

Optimal Uniform Circle Formation by Asynchronous Luminous Robots

Caterina Feletti*

Debasish Pattanayak†

Gokarna Sharma‡

Abstract

We study the UNIFORM CIRCLE FORMATION (UCF) problem for a swarm of n autonomous mobile robots operating in *Look-Compute-Move* (LCM) cycles on the Euclidean plane. We assume our robots are *luminous*, i.e. embedded with a persistent light that can assume a color chosen from a fixed palette, and *opaque*, i.e. not able to see beyond a collinear robot. Robots are said to *collide* if they share positions or their paths intersect within concurrent LCM cycles. To solve UCF, a swarm of n robots must autonomously arrange themselves so that each robot occupies a vertex of the same regular n -gon not fixed in advance. In terms of efficiency, the goal is to design an algorithm that optimizes (or provides a tradeoff between) two fundamental performance metrics: (i) the execution time and (ii) the size of the color palette. There exists an $O(1)$ -time $O(1)$ -color algorithm for this problem under the fully synchronous and semi-synchronous schedulers and a $O(\log \log n)$ -time $O(1)$ -color or $O(1)$ -time $O(\sqrt{n})$ -color algorithm under the asynchronous scheduler, avoiding collisions. In this paper, we develop a deterministic algorithm solving UCF avoiding collisions in $O(1)$ -time with $O(1)$ colors under the asynchronous scheduler, which is asymptotically optimal with respect to both time and number of colors used, the first such result. Furthermore, the algorithm proposed here minimizes for the first time what we call the *computational SEC*, i.e. the smallest circular area where robots operate throughout the whole algorithm.

Keywords: Uniform Circle Formation, Robots with Lights, Autonomous Robots, Rank Encoding, Time and Color Complexities, Computational SEC

1 Introduction

1.1 Background and Motivation

In the field of robotics, a new approach has been established over the past few years: instead of developing *ad hoc* powerful and monolithic robots for specific tasks, *swarm robotics* involves solving different problems by swarms of small, even tiny, simple and autonomous agents, which can be programmed to cooperate. Besides the practical and engineering factors that robotics must consider (hardware, control, data processing, etc.), other theoretical aspects must be investigated: distributed computability, design of (self-stabilizing) algorithms, correctness and complexity analysis. According to this, research has proposed various theoretical models to formalize such distributed systems and to develop distributed algorithms on them [29].

In the classical macro-model [19], robots are assumed to be *autonomous* (no external control), *anonymous* (no unique identifiers), *indistinguishable* (no external identifiers), and *homogeneous* (execute the same algorithm). Robots are modeled as pointlike agents that act on the plane through a sequence of *Look-Compute-Move* (LCM) cycles: when a robot is activated, it first obtains a snapshot of its surroundings (*Look*), then computes a destination based on the snapshot (*Compute*), and finally moves to the destination (*Move*). Most of the literature considers *disoriented* robots: each robot has its local coordinate system without any assumption of global orientation. The sensory capability of a robot, generally called *vision*, allows a robot to determine the positions of other robots in its own local coordinate system. Robots are traditionally

*Department of Computer Science, Università degli Studi di Milano, Italy, caterina.feletti@unimi.it

†School of Computer Science, Carleton University, Canada, drdebmath@gmail.com

‡Department of Computer Science, Kent State University, USA, gsharma2@kent.edu

assumed to be *transparent* (so that each robot has complete visibility of the swarm), *oblivious* (they cannot store any information about past LCM cycles), and *silent* (they do not have any direct communication means) [19].

In this paper, we consider a more recent model, the *robots with lights* (aka *luminous*) model [7, 11, 19, 28], where robots are embedded with a light whose color can be chosen from a fixed palette and persists cycle by cycle until its next update. Since such a light is visible to both the robot itself and the other robots, the luminous model grants robots both a persistent internal state (memory) and a direct communication means. Additionally, we assume our robots are *opaque*, thus they experience *obstructed visibility* in case of collinearities (if robots a, b, c are collinear, a and c cannot see each other). Note that, since by default the size of the swarm n is not known in advance by the robots, they may not realize if they are experiencing complete or obstructed visibility in the *Look* phase.

We say that two robots *collide* if either (i) they share the same position at a given time or (ii) their paths towards their destinations intersect within concurrent LCM cycles. We assume robot movements are *rigid*, i.e., in each *Move*, the robot stops only after reaching its destination.

In this paper, we study the fundamental UNIFORM CIRCLE FORMATION (UCF) problem for *luminous-opaque robots*. Starting from an arbitrary configuration where n robots occupy distinct points on a plane, the problem aims at relocating them autonomously on the vertices of a regular n -gon not fixed in advance. Namely, UCF is solved if the n robots are equally distributed on the same circle. Thanks to the well-known properties of such a geometric configuration, UCF is deemed an important special case of the GEOMETRIC PATTERN FORMATION problem [5, 19, 20, 31, 32]. A *geometric pattern* (or, simply, *pattern*) is defined as a set of points on a plane. The GEOMETRIC PATTERN FORMATION problem for a pattern P is said to be solved by a swarm of robots if they form a stable configuration (i.e. where robots no longer move) where the set of their positions is similar to P up to scaling, rotation, translation, and reflection.

Related to UCF, it is noteworthy to mention its precursor, the CIRCLE FORMATION problem [1, 8]: robots are required to relocate on the boundaries of the same circle, without any other requirement. The uniform version of this problem, namely UCF, has been investigated by multiple works [4, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26] in the classic *oblivious-transparent* robot model (see [33] for an excellent survey). Many of the cited works focused mostly on the solvability of the problem in finite time, considering different model assumptions (e.g. specific initial configurations [13, 22], only 3 or 4 robots [14, 24]), without examining the time complexity of the proposed algorithm [21, 33].

Time complexity is measured based on the underlying scheduler under which robots operate. Generally, literature considers three main schedulers. Under the *fully synchronous* scheduler (\mathcal{FSYNC}), the robots perform their LCM cycles in perfect synchrony and hence time is measured in rounds of LCM cycles. Under the *semi-synchronous* (\mathcal{SSYNC}) and *asynchronous* (\mathcal{ASYNC}) schedulers, a robot may stay inactive for a finite but indeterminate time and hence time is measured using the idea of epoch. An *epoch* is the smallest time interval within which each robot performs its LCM cycle at least once [6]. We will use the term “time” generically to mean rounds for the \mathcal{FSYNC} and epochs for the \mathcal{SSYNC} and \mathcal{ASYNC} schedulers.

Feletti *et al.* [15, 16, 17, 18] are the first to consider UCF in the *luminous-opaque* robot model. They presented a deterministic $O(1)$ -time $O(1)$ -color solution under the \mathcal{FSYNC} and \mathcal{SSYNC} schedulers, and a deterministic $O(\log n)$ -time $O(1)$ -color solution under the \mathcal{ASYNC} scheduler, avoiding collisions. Recently, Pattanayak and Sharma [27] developed a framework that provides a deterministic $O(x)$ -time solution using $O(n^{1/2^x})$ colors under the asynchronous scheduler. Setting x to some constant, it gives a $O(1)$ -time solution (i.e. asymptotically optimal) with $O(\sqrt{n})$ colors. Setting $x = O(\log \log n)$, it gives a $O(\log \log n)$ -time solution which uses $O(1)$ colors.

1.2 Our Result

In this paper, we propose a deterministic algorithm for solving UCF in the luminous-opaque model under \mathcal{ASYNC} , avoiding collisions. Our algorithm runs in $O(1)$ time with $O(1)$ colors. Compared to the state-of-the-art result of Pattanayak and Sharma [27] which is either optimal in time with $O(\sqrt{n})$ colors or optimal in colors with $O(\log \log n)$ time, our algorithm is simultaneously optimal on both time and number of colors. Another important aspect of our proposed algorithm is that, in addition to optimizing both runtime and color complexity, it minimizes a spatial metric that we call *computational SEC*, i.e. the smallest circle containing all the points the robots touch during the execution of the algorithm. This objective is driven by a recent

Algorithm	Time (in epochs)	Number of Colors	Computational SEC	Scheduler
[15]	$O(1)$	$O(1)$	Not minimized	\mathcal{FSYNC}
[18]	$O(1)$	$O(1)$	Not minimized	\mathcal{SSYNC}
[18]	$O(n)$	$O(1)$	Not minimized	\mathcal{ASYNC}
[16]	$O(\log n)$	$O(1)$	Not minimized	
Generic [27]	$O(x)$	$O(n^{1/2^x})$	Not minimized	
OptTime [27]	$O(1)$	$O(\sqrt{n})$	Not minimized	
OptColor [27]	$O(\log \log n)$	$O(1)$	Not minimized	
OptTime&Color (this paper)	$O(1)$	$O(1)$	Minimized	

Table 1: Existing UCF deterministic solutions for $n \geq 1$ luminous-opaque robots on the plane, avoiding collisions. $x \in [1, O(\log \log n)]$.

research direction on robot computing which aims to solve *space-constrained* versions of classic distributed problems. Given a problem P for a swarm of robots, a *space-constrained version of P* requires optimizing some spatial metrics (e.g. the maximum distance traveled by a robot [1, 5]) while solving P . Although, in most cases of our algorithm, the computational SEC minimization turns out to be a byproduct of the technique used to optimize time and color complexity, a particular configuration needed an *ad hoc* technique to be designed to minimize the computational SEC. Note that the existing UCF solutions do not minimize the computational SEC. Table 1 summarizes our result by comparing it with the existing UCF solutions.

1.3 Challenges

Performing in \mathcal{ASYNC} , our algorithm had to face the intrinsic issues that asynchrony entails. Such issues derive from the discrepancy in the duration of the LCM cycles each robot follows. This discrepancy can affect the correctness of algorithmic strategies (e.g. a robot may work on an outdated snapshot of the system it takes on its *Look* portion of the cycle), the integrity of the system (e.g. two robots may collide if their motions are not synchronized), and the algorithmic runtime (e.g. robots may be forced to perform sequentially to avoid erroneous computations or collisions). Moreover, *opaqueness* (and so *obstructed visibility*) posed an additional challenge under \mathcal{ASYNC} , since moving robots can hide or be hidden by other robots.

However, moving in parallel is essential in reaching a $O(1)$ -time algorithm. The main challenge of this work was to make robots exploit parallelism even in conditions of asynchrony and obstructed visibility, always keeping the size of the color palette constant. Indeed, this paper shows that robots can move in parallel to solve UCF without colliding, using $O(1)$ colors. As in [15, 16, 17, 18, 27], we factorize UCF into three sub-problems (see Table 2): *(i)* COMPLETE VISIBILITY, *(ii)* CIRCLE FORMATION, and lastly *(iii)* UNIFORM TRANSFORMATION. Given an arbitrary initial configuration of robots on distinct points on the plane, we *(i)* exploit the deterministic COMPLETE VISIBILITY result of Sharma *et al.* [30] under \mathcal{ASYNC} to arrange robots on the vertices of a convex polygon in $O(1)$ time using $O(1)$ colors, avoiding collisions. After that, *(ii)* a simple procedure will safely move the robots to the perimeter of a circle, say Cir , in $O(1)$ epochs using $O(1)$ colors. The remaining step *(iii)* aims to equally distribute the robots on the perimeter of Cir , thus solving UCF. This last step represents the real challenge for the time-color optimization of UCF.




Table 2: Sub-problems composing UNIFORM CIRCLE FORMATION.

Up to now, step (iii) was solved in a binary tournament fashion in Feletti *et al.* [16] achieving an $O(\log n)$ -time solution using $O(1)$ colors under \mathcal{ASYNC} . Afterward, the step was expedited by Pattanayak and Sharma [27] by dividing the robots in \sqrt{x} groups in each step for x robots in a group achieving an $O(\log \log n)$ -time solution using $O(1)$ colors and $O(1)$ -time solution using $O(\sqrt{n})$ colors. In this paper, we optimize step (iii) by developing a $O(1)$ -time and $O(1)$ -color algorithm, forgoing the use of both binary and square root tournament.

The other main challenge of this work has been minimizing the computational SEC, i.e. the circular area in which robots operate. Note that, to minimize the computational SEC, robots have to always stay within the smallest enclosing circle of the initial configuration. The solutions used to solve (i) COMPLETE VISIBILITY [30] and (ii) CIRCLE FORMATION guarantee to minimize the computational SEC. Thus, to minimize the computational SEC throughout the whole UCF solution, our solution for step (iii) must guarantee robots operate within the initial circle. Note that the $O(\log n)$ -time UNIFORM TRANSFORMATION solution provided in [16] makes robots move out from the initial circle Cir , before having them positioned uniformly on it. Indeed, requiring robots to move internally to Cir complicated the investigation for a $O(1)$ -time solution, since internal moving robots can obstruct the visibility of the robots on the perimeter of Cir . However, our UNIFORM TRANSFORMATION solution proposed in this paper guarantees robots always stay within Cir (perimeter included), thus minimizing its computational SEC.

1.4 Techniques

Let us briefly introduce our algorithmic strategies. Our algorithm for step (iii) receives in input a circle configuration, where all n robots lay on distinct points of a circle, Cir . The target n -gon will be inscribed in Cir . Identifying the type of symmetry of the configuration turns out to be necessary to address the input robot disposition. In particular, we classify the configuration into three categories: regular, biangular, or periodic. The regular configuration immediately solves UCF. A biangular configuration can be converted into a regular configuration through a similar approach to the strategy introduced in [13] in order to minimize the computational SEC. The most challenging is the periodic configuration, for which we developed a sequence of multi-step procedures to form a regular polygon by the robots. At first, we divide Cir into $k \geq 2$ uniform sectors (depending on periodicities) with each arc containing n/k vertices of the target n -gon to be formed. The algorithm then works in parallel in each of the k uniform sectors. Within each sector, two robots are elected as *guards* to fix the chirality of a structure called *odd-block*. Let \mathcal{L} be the chord joining the left guard with the right guard. The other robots on the sector arc are now moved to the chord \mathcal{L} . One robot is elected as the *median* robot and reaches the midpoint of the arc cut by \mathcal{L} . A (inner) circle \mathcal{C} is now drawn such that it passes through the median robot and such that the chord becomes its tangent. All the robots on the chord now move to be positioned on the perimeter of \mathcal{C} .

We now use a procedure to provide a rank to the robots on \mathcal{C} so that a robot with rank j moves to the target n -gon vertex j . Indeed, *rank encoding* is an important task involved in UCF and it belongs to that part of literature that attempted to provide efficient strategies to encode *non-constant* data (e.g. swarm cardinality, robot ranks, configuration properties, etc.) through the swarm configuration, in a sort of *stigmergic behavior* [2, 3, 16, 23]. In [3], Bramas *et al.* develop the *level-slicing technique* for solving the fault-tolerant GATHERING problem using the mutual distance of another robot. In particular, robots operate according to their *level* previously encoded in their distance from another robot. In [16], authors use the *pairing technique* to solve UCF in that pairs of robots exploit their mutual distance to encode their rank, guaranteeing that half of the robots can reach the target position in a binary tournament fashion. To achieve a parallel fashion, one can suggest making robots encode their rank through their mutual distance from a selected robot. However, this general strategy is not sufficient to guarantee robots can reach such a mutual distance in $O(1)$ time without colliding or creating dangerous collinearities (in fact, robots need to count themselves to compute their rank).

To cope with these complications, we split the inner circle \mathcal{C} into slice units (equal to the minimum angular distance between any two robots) and make each robot encode its rank by properly positioning *within* its slice, thus ensuring complete visibility during collision-free motions in a parallel fashion. Besides the closeness with the level-slicing technique [3], our rank encoding presents some peculiar differences: robots operate on a circle instead of a line, the slices are fixed for the whole procedure, and they have the same length instead of exponential lengths. Such differences have been necessary to cope with opaque and collision-intolerant

robots and provide a robust rank encoding that retains effectiveness in complete asynchrony so that a robot must be able to recompute its rank j even when all the other robots are moving. Specifically, let ρ be the diameter of \mathcal{C} passing through the median robot. The robots on the inner circle are equally partitioned into two groups so that one group is positioned on the left half-perimeter of \mathcal{C} and the other group on its right half-perimeter. The robots in the left group then move along the perimeter to encode their rank using the angular distance with a fixed robot. Then, the right group can obtain its rank using the left group as a reference. Then, the robots of each group (first the right one, then the left one) migrate on ρ on their projections, then they recompute their rank and reach their target vertices on the Cir -arc belonging to their uniform sector. After each uniform sector completes the algorithm, the n robots are equally distributed on Cir , thus solving UCF. Care should be taken in synchronizing all these steps to ensure robots never collide even in \mathcal{ASYNC} . We show that all the steps can be executed correctly and safely (avoiding collisions) in $O(1)$ epochs.

1.5 Related Works

UCF has been investigated in the luminous-opaque robot model by Feletti *et al.* [15, 16, 17, 18] and Patanayak and Sharma [27]. Feletti *et al.* [15, 16, 17, 18] exhibited a $O(1)$ -time algorithm in \mathcal{FSYNC} and \mathcal{SSYNC} , and a $O(\log n)$ -time algorithm under \mathcal{ASYNC} , both using $O(1)$ colors and avoiding collisions. Patanayak and Sharma [27] showed that UCF can be solved in $O(1)$ time with $O(\sqrt{n})$ colors, or in $O(\log \log n)$ time with $O(1)$ colors in \mathcal{ASYNC} .

Previous works have studied UCF in the classic oblivious-transparent robot model. The state-of-the-art result by Flocchini *et al.* [21] shows that UCF can be solved under \mathcal{ASYNC} starting from any arbitrary configuration of $n > 5$ robots initially being on distinct locations, without any additional assumption (i.e., chirality, rigidity, etc.). However, their paper focuses on the computability of UCF and not on its complexity in terms of execution time. Prior to [21], other different assumptions [4, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 22] had been considered in the study of UCF. An excellent discussion can be found in [33]. The case of $n \leq 5$ can be solved using ad-hoc algorithms. The special case of the SQUARE FORMATION has been solved in [24]. Recently, UCF has been studied with additional objectives or features: minimizing the maximum distance traveled by a robot [1] and considering transparent/opaque fat robots (of diameter 1) [8, 25, 26].

GEOMETRIC or ARBITRARY PATTERN FORMATION is the macro-problem which encompasses UCF. Due to its importance, this problem has been heavily studied under different models (oblivious and luminous) [19, 20, 32]. Starting from arbitrary configurations of robots initially on distinct points on a plane, robots must autonomously arrange themselves to form the target pattern given to robots as input. Vaidyanathan *et al.* [32] showed that ARBITRARY PATTERN FORMATION can be solved in $O(\log n)$ epochs using $O(1)$ colors under \mathcal{ASYNC} . According to that result, UCF can also be solved in $O(\log n)$ epochs using $O(1)$ colors, provided that the target n -gon positions are given to robots a priori. However, since the target circle is not known in advance in this paper, the strategies in [32] are not compliant with our assumptions.

1.6 Paper Organization

We introduce the model and some preliminaries in Section 2. We present a high-level overview of the three components of our algorithm in Section 3. The first two components are described in Sections 4 and 5. The discussion on the second component focuses on minimizing the computational SEC. Then, we describe the third component in Section 6, which develops novel ideas allowing us to achieve complete parallelism using $O(1)$ colors. Section 7 describes how the techniques developed in the three components collectively solve UNIFORM CIRCLE FORMATION and prove its time- and color-optimization properties as well as computational SEC minimization property. Finally, we conclude with a short discussion in Section 8. The pseudo-code and correctness proofs are provided in Appendices A and B: complexity analysis directly follows from the correctness proofs.

2 Model and Preliminaries

Robots. We consider a swarm of n dimensionless robots (agents) $\mathcal{R} = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n\}$ that can move in an Euclidean plane \mathbb{R}^2 . They enjoy the classical features of these models: they are *autonomous*, *anonymous*,

indistinguishable, and *homogeneous*. They are completely disoriented (no global agreement on coordinate systems, chirality, unit distance, or origin). We consider *collision-intolerant* robots, i.e. robots must avoid collisions at any time. Two robots r_i, r_j are *mutual visible* to each other iff there does not exist a third robot r_k in the line segment joining r_i and r_j , such that $r_k \notin \{r_i, r_j\}$. Clearly, mutual visibility is reflexive and symmetric. The cardinality of the swarm n is not a given parameter of the algorithm robots must execute. We will often use r_i to denote the robot as well as its position.

Lights. Each robot is embedded with a light that can assume one color at a time from a fixed $O(1)$ -size palette.

Look-Compute-Move. By default, a robot r_i is inactive. A robot can be activated by an adversarial scheduler. When activated, it performs a “Look-Compute-Move” cycle as described below. After that, the robot becomes inactive until its next activation. Let us describe each LCM phase:

- *Look:* r_i takes an instantaneous snapshot of the current configuration, i.e. it takes the positions and the colors of all the robots *visible* to it. Robot positions are taken according to the coordinate system of r_i .
- *Compute:* Robot r_i performs a deterministic algorithm with infinite precision using the taken snapshot as the sole input. The algorithm produces in output a (possibly) new position and light color for r_i .
- *Move:* Robot r_i updates its light to the new color and moves to its new position along a straight trajectory. The move is rigid and hence r_i always reaches its calculated position.

Robot Activation and Synchronization. Generally, three schedulers are considered in the literature. Under the synchronous schedulers, time is divided in atomic *rounds*: at each round, a subset of robots is activated and they perform each phase of one LCM cycle in perfect synchrony. Specifically, under the fully synchronous scheduler (\mathcal{FSYNC}), all robots are activated at each round, while under the semi-synchronous scheduler (\mathcal{SSYNC}), an arbitrary non-empty subset of robots is activated at each round. Under the asynchronous scheduler (\mathcal{ASYNC}), robots act without any activation/synchronization assumption except for the fact that the Look phase is always instantaneous. The duration of each cycle is finite but unpredictable. Indeed, an arbitrary amount of time may elapse between Look/Compute and Compute/Move. Both in \mathcal{SSYNC} and in \mathcal{ASYNC} , we assume the *fairness assumption* which states that each robot is activated infinitely often. An activated robot cannot distinguish between active and inactive robots from the snapshot.

Runtime. In \mathcal{FSYNC} , time is measured in rounds of LCM cycles. However, since in \mathcal{SSYNC} and \mathcal{ASYNC} a robot could stay inactive for an indeterminate time, the concept of *epoch* [6] has been introduced to have a proper measure to analyze algorithm runtimes. We will use the term “time” generically to mean rounds for the \mathcal{FSYNC} and epochs for the \mathcal{SSYNC} and \mathcal{ASYNC} schedulers.

Configurations. Let the *initial* configuration be denoted as $Conf_{init}$. In $Conf_{init}$, the n robots in \mathcal{R} are positioned on n distinct points on the plane, all with the same light color (w.l.o.g. **off**). We denote with $Conf_{convex}$ a configuration where the n robots lay on the vertices of a convex n -gon. If this n -gon is inscribed into a circle, we denote this configuration as $Conf_{circle}$. If this n -gon is regular, we denote the configuration as $Conf_{regular}$.

Definition 1 (UNIFORM CIRCLE FORMATION). *Given any $Conf_{init}$ with n luminous-opaque robots on the Euclidean plane, the UNIFORM CIRCLE FORMATION (UCF) problem asks the robots to autonomously reposition themselves to reach $Conf_{regular}$ without colliding, and terminate.*

Terminology. Given two circles Ω_1, Ω_2 on the Euclidean plane, we say that Ω_1 is *enclosed in* Ω_2 , denoted as $\Omega_1 \sqsubseteq \Omega_2$, if all the points of Ω_1 belong to the enclosed region delimited by Ω_2 (perimeter included). Indeed, \sqsubseteq is reflexive and transitive. Given two points A, B , \overline{AB} denotes the line segment connecting such points. If A and B lay on a circle, \widehat{AB} denotes the smaller arc between the points A and B . If points A and B are antipodal (i.e., diametrically opposite), we identify the arc by \widehat{ACB} where C is a point on the circle that is contained in the arc \widehat{AB} . We say that an arc is *chiral* if the robots on it are arranged in an asymmetrical pattern. Given a point D and a segment \overline{EF} , we define the *mirror projection* (or, simply, *projection*) of

D on \overline{EF} the point $D' \in \overline{EF}$ (if it exists) such that $\overline{DD'} \perp \overline{EF}$. The *smallest enclosing circle (SEC)* of a given configuration $Conf$, denoted as $SEC(Conf)$, is the (unique) smallest circle containing all the robot positions in $Conf$. We denote with Cir the circle $SEC(Conf_{convex})$. Cir can be divided into n arcs of equal length. We call these arcs *uniform segments* and the corresponding endpoints are *uniform positions*. Table 3 summarizes the essential notations here or later introduced and mainly used throughout the whole paper.

$\Omega_1 \sqsubseteq \Omega_2$	Circle Ω_1 is enclosed in circle Ω_2
\overline{AB}	The line segment joining points A and B
\widehat{AB}	The smallest arc joining two points on the circle
$SEC(Conf)$	SEC of the configuration $Conf$
Cir	$SEC(Conf_{convex})$
α, β, μ	Angular Sequences
BDCP	BEACON DIRECTED CURVE POSITIONING
Φ	The set of robots with the smallest angular sequence
$\Upsilon_0, \dots, \Upsilon_{k-1}$	Uniform sectors
B_i, B_{i+1}	Boundaries of Υ_i
q	The total number of robots inside each uniform sector
U_1, \dots, U_q	Uniform positions inside a block
\mathcal{L}	The <i>block chord</i> joining the left guard with the right guard
Γ	The Block Arc
\mathcal{C}	The small circle inside an odd block
ρ	The median diameter of \mathcal{C}
m	Number of <i>west</i> (and so <i>east</i>) robots on \mathcal{C}
δ	The small angle for Procedure SLICE

Table 3: Terminology.




Figure 1: Different types of $Conf_{circle}$: (a) $Conf_{regular}$, (b) $Conf_{biangular}$, (c) $Conf_{uniperiodic}$, (d) $Conf_{biperiodic}$ without robots on the axis of symmetry, (e) $Conf_{biperiodic}$ with robots on the axis of symmetry.

2.1 Classes of Circle Configurations

Consider $Conf_{circle}$ where n robots colored onSEC are located on Cir . Let r_0, \dots, r_{n-1} be their positions. We define the *angular sequence* for a robot r_j as the sequence of angles in the clockwise order represented by $\alpha(j) = a_j a_{j+1} \dots a_{j-1}$, where $a_i = \angle r_i O r_{i+1}$, O is the center of Cir , and the indices are considered modulo n . Similarly, we define $\beta(j) = b_j b_{j-1} \dots b_{j+1}$, where $b_i = \angle r_i O r_{i-1}$ considered in the counterclockwise direction. Let $\mu(j) = \min\{\alpha(j), \beta(j)\}$ be the lexicographical minimum sequence for r_j . Let $\hat{\mu} = \min\{\mu(0), \dots, \mu(n-1)\}$. Note that, there may be multiple robots corresponding to the *smallest angular sequence* $\hat{\mu}$. We define $\Phi = \{r_i : \mu(i) = \hat{\mu}\}$.

A configuration is *reflective* (i.e., a mirror symmetry) if there exists a pair of robots r_p and $r_{p'}$ in Φ such that $\alpha(p) = \beta(p')$. Now, we distinguish between two cases, according to the cardinality of Φ :

2.1.1 Case $|\Phi| = n$ – Regular and Biangular Configurations

In this case, all the robots correspond to the smallest angular sequence. There are two types of configurations.

1. **Regular Configuration:** In $Conf_{regular}$, we have $\alpha(0) = \alpha(i)$, for all $i = 0, \dots, n-1$ (Figure 1a).
2. **Biangular Configuration:** In $Conf_{biangular}$, we have $\alpha(0) = \alpha(2i) = (a_0 a_1)^{\frac{n}{2}}$ where $a_0 \neq a_1$ and $n \geq 2$, for any $i = 0, \dots, \frac{n}{2} - 1$ (Figure 1b).

Observation 1. *If $|\Phi| = n$ and $\alpha(i) = \beta(i)$ for some $0 \leq i \leq n-1$, then the configuration is $Conf_{regular}$.*

In $Conf_{biangular}$, an axis of symmetry always passes through the midpoint between any pair of adjacent robots on Cir . Also, no robot lies on this axis of symmetry (Figure 1b).

2.1.2 Case $1 \leq |\Phi| < n$ – Periodic Configurations

In a periodic configuration $Conf_{periodic}$, there are $|\Phi|$ groups of robots creating some form of symmetry (reflective or rotational). $Conf_{periodic}$ can be classified into two subclasses as follows. If $Conf_{periodic}$ is *not reflective*, we call it *uniperiodic* and denote as $Conf_{uniperiodic}$ (Figure 1c). The special case $|\Phi| = 1$ gives us an *asymmetric* configuration, denoted as $Conf_{asymmetric}$. If the configuration is *reflective*, we call it *biperiodic* and denote as $Conf_{biperiodic}$. Given a diameter d lying on an axis of symmetry, there are three cases: (i) no robot lies on the endpoints of d (Figure 1d), (ii) each endpoint of d is covered by one robot (Figure 1e), and (iii) a robot lies on one endpoint of d whereas the other endpoint is robot-free.

Algorithm 1: BEACON DIRECTED CURVE POSITIONING [30]

Input Assumptions:

1. Ω , a k -point curve, with $k \in \{2, 3\}$;
2. $2k$ beacons lay on Ω (k left beacons and k right beacons);
3. m waiting robots r_1, \dots, r_m s.t.
 - (a) they are external to Ω belonging to the same half-plane (if $k = 2$) or the convex side (if $k = 3$);
 - (b) they can see all the $2k$ original beacons;
 - (c) they have to reach Ω
 - in some points between the original *left* beacons and the *right* beacons;
 - traveling along disjoint paths π_1, \dots, π_m ;
 - so that their paths intersect Ω only once;
 - so that if a waiting robot r_i sees at least k beacons, then it can compute its path π_i ;
 - (d) a waiting robot becomes a new beacon once it reaches Ω .

Result: All the waiting robots reach Ω without colliding in $O(\log k)$ epochs.

2.2 Beacon Directed Curve Positioning

BEACON DIRECTED CURVE POSITIONING (BDCP) is a procedure developed by Sharma *et al.* in [30] that uses some robots as *beacons* to define a k -point curve, and then guide other *waiting* robots (external to the curve all on one side) from their initial positions to their final positions on the curve in \mathcal{ASYNC} . A k -point curve Ω is a curve on \mathbb{R}^2 where k is the minimal number of points necessary to define Ω . Here, we consider only straight lines and circular arcs (so $k \in \{2, 3\}$). Beacons and waiting robots have different colors, w.l.o.g. **beacon** and **waiting**. BDCP starts placing $2k$ beacon robots on Ω (divided in k left and k right beacons) to define the curve. Specifically, the beacons are positioned at their final positions on the curve. After that, all the m waiting robots move to be positioned on Ω between left and right beacons (Figure 2). Once a robot reaches Ω , it changes its color to **beacon** becoming a new beacon. It was shown in [30] that if the first epoch started with m waiting robots wanting to move to the curve (i.e., not already in transit to the curve) and an epoch $e \geq 1$ starts with $v \geq 2k$ beacons, then epoch $e + 1$ starts with $\min\{m + 2k, 3v/2\}$ beacons, hence relocating all the robots to the curve in $O(\log k)$ epochs, using $O(1)$ colors. In our framework, we borrow the idea of Sharma *et al.* [30] and use BDCP to relocate robots on line segments ($k = 2$) and circular




Figure 2: BDCP on a circular arc, where b_1, b_2, b_3 (b_4, b_5, b_6 , resp.) are the *left* (*right*, resp.) beacons.




Figure 3: Transition diagram among configurations while solving UCF. The arrows without numbering denote a transition with only color change (no robot moves). The parameter q is the number of robots in each uniform sector of $Conf_{unisect}$.

arcs ($k = 3$) using $2k$ beacons in $O(\log k) = O(1)$ epochs in \mathcal{ASYNC} . Algorithm 1 summarizes the input assumptions and the resulted output of the BDCP procedure.

3 Overview of the Algorithm

In this section, we provide an overview of our $O(1)$ -time $O(1)$ -color algorithm for UCF under \mathcal{ASYNC} , avoiding collisions. Starting from an arbitrary configuration $Conf_{init}$ where n off-colored robots lay on distinct points of the plane, the proposed algorithm includes three major components:

- (I) circle formation;
- (II) transforming biangular configurations to regular configurations;
- (III) transforming periodic configurations to regular configurations.

In the next Sections, we will provide the details on each of these components. The proposed algorithm runs Component I and, subsequently, either Component II or Component III. The diagram in Figure 3 depicts the configuration transitions induced by the execution of each step of our algorithm.

Starting from $Conf_{init}$, robots execute Procedure COMPLETE VISIBILITY [30] to form a convex configuration $Conf_{convex}$ (**transition ①**). Afterward, robots execute Procedure CIRCLE FORMATION to achieve $Conf_{circle}$ (**transition ②**). Pattanayak and Sharma [27] showed that $Conf_{init}$ can be transformed to $Conf_{circle}$ in $O(1)$ epochs using $O(1)$ colors under \mathcal{ASYNC} , avoiding collisions.

Once in $Conf_{circle}$, if robots satisfy $Conf_{biangular}$, they use Procedure BIANGULAR to arrange themselves to satisfy $Conf_{regular}$, thus solving UCF (**transition ③**).

Indeed, the most challenging case results when $Conf_{circle}$ satisfies $Conf_{periodic}$. Our contribution in this paper will establish that $Conf_{periodic}$ can be transformed into $Conf_{regular}$ in $O(1)$ epochs under \mathcal{ASYNC} , avoiding collisions, using $O(1)$ colors (**transitions ④–⑧**). Specifically, $Conf_{periodic}$ is first transformed into $Conf_{unisect}$ (a configuration containing uniform sectors as defined later), using Procedure SPLIT (**transition ④**). Then $Conf_{unisect}$ is transformed into $Conf_{oddblock}$ (an odd block configuration defined later) using Procedure ODD BLOCK (**transition ⑤**). Then, $Conf_{oddblock}$ is transformed into $Conf_{smallcircle}$ using Procedure SMALL CIRCLE (**transition ⑥**). Finally $Conf_{smallcircle}$ is transformed into $Conf_{regular}$ using Procedure SLICE (**transition ⑦**), thus solving UCF. When $Conf_{unisect}$ has less than 12 robots in each uniform sector, we directly solve UCF using Procedure SEQUENTIAL MATCH (**transition ⑧**). We will show that each of

these procedures takes $O(1)$ time and colors. Light colors are also used to synchronize robots to decide on the subsequent configuration to achieve, avoiding ambiguous situations. Moreover, we will show that our solution minimizes the computational SEC by proving that $SEC(Conf) \sqsubseteq SEC(Conf_{init})$ for any intermediate configuration $Conf$ achieved throughout the execution of the whole algorithm.

We now provide details of the algorithm. We give particular focus on Components II and III since Component I can be run using the techniques of Feletti *et al.* [16, 17, 18] and Pattanayak and Sharma [27]. Therefore, we describe Component I in brief in Section 4 and move on to describing techniques for Components II and III in Sections 5 and 6, respectively. Notice that the techniques of Feletti *et al.* [16, 17, 18] and Pattanayak and Sharma [27] can be used in Component II but those techniques only optimize time and color complexities but not minimize the computational SEC. Our new idea both optimizes time/color complexities and minimizes the computational SEC.

4 Component I - Circle Formation (Transitions ① and ②)

Given $Conf_{init}$, the robots use the COMPLETE VISIBILITY algorithm of Sharma *et al.* [30] to reach $Conf_{convex}$ where robots occupy the vertices of a convex n -gon, thus guaranteeing complete visibility to the whole swarm. Let Cir be $SEC(Conf_{convex})$. The COMPLETE VISIBILITY algorithm in [30] works using $O(1)$ time and colors, and guarantees that any robot in the swarm operates within $SEC(Conf_{init})$ (thus minimizing the computational SEC). W.l.o.g. we assume that each robot is colored as **convex** in $Conf_{convex}$.

Starting from $Conf_{convex}$, robots execute Procedure CIRCLE FORMATION. Let r be a **convex** robot. If r already lays on the perimeter of Cir , it sets its color as **onSEC**. Note that at least 2 (if antipodal) or 3 robots (if not antipodal) on Cir set their color as **onSEC** without moving, while the remainder lies in the interior of Cir . Otherwise (i.e. if r is internal to Cir), r moves radially towards Cir until reaching the perimeter of the circle. After reaching Cir , r assumes color **onSEC**. Once every robot turns into **onSEC**, CIRCLE FORMATION is solved. Pattanayak and Sharma [27] showed that this process avoids collisions and robots correctly position themselves on Cir in $O(1)$ epochs with $O(1)$ colors.

Lemma 1 (Circle Formation [27]). *Given $Conf_{init}$ with n off-colored robots on distinct points on a plane, robots reposition themselves in $Conf_{circle}$ using $O(1)$ epochs and $O(1)$ colors under ASYNC, avoiding collisions, guaranteeing that robots operate within $SEC(Conf_{init})$.*

5 Component II - Transforming Biangular Configurations into Regular Configurations (Transition ③)

Each **onSEC** robot on $Conf_{circle}$ can check whether the current configuration satisfies either $Conf_{regular}$, $Conf_{biangular}$, or $Conf_{periodic}$. Thus, each robot changes its color accordingly (without moving) to either **regular**, **biangular**, or **periodic**, respectively. Colors are used to make robots agree on the procedure to be executed. Indeed, $Conf_{regular}$ solves UCF, so robots will no longer update their color or position.




Figure 4: Arrangement of $Conf_{biangular}$ in a regular n -gon.

We discuss here *Confbiangular*. *Confperiodic* is treated in Component III and discussed in the next section. To solve this special configuration, we take inspiration from an idea of Dieudonné *et al.* [13], although we implement a new approach to transform *Confbiangular* into *Confregular* which suits our objective. In *Confbiangular*, n is even and the configuration has $n/2$ axes of symmetry. Let $n = 2k$, and let P be the n -gon formed by the robots in *Confbiangular* (i.e. each vertex of P is covered by a robot). The strategy developed by Dieudonné *et al.* [13] was to spot the target regular n -gon P' which encloses P , such that robots lay on alternative edges of P' (Figure 4b), and make robots slide on the edges of P' until they stop to the vertices of P' . If on the one hand this strategy solves UCF even under \mathcal{ASYNC} , on the other hand it leads the robots to move outside $SEC(\text{Confbiangular})$ to reach the vertices of P' . Seeing that our objective is also to minimize the computational SEC, we propose a target n -gon P'' that is inscribed inside P . Specifically, the inscribed polygon P'' has its vertices on the larger edge of P (being biangular, P has two different edge lengths). After detecting the target polygon P'' , the robots are made to move along the larger edges of P towards the vertices of P'' , thus achieving *Confregular*. We now show that, as in [13], our strategy works also considering asynchronous robots. Given P , we form a regular k -gon by extending the larger edges of P (see Figure 4c). We call this extended k -gon as the *exogenous polygon* (EP for short). Notice that, as long as the robots move along the larger edges of P such that the larger edge remains the larger edge, the EP also remains the same. For an EP , there exists a unique regular $2k$ -gon inscribed in it (see Figure 4d). This property guarantees that the target polygon P'' (i.e. the regular $2k$ -gon inscribed in EP) is maintained even when some robots are in transit, and so it can be correctly computed even when robots no longer form P . In particular, the location of the vertices of P'' is located at a distance y from the vertex of the EP , where z is the edge length of the EP . The value of y is given by

$$y = \frac{z}{2 + \sqrt{2 - 2 \cos\left(\frac{(k-2)\pi}{k}\right)}}$$

After reaching a vertex of P'' , the robots assume color **regular**. In summary, robots form *Confregular* from *Confbiangular* in three epochs: (i) robots change color to **biangular**, (ii) then they head to the vertices of P'' , traveling along the edges of EP , and (iii) lastly they color as **regular**.

Lemma 2 (Biangular to Regular Configuration). *Given Confbiangular of n biangular-colored robots, the robots reposition to Confregular in $O(1)$ epochs using $O(1)$ colors under \mathcal{ASYNC} , avoiding collisions, guaranteeing that robots always operate within $SEC(\text{Confbiangular})$.*

6 Component III - Transforming Periodic Configurations into Regular Configurations (Transitions ④–⑧)

Before diving into the deep of our algorithm, we mention two strategic usages of robot lights to ensure a correct evolution of the algorithm under \mathcal{ASYNC} . For the sake of conciseness, we will often omit the details of these two strategies while explaining the algorithm, assuming their rationale is understood.

- **Elections under \mathcal{ASYNC} .** In some points of our algorithm, a group of robots is elected to perform a movement, in parallel. Being under \mathcal{ASYNC} , we need to ensure that all robots can correctly elect themselves even if part of the elected group is already moving. For this reason, our algorithm requires *all* the elected robots in the group to synchronize themselves setting their colors as **pre_<color>** before starting moving, where **<color>** will be the color they have to set once stopped and reactivated.
- **Movements under \mathcal{ASYNC} .** In the remainder, our algorithm makes a robot color itself as **to_<color>** before starting moving, where **<color>** will be the color it has to set once stopped and reactivated. This strategy guarantees robots recognize moving robots in \mathcal{ASYNC} (those not hidden by other robots), thus avoiding ambiguous situations.

6.1 Procedure SPLIT (Transition ④)

Procedure SPLIT takes in input *Confperiodic* where all n robots are **periodic**-colored and lay on *Cir* in a periodic pattern. This procedure partitions *Confperiodic* into $k \geq 2$ circular sectors $\Upsilon_0, \dots, \Upsilon_{k-1}$ such that

(i) they have the same arc length and (ii) they are size-balanced (i.e. containing the same number of robots), and (iii) they are chiral (i.e. the robots are arranged in an asymmetric pattern along the arc of each Υ_i). We call such sectors as *uniform sectors*. In this procedure, some robots will be elected as *leaders* to fix the boundaries of each Υ_i , and some robots will be elected and made to move to fix the chirality of the sector. Leaders will turn their color into **regular** if they lay on the boundaries of uniform sectors, or, otherwise, into **leader** (i.e. if the boundary of a uniform sector lies in the middle point between two consecutive **leader** robots). We proceed as follows, distinguishing two cases based on $|\Phi|$.




Figure 5: $Conf_{unisect}$ where Cir is split into uniform sectors (here delimited by dotted lines) using the light color: **regular** (here red), **left** (here cyan), **right** (here lime), and **leader** (here lightgray). All the other robots are omitted.

Case $|\Phi| = 1$: In this case, we form two uniform sectors Υ_0, Υ_1 . There are two subcases.

- **n odd:** It is possible to unambiguously select a diameter d passing through only one robot r and splitting Cir into two size-balanced halves. These two Cir -halves correspond to Υ_0, Υ_1 . The robot r changes its color to **regular**. Then, for each Υ_i , let U_1 be the uniform position on the arc Υ_i such that $\angle rOU_1 = 2\pi/n$ and $U_{(n-1)/2}$ be the uniform position such that $\angle r'OU_{(n-1)/2} = (n-1)\pi/n$. Two robots from each Υ_i are elected and made to move to U_1 and $U_{(n-1)/2}$, setting their colors as **left** and **right**, respectively. See Figure 5a.
- **n even:** It is possible to unambiguously select a diameter d either (i) passing through two antipodal robots r and r' , and splitting Cir into two size-balanced halves, or (ii) passing through only one robot r and splitting Cir into two halves with $n/2$ and $n/2 - 1$ robots. This diameter acts as the delimiter for the uniform sectors. The robot r turns its color into **regular**. When only one robot is located on d , then a robot r' from the half containing $n/2$ robots reaches the empty endpoint of d . Similar to the odd case, two robots are elected in each sector, and reach the uniform positions U_1 (such that $\angle rOU_1 = 2\pi/n$) and $U_{(n-2)/2}$ (such that $\angle r'OU_{(n-2)/2} = 2\pi/n$), setting their colors as **left** and **right**, respectively. Finally, r' sets its color to **regular**.

Case $|\Phi| > 1$: In this case, we form $|\Phi|$ uniform sectors. Let $(r_0, r_1, \dots, r_{|\Phi|-1})$ be the robots from Φ in a cyclic order. In the following, we consider indices $i \in \{0, \dots, |\Phi| - 1\}$ modulo n . We distinguish between uniperiodic and biperiodic configurations as defined in Section 2.1.

- **Uniperiodic:** All the robots in Φ set their color as **regular**. They define the boundaries of the uniform sectors so that each Υ_i is delimited by $\widehat{r_i r_{i+1}}$. In a uniperiodic configuration, all the uniform sectors have the same chirality, w.l.o.g. clockwise. Now, inside each Υ_i , two robots have to move and update their color to fix this chirality. Let q be the number of **periodic** robots in the uniform sectors. Let U_1 (U_q , resp.) be the uniform positions on the arc of Υ_i such that $\angle r_iOU_1 = 2\pi/n$ ($\angle U_qOr_{i+1} = 2\pi/n$, resp.). Within each Υ_i , two **periodic** robots are elected to be intended for the points U_1 and U_q . In at most two epochs, the elected **periodic** robots reach the uniform positions U_1 and U_q , setting their colors as **left** and **right**, respectively. Note that, in this case, robots always enjoy complete visibility of the swarm, even if some robots are moving. See Figure 5b.

- **Biperiodic:** All the robots in Φ change their color to **leader**. In this case, $|\Phi|$ is always even, and leaders never lay on the axes of reflective symmetry of the configuration. Let B_i be the midpoint of the arc $\widehat{r_{i-1}r_i}$ for each i . We define Υ_i as the sector whose arc is $\widehat{B_iB_{i+1}}$. If a robot lies on a boundary B_i for some i , it sets its color as **regular**. Notice that each uniform sector Υ_i has a central angle $2\pi/|\Phi|$ and contains the **leader**-colored robot r_i (not necessary on the middle point of the arc of Υ_i). In a biperiodic configuration, two adjacent sectors have opposite chirality. Let us consider a uniform sector Υ_i , and suppose that B_i is the left boundary according to the chirality of Υ_i . Let U_1 (U_q , resp.) be the point on the arc Υ_i such that it forms a central angle with B_i (B_{i+1} , resp.) equal to (i) $\frac{2\pi}{n}$ if a robot lies on B_i (B_{i+1} , resp.), (ii) $\frac{\pi}{n}$ otherwise. In the first epoch, two robots are elected from each sector Υ_i and they set their color as **pre_left** and **pre_right** so that the **pre_left** (**pre_right**, resp.) robot is intended to travel towards U_1 (U_q , resp.). If the elected **pre_left** (**pre_right**, resp.) robot already lies on U_1 (U_q , resp.), then it can directly assume the color **left** (**right**, resp.). Such two robots are unambiguously elected within each Υ_i among the closest adjacent **periodic** robots to the points U_1 and U_q . In the second epoch, all the **pre_left** robots reach the U_1 point on the corresponding sector and change their color to **left**. In the third epoch, all the **pre_right** robots reach the U_q point on the corresponding sector and set their color as **right**. See Figures 5c and 5d.

Let $Conf_{unisect}$ be the configuration obtained at the end of Procedure SPLIT (see Figure 5). In $Conf_{unisect}$, all the n robots lay on Cir , and they are partitioned in $k \geq 2$ uniform sectors $\Upsilon_0, \dots, \Upsilon_{k-1}$. All the robots laying on the boundaries of uniform sectors are **regular**-colored. Each Υ_i contains a **left** robot and a **right** robot, which set the chirality of Υ_i . All the robots that are not **{regular, left, right}**-colored change their color to **split**. Note that all the **{regular, left, right}**-colored robots will not move anymore: they already lay on uniform positions. From now on, no robot will move out from its original uniform sector, and each of the subsequent procedures will run in parallel inside each uniform sector. See Appendix B.1 for the correctness proofs and complexity analysis of Procedure SPLIT.

Lemma 3 (Split). *Starting from $Conf_{periodic}$, $Conf_{unisect}$ is reached in $O(1)$ epochs using $O(1)$ colors under ASYNC, avoiding collisions, guaranteeing that robots always operate within $SEC(Conf_{periodic})$. Robots are evenly partitioned in uniform sectors, whose chirality is set by **right**- and **left**-colored robots.*

6.2 Procedure ODD BLOCK (Transition ⑤)

Given $Conf_{unisect}$, Procedure ODD BLOCK acts on each uniform sector independently. As the name suggests, we build an *odd block* inside each uniform sector Υ_i . Before describing the details of Procedure ODD BLOCK, we depict the target configuration that we want to achieve at the end of this procedure.

Odd block. An odd block of size $2l + 1$, for an integer l , is a circular sector of Cir whose central angle measures $\frac{4l\pi}{n}$. When l is known, we will refer to the odd block as l -block. An l -block contains $2l + 1$ uniform positions along its arc, which we denote as Γ . Let $U_1, U_2, \dots, U_{2l+1}$ be the uniform positions of this block, where U_1 and U_{2l+1} lay on the endpoints of Γ . The block contains two robots on U_1 and U_{2l+1} . We will refer to such two robots as the *left* and the *right guard*. A robot, called the *median robot*, is located at position U_{l+1} . Let \mathcal{L} be the block chord $\overline{U_1U_{2l+1}}$. At the end of Procedure ODD BLOCK, the guards and the median robot are colored as **blockL** (left), **blockR** (right), and **median**, respectively. These robots do not move anymore. Instead, all the other $2l - 2$ robots will have moved to distinct points of \mathcal{L} , with the chord color. Through the subsequent procedures (Procedure SMALL CIRCLE and Procedure SLICE), the chord robots will uniformly arrange themselves on Γ , in order to cover the unoccupied uniform positions $U_2, \dots, U_l, U_{l+2}, \dots, U_{2l}$. An odd block is built *inside* each uniform sector Υ_i . The guards of the block fix the *block chirality*, which is local and is the same as the chirality of the related uniform sector.

Given a uniform sector Υ_i in $Conf_{unisect}$, Procedure ODD BLOCK works in three stages.

- **Stage 1.** Defining the guards of the odd block within Υ_i by adding a **padding** robot if necessary.
- **Stage 2.** Moving the robots located between the boundaries of Υ_i and U_1 (resp. U_{2l+1}) to the block chord \mathcal{L} .
- **Stage 3.** Moving the robots from Γ to the block chord \mathcal{L} .




Figure 6: Odd block formation if q is even.




Figure 7: Stages in Procedure ODD BLOCK.

Let Υ_i be a uniform sector in $Conf_{unisect}$, and let q be the number of robots in Υ_i (except for those on its boundaries). Indeed, all the uniform sectors contain q robots. Let U_1, \dots, U_q be the uniform positions along the arc of Υ_i , such that the **left** robot lies on U_1 whereas the **right** robot lies on U_q . We describe separately below how we perform the movement of robots in each of the five stages. All the robots involved in the following stages belong to Υ_i . Note that some robots use the `pre_<color>` colors to synchronize themselves in the various uniform sectors before starting to move (as explained at the beginning of Section 6).

Stage 1. If q is even, the **split** robot closest to U_{q-1} sets its color as `pre_blockR` and, after the synchronization with all the other `pre_blockR` in the other uniform sectors, it reaches U_{q-1} where $\angle U_{q-1}OU_q = 2\pi/n$, and it changes its color to `blockR`. The **right** robot changes its color to `padding`. The `padding` robot will no longer move. The **left** robot changes its color to `blockL`. If q is odd, then the robots with color `left` and `right` change their colors to `blockL` and `blockR`, respectively. In both cases, `blockL` and `blockR` robots act as the left and right guards for each odd block. The block chord \mathcal{L} is defined as the chord joining the guards, and the block arc Γ is the arc cut by \mathcal{L} . Then, the **split** robot closest to the midpoint of Γ elects itself as `pre_median` and then moves to the midpoint, changing its color to `median` (see Figure 6).

Stage 2. Let us consider the l -odd block built within Υ_i . Let B_i and B_{i+1} be the boundaries of Υ_i , and let U_1 and U_{2l+1} be the boundaries of Γ (i.e. where the guards lay on). All the **split** robots which lay on Γ change their color to `in_chord`, otherwise they change into `out_chord` (i.e. if they lay on $\widehat{B_iU_1}$ and on $\widehat{U_{2l+1}B_{i+1}}$). This stage aims to make all the `out_chord` robots migrate to \mathcal{L} . If no robot with color `out_chord` exists in Υ_i , then Stage 3 begins directly. Let M be the middle point of the arc of Υ_i . If the `median` robot does not lay on M , then the **split** robot closest to M elects itself as `pre_mid` and then it moves to M changing its color to `mid`. Otherwise, the `median` robot sets its color to `mid`. Notice that, for $q \geq 12$, M always lies on Γ . Now, we use BDCP to make `out_chord` robots migrate to \mathcal{L} . Firstly, we set two beacons on \mathcal{L} : one left beacon next to U_1 and one right beacon next to U_{2l+1} . Such two beacons together with the guards on U_1 and U_{2l+1} form the 4 beacons needed to implement BDCP. Let us show how to select the left beacon b (a complement strategy holds for the selection of the right beacon). If there exists an `out_chord` robot on $\widehat{B_iU_1}$, then the closest `out_chord` robot to U_1 is elected as b . In this case, b changes its color to `pre_beacon` and moves to the intersection of the line segments \overline{DM} and \mathcal{L} , where D was the position of b . Otherwise, b is the farthest robot to U_1 selected from the other `out_chord` robots on the arc of Υ_i .

In this case, b reaches a position on \mathcal{L} so that it can play the role of the left beacon and it does not create collinearities with the `mid` robot. Once on \mathcal{L} , b sets its color as `beacon`. An analogous procedure is repeated

to choose the right beacon close to U_{2l+1} . The two `beacon` robots together with the `blockL` and `blockR` robots act as the four beacons for the BDCP procedure (see Figure 7a). By BDCP, each `out_chord` robot r located at E heads to \mathcal{L} to the point intersecting \overline{EM} and \mathcal{L} . Once r reaches \mathcal{L} , it changes its color to `chord`. Note that the setting of the `mid` robot at the midpoint of the arc Υ_i was necessary to make r select the `mid` robot belonging to Υ_i (in fact, no ambiguity arises since the `mid` robot of Υ_i is always closer to r than the other `mid` robots). Stage 2 ends when no more `out_chord` robots are located in Υ_i .

Stage 3. In this stage, we apply BDCP to make the `in_chord` robots migrate from Γ to \mathcal{L} . From now on, the `mid` robot is no longer necessary, so it changes its color to `in_chord` if the `median` exists on the block arc. Otherwise, the `mid` robot resets its color to `median`. At the end of Stage 2, there are `beacon`- and `chord`-colored robots on \mathcal{L} . Such robots can act as beacons for fixing the chord \mathcal{L} for the `in_chord` robots. Let r be a `in_chord` robot located at F on Γ . Let F' be the projection of F on \mathcal{L} , i.e., $\overline{FF'}$ is perpendicular to \mathcal{L} . Let Z be the robot location such that the projection Z' on \mathcal{L} is the closest to F' . If F' is already occupied by a robot, then the revised destination is computed as F'' where $|\overline{F'F''}| = |\overline{F'Z'}|/3$ (see Figure 7b). Once r reaches \mathcal{L} , it changes its color to `chord`. Note that, if there were no robots colored `out_chord` in Stage 2, then the closest `in_chord` colored robots to U_1 and U_{2l+1} move to their projection to act as beacons at the beginning of Stage 3. This ensures that all robots reach \mathcal{L} in $O(1)$ time by implementing BDCP.

See Appendix B.2 for the correctness proofs of Procedure ODD BLOCK.

Lemma 4 (Odd Block). *Starting from $Conf_{unisect}$, $Conf_{oddblock}$ is reached in $O(1)$ epochs using $O(1)$ colors under $ASYNC$, avoiding collisions, guaranteeing robots always operate within $SEC(Conf_{unisect})$. In each odd block, the guards are colored as `blockL` and `blockR`, the median robot is colored as `median`, whereas all the other robots are located on the block chord \mathcal{L} with color `chord`.*

6.3 Procedure SMALL CIRCLE (Transition ⑥)

Consider an l -block in $Conf_{oddblock}$. W.l.o.g., let the block chirality be clockwise. First, the left guard, the median robot, and the right guard change their color to `scL`, `scMedian`, and `scR`, respectively. Let ρ be the line segment connecting U_{l+1} to the projection of U_{l+1} on the block chord \mathcal{L} . We define the *small circle* \mathcal{C} as the circle such that ρ is its diameter (i.e. U_{l+1} lays on \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{L} is its tangent). We say that ρ splits \mathcal{C} into two halves \mathcal{C}_w (left) and \mathcal{C}_e (right). We will refer to ρ as the *median diameter*. See Figure 8.




Figure 8: An odd-block at the beginning of Procedure SMALL CIRCLE, containing the small circle \mathcal{C} . All the chord robots (here *black*) lay on \mathcal{L} .

Now, Procedure SMALL CIRCLE proceeds in three stages as described in the following.

- **Stage 1 – Moving robots to the small circle:** Each `chord` robot moves along the line joining its position and the `scMedian` robot, until it reaches \mathcal{C} .
- **Stage 2 – Moving all robots to the right half:** The robots on \mathcal{C}_w migrate to \mathcal{C}_e .
- **Stage 3 – Balancing robots on the small circle:** The robots on \mathcal{C}_e split into two equal groups, and one of the groups comes back to \mathcal{C}_w forming a reflective symmetric configuration on \mathcal{C} .

Stage 1. Let r be a **chord** robot on the block chord \mathcal{L} . It always sees the **scMedian** robot of its block. Thanks to the presence of the other robots on \mathcal{L} (**chord**-, **scR**- or **scL**-colored), r reconstructs the supporting line of \mathcal{L} , and so ρ and \mathcal{C} . Then, r reaches \mathcal{C} traveling along the trajectory connecting its own position to the **scMedian** robot (see Figure 9), and it updates its color to **smallcircle**. Consider the line connecting the left (right, resp.) guard of the block with the median robot such that it splits \mathcal{C}_w (\mathcal{C}_e , resp.) into two arcs. Indeed, all the **smallcircle** robots on \mathcal{C} lay on the lower arcs of \mathcal{C}_w and \mathcal{C}_e . We call such arcs the *safe arcs* of \mathcal{C} (see Figure 9). When the **scR** (resp. **scL**) robot does not see any **chord** or **to_smallcircle** (i.e. the moving robots towards \mathcal{C} before becoming **smallcircle**) robots on its half-block, then it sets its color as **scR_complete** (resp. **scL_complete**). When a **smallcircle** robot on \mathcal{C}_e (resp. \mathcal{C}_w) sees the **scR_complete** (resp. **scL_complete**) robot on its half-block, it sets its colors as **smallcircle_complete**. These color updates are needed to synchronize all robots on \mathcal{C} before proceeding with the next stage.

See Lemma 18 in Appendix B.3 for the correctness proof of Stage 1.




Figure 9: Stage 1 of Procedure SMALL CIRCLE: trajectories of **chord** robots to reach \mathcal{C} . The two dashed lines delimit the *safe arcs* on \mathcal{C}_e and \mathcal{C}_w .

Stage 2. At the beginning of this stage, all the robots on \mathcal{L} have reached the safe arcs of \mathcal{C} . Specifically, we have two groups of **smallcircle_complete** robots on \mathcal{C}_e and \mathcal{C}_w , possibly with different cardinalities. We assume all the **smallcircle_complete** robots on \mathcal{C}_e (\mathcal{C}_w , resp.) set their color as **smallcircle_east** (**smallcircle_west**, resp.). If the robots on \mathcal{C}_e and \mathcal{C}_w lay in a reflective symmetry, they do nothing else in this stage. Otherwise, let r be a **smallcircle_west** robot on \mathcal{C}_w . If a **smallcircle_east** robot lies on \mathcal{C}_e , symmetrical with respect to r , then r moves to another position x on \mathcal{C}_w such that (i) r does not collide with other robots or change its rank in the displacement of robots, (ii) the symmetrical position of x on \mathcal{C}_e is robot-free, and (iii) r does not leave the safe arc of \mathcal{C}_w . When all the **smallcircle_west** robots have properly shifted their positions (if necessary), then they use BDCP to migrate on their projection on \mathcal{C}_e . After the migration, we assume that all the robots on \mathcal{C}_e (except for the median one) are colored as **smallcircle_east**. See Lemma 19 in Appendix B.3 for the correctness proof of Stage 2.

Stage 3. The **smallcircle_east** robots update their color alternating two colors, **west** and **east**, so that the closest robot to the median robot is colored as **east**. After that, each **west** robot heads to the projection on \mathcal{C}_w of its upper-adjacent **east** robot (see Figure 10). See Lemma 20 in Appendix B.3 for the correctness proof of Stage 3.

Lemma 5 (Small Circle). *Starting from $Conf_{\text{oddblock}}$, $Conf_{\text{smallcircle}}$ is reached in $O(1)$ epochs using $O(1)$ colors in the $ASYNC$ setting, avoiding collisions, guaranteeing robots operate within $SEC(Conf_{\text{oddblock}})$. In $Conf_{\text{smallcircle}}$, the robots in each odd block (guards and median robot excluded) are arranged on the same small circle \mathcal{C} in a mirror-symmetric pattern where the line of symmetry lies on the median diameter ρ .*

6.4 Procedure SLICE (Transition ⑦)

Consider an l -block in $Conf_{\text{smallcircle}}$ (see Figure 11). First, the guards and the median robots turn into **sliceL**, **sliceR** and **sliceMedian**, respectively. Let Q be the center of \mathcal{C} . Let e_1, \dots, e_m (resp., w_1, \dots, w_m) be the ordered sequences of **east** (resp., **west**) robots which lay on \mathcal{C}_e (resp., \mathcal{C}_w) starting from the closest to the median robot. Note that e_j and w_j lay on symmetric positions in the two half-circles, for each $1 \leq j \leq m$.




Figure 10: Stage 3 of Procedure SLICE: **west** robots reach \mathcal{C}_e .

We say that the median robot splits Γ into the right arc Γ_e and the left arc Γ_w . Procedure SLICE aims at moving the robots from \mathcal{C} to Γ to the vertices of the target regular n -gon. Let us present the three main stages that constitute the entire procedure:

- **Stage 1 – Rank encoding:** Each w_j encodes its rank j by reaching a specific position on \mathcal{C}_w .
- **Stage 2 – Moving towards the right target vertices:** Each e_j reaches its uniform position on Γ_e .
- **Stage 3 – Moving towards the left target vertices:** Each w_j reaches its uniform position on Γ_w .




Figure 11: $Conf_{smallcircle}$ at the beginning of Procedure SLICE.

Stage 1. Let us denote with w_0 and w_{m+1} the two endpoints of \mathcal{C}_w (the median robot laying on w_0). Let $\alpha_j = \angle w_j Q w_{j+1}$, for each $0 \leq j \leq m$. At the beginning of this stage, robot w_1 computes $\delta = \min\{\alpha_j\}_{0 \leq j \leq m}$, moves to a position w'_1 on \mathcal{C}_w so that $\angle w_0 Q w'_1 = \delta$ setting its color as **angle** (see Figure 12a). In this way, the **angle** robot fixes the amplitude of the slices both \mathcal{C}_e and \mathcal{C}_w will be split throughout this procedure. After this setting, each **west** robot splits \mathcal{C}_w into δ -slices, starting from the point w_0 (see Figure 12b). Let $\eta_0, \dots, \eta_{\lfloor \frac{m}{\delta} \rfloor - 1}$ be the ordered sequence of such δ -slices, starting from the median robot. We ignore the possible remaining slice of amplitude $< \delta$ that can exist between $\eta_{\lfloor \frac{m}{\delta} \rfloor - 1}$ and w_{m+1} . Indeed, the arc of each δ -slice contains at most two robots: in the case of exactly two robots, both of them must lay on the endpoints of the slice arc. Let w_j be a **west** robot and let η_k be the slice it lays on (if w_j lays on the endpoint between two slices, then it chooses the slice with the smaller rank k). Then, w_j moves to a new position w'_j on \mathcal{C}_w such that $\angle w_0 O w'_j = k\delta + \frac{j\delta}{m+1}$. Note this strategy always guarantees w'_j is strictly contained in η_k , thus ensuring these movements never create collisions or collinearities among **west** robots. See Lemma 21 in Appendix B.4 for the correctness proof of Stage 1.

Stage 2. In this stage, each **east** robot reaches its uniform position on Γ_e in two steps. Let e_1, \dots, e_m be the sequence of the **east** robots and let U_1, \dots, U_m be the sequence of the uniform positions on Γ_e so that U_j is intended for e_j . In the first step, robots e_1, e_2 and e_3 turn their color as **beacon**. Afterward, all the other **east** robots $\{e_j\}_{4 \leq j \leq m}$ on Γ_e migrate towards ρ . Specifically, each **east** robot e_j directly heads



Figure 12: Steps of Stage 1 in Procedure SLICE.

to the projection e'_j of its position on \mathcal{C}_e along ρ , setting its color as **east_diameter**. This migration is accomplished to make robots be aligned and so to avoid collisions and collinearities which might not allow a complete parallelism in the second step. Finally, the three beacons e_1, e_2 and e_3 migrate on Γ_w in order to fix Γ and so to help the **east_diameter** robots to uniformly arrange themselves on the arc Γ_e in the second step. The beacons must safely migrate to some positions that are visible to the robots on ρ . Let u be the intersection point between Γ_w and the line connecting e_1 (the first **beacon**) with w_1 (the **angle** robot). Let v be the intersection point between Γ_w and the line connecting e'_m with w_2 . We call \widehat{uv} the *safe arc* of Γ_w . So, e_1, e_2 and e_3 reach some deterministic and internal points of the safe arc \widehat{uv} (see Figure 13a).


In the second step, all the **east_diameter** robots on ρ compute and reach their uniform position. Let e be an **east_diameter** robot on ρ . To compute its uniform position, e needs to recover the arc Γ_e and its rank j . The rank j can be obtained by slicing \mathcal{C}_w (resp., \mathcal{C}_e) in $\eta_0, \dots, \eta_{\lfloor \frac{m}{\delta} \rfloor - 1}$ (resp., $\eta'_0, \dots, \eta'_{\lfloor \frac{m}{\delta} \rfloor - 1}$). Let η'_k be the slice where e originally laid on (before its migration on ρ). Since e can see all the **west** robots, it is sufficient for e to compute the rank j of the **west** robot located on η_k . After having obtained its rank j and the arc Γ_e (thanks to the presence of the beacons fixing Γ), e heads to U_j setting its color as **regular** (see Figure 13b). Finally, the beacons e_1, e_2, e_3 reach the missing uniform positions U_1, U_2, U_3 . See Lemma 22 in Appendix B.4 for the correctness proof of Stage 2.

Stage 3. In this stage, each **west** robot reaches its uniform position on Γ_w in two steps. Let w_2, \dots, w_m be the sequence of the **west** robots and let U'_2, \dots, U'_m be the sequence of the uniform positions on Γ_w so that U'_j is intended for w_j . Recall that robot w_1 updated its color to **angle** in Stage 1. This robot is destined for position U'_1 .


In the first step, the **angle** robot moves perpendicularly to ρ and reaches its symmetric position on \mathcal{C}_e . Then, w_2 reaches a position on \mathcal{C}_e to form an angle $\frac{\delta}{m}$ with **angle**, setting its color as **anglem**. After this setting, all the **west** robots migrate from \mathcal{C}_w to their projection on ρ in constant time by implementing the BDCP strategy (w_0, w_3, w_{m-1}, w_m as beacons) and change their color in **west_diameter**.

In the second step, all the **west_diameter** robots along ρ compute and reach their uniform position. Let w be a **west_diameter** robot on ρ . It needs Γ_w and its rank to compute its target uniform position. To obtain its rank, w must exploit the slicing technique of \mathcal{C} to decode its rank. So, w recomputes \mathcal{C}_w and \mathcal{C}_e through the presence of the **angle** and **anglem** robots, and the line where ρ lies. Then, w splits \mathcal{C}_w in δ -slices and determines the slice η_k where it originally laid on. Then, w decodes its rank j inverting the formula $\angle w_0 O w' = k\delta + \frac{j\delta}{m+1}$, where w' is the projection of w on \mathcal{C}_w . Recall that w_0 is the position of the median robot. Note that w can determine m through the angle formed by the **angle** and **anglem** robots. After having obtained its rank j and the arc Γ_w (through the presence of the **sliceR** robot and the **regular** robots on Γ_e), w heads towards U'_j and sets its color as **regular** (see Figure 14). Lastly, the **angle** and **anglem** robots on \mathcal{C}_e reach U'_1 and U'_2 setting their color as **regular**. At the end of Procedure SLICE, all the uniform positions of the block are occupied by a robot, and no other robot lays on \mathcal{C} (except for the median one). See Lemma 23 in Appendix B.4 for the correctness proof of Stage 3.

Since Procedure SLICE is repeated for each block of \mathcal{C}_{ir} , the target n -gon is achieved. Eventually, all robots turn into **regular**.



(a) Step 1: `east_diameter` robots on ρ and beacons on the safe arc \widehat{wv} .



(b) Step 2: the `east_diameter` robots reach their uniform positions.

Figure 13: Stage 2, starting with $m = 6$ east robots.




Figure 14: Stage 3, Step 2: `west_diameter` robots reach their uniform positions (here $m = 6$).

Lemma 6 (Slice). *Starting from $Conf_{smallcircle}$, $Conf_{regular}$ is reached in $O(1)$ epochs using $O(1)$ colors in the $AS\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{N}\mathcal{C}$ setting, avoiding collisions, guaranteeing robots always operate within $SEC(Conf_{smallcircle})$. Each robot is colored `regular`.*

6.5 Procedure SEQUENTIAL MATCH (Transition ⑧)

Let $Conf_{unisect}$ be the output configuration of Procedure SPLIT, where Cir is split into k uniform sectors $\{\Upsilon_i\}_{0 \leq i \leq k-1}$. Procedure SEQUENTIAL MATCH is executed starting from $Conf_{unisect}$ when the number of robots q in each uniform sector Υ_i (except for its boundaries) is less than 12. Remember that, at the end of Procedure SPLIT, each Υ_i contains a `left` and a `right` robot at U_1 and U_q , and possibly a `regular` robot at its boundaries. We assume all the robots that are not `left`-, `right`- or `regular`-colored set their color as `unmatched`. Now, the closest `unmatched` robot to the related U_2 of each uniform sector sets its color as `pre_matched`. After the setting of the `pre_matched` in each of the k uniform sectors, these robots reach the corresponding uniform position U_2 and set their color as `matched`. This routine is repeated until each

uniform position U_j for $j = 2, \dots, q - 1$ is covered by a **matched** robot. Since the number of movements is upper-bounded by a constant, the whole procedure is performed in constant time. Eventually, all the robots change their color to **regular**, solving UCF.

See Appendix B.5 for the correctness proofs of Procedure SEQUENTIAL MATCH.

Lemma 7 (Sequential Match). *Starting from $Conf_{unisect}$, $Conf_{regular}$ is reached in $O(1)$ epochs using $O(1)$ colors in the $ASYNC$ setting, avoiding collisions, guaranteeing all robots perform within $SEC(Conf_{unisect})$. Each robot is colored **regular**.*

7 Putting It All Together

Algorithm 2 summarizes the steps of our UCF algorithm. Starting from an arbitrary initial configuration $Conf_{init}$, robots arrange in $Conf_{convex}$ through the algorithm in [30] which guarantees to avoid collisions and to use $O(1)$ epochs/colors (Transition ①). Moreover, no robot moves out from $SEC(Conf_{init})$ while reaching $SEC(Conf_{convex})$, thus not expanding the initial computational SEC. Afterward, robots achieve $Conf_{circle}$ by reaching the boundaries of $SEC(Conf_{convex})$ in $O(1)$ epochs/colors, without colliding or moving out from $SEC(Conf_{convex})$ (Transition ②). Indeed, $SEC(Conf_{circle}) = SEC(Conf_{convex})$. Lemma 1 summarizes the results of Transitions ①-②.

If $Conf_{circle}$ is a biangular configuration, then robots arrange themselves in a regular n -gon through our strategy explained in Section 5 (Transition ③). Lemma 2 shows that this transition occurs without collisions, in $O(1)$ epochs/colors, without expanding the computational SEC. Otherwise, if $Conf_{circle}$ is a periodic configuration, robots perform a sequence of procedures (corresponding to Transitions ④-⑧) to eventually form $Conf_{regular}$. Colors are adopted to synchronize robots and make them identify the exact procedure to be executed. Lemmas 3–7 show that such procedures are performed using $O(1)$ epochs/colors, avoiding collisions and within $SEC(Conf_{circle})$. Combining all these results, we have the following theorem, our contribution.

Theorem 1 (Uniform Circle Formation). *Given any $Conf_{init}$ of n robots on distinct points on a plane initially colored **off**, the robots reposition to $Conf_{regular}$ solving UCF in $O(1)$ epochs using $O(1)$ colors under $ASYNC$, avoiding collisions, always performing within $SEC(Conf_{init})$.*

As a corollary, our UCF algorithm asymptotically optimizes the computational time (number of epochs) and the used light colors, and minimizes the computational SEC.

8 Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we have studied the UNIFORM CIRCLE FORMATION (UCF) problem, which is considered an important special case of the fundamental GEOMETRIC PATTERN FORMATION problem. Specifically, we have investigated UCF under the $ASYNC$ scheduler in the *luminous-opaque* robot model and presented a $O(1)$ -time $O(1)$ -color deterministic algorithm, which is asymptotically optimal in both the fundamental metrics, time and color complexities. Additionally, it minimizes what we have called the *computational SEC*, i.e. the smallest circular area touched by the swarm during the execution of the algorithm. The state-of-the-art solution [27] was optimal in either time complexity or color complexity but not both (Table 1) and the computational SEC was not minimized.

Although our solution optimizes the *color complexity*, we have not focused on minimizing the *exact number* of colors used along the whole algorithm. Indeed, the size of our palette can be significantly reduced by reusing some colors in multiple steps along the algorithm. However, for the sake of clarity, instead of saving on the number of colors, we have used colors with specific, consistent, and meaningful names to help the reader understand their purposes and follow the algorithm steps. Moreover, minimizing the palette size would result in proving that no ambiguities, deadlocks, or wrong computations can ever happen along the algorithm. Trustingly, we leave this investigation for further work.

For other future work, it would be interesting to consider non-rigid movements of robots, so that a robot may not reach the computed destination but stop at some point along the Move trajectory. It would also be interesting to establish whether a $O(1)$ -time solution can be obtained for UCF considering oblivious robots (i.e. without lights) with both rigid and non-rigid movements of robots.

References

- [1] Subhash Bhagat and Krishnendu Mukhopadhyaya. Optimum circle formation by autonomous robots. *Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing*, 666:153 – 165, 2018.
- [2] Kaustav Bose, Ranendu Adhikary, Manash Kumar Kundu, and Buddhadeb Sau. Positional encoding by robots with non-rigid movements. In *26th International Colloquium on Structural Information and Communication Complexity, SIROCCO 2019*, volume 11639 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 94–108. Springer, 2019.
- [3] Quentin Bramas, Anissa Lamani, and Sébastien Tixeuil. Stand up indulgent gathering. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 939:63–77, 2023.
- [4] Ioannis Chatzigiannakis, Michael Markou, and Sotiris E. Nikolettseas. Distributed circle formation for anonymous oblivious robots. In *WEA*, volume 3059 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 159–174. Springer, 2004.
- [5] Jared Ray Coleman, Evangelos Kranakis, Oscar Morales-Ponce, Jaroslav Opatrny, Jorge Urrutia, and Birgit Vogtenhuber. Minimizing the maximum distance traveled to form patterns with systems of mobile robots. In *Proceedings of the 32nd Canadian Conference on Computational Geometry, CCCG 2020, August 5-7, 2020, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada*, pages 73–79, 2020.
- [6] Andreas Cord-Landwehr, Bastian Degener, Matthias Fischer, Martina Hüllmann, Barbara Kempkes, Alexander Klaas, Peter Kling, Sven Kurras, Marcus Märten, Friedhelm Meyer auf der Heide, Christoph Raupach, Kamil Swierkot, Daniel Warner, Christoph Weddemann, and Daniel Wonisch. A new approach for analyzing convergence algorithms for mobile robots. In *ICALP*, volume 6756 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 650–661. Springer, 2011.
- [7] Shantanu Das, Paola Flocchini, Giuseppe Prencipe, Nicola Santoro, and Masafumi Yamashita. Autonomous mobile robots with lights. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 609:171–184, 2016.
- [8] Suparno Datta, Ayan Dutta, Sruti Gan Chaudhuri, and Krishnendu Mukhopadhyaya. Circle formation by asynchronous transparent fat robots. In *Distributed Computing and Internet Technology*, volume 7753, pages 195–207, 02 2013.
- [9] Xavier Défago and Akihiko Konagaya. Circle formation for oblivious anonymous mobile robots with no common sense of orientation. In *POMC*, pages 97–104. ACM, 2002.
- [10] Xavier Défago and Samia Souissi. Non-uniform circle formation algorithm for oblivious mobile robots with convergence toward uniformity. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 396(1-3):97–112, 2008.
- [11] Giuseppe Antonio Di Luna, Paola Flocchini, Sruti Gan Chaudhuri, Nicola Santoro, and Giovanni Viglietta. Robots with lights: Overcoming obstructed visibility without colliding. In *SSS*, pages 150–164, 2014.
- [12] Yoann Dieudonne, Ouiddad Labbani-Igbida, and Franck Petit. Circle formation of weak mobile robots. *ACM Transactions on Autonomous and Adaptive Systems*, 3, 08 2006.
- [13] Yoann Dieudonné and Franck Petit. Swing words to make circle formation quiescent. In *SIROCCO*, volume 4474, pages 166–179, 2007.
- [14] Yoann Dieudonné and Franck Petit. Squaring the circle with weak mobile robots. In *ISAAC*, pages 354–365, 2008.
- [15] Caterina Feletti, Carlo Mereghetti, and Beatrice Palano. Uniform Circle Formation for Swarms of Opaque Robots with Lights. In *SSS*, pages 317–332, 2018.
- [16] Caterina Feletti, Carlo Mereghetti, and Beatrice Palano. $O(\log\{n\})$ -time uniform circle formation for asynchronous opaque luminous robots. In *OPODIS*, pages 5:1–5:21, 2023.

- [17] Caterina Feletti, Carlo Mereghetti, and Beatrice Palano. Uniform Circle Formation for Fully, Semi-, and Asynchronous Opaque Robots with Lights. *Applied Sciences*, 13(13):7991, January 2023.
- [18] Caterina Feletti, Carlo Mereghetti, Beatrice Palano, and Priscilla Raucci. Uniform circle formation for fully semi-, and asynchronous opaque robots with lights. In *ICTCS*, pages 207–221, 2022.
- [19] Paola Flocchini, Giuseppe Prencipe, and Nicola Santoro. Distributed computing by oblivious mobile robots. *Synthesis Lectures on Distributed Computing Theory*, 3(2):1–185, 2012.
- [20] Paola Flocchini, Giuseppe Prencipe, and Nicola Santoro, editors. *Distributed Computing by Mobile Entities, Current Research in Moving and Computing*, volume 11340 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer, 2019.
- [21] Paola Flocchini, Giuseppe Prencipe, Nicola Santoro, and Giovanni Viglietta. Distributed computing by mobile robots: uniform circle formation. *Distributed Comput.*, 30(6):413–457, 2017.
- [22] Branislav Katreniak. Biangular circle formation by asynchronous mobile robots. In *SIROCCO*, pages 185–199, 2005.
- [23] Giuseppe Antonio Di Luna, Paola Flocchini, Nicola Santoro, Giovanni Viglietta, and Masafumi Yamashita. Meeting in a polygon by anonymous oblivious robots. *Distributed Comput.*, 33(5):445–469, 2020.
- [24] Marcello Mamino and Giovanni Viglietta. Square formation by asynchronous oblivious robots. In *CCCG*, pages 1–6. Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, 2016.
- [25] Moumita Mondal and Sruti Gan Chaudhuri. Uniform circle formation by mobile robots. In *ICDCN*, pages 20:1–20:2. ACM, 2018.
- [26] Moumita Mondal and Sruti Gan Chaudhuri. Uniform circle formation by fat robots under non-uniform visibility ranges. In *ICDCN*, pages 58:1–58:5. ACM, 2020.
- [27] Debasish Pattanayak and Gokarna Sharma. Time-color tradeoff on uniform circle formation by asynchronous robots. In *IPDPS*, pages 1–11, 2024.
- [28] David Peleg. Distributed coordination algorithms for mobile robot swarms: New directions and challenges. In *IWDC*, pages 1–12, 2005.
- [29] Giuseppe Prencipe. Autonomous mobile robots: A distributed computing perspective. In *ALGOSENSORS*, pages 6–21, 2013.
- [30] Gokarna Sharma, Ramachandran Vaidyanathan, and Jerry L. Trahan. Constant-time complete visibility for asynchronous robots with lights. In *SSS*, volume 10616 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 265–281. Springer, 2017.
- [31] Ichiro Suzuki and Masafumi Yamashita. Distributed anonymous mobile robots: Formation of geometric patterns. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 28(4):1347–1363, 1999.
- [32] Ramachandran Vaidyanathan, Gokarna Sharma, and Jerry L. Trahan. On fast pattern formation by autonomous robots. *Inf. Comput.*, 285(Part):104699, 2022.
- [33] Giovanni Viglietta. Uniform circle formation. *Chapter 5 of [20]*, pages 83–108, 2019.

through just one robot and the half-circles have $\frac{n}{2}$ and $\frac{n}{2} - 1$ robots, or (ii) the diameter passes through two antipodal robots and the half-circles have $\frac{n}{2} - 1$ robots each.

Proof. Let A, B be two distinct points on Cir , and let D_A, D_B be the respective antipodal points on Cir . We define the *overlap arcs* of A and B as the two equal-length arcs $\widehat{AD_B}$ and $\widehat{BD_A}$. Note that overlap arcs are null iff A, B are antipodal. Let us assume n is odd, and reason by induction on n . For $n = 1$, the property follows straightforwardly. Now, assume the property true for an odd $n > 1$, and let us prove the property for $n + 2$. Let us remove two robots, say r_1 and r_2 , having minimal overlap arcs θ and θ' , so that n robots are left on Cir . So, by the induction hypothesis, there exists a diameter d passing through a robot and dividing Cir into two halves, each having $\frac{n-1}{2}$ robots. Notice that the only way for d to leave r_1 and r_2 in the same half- Cir is to pass through the overlap arcs θ and θ' . Yet, since θ and θ' are minimal, no other robot can sit on these overlap arcs (except for r_1 and r_2). So, since d passes through a robot, it clearly cannot leave r_1 and r_2 on the same half- Cir . Thus, the result follows. For even n , the proof is similar. \square

Lemma 9. *If $|\Phi| = 1$, then the configuration is either asymmetric or mirror-symmetric with just one symmetry axis.*

Proof. If $|\Phi| = 1$, the smallest angular sequence $\hat{\mu}$ starts from a unique robot, say r . There can exist just two cases: either $\hat{\mu}$ can be read just in one orientation (e.g. the clockwise one) or $\hat{\mu}$ can be read in both the orientations. In the first case, the configuration is asymmetric. In the second case, r lies on a mirror-symmetry axis. Since $|\Phi| = 1$, no other axes exist in the configuration. \square

Lemma 10. *If $|\Phi| = 1$, then we can split Cir into two uniform sectors Υ_0, Υ_1 .*

Proof. By Lemma 9, the configuration is asymmetric or mirror-symmetric with just one symmetry axis. In the first case, we can use Lemma 8 to elect the leader robot and the diameter splitting the Cir into two uniform sectors Υ_0, Υ_1 . Indeed, such Cir -halves are asymmetric and so chiral. In the second case, the axis of symmetry splits Cir into two mirrored halves Υ_0, Υ_1 . Since there is just one axis of symmetry, the two halves are asymmetric, thus guaranteeing the two sectors are chiral. \square


Lemma 11. *In $Conf_{biperiodic}$, leader robots (i.e. the robots from Φ) do not lay on the axes of symmetry.*

Proof. By contradiction, let r be a leader robot lying on an axis of symmetry of the configuration. Since r belongs to Φ , the minimal angular sequence $\hat{\mu}$ starts from r , in both directions (being r on a mirror-symmetry axis). Let $\hat{\mu} = \mu_0\mu_1\mu_2\dots$, and let r' be the left (w.l.o.g.) adjacent robot to r , so that from r' starts the angular sequence $\check{\mu} = \mu_0\mu_0\mu_1\dots$ in the clockwise direction. Let μ_i be the first angle in $\hat{\mu}$ which is different from μ_0 (since the configuration is not regular, such an angle always exists). So we can conclude that $\check{\mu} = \mu_0\mu_0\dots\mu_i\dots$ is lexicographically smaller than $\hat{\mu} = \mu_0\dots\mu_i\dots$, and so r does not belong to Φ . Contradiction. \square


Observation 2. *Consider a circle configuration where the robots lay on the same circle Cir . If a robot r on position X has to reach a new position Y on Cir traveling along the chord \overline{XY} , then r can create a collinearity \overline{arb} with just two robots a, b at a given time during its movement. Indeed, a and b must lay on the two distinct arcs cut by the chord \overline{XY} , each on a different arc.*

Lemma 12. *In the case of a biperiodic configuration, a pre_left (pre_right, resp.) robot can always recover its destination point even if other to_left (to_right, resp.) robots are moving and hiding leader robots.*

Proof. Let r be a pre_left robot on the uniform sector Υ_i , activated during the movement of a to_left robot (see Figure 15). Since no robot moves in Υ_i , r can see at least a leader and a pre_right robot. If the uniform sectors are also defined by regular robots (Figure 5d), then r can see all of them (in fact, no robot moves out from its original uniform sector, and so no robot hides regular robots from r). Thus, in presence of regular robots, r can determine the boundaries of the uniform sectors (i.e. the points where regular robots lay on and the middle points on Cir between any pair of consecutive regular robots) and the cardinality n of the swarm by multiplying the number of robots inside its sector Υ_i with the number of uniform sectors (note that r has complete visibility of Υ_i since no robot is moving within it).



(a) `pre_left` (here *light cyan*) and `pre_right` (here *light lime*) robots have to reach the uniform positions and thus to fix the uniform sectors.



(b) `left` (*cyan*) and `right` (*lime*) robots fix the uniform sectors.

Figure 15: Procedure SPLIT in a biperiodic configuration with $|\Phi| = 4$ uniform sectors to be fixed. The moving `to_left` robot hides the `leader` (here *lightgray*) robot from r . However, r can compute its target point even in the case of collinearities, thus fixing the uniform sectors in constant time.

If r cannot see any `regular` robots, then the configuration originally was biperiodic and no robots lay on the boundaries of the uniform sectors (Figure 5c). In this case, r can spot the `pre_right` and the `leader` robot belonging to Υ_i by simply selecting the closest `pre_right` and the closest `leader` robot to r (note that `pre_right` and `leader` robots lay on symmetrical positions in adjacent sectors). Following the `leader-pre_right` orientation of Υ_i , let us consider the adjacent uniform sector, say Υ_{i+1} . Let g be the closest `leader` or `pre_right` robot which r sees following this direction. Of course, g must belong to Υ_{i+1} . In fact, since within Υ_{i+1} at most one robot is moving, at least one `{leader, pre_right}`-colored robot cannot be hidden from r (by Observation 2). If g is `pre_right`, then r can determine the boundary between Υ_i and Υ_{i+1} as the middle point on Cir between g and the position of the `pre_right` robot belonging to Υ_i . Otherwise, it means that the `pre_right` robot of Υ_{i+1} is hidden by a moving robot which is visible to r . Thus, r can compute the exact position of the hidden `pre_right` robot and so determine the boundary between Υ_i and Υ_{i+1} . The same strategy is applied searching the `leader` robot in Υ_{i-1} . Being the uniform sectors equal in amplitude and number of robots, r can easily reconstruct the boundaries of all the other sectors and so the number of robots in the swarm.

The proof for the `pre_right` robots is similar. □

B.2 Procedure ODD BLOCK

We show here all the correctness proofs for Procedure ODD BLOCK (Section 6.2).

Lemma 13. *Consider a configuration $Conf_{unisect}$ with k uniform sectors. Let r be a `pre_x` robot (being $x \in \{mid, median, blockR\}$) lying on the arc of a sector Υ_i . Within Υ_i , no robot is moving. Then, r can always determine the boundaries of all the uniform sectors and the cardinality of the swarm n even if at most one robot `to_x` is moving within any other sector $\Upsilon_{j \neq i}$ to reach a new position on Cir .*

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Lemma 12. Since no robot moves in Υ_i , r can see at least a `left` and a `right` robot. If $Conf_{unisect}$ is also defined by `regular` robots, then r can see all of them (in fact, no robot moves out from its original uniform sector, and so hides `regular` robots from r). According to the number of `regular` robots and the number of `{left, right}`-colored robots between two `regular` robots, r can determine if the configuration originally was uniperiodic (Figure 5b) or biperiodic (Figures 5a, 5c and 5d). If there are `regular` robots, r can determine n by the central angle $2\pi/n$ between the `regular` and the related `left` or `right` robot, and the positions of all the uniform sectors.

If r cannot see any `regular` robots, then the configuration originally was biperiodic and no robots lay on the boundaries of the uniform sectors (Figure 5d). In this case, r can spot the pair of `left-right` robots

belonging to Υ_i . In fact, r selects the closest **left-right** pair which cuts a sector where no robot is moving. Following the **left-right** orientation of Υ_i , let us consider the adjacent uniform sector Υ_{i+1} , which is located on the right w.r.t. Υ_i . Let g be the closest **left** or **right** robot which r sees following the right direction. Of course, g must belong to Υ_{i+1} . In fact, since within Υ_{i+1} at most one **to_x** robot is moving, at least one **{left, right}**-colored robot cannot be hidden from r (by Observation 2). If g is **right**, then r can determine the boundary between Υ_i and Υ_{i+1} as the middle point on Cir between g and the position of the **right** robot belonging to Υ_i . Otherwise, it means that the **right** robot of Υ_{i+1} is hidden by a moving robot which is visible to r . Thus, r can compute the exact position of the hidden **right** robot and so determine the boundary between Υ_i and Υ_{i+1} . The same strategy is applied searching the **left** robot in Υ_{i-1} . Being the uniform sectors equal in amplitude and number of robots, r can easily reconstruct the boundaries of all the other sectors and so the number of robots in the swarm. \square

Corollary 1. *In Procedure ODD BLOCK the setting of the **blockR**, **median**, and **mid** takes $O(1)$ epochs.*

Proof. By Lemma 13, we know that each **pre_x** robot r (being $x \in \{\text{mid}, \text{median}, \text{blockR}\}$) computes its target position (where it will assume the color x once stopped there and reactivated) even if other **to_x** robots are moving to reach their target positions in the other uniform sectors. It follows that the time taken for setting the x robots is independent of the number of uniform sectors. \square

Lemma 14. *Given an odd block built inside a uniform sector Υ_i , the midpoint M of the arc of Υ_i lies on the block arc Γ .*

Proof. Let U_1 and U_{2l+1} be the uniform positions where the guards of the block lay on (i.e. they are the endpoints of Γ), and let B_i and B_{i+1} be the boundaries of Υ_i . To prove the statement, we need to prove that $\angle U_1OU_{2l+1} \geq \frac{\angle B_iOB_{i+1}}{2}$ (where O is the center of Cir), i.e. the amplitude of the odd block is always not smaller than the amplitude of half Υ_i . By construction we know that $\angle B_iOU_1 \leq \frac{2\pi}{n}$ (for the left guard), while $\angle U_{2l+1}OB_{i+1} \leq \frac{2\pi}{n} + \frac{2\pi}{n}$ (for the right guard and for the padding robot). Thus, $\angle U_1OU_{2l+1} \geq \angle B_iOB_{i+1} - \frac{6\pi}{n}$. To prove that $\angle U_1OU_{2l+1} \geq \frac{\angle B_iOB_{i+1}}{2}$, it is sufficient to verify that

$$\begin{aligned} \angle B_iOB_{i+1} - \frac{6\pi}{n} &\stackrel{?}{\geq} \frac{\angle B_iOB_{i+1}}{2} \\ \angle B_iOB_{i+1} &\stackrel{?}{\geq} \frac{12\pi}{n} = 6 \cdot \frac{2\pi}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

Since each Υ contains $q \geq 12$ robots (laying not on its boundaries), we know that $\angle B_iOB_{i+1} \geq 12 \cdot \frac{2\pi}{n}$, thus proving our statement. \square

Observation 3. *Two chords of the same circle can (i) have no points in common, (ii) intersect in only one point, or (iii) be coincident.*

Lemma 15. *During Stage 2 of Procedure ODD BLOCK, all the **out_chord** robots can reach \mathcal{L} in $O(1)$ epochs using BDCP.*

Proof. We verify that all the input assumptions listed in Algorithm 1 hold to correctly implement BDCP in $O(1)$ time.

1. \mathcal{L} is the target 2-curve;
2. 4 beacons are originally set to fix \mathcal{L} (the guards and the two *ad hoc* beacons);
3. the **out_chord** robots are the waiting robots which have to reach \mathcal{L} , so that
 - (a) they lay on the arcs $\widehat{B_iU_1}$ and $\widehat{U_{2l+1}B_{i+1}}$ (except for their endpoints), so they are external to \mathcal{L} , belonging to the same half-plane delimited by \mathcal{L} ;
 - (b) at the beginning of Stage 2, no robot is moving in Υ_i , and all robots of the uniform sector lay on the arc of Υ_i or on \mathcal{L} . So, any **out_chord** robot can see the 4 original beacons on \mathcal{L} .
 - (c) they have to reach \mathcal{L}

- by construction, the two internal beacons lay on \mathcal{L} so that the target points of each `out_chord` robots are located between them;
 - each `out_chord` r robot must reach \mathcal{L} traveling along the trajectory \overline{rM} where M is the position of the `mid` robot. Of course, the trajectories do not intersect each other;
 - such trajectories intersect \mathcal{L} in just one point (see Observation 3);
 - by construction, the beacons have been placed on \mathcal{L} so that they do not create collinearities with the `mid` robot and the `out_chord` robots. This guarantees that any `out_chord` robot can see the `mid` robot at the beginning of Stage 2. Moreover, throughout the whole execution of BDCP, `out_chord` robots travel along distinct concurrent trajectories that are generated by the origin (the `mid` robot), they never create collinearities with the `mid` robot. As follows, any `out_chord` robot can reconstruct its path towards \mathcal{L} . For the same reason, the moving robots never collide since each `out_chord` trajectory does not intersect with any other trajectory.
- (d) each `out_chord` robot sets its color as `chord` once on \mathcal{L} , playing the role of a new beacon fixing the chord \mathcal{L} .

All these assumptions guarantee all `out_chord` robots reach \mathcal{L} in $O(\log 2) = O(1)$ epochs without colliding. \square

Lemma 16. *During Phase 3 of Procedure ODD BLOCK, all the `in_chord` robots can reach \mathcal{L} in $O(1)$ epochs using BDCP.*

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of Lemma 15, so we report just the differences. The presence of the original 4 beacons, plus the `chord` robots, fix the target curve \mathcal{L} . If no such beacons exist, then the robots closest to U_1 and U_{2l+1} move to the \mathcal{L} to act as beacons. By construction, the beacons have been set in order to be on the left and on the right of the target positions of the `in_chord` robots on \mathcal{L} . Let r be a `in_chord` which sees at least 2 robots on \mathcal{L} , and let F' be its projection on \mathcal{L} . Let Z be the position of the closest `in_chord` robot (still on Γ or in transit towards \mathcal{L}) and let Z' be its projection on \mathcal{L} . Then r always can compute its target position F'' on \mathcal{L} and so its path towards \mathcal{L} ($F'' = F'$ if no robot lies on F' , otherwise $|\overline{F'F''}| = |\overline{F'Z'}|/3$). According to this rule, two adjacent `in_chord` robots will always compute two paths without colliding. The other assumptions hold for the same reasons as in Lemma 15. \square

B.3 Procedure SMALL CIRCLE

We show here all the correctness proofs for each step in Procedure SMALL CIRCLE (Section 6.3).

Lemma 17. *When all the robots have migrated from \mathcal{L} to \mathcal{C} , then they can always see the right guard (if they lay on \mathcal{C}_e) or the left guard (if they lay on \mathcal{C}_w).*

Proof. Let l be the line passing through the median robot and the right guard. This line splits \mathcal{C}_e into two arcs: the upper one (which we call *the unsafe arc*) and the lower one (which we call *the safe arc*). According to Stage 1 of Procedure SMALL CIRCLE, all the robots on \mathcal{C}_e are located in the safe arc cut by line l (see Figure 11). Let l' be any other line passing through the right guard and a point of \mathcal{C}_e (different from the median robot). If l' intersects the unsafe arc, then it intersects it into two points. Otherwise, l' intersects the safe arc into only one point. This means that no robot on \mathcal{C}_e creates collinearity with another robot on \mathcal{C}_e and the right guard. The same holds considering the left guard and \mathcal{C}_w . \square

Lemma 18. *During Stage 1 of Procedure SMALL CIRCLE, the following statements hold:*

1. each `chord` robot on \mathcal{L} can see the `scMedian` robot even when other robots are moving to \mathcal{C} . Moreover, the movements at Stage 1 are collision-less.
2. If the right guard (resp. left guard) sets its color as `scR_complete` (resp. `scL_complete`), no `chord` or `to_smallcircle` robot exists in the right (resp. left) half-block.

Proof. We prove each statement:

1. At the beginning of Stage 1, all the robots (except for the `scMedian` one) are located on the block chord \mathcal{L} (and not inside the block), so no robot obstructs the visibility of the `chord` robot. Moreover, since the `chord` robots travel along distinct concurrent trajectories that are generated by the origin (the `scMedian` robot), they never create collinearities with the `scMedian` robot. For the same reason, the moving robots never collide.
2. Let us prove for \mathcal{C}_e (the same holds for \mathcal{C}_w). By Lemma 17, robots on \mathcal{C}_e do not create collinearities with the right guard. Moreover, a `to_smallcircle` robot cannot be hidden by other robots on \mathcal{C}_e from the right guard. So, if a `to_smallcircle` robot exists, the right guard can see it. At the same time, if at least a `chord` robot exists on \mathcal{L} , then the right guard can see.

□

Lemma 19. *During Stage 2 of Procedure SMALL CIRCLE, the following statements hold:*

1. Each `smallcircle_complete` robot on \mathcal{C} can correctly detect if it belongs on \mathcal{C}_e or \mathcal{C}_w and so set its color as `smallcircle_east` or `smallcircle_west`, respectively.
2. The position shift of the `smallcircle_west` robots can be executed without colliding and in $O(1)$ time.
3. The `smallcircle_west` robots migrate from \mathcal{C}_w to \mathcal{C}_e in $O(1)$ using BDCP.

Proof. We prove each statement:

1. By Lemma 17, all the `smallcircle_complete` robots on \mathcal{C}_e (resp. \mathcal{C}_w) see the related guard. Thus, they can detect if they belong to the right/left side of \mathcal{C} , and update their color properly.
2. The new positions of `smallcircle_west` robots can be easily computed so that each robot shifts on \mathcal{C}_w of a little distance downward so that it neither collides with nor goes beyond the adjacent robot. Such movements always guarantee complete visibility among the robots within \mathcal{C} . Note that a `smallcircle_west` robot can always recompute correctly \mathcal{C} even when the other robots are shifting; in fact, there are always at least three robots still on \mathcal{C} : the robot itself, the median robot, and at least one `smallcircle_east` robot on \mathcal{C}_e (otherwise, no shift is needed).
3. We verify that all the input assumptions listed in Algorithm 1 hold to correctly implement BDCP in $O(1)$ time.
 - (a) \mathcal{C}_e is the target 3-curve;
 - (b) 6 robots (selected among the `smallcircle_east` or `smallcircle_west` robots) can be set on \mathcal{C}_e so that they play the role of the left and right beacons (using a proper color). This setting can be achieved in constant time;
 - (c) the `smallcircle_west` robots are the waiting robots which have to reach \mathcal{C}_e . We can guarantee that:
 - i. being on \mathcal{C}_w , they are external to \mathcal{C}_e , and they lay on the convex region delimited by \mathcal{C}_e ;
 - ii. at the beginning of this step, no robot is moving within \mathcal{C} , so the waiting robot on \mathcal{C}_w can see all the robots on \mathcal{C}_e ;
 - iii. they have to reach \mathcal{C}_e
 - to their projections on \mathcal{C}_e . Being the beacons originally the “leftmost” and the “rightmost” robots on \mathcal{C}_e , the robots on \mathcal{C}_w will migrate between the two groups of beacons;
 - being parallel, the robots’ trajectories do not intersect each other;
 - such trajectories are chords connecting \mathcal{C}_w to \mathcal{C}_e , thus they intersect \mathcal{C}_e in just one point;
 - if a `smallcircle_west` robot on \mathcal{C}_w can reconstruct \mathcal{C} , then it can reconstruct its trajectory (looking at the left guard, a `smallcircle_west` robot can detect the position of ρ and so its trajectory towards \mathcal{C}_e);
 - iv. each `smallcircle_west` robot becomes a new beacon (setting its color as `smallcircle_east`) once on \mathcal{C}_e .

All these assumptions guarantee all `smallcircle_west` robots reach \mathcal{C}_e in $O(\log 3) = O(1)$ epochs without colliding. □

Lemma 20. *During Stage 3 of Procedure SMALL CIRCLE, the following statements hold:*

1. Each `west` robot on \mathcal{C}_e correctly detects its upper-adjacent `east` robot, even if other robots are moving.
2. Each `west` robot on \mathcal{C}_e correctly and safely reaches its target position on \mathcal{C}_w .

Proof. We prove each statement:

1. Let w be a `west` robot on \mathcal{C}_e . Thanks to the presence of the right guard (always visible to w), w understands it has to migrate on the other side. Moreover, w can always see its two adjacent `east` robots even when other robots are migrating to \mathcal{C}_w (the first robot on \mathcal{C}_e has an `east` robot and the median robot as adjacent). So w recomputes \mathcal{C} . Now, let us suppose the median robot is hidden from w . Thus, w must detect which of its two `east` adjacent robots is the upper-adjacent one. From the right guard, two chords can be elected as \mathcal{L} . However, by the presence of other robots of other blocks, w can always detect which is the correct block chord, and so it can establish the upper-down orientation of the block.
2. Again, let w be a `west` robot on \mathcal{C}_e . As proved above, w computes \mathcal{C} by the presence of at least three robots on it, and ρ by the presence of the right guard. Once obtained \mathcal{C}_w and once selected its upper-adjacent robot u , w heads to the projection of u on \mathcal{C}_w . All the trajectories are disjoint and so no collision can occur. □

B.4 Procedure SLICE

We show here all the correctness proofs for each step in Procedure SLICE (Section 6.4).

Lemma 21. *During Stage 1 of Procedure SLICE, the following statements hold:*

1. At the beginning of Stage 1, each slice arc on \mathcal{C}_w contains at most two robots: in the case of exactly two robots, both of them must lay on the endpoints of the slice arc;
2. Each slice is chosen by at most one `west` robot where it will encode its rank;
3. During the movements in Stage 1, each `west` robot w_j will move to a new point w'_j which is strictly contained in its original slice;
4. At the end of Stage 1, each slice arc of \mathcal{C}_w contains at most one robot, except for the slice η_0 which contains two robots (the `sliceMedian` robot and the `angle` one) on its endpoints.
5. Movements at Stage 1 never create collisions or collinearities among robots on \mathcal{C} .

Proof. We prove each statement:

1. By construction, each slice has an amplitude of δ , where δ is the minimum angle between any two robots on the circle \mathcal{C}_w . Let η be a δ -slice of \mathcal{C}_w . If three robots lay on the arc of η , then they define a smaller angle than δ (contradiction). The same contradiction results in the case of two robots where one of them does not lay on the endpoint of the η arc. Note that the remaining slice of amplitude $< \delta$ which can exist between the last δ -slice and the lower endpoint of \mathcal{C}_w does not contain any robot (otherwise δ would not be the minimum angle).
2. If a slice does not contain any robots, then it will be chosen by no robots. If a slice contains just one `west` robot, then it will choose its slice to encode its rank. If a slice η_k contain two `west` robots, say w_j, w_{j+1} , one per each arc endpoint, then w_j chooses η_{k-1} whereas w_{j+1} chooses η_k . Since η_{k-1} contains either just w_j or both w_{j-1} and w_j (by Item 1), η_{k-1} will be chosen just by w_j (in fact, if w_{j-1} is not `angle`, then it will choose η_{k-2}).

3. Let η_k be the chosen slice for the rank encoding of w_j (i.e. the slice where w_j lays on, possibly on one of its endpoints). Since w_j reaches a new point w'_j such that $\angle w_0 O w'_j = k\delta + \frac{j\delta}{m+1}$, it is sufficient to prove that w'_j belongs to η_k (endpoints excluded). Such a property is easily proved since $\frac{j\delta}{m+1} < \delta$ (in fact, $j < m+1$) and since $j \neq 0$ (**west** robots have rank $j = 2, \dots, m$).
4. By Item 1, each **west** robot travels in a new position which is strictly contained in its chosen slice. By Item 2, each slice is chosen by at most one robot. These two results ensure each slice arc of \mathcal{C}_w contains at most one robot. To conclude, η_0 is the only slice in \mathcal{C}_w containing two robots at the end of Stage 1.
5. Movements of **west** robots are performed in separated slices, thus never creating collisions with the other robots. Let w_j be a **west** robot which has to travel in the slice η_k to reach the point w'_j . This robot creates collinearity with another robot on \mathcal{C} only if both the arcs cut by the trajectory $\overline{w_j w'_j}$ contain at least a robot. However, since in the minor arc $\widehat{w_j w'_j}$ (i.e. the arc strictly contained in η_k) no robots are contained except for w_j itself, no collinearities can occur.

□

Lemma 22. *During Stage 2, the following statements hold:*

1. **[Step 1]** *The migration of the **east** robots $\{e_j\}_{4 \leq j \leq m}$ on ρ is always possible in one epoch without collisions.*
2. **[Step 1]** *The beacons e_1, e_2 and e_3 correctly and safely migrate on the safe arc \widehat{uv} .*
3. **[Step 2]** *An **east_diameter** robot on ρ can recompute the slices on \mathcal{C}_e and \mathcal{C}_w .*
4. **[Step 2]** *The rank j computed by an **east_diameter** robot on ρ coincides with its original rank on \mathcal{C}_e , for $2 \leq j \leq m$.*
5. **[Step 2]** *Every **east_diameter** robot on ρ can see the three beacons.*
6. **[Step 2]** *An **east_diameter** robot e on ρ can instantly recompute its uniform position U_j on Γ_e .*
7. **[Step 2]** *Beacons e_1, e_2 and e_3 on Γ_w safely reach their target positions on Γ_e in constant time.*

Proof. We prove each statement:

1. Let e be an **east** robot on \mathcal{C}_e at the beginning of Stage 2 (after the setting of the beacons on \mathcal{C}_e). At most $m-4$ **to_east_diameter** robots are moving to ρ , thus possibly obstructing the visibility of e . However, since each moving robot can hide only one other robot on \mathcal{C} from e , and since there are at least $m+5$ robots on \mathcal{C} (included e), then e can always reconstruct \mathcal{C} . By Lemma 17, e can see **sliceR** and so it can recompute the supporting line of *chord*, and so ρ . Thus, e directly travels perpendicularly towards ρ , without waiting. Since all the trajectories are perpendicular to the same line, the migration of the **east** robots is accomplished without colliding.
2. Let b be a **beacon** robot on \mathcal{C}_e which sees all the **east_diameter** robots on ρ . Thanks to the presence of the **west** robots, e can recompute \mathcal{C} , and so it can establish whether a **beacon** is still moving or if the configuration is static. For the sake of simplicity, we make our beacons reach Γ_w following a sequential scheme: thus, firstly e_3 reaches a deterministic point on \widehat{uv} , while e_1 is the last beacon to move. As soon as b sees a static configuration (within its block) and understands it is its turn, it can easily compute the safe arc \widehat{uv} and move to a deterministic position on \widehat{uv} , thus avoiding collisions with the other robots. Since the number of beacons for a block is constant, their migration takes $O(1)$ time.
3. Since at Stage 2 no robot moves within the west half-circle given by \mathcal{C}_w , an **east_diameter** robot e on ρ can always see all the **west** robots and the **angle** one, thus allowing it to determine \mathcal{C} and the angle δ . Moreover, e can easily recompute ρ by the presence of the adjacent **east_diameter** or **sliceMedian** robot. So, e can split \mathcal{C}_w and \mathcal{C}_e in δ -slices and determine the slice η'_k and η_k which contain its projection on \mathcal{C} .

4. Thanks to Lemma 21, each **west** robot w_j (except for w_1 which became the **angle** robot) has moved in its own original slice during Stage 1, thus maintaining the one-to-one rank association with the **east** side.
5. See Figure 13a. The beacons lay on the safe arc \widehat{uv} , which was defined by the two lines: the first one which connects the initial position of e_1 and w_1 (the **angle** robot), and the second one which connects the position of e_m and w_2 . Let ρ' be the segment of ρ cut by such lines. By construction, all the **east_diameter** lay on ρ' (e_m lay on its lower endpoint). Let x be an internal point of the safe arc \widehat{uv} and let y be a point of ρ' . Then, the line connecting x with y crosses the arc $\widehat{w_1w_2}$ (endpoints excluded). Since no robot lays within the arc $\widehat{w_1w_2}$, any robot on \widehat{uv} can see any robot on ρ' .
6. The robot e can always recompute its rank j (according to the previous Items), the circle \mathcal{C} , and the diameter ρ . Thanks to Item 5, e can see the three beacons on \widehat{uv} and so it can reconstruct Γ_e . Since e has complete visibility of \mathcal{C}_w , it counts the m **west** robots and so it can define the positions of all the uniform positions on Γ_e . Thus, it computes its target position U_j .
7. See Figure 13b. Let $b \in \{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$ be a **beacon** robot on Γ_w that sees no **east_diameter** robots or moving robots within the block. Note that, in this situation, b has complete visibility of Γ_e except for at most one robot which can be hidden by the **angle** robot. So, following a sequential scheme ($b = e_3, e_2, e_1$), b recomputes Γ_e , and the angle of each uniform arc $\widehat{U_jU_{j+1}}$ and so its target position. Thus, b reaches its target uniform position and sets its color as **regular**. In particular, if **angle** lays on the trajectory between b and its target position U_j , then b reaches U_j in two moves: firstly, it stops in a position on ρ which is visible to the other **beacon** on Γ_w , secondly, it reaches U_j . Note that at most one beacon has to split its trajectories into two steps (in fact, **angle** can be collinear with just one e_j and the related U_j). So, this task is accomplished in constant time.

□

Lemma 23. *During Stage 3, the following statements hold:*

1. [**Step 1**] *Robots w_1 and w_2 can safely and correctly travel to \mathcal{C}_e fixing the angle δ and the cardinality m .*
2. [**Step 1**] *If a west robot on \mathcal{C}_w sees a west_diameter or a sliceMedian robot, then it is always able to determine whether such robots belong to its block or not.*
3. [**Step 1**] *The west robots w_3, w_{m-1}, w_m migrate to ρ in constant time in order to play the role of the beacons (together with w_0 , the median robot) for the other west robots;*
4. [**Step 2**] *A west_diameter robot w on ρ can correctly and instantly compute \mathcal{C}_e and \mathcal{C}_w and its original slice η_k . So, it correctly decodes its rank j .*
5. [**Step 2**] *A west_diameter robot w on ρ can correctly spot Γ_w and its target uniform position U'_j .*
6. [**Step 2**] *The angle and anglem robots reach U'_1 and U'_2 without colliding.*

Proof. We prove each statement:

1. The **angle** robot (w_1) can detect Stage 2 has ended since it can see all the uniform positions on Γ_e are covered by **regular** robots. So, it can safely migrate on its projection on \mathcal{C}_e , maintaining the angle δ . Once w_1 has switched half-circle, w_2 enjoys complete visibility of all the $m + 1$ robots on \mathcal{C} and so it can correctly migrate on \mathcal{C}_w to fix the angle $\frac{\delta}{m}$.
2. Let us suppose that a **west** robot w on \mathcal{C}_w sees some robots (**west_diameter** or **sliceMedian**) of another median diameter ρ' , and it cannot see the robots on its ρ (due to the movements of the other robots). This situation never creates ambiguous snapshots since w can always understand ρ' does not belong to its block. In fact, the moving robots in the block of w can never hide all the **regular** robots on Γ_e : the visibility of w can be obstructed by at most $m - 6$ robots which are moving inside \mathcal{C} (where the 6 still robots are: w itself, the **angle** and **anglem** robots, and the three beacons w_3, w_{m-1}, w_m). So w can see at least 6 **regular** robots on its block. Such **regular** robots are sufficient to prevent w from selecting the wrong median diameter.

3. Before this step, w_0 (the median robot) is the only robot on ρ . Robots w_3 (as the “left” beacon) and w_{m-1}, w_m (as “right” beacons) can easily and safely elect themselves and reach their projections on ρ , by following a sequential scheme (i.e. in constant time). Traveling along parallel trajectories, they do not collide.
4. Let w be a **west_diameter** robot on ρ . It can always recompute the supporting line of ρ (w can always see another **west_diameter** robot or the **sliceMedian** robot). Moreover, it can always see the robots **angle** and **anglem**. Thus, w can recompute \mathcal{C} (the center of \mathcal{C} is the intersection point between the bisector of **angle-anglem** and the supporting line of ρ) and its projection w' on \mathcal{C}_w . Then, w splits \mathcal{C}_e and \mathcal{C}_w in δ -slices (δ being fixed by the **angle** robot) and computes the slice η_k where w' lays on (i.e. where w originally laid before the migration on ρ).
After having recomputed η_k , w obtains its original rank j by inverting the formula $\angle w_0 O w' = k\delta + \frac{j\delta}{m+1}$, where m is fixed by **angle** and **anglem**.
5. See Figure 14. Thanks to Item 4, we know that w can compute $\mathcal{C}_e, \mathcal{C}_w$, and its rank j , even when other robots are moving to reach their uniform positions on Γ_w . Moreover, w can see at least three robots on Γ_e (one of them is **sliceR**) and so it recomputes Γ_w . The presence of the **angle** and **anglem** robots allows w to recompute m and so the positions of each uniform position. Thus, it can easily spot the position of its target U'_j .
6. For the sake of simplicity, we make **angle** and **anglem** move sequentially. Let a be the **angle** or **anglem** robot. When a sees no **west_diameter** robots, a easily recomputes the (possible) missing uniform positions U'_1 or U'_2 (by the presence of the **sliceMedian** robot and the robots on $\Gamma_{\{e,w\}}$). Then, it heads to its U'_j without colliding with any other robots (due to the absence of robots on ρ and \mathcal{C}_w , except for the **sliceMedian** robot).

□

Lemma 24. *During Stage 3 of Procedure SLICE, all the west robots on \mathcal{C}_w can reach ρ in $O(1)$ epochs by implementing BDCP.*

Proof. We verify that all the input assumptions listed in Algorithm 1 hold to correctly implement BDCP in $O(1)$ time.

1. ρ is the target 2-curve;
2. 4 beacons (w_3, w_{m-1}, w_m together with the median robot w_0) are originally set to fix ρ (see Lemma 23, Item 3);
3. the **west** robots are the waiting robots which have to reach ρ , so that
 - (a) since they start from \mathcal{C}_w (excluded its endpoints), they are external to ρ , belonging to the same half-plane delimited by ρ ;
 - (b) at the beginning of this step, no robot is moving within \mathcal{C} , so each **west** robot can see all the robots on ρ ;
 - (c) they have to reach ρ
 - to their projections on ρ . Being the beacons originally the “leftmost” and the “rightmost” **west** robots on \mathcal{C}_w , the **west** robots will migrate between the two groups of beacons;
 - being parallel, the **west** robots’ trajectories do not intersect each other;
 - such trajectories are perpendicular to ρ , so they intersect each other in just one point;
 - if a **west** robot on \mathcal{C}_w can see its target line ρ , then it can reconstruct its trajectory (the projection on ρ);
 - (d) each **west** robot sets its color as **west_diameter** once on ρ , playing the role of a new beacon fixing the chord ρ .

All these assumptions guarantee all **west** robots reach ρ in $O(\log 2) = O(1)$ epochs without colliding. □

B.5 Procedure SEQUENTIAL MATCH

We show here all the correctness proofs for Procedure SEQUENTIAL MATCH (Section 6.5).

Lemma 25. *Given $Conf_{unisect}$ with $q < 12$ robots in each uniform sector (boundaries excluded), a **pre_matched** robot can compute and reach its target uniform position U_j even if other **to_matched** robots are moving and hiding **right** or **left** robots.*

Proof. The proof is similar to the one for Lemmas 12 and 13. In particular, a **pre_matched** robot can always spot the **left** and **right** robots of its uniform sector Υ_i . Using the same strategy as Lemmas 12 and 13, it recomputes the boundaries of the uniform sectors and the central angle $2\pi/n$ formed by two consecutive uniform positions (occupied by **left**, **right** or **regular** robots). Since a **pre_matched** robot has complete visibility of its uniform sector (in fact, no robot is moving within it), it counts the **matched** robots in Υ_i and, so, it recomputes the current index j of the uniform position to be matched. Thus, it heads to the uniform position U_j of Υ_i and sets its color as **matched**. \square