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Consensus is an important task

- Calibration
- Dissemination
- Coordination
Abstracting the task
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- What are observations?
  - continuous or discrete?
  - scalar or vector?
- How can we communicate?
  - point-to-point or broadcast?
  - low resolution or high resolution?
- What do we compute?
  - averages
  - medians, quantiles
  - convex optimization
The goal(s) for today

1. The basic mathematical model for consensus
2. Routing and mobility can speed up convergence
3. Broadcasting can trade off accuracy for speed
4. The discreet charm of discrete messages
Building a mathematical model
The data model

- Set of \( n \) agents
- Agent \( i \) observes initial value \( x_i(0) \in \mathbb{R} \) for \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \)
- Assume data is bounded: \( x_i(0) \in [0, 10] \), for example
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The communication graph

- Agents are arranged in a graph $G = (V, E)$.
- Agents $i$ can communicate with $j$ if there is an edge $(i, j)$ (e.g. $j \in N_i$).
- Bidirectional communication: agents exchange messages.
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Constraints on the communication

- Time is slotted: only one transmission per slot.
- Synchronous: use many edges, then update.
- Asynchronous: edges chosen randomly in each slot.
Measuring performance

The goal is to pass messages between agents such that they can estimate the average of the initial observations:

\[ x(t) \rightarrow \left( \sum_{i} x_i(0) \right) \cdot 1 \]

**Averaging time** \( T_{\text{ave}}(n, \epsilon) \) is time when \( x(t) \) is within \( \epsilon \) of the average:

\[
T_{\text{ave}}(n, \epsilon) = \sup_{x(0)} \inf_{t} \left\{ \mathbb{P}_{\text{Alg}} \left( \frac{\| x(t) - x_{\text{ave}} \cdot 1 \|}{\| x(0) \|} \geq \epsilon \right) \leq \epsilon \right\}
\]
A centralized solution

Simple centralized algorithm:

1. Build a spanning tree
2. Gather all the values at root
3. Compute and disseminate average

Pro:
- requires $\Theta(n)$ messages

Con:
- completely centralized
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A centralized solution

Simple centralized algorithm:

1. Build a spanning tree
2. Gather all the values at root
3. Compute and disseminate average

**Pro:** requires $\Theta(n)$ messages

**Con:** completely centralized
Distributed synchronous consensus

Suppose each agent linearly combines itself and its neighbors:

\[ x_i(t + 1) = W_{ii} x_i(t) + \sum_{j \in N_i} W_{ij} x_j(t) \]

\[ \sum_j W_{ij} = 1 \quad \forall i \]

\[ W_{ij} = W_{ji} \]

Synchronous algorithm where the update after each slot is given by:

\[ x(t + 1) = W x(t) \]

where \( W \) is a **doubly stochastic** matrix.
A simple result

Theorem

For synchronous consensus with update matrix $W$,

$$T_{\text{ave}}(n, \epsilon) = \Theta (|\mathcal{E}| \cdot T_{\text{relax}}(W) \cdot \log \epsilon^{-1})$$

where $T_{\text{relax}}(W)$ is the relaxation time of the matrix $W$:

$$T_{\text{relax}}(W) = \frac{1}{1 - \lambda_2(W)}.$$

Proof: $W$ is the transition matrix of a Markov chain – consensus is the convergence of the chain to its stationary distribution.
A theme with variations

Survey article by Dimakis et al. in *Proc. IEEE*.

- **Asynchronous** Boyd et al. (2006)
- **Discrete values** Benezit et al. (2010)
- **Many others!**
Asynchronous updates = “gossip”

- Node $i$ wakes up at random, chooses neighbor $j$ at random.
- Nodes $i$ and $j$ exchange $x_i(t)$ and $x_j(t)$ and compute average.
- Set $x_i(t+1) = x_j(t+1) = \frac{1}{2}(x_i(t) + x_j(t))$. 
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- Node $i$ wakes up at random, chooses neighbor $j$ at random.
- Nodes $i$ and $j$ exchange $x_i(t)$ and $x_j(t)$ and compute average.
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Gossip uses random linear updates

At each time a random pair \((i, j) \in \mathcal{E}\) averages:

\[
x_i(t + 1) = x_j(t + 1) = \frac{x_i(t) + x_j(t)}{2}.
\]

Each update is linear : \(x(t + 1) = W^{(i,j)}(t)x(t)\).

**Theorem**

Let \(\bar{W} = \mathbb{E}[W^{(i,j)}]\) over the edge selection process. Then

\[
T_{\text{ave}}(n, \epsilon) = \Theta \left( T_{\text{relax}}(\bar{W}) \cdot \log \epsilon^{-1} \right)
\]
The implication for big graphs

For the grid with uniform selection, gossip takes $\Theta(n^2)$ transmissions!

Selecting edges at random is inefficient! Local exchange is inefficient!
Network properties can accelerate convergence
Joint work with Alex Dimakis and Martin Wainwright
Geographic gossip with routing

- Assume that packets can be routed between any two nodes.
- Now select "neighbor" uniformly from all nodes and route message.
- "Effective graph" is now the complete graph.
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- Assume that packets can be routed between any two nodes.
- Now select “neighbor” uniformly from all nodes and route message.
- “Effective graph” is now the complete graph.
Example: the grid

\[
T_{\text{relax}}(\tilde{W})
\]

| Algorithm | \[ T_{\text{relax}}(\tilde{W}) \] |
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<table>
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<tr>
<th>algorithm</th>
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<tbody>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>algorithm</th>
<th>$T_{relax}(\bar{W})$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local</strong></td>
<td>$\Theta(n^2)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>With routing</strong></td>
<td>$\Theta(n)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is unfair, since routing costs in number of hops.
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One-hop transmissions to reach consensus

Count number of hops (power) to get within $\epsilon$ of the average:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>algorithm</th>
<th>one-hop transmission</th>
<th>Boyd et al.</th>
<th>Dimakis, Sarwate, Wainwright</th>
<th>Benezit et al.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local</strong></td>
<td>$\Theta(n^2)$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>With routing</strong></td>
<td>$\Theta(n^{3/2})$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average on the way</strong></td>
<td>$\Theta(n)$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- Merge all mobile nodes into a “super node.”
- $T_{\text{relax}}$ for induced chain $\leq T_{\text{relax}}$ for original chain.
- At most a $m$-factor improvement.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>algorithm</th>
<th>transmissions</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>( \Theta(n^2) )</td>
<td>Boyd et al.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With routing</td>
<td>( \Theta(n^{3/2}) )</td>
<td>Dimakis-Sarwate-Wainwright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average on the way</td>
<td>( \Theta(n) )</td>
<td>Benezit et al.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add ( m ) mobile</td>
<td>( \Theta\left(\frac{n^2}{m}\right) )</td>
<td>Sarwate-Dimakis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Algorithm</th>
<th>Transmissions</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$\Theta(n^2)$</td>
<td>Boyd et al.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With routing</td>
<td>$\Theta(n^{3/2})$</td>
<td>Dimakis-Sarwate-Wainwright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average on the way</td>
<td>$\Theta(n)$</td>
<td>Benezit et al.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add $m$ mobile</td>
<td>$\Theta\left(\frac{n^2}{m}\right)$</td>
<td>Sarwate-Dimakis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k$-local</td>
<td>$O\left(\frac{n^2}{k^2}\right)$</td>
<td>Sarwate-Dimakis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Asymmetric gossip using broadcasting

Joint work with T.C. Aysal, M.E. Yildiz and A. Scaglione
Wireless is inherently broadcast

- In a wireless network, all neighbors can hear a transmission.
- Can perform multiple computations per slot.
- When graph is well-connected, can get performance gains.
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- In a wireless network, all neighbors can hear a transmission.
- Can perform multiple computations per slot.
- When graph is well-connected, can get performance gains.
Gossip in one direction

\[ \text{All neighbors} \ j \in N_i \text{ of node } i \text{ can hear transmission.} \]

\[ \text{Can do a simultaneous update} \quad x_j(t + 1) = \gamma x_j(t) + (1 - \gamma) x_i(t). \]

\[ \text{No information exchange – can get consensus (agreement) but not the true average.} \]

---
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Gossip in one direction

- All neighbors $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$ of node $i$ can hear transmission.
- Can do a **simultaneous update** $x_j(t + 1) = \gamma x_j(t) + (1 - \gamma) x_i(t)$.
- No information exchange – can get consensus (agreement) but not the true average.
Analyzing the broadcast gossip algorithm

Again, update given by a matrix multiplication:

\[ x(T) = \left( \prod_{t=1}^{T} W^{(i_t)} \right) x(0) \]

For all \( t \) we have \( W^{(i_t)} \mathbf{1} = \mathbf{1} \), so consensus is stable.
Benefits and challenges of broadcast

- No coordination to exchange data.
- Exploits potential long-range connections from shadowing/fading.
- No convergence to true average, but to consensus.
- Important to control the MSE of the consensus.
Main results

Algorithm reaches consensus almost surely:

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \lim_{t \to \infty} x(t) = c1 \right) = 1.$$ 

The expected consensus value is the true average:

$$\mathbb{E}[c] = \bar{x}$$

Moreover, there is a closed form for the limiting MSE.
Simulations : MSE
Simulations: MSE

The graph shows the relationship between the number of radio transmissions per node and the mean squared error (MSE) for different transmission strategies:
- **Randomized N=100** (dotted line)
- **Geographic N=100** (solid line)
- **Broadcast N=100** (dashed line)

As the number of radio transmissions increases, the MSE decreases for all strategies. The geographic strategy shows the lowest MSE compared to the randomized and broadcast strategies.
Extensions

- Can look at effect of the wireless medium as well.
- Fading allows long-distance connections.
- Initial results suggest significant improvement when path loss is not too severe.
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Reaching consensus discretely
Joint work with Tara Javidi
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Existing work doesn’t “look practical”:

- Transmit and receive real numbers
- Consensus is the only goal of the network
- Asymptotics and universality
Synchronous quantized communication

• At each time $t$ all neighbors $(i,j)$ exchange quantized values $\hat{x}_j(t)$.
• Messages $i \rightarrow j$ and $j \rightarrow i$ must take no more than $R$ bits.
• Update $x_i(t+1)$ as a function of $x_i(t)$ and messages $\{\hat{x}_j(t)\}$.
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Synchronous quantized communication

- At each time $t$ all neighbors $(i, j)$ exchange quantized values $\hat{x}_j(t)$.
- Messages $i \rightarrow j$ and $j \rightarrow i$ must take no more than $R$ bits.
- Update $x_i(t + 1)$ as a function of $x_i(t)$ and messages $\{\hat{x}_j(t)\}$. 
A simple protocol

\[ x_i(t + 1) = (x_i(t) - \hat{x}_i(t)) + \sum_{j \in N_i \cup \{i\}} W_{ij} \hat{x}_j(t). \]

- Quantization error plus weighted sum of messages
- Iterations preserve sum \( \sum_i x_i(t) \)
So how well does it work?
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Random topology, 49 nodes, poor connectivity

Log error against iterations
So how well does it work?

Grid, 100 nodes

Log error vs. Iterations graph
Observations

- Quantization is important for practical applications.
- Average consensus to within reasonable resolution can be fast.
- Overhead can be reduced by piggybacking on existing traffic.
• Algorithm can use network resources to accelerate convergence.
• Reaching consensus may be faster than computing averages.
• Lower-resolution averages can be fast and require less overhead.
Some challenges for the future

- Implementing consensus in protocols for applications.
- Extending to other distributed computation problems.
- Quantifying robustness in rate, connectivity, etc.
Thank you!