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Abstract—Modeling problems using predicates that induce a partial order among global states was introduced as a way to permit asynchronous execution in multiprocessor systems. A key property of them is that the predicate induces one lattice in the state space which guarantees that the execution is correct even if nodes execute with old information about their neighbours. Unfortunately, many interesting problems do not exhibit lattice linearity; such algorithms induce a partial order in a subset of the state space even though the problem cannot be defined by a predicate under which the states form a partial order.

This paper focuses on analyzing and differentiating between lattice linear problems and algorithms. It also introduces a new class of algorithms called (fully) lattice linear algorithms. A characteristic of these algorithms is that the entire reachable state space is partitioned into one or more lattices and the initial state locks into one of these lattices. Thus, under a few additional constraints, the initial state can uniquely determine the final state. For demonstration, we present lattice linear self-stabilizing algorithms for minimal dominating set and graph coloring problems, and a parallel processing 2-approximation algorithm for vertex cover.

The algorithm for minimal dominating set converges in $n$ moves, and that for graph colouring converges in $n + 2m$ moves. These algorithms preserve this time complexity while allowing the nodes to execute asynchronously and take actions based on old or inconsistent information about their neighbours. They present an improvement to the existing algorithms present in the literature. The algorithm for vertex cover is the first lattice linear approximation algorithm for an NP-Hard problem; it converges in $n$ moves.

Index Terms—self-stabilization, lattice linear problems, lattice linear algorithms, minimal dominating set, graph colouring vertex cover.

I. INTRODUCTION

A concurrent shared memory algorithm can be viewed as a loop where in each step/iteration, a node reads the shared memory, based on which it decides to take action and update the shared memory. As an example, in an algorithm for graph colouring, in each step, a node reads the colour of its neighbours and, if necessary, updates its own colour. Execution of this algorithm in a parallel or distributed system requires synchronization to ensure correct behavior. For example, if two nodes, say $i$ and $j$ change their colour simultaneously, the resulting action may be incorrect. Synchronization has been studied under various titles such as mutual exclusion, transactions, (cache) coherency, dining philosopher, and locking.

Let us consider that we allow such algorithms to execute in asynchrony: consider that $i$ and $j$ from the above illustration execute asynchronously. Let us suppose that the update of $i$ happens first. The action of $i$ is acceptable till now. However, when we observe $j$, it is possible that $j$ has read the variables of $i$, and consequently these values are now inconsistent, as $i$ has changed its variables. The synchronization primitives discussed in the previous paragraph are aimed at eliminating such behavior. Although, they introduce an overhead. If we permit the execution without these synchronization primitives, the overall execution would be faster, as each node can execute at its own pace. This is reasonable only if the overall execution is still guaranteed to be correct.

Generally, reading old values in this manner causes the algorithm to fail. However, if the correctness of the algorithm can be proved even when a node executes based on old information, then such an algorithm can benefit from asynchronous execution; such execution would not suffer from synchronization overheads and each node can execute independently.

In [1], Garg introduced a class of problems where the execution is correct even if a node reads old values from other nodes. In this class of problems, denoted as lattice linear problems, the predicate representing the problem induces a partial order, resulting in one lattice among the states. However, these problems require the algorithm to initialize in the infimum of the lattice, and by doing so, they do not allow self-stabilization. While being highly useful, the requirements of lattice linear problems are very stringent. Various problems (e.g., minimal vertex cover, graph colouring) are not lattice linear. In [2], the authors introduced eventually lattice linear problems for non-lattice linear problems. Such algorithms induce a partial order in a subset of the state space.

In this paper, we introduce fully lattice linear algorithms (as opposed to lattice linear problems or eventually lattice linear algorithms) that are capable of imposing a partial order on the entire state space even if the underlying problem does not provide it. We also show that with lattice linear algorithms, it is possible to combine lattice linearity with self-stabilization, which ensures that the system converges to a legitimate state even if it starts from an arbitrary state.

A. Contributions of the paper

- We alleviate the limitations of inducing a partial order using a predicate by introducing lattice linear algorithms...
where a partial order is imposed by the algorithm even when the it cannot be induced by a predicate.

- We provide upper bounds to the convergence time for an arbitrary algorithm traversing a lattice of states.
- We bridge the gap between [1] and [2] by introducing fully lattice linear algorithms. The former creates a single lattice among the states whereas the latter creates multiple lattices in a subset of the state space. Fully lattice linear algorithms bridge the gap where they induce one or multiple lattices (depending on the underlying problem) among the states. This overcomes the limitations of [1] and [2].

- We present fully lattice linear self-stabilizing algorithms for the minimal dominating set and graph colouring problems, and a lattice linear 2-approximation algorithm for vertex cover.
- The algorithm for minimal dominating set converges in \( n \) moves, and the algorithm for graph colouring converges in \( n + 2m \) moves. These algorithms are fully tolerant to consistency violations and asynchronous parallel processing systems. Thus, these algorithms present an improvement over the existing algorithms present in the literature.
- The algorithm for vertex cover is the first lattice linear approximation algorithm for an NP-Hard problem; it converges in \( n \) moves.

\[ B. \text{Organization of the paper} \]

In Section II, we elaborate the preliminaries. In Section III, we discuss some background results related to lattice linearity that are present in the literature. In Section IV, we describe the general structure of a lattice linear algorithm. In Section V, we present a fully lattice linear algorithm for minimal dominating set, and that for graph colouring in Section VI. We present a lattice linear 2-approximation algorithm for vertex cover in Section VII. In Section VIII, we provide an upper bound to the number of moves required for convergence in an algorithm traversing a lattice of states. We discuss related works in Section IX and conclude in Section X.

II. PRELIMINARIES

In this paper, we are mainly interested in graph algorithms where the input is a graph \( G, V(G) \) is the set of its nodes and \( E(G) \) is the set of its edges. For a node \( i \in V(G), \) \( Adj_i \) is the set of nodes connected to \( i \) by an edge, and \( Adj^+_i \) is the set of nodes within \( x \) hops from \( i \), excluding \( i \). While writing the time complexity of the algorithms, we note \( n \) to be \( |V(G)| \) and \( m \) to be \( |E(G)| \). For a node \( i, \) \( \text{deg}(i) = |Adj_i| \).

Each node in \( V(G) \) stores a set of variables which represent its local state. A global state, say \( s \), is obtained by assigning each variable of each node a value from its respective domain. We use \( S \) to denote the set of all global states of a given problem, depending on the context.

Each node in \( V(G) \) is also associated with actions. Each action at node \( i \) checks the values of nodes in \( Adj_i \cup \{i\} \) (where the value of \( x \) is problem dependent) and updates its own variables. In other words, an action at a node \( i \) is of the form \( g \rightarrow a_c \) where \( g \), a guard, is a Boolean expression over variables in \( Adj^+_i \cup \{i\} \) and \( a_c \) is a set of instructions that updates the variables of \( i \) if \( g \) is true. A move is an event in which a node updates its variables. A node is enabled iff at least one of its guards is true, otherwise it is disabled.

**Execution without synchronization.** Typically, we view a sequence \( (s_0, s_1, \cdots, s) \) as a computation of the given algorithm where each \( s_j+1 (j \geq 0) \) is obtained by executing some action of the form \( g \rightarrow a_c \) by one or more nodes in state \( s_j \). In a computation with proper synchronization node \( i \) evaluates its guards in the current state.

Let \( x(s) \) denote the value of some variable \( x \) in state \( s \), and let \( \forall j \geq 0, s_{j+1} \) be the state when all nodes perform execution on the current state. On the other hand, without synchronization, when \( g \) is evaluated, node \( i \) may read old values of some variables. In such a case, if we consider the computation prefix \( (s_0, s_1, \cdots, s_j) \) and evaluate \( g \) in state \( s_j \) then the state may appear to \( i \) as \( s' \neq s_j \), where some values are old. Specifically, the state \( s_j \) will appear as \( s' \) where \( x(s') \in \{x(s_0), x(s_1), \cdots, x(s_j)\} \). Now, if \( g \) evaluates to true then node \( i \) will execute \( a_c \). The state \( s'' \) obtained by executing \( a_c \) in \( s' \) is not equal to \( s_{j+1} \). In this paper, we introduce algorithms that are tolerant to such actions.

**Self stabilization:** An algorithm \( A \) is self-stabilizing for the tuple \( (S_0, S_f) \), where \( S_0 \) and \( S_f \) are sets of states and \( S_0 \subseteq S_f \), iff

- **Convergence:** Starting from an arbitrary state, any sequence of computations of \( A \) reaches a state in \( S_o \).
- **Closure:** Any computation of \( A \) starting from \( S_f \) always stays in \( S_f \).

In this work, we are mainly interested in the convergence aspect; after reaching the legitimate states (e.g., the minimal dominating set is found), the algorithm does not have any actions to execute.

**Embedding a \(<\bigtriangleup\)-lattice in global states.** Next, we discuss the structure of a partial order in the state space which, under proper constraints, allows an algorithm to converge to an optimal state. To describe the embedding, let \( s \) denote a global state, and let \( s[i] \) denote the state of node \( i \). First, we define a total order \( \prec \); all local states of a node \( i \) are totally ordered under \( \prec \). Using \( \prec \), we define a partial order \( \prec^\setminus \) among global states as follows:

We say that \( s \prec^\setminus s' \) iff \( \forall i : s[i] = s'[i] \lor s[i] \prec s'[i] \land (\exists i : s[i] \prec s'[i]) \). Also, \( s = s' \) iff \( \forall i : s[i] = s'[i] \). For brevity, we use \( \prec \) to denote \( \prec \) and \( \prec^\setminus \) to correspond to \( \prec \) while comparing local states, and \( \prec \) corresponds to \( \prec^\setminus \) while comparing global states. We use the symbol ‘\( >\)’ which is the opposite of ‘\( <\), i.e. \( s > s' \) iff \( s' < s \). Similarly, we use symbols ‘\( \leq\)’ and ‘\( \geq\); e.g. \( s \leq s' \) iff \( s = s' \lor s < s' \). We call the lattice, formed from such a partial order, a \(<\bigtriangleup\)-lattice.

**Definition 1.** \(<\bigtriangleup\)-lattice. Given a total relation \( \prec \) that orders the values of \( s[i] \) (the local state of node \( i \) in state \( s \)), the \(<\bigtriangleup\)-lattice corresponding to \( \prec \) is defined by the following partial order: \( s < s' \) iff \( (\forall i : s[i] \leq s'[i]) \land (\exists i : s[i] < s'[i]). \)
In the $<$-lattice discussed above, we can define the join and meet of two states in the standard way: the meet (respectively, join), of two states $s_1$ and $s_2$ is a state $s_3$ where $\forall i, s_3[i]$ is equal to $\min(s_1[i], s_2[i])$ (respectively, $\min(s_1[i], s_2[i])$).

By varying $<$ that identifies a total order among the states of a node, one can obtain different lattices. A $<$-lattice, embedded in the state space, is useful for permitting the algorithm to execute asynchronously. Under proper constraints in how the lattice is formed, convergence is ensured.

**Remark:** It is not necessary that a $<$-lattice is of finite size, in which case, there will be no supremum. But a $<$-lattice will always have an infimum. We discuss more on this in Section III-A. In the case that the number of states is unbounded, Definition 1 holds equally well.

### III. Background: Types of Lattice Linear Transition Systems

Lattice linearity has been shown to be induced in problems in two ways, one where the lattice linearity arises due to the problem itself, and another where the problem does not manifest lattice linearity but the algorithm imposes it. We discuss these in Section III-A and Section III-B respectively.

#### A. Natural Lattice Linearity: Lattice Linear Problems

In this subsection, we discuss lattice linear problems, i.e., the problems where description of the problem statement creates the lattice structure automatically. Such problems can be represented by a predicate under which the states in $S$ form a lattice. These problems include stable (man optimal) marriage problem, market clearing price and others. Such problems have been discussed in [1], [3], [4]. We describe the characteristics of these problems as follows.

There are cases where a problem $P$ can be represented by a predicate $\mathcal{P}$ such that for any node $i$, if it is violating $\mathcal{P}$ in some state $s$, then it must change its state, otherwise the system will not satisfy $\mathcal{P}$. Let $\mathcal{P}(s)$ be true iff state $s$ satisfies $\mathcal{P}$. A node violating $\mathcal{P}$ in $s$ is called a forbidden node. Formally,

**Definition 2.** $\mathcal{F}(i, s, \mathcal{P}) \equiv \neg \mathcal{P}(s) \land (\forall s' > s : s'[i] = s[i] \Rightarrow \neg \mathcal{P}(s'))$.

If no node is forbidden in $s$, then $\mathcal{P}(s)$ is true and all nodes are disabled. Based on the above definition and given that $S$ forms a $<$-lattice, we have the definition of lattice linear problems as follows.

**Definition 3.** A problem $P$ is lattice linear iff there exists a predicate $\mathcal{P}$ and an $<$-lattice such that

- $P$ requires that we reach a state where $\mathcal{P}$ is true, and
- $\mathcal{P}$ is lattice linear with respect to the $<$-lattice induced in $S$ [7], i.e., $\forall s : \neg \mathcal{P}(s) \Rightarrow \exists i : \mathcal{F}(i, s, \mathcal{P})$.

For a lattice linear problem $P$, we can design an algorithm $A$ if we follow the following rules [1].

- Each node $i$ checks if it is violating $\mathcal{P}$ in $s$ and determines if it is forbidden.
- If $i$ is forbidden, then $i$ increments its value with respect to $<$, otherwise, no action is taken.

If the above rules are followed and the algorithm initializes in the infimum of lattice then it will either reach a state where $\mathcal{P}$ is true or it will reach the supremum of the lattice, where it will declare an absence of a solution if the supremum also violates $\mathcal{P}$. Definition [1] ensures that this property is satisfied even if a node reads old values; if $\mathcal{P}$ is false in the state observed by the given node, it will also be false in the current state. Thus such an algorithm finds the lowest state in the lattice where $\mathcal{P}$ is true.

**Example 1.** SMP. We describe a lattice linear problem, the stable (man-optimal) marriage problem (SMP) from [1]. In SMP, all men (respectively, women) rank women (respectively men) in terms of their preference (lower rank is preferred more). A global state is represented as a vector $s$ where the vector $s[i]$ contains a single value which represents the ID of the woman $w$ that man $i$ is proposing to.

The requirements of SMP can be defined as $P_{SMP} \equiv \forall m, m', m \neq m' : s[m] \neq s[m']$. $P_{SMP}$ is true iff no two men are proposing to the same woman. A man $m$ is forbidden iff there exists $m'$ such that $m$ and $m'$ are proposing to the same woman $w$ and $w$ prefers $m'$ over $m$. Thus, $\mathcal{F}_{SMP}(m, s, P_{SMP}) \equiv \exists m' : s[m] = s[m'] \land \text{rank}(s[m], m') < \text{rank}(s[m], m)$. If $m$ is forbidden, he increments $s[m]$ by 1 until all his choices are exhausted.

A key observation from the stable marriage problem (SMP) and other problems from [1] is that the partial order formed in $S$ contains a global infimum $\ell$ and possibly a global supremum $u$ i.e., $\ell$ and $u$ are the states such that $\forall s \in S, \ell \leq s$ and $\forall s \in S, u \geq s$. All the states in $S$ form a single lattice.

**Example SMP continuation 1.** As an illustration of SMP, consider the case where we have 3 men $m_1, m_2, m_3$ and 3 women $w_1, w_2, w_3$. The lattice induced in this case is shown in Figure 1. In this figure every vector represents the global state $s$ such that $s[i]$ represents the index of woman that $m_i$ is proposing to. The acting algorithm begins in the state $(1, 2, 2)$ (i.e., each man starts with his first choice) and continues its execution in this lattice. The algorithm terminates in the lowest state in the lattice where no node is forbidden.

In SMP and other problems in [1], the algorithm needs to be initialized to $\ell$ to reach an optimal solution. If we start from a state $s$, $s \neq \ell$, then the algorithm can only traverse the lattice from $s$. Hence, upon termination, it is possible that the optimal solution is not reached. In other words, these algorithms cannot be self-stabilizing [9] unless $u$ is the optimal state.

**Example SMP continuation 2.** Consider that men and women are $M = (A, J, T)$ and $W = (K, Z, M)$ indexed in that sequence respectively. Let that proposal preferences of men are $A = (Z, K, M)$, $J = (Z, K, M)$ and $T = (K, M, Z)$, and women have ranked men as $Z = (A, J, T)$, $K = (J, T, A)$ and $M = (T, J, A)$. The optimal state (starting from $(1,1,1)$) is $(1,2,2)$. Starting from $(1,2,3)$, the algorithm terminates at $(1,2,3)$ which is not optimal. Starting from $(3,1,2)$, the algorithm terminates declaring that no solution is available.
Applies for

Example MDS continuation 1. Even though the MDS problem is not lattice linear, lattice linearity can be imposed on it by the algorithm. Algorithm 1 is based on the algorithm in [2] for a more generalized version of the problem, the service demand based minimal dominating set problem. Algorithm 1 consists of two phases. In the first phase, if node $i$ is addable, i.e. $i$, along with all its neighbours, is not in dominating set (DS) $D$, then $i$ enters $D$. This phase does not follow lattice linear structure. However, once the algorithm reaches a state where nodes in $D$ form a (possibly, non-minimal) DS, in phase 2 of the algorithm, lattice linearity is imposed by the algorithm. Specifically, in phase 2, a node $i$ leaves $D$ iff it is removable, i.e. all neighbours of $i$ stay dominated even if $i$ moves out of $D$, and is of the highest ID among all the removable nodes within its distance-2 neighbourhood.

Algorithm 1. Eventually lattice linear algorithm for MDS.

\[
\text{ADDABLE-DS}(i) \equiv \text{st}.i = \text{OUT} \land (\forall j \in \text{Adj}_i : \text{st}.j = \text{OUT}).
\]
\[
\text{REMOVABLE-DS}(i) \equiv \text{st}.i = \text{IN} \land (\forall j \in \text{Adj}_i \cup \{i\} : (j \neq i \land \text{st}.j = \text{IN}) \lor (\exists k \in \text{Adj}_j, k \neq i : \text{st}.k = \text{IN})).
\]
\[
\text{FORBIDDEN-DS}(i) \equiv \text{REMOVABLE-DS}(i) \land (\forall j \in \text{Adj}_i \land \text{adj}.i \equiv R \equiv \text{FORBIDDEN-DS}(j) \lor \text{id}.i > \text{id}.j).
\]

Rules for node $i$:
\[
\text{ADDABLE-DS}(i) \rightarrow \text{st}.i = \text{IN}. \text{ (phase 1)}
\]
\[
\text{FORBIDDEN-DS}(i) \rightarrow \text{st}.i = \text{OUT}. \text{ (phase 2)}
\]

If we only focus on phase 2, Algorithm 1 is a lattice linear algorithm, i.e. it behaves lattice linearly if the system is initialized in a state manifesting a valid dominating set, otherwise it is eventually lattice linear.

Example MDS continuation 2. To illustrate the partial order imposed by phase 2 of Algorithm 1, consider an example of graph $G_4$ containing four nodes connected in such a way that they form two disjoint edges, i.e. $V(G) = \{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4\}$ and $E(G) = \{\{v_1, v_2\}, \{v_3, v_4\}\}$. Assume that $G$ is initialized in a feasible state, sowe focus only on phase 2.

The lattices formed in this case are shown in Figure 2. We write a state $s$ of this graph as $(\text{st}.v_1, \text{st}.v_2, \text{st}.v_3, \text{st}.v_4)$. As shown this figure, a subset of the global states, i.e. only the feasible states, participate in the partial order.

![Fig. 1. Lattice for SMP with 3 men and 3 women; $\ell = (1, 1, 1)$ and $u = (3, 3, 3)$. Transitive edges are not shown for brevity.

![Fig. 2. The lattices induced in the problem instance in Example MDS continuation 2.](image-url)

Remark: Partial order imposed by Algorithm 1. In Algorithm 1, a subset of the state space forms multiple lattices. After the execution of phase 1, the algorithm locks into one
of these lattices. Thereafter in phase 2, the algorithm executes
lattice linearly to reach the supremum of that lattice. Since the
supremum of every lattice represents a minimal dominating
set, this algorithm will always converge to an optimal state.

IV. INTRODUCING FULLY LATTICE LINEAR ALGORITHMS:

Next, we discuss the gap between [1] and [2] to identify
the notion of fully lattice linear algorithms.

In [1], authors consider lattice linear problems. Here, the
state space is induced under a predicate and forms one lattice.
The algorithm follows that lattice to reach the one-and-only
optimal state.

The problems considered in [2], e.g. the minimal dominating
set, are not lattice linear; the respective algorithms from [2]
impose lattice linearity on a subset of the state space. In
algorithms in [2] induce multiple lattices in a subset of the
state space. For example, in Section IV-B, multiple lattices are
introduced in the subset of the state space where the selected
nodes form a (possibly suboptimal) dominating set.

Limitations of [1]: From the above discussion, we note
that the approach in [2] is more general and is applicable for
a wider class of problems. Also, many lattice linear problems
do not allow self-stabilization. In such cases, e.g. in SMP, if
algorithm starts in, e.g., the supremum of the lattice, then it
may terminate declaring that no solution is available. This
implies that unless the supremum is the optimal state, the
acting algorithm cannot be self-stabilizing.

Limitations of [2]: The approach in [2] suffers from two
issues. First, the lattice structure is imposed only on a subset of
states. Thus, by design, the algorithm has actions, say $A_1$, that
operate in the part of the state space where the lattice structure
does not exist, and actions, say $A_2$, that operate in the part
of the state space where the lattice is formed. Since actions
in $A_1$ are operating outside the lattice structure, the developer
has an extra proof obligation that they work correctly even if
they read old values of variables. Furthermore, a node does
not know if the current global state is in one of the lattices or
whether it is outside all the lattice structures. This means that
it is possible that node $i$ is executing an action in $A_2$ while
its neighbor is executing an action in $A_1$.

As an example, in MDS, actions in $A_1$ (phase 1 in Algorithm [1])
are those that add nodes to ensure that the set of selected
nodes form a valid dominating set whereas actions in $A_2$ (phase 2 in Algorithm [1])
are those that remove nodes from the dominating set to make the current set optimal. One
needs to perform additional work to ensure that the actions
in the latter set execute correctly while reading old values of
variables. Also, extra proof obligation is created to ensure that
actions in $A_2$ do not interfere with actions of $A_1$. Specifically,
one has to make sure that actions in $A_2$ do not perturb the node
to a state where the selected nodes do not form a dominating
set. If this were to happen, the resulting state would be one
that is outside the lattice structures. Therefore, all benefits of
the lattice structure could be lost.

Another issue in [2] is the absence of a deterministic
output. Specifically, if we run MDS on two different computer
systems, their output may differ, even if they start from the
same initial state. This is due to the fact that their computation
in the first phase (where nodes enter the dominating set to
form a valid dominating set) is non-deterministic. By contrast,
this is not observed in lattice linear problems. E.g., if we
independently run SMP on two different computer systems
then their output would be the same. A deterministic output
is important in various applications from mundane reasons
such as automating the grading of a programming assignment
to applications such as blockchains where the deterministic
output is used to validate the work done by others.

Overcoming limitations of [1] and [2]: In this paper, we
investigate if we can benefit from advantages of both [1] and
[2]. We study if there exist fully lattice linear algorithms where

- A partial order can be imposed on the reachable states.
- If multiple lattices are formed, it would be necessary that
  these structures are disjoint (no common states).
- Self-stabilization requires that these lattices are exhaus-
tive (i.e., their union is equal to the entire state space),
and every supremum is an optimal state.

This ensures that the initial state locks into one of the lattices
thereby ensuring deterministic output. If such algorithms can
be developed then this would guarantee deterministic output.
It would also permit multiple optimal states. There will be no
need to deal with interference between actions.

Definition 4. An algorithm $A$ is a lattice linear algorithm for
a problem $P$, represented by a predicate $\mathcal{P}$, iff it induces a
$<=$-lattice among the states of $S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_w (w \geq 1)$ such that

- State space $S$ of $P$ contains mutually disjoint lattices, i.e.
  - $S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_w \subseteq S$ are pairwise disjoint.
  - $S_1 \cup S_2, \ldots, \cup S_w$ contains all the reachable states.
- Lattice linearity is satisfied in each subset, i.e.,
  - $P$ requires that we reach a state where $\mathcal{P}$ is true
  - $\forall k, 1 \leq k \leq w, \mathcal{P}$ is lattice linear with respect to
    the partial order induced in $S_k$ by $A$, i.e. $\forall s \in S_k :$
    $\neg \mathcal{P}(s) \Rightarrow \exists i$ FORBIDDEN($i, s, \mathcal{P}$).
- Any move will make the system move up in the same
  lattice, i.e.,
    - Guards of $A$ check that $\mathcal{P}(s)$ is false, and if the
      execution of $A$ in state $s$ takes the system to $s'$ then
      $s$ and $s'$ are in the same lattice and $s < s'$, i.e.,
      $\forall s : (A(s) = s' \land s \neq s') \implies s < s'$.

Definition 5. Continuing from Definition 2 A is self-
stabilizing only if $S = S_1 \cup S_2, \ldots, \cup S_w$ and $\forall k : 1 \leq k \leq w,$
$\mathcal{P}(\text{supremum}(S_k)) = true.$

In this paper, we demonstrate that fully lattice linear
algorithms exist. Specifically, we present lattice linear self-
stabilizing algorithms for minimal dominating set (Section V)
and for graph colouring (Section VI) problems. In addition,
we present a lattice linear 2-approximation (not stabilizing)
algorithm for vertex cover (Section VII). This algorithm is the
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first parallel processing approximation algorithm developed under the paradigm of lattice linearity.

V. FULLY LATTICE LINEAR ALGORITHM FOR MINIMAL DOMINATING SET (MDS)

In this section, we present a lattice linear self-stabilizing algorithm for MDS. MDS has been defined in Example 2. We describe the algorithm as Algorithm 2.

In Algorithm 2 the first two macros are the same as Example 2. The definition of a node being forbidden (FORBIDDEN-II-DS(i)) is changed to make the algorithm fully lattice linear. Specifically, even allowing a node to enter into the DS is restricted such that only the nodes with the highest ID in their distance-2 neighbourhood can enter the DS. Any node i which is addable or removable will toggle its state iff it is forbidden, i.e. any other node j ∈ Adj

2

i : id.j > id.i is neither addable nor removable. In the case that i is forbidden, if i is addable, then we call it addable-forbidden, if it is removable, then we call it removable-forbidden.

Algorithm 2. Algorithm for MDS.

\[
\text{REMOVABLE-DS}(i) \equiv st.i = IN \land (∀j \in Adj_i \cup \{i\} : \\
((j \neq i \land st.j = IN) \lor \\
(k \in Adj_j, k \neq i : st.k = IN))).
\]

\[
\text{ADDABLE-DS}(i) \equiv st.i = OUT \land (∀j \in Adj_i : st.j = OUT).
\]

\[
\text{UNSATISFIED-DS}(i) \equiv \text{REMOVABLE-DS}(i) \lor \\
\text{ADDABLE-DS}(i).
\]

\[
\text{FORBIDDEN-II-DS}(i) \equiv \text{UNSATISFIED-DS}(i) \land \\
(∀j \in Adj_i^2 : \lnot \text{UNSATISFIED-DS}(j) \land \\
id.j > id.i).
\]

Rules for node i.

\[
\text{FORBIDDEN-II-DS}(i) \rightarrow st.i = \lnot st.i.
\]

To demonstrate that Algorithm 2 is lattice linear, we define state value and rank as follows:

\[
\text{STATE-VALUE-DS}(i, s) = \\
\begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if UNSATISFIED-DS}(i) \text{ in state } s \\
0 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

\[
\text{RANK-DS}(s) = \sum_{i \in V(G)} \text{STATE-VALUE-DS}(i, s).
\]

To understand the lattice imposed by Algorithm 2, we need to consider STATE-VALUE-DS(i, s) as an auxiliary variable associated with node i. The lattice is formed with respect to this variable: STATE-VALUE-DS(i, s) can change from 1 to 0 but not vice versa. Hence, the lattices imposed by Algorithm 2 have the property that RANK-DS always decreases until it becomes zero. At the supremum of a lattice, this value is 0.

Lemma 1. Any node in an input graph does not revisit its older state while executing under Algorithm 2.

Proof. Let s be the state at time step t while Algorithm 2 is executing. We have from Algorithm 2 that if a node i is addable-forbidden or removable-forbidden, then no other node in Adj

2

i changes its state.

If i is addable-forbidden at t, then any other node in Adj

i is out of the DS. After when i moves in, then any other node in Adj

i is no longer addable, so they do not move in after t. As a result i does not have to move out after moving in.

If otherwise i is removable-forbidden at t, then all the nodes in Adj

i are being dominated by some node other than i. So after when i moves out, then none of the nodes in Adj

i becomes unsatisfied. Also, the nodes in Adj

2

i do not change their state unless i changes its state.

Let that i is dominated and out, and some j ∈ Adj

i is removable-forbidden. j will change its state to OUT only if i is being covered by another node. Also, while j turns out of the DS, no other node in Adj

2

i, and consequently in Adj

i, changes its state. As a result i does not have to turn itself in because of the action of j.

From the above cases, we have that i does not change its state to st. i after changing its state from st. i to st’. i throughout the execution of Algorithm 2.

Theorem 1. Algorithm 2 is self-stabilizing and lattice linear.

Proof. We have from the proof of Lemma 1 that if G is in state s and RANK-DS(s) is non-zero, then at least one node will be forbidden. For any node i, we have that STATE-VALUE-DS(i) decreases whenever i is forbidden and never increases. So RANK-DS monotonously decreases throughout the execution of the algorithm until it becomes zero. This shows that Algorithm 2 is self-stabilizing.

Next, we show that Algorithm 2 is fully lattice linear. We claim that there is one lattice corresponding to each optimal state. If so there are w optimal states for a given instance, then there are w disjoint lattices S

1

, S

2

, · · · , S

w

formed in the state space S. We show this as follows.

We observe that an optimal set (where minimal dominating set has been found) is at the supremum of its respective lattice, as there are no outgoing transitions from an optimal state.

Furthermore, given a state s, we can uniquely determine the optimal dominating state, say s

opt

, that would be reached from s. This is because in any given non-optimal state, there will be some forbidden nodes. The non-forbidden nodes will not move even if they are unsatisfied. Hence the forbidden nodes can be uniquely identified, the optimal state reached from a given state s can also be uniquely identified.

This implies that starting from a state s in S

k

(1 ≤ k ≤ w), the algorithm cannot converge to any state other than the supremum of S

k

. This implies that the state space of the problem is partitioned into S

1

, S

2

, · · · , S

w

where each subset S

k

contains one optimal state, say s

k

opt

, and from all states in S

k

, the algorithm converges to s

k

opt

.

Each subset, S

1

, S

2

, · · · , S

w

forms a < - lattice where s[i] < s'[i] iff STATE-VALUE-DS(i, s) > STATE-VALUE-DS(i, s') and s < s' iff RANK-DS(s) > RANK-DS(s'). This shows that Algorithm 2 is lattice linear.
Example MDS continuation 3. For $G_4$ the lattices induced under Algorithm 2 are shown in Figure 4, each vector represents a global state $(s.t.v_1, s.t.v_2, s.t.v_3, s.t.v_4)$.

![Diagram of lattices induced by Algorithm 2](image)

To demonstrate that Algorithm 3 is lattice linear, we define the state value and rank as follows.

$$
\text{STATE-VALUE-GC}(i, s) = \begin{cases} 
\text{deg}(i) + 2 & \text{if UNSATISFIED-GC}(i) \in \text{state } s \\
\text{colour}.i & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
$$

$$
\text{RANK-GC}(s) = \sum_{i \in V(G)} \text{STATE-VALUE-GC}(i, s)
$$

Similar to the proof elaborated in Section V in order to understand the lattice imposed by Algorithm 3, we need to consider STATE-VALUE-GC($i, s$) as an auxiliary variable associated with node $i$. STATE-VALUE-GC($i, s$) can be initialized at a value anywhere from 1 to \(\text{deg}(i) + 2\), depending on the initial colour of $i$. The lattice is formed with respect to this variable: STATE-VALUE-GC($i, s$) monotonically decreases until $i$ is not forbidden. Hence, the lattices imposed by Algorithm 3 have the property that RANK-DS always decreases until no node is forbidden.

Lemma 2. For any node in an input graph executing under Algorithm 3 its colour value never increases.

Proof. Let $s$ be the state at a time step $t$ while Algorithm 3 is executing. We have from Algorithm 3 that if a node $i$ is forbidden, then no node in $\text{Adj}_i$ changes its state.

In any action, $i$ cannot change to a colour value more than \(\text{deg}(i) + 1\). If $i$ is conflict-forbidden, then it changes its colour and obtains the minimum available colour. If otherwise $i$ is reducible-forbidden, then we have that it changes its colour to a value less than its current value. In both these cases, $i$ does not face any conflict with any node in $\text{Adj}_i$ after when it changes its state. From these observations, we have that the state value of $i$ monotonously decreases.

Theorem 2. Algorithm 3 is self-stabilizing and lattice linear.

Proof. From the proof of Lemma 2 we have that for any node $i$, we have that STATE-VALUE-GC($i$) decreases when $i$ is forbidden and never increases. So RANK-GC($G$) monotonously decreases until no node is forbidden. This shows that Algorithm 3 is self-stabilizing.

Algorithm 3 exhibits properties similar to Algorithm 2 which are elaborated in the proof for its lattice linearity in Theorem 1. From there, we obtain that Algorithm 3 also is lattice linear.

VI. FULLY LATTICE LINEAR ALGORITHM FOR GRAPH COLOURING (GC)

In this section, we present a lattice linear self-stabilizing algorithm for graph colouring.

Definition 6. Graph colouring: In the GC problem, the input is a graph $G$ with possibly some initial colouring assignment $\forall i \in V(G): \text{colour}.i \in \mathbb{N}$. The task is to (re)assign the colour values to each node such that there should be no conflict between adjacent nodes, i.e. $\forall i \in V(G), \forall j \in \text{Adj}_i: \text{colour}.i \neq \text{colour}.j$, and there should not be an assignment such that it can be reduced without conflict, i.e. $\forall i \in V(G), \forall c < \text{colour}.i, \exists j \in \text{Adj}_i: c = \text{colour}.j$.

We describe the algorithm as Algorithm 3. Any node $i$ which has a conflicting colour with any of its neighbours, or if its colour value is reducible, is an unsatisfied node. A node having a conflicting or reducible colour changes its colour to the lowest non-conflicting value if it is forbidden, i.e. any $j \in \text{Adj}_i: id.j > id.i$ is not unsatisfied. In the case that $i$ is forbidden, if $i$ has a conflict with any of its neighbours, then we call it conflict-forbidden, if its colour is reducible, then we call it reducible-forbidden.

Algorithm 3. Algorithm for GC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule for node $i$.</th>
<th>Conflicted-GC($i$) $\equiv \exists j \in \text{Adj}_i: \text{colour}.j = \text{colour}.i$.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REDUCIBLE-GC($i$) $\equiv \exists \exists c \in \mathbb{N}, c &lt; \text{colour}.i: (\forall j \in \text{Adj}_i: c \neq \text{colour}.j)$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNSATISFIED-GC($i$) $\equiv \text{CONFLICTED-GC}(i) \lor \text{REDUCIBLE-GC}(i)$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FORBIDDEN-GC($i$) $\equiv \text{UNSATISFIED-GC}(i) \land (\forall j \in \text{Adj}_i: \neg \text{UNSATISFIED-GC}(j) \land \forall i.d.i &gt; i.d.j)$.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rules for node $i$.

FORBIDDEN-GC($i$) $\rightarrow \text{colour}.i = \min\{c \in \mathbb{N}: \forall j \in \text{Adj}_i, c \neq \text{colour}.j\}$. 

VII. LATTICE LINEAR 2-APPROXIMATION ALGORITHM FOR VERTEX COVER

It is highly alluring to develop parallel processing approximation algorithms for NP-Hard problems under the paradigm of lattice linearity. In fact, it has been an open question if this is possible [1]. We observe that this is possible. In this section, we present a lattice linear 2-approximation algorithm for VC.

The following algorithm is the classic 2-approximation algorithm for VC. Choose an uncovered edge $\{A, B\}$, select both $A$ and $B$, repeat until all edges are covered. Since the
minimum VC must contain either A or B, the selected VC is at most twice the size of the minimum VC.

While the above algorithm is sequential in nature, we demonstrate that we can transform it into a distributed algorithm under paradigm of lattice linearity as shown in Algorithm 4 (we note that this algorithm is not self-stabilizing). The symbol ‘⊤’ stands for null.

Algorithm 4. A 2-approximation lattice linear algorithm for VC.

Init: ∀i ∈ V(G), st.i = OUT, done.i = false.
FORBIDDEN-VC(i) ≡ done.i = false ∧ (∀j ∈ Adj^3_i : id.j < id.i ∨ done.j = true).

Rules for node i.
FORBIDDEN-VC(i) →
if ∀k ∈ Adj_i, st.k = IN, then done.i = true.
else, then
j = arg max{id.x : x ∈ Adj_i ∧ done.x = false}, st.i = IN.
if j ≠ ⊤, then st.j = IN, done.j = true.
done.i = true.

Observe that the action of node i is looking at the edge {i, j} and adding i and j to the VC. This follows straightforwardly from the classic 2-approximation algorithm.

A. Lattice Linearity of Algorithm 4

To demonstrate that Algorithm 4 is lattice linear, we define the state value and rank as follows.

STATE-VALUE-VC(i, s) =
\[
\begin{cases}
|\{j ∈ Adj_i : st.s[j] = OUT\}| & \text{if } st.s[i] = OUT \\
0 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

RANK-VC(s) = \sum_{i ∈ V(G)} STATE-VALUE-VC(i, s).

Similar to the proofs elaborated in Section V and Appendix VI, in order to understand the lattice imposed by Algorithm 4, we need to consider STATE-VALUE-VC(i, s) as an auxiliary variable associated with node i. STATE-VALUE-VC(i, s) is initialized at a value equal to the degree of i. Then, as Algorithm 4 executes, STATE-VALUE-VC(i, s) monotonically decreases until it becomes zero. Hence, the lattices imposed by Algorithm 4 have the property that RANK-VC always decreases until it becomes zero.

In the following theorem, we explore the lattice linearity and 2-approximability of Algorithm 4.

Theorem 3. Algorithm 4 is a lattice linear 2-approximation algorithm for VC.

Proof. Lattice linearity: We have that the initial state is where every node i has done.i = false and st.i = OUT. Let s be an arbitrary state at the beginning of some time step while the algorithm is under execution such that s does not manifest a vertex cover. Let i be the node such that i is of the highest ID in its distance 3 neighbourhood such that some of its edges are not covered. Also, let j be the node of highest ID in Adj_i for which done.j = false, if one such node exists. We have that i is the only forbidden node in its distance-3 neighbourhood, and j is the only additional node, which i can turn in. This forms a partial order among the states where state s transitions to another state s’ where s < s’ and for any such i, st.s'[i] = IN, done.s'[i] = true and st.s'[j] = IN ∧ done.s'[j] = true.

If s manifests a vertex cover, then no additional nodes will be turned in, and atmost one additional node (node i, as described in the paragraph above) will have done.s'[i] = true.

From these observations, we have that Algorithm 4 exhibits properties similar to Algorithm 2 which are elaborated in the proof for its lattice linearity in Theorem 1; however it induces only one lattice in the state space since the initial state is predetermined, and so w = 1. From there, we obtain that Algorithm 4 also is lattice linear.

2-approximability: If some node k (at a distance farther than 3 from i) executes and selects k' ∈ Adj_i, to turn in, and then neither i nor j cannot be a neigbour of k or k'. Thus for any pair of edges that are selected together, they will not have a common node, and none of their nodes will be adjacent. This shows that Algorithm 4 preserves the 2-approximability of the classic 2-approximation algorithm for VC.

In Algorithm 4, local state of any node i is represented by two variables done.i and st.i. Observe that in this algorithm, the definition of a node being forbidden depends on done.i and not st.i. Therefore the transitions and consequently the lattice depends on done.i. Hence, the effective number of independent variables in each node according to Corollary 1 is 1 whose domain is of size 2. Therefore, we have Corollary 6 as follows.

In this algorithm, a node i makes changes to the variables of another node j, which is, in general, not allowed in a distributed system. We observe that this algorithm can be transformed into a lattice linear distributed system algorithm where any node only makes changes to its own variables. We describe the transformed algorithm in the following subsection.

B. Distributed Version of Algorithm 4

In Algorithm 4, we presented a 2-approximation lattice linear algorithm for VC. In this algorithm, states of two nodes i and j was changed in the same action.

Here, we present a mapping of that algorithm where i and j change their states separately. The key idea of this algorithm is when i intends to add j to the VC, point.i is set to j. When i is pointing to j, j has to execute and add itself to the VC. Thus, the transformed algorithm is as shown in Algorithm 5.

Algorithm 5. Algorithm 4 transformed where every node modifies only its own variables.

Init: ∀i ∈ V(G), st.i = OUT, done.i = false, point.i = ⊤.
ELSE-POINTED(i) ≡ ∃j ∈ Adj^4_i : \exists k ∈ Adj_j, k ≠ i :
point.k = j ∧ done.j = false.
Proof. Assume for contradiction that the underlying algorithm converges in \( x \geq n \times (m-1)+1 \) moves. This implies, by pigeonhole principle, that at least one of the nodes \( i \) is revising their states \( st.i \) after changing to \( st'.i \). If \( st.i \) to \( st'.i \) is a step ahead transition for \( i \), then \( st'.i \) to \( st.i \) is a step back transition for \( i \) and vice versa. For a system containing a lattice linear state space, we obtain a contradiction since step back actions are absent in such systems.

Example MDS continuation 4. Consider phase 2 of Algorithm \[2\]. As discussed earlier, execution of phase 2 is lattice linear. The domain of each process \( \{IN, OUT\} \) is of size 2. Hence, phase 2 of Algorithm \[2\] requires at most \( n \times (2-1) = n \) moves. (Phase 1 also requires at most \( n \) moves. But this fact is not relevant to the above theorem.)

Corollary 1. Let that the nodes are multivariable. Let that in each node, atmost \( r \) of these variables, \( \text{var}_1.i, \ldots, \text{var}_r.i \) (with domain sizes \( n_1' \), \ldots, \( n_r' \)) respectively contribute independently to the formation of the lattice. Then the LLTS will converge in \( n \times \left( \sum_{j=1}^{r} (m_j' - 1) \right) \) moves.

Corollary 2. (From Theorem \[7\] and Theorem \[4\]) Algorithm \[2\] converges in \( n \) moves.

Corollary 3. (From Theorem \[2\] and Theorem \[4\]) Algorithm \[2\] converges in \( \sum_{i \in V(G)} \deg(i) + 1 = n + 2m \) moves.

Corollary 4. (From Theorem \[3\] and Corollary \[7\]) Algorithm \[2\] converges in \( n \) moves.

IX. RELATED WORK

Lattice theory: In [1], the authors have studied lattice linear problems which possess a predicate under which the states naturally form a lattice among all states. Problems like the stable marriage problem, job scheduling, market clearing price and others are studied in [1]. In [3] and [4], the authors have studied lattice linearity in, respectively, housing market problem and several dynamic programming problems.

In [2], the authors have extended the theory presented in [1] to develop eventually lattice linear self-stabilizing algorithms for some non-lattice linear problems. Such algorithms impose a lattice among the subset of the state space.

In this paper, we developed (fully) lattice linear algorithms that induce a lattice among all reachable states in non-lattice linear problems.

Dominating set: Self-stabilizing algorithms for the minimal dominating set problem have been proposed in several works in the literature, for example, in [9–10]. The best convergence time among these works is \( 4n \) moves. The eventually lattice linear algorithm presented in [2] for a more generalized version, i.e. the service demand based MDS problem, takes \( 2n \) moves to converge.

In this paper, the fully lattice linear algorithm that we present converges in \( n \) moves and is fully tolerant to consistency violations. This is an improvement as compared to the results presented in the literature.

Colouring: Self-stabilizing algorithms for decentralized (where nodes only read from their immediate neighbouring) graph colouring have been presented in [2], [11–18]. The best convergence time among these algorithms is \( n \times \Delta \) moves, where \( \Delta \) is the maximum degree of the input graph.
The fully lattice linear algorithm for graph colouring that we present is decentralized and converges in $n+2m$ moves and is fully tolerant to consistency violations. This is an improvement to the results presented in the literature.

X. Conclusion

In this paper, we focused on lattice linear problems and algorithms. Lattice linear problems [1] exhibit a lattice among the states, which allows more efficient execution of algorithms in concurrent systems [1]. If the problem does not provide a lattice structure, the lattice structure can be induced by constraints imposed by the underlying algorithm. In [2] eventually lattice linear algorithms were introduced where the lattice structure exists in a subset of the state space.

We bridge the gap between lattice linear problems of [1] and eventually lattice linear algorithms of [2] by introducing fully lattice linear algorithms. Unlike [1], here the lattice structure is not imposed by the problem but by the algorithm. Furthermore, unlike [2], lattice is formed among all reachable states in the state space rather than just a subset of states. We demonstrated the existence of fully lattice linear self-stabilizing algorithms by presenting algorithms for minimal dominating set (MDS) and graph colouring (GC).

Fully lattice linear algorithms presented in this paper overcome the limitations of [1] and [2] while keeping their key benefits. Fully lattice linear algorithms can be developed even for problems that are not lattice linear. This overcomes a key limitation of [1] where problems such as dominating set, colouring are not lattice linear. Specifically, since the lattice structures exist in the entire (reachable) state space, there are no actions that execute outside the lattice structures. This overcomes a limitation of [2]. Fully lattice linear algorithms can have a deterministic output (if action of each node does not involve non-determinism). This benefit of [1] (that was lost in [2]) is preserved in fully lattice linear algorithms. Finally, fully lattice linear algorithms preserve a key benefit of [1], [2] that the computation is guaranteed to be correct even if a process is reading old information in its execution. Hence, these programs will not have an overhead of synchronization.

We analyzed the time complexity bounds of an algorithm traversing a lattice of states (whether present naturally in the problem or imposed by the algorithm).

One interesting observation about the lattice linear self-stabilizing algorithms is that the supremum in each lattice is an optimal state. This is not true for (non-stabilizing) algorithms for lattice linear problems in [1].

Finally, it remains an open question as to whether fully lattice linear algorithms can be developed for minimal vertex cover and maximal independent set problems even though eventually lattice linear algorithms exist them [2]. Another open question is if lattice linear self-stabilizing 2-approximation algorithm for vertex cover can be developed.
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