

JUMBO: Fully Asynchronous BFT Consensus Made Truly Scalable

Hao Cheng, Yuan Lu, Zhenliang Lu, Qiang Tang, Yuxuan Zhang, Zhenfeng Zhang

Abstract—Recent progresses in asynchronous Byzantine fault-tolerant (BFT) consensus, e.g. Dumbo-NG (CCS’ 22) and Tusk (EuroSys’ 22), show promising performance through decoupling transaction dissemination and block agreement. However, when executed with a larger number n of nodes, like several hundreds, they would suffer from significant degradation in performance. Their dominating scalability bottleneck is the huge authenticator complexity: each node has to multicast $\mathcal{O}(n)$ quorum certificates (QCs) and subsequently verify them for each block.

This paper systematically investigates and resolves the above scalability issue. We first propose a signature-free asynchronous BFT consensus FIN-NG that adapts a recent signature-free asynchronous common subset protocol FIN (CCS’ 23) into the state-of-the-art framework of concurrent broadcast and agreement. The liveness of FIN-NG relies on our non-trivial redesign of FIN’s multi-valued validated Byzantine agreement towards achieving optimal quality. FIN-NG greatly improves the performance of FIN and already outperforms Dumbo-NG in most deployment settings. To further overcome the scalability limit of FIN-NG due to $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ messages, we propose JUMBO, a scalable instantiation of Dumbo-NG, with only $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ complexities for both authenticators and messages. We use various aggregation and dispersal techniques for QCs to significantly reduce the authenticator complexity of original Dumbo-NG implementations by up to $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ orders. We also propose a “fairness” patch for JUMBO, thus preventing a flooding adversary from controlling an overwhelming portion of transactions in its output.

Finally, we implement our designs in Golang and experimentally demonstrated their enhanced scalability with hundreds of Amazon’s AWS instances. JUMBO and FIN-NG significantly outperform the state-of-the-art in (nearly) all deployment settings. Especially, when $n \geq 196$, JUMBO can attain a throughput that is more than 4x that of FIN and Dumbo-NG.

Index Terms—Blockchain consensus, Byzantine fault tolerance, asynchronous Byzantine agreement.

I. INTRODUCTION

Randomized *asynchronous* Byzantine-fault tolerant (BFT) consensus protocols [1–21] can overcome FLP “impossibility” [22] to ensure both *safety* (i.e. all honest nodes agree the same ledger of transactions) and *liveness* (i.e. a client can expect her valid transactions eventually output) despite a fully asynchronous network that can arbitrarily delay message delivery. In contrast, their synchronous or partial synchronous counterparts, such as PoW [23] and PBFT [24], might suffer

Hao Cheng, Yuan Lu, and Zhenfeng Zhang are with Institute of Software Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, 100190, China. Email: {chenghao2020, luyuan, zhenfeng}@iscas.ac.cn.

Zhenliang Lu and Qiang Tang are with The University of Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia. Email: {zhenliang.lu, qiang.tang}@sydney.edu.au.

Yuxuan Zhang is with University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, 15260, PA, US. Email: yuz276@pitt.edu.

Hao Cheng, Yuan Lu, and Yuxuan Zhang made equal contribution, and part of the work was done while Yuxuan visited Institute of Software CAS.

from inherent violation of security (e.g., PoW might output disagreed decisions [25] and PBFT can completely grind to a halt [12]) if unluckily encountering an asynchronous adversary [22]. Therefore, the fully asynchronous BFT consensus protocols become highly desired for their high security assurance, making them the most robust candidates for critical blockchain infrastructures deployed over the unstable and occasionally adversarial global Internet.

A. Scalability Obstacles of the State of the Art

Interests in asynchronous BFT consensus protocols have recently resurged [12–21] for their higher security assurance against powerful network adversaries. However, there is limited evidence supporting their seamless scalability to efficiently handle larger-scale networks with several hundred nodes. For instance, the state-of-the-art asynchronous BFT consensus protocols like Tusk [16]¹ and Dumbo-NG [18] were demonstrated with only 50 and 64 nodes, respectively. As Figure 1 depicts, we evaluate these state-of-the-art designs in a LAN setting, revealing that they suffer from a significant performance decline as the number of participating nodes increases, despite their appealing performance at smaller scales like 16 or 64 nodes.² Notably, while the number of nodes n increases from 16 to 256, their peak throughput and latency are worse by 3 and 2 orders of magnitude, respectively.




Fig. 1. Tusk [16] and Dumbo-NG [18] for 16-256 nodes in LAN. Each node is an EC2 c6a.2xlarge instance with 12.5 Gbps bandwidth (upload+download).

The inferior performance in larger-scale networks significantly hampers the widespread adoption of asynchronous BFT consensus in real-world blockchain systems. In particular, a larger number of participating nodes is a sine qua non to diversify trust for mission-critical applications such as cryptocurrency and decentralized finance, thus necessitating our continued efforts to boost the performance of asynchronous consensus in larger-scale networks.

Scalability bottlenecks of signature-involved prior art. We begin with a succinct examination of Dumbo-NG and Tusk —

¹<https://github.com/asonnino/narwhal>

²Note that a direct comparison between the throughputs of Tusk and Dumbo-NG is meaningless due to their difference on implementing storage, and we shall focus on the trend of throughput and latency change with scales.

the most practical asynchronous BFT consensus protocols in relatively small networks such as several dozens of nodes, in order to unveil the major obstacles hindering their scalability. Both Tusk and Dumbo-NG can execute a process continuously disseminating transactions concurrently to another process deciding a unitary order of transactions that have been disseminated, thus maximizing bandwidth utilization and achieving appealing performance (for several dozens of nodes).

However, both protocols heavily rely on signature based quorum certificates (QCs) to implement the performance-optimized structure of concurrent broadcast and agreement: each node has to broadcast $\mathcal{O}(n)$ QCs on different messages per decision, indicating overall $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ QCs per output block. Worse still, Dumbo-NG and Tusk, like many earlier BFT studies [26–28], implement QCs by concatenating $2f + 1$ non-aggregate signatures (where f is the number of maximal malicious nodes).³ Although they can theoretically use aggregatable signatures like threshold Boneh-Lynn-Shacham (BLS) signature as alternative, they explicitly avoid the aggregatable threshold signatures in practice, because threshold signatures might entail concretely expensive computation costs of cryptographic pairings and Lagrange interpolation in the exponent (as elaborated by a very recent thorough benchmarking [29]).

Then if we implement QCs by ECDSA/EdDSA with standard 128-bit security as suggested by earlier practices [26–29], when $n=200$ nodes, each node needs to send at least 343 MB signatures per decision;⁴ even worse, each node receives a minimum of n distinct QCs that have to verify, indicating a CPU latency of second(s).⁵ As Figure 2 depicts, we further test Dumbo-NG in LAN to experimentally demonstrate the high cost of QCs in practice. It reveals: (i) when n increases to 196 from 16, the ratio of signature verifications in CPU time increases from $\sim 16.7\%$ to $\sim 66.6\%$,⁶ (ii) the communication of QCs jumps from $\sim 0.8\%$ of total communication to $\sim 40\%$. Apparently, the overhead of signatures (which can be characterized by a fine-grained metric called authenticator complexity [26, 30]) now plays a key role in the inferior performance in the large-scale settings with hundreds of nodes.




Fig. 2. Cost breakdown of Dumbo-NG in LAN consisting of 16-196 nodes.

³It might be a little bit surprising, but we find that the official implementations of many popular BFT protocols (like HotStuff, Speeding Dumbo, Dumbo-NG, Narwhal and Tusk) use ECDSA/EdDSA for implementing QC.

⁴Each QC contains $n-f=134$ ECDSA/EdDSA signatures, and each signature has 64 bytes (if compression is turned off for computation efficiency). So sending n QC to n nodes would cost $(n-f) * 64 * n * n = 343$ MB.

⁵Verifying an ECDSA/EdDSA costs $\sim 40 \mu s$ at EC2 c6a.2xlarge instance.

⁶Breakdown of CPU time was measured using Golang’s profiling tool pprof.

Practical issues of existing (nearly) signature-free designs.

Since the major scalability bottleneck of Dumbo-NG/Tusk stems from their tremendous usage of signature-based QCs, one might wonder whether some existing “signature-free” asynchronous BFT protocols could better extend to work in large-scale networks. In particular, some recent studies like PACE [31] and FIN [20] attempt to reduce authenticators as many as possible, resulting in some (nearly) signature-free asynchronous BFT protocols⁷ that can get rid of public key operations except for distributed randomness.

In short, PACE and FIN directly execute a special variant of asynchronous Byzantine agreement called asynchronous common subset (ACS) [32], which can solicit $n - f$ nodes’ proposals as a block of consensus output. However, these signature-free approaches have their own efficiency issues that could be even more serious than Dumbo-NG and Tusk [18]: (i) *severe transaction censorship*— the adversary can constantly prevent f honest nodes from contributing into consensus results, causing an order of $\mathcal{O}(n)$ communication blowup because censored transactions have to be redundantly broadcasted by majority honest nodes;⁸ (ii) *low bandwidth utilization*— they sequentially execute transaction broadcast and agreement, so during a long period of agreement phase, bandwidth is “wasted” to contribute nothing into throughput; (iii) *costly erasure-code*— they use erasure-code based reliable broadcasts [33], where every node performs $\mathcal{O}(n)$ erasure-code decodings, causing high CPU cost (cf. Figure 3).

CPU time breakdown of FIN (around Peak TPS over 8 vCPUs)




Fig. 3. CPU time breakdown of FIN for 16-196 nodes in LAN (when system load is close to peak throughput). Here “MT” represents Merkle tree [34]; “RS” represents Reed-Solomon code [35] (instantiated by a fast implementation [36] of a systematic Cauchy Reed-Solomon variant [37, 38]).

Bearing the substantial scalability challenge in the state-of-the-art of asynchronous BFT, the next question remains open:

Can we extend the appealing performance of the existing performant asynchronous BFT consensus protocols to larger networks with several hundreds of nodes?

B. Our Contribution

We systematically investigate how to overcome the scalability issues of existing asynchronous BFT consensus and answer the aforementioned question in affirmative. A couple of more scalable asynchronous consensus protocols FIN-NG and JUMBO are designed and experimentally demonstrated. In greater detail, our core contributions can be summarized as:

- **FIN-NG: adapting the existing signature-free approaches into parallel broadcast and agreement.** We

⁷We follow the conventional abuse of term “signature-free”, though these protocols [20, 31] might require public key assumptions to practically generate distributed common randomness and/or leverage cryptographic hash functions for efficiency. Both hidden assumptions theoretically imply signatures.

⁸HoneyBadger BFT (HBBFT) uses threshold encryption to wrap ACS against censorship threat but this introduces considerable computational cost.

TABLE I
COMPARISON BETWEEN ASYNCHRONOUS BFT CONSENSUS (STATE-MACHINE REPLICATION) PROTOCOLS.

	Per-Decision Complexities (summed over all nodes)				Technique to realize Liveness in the worst case against tx censorship	Fairness (Quality)	Concurrent broadcast & agreement
	Amortized Comm. (worst-case)	Message	Authenticator (except dist. common coin)	Round			
BKR94 [32]	$O(n^3 tx)$	$O(n^3)$	-	$O(\log n)$	-	✓	✗
HBBFT [12, 13]	$O(n tx)$	$O(n^3)$	-	$O(\log n)$	$O(n^2)$ *	✓	✗
PACE [31]	$O(n^2 tx)$	$O(n^3)$	-	$O(\log n)$	$O(n^2)$ *	✓	✗
DL [21]	$O(\kappa n tx)$ †	$O(n^3)$	-	$O(\log n)$	$O(n^2)$ *	✓	✗
FIN [20]	$O(n^2 tx)$	$O(n^3)$	-	$O(1)$	$O(n^2)$ *	✓	✗
CKPS01 [11]	$O(n^3 tx)$	$O(n^2)$	$O(n^3)$	$O(1)$	-	✓	✗
sDumbo [27]	$O(n tx)$ †	$O(n^2)$	$O(n^3); O(n^4)$ impl.§	$O(1)$	-	✓	✗
Tusk [16]	$O(n^2 tx)$	$O(n^2)$	$O(n^3); O(n^4)$ impl.§	$O(1)$	-	✓	✓
Dumbo-NG [18]	$O(\kappa n tx)$ †	$O(n^2)$	$O(n^3); O(n^4)$ impl.§	$O(1)$	-	✗	✓
FIN-NG (this work)	$O(\kappa n tx)$ †	$O(n^3)$	-	$O(1)$	-	✓	✓
JUMBO (this work)	$O(\kappa n tx)$ †	$O(n^2)$	$O(n^2)$	$O(1)$	-	✓	✓

‡ “Duplicated tx buffers” mean that a transaction has to be sent to $f + 1$ honest nodes’ transaction buffers, otherwise the transaction might never be agreed and violate liveness. This is a typical problem causing quadratic (amortized) communication cost in protocols directly built from asynchronous common subset (ACS) such as PACE and FIN [20, 31, 32], because the adversary can enforce ACS to constantly drop f honest nodes’ proposed transactions.

◇ HBBFT, BEAT and sDumbo warp ACS by threshold encryption, amortizedly reducing communication cost to $O(n)$ despite duplicated tx buffers.

† “Strong validity” guarantees every transaction proposed by any honest node to be eventually agreed. It allows de-duplication techniques [16, 39] to send each transaction to only κ random nodes (where κ is a small parameter ensuring overwhelming probability to include an honest node in κ random nodes).

§ Tusk, sDumbo and Dumbo-NG [16, 18, 27] have $O(n^3)$ authenticator complexity if using non-interactive threshold signatures to implement QCs, but their implementations actually choose ECDSA/EdDSA for concrete performance, resulting in $O(n^4)$ authenticator complexity.

* Though each node performs $O(n)$ number of erasure-code decoding, this reflects a computation cost of $\tilde{O}(n^2)$, as each decoding has $\tilde{O}(n)$ operations.

initially propose a more scalable signature-free asynchronous BFT consensus protocol FIN-NG, by adapting the signature-free state-of-the-art FIN into the enticing paradigm of concurrent broadcast and agreement. In comparison to FIN, FIN-NG avoids the unnecessary detour to ACS and can (i) achieve significantly higher throughput because concurrently running broadcast and agreement can more efficiently utilize bandwidth resources, (ii) ensures all honest nodes’ proposals to finally output, thus realizing strong liveness to mitigate the censorship threat in FIN, (iii) avoid full-fledged reliable broadcasts as well as computationally costly erasure-coding in normal path to further reduce latency. FIN-NG not only greatly improves the performance of FIN, but also already outperforms the signature-involved state-of-the-art protocols like Dumbo-NG in most deployment settings.

- **Comprehensive benchmarking and optimizations towards concretely faster QC implementation.** We assess the impact of implementing QCs from various digital signatures, including concatenated ECDSA/Schnorr signature [40], non-interactively half-aggregatable Schnorr signature [41, 42], BLS multi-signature [43, 44] and BLS threshold signature [45]. Neither same to many previous practitioners [16, 18, 26–29] suggesting ECDSA/EdDSA for (concrete) computing efficiency nor similar to many theorists using threshold signatures for communication efficiency [9, 11, 15, 17], we strictly suggest to implement QCs by BLS multi-signature in an overlooked “batch-then-verify” manner [46, 47], with adding a “blocklist” against performance downgrade by excluding malicious signers while aggregating. This enjoys the short size of aggregate signatures and avoids their costly verifications or aggregation. Moreover, regarding the major authenticator bottleneck of sending $O(n)$ QCs, we explore the merit of BLS multi-signatures to further compress $O(n)$ QCs on different messages, alleviating the communication of transferring $O(n)$ QCs by saving more than half in size.

- **JUMBO: even more scalable asynchronous BFT instantiation with $O(n^2)$ authenticators and messages.** Despite FIN-NG and our various QC optimizations, we still seek for a more scalable solution to asynchronous BFT that can asymptotically reduce authenticator complexity and simultaneously attain quadratic message complexity. As shown in Table I, we achieve the goal by presenting JUMBO—a non-trivial scalable instantiation of Dumbo-NG, by introducing the information dispersal technique [17] to reduce the number of multicasting $O(n)$ QCs from n to expected constant. JUMBO asymptotically reduces authenticator overhead with preserving a balanced $O(n^2)$ message complexity, thus significantly outperforming the state-of-the-art protocols and FIN-NG in most settings (particularly in these settings with larger scales and restricted bandwidth). Moreover, we propose a patch for JUMBO to achieve a desired security property of “fairness”, thus preventing adversaries from controlling arbitrary portion of transactions in the consensus output.




Fig. 4. Our designs v.s. state-of-the-art in a WAN setting (400 ms RTT, 100 Mbps bandwidth) for $n = 128, 196$ and 256 .

- **Open-source implementation and extensive evaluations in varying network settings with up to 256 nodes.** We implemented JUMBO and FIN-NG in Golang, and also Dumbo-NG [18] and FIN [20] in the same language as by-product for fair comparison. These protocols were comprehensively evaluated in WAN settings for $n = 64, 128, 196, 256$ nodes. Malicious attacks such as MVBA quality manipulation and sending of false signatures are also evaluated. Figure 4 highlights part of

our results in a network of 100 Mbps bandwidth and 400 ms RTT.⁹ Noticeably, JUMBO is 5X and 70X faster than FIN and Dumbo-NG, respectively, in the setting of 256 nodes. More interestingly, JUMBO can realize the least latency and simultaneously achieve the maximal throughput closer to line rate. For detailed performance comparison among these protocols, cf. Section VIII.

Our open-source codebase of JUMBO, FIN-NG, FIN and Dumbo-NG is of about 13,000 LOC and available at:

<https://github.com/tca-sp/jumbo>.

II. CHALLENGES AND OUR TECHNIQUES

Bearing the major scalability bottleneck of authenticator complexity in existing signature-involved asynchronous BFT protocols, our first attempt is to resolve the efficiency issues of signature-free prior art (like FIN), towards achieving a better scalable signature-free asynchronous BFT protocol FIN-NG. Then, we dedicatedly optimize the state-of-the-art signature-involved protocols (like Dumbo-NG), leading up to a scalable asynchronous BFT instantiation JUMBO that not only asymptotically reduce the authenticator overhead but also is concretely efficient in large-scale networks.




Fig. 5. The paradigm of parallel broadcasts and agreement (the high-level rationale behind both FIN-NG and JUMBO).

A. Challenges and Techniques of FIN-NG

As illustrated in Figure 5, FIN-NG has a straightforward high-level idea similar to [18], i.e., adapt the existing signature-free asynchronous common subset protocols like FIN into the enticing paradigm of parallel broadcasts and agreement. The paradigm can deconstruct asynchronous common subset protocol into two concurrent processes: (i) one bandwidth-intensive process consists of n multi-shot broadcast instances, and each broadcast allows a designed node to sequentially disseminate its transactions to the whole network, and (ii) the other agreement process executes a sequence of asynchronous multi-valued validated Byzantine agreement (MVBA) protocols, such that every MVBA can solicit some latest completed broadcasts and decide a new block to output.

⁹Most cloud providers charge $>1,000$ USD/month for reserving 100 Mbps bandwidth, and 400 ms RTT is typical for cities between Asia and America. Such condition arguably reflects a setting of affordable global deployment.

However, when adapting FIN into the enticing paradigm of parallel broadcast and agreement, we face a couple of new challenges that do not exist in the signature-involved setting.

Challenge NG-1: erasure-code computation might bring heavy CPU cost in broadcasts.

The first problem of implementing FIN-NG is how to efficiently implement its broadcast primitives. One might suggest the communication-efficient variants [33, 48, 49] of Bracha’s reliable broadcast [50, 51]. However, although these protocols can attain amortized linear communication cost (for sufficiently large input batch), their price is the necessity of erasure-coding. What is worse, the efficiency issue of using erasure-code in these broadcast protocols could be very serious, even if we cherry-pick fairly fast implementation as suggested by [13] (cf. Figure 3), because these broadcast protocols rely on sufficiently large input batches to amortize their communication cost, making encoding over very large fields and thus unsurprisingly slow.

Our approach. We overcome the efficiency issue by introducing a weakened variant of reliable broadcast that can be efficiently implemented without any erasure-coding. Similar to the normal path of PBFT [24], the broadcast primitive no longer ensures all honest nodes to eventually receive the broadcast value; instead, it only guarantees $f + 1$ honest nodes to receive the original broadcast value, and allows the remaining honest nodes only eventually receive a hash digest of value. We further provide a pulling mechanism to compensate the weakening of broadcast. The pulling mechanism incorporates dispersal technique [33] for communication optimization, such that for any honest node that only receives the hash digest, it can efficiently fetch the missing transactions from other honest nodes, at an amortized linear communication cost.

Challenge NG-2: poor “quality” of existing signature-free MVBA might hinder liveness of FIN-NG.

It is notable that in Dumbo-NG, its liveness relies on the so-called “quality” of MVBA protocols. Here quality means the output of MVBA shall not be fully manipulated by the adversary. Imagine that the adversary can completely manipulate the MVBA result, it thus can rule out a certain honest node’s broadcast from the finalized output (because the MVBA result determines which nodes’ broadcasts shall be solicited by the output block). This clearly violates liveness, because some honest node’s broadcasted transactions wouldn’t eventually output anymore. In the signature-based setting, there are several efficient MVBA protocols [14, 15, 17] with optimal 1/2 quality, such that Dumbo-NG can be securely instantiated with preserving liveness. However, to our knowledge, there is no signature-free MVBA protocol with satisfying quality property, which might potentially cause liveness vulnerability in FIN-NG.

Our approach. To deal with the potential liveness issue, we necessarily redesign the state-of-the-art signature-free MVBA protocol FIN-MVBA [20] to ensure optimal 1/2 quality [52] against adaptive adversaries, i.e. the output is proposed by some honest node with at least 1/2 probability. In contrast, FIN-MVBA protocol only ensures 1/3 quality in the same

setting.¹⁰ The seemingly small difference in MVBA’s quality can reduce the latency by an entire MVBA execution, and can render a considerable improvement of latency in FIN-NG under Byzantine setting (cf. Section VIII for our experiment evaluation of MVBA quality’s impact on latency).

B. Challenges and Techniques of JUMBO

As a concrete instantiation of Dumbo-NG, the design of JUMBO also follows the high-level structure of parallel broadcast and agreement shown in Figure 5. However, to make JUMBO practically operate in large-scale networks with enhanced fairness guarantee, we necessarily overcome the following challenges to reduce the prohibitive authenticator complexity in Dumbo-NG, both concretely and asymptotically.

Challenge J-1: trivial use of aggregatable signatures like BLS could be computationally slow. Although it is well known that aggregatable signatures like BLS threshold signature can make great theoretic improvement to BFT protocols, it is not a popular choice in real-world systems. In particular, some very recent BFT protocols like HotStuff [26], Tusk [16] and Dumbo-NG [18] choose ECDSA/EdDSA signatures instead of BLS threshold signature to implement QCs in practice. And a recent benchmarking [29] even suggests ECDSA/EdDSA signature always favorable than BLS threshold signature for large-scale networks, as it points out that (the trivial use of) BLS threshold signature might suffer from huge computation costs like the verification of individual signature and the aggregation involving interpolation in exponent.

Our approach. To make QC implementation concretely faster, we provide a resolution to settle the debate regarding QC implementation between theory and practice, and affirm that QC from BLS multi-signature (with non-trivial optimizations) could be the best practice for large-scale BFT systems. First, BLS multi-signature has very simple and efficient aggregation, which is concretely much faster than its threshold counterpart as it does not perform the heavy computation of interpolation in exponent. Second, we extend the optimistic “batch verification” approach for BLS multi-signatures [46, 47] by adding an easy-to-implement “blocklist” mechanism to rule out malicious nodes from quorum, thus amortizedly extending its superior efficiency in the optimistic case into the worst case. Third, BLS multi-signature allows to aggregate $O(n)$ QCs across various messages (i.e., the primary authenticator bottleneck in Dumbo-NG and Tusk), and we leverage this nice property to further reduce the concrete size of n different QCs by more than half.

Challenge J-2: how to achieve asymptotically lower authenticator complexity? By extending Dumbo-NG or Tusk? It is worth noticing Tusk has a directed acyclic graph (DAG) structure where every node has to multicast at least $n - f$ QCs of preceding broadcasts, These QCs are so-called “edges” pointing to preceding broadcasts to form DAG. Therefore,

¹⁰Note that although [20] proposed a quality patch for its MVBA, it still only ensures 1/3 quality against an adaptive adversary with “after-fact-removal” (i.e., the adversary can adaptively corrupt some node and remove this node’s undelivered messages), cf. Appendix B in Supplementary for detailed analysis.

all multicasts of $n - f$ QCs are intuitively needed in Tusk as part of its DAG structure. In contrast, a key observation of Dumbo-NG is that the cubic term of its authenticator complexity has a unique reason caused by the input multicast phase of MVBA protocols. This fact raises a question to us: Can we reduce the number of input multicasts inside Dumbo-NG’s MVBA protocol? This is probably plausible because MVBA only decides one node’s input as output, so the remaining input multicasts are essentially redundant.

Our approach. We leverage the neat structure of Dumbo-NG to incorporate a simplistic manner to reduce the authenticator complexity by an $O(n)$ order. In short, we apply MVBA extension protocol [17] to replace the multicasts of n QCs by more efficient dispersals of QCs. More precisely, we let every node use a provable dispersal protocol [17] to efficiently disperse n QCs (instead of trivially multicasting), then only a constant number of dispersals (instead of all n dispersals) are reconstructed for verifications. This dispersal-then-recast paradigm reflects our observation that only one multicast of n QC is necessary, and all else are essentially redundant. Clearly, this optimized execution flow is asymptotically more efficient, because each dispersal has a much less commutation cost that is only $O(1/n)$ of trivial multicast.

III. PROBLEM FORMULATION AND PRELIMINARIES

A. System and Threat Models

We adopt a widely-adopted asynchronous message-passing model with initial setups and Byzantine corruption [9, 11, 15, 17], which can be formally described in the following:

Known participating nodes. There are n designated nodes in the system. We denote them by $\{\mathcal{P}_i\}_{i \in [n]}$, where $[n]$ is short for $\{1, \dots, n\}$. Each \mathcal{P}_i is bounded to some public key pk_i known by all other nodes through a bulletin board PKI (though we might not use the setup in the signature-free construction).

Established threshold cryptosystem. To overcome FLP impossibility, we depend on a cryptographic coin flipping protocol [9], which can return unpredictable common randomness upon a threshold of participation nodes invoke it. This usually requires some threshold cryptosystem [9, 53] that is already setup, which can be done through either asynchronous distributed key generation [19, 54–56] or a trusted third party.

Computationally-bounded Byzantine corruption. We focus on optimal resilience in asynchrony against an adversary \mathcal{A} that can corrupt up to $f = \lfloor (n - 1)/3 \rfloor$ nodes. Following standard cryptographic practice, the adversary is probabilistic polynomial-time bounded, making it infeasible to break cryptographic primitives. We might consider static or adaptive adversaries, where static adversaries choose a fixed set of f nodes to corrupt before the protocol starts, and adaptive ones can gradually corrupt f nodes during protocol execution.

Reliable authenticated asynchronous network. We consider a reliable asynchronous message-passing network with fully-meshed point-to-point links and authentications. Messages sent through the underlying network can be arbitrarily delayed by the adversary due to asynchrony, but they can be eventually delivered without being tampered or forged. In addition, while

a node receives a message, it can assert the actual sender of the message due to authentication.

B. Design Goal: Asynchronous BFT Consensus with Fairness

We aim at secure asynchronous BFT consensus protocols satisfying the next atomic broadcast abstraction.

Definition 1. Asynchronous BFT atomic broadcast (ABC).

In an ABC protocol, each node has an input buffer of transactions, and continually outputs some blocks of transactions that form an ever-growing and append-only linearized log of transactions. The protocol shall satisfy the next properties with all but negligible probability:

- *Agreement.* If an honest node outputs a transaction, then all honest nodes eventually output it.
- *Total Order.* For any two output logs of honest node(s), one is a prefix of the other, or they are equal.
- *Liveness (Strong Validity).* If a transaction is placed in any honest node input buffer, it can eventually be included by the output log of some honest node.
- *α -Fairness.* For any block outputted by some honest node, if the block contains K transactions, then at least $\alpha \cdot K$ transactions in the block are proposed by honest nodes.

Some remarks on the above definition:

- For liveness (validity), we define it in a strong form: if a transaction stays in any honest node’s input buffer, it can eventually output, while some weaker forms only guarantee this if the transaction is input of $f + 1$ honest nodes or all honest nodes. Strong validity is a useful property enabling de-duplication of input transactions [16, 18, 39], namely, allowing a client forward its transactions to only a small number of k consensus nodes.
- Fairness bounds the “quality” of consensus [57] and prevents the adversary controlling an arbitrarily large portion in the output, ensuring that the consensus output contains sufficiently many transactions proposed by honest nodes.

C. Complexity Measurements

Besides security, we are also interested in constructing practical asynchronous BFT protocols. For the purpose, we consider the next complexity metrics as efficiency indicators:

- *Message complexity* [11]: the expected number of messages sent by honest nodes to decide an output. Note that we do not count message complexity amortized for batched decision in order to reflect the actual overhead of packet/datagram headers in a real networked systems.
- *(Amortized) bit communication complexity* [11]: the expected number of bits sent by honest nodes per output transaction. Note that bit communication complexity is amortized for a batch of decision to reflect the number of communicated bits related to each output transaction.
- *Round complexity* [4]: the expected asynchronous rounds needed to output a transaction. Here asynchronous round is a “time” unit defined by the longest delay of messages sent among honest nodes [4, 58].
- *Authenticator complexity* [26, 30]: the expected communicated bits generated by honest nodes associated with transferring (or verifying) signatures per output decision. For

protocols that all have the optimal (linear) amortized bit communication complexity, authenticator communication complexity can provide a more fine-grained measurement to distinguish their actual communication overheads, thus guiding us towards more scalable protocol designs.

D. Preliminaries

Byzantine reliable broadcast (BRBC). A BRBC protocol [50, 59] among n participating nodes has a designated sender and can simulate an ideal broadcast channel in an point-to-point network, thus realizing (i) *agreement*: any two honest nodes’ outputs are same; (ii) *totality*: all honest nodes would eventually output some value conditioned on some honest node has output, and (iii) *validity*: an honest sender’s input can eventually be output by all honest nodes.

Weak Byzantine reliable broadcast (wBRBC). A wBRBC protocol is a relaxed BRBC, where an honest node either outputs a value or a hash digest. The protocol satisfies (i) *weak agreement*: two honest nodes’ outputs are either the same value, or the same hash digest, or a value and its hash digest; (ii) *weak totality*: at least $n - 2f$ honest nodes would eventually output some value and all rest honest nodes would eventually output some digest conditioned on some honest node has output, (iii) *validity*: same to BRBC.

Multi-valued validated Byzantine agreement (MVBA) [11, 15, 17]. This is a variant of Byzantine agreement with external validity, such that all honest nodes can agree on a value satisfying a publicly known predicate Q . More formally,

Definition 2. *Syntax-wise, each node in the MVBA protocol takes a (probably different) value validated by a global predicate Q (whose description is known by the public) as input, and decides a value satisfying Q as the output. An MVBA protocol running among n nodes shall satisfy the next properties except with negligible probability:*

- *Termination.* If all honest nodes input some values (eventually) satisfying Q , then each honest node would output;
- *Agreement.* If two honest nodes output v and v' , respectively, then $v = v'$.
- *External-Validity.* If an honest node outputs a value v , then v is valid w.r.t. Q , i.e., $Q(v) = 1$;
- *1/2-Quality.* If an honest node outputs v , the probability that v was input by the adversary is at most $1/2$.

In addition, many studies [20, 60–62] recently realized that the external validity property of MVBA can be extended to support a somewhat *internal* predicate, which does not return “false”, but keeps on listening the change of the node’s local states and returns “true” only if the joint of predicate input and a node’s local states satisfies a pre-specified validity condition. This is particularly useful if the higher level protocol can enforce all nodes’ internal predicates to eventually be true as long as any honest node’s predicate is true, e.g., all nodes keep on checking whether they output in a specific BRBC protocol. Later in Section IV, the *internal* predicate allows us to design FIN-NG by adapting the signature-free ACS protocol FIN into the paradigm of concurrent agreement and broadcast.

Reproposable asynchronous binary agreement (RABA) [31]. This is a special variant of binary Byzantine agreement, where each node is additionally allowed to change its input from 0 to 1 (but not vice versa). Here we recall its definition:

Definition 3. *Syntactically, a node in RABA is allowed to invoke two input interfaces $raba-propose$ and $raba-repropose$, and has an output interface $raba-decide$ to receive the output; an honest node is required to use the interfaces in the following way: (i) must invoke $raba-propose$ before $raba-repropose$, (ii) cannot use any interface more than once, (iii) can only take 0 or 1 as input of $raba-propose$ and $raba-repropose$ interfaces, (iv) cannot $raba-propose$ 1 and then $raba-repropose$ 0 (but vice versa is allowed). A RABA protocol shall satisfy the next properties except with negligible probability:*

- **Agreement.** *If any two honest nodes terminate, then they $raba-decide$ the same value.*
- **Unanimous termination and Unanimous validity.** *If all honest nodes $raba-propose$ v and never $raba-repropose$, then all honest nodes terminate and $raba-decide$ v .*
- **Biased validity.** *If $f + 1$ honest nodes $raba-propose$ 1, no honest node would $raba-decide$ 0.*
- **Biased termination.** *If all honest nodes $raba-propose$ 1 or eventually $raba-repropose$ 1, then all honest nodes would terminate and $raba-decide$.*

Cryptographic notions. \mathcal{H} denotes a collision-resistant one-way hash function. Sign and SigVerify represent the signing and verifying algorithms of a signature scheme that is existentially unforgeable under adaptive chosen message attack (i.e., EUF-CMA secure). We also consider non-interactively aggregatable multi-signature (or threshold signature) [41–45], where is another Agg algorithm that can input multiple signatures on a message and output a multi-signature (or threshold signature) on the same message.

Aggregating BLS (multi-)signatures in KOSK model. It is noticeably that we adopt the standard knowledge-of-secret-key (KOSK) model [45]: every node has to sign a valid signature to prove its knowledge of secret key when registering public key. This is the standard process of real-world CA while issuing certificates [63] and also reflects the public key registration in proof-of-stake blockchains. The KOSK model brings very convenient aggregation of BLS signatures. In particular, the simplistic aggregation is in form of $\text{Agg}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k) = \prod_{j=1}^k \sigma_j$, which simply returns $\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_k$ as result. Here $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k$ can be BLS signatures or even already-aggregated BLS multi-signatures on either same or different messages. Later in Section V, we will showcase how asynchronous BFT can leverage this aggregation technique towards aggregating $\mathcal{O}(n)$ QCs on different messages.

IV. INITIAL ATTEMPT: FIN-NG TO SCALE UP SIGNATURE-FREE ASYNCHRONOUS BFT

This section attempts to enhance the scalability of signature-free asynchronous BFT protocols, by adapting the cutting-edge signature-free ACS protocol FIN into the enticing paradigm of concurrent broadcast and agreement. The resulting protocol

FIN-NG already outperforms existing asynchronous BFT protocols in the bandwidth-sufficient setting. Finally, we explain why cubic messages of FIN-NG might cause unsatisfying performance degradation in the bandwidth-starved environment.




Fig. 6. High-level of FIN-NG.

Overview of FIN-NG. As shown in Figure 6, FIN-NG deconstructs FIN ACS [20] to separate transaction broadcast from consensus. Noticeably, a trivial parallelization of FIN ACS’s broadcast and agreement wouldn’t bring us well-performing FIN-NG in large-scale networks, and we specially tailor both modules to alleviate their efficiency bottlenecks as follows:

- **Avoid costly BRBC towards more efficient broadcast:** FIN instantiates its broadcast process by using CT05 BRBC [59]. The protocol leverages erasure-code to attain amortized linear communication cost (for sufficiently large batch of broadcast input). However, CT05 BRBC involves expensive decoding, which could be very costly in FIN as each node has to participate in n such BRBCs and perform n times of decoding. We thus suggest to employ a more efficient process of transaction dissemination with weakened reliability. That means, only $f + 1$ honest nodes are ensured to receive consistent transactions and up to f honest nodes might only receive the hash digest (which can be analog to PBFT [24, 28]). Thanks to such weakening, the broadcast attains amortized linear communication cost in the absence of erasure coding. To compensate the weakening in broadcasts, we further propose a couple of communication-efficient pulling mechanisms, such that any honest node can securely fetch its missing transactions with amortized linear communication.
- **Enhance MVBA quality for liveness and lower latency:** When separating broadcasts and MVBA toward realizing FIN-NG, the liveness might be hurt if the underlying MVBA has sub-optimal quality. This is because if the adversary can manipulate MVBA’s output due to low quality, it can make MVBA result never contain the indices of some nodes’ completed broadcasts, thus censoring certain nodes and breaking liveness. To guarantee liveness and fast confirmation in FIN-NG, we redesign the signature-free MVBA protocols proposed in FIN [20]. The resulting FIN-MVBA-Q protocol can ensure optimal 1/2 quality in the influence of a strong adaptive adversary

with “after-the-fact-removal”. In contrast, MVBA protocols in FIN [20] only realizes $1/n$ quality and $1/3$ quality, respectively, in the same setting. Later in Section VIII, we experimentally test FIN-NG using MVBA with different quality, revealing that our seemingly small improvement in MVBA quality can make a large difference in latency.

A. FIN-NG Protocol

This subsection details FIN-NG by elaborating its transaction dissemination process and block agreement process.

Broadcast process in FIN-NG. Figure 7 illustrates the broadcast process that disseminates transactions in FIN-NG. There could be n such multi-shot broadcasts in FIN-NG, where each node \mathcal{P}_i acts as a leader in one broadcast instance, and all nodes execute as receivers in all n broadcasts. A multi-shot broadcast instance in FIN-NG is executed as follows.

- *Tx dissemination through a sequence of weak BRBC.* The designated sender \mathcal{P}_s and all other nodes participate in a sequence of weak reliable broadcast protocols (wBRBC defined in Sec. III-D). The broadcast process resembles a simplistic normal-path of PBFT, so it only ensures that at least $f + 1$ honest nodes might (eventually) receive the original broadcasted transactions, and up to f else honest nodes might only receive a consistent hash digest. To bound the memory of buffering received transactions, all broadcast participants can dump transactions into persistent storage if some wBRBC outputs them, which is because FIN-NG ensures strong validity to guarantee all broadcasted transactions to be part of consensus output (so we can write these broadcast results into disk).
- *Pulling mechanism in companion with broadcasts.* We can enable the f honest nodes that only hold hash digest to fetch missing transactions from other honest nodes. Since the node still can obtain the hash digest (despite missing the original transactions), it can securely fetch the corresponding transactions, because (i) it knows which wBRBC to fetch due to the receipt of digest, and (ii) at least $f + 1$ honest nodes can output the corresponding transactions due to the (weaker) totality property of wBRBC. Given this, we can propose two choices of implementing the efficient pulling mechanism:
 - The first approach resembles Tusk’s pull mechanism against static adversaries [16]: when \mathcal{P}_i receives a hash digest from a certain wBRBC instead of the original transactions, it asks κ random nodes for the missing transactions. There shall be an overwhelming probability such that these selected nodes would contain at least one honest node receiving the original transactions, implying that \mathcal{P}_i can eventually receive at least one respond carrying the correct transactions consistent to its hash digest, with except negligible probability in κ .
 - The second way is secure against adaptive adversaries [18]. It lets \mathcal{P}_i ask all nodes when \mathcal{P}_i realizes some missing transactions, with preserving *amortizedly* linear communication complexity per decision. The crux of improving communication efficiency is: the responses to \mathcal{P}_i are no longer the original transactions,

but incorporate communication-reducing techniques from asynchronous information dispersal [48, 59]. For each node \mathcal{P}_j , it chops the transactions requested by \mathcal{P}_i into $f + 1$ fragments, and uses erasure code to encode the $f + 1$ fragments into n code fragments, then computes a Merkle tree using n code fragments as leaves, and sends \mathcal{P}_i the Merkle tree root, the j -th code fragment, and the corresponding Merkle proof attesting the j -th code fragment’s inclusion in the Merkle tree. At the \mathcal{P}_i side, it can finally receive at least $f + 1$ responses carrying the same Merkle tree root with valid Merkle proofs, such that \mathcal{P}_i can decode the $f + 1$ code fragments to recover the missing transactions.




Fig. 7. Broadcast instance in FIN-NG.

Agreement process in FIN-NG. FIN-NG’s agreement process is a sequence of MVBA proceeding as follows by epoch e :

When entering epoch $e = 1$, each node \mathcal{P}_i initializes a n -size vector $\text{ordered}_e = [0, \dots, 0]$. \mathcal{P}_i also maintains a n -size vector current_i , where the j -th item closely tracks that \mathcal{P}_i has received how many wBRBCs broadcasted by \mathcal{P}_j . When current_i has $n - f$ items larger than ordered_e and has all items not smaller than ordered_e in the corresponding positions, the node \mathcal{P}_i takes a snapshot of current_i as MVBA[e]’s input. \mathcal{P}_i waits for that MVBA[e] returns a vector new-ordered consisting of n indices, and can pack all wBRBCs with indices between ordered_e and new-ordered as a block of consensus result.¹¹ Finally, \mathcal{P}_i sets $e = e + 1$ and $\text{ordered}_e = \text{new-ordered}$, then enters the next epoch e .

Noticeably, MVBA used in the above procedures shall be specified by a predicate function satisfying the next conditions:

- 1) Check that each item in current_j is not *shrink* w.r.t. the last output of MVBA (i.e. ordered_e), return false on check fails, otherwise go the next step.
- 2) Check that at least $n - f$ items in current_j increases w.r.t. the last output of MVBA, return false on check fails, otherwise go the next step.
- 3) Wait for that each item in the local state current_i is larger than or equal to the corresponding item in current_j , and then return true.

Similar to [60–62], the above conditions requires some local states (i.e., current_i —each broadcast’s progress from \mathcal{P}_i ’s view) to verify. One might worry its step 3) might wait forever and hurt termination of MVBA. However, violation of termination wouldn’t happen because (i) any honest node \mathcal{P}_i ’s input to MVBA must be valid regarding its own local states;

¹¹If MVBA[e] decides a certain wBRBC as consensus output but \mathcal{P}_i has not yet received anything from the wBRBC, the node can also invoke the pulling mechanism of broadcast instance to fetch the missing transactions.

(ii) the totality of broadcasts therefore ensure all honest nodes can eventually update their local states to validate \mathcal{P}_i 's input.

Security of FIN-NG. The security of FIN-NG can be summarized as the following main theorem:

Theorem 1. *FIN-NG securely realizes asynchronous BFT atomic broadcast without fairness except with negligible probability, conditioned on the underlying wBRBC and MVBA protocols are secure (where MVBA shall satisfying quality).*

Security analysis. The rationale behind Theorem 1 is straight:

- For safety, the broadcast of FIN-NG built from wBRBC can prevent malicious nodes to broadcast different transactions to distinct nodes due to its weak agreement; moreover, MVBA's validity and agreement can further ensure all honest nodes would solicit the same finished broadcasts into each output block, thus ensuring safety.
- For liveness, wBRBC's validity ensures that all honest nodes can reliably diffuse their transactions in only constant rounds; moreover, MVBA's termination and quality gauntness that once an honest node's broadcast is delivered to all other honest nodes, this broadcast (or the same node's higher broadcast) would be solicited by some MVBA output with an overwhelming probability of $1 - (1 - q)^k$ after k MVBA executions, where q is the quality of MVBA protocol, and $(1 - q)^k$ represents the probability that the adversary successively manipulates k MVBA's outputs to prevent the certain broadcast from outputting. Considering that the expectation of k is $1/q$ and MVBA also has expected constant round complexity, any transaction that is broadcasted by some honest node would be decided as consensus output in expected constant rounds (i.e., the broadcast rounds plus $1/q$ times of MVBA's expected rounds), thus realizing liveness.

We defer the full proof to Appendix D in Supplementary.

Complexity analysis. It is fairly simple to count the complexities of FIN-NG for its modular design. In particular, if FIN-NG is instantiated by signature-free MVBA with quality and cubic messages (e.g., FIN-MVBA-Q to be introduced in next subsection), its authenticator complexity is (nearly) zero, but at a price of cubic messages per decision.

B. FIN-MVBA-Q: MVBA with Optimal Quality

If we prefer a signature-free instantiation of FIN-NG, it comes to our attention that few satisfying signature-free MVBA protocols exist. One candidate is the recent design of FIN-MVBA [20], which unfortunately suffers from quality degradation (cf. Appendix B for detailed analysis) to cause the adversary hold 2/3 chance to manipulate MVBA output. Worse still, quality of MVBA is critical in FIN-NG as it is necessary for liveness: the adversary can lower MVBA output's quality to slow down FIN-NG's confirmation or even completely censor certain nodes. In order to guarantee fast confirmation and liveness of FIN-NG, we redesign FIN-MVBA to improve its quality toward 1/2 against strong adaptive adversaries. Remarkably, our result attains the optimal quality in asynchrony [52].

Abandonable validated Byzantine reliable broadcast. We identify the root reason of quality degradation in FIN-MVBA:

Protocol of avwBRBC with sender \mathcal{P}_s (for each \mathcal{P}_i)

```

Input: a value  $v_i$  s.t.  $Q(v_i) = 1$ 
Initialization:  $ban \leftarrow \text{false}$ ,  $val \leftarrow \perp$ 
1: if  $\mathcal{P}_i = \mathcal{P}_s$  then
2:   multicast VAL( $v_i$ )
3: upon receiving VAL( $v_s$ ) from  $\mathcal{P}_s$  do
4:   wait until  $Q(v)$  holds or  $ban = \text{true}$ 
5:   if  $ban = \text{false}$  then
6:      $val \leftarrow v_s$ 
7:     multicast ECHO( $\mathcal{H}(v_s)$ )
8: upon receiving  $n-f$  matching ECHO( $h$ ) from distinct nodes do
9:   multicast READY( $h$ )
10: upon receiving  $f + 1$  matching READY( $h$ ) from distinct nodes
    and hasn't sent READY message do
11:   multicast READY( $h$ )
12: upon receiving  $n-f$  matching READY( $h$ ) from distinct nodes do
13:    $wr\text{-deliver}(h)$ 
14: upon  $wr\text{-deliver}(h)$  do
15:   wait until  $\mathcal{H}(val) = h$ 
16:    $r\text{-deliver}(val)$ 
17: upon the local interface  $abandon()$  is invoked do
18:    $ban = \text{true}$ 

```

Fig. 8. Our avwBRBC protocol. Code is for each \mathcal{P}_i .

an adaptive adversary can hold a corruption quota until coin flipping is revealed to determine the elected node, after which it can rushing corrupt this elected node and replaces the input value by the manipulating one. To prevent such rushing adversaries, we set forth a notion of abandonable validated weak Byzantine reliable broadcast (avwBRBC), such that the honest nodes can reject a rushing adversary's value by abandoning the slowest broadcasts as soon as the elected node is disclosed. Formally, avwBRBC can be defined as follows:

Definition 4. *An avwBRBC protocol is a generalized wBRBC protocol with a validity predicate $Q() \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ for validating input. It also provides each node a local $abandon()$ interface. An avwBRBC satisfying the following properties except with negligible probability:*

- *Agreement and totality.* Same to wBRBC.
- *Validity.* If no honest node invokes $abandon()$, then an honest sender's input would eventually be output by all honest nodes.
- *External Validity.* An honest node outputs v s.t. $Q(v) = 1$.
- *Abandonability.* If a sender inputs a value v to avwBRBC and remains so-far honest upon the moment when $n - 2f$ forever honest nodes have invoked their $abandon()$ interface, then for any (strongly) adaptive adversary \mathcal{A} , it cannot make any honest node to output a value $v' \neq v$.

As shown in Figure 8, we construct avwBRBC by modifying the wBRBC variant of Bracha's BRBC. External validity is trivial to realize by applying validation check after each node receives the broadcasted value as in many studies [19, 20]. However, abandonability has to be carefully tailored, since we need preserve all other properties of wBRBC such as weak totality, which means if some honest node already outputs, any honest shall still output even if it has invoked $abandon()$. We identify a unique place in Bracha's BRBC to take $abandon()$ into effect with preserving totality, that is to stop sending echo messages after invoking $abandon()$ (lines 4-5 in Figure 8).

Protocol of FIN-MVBA-Q (for each \mathcal{P}_i)

```

Input: a value  $v_i$  s.t.  $Q(v_i) = 1$ 
Initialization:  $r \leftarrow 0$ ,  $H_i \leftarrow [\perp]^n$ ,  $V_i \leftarrow [\perp]^n$ ,  $F_i \leftarrow [\perp]^n$ 
1: start avwBRBC $_i$  with input  $v_i$ 
2: if  $h_j$  is wr-delivered in avwBRBC $_j$  then
3:    $H_i[j] \leftarrow h_j$ 
4:   multicast FIN( $j, h_j$ )
5: if  $v_j$  is r-delivered in avwBRBC $_j$  then
6:    $V_i[j] \leftarrow v_j$ 
7: upon receiving  $n-f$  same FIN( $j, h_j$ ) from distinct nodes do
8:    $F_i[j] \leftarrow \text{true}$ ;  $H_i[j] \leftarrow h_j$ 
9: wait until  $n-f$  values in  $F_i$  are true
10: avwBRBC $_j$ .abandon() for every  $j \in [n]$ 
11: repeat // repeatedly attempt to output a finished broadcast
12:    $k \leftarrow \text{Election}(r)$  // coin flipping to randomly select a node
13:   if  $H_i[k] \neq \perp$  then
14:     raba-propose 1 for RABA $_r$ 
15:   else
16:     raba-propose 0 for RABA $_r$ 
17:     if later  $H_i[k] \neq \perp$  then
18:       raba-repropose 1 for RABA $_r$ 
19:   if RABA $_r$  output 1 then
20:     wait until  $H_i[k] \neq \perp$ 
21:     if  $V_i[k] \neq \perp$  then
22:       multicast Value( $V_i[k]$ )
23:     else
24:       wait Value( $v$ ) such that  $\mathcal{H}(v) = H_i[k]$ 
25:       mvba-decide( $V_i[k]$ ) and halt
26:      $r \leftarrow r + 1$ 
27: until halt

```

Fig. 9. Our FIN-MVBA-Q protocol. Code is for each \mathcal{P}_i .

FIN-MVBA-Q protocol. Given avwBRBC, we now are ready to construct FIN-MVBA-Q—an adaptively secure MVBA protocol with $1/2$ quality. Its formal description is in Figure 9. Slightly informally, it executes in next three phases:

- (1) *Broadcast of input* (lines 1-6). When receiving the input v_i , \mathcal{P}_i activates avwBRBC $_i$ to broadcast v_i . If avwBRBC $_j$ *wr-deliver* h_j , \mathcal{P}_i multicasts a message FIN(j, v_j) and records h_j in H_i (lines 2-4). Once avwBRBC $_j$ *r-deliver* v_j , \mathcal{P}_i records v_j in V_i (lines 5-6).
- (2) *Finish all broadcasts with abandon* (lines 7-10). Then, \mathcal{P}_i waits for $n-f$ FIN(j, h) messages from distinct nodes carrying the same h , \mathcal{P}_i then records avwBRBC $_j$ as finished (i.e., set $F_i[j]$ true in line 8) and accepts v_j as avwBRBC $_j$ output (also in line 8). Upon $n-f$ avwBRBC instances are labeled as finished, \mathcal{P}_i would invoke the *abandon*() interface of all avwBRBC instances (line 10).
- (3) *Repeating vote until decide an output* (lines 11-27). Once \mathcal{P}_i abandons in all broadcasts, it loops a voting phase consisting of three steps: (i) in line 12, invoke coin flipping to randomly *election* a node \mathcal{P}_k ; (ii) in line 13-18, invoke RABA to vote whether decide h_k 's pre-image as candidate output or not; (iii) in line 19-28, if RABA output 0, \mathcal{P}_i will enter the next iteration, otherwise, \mathcal{P}_i will wait for the corresponding h_k and v_k (line 20 and 24) to output and terminate.

The above design ensures all broadcasts are “abandoned” while the adversary learns coin flipping, thus preventing an adaptive rushing adversary to manipulate MVBA output. More formally, the security of FIN-MVBA-Q can be summarized as:

Theorem 2. *FIN-MVBA-Q securely realizes MVBA with $1/2$*

quality except with negligible probability.

Security analysis. Security of FIN-MVBA-Q is also intuitive:

- For agreement, this is because avwBRBC, RABA and leader election are all agreed. So any two nodes’ output must be same (as it must be a value that is broadcasted by the same avwBRBC).
- For termination, the key lemma is: at the moment when the $(f+1)$ -th honest node invokes the leader election (and also abandons all avwBRBCs), there must be at least $2f+1$ distinct nodes’ avwBRBCs have delivered to at least $f+1$ honest nodes. Recalling that for these $2f+1$ avwBRBCs, their corresponding RABAs must return 1 (if were executed), so for in each iteration, there is at least $2/3$ probability to draw an avwBRBC whose corresponding RABA return 1. Hence after k iterations, the chance of not terminating becomes a negligible probability $(1/3)^k$, which also implies the expected constant round complexity.
- For quality, we can make a corollary of termination proof: for each iteration, there is at least $1/3$ probability to decide an honest avwBRBC as output, at most $1/3$ probability to draw an malicious node’s avwBRBC as output, and at most $1/3$ probability to elect some unfinished avwBRBC and thus enter the next iteration. So the lower bound of quality is $\sum_{r=0}^{\infty} (1/3)(1/3)^r = 1/2$.
- For external validity, this is true because: (i) the external validity of avwBRBC prevents the honest nodes from receiving invalid input (or digest of invalid input); (ii) if an avwBRBC does not deliver output to any honest node, its corresponding RABA wouldn’t return 1 as no honest node proposes 1, so it is never decided as output.

We defer the full proof to Appendix C in Supplementary.

Complexity analysis. FIN-MVBA-Q has expected constant round complexity and $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ message complexity. Its communication cost is $\mathcal{O}(|m|n^2 + \lambda n^3)$ where $|m|$ represents MVBA’s input length and λ represents the length of hash digest in avwBRBC. Remark that the communication cost of FIN-MVBA-Q is as same as FIN-MVBA [20]. Though such $\mathcal{O}(|m|n^2 + \lambda n^3)$ communication cost is best so far in the signature-free setting, it is more costly than the state-of-the-art signature-involved MVBA protocol [17] that attains expected $\mathcal{O}(|m|n + \lambda n^2)$ communication cost.

C. Whether is FIN-NG sufficiently scalable or NOT?

Careful readers might realize that the design of FIN-NG can be thought of as a signature-free version of Dumbo-NG, involving a particular trade-off to reduce authenticator complexity at a price of other overheads like cubic message complexity. Observing that, a natural question might raise: is such stringent signature-free approach the best practice in real-world global deployment setting with affordable bandwidth (like 100 Mbps or less) and several hundreds of nodes?

To better understand this natural question, we test two state-of-the-art MVBA protocols— FIN-MVBA (signature-free but cubic messages) and Dumbo-MVBA [17] (involving signatures but only quadratic messages) to estimate the tendency of their latency degradation in bandwidth-limited settings with

$n=196$ nodes. For fair comparison, we take a vector of n integers as input to FIN-MVBA, and use n QCs (which is much larger) as input to Dumbo-MVBA. As Figure 10 illustrates, our experimental comparison between FIN-MVBA and Dumbo-MVBA reveals: (i) FIN-MVBA and Dumbo-MVBA have comparable latency only if each node has more than 100 Mbps bandwidth; (ii) when available bandwidth is less than 50 Mbps, FIN-MVBA’s latency would be dramatically increased.

In short, this evaluation affirms our conjecture that the stringent signature-free approach of FIN-NG might be not the best practice in the deployment environment with restricted bandwidth, motivating us further explore even more scalable asynchronous BFT protocols in the signature-involved setting.




Fig. 10. Latency of signature-free MVBA (i.e. FIN-MVBA-Q) and signature-involved MVBA (i.e. Dumbo-MVBA) for $n = 196$ nodes.

V. OPTIMIZE QUORUM CERTIFICATE TO BEST PRACTICE

As our initial attempt FIN-NG might not scale very well in the important setting of restricted bandwidth, we continue our concentration on how to scale up asynchronous BFT consensus using signatures. To begin with, this section focuses on optimizing QC implementations, as its prevalent usage has led up to a primary scalability bottleneck in existing designs.

Batch verification with blacklist: the right way of implementing QCs. We take consistent broadcast (CBC) [64] as the simplistic context to estimate the CPU cost of different QC implementations from different signatures.

As Figure 11 (a) plots, CBC has a designated sender that waits for $n - f$ valid signatures from distinct nodes, such that it can aggregate/concatenate these $n - f$ valid signatures to form a QC and spread it out. We denote this approach “individual verification” since the aggregation occurs after validating all $n - f$ individual signatures. Figure 11 (b) presents a folklore alternative [46, 65] that directly aggregates (unverified) signatures and then performs batch verification. Intuitively, the “batch verification” approach is promising to take the best advantage of aggregate signature, because it avoids verifying individual signatures in normal case.

We then conduct a comprehensive benchmarking of QCs built from “individual verification” and “batch verification”, with different types of signatures (including ECDSA, Schnorr signature, BLS signature, and BLS threshold signature). Note that ECDSA signature cannot be non-interactively aggregated, and QC from it simply concatenates $n - f$ valid signatures. Schnorr signature can be non-interactively half-aggregated [41, 42], so QC from it has a smaller size that is about half of $n - f$ concatenated signatures, and more importantly, its batch verification can be faster than trivially verifying $n - f$

concatenated Schnorr signatures.¹² BLS signature can be fully aggregated. In order to push efficiency, we use a straight way of computing BLS multi-signature by taking summation of all received signatures (under the standard KOSK model), so aggregation is much faster than the threshold version of BLS, as the latter one’s aggregation needs costly interpolation in the exponent [66]. Our evaluations consider similar security levels for different signatures. ECDSA and Schnorr are implemented over secp256k1 curve with about 128-bit security [67]. For BLS signature, we work on a notable and widely-adopted pairing-friendly elliptic curve BLS12-381 [68, 69], which was designed for 128-bit security and now is still considered with 117-120 bit security despite recent cryptanalysis [70].




Fig. 11. QC generation in CBC: (a) verify individual signatures then aggregate; (b) aggregate then verify a batch.

BLS multi-signature with batch verification would outperform.

The detailed evaluation of CPU latency in a CBC protocol is plotted in Figure 12. Evidently, QC implementation from BLS multi-signature with using batch verification (the violet line and the gray line) vastly outperforms all other instantiations in terms of computation cost. Note the minor difference between the violet and gray lines reflects the choice of implementing signatures in \mathbb{G}_1 or \mathbb{G}_2 groups over BLS12-381 curve.

Maintain blacklist to prevent performance degradation attack.

However, the approach of batch verification might face serious performance downgrade under attacks, particularly when malicious nodes send false signatures. This issue can be addressed by maintaining a blacklist containing the identities of those malicious nodes. As Figure 11 (b) shows, when the aggregated multi-signature fails in batch verification, one verifies all individual signatures and add the malicious nodes sending fake signatures to a blacklist. Later, the blacklist can be used to exclude the faulty nodes from aggregation.




Fig. 12. CPU latency (related to digital signatures) in the critical path of one-shot CBC on varying system scales.

¹²Similar to Schnorr signature, EdDSA can be half-aggregated and might have very tiny speed-up due to Edward curve. However, their performances are essentially comparable. Thus we didn’t do redundant tests of EdDSA.

Further aggregation of multiple QCs: efficiently transfer a vector of QCs on different messages. While implementing QC from BLS multi-signature, one more benefit largely overlooked by the distributed computing community is that many such QCs on different messages can be further aggregated. This bonus property becomes particularly intriguing in asynchronous BFT protocols like Tusk and Dumbo-NG because their scalability bottleneck stems from multicasting $\mathcal{O}(n)$ QCs. As illustrated in Fig 13, while multicasting n QCs made from BLS multi-signature, we can leverage the aggregation property to combine all signature parts in these QCs and reduce their size to less than half of the original (cf. Fig 13).




Fig. 13. Aggregating many QCs made from BLS multi-sig.

More tips on efficient QC implementation. Besides various aggregation techniques, we remark a few other tips of implementing QCs from BLS signatures in real-world BFT systems:

- *BLS signature in \mathbb{G}_1 group is more favorable than \mathbb{G}_2 .* BLS12-381 curve is equipped with asymmetric pairing $e : \mathbb{G}_1 \times \mathbb{G}_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{G}_T$. When implementing BLS signature over the curve, one can let signature in \mathbb{G}_1 and public key in \mathbb{G}_2 , or vice versa. We recommend signature in \mathbb{G}_1 , because (i) \mathbb{G}_1 group element has shorter size, and (ii) there is saving in CPU time for $n \leq 256$ (Figure 12).
- *Encode public keys relating a multi-signature by n bits.* Moreover, in most realistic proof-of-stake and consortium blockchains, participating nodes' public keys can be mutually known to each other. So the identities of signing nodes in a multi-signature can be encoded by n bits instead of transferring their public keys. Here each bit represents whether a node has signed (1) or not (0).

VI. JUMBO: MAKING SIGNATURE-INVOLVED ASYNCHRONOUS BFT TRULY SCALABLE

Given concrete optimizations of QCs, it is worth noting that Tusk and Dumbo-NG still suffer from cubic authenticator overhead per decision, because they still let each node to multicast a vector of $\mathcal{O}(n)$ QCs. Even if using our technique in Section V, this cost is still a cubic in total, because the aggregate $\mathcal{O}(n)$ BLS-based QCs carry $\lambda n + n^2$ bits and need $\mathcal{O}(n)$ cryptographic pairings to verify. Facing still asymptotically large authenticator overhead, this section distills a scalable instantiation of Dumbo-NG—JUMBO, to asymptotically reduce the authenticator complexity by introducing information dispersal. JUMBO can reduce the number of multicasting n QCs from $\mathcal{O}(n)$ to $\mathcal{O}(1)$, and in combination with our

optimized QC implementation, it can seamlessly scale up with hundreds of nodes in bandwidth-starved settings.

Revisiting the core technique of provable dispersal. Before diving into the details of our scalable construction, we first briefly recall our key technical component—asynchronous provable dispersal broadcast (APDB) [17, 18]. Informally, APDB allows a designed sender to disperse a large input like n QCs to the whole network at an overall communication cost of merely $\mathcal{O}(1)$ QCs. Namely, the communication cost of dispersing n QCs can be $\mathcal{O}(1/n)$ of multicasting them. Moreover, the sender can generate a proof at the end of dispersal, such that a valid proof attests that the dispersed n QCs can later be consistently recovered by the whole network.

More precisely, APDB can be formally defined as:

Definition 5. *Syntactically, an APDB consists of two subprotocols (PD, RC) with a validating function ValidateLock:*

- *PD subprotocol. In the PD subprotocol among n parties, a designated sender \mathcal{P}_s inputs a value $v \in \{0, 1\}^\ell$, and aims to split v into n code fragments and disperses each j -th fragment to the corresponding node \mathcal{P}_j . If a party terminates in PD, it shall output a string store, and if the node is sender, it shall additionally output a lock string.*
- *RC subprotocol. In the RC subprotocol among n parties, all honest nodes take store and lock strings outputted by PD subprotocol as input, and aim to output a value $v' \in \{0, 1\}^\ell \cup \perp$.*
- *ValidateLock function. It takes a lock string as input and returns 0 (reject) or 1 (accept).*

An APDB protocol (PD, RC) shall satisfy the following properties except with negligible probability:

- *Termination. If the sender \mathcal{P}_s is honest and all honest nodes activate the PD protocol, then each honest node would output store in PD; additionally, \mathcal{P}_s also outputs valid lock in PD s.t. $\text{ValidateLock}(\text{lock})=1$.*
- *Recast-ability. If all honest parties invoke RC with inputting the output of PD and at least one honest party inputs a valid lock s.t. $\text{ValidateLock}(\text{lock})=1$, then: (i) all honest parties can eventually recover a common value $v' \in \{0, 1\}^\ell \cup \perp$; (ii) if the sender is honest and disperses v in PD, then all honest parties can recover v in RC.*

An APDB protocol satisfying the above definition can be efficiently implemented as in Figures 15 and 16, through simplifying the design from [17]. PD subprotocol has a very simple two-round structure: sender $\xrightarrow{\text{STORE}}$ parties $\xrightarrow{\text{STORED}}$ sender. In this way, the communication cost of using PD to disperse n broadcast QCs can be brought down to minimum, which asymptotically is only $\mathcal{O}(1/n)$ of multicasting n QCs.

Protocol of Provable Dispersal (PD) with sender \mathcal{P}_s

Initialization: $S \leftarrow \{ \}$

/ Protocol for the sender \mathcal{P}_s */*

- 1: **upon** receiving an input value v **do**
- 2: encode v by erasure code to get the code word \mathbf{m} of n fragments
- 3: use n fragments of \mathbf{m} as leaves to compute Merkle tree root mt
- 4: **for each** $j \in [n]$ **do**
- 5: **let** $store := \langle mr, m_j, \pi_j \rangle$ where π_j is the Merkle tree path proving that m_j is the j -th leaf committed to mr
- 6: **send** (STORE, ID, $store$) to \mathcal{P}_j
- 7: **wait** until $|S| = 2f + 1$ // **Aggregate threshold signature**
- 8: $\Sigma \leftarrow \text{Agg}(S)$ and **let** $lock := \langle mr, \Sigma \rangle$
- 9: **output** $lock$ and terminate

10: **upon** receiving valid (STORED, ID, σ_j) from \mathcal{P}_j **do**

11: $S \leftarrow S \cup (j, \sigma_j)$ // **For a neat description, here is not batch verification, but we can implement batch verification in practice.**

/ Protocol for each party \mathcal{P}_i */*

- 12: **upon** receiving (STORE, ID, $store$) from sender \mathcal{P}_s **do**
- 13: **if** $store = \langle mr, m_i, \pi_i \rangle$ carries a valid π_i proving that m_i is the i -th leaf committed to Merkle tree root mr **then**
- 14: $\sigma_i \leftarrow \text{Sign}(sk_i, \langle ID, mr \rangle)$; **send** (STORED, ID, σ_i) to \mathcal{P}_s
- 15: **output** $store$ and terminate if $\mathcal{P}_i \neq \mathcal{P}_s$

Fig. 15. Provable dispersal protocol adapted from [17]. Code is for each \mathcal{P}_i .




Fig. 14. Dispersal-then-recast paradigm of Dumbo-MVBA [17].

Inspiration of JUMBO: Dumbo-NG is friendly for reducing the authenticator overhead by using APDB! It comes to our attention that Dumbo-NG has a very unique place leading up to its cubic authenticator complexity. That is every node using a vector of $\mathcal{O}(n)$ QCs as MVBA input. The neat structure of Dumbo-NG hints at introducing APDB to extend its MVBA component, thus asymptotically reducing overall communication cost for large inputs like n QCs.

The communication-efficient MVBA protocol extended by APDB also has a nickname Dumbo-MVBA [17]. As shown in Figure 14, it proceeds as: every node avoids directly multicasting its large input, but employs the more efficient provable dispersal protocol to spread much shorter encode fragments instead; then, if some node finishes its dispersal, it can generate a dispersal QC attesting its successful spread of n broadcast QCs; every honest node can finish its own dispersal and thus uses its dispersal QC (which is a single QC instead of n QCs) to invoke the original MVBA protocol; finally, all nodes repeat MVBA protocols, until some MVBA picks a dispersal QC that allows them collectively recover a vector of n valid broadcast QCs as their MVBA result.

Clearly, after applying the dispersal technique as above, we can reduce the cubic authenticator bottleneck in Dumbo-NG to only quadratic. This is because: (i) n dispersals of $\mathcal{O}(n)$

Protocol of Reconstruction (RC) (for each \mathcal{P}_i)

Initialization: $C \leftarrow []$ (i.e. a dictionary keyed by Merkle tree root)

- 1: **upon** receiving input ($store, lock$) **do**
- 2: **if** $lock \neq \emptyset$ **then**
- 3: **multicast** (RCLOCK, ID, $lock$) to all
- 4: **if** $store \neq \emptyset$ **then**
- 5: **multicast** (RCSTORE, ID, $store$) to all
- 6: **upon** receiving (RCLOCK, ID, $lock$) **do**
- 7: **if** $\text{ValidateLock}(\text{ID}, lock) = 1$ **then**
- 8: **multicast** (RCLOCK, ID, $lock$) to all, if was not sent before
- 9: parse $lock$ as $\langle mr, \Sigma \rangle$
- 10: **wait** until $|C[mr]| = f + 1$
- 11: decode $C[mr]$ by erasure code to obtain v
- 12: encode v by erasure code to get code word \mathbf{m}
- 13: use \mathbf{m} as leaves to compute Merkle tree root mr'
- 14: **if** $mr = mr'$ **then return** v
- 15: **else return** \perp
- 16: **upon** receiving (RCSTORE, ID, $store$) from \mathcal{P}_j **do**
- 17: **if** $store = \langle mt, m_j, \pi_j \rangle$ carries a valid π_j proving that m_j is the j -th leaf committed to Merkle tree root mr **then**
- 18: $C[mr] \leftarrow C[mr] \cup (j, m_j)$

/ Public ValidateLock function */*

function $\text{ValidateLock}(lock)$:

- 19: parse $lock$ as $\langle mr, \Sigma \rangle$
- 20: verify Σ is a valid $(2f + 1)$ threshold signature on (ID, mr)
- 21: return 1 (accept) if verification passes, otherwise return 0 (reject)

Fig. 16. Provable dispersal protocol adapted from [17]. Code is for each \mathcal{P}_i .

QCs have a communication cost similar to a single multicast of $\mathcal{O}(n)$ QCs; (ii) we only have to reconstruct a small constant number of dispersals, which is also asymptotically same to the communication cost of a single multicast of $\mathcal{O}(n)$ QCs.

A. JUMBO Protocol

As depicted by Figure 17, JUMBO inherits Dumbo-NG to have a couple of concurrent processes—transaction broadcast and block agreement—with using provable dispersal to resolve the authenticator bottleneck. For completeness of presentation, we hereunder briefly describe the two processes of JUMBO, and then introduce its easy-to-implement fairness patch.

Transaction broadcast process. Each node \mathcal{P}_i starts n broadcast threads. Each broadcast proceeds in slot $s \in \{1, 2, 3 \dots\}$. \mathcal{P}_i is designated as sender only in the i -th broadcast. Each broadcast proceeds by an increasing-only slot number s . Once the sender \mathcal{P}_i enters a slot s , it selects a batch of $|B|$ transactions (denoted tx_s) from its input buffer, multicasts tx_s with the current slot index s and a quorum certificate QC_{s-1} attesting that a transaction batch tx_{s-1} was broadcasted in the preceding slot $s - 1$, then it waits for that $n - f$ distinct nodes return valid signatures on $i||s||\mathcal{H}(tx_s)$ (where \mathcal{H} is a cryptographic hash function), and assembles these signatures to form a quorum certificate QC_s and then steps into the next slot $s + 1$. On the other side, when any node \mathcal{P}_j (probably non-leader) enters a slot s , it waits for receiving the message carrying tx_s and QC_{s-1} from the sender node \mathcal{P}_i , checks QC_{s-1} a valid QC and consistent to tx_{s-1} that it received, returns a signature on $i||s||\mathcal{H}(tx_s)$ to the sender, and proceeds to the next slot $s + 1$.

Note that we refrain from reintroducing the pull mechanism that executes in companion with broadcast process to help the

fetch of missing transactions, because we have described two instantiations of it in Section IV for FIN-NG.

Block agreement process. Concurrent to transaction broadcast, every node starts an agreement process that executes a sequence of MVBA protocols in consecutive epochs $e \in \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$. Note that all MVBA are Dumbo-MVBA protocols that are extended by using APDB. To prepare the input of the current epoch’s Dumbo-MVBA protocol, each \mathcal{P}_i locally maintains a vector of $[\text{current}_1, \dots, \text{current}_n]$, where each current_j carries sender \mathcal{P}_j ’s latest broadcast QC that is indeed received by \mathcal{P}_i . Meanwhile, \mathcal{P}_i maintains another vector of $[\text{ordered}_1, \dots, \text{ordered}_n]$ to track the Dumbo-MVBA output of last epoch, where each ordered_j represents sender \mathcal{P}_j ’s highest broadcast QC that was already solicited into consensus output. In each epoch, every \mathcal{P}_i waits for that at least $n - f$ QCs in $[\text{current}_1, \dots, \text{current}_n]$ contain slot numbers higher than their corresponding items in $[\text{ordered}_1, \dots, \text{ordered}_n]$, i.e., $n - f$ broadcasts have indeed progressed since the decision of last block. Then, \mathcal{P}_i takes a snapshot of $[\text{current}_1, \dots, \text{current}_n]$ as input to the current Dumbo-MVBA protocol. To enforce the input validity, Dumbo-MVBA’s validity predicate is set as:

- 1) the input proposal indeed carries n valid QCs associated with n different broadcasts, if passing the check, go to next clause, otherwise, return false (0);
- 2) at least $n - f$ QCs have slot numbers that indeed increase in relative to the last Dumbo-MVBA output, if passing the check, go to next clause, otherwise, return false (0);
- 3) other non-increasing QCs shall not carry slot numbers smaller than the last Dumbo-MVBA output, if the check passes, return true (1), otherwise, return false (0);

After invoking the current epoch’s Dumbo-MVBA, \mathcal{P}_i waits for its output, which are n valid broadcast QCs. According to the Dumbo-MVBA result, all honest nodes can decide a common new block that solicits the transactions due to the difference between the current Dumbo-MVBA output and the previous Dumbo-MVBA output. Finally, every node’s agreement process updates $[\text{ordered}_1, \dots, \text{ordered}_n]$ by the newest Dumbo-MVBA output and goes to the next epoch.

Enhance fairness by an easy-to-implement patch. Although JUMBO could scale up after applying Dumbo-MVBA extension protocol to asymptotically reduce authenticator overhead, it lacks fairness in some extremely adversarial cases, because its transaction dissemination process allows each node \mathcal{P}_i to continually participate in all broadcast threads, thus leaving the adversary a chance to diffuse tremendous transactions ridiculously fast through the malicious nodes’ broadcast instances. Nevertheless, the desired fairness could be easily patched by applying “speed limit” in broadcasts. The high-level idea is very intuitive: let the honest nodes temporarily halt voting in these broadcasts that are running too fast in relative to other slower broadcasts, until the slower broadcast threads catch up.


To implement the “speed limit” idea, a node \mathcal{P}_i maintains a variable δ_j for each broadcast thread. The variable δ_j tracks that the j -th broadcast thread has disseminated how many transactions since the height included by last block (from the local view of node \mathcal{P}_i), i.e., $\delta_j = \text{current}_j.\text{slot} - \text{ordered}_j.\text{slot}$, where current_j tracks the slot number of \mathcal{P}_j ’s latest broadcast

received by \mathcal{P}_i with a valid QC, and ordered_j tracks last broadcast slot of ordered_j that has already been decided as output due to last MVBA result. Let δ to be the $(f + 1)$ -th smallest one of all $\{\delta_j\}_{j \in [n]}$; if there is any δ_j such that $\beta \cdot \delta_j \geq \delta$ and $\delta_j > 0$, \mathcal{P}_i halts voting in the j -th broadcast instance until $\beta \cdot \delta_j < \delta$, where $0 < \beta < 1$ is a fairness parameter (more “fair” if closer to 1, because of enforcing the fastest $2f + 1$ broadcasts to progress at more similar speeds).

To enforce the above “speed limit”, we also need to add a corresponding validity rule to the MVBA’s predicate function: per each node \mathcal{P}_i ’s proposal, the most progressed broadcast since last block and the $(f + 1)$ -th least progressed broadcast since last block shall have a progress ratio bounded by $1/\beta$.

Parallel Broadcast and Consensus in JUMBO

TX Broadcast Process:



Block Agreement Process:




Fig. 17. JUMBO and how does it overcomes authenticator bottleneck.

B. Analysis of JUMBO

JUMBO securely realizes the notion of asynchronous BFT consensus (atomic broadcast) with fairness. More formally,

Theorem 3. *JUMBO implements asynchronous BFT atomic broadcast with fairness except with negligible probability.*

Security analysis. The security proof of JUMBO largely coincides with that of Dumbo-NG [18], except that (i) the proof of liveness has to be adapted to consider possible “stuck” caused by hanging of votes and (ii) fairness requires new analysis. We provide a proof sketch hereunder and defer the full security proof to Appendix E in Supplementary.

For proving liveness, we need to consider the pending of votes due to fairness patch. The roadmap of proofs is as:

- All honest nodes can obtain a valid input to the current MVBA protocol in constant rounds. All honest nodes won’t halt their voting in the first round of each broadcast, as they always continue on voting if $\delta_j = 0$. So every honest node can at least receives one more broadcast with valid QC from each honest broadcast sender in constant

rounds. Given the fact that there are at least $n - f$ honest broadcast senders, all honest nodes can prepare a valid MVBA input in constant rounds.

- *An honest node can broadcast transactions with valid QCs to all honest nodes in constant rounds.* When an honest node broadcasts a batch of transactions, there are two possible cases: (i) one case is that no honest node halts voting in the broadcast; (ii) the other case is that some nodes temporarily hang on voting in the broadcast. In the first case, the sender can generate a valid QC for the broadcasted transactions in constant rounds. In the second case, it on average takes a constant number of MVBA to solicit the highest QC of the hanging broadcast into some block, after which, the honest nodes would continue to vote in the broadcast, thus allowing the broadcast sender to generate a new QC on the broadcast transactions.
- *Any honest node's broadcasted transactions would be solicited by some MVBA after expected constant rounds.* Putting the above two assertions together, if a transaction is broadcasted by an honest node, it first takes expected constant rounds to generate a valid QC on the transaction, then one round is used to send the valid QC to all honest nodes, and finally, QC of this transaction (or the same sender's another QC with higher slot number) would be solicited by some MVBA output, with an overwhelming probability of $1 - (1 - q)^k$ after k MVBA executions. Thus, it takes an expected constant number of rounds to confirm transactions broadcasted by any honest node.

For safety, the security intuitions are very straightforward and actually coincides with the original Dumbo-NG protocol:

- *Guarantee consistency of broadcasts via QCs.* A valid broadcast QC associating with slot number s implies: no malicious sender can broadcast different transactions to distinct honest nodes associating with a slot number $\leq s$;
- *Ensure agreement of each block by soliciting same QCs.* The agreement and external validity of MVBA further ensures: all honest nodes must solicit broadcasts with the same slot numbers and valid QCs into each block. Thus, in combination of broadcasts' consistency, any two honest nodes' output blocks must include same transactions.

For fairness, it can be intuitively seen from "speed limit" placed on fastest broadcasts. More detailedly, rationales are:

- *Bound the number of honest broadcasts solicited in each block.* Each block solicits broadcasts from at least $n - f$ distinct senders, out of which at least $f + 1$ are honest.
- *Bound the difference in progress between malicious and honest broadcasts.* Due to our fairness patch, if malicious broadcasts solicited by a block contribute X transactions, then honest broadcasts solicited by the block contribute $\beta \cdot X$ transactions. Thus, in each output block including K transactions, there are at least $K \cdot \beta / (1 + \beta)$ transactions proposed by honest nodes. This gives a fairness lower bound $\alpha = \beta / (1 + \beta)$. Considering β can be a parameter close to 1, the fairness α can arbitrarily approach 1/2.

Complexity analysis. The round, amortized communication, and message complexities of JUMBO are same to these of original Dumbo-NG. For the fined-grained metric of au-

thenticator complexity, JUMBO is $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$, reducing another $\mathcal{O}(n)$ order when compared to Dumbo-NG using aggregate BLS signatures. The authenticator complexity can be divided into two parts. First, in broadcast process, only the leader generates QCs and multicasts them to receivers. Thus, for any transaction tx , only $\mathcal{O}(1)$ multicasts of a single QC involve. Second, in block agreement process, every node leverages provable dispersal protocol to spread out n QCs, and later, each node reconstructs at most $\mathcal{O}(n)$ QCs, resulting in an authenticator complexity of $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$. Moreover, the underlying MVBA protocol that we use is sMVBA from Guo et al. [27], which also has an authenticator complexity of $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$. In sum, the authenticator complexity of JUMBO is $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$, which is dominated by the block agreement process.

VII. ADDITIONAL RELATED WORK

Sharding is feasible only with more scalable consensus for each shard. One might wonder whether sharding [71–73] can overcome our scalability challenge. But regretfully, this idea still requires each shard to execute consensus consisting of sufficiently many nodes to bound error probability. Considering a shard of k nodes randomly elected from an infinite set with 80% honesty, if we expect each shard's error chance to be 10^{-6} (same parameter in [72, 73]), the shard shall contain 250 or more nodes. Namely, sharding becomes feasible only if we have consensus for hundreds of nodes as basis, which further motivates us to extend the appealing performance of state-of-the-art asynchronous BFT into larger scales.

Dual-mode asynchronous BFT inherits scalability issues. Recently, a few dual-mode asynchronous BFT protocols [74–76] are proposed, such that they can perform similar to partially-synchronous protocols in synchrony. However, their pessimistic paths resemble existing single-mode asynchronous BFT protocols. For example, [74] almost directly inherits Tusk and [76] straightforwardly used Dumbo as their pessimistic paths. That means, these dual-mode protocols might still suffer from severe scalability issues in their pessimistic case.

Executing BFT among an elected sub-committee. It is also seemingly straightforward to sample a sufficiently small sub-committee [77] to solve the scalability challenge in asynchronous BFT. However, this approach has the same problem as the sharding paradigm: when we sample a sub-committee, we either have to assume the candidates have an exaggerated honest portion or need to sample sufficient many nodes. For example, some reasonable parameters [72, 73] could be sampling 250 nodes out of 80% honest candidates.

Scalability solutions to partially synchronous BFT. A few recent studies [30, 78, 79] adopt threshold signature towards scaling up partially synchronous BFT consensus. In HotStuff [26], the paper theoretically realizes linear communication complexity by implementing QCs from threshold signatures, but the authors' implementation chooses ECDSA as concrete instantiation (which now can be understood by our analysis in Section V, because implementing QCs via threshold signature in the sub-optimal individual verification manner is extremely computationally costly). What's more, even if one uses the optimized batch verification approach in lieu of individual

verification, threshold BLS signature still places a heavy aggregation cost in the critical path (making overall computation latency not better than ECDSA), as a result of interpolation in exponent. In contrast, the aggregation of BLS multi-signature simply “adds” all receives signatures. The only extra cost of BLS multi-signature compared to its threshold counterpart is n bits to encode the identities of signers while embedding into QCs, which is essentially a small overhead in realistic BFT systems where n is a number like at most a few hundreds.

VIII. IMPLEMENTATIONS AND EVALUATIONS

We implement FIN-NG and JUMBO in Golang. Dumbo-NG and FIN are also implemented in the same language with same libraries and network layer. We then extensively evaluate them in large testnets of up to 256 nodes.¹³

Implementations details. We implement four types of processes: a client, a txpool, a broadcaster, and an orderer. The client process can generate and submit transactions at a fixed workload rate. The txpool process receives transactions and batches them into broadcast input. The broadcaster processes disseminate the batch of transactions. The orderer process decides how to cut broadcasted transactions into blocks. Each transaction is 250 byte to approximate the size of a typical Bitcoin transaction with one input and two outputs.¹⁴ We also set a upper limit of broadcast batch at 4000, so a broadcast might diffuse 1-4000 transactions depending on system load. To realize reliable fully-meshed asynchronous point-to-point channels, we implement (persistent) TCP connection between every two nodes. If a TCP connection is dropped, our implementation would attempt to re-connect.

Regarding signature, Dumbo-NG [18] chooses ECDSA library from Bitcoin [67] on secp256k1 curve, and JUMBO uses BLS signature library [69] on BLS12-381 curve. For transaction broadcast, Dumbo-NG and JUMBO choose the same QC-based broadcast, FIN-NG variant employs wBRBC as described in Section IV, and FIN adopts CT05 BRBC [59]. Regarding MVBA, Dumbo-NG directly uses sMVBA [27], JUMBO employs sMVBA extended by Dumbo-MVBA [17] to fit large input, and FIN-NG adopts our quality-enhanced version of FIN-MVBA—FIN-MVBA-Q.

Evaluation setups on Amazon EC2. We used Amazon’s EC2 c6a.2xlarge instances (8 vCPUs and 16 GB main memory) in one region (Virginia) to create testnets. The performances of BFT protocols were evaluated with varying scales at $n=64, 128, 196,$ and 256 nodes, where each node corresponds to an EC2 c6a.2xlarge instance. To simulate WAN environment reproducibly and affordably, we use Traffic Control (TC) tool of Linux to configure (upload) bandwidth and latency of all nodes.¹⁵ We consider 3 deployment scenarios: global,

continental, and regional. The global setting reflects a globally distributed environment with 400 ms round-trip time (RTT) and 100 Mbps bandwidth. The continental setting is with 200 ms RTT and 500 Mbps bandwidth to depict the network condition inside a large country or a union of countries. The regional setting has 100 ms RTT and 1 Gbps bandwidth.

Basic benchmarking. Figures 18, 19 and 20 shows throughput and latency of each protocol on varying input rates and scales, for the regional, continental and global settings, respectively. Each data point is averaged over at least a minute execution after a warm-up period of one block.

Peak throughput. JUMBO always presents the largest peak throughput. More intriguingly, its peak throughput is close to the line speed, despite n or network settings. For example, when bandwidth is 500 Mbps, its throughput can roughly achieve 250,000 tx/s, which approximates 500 Mbps as we use 2000-bit (256-byte) transaction.¹⁶ In addition, FIN-NG’s peak throughput is larger than that of FIN and Dumbo-NG in nearly all cases, although it is less than JUMBO.

The peak throughput of JUMBO can exceed that of FIN-NG because the QC-based broadcasts in JUMBO can better utilize bandwidth resources due to less overheads: First, the “uncontributive” network packet headers in JUMBO are an order-of- $\mathcal{O}(n)$ less, because of its asymptotically better message complexity; Second, “loadless” message passing rounds are also reduced in JUMBO, considering that each broadcast in JUMBO only has a single loadless round but each wBRBC in FIN-NG has 2-3 loadless rounds.

Latency-throughput trade-offs. It is clear that JUMBO strictly surpasses FIN-NG in the global and continental settings when $n \geq 128$ nodes, as JUMBO can attain the same throughput at a lower latency. What’s even more intriguing is that JUMBO’s latency can remain low while its throughput increases from minimum to maximum. This hints at that JUMBO is promising to simultaneously handle throughput-critical and latency-critical applications. FIN-NG cannot match JUMBO in handling substantial system loads in large network such as $n=256$, but it might exhibit lower latency when bandwidth is sufficient (e.g., 1 Gbps) and/or system is relatively small (e.g., 64 nodes), indicating its applications in scenarios that are extremely latency-sensitive with low system loads and adequate network resources. Again, FIN and Dumbo-NG perform much worse than FIN-NG and JUMBO in most cases.

Benchmarking with faulty nodes. We also consider 3 types of faulty nodes: (i) crash nodes, (ii) Byzantine nodes that send invalid signatures to cause honest nodes verify all signatures before blacklist comes into effect, and (iii) Byzantine nodes that can lower the quality of MVBA to downgrade performance. These malicious setting experiments are conducted in a network of 1 Gbps bandwidth and 100 ms RTT.

¹³The performance of open-sourced Tusk implementation [16] would be bounded by the I/O of EC2 c6a.2xlarge instance’s low-profile disk, which is much slower than bandwidth. Thus, directly comparing Tusk with our implementations could be meaningless. Nevertheless, the original Dumbo-NG and Tusk have similar trend of performance degradation in network scales.

¹⁴The size choice of transactions essentially has little impact on evaluations, if we count throughput in the unit of “bytes per second” instead. One can simply think each transaction as an alternative information unit.

¹⁵Though simulating WAN in one AWS region using TC can greatly save the expense as no data transfer fee, our experiments’ cost is still about \$6,000.

¹⁶Note 500 Mbps = $500 * 1024^2$ bit/s instead of $5 * 10^8$ bit/s in Linux TC.




Fig. 18. Latency v.s. TPS in the regional setting (100 ms RTT and 1 Gbps bandwidth) for $n = 64, 128, 196$ and 256 nodes.




Fig. 19. Latency v.s. TPS in the continental setting (200 ms RTT and 500 Mbps bandwidth) for $n = 64, 128, 196$ and 256 nodes.




Fig. 20. Latency v.s. TPS in the global setting (400 ms RTT and 100 Mbps bandwidth) for $n = 64, 128, 196$ and 256 nodes.




Fig. 21. Latency v.s. throughput in case of 100ms RTT and 1Gbps bandwidth for $n = 256$ nodes (with 85 crashed nodes).




Fig. 22. Execution of JUMBO for $n = 256$ nodes (where are 85 malicious nodes sending invalid signatures).




Fig. 23. Latency of FIN-NG v.s. the quality of MVBA used in FIN-NG for $n = 256$ nodes (with 85 malicious nodes).

Crash faults. As illustrated in Fig 21, we evaluated the performance of JUMBO and FIN-NG with $\lfloor (n-1)/3 \rfloor$ crash nodes for $n = 256$ nodes. Crashes cause the latency of FIN-NG and

JUMBO slightly increased. The peak throughputs of JUMBO and FIN-NG are almost not impacted by crashes, and they still can reasonably track available network bandwidth.

Byzantine faults that send invalid digital signatures. We evaluated JUMBO for $n=256$ with 85 malicious nodes that send fake signatures to downgrade the performance of batch-verification. Figure 22 (a) and (b) plot the latency and throughput, respectively, during an execution where the Byzantine nodes launch the attack while running the 11th and later blocks. Clearly, the attack almost causes negligible impact on these performance metrics, as the Byzantine nodes were quickly blocklisted and therefore their attack was prevented.

Byzantine faults that manipulate MVBA output quality. Then we run tests of FIN-NG for $n=256$ with 85 Byzantine nodes that attempt to manipulate MVBA output. These Byzantine nodes' inputs to MVBA have minimum validity (e.g., only solicit $n-f$ broadcasts from distinct nodes), and they attempt to let MVBA decide a malicious output as much as possible. As Figure 23 plots, we compared the effect of above attack while MVBA's quality varies from $1/2$ to $1/128$. It is obvious to see that $1/2$ -quality is more robust against such attack and renders a latency closest to the case of no such attack.

Benchmarking in fluctuating network. We also test FIN-NG and JUMBO with 256 nodes in a dynamic network controlled by Linux TC to switch between 1 Gbps and 500 Mbps for each 15 sec. The evaluated results are plotted in Figure 24. JUMBO can always closely track the network capacity and achieve throughput close to the instantaneous line rate. FIN-NG is also can switch smoothly across varying network conditions, though its concrete throughput is less than JUMBO.




Fig. 24. Executions of JUMBO and FIN-NG in a fluctuating network that changes bandwidth and RTT for every 15 sec.

IX. CONCLUSION

We present a couple of more scalable asynchronous BFT consensus protocols FIN-NG and JUMBO with reduced authenticator overhead. Extensive experiments are conducted, revealing that these scalable designs can performantly operate in large-scale WAN settings with up to 256 nodes.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Ben-Or, “Another advantage of free choice (extended abstract) completely asynchronous agreement protocols,” in *Proc. PODC 1983*, pp. 27–30.
- [2] M. O. Rabin, “Randomized byzantine generals,” in *Proc. FOCS 1983*, pp. 403–409.
- [3] A. Mostefaoui, H. Moumen, and M. Raynal, “Signature-free asynchronous byzantine consensus with t_i $n/3$ and $o(n^2)$ messages,” in *Proc. PODC 2014*, 2014, pp. 2–9.
- [4] R. Canetti and T. Rabin, “Fast asynchronous byzantine agreement with optimal resilience,” in *Proc. STOC 1993*, pp. 42–51.
- [5] C. Cachin and J. A. Poritz, “Secure intrusion-tolerant replication on the internet,” in *Proc. DSN 2002*, 2002, pp. 167–176.
- [6] H. Moniz, N. F. Neves, M. Correia, and P. Verissimo, “Ritas: Services for randomized intrusion tolerance,” *IEEE transactions on dependable and secure computing*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 122–136, 2008.
- [7] A. Patra, A. Choudhary, and C. Pandu Rangan, “Simple and efficient asynchronous byzantine agreement with optimal resilience,” in *Proc. PODC 2009*, pp. 92–101.
- [8] I. Abraham, D. Dolev, and J. Y. Halpern, “An almost-surely terminating polynomial protocol for asynchronous byzantine agreement with optimal resilience,” in *Proc. PODC 2008*, pp. 405–414.
- [9] C. Cachin, K. Kursawe, and V. Shoup, “Random oracles in constantinople: Practical asynchronous byzantine agreement using cryptography,” *Journal of Cryptology*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 219–246, 2005.
- [10] M. Ben-Or and R. El-Yaniv, “Resilient-optimal interactive consistency in constant time,” *Distributed Computing*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 249–262, 2003.
- [11] C. Cachin, K. Kursawe, F. Petzold, and V. Shoup, “Secure and efficient asynchronous broadcast protocols,” in *CRYPTO 2001*, pp. 524–541.
- [12] A. Miller, Y. Xia, K. Croman, E. Shi, and D. Song, “The honey badger of bft protocols,” in *Proc. CCS 2016*, 2016, pp. 31–42.
- [13] S. Duan, M. K. Reiter, and H. Zhang, “Beat: Asynchronous bft made practical,” in *Proc. CCS 2018*, 2018, pp. 2028–2041.
- [14] B. Guo, Z. Lu, Q. Tang, J. Xu, and Z. Zhang, “Dumbo: Faster asynchronous bft protocols,” in *Proc. CCS 2020*, pp. 803–818.
- [15] I. Abraham, D. Malkhi, and A. Spiegelman, “Asymptotically optimal validated asynchronous byzantine agreement,” in *Proc. PODC 2019*, pp. 337–346.
- [16] G. Danezis, L. Kokoris-Kogias, A. Sonnino, and A. Spiegelman, “Narwhal and tusk: a dag-based mempool and efficient bft consensus,” in *Proc. EuroSys 2022*, pp. 34–50.
- [17] Y. Lu, Z. Lu, Q. Tang, and G. Wang, “Dumbo-mvba: Optimal multi-valued validated asynchronous byzantine agreement, revisited,” in *Proc. PODC 2020*, pp. 129–138.
- [18] Y. Gao, Y. Lu, Z. Lu, Q. Tang, J. Xu, and Z. Zhang, “Dumbo-ng: Fast asynchronous bft consensus with throughput-oblivious latency,” in *Proc. CCS 2022*, pp. 1187–1201.
- [19] I. Abraham, P. Jovanovic, M. Maller, S. Meiklejohn, G. Stern, and A. Tomescu, “Reaching consensus for asynchronous distributed key generation,” in *Proc. PODC 2021*, pp. 363–373.
- [20] S. Duan, X. Wang, and H. Zhang, “Practical signature-free asynchronous common subset in constant time,” in *Proc. CCS 2023*.

- [21] L. Yang, S. J. Park, M. Alizadeh, S. Kannan, and D. Tse, “Disperse-dLedger: High-Throughput byzantine consensus on variable bandwidth networks,” in *Proc. NSDI 2022*.
- [22] M. J. Fischer, N. A. Lynch, and M. S. Paterson, “Impossibility of distributed consensus with one faulty process,” *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 374–382, 1985.
- [23] S. Nakamoto, “Bitcoin: A peer-to-peer electronic cash system,” *Decentralized Business Review*, p. 21260, 2008.
- [24] M. Castro, B. Liskov *et al.*, “Practical byzantine fault tolerance,” in *Proc. OSDI 1999*, pp. 173–186.
- [25] M. Saad, A. Anwar, S. Ravi, and D. Mohaisen, “Revisiting nakamoto consensus in asynchronous networks: A comprehensive analysis of bitcoin safety and chainquality,” in *Proc. CCS 2021*, pp. 988–1005.
- [26] M. Yin, D. Malkhi, M. K. Reiter, G. G. Gueta, and I. Abraham, “Hotstuff: Bft consensus with linearity and responsiveness,” in *Proc. PODC 2019*, 2019, pp. 347–356.
- [27] B. Guo, Y. Lu, Z. Lu, Q. Tang, J. Xu, and Z. Zhang, “Speeding dumbo: Pushing asynchronous bft closer to practice,” in *Proc. NDSS 2022*.
- [28] A. Bessani, J. Sousa, and E. E. Alchieri, “State machine replication for the masses with bft-smart,” in *Proc. DSN 2014*, pp. 355–362.
- [29] Z. Li, A. Sonnino, and P. Jovanovic, “Performance of eddsa and bls signatures in committee-based consensus,” in *Proc. APPLIED 2023*.
- [30] Z. Avarikioti, L. Heimbach, R. Schmid, L. Vanbever, R. Wattenhofer, and P. Wintermeyer, “Fnf-bft: Exploring performance limits of bft protocols,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.02235*, 2020.
- [31] H. Zhang and S. Duan, “Pace: Fully parallelizable bft from reproposable byzantine agreement,” in *Proc. CCS 2022*, pp. 3151–3164.
- [32] M. Ben-Or, B. Kelmer, and T. Rabin, “Asynchronous secure computations with optimal resilience,” in *Proc. PODC 1994*, pp. 183–192.
- [33] H. V. Ramasamy and C. Cachin, “Parsimonious asynchronous byzantine-fault-tolerant atomic broadcast,” in *Proc. OPODIS 2005*, pp. 88–102.
- [34] R. C. Merkle, “A digital signature based on a conventional encryption function,” in *Conference on the theory and application of cryptographic techniques*, 1987, pp. 369–378.
- [35] I. S. Reed and G. Solomon, “Polynomial codes over certain finite fields,” *Journal of the society for industrial and applied mathematics*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 300–304, 1960.
- [36] “Reed-solomon erasure coding in go,” accessed: 2024-3-10. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/klauspost/reedsolomon>
- [37] J. Blomer, M. Kalfane, M. Karpinski, R. Karp, M. Luby, and D. Zuckerman, “An xor-based erasure-resilient coding scheme,” *Tech Report, Tech. Rep.*, 1995.
- [38] J. S. Plank, “Optimizing cauchy reed-solomon codes for fault-tolerant storage applications,” *University of Tennessee, Tech. Rep. CS-05-569*, vol. 38, 2005.
- [39] C. Stathakopoulou, T. David, M. Pavlovic, and M. Vukolić, “Mir-bft: High-throughput robust bft for decentralized networks,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.05552*, 2019.
- [40] C.-P. Schnorr, “Efficient signature generation by smart cards,” *Journal of cryptology*, vol. 4, pp. 161–174, 1991.
- [41] K. Chalkias, F. Garillot, Y. Kondi, and V. Nikolaenko, “Non-interactive half-aggregation of eddsa and variants of schnorr signatures,” in *Cryptographers’ Track at the RSA Conference*, 2021, pp. 577–608.
- [42] Y. Chen and Y. Zhao, “Half-aggregation of schnorr signatures with tight reductions,” in *ESORICS 2022*, pp. 385–404.
- [43] D. Boneh, B. Lynn, and H. Shacham, “Short signatures from the weil pairing,” *Journal of cryptology*, vol. 17, pp. 297–319, 2004.
- [44] D. Boneh, M. Drijvers, and G. Neven, “Compact multi-signatures for smaller blockchains,” in *ASIACRYPT 2018*, pp. 435–464.
- [45] A. Boldyreva, “Threshold signatures, multisignatures and blind signatures based on the gap-diffie-hellman-group signature scheme,” in *International Workshop on Public Key Cryptography*, 2003, pp. 31–46.
- [46] “Use threshold signature as source of randomness,” accessed: 2023-7-20. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/amiller/HoneyBadgerBFT/commit/ac787c486bc8def0fa0da3cb3287a12926bd437a>
- [47] K. Jannes, E. H. Beni, B. Lagaisse, and W. Joosen, “Beaufort: Robust byzantine fault tolerance for client-centric mobile web applications,” *IEEE TPDS*, vol. 34, no. 4, pp. 1241–1252, 2023.
- [48] S. Das, Z. Xiang, and L. Ren, “Asynchronous data dissemination and its applications,” in *Proc. CCS 2021*, pp. 2705–2721.
- [49] N. Alhaddad, S. Das, S. Duan, L. Ren, M. Varia, Z. Xiang, and H. Zhang, “Balanced byzantine reliable broadcast with near-optimal communication and improved computation,” in *Proc. PODC 2022*, pp. 399–417.
- [50] G. Bracha, “Asynchronous byzantine agreement protocols,” *Information and Computation*, vol. 75, no. 2, pp. 130–143, 1987.
- [51] G. Bracha, “An asynchronous $[(n-1)/3]$ -resilient consensus protocol,” in

- Proc. PODC 1984*, pp. 154–162.
- [52] G. Goren, Y. Moses, and A. Spiegelman, “Probabilistic indistinguishability and the quality of validity in byzantine agreement,” in *Proc. AFT*, 2022, pp. 111–125.
- [53] B. Libert and M. Yung, “Adaptively secure non-interactive threshold cryptosystems,” in *Proc. ICALP 2011*, 2011, pp. 588–600.
- [54] E. Kokoris Kogias, D. Malkhi, and A. Spiegelman, “Asynchronous distributed key generation for computationally-secure randomness, consensus, and threshold signatures,” in *Proc. CCS 2020*, pp. 1751–1767.
- [55] S. Das, T. Yurek, Z. Xiang, A. Miller, L. Kokoris-Kogias, and L. Ren, “Practical asynchronous distributed key generation,” in *IEEE S&P 2022*, pp. 2518–2534.
- [56] Y. Gao, Y. Lu, Z. Lu, Q. Tang, J. Xu, and Z. Zhang, “Efficient asynchronous byzantine agreement without private setups,” in *Proc. ICDCS 2022*.
- [57] J. Garay, A. Kiayias, and N. Leonardos, “The bitcoin backbone protocol: Analysis and applications,” in *EUROCRYPT 2015*, pp. 281–310.
- [58] I. Keidar, E. Kokoris-Kogias, O. Naor, and A. Spiegelman, “All you need is dag,” in *Proc. PODC 2021*, pp. 165–175.
- [59] C. Cachin and S. Tessaro, “Asynchronous verifiable information dispersal,” in *Proc. SRDS 2005*, pp. 191–201.
- [60] T. Yurek, Z. Xiang, Y. Xia, and A. Miller, “Long live the honey badger: Robust asynchronous {DPSS} and its applications,” in *USENIX Security 23*, pp. 5413–5430.
- [61] S. Das, Z. Xiang, L. Kokoris-Kogias, and L. Ren, “Practical asynchronous high-threshold distributed key generation and distributed polynomial sampling,” in *USENIX Security 23*, pp. 5359–5376.
- [62] I. Abraham, G. Asharov, A. Patra, and G. Stern, “Perfectly secure asynchronous agreement on a core set in constant expected time,” *Cryptology ePrint Archive*, 2023.
- [63] M. Nystrom and B. Kaliski, “PKCS #10: Certification Request Syntax Specification Version 1.7,” RFC 2986, Nov. 2000. [Online]. Available: <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2986>
- [64] M. K. Reiter, “Secure agreement protocols: Reliable and atomic group multicast in rampart,” in *Proc. ACM CCS 1994*, pp. 68–80.
- [65] “Pragmatic signature aggregation with bls,” accessed: 2023-7-20. [Online]. Available: <https://ethresear.ch/t/pragmatic-signature-aggregation-with-bls/2105>
- [66] A. Tomescu, R. Chen, Y. Zheng, I. Abraham, B. Pinkas, G. G. Gueta, and S. Devadas, “Towards scalable threshold cryptosystems,” in *Proc. IEEE S&P 2020*, pp. 877–893.
- [67] libsecp256k1. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/bitcoin-core/secp256k1>
- [68] P. S. Barreto, B. Lynn, and M. Scott, “Constructing elliptic curves with prescribed embedding degrees,” in *SCN 2003*, pp. 257–267.
- [69] bls-go-binary. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/herumi/bls-go-binary>
- [70] T. Kim and R. Barbulescu, “Extended tower number field sieve: A new complexity for the medium prime case,” in *Annual international cryptology conference*, 2016, pp. 543–571.
- [71] L. Luu, V. Narayanan, C. Zheng, K. Baweja, S. Gilbert, and P. Saxena, “A secure sharding protocol for open blockchains,” in *Proc. ACM CCS 2016*, pp. 17–30.
- [72] E. Kokoris-Kogias, P. Jovanovic, L. Gasser, N. Gailly, E. Syta, and B. Ford, “Omniledger: A secure, scale-out, decentralized ledger via sharding,” in *Proc. IEEE S&P 2018*, pp. 583–598.
- [73] M. Zamani, M. Movahedi, and M. Raykova, “Rapidchain: Scaling blockchain via full sharding,” in *Proc. ACM CCS 2018*, pp. 931–948.
- [74] N. Giridharan, L. Kokoris-Kogias, A. Sonnino, and A. Spiegelman, “Bullshark: Dag bft protocols made practical,” in *Proc. CCS 2022*, 2022.
- [75] R. Gelashvili, L. Kokoris-Kogias, A. Sonnino, A. Spiegelman, and Z. Xiang, “Jolteon and ditto: Network-adaptive efficient consensus with asynchronous fallback,” in *FC 2022*.
- [76] Y. Lu, Z. Lu, and Q. Tang, “Bolt-dumbo transformer: Asynchronous consensus as fast as pipelined bft,” in *Proc. CCS 2022*, 2022.
- [77] Y. Gilad, R. Hemo, S. Micali, G. Vlachos, and N. Zeldovich, “Algorand: Scaling byzantine agreements for cryptocurrencies,” in *Proceedings of the 26th symposium on operating systems principles*, 2017, pp. 51–68.
- [78] G. G. Gueta, I. Abraham, S. Grossman, D. Malkhi, B. Pinkas, M. Reiter, D.-A. Seredinschi, O. Tamir, and A. Tomescu, “Sbft: a scalable and decentralized trust infrastructure,” in *Proc. DSN 2019*, 2019, pp. 568–580.
- [79] Y. Amir, C. Danilov, D. Dolev, J. Kirsch, J. Lane, C. Nita-Rotaru, J. Olsen, and D. Zage, “Steward: Scaling byzantine fault-tolerant replication to wide area networks,” *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 80–93, 2008.
- [80] R. Neiheiser, M. Matos, and L. Rodrigues, “Kauri: Scalable bft consen-

sus with pipelined tree-based dissemination and aggregation,” in *Proc. SOSP 2021*, pp. 35–48.

APPENDIX A

CPU TIME OF SIGN, NON-INTERACTIVE AGGREGATION AND VERIFICATION OF TYPICAL DIGITAL SIGNATURES

Table II lists the signing time, verification time, aggregation time, and batch-verification time of typical digital signatures. From Table II, we have the next key findings: a) QCs constructed from BLS multi-signature can be verified much faster than QCs constructed from concatenated ECDSA signatures and half-aggregated Schnorr signatures, e.g., verifying a QC from BLS multi-signature is an order of magnitude faster than those from ECDSA and Schnorr for $n = 256$; b) however, verifying a single BLS signature is much slower than verifying a single ECDSA/Schnorr signature because BLS verification needs costly pairing operations of elliptic curve, e.g., the verification of a single BLS signature is an order of magnitude slower than ECDSA and Schnorr signatures. Given our benchmarking of digital signatures, it becomes easy to understand why the earlier study [29] concludes that the tempting BLS multi-signature has inferior performance in their BFT systems with relatively larger sizes, because the verification of $n - f$ single BLS signatures can quickly dominate the overall computing cost while n increases.

APPENDIX B

QUALITY DOWNGRADE ATTACK OF FIN-MVBA

As aforementioned in Section I and Section IV, the quality of FIN-MVBA [20] could be only 1/3 under the influence of an adaptive adversary that can perform “after-fact-removal”, which is lower than the optimal upper bound of 1/2 [52].

Here we illustrate a concrete adversary to perform such quality degradation attack. Note that the adversary is adaptive such that it can gradually corrupt up to f nodes during the course of protocol. Besides, we assume the number of participating nodes n is large enough in order to simplify the calculation of probability.

Below are the detailed attacking steps:

- 1) Before the start of the FIN-MVBA protocol, the adversary chooses $f - 1$ nodes to corrupt, and let us denote this corrupted set by A , such that the input of any node in A can be replaced and thus controlled by the adversary.
- 2) At the moment when the FIN-MVBA protocol starts, the adversary selects f honest nodes, denoted by set D , and delays all messages related to these nodes in D . Note that in addition to D , there are still $f + 2$ so-far-honest nodes, and we denote them as set H .
- 3) The adversary controls the malicious nodes in A to execute the protocol like the honest ones until the *election* protocol. Such that H can proceed to invoke the random leader *election* protocol. To minimize the adversary’s ability, we assume the reconstruction threshold of *election* is $n - f$, which equals to the size of $A \cup H$.
- 4) The adversary controls A not send messages in the *election* protocol, but it can receive H ’s messages in the

TABLE II

TIME OF SIGNING, VERIFYING A SINGLE SIGNATURE, AGGREGATING/CONCATENATING $(n - f)$ SIGNATURES, AND VERIFYING A $(n - f)$ -SIZED QC, WHERE EACH DATA POINT IS AVERAGED OVER 10 THOUSAND EXECUTIONS AT AN AWS EC2 C6A.2XLARGE SERVER. ECDSA/SCHNORR ARE TESTED THROUGH LIBRARY [67] OVER SECP256K1 CURVE AND BLS IS TESTED THROUGH LIBRARY [69] OVER BLS12-381 CURVE.

	Sign (μs)	Verify (μs)	(Half-)aggregate $(n - f)$ signatures to form QC (μs)							Verify $(n - f)$ -sized QC (μs)						
			$n=4$	16	32	64	128	192	256	$n=4$	16	32	64	128	192	256
ECDSA	31	43	0 as just concatenate							$n - f$ times of verifying an individual signature						
Schnorr	25	44	18	63	120	245	485	731	970	141	430	787	1587	2714	3975	5005
BLS multi-sig	187	891	1	6	11	18	49	74	102	904	916	932	951	1036	1102	1184
BLS thld-sig	187	891	203	769	1448	3137	6294	9578	12976	891	891	891	891	891	891	891

election protocol, which allows A to get the *election* protocol's output k .

5) Once the adversary gets k , there are three possible cases:

- k falls in A . In this case, FIN-MVBA will output the input value of P_k , which is chosen by the adversary. Note that the probability of this scenario occurring is about 1/3.
- k falls in H . In this case, FIN-MVBA will output the input value of P_k , which is an input chosen by the honest node. Note that the probability of this scenario occurring is also about 1/3.
- k falls in D . In this case, the adversary can immediately corrupt node P_k because it still has a quota of corruption. Then the adversary removes all messages that P_k attempted to send because these messages are not delivered yet, as such the adversary can replace P_k 's input value, and rushingly finishes P_k 's BRBC, after which, the adversary delivers all messages, then its manipulating value will output in FIN-MVBA. So in this scenario, the output is always chosen by the adversary. Note that the probability of this scenario occurring is also about 1/3.

The above steps complete the attack, and result in that with probability 2/3, the output is manipulated by the adversary.

APPENDIX C PROOF OF FIN-MVBA-Q

Security of avwBRBC. Note that a few properties of avwBRBC, such as weak agreement and validity, can immediately inherited from w BRBC, and we will only focus on the proofs of totality and external validity properties.

Lemma 1. Totality of avwBRBC. *For any avwBRBC instance, if an honest node wr -delivers some value, any honest node eventually wr -delivers some value.*

Proof. Let node \mathcal{P}_i be the first honest node who wr -delivers h in avwBRBC $_j$. So \mathcal{P}_i must have received $n - f$ $READY(h)$ messages from distinct nodes, among which $f + 1$ are honest nodes. As shown in Figure 8, invoking $abandon()$ only blocks sending $ECHO$ messages. So these $f + 1$ honest nodes will eventually transmit their $READY(h)$ messages to all honest nodes. Thus, any honest node will eventually receives $f + 1$ $READY(h)$ messages, and will transmit $READY(h)$ if has not sent it. Therefore, every honest node will eventually receive $n - f$ $READY(h)$, and wr -deliver h . \square

Lemma 2. External validity of avwBRBC. *For any avwBRBC instance, If an honest node outputs a value v , then v is valid w.r.t. Q , i.e., $Q(v) = 1$.*

Proof. This property is fairly trivial, as if it is violated, there must be $f + 1$ honest nodes send $READY(h)$ with $\mathcal{H}(v) = h$, further indicating that there must be $f + 1$ honest nodes send $ECHO(h)$ with $\mathcal{H}(v) = h$, which causes contradiction because honest nodes wouldn't send $ECHO(h)$ with $\mathcal{H}(v) = h$ if $Q(v) \neq 1$. \square

Security of FIN-MVBA-Q. We now prove that FIN-MVBA-Q realizes all four desired properties of MVBA, i.e., termination, agreement, external validity, and 1/2-quality.

Lemma 3. *If all honest nodes input some values satisfying Q , there exists $n - f$ avwBRBC instances, such that all honest nodes will eventually wr -deliver in them.*

Proof. We consider two opposing scenarios: 1) No honest node invoke $abandon()$ before all honest nodes wr -deliver in the same $n - f$ avwBRBC instances. 2) Some honest node invoke $abandon()$ before all honest nodes wr -deliver in the same $n - f$ avwBRBC instances. For the former, *Validity* property ensures all honest nodes eventually wr -deliver in $n - f$ avwBRBC instances leading by honest nodes. For the latter, if some honest node \mathcal{P}_i invoked $abandon()$, the set F_i of \mathcal{P}_i must contain $n - f$ true values. So at least $n - f$ avwBRBC instances have been wr -delivered by at least $f + 1$ honest nodes. According to the *Totality* property of avwBRBC, all honest nodes will eventually wr -deliver in these $n - f$ avwBRBC instances. \square

Lemma 4. *If all honest nodes input some values satisfying Q , all honest nodes will eventually step into iteration phase (line 13-28).*

Proof. According to Lemma 3, there exists $n - f$ avwBRBC instances (denoted by HR_{n-f}), such that all honest nodes will eventually wr -deliver in them. So for every avwBRBC instance in HR_{n-f} , at least $n - f$ nodes will multicast FIN message responding to it. So all honest nodes will eventually receive $n - f$ FIN messages from distinct nodes for every avwBRBC instance in HR_{n-f} . Thus, all honest nodes will step into iteration phase. \square

Lemma 5. *Using H to denote the first $f+1$ honest nodes invoking $abandon()$. For any value v , its hash value $\mathcal{H}(v)$ won't be wr -delivered by any honest node, if responding*

VAL(v) messages haven't been received by any of H before H all invoked $abandon()$.

Proof. Since the reconstruction threshold of $Election()$ we use is $n - f$, at least $f + 1$ honest nodes will have invoked $abandon()$ before adversary can learn the output of $Election()$. As shown in Figure 8, honest node will reject sending $ECHO$ message for new received VAL message after invoking $abandon()$. Thus for any value v whose responding VAL messages haven't been received by any of H before they invoked $abandon()$, it can't gather enough (i.e. $n - f$) $ECHO(\mathcal{H}(v))$ messages. Without enough $ECHO(\mathcal{H}(v))$ messages, honest nodes won't send responding $READY(\mathcal{H}(v))$ messages. So no honest node can receive sufficient ($n - f$) $READY(\mathcal{H}(v))$ messages to $wr-deliver$ $\mathcal{H}(v)$. \square

Lemma 6. Agreement *If two honest nodes output v and v' , respectively, then $v = v'$.*

Proof. According to the *Agreement* property of $RABA$, all honest nodes will have same output for every possible running $RABA$ instances. So honest nodes will end iteration in the same repeat round (denoted by R_{halt}). Let k be the result of $Election()$ of round R_{halt} . $RABA$ output 1 in round R_{halt} , so that at least one honest node $raba-propose$ or $raba-repropose$ 1. So that at least one honest node has $wr-delivered$ in $avwBRBC_k$. According to Theorem1, all honest nodes will $wr-deliver$ the same hash h . According to the collision resistance property of hash function, there can't be a different value v' that $\mathcal{H}(v) = \mathcal{H}(v') = h$. \square

Lemma 7. External-Validity. *If an honest node outputs a value v , then v is valid w.r.t. Q , i.e., $Q(v) = 1$;*

Proof. As shown in Lemma 6, if an honest node outputs a value v , at least one honest node has $wr-delivered$ $\mathcal{H}(v)$. So at least $f + 1$ honest nodes have received message $VALUE(v)$ in responding $avwBRBC$ instance and sent $ECHO(\mathcal{H}(v))$. Since the condition of sending $ECHO(\mathcal{H}(v))$ is $Q(v) = 1$, the *External-Validity* property holds. \square

Lemma 8. 1/2-Quality. *If an honest node outputs v , the probability that v was input by the adversary is at most 1/2.*

Proof. Let node \mathcal{P}_i be the first honest node who step into iteration phase. So at least $n - f$ values in set F_i are true. Let S denotes the set of $avwBRBC$ instances whose responding values in F_i are true. H denotes the set of $avwBRBC$ instances in S who is leading by honest nodes. A denotes the set of $avwBRBC$ instances in S who is leading by adversary. R denotes the set of $avwBRBC$ instances outside S . We now discuss the three possible cases of all possible iterations. Let k_r denotes the result of $Election()$ of the r_{th} iteration.

- 1) k_r falls in A . In this case, at least $f + 1$ honest nodes will input 1 for $RABA_r$. According to the *Totality* of $avwBRBC$, all honest nodes eventually $wr-deliver$ in $avwBRBC_{k_r}$. And Lemma 4 shows that all honest nodes will step into iteration phase. So the *Biased termination* property is met for $RABA_r$. The *Biased validity* property ensures all honest nodes output 1 for $RABA_r$. Then FIN-MVBA will eventually output the input value of

$avwBRBC_{k_r}$, which is chosen by the adversary. Note that the probability of this scenario occurring is at most 1/3.

- 2) k_r falls in H . Similar to the former case, FIN-MVBA will output the input value of $avwBRBC_{k_r}$, which is an input chosen by the honest node. Note that the probability of this scenario occurring is at least 1/3.
- 3) k_r falls in R . In this case, Lemma 5 shows that no *new* value can be delivered after $f + 1$ honest nodes invoking $abandon()$. So the attack we describe in Appendix B won't work here. Since there is no guarantee on how many honest nodes $wr-deliver$ in $avwBRBC_{k_r}$. $RABA_r$ can output 1 or 0 (we will show why $RABA$ eventually outputs in this scenario in Lemma 9). Outputting 1 won't help even if $avwBRBC_{k_r}$ is leading by adversary, as it will reduce the probability of case(1). So we only care about the scenario where $RABA_r$ outputs 0, whose probability of occurrence is at most 1/3. And honest nodes will jump to next iteration in this scenario.

Thus, during every possible iteration, $RABA$ outputs 1 with a probability of up to 2/3. And once $RABA$ outputs 1, the probability that the output of FIN-MVBA-Q belong to the inputs of adversary is up to 1/2. \square

Lemma 9. Termination. *If all honest nodes input some values satisfying Q , then each honest node would output.*

Proof. According to Lemma 4, all honest nodes will eventually step into iteration phase. So we only care about the *Termination* property of $RABA_r$ in r_{th} iteration. Let k_r denote the result of $Election()$ of the r_{th} iteration. As shown in Lemma 8, $RABA_r$ has at least 2/3 probability to meet *Biased termination* property of $RABA$, and thus terminates. We divide the remaining cases into two categories (case(3) in Lemma 8). 1) All honest nodes $raba-propose$ 0 and never $raba-repropose$ 1 for $RABA_r$. Thus $RABA_r$ terminates due to *Unanimous termination* property. 2) Some honest nodes (less than $f + 1$) have $raba-propose$ or $raba-repropose$ 1 for $RABA_r$. Thus at least one honest node has $wr-delivered$ in $avwBRBC_{k_r}$. According to the *Totality* property of $avwBRBC$, all honest nodes will eventually $wr-delivered$ in $avwBRBC_{k_r}$, and thus $raba-propose$ or $raba-repropose$ 1 for $RABA_r$. $RABA_r$ then terminates due to the *Biased termination* property. \square

APPENDIX D PROOF OF FIN-NG

Security of FIN-NG. We now prove that FIN-NG realizes agreement, total order, and liveness, not only for these always-honest nodes but also for obviously recovered nodes (that was corrupted).

We first prove FIN-NG is secure regarding those always-honest nodes (note that there are at least $n - f$ nodes that are always honest during the course of execution). Later we call these nodes always-honest nodes or simply honest nodes.

Lemma 10. *If an honest node \mathcal{P}_i output $current_{e+1}$, it can eventually $wr-delivered$ in all $wBRBC$ instances between $current_e$ and $current_{e+1}$. Let set $Digests_{e+1}$ denote all the digests $wr-delivered$ in those $wBRBC$ instances, and let set*

$TX_{s_{e+1}}$ denote the original data responding to $Digest_{s_{e+1}}$. Then \mathcal{P}_i can eventually obtain the whole $TX_{s_{e+1}}$.

Proof. According to Lemma 7, if \mathcal{P}_i output $current_{e+1}$ from $FIN\text{-}MVBA\text{-}Q_{e+1}$, then $Q(current_{e+1}) = 1$ for at least $f+1$ honest nodes. Such that at least $f+1$ honest nodes have *wr-delivered* in all $wBRBC$ instances between $current_e$ and $current_e + 1$. Due to the *Totality* property of $wBRBC$, all honest nodes will eventually *wr-delivered* in all $wBRBC$ instances between $current_e$ and $current_e+1$. Besides, for every h *wr-delivered* in those $wBRBC$ instances, at least $f+1$ honest nodes have received $VAL(v)$ such that $\mathcal{H}(v) = h$. Thus \mathcal{P}_i can use the pulling mechanism described in Section IV to obtain missing data. \square

Lemma 11. *FIN-NG satisfies agreement, total order, and liveness properties (regarding these always honest nodes) except with negligible probability.*

Proof. Here we prove the three properties one by one (for those always-honest nodes).

For agreement: Suppose that one honest node \mathcal{P}_i output a transaction tx . \mathcal{P}_i must have finished two $FIN\text{-}MVBA\text{-}Q$ instances with output $current_e$ and $current_{e+1}$, such that tx belongs to some $wBRBC$ instance between $current_e$ and $current_{e+1}$. Due to the *Agreement* property of $FIN\text{-}MVBA\text{-}Q$, if another honest \mathcal{P}_j output in the same two $FIN\text{-}MVBA\text{-}Q$ instances, they output the same value. And \mathcal{P}_j thus can obtain some tx' responding to the same $wBRBC$ instance due to Lemma 10. And the collision resistance property of hash function together with the *Agreement* property of $wBRBC$ ensure that $tx = tx'$. Beside, we also need to prove that if node \mathcal{P}_i outputs in some $FIN\text{-}MVBA\text{-}Q$ instance, all honest nodes will eventually active this instance. To prove it, we need the *Liveness* property of $FIN\text{-}NG$ (we will prove it later). In the beginning, all honest nodes will active the first $FIN\text{-}MVBA\text{-}Q$ instance and terminate then due to the *Termination* property of $FIN\text{-}MVBA\text{-}Q$. An the *Liveness* property of $FIN\text{-}NG$ ensures all honest nodes will eventually generate a new input satisfying Q , and then active the next $FIN\text{-}MVBA\text{-}Q$ instance. So that all honest nodes will continuously active $FIN\text{-}MVBA\text{-}Q$ instances one by one. Such that if \mathcal{P}_i output a transaction tx , all honest nodes eventually output tx .

For Total-order: In $FIN\text{-}NG$, all honest nodes sequential participate in $MVBA$ epoch by epoch, and in each $MVBA$, all honest nodes output the same block, so the total-order is trivially hold.

For Liveness: One honest node \mathcal{P}_i can start $wBRBC_{e+1}$ once it *wr-delivered* in $wBRBC_e$. The *Totality* property ensures that all honest nodes eventually *wr-deliver* in $wBRBC_e$. All honest nodes thus can active $wBRBC_{e+1}$. So that \mathcal{P}_i won't be stuck. It also implies at least $n-f$ parallel broadcasts can grow continuously since all honest nodes won't be stuck and can continuously active new $wBRBC$ instance. Such that \mathcal{P}_i can eventually generate a new input to active a new $FIN\text{-}MVBA\text{-}Q$ instance.

According to the *1/2-Quality* of $FIN\text{-}MVBA\text{-}Q$, the input of honest nodes can be outputted with a probability not less than $1/2$, so even in the worst case, once a $FIN\text{-}MVBA\text{-}Q$

instance decides to output the input of an honest node \mathcal{P}_i , the broadcasted transactions proposed by \mathcal{P}_i 's $FIN\text{-}MVBA\text{-}Q$ input will be decided as the final consensus output. It further indicates that the adversary cannot censor the input payloads that are broadcasted by honest nodes, because the probability of $FIN\text{-}MVBA\text{-}Q$ outputting the input of some honest node is at least $1/2$, which implies that after k executions of $FIN\text{-}MVBA\text{-}Q$, the probability that a finished broadcast is not yet output would be at most $(1/2)^k$, i.e., becomes negligible after sufficient repetition of $FIN\text{-}MVBA\text{-}Q$. \square

APPENDIX E PROOF OF JUMBO

Since the proofs of agreement and total order properties for JUMBO resembles those of Dumbo-NG, we only describe the proof for liveness and fairness here.

W.l.o.g, we assume that nodes disseminate the same number of transactions in each CBC instance. To enhance the fairness of JUMBO, we adopt a ‘‘speed limit’’ patch described in Section VI. For a better description, we do some changes on variables. We use δ_{ij} to denote how many transactions output by node \mathcal{P}_i in j -th broadcast thread since the height included by last block (from the local view of node \mathcal{P}_i). Let δ_i to track the $(f+1)$ -th smallest one of all $\{\delta_{ij}\}_{j \in [n]}$. The variable δ_{low} tracks the smallest one of all $\{\delta_i\}_{i \in [n]}$.

Lemma 12. *Any $MVBA$ instance won't be blocked forever. In other words, all honest nodes will constantly output in $MVBA$ thread.*

Proof. We proof this by mathematical induction:

- 1) W.l.o.g, we assume epoch number start from 0. Now we proof that all honest nodes will output in epoch 0. There are two possible cases:
 - a) All honest nodes stay in epoch 0 (they all output 0 block). We recall the condition of halt voting. \mathcal{P}_i halts voting for the j -th broadcast thread, if $\beta \cdot \delta_{ij} \geq \delta_i$ and $\delta_{ij} > 0$. So no honest nodes will halt voting in the first CBC instance of each honest broadcast thread, as $\delta_{ij} = 0$ in their views before running that instance. Hence honest nodes will at least finish the first CBC instance of each honest broadcast thread, and thus meet the condition of generating a new input for a new $MVBA$ instance. As a result, all honest nodes will eventually active the first $MVBA$ instance. Thus they will all output in epoch 0 because of the *Termination* property of $MVBA$.
 - b) Some honest nodes stay in epoch 0, while the rest stay in higher epochs. We use N_0 to denote the set of honest nodes who stay in epoch 0, and N_{high} to denotes the rest honest nodes. Now we proof that all nodes in N_0 can finally generate new inputs for the first $MVBA$ instance.

We assume that $\mathcal{P}_i \in N_{high}$ and the j -th broadcast thread is honest. If \mathcal{P}_i 's outputs contain a higher height than 0 for the j -th broadcast thread. It must have voted in the first CBC instance of the j -th broadcast

thread, and thus won't block other honest nodes there. If \mathcal{P}_i 's outputs don't contain a higher height than 0 for the j -th broadcast thread. Things are going similarly to the former case. As a result, all honest nodes in N_0 can at least finish the first CBC instance of each honest broadcast thread, and thus meet the condition of generating new a input for a new MVBA instance. Thus they will all output in epoch 0 because of the *Termination* property of MVBA.

2) W.l.o.g, we assume all honest nodes have output in epoch $e - 1$. Now we proof that all honest nodes will eventually output in epoch e . There are two possible cases:

a) All honest nodes stay in epoch e (they output the same number of blocks). We recall the condition of halt voting. \mathcal{P}_i halts voting for the j -th broadcast thread, if $\beta \cdot \delta_{ij} \geq \delta_i$ and $\delta_{ij} > 0$. So no honest nodes will halt voting in the first CBC instance of each honest broadcast thread since last block, as $\delta_{ij} = 0$ in their views before running that instance. Hence honest nodes will at least finish the first CBC instance of each honest broadcast thread, and thus meet the condition of generating a new input for a new MVBA instance. As a result, all honest nodes will eventually active the MVBA instance in epoch e . Thus they will all output in epoch e because of the *Termination* property of MVBA.

b) Some honest nodes stay in epoch e , while the rest stay in higher epochs. We use N_{low} to denote the set of honest nodes who stay in epoch e , and N_{high} to denotes the rest honest nodes. Now we proof that all nodes in N_{low} can finally generate new inputs for the MVBA instance of epoch e .

We use h_{ej} to denote the height of the first CBC instance of the j -th broadcast thread since the block committed in epoch $e - 1$. We assume that $\mathcal{P}_i \in N_{high}$ and the j -th broadcast thread is honest. If \mathcal{P}_i 's outputs contain a higher height than h_{ej} for the j -th broadcast thread. It must have voted in the h_{ej} -th CBC instance, and thus won't block other honest nodes who havn't output there. If \mathcal{P}_i 's outputs don't contain a higher height than h_{ej} for the j -th broadcast thread. Things are going similarly to the former case. As a result, all honest nodes in N_{low} can at least finish the first CBC instance of each honest broadcast thread, and thus meet the condition of generating new a input for a new MVBA instance. Thus they will all output in epoch e because of the *Termination* property of MVBA.

Thus all honest nodes will constantly output in MVBA thread. \square

Lemma 13. *All honest broadcast threads won't be blocked forever.*

Proof. According the proof of 12, at least the first CBC instance of honest broadcast threads in each epoch won't be blocked. We assume that node \mathcal{P}_i is honest, and \mathcal{P}_i is in epoch e . Let B_{1st} be the transaction block \mathcal{P}_i propose in his first CBC instance after the block committed in epoch $e - 1$. Then B_{1st}

is guaranteed to be output by all honest nodes according to the *Validity* property of CBC. Because all honest nodes will constantly output in MVBA thread, all honest nodes will add B_{1st} into their inputs. According to the 1/2-Quality of MVBA, B_{1st} will be output after expected constant number of MVBA instances. Thus \mathcal{P}_i will eventually step into an epoch where B_{1st} has been output before. \mathcal{P}_i can then start a new CBC instance, which is guaranteed to be finished by all honest nodes according to the previous description. Thus \mathcal{P}_i can constantly active new CBC instances. So the i -th broadcast thread won't be blocked forever, and so does the rest honest broadcast threads. \square

W.l.o.g, we assume that a transaction tx is placed in honest node \mathcal{P}_i 's input buffer. According to Lemma-13, \mathcal{P}_i will eventually propose it in one of his CBC instance. Thus tx will be output by all honest nodes in that CBC instance. According the proof of 12, tx will finally be contained in all MVBA input from honest nodes. After that, tx will be output by consensus in expected constant number of MVBA instances. Thus the *Liveness* property for JUMBO is held.

APPENDIX F

CHOICE OF EXPERIMENTAL ENVIRONMENT

We adopt a popular approach of using Linux TC to emulate WAN networks among EC2 instances in the same region [21, 80]. Namley, we apply manually-controlled delay and bandwidth throttling at each node. In contrast, a few recent studies [12–14, 16, 18, 20, 27, 31] adopted a different way to set up benchmarking by evenly distributing EC2 instances at different AWS regions. The reasons behind our benchmarking choice are as follows:

- 1) *Economic affordability.* The price of data transfer between different regions for Amazon's EC2 platform is non-negligible, which is around \$0.02 per GigaByte. So if we evaluate protocol at the scale of 256 nodes and 1 Gbps bandwidth, the cost on data transfer is around \$38.4 per minute, as opposed to \$1.5 for computation. If we deploy all nodes at the same region, we can conduct the same experiments for 25 times longer at the same cost, because data transfer within the same region is free. Otherwise, if we distribute 256 nodes across a dozen of regions, the cost would become completely unaffordable.
- 2) *Result reproducibility.* The network bandwidth and latency between different regions vary greatly over time (due to changes of AWS' network infrastructure), making it difficult for us to maintain the same network conditions when repeating the same experiments.
- 3) *Better emulation of WANs.* If we deploy several hundred of nodes in a dozen of different regions, then many nodes will inevitably be deployed in the same region. The network conditions between nodes within the same region are extremely good, typically with only a few milliseconds of latency and 10 Gbps bandwidth, which is completely mismatched with the WAN environment. If we deploy all nodes to the same region, we can use tools like TC to precisely control the bandwidth and latency of each connection, in order to better simulate the

WAN environment. Additionally, we can more accurately simulate network fluctuations and other asynchronous adversarial attack behaviors.

- 4) *Precise control of bandwidth.* The last benefit of our benchmarking choice is that we can precisely control the bandwidth during each test. This allows us compare our throughput to line-rate speed to understand the actual bandwidth utilization of our different protocols.