

Transaction Capacity, Security and Latency in Blockchains

Mustafa Doger Sennur Ulukus

Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering
University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742
doger@umd.edu ulukus@umd.edu

Abstract

We analyze how secure a block is after the block becomes k -deep, i.e., security-latency, for Nakamoto consensus under an exponential network delay model. We give parameter regimes for which transactions are safe when sufficiently deep in the chain. We compare our results for Nakamoto consensus under bounded network delay models and obtain analogous bounds for safety violation threshold. Next, modeling the blockchain system as a batch service queue with exponential network delay, we connect the security-latency analysis to sustainable transaction rate of the queue system. As our model assumes exponential network delay, batch service queue models give a meaningful trade-off between transaction capacity, security and latency. As adversary can attack the queue service to hamper the service process, we consider two different attacks for adversary. In an extreme scenario, we modify the selfish-mining attack for this purpose and consider its effect on the sustainable transaction rate of the queue.

1 Introduction

Blockchains allow users to maintain a distributed ledger of accounts. Nakamoto's white paper [1] described a mining procedure of nonces (proof of work, PoW) and a longest chain protocol that enables the users to converge to a single version of the ledger. The protocol requires the users to mine a new block at the tip of their longest chain of blocks which contains a nonce proving the validity of the block and enabling the miner of the block to get a reward for its troubles.

Some blocks are mined on the same height in the chain due to network delays and create forks that divide the network into two different versions of the ledger. Adversarial activities can create deliberate forks as well that undermine the security of the chain and result in larger latency until a block can be confirmed together with its transactions. The more one

waits to confirm a block, the safer the content of the block will be, i.e., it is less likely that another block at the same height (another version of the ledger) is confirmed after the block is confirmed. This is referred to as the *security-latency problem*. The security-latency problem has been extensively analyzed by various different models and protocols [2–9]. Under bounded network delay Δ , [5] analyzes how secure a block is after waiting t time units whereas [6,8] answer the same security question using block generations as time units.

As transactions arrive to the blockchain system, they are included in the next blocks that are to be mined based on the fee they offer to the miner. The miner of a block can only include up to a certain number of transactions or the block can have up to a certain size of storage units (bytes). In this sense, the blockchain systems can be modeled as a priority-queue, where transactions enter a queue and compete to be included in the next block. Different batch service queues have been modeled for blockchain analysis [10–13]. [10] has given an insightful batch service queue model and has evaluated the average service time and correctly interpreted that the micro-payments are not sustainable for the Bitcoin system. [11] models a batch service queue for Bitcoin that gives an estimate service time of a transaction given the fee and current state of the mempool. Since each mined block experiences a network delay until the other miners can observe it, which decreases the rate of service of transactions, [14] re-models the batch service queue system that accounts for the network delay and gives the stability condition for the queue system as well as a numerical method to find the steady state of the system.

In this paper, we first give bounds on the security-latency question, i.e., how secure a block is after a certain number of blocks are published, where we re-model the delay with exponential distribution and consider a rigged model first introduced in [6]. This analysis in turn is interpreted as how fast blocks can be mined given honest proportion of nodes α , a confirmation rule and a security threshold. Then, we show that the security level can be parameterized in terms of the proportion of mining rate to the network delay which we call κ . Next, the security-latency analysis is connected to the queue model via the stability condition of the batch service queue system which enables us to reinterpret the number of transactions a blockchain system can sustain as a function of the block size, network conditions and κ . We also consider several queue service attacks and their effect on sustainable transaction rate. Although we consider a first-come, first-served queue model, this model could be interpreted as a queue system, where we only consider transactions in the service that have a high priority, i.e., it is a first-come, first-served queue model for transactions that pay a sufficient fee. Otherwise, it does not make sense to consider the stability condition as the low-fee transactions are too many to have a stable system. This priority model is inspired by the two-class queue model of [10] and can also be interpreted as that of [11], where the transactions in the queue are considered as pending only when they pay more fee than the fee a user is willing to pay.

Our findings imply that for given network conditions, a block size b , honest proportion

α , security violation probability threshold \bar{p} , increasing k -block confirmation rule allows the mining rate to increase which in turn increases the sustainable transaction rate. This adjustment of confirmation rule and mining rate first drops the expected transaction confirmation time until a point where a minimum is achieved and further increasing k -block confirmation rule starts to increase the expected transaction confirmation time, i.e., a trade-off emerges.

For Bitcoin parameters, using our model, current transaction safety violation probability threshold is found to be 0.00118 and ≈ 7 transactions per second is shown to be sustainable. Using the same block size b and network conditions for Bitcoin, by increasing the mining rate so that a block is mined every ≈ 90 seconds, sustainable transaction rate increases to ≈ 50 , safety violation probability threshold increases to 0.002 and a transaction is confirmed after ≈ 9 minutes. By keeping 0.00118 as safety violation probability threshold and switching 6-block confirmation rule to 10-block confirmation rule, a block can be mined every ≈ 17 seconds, which increases sustainable transaction rate up to ≈ 235 and a transaction is confirmed after ≈ 3 minutes.

Concurrent with our work, we became aware of [15], which established a new model to analyze the security-latency trade-off for bounded delay model that works for safety parameters up to ultimate fault tolerance and replaces previously established rigged model of [6,7] with a partial Markov chain that counts the number of successful balanced attacks by the adversary. The results are connected to throughput by simply multiplying the block size with the rate of growth under Δ -delay strategy explained in [7]. An optimization problem is formulated for the throughput and security-latency and a trade-off is established between latency and throughput for a given security level. Different from [15], we independently used an exponential delay model which is then connected to the throughput via a batch-service queue system and its stability condition. As the stability condition for exponential delay model, first established in [14], ends up with the same form as the product of the block size with the rate of growth under Δ -delay strategy for bounded delay model, optimistic results for the throughput in both methods agree with each other. In addition to optimistic throughput analysis, here, we consider two different queue-attack strategies, a mild one and a pessimistic one in order to reflect the change in throughput under different situations. Although an analogous throughput-latency result can be established with an optimization problem via our analysis, since we argue against an optimization problem that treats block size independent from security level, our interpretation of the trade-off differs from [15], where we pick a security level and a block size then compare different k -confirmation rules and mining rates.

2 System Model

We assume the reader has familiarity with blockchain protocols, specifically those that employ PoW and longest chain rules. We consider a blockchain network model with n miner

nodes who compete for mining the next block where n is large. A block in this model is considered to be valid if it contains a valid nonce and at most b transactions all of which have to be semantically correct (we assume they are). The transactions arrive with an exponential rate of λ to the mempools of the nodes to be included in the next blocks and are served based on first-come, first-served principle. We assume a transaction arrives to all mempools at the same time (each honest node has its own mempool based on the longest chain they observed). We abstract out all semantic details of validity of transactions and block contents together with a valid nonce as a Poisson process with mining (arrival) rate of μ_2 . This mining process is essentially conducted by n (assumed to be large enough) miner nodes in the system. Out of these n nodes, α proportion are honest and they follow the longest chain protocol, i.e., they mine on the tip of the longest chain they have seen so far. The other nodes, which make up $\beta = 1 - \alpha$ proportion, are adversarial and are allowed to deviate from the longest chain protocol as long as the block they mine contains a valid nonce. Additionally, each block at height h that is mined by an honest node is subject to a network delay of $t_{hi} \in [0, \Delta_h]$ before it becomes available to any other honest node i , where $\Delta_h \sim Exp(\mu_1)$ where Δ_h are i.i.d. In other words, once an honest node mines a block b_h at height h with a valid nonce, the block becomes available to other honest nodes after some delay which is at most $\Delta_h \sim Exp(\mu_1)$. In this model, a single adversary is assumed to be controlling all β mining power (fully-coordinating adversaries) and the network delay as long as $t_{hi} \in [0, \Delta_h]$, and ties are broken in adversary's favor. A transaction in this model is said to be confirmed according to a k -block confirmation rule if it is part of the longest chain of an honest view and k -deep, i.e., there are at least $k - 1$ blocks mined on top of it. We denote this system model as $\mathbb{B}(\alpha, b, \mu_1, \mu_2, \lambda, k)$.

It is important to point out the difference of the delay model here from those that are commonly used for the security-latency analysis in the literature. Here, we assume an honest block at height h is delayed for some $t_{hi} \in [0, \Delta_h]$ where $\Delta_h \sim Exp(\mu_1)$ before it is available to honest node i whereas delays are taken to be bounded between zero and some constant maximum delay Δ in [4–6, 9], i.e., $t_{hi} \in [0, \Delta]$ for $\forall h, i$. Models with constant maximum delays were proven to be secure against adversarial behavior with $\beta < \frac{1-\beta}{1+(1-\beta)\lambda\Delta}$ in the long-run [4]. We provide our conjecture for the ultimate fault tolerance for exponential delay model in Appendix C. Further, in Section 3, we give loose conditions under which the model is secure and rigorously calculate an upper bound for safety violation probability, and show that this probability decays with k .

Further, we note that a slightly different version of this system model without any adversarial behavior and maximum exponential delay, i.e., $t_{hi} = \Delta_h$ for all i was studied as a two-step batch service queue in [14].

Our main goal here is to bring latency-security analysis and queue analysis studied in the literature together. More specifically, we want to find the maximum transaction arrival rate λ a blockchain system can sustain under different adversarial attacks, given honest

Parameters	Definitions
λ	transaction arrival rate
α	honest fraction of all nodes (power)
β	$1 - \alpha$
μ_1	rate of network delay
μ_2	rate of mining
σ	$\frac{\mu_1}{\mu_1 + \mu_2}$
ρ	$1 - \sigma$
σ'	$\frac{\mu_1}{\mu_1 + \mu_2 \beta}$
ρ'	$1 - \sigma'$
\bar{a}_i	$\alpha \rho^i + \beta \cdot \mathbb{1}_{i \leq 2}$
\bar{b}_i	$\alpha \rho^i + \beta \cdot \mathbb{1}_{i \leq 1}$
κ	$\frac{\rho}{\sigma} = \frac{\mu_2}{\mu_1}$

Table 1: Frequently used notations.

proportion α , block size b , safety violation threshold p . Table 1 shows some frequently used variables throughout this paper to ease the navigation of the paper for the reader.

3 Rigged Private Attack

We consider a rigged jumper model and private attack for adversarial strategy, to be defined next and denoted as $\bar{\mathbb{B}}(\alpha, b, \mu_1, \mu_2, \lambda, k)$. Consider the genesis block, which is at height $h = 0$ and available to all nodes at time $t = 0$ and called the zeroth jumper block. At time $t > 0$, the honest node i is trying to mine a new block on top of the genesis block that contains $\min(b, |Q_i(t)|)$ transactions, where $Q_i(t)$ is the mempool at time t observed by honest node i . The block b_1 , which is the first honest block mined on top of the genesis block contains the least number of transactions compared to any other honest block at the same height $h = 1$. After this first honest block on $h = 1$ is mined, say at time t_1 , all other honest blocks mined by other honest nodes on the same height $h = 1$ between t_1 and $t_1 + \Delta_1$ are converted to an adversarial block, i.e., they are rigged. As a result, b_1 , which we call the first jumper, that was mined first on $h = 1$, will enter the view of all other honest nodes at time $t_1 + \Delta_1$ and will be the only block at this height for all of them since they will have to mine on $h = 2$ after $t_1 + \Delta_1$. We assume the same conversion of honest blocks for $h = 2, \dots$ which we call rigged jumper model. Note that in this model, we have a single honest block on each height. It is proven in [6] that *private attack* is the best attack to cancel a transaction after it is confirmed under the condition that all honest blocks are on different heights (we denote this condition in short as AHBODH) for bounded Δ -delay model. Next, we restate this theorem proven in [6] for exponential network delay. We skip proving this theorem as it essentially follows the same steps as bounded Δ -delay model, by simply replacing Δ with

$\Delta_h \sim \text{Exp}(\mu_1)$ in [6, Lemma 8] and [6, Corollary 11].

Theorem 1 (Guo-Ren [6]) *Under AHBODH, if any attack succeeds in violating a transaction’s safety then the private mining attack also succeeds in violating that transaction’s safety.*

The safety violation probability, $\bar{p}(\alpha, \mu_1, \mu_2, k)$ of $\bar{\mathbb{B}}(\alpha, b, \mu_1, \mu_2, \lambda, k)$ is an upper bound on the safety violation probability $p(\alpha, \mu_1, \mu_2, k)$ of $\mathbb{B}(\alpha, b, \mu_1, \mu_2, \lambda, k)$ which follows from Theorem 1 and the fact that the adversary is given the advantage of rigged blocks. In other words, assuming $t_{hi} = \Delta_h$ for all honest i , i.e., each honest node i experiences maximum possible delay for any honest block at height h and rigged adversarial blocks make sure that the adversary is strictly more powerful than it actually is and AHBODH is satisfied, thus we can upper bound the probability of violating a transaction’s safety. Note that, in the model described as $\bar{\mathbb{B}}(\alpha, b, \mu_1, \mu_2, \lambda, k)$, all mempools during $[t_h + \Delta_h, t_{h+1}]$ are the same. Further, as any honest block mined during $[t_h, t_h + \Delta_h]$ is rigged, the mempools observed by honest nodes are effectively the same all the time, which is denoted as $Q(t)$. We call the mining process of building blocks with a valid nonce, controlled by rate μ_2 , as the block-generation process. The network delay process after a block is mined, which is controlled by rate μ_1 , is called blockchain-building process.

3.1 Security-Latency Analysis

We are interested in security-latency analysis of a certain high priority transaction tx which arrives at the mempool at time τ , i.e., we would like to find the safety violation probability which is the probability that tx is discarded after it is confirmed under the k -block confirmation rule. Here, for simplicity, we assume at the time of arrival of tx , $|Q(\tau)| < b$. This assumption can be interpreted as a transaction that has high priority and will enter the next block. The rigorous analysis done in this section can be extended for the case where $|Q(\tau)| \geq b$, which we will explain in Appendix B.

As mentioned earlier, the safety violation probability of $\mathbb{B}(\alpha, b, \mu_1, \mu_2, \lambda, k)$ is upper bounded by the safety violation probability of $\bar{\mathbb{B}}(\alpha, b, \mu_1, \mu_2, \lambda, k)$. Hence, we use the rigged private attack to find $\bar{p}(\alpha, \mu_1, \mu_2, k)$, an upper bound for $p(\alpha, \mu_1, \mu_2, k)$.

3.2 Pre-Mining Gain

We start by analyzing the lead of the adversary at time τ , which is the difference between the longest chain and the longest honest chain just before the transaction arrives at the system. As it was done in [5, 6, 8], we assume that τ is large, thus we model the lead as the stationary distribution of an extended birth-death process of the rigged model. The steady state distribution of the following extended birth-death Markov chain transition matrix will

be equal to adversary's lead:

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha\sigma & \alpha\sigma\rho + \beta & \alpha\sigma\rho^2 & \alpha\sigma\rho^3 & \alpha\sigma\rho^4 & \dots \\ \alpha\sigma & \alpha\sigma\rho & \alpha\sigma\rho^2 + \beta & \alpha\sigma\rho^3 & \alpha\sigma\rho^4 & \dots \\ 0 & \alpha\sigma & \alpha\sigma\rho & \alpha\sigma\rho^2 + \beta & \alpha\sigma\rho^3 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & \alpha\sigma & \alpha\sigma\rho & \alpha\sigma\rho^2 + \beta & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}. \quad (1)$$

The reasoning is as follows: Assume adversarial lead is $l > 0$ and blockchain-building process is not active at some random time, i.e., no block with a valid nonce is experiencing network delay (e.g., right after genesis-block is published at $t = 0$). Hence, the block-generation process will create a new “mining event.” At each “mining event,” we toss a coin. With probability β , the mined block is adversarial and the lead increases by 1. Since adversary does not share the block, we do not need to consider network delay in this case. With probability α , the mined block is an honest block, and we consider the network delay on blockchain-building process following this “mining event.” Before the honest block is published, during the network delay which is distributed exponentially with μ_1 , we consider how many additional blocks can be mined. Honest blocks will be converted to adversarial during this delay time due to the rigged model. Since the mining times are distributed exponentially with rate μ_2 , i additional blocks are mined before the honest block is published with probability $\sigma\rho^i$, all of which will extend the adversarial lead (honest blocks will be rigged). Hence, the lead increases by $i - 1$ by the time the honest block is published with probability $\sigma\rho^i$. Note that the lead cannot go below 0 since when adversary has no lead, it can mine its private chain on top of the newly mined honest block, hence we have a birth-death process. The first row is accounting for this fact as we assume that the adversary is aware of any mined block immediately (upper bound).

Note that the P in [8] is structurally the same as here (i.e., a stochastic matrix of M/G/1 type) even though the delay models are different. Next, we find the steady state of matrix P using Ramaswami's formula [16].

Lemma 1 (Ramaswami [16]) *Steady state of P can be found recursively using*

$$\pi_i = \frac{\pi_0 \bar{b}_i + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \pi_j \bar{a}_{i+1-j}}{1 - \bar{a}_1}, \quad i \geq 1, \quad (2)$$

where $\pi_0 = 3 - \sigma^{-1} - \alpha^{-1}$.

Proof: Note that, finding \bar{a}_i and \bar{b}_i is a straightforward application of Ramaswami's formula and they are provided in Table 1. Here, we only prove that $\pi_0 = 3 - \sigma^{-1} - \alpha^{-1}$.

Summing (2) for $i \geq 1$, we get,

$$(1 - \bar{a}_1) \sum_{i \geq 1} \pi_i = \sum_{i \geq 1} \left(\pi_0 \bar{b}_i + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \pi_j \bar{a}_{i+1-j} \right) \quad (3)$$

$$= \pi_0 \sum_{i \geq 1} \bar{b}_i + \sum_{i \geq 2} \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \pi_j \bar{a}_{i+1-j} \quad (4)$$

$$= \pi_0 \left(\alpha \frac{\rho}{\sigma} + \beta \right) + \sum_{j \geq 1} \sum_{i > j} \pi_j \bar{a}_{i+1-j} \quad (5)$$

$$= \pi_0 \left(\alpha \frac{\rho}{\sigma} + \beta \right) + \sum_{j \geq 1} \pi_j \sum_{i \geq 2} \bar{a}_i \quad (6)$$

$$= \pi_0 \left(\alpha \frac{\rho}{\sigma} + \beta \right) + \sum_{i \geq 1} \pi_i \left(\alpha \frac{\rho^2}{\sigma} + \beta \right). \quad (7)$$

Substituting $\sum_{i \geq 1} \pi_i = 1 - \pi_0$ and $(1 - \bar{a}_1) = \alpha\sigma$ and expanding terms,

$$\alpha\sigma(1 - \pi_0) = \pi_0 \left(\alpha \frac{\rho^2}{\sigma} + \alpha \frac{\rho\sigma}{\sigma} + \beta \right) + (1 - \pi_0) \left(\alpha \frac{\rho^2}{\sigma} + \beta \right) \quad (8)$$

$$= \pi_0 \alpha \rho + \alpha \frac{\rho^2}{\sigma} + \beta. \quad (9)$$

Finally,

$$\pi_0 = \sigma - \frac{\rho^2}{\sigma} - \frac{\beta}{\alpha} \quad (10)$$

$$= \frac{\sigma^2 - \rho^2}{\sigma} - \frac{\beta}{\alpha} \quad (11)$$

$$= 1 - \frac{\rho}{\sigma} - \frac{\beta}{\alpha} \quad (12)$$

gives the desired result. ■

We denote the distribution of the lead as Π where $P(\Pi = i) = \pi_i$.

3.3 Confirmation Interval

At time τ , which is assumed to be large, target tx enters the system and will be included in the next honest block by assumption (e.g., high priority). Since τ is large enough and the lead is calculated as a steady state scenario, i.e., as an initial condition, we assume that the process described from $t = 0$ until τ is independent from what follows next. We also provide a method without independence assumption in Appendix A. The duration starting with τ until the time that tx is confirmed by the honest miners, i.e., the block containing tx becomes k -deep in all honest views, is called the confirmation interval. Denoting the mining time of the k th jumper block after τ as τ_k and exponential delay of the k th jumper block as

Δ_k , confirmation interval spans $[\tau, \tau_k + \Delta_k]$.

Our goal is to find how many adversarial (including rigged) blocks are mined privately during the confirmation interval. To do that, we first find the distribution of the number of adversarial blocks mined between the publication times of two honest jumpers, denoted C .

Lemma 2 *The number of adversarial (including rigged) blocks mined between the publication times of two consecutive jumper blocks C has the following distribution,*

$$P_C(c) = \alpha\beta^c\sigma \sum_{j=0}^c \left(\frac{\rho}{\beta}\right)^j. \quad (13)$$

Proof: After an honest (jumper) is published, there can be m adversarial arrivals before the arrival of the next jumper with probability $\beta^m\alpha$. After the arrival of this honest block, there can be additional j block arrivals with probability $\rho^j\sigma$ before this block is published under exponential network delay. Summing these two cases, i.e., $c = j + m$ results in (13). This jumper block will be published at the end of the exponential network delay. Moreover, by the memoryless property, the next jumper also has the same distribution and they are independent, thus, they are i.i.d. ■

The confirmation interval contains k jumper blocks, hence the distribution of the number of adversarial blocks mined privately during the confirmation interval, denoted as S_k , is equal to the sum of k i.i.d. random variables C .

Corollary 1 *The number of adversarial (including rigged) arrivals during the confirmation interval, denoted as S_k , has the following distribution,*

$$P_{S_k}(s) = \alpha^k\sigma^k\beta^s \sum_{n=0}^s \binom{k-1+n}{n} \binom{k-1+s-n}{s-n} \left(\frac{\rho}{\beta}\right)^n. \quad (14)$$

Proof: We start by computing the probability generating function (PGF) of C ,

$$G_C(z) = \alpha\sigma \sum_{c \geq 0} (z\beta)^c \sum_{j=0}^c \left(\frac{\rho}{\beta}\right)^j \quad (15)$$

$$= \alpha\sigma \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{c \geq j} (z\beta)^c \left(\frac{\rho}{\beta}\right)^j \quad (16)$$

$$= \alpha\sigma \sum_{j \geq 0} \frac{(z\rho)^j}{1 - z\beta} \quad (17)$$

$$= \frac{\alpha\sigma}{(1 - z\beta)(1 - z\rho)}. \quad (18)$$

Next, PGF of S_k denoted as $G_{S_k}(z)$, is,

$$G_{S_k}(z) = G_C(z)^k \tag{19}$$

$$= \alpha^k \sigma^k \frac{1}{(1 - z\beta)^k} \frac{1}{(1 - z\rho)^k} \tag{20}$$

$$= \alpha^k \sigma^k \sum_{m \geq 0} \binom{k-1+m}{m} z^m \beta^m \sum_{n \geq 0} \binom{k-1+n}{n} z^n \rho^n \tag{21}$$

$$= \sum_{s \geq 0} \alpha^k \sigma^k z^s \beta^s \sum_{n=0}^s \binom{k-1+n}{n} \binom{k-1+s-n}{s-n} \left(\frac{\rho}{\beta}\right)^n, \tag{22}$$

which completes the proof. ■

3.4 Post-Confirmation Race

The block containing target transaction tx will be confirmed when k -deep at $\tau_k + \Delta_k$. At the same time, a conflicting block with transaction tx' at the adversarial chain will be $(\Pi + S_k)$ -deep. If $\Pi + S_k \geq k$, then the adversary can publish its private chain and cancel tx . Else, the race enters the post-confirmation phase, where adversarial deficit is $D = k - \Pi - S_k$, i.e., the difference between the length of the longest honest chain containing tx and the longest adversarial chain containing tx' . In this part of the race, the adversary has to make up for its deficit D , in order to discard the confirmed transaction tx . If at any time after $\tau_k + \Delta_k$, the adversary's private chain is able to catch the longest honest chain containing tx , it can publish its chain to cancel tx .

Lemma 3 *Given mining rate μ_2 , honest fraction α , delay rate μ_1 and confirmation depth k , a confirmed transaction cannot be discarded with probability greater than,*

$$\bar{p}(\alpha, \mu_1, \mu_2, k) = P(\max_{i \geq 1} (S'_i - i + 1) \geq D) \tag{23}$$

$$= P(\max_{i \geq 1} (S'_i - i + 1) \geq k - \Pi - S_k) \tag{24}$$

$$= P(\Pi + S_k + M \geq k) \tag{25}$$

where $M = \max_{i \geq 1} (S'_i - i + 1)$ and $S'_i = \sum_{j'=1}^i C'_{j'}$ where $C'_{j'}$ are i.i.d. with $C'_{j'} \sim C$.

Proof: The case of $D \leq 0$, which denotes the fact that the adversary has at least k blocks on top of tx' when tx is k -deep, is trivial since $S_1 = C'_1 \geq 0$. Consider $D > 0$ and beginning from $\tau_k + \Delta_k$, let us denote τ_{k+h} as τ'_h . Once the honest miners mine an honest jumper block b'_1 at τ'_1 , which will be published at $\tau'_1 + \Delta'_1$, there will be $C'_1 \sim C$ adversarial blocks mined during $[\tau_k + \Delta_k, \tau'_1 + \Delta'_1]$. If $C'_1 \geq D$, the adversary can publish its private chain right before $\tau'_1 + \Delta'_1$, discarding the transaction from some honest view. This explains the case where $S'_1 \geq D$. Assume $C'_1 < D$, consider the total number of adversarial blocks mined from $\tau_k + \Delta_k$

until the second honest jumper's publication time at $\tau'_2 + \Delta'_2$, i.e., during $[\tau_k + \Delta_k, \tau'_2 + \Delta'_2]$, which is equal to $S'_2 = C'_1 + C'_2$. Right before $\tau'_2 + \Delta'_2$, tx is $k + 1$ -deep at honest miners views (except the miner of b'_2), whereas tx' is $\Pi + S_k + S'_2$ -deep. If $\Pi + S_k + S'_2 \geq k + 1$, tx will be discarded from some honest view, which explains $S'_2 - 1 \geq D$. In general, for $i > 0$, right before $\tau'_i + \Delta'_i$, tx is $k + i - 1$ -deep at honest miners views (except the miner of b'_i), whereas tx' is $\Pi + S_k + S'_i$ -deep, hence we need $S'_i - i + 1 \geq D$ for some i . ■

Corollary 2 (Fault tolerance) $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{p}(\alpha, \mu_1, \mu_2, k) \rightarrow 0$ iff

$$\alpha > \frac{1}{(2 - \kappa)}. \quad (26)$$

Proof: Note that from Lemma 1, replacing σ^{-1} with $1 + \kappa$, (26) is necessary and sufficient condition for positive recurrence of the birth-death chain of P . Thus, the random walk escapes to infinity for $\alpha \leq \frac{1}{(2 - \kappa)}$. Although after τ , the walk can take negative values as well, this does not change the dynamics of the walk and the transition probabilities. Thus, we can simply check if $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} P(\Pi \geq k)$. ■

Proposition 1 $\bar{p}(\alpha, \mu_1, \mu_2, k) = \bar{p}(\alpha, 1, \kappa, k)$.

Proof: First, note that $\beta = 1 - \alpha$, $\rho = 1 - \sigma$, and

$$M = \max_{i \geq 1} (S'_i - i + 1) \quad (27)$$

$$= \max_{i \geq 1} \sum_{j=1}^i C'_j - i + 1, \quad (28)$$

where C'_j are i.i.d. with $C'_j \sim C$. Hence, the distributions of Π , S_k and M are solely expressible in terms of α , σ and k as a result of Lemmas 1 and 2. Further, σ and κ have one-to-one relationship given in Table 1. Thus, replacing (μ_1, μ_2) with $(1, \kappa)$ does not change $\bar{p}(\alpha, \mu_1, \mu_2, k) = P(M + \Pi + S_k \geq k)$. ■

Proposition 1 essentially means that the relationship between μ_1 and μ_2 has to be kept constant to keep $\bar{p}(\alpha, b, \mu_1, \mu_2, k)$ at a certain level, hence, κ is a safety parameter. In other words, given α , k and a security violation threshold \bar{p} , the maximum κ possible, denoted as $\bar{\kappa}$, can be found from the analysis provided here, i.e., $\bar{\kappa} = f(\alpha, k, \bar{p})$ for some function f . We note that finding f or the distribution of M explicitly is a complex task, which we avoid here since our main goal is to establish a relationship between μ_1, μ_2 and security, which we already did in Proposition 1.

To find an explicit upper bound, we resort to a simpler rigged model originally proposed by [6] where adversary is even more (strictly) powerful than that modeled in the rigged jumper model of [8] during the post-confirmation race. Here, we apply a similar simple model, where Δ_h are exponentially distributed random variables. At each mining event after

$\tau_k + \Delta_k$, we toss a coin: with probability α the block is honest. This honest block is converted to an adversarial one if any other block is mined before the block can be published, which happens with probability ρ . Hence, a block becomes and remains honest with probability $\alpha\sigma$. The race between the adversarial and the honest chains at this time can be represented with this coin toss model similar to [6]. Here, we use the fact that the maximum of a random walk with downward drift, \tilde{M} is distributed geometrically [17, Eqn. (7.3.5)], with

$$P(\tilde{M} = i) = \left(1 - \frac{1 - \alpha\sigma}{\alpha\sigma}\right) \left(\frac{1 - \alpha\sigma}{\alpha\sigma}\right)^i, \quad (29)$$

where $\alpha\sigma$ is the probability of going down. We note that the results from this last model will not be as tight as those calculated for Π and S , in other words $\tilde{M} > M$, but as noted by [6], the main contribution to safety violation comes from S which is modeled tight enough.

Combining the results of each of the phases above, i.e., pre-mining gain, confirmation interval and post-confirmation race, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 4 *Given mining rate μ_2 , honest fraction α , delay rate μ_1 and confirmation depth k , a confirmed transaction cannot be discarded with probability greater than,*

$$p(\alpha, \mu_1, \mu_2, k) \leq \tilde{p}(\alpha, \mu_1, \mu_2, k) = P(\Pi + S_k + \tilde{M} \geq k). \quad (30)$$

Proof: As the adversary modeled in the post-confirmation race is strictly more powerful than the adversary of $\overline{\mathbb{B}}(\alpha, \mu_1, \mu_2, \lambda, k)$, hence, $p(\alpha, \mu_1, \mu_2, k) \leq \overline{p}(\alpha, \mu_1, \mu_2, k) \leq \tilde{p}(\alpha, \mu_1, \mu_2, k)$. ■

Note that using the simple rigged model where a block remains honest with probability $\alpha\sigma$, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \overline{p}(\alpha, \mu_1, \mu_2, k) \rightarrow 0$ is trivially satisfied if $\alpha\sigma > \frac{1}{2}$, which can be restated as

$$\alpha > \frac{1 + \kappa}{2}. \quad (31)$$

Further, $\tilde{p}(\alpha, \mu_1, \mu_2, k) = \tilde{p}(\alpha, 1, \kappa, k)$ can be proved using similar ideas to those in Proposition 1. There is an extensive discussion about choosing parameters of a blockchains in [5] when designing a blockchain while taking security-latency into account, e.g., choosing the mining difficulty μ_2 in relation to Δ . Our security-latency analysis in this section implies that one can consider μ_2 and μ_1 as dependent parameters when designing a blockchain with a certain security level. Moreover, network delay μ_1 is necessarily a function of the block size b , i.e., $\mu_1 = g(b)$ for some function g , which depends on the network [18]. Thus, given b , α , k and a security violation threshold \overline{p} , one can choose the maximum mining rate as,

$$\overline{\mu}_2 = \overline{\kappa}\mu_1 \quad (32)$$

$$= f(\alpha, k, \overline{p})g(b). \quad (33)$$

Further, it is shown in [18], that the block propagation delay (here $\frac{1}{\mu_1}$) increases sublinearly

with block size b and the real-world data for $g(b)$ resembles a piecewise linear function.

Note that the security of the content of a block decreases with the increasing mining rate. As a result, the mining rate should decrease with the increasing block size b to keep the security of the transactions in a block at a certain level since a valid nonce protects the whole block together with all its transactions. The proportional relationship of $g(b)$ and μ_2 shown in (33) is a side effect of the network delay that depends on the block size b , however, it does not consider the security of all b transactions in a single block since \bar{p} analyzed in this section considers the probability that a transaction is discarded. However, the adversary can potentially discard more than one transaction (up to b transactions if they happen to be in the same block) with the same attack which is successful with probability less than \bar{p} . In this sense, a designer should consider \bar{p} as a security threshold for b transactions while determining μ_2 .

Finding f rigorously requires finding the distribution of M explicitly and it is a complex task as mentioned previously. However, one can use bisection method on (30) to find the maximum possible $\tilde{\kappa}$ with $\tilde{p}(\alpha, 1, \tilde{\kappa}, k) < \bar{p}$ which necessarily satisfies $\bar{p}(\alpha, 1, \tilde{\kappa}, k) < \bar{p}$. Since $\tilde{\kappa} \leq \bar{\kappa}$ for a given \bar{p} , picking $\tilde{\mu}_2 = \tilde{\kappa}g(b)$ is an approximate solution to the maximum mining rate $\bar{\mu}_2$, where $\tilde{\mu}_2 < \bar{\mu}_2$.

Remark 1 (30) gives an upper bound for the safety violation probability. For a lower bound on $p(\alpha, \mu_1, \mu_2, k)$, the distributions of Π , S and \tilde{M} have to be replaced as follows: A lower bound for the lead can be found by replacing σ and ρ with σ' and ρ' in Lemma 1 (replacing σ and ρ in definitions of \bar{a}_i and \bar{b}_i as well). A lower bound for the adversarial arrivals during the confirmation interval can be found by replacing σ and ρ with σ' and ρ' in (14). Although tighter results can be obtained by using the idea presented in [8, Lemma 3], lower bound on the maximum deficit adversary can recover can be simply found by replacing $(\frac{1-\alpha\sigma}{\alpha\sigma})$ with $\frac{\beta}{\alpha}$ in (29).

4 Queue Analysis

To consider the effect of rigged jumper model and private attack on the maximum rate λ the blockchain system can sustain, we resort to the queue analysis in [14]. Figure 1 describes the Markovian queue process of [14]. Transactions arrive at the mempool-queue, $Q(t)$, with a rate of λ , waiting to be included in the blockchain on a first-come, first-served basis. All honest nodes observe the same mempool-queue at any time t , i.e., $Q(t)$. In the first stage of the service, called block-generation process, the nodes try to mine a block with a valid nonce, which has rate μ_2 . When a valid nonce is found at any time t , this block will contain the first $\min(b, |Q(t)|)$ transactions from $Q(t)$. After the block is formed with a valid nonce, this block will be added to the blockchain according to the blockchain-building process, i.e., it will experience a network delay with rate μ_1 . It is assumed that no other new block is created until the newly mined block is shared with other miners. The steady state behavior of this




Figure 2: State transition relation.

and

$$B_0 = \begin{bmatrix} -\lambda & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \mu_1 & -(\lambda + \mu_1) & \dots & 0 \\ \mu_1 & 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ \mu_1 & 0 & \dots & -(\lambda + \mu_1) \end{bmatrix}, \quad B_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \mu_2 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B_i = \begin{bmatrix} \dots & \mu_2 & \dots \\ \dots & 0 & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \dots & 0 & \dots \end{bmatrix} \quad (37)$$

Here, B_i has μ_2 at $(1, i + 1)$ th location and the rest of the elements are zero. Necessary and sufficient condition for the positive recurrence is also found in [14] using the analysis of [20, 21].

Theorem 2 (Li-Ma-Chang [14]) *The Markov process Q of GI/M/1 type is positive recurrent iff*

$$\lambda < \frac{b\mu_1\mu_2}{\mu_1 + \mu_2}. \quad (38)$$

This result can be intuitively interpreted as average time to receive b transactions should be more than the sum of the average times of the block-generation process and the blockchain-building process, i.e., $\frac{1}{\mu_1} + \frac{1}{\mu_2} < \frac{b}{\lambda}$.

Let us denote the maximum λ sustainable for $\mathbb{B}(\alpha, b, \mu_1, \mu_2, \lambda, k')$ and for $\overline{\mathbb{B}}(\alpha, b, \mu_1, \mu_2, \lambda, k)$ as $\lambda(\alpha, b, \mu_1, \mu_2)$ and $\overline{\lambda}(\alpha, b, \mu_1, \mu_2)$, respectively.

Proposition 2 $\lambda(1, b, \mu_1, \mu_2) = \frac{b\mu_1\mu_2}{\mu_1 + \mu_2} - \epsilon$.

Proof: Let us call the the chain formed from the genesis block until a block b_h as “the chain associated with block b_h .” The first miner of $\mathbb{B}(1, b, \mu_1, \mu_2, \lambda, k')$ who builds a block b_1 on top of the genesis block at time t_1 has the least amount of transactions compared to other blocks on the same height. Now, miner node j experiences a network delay of $t_{1j} \in [0, \Delta_1]$ before receiving b_1 . This delay essentially hampers the process of transactions joining the blockchain as new blocks will create forks during this delay interval instead of building on top of each other. Thus, to consider the maximum λ sustainable in the worst case scenario,

we need to take $t_{1j} = \Delta_1$, which makes sure that all blocks mined during $[t_1, t_1 + \Delta_1]$ are on height 1. After $t_1 + \Delta_1$, all honest miners will mine a block on height 2. Clearly, the worst case scenario is mining on top of the first mined block on height 1, i.e., b_1 since it contains the least amount of transactions compared to other blocks on the same height. Similarly, the chain associated with the first jumper mined on height 2, i.e., b_2 , which is mined on top of b_1 , has the least amount of transactions compared to other chains associated with any block on the same height. Following this reasoning, the chain consisting of the first jumper on each height always contains the least amount of transactions, hence the worst case scenario. Finally, note that the content of the jumper chain associated with $\mathbb{B}(1, b, \mu_1, \mu_2, \lambda, k')$ is the same as the content of the chain formed by the Markovian queue process of [14], which assumes no block is mined during $[t_i, t_i + \Delta_i]$. This implies $\mathbb{B}(1, b, \mu_1, \mu_2, \lambda, k')$ has the same condition as in Theorem 2. Note that k' does not really matter as $\alpha = 1$. ■

4.1 Blockchain Design

In Proposition 1, we established that the relationship between μ_1 and μ_2 has to be kept constant to keep $\bar{p}(\alpha, \mu_1, \mu_2, k)$ at a certain level and κ is a safety parameter. Hence, from now on, we assume μ_2 was chosen as $\bar{\kappa}\mu_1$ at the design stage to keep the security at a certain level. As a result, the stability condition in Theorem 2 and Proposition 2, i.e., under no adversarial attack on queue process, can be re-expressed as,

$$\lambda < bg(b) \frac{f(\alpha, k, \bar{p})}{(1 + f(\alpha, k, \bar{p}))} \quad (39)$$

$$= bg(b) \frac{\bar{\kappa}}{(1 + \bar{\kappa})}. \quad (40)$$

If we simply assume that the average delay is linear in block size [22], i.e.,

$$\frac{1}{\mu_1} = \frac{b}{c} + \delta_0, \quad (41)$$

where c is the network speed (measured as transaction/second), the stability condition can be expressed in terms of the security and network parameters as,

$$\lambda < \frac{bc}{b + \delta_0 c} \frac{\bar{\kappa}}{1 + \bar{\kappa}}. \quad (42)$$

The relations above give a blockchain designer a means to analyze critical blockchain parameters such as κ, α, k, b and their implications on sustainability and security. In other words, once a desired security level is determined and network conditions are known, the maximum sustainable transaction arrival rate for a blockchain can be obtained using (42).

Note that the way we derive this equation is by assuming that μ_2 was chosen as $\bar{\kappa}\mu_1$ at the design stage to keep security at a certain level. However, this condition does not take

into account any adversarial behavior on the queue process that might try to hamper the progress of the blockchain system. Next, we briefly discuss two different private attacks and their effects on sustainability. In general, there are different adversarial attacks that can hamper the growth of a blockchain, and their effects on the model described in Markovian queue process of [14] can be analyzed thoroughly. As our goal is to give an insight on how attacks could effect sustainability, we avoid rigorous analysis and briefly mention two types of attacks. More general and rigorous analysis is out of the scope of the present paper.

4.2 Queue-Service Attacks

Every honest block in the longest chain contains $\min(b, |Q_i(t)|)$ transactions, where $Q_i(t)$ is the mempool at the mining time t of that block observed by its honest miner i . Hence, every honest block, by assumption, contains the maximum number of transactions possible observed by its honest miner i for its associated chain and does not hamper the queue process. Adversary, on the other hand, by deviating from the protocol, can avoid publishing anything at all. A double-spending attack with adversarial private chain is an example for this type of attack assuming the adversary stops the private attack after a successful double-spending, which we analyze next.

Proposition 3 $\bar{\lambda}(1, b, \mu_1, \mu_2) = \lambda(1, b, \mu_1, \mu_2)$.

Proof: Clearly, the honest chain of $\overline{\mathbb{B}}(1, b, \mu_1, \mu_2, \lambda, k)$ consists of jumpers just like the honest chain of $\mathbb{B}(1, b, \mu_1, \mu_2, \lambda, k)$. However, the blocks mined during $[t_i, t_i + \Delta_i]$ are rigged for $\overline{\mathbb{B}}(1, b, \mu_1, \mu_2, \lambda, k)$. The adversarial forked chain consist of these rigged blocks. With probability no greater than $\bar{p}(\alpha, \mu_1, \mu_2, k)$, the adversarial private attack will be successful, which will slightly revert the queue process (some transactions will be removed from the blockchain and re-added to the mempool-queue). However, this will not affect the queue stability in the long-run, as it happens only once (assuming adversary stops the private attack after double-spending). ■

Proposition 4 $\bar{\lambda}(\alpha, b, \mu_1, \mu_2) = \bar{\lambda}(1, b, \mu_1, \mu_2\alpha)$.

Proof: The honest mining rate of $\overline{\mathbb{B}}(\alpha, b, \mu_1, \mu_2, \lambda, k)$ is $\alpha\mu_2$ and the honest chain consists of the honest jumpers only. On the other hand, the adversarial chain consists of all blocks except the honest jumpers, which will not affect the queue stability condition in the long-run even if the adversarial attack is successful. Thus, the maximum λ sustainable is the same as that of the honest jumper chain in $\overline{\mathbb{B}}(1, b, \mu_1, \mu_2\alpha, \lambda, k)$. ■

Assuming the adversary stops the private attack after a successful double-spending, Proposition 4 gives us the stability condition for the private attack, which essentially says that the maximum sustainable λ under private attack is the same as when adversary is not

mining any block, hence, the mining power decreases to $\mu_2\alpha$. As a result we obtain,

$$\bar{\lambda}(\alpha, b, \mu_1, \mu_2) = \frac{b\alpha\bar{\kappa}\mu_1^2}{(1 + \alpha\bar{\kappa})\mu_1} \quad (43)$$

$$= bg(b)\frac{\alpha\bar{\kappa}}{1 + \alpha\bar{\kappa}}. \quad (44)$$

Notice that during a private attack, the adversary is hiding its private chain from genesis block onwards, in order to maximize the safety violation probability, which was considered previously in security-latency analysis. However, in a private attack, the goal is to double-spend and the model assumes a private chain that is not published until the attack is successful. As a result, a private attack only partially slows down the queue process as adversary is essentially not publishing anything. In fact, by slightly changing the private attack strategy and publishing the private chain with empty blocks whenever the lead satisfies some condition, adversary can significantly reduce the service rate of the queue, which we describe next.

Let h_u denote the length of the longest public chain and h_v denote the length of the longest private chain where $h_v \geq h_u$. Let us call ‘‘honest mining time’’ as the time an honest block is mined and ‘‘honest publishing time’’ as the time an honest block is shared with all other honest nodes where the adversary delays all honest block publications with maximum allowed delay, i.e., $t_{hi} = \Delta_h$ for all h, i . We only consider the jumper chain which has the least amount of transactions and is the worst-case scenario, i.e., the honest blocks mined during $[t_h, t_h + \Delta_h]$ are ignored as they all are on the same height h (i.e., they are forked, not rigged). Consider an adversarial strategy, which we call *queue-service attack*, where adversary mines a private chain with empty blocks as follows:

1. After an honest mining time, t_{h_u} , if there is no private chain, adversary tries to mine on the same height as this lastly mined honest block. If a valid nonce is found at time $t \geq t_{h_u}$ by the adversary, the adversary publishes its block at $\max(t, t_{h_u} + \Delta_{h_u})$ in order to nullify that honest block and starts a private chain on top of its recently published block.
2. At every honest publishing time, $t_{h_u} + \Delta_{h_u}$, if $h_v \geq h_u$, adversary publishes the part of its private chain until (including) the block on height h_u . As the ties are broken in adversary’s favor and adversarial blocks do not suffer network delay, the adversarial block will be favored by everyone. Then, adversary continues mining its private chain.

The algorithm above is a simple variation of the selfish mining attack described in [23], where we slightly change the algorithm since adversary controls the network delay and ties are broken in its favor. Although the original goal of selfish mining attack is to increase the revenues, here we assume that the adversarial blocks are empty in order to hamper the service process of the queue system.

The resulting state machine has states $\{-1, 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. In this sense, state i refers to $h_v - h_u$ at an honest publishing time or an adversarial mining time. Since adversary is delaying every honest block by the maximum allowed delay, the resulting state machine transitions have the same structure as the birth-death process in (1),

$$P' = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha\sigma' & \alpha\sigma'\rho' + \beta & \alpha\sigma'\rho'^2 & \alpha\sigma'\rho'^3 & \alpha\sigma'\rho'^4 & \dots \\ \alpha\sigma' & \alpha\sigma'\rho' & \alpha\sigma'\rho'^2 + \beta & \alpha\sigma'\rho'^3 & \alpha\sigma'\rho'^4 & \dots \\ 0 & \alpha\sigma' & \alpha\sigma'\rho' & \alpha\sigma'\rho'^2 + \beta & \alpha\sigma'\rho'^3 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & \alpha\sigma' & \alpha\sigma'\rho' & \alpha\sigma'\rho'^2 + \beta & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}. \quad (45)$$

The reasoning is as follows: Assume that there is no private chain and adversary tries to mine on the same height h_u as the last block on the public chain which is an honest block, i.e., the chain is at state -1 . With probability β , adversary mines a block on the same height h_u , publishes it and nullifies the honest block and we move to state 0. With probability $\alpha\sigma'\rho'^i$, another honest block is mined on $h_u + 1$ followed by i adversarial blocks that are mined during the delay time of this honest block. The first of these adversarial blocks is mined on height $h_u + 1$ nullifying the honest block on height $h_u + 1$ (the honest block on height h_u stays in the longest chain), the rest ($i - 1$ adversarial blocks) are kept private, thus, we transition to state $i - 1$. When the chain is at state 0, i.e., $h_u = h_v$, if an adversarial block is mined (with probability β), the chain moves to state 1, where adversary has a private block waiting to be published when the next honest block is mined and published. However, when the chain is at state 0, if an honest block is mined followed by no adversarial block during its delay which happens with probability $\alpha\sigma'$, we move to state -1 from state 0. If that honest block was followed by i adversarial blocks during its delay, the first one would be published at the end of the honest delay nullifying the honest block and the rest would be kept private, resulting in a transition to state $i - 1$. The rest of the cases are similar.

Here, we are interested in the proportion of honest blocks on the longest chain in the long-run. Since P' has the same structure as P , using Lemma 1, we get $\pi'_{-1} = 3 - \sigma'^{-1} - \alpha^{-1}$ for the steady state distribution of P' . Using π'_{-1} , and publishing strategy described earlier, we find the honest proportion of the blocks next.

Lemma 5 *Under a queue-service attack, $\alpha' = \frac{\pi'_{-1}}{1 - \pi'_{-1}\rho'}$ proportion of the blocks are honest in the long-run.*

Proof: Let h_u denote the length of longest public chain and h_v denote the the length of the longest private chain as usual. We calculate the honest proportion by considering the blocks which are published and stay in the longest chain indefinitely using the steady state and transition frequencies. Note that whenever the chain is at state -1 and another honest block is mined, the honest block on height h_u stays in the longest chain due to the queue-

service attack strategy described earlier,

$$r_{honest} = \pi'_{-1}\alpha. \quad (46)$$

On the other hand, whenever the chain is at state -1 and an adversarial block is mined, it is published and adopted by everyone (the honest block is nullified). Further, whenever the chain is at state 0 and an honest block is mined followed by $i > 0$ adversarial blocks during its delay, the first adversarial block on the private chain is published and adopted by everyone. Lastly, whenever the chain is at state $i > 0$ and an honest block is mined, the first adversarial block on the private chain is published and adopted by everyone. Hence,

$$r_{adv} = \pi'_{-1}\beta + \pi'_0\alpha\rho + \sum_{i>0} \pi'_i\alpha. \quad (47)$$

Using $\pi'_{-1} = (\pi'_{-1} + \pi'_0)\alpha\sigma'$ and $\sum_{i>0} \pi'_i = (1 - \pi'_{-1} - \pi'_0)$, we obtain,

$$\alpha' = \frac{r_{honest}}{r_{adv} + r_{honest}} \quad (48)$$

$$= \frac{\pi'_{-1}}{1 - \pi'_{-1}\rho'}, \quad (49)$$

completing the proof. ■

When there is no network delay, i.e., $\kappa = 0$, $\alpha' = \frac{\alpha - \beta}{\alpha}$ which agrees with the chain quality argument of [23]. Note that, with this strategy, all adversary is doing is to publish some of its empty private blocks whenever honest blocks are published in order to nullify them and stall the queue service. As a result, the block generation process has the rate $\mu_2\alpha$, which is the rate of honest miners (since adversary only replaces some honest blocks with empty blocks and do not contribute anything to the total rate). The resulting chain, on the other hand, is formed by honest blocks and empty adversarial blocks that cancel some other honest blocks, and it is slightly different from Markovian queue process of [14]. However, in the long-run, we know that the model follows the same block generation process with rate $\mu_2\alpha$, and α' proportion of the mined blocks remain on the longest chain and the rest are replaced by empty adversarial blocks. Using a similar idea as in Proposition 4, where we simply multiplied the rate of block generation process with honest proportion, we can consider the maximum λ sustainable under the queue-service attack approximately as,

$$\lambda \approx bg(b) \frac{\alpha'\alpha\bar{\kappa}}{(1 + \alpha'\alpha\bar{\kappa})}. \quad (50)$$

Notice here that, unlike Proposition 4, the result above is not a rigorous claim since the arrival times of the honest blocks (that are not nullified) in the long-run do not necessarily follow an exponential distribution whereas the stability condition derived in [14] assumes exponential block arrivals. Further, as we assume all ties are broken in adversary's favor




Figure 3: Safety violation for exponential and bounded delay, $\alpha = 0.90$.

and adversarial blocks do not suffer any network delay, the results above are extremely pessimistic.

5 Numerical Results

We first compare the security-latency results of our model with that of the existing bounded delay model in the literature [6, 8]. Since our aim is not to achieve the tightest bound on the security-latency problem, while comparing, we mix the models of [6, 8] for simplicity and to even grounds for comparing the models (as we did not tighten the results for post-confirmation race in the exponential model). For the lead and confirmation interval, we use the distributions derived in [8] whereas we replaced the post-confirmation race model of [8] with that of [6] (as we did the same here in the exponential delay).

We present the results for Bitcoin (BTC) parameters, where we choose $\mu_2 = 1/600$, $\Delta = 10$ for bounded delay, and $\mu_1 = \frac{\ln 10}{4}$ as the 90th percentile delay for block propagation is around 4 seconds [24]. Figure 3 displays the comparison of two models for $\alpha = 0.9$, where it is clear that using an exponential model gives tighter results for upper and lower bounds. The results are not surprising as the bounds in [8] are derived by taking each honest propagation delay as $\Delta = 10$ seconds (maximum possible), whereas we take Δ_h (maximum possible) which is less than 4 seconds 90 percent of the time. However, the exponential delay model captures the real propagation delay data of [24] better than the bounded delay






Figure 4: Safety violation for exponential and bounded delay, $\alpha = 0.75$.

model. Figure 4 presents the safety violation probability results for $\alpha = 0.75$ where we avoid plotting the bounded delay results as the bounds of exponential model overlap with lower bound of bounded delay model and this makes the plots unclear visually. Further, if we pick $\lambda\Delta = \kappa$, the upper bounds of bounded delay and exponential delay overlap with each other, so do the lower bounds.


Next, in Figure 5, we present the relationships of safety violation threshold \bar{p} with confirmation rule k , security parameter κ , expected transaction confirmation time $E[C_f] = \frac{k}{\mu_2}$ and maximum sustainable transaction arrival rate λ (under no queue attack) for $\alpha = 0.9$ where we choose $b = 4500$ (corresponds to approximately 1 MB of BTC block [25]) and $\mu_1 = \frac{\ln 10}{4}$. We note that the shape of the curves in Figure 5 implies that for a given k -block confirmation rule, block size b and network delay rate μ_1 , one gains almost nothing in terms of safety violation probability by decreasing safety parameter κ (and hence the mining rate) in the region where graphs are vertical whereas sustainable transaction rate decreases rapidly and the transaction confirmation time increases significantly. As a result, it is more sensible to choose parameters in the region where the graph in Figure 5a stops its steep rise. Currently, under the 6-block confirmation rule and the current mining rate of BTC, i.e., $\kappa = \frac{4}{600 \ln 10}$, we get a safety violation upper bound of $\bar{p} = 0.00118$ and a maximum sustainable transaction rate of $\lambda < 7.478$. Under the private attack (no adversarial mining), this rate drops to $\lambda < 6.732$ whereas under the queue-service attack, it further drops down to $\lambda < 5.985$. By simply increasing the safety violation upper bound to 0.002 from 0.00118, BTC safety



(a) \bar{p}



(b) $\mathbb{E}[C_f]$



(c) \bar{p} vs λ

Figure 5: Safety violation probability effect on different parameters, $\alpha = 0.9$.

parameter can be increased to $\kappa = 0.02$ (corresponds to one block per ≈ 90 seconds), this in turn allows up to ≈ 50 transactions per second and transaction confirmation time of 9 minutes. These values drop down to ≈ 45 and ≈ 40 transactions per second under no adversarial mining and the queue-service attack, respectively.

The results are even more interesting when one changes 6-block confirmation rule to 10-block confirmation rule, where by choosing 0.00118 as safety threshold again, we get $\kappa \approx 0.1$, which corresponds to a block per ≈ 17 seconds and up to ≈ 235 (≈ 213 and ≈ 191 under attacks) sustainable transactions per second. Increasing the k -block confirmation rule for a given safety threshold allows even more gains in terms of the sustainable transactions per second until a point where we have to trade-off this gain with transaction confirmation time, i.e., more latency. This phenomenon is observable in Figure 5b where the tail of the graphs cross each other in the right bottom corner.

We do not pose the same optimization problem posed in [15] that establishes a trade-off between throughput and latency for a given security level. The optimization problem posed in [15] assumes an independent relationship between security threshold \bar{p} and block size b and connects it to the network delay with a linear relationship assumption as in (41). As we mentioned in Section 3, adversary can potentially discard more than one transaction (up to b transactions if they happen to be in the same block) with the same attack if successful. Hence, b and \bar{p} are inherently dependent parameters and should not be treated differently.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we developed the security-latency analysis for exponential network delay by considering the rigged jumper chain. We reconstructed the Markov chains and random walk models of the security-latency analysis for exponential network delay [6, 8], derived their steady state behaviors. By dividing the honest and adversarial race into three phases, we derived the relevant distributions for each phase and combined them to give an upper bound on safety violation probability. We derived fault tolerance conditions under which the upper bound on safety violation probability vanishes. We also showed that the upper bound on safety violation probability is a function of the ratio of the mining rate and the network delay rate, which we called κ , a safety parameter. Using the queue analysis of [14], we re-expressed the sustainable transaction rate condition in terms of block size b , κ and network parameters. We considered two different queue attack strategies that can drop the sustainable transaction rate and analyzed their drop rate.

There are several parts of security-latency analysis that can be further tightened by using similar methods such as [8, Lemma 3], or explicitly finding the distribution of M , and etc. Further, although the honest proportion of blocks under the queue attack is derived rigorously in Lemma 5, the maximum rate in (50) is an approximation as the resulting honest blocks do not necessarily follow an exponential arrival process. We connected the

security-latency analysis to the queue analysis by assuming a designer which first chooses a safety parameter κ to achieve a safety threshold and then uses this same κ to obtain the sustainable transaction rate under no queue attack or queue-service attacks. The question remains whether one could devise a single attack in a way that could give an upper bound both on safety violation and queue-service.

A Appendix A

In Section 3, we assumed, the process described from $t = 0$ until τ is independent from what follows next. Here, we give a method for the case where we do not make the independence assumption.

Lemma 6 *Given mining rate μ_2 , honest fraction α , delay rate μ_1 and confirmation depth k , a confirmed transaction cannot be discarded with probability greater than,*

$$p(\alpha, \mu_1, \mu_2, k) \leq \bar{p}(\alpha, \mu_1, \mu_2, k) \quad (51)$$

$$= P(\Pi + C_0 + S_k + M \geq k) \quad (52)$$

$$\leq \tilde{p}(\alpha, \mu_1, \mu_2, k) \quad (53)$$

$$= P(\Pi + C_0 + S_k + \tilde{M} \geq k), \quad (54)$$

where

$$P(C_0 = i) = \frac{1}{1 + \kappa\alpha} \mathbb{1}_{i=0} + \frac{\kappa\alpha}{1 + \kappa\alpha} \sigma \rho^i. \quad (55)$$

Proof: At time τ , either there is no honest block that is waiting to be published (experiencing network delay) or the last honest block mined before τ is still not published and is experiencing network delay, i.e., blockchain-building process is active. To find the probability of these two cases, we resort to the steady state of the following rate matrix,

$$Q' = \begin{bmatrix} -\mu_2\alpha & \mu_2\alpha \\ \mu_1 & -\mu_1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (56)$$

where the first state represents an active block-generation process (no honest block that is waiting to be published) and the second state represents an active blockchain-building process. Thus, with probability $\frac{1}{1+\kappa\alpha}$, the blockchain-building process is not active and honest miners are trying to mine a new block in which case the total number of adversarial (including rigged) arrivals during the confirmation interval is equal to S_k as given in Corollary 1. However, if the blockchain-building process is active, there will be some number of adversarial (including rigged) arrivals during the delay process before honest miners start to mine the first block of confirmation interval. We denote this number as C_0 . If the blockchain-building

process is active, by memorylessness property, the honest block that arrived before τ and that is still experiencing network delay is published after i adversarial arrivals (including rigged) with probability $\sigma\rho^i$. ■

B Appendix B

Adopting the notation of [14], the stationary vector of queue Q is written as,

$$\pi_k = (\pi_{0,k}, \pi_{1,k}, \dots, \pi_{b,k}), \quad k \geq 0. \quad (57)$$

A recursive formula for finding $\pi = (\pi_0, \pi_1, \dots)$ is given in [14, Theorem 2]. Note that, the state of the system at time t is taken as $w(t) = (|B(t)|, |Q(t)|)$, where $|B(t)|$ and $|Q(t)|$ are the number of transactions in the block pending to be published and the queue, respectively.

In Section 3, we assumed that, at the time of arrival of tx , $|Q(\tau)| \leq b$. Here, we give a method that applies to general mempool size at the time of arrival of tx .

Hence, the probability that tx is included in the next m th honest block after τ (denoted as b_m) is,

$$P(tx \in b_m) = \sum_{i=0}^b \sum_{j=(m-1)b}^{mb-1} \pi_{i,j}. \quad (58)$$

Note that $\Pi + C_0$ is the distribution of the adversarial lead when the first honest block-generation process of the confirmation interval starts. We represent this vector with \mathbf{d} where $d(i) = P(\Pi + C_0 = i)$. Next, we convert the distribution C derived in Lemma 2 to a Markov chain as follows,

$$P_C = \begin{bmatrix} P'_C(0) & P'_C(1) & P'_C(2) & P'_C(3) & \dots \\ P_C(0) & P_C(1) & P_C(2) & P_C(3) & \dots \\ 0 & P_C(0) & P_C(1) & P_C(2) & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & P_C(0) & P_C(1) & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & P_C(0) & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}, \quad (59)$$

where $P'_C(i) = P_C(i+1) + \alpha\sigma(\rho^i - \rho^{i+1})$. P_C is the transition of a Markov chain where the (i, j) th element represents a transition from lead i to j between publications of honest blocks. For $i > 0$, this is a simple conversion of Lemma 2. For $i = 0$, the elements are adjusted by taking into account whether adversarial blocks are arrived during the block-generation process or not. The adjustment is made according to the observation that if all arrivals are during blockchain-building process, then all adversarial blocks can be built on top of the honest block waiting to be published, hence the shift in some elements.

After τ , $m - 1$ blocks are mined and published before tx can enter the chain with b_m . Denoting the publication time of b_{m-1} as τ' , the m th honest block after τ is the first honest block after τ' and tx is going to be included in this block. Further, the lead vector of the adversary transitions to $\mathbf{d}P_C^{m-1}$ right at τ' , thus, we call the new lead at τ' as D_m where $P(D_m = i) = \mathbf{d}P_C^{m-1}(i)$. From τ' onwards, repeating the analysis of confirmation interval and post-confirmation race of Section 3 gives,

$$p(\alpha, \mu_1, \mu_2, k) \leq \bar{p}(\alpha, \mu_1, \mu_2, k) \quad (60)$$

$$= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} P(tx \in b_m) P(D_m + S_k + M \geq k) \quad (61)$$

$$\leq \tilde{p}(\alpha, \mu_1, \mu_2, k) \quad (62)$$

$$= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} P(tx \in b_m) P(D_m + S_k + \tilde{M} \geq k). \quad (63)$$

C Appendix C: Ultimate Fault Tolerance

Observation 1 *The ultimate fault tolerance for exponential delay model is,*

$$\beta < \frac{1 - \beta}{1 + (1 - \beta)\kappa}. \quad (64)$$

In other words, any transaction is safe after waiting long enough if (64) is satisfied and no transaction is safe if (64) is not satisfied.

We do not provide any proof for the observation above as it is out of the scope for this paper and requires another model to rigorously prove it. The bound in (64) is based on the observation that in the long-run, adversarial chain grows with rate $\beta\mu_2$ whereas honest chain grows by $\frac{\alpha\mu_2}{1+\kappa\alpha}$. Alternatively, note that, when adversary delays all honest blocks by maximally allowed time Δ_h and mines its own private chain (no rigged blocks), the lead is finite if $3 - \sigma'^{-1} - \alpha^{-1} > 0$. This condition can be re-expressed as $\alpha > \frac{1}{2-\kappa\beta}$ or as in (64).

Equation (64) implies that the safety parameter is bounded by,

$$\kappa < \frac{1}{\beta} - \frac{1}{\alpha}, \quad (65)$$

which is the same condition as the ultimate fault tolerance of bounded delay models [4] and [15, Section 3.3]. This implies that the maximum sustainable transaction rate (under no queue-attack) is,

$$\lambda < bg(b) \frac{\kappa}{1 + \kappa} \quad (66)$$

$$< bg(b) \frac{1 - 2\beta}{1 - \beta - \beta^2}, \quad (67)$$

whereas the sustainable transaction rate further drops to,

$$\lambda < bg(b) \frac{\alpha\kappa}{1 + \alpha\kappa} \quad (68)$$

$$< bg(b) \frac{1 - 2\beta}{1 - \beta}, \quad (69)$$

under the case where adversary does not mine anything.

References

- [1] S. Nakamoto, “Bitcoin: A peer-to-peer electronic cash system.” <https://bitcoin.org/bitcoin.pdf>, March 2008.
- [2] J. Garay, A. Kiayias, and N. Leonardos, “The bitcoin backbone protocol: Analysis and applications,” in *EUROCRYPT*, April 2015.
- [3] R. Pass and E. Shi, “Rethinking large-scale consensus,” in *IEEE CSF*, August 2017.
- [4] A. Dembo, S. Kannan, E. Tas, D. Tse, P. Viswanath, X. Wang, and O. Zeitouni, “Everything is a race and Nakamoto always wins,” in *ACM CCS*, November 2020.
- [5] J. Li, D. Guo, and L. Ren, “Close latency-security trade-off for the Nakamoto consensus,” in *ACM AFT*, November 2021.
- [6] D. Guo and L. Ren, “Bitcoin’s latency–security analysis made simple,” in *ACM AFT*, September 2023.
- [7] M. Doger and S. Ulukus, “Security bounds for bitcoin under network delay,” in *IEEE ISIT*, June 2023.
- [8] M. Doger and S. Ulukus, “Refined bitcoin security-latency under network delay,” Available online at arXiv2212.01372.
- [9] P. Gazi, L. Ren, and A. Russell, “Practical settlement bounds for proof-of-work blockchains,” in *ACM CCS*, November 2022.
- [10] S. Kasahara and J. Kawahara, “Effect of bitcoin fee on transaction-confirmation process,” *Journal of Industrial and Management Optimization*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 365–386, 2019.
- [11] I. Malakhov, A. Marin, and S. Rossi, “Analysis of the confirmation time in proof-of-work blockchains,” *Future Generation Computer Systems*, vol. 147, pp. 275–291, 2023.

- [12] Q.-L. Li, Y. Ma, J.-Y. Ma, and Y. X. Chang, “Information theory of blockchain systems,” in *Combinatorial Optimization and Applications*, pp. 443–454, Springer Nature Switzerland, 2024.
- [13] S. Ricci, E. Ferreira, D. S. Menasche, A. Ziviani, J. E. Souza, and A. B. Vieira, “Learning blockchain delays: A queueing theory approach,” *SIGMETRICS Perform. Eval. Rev.*, vol. 46, p. 122–125, January 2019.
- [14] Q.-L. Li, J.-Y. Ma, and Y.-X. Chang, “Blockchain queue theory,” in *Computational Data and Social Networks*, Springer International Publishing, 2018.
- [15] S.-J. Cao and D. Guo, “Trade-off of security, latency, and throughput of the Nakamoto consensus,” Available online at arXiv2312.05506.
- [16] V. Ramaswami, “A stable recursion for the steady state vector in markov chains of m/g/1 type,” *Communications in Statistics. Stochastic Models*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 183–188, 1988.
- [17] S. M. Ross, *Stochastic processes*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., second ed., 1996.
- [18] Y. Shahsavari, K. Zhang, and C. Talhi, “A theoretical model for block propagation analysis in bitcoin network,” *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, vol. 69, no. 4, pp. 1459–1476, 2022.
- [19] Q.-L. Li, J.-Y. Ma, Y.-X. Chang, F.-Q. Ma, and H.-B. Yu, “Markov processes in blockchain systems,” in *Computational Social Networks*, Springer International Publishing, 2019.
- [20] M. Neuts, *Matrix-Geometric Solutions in Stochastic Models*. Johns Hopkins University Press, 1981.
- [21] Q.-L. Li, *Constructive Computation in Stochastic Models with Applications: The RG-Factorization*. Springer, January 2010.
- [22] J. Göbel and A. Krzesinski, “Increased block size and bitcoin blockchain dynamics,” in *ITNAC*, 2017.
- [23] I. Eyal and E. G. Sirer, “Majority is not enough: Bitcoin mining is vulnerable,” *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 61, p. 95–102, July 2018.
- [24] “DSN Bitcoin Monitoring.” <https://dsn.tm.kit.edu/bitcoin/>. Accessed: 2023-12-30.
- [25] “Y Charts.” ycharts.com/indicators/bitcoin_average_transactions_per_block/. Accessed: 2023-12-30.