

---

# COMPLETE VISIBILITY ALGORITHM FOR AUTONOMOUS MOBILE LUMINOUS ROBOTS UNDER AN ASYNCHRONOUS SCHEDULER ON GRID PLANE

---

A PREPRINT

✉ **Yonghwan Kim**

Department of Computer Science  
Nagoya Institute of Technology  
Aichi, Japan  
kim@nitech.ac.jp

✉ **Yoshiaki Katayama**

Department of Computer Science  
Nagoya Institute of Technology  
Aichi, Japan  
katayama@nitech.ac.jp

✉ **Koichi Wada**

Department of Applied Informatics  
Hosei University  
Tokyo, Japan  
wada@hosei.ac.jp

## ABSTRACT

An autonomous mobile robot system is a distributed system consisting of mobile computational entities (called robots) that autonomously and repeatedly perform three operations: Look, Compute, and Move. Various problems related to autonomous mobile robots, such as gathering, pattern formation, or flocking, have been extensively studied to understand the relationship between each robot's capabilities and the solvability of these problems. In this study, we focus on the complete visibility problem, which involves relocating all the robots on an infinite grid plane such that each robot is visible to every other robot. We assume that each robot is a luminous robot (*i.e.*, has a light with a constant number of colors) and opaque (not transparent). In this paper, we propose an algorithm to achieve complete visibility when a set of robots is given. The algorithm ensures that complete visibility is achieved even when robots operate asynchronously and have no knowledge of the total number of robots on the grid plane using only two colors.

**Keywords** Autonomous Mobile Robot · Complete Visibility · Luminous Robot

## 1 Introduction

An autonomous mobile robot system is a distributed system composed of mobile computational entities known as *robots* which operate and move autonomously. Each robot determines its destination based solely on the (relative) locations of other robots obtained from its own (*i.e.*, local) observation, and cooperate with others to achieve a common goal for the system. The fundamental model is proposed by Suzuki *et al.*, wherein the robots possess no communication abilities (*silent*), have no memory to recall past activities (*oblivious*), and lack identifiers (*anonymous*). Furthermore, all robots are indistinguishable from each other (*identical*) and execute the same algorithm (*homogeneous*). Each robot continuously executes a cycle consisting of three phases; *Look*, *Compute* and *Move*. In the *Look* phase, a robot observes the positions of other robots. In the *Compute* phase, a robot calculates its destination using an algorithm based on the results of the last *Look* phase, then proceeds to the calculated destination during the *Move* phase. In general, the level of synchronization between phase executions for each robot differs, leading to three basic schedulers: fully-synchronous (FSYNC), semi-synchronous (SSYNC), and asynchronous (ASYNC). In an FSYNC scheduler model, all robots perform the cycle in a fully synchronous manner, meaning all robots execute the same phase synchronously.

SSYNC is a scheduler model that allows some robots to not execute a cycle while all robots are executing a cycle in FSYNC. ASYNC is a scheduler model that makes no assumptions about synchronization between robots' executions.

Several problems are considered in autonomous mobile robots systems under various assumptions (*i.e.*, capabilities of the robots), such as gathering Cieliebak and Prencipe [2002], deployment Barrière et al. [2009], and pattern formation problem Flocchini et al. [1999]. The solvability of a problem is sensitively changed by the capability of the robots; therefore, researchers primarily aim to define the minimum capability required to solve a given problem. Many autonomous mobile robot models neither have an explicit communication function nor memory. However, a new model, termed the *luminous model*, has been introduced Luna et al. [2017]. A luminous robot is equipped with a color-changing light that can be observed by itself and/or other robots, and can communicate with other robots and remember its own status using its light. The luminous model clearly provides greater functionality than the basic model. Indeed, research has demonstrated that problems previously unsolvable using the basic model can be addressed effectively with the luminous model Luna et al. [2017], Sharma et al. [2015a]. In luminous robot systems, a primary area of interest for researchers is the number of light colors needed to solve a problem.

Observability among robots to each other is a critical aspect in these systems. If a robot is opaque, it can only observe its immediate neighbors when three or more robots are align in a straight line (collinear). Consequently, it becomes impossible to recognize the configuration of the entire system based on personal observation alone. To address this issue, the complete visibility problem has been studied extensively Luna et al. [2017, 2014a,b], Sharma et al. [2015b,a, 2020, 2021, 2016, 2017]. The complete visibility problem is a situation where all robots are required to locate themselves at points where they can mutually observe each other in a Euclidean or grid plane. According to known results of this problem on a grid plane Adhikary et al. [2018], Sharma et al. [2020, 2021], more than 10 colors of light are required when there is no agreement on the coordinate system. As a preliminary step in investigating the trade-off between the degree of agreement on the coordinate system and the number of colors of lights required to solve the problem, we propose an algorithm that addresses the problem using only two colors of light within a system that has agreement on the orientation and direction of grid plane's two axes. This finding suggests that by establishing consensus on the coordinate system, the number of required colors can be drastically reduced.

**Related Works:** The complete visibility is firstly studied by G. Di Luna *et al.* Luna et al. [2014a], which shows that a set of robots with a constant-sized color of lights (*i.e.*, luminous model) can solve the complete visibility problem on an Euclidean plane under ASYNC, even there is no assumption on the number of robots, rigidity of movements, nor chirality. They also proposed an algorithm for oblivious robots under SSYNC in Luna et al. [2014b]. Moreover, G. Di Luna *et al.* investigate under what conditions luminous robots can solve the complete visibility problem, and at what cost, in terms of the number of colors used by the robots in Luna et al. [2017]. They provided a spectrum of results which depends on the scheduler, on the number of robots, and on the number of colors. Two algorithms, Shrink and Contain algorithms, are introduced in Luna et al. [2017], however, the time analyses of both algorithms are not provided. G. Sharma *et al.* analyzed and proved these two algorithms: they showed that Shrink algorithm required  $\Theta(n)$  and the time complexity of Contain algorithm is  $\Omega(n^2)$ , where  $n$  is the total number of robots, in Sharma et al. [2015b]. Furthermore, Sharma *et al.* proposed an improved version of Shrink algorithm (called Modified Shrink algorithm) which decreases its time complexity to  $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ . The optimal number of colors to solve the complete visibility problem is discussed in Sharma et al. [2015a]; this paper presents the optimal number of colors when a scheduler is assumed as SSYNC or ASYNC, and/or robots are non-rigid or rigid. G. Sharma *et al.* proposed the first algorithm for complete

Work	# of colors	Time Complexity	Area	Agreement	Algorithm
Adhikary et al. [2018]	11	finite <sup>§</sup>	finite <sup>§</sup>	none	deterministic
Sharma et al. [2020]	50	$\mathcal{O}(D + n)$ <i>w.h.p.</i>	$\mathcal{O}(n^2)$	none	randomized
Sharma et al. [2020]	17	$\mathcal{O}(D + n)$	$\mathcal{O}(n^2)$	none	deterministic <sup>†</sup>
Sharma et al. [2021]	32	$\mathcal{O}(D + n)$ <i>w.h.p.</i>	$\mathcal{O}(n^2)$	none	randomized
This work	2	$\mathcal{O}((D + n))$	$\mathcal{O}(n^2)$	$X$ and $Y$ axes	deterministic
<b>Lower bounds of time and spatial (area) complexities</b>					
Sharma et al. [2020, 2021]	any	$\Omega(n)$	any	any	any
Flammenkamp [1992]	any	any	$\Omega(n^2)$	any	any

<sup>§</sup>The complexities are not provided in Adhikary et al. [2018]. It is shown in Sharma et al. [2021] that the algorithm in Adhikary et al. [2018] requires  $\Omega(Dn + n^2)$  time and  $\Omega(n^2)$  area.

<sup>†</sup>The algorithm operates only when the initial configuration is not symmetric.

Table 1: Comparison table between the previous works and this work and the known lower bounds of the complexities

visibility with  $\mathcal{O}(1)$  runtime under SSYNC in Sharma et al. [2016], and  $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ -time complete visibility algorithm for asynchronous robots with lights.

R. Adhikary *et al.* Adhikary et al. [2018] were the first to investigate the complete visibility problem on a grid plane, introducing a deterministic and asynchronous algorithm under the assumptions that robots do not agree on the global coordinates nor chirality, and they do not know the total number of robots, using 11 colors of lights. However, neither time nor spatial analysis of the algorithm was provided in Adhikary et al. [2018] (only the finite-time termination is stated). These complexities were later addressed in another paper Sharma et al. [2021] after several years, which shows that the time complexity of this algorithm is  $\Omega(Dn + n^2)$  and the spatial complexity<sup>1</sup> is  $\Omega(n^2)$ , where  $n$  is the total number of robots and  $D$  is the diameter in the initial configuration.

G. Sharma *et al.* proposed randomized complete visibility algorithms using 50 colors of lights in Sharma et al. [2020], and introduced another deterministic algorithm using 17 colors of light which ensures the achievement of complete visibility only when an initial configuration is non-symmetric. They reduced the number of colors from 50 to 32 for the randomized algorithm in Sharma et al. [2021]. These algorithms solve the complete visibility problem in  $\mathcal{O}(D + n)$ -time and  $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ -space which are optimal; the lower bounds of the time complexity and spatial complexity are also provided in Sharma et al. [2021].

In this study, we focus on reducing the required number of colors for the complete visibility problem on a grid plane, even under stronger assumptions. From another perspective, we are interested in using the required number of colors as a measure of the changes in computational power of robots under different assumptions. As a result, we have drastically reduced the number of colors to two, whereas all the previous works Adhikary et al. [2018], Sharma et al. [2020, 2021] on a grid plane require more than 10 colors, if the robots share a common sense of directions (*i.e.*, agree on both X and Y axes). Table 1 shows the difference between the previous works Adhikary et al. [2018], Sharma et al. [2020, 2021] and this work, where  $n$  is the number of robots,  $D$  is the diameter of the initial configuration, and the known lower bounds of time and spatial complexities. Our proposed algorithm asynchronously solves the same problem using a smaller number of colors in optimal time and space when  $D = \mathcal{O}(n)$  provided the robots agree on two axes.

## 2 Model and Problem Definition

### 2.1 Model

**Robots and Grid Plane:** Let  $\mathcal{R} = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n\}$  be the set of autonomous mobile robots with a total number of robots  $n$ . These robots have no identifiers and cannot be distinguished from each other by appearance. Also, robots do not have any memory to maintain their own past executions, *i.e.*, oblivious, and do not know the total number of robots  $n$ . The robots exist on infinite grid plane  $\mathcal{P}$ , and every point in  $\mathcal{P}$  can be occupied by at most one robot. The robots agree on the directions and the orientations of both axes, X-axis and Y-axis, but they do not know the origin of  $\mathcal{P}$ , *i.e.*, they do not know their global coordinates. In this paper, without loss of generality, we assume that the positive direction of X-axis (resp. Y-axis) is *right* (resp. *up*).

**Movement of Robots:** A robot can move to only one of the four grid points adjacent to the grid point where it currently exists. Hence we assume that every robot moves asynchronously but instantaneously: each robot cannot be observed by any other robots while it is moving. This property is known as *Move-Atomic* introduced in Flocchini et al. [1999].

**Lights:** Each robot maintains a constant-sized visible memory register called light that can be observed by other robots Luna et al. [2017]. Each light can be set by one among the constant number of colors. The color of the light can be changed at the end of Compute in the LCM cycle (will be described later) if necessary. In other words, the robot decides where to move and the color of the light based on the observation results, and starts moving after changing the color of the light. In the proposed algorithm, we assume that a robot uses only two colors,  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$ ,  $\mathcal{C} \in \{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}\}$ .

**Visibility Range and Transparency:** We assume that there is no limit to the robot's field of view, *i.e.*, a robot has unlimited visibility range. Each robot is not transparent, *i.e.*, opaque; if robot  $r_k$  exists on the line between two robots  $r_i$  and  $r_j$ , then robots  $r_i$  and  $r_j$  cannot observe each other.

**Operations and Scheduler:** Each robot performs one of the four operations: *Look*, *Compute*, *Move*, and *Wait*. Let *Look*, *Compute*, *Move* be one cycle (called LCM cycle). (**Wait**) A robot is in a standby state. A robot which is in *Wait* should perform its LCM operations again within the finite time. At the start, all robots are in the *Wait* state. (**Look**) A robot gets the color of its own light. A robot gets the coordinates and light color of the other robots in its local coordinate system which is self-centric, *i.e.*, the origin is the position of the robot itself. As a result of *Look*, a robot

<sup>1</sup>The spatial complexity represents the area of the smallest rectangle including all robots when the algorithm terminates (*i.e.*, complete visibility is achieved).

gets a set  $\mathcal{V}_r = \{r_0, r_1, \dots, r_M\}$  of the coordinates and light colors of the observed robots based on its local coordinate system. **(Compute)** A robot executes an algorithm to determine the color of its light and the destination point. As the result of the executing algorithm, a robot immediately changes the color of its light (if necessary). **(Move)** A robot instantaneously moves to the destination point determined by *Compute* operation.

We consider an asynchronous scheduler (ASYNC) which has no assumption on the timing of each robot's operation. This means that all robots perform their operations at unpredictable time instants and durations.

**Configuration:** Let configuration  $C_t$  be the set of the (global) coordinates and colors of all robots at a given time  $t$ :  $C_t = \{(r_{1,x}^t, r_{1,y}^t, r_{1,c}^t), (r_{2,x}^t, r_{2,y}^t, r_{2,c}^t), \dots, (r_{n,x}^t, r_{n,y}^t, r_{n,c}^t)\}$ , where  $r_{i,x}^t$  (resp.  $r_{i,y}^t$ ) is the x-coordinate (y-coordinate) of robot  $r_i$  on grid  $\mathcal{P}$ , and  $r_{i,c}^t$  is the color of  $r_i$ 's light at time  $t$ . Remind that no robot knows its global coordinate.

Configuration  $C_t$  is changed into another configuration  $C_{t+1}$  when at least one of the robots moves or changes the color of its light. In other words, under an ASYNC scheduler, configuration  $C_{t+1}$  is obtained by any atomic operation of any robot's operates *Compute* or *Move* at configuration  $C_t$  (if it moves or changes its color).

## 2.2 Complete Visibility Problem

Here we define the complete visibility problem as the following.

**Definition 1 The Complete Visibility Problem.** Given a set of robots which is initially located on the distinct points in grid plane. Algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$  solves the complete visibility problem if  $\mathcal{A}$  satisfies all the following conditions: (1) Algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$  eventually terminates; algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$  eventually reaches a configuration such that no robot can move, and (2) Every robot can observe all other robots, *i.e.*, any three robots are not collinear, when algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$  terminates.

## 3 Proposed Algorithm

### 3.1 Basic Strategy

In this subsection, we briefly give the basic strategy of the proposed algorithm for solving the complete visibility problem under ASYNC. To achieve complete visibility, we refer to the previous study Roth [1951]: for any prime number  $m$ , it is known that any three distinct points  $(i^2 \bmod m, i)$ , for any distinct  $i \leq m$ , are not collinear. Therefore, we aim to make a configuration such that all robots are located on  $(i^2 \bmod m, i)$  for distinct  $i$  and  $n \leq m$ , where  $n$  is the total number of robots and  $m$  is the smallest prime number which is equal to or greater than  $n$ . The proposed algorithm to solve the complete visibility problem consists of the following three phases.

1. **Line Formation Phase:** The first phase of the proposed algorithm locates all robots on a straight line parallel to the Y-axis.
2. **Coordinate System Generation Phase:** In the second phase, the algorithm determines three reference points by moving three robots to generate the agreed coordinate system, because the robots do not agree on the global coordinate system, and no robot knows its global coordinates. All robots can recognize the current common coordinate system by referring these reference points. Moreover, the robots which moves to the reference points can count the total number of robots  $n$ , and this information  $n$  is (implicitly) propagated to all other robots by their positions.
3. **Complete Visibility Achievement Phase:** Each robot computes its destination point on the common coordinate system generated in the previous phase, and moves to its appropriate position to achieve complete visibility.

The proposed algorithm consists of 26 rules based on the observation result of each robot; 15 rules for the first phase, 8 rules of the second one, and 3 rules for the last phase. Because of the lack of space, the detailed algorithm is presented in Appendix.

### 3.2 Presentation of Algorithm

Before the introduction of the proposed algorithm, we present some notations and functions which are used in the presentation of the proposed algorithm.

We present the proposed algorithm using the conditions and action, which means each robot executes the action when all conditions are satisfied, and represent as  $\langle \text{Conditions} \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{Action} \rangle$ . In  $\langle \text{Conditions} \rangle$ , we use a triplet (ordered triple)  $(X, Y, C)$ , which means that the number of robots satisfying the following three conditions among all observed

robots:  $X$  (resp.  $Y$ ) indicates the range of  $x$ -coordinate (resp.  $y$ -coordinate), and  $C$  indicates the color of the light:  $C \in \mathcal{C} \cup \{*\}$ , where  $*$  means any color (*i.e.*, do not care).  $\langle \text{Action} \rangle$  is presented as a tuple  $(a^d, C)$ : the former one  $a^d$  represents the destination point to move and the latter one  $C$  represents the color of the light to change. Remind that each robot can move to its adjacent (four) point, thus we can present the destination point using  $a^d$ , where  $a \in \{x, y\}$  and  $d \in \{+, -\}$ , which means the orientation and the direction respectively based on its local coordination system. Both  $a^d$  and  $C$  can have  $\perp$ , which means null movement (does not move) and keep color (does not change color) respectively. We also use a macro  $\text{my}C$  which indicates its own light. As a common rule that applies to all rules, a robot never moves if the destination point is already occupied by another robot, even if the conditions are satisfied.

Here we give an example of the algorithm to help to understand.

---

**Algorithm 1** An example of Algorithm

---

**Rule  $x$ :**  $\text{my}C = \mathcal{A} \wedge (3 \geq x \geq 1, y = 2, \mathcal{A}) = 3 \wedge (x = 0, y \geq 1, *) = 1 \rightarrow (x^+, \mathcal{B})$

---

Algorithm 1 shows the  $x$ -th rule: robot  $r_i$  changes the color of its light to  $\mathcal{B}$  (in the end of its *Compute* phase) and moves to the positive direction of  $X$ -axis (in its *Move* phase) if all the following conditions are satisfied; (1) the color of its light is  $\mathcal{A}$ , (2) the number of the observed robots, whose  $x$ -coordinate is between 1 and 3 (based on  $r_i$ 's local coordination),  $y$ -coordinate is exactly 2 (based on  $r_i$ 's local coordination), and color of the light is  $\mathcal{B}$ , is equal to 3, and (3) there exists a robot on the positive direction of  $r_i$ 's current  $Y$ -axis.

It is worthwhile to mention that different algorithms are required where the number of robots  $n$  is 2, 3, and 4 or more. We present the algorithm only for  $n \geq 4$ , which is the most general case. Note that the number of robots can be counted in the coordinate system generation phase, thus we can determine the algorithm to execute based on  $n$ .

### 3.3 Phase 1: The Line Formation Phase

Algorithm 2 shows the first phase of the proposed algorithm, called *the Line Formation Phase*, which consists of 15 rules, from Rule 1 to Rule 15.

In this phase, we consider four different configurations, called configurations from  $C_A$  to  $C_D$  respectively, as the following.

**Configuration  $C_A$ :** Only one robot with color  $\mathcal{B}$  is located at a point with the smallest  $y$ -coordinate and the largest  $x$ -coordinate and all other robots have lights with color  $\mathcal{A}$ .

**Configuration  $C_B$ :** Two robots with color  $\mathcal{B}$  are on the same  $Y$ -axis and can observe each other (*i.e.*, there is no other robot between the two robots). Moreover, all other robots than the two robots with color  $\mathcal{B}$  have lights with color  $\mathcal{A}$ . The two robots with color  $\mathcal{B}$  are located on the same or smaller  $y$ -coordinate than any other robots with color  $\mathcal{A}$ .

**Configuration  $C_C$ :** All robots are located on the same  $Y$ -axis, and the robot with the smallest  $y$ -coordinate and the robot with the largest  $y$ -coordinate have lights with color  $\mathcal{B}$ , while all other robots have lights with color  $\mathcal{A}$ .

**Configuration  $C_D$ :** All robots are located on the same  $Y$ -axis, have the same lights with color  $\mathcal{B}$ , and are lined up without gaps.




Figure 1: Examples of configurations from  $C_A$  to  $C_D$

Figure 1(a) to Figure 1(d) illustrate the examples of these four configurations in the *Line Formation Phase* respectively. First of all, the proposed algorithm determines the reference point to form a straight line from any initial configuration so that all the robots have light with color  $\mathcal{A}$ . The proposed algorithm uses the robot which has the largest  $x$ -coordinate

**Algorithm 2** The Line Formation Phase

*/\* From an initial configuration to configuration  $C_A$  \*/*

**Rule 1:**  $\text{myC} = \mathcal{A} \wedge (x \leq -1, y \leq -1, *) = 0 \wedge (x \geq 1, y \leq -1, *) = 0 \wedge (x = 0, y \leq -1, *) = 0 \wedge (x \geq 1, y = 0, *) = 0 \wedge (x \leq -1, y = 0, \mathcal{A}) = 1 \wedge (-\infty \leq x \leq \infty, -\infty \leq y \leq \infty, \mathcal{B}) = 0 \rightarrow (y^-, \perp)$

**Rule 2:**  $\text{myC} = \mathcal{A} \wedge (x \leq -1, y \leq -1, *) = 0 \wedge (x \geq 1, y \leq -1, *) = 0 \wedge (x = 0, y \leq -1, *) = 0 \wedge (x \geq 1, y = 0, *) = 0 \wedge (x \leq -1, y = 0, *) = 0 \wedge ((x = 0, y \geq 1, \mathcal{A}) \geq 1 \vee (x \geq 1, y \geq 1, \mathcal{A}) \geq 1) \wedge (-\infty \leq x \leq \infty, -\infty \leq y \leq \infty, \mathcal{B}) = 0 \rightarrow (x^+, \perp)$

**Rule 3:**  $\text{myC} = \mathcal{A} \wedge (x \leq -1, y \geq 1, \mathcal{A}) \geq 1 \wedge (\neg(x \leq -1), \neg(y \geq 1), *) = 0 \rightarrow (\perp, \mathcal{B})$

*/\* From configuration  $C_A$  to configuration  $C_B$  \*/*

**Rule 4:**  $\text{myC} = \mathcal{A} \wedge (x \leq 1, y \leq -1, \mathcal{B}) = 1 \wedge (\neg(x \geq 1), \neg(y \leq -1), \mathcal{B}) = 0 \rightarrow (x^+, \perp)$

**Rule 5:**  $\text{myC} = \mathcal{A} \wedge (x = 1, y \leq -1, \mathcal{B}) = 1 \wedge (\neg(x = 1), \neg(y \leq -1), \mathcal{B}) = 0 \wedge (-\infty \leq x \leq \infty, y \leq -1, \mathcal{A}) = 0 \rightarrow (x^+, \perp)$

**Rule 6:**  $\text{myC} = \mathcal{A} \wedge (x = 0, y \leq -1, \mathcal{B}) = 1 \wedge (-\infty \leq x \leq \infty, \neg(y \leq -1), \mathcal{B}) = 0 \wedge (-\infty \leq x \leq \infty, y \leq -1, \mathcal{A}) = 0 \wedge (x \geq 0, y \geq 0, \mathcal{A}) = 0 \rightarrow (\perp, \mathcal{B})$

*/\* From configuration  $C_B$  to configuration  $C_C$  \*/*

**Rule 7:**  $\text{myC} = \mathcal{B} \wedge (x \geq 1, -\infty \leq y \leq \infty, *) = 0 \wedge (x = 0, y \geq 1, *) = 0 \wedge (x \leq -1, y \geq 0, \mathcal{A}) \geq 1 \rightarrow (y^+, \perp)$

**Rule 8:**  $\text{myC} = \mathcal{B} \wedge (x \geq 1, -\infty \leq y \leq \infty, *) = 0 \wedge (x = 0, y \leq -1, *) = 0 \wedge (x \leq -1, y \leq 0, \mathcal{A}) \geq 1 \rightarrow (y^-, \perp)$

**Rule 9:**  $\text{myC} = \mathcal{A} \wedge 1 \leq (x \geq 2, -\infty \leq y \leq \infty, \mathcal{B}) \leq 2 \wedge (x \leq 1, -\infty \leq y \leq \infty, \mathcal{B}) = 0 \rightarrow (x^+, \perp)$

**Rule 10:**  $\text{myC} = \mathcal{A} \wedge (x = 1, y \geq 1, \mathcal{B}) = 1 \wedge (x = 1, y \leq -1, \mathcal{B}) = 1 \wedge (x \leq 0, -\infty \leq y \leq \infty, \mathcal{B}) = 0 \rightarrow (x^+, \perp)$

**Rule 11:**  $\text{myC} = \mathcal{A} \wedge (x = 1, y \geq 1, \mathcal{B}) = 1 \wedge (x = 1, y \leq -1, \mathcal{B}) = 1 \wedge (x \leq 0, -\infty \leq y \leq \infty, \mathcal{B}) = 0 \wedge (x = 1, y = 0, \mathcal{A}) = 1 \wedge (x \leq 0, y \geq 1, *) = 0 \rightarrow (y^+, \perp)$

**Rule 12:**  $\text{myC} = \mathcal{A} \wedge (x = 1, y \geq 1, \mathcal{B}) = 1 \wedge (x = 1, y \leq -1, \mathcal{B}) = 1 \wedge (x \leq 0, -\infty \leq y \leq \infty, \mathcal{B}) = 0 \wedge (x = 1, y = 0, \mathcal{A}) = 1 \wedge (x \leq 0, y \leq -1, *) = 0 \rightarrow (y^-, \perp)$

**Rule 13:**  $\text{myC} = \mathcal{A} \wedge (x = 1, y \geq 1, \mathcal{B}) = 1 \wedge (x = 1, y \leq -1, \mathcal{B}) = 1 \wedge (x \leq 0, -\infty \leq y \leq \infty, \mathcal{B}) = 0 \wedge (x = 1, y = 0, \mathcal{A}) = 1 \wedge (x \leq 0, y \leq -1, *) = 0 \wedge (x \leq 0, y \geq 1, *) = 0 \rightarrow (y^+, \perp)$

*/\* From configuration  $C_C$  to configuration  $C_D$  \*/*

**Rule 14:**  $(x = 0, y \geq 2, *) = 1 \wedge (x \geq 1, -\infty \leq y \leq \infty, *) = 0 \wedge (x \leq -1, -\infty \leq y \leq \infty, *) = 0 \rightarrow (y^+, \perp)$

**Rule 15:**  $\text{myC} = \mathcal{A} \wedge (x = 0, y = 1, \mathcal{B}) = 1 \wedge (x \geq 1, -\infty \leq y \leq \infty, *) = 0 \wedge (x \leq -1, -\infty \leq y \leq \infty, *) = 0 \rightarrow (\perp, \mathcal{B})$

and the smallest y-coordinate, *i.e.*, the rightmost and undermost robot, as the reference point to determine where the robots are lined up.

The proposed algorithm uses 3 rules to achieve configuration  $C_A$  from any initial configuration (refer to Rules 1 to 3 in Algorithm 2). In any initial configuration, there exists a robot that cannot observe any other robots in the third and fourth quadrants based on its local coordinate system by assuming its current position as the origin, *i.e.*, there is no robot located on the point with the smaller y-coordinate than the robot's. If the robot cannot observe any other robots in positive direction of the same X-axis neither, the robot becomes the reference robot (denoted by  $\alpha$ ). And robot  $\alpha$  moves to the appropriate reference point. If robot  $\alpha$  can observe another robot in its negative direction of the same X-axis, it first moves to the negative direction along the current Y-axis (Figure 2(a)). If robot  $\alpha$  cannot observe any other robots on the negative direction of its current X-axis, robot  $\alpha$  moves to the positive direction along the X-axis (Figure 2(b)). If robot  $\alpha$  cannot observe any other robots both in the negative direction of its current X-axis and in its first quadrant, it changes its color of the light to  $\mathcal{B}$ , because the robot reaches the reference point (Figure 2(c)). This implies that robot  $\alpha$  changes its color from  $\mathcal{A}$  to  $\mathcal{B}$  only when it observes all other robots with color  $\mathcal{B}$  in its second quadrant. When robot  $\alpha$  changes its color to  $\mathcal{B}$ , configuration  $C_A$  is achieved.

The proposed algorithm uses 3 rules to achieve configuration  $C_B$  from configuration  $C_A$  (refer to Rules 4 to 6 in Algorithm 2). Let  $y_0$  be the Y-axis where robot  $\alpha$  exists in configuration  $C_A$ , and each  $y_i$  be the Y-axis  $i$  away from  $y_0$  on the positive or negative direction of X-axis. For example,  $y_1$  represents the Y-axis whose x-coordinate is 1 larger than  $y_0$ , *i.e.*, the right neighbor of  $y_0$ ,  $y_{-1}$  represents the Y-axis whose x-coordinate is 1 smaller than  $y_0$ , *i.e.*, the left neighbor of  $y_0$ . In configuration  $C_A$ , robots with color  $\mathcal{A}$  can observe only one robot with color  $\mathcal{B}$  in its fourth quadrant, or no robot with color  $\mathcal{B}$  (because they are not transparent). The robot with color  $\mathcal{A}$ , which observes a robot with color  $\mathcal{B}$  in its fourth quadrant, moves to the positive direction of its current X-axis toward  $y_{-1}$  (Figure 3(a)). Note that each robot moves only to the positive direction of X-axis *i.e.*, right, and a robot does not move to its destination point if




Figure 2: Examples of movements by Rules 1 to 3

another robot exists there to avoid a collision. Therefore, each robot with color  $\mathcal{B}$  stops when it reaches  $y_{-1}$  or there exists another robot on its adjacent point on the positive direction of X-axis (if it can observe robot  $\alpha$ ).

Now we consider a robot with color  $\mathcal{A}$  which reaches  $y_{-1}$  and cannot observe any other robot on its negative side of Y-axis. We call this robot  $\beta$  and only robot  $\beta$  moves to  $y_0$  whereas all other robots with color  $\mathcal{A}$  stops when they reaches  $y_{-1}$ . After that, robot  $\beta$  changes its light color to  $\mathcal{B}$  (Figure 3(c)). When robot  $\beta$  changes the light color to  $\mathcal{B}$ , configuration  $C_B$  is achieved.




Figure 3: Examples of movements by Rules 4 to 6

The proposed algorithm uses 7 rules to achieve configuration  $C_C$  from configuration  $C_B$  (refer to Rules 7 to 13 in Algorithm 2). In configuration  $C_B$ , two robots with color  $\mathcal{B}$  (robots  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ ) exist on the same Y-axis and they can observe each other. Robot  $\alpha$  has a smaller y-coordinate than all the other robots, and robot  $\beta$  has a equal or smaller y-coordinate than all the other robots except robot  $\alpha$ . Note that, robots  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  have larger x-coordinate than all other robots. Our strategy in this phase is to locate all other robots than  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  at the points between two robots  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ . To use this strategy, robots  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  should move away from each other if necessary. Notice that, in Configuration  $B$ , only two robots  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  have a light with color  $\mathcal{B}$  and all other robots are located on the negative side of X-axis in local coordinates of robots  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  (Figure 4(a)). If a robot with color  $\mathcal{A}$  observes one or two robots with color  $\mathcal{B}$  on its positive side of X-axis, it moves along its current X-axis toward the  $y_{-1}$  (Figure 4(b)). If a robot on  $y_{-1}$  observes one robot with color  $\mathcal{B}$  in the first quadrant and another robot with color  $\mathcal{B}$  in forth quadrant, it moves to its neighboring point on  $y_0$  (Figure 4(c)) if the point is empty. However, if there is another robot on its neighboring point in  $y_0$ , it moves along its Y-axis according to the following rules: if there is no robot in the positive (resp. negative) direction of its current Y-axis and the second (resp. third) quadrant based on its local coordinate system, the robot moves to the positive (resp. negative) direction of its Y-axis (Figure 4(d)). Note that if it is possible to move to both directions, the robot moves to the positive direction of Y-axis due to the priority of the algorithm. When all robots are located on  $y_0$ , the configuration satisfies configuration  $C_C$ .

The proposed algorithm uses two rules to achieve configuration  $C_D$  from configuration  $C_C$  (refer to Rule 14 and Rule 15 in Algorithm 2). In configuration  $C_C$ , all robots are located on the same Y-axis, and only two robots with the smallest and largest y-coordinate respectively (robots  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ ) have light with color  $\mathcal{B}$ , while all the other robots have light with color  $\mathcal{A}$ . Note that, in this case, all robots observe no robot in all quadrants and on its current X-axis. If a robot observes an other robot in the positive direction of its Y-axis but no robot on its neighboring point in the positive direction of its Y-axis, the robot moves to the positive direction of its Y-axis to close the gap (Figure 5(a)). If a robot with color  $\mathcal{A}$  observes in the adjacent point in the positive direction of the Y-axis, it changes its color into  $\mathcal{B}$  (Figure 5(b)). If all robots are lined up without gaps, configuration  $C_D$  is achieved, and the first phase, *The Line Formation Phase*, is completed.




Figure 4: Examples of movements by Rules 7 to 13





Figure 5: Examples of movement by Rules 14 and 15

Figure 6:  $C_E$  when  $n = 9$ 

### 3.4 Phase 2: The Coordinate System Generation Phase

Algorithm 3 presents the second phase of the proposed algorithm, called *the Coordinate System Generation Phase*, which consists of 8 rules, from Rule 16 to Rule 23.

---

#### Algorithm 3 Coordinate System Generation Phase

---

*/\* From configuration  $C_D$  to configuration  $C_E$  \*/*

**Rule 16:**  $\text{myC} = \mathcal{B} \wedge (x = 0, y = 1, \mathcal{B}) = 1 \wedge (\neg(x = 0, y = 1), *) = 0 \rightarrow (x^-, \perp)$

**Rule 17:**  $\text{myC} = \mathcal{B} \wedge (x = -1, y \leq -1, \mathcal{B}) = 1 \wedge (-\infty \leq x \leq \infty, y = 0, *) = 0 \rightarrow (\perp, \mathcal{A})$

**Rule 18:**  $\text{myC} = \mathcal{B} \wedge (x = 1, y \geq 1, \mathcal{A}) \geq 3 \wedge (\neg(x = 1, y \geq 1), *) = 0 \rightarrow (x^-, \perp)$

**Rule 19:**  $\text{myC} = \mathcal{A} \wedge (x = -2, y = -1, \mathcal{B}) = 1 \wedge (x = 0, y = 1, \mathcal{A}) = 1 \wedge (\neg((x = -2, y = -1) \wedge (x = 0, y = 1)), *) = 0 \rightarrow (x^-, \perp)$

**Rule 20:**  $\text{myC} = \mathcal{A} \wedge (x = -1, y = -1, \mathcal{B}) = 1 \wedge (x = 1, y \geq 1, \mathcal{A}) \geq 2 \wedge (\neg((x = -1, y = -1) \wedge (x = 1, y \geq 1)), *) = 0 \rightarrow (\perp, \mathcal{B})$

**Rule 21:**  $\text{myC} = \mathcal{A} \wedge (x = -1, y \leq -1, \mathcal{B}) = 1 \wedge (x = -2, y \leq -1, \mathcal{B}) = 1 \wedge (x = 0, y = -1, \mathcal{A}) = 1 \wedge (\neg((x = -1, y \leq -1) \wedge (x = -2, y \leq -1) \wedge (x = 0, y = -1)), *) = 0 \rightarrow (x^-, \perp)$

**Rule 22:**  $\text{myC} = \mathcal{A} \wedge (x = 0, y \leq -1, \mathcal{B}) = 1 \wedge (x = -1, y \leq -1, \mathcal{B}) = 1 \wedge (x = 0, y = -m + 1, \mathcal{B}) = 0 \wedge (\neg(x = 0, y \leq -1) \wedge (x = -1, y \leq -1), \mathcal{B}) = 0 \rightarrow (y^+, \perp)$

**Rule 23:**  $\text{myC} = \mathcal{A} \wedge (x = 0, y \leq -1, \mathcal{B}) = 1 \wedge (x = -1, y \leq -1, \mathcal{B}) = 1 \wedge (x = 0, y = -m + 1, \mathcal{B}) = 1 \wedge (\neg(x = 0, y \leq -1) \wedge (x = -1, y \leq -1), \mathcal{B}) = 0 \rightarrow (\perp, \mathcal{B})$

---

Here we define configuration  $C_E$  which is the goal configuration of this phase as the following:

**Configuration  $C_E$ :** Let a robot with color  $\mathcal{B}$  with the smallest y-coordinate be the origin, there exists two robots with color  $\mathcal{B}$  at (1,1) and (1,m-1) respectively, where  $m$  is the smallest prime number greater than or equal to  $n$ . All other robots have light with color  $\mathcal{A}$  and are lined up with no gaps on the line,  $y = 2$ , from (2,2) to (2,n-2) (Figure 6).

In this phase, only some specific robots can operate (moves or changes the color of light) in every configuration, thus the goal configuration is achieved by the sequential operations of the robots. The proposed algorithm uses 8 rules to achieve the second phase (refer to Algorithm 3).

Remind that in configuration  $C_D$ , which is the final configuration of the first phase, all robots with color  $\mathcal{B}$  are lined up with no gaps. Therefore, there exists only one robot (robot  $\alpha$ ) which cannot observe any other robot in the negative direction of Y-axis, and robot  $\alpha$  moves to the negative direction of X-axis by Rule 16 (Figure 7(a)). By this movement,




Figure 7: Examples of movements by Rules 16 to 19

all other robots can observe a robot with  $\mathcal{B}$  in their third quadrant, and the robots changes their colors into  $\mathcal{A}$  by Rule 17 (Figure 7(b)). If robot  $\alpha$  observes no robot with color  $\mathcal{B}$ , it moves again to the negative direction of X-axis by Rule 18 (Figure 7(c)). After that, the robot with the smallest y-coordinate among the robots with color  $\mathcal{A}$  moves to the negative direction of X-axis by Rule 19 (Figure 7(a)), and changes its color into  $\mathcal{B}$  by Rule 20 (Figure 8(a)). The robot with the largest y-coordinate (robot  $\beta$ ) moves to the negative direction of X-axis by Rule 21 (Figure 8(b)). It is worthwhile to mention that robot  $\beta$  can observe both robots with color  $\mathcal{B}$  because the number of the robots  $n$  is greater than 3. Furthermore, robot  $\beta$  can observe all other robots after the execution of Rule 21, this means that robot  $\beta$  can count the number of robots  $n$  even it moves to the positive direction of Y-axis. Robot  $\beta$  can repeatedly move to the positive direction of Y-axis until it reaches  $(1, m-1)$  (assuming that robot  $\alpha$  is on the origin) by Rule 22 (Figure 8(c)). When robot  $\beta$  reaches  $(1, m-1)$ , it changes the color of its light into  $\mathcal{B}$  by Rule 23 (Figure 8(d)). As a result, the configuration satisfies configuration  $C_E$ , and the second phase is completed.




Figure 8: Examples of movements by Rules 20 to 23

### 3.5 Phase 3: The Complete Visibility Achievement Phase

Algorithm 4 shows the third phase of the proposed algorithm, called *the Complete Visibility Achievement Phase*, which consists of 3 rules, from Rule 24 to Rule 26.

---

#### Algorithm 4 Complete Visibility Achievement Phase

---

*/\* From configuration  $C_E$  to configuration  $C_F$  \*/*

**Rule24:**  $\text{myC} = \mathcal{A} \wedge (x \leq -1, y \geq 1, \mathcal{B}) \geq 1 \wedge (x \leq -1, y \leq -1, \mathcal{B}) \geq 1 \wedge (x \leq -1, -\infty \leq y \leq \infty, \mathcal{A}) = 0 \wedge \text{LookCS}() = 1 \wedge \text{MyLocation}() \neq (\Upsilon^2 \bmod m, \Upsilon) \rightarrow (x^+, \perp)$

**Rule25:**  $\text{myC} = \mathcal{A} \wedge (x \leq -1, y \geq 1, \mathcal{B}) \geq 1 \wedge (x \leq -1, y \leq -1, \mathcal{B}) \geq 1 \wedge (x \leq -1, -\infty \leq y \leq \infty, \mathcal{A}) = 0 \wedge \text{LookCS}() = 0 \rightarrow (x^+, \perp)$

**Rule26:**  $\text{myC} = \mathcal{A} \wedge (x \leq -1, y \geq 1, \mathcal{B}) \geq 1 \wedge (x \leq -1, y \leq -1, \mathcal{B}) \geq 1 \wedge (x \leq -1, -\infty \leq y \leq \infty, \mathcal{A}) = 0 \wedge \text{LookCS}() = 1 \wedge \text{MyLocation}() = (\Upsilon^2 \bmod m, \Upsilon) \rightarrow (\perp, \mathcal{B})$

---

We define the final configuration  $C_F$  as the following. Note that the complete visibility problem is solved when configuration  $C_F$  is achieved because any three robots in  $C_F$  are not collinear.

**Configuration  $C_F$ :** Let a robot with color  $\mathcal{B}$  with the smallest y-coordinate be the origin, all robots have light with color  $\mathcal{B}$  and are located at  $(i^2 \bmod m, i)$  for distinct  $i$  ( $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$ ), where  $m$  is the smallest prime number greater than or equal to the number of robots  $n$ .

As the result of the second phase, *Complete Visibility Achievement Phase*, the coordinate system is defined by the three robots with color  $\mathcal{B}$ , which are located at  $(0,0)$ ,  $(1,1)$ , and  $(1,m-1)$  respectively assuming that the point occupied by the robot with the smallest y-coordinate (robot  $\alpha$ ) is the origin. All other robots than the three reference robots can observe robots both in the second and third quadrants only during the third phase. In Phase 3, we use two functions,  $\text{LookCS}()$  and  $\text{MyLocation}()$ :  $\text{LookCS}()$  returns 1 if a robot can observe all three reference robots with color  $\mathcal{B}$ , and  $\text{MyLocation}()$  returns its current coordinate based on the generated coordinate system by the three reference robots. Note that all robots have distinct y-coordinates since the end of the first phase thus we use each robot's y-coordinate as distinct  $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . In the proposed algorithm,  $\Upsilon$  represents the robot's y-coordinate based on the generated coordinate system (it is obvious that each robot knows  $\Upsilon$  only when  $\text{LookCS}() = 1$ ).



Figure 9: Example of  $C_F$ 

Figure 10: Problem by obstruction

The main strategy of this phase is that each robot with color  $\mathcal{A}$  repeatedly moves to the positive direction of X-axis until it reaches  $(\Upsilon^2 \bmod m, \Upsilon)$  where  $\Upsilon$  is its y-coordinate based on the defined coordinate system, and changes its color into  $\mathcal{B}$  when it reaches  $(\Upsilon^2 \bmod m, \Upsilon)$ . Hence, when all robots change their color into  $\mathcal{B}$ , the complete visibility is achieved, *i.e.*, configuration  $C_F$  is achieved (refer to Figure 9).

However, every robot with color  $\mathcal{B}$  moves asynchronously, there can be exist a robot cannot observe some reference robots caused by the obstruction by the other robots (Figure 10). Therefore, we consider the pseudo-synchronous movement of the robots with color  $\mathcal{A}$ : each robot with color  $\mathcal{A}$  can move only when no other robot with color  $\mathcal{A}$  exists in the negative side of X-axis. This implies that each robot with color  $\mathcal{A}$  has to wait until all other robots with color  $\mathcal{A}$  reach the point on the same Y-axis. The proposed algorithm uses 3 rules to achieve the third phase (refer to Algorithm 4).

Basically, each robot with color  $\mathcal{A}$  checks whether its current position is  $(\Upsilon^2 \bmod m, \Upsilon)$  or not: if it is located on  $(\Upsilon^2 \bmod m, \Upsilon)$ , it changes its color into  $\mathcal{B}$  and stops by Rule 26 (Figure 11(c)), otherwise it moves to the positive direction of X-axis unless there exist a robot with color  $\mathcal{A}$  on the negative side of X-axis by Rule 24 (Figure 11(a)). If a robot with color  $\mathcal{A}$  cannot observe the three reference robots, it moves to the positive direction of X-axis without regard to its current position by Rule 25 (Figure 11(b)): this is because that if the robot is located on  $(\Upsilon^2 \bmod m, \Upsilon)$ , it can observe all the reference robots.




Figure 11: Examples of movement by Rules 24 to 26

### 3.6 Analysis of the Algorithm

**Theorem 1** *The proposed algorithm guarantees to solve the complete visibility problem using only two colors,  $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}\}$ , under an asynchronous scheduler in  $\mathcal{O}(D + n)$  asynchronous rounds and within  $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$  area when an arbitrary set of robots with color  $\mathcal{A}$  is given.*

We omit the proof of the correctness of the proposed algorithm, but here we briefly give a proof sketch of the time complexity of the proposed algorithm. We analyze the time complexity using an asynchronous round that is defined as the shortest sequence of an execution where each robot performs its three operations at least once.

The worst case of Phase 1 is a configuration so that all robots except two robots,  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , are lined up along X-axis: only one robot may move in the first round after this configuration under an adversary scheduler because all robots located on  $y_i$  (where  $i \leq -2$ ) cannot move even they are activated by the scheduler. However, two robots can move in the next round regardless of the sequence of activation, as the same manner,  $i$  robots can move in the  $i$ -th round. the head (leading) robot may stop only one round to wait until robot  $\beta$  moves, which causes all robots to stop once: this implies that the tail robot may stop at most  $\mathcal{O}(n)$  rounds. As a result, from any initial configuration, all robots are lined up along X-axis in  $\mathcal{O}(D)$  rounds (where  $D$  is the diameter of the initial configuration), the robot farthest away from the target line,  $y_0$ , begins to move after  $\mathcal{O}(n)$  rounds, and it moves  $\mathcal{O}(n)$  times but it may wait at most  $\mathcal{O}(n)$  times. Hence, Phase 1 requires  $\mathcal{O}(D + n)$  rounds.

In Phase 2, two robots (other than robot  $\beta$ ) among the three reference robots move the constant number of rounds and one robot (robot  $\beta$ ) moves  $\mathcal{O}(m)$  times. Thus Phase 2 converges in  $\mathcal{O}(n)$  rounds by *Bertrand's postulate*; for any integer  $n > 3$ , there always exists at least one prime number  $p$  with  $n < p < 2n - 2$ .

In Phase 3, every robot which is not located on the goal position can move to the positive direction of X-axis in every round, at most  $\mathcal{O}(m)$  times. As the same reason of Phase 2, Phase 3 also converges in  $\mathcal{O}(n)$  rounds. Hence the proposed algorithm terminates in  $\mathcal{O}(D + n) + \mathcal{O}(n) + \mathcal{O}(n) = \mathcal{O}(D + n)$  rounds.

It is obvious that the spatial complexity of the proposed algorithm is  $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$  due to the deployment strategy:  $(i^2 \bmod m, i)$  for distinct  $i < n$  (note that  $n < m$ ).

## 4 Conclusion

In this paper, we consider the complete visibility problem which is a problem to relocate all robots on grid plane to observe each other, *i.e.*, no three robots are collinear. We proposed an (asynchronous) algorithm for oblivious robots to solve the complete visibility problem in  $\mathcal{O}(D + n)$  asynchronous rounds under the following assumptions: the robots (1) agree on both axes, X-axis and Y-axis, but do not agree on the position of the origin, (2) have unlimited visibility range, (3) are not transparent, (4) do not know the number of robots, and (5) have the light with only 2 colors.

Compared with the previous studies, the proposed algorithm uses the fewest number of colors to achieve complete visibility, even we assume the stronger geometrical agreement. In many previous works for the luminous model, *i.e.*, robots with lights, the necessary number of colors is one of the important issue. As the main contribution of this work, we show that the necessary number of colors to solve the complete visibility problem on grid plane can reduce to 2 if robots have the common sense of direction, *i.e.*, they agree on the both axes.

As a future work, we consider the weaker assumptions of the geometrical agreement, *e.g.*, only one axis or chirality. To clarify the possibility of the algorithm by the robots without light, *i.e.*, fully oblivious robots, is another future work: to propose an algorithm or to provide the impossibility result.

## Acknowledgements

This work was supported in part by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers 19K11823, 20K11685, 20KK0232, and 21K11748.

## References

- Mark Cieliebak and Giuseppe Prencipe. Gathering autonomous mobile robots. In *Proc. of the 9th International Colloquium on Structural Information and Communication Complexity*, volume 13 of *Proceedings in Informatics*, pages 57–72. Carleton Scientific, 2002.
- Lali Barrière, Paola Flocchini, Eduardo Mesa Barrameda, and Nicola Santoro. Uniform scattering of autonomous mobile robots in a grid. In *23rd IEEE International Symposium on Parallel and Distributed Processing, IPDPS*, pages 1–8, 2009.

- Paola Flocchini, Giuseppe Prencipe, Nicola Santoro, and Peter Widmayer. Hard tasks for weak robots: The role of common knowledge in pattern formation by autonomous mobile robots. In *Algorithms and Computation, 10th Int. Symposium, ISAAC*, volume 1741 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 93–102, 1999. doi:10.1007/3-540-46632-0\_10. URL [https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-46632-0\\_10](https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-46632-0_10).
- Giuseppe Antonio Di Luna, Paola Flocchini, Sruti Gan Chaudhuri, Federico Poloni, Nicola Santoro, and Giovanni Viglietta. Mutual visibility by luminous robots without collisions. *Inf. Comput.*, 254:392–418, 2017.
- Gokarna Sharma, Costas Busch, and Supratik Mukhopadhyay. Mutual visibility with an optimal number of colors. In *11th International Symposium on Algorithms and Experiments for Wireless Sensor Networks, ALGOSENSORS*, volume 9536 of *LNCS*, pages 196–210, 2015a.
- Giuseppe Antonio Di Luna, Paola Flocchini, Sruti Gan Chaudhuri, Nicola Santoro, and Giovanni Viglietta. Robots with lights: Overcoming obstructed visibility without colliding. In *Stabilization, Safety, and Security of Distributed Systems SSS*, volume 8756 of *LNCS*, pages 150–164, 2014a.
- Giuseppe Antonio Di Luna, Paola Flocchini, Federico Poloni, Nicola Santoro, and Giovanni Viglietta. The mutual visibility problem for oblivious robots. In *Proc. of the 26th Canadian Conference on Computational Geometry, CCCG*, 2014b.
- Gokarna Sharma, Costas Busch, and Supratik Mukhopadhyay. Bounds on mutual visibility algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 27th Canadian Conference on Computational Geometry, CCCG*, 2015b.
- Gokarna Sharma, Ramachandran Vaidyanathan, and Jerry L. Trahan. Optimal randomized complete visibility on a grid for asynchronous robots with lights. In *2020 IEEE International Parallel and Distributed Processing Symposium Workshops, IPDPSW*, pages 607–616, 2020.
- Gokarna Sharma, Ramachandran Vaidyanathan, and Jerry L. Trahan. Optimal randomized complete visibility on a grid for asynchronous robots with lights. *Int. J. Netw. Comput.*, 11(1):50–77, 2021.
- Gokarna Sharma, Ramachandran Vaidyanathan, Jerry L. Trahan, Costas Busch, and Suresh Rai. Complete visibility for robots with lights in  $O(1)$  time. In *Stabilization, Safety, and Security of Distributed Systems SSS*, volume 10083 of *LNCS*, pages 327–345, 2016.
- Gokarna Sharma, Ramachandran Vaidyanathan, Jerry L. Trahan, Costas Busch, and Suresh Rai.  $O(\log n)$ -time complete visibility for asynchronous robots with lights. In *2017 IEEE International Parallel and Distributed Processing Symposium, IPDPS*, pages 513–522, 2017.
- Ranendu Adhikary, Kaustav Bose, Manash Kumar Kundu, and Buddhadeb Sau. Mutual visibility by asynchronous robots on infinite grid. In *14th International Symposium on Algorithms and Experiments for Wireless Sensor Networks, ALGOSENSORS*, volume 11410 of *LNCS*, pages 83–101, 2018.
- Achim Flammenkamp. Progress in the no-three-in-line-problem. *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. A*, 60(2):305–311, 1992.
- K. F. Roth. On a problem of heilbronn. *Journal of The London Mathematical Society-second Series*, pages 198–204, 1951.