

Equivalence and Separation between Heard-Of and Asynchronous Message-Passing Models

Hagit Attiya

Technion – Israel Institute of Technology, Israel

Armando Castañeda

Instituto de Matemáticas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico

Dhrubajyoti Ghosh

Université Paris-Saclay, CNRS, ENS Paris-Saclay, Laboratoire Méthodes Formelles, France

Thomas Nowak

Université Paris-Saclay, CNRS, ENS Paris-Saclay, Laboratoire Méthodes Formelles, France

Institut Universitaire de France, France

Abstract

We revisit the relationship between two fundamental models of distributed computation: the asynchronous message-passing model with up to f crash failures (AMP_f) and the Heard-Of model with up to f message omissions (HO_f). We show that for $n > 2f$, the two models are equivalent with respect to the solvability of colorless tasks, and that for colored tasks the equivalence holds only when $f = 1$ (and $n > 2$). The separation for larger f arises from the presence of *silenced processes* in HO_f , which may lead to incompatible decisions. The proofs proceed through bidirectional simulations between AMP_f and HO_f via an intermediate model that captures this notion of silencing. The results extend to randomized protocols against a non-adaptive adversary, indicating that the expressive limits of canonical rounds are structural rather than probabilistic. Together, these results delineate precisely where round-based abstractions capture asynchronous computation, and where they do not.

Keywords: Equivalence of models, Asynchronous Message Passing model, Heard-Of model, Message Adversaries, Task Solvability

1 Introduction

Distributed computing has been studied through a variety of models that differ in communication primitives, synchrony assumptions, and failure types. A natural question is how these models compare in their computational power. Specifically, we compare the sets of *tasks* solvable in different models. This is particularly valuable when two models are equivalent, but one offers a simpler setting for analysis or verification. Simulations are often used to provide these relationships, relating models that differ in synchrony or fault tolerance.

The standard *Asynchronous Message-Passing model with f failures* (AMP_f) assumes unbounded message delivery times and allows up to f process crashes. Many protocols in this model proceed in *rounds*: each process broadcasts a message tagged with its current round number and waits for $n - f$ messages from that round before advancing to the next. This round-based behavior is formalized in the *Heard-Of model* [10], which describes communication through *Heard-Of sets*, the sets of processes from which each process receives a message in a given round. The variant with f message omissions, denoted HO_f , corresponds to executions in which every process hears from at least $n - f$ processes per round.

The HO_f model is well suited to algorithm design and verification, partly because its executions form a compact set in a topology based on common prefixes (proved in Appendix B). Compactness implies that every infinite execution has finite, well-defined prefixes that can be reasoned about independently. As a result, correctness can be expressed through safety predicates and locally finite execution trees, avoiding the need to handle liveness properties explicitly as in AMP_f . This makes the HO_f model particularly amenable to both manual proofs and automated verification.

The precise relationship between HO_f and AMP_f has remained unclear. In particular, it is not known whether canonical rounds are fully general, or whether all tasks solvable in AMP_f can be solved also in HO_f . Indeed, not every protocol in AMP_f conforms to the canonical-round pattern. For example, the renaming task [4], is solved in AMP_f by a protocol in which each process maintains and shares the set of initial names it knows, and decides once it has received $n - f - 1$ additional copies of this set. Here, decisions depend on the number of identical messages, rather than on the number of messages associated with a particular round. This example highlights that not all asynchronous protocols are expressed in terms of canonical rounds, motivating a closer examination of the precise boundary between AMP_f and HO_f .

The most relevant prior work is due to Gafni and Losa [16], who showed that HO_1 and AMP_1 solve the same set of *colorless* tasks for $n > 2$. (Roughly speaking, in a colorless task, like consensus, processes can adopt each other’s decisions.) However, to the best of our knowledge, the case of colored tasks and larger fault thresholds ($f > 1$) has not been explored.

In this work, we complete the characterization of the relative computational power of HO_f and AMP_f for arbitrary f , considering both colorless and colored tasks.

To relate HO_f and AMP_f , we introduce an intermediate model based on the notion of silenced processes. A process in HO_f is considered *silenced* when its influence eventually stops propagating: only a proper subset of processes continue to hear from it, directly or indirectly. The *Silenced-Faulty* model, SFHO_f , treats such processes as faulty, while in HO_f they are still required to decide. Thus, establishing the equivalence between HO_f and AMP_f reduces to proving the equivalence between HO_f and SFHO_f . Whether this holds depends on the number of failures and on whether the task is colorless or colored.

We use bidirectional simulations to prove the following results:

- For $n > 2f$, AMP_f and HO_f solve the same set of colorless tasks (Theorem 7).
- For $n > 2$ and $f \leq 1$, AMP_f and HO_f solve the same set of colored tasks (Theorem 13).
- For $f > 1$ and $n > 2f$, the renaming task, which is colored, is solvable in AMP_f but *not* in HO_f (Theorem 14).

	$0 \leq f \leq 1$ colorless	$0 \leq f \leq 1$ colored	$f > 1$ and $n > 2f$ colorless	$1 < f < n/2$ colored	$f \geq n/2$
HO_f in AMP_f	✓Lemma 1	✓Lemma 1	✓Lemma 1	✓Lemma 1	✓Lemma 1
AMP_f in HO_f	✓ [16]	✓Theorem 13	✓Theorem 7	✗Theorem 14	unknown

Table 1: Conditions under which tasks solvable in HO_f are also solvable in AMP_f and vice versa.

Table 1 summarizes the results.

We also show that the results essentially carry over to randomized protocols with private local coins and a non-adaptive adversary, i.e., one whose behavior is fixed independently of the protocol’s random choices; see Theorems 15, 16 and 18. With an adaptive adversary, the separation result still holds because they are stronger than non-adaptive adversaries; however the equivalence results remain open.

Additional related work: A long line of work has sought to bridge asynchronous and round-based message-passing models by placing them within a common framework for reasoning about protocols and impossibility results. The Heard-Of model of Charron-Bost and Schiper [10], Gafni’s round-by-round fault detectors [15], and the unification framework of Herlihy, Rajsbaum, and Tuttle [17] are central to this direction. The problem of finding a round-based message-passing model equivalent to the read-write wait-free model was addressed by Afek and Gafni [1]. More recently, it was shown that canonical rounds are not fully general, when failures are Byzantine [5]. Our work contributes to this line by refining the comparison between asynchronous and round-based computation and pinpointing conditions under which equivalence holds.

Another body of research studies how asynchronous message-passing models can be characterized directly in round-based terms. Shimi et al. [18] introduce *delivered predicates* and show how they generate Heard-Of predicates for asynchronous models, providing a formal mechanism for deriving round-based behavior from asynchronous assumptions. Our approach differs in that we focus on *task solvability* and use the notion of *silenced processes* to identify where the Heard-Of abstraction HO_f diverges from AMP_f .

The Heard-Of abstraction has also proved valuable for the verification of distributed algorithms. Several works, including [7, 11–13, 18], have used it to reason about correctness within purely safety-based frameworks. Balasubramanian and Walukiewicz [7] formalized this connection, showing that verification in the Heard-Of model can be reduced to reasoning over locally finite trees. Because HO_f is defined by safety predicates and its executions form locally finite trees, automated verification is often more tractable than in AMP_f , which also requires liveness properties. The compactness result we establish for HO_f provides a theoretical explanation for this practical advantage.

Beyond verification, other comparisons between message-passing models have focused on the relationship between failure assumptions. Analyses such as Gafni’s round-by-round fault detectors [15] investigate reductions between crash and omission failures, highlighting algorithmic reductions between models. Our perspective differs: we study *computational equivalence*, namely, whether two models can solve exactly the same set of tasks, rather than the existence of specific simulation-based transformations. This shift in focus clarifies the boundaries between asynchronous and round-based computation. In particular, our results refine the Heard-Of framework by identifying when the abstraction of canonical rounds captures the behavior of asynchronous message passing, and when it does not.

2 Models and preliminaries

We consider message-passing models where processes modeled as deterministic automata with infinite state spaces communicate by broadcasting and receiving messages. A *protocol* is a set of n processes $\mathcal{P} = \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$. We assume our protocols to be *full-information*, where each process always broadcasts its current *view*, which is initially its initial state and afterwards its complete local history. A configuration of the system consists of the local states of all the processes and also the state of the environment, e.g., messages in transit, etc. A *schedule* describes the order in which processes send and receive messages, and which processes' messages are obtained during each receive. An initial configuration I and a schedule S determine a *run* $\alpha(I, S)$ of the system which is an alternating sequence of configurations and send or receive events. Each model describes a set of possible schedules and for each schedule, a set of processes that are *faulty*.

2.1 The AMP_f model

In the *Asynchronous Message-Passing Model with $f \geq 0$ process failures* (AMP_f), there is no fixed upper bound on the time it takes for a message to be delivered nor on the relative speeds of the processors. Processes proceed in atomic steps, where they execute a receive, then a local computation and finally a send. In a send event, denoted as $\text{amp-send}_i(m)$, process p_i broadcasts message m to all processes including itself. In a receive event, denoted $\text{amp-recv}_i(m)$, process p_i receives message $m \in M \cup \{\perp\}$ where M is the message domain and \perp denotes “no message”.

There are multiple definitions for AMP ; we present one that is equivalent to the classical definition by Fischer, Lynch and Patterson [14] (see Appendix C). A process that has infinitely many steps in a run is said to be *non-faulty*, and *faulty* otherwise. There can be at most $f \geq 0$ faulty processes. Messages sent by a non-faulty process are received by all non-faulty processes (Non-faulty Liveness). All messages *but* the last sent by a faulty process are received by all non-faulty processes (Faulty Quasi-Liveness). Every message received by a process was previously sent to the process (Integrity). No message is received more than once at any process (No Duplicates).

2.2 The HO_f model

The Heard-Of model [10] is a round-based model. Here we consider one of its instances, the *Heard-Of model with $f \geq 0$ message omissions*. In each round, every process does a send, then a receive and finally a local computation. In a send event, denoted $\text{ho-send}_i(m)$, process p_i broadcasts m to all processes including itself. In a receive event, denoted $\text{ho-recv}_i(M')$, it gets a subset M' of the messages sent to it during the round. Messages missed in a round are lost forever.

Conceptually, processes proceed in lockstep; to represent the computation in the form of a sequence, we impose a total order on the events that is consistent with the order of events at each process, e.g., the round-robin pattern [6, Section 11.1]. In each round, a process may lose at most f messages from other processes; it always hears from itself (Weak Liveness). Every message received by a process in round k must have been sent in round k by some process (Integrity). A receive event can contain at most one message from each neighbor (No Duplicates). We remark that no process is defined to be faulty.

2.3 Tasks

In a run of a protocol, every process p_i has a non- \perp *input* value in its initial state and *decides* on an *output* value *at most once*. If a process does not decide, its output is denoted by \perp .

A *task* is a tuple $T = (\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{O}, \Delta)$ where \mathcal{I} is a set of input vectors (one input value for each process), \mathcal{O} is a set of output vectors (one output value for each process), and Δ is a total

relation that associates each input vector in \mathcal{I} with a set of possible output vectors in \mathcal{O} . An output value of \perp denotes an *undecided* process. We require that if $(I, O) \in \Delta$, then for each O' resulting after replacing some items in O with \perp , $(I, O') \in \Delta$.

In a *colorless* task, processes are free to copy the inputs and outputs of other processes. Formally, let $\text{val}(U)$ denote the *set* of non- \perp values in a vector U . In a colorless task, for all input vectors I, I' and all output vectors O, O' such that $(I, O) \in \Delta$, $\text{val}(I) \subseteq \text{val}(I')$ and $\text{val}(O') \subseteq \text{val}(O)$, we have $(I', O) \in \Delta$ and $(I, O') \in \Delta$.

A task is *colored* if it is not colorless.

A protocol \mathcal{P} *solves* T in model \mathcal{M} , if in every run R of \mathcal{P} with input vector I and output vector O , we have (1) $(I, O) \in \Delta$, and (2) $O[i] = \perp$ only if p_i is faulty in \mathcal{M} in R . Finally, task T is *solvable* in model \mathcal{M} if there exists a protocol \mathcal{P} that solves T in \mathcal{M} .

2.4 Simulations

The definition of simulations follows [6, Chapter 7]. A simulation of model \mathcal{M}_2 in model \mathcal{M}_1 consists of three layers: (1) n *simulated processes* p_1, \dots, p_n , (2) n *simulating machines* P_1, \dots, P_n , with machine P_i assigned to simulated process p_i , and (3) the communication system of \mathcal{M}_1 (see Figure 1). Each simulated process p_i interacts with its simulating machine P_i via \mathcal{M}_2 -communication primitives, as if the communication system is that of \mathcal{M}_2 . The simulating machines interact with each other through \mathcal{M}_1 using \mathcal{M}_1 -communication primitives. Transitions between states in simulated processes and simulating machines are triggered by the occurrence of events in \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2 . The occurrence of an event between p_i and P_i entails a transition in both p_i and P_i . A simulation is described by specifying the automaton for the simulating machines.

3 Simulating HO_f in AMP_f

In this section, we show that tasks solvable in HO_f are solvable in AMP_f , with a simple simulation showing that an HO_f protocol can be executed in AMP_f , as a consequence of the canonical-round construction technique in AMP . This helps to prove one direction of Theorems 7 and 13.

Lemma 1. *Any task that is solvable in HO_f is also solvable in AMP_f for $0 \leq f \leq n$.*

Proof. We first simulate a variant of the HO_f model, called CFHO_f (for *Crashed-Faulty HO_f*), in AMP_f and then show the inclusion of HO_f in CFHO_f . The CFHO_f model is identical to HO_f except that we allow a subset of processes to crash, i.e., have a finite number of events. These processes are considered faulty, so they do not have to decide.

Suppose a protocol \mathcal{P} solves a task T in CFHO_f . Each round of CFHO_f can be emulated in AMP_f by waiting for $n - f$ messages before proceeding, preserving the causal structure of message delivery. We can construct a simulation system that simulates CFHO_f in AMP_f so that for $1 \leq i \leq n$, (1) the i -th simulated process is p_i , and (2) the i -th simulation machine P_i is specified by Algorithm 1.

A protocol \mathcal{Q} solving task $T = (\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{O}, \Delta)$ in AMP_f can be constructed as in Figure 2 by converting the simulation system into a network of automata $\mathcal{Q} = \{q_1, \dots, q_n\}$ such that q_i runs both p_i and the i -th simulation machine P_i internally, and interacts with the communication system of AMP_f using *amp-send* and *amp-recv* events. The *ho-send* and *ho-recv* events between p_i and P_i become part of q_i 's internal computation.

The simulator q_i works as follows. The input of q_i is also used as the input for p_i . When p_i does an internal *ho-send*(m) for round r to P_i , q_i does an *amp-send*($\langle m, r \rangle$) and waits to receive at least $n - f$ messages of the form $\langle \cdot, r \rangle$, and collects their first components in a set M' . Then q_i performs an internal *ho-recv*(M') from P_i to p_i and changes p_i 's state accordingly. If p_i internally decides an output o , then q_i decides o as well.

Algorithm 1 Pseudocode for machine P_i

- 1: Initialize counter $round \leftarrow 0$
 - 2: Initialize empty lists $received[r]$ for all $r \geq 0$
 - 3: When $ho\text{-}send_i(m)$ occurs:
 - 4: $round \leftarrow round + 1$
 - 5: Enable $amp\text{-}send_i(\langle m, round \rangle)$
 - 6: When $amp\text{-}recv_i(\langle m, r \rangle)$ occurs:
 - 7: Add m to $received[r]$
 - 8: Enable $ho\text{-}recv_i(received[round])$ when:
 - 9: $|received[round]| \geq n - f$
-




Figure 1: Simulating \mathcal{M}_2 in \mathcal{M}_1




Figure 2: Constructing q_i from p_i and P_i

In a simulated run in $CFHO_f$, every process p_i receives at least $n - f$ messages from distinct processes associated with its current round counter before it can increment the counter. This means the simulated run is locally valid at every process, though it need not be globally valid, e.g., a process may finish a simulated round before another starts the same round. However once the local sequence of events are correctly interleaved, the run satisfies the Integrity and No Duplicates properties and so is valid in $CFHO_f$. Thus the vector of outputs (which only depends on the local histories) of all the internal p_i and thus all q_i is valid for the input vector.

Moreover, it can be shown using induction on the round number that if q_i is non-faulty in the run in AMP_f , then p_i is non-faulty in the simulated run, showing that non-faulty q_i gets a non- \perp output from p_i . Thus protocol \mathcal{Q} solves task T in AMP_f showing that any task that is solvable in $CFHO_f$ is also solvable in AMP_f for $0 \leq f \leq n$.

Finally, suppose that some protocol solves a task T in HO_f . Any run in $CFHO_f$ has a corresponding run in HO_f where each process that originally crashes in some round r does not crash, but instead from round r , (1) its messages are still lost to all other processes, and (2) it hears from all originally non-crashed processes (by Weak Liveness, there are at least $n - f$ such processes). Since processes that decide in the given $CFHO_f$ run decide based on the same information as in the constructed HO_f run, their outputs remain unchanged and moreover, non-crashed processes decide in the given run. This implies that the same protocol also solves T in $CFHO_f$, which concludes the proof of the lemma. \square

4 From AMP_f to HO_f

We now examine the conditions under which tasks solvable in AMP_f are solvable in HO_f . Instead of directly simulating AMP_f in HO_f , we introduce the *Silenced-Faulty Heard-Of* ($SFHO_f$) model, a variant of HO_f , which simplifies our proofs. The proof strategy for the equivalence results is outlined in Figure 3.




Figure 3: Strategy for equivalence results; $\mathcal{M}_1 \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_2$ indicates a simulation of \mathcal{M}_1 in \mathcal{M}_2

4.1 The Silenced-Faulty Heard-Of model

The schedules in SFHO_f must satisfy exactly the same conditions as they do in HO_f (Round-robin property, Integrity, No Duplicates, Weak Liveness). The difference between the models is that we can also declare a process to be faulty in SFHO_f . We first define the notion of a *silenced* process.

The *reach* of a process p_i from round r can be defined as the union of the set of processes that hear from p_i in round r , the set of processes that hear from one of these processes in round $r + 1$, the set of processes that hear from one of the previous processes (of rounds r and $r + 1$) in round $r + 2$ and so on. Intuitively, the reach captures the transitive closure of message deliveries originating from p_i until a particular round. Formally,

Definition 1. Let $\text{RCV}_i(r)$ be the set of processes that receive a message from process p_i in round r . The reach of process p_i between rounds r and $s \geq r$, denoted $\text{REACH}_i(r, s)$, is defined as

$$\text{REACH}_i(r, s) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} \{p_i\}, & \text{if } s = r \\ \bigcup_{p_j \in \text{REACH}_i(r, s-1)} \text{RCV}_j(s-1), & \text{if } s > r. \end{cases}$$

The reach of process p_i starting from round r , denoted $\text{REACH}_i(r, \infty)$, is $\bigcup_{s \geq r} \text{REACH}_i(r, s)$.

Definition 2. A process p_i is silenced from round r if $|\text{REACH}_i(r, \infty)| \leq f$. We say that p_i is silenced if there exists r such that p_i is silenced from round r .

Definition 3. A process is faulty in a run σ in SFHO_f if it is silenced in σ .

We make the following simple but crucial observation about non-silenced processes for $n > f$, which also explains the term “silenced”. If a process p_i is not silenced, then for any round r , there is a round $s \geq r$ such that $|\text{REACH}_i(r, s)| = |\text{REACH}_i(r, \infty)| \geq f + 1$. This implies that in round $s + 1$ every process hears from some process in $\text{REACH}_i(r, s)$, which implies:

Lemma 2. If $n > f$ then p_i is not silenced if and only if for any round r , $|\text{REACH}_i(r, \infty)| = n$.

When $n > 2f$, another important observation is that at most f processes are silenced.

Lemma 3. If $n > 2f$, there are at most f silenced processes.

Proof. Let Sil be the set of silenced processes. Suppose that $p_i \in \text{Sil}$ is silenced from round r_i . Then all the processes in $\text{REACH}_i(r_i, \infty)$ must be silenced. Indeed, if some process $p_j \in \text{REACH}_i(r_i, \infty)$ is not, then by Lemma 2, $|\text{REACH}_j(r', \infty)| = n$ for some $r' > r_i$ and so $|\text{REACH}_i(r_i, \infty)| = n$, contradicting our assumption that p_i is silenced.

By the definition of reach, there is a round after which no message sent by a process in $\text{REACH}_i(r_i, \infty)$ is received by a process outside the set. As we have shown for any $p_i \in \text{Sil}$ that $\text{REACH}_i(r_i, \infty) \subseteq \text{Sil}$, there is a round after which no message sent by a process in Sil is received by a process outside Sil .

We next argue that when $n > 2f$, at least one process is not silenced. Otherwise, all processes are silenced by some round R . In any round $r > R$, a message broadcast by any

process is received by at most f processes in round r . So the total number of successfully received messages in round r is at most nf . However, by Weak Liveness, this number is at least $n(n - f)$, which is a contradiction as $n - f > f$.

Let p_k be a non-silenced process, that is, $p_k \notin \text{Sil}$. Since p_k misses at most f messages from other processes in any round and eventually does not hear from processes in Sil , it follows that $|\text{Sil}| \leq f$; that is, there are at most f silenced processes. \square

4.2 From AMP_f to SFHO_f

Lemma 4. *If $n > 2f$, then any task that is solvable in AMP_f is also solvable in SFHO_f .*

Proof. Let $T = (\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{O}, \Delta)$ be a task that is solvable in AMP_f by a protocol $\mathcal{P} = \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$. We use a hard-coded unique identifier id_i for each process p_i .

We construct a simulation system that simulates AMP_f in SFHO_f so that for $1 \leq i \leq n$, (1) the i -th simulated process is p_i , and (2) the i -th simulation machine P_i has the specification given by Algorithm 2. Roughly, to simulate sending a message in AMP_f , it is echoed in every round of SFHO_f by the processes that have already received it, in the hope that all processes eventually receive it. This fails when the message's original process is silenced in SFHO_f , and the simulated run risks violating the Non-faulty Liveness condition of AMP_f . So processes rely on acknowledgements to determine if their messages have reached everyone, until which they temporarily block themselves from proceeding in AMP_f . Thus if they are silenced in SFHO_f , they are faulty in AMP_f , and the Faulty Quasi-Liveness condition allows their last message to be not received by everyone in the simulated run.

Algorithm 2 Pseudocode for machine P_i

- 1: Initialize set $seen := \emptyset$ \triangleright History of messages received since the beginning
 - 2: Initialize set $old := \emptyset$ \triangleright History of messages received before p_i 's last amp-send
 - 3: Initialize variable $latest := \text{null}$
 - 4: Initialize variable $T := 0$ \triangleright For timestamping
 - 5: Enable ho-send $_i(seen)$ \triangleright Enable send for the first round of SFHO_f
 - 6: When amp-send $_i(m)$ occurs:
 - 7: $latest \leftarrow \langle id_i, m, T \rangle$
 - 8: Add $latest$ to $seen$
 - 9: $T \leftarrow T + 1$
 - 10: When ho-recv $_i(M')$ occurs:
 - 11: Add previously unseen messages in M' to $seen$ and acknowledge those of type $\langle s, m', t \rangle$ by adding $ack(id_i, \langle s, m', t \rangle)$ to $seen$
 - 12: If $latest \neq \text{null}$ **and** $ack(j, latest)$ occurs in M' for $\geq f$ distinct values of $j \neq id_i$:
 - 13: Initialize set $pending := \emptyset$
 - 14: Add messages of type $\langle s, m', t \rangle$ in $seen \setminus old$ to $pending$
 - 15: If $pending$ is empty:
 - 16: Enable amp-recv $_i(\perp)$
 - 17: Else:
 - 18: For each $\langle s, m', t \rangle \in pending$: \triangleright Release all newly received messages
 - 19: Enable amp-recv $_i(m')$
 - 20: $old \leftarrow seen$
 - 21: $latest \leftarrow \text{null}$ \triangleright Update old and reset $latest$ for next AMP step
 - 22: Enable ho-send $_i(seen)$ \triangleright Enable send for the next round of SFHO_f
-

To solve a task T in SFHO_f , a protocol $\mathcal{Q} = \{q_1, \dots, q_n\}$ can again be constructed in the same manner as in Section 3, except that now the main events of q_i are ho-send and ho-recv,

while its internal events are amp-send and amp-recv.

The simulator q_i works as follows. The input of q_i is also used as the input for p_i . When p_i does an internal $\text{amp-send}_i(m)$, q_i broadcasts $\text{latest} = \langle id_i, m, T \rangle$ for some time value T in every subsequent round of SFHO_f . Also in every round, it broadcasts all previously received messages and acknowledgements for messages of the form $\langle \cdot, \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. It waits to receive at least f acknowledgements for $\langle id_i, m, T \rangle$ before unblocking p_i by enabling an internal $\text{amp-recv}_i(m')$ for every pending received message of the form $\langle \cdot, m', \cdot \rangle$. If p_i internally decides an output o , then q_i decides o as well.

Every P_i tags every message m from p_i with the identifier id_i and a timestamp T , to distinguish an AMP_f message that is sent multiple times by a process or by different processes.

The first observation is that if q_i is non-faulty (in SFHO_f) then p_i is also non-faulty (in AMP_f). By Lemma 2 and since q_i is non-silenced, every non-null latest value that occurs at q_i eventually reaches all processes in \mathcal{Q} . After a latest value by q_i is acknowledged by all the processes, q_i receives at least $n - f > f$ acknowledgements and thus allows p_i to continue in the simulated run.

As a consequence, Lemma 3 implies that there are at most f faulty processes in \mathcal{P} in the simulated run.

In the simulated run, if a process p_i has an $\text{amp-send}(m)$ event eventually followed by an amp-recv event, it means that q_i received at least f acknowledgements to $\langle id_i, m, T \rangle$ (for some T) from others before allowing further amp-recvs at p_i . Thus eventually all processes q_j receive $\langle id_i, m, T \rangle$ and as all non-faulty processes p_j have infinitely many amp-recvs , $\text{amp-recv}(m)$ must be one of them. Non-faulty Liveness and Faulty Quasi-Liveness hold as a consequence. Finally, it is straightforward to show that the simulated run satisfies the Integrity and No Duplicates properties.

We conclude that the simulated run is valid in AMP_f , meaning the vector of outputs of the simulated processes p_i and thus that of the q_i is valid. Moreover, a non-faulty q_i gets a non- \perp output from its internal p_i . Thus task T is also solvable in SFHO_f , proving the lemma. \square

The next sections study the conditions under which a task solvable in SFHO_f is also solvable in HO_f , and then apply Lemmas 1 and 4.

5 Equivalence for colorless tasks

We now show that when $n > 2f$, HO_f and AMP_f solve the same set of colorless tasks. Let $T = (\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{O}, \Delta)$ be a colorless task that is solvable in SFHO_f by a protocol $\mathcal{P} = \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$. One can easily construct a protocol $\mathcal{Q} = \{q_1, \dots, q_n\}$ that solves T in HO_f . In every round, every process q_i runs p_i , and if a yet undecided process q_i hears from process q_j such that q_j has already decided o , then q_i decides o .

Let α be a run of \mathcal{Q} with input vector I and output vector $O_{\mathcal{Q}}$ in HO_f . We first prove that all processes of \mathcal{Q} decide on a value.

Lemma 5. *All processes q_i have non- \perp output values in $O_{\mathcal{Q}}$.*

Proof. Since $n > 2f$, at least $n - f$ processes in \mathcal{Q} are not silenced by Lemma 3 and decide by some round. In the next round, any q_i that has not yet decided hears from a decided process due to Weak Liveness and copies its output. \square

It remains to show that \mathcal{Q} gives a valid output vector for the input vector of α . Let $O_{\mathcal{P}}$ be the output vector of \mathcal{P} on α . Then $(I, O_{\mathcal{P}}) \in \Delta$ as α can be viewed as a run of \mathcal{P} in SFHO_f .

Lemma 6. *$\text{val}(O_{\mathcal{Q}}) \subseteq \text{val}(O_{\mathcal{P}})$ and thus $(I, O_{\mathcal{Q}}) \in \Delta$.*

Proof. Suppose q_i decides output o in some round. This must be because either p_i decides o in that round in which case $o \in \text{val}(O_{\mathcal{P}})$, or q_i heard from some q_j that had already decided o in which case we can argue by induction that $o \in \text{val}(O_{\mathcal{P}})$. Thus $\text{val}(O_{\mathcal{Q}}) \subseteq \text{val}(O_{\mathcal{P}})$ and as T is colorless, $(I, O_{\mathcal{Q}}) \in \Delta$. \square

Thus protocol \mathcal{Q} solves colorless task $T = (\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{O}, \Delta)$ in HO_f , proving that for $n > 2f$, colorless tasks solvable in SFHO_f are solvable in HO_f . Combining this with Lemmas 1 and 4, we conclude that:

Theorem 7. *For $n > 2f$, models HO_f and AMP_f solve the same set of colorless tasks.*

6 Equivalence and separation for colored tasks

6.1 Equivalence with one fault

We now show for $f \leq 1$ and $n > 2f$ that HO_f and AMP_f solve the same set of colored tasks. When $f = 0$, there are no silenced processes in SFHO_0 , and it is the same model as HO_0 and thus AMP_0 (by Lemmas 1 and 4). Thus, it suffices to consider the case $f = 1$ and $n > 2f = 2$.

Let $T = (\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{O}, \Delta)$ be a colored task that is solvable in SFHO_1 by a protocol $\mathcal{P} = \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$. We show that the following protocol $\mathcal{Q} = \{q_1, \dots, q_n\}$ solves task T in HO_1 .

Recall that unlike colorless tasks, colored tasks require each process to produce its own output; thus decisions cannot be freely adopted from other processes. Thus, while process q_i runs p_i in each round, the decision rule is modified as in Algorithm 3.

Algorithm 3 Pseudocode for process q_i

- 1: Round r : Send and receive messages and change the state of p_i accordingly. If q_i does not have an output yet, then
 - 2: If p_i decides o in round r , then q_i decides o
 - 3: Else
 - 4: If q_i determines from its round- r view that every other process has decided, then
 - 5: q_i chooses an output which, combined with the others' outputs and the input vector, satisfies the task.
-

Let α be a run of \mathcal{Q} in HO_1 with input vector I and output vector $O_{\mathcal{Q}}$.

Lemma 8. *If q_i executes line 4 in round r , then there is a value for q_i to choose in line 5.*

Proof. Process q_i starts constructing a run α' by using the view of each q_j for the round where q_i last hears from q_j . It can then fill in the missing events in α' till round r by going over all possibilities (there is at least one that is valid, namely run α till round r). From round $r + 1$ onwards, it assumes that no messages are lost, so no process is silenced in α' . Thus p_i decides an output in α' , which q_i uses in α . To see that q_i 's choice leads to $O_{\mathcal{Q}}$ being a valid output vector, note that it is equal to the output vector yielded by \mathcal{P} on α' . \square

We complement Lemma 8 with the observation that if a process is silenced, then it has nearly up-to-date information about the entire system.

Lemma 9. *If process q_i is silenced from round R in α , then for every round $r \geq R + 1$, its round- r view contains the round- $(r - 2)$ views of all processes.*

Proof. The round- r view of q_i contains the round- $(r - 1)$ views (and hence the round- $(r - 2)$ views) of at least $n - 1$ processes including itself. Let q_j be an exception. All processes in $\mathcal{Q} \setminus \{q_i, q_j\}$ must hear from q_j in round $r - 1$ as q_i is already silenced and no one hears from it. Thus q_i receives the round- $(r - 2)$ view of q_j from $\mathcal{Q} \setminus \{q_i, q_j\}$ in round r . \square

It remains to show that all processes decide and the run yields a valid output vector.

Lemma 10. *All processes q_i have non- \perp output values in O_Q .*

Proof. If q_i is not silenced then it is guaranteed to decide using p_i . Now suppose that q_i is silenced from round R and it does not get to decide using line 2. By Lemma 3, since no other process in \mathcal{Q} is silenced, all processes in $\mathcal{Q} \setminus \{q_i\}$ decide by some round R' . Thus by Lemma 9, q_i satisfies the condition in line 4 by round $\max(R, R') + 2$ and also decides, by Lemma 8. \square

Lemma 11. $(I, O_Q) \in \Delta$.

Proof. There can be at most one process q_i that decides using line 5. Indeed, if there were two such processes, both must have satisfied line 4, meaning each decided their outputs before the other; this is absurd. If *all* processes in \mathcal{Q} decide their outputs in line 2, then \mathcal{P} must yield output vector O_Q on run α in SFHO₁ and thus $(I, O_Q) \in \Delta$. Otherwise, some process q_i decides in line 5, and thus, all other processes q_j decide in line 2. By Lemma 8, q_i 's output combined with the others' outputs and the input vector I satisfy the task and thus $(I, O_Q) \in \Delta$. \square

Hence protocol \mathcal{Q} solves task $T = (\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{O}, \Delta)$ in HO₁, which implies:

Lemma 12. *For $f \leq 1$ and $n > 2f$, colored tasks solvable in SFHO _{f} are solvable in HO _{f} .*

Combining this with Lemmas 1 and 4 gives

Theorem 13. *For $f \leq 1$ and $n > 2f$, HO _{f} and AMP _{f} solve the same set of colored tasks.*

6.2 Separation with more than one fault

Algorithm 3 cannot be generalized to the case where $f > 1$, since it is possible to have a run with two silenced processes such that they are the only ones hearing from themselves. Since the two silenced processes will never have information about each other, getting them to decide compatible outputs is a challenge due to symmetry. Indeed, this prevents HO _{f} and AMP _{f} from coinciding for colored tasks and $f > 1$. We demonstrate this with the renaming task [4].

The *renaming task* with initial name space of potentially unbounded size M and new name space of size N and $M > N$ is defined as follows. Every process initially has as input a distinct identifier from the initial name space. Every process with a non- \perp output must return a distinct output name from the new name space. To avoid trivial protocols for this task (e.g., for $N = n$, the protocol where process p_i always chooses i as output), we use the *anonymity assumption* on renaming protocols used in [4]. In particular, this means that all processes have the same decision function δ that maps the sequence of views at a process to an output value.

Theorem 14. *For $1 < f < n/2$, the renaming task with an initial name space of size $N + n - 1$ and new name space of size $N = n + f$ is solvable in AMP _{f} but is not solvable in HO _{f} .*

Proof. For $n > 2f$, the renaming task with an unbounded initial name space and a new name space of size $N = n + f$ is solvable in AMP _{f} [4, Theorem 7.9]. Trimming the size of the initial name space to $N + n - 1$ clearly preserves the result. It is worth noting that the specifications of the AMP _{f} model in [4] differ in that all messages sent to non-faulty processes are required to be received. However it can be checked that the protocol works even if we weaken this by assuming Faulty Quasi-Liveness.

To show the separation, assume by way of contradiction that there is a protocol \mathcal{P} solving the task in HO _{f} . We show how to obtain an input vector on which \mathcal{P} fails. Fix arbitrary distinct initial names x_1, \dots, x_{n-2} for processes p_1, \dots, p_{n-2} . Let processes p_{n-1} and p_n have initial names a and b that will be chosen later. Consider a run of \mathcal{P} in HO _{f} with input vector $(x_1, \dots, x_{n-2}, a, b)$ such that: (1) p_1, \dots, p_{n-2} hear from each other in every round, (2) p_{n-1} and

p_n are not heard of by any other process in any round and (3) p_{n-1} and p_n get to hear from p_1, \dots, p_{n-2} in every round.

With x_1, \dots, x_{n-2} fixed, the sequence of views of p_{n-1} is the value of some function $f(a)$ that does not depend on b , and its new name is some value $\delta(f(a))$. The sequence of views of p_{n-1} and p_n are symmetric, so the sequence of views of p_n is $f(b)$ and its new name is $\delta(f(b))$. As there are $N + 1$ initial names apart from x_1, \dots, x_{n-2} and only N possible new names, there exist values for a, b such that $x_1, \dots, x_{n-2}, a, b$ are distinct and $\delta(f(a)) = \delta(f(b))$. Thus \mathcal{P} fails on the input vector $(x_1, \dots, x_{n-2}, a, b)$; a contradiction. \square

7 Randomized protocols with a non-adaptive adversary

In this section, we extend our study to randomized protocols under a *non-adaptive adversary*, which fixes process crashes and message omissions independently of the protocol's random choices. Randomization can break symmetry among processes, but it cannot repair lost communication: once two processes are silenced with respect to each other, their random choices evolve independently, and their outputs may diverge. We prove that the equivalence between AMP_f and HO_f for colorless tasks persists in this setting, while the separation for colored tasks remains. Thus, the expressive boundary between the two models is *structural*, determined by the flow of information rather than by deterministic constraints.

More specifically, we assume processes are equipped with their own local coins, which they may flip an arbitrary number of times during the local computation of each step. Together with an initial configuration and schedule, the sequences of local coin flips determine a run. An overview of randomized protocols can be found in [3].

We assume that the scheduling of processes and messages is handled by a *non-adaptive adversary*, which must fix the schedule of the run in advance. Once fixed, the results of the coin flips are the only remaining unknowns that determine the run of the protocol. We also alter the definition of task solvability in Section 2 by replacing the second condition that says that all non-faulty processes must decide. Instead, we require that once the adversary fixes the scheduling, all non-faulty processes must decide with probability 1. The first condition remains unchanged, i.e., the output vector of a run always has to satisfy the task specification.

The following randomized versions of Theorems 7 and 13 are proved by identical simulation constructions, detailed in Appendix A. The only difference is in showing almost-sure termination.

Theorem 15. *For $n > 2f$, AMP_f and HO_f solve the same set of randomized colorless tasks.*

Theorem 16. *For $f \leq 1$ and $n > 2f$, AMP_f and HO_f solve the same set of randomized colored tasks.*

In order to show the randomized counterpart of the separation result (Theorem 14), we will use a probabilistic version of the pigeonhole principle that shows a positive probability of name collisions of randomized renaming protocols in HO_f (proved in Appendix A).

Lemma 17. *Let $N \geq 1$ be a positive integer and let $0 < c < 1/N$. There exists an integer $L = L(N, c)$ with the following property: for every collection X_1, \dots, X_L of L pairwise independent random variables taking values in the set $\{a_1, \dots, a_N\}$, there exist distinct indices $a, b \in \{1, \dots, L\}$ such that $\mathbb{P}(X_a = X_b) \geq c$.*

To demonstrate separation, we will use the renaming task as in the deterministic version, only with a potentially larger initial name space because of Lemma 17.

Theorem 18. *For $1 < f < n/2$, there exists $L \geq 2$ such that the renaming task with initial name space of size $n - 2 + L$ and new name space of size $N = n + f$ is solvable in AMP_f but not in HO_f .*

Proof. The task is solvable for any $L \geq 2$ in AMP_f even by a deterministic protocol. Assume for all $L \geq 2$ that there is a randomized protocol solving it in HO_f against a non-adaptive adversary.

We choose the same message schedule and input vector $(x_1, \dots, x_{n-2}, a, b)$ as in the proof of Theorem 14, with a and b to be chosen later. Let R be the set of runs having the chosen input vector and schedule. In run $r \in R$, let $c'(r)$ be the sequence of random choices of the processes p_1, \dots, p_{n-2} and let $c_{n-1}(r)$ and $c_n(r)$ be those of p_{n-1} and p_n . Write \mathcal{C}' for the set of sequences of random choices $c'(r)$. Once x_1, \dots, x_{n-2} are fixed, the new names of p_{n-1} and p_n depend on their own initial names, their own sequences of random choices and those of p_1, \dots, p_{n-2} , and thus can be written as $\delta(a, c_{n-1}(r), c'(r))$ and $\delta(b, c_n(r), c'(r))$. We use the fact that all processes almost-surely decide distinct non- \perp values and the law of total probability [8, Theorem 34.4] to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \mathbb{P}(\delta(a, c_{n-1}(r), c'(r)) \neq \delta(b, c_n(r), c'(r))) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{C}'} \mathbb{P}(\delta(a, c_{n-1}(r), c'(r)) \neq \delta(b, c_n(r), c'(r)) \mid c'(r) = c') d\mathbb{P}(c'). \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Once $c'(r)$ is fixed to c' and values for a and b are chosen, the new names $\delta(a, c_{n-1}(r), c')$ and $\delta(b, c_n(r), c')$ are independent random variables due to $c_{n-1}(r)$ and $c_n(r)$ being independent. Moreover they must be chosen from a set of $k = N - (n - 2)$ names. By setting $c = 1/2k$ in Lemma 17, there exists a choice of initial names a and b from a set of $L = L(N, c)$ names such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\delta(a, c_{n-1}(r), c'(r)) \neq \delta(b, c_n(r), c'(r)) \mid c'(r) = c') \leq 1 - \frac{1}{2k}. \quad (2)$$

Combining (1) and (2) gives

$$1 \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{2k}\right) \int_{\mathcal{C}'} d\mathbb{P}(c') = 1 - \frac{1}{2k} < 1, \quad ,$$

a contradiction. □

8 Summary and Discussion

This work establishes a precise correspondence between the asynchronous message-passing model with crash failures, AMP_f , and the round-based Heard-Of model with message omissions, HO_f . The two coincide for colorless tasks when $n > 2f$, and for colored tasks only when $f = 1$ (and $n > 2$). The distinction stems from *silenced processes* in HO_f : when several processes become permanently unheard, their views diverge and they may reach incompatible decisions. With a single such process, compatibility can still be preserved; with more, it cannot. The results extend to randomized algorithms with non-adaptive adversaries, indicating that the limitations arise from communication structure rather than determinism.

The notion of silencing offers a new perspective on the limits of coordination in asynchronous systems, showing that failures of propagation, rather than timing, define what is computable. One open question involves understanding the case $n \leq 2f$. While it initially appears that the landscape of solvable problems in both AMP_f and HO_f might only contain trivial tasks, it turns out that $(n - 1)$ -set agreement is solvable in both for $f = n - 2$: this is done by doing one round of exchanging input values and deciding on the minimal value received. Other open directions include identifying broader task classes for which the models coincide, and clarifying the role of the intermediate model SFHO_f for colored tasks with $f > 1$ and $n > 2f$. More broadly, reasoning in terms of information propagation may help reveal similar boundaries in models of partial synchrony and Byzantine behavior.

References

- [1] Yehuda Afek and Eli Gafni. Asynchrony from synchrony. In *Distributed Computing and Networking*, volume 7730 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 225–239. Springer Berlin / Heidelberg, Germany, 2012.
- [2] Bowen Alpern and Fred B. Schneider. Defining liveness. *Information Processing Letters*, 21(4):181–185, 1985.
- [3] James Aspnes. Randomized protocols for asynchronous consensus. *Distributed Comput.*, 16(2-3):165–175, 2003. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00446-002-0081-5>, doi:10.1007/S00446-002-0081-5.
- [4] Hagit Attiya, Amotz Bar-Noy, Danny Dolev, David Peleg, and Rüdiger Reischuk. Renaming in an asynchronous environment. *J. ACM*, 37(3):524–548, July 1990. doi:10.1145/79147.79158.
- [5] Hagit Attiya, Itay Flam, and Jennifer L. Welch. Brief announcement: Communication patterns for optimal resilience. In Dariusz R. Kowalski, editor, *39th International Symposium on Distributed Computing, DISC 2025, October 27-31, 2025, Berlin, Germany*, volume 356 of *LIPICs*, pages 46:1–46:7. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2025. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.DISC.2025.46>, doi:10.4230/LIPICs.DISC.2025.46.
- [6] Hagit Attiya and Jennifer Welch. *Distributed Computing: Fundamentals, Simulations and Advanced Topics*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, NJ, USA, 2004.
- [7] A. R. Balasubramanian and Igor Walukiewicz. Characterizing consensus in the heard-of model. In Igor Konnov and Laura Kovács, editors, *31st International Conference on Concurrency Theory, CONCUR 2020, September 1-4, 2020, Vienna, Austria (Virtual Conference)*, volume 171 of *LIPICs*, pages 9:1–9:18. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2020. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.CONCUR.2020.9>, doi:10.4230/LIPICs.CONCUR.2020.9.
- [8] Patrick Billingsley. *Probability and measure*. Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, third edition, 1995. A Wiley-Interscience Publication.
- [9] Nicolas Bourbaki. *General Topology, Chapters 1–4*. Elements of Mathematics. Springer, Heidelberg, 1989.
- [10] Bernadette Charron-Bost and André Schiper. The heard-of model: Computing in distributed systems with benign failures. *Distributed Computing*, 22(1):49–71, 2009.
- [11] Andrei Damian, Cezara Dragoi, Alexandru Militaru, and Josef Widder. Communication-closed asynchronous protocols. In Isil Dillig and Serdar Tasiran, editors, *Computer Aided Verification - 31st International Conference, CAV 2019, New York City, NY, USA, July 15-18, 2019, Proceedings, Part II*, volume 11562 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 344–363. Springer, 2019. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-25543-5_20.
- [12] Henri Debrat and Stephan Merz. Verifying fault-tolerant distributed algorithms in the heard-of model. *Arch. Formal Proofs*, 2012, 2012. URL: https://www.isa-afp.org/entries/Heard_Of.shtml.
- [13] Cezara Drăgoi, Thomas A. Henzinger, Helmut Veith, Josef Widder, and Damien Zufferey. A Logic-Based Framework for Verifying Consensus Algorithms. In Kenneth L. McMillan

- and Xavier Rival, editors, *Verification, Model Checking, and Abstract Interpretation*, pages 161–181, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2014. Springer. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-54013-4_10.
- [14] Michael J. Fischer, Nancy A. Lynch, and Michael S. Paterson. Impossibility of distributed consensus with one faulty process. *J. ACM*, 32(2):374–382, apr 1985. doi:10.1145/3149.214121.
- [15] Eli Gafni. Round-by-round fault detectors (extended abstract): unifying synchrony and asynchrony. In *Proceedings of the seventeenth annual ACM symposium on Principles of distributed computing*, PODC ’98, pages 143–152, New York, NY, USA, June 1998. Association for Computing Machinery. URL: <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/277697.277724>, doi:10.1145/277697.277724.
- [16] Eli Gafni and Giuliano Losa. Invited Paper: Time Is Not a Healer, but It Sure Makes Hindsight 20:20. In Shlomi Dolev and Baruch Schieber, editors, *Stabilization, Safety, and Security of Distributed Systems*, pages 62–74. Springer Nature Switzerland, 2023. doi:10.1007/978-3-031-44274-2_6.
- [17] Maurice Herlihy, Sergio Rajsbaum, and Mark R. Tuttle. Unifying synchronous and asynchronous message-passing models. In Brian A. Coan and Yehuda Afek, editors, *Proceedings of the Seventeenth Annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing, PODC ’98, Puerto Vallarta, Mexico, June 28 - July 2, 1998*, pages 133–142. ACM, 1998. doi:10.1145/277697.277722.
- [18] Adam Shimi, Aurélie Hurault, and Philippe Quéinnec. Characterization and derivation of heard-of predicates for asynchronous message-passing models. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 17, 2021.

A Proofs for Section 7

We first prove Theorems 15 and 16.

Theorem. For $n > 2f$, AMP_f and HO_f solve the same set of randomized colorless tasks.

Theorem. For $f \leq 1$ and $n > 2f$, AMP_f and HO_f solve the same set of randomized colored tasks.

The randomized versions of Lemmas 1 and 4 can be proved using the same simulations: Every simulated process p_i now uses randomization and the processes q_i are constructed as before. The non-adaptive adversary fixes the scheduling of \mathcal{Q} , which also fixes that of \mathcal{P} . We can use the same proofs to show that any simulated run of \mathcal{P} is valid and obtain that any output vector yielded by \mathcal{P} is valid and that all non-faulty p_i decide with probability 1. It follows that any output vector yielded by \mathcal{Q} is also valid and moreover as it is still true that p_i is non-faulty if q_i is, all non-faulty q_i decide with probability 1.

To prove the randomized version of the result in Sections 5 and 6.1, the same protocol constructions work: The proofs of the output vector $O_{\mathcal{Q}}$ being valid (Lemmas 6 and 11) remain unchanged, and we only need to show the randomized versions of Lemmas 5 and 10. In both the lemmas, if q_i is not silenced, its probability of deciding is at least that of p_i , i.e. 1. Thus $n - f$ processes of \mathcal{Q} decide in a run with probability 1. Then using the same ideas in Lemmas 5 and 10, we conclude that non-faulty processes in \mathcal{Q} decide with probability 1.

We next prove Lemma 17.

Lemma. Let $N \geq 1$ be a positive integer and let $0 < c < 1/N$. There exists an integer $L = L(N, c)$ with the following property: for every collection X_1, \dots, X_L of L pairwise independent random variables taking values in the set $\{a_1, \dots, a_N\}$, there exist distinct indices $a, b \in \{1, \dots, L\}$ such that $\mathbb{P}(X_a = X_b) \geq c$.

Proof. We will view the random variables X_i as vectors $x = (x_k)_{1 \leq k \leq N}$ in the standard simplex $\Delta^{N-1} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^N$ with $x_k = \mathbb{P}(X_i = a_k)$. We then need to show that there are distinct vectors x and y such that we have following inequality on their dot product:

$$x \cdot y = \sum_{k=1}^N x_k y_k \geq c$$

Every vector $x \in \Delta^{N-1}$ satisfies $\|x\|_2^2 = \sum_{k=1}^N x_k^2 \geq 1/N$, since $(\sum_{k=1}^N x_k)^2 \leq N \sum_{k=1}^N x_k^2$ by the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality.

Suppose by contradiction that for some $c < 1/N$ there is an arbitrarily large finite collection of vectors with the property that for all distinct vectors x, y , we have

$$x \cdot y < c. \tag{3}$$

Then for any distinct x and y , we have

$$\|x - y\|_2^2 = \|x\|_2^2 + \|y\|_2^2 - 2x \cdot y > 2\left(\frac{1}{N} - c\right) > 0.$$

Hence all vectors are separated by the positive distance

$$d = \sqrt{2\left(\frac{1}{N} - c\right)}.$$

But the simplex Δ^{N-1} is compact, so any d -separated subset of Δ^{N-1} is finite. Therefore there is a uniform finite upper bound $M = M(N, c)$ on the size of any set satisfying (3). Taking $L = M + 1$ proves the existence of the claimed finite $L = L(N, c)$. \square

A crude explicit packing-type bound for L may be obtained as follows. The simplex is contained in a Euclidean ball of radius at most \sqrt{N} , so the maximal number $M(N, c)$ of points pairwise at distance at least d satisfies (very roughly)

$$M(N, c) < \left(1 + \frac{2\sqrt{N}}{d}\right)^{N-1} = \left(1 + \frac{2\sqrt{N}}{\sqrt{2(1/N - c)}}\right)^{N-1},$$

and one may take $L = M(N, c)$.

B Compactness of HO_f

In this section, we prove that the set of runs of a protocol in HO_f with a *finite* number of possible initial configurations is compact with respect to the *longest-common-prefix* metric. Given two sequences $\alpha = (\alpha_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ and $\beta = (\beta_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$, their *longest-common-prefix distance* [2] is:

$$d(\alpha, \beta) = 2^{-\inf\{k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \mid \alpha_k \neq \beta_k\}}.$$

If α and β are identical, then the infimum is $+\infty$ and their distance is zero. If not, then their distance is equal to 2^{-K} where K is the smallest index at which the sequences differ.

We first define schedules using *communication graphs* and show that the set of schedules is compact when equipping it with the longest-common-prefix metric. We then show that the mapping from schedules to protocol runs in HO_f is continuous. This then proves that the set of runs is compact, as the continuous image of a compact set.

We define $\mathcal{G}_{n,f}$ as the set of directed graphs $G = (V, E)$ such that:

1. the set of vertices of G is equal to $V = [n]$,

2. every vertex has a self-loop in G , i.e., $(i, i) \in E$ for all $i \in [n]$,
3. the set of incoming neighbors of every vertex has size at least $n - f$, i.e., $|\{j \in [n] \mid (j, i) \in E\}| \geq n - f$ for every $i \in [n]$.

A *communication graph* is a graph $G \in \mathcal{G}_{n,f}$. A *schedule* is an infinite sequence G_1, G_2, \dots of communication graphs.

To prove compactness of the set of schedules, we use Tychonoff's theorem (see, *e.g.* [9, Chapter I, §9, no. 5, Theorem 3]).

Theorem 19 (Tychonoff). *The product of a family of compact topological spaces is compact with respect to the product topology.*

Lemma 20. *The set of schedules is compact with respect to the longest-common-prefix metric.*

Proof. The set of schedules is equal to $\mathcal{G}_{n,f}^{\mathbb{N}}$. It is straightforward to show that the product topology is induced by the longest-common-prefix metric if every copy of $\mathcal{G}_{n,f}$ is equipped with the discrete metric. Each $\mathcal{G}_{n,f}$ is compact since it is finite. Thus, applying Theorem 19 shows that the set of schedules is compact as well. \square

Given a protocol in HO_f , denoting by Σ the set of schedules, by \mathcal{S} the set of runs of HO_f , and by \mathcal{C}_0 the set of initial configurations of the protocol, we define the mapping $f : \mathcal{C}_0 \times \Sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ inductively on every element $(C_0, \alpha) \in \mathcal{C}_0 \times \Sigma$ by simulating the protocol starting from the given initial configuration C_0 and delivering messages in round r according to the round- r communication graph G_r of schedule α .

Lemma 21. *The function $f : \Sigma \times \mathcal{C}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ is continuous when equipping Σ and \mathcal{S} with the longest-common-prefix metric and \mathcal{C}_0 with the discrete metric.*

Proof. Since the round- r prefix of $f(\alpha, C_0)$ is entirely determined by C_0 and the round- r prefix of α , we have $d(f(\alpha, C_0), f(\beta, C_0)) \leq d(\alpha, \beta)$ for all $\alpha, \beta \in \Sigma$ and all $C_0 \in \mathcal{C}_0$. \square

Lemma 22. *For a protocol \mathcal{P} whose set \mathcal{C}_0 of initial configurations is finite, the set of runs of \mathcal{P} in HO_f is compact with respect to the longest-common-prefix metric.*

Proof. It is straightforward to check that the set of runs of \mathcal{P} is the image of the function f . We thus have $\mathcal{S} = \bigcup_{C_0 \in \mathcal{C}_0} f(\Sigma, C_0)$. Each set $f(\Sigma, C_0)$ is compact as the continuous image of a compact set. Then, if \mathcal{C}_0 is finite, the set \mathcal{S} is compact as the finite union of compact sets. \square

C AMP is equivalent to the FLP definition

In the FLP version of the AMP_f model, we denote the communication primitives by *flp-send* and *flp-recv*. In a send event *flp-send* _{i} (m, j), process p_i sends message m to a *single* process p_j . In a receive event, as in AMP_f , the process receives either a single message or nothing. As in AMP_f , runs in FLP_f may have at most f faulty processes and must satisfy the Integrity and No Duplicates properties. Importantly, we have a stronger condition than Faulty Quasi-Liveness where we require that non-faulty processes receive all messages sent to them.

In order to show that our definition of AMP_f is equivalent to the FLP_f definition, we show that each model can simulate the other. For the simulation of AMP_f in FLP_f , the broadcasting of a message in AMP_f can be simulated in FLP_f by sending it individually to all processes, and a message m is said to be received in AMP_f if m is received in FLP_f .

Algorithm 4 Machine P_i simulating AMP_f in FLP_f

- 1: When $\text{amp-send}_i(m)$ occurs:
 - 2: Enable $\text{flp-send}_i(m, j)$ for all j
 - 3: Enable $\text{amp-recv}_i(m)$ when:
 - 4: $\text{flp-recv}_i(m)$ occurs
-

For the simulation of FLP_f in AMP_f , the sending of a message m in FLP_f to p_j can be simulated in AMP_f by broadcasting the message $\langle m, j \rangle$, and a message m is said to be received by process p_i in FLP_f if p_i receives $\langle m, i \rangle$ in AMP_f .

Algorithm 5 Machine P_i simulating FLP_f in AMP_f

- 1: When $\text{flp-send}_i(m, j)$ occurs:
 - 2: Enable $\text{amp-send}_i(\langle m, j \rangle)$
 - 3: Enable $\text{flp-recv}_i(m)$ when:
 - 4: $\text{amp-recv}_i(\langle m, i \rangle)$ occurs
-