

Optimized Denial-of-Service Threats on the Scalability of LT Coded Blockchains

Harikrishnan K and J. Harshan
Department of Electrical Engineering
Indian Institute of Technology Delhi, India

Anwitaman Datta
School of Computer Science and Engineering
Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

Abstract—Coded blockchains have acquired prominence in the recent past as a promising approach to slash the storage costs as well as to facilitate scalability. Within this class, Luby Transform (LT) coded blockchains are an appealing choice for scalability in heterogeneous networks owing to the availability of a wide range of low-complexity LT decoders. While these architectures have been studied from the aspects of storage savings and scalability, not much is known in terms of their security vulnerabilities. Pointing at this research gap, in this work, we present novel denial-of-service (DoS) threats on LT coded blockchains that target nodes with specific decoding capabilities, thereby preventing them from joining the network. Our proposed threats are non-oblivious in nature, wherein adversaries gain access to the archived blocks, and choose to execute their threat on a subset of them based on underlying coding scheme. We show that our optimized threats can achieve the same level of damage as that of blind attacks, however, with limited amount of resources. This is the first work of its kind that opens up new questions on designing coded blockchains to jointly provide storage savings, scalability and resilience to optimized threats.

Index Terms—Blockchain, Luby transform codes, DoS threats, Non-oblivious adversaries

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Blockchain, which emerged as the underlying technology for cryptocurrencies, has also gained popularity in a number of other applications such as Internet of Things (IoT), health-care and supply chains. Owing to its distinguished security properties of decentralization, distributed trust, immutability and transparency, blockchain relies on the so-called *full nodes* whose functionalities include preserving the blockchain history, independently validating new blocks and bootstrapping new nodes that wish to join the network. However, due to the rapid growth in the size of blockchain [1], the storage requirements of full nodes have also increased. Consequently, this has led to a significant drop in the number of full nodes over the years [2], thereby affecting the decentralization property of blockchain.

In the recent past, several approaches such as simplified payment verification, block pruning and sharding have been proposed to cut down the storage cost of full nodes. However, these approaches are prone to security issues, as reported in [3]. As a result, coded blockchain [4] has emerged as an alternative approach to securely scale the blockchain with reduced storage requirement on the devices of the nodes. The idea of coded blockchain originates from distributed storage settings wherein all the archived blocks of a node, say a full

node, are erasure coded using an underlying coding strategy to generate coded blocks. Subsequently, these coded blocks are distributed across a number of storage devices, referred to as droplet nodes, thereby reducing storage requirement per device and also enhancing reliability against device failures [5]. With such an architecture, a new node that wishes to mirror the blockchain would need to contact sufficient number of droplet nodes, download their data and then apply a decoding strategy to recover the archived-blocks. While coded blockchains enjoy the benefits in reduced storage size, it requires new nodes to download more data compared to the uncoded counterparts. In this line, [6] proposed a secure fountain (SeF) architecture for blockchains by using Luby Transform (LT) codes to provide storage benefits. Furthermore, LT codes were chosen in [6] as they offer the following advantages on scalability: (i) new nodes would need to download marginally larger-sized data than the uncoded counterpart, and (ii) new nodes have the choice to use from a wide range of low-complexity LT decoders depending on their computational-complexity and communication overhead.

In this work, we are interested in analyzing the vulnerability of coded blockchain architectures against security threats that target their scalability feature. Since full nodes assist in bootstrapping new nodes in the network, it is essential to study their vulnerability to a wide range of active threats. One way in which an adversary or a group of adversaries could jeopardize scalability is to contact full nodes as potential new nodes and then deny them from serving other new nodes in the network by flooding service requests. Another option for the adversaries is to contact full nodes, compromise their access structure and then manipulate their coded blocks in the form of integrity threats or ransomware threats. Consequently such attacks forbid new nodes from downloading the contents of those full nodes, thereby stalling scalability. With such potential threats on the full nodes in blockchain, in this work, we explore whether the coded structure of LT-coded architecture in [6] provides any advantage to the adversaries in terms of the attack strategies.

A. Contributions

While our main focus is on highlighting the vulnerabilities of the LT coded blockchains, we also design practical decoders that are suitable for heterogeneous download and computational capabilities of the storage nodes. To this end we propose




Fig. 1. Depiction of coded blockchain architecture wherein k blocks of an epoch are coded to generate S coded blocks and then stored across S droplet nodes. The vectors \mathbf{v} store the indices of the message blocks used to generate the corresponding coded block, thus capturing the degree information.

Bootstrap Rigid Hybrid (BRH) decoder and the Complexity-Rigid Hybrid (CRH) decoder, both of which exploit the advantage of low-complexity of the well-known Belief Propagation (BP) decoder and low communication overhead of the well-known On-the-Fly Gaussian Elimination (OFG) decoder.

For vulnerability analysis, we propose reasonable attack strategies specific to all the four above-mentioned LT decoders, given that the adversary has information about a subset of storage nodes. This allows an adversary to deny new nodes with certain download and computational capabilities from joining the blockchain network, thereby hampering its scalability. We also consider a cost constrained adversary, for which the total cost that the adversary could spend in terms of reading the contents of the storage nodes as well as launching the DoS attack on a subset of them, is fixed. Under such a constraint, our analysis assists the adversary to obtain the optimal fraction of storage nodes that has to be read/attacked to incur maximum decoding failure rate in the decoder he targets. Overall, our work is the first of its kind in analysing the threats caused by a non-oblivious adversary in LT coded blockchain architecture.

II. LT CODED BLOCKCHAIN ARCHITECTURE

To accommodate the rapid growth in the size of a full node, coded blockchain framework distributes the contents of a full node as coded fragments across multiple smaller-sized storage devices. In such an architecture, the entire set of transactions stored on a full node is divided into several *epochs*, wherein an epoch is defined as a collection of k blocks of the blockchain, for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. For every epoch, a set of coded blocks referred to as *droplets* are generated, and these are stored on storage constrained nodes referred to as *droplet nodes*. Henceforth, we assume that a droplet node will store one droplet per epoch, thus storing as many droplets as the number of epochs. This way, the storage size of full node is slashed by distributing it across smaller-sized storage devices with roughly $\frac{1}{k}$ storage capacity. An illustration of this model is given in Fig. 1. In the next section, we explain how a blockchain is encoded to obtain the droplet nodes using an LT coded architecture [6].

A. Slashing Storage Costs through LT Encoding

When generating the droplets of a full node, LT encoding is done as follows. First, a number $d \in [k]$ is chosen randomly from a suitable probability distribution. Subsequently, d distinct input blocks are uniformly chosen from the k blocks of an epoch, and a bit-wise XOR of the chosen blocks, denoted by C , is obtained. Along with C , a binary vector \mathbf{v} of length k is also generated, wherein the b -th entry is 1 if the b -th input block is among the d chosen blocks, else the b -th entry is 0. This combination of C and \mathbf{v} constitute a droplet for an epoch. We assume that all the droplets that correspond to different epochs, will have the same degree and also the same selection of indexes of the input blocks. In the LT code terminology, the number d , which is referred to as the degree, is picked from the popular Robust Soliton Distribution (RSD) [7, Definition 11]. By choosing d in a statistically independent manner, a total of S droplet nodes, for $S > k$, are created at the full node along the similar lines.

B. Blockchain Retrieval through Traditional LT Decoders

A new storage-constrained node that wants to retrieve the blockchain from a full node is termed as a *bucket node*. For the blockchain retrieval, the bucket node contacts a little more than k droplet nodes (from the set of S nodes), and downloads their droplets corresponding to all the epochs. To perform LT decoding, the bucket node can employ any one of the following traditional LT decoders.

1) *Belief Propagation (BP) Decoder*: The bucket node randomly contacts $K \geq k$ droplet nodes, for some $K \in \mathbb{N}$, and downloads their droplets. Since all the droplets corresponding to a particular droplet node share the same set of neighbours, decoding procedure of one epoch explains the decoding procedure of the entire blockchain. The decoding procedure to recover an epoch is explained as follows:

- 1) Form a bipartite graph \mathcal{T} with the k input blocks as left vertices and the K droplets as right vertices. The input blocks are denoted by $\{B_m \mid m \in [k]\}$, and the droplets are denoted by $\{C_i \mid i \in [K]\}$. An edge connects a droplet C_i to an input block B_m if B_m is used in computing C_i . Note that this information is available from the vector \mathbf{v}_i associated with each C_i .
- 2) Find a droplet C_i , for $i \in [K]$, that is connected to exactly one input block B_m in \mathcal{T} . Such a droplet is called a singleton. If there are no singletons, we declare a decoding failure and terminate the process.
- 3) If C_i is a singleton, set $\hat{B}_m = C_i$, where \hat{B}_m denotes the m -th decoded block. For all the droplets C_i connected to the decoded block B_m in \mathcal{T} , set $C_i \leftarrow C_i \oplus B_m$ (\oplus denotes bit-wise XOR) and modify \mathcal{T} by removing all the edges connected to block B_m .
- 4) If all the k blocks are not recovered, go to Step 2.

For more details on the BP decoding process, we refer the reader to [6, Section 3.2.3]. The BP decoder is said to experience decoding failure if all the k blocks of an epoch cannot be recovered using the K droplet nodes.

2) *On-the-Fly Gaussian Elimination (OFG) Decoder*: The OFG decoder prepares a generator matrix \mathbf{G} , whose rows are the binary vectors $\{\mathbf{v}_i \mid i \in [K]\}$ stored along with the droplets $\{C_i \mid i \in [K]\}$. Subsequently, the decoder works on the principle of Gaussian Elimination (GE) decoding, which requires \mathbf{G} to have rank k for decoding the k blocks of an epoch. The main idea here is to use \mathbf{G} to obtain a sparse upper triangular matrix by deleting redundant equations on the fly. Once the sparse upper triangular matrix is ready, back-substitution can be performed to recover the epoch. For more details on the OFG process, we refer the reader to [8, Algorithm 1]. Note that the OFG decoder is said to experience decoding failure if the rank of \mathbf{G} is less than k .

Other than the BP and OFG decoders, LT coded blockchains can also be retrieved through a class of hybrid decoders.

C. Blockchain Retrieval Through Hybrid Decoders

The idea of hybrid decoders, as described in [9, Section III], is to start with the BP decoding process using the K downloaded droplets and then retrieve the input blocks of an epoch one by one. Once the BP part exhausts its singletons the non-singletons remaining in the BP part are used by its OFG counterpart to retrieve the remaining blocks. This idea exploits the advantage of low-complexity decoding of BP decoder by retrieving as many blocks as possible using BP, and also exploits the advantage of the OFG decoder, which guarantees successful decoding by contacting fewer droplet nodes than the BP decoder. Towards proposing specific variants of the hybrid decoders, we define the two main metrics, namely: *bootstrap-overhead* and *computational-complexity*. Here, bootstrap-overhead is defined as the number of droplet nodes that a bucket node must contact in order to successfully decode an epoch. Similarly, computational-complexity is defined as the number of XOR operations performed between droplets to decode an epoch. To optimally trade the bootstrap-overhead with the computational-complexity for bucket nodes, we propose the following two new variants of hybrid decoders.

1) *Bootstrap-Rigid Hybrid (BRH) Decoder*: With this decoder, the bucket node initially decides on the number of droplet nodes that it contacts. Let that number be K , for some $K > k$. Then, it executes the generic hybrid decoding method as explained earlier. However, the BRH decoder is particular about the number of droplet nodes it contacts and not concerned about what fraction of the epoch is getting recovered by its BP and OFG counterparts. As a result, the BRH decoder is rigid in terms of bootstrap-overhead and flexible in terms of computational-complexity. Given its flexibility in computational-complexity, the BRH decoder experiences decoding failure if the rank of \mathbf{G} is less than k .

2) *Complexity-Rigid Hybrid (CRH) Decoder*: The CRH decoder initially decides on the number of blocks of an epoch that must be retrieved by its BP part. Let that number be denoted by η_c , such that $0 \leq \eta_c \leq k$. Then the bucket node contacts as many number of droplet nodes K as required so that the BP part of the CRH decoder retrieves at least η_c blocks of an epoch. Once the target η_c is met, the rest of the




Fig. 2. The proposed non-oblivious adversary model wherein a subset of droplet nodes are erased after gathering information on their degrees.

blocks are decoded either using the BP decoder or the OFG decoder. Unlike the BRH decoder, the number of droplet nodes contacted by the bucket node is not fixed in the CRH decoder. Note that the CRH decoder experiences decoding failure in either of the following cases: (i) when η_c blocks cannot be decoded by the BP part even after downloading from all the droplet nodes of a full node, (ii) when the residual $k - \eta_c$ blocks cannot be decoded by the OFG counterpart after successfully decoding the first η_c blocks using the BP decoder.

We emphasize that a bucket node can employ any one of the above variants of the decoders depending on its constraints on the computational-complexity and bootstrap-overhead.

III. DOS THREATS ON LT CODED BLOCKCHAINS

In this section, we consider an adversary or a group of adversaries that launch DoS attacks on a subset of droplet nodes, thereby preventing new bucket nodes from using the compromised droplet nodes for their decoding process. In this work, we adopt a non-oblivious model, wherein the adversaries gain access to a set of droplet nodes, read their contents, and then decide to launch attacks on a subset of their nodes. To execute an attack, we assume that the adversary floods his target set of droplet nodes with repeated service requests such that a legitimate bucket node is not able to access those droplet nodes [10]. Henceforth, throughout the paper, such attacked droplet nodes are referred to as *erased* nodes. In contrast, the residual droplet nodes that are not erased are referred to as *honest* nodes. In the next section, we show that the choice of the erased nodes can be made depending on the decoding capability of the targeted victim nodes that the adversary forbids from joining the network.

A. DoS Threats from Non-Oblivious Adversaries

Let us consider a full node that has S number of droplet nodes under the LT coded architecture. Recall from Section II that the degree information of droplet nodes is available in the form of vector \mathbf{v} along with the coded blocks. On this full node, we consider an adversary who reads the degree information of a randomly chosen σ_0 -fraction of S droplet nodes, where $\sigma_0 \in (0, 1)$. To read the degrees, the adversary acts as a legitimate bucket node, contacts a subset of droplet

nodes and then downloads their droplets. He then uses this information to tactically choose σS nodes to erase among them, where $0 < \sigma \leq \sigma_0$. Fig. 2 depicts our adversarial model wherein regions I, II and III respectively represent the set of droplet nodes that the adversary has (i) neither read nor erased, (ii) read, however not erased, and (iii) both read and erased. As a special case, note that our adversarial model will collapse to oblivious model if $\sigma_0 = \sigma$. This is equivalent to the case when the adversary attacks a randomly chosen σ -fraction of S nodes without reading information on its coded structure.

In the rest of this section, we explore questions on what could be a reasonable *attack strategy* from the adversary's perspective, given that he knows the decoder used by the legitimate bucket nodes for blockchain retrieval. In this context, given the set of $\sigma_0 S$ droplet nodes read by the adversary, a reasonable attack strategy refers to an appropriate selection of a subset of σS droplet nodes to erase, such that the probability of decoding failure at the legitimate bucket node is more than that of blind attack. To this end, we provide reasonable attack strategies specific to BP, OFG, CRH and BRH decoders in the following propositions.

Before presenting the attack strategy against the BP decoder, we recall that the BP decoder thrives on the availability of the singleton droplets and then iteratively generates new singletons to recover the blockchain. Note that the adversary neither has control on the specific droplet nodes that would be accessed by the victim, nor knows the order in which the singletons would be used in the BP decoder. Therefore, under such conditions, a reasonable attack strategy for the adversary is to minimize the probability with which the victim bucket node can access singletons.

Proposition 1. *A reasonable attack strategy against the BP decoder is to arrange the $\sigma_0 S$ droplet nodes in the increasing order of their degrees and then erase the first σS droplet nodes of the sorted set. Note that the order of the droplet nodes having the same degree can be chosen in an arbitrary manner.*

Even with the OFG decoder, the adversary neither has control on the specific droplet nodes accessed by the victim bucket node, nor knows the order in which Gaussian elimination would be used. Therefore, under such conditions, a reasonable attack strategy for the adversary is to minimize the probability with which the victim can access droplet nodes with rank k on the \mathbf{G} matrix.

Proposition 2. *A reasonable attack strategy against the OFG decoder involves the following steps:*

- 1) *Using the $\sigma_0 S$ droplet nodes, the adversary juxtaposes the binary vectors \mathbf{v} corresponding to each droplet and forms a binary matrix of dimensions $\sigma_0 S \times k$.*
- 2) *Then, he identifies $(\sigma_0 - \sigma)S$ rows of the above matrix that will result in the minimum rank.*
- 3) *Finally, he erases the residual σS droplet nodes which correspond to the complementary rows of the above step.*

When using the BRH decoder, recall that the bucket node is flexible with its computational-complexity. As a result,

owing to the possibility of implementing the OFG decoder, minimizing the rank of the \mathbf{G} matrix corresponding to the honest droplet nodes is a reasonable attack strategy.

Proposition 3. *A reasonable attack strategy against the BRH decoder is same as that against the OFG decoder.*

With the CRH decoder, it is clear that its requirements for successfully decoding the blockchain are in terms of both singleton droplet nodes as well as rank offered by the residual honest droplet nodes. As a result, putting forward a reasonable attack strategy for this case is non-trivial. However, given that the BP part of the CRH decoder is executed before the OFG part, we believe that depleting singletons in the network would help stalling the decoding process. Thus, with the following proposition, we show that attacks in Proposition 1 and Proposition 2 are applicable depending on the value of η_c .

Proposition 4. *For the CRH decoder with $\eta_c > 0$, we propose to follow the same attack strategy as that against the BP decoder. However, for the CRH decoder with $\eta_c = 0$, we propose to follow the same attack strategy as that against the OFG decoder.*

B. Simulation Results

In this section, we present the simulation results that demonstrate the effectiveness of the attack strategies corresponding to each of the decoders. To present the simulation results, let us define the read-write ratio for an adversary as $\xi \triangleq \frac{\sigma_0}{\sigma}$. As we have $\sigma_0 \geq \sigma$, this implies $\xi \geq 1$.

First, we conduct simulation results to characterize the decoding failure rate of the BP decoder for a given σ , as a function of ξ . Our experiments are performed for $k = 20$, $S = 3k$ such that $\sigma \in \{0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4\}$. For each value of σ , decoding failure rates are presented with $\xi \in \{1.3, 1.6, 1.9, 2.2, 2.5\}$ for two cases: one wherein the droplets that are erased are randomly chosen, and the other wherein droplets are chosen after executing the proposed attack strategy. For each (σ, ξ) pair, the obtained failure rates are presented in Fig. 3. Based on the blue bars in Fig. 3, it is clear that for a given σ , decoding failure rate increases with increase in ξ when the droplet nodes are erased by executing the proposed attack strategy. This behaviour is intuitive since the adversary should get advantage as he reads more droplet nodes. Furthermore, when the erased droplet nodes are randomly chosen (blind attack), we observe from the green bars that the failure rate remains constant at different values of ξ for a given σ .

Similar experiments are conducted for the OFG decoder and the BRH decoder, and their results are presented in Fig. 4 and Fig. 5, respectively. The inferences in this case are similar to that of the BP decoder. Finally, Fig. 6 demonstrates the comparison on the effectiveness of the attack strategies given in Proposition 1 and Proposition 2 on the CRH decoder. The experiments are performed for $k = 20$, $S = 3k$ and $\sigma = 0.4$. The failure rates of the CRH decoder corresponding to blind attack (green bars), OFG attack strategy (red bars) and BP attack strategy (blue bars) are obtained for values




Fig. 3. Effectiveness of the proposed attack strategy against a bucket node with BP decoder. The parameters for simulations are $k=20$, $S=60$, $\sigma \in \{0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4\}$ and $\xi \in \{1.3, 1.6, 1.9, 2.2, 2.5\}$.




Fig. 4. Effectiveness of the proposed attack strategy against a bucket node with OFG decoder. The parameters for the simulations are $k=20$, $S=60$, $\sigma \in \{0.4, 0.45, 0.5, 0.55\}$, and $\xi \in \{1.2, 1.4, 1.6, 1.8\}$.

of $\xi \in \{1.6, 1.8, 2, 2.2\}$. The experiments are conducted for values of $\eta_c \in \{0, 1, 8, 16\}$, in order to study the behaviour of the employed attack strategies, for different values of η_c . From the plots, we infer that for any non-zero values of η_c , the attack strategy in Proposition 1 produces higher decoding failure rates. However, for $\eta_c = 0$, the attack strategy in Proposition 2 maximises the failure rate because the CRH decoder does not necessarily require any singleton for decoding and hence minimizing the rank of honest droplet nodes is sufficient.




Fig. 5. Effectiveness of the proposed attack strategy against a bucket node with BRH decoder. The simulation parameters for the experiment are $k = 20$, $S = 3k$, $K = 44$, $\sigma \in \{0.4, 0.45, 0.5, 0.55\}$, $\xi \in \{1.3, 1.6, 1.9, 2.2, 2.5\}$.




Fig. 6. Effect of the proposed attack strategies against the CRH decoder. The simulation parameters are $k=20$, $S=60$. The legends for the top two subplots follow for the bottom two subplots.




Fig. 7. Optimal (σ_0, σ) pair to attack BP decoder for $(k = 20, S = 60)$ when $\nu = 1 \times S$.

IV. COST CONSTRAINED OPTIMAL ATTACKS

In the previous section, we have characterized the decoding failure rates of various LT decoders for arbitrary values of σ_0 and σ such that $\sigma_0 \geq \sigma$. However, in practice, there are costs associated with reading and erasing droplet nodes. In this regard, we denote c_r and c_e as the cost to read and erase one droplet node, respectively. Therefore, we introduce attack-cost as a new metric of interest, which is defined as $c_r \times \{\text{no. of droplet nodes read}\} + c_e \times \{\text{no. of droplet nodes erased}\}$. Furthermore, since the attack-cost is usually upper-bounded in practice, we propose a method to choose the optimal pair (σ_0, σ) using which the cost constrained adversary can incur maximum failure rates on the LT decoders.

By defining the read-write cost ratio as $\zeta \triangleq \frac{c_e}{c_r}$ we can rewrite the attack-cost as $c_r \times \sigma_0 S + c_e \times \sigma S = \sigma S c_r \times (\xi + \zeta)$. To simplify the analysis, we normalise c_r to 1, and use the normalised attack-cost as $\sigma S \times (\xi + \zeta)$. Now, let the normalised attack-cost be upper-bounded by ν units for some $\nu > 0$. The corresponding inequality is

$$\sigma S \cdot (\xi + \zeta) \leq \nu. \quad (1)$$

In practice, given S , ν and ζ , the adversary would need to choose the pair (σ_0, σ) such that the failure rates of the targeted decoder is maximized under the constraint in (1) along with the constraints $0 \leq \sigma_0 \leq 1$ and $0 \leq \sigma \leq \sigma_0$. Towards reducing the search space for the above problem without compromising




Fig. 8. Optimal (σ_0, σ) pair to attack OFG decoder for $(k = 20, S = 60)$ when $\nu = 1.5 \times S$.




Fig. 9. Optimal (σ_0, σ) pair to attack BRH decoder for $(k = 20, S = 60)$ with $K = 44$ when $\nu = 1.4 \times S$.

on the failure rates, the following proposition presents tighter bounds on σ and σ_0 .

Proposition 5. *The feasible range for the search space on σ and σ_0 is to use $\sigma \in (0, \frac{\nu}{S(1+\zeta)})$, and then to fix $\sigma_0 = \frac{\nu - \sigma S \zeta}{S}$ for a given value of σ .*

Proof: Rearranging (1), we get $\sigma \cdot (\xi + \zeta) \leq \frac{\nu}{S}$. The maximum value of σ as a function of ζ under this constraint is $\sigma_{\max}(\zeta) = \frac{\nu}{S(1+\zeta)}$. As a result, we get a constraint on σ as $0 < \sigma \leq \sigma_{\max}(\zeta)$. Now, for each value of σ in this range, the corresponding values of ξ lies in the range $1 \leq \xi \leq \frac{\nu - \sigma S \zeta}{\sigma S}$, where the upper limit on ξ is obtained by rearranging (1). From our previous experiments on proving the effectiveness of the proposed attack strategies specific to various decoders, we have shown that for any decoder, the failure rate increases with ξ when σ is constant. Therefore, in this case for a given σ , the maximum value of ξ that satisfies the constraint in (1) results in the maximum decoding failure rate for that σ . ■

Using the above proposition, we are able to reduce the search space to one-dimension, thereby reducing the attack complexity. Fig. 7 to Fig. 10 demonstrates the evaluation of decoding failure rates of BP, OFG, BRH and CRH decoders respectively, for values of σ in the range $0 < \sigma \leq \sigma_{\max}(\zeta)$ with a step size of 0.01, and their corresponding maximum values of ξ . All four decoders use k and S values of 20 and 60, respectively. Fig. 7 finds the optimal (σ_0, σ) using the proposed attack strategy for BP decoder, wherein the normalised attack-cost of the adversary is constrained to $\nu = 1 \times S$. Fig. 8 is for the proposed attack strategy for OFG decoder, where $\nu = 1.5 \times S$. Fig. 9 corresponds to failure rates resulting from attacking the BRH decoder with $K = 44$ and $\nu = 1.4 \times S$. Fig. 10 shows failure rates resulting from CRH decoder with $\eta_c = 6$ and $\nu = 1 \times S$. Also, we have used $\zeta \in \{1.25, 1.5, 1.75, 2\}$.

V. DISCUSSION

In this work, we have investigated the vulnerabilities of LT-coded blockchains against non-oblivious DoS attacks. We have identified that the degree of the droplet nodes, which are easily accessible to the adversary, open doors to the proposed class of attacks. When implementing coded blockchains, one must be




Fig. 10. Optimal (σ_0, σ) pair to attack CRH decoder for $(k = 20, S = 60)$ with $\eta_c = 6$ when $\nu = 1 \times S$.

aware of these threats, and hence take preventive measures against them. Furthermore, as an interesting direction for future research, new coded architectures can be proposed for blockchains that enhance its resilience against optimized threats while also providing the storage savings and scalability features.

REFERENCES

- [1] "Blockchain Size," 2023 [Online]. Available: <https://www.blockchain.com/explorer/charts/blocks-size>
- [2] Z. Voell, "Bitcoin node count falls to 3-year low despite price surge," 2020 [Online]. Available: <https://www.coindesk.com/bitcoin-node-count-falls-to-3-year-low-despite-price-surge>.
- [3] C. Yang, et al. "Scaling blockchains with error correction codes: A survey on coded blockchains," available in *arXiv:2208.09255*, 2022.
- [4] D. Perard, et al. "Erasure Code-Based Low Storage Blockchain Node," in *IEEE International Conference on Internet of Things*, July 2018.
- [5] M. K. Aguilera, R. Janakiraman and L. Xu, "Using erasure codes efficiently for storage in a distributed system," in *International Conference on Dependable Systems and Networks (DSN'05)*, June 2005.
- [6] S. Kadhe, J. Chung, and K. Ramchandran, "SeF: A secure fountain architecture for slashing storage costs in blockchains," available in *arXiv:1906.12140*, June 2019.
- [7] M. Luby, "LT codes," in the *43rd Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, Nov. 2002.
- [8] V. Bioglio, M. Granetto, R. Gaeta, and M. Sereno, "On the fly gaussian elimination for LT codes," in *IEEE Communications Letters*, vol. 13, no. 12, pp. 953-955, Dec. 2009.
- [9] A. Kharel and L. Cao, "Decoding of short LT codes over BIAWGN channels with Gauss-Jordan elimination-assisted belief propagation method," in *2015 Wireless Telecommunications Symposium (WTS)*, April 2015.
- [10] B. Prabadevi and N. Jeyanthi, "Distributed Denial of service attacks and its effects on Cloud environment- a survey," in *International Symposium on Networks, Computers and Communications*, June 2014.