

Fault-Induced Dynamics of Oblivious Robots on a Line *

Jean-Lou De Carufel [†], Paola Flocchini[†]

[†] University of Ottawa, Canada. {jdecaruf,paola.flocchini}@uottawa.ca

Abstract

The study of computing in presence of faulty robots in the LOOK-COMPUTE-MOVE model has been the object of extensive investigation, typically with the goal of designing algorithms tolerant to as many faults as possible.

In this paper, we initiate a new line of investigation on the presence of faults, focusing on a rather different issue. We are interested in understanding the dynamics of a group of robots when they execute an algorithm designed for a fault-free environment, in presence of some undetectable crashed robots. We start this investigation focusing on the classic point-convergence algorithm by Ando et al. [2] for robots with limited visibility, in a simple setting (which already presents serious challenges): the robots operate fully synchronously on a line, and at most two of them are faulty. Interestingly, and perhaps surprisingly, the presence of faults induces the robots to perform some form of *scattering*, rather than *point-convergence*. In fact, we discover that they arrange themselves inside the segment delimited by the two faults in interleaved sequences of equidistant robots. The structure that they form has a hierarchical nature: robots organize themselves in groups where a group of some level converges to an equidistant distribution only after all groups of lower levels have converged.

This is the first study on the unintended dynamics of oblivious robots induced by the presence of faults.

1 Introduction

Consider a group of robots represented as points, which operate in a continuous space according to the LOOK-COMPUTE-MOVE model [16]: when active, a robot LOOKS the environment obtaining a snapshot of the positions of the other robots, it COMPUTES a destination point on the basis of such a snapshot, and it MOVES there. As typically assumed by the model, the robots are *anonymous* (i.e., they are identical), *autonomous* (without central or external control), *oblivious* (they have no memory of past activations), *disoriented* (they do not agree on a common coordinate systems), *silent* (they have no means of explicit communication). These systems of autonomous robots have been extensively investigated under different assumptions on the various model parameters (different levels of synchrony, level of agreement on the coordinate system, etc.), and most algorithms in the literature are designed for fault-free groups of robots (e.g., see [7, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19, 20, 21]).

There are several studies that consider the presence of faults: crashes (robots that are never activated) or byzantine (robots that behave differently than intended). The goal, in these cases, has been to design fault-tolerant algorithms focusing on the maximum amount of faults that can be tolerated for a solution to exist in a given model (e.g., see [1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10]). For a detailed account of the current investigations see [10].

*This work has been supported in part by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada through the Discovery Grant program; by Prof. Flocchini's University Research Chair.

In this paper, we consider a rather different question in presence of faulty robots that has never been asked before. Given an algorithm designed to achieve a certain global goal by a group of fault-free robots, what is the behaviour of the robots in presence of crash faults ? Clearly, in most cases, the original goal is not achieved, but the theoretical interest is in characterizing the dynamics of the non-faulty robots induced by the presence of the faulty ones, from arbitrary initial configurations.

We start this new line of investigation focusing on the classic point-convergence algorithm by Ando et al. [2] for robots with limited visibility, and considering one of the simplest possible settings, which already proves to be challenging: fully synchronous robots (FSYNCH) moving in a 1-dimensional space (a line), in presence of at most two faults. In a line, the convergence algorithm prescribes each robot to move to the center of the two farthest visible robots and, in absence of faults, starting from a configuration where the robots’ “visibility graph” is connected, the robots are guaranteed to converge toward a point. It is not difficult to see that with a single fault in the system, the robots successfully converge toward the faulty robot. The presence of multiple faults, however, gives rise to intricate dynamics, and the analysis of the robots behaviour is already quite complex with just two faults.

Interestingly, and perhaps surprisingly, the presence of faults induces the robots to perform some form of *scattering*, rather than *gathering*. In fact, we discover that they arrange themselves inside the segment delimited by the two faults in interleaved sequences composed of equidistant robots. The structure that they form has a hierarchical nature: robots organize themselves in groups where a group of some level converges to an equidistant distribution between the first and the last robots of that group, only after all groups of lower levels have converged. Also interesting to note is the rather different dynamics that arises when moving to the middle between two robots, depending on the choice of the robots: when considering the *closest* neighbours, the result is an equidistant distribution (scattering algorithm of [13]), when instead selecting the *farthest* robots the result is a more complex structure of sequences of robots, each converging to an equidistant distribution. The main difficulty of our analysis is to show that the robots indeed form this special combination of sequences: the convergence of each sequence is then derived from a generalization of the result by [13].

Finally observe that the 2-dimensional case has a rather different nature. In fact, in contrast to the 1-dimensional setting, where any initial configuration converges toward a pattern, when robots move on the plane oscillations are possible, even with just two faults. The investigation of this case is left for future study.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Model and Notation

Let X denote a set of identical robots moving on a line, simultaneously activated in synchronous time steps according to the LOOK-COMPUTE-MOVE model. At each activation, the robots “see” the positions of the ones that are visible to them (each robot can see up to a fixed distance V), they all compute a destination point, and they move to that point. The robots are oblivious in the sense that the computation at time t solely depends on the positions of the robots perceived at that step. We assume that two robots are permanently faulty and do not participate in any activity; their faulty status, however, is not visible and they appear identical to the others.

Let x denote robot a $x \in X$ and $x(t)$ its position at time t with respect to the leftmost faulty robot, which is considered to be at position 0 on the real axis. Let $X(t) = \{x_0(t), x_1(t), \dots, x_n(t)\}$ denote the *configuration* of robots at time t . With an abuse of notation $x(t)$ may indicate both the robot itself and its position at time t . Robots do not necessarily occupy distinct positions. For

instance we might have $x_i(t) = x_j(t)$ where $0 \leq i, j \leq n$ are two different indices. Note however that non-faulty robots in the same position behave in the same way and can be considered as a single one. Indeed, when non-faulty robots end up in the same position, we say that they “merge” and from that moment on they will be considered as one.

Throughout the paper, we suppose that x_0 is the leftmost faulty robot and x_n is the rightmost faulty robot. Therefore, for all $t \geq 0$, we have $x_0(t) = 0$ and $x_n(t)$ is equal to some positive fixed position on the real axis.

We denote the distance between robots x and y at time t by $|x(t) - y(t)|$. We denote by $[\alpha, \beta]$ the interval of real numbers starting at $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and ending at $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, where $\alpha \leq \beta$. Let $N(x(t))$ be the set of robots visible by x at time t . In other words, for all $y \in N(x(t))$, $|x(t) - y(t)| \leq V$. Let $r(x(t))$ (respectively $l(x(t))$) denote the rightmost (respectively the leftmost) visible robot from robot x at time t .

We say that a configuration of robots $X = \{x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ converges to a pattern $P = \{p_0, p_1, \dots, p_n\}$ if for all $0 \leq i \leq n$, $x_i(t) \rightarrow p_i$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

2.2 Point-Convergence

A classical problem for oblivious robots is gathering: the robots, initially placed in arbitrary positions, need to find themselves on the same point, not established a-priori. The convergence version of the problem requires the robots to converge toward a point. A solution to this problem is given by the well known algorithm by Ando et al. [2]. The algorithm achieves convergence to a point, not only in synchronous systems, but also when at each time step, only a subset of the robots is activated (semi-synchronous scheduler SSYNCH), as long as every robot is activated infinitely often.

CONVERGENCE2D [2] (for robot x_i)

- $\forall x_j \in N(x_i) \setminus \{x_i\}$,
 - $d_j := \text{dist}(x_i, x_j)$,
 - $\theta_j := c_i \hat{x}_i x_j$,
 - $l_j := (d_j/2) \cos \theta_j + \sqrt{(V/2)^2 - ((d_j/2) \sin \theta_j)^2}$,
- $limit := \min_{x_j \in \mathcal{R}_i(t) \setminus \{x_i\}} \{l_j\}$,
- $goal := \text{dist}(x_i, c_i)$,
- $D := \min\{goal, limit\}$,
- $p :=$ point on $\overline{x_i c_i}$ at distance D from x_i .
- Move towards p .

Robots are initially placed in arbitrary positions in a 2-dimensional space, with limited visibility. Let $SC_i(t)$ denotes the smallest enclosing circle of the positions of robots in $\mathcal{R}(t)$ seen by x_i ; let $c_i(t)$ be the center of $SC_i(t)$. According to the algorithm, x_i moves toward $c_i(t)$, but only up to a certain distance. Specifically, its destination is the point on the segment $\overline{x_i(t)c_i(t)}$ that is closest to $c_i(t)$ and that satisfies the following condition: For every robot $x_j \in N(x_i(t))$, p lies in the disk \mathcal{C}_i whose center is the midpoint of $x_i(t)$ and $x_j(t)$, and whose radius is $V/2$. This condition ensures that x_i and x_j will still be visible after the movement of x_i , and possibly of x_j .

The 1-Dimensional Case. Consider now the same algorithm in the particular case of a one-dimensional setting where the space where the robots can move is a line. In this setting, the

algorithm (CONVERGENCE1D) becomes quite simple because the smallest enclosing circle of the visible robots is the segment delimited by the two farthest apart robot, and a robots moves to occupy the mid-point between those two robots.

CONVERGENCE1D (for robot x_i at time step t)

- Let $l(x_i(t))$ and $r(x_i(t))$ be the farthest visible robots.
- move to the midpoint between $l(x_i(t))$ and $r(x_i(t))$.

Theorem 1. [2] *Executing Algorithm CONVERGENCE1D in FSYNCH or SSYNCH, the robots converge to a point.*

2.3 Spreading on a line

In [9], a classical spreading algorithm for robots in 1-dimensional systems has been analyzed both in FSYNCH and SSYNCH. A variant of this result, which is derived below, will be used in the paper when proving convergence to a pattern.

Consider a set of oblivious robots $X = \{x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ on a line that follow the LOOK-COMPUTE-MOVE model, where x_0 and x_n do not move (equivalently, this can be considered as a segment delimited by the positions of x_0 and x_n). Let $|x_0(0), x_n(0)| = D$. The robots have *neighbouring visibility*, which means that they are able to see the two closest robots (while x_0 and x_n know they are the delimiters of the segment). The algorithm of [9] (SPREADING) makes the robot converge to a configuration where the distance between consecutive robots tends to $\frac{D}{n}$ by having the extremal robots never move and the others move to the middle point between the two neighbouring robots.

SPREADING (for robot x_i at time step t)

- If I am an extremal robot: do nothing.
- Let $x_i(t)^-$ and $x_i(t)^+$ be the closest visible robots.
- move to the midpoint between $x_i(t)^-$ and $x_i(t)^+$.

Theorem 2. [9] *Executing Algorithm SPREADING in FSYNCH or in SSYNCH on the set of robots R where the first and the last robots do not move, the robots converge to equidistant positions.*

We now prove that, in FSYNCH, convergence is achieved using the same algorithm also in a slightly different setting. In fact, we consider the case when x_0 and x_n are not still, but they are each converging towards a point. The generalization to this case is not straightforward.

Theorem 3. *Let $X = \{x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ where $x_0(t) \rightarrow x'_0$ and $x_n(t) \rightarrow x'_n$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Executing Algorithm SPREADING in FSYNCH on the set of robots $\{x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}\}$, the robots converge to equidistant positions between x'_0 and x'_n .*

Proof. Without loss of generality, suppose that $x'_0 = 0$ and $x'_n = 1$. We want to prove that $x_i(t) \rightarrow \frac{i}{n}$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. We follow the proof of Theorem 2. For all $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, the next position of $x_i(t)$ is

$$x_i(t+1) = \frac{x_{i-1}(t) + x_{i+1}(t)}{2}.$$

Let $\eta_i(t) = x_i(t) - \frac{i}{n}$ for all $0 \leq i \leq n$. We get

$$\eta_i(t+1) = \frac{\eta_{i-1}(t) + \eta_{i+1}(t)}{2}$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. Our goal is to show that $\eta_i(t) \rightarrow 0$ for all $0 \leq i \leq n$. By the hypothesis, we already know that $\eta_0(t) \rightarrow 0$ and $\eta_n(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. The fact that $\eta_i(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ relies on the following lemma. \square

The following lemma is a generalization of a result by Cohen and Peleg [9].

Lemma 4. *Let $\eta_i(t)$ be a sequence of real numbers for all $0 \leq i \leq m$, where $m \geq 2$ is an integer. Suppose that*

$$\eta_i(t+1) \leq \frac{\eta_{i-1}(t) + \eta_{i+1}(t)}{2}$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq m-1$ and for all $t \geq 0$, and $\eta_0(t) \rightarrow 0$ and $\eta_m(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, suppose that there exists a positive real number M such that $|\eta_i(t)| \leq M$ for all $0 \leq i \leq m$ and for all $t \geq 0$. Then, for all $0 \leq i \leq m$, $\eta_i(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. We show that for all $0 \leq i \leq m$, $\eta_i(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. By definition, this is true for $i \in \{0, m\}$. To deal with other values of i , let

$$\psi(t) = \sum_{i=0}^m \eta_i^2(t).$$

We show that $\psi(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, which completes the proof. Following the same approach as the one used in the proof of Theorem 2, we use the Fourier sine series of $\eta_i(t)$. However, in our case, we need to be careful since $\eta_0(t)$ and $\eta_m(t)$ are not necessarily equal to 0. Let

$$g(i, k) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{m}} \sin\left(\frac{ki\pi}{m}\right),$$

$$\mu_k = \sum_{i=0}^m \eta_i g(i, k).$$

We have

$$\eta_i = \sum_{k=0}^m \mu_k g(i, k)$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq m-1$. Moreover, we have

$$g(0, k) = g(m, k) = 0$$

for all $0 \leq k \leq m$, from which

$$\sum_{k=0}^m \mu_k g(0, k) = \sum_{k=0}^m \mu_k g(m, k) = 0.$$

Notice that

$$\sum_{i=0}^m g(i, k) g(i, q) = \delta_{k, q},$$

where $\delta_{k, q}$ stands for the Kronecker's delta, i.e., $\delta_{k, q} = 1$ if $k = q$ and 0 otherwise. Moreover, observe that for all $0 \leq k \leq m$,

$$|\mu_k| = \left| \sum_{i=0}^m \eta_i g(i, k) \right| = \left| \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \eta_i g(i, k) \right| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} |\eta_i g(i, k)| \leq (m-1) \sqrt{\frac{2}{m}} M \leq \sqrt{2m} M.$$

Since $\eta_0(t) \rightarrow 0$ and $\eta_m(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, for all $\epsilon > 0$, there is a time $t_0 \geq 0$ such that $|\eta_0(t)| < \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\epsilon$ and $|\eta_m(t)| < \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\epsilon$ for all $t \geq t_0$. Therefore, for all $t \geq t_0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi(t) &= \sum_{i=0}^m \eta_i^2(t) \\
&\leq \epsilon^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \eta_i^2(t) \\
&= \epsilon^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \left(\sqrt{\frac{2}{m}} \sum_{k=0}^m \mu_k(t) \sin\left(\frac{ki\pi}{m}\right) \right)^2 \\
&= \epsilon^2 + \sum_{i=0}^m \left(\sqrt{\frac{2}{m}} \sum_{k=0}^m \mu_k(t) \sin\left(\frac{ki\pi}{m}\right) \right)^2 \\
&= \epsilon^2 + \sum_{i=0}^m \left(\sum_{k=0}^m \sqrt{\frac{2}{m}} \mu_k(t) \sin\left(\frac{ki\pi}{m}\right) \right)^2 \\
&= \epsilon^2 + \sum_{i=0}^m \sum_{k=0}^m \sum_{q=0}^m \left(\sqrt{\frac{2}{m}} \mu_k(t) \sin\left(\frac{ki\pi}{m}\right) \right) \left(\sqrt{\frac{2}{m}} \mu_q(t) \sin\left(\frac{qi\pi}{m}\right) \right) \\
&= \epsilon^2 + \sum_{k=0}^m \sum_{q=0}^m \mu_k(t) \mu_q(t) \sum_{i=0}^m \left(\sqrt{\frac{2}{m}} \sin\left(\frac{ki\pi}{m}\right) \right) \left(\sqrt{\frac{2}{m}} \sin\left(\frac{qi\pi}{m}\right) \right) \\
&= \epsilon^2 + \sum_{k=0}^m \sum_{q=0}^m \mu_k(t) \mu_q(t) \sum_{i=0}^m g(i, k) g(i, q) \\
&= \epsilon^2 + \sum_{k=0}^m \sum_{q=0}^m \mu_k(t) \mu_q(t) \delta_{k, q} \\
&= \epsilon^2 + \sum_{k=0}^m \mu_k^2(t).
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for $1 \leq k \leq m-1$ (since by definition, $\mu_0(t+1) = \mu_m(t+1) = 0$), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mu_k(t+1) \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^m \sqrt{\frac{2}{m}} \sin\left(\frac{ki\pi}{m}\right) \eta_i(t+1) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \sqrt{\frac{2}{m}} \sin\left(\frac{ki\pi}{m}\right) \eta_i(t+1) \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \sqrt{\frac{2}{m}} \sin\left(\frac{ki\pi}{m}\right) \frac{\eta_{i-1}(t) + \eta_{i+1}(t)}{2} \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{m-2} \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{2}{m}} \sin\left(\frac{k(i+1)\pi}{m}\right) \eta_i(t) + \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{2}{m}} \sin\left(\frac{k(i-1)\pi}{m}\right) \eta_i(t) \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{2}{m}} \sin\left(\frac{k(i+1)\pi}{m}\right) \eta_i(t) + \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{2}{m}} \sin\left(\frac{k(i-1)\pi}{m}\right) \eta_i(t) \\
&\leq \epsilon + \sum_{i=0}^m \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{2}{m}} \sin\left(\frac{k(i+1)\pi}{m}\right) \eta_i(t) + \sum_{i=0}^m \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{2}{m}} \sin\left(\frac{k(i-1)\pi}{m}\right) \eta_i(t) \\
&= \epsilon + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{2}{m}} \sum_{i=0}^m \left(\sin\left(\frac{k(i+1)\pi}{m}\right) + \sin\left(\frac{k(i-1)\pi}{m}\right) \right) \eta_i(t) \\
&= \epsilon + \sqrt{\frac{2}{m}} \sum_{i=0}^m \sin\left(\frac{ki\pi}{m}\right) \cos\left(\frac{k\pi}{m}\right) \eta_i(t) \\
&= \epsilon + \cos\left(\frac{k\pi}{m}\right) \mu_k(t)
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi(t+1) &\leq \epsilon^2 + \sum_{k=0}^m \mu_k^2(t+1) \\
&= \epsilon^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \mu_k^2(t+1) \\
&\leq \epsilon^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \left(\epsilon + \cos\left(\frac{k\pi}{m}\right) \mu_k(t) \right)^2 \\
&= \epsilon^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \left(\epsilon^2 + 2\epsilon \cos\left(\frac{k\pi}{m}\right) \mu_k(t) + \cos^2\left(\frac{k\pi}{m}\right) \mu_k^2(t) \right) \\
&\leq m\epsilon^2 + 2\epsilon(m-1) \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{m}\right) \sqrt{2m}M + \cos^2\left(\frac{\pi}{m}\right) \psi(t) \\
&= \left(m\epsilon + 2(m-1) \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{m}\right) \sqrt{2m}M \right) \epsilon + \cos^2\left(\frac{\pi}{m}\right) \psi(t) \\
&= \Phi\epsilon + \Upsilon\psi(t),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Phi = m\epsilon + 2(m-1) \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{m}\right) \sqrt{2m}M$$

is bounded above by a constant and

$$\Upsilon = \cos^2\left(\frac{\pi}{m}\right) < 1.$$

Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\psi(t_0 + t') &\leq \Phi\epsilon \left(1 + \Upsilon + \Upsilon^2 + \dots + \Upsilon^{t'-1}\right) + \Upsilon^{t'}\psi(t_0) \\ &\leq \Phi\epsilon \frac{1}{1 - \Upsilon} + \Upsilon^{t'}\psi(t_0)\end{aligned}$$

and for t' sufficiently large, we get

$$\Phi\epsilon \frac{1}{1 - \Upsilon} + \Upsilon^{t'}\psi(t_0) \leq \Phi\epsilon \frac{1}{1 - \Upsilon} + \epsilon = \left(\Phi \frac{1}{1 - \Upsilon} + 1\right)\epsilon,$$

which can be made arbitrarily small by an appropriate choice of ϵ . \square

3 Robots' Dynamics in Presence of Two Faults

It is easy to see that if the configuration contains a single faulty robots, the other robots converge toward it. In this Section we then focus on the case when the system contains two faults and we show that, starting from an arbitrary configuration and following algorithm CONVERGENCE1D, the system converges towards a limit configuration. Intuitively, we will show the convergence of X by showing that the robots will eventually form a “hierarchical” structure of “independent” groups, where the robots at a certain level of the hierarchy move ϵ -close to their convergence point after the lower levels robots have already done so.

3.1 Basic Properties

We start with a series of lemmas leading to the proof of two crucial properties: there exists a time after which robots preserve their farthest neighbours (Theorem 11) and there exists a time after which the number of different positions occupied by them becomes constant (Corollary 10).

Lemma 5 (No Crossing). *If x and z are two non-faulty robots and $x(t) < z(t)$, then $x(t+1) \leq z(t+1)$.*

Proof. Since $x(t) < z(t)$, we have that $r(x(t)) \leq r(z(t))$ and $l(x(t)) \leq l(z(t))$ by definition. It follows that $x(t+1) = \frac{l(x(t))+r(x(t))}{2} \leq \frac{l(z(t))+r(z(t))}{2} = z(t+1)$. \square

With the next three lemmas (6, 7, and 8), we show that all robots, except possibly two, eventually enter the segment $[x_0, x_n]$ delimited by the two faulty robots. At most two robots might perpetually stay outside of it, one to the left of x_0 and one to the right of x_n . If this is the case, however, the two outsiders converge to x_0 and x_n , respectively.

Lemma 6. *Either one of the following two scenarios happens as $t \rightarrow \infty$.*

1. *In a finite number of steps, all robots place themselves inside the line segment $[x_0, x_n]$.*
2. *There is at least one robot x that never enters the line segment $[x_0, x_n]$. If $x(0) < x_0$, then $x(t)$ tends towards x_0 as $t \rightarrow \infty$. If $x(0) > x_n$, then $x(t)$ tends towards x_n as $t \rightarrow \infty$.*

Proof. Since the two faulty robots do not move, they are already inside $[x_0, x_n]$. For the rest of the proof, we consider only the non-faulty robots. Let x_ℓ and x_r be the leftmost and the rightmost non-faulty robots, respectively. By Lemma 5, x_ℓ (respectively x_r) stays the leftmost (respectively

the rightmost) non-faulty robot at all steps of the execution of the algorithm. Therefore, it is sufficient to prove the lemma for x_ℓ and x_r .

We first argue that if at some time $t_0 > 0$, $x_\ell(t_0) \in [x_0, x_n]$, then for all $t > t_0$, $x_\ell(t) \geq x_0$. Since x_ℓ is the leftmost non-faulty robot and $x_\ell(t_0) \in [x_0, x_n]$, we have $l(x_\ell(t_0)) \geq x_0$. Therefore,

$$x_\ell(t_0 + 1) = \frac{l(x_\ell(t_0)) + r(x_\ell(t_0))}{2} \geq \frac{x_0 + x_\ell(t_0)}{2} \geq \frac{x_0 + x_0}{2} = x_0,$$

from which the proof follows by induction on t . A symmetric argument shows that if $x_r(t_0) \in [x_0, x_n]$, then for all $t > t_0$, $x_r(t) \leq x_n$. It remains to consider the case where x_ℓ or x_r never enters $[x_0, x_n]$.

Suppose that x_ℓ does not enter the interval $[x_0, x_n]$ in a finite number of steps. Therefore¹, $x_\ell(t) < x_0$ for all $t \geq 0$. Together with the fact that x_ℓ is the leftmost non-faulty robot, we get $l(x_\ell(t)) = x_\ell(t)$ and $r(x_\ell(t)) > x_\ell(t)$ for all $t \geq 0$. Therefore,

$$x_\ell(t + 1) = \frac{l(x_\ell(t)) + r(x_\ell(t))}{2} > \frac{x_\ell(t) + x_\ell(t)}{2} = x_\ell(t)$$

for all $t \geq 0$. Thus, it follows that $x_\ell(t)$ is strictly increasing for $t \geq 0$. Since x_ℓ never enters the interval $[x_0, x_n]$, $x_\ell(t) < x_0$ for all $t \geq 0$. Therefore, $x_\ell(t)$ converges to a point $x_\ell^* \leq x_0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

We show that $x_\ell^* = x_0$ by contradiction. Suppose that $x_\ell^* < x_0$. Since $x_\ell(t)$ is strictly increasing for $t \geq 0$ and $x_\ell(t)$ converges to x_ℓ^* as $t \rightarrow \infty$, then $x_\ell(t) < x_\ell^*$ for all $t \geq 0$. Let $t_0 \geq 0$ be a time for which $x_\ell^* - x_\ell(t_0) = \delta < \frac{V}{4}$. Let $x_1(t_0) = r(x_\ell(t_0))$ and $\delta' = x_1(t_0) - x_\ell^*$. We do not know whether $x_1(t_0)$ is to the left or to the right of x_ℓ^* . In other words, we do not know the sign of δ' . Since $x_\ell(t)$ is strictly increasing and $x_\ell(t) < x_\ell^*$ for all $t \geq 0$, we have $|\delta'| < \delta$. Therefore, $x_\ell^* - x_\ell(t_0 + 1) = \frac{\delta - \delta'}{2}$. We now look at the rightmost visible robot from $x_1(t_0)$. We have $r(x_1(t_0)) - x_\ell(t_0) > V$, otherwise $x_1(t_0)$ would not be the rightmost visible robot from $x_\ell(t_0)$. Therefore, we have

$$r(x_1(t_0)) - x_1(t_0) = (r(x_1(t_0)) - x_\ell(t_0)) + (x_\ell(t_0) - x_1(t_0)) > V - (\delta + \delta'). \quad (1)$$

We also have

$$x_1(t_0 + 1) - x_\ell(t_0 + 1) = \frac{l(x_1(t_0)) + r(x_1(t_0))}{2} - \frac{l(x_\ell(t_0)) + r(x_\ell(t_0))}{2} \quad (2)$$

$$= \frac{x_\ell(t_0) + r(x_1(t_0))}{2} - \frac{x_\ell(t_0) + x_1(t_0)}{2} \quad (3)$$

$$= \frac{r(x_1(t_0)) - x_1(t_0)}{2} \quad (4)$$

$$< V, \quad (5)$$

¹The case where the leftmost robot is to the right of x_n is taken care of by the case where the rightmost robot is to the right of x_n .

from which $x_1(t_0 + 1)$ is visible from $x_\ell(t_0 + 1)$. This leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
x_\ell(t_0 + 2) - x_\ell^* &= \frac{l(x_\ell(t_0 + 1)) + r(x_\ell(t_0 + 1))}{2} - x_\ell^* \\
&\geq \frac{x_\ell(t_0 + 1) + x_1(t_0 + 1)}{2} - x_\ell^* \\
&= \frac{(x_\ell(t_0 + 1) - x_\ell^*) + (x_1(t_0 + 1) - x_\ell^*)}{2} \\
&= \frac{(x_\ell(t_0 + 1) - x_\ell^*) + (x_1(t_0 + 1) - x_\ell(t_0 + 1)) + (x_\ell(t_0 + 1) - x_\ell^*)}{2} \\
&= \frac{2(x_\ell(t_0 + 1) - x_\ell^*) + (x_1(t_0 + 1) - (x_\ell(t_0 + 1)))}{2} \\
&> \frac{(\delta' - \delta) + \frac{V - (\delta + \delta')}{2}}{2} && \text{from (2), (4) and (1)} \\
&= \frac{V - 3\delta + \delta'}{4} \\
&> \frac{V - 4\delta}{4} \\
&> 0,
\end{aligned}$$

from which $x_\ell(t_0 + 2) > x_\ell^*$, which is a contradiction since $x_\ell(t) < x_\ell^*$ for all $t \geq 0$.

Since $x_\ell(t)$ converges to x_0 as $t \rightarrow \infty$, x_ℓ will be at distance at most ϵ from x_0 in a finite number of steps.

A symmetric argument completes the proof for x_r . \square

Lemma 7 (No More Crossing). *If x is a non-faulty robot, it will cross at most a finite number of times with a faulty robot.*

Proof. Let x_ℓ be the leftmost non-faulty robot. From the proof of Lemma 6, we know that x_ℓ will stay the leftmost non-faulty robot at all steps of the execution of the algorithm. Moreover, from Lemma 6, two scenarios are possible: (1) x_ℓ enters the line segment $[x_0, x_n]$ after some time t_0 and for all $t \geq t_0$, $x_\ell(t) \geq x_0$ or (2) $x_\ell(t)$ is strictly increasing for $t \geq 0$ and $x_\ell(t)$ converges to 0 as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

1. In this case, after time t_0 , no robot will cross x_0 .
2. In this case, let x be a robot and $t' > t_0$ be a time such that $x(t') < 0$, $x(t' + 1) > 0$ and $x_0 - x_\ell(t') = 0 - x_\ell(t') = \delta < \frac{V}{2}$. Suppose that there is a time $t'' > t'$ such that $x(t'') \geq 0$ and $x(t'' + 1) < 0$. Since x_ℓ is the leftmost agent, we have $l(x(t'')) \geq x_\ell(t'')$. Moreover, since $x(t'' + 1) < x_0 = 0$ and $x_\ell(t)$ is strictly increasing for $t \geq 0$, we have

$$r(x(t'')) < x_0 - l(x(t'')) \leq x_0 - x_\ell(t'') < x_0 - x_\ell(t') = \delta < V/2$$

and hence,

$$r(x(t'')) - x_\ell(t'') < r(x(t'')) - x_\ell(t') < V/2 + V/2 = V.$$

Thus, $l(x(t'')) = x_\ell(t'') = l(x_\ell(t''))$ and $r(x(t'')) = r(x_\ell(t''))$. Consequently, $x(t'' + 1) = x_\ell(t'' + 1)$. In other words, x and x_ℓ merge. Since $x_\ell(t)$ is strictly increasing for $t \geq 0$ and $x_\ell(t)$ converges to 0 as $t \rightarrow \infty$, x will not cross 0 anymore.

A symmetric argument with the rightmost non-faulty robot x_r completes the proof. \square

Lemma 8. *Suppose that there is at least one robot x that never enters the line segment $[x_0, x_n]$.*

- *If $x < x_0$, then after a finite number of steps, x is the only robot on the left of x_0 .*
- *If $x > x_n$, then after a finite number of steps, x is the only robot on the right of x_n .*

Proof. We prove this lemma by contradiction. Suppose that for all $t \geq 0$, there is a robot x' outside of the line segment $[x_0, x_n]$.

Suppose that $x < x_0$ (the case where $x > x_n$ is symmetric). Let x' be a robot and t be a time such that

- $x(t) < x'(t) < x_0(t)$,
- $\epsilon = x_0 - x(t) < \frac{V}{2}$,
- and if the rightmost non-faulty robot x_r satisfies $x_r(t) > x_n$ and x_r never enters the line segment $[x_0, x_n]$, then $x_r(t) - x_n < \frac{V}{2}$.

We consider two cases: (1) x' eventually enters the line segment $[x_0, x_n]$ or (2) not.

1. If x' enters the line segment $[x_0, x_n]$ and stays there, then after a finite number of steps, it is not outside of the line segment $[x_0, x_n]$.

Therefore, let us consider the case where x' enters the line segment $[x_0, x_n]$ and it eventually gets out of $[x_0, x_n]$. If x' gets out of $[x_0, x_n]$ by crossing x_0 , then it merges with x (refer to the proof of Lemma 7). If x' gets out of $[x_0, x_n]$ by crossing x_n , then it merges with x_r (refer to the proof of Lemma 7).

2. If x' never enters the line segment $[x_0, x_n]$, let $\delta = x_0 - x'(t)$. Notice that $\delta < \epsilon < \frac{V}{2}$. Since x' never enters the line segment $[x_0, x_n]$, $r(x'(t)) - x_0 < \delta < \frac{V}{2}$. Therefore, $r(x(t)) = r(x'(t))$ and $x(t) = l(x(t)) = l(x'(t))$. Therefore, $x(t+1) = \frac{l(x(t)) + r(x(t))}{2} = \frac{l(x'(t)) + r(x'(t))}{2} = x'(t+1)$.

In all cases, if there is a robot x' between x and x_0 , then after a finite number of steps, x' enters the line segment $[x_0, x_n]$ and stays there or x' merges with another robot. Since we have a finite number of robots, after a finite number of steps, x will be the only robot satisfying $x < x_0$. \square

We now show that during the evolution of the system, a robot never loses visibility of the robots seen in the past.

Lemma 9 (Preserved Visibility). *Let $y \in N(x(t))$. For all $t' > t$, $y \in N(x(t'))$.*

Proof. Let $y \in N(x(t))$. Hence, we have $|x(t) - y(t)| \leq V$. Without loss of generality, suppose that $y(t)$ is to the left of $x(t)$, from which $0 < x(t) - y(t) \leq V$. We consider three cases: (1) x and y are non-faulty, (2) exactly one of x and y is faulty, or (3) both x and y are faulty.

1. In this case, by Lemma 5, $x(t+1) - y(t+1) \geq 0$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} x(t+1) - y(t+1) &= \frac{l(x(t)) + r(x(t))}{2} - \frac{l(y(t)) + r(y(t))}{2} \\ &\leq \frac{y(t) + (x(t) + V)}{2} - \frac{(y(t) - V) + x(t)}{2} \\ &= V. \end{aligned}$$

2. Without loss of generality, suppose that x is faulty and y is non-faulty. If $x(t+1) - y(t+1) \geq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
x(t+1) - y(t+1) &= x(t) - \frac{l(y(t)) + r(y(t))}{2} \\
&\leq x(t) - \frac{(y(t) - V) + x(t)}{2} \\
&= \frac{x(t) - y(t) + V}{2} \\
&\leq \frac{V + V}{2} \\
&= V.
\end{aligned}$$

If $y(t+1) - x(t+1) \geq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
y(t+1) - x(t+1) &= \frac{l(y(t)) + r(y(t))}{2} - x(t) \\
&\leq \frac{x(t) + (y(t) + V)}{2} - x(t) \\
&= \frac{y(t) - x(t) + V}{2} \\
&\leq \frac{0 + V}{2} \\
&< V.
\end{aligned}$$

3. In this case, we have $x(t+1) = x(t)$ and $y(t+1) = y(t)$, so the result follows. □

A robot never loses visibility of the robots seen in the past; however, notice that new robots could enter its visibility range (*inclusion*). It is also possible for robots to merge and occupy the same position (*merging*). Once some robots occupy the same position they act as one single robot (except possibly for a non-faulty robot merging with a faulty one).

Definition 1 (Size-Stable Time). *A time t_0 is called a size-stable time if, for all $t \geq t_0$,*

- *there will be no inclusions, mergings or crossings in the system,*
- *and either all agents are inside the line segment $[x_0, x_n]$ or at most one agent is on each side of the line segment $[x_0, x_n]$ and stay outside of $[x_0, x_n]$. Moreover, the two outsiders converge to x_0 and x_n , respectively.*

Observe that if t_0 is a size-stable time, then t is a size-stable time for all $t \geq t_0$.

From Lemmas 5 and 7, after a finite number of steps, no two robots are *crossing* each others. From Lemma 8, either all robots are inside the line segment $[x_0, x_n]$ after a finite number of steps, or at most two robots will stay outside of the line segment $[x_0, x_n]$ for all time $t \geq 0$. We then get the following corollary.

Corollary 10. *For all set of robots X , there exists a size-stable time t_0 .*

Finally, from Lemmas 5, 7 and 9, and Corollary 10, we can conclude that at any time after a size-stable time t is reached, the farthest left and right neighbours, namely $l(x(t))$ and $r(x(t))$, of any robot x will never change.

Theorem 11 (Preserved-farthest-neighbours). *Let t be a size-stable time and $x \in \mathcal{R}$ be a robot. For all $t' > t$, $r(x(t')) = r(x(t))$ and $l(x(t')) = l(x(t))$.*

For the rest of the paper, we suppose that the earliest size-stable time is 0. Thus, from Corollary 10, for all $t \geq 0$, t is a size-stable time.

3.2 Convergence of Mutual Chains

We now define the notion of *mutual chain* as a set of robots that are mutually the farthest from each other.

Definition 2 (Mutual Chain). *Let $0 \leq k \leq n$ be an integer and $t \geq 0$ be any size-stable time. A mutual chain at time t (or mutual chain for short) is a configuration $C(t) = \{x'_1(t), x'_2(t), \dots, x'_k(t)\} \subset X(t)$ made of k robots such that for all $1 \leq i \leq k-1$, $l(x'_{i+1}(t)) = x'_i(t)$ and $r(x'_i(t)) = x'_{i+1}(t)$ (refer to Figure 1).*

If $r(x_i(t)) = x_j(t)$ and $l(x_j(t)) = x_i(t)$, we say that x_i and x_j are mutually chained at time t or that $x_i(t)$ and $x_j(t)$ are mutually chained.




Figure 1: A mutual chain of robots $C(t) = \{x_1(t), x_2(t), x_3(t), x_4(t), x_5(t)\}$ anchored in x_0 and x_6 , where the arrows indicate farthest visibility.

The *anchors* of a mutual chain $C(t) = \{x'_1(t), x'_2(t), \dots, x'_k(t)\}$ are the farthest left neighbour of $x'_1(t)$ and the farthest right neighbour of $x'_k(t)$.

Definition 3 (Anchors). *Given a mutual chain $C(t) = \{x'_1(t), x'_2(t), \dots, x'_k(t)\}$, we say that $l(x'_1(t))$ and $r(x'_k(t))$ are the left and right anchors of $C(t)$ (or that $C(t)$ is anchored at $l(x'_1(t))$ and $r(x'_k(t))$) (refer to Figure 1).*

Note that the definition of anchor allows the anchors of a mutual chain to be part of the mutual chain (refer to Figure 2). Moreover, the definition of mutual chain allows a mutual chain to possibly




Figure 2: The configuration $\{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}$ is a mutual chain. It is anchored at x_1 and x_4 .

contain only one robot (refer to Figure 3). Note that the anchors do not have to be faulty robots




Figure 3: The configuration $\{x_1\}$ is a mutual chain. It is anchored at x_0 and x_2 .

for this situation to happen. Indeed, any robot x forms a mutual chain $\{x(t)\}$ anchored at $l(x(t))$ and $r(x(t))$.

We now prove the formation, during the execution of the algorithm, of a special unique mutual chain called *primary chain*. Intuitively, the primary chain is a mutual chain starting from x_0 and ending in x_n . We will then introduce a hierarchical notion of mutual chains with different levels, where chains of some level are anchored in lower level ones. Moreover, we will show that the robots will eventually arrange themselves in such a hierarchical structure of mutual chains.

Theorem 12 (Primary Chain). *There exists a configuration of robots $\mathcal{C}_1 = \{x'_0, x'_1, x'_2, \dots, x'_k\} \subseteq X$ such that at any size-stable time $t > 0$, $\mathcal{C}_1(t)$ is a mutual chain anchored at x_0 and x_n , where $x'_0 = x_0$ and $x'_k = x_n$. This mutual chain is called the primary chain of X and it is unique.*

Before we prove Theorem 12, we need the following technical lemma. Intuitively, when the distance between two mutually chained robots tends to V (as $t \rightarrow \infty$), this limit behaviour propagates to the leftmost and rightmost visible robots.

Lemma 13. *Let $x'_{\alpha+1}, x'_{\alpha+2} \in X$ such that for all $t \geq 0$, (refer to Figure 4)*




Figure 4: Illustration of Lemma 13.

- $x'_{\alpha+1}(t)$ and $x'_{\alpha+2}(t)$ are mutually chained,
- $d(t) = x'_{\alpha+2}(t) - x'_{\alpha+1}(t) \rightarrow V$, as $t \rightarrow \infty$
- $l(x'_{\alpha+1}(t)) \neq x'_{\alpha+1}(t)$
- and $r(x'_{\alpha+2}(t)) \neq x'_{\alpha+2}(t)$.

Then $r(x'_{\alpha+2}(t)) - x'_{\alpha+2}(t) \rightarrow V$ and $x'_{\alpha+1}(t) - l(x'_{\alpha+1}(t)) \rightarrow V$, as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} x'_{\alpha+1}(t+1) &= l(x'_{\alpha+1}(t)) + \frac{x'_{\alpha+1}(t) - l(x'_{\alpha+1}(t)) + d(t)}{2}, \\ x'_{\alpha+2}(t+1) &= x'_{\alpha+1}(t) + \frac{d(t) + r(x'_{\alpha+2}(t)) - x'_{\alpha+2}(t)}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $x'_{\alpha+1}$ and $x'_{\alpha+2}$ are mutually chained and $d(t) \rightarrow V$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, there is a function $\epsilon(t)$ such that $\epsilon(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ and

$$\begin{aligned} d(t+1) &= x'_{\alpha+2}(t+1) - x'_{\alpha+1}(t+1) \\ &= \left(x'_{\alpha+1}(t) + \frac{d(t) + r(x'_{\alpha+2}(t)) - x'_{\alpha+2}(t)}{2} \right) - \left(l(x'_{\alpha+1}(t)) + \frac{x'_{\alpha+1}(t) - l(x'_{\alpha+1}(t)) + d(t)}{2} \right) \\ &= \frac{x'_{\alpha+1}(t) - l(x'_{\alpha+1}(t)) + r(x'_{\alpha+2}(t)) - x'_{\alpha+2}(t)}{2} \\ &> V - \epsilon(t). \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Let $\delta_1(t)$ and $\delta_2(t)$ be two functions such that $V - \delta_1(t) = x'_{\alpha+1}(t) - l(x'_{\alpha+1}(t))$ and $V - \delta_2(t) = r(x'_{\alpha+2}(t)) - x'_{\alpha+2}(t)$. Since $l(x'_{\alpha+1}(t)) \neq x'_{\alpha+1}(t)$ and $r(x'_{\alpha+2}(t)) \neq x'_{\alpha+2}(t)$, we have $0 < \delta_1(t) \leq V$ and $0 < \delta_2(t) \leq V$. Therefore, from (6), we get

$$\frac{V - \delta_1(t) + V - \delta_2(t)}{2} > V - \epsilon(t),$$

from which

$$0 < \frac{\delta_1(t) + \delta_2(t)}{2} < \epsilon(t) \rightarrow 0,$$

as $t \rightarrow \infty$. This means that $\delta_1(t) \rightarrow 0$ and $\delta_2(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, from which $x'_{\alpha+1}(t) - l(x'_{\alpha+1}(t)) \rightarrow V$ and $r(x'_{\alpha+2}(t)) - x'_{\alpha+2}(t) \rightarrow V$, as $t \rightarrow \infty$. \square

Proof. (Theorem 12)

[Uniqueness] We first explain that if the primary chain exists, then it is unique. Since $x_0 = x'_0$ and $x_n = x'_k$ are part of the mutual chain, starting at x_0 , we get $x'_1 = r(x_0)$ and $x'_{i+1} = r(x'_i)$ for all $0 \leq i \leq k-1$, where $x'_k = x_n$. So each x'_i is uniquely defined.

[Existence] We now prove that the primary chain does exist. By Lemma 8, at any size-stable time t , there is at most one robot x_ℓ to the left of x_0 which will never enter $[x_0, x_n]$ and there is at most one robot x_r to the right of x_n which will never enter $[x_0, x_n]$. Moreover, as $t \rightarrow \infty$, $x_\ell \rightarrow x_0$ and $x_r \rightarrow x_n$. Therefore, without loss of generality, we can ignore x_ℓ and x_r . For the rest of the proof, we suppose that $X(t) \subset [x_0, x_n]$ for any size-stable time t . We need to prove that the primary chain exists.

We prove the existence of the primary chain by contradiction.

Let us summarize the steps of the proof. We assume that there does not exist any mutual chain.

1) We construct a particular configuration, composed by a forward-chain from x_0 connecting each node to its farthest right neighbour till x_n and a backward chain from x_n connecting each node to its farthest left neighbour back to x_0 . 2) We then show that the two chains converge to each other, i.e., they converge to a single chain, called *right-left chain*. This construction does not directly guarantee that the right-left chain is a mutual chain. We then show a contradiction, reasoning on the total length of the segment delimited by x_0 and x_n . 3) A consequence of the right-left chain not being a mutual chain is that the total length of the segment between x_0 and x_n is strictly smaller than $(j+1)V$ (where $j+1$ is the number of intervals between consecutive robots in the chain). 4) On the other hand, each such interval converges to V , thus implying that the total length of the segment is a number arbitrarily close to $(j+1)V$. The contradiction implies that the right-left chain is indeed mutual.

1) Construction of forward and backward chains. Let us consider a configuration of robots $\{x'_0(t), x'_1(t), \dots, x'_{j+1}(t)\} \subseteq X(t)$, called *forward chain* (refer to Figure 5), such that:

- $x'_0(t) = x'_0 = x_0$,
- $x'_{i+1}(t) = r(x'_i(t))$ for all $0 \leq i \leq j < n$
- and $x'_{j+1}(t) = x'_{j+1} = x_n$

We define another configuration of robots, called *backward chain*, $\{y_0(t), y_1(t), \dots, y_{j+1}(t)\} \subseteq X(t)$ as follows. Let $y_{j+1}(t) = x'_{j+1}(t)$ and for all $0 \leq i \leq j$, let $y_i(t) = l(y_{i+1}(t))$ (refer to Figure 5). Let us call the union of the two chains *right-left chain*. We now prove two useful properties about the right-left chain.




Figure 5: Illustration of the proof of Theorem 12.

Property 1 (Alternation Property.) For all $1 \leq i \leq j+1$, we have $x'_{i-1}(t) < y_i(t) \leq x'_i(t)$.

We prove this property by induction, starting at $i = j+1$. For the base case, notice that $y_{j+1}(t) = x'_{j+1}(t)$ by definition. Suppose that $x'_{i-1}(t) < y_i(t) \leq x'_i(t)$ for some $1 \leq i \leq j+1$. Then, $y_{i-1}(t) = l(y_i(t)) \leq x'_{i-1}(t)$ otherwise this would contradict the fact that $r(x'_{i-1}(t)) = x'_i(t)$. Moreover, $x'_{i-2}(t) < l(y_i(t)) = y_{i-1}(t)$ otherwise this would contradict the fact that $r(x'_{i-2}(t)) = x'_{i-1}(t)$.

Property 2 (Starting point Property.) We have that $y_0(t) = y_0 = x_0$. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} y_0(t) &= l(y_1(t)) && \text{by the definition of } y_0(t), \\ &\leq l(x'_1(t)) && \text{by Property 1,} \\ &\leq x_0, \end{aligned}$$

otherwise $x'_1(t)$ would not be the rightmost visible robot from $x_0 = x'_0$.

2) Convergence of forward and backward chains to a right-left chain. Notice that since the forward chain $\{x'_0(t), x'_1(t), \dots, x'_{j+1}(t)\}$ is not a mutual chain, there exists an i with $1 \leq i \leq j$ such that $x'_{i-1}(t) < y_i(t) < x'_i(t)$. For all $1 \leq i \leq j+1$, let $a_i(t) = y_i(t) - x'_{i-1}(t)$ and $s_i(t) = x'_i(t) - y_i(t)$. Our aim, in the following, is to prove that $x'_i(t)$ and $y_i(t)$ get arbitrarily close for t going to infinity.

From Property 1, we have $a_i(t) > 0$ and $s_i(t) \geq 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq j+1$. Moreover, $s_i(t) = 0$ if and only if $y_i(t) = x'_i(t)$. Notice that $l(x'_i(t-1)) \leq x'_{i-1}(t-1)$, otherwise there would be a contradiction with the fact that $r(x'_{i-1}(t-1)) = x'_i(t-1)$. Therefore,

$$x'_i(t) = \frac{l(x'_i(t-1)) + r(x'_i(t-1))}{2} \leq \frac{x'_{i-1}(t-1) + x'_{i+1}(t-1)}{2},$$

from which

$$x'_i(t) \leq \begin{cases} 0 & i = 0, \\ x'_{i-1}(t-1) + \frac{1}{2}(a_i(t-1) + s_i(t-1) + a_{i+1}(t-1) + s_{i+1}(t-1)) & 1 \leq i \leq j, \\ x_n & i = j+1. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

Moreover, notice that $r(y_i(t-1)) \geq y_{i+1}(t-1)$, otherwise there would be a contradiction with the fact that $l(y_{i+1}(t-1)) = y_i(t-1)$. Therefore,

$$y_i(t) = \frac{l(y_i(t-1)) + r(y_i(t-1))}{2} \geq \frac{y_{i-1}(t-1) + y_{i+1}(t-1)}{2},$$

from which

$$y_i(t) \geq \begin{cases} 0 & i = 0, \\ y_{i-1}(t-1) + \frac{1}{2}(s_{i-1}(t-1) + a_i(t-1) + s_i(t-1) + a_{i+1}(t-1)) & 1 \leq i \leq j, \\ x_n & i = j+1. \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

Since $s_i(t) = x'_i(t) - y_i(t)$, by subtracting (8) from (7) we obtain

$$s_i(t) \leq \begin{cases} 0 & i = 0, \\ \frac{1}{2}(s_{i-1}(t-1) + s_{i+1}(t-1)) & 1 \leq i \leq j, \\ 0 & i = j+1. \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

We are now ready to prove that for all $0 \leq i \leq j+1$, $s_i(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, implying that $y_i(t) \rightarrow x'_i(t)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Notice that we already have $y_0(t) = x'_0(t)$ and $y_{j+1}(t) = x'_{j+1}(t)$ by definition. We then have:

$$\begin{aligned} s_i(t) &\leq \frac{1}{2}(s_{i-1}(t-1) + s_{i+1}(t-1)) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4}(s_{i-2}(t-2) + 2s_i(t-2) + s_{i+2}(t-2)) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{8}(s_{i-3}(t-3) + 3s_{i-1}(t-3) + 3s_{i+1}(t-3) + s_{i+3}(t-3)) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{16}(s_{i-4}(t-4) + 4s_{i-2}(t-4) + 6s_i(t-4) + 4s_{i+2}(t-4) + s_{i+4}(t-4)) \\ &\vdots \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2^t} \sum_{k=0}^t \binom{t}{k} s_{i-t+2k}(0), \end{aligned}$$

where $s_i(t) = 0$ for all $i \leq 0$ and $i \geq j+1$.

In order to determine the limit of $s_i(t)$ when $t \rightarrow \infty$, we need to make a few observations. First of all, the $s_i(t)$'s in the summation with $i \leq 0$ or $i \geq j+1$ are all equal to zero. In other words, regardless of the value of t , there are at most j non-zero values in the summation. These j values correspond to the j -central binomial coefficients. Also note that since the segment delimited by the two faulty robots has a constant size, the values of the s_i 's are bounded. Let C be the value of the largest such s_i ever occurring. Since the largest binomial coefficient is the central one (or the central ones for odd values of t), we can write

$$0 \leq s_i(t) \leq \frac{1}{2^t} j \binom{t}{\lfloor \frac{t}{2} \rfloor} C.$$

Since² $\binom{t}{\lfloor \frac{t}{2} \rfloor} \sim \frac{2^t}{\sqrt{\pi \frac{t}{2}}}$, we have

$$0 \leq \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} s_i(t) \leq \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2^t} j \binom{t}{\lfloor \frac{t}{2} \rfloor} C = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2^t} j \frac{2^t}{\sqrt{\pi \frac{t}{2}}} C = 0,$$

from which $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} s_i(t) = 0$.

We are ready to derive a contradiction.

3) Length of the segment strictly smaller than $(j+1)V$. Since the right-left chain is not a mutual chain, and x_0 and x_n are not moving, the distance between x_0 and x_n must be strictly smaller than $(j+1)V$ (otherwise x'_j and y_j would necessarily coincide, for all j). So, there exists a real number $\delta > 0$ such that $x_n - x_0 = (j+1)V - \delta$.

²We write $f(t) \sim g(t)$ whenever $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(t)}{g(t)} = 1$.

4) Distance between $x'_i(t)$ and $x'_{i+1}(t)$ tending to V . Let us consider any sub-chain of the right-left chain for which the x'_i and the y_i are distinct except for the extremal ones. More precisely, let α and β be two indices such that $x'_\alpha = y_\alpha$, $x'_\beta = y_\beta$ and $x'_i \neq y_i$ for all $\alpha < i < \beta$ (refer to Figure 6). Notice that $l(x'_{\alpha+1}) = x'_\alpha$, otherwise this would contradict the fact that $l(y_{\alpha+1}) = x'_\alpha$.




Figure 6: Illustration of the contradiction in the proof of Theorem 12 (propagation of distance V). We do not make any assumption about $x'_{\alpha-1}$ being equal or not to $y_{\alpha-1}$, nor about $x'_{\beta+1}$ being equal or not to $y_{\beta+1}$.

We also have $r(y_{\beta-1}) = x'_\beta$, otherwise this would contradict the fact that $r(x'_{\beta-1}) = x'_\beta$. Therefore, $l(x'_{\alpha+1}) = x'_\alpha$, $r(x'_{\alpha+1}) = x'_{\alpha+2}$, $l(y_{\beta-1}) = y_{\beta-2}$ and $r(y_{\beta-1}) = y_\beta = x'_\beta$. This implies that $k \geq i + 3$, otherwise $x'_{\alpha+1}$ and $y_{\beta-1}$ would have the same leftmost and rightmost visible robots and they would merge in one step, which is not possible at a size-stable time. Since there cannot be any merging, given that $l(y_{\alpha+1}) = y_\alpha = x'_\alpha$, we must also have that $x'_{\alpha+2}$ is not visible from $y_{\alpha+1}$ at any time. Therefore, for all $t \geq 0$, $s_{\alpha+1}(t) + a_{\alpha+2}(t) + s_{\alpha+2}(t) > V$. Since $r(x'_{\alpha+1}) = x'_{\alpha+2}$, for all $t \geq 0$, $a_{\alpha+2}(t) + s_{\alpha+2}(t) \leq V$. Together with the fact that $s_{\alpha+1}(t) \rightarrow 0$ and $s_{\alpha+2}(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, we get that $a_{\alpha+2}(t) \rightarrow V$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, $x'_{\alpha+2}(t) - x'_{\alpha+1}(t) \rightarrow V$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

Our goal is to apply Lemma 13 and conclude that $x'_{\alpha+1}(t) - x'_\alpha \rightarrow V$ and $x'_{\alpha+3}(t) - x'_{\alpha+2} \rightarrow V$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. However, since $x'_{\alpha+1}(t)$ and $x'_{\alpha+2}(t)$ are not mutual, we cannot apply the lemma directly. Here is the idea we use to circumvent this problem. We can prove that there is a robot $x''_{\alpha+1}(t)$, satisfying $y_{\alpha+1}(t) \leq x''_{\alpha+1}(t) \leq x'_{\alpha+1}(t)$, that is mutually chained with $x'_{\alpha+2}(t)$. Intuitively, since $y_{\alpha+1}(t) \rightarrow x'_{\alpha+1}(t)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, and since $x''_{\alpha+1}(t) \in [y_{\alpha+1}(t), x'_{\alpha+1}(t)]$, $x''_{\alpha+1}$ behaves the same way $x'_{\alpha+1}$ does. But since $x''_{\alpha+1}(t)$ is mutually chained with $x'_{\alpha+2}(t)$, we can apply Lemma 13. Formally, let $x''_{\alpha+1}(t) = l(x'_{\alpha+2}(t))$. Notice that we must have the following: $x''_{\alpha+1}(t) \leq x'_{\alpha+1}(t)$, $y_{\alpha+1}(t) \leq x''_{\alpha+1}(t)$, $r(x''_{\alpha+1}(t)) = x'_{\alpha+2}(t)$, otherwise we would have contradictions, respectively, with the following three facts: $r(x'_{\alpha+1}(t)) = x'_{\alpha+2}(t)$, $l(y_{\alpha+2}(t)) = y_{\alpha+1}(t)$, and $r(x'_{\alpha+1}(t)) = x'_{\alpha+2}(t)$. Since $y_{\alpha+1}(t) \rightarrow x'_{\alpha+1}(t)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, then $x''_{\alpha+1}(t) \rightarrow x'_{\alpha+1}(t)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. The fact that $x'_{\alpha+2}(t) - x'_{\alpha+1} \rightarrow V$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ therefore implies that $x'_{\alpha+2}(t) - x''_{\alpha+1}(t) \rightarrow V$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. By Lemma 13, $x'_{\alpha+1}(t) - x'_\alpha \rightarrow V$ and $x'_{\alpha+3}(t) - x'_{\alpha+2} \rightarrow V$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

By the previous argument, the fact that $x'_{\alpha+2}(t) - x'_{\alpha+1} \rightarrow V$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ propagates to $x'_{\alpha+1}(t) - x'_\alpha$ and $x'_{\alpha+3}(t) - x'_{\alpha+2}$. We can repeat the same argument and show that this propagates to all x'_i 's, from which we get that for all $0 \leq i \leq j$, $x'_{i+1}(t) - x'_i \rightarrow V$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, the total distance between x_0 and x_n is arbitrarily close to $(j+1)V$. This contradicts the fact that $x_n(t) - x_0(t) = (j+1)V - \delta$ for all $t \geq 0$. \square

In the proof of Theorem 12, we showed the existence of a unique mutual chain called the primary chain. Intuitively, we say that a configuration of robots is a secondary chain if it is a mutual chain anchored at two robots that belong to the primary chain. However, such a configuration is not necessary unique (refer to Figure 7 for an example). Level- j chains (for $j > 2$) are defined in a similar way.

Definition 4 (Secondary Chains and Level- j Chains).




Figure 7: An example of a primary chain $\{x_0, x_1, \dots, x_6\}$ with two level-2 chains: $\{z\}$ (anchored at x_0 and x_1) and $\{y_1, y_2, y_3\}$ (anchored at x_3 and x_6).

- The primary chain is called a level-1 chain.
- A configuration of robots C is a secondary chain if it is a mutual chain anchored at two robots x and x' , such that $x, x' \in C_1$ and at least one of x and x' is non-faulty. We say that a secondary chain is a level-2 chain.
- A configuration of robots C is a level- j chain if it is a mutual chain anchored at two robots x and x' which satisfy the following property. There exists an index $j' < j$ such that one of the following two statements is true:
 - x is part of a level- j' chain and x' is part of a level- $(j-1)$ chain
 - or x is part of a level- $(j-1)$ chain and x' is part of a level- j' chain.

The convergence of the primary chain can be proven by observing that the behaviour of the robots in the primary chain executing our algorithm (CONVERGENCE1D) is equivalent to the behavior they would have if they were executing Algorithm SPREADING. Once this is established, convergence follows from Theorem 3. The following lemma shows under what conditions Theorem 3 can be applied to a general mutual chain $Y(t) = \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k\}$. More specifically, suppose that there exists two real numbers y'_0 and y'_{k+1} such that $y_0(t) = l(y_1(t)) \rightarrow y'_0(t)$ and $y_{k+1}(t) = r(y_k(t)) \rightarrow y'_{k+1}$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Then, by applying Algorithm CONVERGENCE1D, $Y(t)$ converges towards an equidistant configuration between $y'_0(t)$ and $y'_{k+1}(t)$.

Lemma 14. Let $Y(t) = \{y_1(t), y_2(t), \dots, y_k(t)\}$ be a mutual chain at a size-stable time t , anchored in $y_0(t) = l(y_1(t))$ and $y_{k+1}(t) = r(y_k(t))$, where $y_0(t) \neq y_1(t)$ and $y_{k+1}(t) \neq y_k(t)$. Suppose that there exist two numbers y'_0 and y'_{k+1} , such that $y_0(t) \rightarrow y'_0$ and $y_{k+1}(t) \rightarrow y'_{k+1}$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. We have that, for all $0 \leq i \leq k+1$,

$$y_i(t) \rightarrow y'_0 + \frac{|y'_{k+1} - y'_0|}{k+1} i$$

as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, as $t \rightarrow \infty$, the robots in $\{y_1(t), y_2(t), \dots, y_k(t)\}$ converge to a configuration where the distance between any two consecutive robots is $\frac{|y'_{k+1} - y'_0|}{k+1}$.

Proof. Let $Z(t) = \{z_0(t) = y_0(t), z_1(t), z_2(t), \dots, z_m(t) = y_{k+1}(t)\}$ be the global configuration of robots at time t , restricted to the interval $[y_0(t), y_{k+1}(t)]$.

By Theorem 11, $Y(t)$ satisfies the following property: for all $1 \leq i \leq k$ and for all $t' \geq t$, $l(y_i(t')) = l(y_i(t))$ and $r(y_i(t')) = r(y_i(t))$. Therefore, even if there is a robot $z_j(t) \in N(y_i(t)) \setminus Y(t)$, the presence of $z_j(t)$ has no impact on the position of $y_i(t+1)$. Consequently, the positions of the robots in $Y(t+1)$, after executing Algorithm CONVERGENCE1D on $Y(t)$, are uniquely determined by the positions of the robots in $Y(t)$. Hence, executing Algorithm CONVERGENCE1D on $Y(t)$ produces the same result as executing Algorithm SPREADING on $Y(t)$, and thus the lemma follows from Theorem 3. \square

We now show that the primary chain $\mathcal{C}_1 = \{x'_0, x'_1, x'_2, \dots, x'_k\} \subseteq X$, where $x'_0 = x_0$ and $x'_k = x_n$, converges towards a configuration of equidistant robots delimited by its anchors x_0 and x_n .

Theorem 15 (Convergence of the Primary Chain). *Let $\mathcal{C}_1 = \{x'_0, x'_1, x'_2, \dots, x'_k\}$ be the primary chain. We have that $x'_0 = x_0$, $x'_k = x_n$ and for all $0 \leq i \leq k$*

$$x'_i(t) \rightarrow \frac{|x_n - x_0|}{k} i$$

as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. Since \mathcal{C}_1 is a mutual chain, the configuration $\{x'_1, x'_2, \dots, x'_{k-1}\}$ is also a mutual chain. It is anchored at x'_0 and x'_k , where $x'_0 \neq x'_1$ and $x'_k \neq x'_{k-1}$. Since the anchors $x'_0 = x_0 = 0$ and $x'_k = x_n$ are faulty, they do not move. Hence, $x'_0(t) \rightarrow x_0$ and $x'_k(t) \rightarrow x_n$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, the theorem follows directly from Lemma 14. \square

We now show that every level- j chain converges towards a configuration of equidistant robots.

Theorem 16 (Convergence of Level- j Chains). *Let $C_j = \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k\}$ be a level- j chain, where $j \geq 1$ is an integer. Let t be a size-stable time. Let $y_0(t) = l(y_1(t))$ and $y_{k+1}(t) = r(y_k(t))$. There exist real numbers y'_0 and y'_{k+1} such that $y_0(t) \rightarrow y'_0$ and $y_{k+1}(t) \rightarrow y'_{k+1}$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, for all $0 \leq i \leq k+1$,*

$$y_i(t) \rightarrow y'_0 + \frac{|y'_{k+1} - y'_0|}{k+1} i$$

as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. We proceed by induction on j . By Theorem 15, our statement is true for $j = 1$. Suppose that the theorem is true for all integers from 1 to $j-1$. Consider a level- j chain $C_j = \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k\}$ anchored at $y_0(t) = l(y_1(t))$ and $y_{k+1}(t) = r(y_k(t))$, where t is a size-stable time.

By Definition 4, there exists an index $j' < j$ such that one of the following two statements is true:

- y_0 is part of a level- j' chain and y_{k+1} is part of a level- $(j-1)$ chain
- or y_0 is part of a level- $(j-1)$ chain and y_{k+1} is part of a level- j' chain.

Without loss of generality, suppose that y_0 is part of a level- j' chain and y_{k+1} is part of a level- $(j-1)$ chain.

By the induction hypothesis, there exist two real numbers y'_0 and y'_{k+1} such that $y_0(t) \rightarrow y'_0$ and $y_{k+1}(t) \rightarrow y'_{k+1}$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. The theorem follows from Lemma 14. \square

The following lemma states that every robot belongs to some level- j chain. To simplify the presentation, we assume that the faulty robot x_0 is part of the level-0 chain $\{x_0\}$ and that the faulty robot x_n is part of the level-0 chain $\{x_n\}$.

Lemma 17. *For all size-stable time t and all $0 \leq i \leq n$, $x_i(t) \in X(t)$ belongs to a level- j chain.*

Proof. Suppose that the statement is false. Let $y_1(t)$ be the leftmost robot that does not satisfy the statement. We will derive a contradiction.

Since the leftmost robot x_0 is faulty, $l(y_1(t))$ belongs to a mutual chain, say $C(t) = \{x''_1, x''_2, \dots, x''_m\}$, where $l(y_1(t)) = x''_\alpha$ for some index $1 \leq \alpha \leq m$. Let $Y = \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k\}$ be the configuration of robots such that (refer to Figure 8)

1. $y_i(t) = r(y_{i-1}(t))$ for all $2 \leq i \leq k$,




Figure 8: Illustration of the proof of Lemma 17.

2. $r(y_k(t))$ belongs to a mutual chain
3. and for all $1 \leq i \leq k$, $y_i(t)$ does not belong to a mutual chain.

Observe that the definition of Y allows k to be equal to 1 (in such a case, only items 2 and 3 apply). By construction and the definition of $y_1(t)$, $\{y_1(t), y_2(t), \dots, y_k(t)\}$ is not a mutual chain. Therefore, for the rest of the proof, $k \geq 2$.

Let $\{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_k\}$ be the configuration of robots such that $z_k = y_k$ and $z_i(t) = l(z_{i+1}(t))$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k-1$. Using the same arguments as in the proof of Theorem 12, we get that $x''_\alpha \leq z_1 \leq y_1$ and $y_{i-1} < z_i \leq y_i$ for all $2 \leq i \leq k$. Since $\{y_1(t), y_2(t), \dots, y_k(t)\}$ is not a mutual chain, there is an index i such that $z_i(t) \neq y_i(t)$. Let j be the smallest index such that $z_j = y_j$ and $z_{j-1} \neq y_{j-1}$. Suppose there is an index $\gamma < j-1$ such that $z_\gamma(t) = y_\gamma(t)$. Therefore, by the definition of j , $z_i = y_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq \gamma$. Moreover, x''_α and $r(y_k)$ are part of mutual chains. Therefore, by Theorems 15 and 16, $x''_\alpha(t)$ and $r(y_k)(t)$ converge to a fixed location as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Consequently, we get the same contradiction as in the proof of Theorem 12. Hence, for the rest of the proof, assume that $z_i(t) \neq y_i(t)$ for all $1 \leq i < j-1$.

We have the following property.

Property 1 If, for all $2 \leq i \leq j-1$, $z_i(t)$ does not belong to any mutual chain, then $z_1(t) = l(z_2(t))$ belongs to a mutual chain. Indeed, we must have $z_1(t) \leq y_1(t)$ otherwise this would contradict the fact that $y_2(t) = r(y_1(t))$. Moreover, we assumed that $z_i(t) \neq y_i(t)$ for all $1 \leq i < j-1$. Hence, $z_1(t) < y_1(t)$. Moreover, we must have $z_1(t) \geq x''_\alpha(t)$ otherwise this would contradict the fact that $x''_\alpha = l(y_1(t))$. But then, since $y_1(t)$ is the leftmost robot that does not belong to a mutual chain, we must have that $z_1(t) = l(z_2(t))$ belongs to a mutual chain.

Consequently, there is an index $1 \leq i \leq j-1$ such that z_i belongs to a mutual chain. Let $1 \leq \mu \leq j-1$ be the largest index such that z_μ belongs to a mutual chain, say $W = \{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_{m'}\}$. Let $1 \leq \nu \leq m'$ be the index such that $w_\nu = z_\mu$.

We have the following property.

Property 2 $z_{\mu+1} < w_{\nu+1} < y_{\mu+1}$. Indeed, observe that $w_{\nu+1} = r(w_\nu)$. Therefore, $w_{\nu+1} \leq y_{\mu+1}$ otherwise this would contradict the fact that $y_{\mu+1} = r(y_\mu)$. Moreover, by definition, $w_{\nu+1} \neq y_{\mu+1}$. We also have that $w_{\nu+1} \geq z_{\mu+1}$ otherwise this would contradict the fact that $z_\mu = l(z_{\mu+1})$. Moreover, by definition, $w_{\nu+1} \neq z_{\mu+1}$.

By repeating the argument for proving Property 2, we reach the index ν' such that $z_{j-1} < w'_{\nu'} < y_{j-1}$. Observe that $w'_{\nu'+1} = r(w'_{\nu'}) \leq y_j$ otherwise this would contradict the fact $y_j = r(y_{j-1})$. Moreover, $w'_{\nu'+1} \geq y_j = z_j$ otherwise this would contradict the fact $z_{j-1} = l(z_j)$. Therefore, $w'_{\nu'+1} = y_j$. However, by the definition of Y , y_j is not part of a mutual chain. We get a contradiction. \square

From Theorems 15 and 16, and Lemma 17, we can conclude with the following theorem.

Theorem 18 (Global Convergence). *For all $0 \leq i \leq n$, $|x_i(t+1) - x_i(t)| \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, $X(t)$ converges towards a fixed configuration as $t \rightarrow \infty$.*

4 Conclusion

To study the impact of faults on the robots dynamics, in this paper we analyzed the behaviour of a group of oblivious robots which execute an algorithm designed for a fault-free environment in presence of undetectable crash faults. We focused on the classic point-convergence algorithm by Ando et al. [2] executed on a line, when the robots are synchronous and at most two of them are faulty.

The paper leaves several open questions and research directions. An obvious extension would be the study of the point-convergence algorithm in the case of more than two faults: we know that the robots still converge to a pattern, but the analysis is not simple and left for further study. When the robots operate fully synchronously in a two dimensional space, the dynamics has a rather different nature: we have observed that oscillations are possible, even with just two faults and the study of this case is undergoing.

More generally, this work can be seen as a first step toward the study of the interaction between heterogeneous groups of robots operating in the same space, each following a different algorithm. The existing literature on LOOK-COMPUTE-MOVE robots has always considered robots with the same set of rules. The presence of different teams following different, possibly conflicting, rules in the environment is an interesting new area of investigation.

References

- [1] N. Agmon and D. Peleg. Fault-tolerant gathering algorithms for autonomous mobile robots. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 36(1): 56–82, 2006.
- [2] H. Ando and Y. Oasa and I. Suzuki and M. Yamashita. A distributed memoryless point convergence algorithm for mobile robots with limited visibility, *IEEE Trans. Robotics and Automation*, 15:5, 818–828, 1999.
- [3] C. Auger, Z. Bouzid, P. Courtieu, S. Tixeuil, X. Urbain. Certified impossibility results for byzantine-tolerant mobile robots. 15th Int. Symposium on Stabilization, Safety, and Security of Distributed Systems (SSS), 178-190, 2013.
- [4] Z. Bouzid, S. Das, S. Tixeuil. Gathering of mobile robots tolerating multiple crash faults. 14th Int. Conf. on Distr. Comp. and Networking (ICDCS), 337-346, 2013.
- [5] Z. Bouzid, M. Gradinariu, S. Tixeuil. Optimal byzantine-resilient convergence in uni-dimensional robot networks. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 411(34-36): 3154-3168, 2010.
- [6] Q. Bramas, S. Tixeuil. Wait-free gathering without chirality. 22nd Int. Colloquium Structural Information and Communication Complexity (SIROCCO), 313-327, 2015.
- [7] M. Cieliebak, P. Flocchini, G. Prencipe, and N. Santoro. Distributed computing by mobile robots: Gathering. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 41(4):829–879, 2012.
- [8] R. Cohen and D. Peleg. Convergence properties of the gravitational algorithms in asynchronous robots systems. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 34:1516–1528, 2005.
- [9] R. Cohen, D. Peleg, Local spreading algorithms for autonomous robot systems. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 399(1-2): 71-82, 2008.
- [10] X. Défago, M. Gradinariu, S. Messika, P. Raipin Parvédy. Fault-tolerant and self-stabilizing mobile robots gathering. 20th Int. Symposium on Distributed Computing (DISC), 46-60, 2006.
- [11] X. Défago, M. Gradinariu, S. Messika, P. Raipin Parvédy. Fault and byzantine tolerant self-stabilizing mobile robots gathering - feasibility study - arXiv:1602.05546, 2016.
- [12] Y. Dieudonné, O. Labbani-Igbida, and F. Petit. Circle formation of weak mobile robots. *ACM Trans. on Autonomous and Adaptive Systems*, 3(4):16:1–16:20, 2008.

- [13] Y. Dieudonné, F. Petit. Scatter of rRobots. *Parallel Processing Letters* 19(1): 175-184, 2009.
- [14] P. Flocchini, G. Prencipe, N. Santoro, G. Viglietta. Distributed computing by mobile robots: solving the uniform circle formation problem, 18th Int. Conference on Principles of Distributed Systems (OPODIS), 217-232, 2014. Extended version to appear in *Distributed Computing*, 2017.
- [15] P. Flocchini, G. Prencipe, and N. Santoro. Self-deployment algorithms for mobile sensors on a ring. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 402(1):67–80, 2008.
- [16] P. Flocchini, G. Prencipe, and N. Santoro. *Distributed Computing by Oblivious Mobile Robots*. Synthesis Lectures on Distributed Computing Theory, Morgan & Claypool, 2012.
- [17] N. Fujinaga, Y. Yamauchi, H. Ono, S. Kijima, M. Yamashita. Pattern formation by oblivious asynchronous mobile robots. *SIAM Journal Computing* 44(3): 740-785, 2015.
- [18] T. Izumi, M. Gradinariu Potop-Butucaru, S. Tixeuil. Connectivity-preserving scattering of mobile robots with limited visibility. 12th Int. Symposium on Stabilization, Safety, and Security of Distributed Systems (SSS), 319-331, 2010.
- [19] T. Izumi, S. Souissi, Y. Katayama, N. Inuzuka, X. Défago, K. Wada, and M. Yamashita. The gathering problem for two oblivious robots with unreliable compasses. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 41(1):26–46, 2012.
- [20] M. Yamashita and I. Suzuki. Characterizing geometric patterns formable by oblivious anonymous mobile robots. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 411(26–28):2433–2453, 2010.
- [21] Y. Yamauchi, T. Uehara, S. Kijima, M. Yamashita. Plane formation by synchronous mobile robots in the three dimensional euclidean space. *Journal of the ACM*, 63(3), 2017.