

Fast Transaction Scheduling in Blockchain Sharding

Ramesh Adhikari
 Augusta University
 Augusta, Georgia, USA
 radhikari@augusta.edu

Costas Busch
 Augusta University
 Augusta, Georgia, USA
 kbusch@augusta.edu

Miroslav Popovic
 University of Novi Sad
 Novi Sad, Serbia
 miroslav.popovic@rt-rk.uns.ac.rs

ABSTRACT

Sharding is a promising technique for addressing the scalability issues of blockchain. It divides the n participating nodes into s disjoint groups called shards, where each shard processes transactions in parallel. The accounts (shared objects) are also distributed among the s shards. We investigate scheduling algorithms for the blockchain sharding systems, where each transaction resides in a shard of the communication graph and attempts to access accounts at possibly remote shards. We examine batch scheduling problems on the shard graph G_s , where given a set of transactions, we aim to find efficient schedules to execute them as fast as possible. First, we present a centralized scheduler where one of the shards has global knowledge of transactions to be processed. For general graphs, where the transaction and its accessing objects are arbitrarily far from each other with a maximum distance d , the centralized scheduler provides $O(kd)$ approximation to the optimal schedule, where k is the maximum number of shards each transaction accesses. Consequently, for a Clique graph where shards are at a unit distance from each other, we obtain $O(k)$ approximation to the optimal schedule. We also get $O(k \log s)$ approximation for Hypercube, Butterfly, and g -dimensional Grid, where $g = O(\log s)$. Next, we provide a centralized scheduler with a bucketing approach that offers improved bounds for special cases. For the General graph where each transaction chooses k objects randomly we give $O(k \log D \cdot (k + \log s))$ approximation, and for the Line graph we provide $O(k\sqrt{d} \log D)$ approximation to the optimal schedule, where D is the diameter of shard graph G_s . Finally, we provide a distributed scheduler where shards do not require global transaction information. We achieve this by using a hierarchical clustering of the shards and using the centralized scheduler in each cluster. We show that the distributed scheduler has a competitive ratio of $O(\mathcal{A}_{CS} \log^2 s)$, where \mathcal{A}_{CS} is the approximation ratio of the centralized scheduler. To our knowledge, we are the first to give provably fast transaction scheduling algorithms for blockchain sharding systems.

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Computing methodologies** → **Distributed algorithms**; • **Theory of computation** → **Scheduling algorithms**.

KEYWORDS

Blockchain, Blockchain Sharding, Transaction Scheduling, Batch Scheduling.

1 INTRODUCTION

Blockchains are known for their special features such as fault tolerance, transparency, non-repudiation, immutability, and security [37]. Thus, blockchains have been used in various domains, such

as cryptocurrency [17, 36], healthcare [35], digital forensics [4, 5, 41], supply chain management [12], edge and scientific computing [6, 7].

Blockchain technology is also gaining interest from banks and financial institutions because of its transformational power in the financial industry [8, 10, 31, 42]. This innovation is expected to reshape financial services, revolutionize banking operations, and address dynamic industry demands without sacrificing privacy [13, 42]. Implementing blockchain can offer competitive benefits to traditional banking systems by enhancing transaction privacy and security at a minimum cost [23]. Traditional financial institutions, tech firms, and startups are also coordinating with financial technology to offer affordable and easy to use financial services [18]. However, the primary drawback of blockchain is its scalability and its performance, which is dependent on the throughput of the transactions [21, 22]. Thus, there is a research gap to address the scalability issues of blockchain.

To append a new block in the blockchain network, each participating node needs to reach a consensus, which is a time and energy-consuming process [1–3]. Moreover, each node is required to process and store all transactions, which leads to scalability issues in the blockchain system. To improve scalability and performance, *sharding* protocols have been proposed, such as Elastico [34], OmniLedger [32], RapidChain [43], Sharper [9], and ByShard [26]. However, these sharding protocols do not provide a formal analysis of how we can schedule the transaction as fast as possible. Sharding divides participating nodes into smaller groups called shards that allow the parallel processing of transactions. In the sharded blockchain, independent transactions are processed and committed in multiple shards concurrently, which improves the blockchain system’s throughput.

We consider a blockchain system consisting of n nodes, which are further divided into s shards, and each shard consists of a set of nodes. Shards are connected in a graph network G_s with a diameter D , and each shard holds a subset of the objects (accounts). We assume that transactions are distributed across the shards, and each transaction accesses at most k accounts. A transaction T initially is in one of the shards; we called it as *home shard* for T . Similar to other sharding systems [1–3, 26], each transaction T is split into subtransactions, where each subtransaction accesses an account. A subtransaction of T is sent to the *destination shard* that holds the respective account. The maximum distance between the home shard and the destination shards in the shard graph is at most $d \leq D$. In other words, the transaction and its accessing shards (objects) are arbitrarily far from each other with a maximum distance of d . All home shards process transactions concurrently. A problem occurs when *conflicting* transactions try to access the same account simultaneously. In such a case, the conflict prohibits the transactions to be committed concurrently and forces them to serialize [2, 3].

Our proposed *scheduling algorithms* coordinate the home shards and destination shards to process the transactions (and respective subtransactions) in a conflict-free manner. Each destination shard maintains a local blockchain of the subtransactions that are sent to it. The global blockchain can be constructed by taking the union of the local blockchains at the shards [1].

We consider batch problem instances where a (batch) set of transactions \mathcal{T} initially reside at shards and need to be processed. We study the shard model in different graph topologies such as General graph, Clique (Complete) graph, Hypercube, Butterfly, Grid, and Line graphs and provide the analysis for execution time. The scheduler determines the time step for each transaction $T_i \in \mathcal{T}$ to process and commit. The execution of our scheduling algorithm is synchronous, where the timeline is divided into time steps referred to as *rounds*. Similar to the work in [2, 3], we consider that the duration of a round is sufficient to allow the execution of the PBFT consensus algorithm [19] in each shard. A round is also the time to send a message between shards in a unit distance. The main goal of a scheduling algorithm is to efficiently and fairly process all transactions while minimizing the total execution time (makespan) until all transactions are either committed or aborted. Unlike previous sharding approaches [26, 32, 43], our scheduling algorithms do not require locking mechanisms for concurrency control. Hence, we can also say our algorithms are lock-free.

1.1 Contributions and Techniques

To our knowledge, we give the first provably efficient batch transaction scheduling algorithms for blockchain sharding systems. We provide a summary of contributions in Table 1, which are also described as follows:

- **Centralized Scheduler:** First, we provide a Centralized scheduler where one of the shards has global knowledge of the transactions. Consider a general graph G_s with diameter D . Suppose that each transaction accesses at most k objects, where the distance between a transaction and its accessing objects is at most $d \leq D$. The centralized scheduler provides an $O(kd)$ approximation to the optimal schedule. Hence, when G_s is a Clique graph, where shards are at a unit distance from each other (thus, $d = 1$), we obtain an $O(k)$ approximation to the optimal schedule. Moreover, we obtain an $O(k \log s)$ approximation for the Hypercube, Butterfly, and g -dimensional Grid where $g = O(\log s)$, since in all these cases $d = O(\log s)$.
 - **Technique:** Our scheduling algorithm consists of two main phases. In the first phase, the scheduler determines the order of execution of the transactions by coloring transactions that need to be processed using a conflict graph. In the second phase, our algorithm confirms and commits each transaction according to the schedule determined by the first phase. In the centralized scheduler, we consider a set of transactions \mathcal{T} that are distributed in a shard graph G_s , and one of the shard as leader shard are given to the algorithm as input. Then, the scheduler provides the schedule and processes transactions \mathcal{T} . We assume that the leader shard has global knowledge of the transactions that
- **Centralized Scheduler with Buckets:** Next, we give the centralized scheduler with a bucketing approach. Similar to a centralized scheduler, we consider a shard graph G_s with diameter D , and the maximum distance between the home shard of the transaction and its accessing objects is at most $d \leq D$. We divide the transactions into buckets B_0, B_1, \dots , according to the maximum distance between the home shard of the transaction and its accessing objects (i.e., destination shards). B_i consists of the transactions whose maximum distance between the home shard and its destination shard is in range $[2^i, 2^{i+1})$. This approach offers improved bounds for special cases: for the General graph where the k objects are chosen randomly per transaction we give $O(k \log D \cdot (k + \log s))$ approximation, and for the Line graph, we provide $O(k\sqrt{d} \log D)$ approximation to the optimal schedule.
 - **Technique:** Each home shard of transaction $T_i \in \mathcal{T}$ discovers the position of its accessing objects (destination shards) and sends that transaction information to the respective bucket B_i . Bucket B_i denotes the set of transactions whose distance between the home shard and the accessing objects (destination shards) is in the range $[2^i, 2^{i+1})$; $i \in \{0, \dots, \lfloor \log D \rfloor\}$ where D is the diameter of shards graph G_s . We assume that each bucket B_i has its own leader shard ℓ_i , which is known to all shards in G_s . First, each transaction determines its bucket, and then we run the centralized scheduler for each bucket. Details of the algorithm is provided in Section 5.
- **Distributed Scheduler:** Finally, we give a distributed scheduler where shards are not aware of global transaction information. We use a clustering approach for the shard network by hierarchical clustering [25] so that independent transactions can be scheduled and committed concurrently. The basic idea is to simulate the centralized scheduler within

Shards Connected as	Approximation to Optimal Schedule of	
	Centralized Scheduler	Distributed Scheduler
General Graph	$O(kd)$	$O(kd \log^2 s)$
Hypercube, Butterfly, and g -dimensional Grid Graph	$O(k \log s)$	$O(k \log^3 s)$
General Graph where, k is chosen as random	$O(k \log D \cdot (k + \log s))$	$O(k \log D \cdot (k + \log s) \log^2 s)$
Line Graph	$O(k\sqrt{d} \log D)$	$O(k\sqrt{d} \log D \cdot \log^2 s)$

Table 1: Summary of the proposed centralized and distributed scheduler approximation to the optimal schedule. The used notations are as follows: s represents the total number of shards, k denotes the maximum number of shards (objects) accessed by each transaction, d denotes the worst distance between any transaction (home shard) and its accessing objects (destination shard), D denotes the diameter of shard graph G_s .

each cluster of the hierarchy to make a distributed scheduler. We show that the distributed scheduler has a competitive ratio of $O(\mathcal{A}_{CS} \log^2 s)$, where \mathcal{A}_{CS} is the approximation ratio of the centralized scheduler.

- **Technique:** We consider that our distributed scheduling algorithm uses a hierarchical decomposition of shard graph G_s which is known to all the shards and calculated before the algorithm starts. This shard clustering (graph decomposition) is based on the clustering techniques in [25] and which were later used in [2, 3, 16, 39]. We divide the shard graph G_s into the hierarchy of clusters with layers and sublayers. The *home cluster* for each transaction T_i is defined as follows: suppose S_i is the home shard of T_i , and z is the maximum distance from S_i to the destination shards that will be accessed by T_i ; the home cluster of T_i is the lowest-layer (and lowest sub-layer) cluster in the hierarchy that contains the z -neighborhood of S_i . Each home cluster has one dedicated leader shard, which will handle all the transactions that have their home shard in that cluster (i.e., transaction information is sent from the home shard to the cluster leader shard for processing). After that, each cluster leader shard schedules the transaction of its cluster by assigning color using a greedy coloring algorithm (similar to the centralized scheduler). To achieve the benefit of locality and reduce the transaction latency, the lower cluster layer gets priority in processing its transactions. Within each cluster, we simulate and run a centralized scheduler algorithm to schedule transactions. A detailed description of our distributed scheduler is in Section 6.

Paper Organization: The rest of this paper is structured as follows: Section 2 provides related works. Section 3 describes the preliminaries for this study and the sharding model. Section 4 presents a centralized scheduling algorithm. In Section 5, we provide a centralized scheduler with the bucketing approach. Section 6 generalizes the techniques to a fully distributed setting. Finally, we give our conclusions in Section 7.

2 RELATED WORK

Extensive research has been proposed to address the scalability issues of blockchain in the consensus layer [28–30]. While these proposed algorithms and protocols have made some improvements in scalability, the system’s performance still degrades as the network size increases. To tackle the scalability issue of blockchain, various sharding protocols [1, 9, 24, 26, 32, 34, 43] have been proposed. These protocols have shown promising enhancements in the transaction throughput of blockchain by processing non-conflicting transactions in parallel in multiple shards. However, none of these protocols have specifically explored the batch scheduling of transactions within a sharding environment, and they do not provide an extensive theoretical analysis for transaction scheduling.

To process transactions parallelly in the sharding model, some research work [26, 32, 38] has used two-phase locking for concurrency control. However, locks are expensive because when one process locks shared data for reading/writing, all other processes attempting to access the same data set are blocked until the lock is released, which lowers system throughput. Our scheduling algorithm does not use locks, as concurrency control is managed by the scheduler by processing non-conflicting transactions concurrently. In [1] the authors propose lockless blockchain sharding using multi-version concurrency control. However, they lack an analysis and technique for optimal scheduling. Moreover, they do not provide the benefits of locality and optimization techniques for transaction scheduling.

Several works have been conducted on transaction scheduling in shared memory multi-core systems, distributed systems, and transactional memory. In a recent work [14], a stable scheduling algorithm was proposed specifically for software transactional memory systems, considering transactions generated by an adversarial model. Similarly, in research works [11, 39, 40], authors explored transaction scheduling in distributed transactional memory systems aimed at achieving better performance bounds with low communication costs. Authors in work [15] provided offline scheduling for transactional memory, where each transaction attempts to access an object, and once it obtains the object, it executes the transaction. In another [16], the author extended their work from offline to online scheduling for the transactional memory model. However, these works do not address transaction scheduling problems

in the context of blockchain sharding. This is because, in the transactional memory model, the object is mobile, and once the transaction obtains the object, it immediately executes the transaction. In contrast, in blockchain sharding, the object is static in the shard, and there is a confirmation scheme to confirm and commit each subtransaction consistently in the respective accessing shard.

In a recent work [2, 3], the authors provide a stability analysis of blockchain sharding considering adversarial transaction generation. However, their solution does not consider different types of sharding graphs, and they also do not provide a theoretical analysis of the optimal approximation for the scheduling algorithm.

3 TECHNICAL PRELIMINARIES

A block is a data structure that consists of a set of transactions. The block header contains additional metadata, including the block hash, previous block hash, block sequence, etc. Blockchain is simply a chain of blocks, where a block points to its predecessor (parent) through its hash, which makes them immutable. A blockchain is essentially implemented as a decentralized peer-to-peer ledger where the blockchain is replicated across multiple interconnected nodes.

3.1 Blockchain Sharding Model

We consider blockchain sharding model which is similar to [1–3, 26], consisting of n nodes which are partitioned into s shards S_1, S_2, \dots, S_s such that $S_i \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$, for $i \neq j$, $S_i \cap S_j = \emptyset$, $n = \sum_i |S_i|$, and $n_i = |S_i|$ denotes the number of nodes in shard S_i . Let $G_s = (V, E, w)$ denote a weighed graphs of shards, where $V = \{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_s\}$, and the edges E correspond to the connections between the shards, and the weight represents the distance between the shards.

Shards communicate with each other via message passing, and here, we are not focusing on optimizing the message size. Moreover, all honest nodes in a shard agree on each message before transmission (e.g. running the PBFT [19] consensus algorithm within the shard). Similar to work in [2, 3, 26, 27], we assume that we are given a *cluster-sending* protocol for reliable and secure communication between shards, satisfying the following properties for sending data \mathfrak{D} from shard S_x to shard S_y :

- Shard S_x sends \mathfrak{D} to S_y if there is an agreement among the honest nodes in S_x to send \mathfrak{D} ;
- All honest nodes in recipient shard S_y will receive the same data \mathfrak{D} ;
- All non-faulty nodes in sender shard S_x receive confirmation of data \mathfrak{D} receipt.

We assume that the above cluster-sending properties between two shards at unit distance are guaranteed to be satisfied within a single communication *round*. We assume that the communication is synchronous and time is divided into rounds. Moreover, the distance between two shards is measured as the number of rounds required to send a message from one shard to another over the graph G_s . Note that some of the messages need to propagate through multiple shards in G_s .

Similar to work in [2, 3], for secure inter-shard communication, we use a broadcast-based protocol that can operate in a system with Byzantine failures [27]. For the communication between shard

S_1 and S_2 , shard S_1 uses a consensus protocol to reach agreement on a value v . Then, a set $M_1 \subseteq S_1$ of $f_1 + 1$ nodes in S_1 and a set $M_2 \subseteq S_2$ of $f_2 + 1$ nodes in S_2 are chosen, where f_i is the number of faulty nodes in shard S_i . Finally, each node in M_1 is instructed to broadcast v to all nodes in M_2 . Due to the size of M_1 and M_2 , at least one non-faulty node in S_1 will send a value to a non-faulty node in S_2 , which is sufficient to receipt and confirmation of v in S_2 .

Each shard consists of a local blockchain (which is part of the global blockchain) according to the subtransactions it receives and commits. We use f_i to represent the number of Byzantine nodes in shard S_i . To guarantee consensus on the current state of the local blockchain, we assume that every shard executes the PBFT [19] consensus algorithm. In order to achieve Byzantine fault tolerance, each shard S_i consists of $n_i > 3f_i$ nodes, where n_i is the total number of nodes in S_i .

Suppose we have a set of shared accounts \mathcal{O} (which we also call *objects*). Similar to previous work in [1, 2, 26], we assume that each shard is responsible for a specific subset of the shared objects (accounts). To be more specific, \mathcal{O} is split into disjoint subsets $\mathcal{O}_1, \dots, \mathcal{O}_s$, where the set of items under the control of shard S_i is represented by \mathcal{O}_i . Every shard S_i keeps track of local subtransactions that use its corresponding \mathcal{O}_i to access objects.

We assume that shards are connected in a communication graph, and the diameter of the graph is D . Moreover, we assume that the distance between the transaction and its accessing objects are in ranges from 1 to $d \leq D$.

3.2 Transactions and Subtransactions

Let's consider a set of transactions $\mathcal{T} = \{T_1, T_2, \dots\}$ that are distributed across different shards. Let's say a transaction T_i resides in a node v_{T_i} within the system. The *home shard* of T_i is the shard containing v_{T_i} . In this work, we consider the batch transactions that are already in the shard and need to proceed.

Similar to work in [1–3, 26], we define a transaction T_i as a group of subtransactions $T_{i,a_1}, \dots, T_{i,a_j}$. Each subtransaction T_{i,a_l} accesses objects only in \mathcal{O}_{a_l} and is associated with shard S_{a_l} . Therefore, each subtransaction T_{i,a_l} has a respective *destination shard* S_{a_l} . The home shard of T_i sends subtransaction T_{i,a_l} to shard S_{a_l} for processing, where it is appended to the local blockchain of S_{a_l} . The subtransactions within a transaction T_i are independent, meaning they do not conflict and can be processed concurrently. Like previous work in [2, 3, 26], each subtransaction T_{i,a_l} consists of two parts: (i) a condition check, where it verifies whether a condition of the objects in \mathcal{O}_{a_l} is satisfied, and (ii) the main action, where it updates the values of the objects in \mathcal{O}_{a_l} .

EXAMPLE 1. Consider a transaction T_1 that involves read-write operations on accounts with certain conditions. For instance, let T_1 be “Transfer 3000 from Ray’s account to Alex’s account if Ray has 8000, Alex has 500 and Balen has 700”. The home shard of T_1 divides this transaction into three subtransactions $T_{1,r}, T_{1,a}, T_{1,b}$, where the destination shards $S_r, S_a,$ and S_b handle Ray’s, Alex’s, and Balen’s accounts respectively:

- $T_{1,r}$ - condition: “Check if Ray has 8000”
- action: “Deduct 3000 from Ray’s account”
- $T_{1,a}$ - condition: “Check if Alex has 500”

- action: “Add 3000 to Alex’s account”
- $T_{1,b}$ - condition: “Check if Balen has 700”

The home shard of T_1 sends the subtransactions to their respective destination shards. If the conditions are met (for example, in $T_{1,b}$ if Balen has 700) and the transactions are valid (for example, in $T_{1,r}$ if Ray indeed has 3000 in the account to be deducted), then the destination shards are prepared to commit the subtransactions in the local blockchains, which implies the entire transaction T_1 implicitly commits as well. However, if any of the conditions in the subtransactions are not met or the subtransactions are invalid, then all the subtransactions must abort (i.e., they are not added to the local blockchains), resulting in the abortion of T_1 as well.

DEFINITION 1 (CONFLICT). *Transactions T_i and T_j are said to be conflict if they access the same object $o_z \in \mathcal{O}$ and at least one of these transactions writes (updates) the value of object o_z .*

Transactions that conflict should be processed in a sequential manner to guarantee atomic object update. In such a case, their respective subtransactions should serialize in the exact same order in every involved shard. To resolve the conflict between two transactions T_i and T_j while accessing an object o_z , we schedule them one after another in such a way that T_i executes before T_j or vice versa.

4 CENTRALIZED SCHEDULER

We consider a shard graph G_s built from s shards, where a set of transactions \mathcal{T} and a set of objects \mathcal{O} are distributed across the G_s . In this centralized scheduler, we consider one shard as the *leader shard* ℓ , which has global knowledge of the transactions that need to be processed. The leader shard runs a greedy coloring algorithm to schedule transactions in a conflict-free manner. The parameters (G_s, \mathcal{T}, ℓ) are given as input to the algorithm, which then produces a schedule and processes the set of transactions \mathcal{T} . The details appear in Algorithm 1.

Consider each transaction $T_i \in \mathcal{T}$ accesses k objects from a set of objects \mathcal{O} . Suppose $G_{\mathcal{T}}$ is the transactions interference (conflict) graph where each node represents a transaction and an edge between two nodes correspond to a conflict between them. The conflict occurs when the respective transactions try to access the same account (object) $o_j \in \mathcal{O}$ in the same shard. In Phase 1 of Algorithm 1, our scheduler schedules these transactions using a greedy vertex coloring of $G_{\mathcal{T}}$, which assigns execution times to each transaction based on the coloring of $G_{\mathcal{T}}$. A valid coloring of $G_{\mathcal{T}}$ assigns a unique positive integer to each transaction such that two adjacent transactions (conflicting transactions) receive different colors. The colors correspond to the distinct time steps (also called rounds) where the respective transactions are processed for commit. For each color, our algorithm takes four steps to confirm and commit the transaction in each destination shard, which is also shown in Phase 2 of Algorithm 1. We continue to describe each phase of the algorithm as follows:

Phase 1: In this phase, each home shard of transaction $T_i \in \mathcal{T}$ sends its transaction information to the leader shard ℓ . Then, the leader shard constructs the transactions conflict graph $G_{\mathcal{T}}$ and runs the greedy coloring algorithm on $G_{\mathcal{T}}$. The greedy coloring algorithm assigns the colors to each transaction of $G_{\mathcal{T}}$ using at

Algorithm 1: CENTRALIZEDSCHEDULER (G_s, \mathcal{T}, ℓ)

```

1 // txn: transaction; txns: transactions
  Input : Shard graph  $G_s$ ; set of txns  $\mathcal{T}$  that need to be processed
         in  $G_s$ ;  $\ell$  is the leader shard for txns  $\mathcal{T}$ ;

2 // Phase 1: Graph Coloring and determining schedule
3 Home shard of each txn  $T_i \in \mathcal{T}$  shares the txn information with
  the leader shard  $\ell$ ;
4 Leader shard  $\ell$  constructs  $G_{\mathcal{T}}$ , and runs a greedy coloring on  $G_{\mathcal{T}}$ 
  which returns  $\xi$  colors;
5 Leader shard  $\ell$  informs the home shards of each txn  $T_i \in \mathcal{T}$  about
  the respective txn colors;

6 // Phase 2: confirming and committing
7 /* processed colored txn at appropriate round(s) */
8 for color  $clr \leftarrow 1$  to  $\xi$  do
9   /* Step 1: Home Shard */
10  The home shard of txn  $T_i \in \mathcal{T}$  of color  $clr$ , splits  $T_i$  into
  subtransactions  $(T_{i,j})$  and sends them to respective
  destination shards for voting;
11 /* Step 2: Destination shards */
12 At destination shard  $S_j$ , if  $T_{i,j}$  is valid and its condition is
  satisfied, then  $S_j$  sends commit vote for  $T_{i,j}$  to home shard of
   $T_i$ ; otherwise,  $S_j$  sends abort vote for  $T_{i,j}$  to home shard of  $T_i$ ;
13 /* Step 3: Home Shard */
14 The home shard of  $T_i$  checks whether all commit votes are
  received for  $T_i$  from its destination shards; if true, the home
  shard sends confirm commit to destination shards; otherwise
  (if any abort vote received), the home shard sends confirm
  abort to destination shards;
15 /* Step 4: Destination Shards */
16 At destination shard  $S_j$  of  $T_{i,j}$ , if  $S_j$  receives confirm commit
  for  $T_{i,j}$  (from home shard of  $T_i$ ), then  $S_j$  commits  $T_{i,j}$  by
  appending it in the local blockchain; Otherwise, if  $S_j$  receives
  confirmed abort (from home shard of  $T_i$ ), then  $S_j$  aborts  $T_{i,j}$ ;

```

most ξ colors. After that, the leader shard informs the home shard of each transaction $T_i \in \mathcal{T}$ about the respective transaction color.

Phase 2: In this phase, each transaction is processed based on a computed schedule using the greedy coloring in Phase 1. Each home shard knows its transaction committing time and proceeds to determine whether it can be committed or not. Each color in ξ takes 4 steps for the confirmation (i.e., 4 communication interactions between home shard and destination shards). So, for each color $clr \in \xi$ in Step 1, each home shard of transaction $T_i \in \mathcal{T}$ of color clr splits the transaction T_i into subtransactions $(T_{i,j})$ and sends them to the respective destination shards parallelly to check whether that transaction (i.e. its subtransactions) can be committed or not. In Step 2, each destination shard S_j checks the conditions and validity of the subtransactions $T_{i,j}$ (such as account balance) and sends a commit vote to the home shard of T_i if the subtransaction $T_{i,j}$ is valid; otherwise sends an abort vote to home shard of T_i if the subtransaction $T_{i,j}$ is invalid. In Step 3, the home shard of T_i collects the votes, and if it receives all the commit votes for a transaction T_i from its destination shards, then it sends the confirmed commit message to the respective destination shards.

Otherwise, if the home shard of T_i receives any abort vote, then it will send a confirmed abort message to all respective destination shards. In Step 4, each destination shard either commits the sub-transactions $T_{i,j}$ and appends them to a local ledger or aborts the sub-transactions $T_{i,j}$ according to the message received from the home shard of T_i .

4.1 Analysis for General Graph

Suppose we run Algorithm 1 for the general graph whose diameter is D and the distance between the home shard (transaction) and its accessing objects (destination shards) ranges from 1 to d , where $d \leq D$. In the following section, we provide an analysis of such a case.

LEMMA 1 (LOWER BOUND). *For the general graph, the processing time of any schedule for \mathcal{T} in a graph $G_{\mathcal{T}}$ is at least $\Omega(l)$, where l is the maximum number of transactions that access any object $o_j \in O$.*

PROOF. Let \mathcal{T}_{o_j} denote the set of transactions that use object $o_j \in O$. Let $l_{o_j} = |\mathcal{T}_{o_j}|$, and $l = \max_j l_{o_j}$ be the maximum degree in the graph for any object in O . Then, the length of the schedule is at least l because an object has to be accessed once at a time by l transactions. Consequently, the processing time of any schedule for \mathcal{T} is at least $\Omega(l)$. \square

LEMMA 2 (UPPER BOUND). *For the general graph, the time to process the transactions \mathcal{T} is at most $O(kld)$, where l is the maximum number of transactions that access an object $o_j \in O$, k is the maximum number of objects accessed by each transaction, and d is the maximum distance between a transaction and its accessing objects.*

PROOF. The maximum degree in the conflict graph $G_{\mathcal{T}}$ is at most kl , since each transaction accesses k objects and each object is accessed by at most l transactions. Therefore, the conflict graph $G_{\mathcal{T}}$ can be greedily colored with at most $\xi \leq kl + 1$ colors.

The distance between a transaction and its accessing object is at most d far away. Since Algorithm 1 has at most 4 rounds of interactions between a transaction and its accessing objects in Phase 2, each color corresponds to $4d$ communication rounds. Thus, it takes at most $(kl + 1)4d = O(kld)$ rounds to confirm and commit the transactions. \square

THEOREM 1. *For the general graph, Algorithm 1 gives an $O(kd)$ approximation to the optimal schedule.*

PROOF. From Lemma 2, the time to process all the transactions is at most $O(kld)$. Moreover, from Lemma 1, $\Omega(l)$ is the lower bound, which gives us $O(kd)$ approximation to the optimal schedule. \square

4.2 Analysis for Specialized Graphs

Let us consider shards are connected in a clique (complete) graph G_s with s shards where every shard is connected to every other shard with a unit distance (thus, $d = 1$). Then, from Theorem 1, Algorithm 1 gives $O(k)$ approximation to the optimal schedule.

Let G_s be a hypercube graph [33]. Then, there is a connecting path between each pair of shards with length $\log s$; hence $D = \log s$,

and $d \leq D = \log s$. Therefore, Theorem 1 implies that there is an execution schedule which is a $O(k \log s)$ approximation of the optimal schedule.

Similar to the Hypergraph [33], we can use the same result in the Butterfly networks [33] and g -dimensional grids [20], where $g = O(\log s)$, which also gives an approximation for execution time as $O(k \log s)$.

Hence, from Theorem 1 we obtain the following corollaries.

COROLLARY 1. *For a clique graph with unit distance per edge (i.e. $d = 1$), Algorithm 1 gives an $O(k)$ approximation to the optimal schedule.*

COROLLARY 2. *Algorithm 1 gives an $O(k \log s)$ approximation for Hypercube, Butterfly, and g -dimensional grids graph, where $g = O(\log s)$.*

5 CENTRALIZED SCHEDULER WITH BUCKETS

In the Centralized scheduler (Algorithm 1), a single shard (the leader shard) colors the transactions and determines the schedule. We propose an alternative algorithm that uses buckets to organize transactions based on the distances between the transaction and its accessed objects. This approach offers improved bounds for special cases when the k objects are selected randomly, as well as for the Line graph.

Here, we distribute the coloring load in different shards, i.e., each bucket has its own leader shard, which is known to all the shards and determines the schedule to process the transaction of that bucket. We divide the transactions into buckets B_0, B_1, \dots , according to the maximum distance between the home shard of the transaction and its accessing objects (i.e., destination shards). In bucket B_i , we add transactions whose maximum distance between home shard and its destination shard is in range $[2^i, 2^{i+1})$. We compute a schedule for each bucket. We also prioritize the processing of the lower index bucket transactions over the higher index bucket so that we can get the locality benefits and reduce transaction latency, that is, first, we calculate a schedule and process transactions of B_0 , then for B_1 , then for B_2 , and so on.

The pseudocode of the centralized scheduler with the bucketing approach is presented in Algorithm 2. We assume that shard graph G_s , a set of transactions \mathcal{T} that need to be processed, are given as input to the algorithm. Then, the scheduler provides the schedule and processes all the transactions \mathcal{T} . We assume that each bucket B_i has its own leader shard ℓ_i , which is known to all shards in G_s . First, each transaction determines its bucket, and then we run Algorithm 1 for each bucket by providing the shard graph G_s , set of transactions of each bucket B_i and leader of that bucket as parameters.

5.1 Analysis for General Graph with Objects Chosen Randomly

Suppose each shard contains one transaction that needs to be processed and each transaction accesses at most k objects picked randomly and uniformly from different shards. We use the following version of Chernoff bound in our analysis.

Algorithm 2: SCHEDULERWITHBUCKETS

Input : Shard graph G_s ; set of txns \mathcal{T} ;

- 1 B_i is the set of txns whose distance between the home shard and the accessing objects (destination shards) is in the range $[2^i, 2^{i+1})$; $i \in \{0, \dots, \lfloor \log D \rfloor\}$ where D is the diameter of shards graph G_s ;
- 2 Each Bucket B_i has its own leader shard ℓ_i which is known to all shards in G_s ;
- 3 /* Run Algorithm 1 for each bucket B_i */
- 4 **for** Bucket $B_i \leftarrow B_0$ **to** Bucket $B_{\lfloor \log D \rfloor}$ **do**
- 5 Run CENTRALIZEDSCHEDULER(G_s, B_i, ℓ_i);

LEMMA 3 (CHERNOFF BOUND). *Let X_1, X_2, \dots, X_m be independent Poisson trials such that, for $1 \leq i \leq m$, $X_i \in \{0, 1\}$. Then, for $X = \sum_{i=1}^m X_i$, $\mu = E[X]$, and any $\delta > 1$, $\Pr[X \geq (1 + \delta)\mu] \leq e^{-\frac{\delta\mu}{2}}$, and any $0 \leq \delta \leq 1$, $\Pr[X \geq (1 + \delta)\mu] \leq e^{-\frac{\delta^2\mu}{3}}$ and $\Pr[X \leq (1 - \delta)\mu] \leq e^{-\frac{\delta^2\mu}{2}}$.*

LEMMA 4. *If a transaction chooses k objects randomly and uniformly (out of s shards), then the maximum number of transactions accessing any object is $l \leq 2k + 4 \ln s$, with probability at least $1 - 1/s$.*

PROOF. Consider an object $o_z \in \mathcal{O}$. Let $X_i^{(z)}$ be the random variable such that $X_i^{(z)} = 1$ if transaction T_i accesses object o_z . Let $Y_z = \sum_{j=1}^s X_j^{(z)}$, and let $\mu = E[Y_z]$ be the number of transactions that access object o_z .

Using the union bound, the probability that there exists an object o_z such that Y_z exceeds a certain value c is at most the sum of the probabilities that each Y_z exceeds c .

$$\Pr(l \geq c) = \Pr(\text{exists } o_z \text{ s.t. } Y_z \geq c) \leq \sum_{z=1}^s \Pr(Y_z \geq c).$$

Since each transaction accesses k objects, and each shard has a transaction, the expected number (average) of transactions accessing each object is $\frac{s \cdot k}{s} = k$.

From Lemma 3 (Chernoff bound) for a random variable Y_z and any $\delta > 1$ with expected value μ is:

$$\Pr(Y_z \geq (1 + \delta)\mu) \leq e^{-\frac{\delta\mu}{2}}.$$

In our case, Y_z represents the number of transactions accessing a specific object, and $\mu = k$ (the expected number of transactions accessing each object).

We want to find the probability that the number of transactions accessing this object is greater or equal to c , i.e., $\Pr(Y_z \geq c)$. To apply the Chernoff bound, we set $c = (1 + \delta)k$, which gives us $\delta = \frac{c-k}{k}$ and $\mu = k$. Let's substitute these into the Chernoff bound:

$$\Pr(Y_z \geq c) \leq e^{-\frac{(c-k)}{2}k} = e^{-\frac{(c-k)}{2}}.$$

For the union bound, we sum these probabilities over all objects:

$$\Pr(l \geq c) \leq \sum_{i=1}^s \Pr(Y_z \geq c) = s \cdot e^{-\frac{(c-k)}{2}}.$$

We want this probability to be less than or equal to $\frac{1}{s}$, so:

$$s \cdot e^{-\frac{(c-k)}{2}} \leq \frac{1}{s}.$$

Solving for c , we get:

$$c \geq k + 4 \ln s.$$

We assume $c = (1 + \delta)k$, where $\delta > 1$. Thus, we can take

$$c \geq 2k + 4 \ln s.$$

Therefore, $l \leq 2k + 4 \ln s$ with probability at least $1 - \frac{1}{s}$. \square

LEMMA 5 (LOWER BOUND). *The time to process the transactions in bucket B_i is at least 2^i .*

PROOF. This follows immediately from the definition of bucket B_i , since there is a transaction in B_i that has distance at least 2^i to one of its accessing objects. \square

LEMMA 6 (UPPER BOUND). *If each transaction accesses at most k objects randomly from different shards, then the time to process the transactions in any bucket B_i is at most $O(2^i k \log D \cdot (k + \log s))$.*

PROOF. Suppose $|B_i|$ is the total number of transactions in the bucket B_i . Let $\mathcal{T}_x^{B_i}$ denote the set of transactions in B_i that use object $o_j \in \mathcal{O}$. Let $l_x = |\mathcal{T}_x^{B_i}|$ and $l_i = \max_x l_x$ be the maximum number of transactions that used any object in \mathcal{O} . From Lemma 4, if the transaction accesses the objects randomly, the maximum degree of any object is bounded by $2k + 4 \ln s$. Thus, we can write $l_i \leq 2k + 4 \ln s$. Since all the transactions in the bucket B_i access at most k objects and each object is used by at most l_i transactions. Thus, the maximum degree in the transaction graph of bucket B_i is at most kl_i , and therefore, the conflict graph $G_{\mathcal{T}}$ can be greedily colored with $\xi \leq kl_i + 1$ colors.

The distance between a transaction and its accessing object of bucket B_i is at most $2^{i+1} - 1 < 2^{i+1}$. Moreover, the simulation of Algorithm 1 has at most 4 rounds of interactions between the transaction and its accessing objects for the confirmation and commit. Therefore, each color corresponds to $4 \cdot 2^{i+1}$ rounds. Thus, it takes $4 \cdot 2^{i+1}(kl_i + 1) = O(2^i kl_i) = O(2^i k(k + \log s))$ rounds to confirm and commit transactions.

Thus, if we have only one bucket B_i , then the time to process all the transactions of the bucket B_i is at most:

$$\text{Maximum processing time for bucket } B_i = 2^{i+3}(kl_i + 1) \quad (1)$$

In our algorithm, transactions from lower index buckets are prioritized for processing over higher index buckets. As we have at most $\lfloor \log D \rfloor + 1$ buckets, we analyzed the effect of it to process all the transactions.

Assume bucket B_i is the worst bucket, and it takes more time to process all the transactions on its bucket than any other bucket. From equation 1, if we only have bucket B_i , the cost required for the scheduler to process all the transactions is at most $B_i^C = 4 \cdot 2^{i+1}(kl_i + 1)$ rounds. However, if we consider all the buckets, the scheduler needs to process transactions from bucket 0 to bucket

$\log D$. Thus, the total number of rounds needed to process all bucket transactions is at most:

$$\sum_{x=0}^{\log D} B_x^c \leq 2B_i^c \log D = 2 \cdot 4 \cdot 2^{i+1} (kl_i + 1) \log D = 2^{i+4} (kl_i + 1) \log D \quad (2)$$

Thus, the total processing time to process all the transactions from all the buckets is at most $2^{i+4} (kl_i + 1) \log D = O(2^i kl_i \log D) = O(2^i k \log D \cdot (k + \log s))$. \square

From Equation 1, if we consider only one bucket B_i and B_i is the worst bucket, then total transactions processing time is at most $2^{i+3} (kl_i + 1)$. However, from Equation 2, if we consider all the buckets, then total transactions processing time is at most $2^{i+4} (kl_i + 1) \log D$. Thus, if we use a bucketing approach, then we need to pay an extra $O(\log D)$ cost over the worst bucket. Hence, we have the following corollary.

COROLLARY 3. *If we use a bucketing approach, we need to pay an extra $O(\log D)$ cost over the worst bucket.*

THEOREM 2. *For the General graph, if the transaction accesses k objects randomly from different shards, then Algorithm 2 gives an $O(k \log D \cdot (k + \log s))$ approximation to the optimal schedule with probability at least $1 - 1/s$.*

PROOF. From Lemma 6, the time to process all the transactions in the bucket B_i is at most $O(2^i k \log D \cdot (k + \log s))$. Moreover, from Lemma 5, 2^i is the lower bound, which gives us $O(k \log D \cdot (k + \log s))$ approximation to the optimal schedule. \square

5.2 Analysis for Line Graph with Buckets

We consider a graph as a line graph with (V, E) where shards are connected in a line. We consider the sequence of s shards, where $V = \{v_1, v_2, v_3, \dots, v_s\}$, and there is an edge between two vertices v_i, v_{i+1} of weight 1 for $1 \leq i \leq s - 1$. We consider the position of the shards in the line graph to be left to right. Thus, v_1 is the leftmost shard, and v_s is the rightmost shard. We can also consider mapping the line graph into the clique graph we discussed in the previous section. That means we can map every shard of the line to the corresponding shard in a clique graph, and every edge of a line graph corresponds to some edge in a clique graph, which connects direct neighbors in the line graph. Additional edges in the clique graph that connect indirect neighbors in the line graph have weights equal to the distance between the neighbors.

LEMMA 7 (LOWER BOUND). *For the Line graph, the time to process the transactions in bucket B_i is at least $2^i + \frac{l_i^2}{4}$, where l_i is the maximum number of transactions in B_i that access any object $o_j \in \mathcal{O}$.*

PROOF. Suppose shards are arranged in a line, and each shard contains one transaction to be processed. Let $|B_i|$ be the total number of transactions in the bucket B_i . Suppose there is an object $o_j \in \mathcal{O}$, which is accessed by all the transactions that are in $B_i' \subseteq B_i$. Thus the maximum number of transactions l_i in B_i that access an object o_j is $|B_i'|$, i.e. $l_i = |B_i'|$.

We can decompose the bucket B_i' into partial buckets $\bar{B}'_{0,i}, \bar{B}'_{1,i}, \dots, \bar{B}'_{z,i}$ where partial bucket $\bar{B}'_{z,i}$ store the transaction which access object o_j from distance $[2^z, 2^{z+1})$.

Without loss of generality, suppose the object o_j is in the middle of the line. Since each shard hosts a single transaction, the size of the bucket is bounded by the distance that comprised transactions have to traverse $|B'_{z,i}| < 2^{i+1}$. Thus $z \leq \log l_i$. Now calculate the number of transactions that are at a distance of at least $z - 2 \implies \log l_i - 2$.

$$\sum_{z=0}^{\log l_i - 2} |B'_{z,i}| < \sum_{z=0}^{\log l_i - 2} 2^z \leq 2 \cdot 2^{\log l_i - 2} \leq l_i/2.$$

As the transactions are in line, the remaining $l_i/2$ transactions must be in the bucket index $\bar{B}'_{>z-2,i}$. Consider a bucket $\bar{B}'_{z-1,i}$ which stores the transaction accessing object o_j from distance $2^{z-1} \implies 2^{\log l_i - 1} = l_i/2$. This implies that other $l_i/2$ transactions are at least $l_i/2$ distance from object o_j . Thus, the maximum degree for the object o_z is at least $l_i/2 \cdot l_i/2 = \frac{l_i^2}{4}$ because each $l_i/2$ conflicting transaction needs to be serialized, and they are far from object o_j and need to be travel at least $l_i/2$ distance.

Moreover, there is at least one transaction in bucket B_i , which accesses the object at a distance of at least 2^i ; that is why they are in bucket B_i . Consequently, the total time to process all the transactions of bucket B_i is at least $2^i + \frac{l_i^2}{4}$. \square

LEMMA 8 (UPPER BOUND). *For the Line graph, the time to process the transactions in bucket B_i is at most $O(2^i kl_i \log D)$, where l_i is the maximum number of transactions in B_i that access any object $o_j \in \mathcal{O}$.*

PROOF. Suppose shards are arranged in a line and consist of transactions that need to be processed in each shard. Let $|B_i|$ be the total number of transactions in the bucket B_i . In the worst case, all of the transactions can access the same object o_j . Thus, the maximum degree of the object o_j access by transactions in bucket B_i is $l_i = |B_i|$. Since all the transactions in the bucket B_i access at most k objects and each object is used by at most l_i transactions. The maximum degree of the transaction graph of bucket B_i is at most kl_i , and therefore, the transaction graph can be greedily colored with $\xi \leq kl_i + 1$ colors.

The distance between a transaction and its accessing objects of bucket B_i is at most $2^{i+1} - 1 < 2^{i+1}$. Moreover, for each color, Algorithm 1 takes $4 \cdot 2^{i+1}$ rounds to confirm and commit the transactions. Thus, transactions of the bucket B_i take at most $4 \cdot 2^{i+1} (kl_i + 1) = O(2^i kl_i)$ rounds to process transactions.

Additionally, from Corollary 3, if we consider all the buckets, we need to pay an extra $O(\log D)$ cost. Thus, the total execution time to process all the transactions of the bucket B_i is at most $O(2^i kl_i \log D)$. \square

THEOREM 3 (APPROXIMATION). *If the shards are in a line graph and each transaction accesses k objects, then Algorithm 2 provides an $O(k\sqrt{d} \log D)$ approximation to the optimal schedule, where d is the worst distance of transaction and its accessing objects and D diameter of the line graph.*

PROOF. From Lemma 8, time to process all the transactions in any bucket B_i is at most $O(2^i kl_i \log D)$. Moreover, from Lemma 7, lower bound to process all the transaction of bucket B_i is at least

$2^i + l_i^2/4 = O(2^i + l_i^2)$, which gives us $O(\frac{2^i k l_i \log D}{2^i + l_i^2})$ approximation.

we will analyze two cases:

(i) When $l_i < 2^{i/2}$:

$$O(\frac{2^i k l_i \log D}{2^i + l_i^2}) \leq O(\frac{2^i k 2^{i/2} \log D}{2^i + 2^{i/2}}) < O(\frac{2^i k 2^{i/2} \log D}{2^i}) = O(k\sqrt{2^i} \log D).$$

We can replace 2^i with d because 2^i is the distance between the home shard of the transactions and its accessing objects, and d is the maximum distance between transactions and their accessing objects in the line graph (L). Thus, we will get $O(k\sqrt{d} \log D)$.

(ii) When $l_i \geq 2^{i/2}$:

$$O(\frac{2^i k l_i \log D}{2^i + l_i^2}) \leq O(\frac{2^i k l_i \log D}{l_i^2}) = O(\frac{2^i k \log D}{l_i}) = O(k\sqrt{2^i} \log D) \\ = O(k\sqrt{d} \log D).$$

From the above analysis and expression, we can say that the line graph Algorithm 1 gives an $O(k\sqrt{d} \log D)$ approximation to optimal schedule. \square

6 DISTRIBUTED SCHEDULER (DS)

The scheduling algorithm we presented earlier uses a central authority in a shard with knowledge about all current transactions and the maximum degree of the transaction graph. However, such a central authority might not exist in blockchain sharding since each transaction is generated in a distributed manner in any shard. Here, we discuss a fully distributed scheduling approach using a clustering technique that allows the transaction schedule to be computed in a decentralized manner without requiring a central authority in the shard. We can also view distributed scheduling Algorithm 3 as a simulation of centralized scheduling Algorithm 1, which is described in Subsection 6.3.

6.1 Shard Clustering

In the distributed scheduler, shards are distributed across the network, and the distance between the home shard of the transaction and its accessing objects (destination shards) ranges from 1 to $d \leq D$, where D is the diameter of the shard graph. Let us suppose shards graph G_s constructed with s shards, where the weights of edges between shards denote the distances between them. We consider that G_s is known to all the shards. We define z -neighborhood of shard S_i as the set of shards within a distance of at most z from S_i . Moreover, the 0-neighborhood of shard S_i is the S_i itself.

We consider that our distributed scheduling algorithm uses a hierarchical decomposition of G_s which is known to all the shards and calculated before the algorithm starts. This shard clustering (graph decomposition) is based on the clustering techniques in [25] and which were later used in [2, 3, 16, 39]. We divide the shard graph G_s into the hierarchy of clusters with $H_1 = \lceil \log D \rceil + 1$ layers (logarithms are in base 2), and a layer is a set of clusters, and a cluster is a set of shards. Layer q , where $0 \leq q < H_1$, is a sparse cover of G_s such that:

- Every cluster of layer q has (strong) diameter of at most $O(2^q \log s)$.
- Every shard participates in no more than $O(\log s)$ different clusters at layer q .

- For each shard S_i there exists a cluster at layer q which contains $(2^q - 1)$ -neighborhood of S_i within that cluster.

The clusters have a *strong diameter*, which measures distances within a cluster on the induced subgraph of G_s .

For each layer q , the sparse cover construction in [25] is actually obtained as a collection of $H_2 = O(\log s)$ partitions of G_s . These H_2 partitions are ordered as sub-layers of layer q labeled from 0 to $H_2 - 1$. A shard might participate in all H_2 sub-layers but potentially belongs to a different cluster at each sub-layer. At least one of these H_2 clusters at layer q contains the whole $2^q - 1$ neighborhood of S_i .

In each cluster at layer q , a leader shard is specifically designated such that the leader's $(2^q - 1)$ -neighborhood is in that cluster. As we give an idea of layers and sub-layers, we define the concept of height as a tuple $h = (h_1, h_2)$, where h_1 denotes the layer and h_2 denotes the sub-layer. Similar to [2, 3, 16, 39], heights follow lexicographic order.

The *home cluster* for each transaction T_i is defined as follows: suppose S_i is the home shard of T_i , and z is the maximum distance from S_i to the destination shards that will be accessed by T_i ; the home cluster of T_i is the lowest-layer (and lowest sub-layer) cluster in the hierarchy that contains z -neighborhood of S_i . Each home cluster consists of one dedicated leader shard, which will handle all the transactions that have their home shard in that cluster (i.e., transaction information will be sent from the home shard to the cluster leader shard to determine the schedule).

6.2 Distributed Scheduling Algorithm

In the distributed scheduler Algorithm 3, each home shard determines the home cluster for its transaction based on the distance between the home shard of the transaction and its accessing objects (destination shards) and sends that transaction information to the leader of the respective home cluster. Each cluster C_z belongs to some layer q and sublayer r , where $0 \leq q < H_1$ and $0 \leq r < H_2$; Suppose a transaction T_i with home cluster C_z ; we also say that T_i is at level (q, r) . The leader shard of C_z assigns an integer *color* to each transaction T_i . We define the concept of the *height* for T_i represented by a tuple (q, r, color) . The heights of transactions are ordered lexicographically, and a the priority scheme is implemented. The priority for committing transactions is determined based on this order, giving precedence to transactions generated in lower cluster layers. The reason behind this priority scheme is to take the benefit of the locality to improve the transaction latency. Note that a home shard may have transactions at various levels. Those transactions will be processed at the respective level.

For each level (q, r) , each cluster C_z invokes the Algorithm 1 parallelly to schedule and process the transactions. While invoking Algorithm 1 for each cluster C_z we set the parameters as $G[C_z]$, $\mathcal{T}(C_z)$, $\ell(C_z)$, where $G[C_z]$ is the cluster graph induced by C_z , $\mathcal{T}(C_z)$ is the set of transactions whose home cluster is C_z , and $\ell(C_z)$ is the leader shard of the cluster C_z which is also presented in Algorithm 3.

6.3 Simulating Centralized Scheduler

We can use the centralized scheduler algorithm (Algorithm 1) in each cluster of the distributed scheduler. In Algorithm 1, each leader

Algorithm 3: DISTRIBUTEDSCHEDULER

Input : Shard graph G_s ; set of txns \mathcal{T} ;

- 1 Assume a hierarchical cluster decomposition of G_s , which is known to all the shards in G_s ;
- 2 Each cluster C_z belongs at some level (q, r) , at layer q and sublayer r of the hierarchical decomposition, where $0 \leq q < H_1$ and $0 \leq r < H_2$; the levels (q, r) are ordered lexicographically;
- 3 The home shard of each txn $T_i \in \mathcal{T}$ discovers the position of its destination shards in G_s ;
- 4 The home shard of each txn T_i picks as a home cluster as the lowest level (q, r) cluster C_z , which includes T_i and the destination shards of its subtransactions;

5 /* Run Algorithm 1 for each cluster */

- 6 **for each** cluster layer $q \leftarrow 0$ to H_1 and sublayer $r \leftarrow 0$ to H_2 **do**
- 7 **for each** cluster C_z in level (i, j) **in parallel do**
- 8 $\mathcal{T}(C_z) \leftarrow$ set of transactions with home cluster C_z ;
- 9 $\ell(C_z) \leftarrow$ leader shard of cluster C_z ;
- 10 $G[C_z] \leftarrow$ cluster graph induced by C_z ;
- 11 Run CENTRALIZEDSCHEDULER($G[C_z], \mathcal{T}(C_z), \ell(C_z)$);

shard has knowledge of transactions assigned to it and schedules them in a conflict-free manner using coloring. Similarly, in the distributed scheduler, each cluster leader shard knows all the transactions within its cluster and determines the transaction schedule by coloring the transactions conflict graph.

For example, let's suppose the shard cluster graph has a maximum diameter D . Assume the distance between all the transactions and their accessed objects is $d \leq D$ far away from each other. In this scenario, each home shard of the transaction reports to the same home cluster, and the leader shard of that home cluster determines the schedule by coloring all the transactions similar to Algorithm 1. However, the distributed scheduler algorithm can provide significant benefits if transactions access nearby objects, allowing for parallel processing at each cluster level. Moreover, the distributed scheduler algorithm is based on hierarchical clustering, which needs to pay some constant factor delay due to layer and sublayer hierarchy with a priority scheme.

Moreover, to improve the bounds for the Line graph and for special cases in the general graph when the k objects are selected randomly in the distributed setting, we can simulate the Centralized Scheduler with Bucket (Algorithm 2) in a distributed manner. For each cluster C_z graph (induced graph), we can run Algorithm 2, which will ultimately simulate Algorithm 1.

Due to the layer and sublayer structure, we need to pay an $O(\log^2 s)$ cost over the analysis obtained in the centralized approach, which is provided in the following Theorem 4.

THEOREM 4. *The distributed scheduler has a competitive ratio of $O(\mathcal{A}_{CS} \log^2 s)$, where \mathcal{A}_{CS} is the approximation ratio of the centralized scheduling algorithm (CS).*

PROOF. If the transactions are scheduled by the centralized scheduling algorithm 1, then their execution time would be within the

centralized scheduler from optimal. However, in the distributed approach, the schedule is restricted by the layer and sublayer hierarchy of the cluster, as the lowest layer gets priority over the higher layer.

Suppose we only have transactions with cluster layer q_i having cluster diameter d_q . Let S_q be the leader shard of cluster q_i . Let \mathcal{T}_w denote the set of transactions in S_q that use object O_w . Let's denote $l_w = |\mathcal{T}_w|$ and $l = \max_w l_w$. Suppose each transaction uses k objects, and every object is used by at most l transactions. Thus, the maximum degree in the transactions graph is at most kl , and therefore, the transactions graph can be greedily colored with $\xi \leq kl + 1$ colors. Moreover, the diameter of the cluster is d_q , and for each color, Algorithm 1 takes at most 4 rounds of interactions between the home shard of transaction and its accessing objects (destination shards). Thus, it takes $4d_q(kl + 1) = O(kld_q)$ rounds to process the transactions. Since $\Omega(l)$ is the lower bound, it gives $O(kd_q)$ approximation. Which is equal to the approximation of the centralized scheduler algorithm Theorem 1. Thus we can say $\mathcal{A}_{CS} = O(kd)$ for diameter d .

Let q' be the maximum layer accessed by any transaction where the diameter is at most d'_q . If we only have layer q_i , the scheduler will require $4d_q(kl + 1)$ rounds. However, if we consider the distributed scheduler with the layer and sublayer hierarchy, S_q needs to process transactions from all layers $0, 1, \dots, q'$ and sublayers indexed by r , which goes from 0 to $H_2 - 1$.

As cluster layer q has diameter $O(2^q \log s)$, which is discussed in the shard clustering subsection above. So $d_q = O(2^q \log s)$ and we can write $d_q = c_1 2^q \log s$ for some constant c_1 . This implies $\sum_{q=0}^{q'} d_q \leq 2d_q$. Thus, the total number of rounds needed to schedule all level (q, r) clusters at S_q is at most

$$\sum_{q=0}^{q'} \sum_{r=0}^{H_2-1} 4d_q(kl + 1) \leq 8d_q(kl + 1)H_2. \quad (3)$$

We can replace $H_2 = c'_1 \log s$ and $d_q = c'_2 d \log s$. Let's combine positive constant c'_1 and c'_2 as c . The equation 3 becomes $8 \cdot cd(kl + 1) \log^2 s$. Since $\Omega(l)$ is the lower bound and $\mathcal{A}_{CS} = O(kd)$, we conclude that the distributed scheduler has competitive ratio $O(\mathcal{A}_{CS} \log^2 s)$. \square

From Theorem 4, we conclude that we need to pay an extra $O(\log^2 s)$ rounds penalty for the distributed scheduler (Algorithm 3) due to hierarchical clustering. Hence, we have the following corollary:

- For a General graph, Algorithm 3 provides an $O(kd \log^2 s)$ approximation to the optimal schedule, where d is the maximum distance between the transaction and its accessing objects.
- Algorithm 3 provides an $O(k \log^3 s)$ approximation for Hypercube, Butterfly, and g -dimensional grids graphs, where $g = O(\log s)$.
- For a General graph, If the transaction accesses k objects randomly, then Algorithm 3 gives an $O(k \log D \cdot (k + \log s) \log^2 s)$ approximation to the optimal schedule with probability at least $1 - 1/s$, where D is the diameter of shard graph.

- For a Line graph, Algorithm 3 gives an $O(k\sqrt{d} \log D \cdot \log^2 s)$ approximation to the optimal schedule, where k is the maximum number of objects accessed by a transaction.

7 CONCLUSIONS

We presented efficient and fast execution time schedules to process batches of transactions for blockchain sharding systems under a synchronous communication model. Our approach includes centralized and distributed schedulers. In the centralized scheduler, we assume each shard has global transaction information, while in the distributed scheduling algorithm, shards do not have global information. We provide optimal approximations for the proposed scheduling algorithm, along with lower and upper bounds. Our results represent the first known attempts to obtain provably fast batch transaction scheduling for blockchain sharding.

For future work, it would be interesting to extend our results to the online and dynamic setting, where the set of transactions to be processed is continuously generated and injected into a shard. Additionally, exploring efficient communication mechanisms between shards and considering the impact of network congestion, where network links have bounded capacity, would be interesting areas for further research.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This paper is supported by NSF grant CNS-2131538.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ramesh Adhikari and Costas Busch. 2023. Lockless Blockchain Sharding with Multiversion Control. In *Structural Information and Communication Complexity: 30th International Colloquium, SIROCCO 2023, Alcalá de Henares, Spain, June 6–9, 2023, Proceedings* (Alcala de Henares, Spain). Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 112–131. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-32733-9_6
- [2] Ramesh Adhikari, Costas Busch, and Dariusz Kowalski. 2024. Stable Blockchain Sharding under Adversarial Transaction Generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.04438* (2024).
- [3] Ramesh Adhikari, Costas Busch, and Dariusz Kowalski. 2024. Stable Blockchain Sharding under Adversarial Transaction Generation.
- [4] Asma Jodeiri Akbarfam, Sina Barazandeh, Deepti Gupta, and Hoda Maleki. 2023. Deep Learning meets Blockchain for Automated and Secure Access Control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.06236* (2023).
- [5] Asma Jodeiri Akbarfam, Mahdieh Heidaripour, Hoda Maleki, Gokila Dorai, and Gagan Agrawal. 2023. ForensiBlock: A Provenance-Driven Blockchain Framework for Data Forensics and Auditability. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.03927* (2023).
- [6] Abdullah Al-Mamun, Haoting Shen, and Dongfang Zhao. 2022. Dean: A lightweight and resource-efficient blockchain protocol for reliable edge computing. In *2022 IEEE International Parallel and Distributed Processing Symposium (IPDPS)*. IEEE, 1261–1271.
- [7] Abdullah Al-Mamun, Feng Yan, and Dongfang Zhao. 2021. SciChain: Blockchain-enabled lightweight and efficient data provenance for reproducible scientific computing. In *2021 IEEE 37th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*. IEEE, 1853–1858.
- [8] Andry Alamsyah, Gede Natha Wijaya Kusuma, and Dian Puteri Ramadhani. 2024. A Review on Decentralized Finance Ecosystems. *Future Internet* 16, 3 (2024), 76.
- [9] Mohammad Javad Amiri, Divyakant Agrawal, and Amr El Abbadi. 2021. Sharper: Sharding permissioned blockchains over network clusters. In *Proceedings of the 2021 international conference on management of data*. 76–88.
- [10] Elli Androulaki, Jan Camenisch, Angelo De Caro, Maria Dubovitskaya, Kaoutar Elkhiyaoui, and Björn Tackmann. 2020. Privacy-preserving auditable token payments in a permissioned blockchain system. In *Proceedings of the 2nd ACM Conference on Advances in Financial Technologies*. 255–267.
- [11] Hagit Attiya, Vincent Gramoli, and Alessia Milani. 2015. Directory protocols for distributed transactional memory. *Transactional Memory: Foundations, Algorithms, Tools, and Applications: COST Action Euro-TM IC1001* (2015), 367–391.
- [12] Rita Azzi, Rima Kilany Chamoun, and Maria Sokhn. 2019. The power of a blockchain-based supply chain. *Computers & industrial engineering* 135 (2019), 582–592.
- [13] Carsten Baum, James Hsin-yu Chiang, Bernardo David, and Tore Kasper Fredriksen. 2023. Sok: Privacy-enhancing technologies in finance. *Cryptology ePrint Archive* (2023).
- [14] Costas Busch, Bogdan S Chlebus, Dariusz R Kowalski, and Pavan Poudel. 2023. Stable Scheduling in Transactional Memory. In *Algorithms and Complexity: 13th International Conference, CIAC 2023, Larnaca, Cyprus, June 13–16, 2023, Proceedings*. Springer, 172–186.
- [15] Costas Busch, Maurice Herlihy, Miroslav Popovic, and Gokarna Sharma. 2017. Fast scheduling in distributed transactional memory. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM Symposium on Parallelism in Algorithms and Architectures*. 173–182.
- [16] Costas Busch, Maurice Herlihy, Miroslav Popovic, and Gokarna Sharma. 2022. Dynamic scheduling in distributed transactional memory. *Distributed Computing* 35, 1 (2022), 19–36.
- [17] Vitalik Buterin et al. 2014. A next-generation smart contract and decentralized application platform. *white paper* 3, 37 (2014), 2–1.
- [18] Tyrone Canaday. 2017. Evolving a payments business to meet the demands of a distributed economy. *Journal of Payments Strategy & Systems* 11, 1 (2017), 15–22.
- [19] Miguel Castro, Barbara Liskov, et al. 1999. Practical byzantine fault tolerance. In *OSDI*, Vol. 99. 173–186.
- [20] Mee-Yee Chan. 1989. Embedding of d-dimensional grids into optimal hypercubes. In *Proceedings of the first annual ACM symposium on Parallel algorithms and architectures*. 52–57.
- [21] Yan Chen and Cristiano Bellavitis. 2020. Blockchain disruption and decentralized finance: The rise of decentralized business models. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights* 13 (2020), e00151.
- [22] Luisanna Cocco, Andrea Pinna, and Michele Marchesi. 2017. Banking on blockchain: Costs savings thanks to the blockchain technology. *Future internet* 9, 3 (2017), 25.
- [23] Nicola Cucari, Valentina Lagasio, Giuseppe Lia, and Chiara Torriero. 2022. The impact of blockchain in banking processes: The Interbank Spunta case study. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management* 34, 2 (2022), 138–150.
- [24] Hung Dang, Tien Tuan Anh Dinh, Dumitrel Loghin, Ee-Chien Chang, Qian Lin, and Beng Chin Ooi. 2019. Towards scaling blockchain systems via sharding. In *Proceedings of the 2019 international conference on management of data*. 123–140.
- [25] Anupam Gupta, Mohammad T Hajiaghayi, and Harald Räcke. 2006. Oblivious network design. In *Proceedings of the seventeenth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithm*. 970–979.
- [26] Jelle Hellings and Mohammad Sadoghi. 2021. Byshard: Sharding in a byzantine environment. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 14, 11 (2021), 2230–2243.
- [27] Jelle Hellings and Mohammad Sadoghi. 2022. The fault-tolerant cluster-sending problem. In *Foundations of Information and Knowledge Systems: 12th International Symposium, FoIKS 2022, Helsinki, Finland, June 20–23, 2022, Proceedings*. Springer, 168–186.
- [28] M. M. Jalalzai and C. Busch. 2018. Window Based BFT Blockchain Consensus. In *iThings, IEEE GreenCom, IEEE (CPSCom) and IEEE SmartData 2018*. 971–979.
- [29] Mohammad M Jalalzai, Costas Busch, and Golden G Richard. 2019. Proteus: A scalable BFT consensus protocol for blockchains. In *2019 IEEE international conference on Blockchain (Blockchain)*. IEEE, 308–313.
- [30] Mohammad M Jalalzai, Chen Feng, Costas Busch, Golden G Richard, and Jianyu Niu. 2021. The Hermes BFT for Blockchains. *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing* 19, 6 (2021), 3971–3986.
- [31] Mohd Javaid, Abid Haleem, Ravi Pratap Singh, Rajiv Suman, and Shahbaz Khan. 2022. A review of Blockchain Technology applications for financial services. *BenchCouncil Transactions on Benchmarks, Standards and Evaluations* 2, 3 (2022), 100073.
- [32] Eleftherios Kokoris-Kogias, Philipp Jovanovic, Linus Gasser, Nicolas Gailly, Ewa Syta, and Bryan Ford. 2018. Omniledger: A secure, scale-out, decentralized ledger via sharding. In *2018 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 583–598.
- [33] F Thomson Leighton. 2014. *Introduction to parallel algorithms and architectures: Arrays, trees, hypercubes*. Elsevier.
- [34] Loi Luu, Viswesh Narayanan, Chaodong Zheng, Kunal Baweja, Seth Gilbert, and Prateek Saxena. 2016. A secure sharding protocol for open blockchains. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security*. 17–30.
- [35] Thomas McChin, Kim-Kwang Raymond Choo, Charles Zhechao Liu, and Debiao He. 2019. Blockchain in healthcare applications: Research challenges and opportunities. *Journal of network and computer applications* 135 (2019), 62–75.
- [36] Satoshi Nakamoto. 2009. Bitcoin : A Peer-to-Peer Electronic Cash System.
- [37] Lakshmi Siva Sankar, M Sindhu, and M Sethumadhavan. 2017. Survey of consensus protocols on blockchain applications. In *2017 4th international conference on advanced computing and communication systems (ICACCS)*. IEEE, 1–5.
- [38] Sithu Kaung Set and Gi Seok Park. 2022. Service-aware dynamic sharding approach for scalable blockchain. *IEEE Transactions on Services Computing* (2022).
- [39] Gokarna Sharma and Costas Busch. 2014. Distributed transactional memory for general networks. *Distributed computing* 27, 5 (2014), 329–362.

- [40] Gokarna Sharma and Costas Busch. 2015. A load balanced directory for distributed shared memory objects. *J. Parallel and Distrib. Comput.* 78 (2015), 6–24.
- [41] Dane Troyer, Justin Henry, Hoda Maleki, Gokila Dorai, Bethany Sumner, Gagan Agrawal, and Jon Ingram. 2021. Privacy-Preserving Framework to Facilitate Shared Data Access for Wearable Devices. In *2021 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*. IEEE, 2583–2592.
- [42] Rashikala Weerawarna, Shah J Miah, and Xuefeng Shao. 2023. Emerging advances of blockchain technology in finance: a content analysis. *Personal and Ubiquitous Computing* 27, 4 (2023), 1495–1508.
- [43] Mahdi Zamani, Mahnush Movahedi, and Mariana Raykova. 2018. RapidChain: Scaling Blockchain via Full Sharding. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (Toronto, Canada) (CCS '18)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 931–948. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3243734.3243853>