

# Program

Program is also available in [Google Calendar](#) ([Link](#))

Conference proceedings are available on [Springer website](#).

Recordings available on [YouTube](#).

[Show abstracts](#)

WEDNESDAY 26.08.2020

<div>Volatile Memory</div> <div>Alexandro Baldassari, Rafael Maruri, João Paulo Carvalho, Guido Arduini, David Castro, João Barreto and Paolo Romano Download paper from <a href="#">Springer LNCS</a>. <a href="#">[Video]</a></div> <div>Non-Volatile Memory (NVM) is an emerging memory technology aimed to eliminate the gap between main memory and stable storage. Nevertheless, today's programs will not readily benefit from NVM because crash failures may render the program non-recoverable and inconsistent state. In this context, the use of durable transactions has been proposed so as to ease the adoption of NVM. It leverages on the well-known semantics of database transactions to simplify the task of programming NVM systems. This is achieved by logging NVM writes using software (SW) or hardware (HW) transaction primitives. Although SW transactions are flexible and unbounded, they may significantly hurt the performance of short-lived transactions. On the other hand, HW transactional memories provide low-overhead but are resource-constrained. In this paper we present NVPM, a transactional system for NVM that delivers the best out of both HW and SW transactions by dynamically selecting the best execution mode according to the application's characteristics. NVPM is comprised of a set of heuristics to guide online phase transition. Furthermore, a careful design of the phase transition state is devised to guarantee consistency when transitioning between HW and SW phases. To the best of our knowledge, NVPM is the first phase-based system to provide durable transactions. Experimental results with the STAMP benchmark show that the proposed heuristics are efficient in guiding phase transitions with low overhead. In particular, the NVM-aware heuristics provided an average speedup of up to 10.4x when compared to a system using NVM-oblivious heuristics, with only 1.9x of transaction overhead in the worst case.</div>		<div>Storage</div> <div>Dhruv Garg, Pratik Shrivastava, Anshu Shukla and Yogesh Simmhan Download paper from <a href="#">Springer LNCS</a>. <a href="#">[Video]</a></div> <div>The rapid growth in edge computing devices as part of Internet of Things (IoT) demand real-time access to time-series data from 1000's of sensors. Such observations are queried to optimize the health of the infrastructure. Recently, edge-local storage is being refain data on the edge rather than move them centrally to the cloud. However, such systems do not support flexible querying over the data spread across 100's of devices. This is also a lack of distributed time-series databases that can run on the edge devices. Here, we propose TorqueDB, a distributed query engine over time-series data that operates on edge and fog resources. TorqueDB leverages our prior work on EStore, a distributed edge-local file store, and introduces time-series databases, to enable temporal queries to be decomposed and executed across multiple fog and edge devices. Interestingly, we move data into influxDB on-demand while retaining the durable data within EStore to be used by other applications. We also design a cost model that motivates parallel monitoring and execution of the queries across resources, and utilizes caching. Our experiments on a real edge, fog and cloud deployment show that TorqueDB performs comparable to influxDB on a cloud VM for a smart city query workload, but without the associated costs.</div>
<div>Enhancing Resource Management through Prediction-based Policies</div> <div>Antonio Navarro, Arthur F. Lorenzon, Eduardo Ayuda and Vicens Beltron Download paper from <a href="#">Springer LNCS</a>. <a href="#">[Video]</a></div> <div>Task-based programming models are emerging as a promising alternative to make the most of multi-/many-core systems. These programming models rely on runtime systems, and their goal is to improve application performance by properly scheduling application tasks to cores. Additionally, these runtime systems offer policies to cope with application phases that lack parallelism to fill all cores. However, these policies are usually static and favor either performance or energy efficiency. In this paper, we have extended a task-based runtime system with a lightweight monitoring and prediction infrastructure that dynamically predicts the optimal number of cores required for each application phase, thus improving both performance and energy efficiency. Through the execution of several benchmarks in multi-/many-core systems, we show that our prediction-based policies have competitive performance while improving energy efficiency when compared to state of the art policies.</div>		<div>Data-Centric Distributed Computing on Mobile Devices</div> <div>Rodrigo Sánchez, João A. Silva, António Teófilo and Hervé Roulin Download paper from <a href="#">Springer LNCS</a>. <a href="#">[Video]</a></div> <div>In the last few years we have seen a significant increase both in the number and capabilities of mobile devices, as well as in the number of applications that need more and more computing and storage resources. Currently, in order to deal with this growing need for resources, applications make use of cloud services. This brings some problems, high latencies, considerable use of energy and bandwidth, and the unavailability of connectivity infrastructures. Given this context, for some applications it makes sense to do part or all of the computing locally on the mobile devices themselves. In this paper we present Oregano, a framework for distributed computing on mobile devices. Oregano is capable of processing sets or streams of data generated on mobile devices networks, without requiring centralized services. Contrary to the current state of the art, where computing and data are sent to a worker mobile device, our Oregano performs the computation where the data is located, significantly reducing the amount of data exchanged.</div>
<div>Accelerating Overlapping Community Detection: Performance Tuning a Stochastic Gradient Descent Chain Monte Carlo Algorithm</div> <div>Ismael Eshikh, Rutger Hofman and Henri Bal Download paper from <a href="#">Springer LNCS</a>. <a href="#">[Video]</a></div> <div>Building efficient algorithms for task-intensive problems requires deep analysis of data access patterns. Random data access patterns exacerbate this process. In this paper, we discuss accelerating a randomized data-intensive machine learning algorithm using multi-core CPUs and several GPUs. A thorough analysis of the algorithm's data dependencies enabled a 75% reduction in its memory footprint. We created custom compute kernels via code generation to identify the optimal set of data placement and computational optimizations per compute device. An empirical evaluation shows up to 245% speedups compared to an optimized sequential version. Another result from this evaluation is that achieving performance that does not always match intuition e.g., depending on the GPU architecture, vectorization may increase or hamper performance.</div>		<div>WSPS: a multi-correlated weighted policy for VM selection and migration for Cloud computing</div> <div>Sergio Vilalmina, Josep Luis Llerda, Fernando Ceres, Fernando Guirado and Fabio Vardi Download paper from <a href="#">Springer LNCS</a>. <a href="#">[Video]</a></div> <div>Using virtualization, cloud environments satisfy dynamically the computational resource necessities of the user. The dynamic use of the resources determines the demand of working hosts. Therefore, through virtual machine (VM) migrations, datacenters perform load balancing to optimise the resource usage and solve saturation. In this work, a policy, named as WSPS (Weighted Pearson Selection Policy), is implemented to choose which virtual machines are more suitable to be migrated. The policy evaluates, for each VM, both the CPU load and the Network traffic influence on the assigned host. The corresponding Pearson correlation coefficients are calculated for each one of the VMs and then weighted in order to provide a relationship between the values and the host behaviour. The main goal is to clearly identify and then migrate the VMs that are responsible of the host saturation but also considering their communications. Using the CloudSim simulator, the policy is compared with the rest of heuristic techniques in the literature, such as scheduling algorithms that take load balancing, data dependencies, and data locality into account. Simulations and an experimental evaluation using Apache Spark cluster demonstrate the advantages of our solutions.</div>
<div>Blockchain to verify the parallelization of Omp5+2 applications</div> <div>Sergio E. Contreras, Rosa Rayuela Alcaraz, Emma Ayuda-Parras and Vicens Beltron Querol Download paper from <a href="#">Springer LNCS</a>. <a href="#">[Video]</a></div> <div>Program models for task-based parallelization based on compile-time directives are very effective at uncovering the parallelism available in HPC applications. Despite that, the process of correctly annotating code with these models is error-prone and may hinder the general adoption of these models. In this paper, we target the Omp5+2 programming model and present a novel toolchain able to detect parallelism opportunities coming from non-compile-time Omp5+2 applications. Our toolchain verifies the compliance with the Omp5+2 programming model using local task analysis to deal with each task separately, and structural induction to extend the analysis to the entire program. To improve program analysis, we use a novel technique to introduce some of the verification annotations, which can be used manually or automatically to disprove the analysis of specific code regions. Experiments run on a sample of representative kernels and applications show that our toolchain can be successfully used to verify the parallelization of complex real-world applications.</div>		<div>Parallel Scheduling of Data-Intensive Tasks</div> <div>Xiao Meng and Lukasz Golab Download paper from <a href="#">Springer LNCS</a>. <a href="#">[Video]</a></div> <div>Workloads with precedence constraints due to data dependencies are common in various applications. These workloads can be represented as directed acyclic graphs (DAGs). These are often data-intensive, meaning that data locality, into account. Simulations and an experimental evaluation on real-world tasks demonstrate the effectiveness of our DAG-to-data-intensive tasks to minimize makespan. To do so, we propose greedy online scheduling algorithms that take load balancing, data dependencies, and data locality into account. Simulations and an experimental evaluation using Apache Spark cluster demonstrate the advantages of our solutions.</div>
<div>High Performance Architectures and Compilers (A)</div> <div>Chairs: Bartosz Białe <a href="#">[Link]</a></div> <div>Modelling Standard and Randomized Slimmed Folded Clos Networks</div> <div>Cristóbal Camarero, Carmen Martínez, Ramon Beivide and Javier Corral Download paper from <a href="#">Springer LNCS</a>. <a href="#">[Video]</a></div> <div>Fat-trees (FTs) are widely known topologies that, among other advantages, provide full bisection bandwidth. However, many implementations of FTs are made slimmed to change the infrastructure, since most applications do not make use of this full bisection bandwidth. In this paper Extended Generalized Random Folded Clos (XGRFC) is presented, a new topology that introduced as cost-efficient alternatives to Extended Generalized Fat Trees (XGFT), which is a widely used topological description for slimmed FTs. This was proved by obtaining a theoretical model of the performance and evaluating it using simulation. Among the results, it is shown that a XGRFC is able to connect 20k servers with 27% less routers than the corresponding XGFT and still providing the same performance under uniform traffic.</div>		<div>Optimal GPU-CPU Offloading Strategies for Deep Neural Network Training</div> <div>Oliver Beaumont, Lionel Eyraud-Dubois and Alena Shilova Download paper from <a href="#">Springer LNCS</a>. <a href="#">[Video]</a></div> <div>Training Deep Neural Networks is known to be an expensive operation, both in terms of computational cost and memory load. Indeed, during training, intermediate layer outputs (called activations) computed during the forward phase must be stored until the corresponding gradient has been computed in the backward phase. These memory requirements sometimes prevent to consider larger batch sizes and deeper networks, so that they can fit both convergence speed and accuracy. Recent works have proposed to offload some of the computed forward activations from the memory of the GPU to the memory of the CPU. This requires to determine which activations should be offloaded and when these transfer nodes are needed. In this paper, we propose a new heuristic to solve this problem. In the first part, we propose two heuristics based on relaxations of the problem. We perform extensive experimental evaluation on standard Deep Neural Networks. We compare the performance of our heuristics against previous approaches from the literature and find that they achieve much better performance in a wide variety of situations.</div>
<div>OMPMemOpt: Optimized Memory Movement for Heterogeneous Computing</div> <div>Prithvraj Barua, Jisheng Zhao and Vivek Sarkar Download paper from <a href="#">Springer LNCS</a>. <a href="#">[Video]</a></div> <div>The fast development of accelerator architectures and applications has made heterogeneous computing the norm for high-performance computing. The cost of high volume data movement to the accelerators is an important bottleneck both in terms of application performance and developer productivity. Memory management is still manual task performed tediously by expert programmers. In this paper, we develop a compiler analysis to automate memory management for heterogeneous computing. We propose an optimization framework that casts the problem of detection and removal of redundant data movements into a partial redundancy elimination (PRE) problem and applies the lazy code motion technique to optimize it. We chose OpenMP as the underlying parallel programming model and implemented our optimization framework in the LLVM toolchain. We evaluated it with ten benchmarks and obtained a geometric speedup of 2.58 times, and reduced on average 50.1% of the total bytes transferred between the host-GPU.</div>		<div>Improving mapping for sparse direct solvers: A trade-off between data locality and load balancing</div> <div>Changlong Gou, Ali Al-Zoubi, Anne Benoit, Mathieu Fauvege, Louis Marchat, Grégoire Pichon and Pierre Ramet Download paper from <a href="#">Springer LNCS</a>. <a href="#">[Video]</a></div> <div>In order to express parallelism, parallel sparse direct solvers take advantage of the elimination tree to exhibit tree-shaped task graphs, where nodes represent computational tasks and edges represent data dependencies. One of the pre-processing stages of sparse direct solvers consists in mapping computational resources (processors) to these tasks. The objective is to minimize the factorization time by exhibiting good data locality and load balancing. The proportional mapping technique is a widely used approach to solve this resource-allocation problem. It achieves good data locality by assigning tasks to processors in large parts of the elimination tree. However, it may limit load balancing in some cases. In this paper, we propose a dynamic mapping algorithm based on proportional mapping. This new approach relaxes the data locality criterion to improve load balancing. In order to evaluate the effectiveness of our approach, we perform extensive experiments on the PaStiX sparse direct solver. It demonstrates that our algorithm enables better static scheduling of the numerical factorization while keeping good data locality.</div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>
<div>THURSDAY 27.08.2020</div> <div></div>		

FRIDAY 28.08.2020

|               |  |   
   
   
   
   
   
  |  |  |
|---------------|--
--
--
--
--
--
--
--|--|--|
| 13.00 - 14.45 |  | <div><div><b>Industry: IBM (A)</b></div><div></div></div>   
   
   
   
   
   
  |  | <div><div><b>Industry: IBM (A)</b></div><div></div></div>  |
| 14.45 - 15.00 |  | <div><div><b>Break</b></div><div></div></div>   
   
   
   
   
   
  |  | <div><div><b>Break</b></div><div></div></div>  |
| 15.00 - 15.50 |  | <div><div><b>Keynote Piotr Sankowski (A)</b></div><div>Abstract available on <a href="#">keynotes page</a></div></div>  
   
   
   
   
   
  |  | <div><div><b>Keynote Piotr Sankowski (A)</b></div><div>Abstract available on <a href="#">keynotes page</a></div></div> |
| 15.50 - 16.00 |  | <div><div><b>Break</b></div><div></div></div>   
   
   
   
   
   
  |  | <div><div><b>Break</b></div><div></div></div>  |
| 16.00 - 17.00 |  | <div><div><b>Theory and Algorithms for Parallel and Distributed Processing (A)</b></div><div>Chairs: Marek Klonowski <a href="#">[Link channel]</a></div><div><b>On the Power of Randomization in Distributed Algorithms in Dynamic Networks with Adaptive Adversaries</b><br/>Ivan Jakić, Harfeiy Yu and Aduurami Hou<br/>Download paper from <a href="#">Springer LNCS</a>. <a href="#">[Video]</a></div><div>This paper investigates the power of randomization in general distributed algorithms in dynamic networks where the adversary's topology may evolve over time, as determined by some adaptive adversary. In this context, a randomized algorithm is said to be efficient if it uses only a small number of random bits. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to
the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies
generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving
topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving
topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We
prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the
algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology and the adversary's choice of the algorithm, and "bad" evolving topologies generated by the adaptive adversary. We prove that randomness offers limited power to the better deal with "bad" evolving topologies. We define a simulation of prophetic adversary to observe the evolving topology</div></div> |  |  |





SHARE ON:

