

Fast-HotStuff: A Fast and Resilient BFT protocol for Blockchains

Mohammad M. Jalalzai^{*†}, Jianyu Niu^{*†}, Chen Feng^{*†} and Fangyu Gai^{*†}

^{*}School of Engineering, University of British Columbia (Okanagan Campus)

[†]Blockchain@UBC, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada

{m.jalalzai, jianyu.niu, chen.feng, fangyu.gai}@ubc.ca

Abstract—The HotStuff protocol is a breakthrough in Byzantine Fault Tolerant (BFT) consensus that enjoys both responsiveness and linear view change. It creatively adds an additional round to classic BFT protocols (like PBFT) using two rounds. This brings us to an interesting question: Is this additional round really necessary in practice? In this paper, we answer this question by designing a new two-round BFT protocol called Fast-HotStuff, which enjoys responsiveness and efficient view change that is comparable to linear view change in terms of performance. Compared to (three-round) HotStuff, Fast-HotStuff has lower latency and is more resilient against certain attacks. Moreover, Fast-HotStuff provides friendly support for Proof-of-Stake (PoS) which is very important in blockchain applications. Whereas, HotStuff and its variant LibraBFT fail to have this property as malicious replicas may take over the network. Fast-HotStuff adds a small amount of overhead during the block proposal phase, if the previous primary fails. Moreover, the algorithm has been revised to address the subtle safety violation bug that was mentioned in Gemini [1] (due to the network partitions) without any significant performance penalty. The algorithm still holds all of the previous mentioned contributions.

Index Terms—Blockchain, BFT, Consensus, Latency, Performance, Security.

I. INTRODUCTION

Byzantine fault-tolerant (BFT) consensus has received considerable attention in the last decade due to its promising application in blockchains. Several state-of-the-art BFT protocols including Tendermint [2], Pala [3], Casper FFG [4], and HotStuff [5] have been proposed. These BFT protocols not only support linear message complexity by using advanced cryptography like aggregated signatures, but also enable frequent leader rotation by adopting the chain structure (which is popular in blockchains). What is more, these protocols can be pipelined, which can further improve their performances, and meanwhile, make them much simpler to implement.

The HotStuff protocol is the first to achieve both linear view change and responsiveness, solving a decades-long open problem in BFT consensus. Linear view change enables fast leader rotation while responsiveness drives the protocol to consensus at the speed of actual network delay. Both are desirable properties in blockchain space. To achieve both properties, HotStuff uses threshold signatures and creatively adopts a three-chain commit rule (which takes three rounds of communication among replicas to commit a block). This is in contrast with the two-chain commit rule commonly used in most other BFT protocols [2]–[4], [6]. In BFT protocols, a decision

is made after going through several phases and each phase usually takes one round of communication before moving to the next. Furthermore, HotStuff introduces a chained structure borrowed from blockchain to pipeline all the phases into a unifying propose-vote pattern which significantly simplifies the protocol. Perhaps for this reason, pipelined HotStuff (also called chained HotStuff) is adopted by Facebook’s LibraBFT [7], Flow platform [8], as well as Cypherium Blockchain [9].

The success of HotStuff leads to the following question: **Is an additional phase really necessary in practice?** In particular, *is it possible to design a new BFT protocol (without adding another phase) that retains responsiveness and enjoys efficient view change which is comparable to linear view change in terms of performance?* Such a protocol, if possible, has two salient advantages over HotStuff. First, it saves one round of communication, leading to lower latency. Second, it is more resilient to certain Byzantine behavior in which attackers intentionally create forks to overwrite blocks before they are committed.

In this paper, we answer the above questions by designing a new two-chain variant of HotStuff called Fast-HotStuff that is faster and more resilient to certain attacks than HotStuff. It features responsiveness as well as efficient view change (with performance comparable to linear view change) without introducing an additional phase. Moreover, Fast-HotStuff is resilient to the forking attacks and provides fairness which is an important condition for implementing PoS over the top of a consensus protocol, as explained in later sections. The forking attack in HotStuff is made possible due to the fact that a malicious primary can use an old QC^1 to point to the older block as its parent. In this way, a fork is generated by malicious primary block to override blocks from honest primaries as shown in Figure 1.

The basic idea behind our Fast-HotStuff is simple. Unlike HotStuff, a primary in Fast-HotStuff has to provide a *proof* that it has included the latest QC in the proposed block. The QC in a block points to its parent block. Therefore, by providing proof of the latest/highest QC , a Byzantine primary cannot perform forking attacks. In other words, Fast-HotStuff not only outperforms HotStuff in terms of latency but also enjoys improved resilience (to forking) and fairness.

¹ QC stands for quorum certificate that is built from $n-f$ votes from replicas for a block, which will be explained in later sections.




Fig. 1. Forking attack by the primary of the view $v+3$.

Contributions: The contributions of this paper can be summarized as follows:

- We propose a new BFT protocol, called Fast-HotStuff, for blockchain. It achieves both efficient view change and responsiveness but outperforms HotStuff. Fast-HotStuff is also resilient against forking attacks that HotStuff is subject to.
- We conduct the incentive analysis of both HotStuff and Fast-HotStuff, and show that Fast-HotStuff can achieve fairness which is one of the most important requirements for implementing Proof-of-Stake (PoS)-based blockchains.
- We develop a proof-of-concept implementation of Fast-HotStuff. The experimental results indicate that Fast-HotStuff outperforms HotStuff, especially under forking attacks.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we present a brief overview of classic HotStuff protocol. In Sections III and IV, we describe the system model and a design overview of Fast-HotStuff. Section V provides algorithms for basic Fast-HotStuff and pipelined Fast-HotStuff protocols as well as their safety and liveness proofs. This section also discusses how pipelined Fast-HotStuff is resilient to forking attacks. Evaluation and related work are presented in Sections VI and VII, respectively. The paper is concluded in Section VIII.

II. HOTSTUFF IN A NUTSHELL

In this section, we provide a brief description of the three-chain HotStuff protocol. In addition, we explain the reason why it is risky for PoS-based blockchains to use HotStuff and the LibraBFT.

There are two variants of the three-chain HotStuff protocol, the basic and pipelined HotStuff.² In the basic HotStuff protocol, the primary uses four phases (PREPARE, PRE-COMMIT, COMMIT, DECIDE) to commit a block. Specifically, the primary proposes a block in PREPARE phase, and collect votes from replicas for the proposed block and broadcast the latest QC (which are either formed through collections of votes from $n-f$ replicas or extracted from $PrepareQCs$ from $n-f$ replicas.) to all replicas in the later three phases

The QC in each round proves that at least $f+1$ out of $n-f$ correct replicas have voted in that round. The QC can be realized by threshold signatures containing $n-f$ votes partially signed by each replica. During PRECOMMIT phase, a replica receives $PrepareQC$. In COMMIT phase, the replica places a lock on $PrecommitQC$. The locked $PrecommitQC$ is referred

²The pipelined version is also called Chained HotStuff [5]




Fig. 2. The chain structure of pipelined HotStuff. Curved arrows denote the Quorum certificate references.

to as *lockedQC*. The *lockedQC* provides a safety guard for the block which might be executed during the *Decide* phase. Upon switching to the next view, a replica sends its latest known $PrepareQC$ to the new primary. This allows the primary to choose the latest QC to be included in the next proposal (as previously stated).

In pipelined HotStuff, three phases that are being used for vote collection are pipelined with the PREPARE phase in such a way that in each PREPARE phase the view delegation is handed over to the next primary. In each PREPARE phase, the new primary needs to collect $n-f$ votes before proposing new PREPARE message which also contains the QC (threshold signature) built from $n-f$ votes containing partial signature from each replica. Therefore, each PREPARE phase for view $v+3$ also includes a QC for the previous PREPARE message (with view $v+2$). The QC received during PREPARE for view $v+3$ will act as PRECOMMIT, COMMIT, and DECIDE for views $v+2$, $v+1$ and v , respectively as shown in Figure 2. Further, details along with safety and liveness proofs for HotStuff can be found in [5]. Below we describe why the responsive HotStuff has *three-chain* structure instead of *two-chain* structure.

The reason behind three-round vote collection in HotStuff. Responsive HotStuff protocol is a three-chain protocol. The main reason for an additional round in HotStuff is to avoid an indefinite non-deciding scenario for a “two-chain” HotStuff where the protocol gets stuck and its liveness fails as described in the HotStuff paper [5], [10]. If the PRECOMMIT phase is removed from HotStuff, then a replica has to lock on the request/block after receiving $PrepareQC$. This gives rise to the possibility that due to the asynchronous nature of the network only a single replica r receives the block and gets locked on $PrepareQC$. Whereas other replicas move to the next view without receiving the block and locking on $PrepareQC$. This indefinite non-deciding scenario occurs because replicas are avoiding broadcast and depend on primary for message communication.

A. Lack of Fairness and Incentive Design

One of the important aspects of incentive design is fairness. It means every replica can add a block into the chain and get rewards. Lack of fairness in incentive-based mechanisms like PoS may result in disincentive, censorship, liveness, and safety failures. PoS is an example of an incentive mechanism. Supporting PoS for the HotStuff protocol and its variants like LibraBFT [7] is problematic. The general idea in PoS [2], [4], [11] is that a replica with higher stake is unlikely to behave maliciously as it might result in the loss of its stake. In PoS a primary replica can be rewarded for its valid proposal and/or voters can get a reward if they voted for a block proposal. Similarly, replicas can be punished for

malicious behaviors. But implementing PoS over the top of HotStuff may allow Byzantine replicas to perform censorship attacks and compromise safety and liveness (depending on how PoS is implemented) of the consensus protocol. Below we describe how lack of fairness inversely affects the incentive design for HotStuff and LibraBFT. We also show that HotStuff and LibraBFT in current status with any of the known implementations of PoS with BFT [2], [4], [11] can end up with several issues.

1) *Rewarding primaries*: Forking attack will cause honest primaries to not earn any reward or lose stakes as their blocks are not being committed. Whereas blocks proposed by Byzantine primaries are getting committed. This will result in a higher rate of increase in the overall stake of Byzantine replicas than the overall stake of honest replicas. As a result, more than a third of the network stake may be controlled by Byzantine replicas as shown in Figure 3(a). Since it is not possible to detect the forking attack due to impossibility result [12], a Byzantine primary replica cannot be punished.

We simulated a network of size $n = 100$ with α total stake. Such as initially 0.3α is being held by Byzantine replicas and 0.7α by honest replicas. a value of 0.00001α is added to the stake of a replica if its proposed block is committed. Then we simulated forking attack on the network (while randomly selecting a primary to propose a block) in which Byzantine primaries prevent blocks proposed by honest primaries to be committed. As it can be seen in the Figure 3a more than a third stake of the network is eventually controlled by the Byzantine replicas.

2) *Rewarding voters*: Similarly rewarding voters is also risky in Libra and HotStuff. This is due to the reason that Byzantine primary will build a *QC* from $f + 1$ votes from honest replicas and f Byzantine replicas (while ignoring votes from other f honest replicas). This will again slow down the rate of stake increase of honest replicas. Therefore, this will enable Byzantine replicas to first compromise the liveness. The graph of this case is similar to the ones in Figure 3a, therefore we omit them for brevity.

3) *Controlling of More than Two-Third of Stake by Byzantine Replicas*: As the honest stake threshold decreases than the two-third then Byzantine replicas have the power to choose which block should be committed. Therefore, Byzantine replicas will not vote for any block proposed by an honest primary but will only vote for the block proposed by Byzantine primary. As a result, only the blocks proposed by the Byzantine primary are committed as these blocks are able to collect votes with a two-third stake from the network. Hence, Byzantine replicas can prevent all honest replicas from getting rewards whereas themselves getting reward. This will eventually result in a two-third stake of the network controlled by Byzantine replicas. Figure 3(b) presents the result of simulation where initially Byzantine primaries break the liveness by acquiring more than a third of network stake and then only vote for blocks proposed by Byzantine primaries. Hence, only Byzantine primaries are getting rewards, while no honest replica is able to get a reward as their blocks cannot collect votes with aggregated two-third

stake of the network.

Implications of lack of fairness:

- If the vote weight of a replica is counted proportional to its stake in the network as done in [4], [11] and to be implemented in the LibraBFT as mentioned in [13], then the network liveness and safety can be compromised due to the fact that Byzantine replicas can take over more than two-third of network stake as shown in Figure 3a and 3b.
- On the other hand, if the primary/proposer is selected randomly based on the proportion of its stake in the network as done in Tendermint [2], then Byzantine primaries will be selected more frequently, which will further increase their stake by getting rewards. This acts as a disincentive for honest primaries and allows Byzantine primaries to censor transactions. Since Byzantine replicas are selected frequently they can censor some transactions and those transactions will not be proposed until an honest replica is selected as primary.
- The third case can be when replicas do receive a reward when their block is added to the chain and/or their vote is included in the *QC*. But their stake proportion has no role in their selection as primary and the vote of every replica has an equal weight. In this case, there is little incentive for honest replicas as Byzantine replicas will earn reward while they have to power to prevent honest replicas from earning reward by adding blocks to the chain.

Therefore, in current state, HotStuff and LibraBFT lack fairness and without fairness guarantees, using BFT protocol with PoS can result in disincentivize replicas, censorship or the loss of safety and liveness. Designing an incentive mechanism like PoS over the top of BFT requires more in-depth research which is part of our future work. But providing fairness is an important step towards achieving a fair and safer incentive design mechanism over top of BFT consensus.

III. SYSTEM MODEL AND PRELIMINARIES

A. System Model

We consider a system with $n = 3f + 1$ parties (also called replicas) denoted by the set N such that the system can tolerate at most f Byzantine replicas. Byzantine replicas may behave in an arbitrary manner, whereas correct (or honest) replicas follow the protocol which results in the execution of identical commands at the same order. We assume a partial synchronous model presented in [14], where the network is synchronous with a known bound on message transmission delay denoted by Δ . This known bound on message transmission holds after an unknown asynchronous period called *Global Stabilization Time* (GST). All exchanged messages are signed. Adversaries are computationally bound and cannot forge signatures or message digests (hashes) but with negligible probability.

B. Preliminaries

Signature aggregation. Fast-HotStuff uses signature aggregation [15] to obtain a single collective signature instead of appending all replica signatures, when a primary fails. As the primary p receives the message M_i with their respective




Fig. 3. Liveness and safety failure with PoS




Fig. 4. A simple case of conflicting blocks. Block B_v is fork vertex, and blocks B_{v+1} and B_{v+2} are two conflicting blocks.

signatures $\sigma_i \leftarrow \text{sign}_i(M_i)$ from each replica i , the primary then uses these received signatures to generate an aggregated signature $\sigma \leftarrow \text{AggSign}(\{M_i, \sigma_i\}_{i \in N})$. The aggregated signature can be verified by replicas given the messages M_1, M_2, \dots, M_y where $2f + 1 \leq y \leq n$, the aggregated signature σ , and public keys PK_1, PK_2, \dots, PK_y . To authenticate message senders as done in previous BFT-based protocols [6], [16], [17] each replica i keeps the public keys of other replicas in the network.

Block and block tree. Clients send transactions to primary, who then batch transactions into blocks. Block data structure also has a field that it uses to point to its parent. In the case of HotStuff and Fast-HotStuff, a QC (which is built from $n - f$ votes) is used as a pointer to the parent block. Every block except the genesis block must specify its parent block and include a QC for the parent block. In this way, blocks are chained. As there may be forks, each replica maintains a block tree (referred to as *blockTree*) of received blocks. Two blocks B_{v+1} and B_{v+2} are conflicting if they have a common parent B_v . The parent block B_v is the vertex of the fork as shown in Figure 4.

Direct Parent Link. There are two ways that the chain or tree of blocks grows. First, the chain grows in a continuous manner where there is a direct parent link between two consecutive blocks. For example for two blocks B and B' we have $B.\text{curView} = B'.\text{curView} + 1$ and $B = B'.\text{parent}$. But there is also the possibility that one or more views between two views fail to generate block due to primary being Byzantine or network failure. In that case $B.\text{curView} = B'.\text{curView} + k$ where $k > 1$ and $B = B'.\text{parent}$ and direct parent link does not exist between B and B' .

IV. OVERVIEW OF FAST-HOTSTUFF

In this section, we present a high-level overview of the design considerations behind Fast-HotStuff. The details and proofs will be provided in later sections. Fast-HotStuff operates in a series of views with monotonically increasing view numbers. Each view number is mapped to a unique dedicated primary known to all replicas. The basic idea of Fast-HotStuff is simple. The primary has to convince voting replicas that its proposed block is extending the block pointed by the latest QC (the latest QC is also called *highQC*). Once replicas are convinced that the proposed QC is the latest QC , then a replica can safely commit the parent of the block pointed by the latest QC (*two-chain*).

A. Efficient View change

The view change complexity is an important metric in BFT consensus protocols. In previous works, view change complexity has either measured in bit-complexity or message complexity. Bit complexity or message complexity was relevant previously as in BFT state replication protocols, the size of a proposal (transaction/ batch of transactions) was small. In HotStuff [5], view change complexity is measured in authenticator complexity. Authenticator complexity is the number of signatures received by replicas when a single block is committed. In the blockchain era, a block is usually large in size for better throughput. For example, a block in Bitcoin is around 1 MB. Therefore, even if the messages for view change have higher bit complexity (in the magnitude of KB), their impact on the overall performance is limited considering the size is still significantly smaller than block size (in the magnitude of MB). For example, if the quadratic bit complexity during view change generates a message of size 20KB whereas the block size is 1MB, then it has little effect on performance. As a result, bit complexity, message complexity, or authenticator complexity is not a good way to measure the view change complexity (as long as their size is much smaller than the proposed block). We argue that during view change, computational cost from processing signatures has a dominant effect on performance. The dominant signature computational cost incurs in each replica during verification of aggregated signatures in the aggregated signature scheme. In




Fig. 5. Comparing Signature Schemes.

threshold signatures, building threshold signature from partial signatures in primary dominates the computational cost.

Threshold signatures have been used in previous blockchain proposals [5], [18]. Though threshold signatures in HotStuff can be verified very efficiently per replica, a primary suffers from $O(n^2)$ polynomial-time interpolation due to $O(n^2)$ compute or verify of proofs in current polynomial commitment schemes. Building threshold signatures from shares by the primary affects the overall performance of a protocol because it happens in the critical path, i.e., replicas waiting for the primary to send messages. Figure 5 shows latency caused by verifying threshold signature, aggregated signature and building threshold signature from signature shares under different network sizes. As it can be seen, threshold signatures might not give a performance boost as it was thought earlier. In Fast-Hotstuff, we show that only a linear number of signatures are needed to be verified during view change at a single replica. As shown in Figure 5, the computational cost incurred by the aggregated signature scheme (used in Fast-HotStuff) in a replica is comparable to the cost in the threshold scheme incurred by the primary in HotStuff. In HotStuff, although each replica receives a constant size of a signature and verifies it at a constant computational cost, the latency incurred at the primary due to $O(n^2)$ interpolation computation degrades the overall performance. Therefore, verifying aggregated signatures (in Fast-HotStuff) and aggregating/building threshold signatures (in HotStuff) have a similar effect on performance. Also, any signature schemes where the identity of a message sender is known can be used in Fast-HotStuff.

B. Reducing one round of communication while still keeping responsiveness.

HotStuff operates in four phases, PREPARE, PRECOMMIT, COMMIT, and DECIDE. It takes one round of communication among all replicas to move from one phase to another. This means Hotstuff requires three rounds of communication to complete the four phases mentioned above.

Unlike HotStuff (where a block is committed in three rounds), in the Fast-HotStuff protocol, a replica r can optimistically commit/execute a block during the COMMIT phase at the end

of the second round while guaranteeing that all other correct replicas will also commit the same block in the same sequence eventually. This guarantee is valid when either one of the two conditions is met: **1) the block proposed by the primary is built by using the latest QC that is held by the majority of the honest replicas, or 2) by a QC higher than the latest QC being held by a majority of replicas.** Therefore, the primary has to incorporate proof of the latest QC in every block it proposes, which can be verified by every replica. In normal cases, the proof of the latest QC for view v is achieved by integrating the QC for the view $v-1$ into the block proposed in the view v . Normal-case operations of (Pipelined) Fast-Hotstuff are similar to HotStuff.

In the case of primary failure in the view $v-1$, we use a quorum of QCs ($n-f$ QCs), or aggregated QC ($AggQC$), as the proof showing that the latest QC is indeed included. Although some overhead is introduced because of the generation and attachment of the proof ($AggQC$), we argue that the proof is succinct compared with the size of a block, and the overhead is negligible. The main bottleneck is verifying an aggregated signature associated with a $AggQC$ after primary failure. we address this problem by showing that verifying the proof in the case of failure requires the verification of two aggregated signatures along with the primary signature in Fast-Hotstuff, hence, keeping signature verification complexity linear for each replica even during the worst case (after primary failure).

Interestingly, the inclusion of the proof of the latest QC by the primary in Fast-HotStuff also enables us to design a responsive two-chain consensus protocol. Indeed, the presence of the proof for the latest QC guarantees that a replica can safely commit a block after two-chain without waiting for the maximum network delay as done in two-chain HotStuff [5], Tendermint [2], and Casper [4]. Therefore, Fast-HotStuff achieves responsiveness only with a two-chain structure (which means two rounds of communication) in comparison to the three-chain structure in HotStuff (three rounds of communication).

C. Mitigating forking attack and leadership fairness.

Similarly, forking attack is not possible as the primary has to provide a proof that the block is built over the top of the latest QC ($PrepareQC$ in case of basic HotStuff). This prevents Byzantine replicas from unfairly increasing their rewards while denying honest replicas from getting rewards when PoS is used. Therefore, providing leadership fairness and effectively preventing censorship attacks. Fairness is one of the important conditions for implementing incentive mechanisms like PoS over the top of BFT consensus. More discussion on this will be provided in Section V.

V. FAST-HOTSTUFF DESIGN

In this section, we first present a detailed design of Fast-HotStuff and then give the safety and liveness proofs. Recall that the protocol will encounter liveness failure if we omit PRECOMMIT phase in HotStuff as explained before. But we can merge the COMMIT and DECIDE phase into a single phase

Algorithm 1: Utilities for replica i

```
1 Func CreatePrepareMsg( $type, aggQC, qc, cmd$ ):
2    $b.type \leftarrow type$ 
3    $b.AggQC \leftarrow aggQC$ 
4    $b.QC \leftarrow qc$ 
5    $b.cmd \leftarrow cmd$ 
6   return  $b$ 
7 End Function
8 Func GenerateQC( $V$ ):
9    $qc.type \leftarrow m.type : m \in V$ 
10   $qc.viewNumber \leftarrow m.viewNumber : m \in V$ 
11   $qc.block \leftarrow m.block : m \in V$ 
12   $qc.sig \leftarrow AggSign(qc.type, qc.viewNumber, qc.block, i,$ 
13     $\{m.Sig | m \in V\})$ 
14  return  $qc$ 
15 End Function
16 Func CreateAggQC( $\eta_{Set}$ ):
17   $aggQC.QCset \leftarrow \text{extract QCs from } \eta_{Set}$ 
18   $aggQC.sig \leftarrow AggSign(curView,$ 
19     $\{qc.block | qc.block \in aggQC.QCset\}, \{i | i \in N\},$ 
20     $\{m.Sig | m \in \eta_{Set}\})$ 
21  return  $aggQC$ 
22 End Function
23 Func BasicSafeProposal( $b, qc$ ):
24  return  $b \text{ extends from } highQC.block$ 
25 End Function
26 Func PipelinedSafeBlock( $b, qc, aggQC$ ):
27  if  $QC$  then
28    return  $b.viewNumber \geq curView \wedge b.viewNumber ==$ 
29       $qc.viewNumber + 1$ 
30  end
31 if  $AggQC$  then
32    $highQC \leftarrow \text{extract highQc from } AggregatedQC$ 
33   return  $b \text{ extends from } highQC.block$ 
34 end
35 End Function
```

while incorporating the latest *PrepareQC* evidence in the proposal without encountering the liveness failure problem in a two-chain structure. This is the key idea behind our Fast-HotStuff. We argue that if the replica r reaches the COMMIT phase for a block B , then the replica r can simply lock and execute the block optimistically without moving to the DECIDE phase for good. Basically, the proof of the latest *PrepareQC* ensures that other replicas will eventually commit the block B . Therefore, an additional round of communication is not required anymore.

Since HotStuff has two *three-chain* variant (the basic and the pipelined HotStuff), therefore we present *two-chain* basic Fast-HotStuff as well as pipelined Fast-HotStuff protocols. First, we present the basic optimised *two-chain* Fast-HotStuff and then extend it to a *two-chain* pipelined Fast-HotStuff protocol. As mentioned earlier the basic Fast-HotStuff is *two-chain* protocol and uses the aggregated signature scheme. Moreover, basic Fast-HotStuff needs the proof for the latest *QC* in the form of $n-f$ *QCs* or *qCs* attached in the proposed block by the primary in order to be able to guarantee safety and liveness as a *two-chain* protocol. In the case of blockchains since block size is usually large (multiples of Megabytes), this overhead ($\approx 1.4\%$ of 1MB block when $n = 100$) has little effect on performance metrics like throughput and latency. Moreover,

the computation cost for signature verification by each replica is linear.

A. Basic Fast-HotStuff

The algorithm for two-chain Responsive basic HotStuff is given in Algorithm 2. Below we describe how the basic Fast-HotStuff algorithm operates.

PREPARE phase. Initially the primary replica waits for new-view messages $\eta = \langle \text{"NEWVIEW"}, curView, prepareQC, i \rangle$ from $n-f$ replicas. The NEWVIEW message contains four field indicating message type (NEWVIEW), current view (*curView*), the latest *PrepareQC* known to replica i , and replica id i . The NEWVIEW message is signed by each replica over fields $\langle curView, prepareQC.block, i \rangle$. *prepareQC.block* is presented by the hash of the block for which *prepareQC* was built (hash is used to identify the block instead of using the actual block). The primary creates and signs a prepare message ($B = \langle \text{"Prepare"}, AggQC, commands, curView, h, i \rangle$) and broadcasts it to all replicas as shown Algorithm 2. We can also use the term block proposal or simply block for PREPARE message. *AggQC* is the aggregated *QC* build from valid η messages collected from $n-f$ replicas.

Upon receipt of prepare message B from the primary, a replica i verifies *AggQC*, extracts *highQC* as well from PREPARE message and then checks if the proposal is safe. Verification of *AggQC* involves verification of aggregated signatures built from $n-f$ η messages and verification of the latest *PrepareQC*. Signature verification of each *QC* is not necessary, a replica only needs to make sure messages are valid. *BasicSafeProposal* predicate makes sure a replica only accepts a proposal that extends from the *highQC.block*.

If a replica notices that it is missing a block it can download it from other replicas. At the end of PREPARE phase, each replica sends its vote v to the primary. Any vote message v sent by a replica to the primary is signed on tuples $\langle type, viewNumber, block, i \rangle$. Each vote has a type, such that $v.type \in \{PREPARE, PRECOMMIT, COMMIT\}$ (Here again block hash can be used to represent the block to save space and bandwidth).

PRECOMMIT phase. The primary collects PREPARE votes from $n-f$ replicas and builds *PrepareQC*. The primary then broadcasts *PrepareQC* to all replicas in PRECOMMIT message. Upon receipt of a valid PRECOMMIT message, a replica will respond with a PRECOMMIT vote to the primary. Here (in line 25-27 Algorithm 2) replica i also checks if it has committed the block for latest *QC* called *HighQC.block*. Since the majority of replicas have voted for *HighQC.block*, it is safe to commit it.

COMMIT phase. Similar to PRECOMMIT phase, the primary collects PRECOMMIT votes from $n-f$ replicas and combines them into *PrecommitQC*. As a replica receives and verifies the *PrecommitQC*, it executes the commands. The replica increments *newNumber* and begins the next view.

New-View. Since a replica always receives a message from the primary at a specific viewNumber, therefore, it

has to wait for a timeout period during all phases. If NEXTVIEW(viewNumber) utility interrupts waiting, the replica increments viewNumber and starts next view.

Algorithm 2: Basic Fast – HotStuff for replica i

```

1 foreachin curView  $\leftarrow 1, 2, 3, \dots$ 
2    $\triangleright$  Prepare Phase
3   if  $i$  is primary then
4     wait until  $(n - f)$   $\eta$  messages are received:
5        $\eta_{Set} \leftarrow \eta_{Set} \cup \eta$ 
6        $aggQC \leftarrow CreateAggQC(\eta_{Set})$ 
7        $B \leftarrow CreatePrepareMsg(Prepare, aggQC, \text{client's}$ 
8          $command)$ 
9       broadcast  $B$ 
10    end
11    if  $i$  is normal replica then
12      wait for prepare  $B$  from primary(curView)
13       $HighQC \leftarrow extract\ highQc\ from\ B.AggQC$ 
14      if BasicSafeProposal( $B, HighQC$ ) then
15        Send vote  $v$  for prepare message to
16        primary(curView)
17      end
18    end
19     $\triangleright$  Pre – Commit Phase
20    if  $i$  is primary then
21      wait for  $(n - f)$  prepare votes:  $V \leftarrow V \cup v$ 
22       $PrepareQC \leftarrow BasicGenerateQC(V)$ 
23      broadcast PrepareQC
24    end
25    if  $i$  is normal replica then
26      wait for PrepareQC from primary(curView)
27      Send Precommit vote  $v$  to primary(curView)
28      if have not committed  $HighQC.block$  then
29        commit  $HighQC.block$ 
30      end
31    end
32     $\triangleright$  Commit Phase
33    if  $i$  is primary then
34      wait for  $(n - f)$  votes:  $V \leftarrow V \cup v$ 
35       $PrecommitQC \leftarrow GenerateQC(V)$ 
36      broadcast PrecommitQC
37    end
38    if  $i$  is normal replica then
39      wait for PrecommitQC from primary(curView)
40      execute new commands through  $PrecommitQC.block$ 
41      respond to clients
42       $\triangleright$  New-View
43      check always for nextView interrupt then
44        goto this line if nextView(curView) is called
45        during “wait for” in any phase
46        Send  $\eta$  to primary(curView + 1)
47      end
48    end

```

B. Safety and Liveness Proof for Basic Fast-HotStuff

In this section, we provide proofs for safety and liveness properties of Fast-HotStuff. We begin with two standard definitions.

Definition 1 (Safety). *A protocol is safe if the following statement holds: if at least one correct replica commits a block at the sequence (blockchain height) s in the presence of*

$\lceil n/3 \rceil - 1$ Byzantine replica, then no other block will ever be committed at the sequence s .

Definition 2 (Liveness). *A protocol is alive if it guarantees progress in the presence of at most $\lceil n/3 \rceil - 1$ Byzantine replica.*

Next, we introduce several technical lemmas.

Lemma 1. *If any two valid QCs, qc_1 and qc_2 with same type $qc_1.type = qc_2.type$ and conflicting blocks i.e., $qc_1.block = B$ conflicts with $qc_2.block = B'$, then we have $qc_1.viewNumber \neq qc_2.viewNumber$.*

Proof. We can prove this lemma by contradiction. Furthermore, we assume that $qc_1.viewNumber = qc_2.viewNumber$. Now let's consider, N_1 is a set of replicas that have voted for for block B in qc_1 ($|N_1| \geq 2f + 1$). Similarly, N_2 is another set of replicas that have voted for block B' and whose votes are included in qc_2 ($|N_2| \geq 2f + 1$). Since $n = 3f + 1$ and $f = \frac{n-1}{3}$, this means there is at least one correct replica j such that $j \in N_1 \cap N_2$ (which means j has voted for both qc_1 and qc_2). But a correct replica only votes once for each phase in each view. Therefore, our assumption is false and hence, $qc_1.viewNumber \neq qc_2.viewNumber$. \square

Lemma 2. *If at least one correct replica has received PrecommitQC for block B , then the PrepareQC for block B will be the highQC (latest QC) for next (child of block B) block B' .*

Proof. The primary begins with a new view $v + 1$ as it receives $n - f$ NEWVIEW messages. Here for ease of understanding, we assume $v + 1$, basically B' could have been proposed during any view $v' > v$. We show that any combination of $n - f$ NEWVIEW messages have at least one of those NEWVIEW message received by the primary containing highQC (PrepareQC for block B) for block B .

We know that in previous view v , a set of replicas R_1 of size $|R_1| \geq 2f + 1$ have voted for PrepareQC (which is built from votes for block B). Similarly, another set of replicas R_2 of size $|R_2| \geq 2f + 1$ have sent their NEWVIEW messages to the primary of view $v + 1$ after the end of view v . Since the total number of replicas is $n = 3f + 1$ and $f = \frac{n-1}{3}$, therefore, $R_1 \cap R_2 = R$, such that, $|R| \geq f + 1$, which means that there is at least one correct replica in R_2 that has sent its PrepareQC as highQC in NEWVIEW message to the primary. Therefore, when primary of view $v + 1$ proposes B' , the PrepareQC for block B will be the highQC. In other words B' will point to B as its parent (through highQC). \square

Lemma 3. *A correct replica will not commit two conflicting blocks.*

Proof. From lemma 1 we know that each correct replica votes only once for each view and therefore view number for conflicting blocks B and B' will not be the same. Therefore, we can assume that $B.curView < B'.curView$. Based on lemma 2 we know that if at least one correct replica has received PrecommitQC for block B (have committed B), then the

PrepareQC for block B will be the *highQC* for the next block B' (child of block B). Therefore, any combination of $n - f$ *PrepareQCs* in *AggQC* for B' will include at least one *highQC* such that $highQC.block = B$ or $highQC.block.view = B.view$. But for B' to be conflicting with B it has to point to the parent of B at least. Consequently, first it is not possible for a primary to build a valid PREPARE message B' in which $highQC.block.view < B.view$. Secondly, if a primary tries to propose a block with invalid *AggQC*, it will be rejected by the replica based on Algorithm 2 line 12. \square

Lemma 3 provides a safety proof for basic Fast-HotStuff consensus protocol. To ensure liveness, Fast-HotStuff has to make sure in each view a replica is selected as a primary and the view number is incremented. Moreover, we should also show that the protocol will eventually add a block to the chain/tree of blocks (a block to the blockchain) or will result in view change in case of failure.

In Fast-HotStuff a new primary is chosen deterministically in a round-robin manner. If a replica times out, it employs exponential-backoff used in PBFT [6] to double its timeout value. This guarantees that eventually during GST there will be an interval T_f when timeout values from all correct replicas intersect and this bounded period is enough to reach a decision during consensus. Below we provide liveness proof for our Fast-HotStuff protocol.

Lemma 4. *After GST, there is a time T_f , when there is an honest primary and all correct/honest replicas are in the same view. As a result, a decision is reached during T_f .*

Proof. Based on lemma 2, at the beginning of a view, the primary will have the latest *PrepareQC* or *highQC* from $n - f$ replicas. As per assumption, all correct replicas are in the same view, therefore the correct primary will propose a PREPARE message with *AggQC* containing the latest *PrepareQC*, which is extracted by each replica. Since all replicas are in the same view until bounded T_f time, therefore all replicas successfully complete PREPARE, PRECOMMIT, and COMMIT phase. \square

Aggregated QC verification. As stated a replica needs to verify only $O(n)$ signatures to make sure an aggregated *QC* (*AggQC*) is valid. Upon receipt of a block containing an *AggQC*, first the aggregated signature for the $n - f$ *NEWVIEW* (η) messages needs to be verified. The first check (verification of aggregated signature of *AggQC*) verify that the *AggQC* that is built from η messages has $n - f$ valid *QCs* (*QCs* come from $n - f$ distinct replicas). It further guarantees that at least $f + 1$ *QCs* out of $n - f$ are from honest replicas. Based on Lemma 2 we know that out of these $f + 1$ *QCs* from honest replicas at least one of them is a valid *highQC*.

Therefore, a replica only needs to find a *QC* with highest view among *QCs* in *AggQC* by looping over the view numbers of *QCs*. Next, the replica has to verify the aggregated signature of *highQC* or latest *QC*. As a result, we do not need to verify the remaining $n - f - 1$ *QCs* as a replica only needs to verify *highQC* and make sure if the block extends $highQC.block$.

There is a possibility that the η messages containing *highQC* are invalid. This means η does not meet formatting requirements or its view number is incorrect. In this case, the replica can simply reject the block proposal.

C. Pipelined Fast-Hotstuff

Pipelined Fast-HotStuff has been optimized in different ways. First similar to the pipelined HotStuff, it pipelines requests and proposes them in each phase. Secondly, the proof of the latest/highest *QC* in the block in pipelined Fast-HotStuff carries a small overhead in the block during view v if the primary in view $v - 1$ fails. Therefore during a view change when no failure occurs this overhead is not required. Below we present the two-chain responsive pipelined HotStuff.

Blocks can be added into the chain during happy path with no failure or the primary fails and the next primary will have to add its block into the chain. Unlike HotStuff, pipelined Fast-HotStuff addresses these two cases differently. Indeed, there are two ways a primary can convince replicas that the proposed block extends the latest *QC* (*highQC*). In case of contiguous chain growth, a primary can only propose a block during view v if it is able to build a *QC* from $n - f$ votes received during the view $v - 1$. Therefore in a contiguous case, each replica signs the vote, the primary will build a *QC* from $n - f$ received votes and include it in the next block proposal. Therefore, the block will contain only the *QC* for view $v - 1$. As a result, for the block during view v , the *QC* generated from votes in $v - 1$ is the proof of *highQC*. It should be noted that in pipelined Fast-HotStuff, a replica commits a block if two direct parent link is formed over the top of it. In other words, a block is committed if two blocks from consecutive views are added over the top of it. Similarly, if a primary during view v did not receive $n - f$ votes from view $v - 1$ (this means the primary during view $v - 1$ has failed), then it can only propose a block if it has received $n - f$ η (*NEWVIEW*) messages from distinct replicas for view v . In this case, the primary during view v has to propose a block with aggregated *QC* or *AggQC* from $n - f$ replicas. *AggQC* is simply a vector built from a concatenation of *QCs*.

The signatures on η are aggregated to generate a single aggregated signature in *AggQC*. Therefore, there are basically two types of blocks that can be proposed by a primary: a block with *QC* if the primary is able to build a *QC* from previous view or a block with *AggQC* if the previous primary has failed. It should be noted that to verify *AggQC* a replica only needs to verify the aggregated signature of *AggQC* and the latest *QC* in the *AggQC*. Thus, the signature verification cost is linear for each replica. The latest *QC* or *highQC* can simply be found by looping over view numbers of each *QC* and choose the highest one.

The chain structure in pipelined Fast-HotStuff is shown in Figure 6. Here, we can see that upon receipt of block B_{v+2} (during the view $v + 2$), a two-chain with direct parent link is completed for the block B_v . Now a replica can simply execute the block B_v . Since there is no primary failure for views v through view $v + 2$, only *highQC* is included in the block




Fig. 6. **Pipeined/Chained Fast-HotStuff** where a QC can serve in different phases simultaneously. Note that the primary for view $v+3$ has failed.

proposal. Similarly, the primary for the view $v+3$ has failed, therefore, the primary for the view $v+4$, has to propose a block with $AggQC$ (small overhead). Upon receipt of B_{v+4} , the latest QC ($highQC$) can be extracted from $AggQC$. In this case, the QC for the block B_{v+2} has been selected as the $highQC$.

As it can be seen the algorithm mainly has two components: the part executed by the primary and the part run by replicas. The *primary* either receives votes that it will aggregate into a QC or $NEWVIEW$ messages containing QC from $n-f$ replicas that the primary will aggregate into $AggQC$ (Algorithm 3 lines 22-24 and 2-9). The primary then builds a proposal in the form of $PREPARE$ message also called a block. $PREPARE$ also contains QC or $AggQC$ depending on if it has received $n-f$ votes or $NEWVIEW$ messages (Algorithm 3 lines 2-11).

Upon receipt of block B (containing a QC) through a proposal, each replica can check the condition $B.viewNumber == B.QC.viewNumber + 1$ and accept the proposal if the condition is met. On other hand, if the block contains a valid $AggQC$, then each replica extracts the $highQC$ from $AggQC$ and checks if the block extends the $highQC.block$. These checks are performed through $PipelinedSafeBlock$ predicate (Algorithm 1). If the check was successful, each replica sends back a vote to the next primary (Algorithm 3 lines 13-16). After that, each replica commits the grandparent of the received block if two-chain with direct parent link is formed (Algorithm 3, lines 17-21). In other words, a block is committed if two blocks are built over top of it (two-chain is complete).

We can establish the safety and liveness of pipelined Fast-HotStuff in a way similar to what we have proven for the basic Fast-HotStuff.

Lemma 5. *If B and B' are two conflicting blocks, then only one of them will be committed by a replica.*

Proof. From lemma 1, we know that each correct replica votes only once for each view and therefore view number for conflicting blocks $B.curView < B'.curView$ and we assume that block B is already committed. Now, a replica r receives a $PREPARE$ message in the form of block B' . Since B' is a conflicting block to B therefore, the $highQC$ in the block must point to an ancestor of block B . In this case we consider B^* as the parent of B ($B.parent = B^*$) and $B'.QC.block = B^*$. Since B' extends from B^* which is parent of B , therefore first condition in $PipelinedSafeBlock$ predicate fails because $highQC$ in B' ($B'.QC$) extends the parent of B (B^*) but not B . Similarly, second condition in $PipelinedSafeBlock$ predicate also fails because $B'.viewNumber = B'.QC.viewNumber + k$,

Algorithm 3: pipelined *Fast – HotStuff* for block i

```

1 foreachin curView ← 1,2,3,...
2   if  $i$  is primary then
3     if  $n-f \eta$  msgs are received then
4        $aggQC \leftarrow CreateAggQC(\eta_{Set})$ 
5        $B \leftarrow CreatePrepareMsg(Prepare, aggQC, \perp, client's command)$ 
6     end
7     if  $n-f v$  msgs are received then
8        $qc \leftarrow GenerateQC(V)$ 
9        $CreatePrepareMsg(Prepare, \perp, qc, client's command)$ 
10    end
11    broadcast  $B$ 
12  end
13  if  $i$  is normal replica then
14    wait for  $B$  from primary( $curView$ )
15    if  $PipelinedSafeBlock(B, B.qc, \perp) \vee PipelinedSafeBlock(B, \perp, B.aggQC)$  then
16      Send vote  $v$  for prepare message to primary( $curView+1$ )
17    end
18    // start commit phase on  $B^*$ 's grandparent if two-chain direct parent link exists
19    if  $(B^*.parent = B' \wedge B^*.view = B'.view + 1) \wedge (B''.parent = B' \wedge B''.view = B'.view + 1)$  then
20      execute new commands through  $B'$ 
21      respond to clients
22    end
23  end
24  if  $i$  is next primary then
25    wait until  $(n-f) v/\eta$  for current view are received:
26     $\eta_{Set} \leftarrow \eta_{Set} \cup \eta \vee V \leftarrow V \cup v$ 
27  end
28  ▷ Finally
29  check always for nextView interrupt then
30    goto this line if nextView( $curView$ ) is called during "wait for" in any phase
31    Send  $\eta$  to primary( $curView + 1$ )
32  end

```

where $k > 1$. □

D. Safety Violation Bug

Authors from Facebook's Novi in Gemini [1] have reported a subtle bug in Fast-HotStuff protocol. They argue that the safety violation might occur when a network partition is done in a specific pattern. We found that this problem occurs when the two-chain is formed over the top of the block being committed without the direct parent link. Normally, there can be at most two candidate QCs that can be selected as the $highQC$ after the view change (out of many QCs sent by replicas after view change). Candidates can be the highest QC held by majority of replicas or its child (if exists) that is only known to a small subset of replicas due to network partition or failure. It can be seen in Figure 7 that qc is being held by majority of replicas (as majority of replicas have voted to build qc') where as qc' is the QC certifying $qc'.block$ and here qc' is known only to a small subset of replicas. After a view change either of QCs (qc or qc') is safe to extend the chain. But authors in Gemini shows that if the network partition occurs in a specific pattern




Fig. 7. Safety violation scenario.

there can be an additional candidate (qc^*) for *highQC* from a competing branch such that $qc.view < qc^*.view < qc'.view$. Similar to qc' , qc^* is also known to a small subset of replicas (at least one) due to network partition. Since $qc.view < qc^*.view$ therefore, it is possible that qc^* might be chosen as *highQC* after a view change. This will result in some replicas may end-up committing B while later on other replicas build blocks over the top of B^* and then eventually commit B^* as shown in Figure 7.

To avoid this issue from happening we have changed the commit rule to check for direct parent link in addition to two-chain condition. Once a block has a two-chain built over the top of it (two blocks are built over it) and the direct parent link of each chain is verified (Algorithm 3 lines 18-20), then the block can safely be committed. As a result, it won't be possible to have a *highestQC* candidate from a competing branch/fork for a committed block (because $qc.view + 1 = qc'.view$). Below we provide an additional lemma to lemma 5 proving Fast-HotStuff's safety.

Lemma 6. *If a block B is committed by a replica r at the height h , then no other replica r^* in the network will commit another block B^* at the height h .*

Proof. For the sake of contradiction let's assume that it is possible that if block B at the height h is committed only by a single replica then at least one another replica r^* can commit another block B^* the height h . To make this assumption possible we should consider that $qc^*.view < qc'.view$. This means at least $2f + 1$ replicas hold the *QC* for block B (qc) and have voted for child block of B , B' at the height $h + 1$. Such that out of $2f + 1$, at least $f + 1$ are honest replicas. Since replica r is the only replica that has received the *QC* for B' (qc'), therefore r commits the block B . Other replicas that did not receive qc' , will timeout and move to the next view. During view change one of the following cases may occur. We only need one of the cases below to prove the correctness of our assumption.

Case 1: When $highQC = qc$ In the first case, the latest *QC* proposed by the next primary p (in *AggQC*) is *highQC* and $highQC = qc$. Since qc , extends block B , therefore, it is safe and the next block proposed by the new primary will extend block B . Therefore, it is not possible to have a valid block B' , that does not extend block B .

Case 2: When $qc^*.view < qc.view$. In second case, since $qc^*.view < qc.view$ therefore, $qc^*.view < highQC.view$. As a result, qc^* will not be selected as *highQC* by any honest replica (based on Lemma 2).

Case 3: When $qc^*.view > qc.view$. In the third case, there is a possibility that a number of replicas hold a *QC* qc^* such

that $qc^*.view > qc.view$. qc^* has not been propagated to the majority of honest nodes due to the network partition. The $qc^*.block$ is conflicting block to block B . After the view change the new primary p (that is aware of qc^*) includes qc^* in the *AggQC*. If qc^* is accepted then it is possible that other replicas may commit a block B^* which is conflicting to block B . But this is not possible because $qc.view + 1 = qc'.view$ due to the two direct parent link requirements to commit a block (Algorithm 3 lines 18-20). Therefore, there can be no qc^* , with a view $qc'.view > qc^*.view > qc.view$. Hence, our assumption is proved to be false. \square

This lemma confirms that if a single replica commits a block B , then no conflicting block to B will be committed by another replica. This lemma is developed to address a subtle safety violation scenario due to the network partition that was reported in Gemini [1] (that simulates Byzantine scenarios at scale) by Facebook's Novi group. We also successfully verified the safety of revised Fast-HotStuff using the Twins simulator for Fast-HotStuff developed by Novi team ³.

E. Performance Penalty of Direct Parent Link Condition

Direct parent link has a high cost in HotStuff protocol due to the forking attack. Each time when a Byzantine primary over-rides blocks for honest primaries it not only reduces the throughput but also prevents direct parent link formation. This results in increased latency. On the other hand, since a forking attack is not possible in HotStuff, a direct parent cannot be broken through forking. But it is possible that a direct parent link is broken when a primary fails to propose a block and replicas timeout. Since replicas wait for the maximum timeout period Δ , which is very large than the actual wire speed δ ($\delta \ll \Delta$). Therefore, incurring latency in the order of δ (due to lack of direct parent link) is negligible when the overall delay is in the order of Δ . Moreover, if an incentive mechanism is used over the top of Fast-HotStuff, it will be expensive for a Byzantine primary to timeout in order to cause δ delay and not earn a reward by proposing a block. Whereas, in HotStuff a Byzantine primary can simply cause a forking attack without triggering a view change or timeout.

The liveness proof for pipelined Fast-HotStuff is similar to the proof for Basic Fast-HotStuff and is omitted here for brevity.

F. Resilience to performance attacks and Fairness

Fast-HotStuff has natural resiliency towards delay attacks (primary delays block proposal) due the rotating primary mechanism. The primary that delays the block changes once the block is proposed. More stringent monitoring of primary performance can be applied as proposed in [19]–[21]. Moreover, if a primary fails frequently, it can be blacklisted as done in [21]. Moreover, this blacklisting mechanism can be in exponential-backoff manner. For example if a primary fails once, it will not be selected primary next time after n epochs. After failing

³<https://github.com/asonnino/twins-simulator>




Fig. 8. Performance tests with 1MB block size




Fig. 9. Performance tests with 2MB block size

for second time the primary will not be chosen for 2 epochs as primary, then for 4 epochs and so on.

Resilience against Forking Attack. Fast-HotStuff is resilient to forking attacks. The main reason is that the primary cannot replace the $n - f$ votes it has received for the previous block with an older QC (QC points to the parent block) to perform a forking attack. A primary has to provide the proof of *highQC* it is holding. If a primary does not provide the proof for *highQC* or provides invalid proof other replicas will reject its proposal. Therefore the attack fails. A replica that received an invalid proof can simply let others know about it. There can be done by sending the proof as an additional field in the vote or a replica can simply broadcast the proof against the primary. Based on the proof, the malicious primary can be blacklisted from the network. Although, this may cause a one-time small delay but once the malicious primary is black listed then it cannot perform this attack anymore. Therefore, the asymptotic latency and throughput of the system remains unchanged. Whereas, in HotStuff a malicious primary can perform forking attacks indefinitely without being detected.

Fairness. Since forking attack is thwarted in Fast-HotStuff, therefore it provides a fair chance for every primary to add

its block to the chain. As a result, Byzantine primaries cannot deliberately prevent honest primaries from having their blocks committed in the chain through forking attack. As a result, honest primaries can earn rewards without any interruption. Fairness is an important precondition for implementing an incentive mechanism over the top of a consensus protocol. By thwarting forking attack Fast-HotStuff takes a step further to provide a suitable environment for an incentive mechanism like PoS to be implemented.

Moreover rewarding replicas for casting their vote for a block is risky in HotStuff. LibraBFT uses aggregated signatures to identify voters and reward them in the future once PoS is implemented over the top of LibraBFT to provide incentive for voters. As previously explained in Section II voter reward in HotStuff/Libra BFT can result in liveness and safety violation of protocol by Byzantine replicas. Currently in Fast-HotStuff we think no such incentive is necessary. Rewarding primaries for proposing blocks is sufficient. Because if a replica promptly votes for a valid block proposal it received, it helps the block get committed faster with less delay. Less delay means primaries are able to propose more blocks in less time and hence, earn more rewards. But it should be noted that though we have

progress in achieving leadership fairness in Fast-HotStuff, there are other factors that need to be considered to make sure PoS can be used together with BFT consensus protocol. Addressing this will be part of our future work.

VI. EVALUATION

As pipelined HotStuff is widely adopted due to its higher throughput, we implemented prototypes of pipelined Fast-HotStuff and pipelined HotStuff using Go programming language. For cryptographic operations we used dedis advanced crypto library in Go [22] as it supports both aggregated and threshold signature schemes. Moreover, for hashing values, we used SHA256 hashing in the Go crypto library⁴. We tested Fast-HotStuff’s performance on Amazon cloud (AWS) with different network sizes 40, 70, 100, 130, 160 (to compare performance and scalability) and different block sizes (1MB and 2MB). We used *t2.micro* replicas in AWS, where each replica has a single vCPU (virtual CPU) comparable to a single core with 1GB memory. The bandwidth was set to 500 Mb/sec (62.5 MB/sec) and the latency between two end points was set to 50 msec. We also performed forking attack on each network of different sizes, $k = 1000$ times and took mean of the average throughput of the network and the latency incurred by blocks affected by this attack.

We compared pipelined Fast-HotStuff’s performance (throughput and latency) against pipelined HotStuff in three scenarios: 1) during happy path (when no failure occurs), therefore, the primary only includes the *QC* in the block (red vs blue curves), 2) when the previous primary fails and the next primary in the Fast-HotStuff has to include the aggregated *QC* ($(n - f)$ *QCs*) in the block (red vs green curves), and 3) when HotStuff and Fast-HotStuff come under forking attack. Results achieved from each case are discussed below:

- 1) As the results shown in Figure 8a and 9a, during happy path when no failure occurs, Fast-HotStuff outperforms HotStuff in terms of latency. HotStuff’s throughput (in red) slightly decreases against Fast-HotStuff’s throughput (in blue) due to $O(n^2)$ time complexity for interpolation calculation at the primary when n increases (Figure 8b and 9b).
- 2) We did not consider the timeout period taken by replicas to recover, as our main objective is to show that even the inclusion of aggregated *QC* (small overhead) after primary failure has a negligible effect on pipelined Fast-HotStuff’s performance. Therefore, just after GST (after primary failure), when an honest primary is selected, HotStuff does not incur additional overhead. However, HotStuff needs an additional round of consensus during happy (normal) as well as unhappy (failure) cases in comparison to Fast-HotStuff. As a result, the throughput and latency of HotStuff during happy path or unhappy path just after primary failure is the same and is shown by the red curve (by ignoring timeout period). Consequently,

HotStuff’s throughput (in red) is slightly better than Fast-HotStuff’s throughput (in green). See in Figure 8b and Figure 9b. Despite the small overhead, Fast-HotStuff’s latency (in green) is lower than the HotStuff’s latency (red) as shown in Figure 8a and Figure 9a.

- 3) Forking attack effects in Fast-HotStuff and HotStuff can be observed in Figure 8a and b and Figure 9a and b by comparing blue vs. cyan curves. Since forking attack has no effect on Fast-Hotstuff (as explained in subsection V-F), there is no difference between Fast-HotStuff’s normal throughput and latency and its throughput and latency under attack. As such, we did not use additional curves representing the performance of Fast-HotStuff under attack in Figure 8a and b and Figure 9a and b (blue). By contrast, under attack, HotStuff’s latency increases and its throughput decreases significantly (shown with cyan curve).

VII. RELATED WORK

There have been multiple works on improving BFT protocols performance and scalability [17], [18], [23], [24]. But these protocols suffer from expensive view change where either the message complexity or a number of signatures/authenticators to be verified grows quadratically. Moreover, these protocols do not employ a primary rotation mechanism.

Other protocols that offer a simple mechanism of leader/primary replacement include Casper [4] and Tendermint [2]. But both of these protocols have synchronous cores where replicas in the network have to wait for the maximum network latency before moving to the next round. In other words, these protocols lack responsiveness which will result in high-performance degradation.

HotStuff [5] is designed to not only keep a simple leader change process but also maintain responsiveness. These features along with the pipelining optimization have provided an opportunity for wide adoption of the HotStuff [7] protocol. HotStuff has linear view change but we show that in practice during primary failure (unhappy path) Fast-Hotstuff’s view change performance is comparable to HotStuff. LibraBFT [7] is a variant of HotStuff. Unlike the HotStuff that uses threshold signatures, Libra BFT uses aggregated signatures. LibraBFT uses broadcasting during primary failure. LibraBFT also has *three – chain* structure and is susceptible to forking attacks.

Pala BFT [3] is another variant of HotStuff (though the paper has not been peer reviewed) that introduces a strong notion of synchrony with quadratic message complexity to achieve the *two – chain* structure. Pala assumes that the clocks in replicas are synchronous and with negligible bounded skew. If this bound breaks, Pala cannot guarantee liveness. On the other hand, Fast-HotStuff does not require any notion of synchronous clock and is highly event-driven once a block is proposed by the primary. This makes Fast-HotStuff a highly reliable and resilient protocol that can safely be used over the Internet where message latency may not be always uniform. Moreover, pipelined Fast-HotStuff uses an on-demand signature scheme mechanism to provide efficiency and resilience.

⁴<https://golang.org/pkg/crypto/sha256/>

VIII. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we presented Fast-Hotstuff which is a two-chain consensus protocol with efficient and simplified view change. Moreover, Fast-Hotstuff is resilient against forking attacks and provides fairness, which makes it possible to support PoS. Whereas HotStuff and its variant LibraBFT lack resilience against forking attacks and do not provide fairness. Fast-Hotstuff achieves these unique advantages by adding a small amount of overhead in the block. This overhead is only required in rare situations when a primary fails. Our experimental results show that whether the overhead is included in the proposed block or not, Fast-Hotstuff outperforms Hotstuff in terms of latency.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors gratefully acknowledge valuable discussions with Dr. Dahlia Malkhi and her team which helped to improve this work.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Bano, A. Sonnino, A. Chursin, D. Perelman, Z. Li, A. Ching, and D. Malkhi, "Gemini: Bft systems made robust."
- [2] E. Buchman, "Tendermint: Byzantine fault tolerance in the age of blockchains," Jun 2016.
- [3] T.-H. H. Chan, R. Pass, and E. Shi, "Pala: A simple partially synchronous blockchain," Cryptology ePrint Archive, Report 2018/981, 2018, <https://eprint.iacr.org/2018/981>.
- [4] V. Buterin and V. Griffith, "Casper the friendly finality gadget," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.09437*, 2017.
- [5] M. Yin, D. Malkhi, M. K. Reiter, G. G. Gueta, and I. Abraham, "Hotstuff: Bft consensus with linearity and responsiveness," in *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM PODC*, ser. PODC '19. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2019, p. 347–356.
- [6] M. Castro and B. Liskov, "Practical Byzantine fault tolerance," in *Proceedings of the Third Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation*, ser. OSDI '99. Berkeley, CA, USA: USENIX Association, 1999, pp. 173–186.
- [7] M. Baudet, A. Ching, A. Chursin, G. Danezis, F. Garillot, Z. Li, D. Malkhi, O. Naor, D. Perelman, and A. Sonnino, "State machine replication in the libra blockchain," 2019.
- [8] A. Hentschel, Y. Hassanzadeh-Nazarabadi, R. M. Seraj, D. Shirley, and L. Lafrance, "Flow: Separating consensus and compute - block formation and execution," *ArXiv*, vol. abs/2002.07403, 2020.
- [9] Y. Guo, Q. Yang, H. Zhou, W. Lu, and S. Zeng, "System and methods for selection and utilizing a committee of validator nodes in a distributed system," Cypherium Blockchain, Feb 2020, patent.
- [10] M. Yin, D. Malkhi, M. K. Reiter, G. G. Gueta, and I. Abraham, "Hotstuff: Bft consensus in the lens of blockchain," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.05069*, 2018.
- [11] Y. Gilad, R. Hemo, S. Micali, G. Vlachos, and N. Zeldovich, "Algorand: Scaling Byzantine agreements for cryptocurrencies," in *Proceedings of the 26th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*, ser. SOSP '17. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2017, pp. 51–68.
- [12] M. J. Fischer, N. A. Lynch, and M. S. Paterson, "Impossibility of distributed consensus with one faulty process," *J. ACM*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 374–382, Apr. 1985.
- [13] A. Zachary, A. Ramnik, B. Shehar *et al.*, "The libra blockchain," July 2019, Facebook Calibra.
- [14] C. Dwork, N. Lynch, and L. Stockmeyer, "Consensus in the presence of partial synchrony," *J. ACM*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 288–323, Apr. 1988.
- [15] D. Boneh, C. Gentry, B. Lynn, and H. Shacham, "Aggregate and verifiably encrypted signatures from bilinear maps," in *Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference on Theory and Applications of Cryptographic Techniques*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 2003, pp. 416–432.
- [16] L. Lamport, R. Shostak, and M. Pease, "The Byzantine generals problem," *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 382–401, Jul. 1982.
- [17] M. M. Jalalzai and C. Busch, "Window based BFT blockchain consensus," in *iThings, IEEE GreenCom, IEEE (CPSCom) and IEEE SSmartData 2018*, July 2018, pp. 971–979.
- [18] G. Golan-Gueta, I. Abraham, S. Grossman, D. Malkhi, B. Pinkas, M. K. Reiter, D. Seredinschi, O. Tamir, and A. Tomescu, "SBFT: a scalable decentralized trust infrastructure for blockchains," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1804.01626, 2018.
- [19] A. Clement, E. Wong, L. Alvisi, M. Dahlin, and M. Marchetti, "Making byzantine fault tolerant systems tolerate byzantine faults," in *Proceedings of the 6th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation*, ser. NSDI'09. USA: USENIX Association, 2009, p. 153–168.
- [20] Y. Amir, B. Coan, J. Kirsch, and J. Lane, "Byzantine replication under attack," in *2008 IEEE International Conference on Dependable Systems and Networks With FTCS and DCC (DSN)*, vol. 00, June 2008, pp. 197–206. [Online]. Available: doi.ieeecomputersociety.org/10.1109/DSN.2008.4630088
- [21] M. Correia, A. N. Bessani, L. C. Lung, and G. S. Veronese, "Spin one's wheels? byzantine fault tolerance with a spinning primary," in *Reliable Distributed Systems, IEEE Symposium on (SRDS)*, vol. 00, 09 2009, pp. 135–144. [Online]. Available: doi.ieeecomputersociety.org/10.1109/SRDS.2009.36
- [22] P. Jovanovic, J. R. Allen, T. Bowers, and G. Bosson, "dedis kyber," 2020.
- [23] M. M. Jalalzai, C. Busch, and G. G. Richard, "Proteus: A scalable bft consensus protocol for blockchains," in *2019 IEEE International Conference on Blockchain (Blockchain)*, 2019, pp. 308–313.
- [24] A. Bessani, J. Sousa, and E. E. P. Alchieri, "State machine replication for the masses with bft-smart," in *2014 44th Annual IEEE/IFIP International Conference on Dependable Systems and Networks*, 2014, pp. 355–362.