

# Fault Independence in Blockchain

Jiangshan Yu  
Monash University

**Abstract**—Byzantine Fault-Tolerant (BFT) protocols have been proposed to tolerate malicious behaviors in state machine replications. With classic BFT protocols, the total number of replicas is known and fixed a priori. The resilience of BFT protocols, i.e., the number of tolerated Byzantine replicas (denoted  $f$ ), is derived from the total number of replicas according to the quorum theory.

To guarantee that an attacker cannot control more than  $f$  replicas, so to guarantee safety, it is vital to ensure fault independence among all replicas. This in practice is achieved by enforcing diverse configurations of replicas, i.e., each replica has a unique configuration, avoiding  $f$  fault compromises more than  $f$  replicas.

While managing replica diversity in BFT protocols has been studied in permissioned environments with a small number of replicas, no prior work has discussed the fault independence in a permissionless environment (such as public blockchains) where anyone can join and leave the system at any time. This is particularly challenging due to the following two facts. First, with permissionless environment, any one can join as a replica at any time and no global coordinator can be relied on to manage replica diversity. Second, while great progress has been made to scale consensus algorithms to thousands of replicas, the replica diversity cannot provide fault independence at this scale, limiting practical and meaningful resilience.

This paper provides the first discussion on the impact of fault independence on permissionless blockchains, provides discussions on replica configuration diversity, quantifies replica diversity by using entropy, and defines optimal fault independence.

## I. INTRODUCTION

State Machine Replication (SMR) is a classical technique for implementing reliability and resilience services. Many critical infrastructure and Internet services, such as Google Spanner, implement Crash Fault-Tolerant State Machine Replication (CFT-SMR) to ensure that their services can continue in the presence of crash failures, in which machines stop working due to faults such as hardware failure, software failure, network failure or power failure. With increasing concerns of cyber-attacks, Byzantine Fault-Tolerant (BFT) protocols are considered to tolerate arbitrary faults (such as corruption and intrusions), where machines running BFT protocols can behave arbitrarily. For example, Boeing 777 and Boeing 787 implement BFT protocols in their Aircraft Information Management System [1].

All these CFT and BFT protocols are implemented and executed in well-controlled SMR environments, where the faults of different machines are assumed to be independent through diverse replicas. For clarity, we consider replicas as machines running fault tolerant protocols to replicate the

same state machine. The replica diversity in a permissioned environment can be implemented by enforcing machines using different Commercial-Off-The-Shelf components, such as operating system, external database, and critical crypto and fault tolerant libraries [2]. In this way, the probability of the same fault affecting multiple machines is reduced.

Permissionless blockchains [3] are one of the most popular applications deploying BFT protocols. They introduce a different system model where any participant can join and leave at any time. Such an environment makes diversity management very challenging, due to the lack of trust in individual participants and the lack of a global diversity manager. While the following discussion is generic and applies to different permissionless blockchains, for the ease of presentation we use Bitcoin [4] as an example in this paper.

Bitcoin [4] introduces a different fault model. Rather than considering the number of tolerated faulty machines, it argues that the system is secure if an attacker can only control a minority of hash power. Machines with hash power to perform the Nakamoto consensus are also called miners [4]. Following conventional naming, in the rest of this paper, we use the term “miner” to specify replicas in the permissionless blockchains.

Existing works have studied the upper bound of Byzantine hash power the system can tolerate under different system models [5]–[7]. In addition, the practicality of such an assumption (e.g., honest majority) held in practice has also been analysed and challenged [8]–[10].

All the prior works only consider the theoretical bounds of tolerated Byzantine hash power and factors to break the assumption by gaining more hash power. For example, prior works consider possibilities of renting hash power from cloud services or maintaining a mining pool of distributed machines [8], [10]. However, to the best of our knowledge, no work has considered the possibility of a single fault affecting multiple machines, leading to an attacker controlling a large amount of honest miners in permissionless environments. This may happen, for example, if the same operating system or application software (such as mining software or blockchain wallet) used by multiple machines has an exploitable vulnerability (such as zero-day vulnerability). Other examples include exploitable vulnerabilities in trusted hardware components (such as Intel SGX), that are required by hybrid fault-tolerant protocols for blockchain [11], [12]. Even though vulnerabilities can be patched, there exists a vulnerability window due to the latency in patching vulnerabilities [13], [14].

**Contribution.** We provide a first step in exploring the impact of fault independent on permissionless blockchains with the following two contributions. First, we provide a discussion

Preprint to appear in the [Disrupt Track](#) of DSN’23.

This work was supported by the Australian Research Council (ARC) under project [DE210100019](#).

on replica diversity and configuration discovery. Second, we propose to use entropy to quantify replica diversity and define optimal fault independence, which leads to three propositions on fault independence and resilience. We hope this would serve as a call for the dependability and fault-tolerant community to study this critical yet overlooked challenge.

## II. SYSTEM AND FAULT MODELS

### A. System model

We consider a permissionless blockchain environment where any participant can join and leave at any time. Let  $n_t$  be the total *voting power* in the system at time  $t$ . We define *voting power* as an abstraction representing the total amount of valid voting power units. For example, for BFT protocols with a fixed number of replicas,  $n_t$  represents the total number of replicas at time  $t$ . For Bitcoin,  $n_t$  represents the total computational power (measured by hashrate) on the Bitcoin network at time  $t$ . For permissionless protocols with membership selection to form a consensus committee [15], the voting power represents the total voting power of the committee, as all participants outside of the consensus committee do not have valid voting power.

A participant with voting power is called a “*replica*”. Each replica consists of a machine running a stack of software, where system software (i.e., operating systems) manages machine hardware and supports application software (such as implementations of blockchains).

### B. Adversary model

We consider Byzantine faults, which enables an attacker to arbitrarily delay, drop, re-order, insert, or modify messages. The total number of faults is measured and quantified by the amount of affected voting power. The upper bound  $f$  of tolerated faults is protocol specific.

We assume the security of the used cryptographic primitives and protocols, but **not** their implementations. For example, an attacker may compromise a replica if the deployed crypto library of the replica is flawed, but the attacker cannot compromise other replicas in the same way, if their deployed version of the crypto library has no exploitable vulnerabilities.

We consider a diverse vulnerabilities leading to Byzantine faults. Let  $k_t$  be the total number of diverse vulnerabilities at time  $t$ , and  $f_t^i$  be voting power (out of  $n_t$ ) affected by the Byzantine fault due to the  $i$ -th vulnerability at time  $t$ .

**Remark 1.** *Our work can be easily extended to a hybrid model considering multiple types of faults (e.g., a mix of Byzantine faults and crash faults), by using different variables/parameters to represent the total number of different types of faults. In addition, while faults can be detected and patched, they do not have any impact on this work as the attacks happen during the vulnerability windows.*

### C. The challenge

To guarantee system security, it is essential to ensure that the total number of Byzantine faults does not exceed the resilience ( $f$  replicas) of the system, i.e.,  $\forall t, f \geq \sum_{i=1}^{k_t} f_t^i$ .

However, this is extremely challenging to guarantee in permissionless blockchains. Therefore, the open challenge is identifying efficient ways to enforce the above equation in a permissionless environment, at least with a high probability. This introduces the following sub-challenges, which we provide discussions on the possible solutions in the next sections:

- *Challenge 1:* Replica configuration discovery in permissionless environments.
- *Challenge 2:* Fault independence quantification. Assuming that the configuration distribution of replicas is known, how to measure replica diversity to quantify fault independence is challenging.

## III. REPLICA DIVERSITY AND CONFIGURATION DISCOVERY

This section provides a brief discussion on the replica diversity and configuration discovery.

### A. Replica diversity

We consider three main components of a replica, including trusted hardware<sup>1</sup>, system software, and application software.

**Trusted hardware.** Many blockchain systems rely on trusted hardware for executing consensus or protecting privacy of smart contracts. For example, Intel’s Hyperledger Sawtooth requires Software Guard Extension (SGX) to perform PoET as a time-lottery-based consensus algorithm, allowing replica in the network to vote with equal chance [11], [16]. Another example is Damysus [12], where trusted hardware components are employed to improve the performance of streamlined consensus algorithms. However, trusted hardware are also vulnerable to attacks (e.g., a recent survey on SGX attacks [17]). Having diversity of trusted hardware would help to improve failure independence.

**Remark 2.** *The diversity of trusted hardware is limited, given the little choices of hardware-assisted isolated execution environments. One possibility is to implement software protocols to provide post device compromise security [13], [18]–[20]. Further discussions on how to detect the compromise of endpoint trusted hardware are vital for dependable blockchains but orthogonal to this work.*

**System software.** Operating system is arguably the heaviest component, in terms of complexity and lines of code, and the most targeted component. Given the importance of the operating system, there are many alternative sub-components to provide diversity in operating system. Lazarus [2] is a tool to automatically manage the diversity of operating systems for BFT protocols. While Lazarus cannot be directly used to manage diversity of operating systems in permissionless blockchains, we refer readers to their work for more detailed discussion on the diversity of operating systems.

**Application software.** Using different Commercial-Off-The-Shelf (COTS) application software in the software

<sup>1</sup>Other non-trusted hardware may also fail, but they are not an anchor of trust and not as significant when considering Byzantine faults.

stack [21] can improve fault independence. Out of many COTS components, such as databases and web browsers, the application software components that most directly related to blockchain dependability are the blockchain software. Two of the most important modules of blockchain software, in terms of security and fault tolerance, are the key/account management module and consensus module.

Wallet is commonly used to manage keys and accounts. Loosely speaking, a wallet can be a build-in wallet that is included in the software of a full node, or it can be a third party software managing private keys for users. When using a build-in wallet, there is a limited number of choices (e.g., implementing the same module with different languages or dependencies), leading to limited (or even no) variety. Third party wallet has many types, including mobile wallets, web wallets, desktop wallets, and hardware wallets. However, they are normally designed for end users rather than for replicas.

Another common way for end users to manage keys is the use of a delegation (such as exchange platforms), which often manages the private keys on behalf of users. The users only have a pair of user name and password of the third party service, rather than the actual public key and private key associated to the account, to claim the ownership. This allows exchange platforms to gain access to a large volume of stake, becoming an oligopoly, leading to safety concerns in the (potentially delegated) proof-of-stake based blockchains. This also reduces the diversity of replicas, as a potentially large number of replicas are represented by a single delegate.

Improving the diversity of consensus module, such as N-version BFT library [22], is a known open challenge due to its cost [2]. Possible ways to circumvent this challenge, protocols with proactive security [23]–[27] and self-stabilization [28] can be considered to reduce the potential risk.

Similar to key management, third party software for the consensus module are also available for users to “delegate” the voting power. For example, mining pool operators in Bitcoin attract and manage the mining power of distributed participants, leading to an oligopoly<sup>2</sup>. Possible solutions include the design of Non-outsourcable mining algorithms [29], [30] and decentralized mining pools [31].

### B. Configuration discovery

We consider the use of remote attestation to discover the configuration of a replica. The three main components of a replica, namely its trusted hardware, the system software, and the application software, can be attested by using remote attestation through trusted computing. For example, Trusted Platform Modules (TPMs) and Trusted Execution Environments (TEEs) support remote attestation of the replica system software and application software. As of Jan 2023, The *Trusted Computing Group* has certified 41 TPM products<sup>3</sup>, including 5

<sup>2</sup>The top 10 mining pools in Bitcoin in total possess over 96% mining power (7 day average), where the largest mining pool, i.e., Foundry USA, controls over 34% mining power. <https://www.blockchain.com/explorer/charts/pools> (as of 02 February 2023.)

<sup>3</sup><https://trustedcomputinggroup.org/membership/certification/tpm-certified-products/>

products on the latest specification (TPM 2.0, Revision 01.59). Similarly, TEE implementations are also supported by several hardware technologies, such as *ARM TrustZone*, *Intel Software Guard Extensions (SGX)*, *IBM Secure Service Container*, and *AMD Platform Security Processor (PSP)*. Services, such as Microsoft Azure Attestation, are also available to provide a unified attestation solution.

**Remark 3. Additional concerns.** *When using remote attestation, it is essential to associate the secret key for attestation and the secret key for authenticating a vote, proving that a vote indeed comes from a replica with the attested configuration. This can be done in different ways, for example, by using the TEE to create a vote as in Damysus BFT [12]. In addition, the privacy of replica configuration should also be protected, as otherwise it provides attackers a clear target when new vulnerabilities are exposed.*

## IV. MEASURING REPLICA DIVERSITY

### A. Modeling replica diversity

We propose using entropy to measure replica diversity. Let  $\mathbf{D} = \{d_1, \dots, d_k\}$  be the complete space of replica confirmation that can be remotely attested, where each element in  $\mathbf{D}$  is a unique replica confirmation, s.t.  $d_i \neq d_j$  for all  $i, j \in [k]$ ,  $[k] = \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$  and  $i \neq j$ .

Let  $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_k)$  be a probability distribution of  $\mathbf{D}$  on  $k$  replica configurations, i.e.,  $(d_1, \dots, d_k)$ . For all  $i \in [k]$ ,  $p_i$  represents the ratio of replicas having configuration  $d_i$ . If no replica has configuration  $d_i$ , then  $d_i = 0$  and we define  $\log \frac{1}{0} = 0$ . The Shannon entropy  $H(\mathbf{p})$  of  $\mathbf{p}$  is

$$H(\mathbf{p}) = - \sum_{i \in [k]} p_i \log p_i = \sum_{i \in [k]} p_i \log \frac{1}{p_i}.$$

For a given  $\mathbf{p}$  of  $\mathbf{D}$ , the maximal value of  $H(\mathbf{p})$  represents the ideal worst-case resilience, as maximising  $H(\mathbf{p})$  requires:

- *Uniform distribution of replicas.* For the same number of available configuration (i.e., the number of nonzero elements in the probability distribution  $\mathbf{p}$  is identical),  $H(\mathbf{p})$  is at its maximum when  $p_i = p_j$ , for all  $i, j \in [k]$  and nonzero  $p_i$  and  $p_j$ .
- *Greater diversity* in available replica configurations, i.e., more nonzero elements in  $\mathbf{p}$ .

The above two conditions to maximise entropy are orthogonal, as the entropy of a probability distribution with more available replica configurations is not necessarily larger. We define it formally below.

**Definition 1.** ( *$\kappa$ -optimal fault independence*). *For all  $\kappa \leq k$ , a replica configuration distribution  $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_k)$  achieves  $\kappa$ -optimal fault independence iff the following holds:*

- $|\mathbf{p}'| = \kappa$ , where  $\mathbf{p}' = \{\forall p_i \in \mathbf{p} : p_i \neq 0\}$ ;
- $\forall p_i, p_j \in \mathbf{p}', p_i = p_j$ .



## B. The impact of configuration abundance

The definition of  $\kappa$ -optimal fault independence maximises the entropy of distributions where  $|\mathbf{p}'| = \kappa$ . However, theoretically they are not equivalent, which we will explain by using *configuration abundance*. In ecology, abundance has been used to measure the number of individuals found per sample. In this work, we use *configuration abundance* to define the number of individuals per replica configuration, and *relative configuration abundance* to represent the associated percent composition. The former is useful for traditional BFT protocols, where the number of replica matters. The latter is particularly useful for Bitcoin-like protocols, where the relative configuration abundance represents mining power distribution.

**Proposition 1.** *For  $\kappa$ -optimal fault independence system, increasing configuration abundance decreases entropy, unless the relative configuration abundance remains identical.*

**Proposition 2.** *Assuming each replica has a unique configuration, having more replicas does not provide more resilience, unless the relative configuration abundances are identical.*

While Prop. 1 is intuitive, we use the following example to illustrate Prop. 2.

**Example 1.** *We analyse the best case entropy of replica diversity in Bitcoin (Figure 1). As of 02 February 2023, 17 mining pools in Bitcoin possess 99.13% mining power, where the distribution is (34.239%, 19.981%, 12.997%, 11.348%, 8.826%, 2.619%, 2.037%, 1.649%, 1.358%, 1.261%, 0.78%, 0.68%, 0.68%, 0.39%, 0.10%, 0.10%, 0.10%)<sup>4</sup>. We take this as an example to quantify Bitcoin replica diversity. We consider the best possible configuration diversity of all replicas in Bitcoin, that is, we assume that each of the mining pools has a unique configuration where a fault in one pool does not affect other pools. In addition, since the distribution of the rest 0.87% mining power is unknown, we consider the rest 0.87% mining power is uniformly distributed to a number of replicas ranging from 1 to 1000. Figure 1 presents the entropy distribution. This shows that, even with a large number of miners in Bitcoin, as there is an oligopoly in Bitcoin, the entropy is less than 3. However, when considering BFT protocols with 8 replicas, the entropy is already higher (entropy is 3) also assuming a unique configuration per replica. This reveals that, at least from this simplified model, Bitcoin with a large number of miners does not provide better fault tolerance than BFT protocols with a small number of replicas, when oligopoly exists (represented by the relative configuration abundance).*

Traditional BFT-SMR systems assume that each replica has a unique configuration to guarantee optimal fault independence, i.e., the configuration abundance is 1 for all configurations. This is sufficient but not necessary to achieve  $\kappa$ -optimal fault independence, i.e., it satisfies our above  $\kappa$ -optimal fault independence, but at the same time it also requires *only one replica per unique configuration*. While this provides ideal




Fig. 1. Best case entropy of Bitcoin replica diversity, assuming each miner has a unique configuration. X-axis indicates the number of miners where 0.87% mining power has been uniformly distributed to. For example, when  $x=101$ , it means that there are 118 miners in the system, where the mining power (99.13%) of the top 17 miners are distributed as in Example 1 and the rest 0.87% mining power are uniformly distributed among other 101 miners.

fault independence, i.e., the same fault does not allow an attacker to control more than one replica, it only applies to the adversary model where cyber-attackers controlling replicas via exploitable faults.

**Proposition 3.** *Higher configuration abundance improves the resilience of permissionless blockchains.*

This proposition is discussed below and motivates us to define optimal resilience as follows:

**Definition 2.** ( $(\kappa, \omega)$ -optimal resilience). *A system is  $(\kappa, \omega)$ -optimal resilience if it is  $\kappa$ -optimal fault independence with configuration abundance of  $\omega$ .*

When Byzantine faults are only introduced by vulnerabilities (which is more likely to be the case for permissioned systems), higher configuration abundance doesn't help to improve resilience. However, configuration abundance provides extra resilience in the case where cyberattacks are not the only reason for having a Byzantine replica. For example, a replica may choose to be malicious for gaining financial benefits, which is a widely accepted adversary model and concern in permissionless blockchains. In this case, a higher configuration abundance help improve resilience as the malicious operator cannot control other replicas of the same configuration. This introduces a trade-off between performance and reliability, as a higher configuration abundance always introduces more network overhead, as the number of messages to communicate is also increasing proportionally.

## V. CONCLUSION

This paper investigated fault independence in permissionless blockchains. We do not expect every replica to equip with a trusted hardware for configuration attestation. However, having two types of replicas (potentially with different voting right/weight), one supporting configuration attestation and one does not, will help to improve blockchain resilience. We leave further details and discussions as future work.

<sup>4</sup><https://www.blockchain.com/explorer/charts/pools> (02 February 2023.)

## REFERENCES

- [1] Y. C. Yeh, "Safety critical avionics for the 777 primary flight controls system," in *The 20th Digital Avionics Systems Conference (DASC)*, 2001.
- [2] M. Garcia, A. Bessani, and N. Neves, "Lazarus: Automatic management of diversity in BFT systems," in *The 20th International Middleware Conference*, 2019, pp. 241–254.
- [3] M. Vukolić, "The quest for scalable blockchain fabric: Proof-of-Work vs. BFT replication," in *Open Problems in Network Security*, 2015, pp. 112–125.
- [4] S. Nakamoto, "Bitcoin: A peer-to-peer electronic cash system," 2009. [Online]. Available: <https://bitcoin.org>
- [5] I. Eyal and E. G. Sirer, "Majority is not enough: Bitcoin mining is vulnerable," in *Financial Cryptography and Data Security (FC)*, 2014.
- [6] K. A. Negy, P. R. Rizun, and E. G. Sirer, "Selfish mining re-examined," in *Financial Cryptography and Data Security (FC)*, 2020, pp. 61–78.
- [7] T. Cao, J. Decouchant, and J. Yu, "Leveraging the verifier's dilemma to double spend in Bitcoin," in *Financial Cryptography and Data Security (FC)*, 2023.
- [8] J. Bonneau, "Why buy when you can rent? - bribery attacks on Bitcoin-style consensus," in *Financial Cryptography and Data Security (FC)*, 2016.
- [9] J. Yu, D. Kozhaya, J. Decouchant, and P. J. E. Verissimo, "Repucoin: Your reputation is your power," *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, vol. 68, no. 8, pp. 1225–1237, 2019.
- [10] R. Han, Z. Sui, J. Yu, J. K. Liu, and S. Chen, "Fact and fiction: Challenging the honest majority assumption of permissionless blockchains," in *ACM Asia Conference on Computer and Communications Security (ASIACCS)*, 2021, pp. 817–831.
- [11] Intelledger, "Proof of elapsed time," 2016. [Online]. Available: <https://intelledger.github.io/introduction.html>
- [12] J. Decouchant, D. Kozhaya, V. Rahli, and J. Yu, "DAMYSUS: streamlined BFT consensus leveraging trusted components," in *The 17th European Conference on Computer Systems (EuroSys)*, 2022, pp. 1–16.
- [13] J. Yu and M. D. Ryan, "Device attacker models: Fact and fiction," in *Security Protocols XXIII*, 2015, pp. 158–167.
- [14] BitcoinCore, "CVE-2017-18350 Disclosure," 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://bitcoincore.org/en/2019/11/08/CVE-2017-18350/>
- [15] C. Natoli, J. Yu, V. Gramoli, and P. J. E. Verissimo, "Deconstructing blockchains: A comprehensive survey on consensus, membership and structure," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1908.08316, 2019.
- [16] Hyperledger, "Hyperledger Sawtooth." [Online]. Available: <https://sawtooth.hyperledger.org>
- [17] S. van Schaik, C. Garman, A. Seto, D. Genkin, T. Yurek, A. Miller, A. Batori, E. Ronen, B. Albassam, and Y. Yarom, "SoK: SGX.Fail: How stuff gets eXposed," in *Real World Crypto*, 2023.
- [18] J. Yu, "Mitigating private key compromise," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Birmingham, UK, 2016.
- [19] K. Milner, C. Cremers, J. Yu, and M. Ryan, "Automatically detecting the misuse of secrets: Foundations, design principles, and applications," in *The 30th IEEE Computer Security Foundations Symposium (CSF)*, 2017, pp. 203–216.
- [20] J. Yu, M. Ryan, and C. Cremers, "DECIM: detecting endpoint compromise in messaging," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 106–118, 2018.
- [21] Y. Deswarte, K. Kanoun, and J.-C. Laprie, "Diversity against accidental and deliberate faults," in *the Conference on Computer Security, Dependability, and Assurance: From Needs to Solutions*, 1998.
- [22] A. Avizienis, "The n-version approach to fault-tolerant software," *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, vol. 11, no. 12, pp. 1491–1501, 1985.
- [23] M. Castro and B. Liskov, "Practical Byzantine fault tolerance and proactive recovery," *ACM Transactions on Computer Systems*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 398–461, 2002.
- [24] P. Sousa, A. N. Bessani, M. Correia, N. F. Neves, and P. Verissimo, "Highly available intrusion-tolerant services with proactive-reactive recovery," *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 452–465, 2010.
- [25] T. Distler, I. Popov, W. Schröder-Preikschat, H. P. Reiser, and R. Kapitza, "SPARE: replicas on hold," in *The Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS)*, 2011.
- [26] J. Yu, M. Ryan, and L. Chen, "Authenticating compromisable storage systems," in *IEEE Trustcom*, 2017, pp. 25–32.
- [27] R. Vassantlal, E. Alchieri, B. Ferreira, and A. Bessani, "COBRA: dynamic proactive secret sharing for confidential BFT services," in *The 43rd IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 1335–1353.
- [28] E. W. Dijkstra, "Self-stabilizing systems in spite of distributed control," *Commun. ACM*, vol. 17, no. 11, pp. 643–644, 1974.
- [29] A. Miller, A. E. Kosba, J. Katz, and E. Shi, "Nonoutsourcable scratch-off puzzles to discourage Bitcoin mining coalitions," in *The 22nd ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS)*, 2015, pp. 680–691.
- [30] R. Han, H. Lin, and J. Yu, "VRF-based mining simple non-outsourcable cryptocurrencies mining," in *Data Privacy Management, Cryptocurrencies and Blockchain Technology (DPM and CBT) - ESORICS International Workshops*, 2020, pp. 287–304.
- [31] L. Luu, Y. Velner, J. Teutsch, and P. Saxena, "Smartpool: Practical decentralized pooled mining," in *The 26th USENIX Security Symposium*, 2017, pp. 1409–1426.