

Neonpool: Reimagining cryptocurrency transaction pools for lightweight clients and IoT devices

HINA BINTE HAQ¹, TAHIR AHMAD², ATTAULLAH BURIRO³, AND SUBHAN ULLAH⁴

¹National University of Sciences and Technology, Islamabad, Pakistan. (e-mail: hhaq.dphd18seecs@seecs.edu.pk)

²Center for Cybersecurity, Bruno Kessler Foundation, 38123 Trento, Italy. (e-mail: ahmad@fbk.eu)

³Faculty of Computer Science, Free University of Bolzano, Bolzano, Italy (e-mail: aburiro@unibz.it)

⁴FAST National University of Computer and Emerging Sciences (FAST-NUCES), Islamabad, Pakistan (e-mail: subhan.ullah@nu.edu.pk)

Corresponding author: Attaullah Buriro, Tahir Ahmad (e-mail: aburiro@unibz.it, ahmad@fbk.eu).

ABSTRACT The transaction pool plays a critical role in processing and disseminating transactions in cryptocurrency networks. However, increasing transaction loads strain the resources of full node deployments. We present *Neonpool*, an innovative transaction pool optimization using bloom filter variants, which reduces the memory footprint of the transaction pool to a fraction. Implemented in C++ and benchmarked using a unique Bitcoin and Ethereum dataset, our solution verifies and forwards transactions with over 99.99% accuracy and does not necessitate a hard fork. *Neonpool* is ideally suited for lightweight cryptocurrency clients and for resource-constrained devices such as browsers, systems-on-a-chip, mobile or IoT devices.

INDEX TERMS Cryptocurrencies, full-node, IoT, lightweight, memory, mempool, optimization, txpool

I. INTRODUCTION

CRYPTOCURRENCIES are revolutionizing finance by fostering decentralization, efficient cross-border transactions, and creating new investment opportunities. In recent years, cryptocurrencies have witnessed global impact, gaining users and acceptance by major players like PayPal and Tesla [7], and governments actively exploring and piloting central bank digital currencies. Blockchain technology has also driven innovation beyond finance, impacting domains such as healthcare, real estate, freight and supply chains, etc.

Participating in the cryptocurrency ecosystem, however, is a significant undertaking: running cryptocurrency nodes entails growing resource costs (hardware, bandwidth, and electricity consumption). Many novel lightweight cryptocurrency clients have been proposed over the years to address this issue [3]. These clients cater to diverse users and typically prioritize certain node functions over others.

For instance, pruned nodes conserve storage by discarding old transactions. Simplified payment verification (SPV) clients, designed for lightweight devices, store block headers and only request transactions of interest from full nodes [10]. Other proposals include lowering computation costs using lightweight transaction inclusion proofs [26], minimizing state size [35], and reducing bandwidth consumption using limited flooding and intermittent reconciliation of transac-

tions [17]. Most light clients cannot function independently and rely on full nodes for proper functioning.

Furthermore, none of the clients proposed thus far cater to the growing local memory (RAM) consumption of cryptocurrency nodes. This includes the transaction pool, which indexes unconfirmed transactions in local memory for inventory purposes and network-wide propagation. The transaction pool uses map data structures to store, manage, and organize transactions, resulting in memory usage significantly greater than the actual transaction data, typically several hundreds of megabytes. Storing the transaction pool in RAM is two orders of magnitude faster than disk storage [9].

Increased transaction loads substantially increase the size of the pool, which strains the resources of nodes, and results in dropped transactions, processing delays, spikes in transaction fees, and even exposes the network to sophisticated attacks. Additionally, the transaction pool is also a vector for spam and dust attacks. In October 2015, a Bitcoin spam campaign grew the transaction pool to 1 GB (88,000 transactions), crashing 10% of nodes, mostly on Raspberry Pi [8].

In this paper, we propose *Neonpool*, a novel solution that optimizes the transaction pool for resource-constrained platforms. *Neonpool* uses probabilistic data structures to design the transaction pool, which utilizes statistical properties for compact representations of large data sets, offering highly

space-efficient solutions that provide answers to membership queries with tightly controlled error rates.

Neonpool utilizes two key insights: first, we observe that a majority of light clients levy a burden on the network, by piggybacking on existing full-node clients for their proper functioning. Second, we note that the two key functions of the transaction pool, *inventory* and *forwarding*, can be dissociated. This approach is similar to how lightweight clients (e.g. pruned nodes, SPV wallets) are commonly built, by prioritizing one function over another [3]. So we ask the question, is it possible to get the best of both worlds, i.e. design a client that optimizes local memory, and contributes to the health of the network, without imposing a significant burden on existing full-nodes?

Specifically, we make the following contributions:

- We describe *Neonpool*, an optimized transaction pool construction for cryptocurrencies that explores the use of standard bloom filters, decaying bloom filters, and bloom filters with key-value storage to replicate the transaction pool's core function of transaction inventory. It reduces the local memory consumption of the transaction pool by up to two orders of magnitude (400 MB to 2 MB) while still processing unconfirmed transactions with over 99.99% fidelity.
- We implement two variants: *Neonpool-BTC* and *Neonpool-ETH*, individually developed in C++ and benchmarked on two novel blockchain network datasets, each containing 10 million unique Bitcoin and Ethereum network transactions.
- *Neonpool-BTC* and *Neonpool-ETH* are theoretically and empirically evaluated on multiple dimensions including error rates, memory utilization, computation time, and security on popular IoT devices.

To the best of our knowledge, *Neonpool* is the first optimization solution targeted specifically at the transaction pool and local memory. Our results demonstrate a dramatic reduction in memory consumption, up to 200x (400 MB to 2 MB for Bitcoin and Ethereum), with transaction processing accuracy over 99.99%. This solution enables resource-constrained systems like smartphones, systems-on-a-chip, mobile, and IoT devices to run a high-performing functional transaction pool. It does not require a hard fork and is orthogonal to other light clients. *Neonpool* may therefore be combined with them to aggregate their benefits. *Neonpool* can be extended to other cryptocurrencies.

Neonpool helps reduce the cost of running a full node for users. Running a network node contributes to the health of the network: it helps keep the network decentralized, as each node independently enforces consensus rules, and validates and verifies transactions. It also ensures privacy for users unlike SPV nodes and wallets that expose transaction history to external servers.

In the subsequent sections, we delve into the requisite background in §II, followed by the proposed scheme in §III. We analyze and discuss empirical results in §IV. We compare

our scheme with prior work in §V. We identify potential future directions and conclude in §VI.

II. BACKGROUND


A. UNCONFIRMED TRANSACTION POOL

The unconfirmed transaction pool (alternately called the transaction pool) serves as a gateway for verifying and temporarily storing unconfirmed or pending transactions in a cryptocurrency node, while they await inclusion in a block.


Its primary functions include **1. Transaction verification:** All incoming transactions are checked for adherence to the cryptocurrency's protocol rules such as syntax, valid signatures, availability of funds, etc; **2. Transaction storage:** A verified transaction is stored temporarily until it is included in a block. **3. Transaction propagation:** The verified transactions are disseminated through the peer-to-peer network. A verified transaction is only forwarded to the peers the first time it is received by a node, to prevent loops in the network. Forwarding a transaction enables other nodes to independently verify and store them in their transaction pool.

Other functions include transaction fee estimation, transaction prioritization for inclusion in a block, and bootstrapping the transaction pool of a newly connected node.

The components of the transaction pool can vary depending on the cryptocurrency but generally include **Transaction data:** the raw transaction data itself; **Transaction metadata:** other relevant information associated with each transaction, such as the time the transaction was received, the fee it pays, transaction's priority, to name a few; **Transaction indexing data:** to efficiently search and retrieve transactions from the transaction pool, implementations utilize indexing structures like maps or priority queues. They enable rapid lookup, insertion, and deletion operations based on transaction IDs or other unique identifiers, to help optimize the process of transaction validation and propagation.



(a) Bitcoin [15]



(b) Ethereum [21]

FIGURE 1: Transaction count, raw size, and memory usage

Algorithm 1 *transaction pool*

```

1: function RECEIVE TRANSACTION(tx)
2:   if TRANSACTIONPOOLLOOKUP(tx) then
3:     DROP TRANSACTION(tx)
4:   else
5:     if SYNTAXANDSEMANTICS CHECK(tx) then
6:       if DOUBLESPEND CHECK(tx) then
7:         ADD TRANSACTION(tx)
8:         RELAY TRANSACTION(tx)
9:       else
10:        DROP TRANSACTION(tx)
11:    else
12:      DROP TRANSACTION(tx)

```




FIGURE 4: *Neonpool-BTC* Ingress (Where only (Y)es or (N)o is shown, the other implies the transaction is dropped.)

1) Neonpool-BTC

As shown in Fig. 4, in both Bitcoin Core and *Neonpool-BTC* the process begins with the arrival of a transaction announcement through an *inv* message. In Bitcoin, *txHash* is used to query the *mempool* to determine if the transaction already exists in the *mempool*. In *Neonpool-BTC*, the *txHash* is used to query the *bloomtxFilter*.

Nodes may receive a transaction announcement multiple times but only accept it the first time they receive it. In both Bitcoin and *Neonpool-BTC*, if a transaction with the same *txHash* has already been received, it is discarded. If the transaction is determined to be new, the complete transaction *txBTC* undergoes syntax, validity (valid transaction signatures, availability of sufficient funds etc), and semantics checks in both Bitcoin and *Neonpool-BTC*. Then the transaction is checked to detect double-spends.

In both Bitcoin and *Neonpool-BTC*, each of the *inputs*, comprising the *inputtxHash* and *index* are scanned for double-spends. Transaction inputs are validated using the UTXO set. Transactions with invalid or spent inputs are discarded. It is also checked that none of the inputs exist in the *mempool* in Bitcoin. For *Neonpool-BTC* the *dstxFILTER* is queried with the tuple $\langle \text{inputtxHash}, \text{index} \rangle$ to ascertain that the input does not already exist in the filter. If any of the inputs already exist in the *mempool* or *dstxFILTER*, the transaction is dropped, as it constitutes a potential double spend. If two transactions with the same inputs are in circulation, the first seen by a node is regarded

Algorithm 2 *Neonpool*

```

1: function RECEIVE TRANSACTION(tx)
2:   if BLOOMTXFILTER(tx) then
3:     DROP TRANSACTION(tx)
4:   else
5:     if SYNTAXANDSEMANTICS CHECK(tx) then
6:       if DSTXFILTER(tx) then
7:         ADD TRANSACTION(tx)
8:         RELAY TRANSACTION(tx)
9:       else
10:        DROP TRANSACTION(tx)
11:    else
12:      DROP TRANSACTION(tx)

```




FIGURE 5: *Neonpool-ETH* Ingress (Where only (Y)es or (N)o is shown, the other implies the transaction is dropped.)

as safe, while the second is dropped. If any transaction input also (referred to as *parent* or *ancestor*) is missing, the transaction is added to the orphan pool. It will reside in the orphan pool until its ancestor is received, after which it will be re-processed. If the *txBTC* passes the verification process, it is added to the *mempool* in Bitcoin and *bloomtxFilter* in *Neonpool-BTC*. Finally, the transaction hash, *txHash* is relayed to the connected peers.

2) Neonpool-ETH

As shown in 5, in both Ethereum and *Neonpool-ETH* a complete transaction *txETH* arrives via a *transaction* message. In Ethereum, the transaction hash (or ID) *txHash* is used to query the *txpool* to determine if the transaction already exists in the *txpool*. In *Neonpool-ETH*, the *txHash* is used to query the *bloomtxFilter*.

Nodes may receive a transaction announcement multiple times but only accept it the first time they receive it. In both Ethereum and *Neonpool-ETH*, if a transaction with the same *txHash* has already been received, it is discarded. If the transaction is determined to be new, it undergoes syntax, validity (valid transaction signatures, funds availability etc), and semantics checks in both Ethereum and *Neonpool-ETH*.

In both Ethereum and *Neonpool-ETH*, the transaction is then checked for potential double-spends by validating the transaction's *address*, *nonce* and *amount* against the *Trie*. Transactions with an invalid or out-of-order nonce, or insufficient funds are rejected.

Then, in Ethereum, the *txpool* is queried to check if a

transaction with the same *address* and *nonce* already exists in it. If two transactions from the same *address* and with the same *nonce* are in circulation, the first seen by a node is regarded as safe, while the second is dropped. The first seen may differ for nodes on the network. In *Neonpool-ETH*, the $\langle \text{address}, \text{nonce} \rangle$ tuple of *txETH* is scanned in `dstxFilter` to detect any potential double-spends and drop such transactions.

In Ethereum, if *txETH* passes the verification process, it is added to the *txpool*. In *Neonpool-ETH*, the `txHash` is used to add the transaction to the `bloomtxFilter`, while the tuple $\langle \text{address}, \text{nonce} \rangle$, representing the sender's address, and the nonce value of the transaction is added to the `dstxFilter`. Finally, the complete transaction is relayed to a random fraction of connected peers.

B. EGRESS

Transactions are removed from the unconfirmed transaction pool for various reasons, such as inclusion in a block, limited transaction pool capacity, transaction expiry, fee priority or running out of gas (in Ethereum), replacement by a newer version that offers a higher fee, invalid or conflicting transaction or chain reorganization event at the node.

We also set a parameter to remove older transactions in *Neonpool*, to make space for newer transactions. This is necessary because we do not perform any deletions on the bloom filter and the load in the bloom filter is bound to exceed the number of transactions it was initially dimensioned for. We consider two approaches: Firstly, the accumulated transactions can be periodically removed by **clearing the filter**. This period may be a fixed hourly interval or based on the number of transactions processed. Secondly, Decaying Bloom filters may be employed to **randomly decay or age out transactions** over time, to maintain an accurate representation of recent data while letting old data expire.

Our work is a pioneering investigation into the feasibility and suitability of probabilistic data structures for transaction pool construction. Based on the core function of the transaction pool, we require a data structure with the following properties: can answer membership queries, can let old transactions expire to make way for more recent ones, and to ensure double spend protection key-value support is also required. While there are more than a dozen variants of bloom filters available in the literature, we start by using the most basic ones that meet our requirements and are widely understood. As proof-of-concept, we evaluate these in IV and gain greater insight into the theoretical limitations of each data structure. Further optimizations will be explored in an extension study.

C. SCALING NEONPOOL

We next discuss a strategy to help *Neonpool* scale to increasing transaction loads: We initialize a counter to track total number of transactions in `bloomTxFilter`, and as soon as filter capacity is exceeded, additional bloom filters are generated recursively as per demand [31] [32]. The user

can tweak the filter capacity parameter as per the resources available at the node. The filters can then expire in the order of their age at defined intervals. New filters can be generated repeatedly if congestion persists.

IV. EXPERIMENTS, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section comprehensively evaluates *Neonpool-BTC* and *Neonpool-ETH* in comparison to *Bitcoin mempool* and *Ethereum txpool* respectively, on multiple dimensions including error rates, memory utilization, computation time, and security, on popular IoT devices.

A. DATA SET, IMPLEMENTATION, AND METHODOLOGY

We record *ingress* and *egress* transactions in the transaction pool in JSON format (for raw transaction structure in Bitcoin and Ethereum, see [11] [33]) to allow us to reconstruct the transaction pool state at the client and replay network activity for simulation purposes. Our data set also includes all transactions (for Bitcoin inventory and Ethereum transaction message structure see [36] [34]) received over the network stored in CSV format. For Bitcoin, we run an instrumented version of Bitcoin Core modifying `txmempool.cpp`, to capture 10 million unique transactions (around 30 million transaction announcements over ~ 30 days). Similarly, for Ethereum, we run an instrumented version of Geth, modifying `txpool.go`, to capture 10 million unique transactions (around 13 million transactions over ~ 10 days).

We individually develop a simulation for *Bitcoin mempool* and *Ethereum txpool* using map data structures, with high-level pseudocode as described in Algo 2, and for *Neonpool-BTC* and *Neonpool-ETH* as described in Fig. 4 and 5. We replay transactions in each data set to reconstruct the *Bitcoin mempool* and *Ethereum txpool* over 30 and 10 days respectively. The simulated *Bitcoin mempool* and the *Ethereum txpool* act as the ground truth, and running it in parallel with *Neonpool-BTC* and *Neonpool-ETH* helps us evaluate how our scheme performs. Our dataset and C++ code are publicly accessible. For bloom filters and variants, we employ the Berkeley libbf library [20] which incorporates the H_{3exp} hash functions.

We perform independent queries on *Neonpool* and the transaction pool at each *ingress* transaction in our data set. The responses are recorded at each stage. The responses may diverge from the ground truth owing to the probabilistic nature of bloom filters. We discuss how these false positives affect our scheme and offer a quantitative analysis.

B. EVALUATION METRICS

The responses obtained from the `bloomtxFilter` can be categorized as **True Positive (TP)**: a positive instance correctly classified as positive; **True Negative (TN)**: a negative instance correctly classified as negative; **False Positive (FP)**: a negative instance incorrectly classified as positive.

In the context of an *ingress* event, the following implications hold $TP_{ingress}$: the transaction already exists in the pool and will be discarded correctly. $TN_{ingress}$: the

Expiry Hours(h)/ Decay(d)	Rejected Transactions			Redundant Transactions		
	500 kB FPR/Num	1 MB FPR/Num	2 MB FPR/Num	500 kB FNR/Num	1 MB FNR/Num	2 MB FNR/Num
None	8.06E01 / 26897923	7.43E01 / 25191220	6.82E01 / 23508643	0/0	0/0	0/0
h=48	5.20E-02 / 1650093	2.08E-02 / 658984	3.77E-03 / 119770	1.08E-03 / 34309	1.17E-03 / 37060	1.21E-03 / 38510
h=24	9.03E-03 / 286612	1.94E-03 / 61577	6.22E-04 / 19735	1.77E-03 / 56112	1.79E-03 / 56905	1.80E-03 / 57057
h=12	2.83E-03 / 89922	9.28E-04 / 29479	6.05E-04 / 19200	1.99E-03 / 63224	2.00E-03 / 63473	2.00E-03 / 63549
h=6	1.51E-03 / 48011	7.32E-04 / 23247	5.82E-04 / 18476	2.27E-03 / 72025	2.27E-03 / 72180	2.27E-03 / 72194
h=3	1.03E-03 / 32575	6.51E-04 / 20680	5.80E-04 / 18415	3.06E-03 / 97205	3.06E-03 / 97320	3.07E-03 / 97333
400k tx	9.80E-03 / 408250	1.70E-03 / 73000	6.00E-03 / 9824	1.49E-03 / 46785	1.50E-03 / 46813	1.51E-03 / 46872
d=16	1.73E-03 / 72561	7.27E-04 / 30427	4.87E-04 / 20398	4.64E-03 / 148179	4.66E-03 / 148905	4.67E-03 / 149097
d=32	3.85E-04 / 16112	7.44E-05 / 3115	1.90E-05 / 794	5.04E-03 / 164708	5.04E-03 / 164608	5.06E-03 / 165318
d=64	1.45E-04 / 6055	2.64E-05 / 1103	4.44E-06 / 186	5.48E-03 / 182864	5.47E-03 / 182592	5.48E-03 / 182790
d=128	1.19E-05 / 498	8.53E-06 / 357	1.98E-06 / 83	6.06E-03 / 207234	6.05E-03 / 206961	6.03E-03 / 206087
d=256	1.19E-05 / 497	4.35E-06 / 182	8.60E-07 / 36	7.03E-03 / 247948	7.04E-03 / 248219	7.04E-03 / 248218

TABLE 1: *Neonpool-BTC* performance for n=400k

transaction is new and will be added to the pool as intended. $FP_{ingress}$: the transaction is new and should be added to the pool, but it will be erroneously rejected. Inherently, bloom filters do not have false negatives. However, because we periodically expire older transactions, we may receive a false negative response in our scenario. $FN_{ingress}$: The transaction has already been added and expired, but it will be erroneously added again.

Hence, the criteria used to assess the performance are:

False Positive Rate (FPR) measures the proportion of transactions rejected erroneously, calculated as $\frac{FP_{ingress}}{Queries_{ingress}}$;

False Negative Rate (FNR) measures the proportion of transactions reprocessed, calculated as $\frac{FN_{ingress}}{Queries_{ingress}}$.

C. ERROR RATES AND MEMORY UTILIZATION

1) *Neonpool-BTC*

The highest transaction volumes observed in the *Bitcoin mempool* to date is around 200k. We dimension `bloomtxFilter` to handle its double i.e. 400k transactions, because *Neonpool* delays the removal of transactions, as discussed below. Using Eq. 2 and Eq. 3, we dimension three filters of size 500 KB, 1 MB and 2 MB with 4M, 8M and 16M cells, having 7, 14, and 28 hash functions, and theoretical FPR of $8.2E-03$, $6.7E-05$, and $5.0E-09$ respectively.

We replay transaction events in the *Bitcoin dataset*. When *Neonpool-BTC* is run without any transaction expiry mechanism, the transactions accumulate and quickly surpass the filter design capacity. Due to overloading in the filter, we get poor results. As shown in Tab. 2, the 500 KB, 1 MB and 2 MB filters report a false positive rate (FPR) of $8.06E01$, $7.43E01$ and $6.82E01$, erroneously *rejecting* around 80.6%, 74.3% and 68.2% of transactions respectively. However, as no transactions are expired, the false negative rate (FNR) is zero.

We introduce expiry mechanisms to prevent overloading of the filters. We follow two approaches: 1. reset the bloom filter at fixed hourly intervals or once the count of transactions surpasses the number of transactions the filter was originally dimensioned for i.e. 400k in our case; 2. employ a decaying

bloom filter that decrements a certain number of indices at random upon every insertion, hence mimicking expiry.


FIGURE 6: *Neonpool-BTC* 1 MB, 24 hours expiry

Fig. 6 depicts in real-time the number of transactions stored in *Neonpool-BTC* with 1 MB filters and 24-hour expiry along with the FPR for 30 days (10 million unique transactions). We also plot the corresponding number of transactions in the *Bitcoin mempool*, the ground truth in our evaluation. The number of transactions closely tracks the pattern in the *Bitcoin mempool*, with an increasing offset, as egress transactions are retained in the filter until the expiry interval has lapsed.

For instance, when the filter is cleared every 24 hours the average FPR, at $9.03 - 03$ is highest for the 500 kB filter, reducing to $1.94E - 03$ and $6.22E - 04$ as the filter size increases to 1 MB and further to 2 MB. For the 500 kB, 1 MB, and 2 MB filters, this translates to 286612 or 0.90%, 61577 or 0.19% and 19735 or 0.06% of transactions being erroneously rejected due to false positives. For each filter, there are around 0.18% redundant transactions due to false negatives. Table 1 shows that as expected, as the expiry interval is reduced, the FPR improves, while the FNR deteriorates.

Table 1 also shows that when the filter is cleared every 400k transactions, the average false positive rate at $9.80E - 03$ is highest for the 500 kB filter and reducing to $1.7E - 03$ and $6.00E - 03$ as the filter size increases to 1 MB and further to 2 MB. For the 500 kB, 1 MB, and 2 MB filters. We observe 0.98%, 0.17%, and 0.06% of transactions being erroneously rejected due to false positives. For each filter, there are around 0.15% redundant transactions due to false negatives.

Empirical false positive rates are significantly higher than the theoretical value, sometimes even more than an order

of magnitude. We theorize the causes: first, multiple works have reported that false positive rates in real deployments are higher than theoretically computed [23] [22]. Researchers contend that this is because theoretical calculations assume that "each hash transformation is perfect" [23] and that transactions "are independent and uniformly distributed over all records" whereas real activity tends to be "clumped" [22]. In this context, Bose et al. prove that Eq. 1 gives us a lower bound on the false positive rate [24].

If we use a decaying bloom filter, we achieve vast improvements in terms of false positive rates. The average FPR at $1.19E - 05$ is highest for the 500 kB filter and reduces to $8.53E - 06$ and $1.98E - 06$ as the filter size increases to 1 MB and further to 2 MB. For a decay factor of 128, the 500 kB, 1 MB, and 2 MB filters observe 498 or 0.0012%, 357 or 0.0009% and 83 or 0.0002% of transactions being erroneously rejected due to false positives and there are around 0.61% redundant transactions due to false negatives. Table 1 shows that by increasing the decay factor the FPR and hence the number of erroneously rejected transactions reduce. This is because the decay average meets the insertion average, and the filter reaches a stable state. However on the flip side the false negative rate increases.

The `dstxFILTER` which prevents double spends, can have implications denoted as TP_{input} , TN_{input} , FP_{input} , and FN_{input} . Similar to `bloomtxFilter`, a TP_{input} transaction should be discarded, while a TN_{input} transaction should be accepted. The error FP_{input} will lead to a genuine transaction being discarded, while FN_{input} will lead to accepting a transaction the `<inputtxHash, index>` of which has already been processed. However, circulating such transactions does not imply a double-spend, as *Neonpool-BTC* and other network nodes maintain the UTXO and screen transactions in incoming blocks to prevent double-spending.

In the dataset, incoming transactions average 40,000 inputs hourly, peaking at 191,947 inputs. Thus it is safe that `dstxFILTER` will have the same dimensions as `bloomtxFilter` and consequently similar FPR. Thus, for a 1 MB `bloomtxFilter`, rejecting around 0.0009% of valid transactions, the corresponding `dstxFILTER` will also reject around 0.0009% of valid transactions. **Neonpool-BTC achieves 99.99% fidelity, handling 300 MB of transactions in just 2 MB, as shown in Fig. 7.**




FIGURE 7: Memory Usage of Bitcoin and *Neonpool-BTC*

2) *Neonpool-ETH*

The highest transaction volumes observed in the *Ethereum txpool* to date is around 350k. We dimension `bloomtxFilter` to handle its double i.e. 700k transactions, because *Neonpool* delays the removal of transactions, as discussed below. Using Eq. 2 and Eq. 3 we dimension three filters of size 500 KB, 1 MB and 2 MB, with 4M, 8M and 16M cells, having 4, 8 and 16 hashes, and theoretical FPR of $6.4E - 02$, $4.1E - 03$, $1.7E - 05$ respectively.




FIGURE 8: *Neonpool-ETH*: 1 MB, 12 hours expiry

We replay transaction events in the *Ethereum* dataset. First, we run *Neonpool-ETH* without any transaction expiry mechanism. Thus transactions accumulate and quickly surpass the filter design capacity. Due to overloading in the filter, we get poor results. As shown in Table 2, the 500 KB, 1 MB and 2 MB filters report a FPR of $7.30E01$, $6.70E01$ and $6.07E01$, erroneously rejecting around 73.0%, 67.0% and 60.07% of transactions respectively. However, as no transactions are expired, the FNR is zero.

We introduce expiry mechanisms to prevent overloading of the filters. We follow two approaches: 1. reset the bloom filter at fixed hourly intervals or once the count of transactions surpasses the number of transactions the filter was originally dimensioned for i.e. 700k in our case; 2. employ a decaying bloom filter that decrements a certain number of indices at random upon every insertion, hence mimicking expiry.

Figure 8 depicts the number of transactions in *Neonpool-ETH* with 1 MB filters and 24-hour expiry along with the FPR for almost 10 days (10 million unique transactions). We also plot the corresponding number of transactions in the *Ethereum txpool*, the ground truth in our evaluation. The number of transactions closely tracks the pattern in the *Ethereum txpool*, with an increasing offset, as egress transactions are retained in the filter until the expiry interval has lapsed.

For instance, when the filter is cleared every 12 hours the average FPR, at $7.43E - 03$ is highest for the 500 kB filter, reducing to $2.39E - 04$ and $5.38E - 05$ as the filter size increases to 1 MB and further to 2 MB. For the 500 kB, 1 MB, and 2 MB filters, this translates to 80758 or 0.74%, 2593 or 0.02% and 584 or 0.0569% of transactions being erroneously rejected, respectively. For each filter, there are over 1% redundant transactions due to false negatives. Table 2 shows that as expected, as the expiry interval is reduced, the FPR improves, while the FNR deteriorates.

Table 2 also shows that when the filter is cleared every 700k transactions, the average FPR at $1.63E - 02$ is highest

Expiry event	Rejected Transactions			Redundant Transactions		
	500 kB FPR/Num	1 MB FPR/Num	2 MB FPR/Num	500 kB FNR/Num	1 MB FNR/Num	2 MB FNR/Num
None	7.30E-01 / 7932070	6.70E-01 / 7282537	6.07E-01 / 6596909	0.00E+00 / 0	0.00E+00 / 0	0.00E+00 / 0
h=48	2.33E-01 / 2529181	1.05E-01 / 1142566	2.95E-02 / 320771	1.05E-02 / 113631	1.26E-02 / 136556	8.53E-03 / 92649
h=24	5.62E-02 / 610328	8.14E-03 / 88437	5.69E-04 / 6181	1.19E-02 / 129414	8.50E-03 / 92339	1.29E-02 / 139987
h=12	7.43E-03 / 80758	2.39E-04 / 2593	5.38E-05 / 584	1.29E-02 / 139620	1.29E-02 / 139981	1.44E-02 / 156081
h=6	5.58E-04 / 6059	5.87E-05 / 638	5.74E-05 / 624	1.63E-02 / 177183	1.63E-02 / 177219	1.63E-02 / 177,219
h=3	3.21E-05 / 349	1.69E-05 / 184	1.69E-05 / 184	2.29E-02 / 248518	2.29E-02 / 248518	2.29E-02 / 248518
700k tx	1.63E-02 / 177428	4.61E-04 / 5012	1.66E-04 / 1801	6.43E-03/69810	6.44E-03 / 69991	6.44E-03 / 70041
d=16	1.54E-03 / 16696	4.72E-05 / 513	2.48E-05 / 269	2.57E-03 / 27924	2.58E-03 / 27996	2.87E-03 / 31216
d=32	1.66E-04 / 1806	2.63E-05 / 286	1.07E-05 / 116	6.40E-03 / 69508	6.41E-03 / 69685	6.40E-03 / 69563
d=64	1.69E-05 / 184	7.36E-06 / 80	6.63E-06 / 72	7.36E-03 / 80010	7.35E-03 / 79896	7.34E-03 / 79742
d=128	3.41E-06 / 37	2.02E-06 / 22	2.21E-06 / 24	8.15E-03 / 88542	8.16E-03 / 88668	8.17E-03 / 88723
d=256	1.01E-06 / 11	9.20E-07 / 10	5.52E-07 / 6	8.88E-03 / 96459	8.88E-03 / 96502	8.89E-03 / 96558

TABLE 2: Neonpool-ETH: Performance for n=700,000

for the 500 kB filter and reducing to $4.61E - 04$ and $1.66E - 04$ as the filter size increases to 1 MB and further to 2 MB. For the 500 kB, 1 MB, and 2 MB filters, this translates to 1.63%, 0.05% and 0.017% of transactions being erroneously rejected due to false positives, respectively. For each filter, there are around 0.64% redundant transactions.

Empirical false positive rates are significantly higher than the theoretical value, almost by an order of magnitude e.g. $2.39E - 04$ vs $4.1E - 03$ for the 1 MB filter. This observation is consistent with *Neonpool-BTC* as discussed above.

If we use a decaying bloom filter, we achieve vast improvements in terms of false positive rates. The average FPR at $3.41E - 06$ is highest for the 500 kB filter and reduces to $2.02E - 06$ and $2.21E - 06$ as the filter size increases to 1 MB and further to 2 MB. For a decay factor of 128, the 500 kB, 1 MB, and 2 MB filters observe 37 or 0.0003%, 22 or 0.0002% and 24 or 0.0002% of transactions being erroneously rejected due to false positives, respectively. For each filter, there are over 0.82% redundant transactions due to false negatives. Table 2 shows that by increasing the decay factor the FPR and hence the number of erroneously rejected transactions reduce. This is because the decay average meets the insertion average, and the filter reaches a stable state. However on the flip side the false negative rate increases.

The *dstxFILTER* which prevents double spends, can have implications denoted as $TP_{account}$, $TN_{account}$, $FP_{account}$, and $FN_{account}$. Similar to *bloomtxFilter*, a $TP_{account}$ transaction should be discarded, while a $TN_{account}$ transaction should be accepted. The error $FP_{account}$ will lead to a genuine transaction being discarded, while $FN_{account}$ will lead to accepting a transaction, the $\langle address, nonce \rangle$ of which has already been processed. However, circulating such transactions does not imply a double-spend, as *Neonpool-ETH* and other network nodes maintain the State Trie and screen transactions in incoming blocks to prevent double-spending.

Assuming each transaction is from a unique account, *dstxFILTER* will have the same dimensions as *bloomtxFilter* and consequently similar FPR. Thus, for a 1 MB *bloomtxFilter*, rejecting around 0.0005% of valid transactions, the corresponding *dstxFILTER* will also




FIGURE 9: Memory Usage of Ethereum and Neonpool-ETH

reject around 0.0005% of valid transactions. **Neonpool-ETH achieves 99.999% fidelity, handling 400 MB of transactions in just 2 MB, as shown in Fig. 9.**

D. COMPUTATION TIME

We undertake some experiments to estimate the computation overhead of *Neonpool*. The map based *transaction pool* in both Bitcoin and Ethereum performs query, insertion, and deletion operations in $O(\log n)$ time, where n represents the number of stored transactions. In *Neonpool*, bloom filters operate in constant time, $O(k)$, where k is the number of hash functions.

We perform simulations on *Raspberry Pi 4 - Broadcom BCM2711, Quad-core Cortex-A72 64-bit @ 1.8GHz with 8 GB RAM*, and *Jetson Nano Quad-core ARM Cortex-A57 64-bit @ 1.43 GHz MPCore processor 4 GB RAM*. Table 3 shows the computation time in microseconds (μs), averaged over $1E06$ iterations, for querying and inserting transactions.

Bitcoin, for querying and inserting a transaction and its inputs takes $20.2 \mu s$ ($2 \times (1.8 + 8.3) \mu s$) on a *Raspberry Pi 4* and $27.2 \mu s$ on a *Jetson Nano* on average. *Neonpool-BTC* with *bloomtxFilter* and *dstxFILTER* dimensioned at 1 MB with $k=14$ hash functions, cumulatively for query and insert will take $20.8 \mu s$ ($2 \times (4.4 + 6.0) \mu s$) on a *Raspberry Pi 4* and $26 \mu s$ on a *Jetson Nano* on average to process one transaction.

Ethereum, for querying and inserting a transaction and the state information takes $17.4 \mu s$ ($2 \times (6.9 + 1.8) \mu s$) on a *Raspberry Pi 4* and $20.6 \mu s$ on a *Jetson Nano* on average. Similarly, *Neonpool-ETH* with *bloomtxFilter*

and `dstxFilter`, dimensioned at 1 MB and $k=8$ hash functions, cumulatively for query and insert, will take $12.4 \mu s$ ($2 \times (2.9 + 3.3) \mu s$) on a *Raspberry Pi 4* and $14.4 \mu s$ on a *Jetson Nano*, on average.

Thus for practical values of k *Neonpool* does not increase computation load. *Neonpool* can scale to support cryptocurrencies throughout to the order of thousands of transactions per second (tps). However, the current throughput for Bitcoin and Ethereum is around 3-7 tps and 15-20 tps, respectively.

Raspberry Pi 4				Jetson Nano				
Bitcoin	<i>Neonpool-BTC</i>			Bitcoin	<i>Neonpool-BTC</i>			
	k=7	k=14	k=28		k=7	k=14	k=28	
	1.8/8.3	2.6/2.9	4.4/6.0	9.6/12.6	2.4/11.2	3.5/4.1	6.0/7.0	12.4/15.4
Ethereum	<i>Neonpool-ETH</i>			Ethereum	<i>Neonpool-ETH</i>			
	k=4	k=8	k=16		k=4	k=8	k=16	
	1.8/6.9	1.6/1.8	2.9/3.3	4.3/5.1	2.1/8.2	1.9/2.1	3.4/3.8	5.1/5.8

TABLE 3: Query/Insert Time (μs)

E. SECURITY ANALYSIS

Here, we establish the security of *Neonpool*, focusing on two main aspects: 1. whether errors made by *Neonpool* compromise its security or that of the broader network; and 2. *Neonpool*'s resilience to adversarial attacks. *Neonpool* uses bloom filter variants which yield false positives and false negatives. However, their effect on transaction propagation vanishes at the network level. This is because each node initializes its filters using a random 128-bit salt, making filters at each node independent and the false positives at each node different. For instance, 99.99% accuracy or an FPR of 0.0001 at each *Neonpool* node, implies that the probability that two nodes drop the same transaction is $(0.0001)^2$, which is negligible. The same argument applies to false negatives.

Additionally, an adversary may: 1. trigger false positives to censor specific transactions; 2. craft invalid transactions that evade verification and validation; 3. generate dust or spam.

Literature shows that any bloom filter can be efficiently transformed to be adversarial resilient by applying a pseudo-random permutation of the input [14] i.e. applying a sufficiently large (128-bit) random salt before forwarding it to the bloom filter. This change requires little overhead and randomizes the adversary's queries by applying a pseudo-random permutation to them; then we may consider the transactions sent by the attacker as random and not as chosen adaptively by the adversary. It is also recommended that a node regenerate its 128-bit random salt every time a new `bloomtxFilter` or `dstxFilter` is generated. The adversary has only oracle access to the bloom filter and does not know its internal memory representation or seed.

Secondly, Eve may craft invalid transactions that evade verification and validation i.e. attempt to double-spend. *Neonpool* preserves the transaction verification and validation mechanism of Bitcoin and Ethereum. With regards to transactions that have conflicting inputs or out-of-order nonce, typically nodes accept and forward the first seen

transaction and the first seen can differ for nodes. It is the job of miners to not add conflicting transactions to a block and the network nodes to screen incoming blocks. Since *Neonpool* maintains complete UTXO and Trie information, *Neonpool* nodes will reject blocks that include double-spend transactions.

Thirdly, Eve might launch a dust and spam attack or simply replay transactions. Dust and spam frequently occur in the transaction. A 2015 Bitcoin spam campaign swelled the transaction pool to nearly 1 GB, crashing 10% of nodes, mostly memory-constrained like Raspberry Pi. *Neonpool* can easily withstand such an attack by generating additional bloom filters recursively as per demand, as described in section III.

Replay transactions are rejected. Already seen transactions will trigger a positive in *Neonpool* indicating that the transaction is already present and thus will be dropped.

F. SUMMARY

The unconfirmed transaction pool plays a critical role in verifying, storing, and disseminating transactions while they await inclusion in a block. We present *Neonpool*, a novel transaction pool construction for cryptocurrencies that instead of storing complete transactions via map data structures, stores transaction fingerprints via bloom filters. We perform benchmarks using unique Bitcoin and Ethereum datasets comprising approximately 10 million unique transactions. We achieve up to two orders of magnitude reduction in memory consumption, fingerprinting up to 400 megabytes of data in as low as 2 MB, while maintaining a verification and forwarding accuracy exceeding 99.99%, with a slight increase in computation load. We also demonstrate its adversarial resilience. We summarize our findings in Tab. 4.

Transaction(s)	Bitcoin / Ethereum	<i>Neonpool</i> - BTC/ETH
Storage	complete	fingerprint
Data Structure	map-based mempool/txpool	bloomtxFilter, dstxFilter
Memory Usage	up to 400 MB	2 MB
Verification	Yes	Yes
Inventory & Propagation	Yes	Probabilistic (99.99%)

TABLE 4: *Neonpool* vs Bitcoin/Ethereum

V. PRIOR WORK

Researchers have proposed optimizations and light clients that reduce the computation, storage, and communication requirements of cryptocurrency nodes while ensuring robust security. Here we present prominent contributions in the literature, along with a comparison with *Neonpool* in Table 5.

Reducing blockchain overheads: Satoshi Nakamoto introduced Simplified Payment Verification (SPV) clients as a lightweight client, which requires download of only block headers and select blocks to verify transactions [10]. However, these scale linearly: Ethereum's SPV client storage exceeds 10 GB as of July, 2023 [28].

Pruned nodes retain only a recent subset of the blockchain. While they offer robust security, they cannot bootstrap new nodes. Ultra-light clients of this type depend on trusted full nodes since they cannot verify transactions independently, leading to security and privacy concerns.

Reducing bootstrapping costs: Kiayias et al. [12] introduced sublinear storage complexity in SPV clients via skip lists, termed noninteractive proofs of proof-of-work (NiPoPoW). This solution checks for high-difficulty previous blocks. Verifying a logarithmic number of these suffices to ensure security for the whole chain. However, this solution is only practical in an honest network with fixed difficulty, unlike most cryptocurrencies that have variable block difficulty.

FlyClient [2] achieves logarithmic complexity, using Merkle Mountain Range Commitments to achieve memory improvements, and a random block sampling protocol to ensure security. This solution works even if parts of the network are adversarial and also with variable block difficulty. However, NiPoPoW and Flyclient still require linear resources, and verifying transactions remains costly, as for each verified transaction, the corresponding block must also be downloaded.

TXCHAIN [26] addresses this issue, using contingent transaction aggregation as a technique for compressing transaction inclusion proofs. Proof of Necessary Work [4] performs necessary computation for system verification within the proof-of-work computation, utilizing SNARKs and Pederson hash.

State optimizations: Bitcoin's UTXO and Ethereum's state trie occupy tens of gigabytes, prompting proposals for more efficient representations: Utreexo [13] and BZIP [9] recommend representing the UTXO using hash-based accumulators and lossless compression methods. Dietcoin [1] splits UTXO into shards, while EDRAx [35] uses sparse Merkle trees for UTXO and vector commitments for the state trie. Ethanos downsizes the state trie by periodically emptying idle accounts [27].

Network optimizations: Graphene uses bloom filters to reduce network bandwidth in block reconciliation [5]. Anas et al. recommend increasing the orphan pool size from 100 to 1000, reducing their overhead by 17%. Other works propose lightweight transaction broadcasting: Strokur uses rateless erasure LT codes [4], Erelay combines limited flooding with intermittent reconciliation [17], and Shrec employs an efficient low-collision hybrid hashing scheme [16].

Bloom filters in cryptocurrencies: Bloom filters have

Scheme	Target	Consensus Model	Integration	Primitive(s)
SPV [10]	blocks	Any	Any	Yes -
NiPoPoW [12]	blocks	PoW	UTXO	Mod NiPoPoWs
Flyclient [2]	blocks	PoW	UTXO	Mod MMR
PoNW [4]	blocks	PoW	UTXO	New/Mod SNARKs
EdraX [35]	state	Any	Any	New/Mod SparseMT, Dist.VC
Ethanos [27]	state	PoS	Account	Mod -
Neonpool	txpool	Any	Any	Mod Bloom filters

TABLE 5: Comparison with other light-clients

been employed for tasks such as generating block summaries and event logs, filtering transactions for SPV nodes, enabling efficient pool synchronization and block declaration, ensuring fairness in block selection, ascertaining unique addresses, and examining privacy concerns. We refer the reader to [6] for a summary of existing applications and some potential future applications of probabilistic data structures in blockchains.

Optimizing the transaction pool: This remains a neglected area in the research literature. In Bitcoin, the mem-pool is allocated 300 MB by default [38]. In Ethereum the default number of executable and non-executable transaction slots per account and globally are 16, 64, 4096, and 1024 respectively [19]. Surplus transactions are evicted. Users can define a custom transaction pool acceptance policy. In a low-memory environment, the transaction pool size can be disabled entirely.

Our work is a new direction in the domain of light clients. Being orthogonal to existing light clients, these may be integrated with *Neonpool* to maximize resource saving.

VI. FUTURE WORK AND CONCLUSION

Our work introduces a promising new direction in the domain of light clients, scalability solutions, and improving the health of cryptocurrency networks. *Neonpool* proposes a novel transaction pool design based on bloom filter variants and achieves a remarkable reduction of up to 200x in memory usage while maintaining a verification and forwarding accuracy of over 99.99%. This breakthrough makes it a viable solution for supporting resource-constrained devices, such as browsers, smartphones, systems-on-a-chip, mobile, and IoT devices, to perform full-node functions effectively. Additionally, *Neonpool* does not require a hard fork.

Our approach, to utilizing bloom filters, in principle, can be extended to other cryptocurrencies. It is straightforward to adapt *Neonpool-BTC* to UTXO-based and *Neonpool-ETH* to account-based cryptocurrencies, tweaking parameters such as expiry time and filter size according to network conditions.

Moving forward, we aim to conduct individual studies for cryptocurrencies, collecting data, documenting their architecture in-depth, and further exploring the trade-offs between error rates, memory utilization, reprocessing costs, security, and computation. We intend to initiate a Bitcoin Improvement Proposal (BIP) and an Ethereum Improvement Proposal (EIP).

REFERENCES

- [1] Frey, D., Makkes, M. X., Roman, P.-L., Taiani, F., and Voulgaris, S. Dietcoin: Hardening bitcoin transaction verification process for mobile devices. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment (PVLDB)*, 12(12):1946–1949, 2019.
- [2] Bünz, B., Kiffer, L., Luu, L., and Zamani, M. Flyclient: Super-light clients for cryptocurrencies. In *2020 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 928–946. IEEE, 2020.
- [3] Chatzigiannis, P., Baldimtsi, F., and Chalkias, K. Sok: Blockchain light clients. In *International Conference on Financial Cryptography and Data Security*, pages 615–641. Springer, 2022.
- [4] Kattis, A. and Bonneau, J. Proof of necessary work: Succinct state verification with fairness guarantees. *Cryptology ePrint Archive*, 2020.

- [5] Ozisik, A. P., Andresen, G., Levine, B. N., Tapp, D., Bissias, G., and Katkuri, S. Graphene: Efficient interactive set reconciliation applied to blockchain propagation. In *Proceedings of the ACM Special Interest Group on Data Communication*, pages 303–317. Springer, 2019.
- [6] Rottenstreich, O. Sketches for blockchains. In *2021 International Conference on COMMunication Systems & NETWORKS (COMSNETS)*, pages 254–262. IEEE, 2021.
- [7] 250+ companies and stores that accept cryptocurrency. Bit Pay, 2023. Available at: <https://bitpay.com/directory>.
- [8] Baqer, K., Huang, D. Y., McCoy, D., and Weaver, N. Stressing out: Bitcoin “stress testing”. In *International Conference on Financial Cryptography and Data Security*, pages 3–18. Springer, 2016.
- [9] Jiang, S., Li, J., Gong, S., Yan, J., Yan, G., Sun, Y., and Li, X. BZIP: A Compact Data Memory System for UTXO-based Blockchains. In *2019 IEEE International Conference on Embedded Software and Systems (ICESS)*, pages 1–8. IEEE, 2019.
- [10] Nakamoto, S. Bitcoin P2P e-cash paper. *The Cryptography Mailing List*, 2008.
- [11] “Transactions Bitcoin, Raw Transactions format.” Available at: <https://developer.bitcoin.org/reference/transactions.html>
- [12] Kiayias, A., Miller, A., and Zindros, D. Non-interactive proofs of proof-of-work. In *International Conference on Financial Cryptography and Data Security*, pages 505–522. Springer, 2020.
- [13] Dryja, T. Utreexo: A dynamic hash-based accumulator optimized for the Bitcoin UTXO set. *IACR Cryptol. ePrint Arch.*, 2019.
- [14] Naor, M. and Yogev, E. Bloom filters in adversarial environments. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms (TALG)*, 15(3):1–30, 2019.
- [15] Blockchain.com Blockchain Charts, 2023. Available at: <https://www.blockchain.com/explorer/charts>.
- [16] Han, Y., Li, C., Li, P., Wu, M., Zhou, D., and Long, F. Shrec: Bandwidth-efficient transaction relay in high-throughput blockchain systems. In *Proceedings of the 11th ACM Symposium on Cloud Computing*, 2020.
- [17] Naumenko, G., Maxwell, G., Wuille, P., Fedorova, A., and Beschastnikh, I. Erelay: Efficient transaction relay for bitcoin. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 817–831. 2019.
- [18] Bitcoin source code. GitHub, 2021. Available at: <https://github.com/bitcoin/bitcoin/blob/master/src/txmempool.h>.
- [19] Ethereum, go-ethereum. GitHub, 2023. Available at: <https://github.com/ethereum/go-ethereum/blob/master/light/txpool.go>.
- [20] libbf Bloom filters for C++11. Available at: <http://mavam.github.io/libbf>.
- [21] Ethereum Network Pending Transactions Chart. Etherscan. Available at: <https://etherscan.io/chart/pendingtx>.
- [22] Gremillion, L. L. Designing a Bloom filter for differential file access. *Communications of the ACM*, 25:600–604, 1982.
- [23] Mullin, J. K. A second look at Bloom filters. *Communications of the ACM*, 26(8):570–571, 1983.
- [24] Bose, P., Guo, H., Kranakis, E., Maheshwari, A., Morin, P., Morrison, J., Smid, M., and Tang, Y. On the false-positive rate of Bloom filters. *Information Processing Letters*, 108(4):210–213, 2008.
- [25] Luu, L., Narayanan, V., Zheng, C., Baweja, K., Gilbert, S., and Saxena, P. A secure sharding protocol for open blockchains. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 17–30, 2016.
- [26] Zamyatin, A., Avarikioti, Z., Perez, D., and Knottenbelt, W. J. TxChain: Efficient Cryptocurrency Light Clients via Contingent Transaction Aggregation. *IACR Cryptol. ePrint Arch.*, 2020:580.
- [27] Kim, J.-Y., Lee, J., Koo, Y., Park, S., and Moon, S.-M. Ethanos: Efficient bootstrapping for full nodes on account-based blockchain. In *Proceedings of the Sixteenth European Conference on Computer Systems*, pages 99–113, 2021.
- [28] Ethereum nodes and clients. Ethereum, 2023. Available at: <https://ethereum.org/en/developers/docs/nodes-and-clients>.
- [29] MSVC’s implementation of the C++ Standard Library. GitHub, 2023. Available at: <https://github.com/microsoft/STL>.
- [30] Bloom, B. H. Space/time trade-offs in hash coding with allowable errors. *Communications of the ACM*, 13(7):422–426, 1970.
- [31] Guo, D., Wu, J., Chen, H., Yuan, Y., and Luo, X. The dynamic bloom filters. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 22(1):120–133, 2009.
- [32] Beyer, K. S., Rajagopalan, S., and Zubiri, A. System and method for generating and using a dynamic bloom filter. Google Patents, US Patent 7,937,428, May 2011.
- [33] Raw Transactions | Ethereum.org. Ethereum. Available: <https://ethereum.org/en/developers/docs/transactions>
- [34] Ethereum Transactions Message. devp2p. GitHub. Available: <https://github.com/ethereum/devp2p/blob/master/caps/eth.md#transactions-0x02>
- [35] Chepurnoy, Alexander, Charalampos Papamanthou, Shравan Srinivasan, and Yupeng Zhang. “Edrax: A cryptocurrency with stateless transaction validation.” *Cryptology ePrint Archive* (2018).
- [36] “P2P Network—Bitcoin, Inventory Messages.” April 2021. Available at: <https://developer.bitcoin.org/reference/p2p-networking.html>.
- [37] Bianchi, Giuseppe, Nico d’Heureuse, and Saverio Niccolini. “On-demand time-decaying bloom filters for telemarketer detection.” *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review* 41, no. 5 (2011): 5-12. ACM New York, NY, USA.
- [38] Bitcoin Network Guide. “P2P Network Guide - Bitcoin.” May 2020. Available at: <https://bitcoin.org/en/p2p-network-guide>.



HINA BINTE HAQ received her Bachelors in Telecommunication (Electrical) Engineering from MCS, NUST, Pakistan in 2011. She completed her MS in Information Security from SEecs, NUST, Pakistan in 2018. She is currently pursuing her Ph.D. in Information Security, from SEecs, NUST, Pakistan. Her research interests include blockchain, cryptocurrencies, election security, and machine learning.



TAHIR AHMAD received his Master’s degree in Computer and Communication Security from the School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science (SEecs), National University of Science & Technology (NUST) Islamabad, Pakistan, in 2013. He obtained his PhD with a European PhD. Label in Computer Science and Systems Engineering from the Department of Computer Science, Bioengineering, Robotics and Systems Engineering (DIBRIS), University of Genova, Italy, in 2020. He has over 18 years of research experience in various national and international R&D organizations. His research interests are in distributed systems security, with particular emphasis on understanding the security issues in the current data-driven Internet-connected world and exploring practical solutions for improving their security and privacy.



ATTAULLAH BURIRO is currently holding the post of Assistant Professor at the Free University of Bolzano, Italy. Prior to that he held a postdoctoral researcher position at the Free University of Bolzano (1st Sep. 2019 - 30th Aug. 2020) and DISI Security Lab, University of Trento (1st Mar. 2017 - Aug. 30th 2019). He earned his PhD. degree in Information and Communication Technology (security and privacy) from the University of Trento, Italy, in February 2017. His research interests include biometrics, access control, the Internet of Things (IoT), Computer Vision, machine learning, artificial intelligence, and data mining. He has developed several secure, user-friendly, and implicit behavioral biometric-based authentication solutions for smartwatches, smartphones, and critical infrastructures.



SUBHAN ULLAH is Assistant Professor of Computer Science at FAST National University of Computer and Emerging Sciences (FAST-NUCES), Islamabad, Pakistan. He received his PhD in Computer Science/IT (April 2019) from the University of Klagenfurt, Austria in collaboration with the University of Genoa, Italy, under an Erasmus Mundus Joint Doctorate Program for Interactive and Cognitive Environments (EMJD-ICE). As the European Union IDEAS scholarship recipient, he also studied two semesters of Joint International Master (JIM) in Computer Science (Dec 2014) at the University of Applied Science, Darmstadt, Germany. He received an MS (Computer Science) degree from the International Islamic University Islamabad (March 2013) and a BS (Computer Science) degree from the University of Malakand, Dir (Lower), Pakistan (August 2008). His research focuses on lightweight security and data protection techniques for smart Internet of Things (IoT) applications.

...