

BBCA-LEDGER: High Throughput Consensus meets Low Latency

Chrysoula Stathakopoulou
Chainlink Labs

Michael Wei
Chainlink Labs and VMWare
Research

Maofan Yin
Chainlink Labs

Hongbo Zhang
Chainlink Labs and Cornell
University

Dahlia Malkhi
Chainlink Labs

Abstract

This paper presents BBCA-LEDGER*, a Byzantine log replication technology for partially synchronous networks enabling blocks to be broadcast in parallel, such that each broadcast is *finalized* independently and instantaneously into an individual slot in the log. Every finalized broadcast is eventually *committed* to the total ordering, so that all network bandwidth has utility in disseminating blocks. Finalizing log slots in parallel achieves both high throughput and low latency.

BBCA-LEDGER is composed of two principal protocols that interweave together, a low-latency/high-throughput happy path, and a high-throughput DAG-based fallback path.

The happy path employs a novel primitive called BBCA, a consistent broadcast enforcing unique slot numbering. In steady state, BBCA ensures that a transaction can be committed with low latency, in just 3 network steps.

Under network partitions or faults, we harness recent advances in BFT and build a fallback mechanism on a direct acyclic graph (DAG) created by BBCA broadcasts. In this manner, BBCA-LEDGER exhibits the throughput benefits of DAG-based BFT in face of gaps.

1 Introduction

The popularity of blockchains has undeniably changed the landscape of Byzantine fault tolerant (BFT) consensus. Scalable protocols with multiple leaders, enabling transaction proposals to occur in parallel, are being pursued both in theory and in practice [1, 13–15, 18, 20, 22–25, 28–30, 33]. While these protocols demonstrate terrific throughput, they all have a similar “recipe”: They allow parallel broadcasts to proceed for a while, and then wait for a leader to drive a commit decision on an entire “wave” of accumulated broadcasts. This introduces a rather large delay, as these protocols first wait for reliable broadcasts to be finalized and then start ordering them.

Traditional, non-BFT consensus protocols have benefited greatly from decoupling finalization and sequencing. Distributed shared logs [2–5, 32] have shown that finalization and sequencing can be performed independently, and can greatly improve parallelism, throughput and latency. Instead of waiting for a consensus protocol to both finalize transactions and order them into a sequenced log, they assign slots in the log for transactions by a “sequencer” immediately upon request. Sequenced

transactions are then finalized into their assigned slots independently and in parallel, enabling the protocol to proceed as quickly as the sequencer can assign slots.

In this work, BBCA-LEDGER, we apply the benefits of decoupling finalization from sequencing to the Byzantine setting. How do we build a sequencer in the Byzantine setting, though? Our first insight is remarkably simple: consistent broadcast itself prevents sender equivocation, hence broadcasts can be finalized into pre-assigned slots so long as the uniqueness of slot numbers is enforced by the protocol. Therefore, as in non-BFT settings, broadcasts carrying unique slot numbers can be finalized independently and in parallel, successfully growing a sequenced log. Based on this insight, BBCA-LEDGER is built on a core broadcast primitive called BBCA, a novel variant of consistent broadcast guaranteeing unique slot numbering. When there is no contention over slots numbers, BBCA broadcasts can be finalized in three network delays.

However, gaps in the log may occur in BBCA-LEDGER due to faulty nodes or network partitions. We use a fallback consensus decision to finalize gap slots. Harnessing recent advances in Byzantine fault tolerance on DAGs [24, 28], we allow broadcasts to keep being finalized and drive consensus decisions with zero message overhead. In this manner, while a gap in slot numbers may delay growing the committed log, all broadcasts have utility in contributing to throughput and system resources continue being fully utilized.

Combining these two components enables BBCA-LEDGER to decouple finalization and sequencing, providing a optimistically fast, high-throughput happy path with a high-throughput fallback. More specifically, BBCA allows blocks of transactions to be finalized into a sequenced log extremely fast in the common case. At the same time, using a DAG to drive consensus allows BBCA-LEDGER to maintain the high-throughput scalability of state-of-art DAG protocols (e.g., [15, 18, 28]) under contention. Note that this line of research work emphasizes separating transaction dissemination from block finalization to improve throughput. This is orthogonal yet compatible with the core design of BBCA-LEDGER.

As an added benefit, BBCA-LEDGER supports “eager” notifications which allow nodes to observe finalized slots in the log out of order. Many use-cases can benefit from the eager finalization notifications, so that BBCA-LEDGER can support diverse applications on the same platform.

This paper presents a complete BBCA-LEDGER protocol, which is part of a larger ongoing system project. The goal of

*BBCA, pronounced “bab-ka”, loosely stands for Byzantine Broadcast with Commit-Adopt.

this paper is to present the background on the key insights of BBKA-LEDGER, to formally describe the protocol and the key primitive BBKA, and to argue correctness. We are in the process of building a complete system around BBKA-LEDGER which leverages its full performance and sequencing capabilities.

2 Model

We assume a set of n nodes, such that each one of them represents an independent trust authority. A computationally bound adversary controls the network and may corrupt up to f nodes, such that $n \geq 3f + 1$. We refer to the corrupted nodes as Byzantine, as they may fail arbitrarily, and to the non-corrupted nodes as correct.

Each node participates in various types of roles/activities, encapsulated by processes hosted on the same node:

- *Validation*: Validator processes are responsible for populating the log with blocks. Each node hosts a single validator process.
- *Work*: Worker processes are responsible for transaction dissemination. Each node hosts at least one worker process.
- *Ticketing*: A ticketmaster process is a functionality responsible for assigning log slots to validators (see Section 6.1 for details). A ticketmaster may be implemented by process hosted by nodes, in which case each node hosts at most one ticketmaster process.

Below, we will interchangeably refer to a node and to the processes it hosts, since there is a 1-1 mapping between them. Furthermore, we assume that the adversary controls any process of a corrupted node.

Unless mentioned otherwise, processes communicate through authenticated point-to-point channels. We assume an eventually synchronous network [17] such that the communication between any pair of correct processes is asynchronous before a global stabilization time (GST), unknown to the processes, when the communication becomes synchronous. Finally, we assume a public key infrastructure (PKI) such that each process i is equipped with a public-private key pair PK_i, SK_i used for authentication. We use $\langle [field] \dots, \sigma_i \rangle$ to denote messages carrying a signature σ_i by i .

3 System Overview

BBKA-LEDGER is a Byzantine log replication technology enabling blocks to be broadcast in parallel, such that each broadcast block is *finalized* independently and instantaneously into an individual slot in the log. Every finalized block is eventually *committed* to the total ordering, so that all network bandwidth has utility in disseminating blocks. Finalizing log slots in parallel addresses our goal of having both high throughput and low latency.

3.1 The Log Abstraction

BBKA-LEDGER exposes an abstraction of a totally ordered log to the set of validators. The log is a sequence of indexable *slots* that contain *blocks* or a special \perp value. To add a block to the log, BBKA-LEDGER interface exposes to validators

a PROPOSE event call. We say that a slot is *finalized* once it is filled with a finalized block or a \perp . Slots become finalized consistently and irreversibly across all correct validators.

In common settings, validators are notified through a COMMIT event when a contiguous prefix of the log, starting with the genesis, containing finalized slots grows. Figure 1(top) shows a potential log instance with slots 1 – 4 finalized and committed.

In case “holes” are left in the log, they are finalized with a special \perp value via a fallback consensus mechanism, allowing higher slots in the log to become committed. Figure 1(bottom) shows pending slots (5 and 7) becoming finalized with permanent holes, allowing slots 6 and 8 to become committed.




Figure 1: BBKA-LEDGER. The top shows slots 1 – 4 are finalized contiguously, and a COMMIT notification is sent. Slots 6 and 8 are finalized but their COMMIT is pending until 5 and 7 become finalized. On the bottom, slots 5 and 7 become permanent holes via a fallback consensus decision, allowing a commit notification to be sent on slots 6 and 8.

3.2 Technical Approach

BBKA-LEDGER is composed of two principal protocols that interweave together, a low-latency/high-throughput happy path, and a high-throughput DAG-based fallback path.

Happy Path. In order to allow blocks to be added to the log in parallel, we introduce a broadcast primitive called BBKA, a variant of Byzantine consistent broadcast [9] that with two features: First, processing broadcasts includes enforcing unique slot numbers. Second, broadcasts expose two API events, BBKA-DELIVER-ADOPT and BBKA-DELIVER-COMMIT, with a commit-adopt guarantee: BBKA-DELIVER-COMMIT occurs only if BBKA-DELIVER-ADOPT occurs at $2f + 1$ validators.

Blocks of transactions are broadcast in parallel, as soon as validators are ready to add them to the log. Every validator may invoke BBKA to add a block to the log with a *desired* slot number. To use BBKA, a validator prepares a block with some payload, a set of *causal* references to a causal-frontier of previously delivered BBKA blocks, a field to identify its sender, and metadata. Multiple validators may propose blocks for different slot numbers simultaneously. Strategies for slot allocation will be discussed later. A correct validator finalizes a block b when it consistently delivers b via BBKA and it has finalized all the blocks in b 's causal references.

In the common case, when BBCA is invoked by a correct sender with a unique slot number sn and with block b , all correct validators eventually receive a COMMIT event for b at slot sn .

Fallback Path. We use a fallback consensus protocol to finalize slots that remain empty due to faults. To address the issue of empty slots, we build a fallback mechanism on a direct acyclic graph (DAG) created by BBCA broadcasts. In this manner, while a gap in the log may delay the COMMIT event for higher slots, the log continues to be filled so the resources of the system are continuously utilized. Moreover, consensus decisions about empty slots are embedded within normal broadcasts and have throughput utility as well. The fallback mechanism works as follows.

Each validator maintains a timer for sn , the first empty slot it knows of. Upon timeout, the validator uses a special FINALIZE mechanism that causes the validator to stop participating in BBCA for slot sn , and to broadcast a “complaint”. The complaint carries an intermediate BBCA-DELIVER-ADOPT event, which BBCA exposes, that has the following guarantee: if BBCA-DELIVER-COMMIT of a block b with slot sn ever occurs at any correct validator, then $f + 1$ correct validators will incur BBCA-DELIVER-ADOPT with b upon invoking FINALIZE. We then use a fallback consensus protocol to finalize sn with either a special \perp value, or with the (unique) block b indicated in complaints as FINALIZE-adopted values.

The specific fallback consensus protocol in BBCA-LEDGER is implemented on top of a DAG using the in-DAG consensus framework introduced in the partial-synchrony part of Bullshark [28] and generalized to general DAGs in Fino [24]. Briefly, utilizing Fino, a *leader-proposal* which causally follows FINALIZE complaints from a quorum of validators determines a value, possibly \perp , for the stalled slot number. A proposal becomes committed through $f + 1$ successor blocks interpreted as *votes*.

Ticketmaster. Key to the performant functioning of BBCA-LEDGER, and ultimately to its progress, is a contention-free allocation of slot numbers to validators. We capture the abstract functionality of slot numbering by a role referred to as a ticketmaster. A naïve ticketmaster strategy is a simple round robin rotation among all validators. Even such a naïve regime has certain desirable features, including fairness and guaranteed liveness. However, BBCA-LEDGER would get delayed by the slowest sender. More elaborate regimes are discussed in Section 6.1, embodying greater adaptability and dynamism.

3.3 Enhancements

BBCA-LEDGER includes two principal enhancements over the basic protocol, slotless-blocks and FINAL events.

Slotless blocks. In case of contention over slot numbers, at most one invocation of BBCA with the same sn will succeed. BBCA salvages the blocks which could not be delivered with a slot number by allowing a failed validator to *yield* the slot sn and be delivered as a *slotless* block. The yield mechanism ensures BBCA liveness, and also ensures that the bandwidth used for dissemination of yielded-blocks is not wasted. This is

similar to uncle blocks [27], effectively flattening a sub-graph of blocks linked to a single slot number. After BBCA delivers a block b with an empty slot number, another block b' may reference b as a causal predecessor. When b' becomes committed, all its causal predecessors become committed as well (using any deterministic ordering among them). In Figure 2, blocks S, T, U, V, W are slotless; the block at slot 3 has three causal predecessors, S, T , and U , that become committed jointly with it.




Figure 2: Slotless blocks S, T, U, V, W . Slot 3 causal predecessors, S, T , and U , become finalized and committed jointly with it. FINAL notifications are received on slots 6 and 8.

Eager finality. BBCA-LEDGER supports an FINAL event in addition to COMMIT events, such that validators are notified as soon as individual slots become finalized, possibly out-of-order. Figure 2 shows slots 6 and 8 already finalized and a FINAL notification is sent on the blocks in these slots. Exposing finalized slots *eagerly* via FINAL notifications is optional. Using COMMIT offers a standard, totally-ordered log replication service to validators, whereas FINAL may be used to support new use-cases. By mixing both interfaces, it is possible to construct applications that utilize total ordering for consensus operations (such as abort, or reconfiguration) while employing FINAL for steady state. We describe several possible use-cases of FINAL.




Figure 3: A 3-out-of-4 threshold signature with a deadline example. On the top, signature shares σ_1, σ_2 , and σ_3 can be aggregated as soon as they become finalized. On the bottom, the block which indicates a deadline is committed before 3 signature shares are committed, and, therefore, the signature reconstruction is aborted.

As observed previously in [6, 19, 26], supporting payments requires only partial ordering, that can be readily supported

via FINAL events. Some blockchains, e.g., Sui [31] and Linera [21], support single-owner tokenized assets requiring only FIFO ordering of an owner’s operations. They provide cross-owner ordering for compound transactions by explicit request. BBCA-LEDGER can support owner-only ordering by allowing owners to subscribe to FINAL events for their own operations. Cross-owner ordering is automatically facilitated by waiting for COMMIT events in sequence order.

Another example is a t -out-of- n threshold signature reconstruction with a deadline. In this example, the signature can be reconstructed as soon as t signature shares are finalized. The total order is only required to enforce the deadline, i.e. abort the reconstruction if fewer than t shares are added to the log by a certain slot. Figure 3 demonstrates a 3-out-of-4 example.

4 The BBCA primitive

A core building block of BBCA-LEDGER is BBCA, a variant of Byzantine consistent broadcast [9] with *desired* slot numbers and an external validity predicate \mathcal{P} . The key property we require from BBCA is that slot numbers of delivered blocks are unique across BBCA instances. Notice that, uniqueness of slot numbers could be expressed as an external validity predicate; we make it an explicit part of the primitive specification in order to express properties about the log which is constructed via these slots.

A BBCA instance for some block b is invoked with an BBCA-BCAST(id, sn, b, \mathcal{P}) event, where $id \in \mathbb{N}$ is the instance label and $sn \in \mathbb{N}$ is the desired slot number. We say in short that the sender bbca-bcasts (id, sn, b). Two distinct instances invoked with the same desired slot number sn are *conflicting*, and at most one can succeed in delivering a block with sn .

In order to handle faults that potentially leave slots unfilled, BBCA allows validators to trigger finalization of slot numbers via a FINALIZE mechanism that triggers an intermediate BBCA-DELIVER-ADOPT event that has the following guarantee: If any validator BBCA-DELIVER-COMMIT’s a block b with slot sn , then $f + 1$ correct validators would incur BBCA-DELIVER-ADOPT of b upon invoking FINALIZE. Adopting is supported through a BBCA-FINALIZE(sn) interface. To use the FINALIZE mechanism, when BBCA-FINALIZE(sn) is invoked by a validator, BBCA stops participating in broadcasts for slot sn , and asynchronously responds to the validator with an adopt event BBCA-DELIVER-ADOPT(id, sn, b, π, Q) with a (unique) block b (possibly \perp). π is a certificate of uniqueness, and Q is a predicate indicating whether the block indicated by π should be finalized. We introduce this API event call to allow any BBCA-LEDGER slot to become finalized within a finite time, potentially with a \perp value.

In order to salvage a BBCA that cannot obtain its desired slot number and uphold broadcast Validity, we allow blocks to be delivered without slots, indicated with a -1 slot value. Delivery events are denoted BBCA-DELIVER-COMMIT(id, sn, b), where $sn \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{-1\}$. We say that the validator bbca-delivers (id, sn, b).

Figure 4 shows an example with multiple BBCA invocations.



Figure 4: BBCA invocations. Block c is delivered without a slot number, as at most one block can be delivered with slot number 1.

We define BBCA with the following properties:

- BBCA1: Integrity:** If a correct validator bbca-delivers (id, sn, b) and the sender p is correct, then p had previously invoked bbca-bcast for (id, sn, b).
- BBCA2: No-duplication:** Every correct validator bbca-delivers at most once per instance.
- BBCA3: Consistency:** If a correct validator p bbca-delivers (id, sn, b) and a correct q validator bbca-delivers (id, sn', b') for the same instance id , then $b = b'$ and $sn = sn'$.
- BBCA4: Unique sequencing:** If a correct validator p bbca-delivers (id, sn, b) and a correct validator q bbca-delivers (id', sn, b') for the same non-nil slot number $sn \in \mathbb{N}$, then $id = id'$ (and by Consistency also $b = b'$).
- BBCA5: Validity:** If a correct validator p bbca-bcasts (id, sn, b) then eventually every correct validator bbca-delivers (id, sn', b), such that either $sn' = sn \in \mathbb{N}$ or $sn' = -1$.
- BBCA6: Weak Sequencing Validity:** After GST, if a correct validator p bbca-bcasts (id, sn, b) with $sn \in \mathbb{N}$, no other validator bbca-bcasts (id', sn, b'), and no correct validator incurs BBCA-FINALIZE(sn), then every correct validator delivers (id, sn, b).
- BBCA7: External Validity:** If some correct validator bbca-delivers (id, sn, b) then $\mathcal{P}(b)$ is TRUE.
- BBCA8: Finalization:** If some correct validator p incurs BBCA-FINALIZE(sn) with $sn \in \mathbb{N}$, then p incurs BBCA-DELIVER-ADOPT. Moreover, if $2f + 1$ validators with indexes in set I incur BBCA-DELIVER-ADOPT(id_i, sn, b_i, π_i, Q) such that $Q(\bigcup_{i \in I} \{\pi_i\}) = \text{FALSE}$, then no correct node bbca-delivers (id, sn, b) for any id and block b .

In Algorithm 1 we describe a protocol that implements BBCA. The protocol makes use of a point-to-point communication primitive, PL-SEND(p, b) and PL-RCV(p, b), corresponding to a process sending a block b to process p and to a process receiving a block b from process p respectively. Likewise, it makes use of a validated Byzantine reliable broadcast primitive, VRB-BCAST(b, Q) and VRB-DELIVER(p, b, Q), where a block b with a dedicated sender p is broadcast with an external validity predicate Q (see [10] for definition). We assume that all events in Algorithm 1 are handled atomically.

The core of the BBCA protocol borrows from Bracha’s known scheme [7]. However, the key difference in our protocol is that if validators cannot deliver a block b with its desired slot number sn within a time period, they must allow the sender to

broadcast b without a slot number. To this end, they “convince” an honest sender that it is safe to rebroadcast b with $sn = -1$. Conversely, if it is possible that some correct validator has already delivered b with $sn \neq -1$, a correct sender will convince all correct validators to deliver the same way.

The protocol. A dedicated BBCA sender s for instance id sends to all validators an $\langle \text{INITIATE}, id, sn, b, \sigma_s \rangle$ message. Upon receiving an INITIATE message for slot number sn and block b and upon the validity predicate \mathcal{P} for b becomes true, a correct validator p verifies that it is sent by the dedicated instance sender, and that the signature on it is valid. Moreover, p verifies that it has not echoed another message for either the same instance id or sn . Then p sends a message $\langle \text{ECHO}, id, sn, b, \sigma_p \rangle$ to all validators and starts a timer T_{id} for instance id .

Upon receiving $2f + 1$ matching valid ECHO messages from different validators, q sends a $\langle \text{READY}, id, sn, b \rangle$ message to all validators. After receiving $2f + 1$ READY messages, q bbca-delivers id, sn, b and cancels the timer.

Figure 5(a) illustrates the common-case execution of our BBCA implementation.


Finalizing a slot number. Validators must eventually finalize each slot, potentially with an empty block, in order to allow higher slots to commit. To this end, when the timer of a slot number sn goes off at a correct validator p it invokes BBCA-FINALIZE(sn). After BBCA-FINALIZE(sn) is invoked at p , p stops accepting and sending INITIATE, ECHO and READY messages for sn , and triggers a BBCA-DELIVER-ADOPT(sn, b, π, Q) event, where $\pi = C_R$, a set of the $2f + 1$ ECHO messages p has received in case it has sent a READY message for slot number sn , or an empty set otherwise. Notice that there exists at most one instance for which C_R could be non-empty. Contrary to yield, finalizing a slot number requires a consensus decision, which is described in the next section.

Yielding the slot number of a BBCA instance. If the timer of an instance id goes off, q must “yield” the slot number of the instance. To this effect q stops accepting or sending INITIATE/ECHO/READY messages for this instance and sends $\langle \text{YIELD}, id, sn, b, C_R, \sigma_p \rangle$ to all validators. C_R is a set of the $2f + 1$ ECHO messages q has received that triggered READY, $C_R = \emptyset$ if none. We refer to C_R as *ready certificate*. Moreover, upon receiving $f + 1$ matching YIELD messages from different validators, if q has not already yielded the slot number of the instance, it does so, too.

When a sender of instance id receives $2f + 1$ YIELD messages for id , it must decide how to help all correct validators BBCA-DELIVER-COMMIT the corresponding block b . If there exists at least one $C_R \neq \emptyset$ with some sn among the YIELD messages, it is safe to assign slot number sn to b . By quorum intersection, no validator could have received enough ECHO messages for a different block b' carrying the same sn . Therefore, the sender invokes VRB-BCAST($(id, sn, C, b), Q$), where C is the set of the $2f + 1$ ready certificates and the external validity predicate Q verifies that indeed the set C justifies assigning sn to b .

If, on the other hand, all C_R sets are empty, no validator can bbca-deliver b , as not enough validators will ever send a READY message. Therefore, it is safe for the sender to rebroadcast b with no slot number. It invokes a VRB-BCAST($(id, -1, C, b), Q$), where the external validity predicate Q checks that indeed the set C justifies assigning the special slot number -1 to b .

Figure 5(b-c) illustrate potential yielding scenarios.



(b) Yield where no node sent a READY message: validator 0 must invoke VRB with -1 .

(c) Yield where validator 2 sent READY with sn : validator 0 must invoke VRB with sn .

Figure 5: BBCA executions with and without a timeout for 4 validators. The dashed line represents the timer.

Validity. BBCA is weaker than consensus, since we only require to guarantee Validity for a correct sender. Moreover, even for a single, correct sender, BBCA requires a checkpointing mechanism to satisfy the Validity property for all correct validators. In particular, note that a correct validator either delivers a block for some instance, or times out. It is, however, possible that fewer than $f + 1$ validators time out for some instance and, therefore, the sender never triggers VRB to help them bbca-deliver some block for this instance. To ensure that all correct validators bbca-deliver a block for any instance with a correct sender, a checkpointing mechanism should be in place. A correct validator p sends a $\langle \text{CHECKPOINT}, id, sn, b, \sigma_p \rangle$ message upon bbca-deliver. A validator may bbca-deliver (id, sn, b) upon receiving $f + 1$ CHECKPOINT messages, as at least one of them is from a correct validator. Importantly, this mechanism does not increase latency in the common case and, moreover, validators can batch CHECKPOINT messages.

5 The BBCA-LEDGER

BBCA-LEDGER exposes to validators a Byzantine fault-tolerant log abstraction built around the BBCA primitive. Validators can request to add blocks to the log. Every validator can read from the log, or subscribe to asynchronous notifications when slots are finalized.

Eventually, every slot is *finalized* with some value. Values can be blocks, or a special \perp value. Each slot has two finalization events, COMMIT and FINAL.

Algorithm 1 BBBCA implementation.

```

1: Implements:
2:   BBBCA BBBCA with external validity predicates  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $Q$ .
3:
4: Uses:
5:   Byzantine reliable broadcast, VRB
6:   Point-to-point links, PL
7:
8: Parameters:
9:    $n$                                      ▶ Number of nodes
10:   $f$                                      ▶ Maximum number of faulty nodes
11:   $N$                                      ▶ Set of all  $n$  nodes
12:   $\Delta$                                   ▶ Progress timeout period
13:   $T \leftarrow \{\}$                        ▶ Map of timers per instance label
14:   $sentecho \leftarrow \{\}$                 ▶ Map of boolean values per instance label
15:   $sentyready \leftarrow \{\}$             ▶ Map of boolean values per instance label
16:   $delivered \leftarrow \{\}$             ▶ Map of boolean values per instance label
17:   $yielded \leftarrow \{\}$               ▶ Map of boolean values per instance label
18:   $echos \leftarrow \{\}$                 ▶ Map of maps of  $(sn, b)$  tuples per sender per instance label
19:   $readys \leftarrow \{\}$                 ▶ Map of maps of  $(sn, b)$  tuples per sender per instance label
20:   $yields \leftarrow \{\}$                 ▶ Map of maps of  $(sn, b)$  tuples per sender per instance label
21:   $checkpoints \leftarrow \{\}$           ▶ Map of maps of  $(sn, b)$  tuples per sender per instance label
22:   $readyCertPerId \leftarrow \{\}$         ▶ Map ready certificates per sender per instance label
23:   $readyCertPerSn \leftarrow \{\}$        ▶ Map ready certificates per sender per sequence number
24:   $seqnos \leftarrow \{\}$                ▶ Map of boolean values per sequence number
25:   $finalized \leftarrow \{\}$            ▶ Map of boolean values per sequence number
26:
27: upon event BBBCA-BCAST( $id, sn, b, \mathcal{P}$ ) do ▶ Triggered only by the dedicated sender
     $s$  of instance with label  $id$ 
28:   if  $finalized[sn] = \text{FALSE}$  then
29:      $\sigma_s \leftarrow \text{sign}(s, (id, sn, b))$ 
30:     for  $q \in N$  do
31:       trigger PL-SEND( $q, (\text{INITIATE}, id, sn, b, \sigma_s)$ )
32:     end for
33:   end if
34:
35: upon event PL-RECV( $q, (\text{INITIATE}, id, sn, b, \sigma_q)$ ) and  $\mathcal{P}(b) = \text{TRUE}$  do ▶
    Executed by node  $p$ 
36:   if  $q$  is the sender of instance with label  $id$  then
37:      $T[id].\text{settimer}(\Delta)$  ▶ Set a progress timer
38:     if  $sentecho[id] = \text{FALSE}$  and  $yielded[id] = \text{FALSE}$  and  $finalized[sn] = \text{FALSE}$ 
and  $seqnos[sn] = \text{FALSE}$  and  $\text{valid}(q, (id, sn, b), \sigma_q)$  then
39:        $sentecho[id] \leftarrow \text{TRUE}$ 
40:        $seqnos[sn] \leftarrow \text{TRUE}$ 
41:        $\sigma_p \leftarrow \text{sign}(p, (id, sn, b))$ 
42:       for  $q \in N$  do
43:         trigger PL-SEND( $q, (\text{ECHO}, id, sn, b, \sigma_p)$ )
44:       end for
45:     end if
46:   end if
47:
48: upon event PL-RECV( $q, (\text{ECHO}, id, sn, b, \sigma_q)$ ) do ▶ Executed by node  $p$ 
49:   if  $yielded[id] = \text{FALSE}$  and  $finalized[sn] = \text{FALSE}$  and  $\text{valid}(q, (id, sn, b), \sigma_q)$ 
and  $echos[id][q] = \perp$  then
50:      $echos[id][q] \leftarrow (sn, b)$ 
51:   end if
52:
53: upon exists ( $id, sn, b$ ) such that  $|\{p \in N | echos[id][p] = (sn, b)\}| >$ 
 $2f$  and  $sentyready[id] = \text{FALSE}$  do ▶ Executed by node  $p$ 
54:    $sentyready[id] \leftarrow \text{TRUE}$ 
55:    $readyCertPerId \leftarrow echos[id]$ 
56:    $readyCertPerSn \leftarrow echos[id]$ 
57:    $\sigma_p \leftarrow \text{sign}(p, (id, sn, b))$ 
58:   for  $q \in N$  do
59:     trigger PL-SEND( $q, (\text{READY}, id, sn, b, \sigma_p)$ )
60:   end for
61:
62: upon event PL-RECV( $q, (\text{READY}, id, sn, b, \sigma_q)$ ) do ▶ Executed by node  $p$ 
63:   if  $yielded[id] = \text{FALSE}$  and  $finalized[sn] = \text{FALSE}$  and  $\text{valid}(q, (id, sn, b), \sigma_q)$ 
and  $readys[id][q] = \perp$  then
64:      $readys[id][q] \leftarrow (sn, b)$ 
65:   end if
66:
67: upon exists ( $id, sn, b$ ) such that  $|\{p \in N | readys[id][p] = (sn, b)\}| >$ 
 $2f$  and  $delivered[id] = \text{FALSE}$  do ▶ Executed by node  $p$ 
68:    $delivered[id] \leftarrow \text{TRUE}$ 
69:    $T[id].\text{cancel}()$  ▶ Cancel progress timer with with timeout duration  $\Delta$ 
70:   trigger BBBCA-DELIVER-COMMIT( $p, id, sn, b$ )
71:    $\sigma_p \leftarrow \text{sign}(p, (id, sn, b))$ 
72:   for  $q \in N$  do
73:     trigger PL-SEND( $q, (\text{CHECKPOINT}, id, sn, b, \sigma_p)$ )
74:   end for
75:

```

Algorithm 1 BBBCA implementation (continues).

```

76: upon event  $T[id].\text{timeout}$  do ▶ Executed by node  $p$ 
77:    $yielded[id] \leftarrow \text{TRUE}$ 
78:    $C_R \leftarrow readyCertPerId[id]$ 
79:    $\sigma_p \leftarrow \text{sign}(p, (id, sn, b, C_R))$ 
80:   for  $q \in N$  do
81:     trigger PL-SEND( $q, (\text{YIELD}, id, sn, b, C_R, \sigma_p)$ )
82:   end for
83:
84: upon event BBBCA-FINALIZE( $sn$ ) do ▶ Executed by node  $p$ 
85:    $finalized[sn] \leftarrow \text{TRUE}$ 
86:    $C_R \leftarrow readyCertPerSn[sn]$ 
87:   trigger BBBCA-DELIVER-ADOPT( $p, sn, b, C_R$ )
88:
89: upon event PL-RECV( $q, (\text{YIELD}, id, sn, b, C_R, \sigma_q)$ ) do ▶ Executed by node  $p$ 
90:   if  $\text{valid}(q, (id, sn, b, C_R), \sigma_q)$  and  $yielded[id][q] = \perp$  then
91:      $yielded[id][q] \leftarrow sn, b, C_R$ 
92:   end if
93:
94: upon exists ( $id, sn, b$ ) such that  $|\{p \in N | yielded[id][p] = (sn, b, \_)\}| >$ 
 $2f$  and  $delivered[id] = \text{FALSE}$  do ▶ Executed by sender  $s$ 
95:    $C \leftarrow yielded[sn]$ 
96:   if exists ( $sn, b, C_R$ )  $\in C$  such that  $C_R \neq \emptyset$  then
97:     trigger VRB-BCAST( $((id, sn, b, C), Q)$ )
98:   else
99:     trigger VRB-BCAST( $((id, -1, b, C), Q)$ )
100:   end if
101:
102: upon exists ( $id, sn, b$ ) such that  $|\{p \in N | yielded[id][p] = (sn, b, \_)\}| >$ 
 $f$  and  $yielded[id] = \text{FALSE}$  do
103:    $yielded[id] \leftarrow \text{TRUE}$ 
104:    $C_R \leftarrow readyCertPerId[id]$ 
105:    $\sigma_p \leftarrow \text{sign}(p, (id, sn, b, C_R))$ 
106:   for  $q \in N$  do
107:     trigger PL-SEND( $q, (\text{YIELD}, id, sn, b, C_R, \sigma_p)$ )
108:   end for
109:
110: upon event VRB-DELIVER( $p, (id, sn, b), Q$ ) do
111:   if  $delivered[id] = \text{FALSE}$  then
112:      $delivered[id] \leftarrow \text{TRUE}$ 
113:     trigger BBBCA-DELIVER-COMMIT( $p, id, sn, b$ )
114:      $\sigma_p \leftarrow \text{sign}(p, (id, sn, b))$ 
115:     for  $q \in N$  do
116:       trigger PL-SEND( $q, (\text{CHECKPOINT}, id, sn, b, \sigma_p)$ )
117:     end for
118:   end if
119:
120: upon event PL-RECV( $q, (\text{CHECKPOINT}, id, sn, b, \sigma_q)$ ) do ▶ Executed by node  $p$ 
121:   if  $\text{valid}(q, (id, sn, b), \sigma_q)$  and  $checkpoints[id][q] = \perp$  then
122:      $checkpoints[id][q] \leftarrow (sn, b)$ 
123:   end if
124:
125: upon exists ( $id, sn, b$ ) such that  $|\{p \in N | checkpoints[id][p] = (sn, b)\}| >$ 
 $f$  and  $delivered[id] = \text{FALSE}$  do
126:    $delivered[id] \leftarrow \text{TRUE}$ 
127:   trigger BBBCA-DELIVER-COMMIT( $p, id, sn, b$ )
128:

```

More specifically, we define the log interface as follows:

- **INIT()**: initializes the log.
- **PROPOSE(b)**: proposes to add block b .
- **FINAL(b)**: finalizes b .
- **COMMIT(b)**: commits b , its non-committed, slotless causal predecessors, and all blocks in its preceding slots in the log.

To propose a block b , a validator p invokes BBBCA-BCAST(id, sn, b) for a new instance id and the next slot sn available for p . Policies for slot allocation to validators are discussed in Section 6.1.

A *block* becomes finalized when all the blocks in its causal references are finalized and either (1) is bbca-delivered, with or without a slot number, or (2) is decided by the fallback consensus protocol as the value for some slot. A *slot* sn becomes finalized when a block becomes finalized for sn or a \perp value is decided by the fallback consensus protocol for sn . The slot becomes committed when the slot is finalized and its previous

slot is committed. The log grows infinitely and starts with a known committed block (“genesis”).

When a slot becomes finalized at a validator, BBCA-LEDGER triggers a FINAL notification to the validator. The finalized slot value may contain a block, or \perp to mark a “hole”. Subsequently, when the slot becomes committed, BBCA-LEDGER triggers a COMMIT notification.

Fallback finalization protocol. Recall that BBCA only guarantees a weak validity property for slot numbers (see BBCA6 in Section 4). To ensure that any slot is eventually finalized, and therefore all blocks added to the log can eventually become committed, BBCA-LEDGER employs on a fallback finalization protocol which implements a consensus decision on stalled slots.

A validator p maintains a timer for the first non-finalized slot it knows of as sn_{min} . Upon finalizing sn_{min} , p restarts a timer for the next non-finalized position. If the timer expires, p invokes the fallback finalization protocol by triggering the BBCA-FINALIZE event for sn_{min} and subscribes for BBCA-DELIVER-ADOPT on sn_{min} .

Upon a BBCA-DELIVER-ADOPT(sn, b, C_R, Q) event, p BBCA’s a block which includes in its metadata a FINALIZE flag and the information sn, b, C_R . If p has not sent a READY message for sn , then $C_R = \emptyset$ and $b = \perp$.

Algorithm 2 describes the log protocol using a consensus protocol with an external validity predicate (VBC) as a “black-box”. VBC exposes two events, VBC-PARTICIPATE(v, Q) is triggered by a validator to participate in the protocol with a value v , and VBC-DECIDE(v). We assume that VBC satisfies the following properties: if all correct validators participate with some value, eventually, all validators decide a value v , which is the value with which some validator participated (liveness) and, no two validators decide differently (safety). Moreover, any value decided by a correct validator satisfies Q .

Once a validator has bbca-delivered a set of $2f + 1$ blocks with a FINALIZE flag for some sequence number sn , it invokes VBC-PARTICIPATE($[sn, b, C], Q$), where C the corresponding set of $2f + 1$ ready certificates. The proposal entails a non- \perp block b if any of the $2f + 1$ ready certificate is non-empty. The external predicate Q enforces this condition to the value that correct validators deliver via VBTOB. A correct validator finalizes slot sn the first time it receives an event VBC-DECIDE($[sn, b, C]$) with some block b , as soon as it finalizes all b' causal predecessors.

Fallback protocol implementation. There exist several consensus protocols in literature which satisfies the properties described above, such as HotStuff [34] and Tendermint [8]. We implement the fallback protocol using the consensus framework of Fino [24] on top of the DAG which is already populated by including causal references in bbca-delivered blocks, so that no additional messages are required to be exchanged. Information pertaining to the consensus protocol is embedded in the metadata field of blocks. In this way, every BBCA broadcast carries useful payload and allows the system to continue utilizing its bandwidth for transaction dissemination even when resolving non-finalized slots.

Briefly, the Fino consensus framework is structured in views and each view has a designated leader. Upon entering a new view r , the leader broadcasts a proposal for view r with BBCA, by including $proposal(r)$ in the metadata field of the block. The proposal for view r is justified if it has in its causal predecessors either $f+1$ votes for proposal $r-1$, or $2f+1$ complaints for round $r-1$. When a proposal is added to the DAG, if it is justified then correct validators vote for it. To vote for a proposal for view r , a validator includes $vote(r)$ in the metadata field of the block. A consensus proposal is *decided* in the DAG once it has $f + 1$ votes succeeding it. If the proposal for view r is not decided in time, a correct validator BBCA-BCAST a complaint by adding $complaint(r)$ in the metadata of the block. Fino requires that messages by each validator are numbered and authenticated. If a validator delivers some message as the k^{th} from a particular sender, then all other validators deliver the same message as the sender’s k^{th} message. We use the external validity predicate \mathcal{P} of BBCA to enforce this condition.

The first consensus proposal which follows $2f + 1$ predecessor blocks with a FINALIZE flag for some slot number sn , constitutes a consensus proposal to stop waiting for BBCA to finalize the slot sn . It becomes decided by the Fino consensus protocol as described above. Note that Fino proposals do not need to explicitly carry the set not ready certificates C , as the reference the corresponding blocks which carry them as causal predecessors. Figure 6 shows an example of a DAG instance for finalizing an expired slot number.




Figure 6: Finalizing slot 4: Blocks 5, 7, and 8 indicate that validators the timers of p_0 , p_1 , and p_2 expired for slot 4. Validator p_1 , who is a consensus leader for view r , implicitly proposes block 10 for slot 4. Blocks 12 and 13 are the votes for the leader proposal.

Causality. When validator p creates a new block, it includes in it references to a set of *causal predecessors*, a causal-frontier of previously bbca-delivered blocks which p has not previously referenced in other blocks. A reference to block b is simply a pair $(sn, H(b))$, where H a collision resistant hash function and sn the slot number with which b was delivered, or \perp if b is a slotless block. A validator before finalizing a block b which it bbca-delivers, it finalizes all the blocks in b ’s causal predecessors. In other words, finalizations are causal. To ensure

causal finalizations, we want to ensure that no correct validator delivers b without delivering b 's causal predecessors first. For this we use the external validity predicate of BBCA. Moreover, a correct validator, upon receiving a BBCA-BCAST event for a block b , starts a timer for all slot numbers of blocks in its b 's causal predecessors that are not finalized yet. If the timer times out and the slot number is still not finalized, p invokes BBCA-FINALIZE(sn). This timeout along with BBCA and the fallback finalization protocol ensure that if a correct validator proposes a block with a block b' in its causal predecessors, then all correct validators can eventually bbca-deliver or decide b' (see Lemma 7.1). Therefore, a proposal from a correct validator will always eventually satisfy the external validity predicate.

Slotless blocks. Recall that BBCA may deliver slotless blocks without slot numbers. Slotless blocks are not directly assigned to any slot. However, validators receive a FINAL notification as soon as they become finalized. Moreover, when the block b' that references b as a causal predecessor becomes committed, validators receive a COMMIT notification about b together with b' (using any deterministic order among them).

6 Practical Considerations

6.1 Ticketmaster

Key to the good performance of system is an effective way for allocating sequence slots to validators exclusively. Otherwise, sender broadcasts might “collide” in their attempted sequence slots.

It is important to note that in case of collisions, broadcasts are not lost: BBCA eventually delivers every block bbca-bcast by a correct sender, albeit without a sequence number. Therefore, eventually a consensus decision will reference it and it will become committed to the total order. However, this scenario will suffer the same commit delay as previous protocols, which rely on a leader to commit a wave of accumulated broadcasts; we want to avoid this in BBCA-LEDGER. Additionally, eventually blocks carrying sequence numbers need to be enabled for the system to make progress.

To this end, we introduce an abstract functionality referred to as a *ticketmaster*. The goal of a ticketmaster is to assign sequence slots to actively broadcasting validators, hereon referred to as active validators, exclusively and consecutively. In order to prevent Byzantine validators from capriciously attempting to bbca-bcast sequence numbers, potentially causing collisions and slowdowns, validators should be allowed to invoke BBCA-BCAST only with their sequence slots. Validators accept and echo other validators' blocks only when they carry allowed sequence numbers.

There are a number of strategies for realizing a ticketmaster functionality.

Round robin. A communication-less strategy is to assign sequence numbers by a round robin rotation among active validators. For example, say that there are four validators, p_0, p_1, p_2, p_3 . By round robin rotation, they will be assigned sequence slots, 0, 1, 2, 3 respectively, then 4, 5, 6, 7, and so on.

Algorithm 2 BBCA-LEDGER implementation with validity predicates \mathcal{P}, Q .

```

1: Implements:
2:   BBCA-LOG LOG, executed by process  $p$ .
3:
4: Uses:
5:   BBCA
6:   Validated Byzantine Total Order Broadcast, VBTOB
7:
8: Parameters:
9:    $n$  ▷ Number of nodes
10:   $f$  ▷ Maximum number of faulty nodes
11:   $N$  ▷ Set of all  $n$  nodes
12:   $\Delta$  ▷ Progress timeout period
13:   $pid \leftarrow 0$  ▷ BBCA identifier for node  $p$ 
14:   $log$  ▷ Map of blocks per slot number
15:   $toFinalize \leftarrow \{\}$  ▷ Map of boolean values per slot number
16:   $unreferenced \leftarrow \emptyset$  ▷ Set of blocks previously not referenced by some block
17:   $firstUncommitted \leftarrow 0$  ▷ First uncommitted log slot number
18:   $finalized \leftarrow \emptyset$  ▷ Set of finalized blocks
19:   $toFinalize \leftarrow \emptyset$  ▷ Set of (seq no, blocks) tuples pending finalization
20:
21: Struct Block contains
22:   sender ▷ Validator who proposes the block
23:   command ▷ Block metadata
24:   predecessors ▷ Block references
25:   payload ▷ Transaction references
26:
27: upon event INIT () do
28:    $T_f.reset(\Delta)$  ▷ timer with duration  $\Delta$  for the first not uncommitted slot
29:
30: upon event PROPOSE( $b$ ) do
31:   propose( $b, \perp$ )
32:
33: upon event BBCA-DELIVER-COMMIT( $\_, sn, b$ ) do
34:   finalize( $sn, b$ )
35:   if  $b \notin unreferenced$  then
36:      $unreferenced \leftarrow \{b\} \cup unreferenced$ 
37:   end if
38:
39: upon event log[ $firstUncommitted$ ]  $\neq None$  do
40:    $b \leftarrow log[firstUncommitted]$ 
41:   if  $b \neq \perp$  then
42:     for  $b' \in traverse(b)$  do
43:       trigger COMMIT ( $b'$ )
44:     end for
45:   end if
46:    $T_f.reset(\Delta)$ 
47:    $firstUncommitted \leftarrow firstUncommitted + 1$ 
48:
49: upon event  $T_f$ . timeout do
50:   trigger BBCA-FINALIZE ( $firstUncommitted$ )
51:    $T_f.reset(\Delta)$ 
52:    $firstUncommitted \leftarrow firstUncommitted + 1$ 
53:   while  $log[firstNotTimedOut] \neq None$  do
54:      $firstUncommitted \leftarrow firstUncommitted + 1$ 
55:   end while
56:

```

The advantage of round robin is that it removes contention completely, and that it incurs no extra messages. The downside is that it requires all validators to be active in each rotation. Additionally, any validator that fails to use their slot slows down those that come after it because they have to wait for the fallback protocol to finalize the slot.

As a mitigation measure, the set of active validators may be automatically adjusted every time a fallback consensus decision is made in order to finalize a timed-out slot. The consensus decision pertaining a new configuration of active validators would have to specify the slot from which the rotation starts. A new rotation might incur temporary contention due to the switchover, but this does not hurt consistency; it only (potentially) causes a temporary hiccup in throughput.

For example, say slot 3 and 7 fail to finalize within a designated timeout period. A fallback consensus can finalize the

Algorithm 2 BBKA-LEDGER implementation (continues).

```
57: upon event BBKA-DELIVER-ADOPT( $sn, b, C_R, Q$ ) do
58:    $b'.payload \leftarrow payload()$ 
59:   propose( $b', [FINALIZE, sn, b, C_R]$ )
60:
61: upon event BBKA-DELIVER-COMMIT( $\_, b$ ) such that  $b.command =$ 
  [FINALIZE,  $sn', b', C_R$ ] do
62:   if toFinalize[ $sn'$ ][ $q$ ] =  $\perp$  then
63:     toFinalize[ $sn'$ ][ $q$ ]  $\leftarrow sn', b', C_R$ 
64:   end if
65:
66: upon exists ( $id, sn, b$ ) such that  $|\{p \in N \mid toFinalize[sn][p] = (sn, b, C_R)\}| >$ 
   $2f$  do
67:    $C \leftarrow toFinalize[sn]$ 
68:   if exists ( $sn, m, C_R$ )  $\in toFinalize[sn]$  such that  $C_R \neq \emptyset$  then
69:     trigger VBC-PARTICIPATE( $[sn, m, C], Q$ )
70:   else
71:     trigger VBC-PARTICIPATE( $[sn, \perp, C], Q$ )
72:   end if
73:
74: upon event VBC-DECIDE( $sn, b$ ) do
75:   if  $b = \perp$  then
76:      $log[sn] \leftarrow b$ 
77:     return
78:   end if
79:   toFinalize  $\leftarrow \{b\} \cup (b.predecessors \setminus finalized) \cup toFinalize$ 
80:
81: upon exists  $b \in toFinalize$  such that  $b.predecessors \in finalized$  do
82:   trigger BBKA-DELIVER-COMMIT( $\_, sn, b$ )
83:
84: upon event BBKA-BCAST( $\_, sn, b$ ) do
85:   for  $b' \in b.predecessors$  do
86:     if  $b' \notin finalized$  then
87:       trigger timeout( $sn, b$ ) after  $\Delta$ 
88:     end if
89:   end for
90:
91: upon event timeout( $sn, b$ ) do
92:   if  $b \notin finalized$  then
93:     trigger BBKA-FINALIZE( $sn$ )
94:   end if
95:
96: function propose( $b, c$ ):
97:    $id \leftarrow p \parallel pid$ 
98:    $pid \leftarrow pid + 1$ 
99:    $sn \leftarrow next()$ 
100:    $R \leftarrow unreferenced$ 
101:    $unreferenced \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
102:    $b.sender, b.command, b.predecessors \leftarrow p, c, R$ 
103:   trigger BBKA-BCAST( $id, sn, b, \mathcal{P}$ )
104:
105: function payload():
106:   returns the next batch of transaction references, possibly empty
107:
108: function next():
109:   returns the next  $sn$  which  $p$  is assigned
110:
111: function traverse( $p$ ):
112:   traverses a graph with root  $p$  and returns a list of its nodes in a deterministic order
113:
114: function finalize( $sn, b$ ):
115:    $finalized \leftarrow \{b\} \cup finalized$ 
116:   if  $sn \neq -1$  then
117:      $log[sn] \leftarrow b$ 
118:     trigger FINAL( $b'$ )
119:   end if
120:
```

slots with a \perp value, and at the same time, will kick validator p_3 from the active validators' set starting at slot number 8.

To bring p_3 back to the system, there would be another fallback consensus decision with a special control command for adding p_3 back.

Ticketmaster process. Another option is using a ticketmaster server to hand out slot reservations. This works as follows. When a validator wishes to propose a block, it first reaches out to the ticketmaster process with a ticket-request to be assigned a slot. The ticketmaster responds with a certified slot, which the validator can use to invoke BBKA-BCAST with. Note that the slot must be certified by the server to prevent Byzantine

validators from capriciously attempting to BBKA-BCAST sequence numbers. Due to the chance of Byzantine faults, the ticketmaster process should be rotated regularly among nodes every fixed number of slots.

The advantage of this approach is there only active validators need to broadcast. The downside is that the interaction with a ticketmaster process adds two network latencies to the critical path of BBKA. However, note that the messages involved in this interaction are very small. Additionally, batching can amortize the communication cost and delay across a bulk of transmissions.

Experience gained in the benign fault setting [2, 3] indicates that this strategy can perform extremely well, easily reaching hundreds of thousands to a million commits per second. The ticketmaster process, albeit being a bottleneck, is very lightweight and stateless, and therefore can perform with very high throughput.

Hybrid. In a hybrid approach, slots are allocated by a rotational regime. However, each rotation (or group of rotations) is determined by a ticketmaster process on demand. This works as follows.

Except for the first rotation, each validator sends a ticket request to the ticketmaster process of the next rotation. The ticketmaster process waits for a certain threshold of requests (a threshold may be determined by assistant policy), and then bbka-bcasts a message allocating validators to the next set of rotations.

An advantage of the threshold participation requirement is guaranteeing a certain degree of participation fairness, namely, that some fraction of the slots in each rotation will be assigned to correct validators. This is similar to the full rotation regime, however, the hybrid regime has the benefit of adaptively determining a rotation by demand. The downside is the same as having a ticketmaster per request, namely having a server in the critical path of broadcast deliveries.

6.2 Transaction dissemination

Similarly to Narwhal [16], we decouple transaction dissemination from establishing a total order. Transactions can be disseminated by a consistent broadcast protocol run by worker processes. Each validator may correspond to multiple worker processes. Transaction deduplication techniques, as in [29] or [20] can be applied among workers to ensure effective bandwidth utilisation. We do not go in depth with respect to transaction dissemination, as this is still a work in progress.

Also, a practical implementation of BBKA would avoid repeatedly sending the actual user payload in ECHO, READY, and CHECKPOINT messages, but instead with block digests whenever possible. One can pull the full payload from the validator that first sends a block and a correct validator only needs to do it once throughout the entire BBKA instance. Therefore, in our implementation, an auxiliary <PULL> message is used to trigger the resend of an ECHO/READY/CHECKPOINT message with the full payload in place of the hash. An adversary cannot effectively abuse this pull-style functionality as a validator needs to resend a full payload at most once to each of other correct validators. It does not impose additional latency

when every validators just receive the payload in the INITIATE message and also handles the scenario where the asynchrony of the network could make an ECHO/READY message arrive earlier than INITIATE message, with the minimum communication overhead. Another optimization would be to precariously send an YIELD message upon receiving an INITIATE message with a conflicting sequence number. Last, we follow PBFT [11] which requires signed messages. However, we could replace signatures with authenticated point-to-point channels, similarly to [12].

6.3 Pacing dissemination via the DAG

BBCA broadcasts form a DAG, whose primary purpose is the fallback consensus mechanism. However, We can utilize the DAG itself to prevent the use of the DAG for fallback. What we mean by this is the following.

Optimistically, BBCA-LEDGER should operate at its full speed even without ever reverting to the fallback consensus. In theory, one can create contentionless and gap-less broadcasts. We are therefore designing BBCA-LEDGER to synchronize the pace of block generations among validators. This is needed because validators would otherwise keep working on their own slots, where the fastest stays way ahead of others, leaving lots of gaps which don't contribute to the commit progress. While a process-based ticketmaster could balance the pace, it is more natural to just make use of the DAG itself for synchronization. It also helps unify the happy path with the fallback path as there is already some causality among the blocks. Our current implementation uses a simple strategy: each validator can at most have k outstanding BBCA instances. Whenever some instances are finalized, the validator can immediately dispatch new broadcasts. A validator keeps track of the frontier set (blocks without causal successors), which is used as the references for a generated block. The frontier is then set to only contain the new block once it is finalized. This design does not require extra timeouts and relies on the causality of the DAG to help synchronize the pace.

7 Correctness Arguments

7.1 BBCA implementation

In this section we argue that BBCA implementation in Algorithm 1 satisfies BBCA properties.

7.1.1 Integrity Integrity is satisfied by correct validators only sending a ECHO message for an INITIATE message signed by the dedicate sender of the instance (see Algorithm 1, line 38).

7.1.2 No duplication No duplication trivial to satisfy by a correct validator checking that it has not bbca-delivered for the same instance before (see Algorithm 1, lines 67, 111).

7.1.3 Consistency Let's assume by contradiction that there exist correct validators p and q who bbca-deliver (id, sn, b) and (id, sn', b') with $sn \neq sn'$ or $b \neq b'$.

There are three conditions which, upon being satisfied, cause a validator to trigger BBCA-DELIVER-COMMIT(p, id, sn, b): (a) by receiving $2f + 1$ matching READY messages before a timeout for instance id or a BBCA-FINALIZE(sn) event, (b)

because of a VRB-DELIVER event, and (c) by receiving $f + 1$ matching CHECKPOINT messages.

We exhaustively examine all the possible combinations.

- (1) Both p and q trigger BBCA-DELIVER-COMMIT by condition (a).
- (2) Both p and q trigger BBCA-DELIVER-COMMIT by condition (b).
- (3) One of p and q triggers BBCA-DELIVER-COMMIT by condition (a) and one of p and q triggers BBCA-DELIVER-COMMIT by condition (b).
- (4) Both p and q trigger BBCA-DELIVER-COMMIT by condition (c).
- (5) One of p and q triggers BBCA-DELIVER-COMMIT by conditions (a) or (b) and one of p and q triggers BBCA-DELIVER-COMMIT by condition (c).
- (6) One of p and q triggers BBCA-DELIVER-COMMIT before a timeout on instance id or BBCA-FINALIZE for sn or sn' has been triggered and the other after.

Case 1. In this case, p has received $2f + 1$ ECHO messages for (id, sn, b) and q has received $2f + 1$ ECHO messages for (id, sn', b') , which suggests that there exists a correct validator who sent an ECHO message for both triplets. A contradiction, since a correct validator sends only one ECHO message per instance (see Algorithm 1, line 38).

Case 2. A contradiction due to the consistency property of VRB (no two different correct validators trigger VRB-DELIVER for different messages).

Case 3. Let's assume, without loss of generality, that p bbca-delivers before a timeout on instance id or a BBCA-FINALIZE event (condition (a)) and q after (condition (b)). Therefore p has received $2f + 1$ ECHO messages for (id, sn, b) . This suggests that the external validity predicate for VRB is satisfied: there exist some ready certificate $C_R \neq \emptyset$ for id, sn', b' , i.e., $2f + 1$ validators sent an ECHO message for id, sn', b' . A contradiction, since a correct validator sends only one ECHO message per instance.

Case 4. In this case, p has received $f + 1$ CHECKPOINT messages from $f + 1$ validators for (id, sn, b) , among which there exists at least one correct validator, let's call it p_1 . Similarly, q has received $f + 1$ CHECKPOINT messages from $f + 1$ validators for (id, sn', b') , among which there exists at least one correct validator, let's call it q_1 . If $p_1 = q_1$, then p_1 has triggered BBCA-DELIVER-COMMIT for different triplets, a contradiction. If $p_1 \neq q_1$, they have triggered BBCA-DELIVER-COMMIT due to either (a) or (b). Hence, we fall back to cases 1, 2, and 3.

Case 5. Let's assume, without loss of generality, that p has received $f + 1$ CHECKPOINT messages from $f + 1$ validators for (id, sn, b) , among which there exists at least one correct validator, let's call it p_1 . In this case p_1 has triggered BBCA-DELIVER-COMMIT due to either (a) or (b). Therefore, we fall back to cases 1, 2, and 3 for the correct validators p_1 and q .

7.1.4 Unique sequencing Again, let's assume by contradiction that there exist correct validators p and q who bbca-deliver (id, sn, b) and (id', sn, b') with $id \neq id'$ and $b \neq b'$.

Since $sn \neq -1$, both p and q trigger BBCA-DELIVER-COMMIT before a timeout on instance id or id and before BBCA-FINALIZE for sn .

Therefore, p has received $2f+1$ ECHO messages for (id, sn, b) and q has received $2f + 1$ ECHO messages for (id', sn, b') , which suggests that there exists a correct validator who sent an ECHO message for both triplets. A contradiction, since a correct validator sends only one ECHO message per slot number (see Algorithm 1, line 38).

7.1.5 Validity

Synchronous network communication. If the network is synchronous, i.e. we are after GST, no correct validator triggers a BBCA-FINALIZE event and there is no invocation of BBCA-BCAST with the same slot number s , by the weak sequencing validity property, every correct validator delivers the same triplet (id, sn, b) .

Let's assume now that we are before GST.

Timed-out instances. There exist two mutually exclusive cases: (a) at least $f + 1$ correct validators who timed-out for instance id and (b) at most f validators timed-out for instance id .

In case (a), all correct validators will receive a YIELD message and, therefore, send an YIELD message themselves. Therefore, the sender of the instance will receive $2f + 1$ YIELD messages and invoke VRB-BCAST(id, sn', b) where $sn' = sn$ or $sn' = -1$, depending on the ready certificates in the YIELD messages. Since the sender is correct, by VRB validity, all correct validators will VRB-deliver (id, sn', b) , and, therefore, all correct validators who had timed-out before sending an YIELD message bbca-deliver id, sn', b . Finally, by BBCA consistency, all correct validators will bbca-deliver id, sn', b .

In case (b), there exist at least $f + 1$ correct validators who bbca-deliver (id, sn, b) . They all deliver (id, sn, b) by BBCA consistency property. Therefore, all correct validators, who had not delivered before, will eventually receive $f + 1$ CHECKPOINT messages and bbca-deliver (id, sn, b) .

Conflicting instances. Let us now assume that some other sender invokes BBCA-BCAST(id', sn, b'). If some correct validator sends an ECHO message for (id', sn', b') before receiving an INITIATE message for (id, sn, b) , then it is possible that some correct validators will not gather $2f + 1$ ECHO messages for (id, sn, b) , resulting in a timeout for instance id . Then validity follows by the same arguments as in timed-out instances paragraph.

Finalizations. If some correct validator triggers a BBCA-FINALIZE event before it bbca-delivers, it will timeout for instance id . Then validity follows by the same arguments as in timed-out instances paragraph.

7.1.6 Weak sequencing validity Since there is no other instance bbca-bcast with sn , no correct validator has sent an $\langle \text{ECHO}, id', sn, b' \rangle$ message. Also, since the sender is correct, it invokes BBCA-BCAST for id, sn, b such that $\mathcal{P}(id, sn, b) = \text{TRUE}$. Moreover, since we are after GST no correct validator triggers BBCA-FINALIZE(sn) and no timeout occurs for id . Therefore, every correct validator sends an $\langle \text{ECHO}, id, sn, b \rangle$

message and, thus, every correct validator receives $2f + 1$ valid ECHO messages and sends a READY message. Similarly, every correct validator receives $2f + 1$ valid READY messages and bbca-delivers (id, sn, b) . Finally, by consistency and unique sequencing properties, all validators bbca-deliver (id, sn, b) .

7.1.7 External validity If $P(b)$ is not satisfied, no correct validator sends an ECHO message. Therefore, no correct validator can deliver (id, sn, b) .

7.1.8 Finalization A BBCA-FINALIZE(sn) event trivially triggers a BBCA-DELIVER-ADOPT event by the implementation (see Algorithm 1, line 87). Let's now argue about the second part of the property. In our implementation the proof π is a ready certificate. Predicate Q corresponds to no ready certificate being empty. Therefore, we have $2f + 1$ empty ready certificates, among which at least $f + 1$ are from correct validators. Since $f + 1$ correct validators did not send a READY message, there exist at most $2f$ validators which sent a READY message for slot number sn . Therefore, no correct validator could have bbca-delivered id, sn, b for any block b and any instance id .

7.2 BBCA-LEDGER implementation correctness

Let us first formally specify the properties we need BBCA-LEDGER to guarantee.

- **Safety**
 - *Consistency*: If two correct validators p and q commit blocks b and b' respectively to the same slot, then $b=b'$.
- **Liveness**
 - *Infinite log growth*: Eventually all correct validators commit a value (a block or the special \perp value) for any slot.
 - *Eventual progress*: After GST the log grows with non \perp values.

We argue that the implementation in Algorithm 2 satisfies the properties of BBCA-LEDGER.

7.2.1 Consistency We prove consistency by contradiction[†]. Let us assume that validators p and q commit blocks p and q at slot sn with $b \neq b'$. There exist six potential ways in which the blocks have been committed.

- (1) Both p and q bbca-delivered b and b' with sn .
- (2) One of p, q bbca-delivered the corresponding block and the other decided via the fallback protocol.
- (3) Both p, q decided via the fallback protocol.
- (4) One of p and q bbca-delivered b and the other pulled b' from another validator.
- (5) One of p and q decided b via the fallback protocol and the other pulled b' from another validator.
- (6) Both p, q pulled b and b' from other validators.

In the first case, p and q bbca-delivered (id, sn, b) and (id', sn, b') respectively. Then, from BBCA unique sequencing property (BBCA4), $b = b'$, a contradiction.

[†] Slotless blocks inherit consistency from the blocks with slot numbers by which they are committed.

In the second case, let us assume without loss of generality that p bbca-delivered id, sn, b and q decided sn, b' . Therefore, within BBCA, p received $2f + 1$ READY messages, $f + 1$ out of which from a set of correct validators S_1 . Let S_2 be the set of validators who invoked the BBCA-FINALIZE events leading to q deciding. S_1, S_2 intersect in at least one correct validator; let's name the correct validator p_c . By belonging in set S_1 , p_c sent a READY message for block b , and as argued above already, b is unique with such a ready message for sn . Hence, q must decide on b , because S_2 includes the ready-certificate C_R by p_c . A contradiction.

In the third case, let us assume that p and q decide sn, b and sn, b' respectively. By the VBC safety, no two correct processes decide differently. Hence, $b = b'$. A contradiction.

In the fourth case, let's assume without loss of generality that q pulled b' from another validator. This means that b' was referenced in $f + 1$ blocks the q bbca-delivered such each of them was bbca-cast by a different validator. Among the $f + 1$ validators at least one is correct. Let's name the correct validator p_c . Therefore, p_c bbca-delivered b' with sn . A contradiction follows from the arguments for case (1) for p and p_c . Similarly, case (5), assuming that p decided via the fallback consensus, reduces to case (2) for p and p_c . Finally, in case (6), both blocks b and b' are referenced by $f + 1$ blocks. Therefore, there exist correct validators p_c and q_c who bbca-delivered b and b' and the contradiction follows from case (1).

7.2.2 Infinite log growth

LEMMA 7.1. *Totality: If a correct validator bbca-delivers a block (id, sn, b) or decides sn for b via the fallback consensus protocol, then every correct validator either bbca-delivers (id, sn, b) or decides b for slot number sn via the fallback consensus protocol.*

PROOF. If the BBCA sender p_s for instance id is correct, by BBCA integrity, p_s has invoked bbca-cast for (id, sn, b) and, by BBCA validity, eventually every correct validator delivers (id, sn, b) . We examine the case where BBCA sender is not correct. There are two possible cases; either $sn = -1$ or $sn \neq -1$. In the first case, b is delivered in the second phase of BBCA, i.e. via a validated reliable broadcast instance which guarantees totality. In the second case, if $f + 1$ correct validators bbca-deliver (id, sn, b) , then every correct validator bbca-delivers (id, sn, b) via the BBCA checkpointing mechanism. Otherwise, for the BBCA-ledger protocol, sn will cause a timeout for at least $f + 1$ correct validators. This is because, by BBCA consistency property, no correct validator will deliver any block other than b for sn . Therefore, at least $f + 1$ correct validators will bbca-cast a block with the FINALIZE flag which, by BBCA validity, will be bbca-delivered by all correct validators. Therefore, all correct validators to bbca-cast a block with the FINALIZE flag and eventually trigger VBC for sn . By VBC liveness and following the argumentation of Section 7.2.1, all correct validators will eventually decide b for sn . Finally, if a correct validator decides sn for b via the fallback consensus protocol, then by the properties of the fallback consensus, all correct validators eventually decide sn for b .

LEMMA 7.2. *Causality: If a correct validator p either bbca-delivers (id, sn, b) or decides b for slot number sn via the fallback consensus protocol, where $b \neq \perp$, then p eventually finalizes b with sn .*

PROOF. Let us assume by contradiction that there exists a causal predecessor b' of b which p never delivers, and therefore p cannot finalize b . In the first case, where p either bbca-delivers, by BBCA external validity property, the external predicate P is valid for b , i.e., p has bbca-delivered b' . A contradiction. In the second case, where p decides b via the fallback finalization protocol, since $b \neq \perp$, there exists at least one non empty ready certificate for b . This suggests that $2f + 1$ validators sent ECHO messages for b , and therefore, they had already delivered b' . Among them, there exist at least $f + 1$ correct. Therefore, by Lemma 7.1, all correct validators, including p , will eventually deliver p . A contradiction.

Using Lemma 7.1 and Lemma 7.2 we prove the infinite log property for sn_{min} , the first slot number which has not been committed. Then by a simple induction argument we can show that the property holds for any slot number.

Let's assume by contradiction that some correct validator p never commits a value in slot sn_{min} . This will eventually trigger a timeout for slot number sn_{min} and p will trigger BBCA-FINALIZE(sn_{min}). Let t be the number of correct validators who bbca-deliver a block b for slot number sn_{min} . We examine two mutually exclusive sub-cases.

- (1) $t \geq f + 1$: At least $f + 1$ correct validators bbca-deliver a block b for slot number sn_{min} and $b \neq \perp$.
- (2) $t < f$: There exist at least f more correct validators whose timer for sn_{min} expires.

In the first case, since the $f + 1$ correct validators are correct, by Lemma 7.1, all correct validators, including p , will either bbca-deliver b with sn or VBC-decide b for sn and by Lemma 7.2, p will finalize slot sn with b . Since, by assumption, all slots before sn_{min} are committed, then sn_{min} also gets committed. A contradiction.

In the second case $f + 1$ correct validators will bbca-bcast a block with a FINALIZE flag for sn_{min} . By BBCA validity, all correct validators will bbca-deliver the blocks, causing eventually all correct validators to bbca-bcast a block with a FINALIZE flag for sn_{min} . Therefore, all correct validators will bbca-deliver at least $2f + 1$ blocks with a FINALIZE flag for sn_{min} carrying a valid ready certificate and will invoke VBC-PARTICIPATE($\{sn_{min}, b, C\}, Q$), where C be set of the ready certificates of the first $2f + 1$ blocks which satisfy the predicate Q for sn_{min} and some block b , possibly also \perp . By VBC liveness, all correct validators, including p , receive VBTOD-DECIDE($\{sn_{min}, b, C\}$). By Lemma 7.2, p finalizes b with sn_{min} . Since p has committed all slots before sn_{min} , it also commits slot sn_{min} . A contradiction.

7.2.3 *Eventual progress* If a correct validator p invokes BBCA for some block b which includes a set of causal references to a set of blocks B , such that p has either bbca-delivered or VBC-decided for each block in B , then, by Lemma 7.1, all correct validators will bbca-deliver or VBC-decide for all blocks in B . Therefore, the external validity predicate for

BBCA will be satisfied for all correct validators. Moreover, by the weak sequencing validity property of BBCA (BBCA₆), after GST, if some correct validator p invokes BBCA-BCAST for some slot number sn , all correct validators will BBCA-DELIVER-COMMIT sn with some block $b \neq \perp$, and hence add it to the log, if the following conditions hold:

- (1) No correct validator invokes BBCA-FINALIZE for sn .
- (2) There exists no other validator who invokes BBCA for sn .

The first condition is satisfied, since we are after GST and, therefore no validator will timeout. The second condition depends on the ticket master implementation. As we cover in Section 6.1, the ticketmaster functionality ensures that all correct validators are assigned slot numbers and, moreover, slot numbers are assigned exclusively. The round robin strategy satisfies this by assigning slot numbers to validators in a deterministic way. In the strategies where the ticket master is a server, we achieve this by rotating the ticket master among validators, so that eventually some correct validator assumes the role.

8 Conclusion

BBCA-LEDGER is a Byzantine log replication technology enabling parallel broadcasts, where each broadcast is sequenced independently and can finalize instantaneously. While a gap in the sequence numbers will delay the commit of higher sequence numbers, the log continues to be filled, hence the resources of the system are continuously utilized. Moreover, consensus decisions about gaps in sequence numbers are likewise embedded within broadcasts accumulating is a DAG structure, hence have throughput utility as well.

BBCA-LEDGER is built around a novel consistent broadcast variant, BBCA, that attempts to add unique sequence numbers to messages, while maintaining the safety and liveness guarantees of Byzantine consistent broadcast. Using BBCA to build a DAG of sequenced messages allows us to commit to a total order of messages extremely fast in the common case. At the same time, using the DAG to derive consensus under contention, allows our system to maintain the high throughput scalability of state-of-art DAG protocols.

References

- [1] Leemon Baird. The swirls hashgraph consensus algorithm: Fair, fast, byzantine fault tolerance. *Swirls Tech Reports SWIRLDS-TR-2016-01, Tech. Rep.*, 34:9–11, 2016.
- [2] Mahesh Balakrishnan, Jason Flinn, Chen Shen, Mihir Dharamshi, Ahmed Jafri, Xiao Shi, Santosh Ghosh, Hazem Hassan, Aaryaman Sagar, Rhed Shi, et al. Virtual consensus in delos. In *Proceedings of the 14th USENIX Conference on Operating Systems Design and Implementation*, pages 617–632, 2020.
- [3] Mahesh Balakrishnan, Dahlia Malkhi, Vijayan Prabhakaran, Ted Wobber, Michael Wei, and John D Davis. Corfu: A shared log design for flash clusters. In *NSDI*, pages 1–14, 2012.
- [4] Mahesh Balakrishnan, Dahlia Malkhi, Ted Wobber, Ming Wu, Vijayan Prabhakaran, Michael Wei, John D Davis, Sriram Rao, Tao Zou, and Aviad Zuck. Tango: Distributed data structures over a shared log. In *Proceedings of the twenty-fourth ACM symposium on operating systems principles*, pages 325–340, 2013.
- [5] Mahesh Balakrishnan, Chen Shen, Ahmed Jafri, Suyog Mapara, David Geraghty, Jason Flinn, Vidhya Venkat, Ivailo Nedelchev, Santosh Ghosh, Mihir Dharamshi, Jingming Liu, Filip Gruszczynski, Jun Li, Rounak Tibrewal, Ali Zaveri, Rajeev Nagar, Ahmed Youssef, Francois Richard, and Yee Jiun Song. Log-structured protocols in delos. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGOPS 28th*

Symposium on Operating Systems Principles, SOSP '21, page 538–552, New York, NY, USA, 2021. Association for Computing Machinery.

- [6] Mathieu Baudet, George Danezis, and Alberto Sonnino. Fastpay: High-performance byzantine fault tolerant settlement. In *Proceedings of the 2nd ACM Conference on Advances in Financial Technologies*, pages 163–177, 2020.
- [7] Gabriel Bracha and Sam Toueg. Asynchronous consensus and broadcast protocols. *J. ACM*, 32(4):824–840, 1985.
- [8] Ethan Buchman, Jae Kwon, and Zarko Milosevic. The latest gossip on bft consensus. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.04938*, 2018.
- [9] Christian Cachin, Rachid Guerraoui, and Luís E. T. Rodrigues. *Introduction to Reliable and Secure Distributed Programming (2. ed.)*. Springer, 2011.
- [10] Christian Cachin, Klaus Kursawe, Frank Petzold, and Victor Shoup. Secure and efficient asynchronous broadcast protocols. *IACR Cryptol. ePrint Arch.*, page 6, 2001.
- [11] Miguel Castro and Barbara Liskov. Practical Byzantine fault tolerance. In Margo I. Seltzer and Paul J. Leach, editors, *Proceedings of the Third USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI)*, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, February 22–25, 1999, pages 173–186. USENIX Association, 1999.
- [12] Miguel Castro and Barbara Liskov. Practical Byzantine fault tolerance and proactive recovery. *ACM Trans. Comput. Syst.*, 20(4):398–461, 2002.
- [13] Tyler Crain, Christopher Natoli, and Vincent Gramoli. Red belly: A secure, fair and scalable open blockchain. In *2021 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 466–483. IEEE, 2021.
- [14] George Danezis and David Hrycyszyn. Blockmania: from block dags to consensus. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.01620*, 2018.
- [15] George Danezis, Lefteris Kokoris-Kogias, Alberto Sonnino, and Alexander Spiegelman. Narwhal and tusk: a dag-based mempool and efficient bft consensus. In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth European Conference on Computer Systems*, pages 34–50, 2022.
- [16] George Danezis, Lefteris Kokoris-Kogias, Alberto Sonnino, and Alexander Spiegelman. Narwhal and tusk: a dag-based mempool and efficient BFT consensus. In Yérom-David Bromberg, Anne-Marie Kermarrec, and Christos Kozyrakis, editors, *EuroSys '22: Seventeenth European Conference on Computer Systems, Rennes, France, April 5 - 8, 2022*, pages 34–50. ACM, 2022.
- [17] Cynthia Dwork, Nancy A. Lynch, and Larry J. Stockmeyer. Consensus in the presence of partial synchrony. *J. ACM*, 35(2):288–323, 1988.
- [18] Adam Gagol, Damian Leśniak, Damian Straszak, and Michał Świątek. Aleph: Efficient atomic broadcast in asynchronous networks with byzantine nodes. In *Proceedings of the 1st ACM Conference on Advances in Financial Technologies*, pages 214–228, 2019.
- [19] Rachid Guerraoui, Petr Kuznetsov, Matteo Monti, Matej Pavlovic, and Dragos-Adrian Seredinschi. The consensus number of a cryptocurrency. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*, pages 307–316, 2019.
- [20] Suyash Gupta, Jelle Hellings, and Mohammad Sadoghi. RCC: resilient concurrent consensus for high-throughput secure transaction processing. In *37th IEEE International Conference on Data Engineering, ICDE 2021, Chania, Greece, April 19-22, 2021*, pages 1392–1403. IEEE, 2021.
- [21] <https://linera.io/whitepaper>. Linera: a blockchain infrastructure for highly scalable web3 applications. 2022.
- [22] Idit Keidar, Oded Naor, and Ehud Shapiro. Cordial miners: A family of simple, efficient and self-contained consensus protocols for every eventuality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.09174*, 2022.
- [23] Kfir Lev-Ari, Alexander Spiegelman, Idit Keidar, and Dahlia Malkhi. Fairledger: A fair blockchain protocol for financial institutions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.03819*, 2019.
- [24] Dahlia Malkhi and Pawel Szalachowski. Maximal extractable value (MEV) protection on a DAG. *CoRR*, abs/2208.00940, 2022.
- [25] Andrew Miller, Yu Xia, Kyle Croman, Elaine Shi, and Dawn Song. The honey badger of bft protocols. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security*, pages 31–42, 2016.
- [26] Team Rocket, Maofan Yin, Kevin Sekniqi, Robbert van Renesse, and Emin Gün Sirer. Scalable and probabilistic leaderless bft consensus through metastability. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.08936*, 2019.
- [27] Yonatan Sompolinsky and Aviv Zohar. Secure high-rate transaction processing in bitcoin. In *Financial Cryptography and Data Security: 19th International Conference, FC 2015, San Juan, Puerto Rico, January 26-30, 2015, Revised Selected Papers 19*, pages 507–527. Springer, 2015.
- [28] Alexander Spiegelman, Neil Girdharan, Alberto Sonnino, and Lefteris Kokoris-Kogias. Bullshark: Dag bft protocols made practical. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 2705–2718, 2022.
- [29] Chrysoula Stathakopoulou, Tudor David, Matej Pavlovic, and Marko Vukolic. [solution] Mir-BFT: Scalable and robust BFT for decentralized networks. *J. Syst. Res.*, 2(1), 2022.

- [30] Chrysoula Stathakopoulou, Matej Pavlovic, and Marko Vukolic. State machine replication scalability made simple. In Y erom-David Bromberg, Anne-Marie Kermarrec, and Christos Kozyrakis, editors, *EuroSys '22: Seventeenth European Conference on Computer Systems, Rennes, France, April 5 - 8, 2022*, pages 17–33. ACM, 2022.
- [31] The MystenLabs Team. The Sui smart contracts platform. 2022.
- [32] Michael Wei, Amy Tai, Christopher J Rossbach, Ittai Abraham, Maithem Munshed, Medhavi Dhawan, Jim Stabile, Udi Wieder, Scott Fritchie, Steven Swanson, et al. vcorfu: A cloud-scale object store on a shared log. In *14th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation*, 2017.
- [33] Lei Yang, Seo Jin Park, Mohammad Alizadeh, Sreeram Kannan, and David Tse. {DispersedLedger} : {High-Throughput} byzantine consensus on variable bandwidth networks. In *19th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 22)*, pages 493–512, 2022.
- [34] Maofan Yin, Dahlia Malkhi, Michael K Reiter, Guy Golan Gueta, and Ittai Abraham. Hotstuff: Bft consensus with linearity and responsiveness. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*, pages 347–356, 2019.