithm 4 (*Dispersion_With_Election*).

Proof. Consider first the case of $\ell = 1$. There is a single procedure *Dispersion_With_Election* (Algorithm 4) running. When *Dispersion_With_Election* (Algorithm 4) finishes, let w be the node on which the initially non-singleton agent r_u of minimum ID is positioned. Let T_u be the DFS tree built during *Dispersion_With_Election* (Algorithm 4). Let w' be the parent node of w in T_u . Note that w' has the initially non-singleton agent of second minimum ID $r_{w'}$ is positioned. Therefore, r_u can become a local leader writing its home node information at the agent $r_{w'}$ positioned at w' .

Consider now the case of $\ell \geq 2$. There will be ℓ instances of *Dispersion_With_Election* (Algorithm 4) running possibly concurrently. When a *Dispersion_With_Election* (Algorithm 4) instance finishes, let w be the node on which it finishes. Notice that, the initially non-singleton agent r' of minimum ID from that finished instance is positioned on w . Let $T_{r'}$ be the DFS tree built by agent r' while running *Dispersion_With_Election*. Let w' be the parent node of w in $T_{r'}$. If w' is non-empty, r_u can become a local leader writing its home node information at the agent r'' positioned at w' . Therefore, if non-empty parent condition in $T_{r'}$ satisfies for each *Dispersion_With_Election* (Algorithm 4) instance, there will be ℓ local leaders.

Suppose non-empty parent condition in $T_{r'}$ does not satisfy for r' . For this to happen, another instance of *Dispersion_With_Election* by some agent r'' must have previously finished on the parent node w' of r' in $T_{r'}$. and r'' must have become a local leader at w' . For r' to find w' empty, r'' must have now running *Leader_Election* (Algorithm 6). Since w' is empty, r' cannot write its home node information at w' and hence cannot immediately become a local leader.

The agent r' now comes to w' and waits until r'' returns to w' . During the wait, no other agent r''' occupies node w , since when r''' runs *Confirm_Empty()*, it finds that r' which was supposed to be at w is waiting at the parent node w' of T' . r''' then tries to position itself at a neighbor, say w'' , of w . If w'' is empty, then the parent node in T''' is w which is empty (since r' is waiting at w'). This process forms a chain of nodes (i.e., each node in the chain being the parent in the DFS tree of an agent) such that the first node in the chain is the home node of a local leader and all other nodes in the chain are the home nodes of the agents waiting (on the predecessor nodes in the chain) to become local leaders. After the local leader returns to w' , the waiting agents in the chain go back to their nodes (traversing the child pointers), i.e., r' waiting at w' goes to w , r''' waiting at w goes to w'' , and so on. When a waiting agent r_1 goes to its home node h_1 and finds a waiting agent r_2 positioned at h_1 , then r_1 knows that r_2 must have started waiting later in time compared to r_1 . Therefore, r_1 becomes a non-candidate and stays at h_1 . r_2 goes to its home node, say h_2 , and finds an agent r_3 waiting, then r_2 becomes a non-candidate and stays at h_2 , and the process repeats. Otherwise, r_2 knows that it is the last waiting agent in the chain. r_2 becomes a local leader at h_2 and writes the home node information at agent r_1 at node h_1 , which is the parent node in the DFS tree of r_2 . Therefore, at least two initially non-singleton agents become local leaders during *Dispersion_With_Election* (Algorithm 4). \square

Lemma 14. *In Lemma 13, each initially non-singleton agent r_u running *Dispersion_With_Election* (Algorithm 4) either becomes a local leader or a non-candidate within $O(m)$ rounds.*

Proof. We have from Lemma 12, agents disperse in $O(m)$ rounds. Therefore, for $\ell = 1$ in Lemma 13, an initially non-singleton agent of minimum ID r_u in the single multiplicity node becomes a local leader in $O(m)$ rounds. For $\ell \geq 2$, if non-empty parent condition is satisfied for each of ℓ initially non-singleton agents of minimum ID in their respective multiplicity nodes, then they all

become local leaders in $O(m)$ rounds because they do not wait. If non-empty parent condition is not satisfied, then for each chain of waiting agents, one agent in the parent node in the DFS tree of the first waiting agent in the chain becomes a local leader in $O(m)$ rounds since it does not wait. That local leader in the chain running *Leader_Election* (Algorithm 6) must return to its home node in next $O(m)$ rounds, since it runs a DFS traversal which must finish in $O(m)$ rounds [13]. After that if the chain is of length $\ell' \leq \ell$ then the last waiting agent in the chain reaches its node in $O(\ell')$ rounds and becomes a local leader. Other waiting robots in the chain become non-candidates. Since $\ell' < \ell \leq n/2$, we have total time $O(m + \ell') = O(m)$ rounds. \square

Lemma 15. *Consider a currently empty home node u of a local leader agent r_u running *Leader_Election* (Algorithm 6).*

- *If r_u became a local leader through *Singleton_Election* (Algorithm 2), node u will not be occupied by an agent other than r_u .*
- *If r_u became a local leader through *Dispersion_With_Election* (Algorithm 4), node u may be occupied for a short period by an agent waiting to become a local leader at the neighbor of u until r_u returns to u .*

Proof. We prove the first case. Notice that when an agent becomes a local leader at node u through from *Singleton_Election* (Algorithm 2), then all the neighbors must have an initially non-singleton agent positioned. Therefore, when r_u becomes a local leader at u from *Singleton_Election* (Algorithm 2), then the information that u is a home node is written in port-1 neighbor of u by r_u before it initiates *Leader_Election* (Algorithm 6) as that port-1 neighbor is non-empty and not moving. For an agent to settle at u when it finds empty, it has to confirm that it is in fact empty, i.e., not a home node of another agent. When the agent runs *Confirm_Empty* (Algorithm 5), it finds that u is in fact a home node. Therefore, no other agent occupies u , the home node of local leader agent r_u .

We now prove the second case. Notice that when an agent r_u becomes a local leader at node u through from *Dispersion_With_Election* (Algorithm 4), there is no guarantee that all neighbors of u have agents positioned except the parent node in the DFS tree of r_u at u . When an agent r^* finishes its *Dispersion_With_Election* (Algorithm 4) instance at the empty-neighbor, say w'' , of u , then r^* finds that u (the parent node in its DFS tree) empty and has to wait to become a local leader or non-candidate. r^* waits at u until r_u running *Leader_Election* (Algorithm 6) returns to u . After that r^* leaves u and enters w'' at which it becomes either a local leader or non-candidate. \square

Lemma 16. *Consider a local leader agent r_u running *Leader_Election* (Algorithm 6). As soon as r_u realizes it cannot become a (global) leader, it can return to its home node u .*

Proof. Recall that r_u runs a DFS traversal $DFS(roundNo_u, r_u)$ during *Leader_Election* (Algorithm 6). $DFS(roundNo_u, r_u)$ builds a DFS tree T with its root node the home node u of r_u . In T , there is a sequence of parent pointers from the current node position (which is the head of $DFS(roundNo_u, r_u)$) of r_u to the root node of T . Since every local leader runs its separate DFS traversal and maintains the tree information in each node its DFS visits, r_u can follow the parent pointers in T until reaching the root node, which is its home node. \square

Lemma 17. **Leader_Election* (Algorithm 6) elects a unique (global) leader and terminates in $O(m)$ rounds with $O(n \log n)$ bits at each agent.*

Proof. An agent that is not a local leader does not run *Leader_Election* (Algorithm 6). We have from Lemmas 11 and 13 that at least one agent becomes a local leader starting from any initial configuration. Consider an agent r_u that becomes a local leader at $roundNo_u$. It initiates $DFS(roundNo_u, r_u)$ at $roundNo_u$. Suppose it visits an empty node w at some round $t > roundNo_u$. We have from the proof of Lemma 12 that it can be confirmed in $O(\delta_w)$ rounds that whether w is in fact empty or a home node running *Confirm_Empty* (Algorithm 5). If it is empty, there must be at least one *Dispersion_With_Election* still running and an agent will become a local leader in some round $t' > t$, and hence $DFS(roundNo_u, r_u)$ stops. If $DFS(roundNo_u, r_u)$ does not visit any empty node, then it must visit another $DFS(roundNo_v, r_v)$. We have that either $DFS(roundNo_u, r_u)$ stops or $DFS(roundNo_v, r_v)$ stops due to this meet but not both. Since the IDs are unique, there is always one and only one $DFS(roundNo_w, r_w)$ run by local leader w that wins all the competitions on the DFSs. Therefore, we have a unique leader. Since *Confirm_Empty* (Algorithm 5) needs to be run for n different nodes at most once with total overhead of $O(\sum_{i=1}^n \delta_i) = O(m)$ rounds and each DFS takes $O(m)$ rounds, the total time to finish *Leader_Election* (Algorithm 6) after *Dispersion_With_Election* is $O(m)$ rounds. To store information about *Leader_Election* run by all local leaders, $O(n \log n)$ bits at each agent is sufficient. \square

We are now ready to prove Theorem 2, the main result of this section.

Proof of Theorem 2:

Proof. The rooted initial configuration is easy since only one *Dispersion_With_Election* (Algorithm 4) instance runs until n agents disperse to n nodes and the minimum ID agent running *Dispersion_With_Election* becomes a local leader. It then runs *Leader_Election* (Algorithm 6) and becomes a global leader. The total time will be $O(m)$ rounds (Lemmas 12 and 17).

In the dispersed initial configuration, only *Singleton_Election* (Algorithm 2) runs. The agents either become local leaders or non-candidates in $O(m)$ rounds (Lemma 10) and there will be at least one agent elected as a local leader (Lemma 11). *Leader_Election* then runs for the next $O(m)$ rounds for an agent among local leaders to become a global leader.

For the case of ℓ non-singleton nodes and no singleton node initially, again, ℓ instances of *Dispersion_With_Election* finish in $O(m)$ time electing at least 2 local leaders and they again synchronize in the lexicographical order of the DFS IDs while running *Leader_Election* so that one local leader agent becomes a global leader in next $O(m)$ rounds (Lemmas 12, 14, and 17).

Now the only remaining case is the combination of non-singleton and singleton nodes in the initial configuration. In this case, *Dispersion_With_Election* finishes in $O(m)$ rounds electing at least one agent as a local leader for any $\ell \geq 1$ (Lemmas 13 and 14) and by that time any agent running *Singleton_Election* either becomes a local leader or gets to know *Dispersion_With_Election* and stops running *Singleton_Election* changing its status to “non_candidate”. After that *Leader_Election* finishes in $O(m)$ rounds electing one agent that becomes a local leader as a global leader. Therefore, the total runtime is $O(m)$ rounds.

Consider the local leaders (thorough both *Singleton_Election* and *Dispersion_With_Election*) that cannot become a global leader. We have from Lemmas 15 and 16 that they can return to their home nodes and stay as those nodes as non-candidates. Notice that returning to home nodes takes $O(n)$ rounds since the agents can traverse parent points on the DFS tree they build while running *Dispersion_With_Election*.

Regarding memory, *Dispersion_With_Election* and *Leader_Election* need to run *Confirm_Empty()* (Algorithm 5) and store the information. Additionally, the ℓ DFSs during *Dispersion_With_Election* and all local leader DFSs during *Leader_Election* ask nodes to

keep their information; hence, $O(n \log n)$ bits per agent is needed. All the other variables are of either $O(1)$ size or $O(\log n)$ size and there are only a constant number of them. \square

5 MST Construction

In this section, we present a deterministic algorithm to construct an MST of the graph G given a leader r_l elected in the previous section and its DFS tree T_{r_l} built while running $DFS(roundNo_l, r_l)$. The MST construction finishes in $O(m)$ rounds with $O(\Delta \log n)$ bits of memory at each agent.

Overview of the Algorithm. Starting from any arbitrary initial configuration n agents, when Algorithm 1 finishes electing a leader, $n - 1$ nodes of G have an agent each positioned with status *non_candidate* and one node has an agent with status *leader*.

Let r_v be a leader positioned at node v . We can have two methods for MST construction. The first method is to ask the leader r_v to collect all the agents at node v , making a rooted configuration. This can be done by revisiting the DFS tree T_{r_l} built by r_v while running $DFS(roundNo_v, r_v)$ to elect itself as a leader during Algorithm 6 (*Leader_Election*), collecting the agents at node v in $O(n)$ rounds. After that r_v can run $DFS(r_v)$ as in Algorithm 4 to disperse the agents as well as assign ranks 1 to n . The leader will have rank 1 and the agent that settles i -th in the DFS order of empty node visits will have rank i . The second method is to run $DFS(r_v)$ to visit all other $n - 1$ agents and assign them rank based on the order they are visited, i.e., the agent visited i -th in the order receives rank i . This can again be done by revisiting the DFS tree T_{r_l} built by r_v while running $DFS(roundNo_v, r_v)$ to elect itself as a leader during Algorithm 6 (*Leader_Election*). This revisit finishes in $O(n)$ rounds. We use this second method for MST construction.

As soon as an agent receives its rank, it considers itself as a single component. The leader r_v at node v (which has rank-1) starts MST construction. r_v includes the MOE adjacent to v in its component and passes a token (message) to the rank-2 agent. This process runs iteratively until the rank- $(n - 1)$ agent passes the token to the rank- n agent. Consequently, the rank- n agent includes in its component the MOE available and passes the token to the rank-1 agent (r_v). This whole process of passing token from rank-1 node to rank- n node and back to rank-1 node is one phase.

In the next phase, the minimum rank agent would include the MOE available to its component and pass the token to the next minimum rank agent, iteratively. In this way, the token reaches the minimum rank agent from the highest rank agent and this phase is completed. This process is repeated phase-by-phase until there is a single component left. Eventually, we have an MST of a single component with n agents. Let us call this algorithm *MST_Construction*. Below, we discuss the algorithm in detail. A complete pseudocode is given in Algorithm 7.

Our algorithm resembles the MST construction algorithm of Gallager, Humblet, and Spira [8] with the difference that we start MST construction through ranks already provided to agents, whereas in [8] all nodes have the same rank. The merging of two same rank components with rank k in [8] provide a new rank of $k + 1$ for the merged component. In ours, there will be no same rank components and hence the merged component gets the rank of one of the components merged. The token is sent in our algorithm in the order of the component ranks to ensure that all the components can run merging.

Detailed Description of the Algorithm. As discussed earlier, consider that r_v is the leader positioned at node v . Leader r_v runs $DFS(r_v)$ to visit all the *non_candidate* agents and the i -th visited agent receives the rank i . The leader position is considered as the first, therefore, the assigned rank for the leader is 1. Let C_i be the component of rank- i agent. Initially, $|C_i| = 1$. We set the rank of component C_i be the rank of agent i , i.e., $rank(C_i) = rank(i)$. The rank-1 agent

Algorithm 7: *MST_Construction*

Input: An n -node anonymous network with n agents with unique IDs placed on n nodes with an agent r_l at a node elected as a leader (Algorithm 1) with DFS tree T_{r_l} built while running $DFS(roundNo_l, r_l)$ (Algorithm 6).

Ensure: MST construction.

- 1 The leader assumes rank 1. It re-traverses the DFS tree T_{r_l} and returns to its home node. While re-traversing T_{r_l} , it provides the distinct rank from the range of $[2, n]$ to the agents at $n - 1$ other nodes in order of visit.
 - 2 Each agent r_u considers itself as a component C_{r_u} with $rank(C_{r_u}) \leftarrow rank(r_u)$.
 - 3 The leader r_l generates a token. Let its component be C_{r_l} .
 - 4 **while** $|C_{r_l}| < n$ **do**
 - 5 **if** r_u has the token **then**
 - 6 **if** $rank(r_u) \leq rank(C_{r_u})$ **then**
 - 7 Agent r_u finds the MOE of the C_{r_u} going to another component C_{r_w} connecting r_u with r_w .
 - 8 **if** $rank(C_{r_u}) < rank(C_{r_w})$ **then**
 - 9 r_w becomes the root node of C_{r_w} by reversing the parent-child pointers from r_w up to the root node of C_{r_w} and r_u becomes the parent of r_w (Figs. 1 and 2). C_{r_w} then merges with C_{r_u} giving a new component $C_{r_u}^{new}$ with $rank(C_{r_u}^{new}) \leftarrow rank(C_{r_u})$.
 - 10 **if** $rank(r_u) < n$ **then**
 - 11 r_u passes the token to agent r_v with $rank(r_v) = rank(r_u) + 1$ using T_{r_l} .
 - 12 **else if** $rank(r_u) > rank(C_{r_u})$ and $rank(r_u) < n$ **then**
 - 13 r_u passes the token to agent r_v with $rank(r_v) = rank(r_u) + 1$ using T_{r_l} .
 - 14 **else if** $rank(r_u) = n$ **then**
 - 15 r_u passes the token to the leader r_l (with rank 1) using T_{r_l} . This token passing visits the parents of r_u until the token reaches the root node of T_{r_l} , where the leader is positioned.
-

(leader) generates a token and performs the following step iteratively. The rank-1 agent checks its component size $|C_1|$. If $|C_1| < n$, the leader includes the MOE leading to neighbor agent r_u in C_1 , and assigns $rank(C_1) \leftarrow rank(C_{r_u})$, where $rank(C_{r_u})$ is the rank of the component C_{r_u} that r_u belongs to. The MOE is the edge having one endpoint at a node in C_i (r_v 's component) and the other endpoint at a node in C_j (r_u 's component). Including the MOE in a component is *component merging* which makes two components a single component. The leader then passes the token to the next minimum available rank agent r_w , which is *token passing*. If $rank(C_{r_w}) < rank(r_w)$, r_w passes the token to the agent r_x with $rank(r_x) = rank(r_w) + 1$ (without component merging). Otherwise, r_w includes the MOE to its component C_{r_w} and assigns $\forall r \in C_{r_w}, rank(r) \leftarrow rank(C_{r_w})$ and pass the token to the agent r_x with $rank(r_x) = rank(r_w) + 1$. This inclusion of MOE is component merging. When this is done for all the agents once and rank- n agent passes the token back to the leader, a phase is finished. This process repeats and stops after the leader agent (rank-1) has $|C_1| = n$.

Now, we discuss the *token passing* and *merging* in detail.

Token Passing: The tokens passed are of two types: (1) token passed by the rank- i agent to rank- $(i + 1)$ agent (2) token passed by the rank- n agent to rank-1 agent (the leader). Both token types are passed using the DFS tree T_{r_l} built by the leader agent r_v while running $DFS(roundNo_v, r_v)$ (during Algorithm 6). In the first case, the token passing follows the order in which nodes of G are visited by $DFS(roundNo_v, r_v)$. In the second case, the token passed by the rank- n agent follows the parent pointers in T_{r_l} until it reaches the root of T_{r_l} where rank-1 agent is positioned.

Merging: Suppose agent r_u with $1 \leq rank(r_u) \leq n$ in component C_{r_u} has the token and




Figure 1: The components C_{r_w} and C_{r_u} before C_{r_w} merges with C_{r_u} due to the MOE connecting node $r_u \in C_{r_u}$ with node $r_w \in C_{r_w}$ and $\text{rank}(C_{r_u}) < \text{rank}(C_{r_w})$ (if $\text{rank}(C_{r_w}) < \text{rank}(C_{r_u})$, then C_{r_u} merges with C_{r_w} due to the MOE connecting $r_w \in C_{r_w}$ with node $r_u \in C_{r_u}$). Both C_{r_u} and C_{r_w} are rooted trees with roots r_a and r_y , respectively. In the figure, $r_A \rightarrow r_B$ denotes r_A is the parent of r_B .

$\text{rank}(r_u) \leq \text{rank}(C_{r_u})$. C_{r_u} is a tree and has a root node/agent. Agent r_u finds the MOE connected to C_{r_u} (the component it belongs to) as follows. Agent r_u traverses C_{r_u} and checks the incident edges of the nodes in C_{r_u} (edges with both endpoints on the nodes in C_{r_u} are not considered) in the ascending order of the (edge) weights. r_u adds the MOE among the incident edges to C_{r_u} . Let the (added) MOE have the other end at a node w that belongs to C_{r_w} . W.l.o.g., let us consider $\text{rank}(C_{r_u}) < \text{rank}(C_{r_w})$ (otherwise, r_u simply passes the token to agent with $\text{rank}(r_u) + 1$). The old parent, say r_x (from the component C_{r_w}), of r_w becomes r_w 's child. The process of converting a parent to a child starting from r_w runs until reaching the root node in C_{r_w} . Each subsequent parent now becomes a child and the child becomes a parent, i.e., r_w becomes the root of C_{r_w} . Since MOE is added, r_u becomes the parent of r_w . C_{r_u} and C_{r_w} now become a new single component $C_{r_u}^{\text{new}}$. Since $\text{rank}(C_{r_u}) < \text{rank}(C_{r_w})$, $\text{rank}(C_{r_u}^{\text{new}}) \leftarrow \text{rank}(C_{r_u})$, which is communicated to all the agents (nodes) in $C_{r_u}^{\text{new}}$. Furthermore, the C_{r_u} 's component does not go through any transition with respect to parent-child pointers except the fact that r_u becomes the parent of r_w . Figs. 1 and 2 illustrate these ideas. Fig. 1 shows components C_{r_u} and C_{r_w} before they merge due to the MOE connecting r_u with r_w . Fig. 2 captures the merged component $C_{r_u}^{\text{new}}$ such that root of the $C_{r_u}^{\text{new}}$ remains unchanged and the pointer changes occurred in the C_{r_w} component during the merging. The directed edge denotes new parent-child relationships.

Analysis of the Algorithm. We now analyze Algorithm 7 for its correctness and time and memory complexities. The correctness proof shows that Algorithm 7 indeed constructs a MST.

Lemma 18. *Algorithm 7 (MST_Construction) generates the MST of G .*

Proof. We prove this in three steps: firstly, Algorithm 7 constructs a tree; secondly, the constructed tree is a spanning tree; finally, the spanning tree is, indeed, a minimum spanning tree. Firstly, we prove by contradiction that no cycle is generated during Algorithm 7. Let us suppose, there exists a cycle at any point during the algorithm. Then it implies two components with the same rank merged at some point, which is a contradiction. Secondly, let us suppose there exist at least two components at the end of the algorithm. This implies that the leader component (rank-1) did not merge with the other component and terminated the algorithm, which contradicts the fact that the algorithm terminates when the leader is connected to n agents altogether.




Figure 2: The resulting component $C_{r_u}^{new}$ after merging C_{r_w} with C_{r_u} . Component $C_{r_u}^{new}$ gets rank $\text{rank}(C_{r_u}^{new}) \leftarrow \text{rank}(C_{r_u})$ since C_{r_w} merged with C_{r_u} to become $C_{r_u}^{new}$ due to $\text{rank}(C_{r_u}) < \text{rank}(C_{r_w})$. Two parent-child pointers in C_{r_w} are reversed to keep $C_{r_u}^{new}$ a rooted tree.

Finally, consider that the tree formed by our algorithm is T and the MST is T^* . Note that in Algorithm 7, each edge added to the MST tree is by selection of a MOE. If $T = T^*$ then T is minimum spanning tree. If $T \neq T^*$ then there exists an edge $e \in T^*$ of minimum weight such that $e \notin T$. Therefore, there exists a phase in which e was not considered during component merging and an edge with higher weight, say e' , was considered. But this is contradictory to Algorithm 7 which merges the components with a MOE. Therefore, Algorithm 7 constructs the MST of G . \square

We now prove time and memory complexities. We start with the following lemma.

Lemma 19. *In Algorithm 7 (MST_Construction), the leader initiates the merging process at most $O(\log n)$ times.*

Proof. Initially, there are n single-node components in Algorithm 7 (Line 2). In each phase (leader initiating a token until token returns to the leader), each component merges at least once with another component. Therefore, after every phase, the number of components is reduced by at least half. Consequently, after $O(\log n)$ phases, there remains only a single component of n nodes. \square

We are now ready to prove Theorem 3, the MST construction result.

Proof of Theorem 3:

Proof. Providing ranks to agents takes $O(n)$ rounds by re-traversing the DFS tree T_{DFS} constructed by $DFS(\text{roundNo}_u, r_u)$ during leader election (Algorithm 6). The while loop performs two operations - token passing and merging.

In token passing, the token is passed through the edge of the tree T_{DFS} , and an edge is not traversed more than twice. Therefore, in a phase, to pass the token from rank-1 agent to rank- n agent takes $O(n)$ rounds. From rank- n agent the token returns to the leader again in $O(n)$ rounds. Combining this with Lemma 19, token passing takes $O(n \log n)$ rounds.

In the process of merging, an agent r_u visits at most three types of edges: i) MOE edges within its component C_{r_u} ii) edges traversed to find MOE iii) reversing the edges from r_w until the root of C_{r_w} when it merges with another component C_{r_u} at r_w . In the case of i) MOE is the part of the component C_{r_u} , i.e., a tree. Its traversal finishes in $O(|C_{r_u}|)$ rounds. In a phase, the combined size of all the components is $O(n)$. In case ii) edges that are traversed to find the MOE were either part

of MOE or not, in case, they become part of MOE they were traversed two times. There are at most $(n - 1)$ such edges throughout the process. On the other hand, if some edges did not become part of the MOE then they were never traversed again. Therefore, there are in total $m - (n - 1)$ such edges. In case iii) reversing an edge from its merging point to the root can not be more than its component size. Therefore, reversing of edge for agent r_u takes $O(|C_{r_u}|)$. Combining the time for the cases i) and iii) per phase with $O(\log n)$ phases (Lemma 19), we have total runtime $O(n \log n)$ rounds and for case ii) we have total $O(m)$ rounds throughout the execution. Thus, the overall round complexity becomes $O(m + n \log n)$.

For memory, rank numbering takes $O(\log n)$ bits at each agent to re-traverse the DFS tree T_{DFS} (constructed during Algorithm 6). Furthermore, each agent stores $O(\log n)$ bits to keep the account of the ID/rank and component rank. Also, there might be a case in which all the neighbors are part of the MST. Therefore, in the worst case, the highest degree (Δ) agent (agent placed at the highest degree node) keeps the account of all the MST edges and requires $O(\Delta \log n)$ memory. Hence, the overall memory required by each agent in Algorithm 7 is $O(\Delta \log n)$ bits. \square

6 Concluding Remarks

We have initiated the study of constructing MST of a graph in the agent model. The considered agent model poses unique challenges compared to the well-studied message-passing model. We have developed three results. The first result provides a solution simulating an existing MST algorithm in the message-passing model to the agent model under some assumptions on known graph parameters n and Δ and with memory at each node proportional to the node memory in the message-passing model. The second result elects a leader in the agent model with agents starting initially arbitrarily on the graph nodes in $O(m)$ time with $O(n \log n)$ bits at each agents, without agents knowing any graph parameter a priori. Finally the third result provides a MST solution given an elected leader in $O(m + n \log n)$ time with $O(\Delta \log n)$ bits at each agent, without agents knowing any graph parameter a priori. The time complexity of our MST algorithm matches that of Prim’s algorithm in the centralized computing model. The MST result is made possible by the highly non-trivial technique of electing one agent as a unique leader which we developed for proving Theorem 2. This technique may be of independent interest in distributed robotics since having a leader allows to provide solutions to the problems in which symmetry breaking is otherwise difficult. For future work, it would be interesting to improve the time complexity of our MST solution (and leader election) to match the lower bound and/or improve the memory complexity to match the optimal $O(\log n)$ bits per agent, without agents knowing graph parameters a priori.

References

- [1] Baruch Awerbuch. Optimal distributed algorithms for minimum weight spanning tree, counting, leader election and related problems (detailed summary). In Alfred V. Aho, editor, *STOC*, pages 230–240. ACM, 1987.
- [2] David A. Bader and Guojing Cong. Fast shared-memory algorithms for computing the minimum spanning forest of sparse graphs. *J. Parallel Distributed Comput.*, 66(11):1366–1378, 2006.
- [3] Prabhat Kumar Chand, Apurba Das, and Anisur Rahaman Molla. Agent-based triangle counting and its applications in anonymous graphs. *CoRR*, abs/2402.03653, 2024.

- [4] Prabhat Kumar Chand, Anisur Rahaman Molla, and Sumathi Sivasubramaniam. Run for cover: Dominating set via mobile agents. In *ALGOWIN*, pages 133–150. Springer, 2023.
- [5] Bernard Chazelle. A minimum spanning tree algorithm with inverse-ackermann type complexity. *J. ACM*, 47(6):1028–1047, 2000.
- [6] Ka Wong Chong, Yijie Han, and Tak Wah Lam. Concurrent threads and optimal parallel minimum spanning trees algorithm. *J. ACM*, 48(2):297–323, 2001.
- [7] Edsger W. Dijkstra. A note on two problems in connexion with graphs. *Numerische Mathematik*, 1:269–271, 1959.
- [8] R. G. Gallager, P. A. Humblet, and P. M. Spira. A distributed algorithm for minimum-weight spanning trees. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.*, 5(1):66–77, jan 1983.
- [9] Juan A. Garay, Shay Kutten, and David Peleg. A sub-linear time distributed algorithm for minimum-weight spanning trees (extended abstract). In *FOCS*, pages 659–668. IEEE Computer Society, 1993.
- [10] R.L. Graham and Pavol Hell. On the history of the minimum spanning tree problem. *Annals of the History of Computing*, 7(1):43–57, 1985.
- [11] David R. Karger, Philip N. Klein, and Robert Endre Tarjan. A randomized linear-time algorithm to find minimum spanning trees. *J. ACM*, 42(2):321–328, 1995.
- [12] J. B. Kruskal. On the Shortest Spanning Subtree of a Graph and the Traveling Salesman Problem. In *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 7, 1956.
- [13] Ajay D. Kshemkalyani and Faizan Ali. Efficient dispersion of mobile robots on graphs. In *ICDCN*, pages 218–227, 2019.
- [14] Ajay D. Kshemkalyani, Anisur Rahaman Molla, and Gokarna Sharma. Dispersion of mobile robots in the global communication model. In *ICDCN*, pages 12:1–12:10, 2020.
- [15] Ajay D. Kshemkalyani and Gokarna Sharma. Near-optimal dispersion on arbitrary anonymous graphs. In *25th International Conference on Principles of Distributed Systems, OPODIS*, pages 8:1–8:19, 2021.
- [16] Shay Kutten and David Peleg. Fast distributed construction of small k -dominating sets and applications. *J. Algorithms*, 28(1):40–66, 1998.
- [17] Debasish Pattanayak, Subhash Bhagat, Sruti Gan Chaudhuri, and Anisur Rahaman Molla. Maximal independent set via mobile agents. In *ICDCN*, pages 74–83. ACM, 2024.
- [18] David Peleg and Vitaly Rubinfeld. A near-tight lower bound on the time complexity of distributed minimum-weight spanning tree construction. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 30(5):1427–1442, 2000.
- [19] Seth Pettie and Vijaya Ramachandran. A randomized time-work optimal parallel algorithm for finding a minimum spanning forest. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 31(6):1879–1895, 2002.
- [20] Yuichi Sudo, Masahiro Shibata, Junya Nakamura, Yonghwan Kim, and Toshimitsu Masuzawa. Near-linear time dispersion of mobile agents, 2023.