

A Treatment of EIP-1559: Enhancing Transaction Fee Mechanism through N^{th} -Price Auction

Kun Li¹, Guangpeng Qi², Guangyong Shang², Wanli Deng¹, Minghui Xu^{1*},
and Xiuzhen Cheng¹

¹ Shandong University, Jinan, China

kunli@sdu.edu.cn, dengwanli7@gmail.com, {mhxu, xzcheng}@sdu.edu.cn,

² Inspur Yunzhou Industrial Internet Co., Ltd., Jinan, China

{qigp, shangguangyong}@inspur.com

Corresponding author: Minghui Xu

Abstract. With the widespread adoption of blockchain technology, the transaction fee mechanism (TFM) in blockchain systems has become a prominent research topic. An ideal TFM should satisfy user incentive compatibility (UIC), miner incentive compatibility (MIC), and miner-user side contract proofness (*c*-SCP). However, state-of-the-art works either fail to meet these three properties simultaneously or only satisfy them under certain conditions. In this paper, we propose a burning N -price auction TFM named BNP. This mechanism divides the transaction fee into a base fee, which is burned, and a priority fee, which is allocated to miners. Theoretical proofs and experimental analyses demonstrate that, even under conditions of significant transaction congestion, this mechanism satisfies UIC, MIC, and *c*-SCP simultaneously. Furthermore, the BNP mechanism is not constrained by the type of blockchain consensus, making it widely applicable.

Keywords: Transaction fee mechanism · Auction mechanism · Blockchain · Incentive compatibility.

1 Introduction

The improvement of hardware performance, the widespread embrace of cryptocurrencies, and ongoing refinements in consensus mechanisms have propelled the extensive utilization of blockchain technology across diverse transactional scenarios, including data storage and sharing[17,5,6], data asset trading[4,19], distributed learning[18,15], among others. This diverse range of application domains has resulted in an increase in the variety and complexity of transactions within blockchain systems. To expedite transaction validation and maintain the stability and integrity of blockchain networks, transaction fee mechanisms (TFM) have been introduced, representing the fees users must pay for on-chain transactions.

According to [2], an ideal Transaction Fee Mechanism (TFM) should satisfy the following three properties:

1. User Incentive Compatible (UIC): When other participants in the system behave honestly, users will bid truthfully.
2. Miner Incentive Compatible (MIC): When other participants in the system behave honestly, miners will adhere to the rules established by the TFM.
3. Miner-user Side Contract Proofness (c -SCP): Collusion between miners and up to c users cannot increase their joint payoff through dishonest behavior.

In some blockchain systems, such as Bitcoin[11], all transaction fees submitted by users belong to the miners. But this particular type of TFM fails to meet the aforementioned three properties, thereby presenting several drawbacks. Firstly, it lacks fairness, as miners tend to prioritize transactions with higher fees, making it challenging for lower-fee transactions to be included in blocks. Secondly, users may experience suboptimal transaction experiences due to the unpredictability of miners' behavior, leading to overpayment or transaction delays.

To address these issues, Ethereum's EIP-1559 proposal[14] has introduced a complex TFM that includes a fixed-per-block fee, which is burned. This innovative approach aims to enhance fee transparency, predictability, and fairness, ultimately improving the overall efficiency and user experience of the blockchain network.

However, TFMs based on second-price auctions, such as EIP-1559, often struggle to satisfy all three properties simultaneously under the constraint of limited block size [12]. For instance, during congestion on the Ethereum network, EIP-1559 may resort to violating user incentive compatibility by reverting to first-price auctions. Several studies explore alternative approaches to address this challenge in specific scenarios or consensus mechanisms. One notable study, [13], examines a TFM based on the burning second-price auction for Proof of Stake (PoS) and demonstrates its ability to satisfy all three conditions under certain circumstances. Motivated by this research, we propose BNP mechanism — a TFM for congested states based on the burning N^{th} -price auction. Through a combination of theoretical analysis and experimental validation, we demonstrate that this mechanism fulfills all three conditions under the Proof of Work (PoW) consensus. The contributions in our paper are summarized as follows:

1. We proposed a TFM in blockchain system that is not restricted by the type of blockchain consensus, thus enabling its application in a wider range of scenarios.
2. The mechanism, through the combination of a burning mechanism and an N -th price auction, ensures compliance with UIC, MIC, and c -SCP even under conditions of significant transaction congestion, thus addressing the shortcomings of EIP-1559.
3. Theoretical analysis and experimental verification both verify the effectiveness of the proposed mechanism.

The rest of this paper proceeds as follows. In Section 2, we summarize the related work on TFM in blockchain. An overview of our proposed TFM is presented in Section 3, which is specifically elaborated in Section 4. In Section 5, we

conduct substantial experiments to evaluate our proposed mechanism. Finally, we conclude the whole paper in Section 6.

2 Related Works

As blockchain technology continues to gain traction across diverse industries and applications, understanding and optimizing transaction fee mechanisms have become paramount for enhancing the efficiency, fairness, and stability of blockchain ecosystems. Consequently, the study of transaction fees within blockchain systems has emerged as a crucial area of research.

Liu et al.[9]conducted a systematic evaluation of the real-world impacts of TFM. They examined the causal effects of EIP-1559 on blockchain transaction fee dynamics, transaction wait times, and consensus security, proposing new directions for improving TFM based on their findings. Liu et al. [10] addressed the issue of blockchain storage sustainability. They proposed that transaction fees could help offset the increasing storage costs for miners and designed a social welfare-maximizing mechanism. This mechanism models the interaction between protocol designers, users, and miners as a three-stage Stackelberg game, incentivizing each user to pay sufficient transaction fees to cover storage costs.

In contrast to the focus of the aforementioned studies, Landis et al. [7] explored Stackelberg attacks on the transaction fee auction process. These attacks are applicable to first-price auctions, second-price auctions, and the transaction fee mechanism used in Ethereum’s EIP-1559. Their research highlights the critical importance of designing transaction fees that are incentive-compatible to prevent such vulnerabilities.

Unlike the general area of mechanism design, which primarily focuses on bidder strategies and behavior, blockchain transaction fee auctions involve miners’ behavior, who, as auctioneers, have incentives to engage in malicious behavior[1,16]. Building on a detailed analysis of the characteristics of blockchain transaction scenarios, [3,8,12] propose that an ideal TFM should satisfy three key properties: user incentive compatibility, miner incentive compatibility, and miner-user side contract proofness.

Tang et al.[13] extend the TFM in [3] by incorporating a long-run utility model for the miner. Their $BSP(\theta)$ mechanism is shown to satisfy all three desired properties of a TFM when the parameter θ falls within a specific range and an appropriate “tick” size is imposed on user bids.

Chung et al.[2] prove that when there is contention between transactions, no (possibly randomized) direct-revelation TFM can satisfy UIC, MIC, and OCA-proofness (off-chain agreement, which refers to colluding strategies between the miner and a set of users that allow off-chain transfers). They also explore possible ways to circumvent these impossibilities.

Building on these studies, we propose the BNP mechanism, which combines the burning mechanism and N -price auction. This mechanism takes into account the long-run payoff of both miners and users and is proved to satisfy the three properties of the ideal TFM without being constrained by the type of consensus.

3 Preliminary and Overview

According to the analysis in Section 1, Ethereum proposed EIP-1559[14] which introduces a significant improvement by incorporating a burning mechanism. This improvement aims to simultaneously satisfy the three properties of TFM: user- and miner-incentive compatibility (UIC and MIC) as well as c-SCP, under the assumption that the block size is unlimited and there is no congestion in the blockchain system. Specifically, EIP-1559 specifies a base fee for each block, and all transactions within that block will burn an amount of ETH equal to base fee multiplied by gasUsed. In addition to the base fee, users have the option to increase the priority fee to prioritize their transactions for inclusion in the next block. This smoothes out the fluctuations in transaction fees and reduces the need for user intervention in transaction sequencing. However, in reality, block sizes are limited, and blockchain transaction systems are inevitably prone to congestion. This results in the degradation of the TFM based on base fee & priority fee into a first-price auction centered around the priority fee, thereby no longer being able to simultaneously satisfy the properties of TFM.

Building upon the foundations laid in [3], [13] introduced the burning second-price auction mechanism $BSP(\theta)$ for PoS consensus. This mechanism, under the condition that the block size is limited, has been demonstrated to satisfy all three desired properties of the TFM under specified conditions.

Inspired by this research, we propose the BNP mechanism as illustrated in Fig. 1. In this mechanism, all users submit their bids for transaction fees in the form of a sealed-bid auction, and the top N bidders will pay at the N^{th} price. Similar to EIP-1559, this mechanism also divides the transaction fee into base fee and priority fee, where the base fee is burned, and the priority fee goes to the miners.




Fig. 1. Overview of BNP mechanism.

Specifically, transactions awaiting packaging in the transaction pool are sorted by bid for transaction fee from high to low, denoted as $\{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_N, b_{N+1}, \dots\}$, where N represents the number of transactions to be included in the next block. Following the principles of the N -price auction mechanism, the first N transactions will pay at the N^{th} transaction's bid price. That is, transactions $\{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_N\}$ will be included in the next block with the cost of b_N . $b_i - b_N, i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ will be refunded to user u_i . Of the total transaction fees $N \times b_N$ submitted to the blockchain system, $\sum_{i=1}^N b_{i+N}$ is considered the priority fee, which goes to the miners, while $N \times b_N - \sum_{i=1}^N b_{i+N}$ is considered the base fee, which will be burned. If the number of transactions awaiting packaging is less than $2N$, the missing values will be filled with zeros.

Unlike [13], the mechanism is not specific to any particular type of consensus. In the following discussion, we will demonstrate how this mechanism can still satisfy the three properties of TFM: UIC, MIC, and c-SCP even under conditions of limited block capacity and high transaction volume congestion.

4 The Properties of BNP Mechanism

From the above content, it is evident that when all users' bids for transaction fees are arranged in descending order as $b_1, b_2, \dots, b_N, b_{N+1}, \dots$, the miner's payoff function is:

$$\mathcal{P}_m = \sum_{i=1}^N b_{i+N} \quad (1)$$

In a given round of auctions, if a user u_i 's transaction t_i is successfully included in the next block with the cost of b_N , he will receive the revenue generated from having the transaction confirmed on-chain. It's evident that u_i 's bid b_i for the transaction fee is directly related to this revenue and cannot exceed it. Each user u_i has a psychological price b_i^{true} for the transaction fee, indicating the fee they are willing to pay. If the actual transaction fee paid exceeds b_i^{true} , u_i will perceive it as a loss. For simplicity, we assume that the revenue u_i can generate from having his transaction included in a block is equivalent to b_i^{true} . In summary, if u_i 's transaction is successfully included in the next block, he will receive b_i^{true} with a cost of b_N , resulting in the user's payoff function is:

$$\mathcal{P}_u = b_i^{\text{true}} - b_N \quad (2)$$

An honest user's bid b_i equals b_i^{true} . Clearly, in scenarios with a high volume of transactions and congested trading systems, users have the motivation to engage in the following dishonest behaviors which undermines UIC:

1. Fake bid: Refers to the user fabricating a transaction and submitting a bid to participate in the auction for transaction fees, despite having no actual transaction need.
2. Overbid: Refers to the user submitting a bid that exceeds his psychological price, i.e., $b_i > b_i^{\text{true}}$.

3. Underbid: Refers to the user submitting a bid that is lower than his psychological price, i.e., $b_i < b_i^{true}$.

On the other hand, in pursuit of higher profits, miners also have an incentive to fabricate a bid higher than b_N , intending to artificially inflate the clearing price without being detected, which renders MIC unfulfilled. It's important to note that due to the transparency of the blockchain transaction system, the transaction corresponding to this fake bid needs to be genuinely sent out by the miner and added to the pending transaction pool. If this transaction is not included in the current miner's block, it's highly likely to be included by other miners in the future. This implies that the miner would need to pay transaction fees to other miners.

Furthermore, since a miner's revenue is directly determined by bids from the $N+1^{th}$ to the $N+N^{th}$ positions, miners may also collude with users through off-chain negotiations to conspire. This collusion could involve incentivizing certain users to increase their bids, thus allowing the miner to achieve higher profits, which contradicts the requirement of c -SCP.

An ideal TFM should eliminate the incentives for all participants to engage in the aforementioned malicious behaviors. In the following sections, we will systematically demonstrate how the mechanism proposed in this paper, BNP, can probabilistically satisfy the three properties of the ideal TFM: UIC, MIC, and c -SCP.

4.1 User Incentive Compatible

In this section, we examine whether BNP adheres to UIC, ensuring that if u_i bids truthfully ($b_i = b_i^{true}$), his expected utility is maximized, assuming all other system participants are honest.

Based on the payment rules of the blockchain system, any fake bid offers no value to the user and necessitates paying transaction fees. It's evident that without collusion, users cannot gain any profit from fake bids; on the contrary, they would incur losses. Engaging in fake bidding is inherently irrational, as rational users lack motivation to partake in such behavior. Hence, in this section, our primary focus lies in analyzing two forms of dishonest conduct by users: underbidding and overbidding.

Let's delve into the scenario of overbidding, i.e., $b_i > b_i^{true}$. For t_i , u_i 's bid can take on the following possibilities:

1. $b_N > b_i > b_i^{true}$: This indicates that the transaction will not be immediately packaged, resulting in no immediate consequences. However, there's a chance it might be packaged in the future at a price higher than b_i^{true} , which would result in a loss. Therefore, users will likely refrain from overbidding.
2. $b_i \geq b_N \geq b_i^{true}$: Initially, when the bid is at b_i^{true} , the transaction might not qualify for packaging. However, by increasing the bid to b_i , the transaction could become eligible for packaging at the expense of b_N . Nevertheless, the profits accrued from being packaged are outweighed by the costs users

incur. Consequently, users are unlikely to engage in overbidding within this scenario.

3. $b_i > b_i^{true} \geq b_N$: In this case, the transaction can be packaged regardless of whether the user overbids. This scenario can be further divided into two subcases:
 - (a) $b_i > b_i^{true} = b_N$: This suggests that the bid precisely occupies the N^{th} position in the descending order of bids. Following an overbid, all users will be required to pay transaction fees of $\min b_i, b_{N-1}$. It's evident that the cost still surpasses the profit, hence users will continue to abstain from overbidding.
 - (b) $b_i > b_i^{true} > b_N$: This indicates that the bid ranks among the top $N - 1$ bids after being sorted in descending order. Regardless of whether the user decides to overbid, the final transaction fee required remains b_N , and the user's payoff remains unchanged. Consequently, users lack any incentive to engage in overbidding within this scenario.

In summary, users refrain from overbidding, considering the possibility of transactions being packaged and the associated costs.

Next, let's delve into the scenario of underbidding, where $b_i < b_i^{true}$. This scenario can be categorized as follows:

1. $b_N > b_i^{true} > b_i$: Regardless of whether the user underbids, the transaction will not be packaged. Additionally, since the new bid is lower, miners tend to prioritize higher bids, potentially delaying the packaging of this transaction. Consequently, users lack motivation to underbid in this case.
2. $b_i^{true} \geq b_N > b_i$: In this case, if the user refrains from underbidding, the transaction is initially eligible for packaging. However, once underbidding occurs, the situation requires further examination, leading to the following two scenarios:
 - (a) $b_i^{true} \geq b_N > b_{N+1} \geq b_i$: After underbidding, the transaction cannot be packaged, resulting in no corresponding profit. Similarly, due to the lower bid, the transaction's packaging might be delayed. Therefore, users lack motivation to underbid.
 - (b) $b_i^{true} \geq b_N > b_i > b_{N+1}$: After underbidding, the transaction can still be packaged, and the transaction fee for all users decreases from b_N to b_i . In this case, since expenses decrease, users have motivation to underbid.
3. $b_i^{true} > b_i \geq b_N$: Regardless of whether the user underbids, the transaction will be packaged with the cost of b_N . Since the user's payoff remains unchanged, there is no motivation for the user to underbid.

Since transaction fees operate on a sealed-bid auction basis, users cannot predict the specific outcome of underbidding when making their bids. Moreover, during congestion, the difference between b_N and b_{N+1} tends to be minimal, indicating a low probability of Scenario 2b. Additionally, the potential gains are limited, not exceeding $b_N - b_{N+1}$. Without knowledge of other bids, underbidding poses a significant risk for relatively small returns. Considering all scenarios, rational users are unlikely to underbid.

Based on the above analysis, it can be concluded that the BNP mechanism has a high probability of satisfying UIC.

4.2 Miner Incentive Compatible

This section analyzes whether the miner can achieve higher profits through fake bids.

Unlike users, the miner have access to all bids, allowing him to precisely evaluate the potential profits from various fake bids and choose the most lucrative option. We denote the fake bid chosen by the miner as b_{fake} . As previously discussed, in the BNP mechanism, user expenses are determined by the N^{th} bid, while miner profits are determined by bids ranging from the $(N + 1)^{th}$ to the $2N^{th}$ bid. Clearly, the miner would not choose to submit a bid lower than b_{2N} , as it would have no impact on his profits and would instead entail paying transaction fees for that transaction in the future. Moreover, we can further analyze the potential fake bids that the miner may consider in the following scenarios:

1. $b_N > b_{fake} \geq b_{2N}$: In this scenario, the fake bid submitted by the miner would displace b_{2N} from the previous top $2N$ bids. The miner's payoff becomes $\mathcal{P}_m = \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} b_{i+N} + b_{fake}$. Comparing this with Equation 1, it's evident that the fake bid increases the miner's profit by $b_{fake} - b_{2N}$. Clearly, to maximize profit, the miner would seek to increase b_{fake} as much as possible without exceeding b_N , namely $b_{fake} \rightarrow b_N$. However, as previously mentioned, this transaction will be packaged by other miners in the future, leading the miner to pay a transaction fee denoted as b'_N . In other words, the profit brought by the miner's fake bid is $\mathcal{P}_m^{fake} = b_{fake} - b_{2N} - b'_N$. If no new transactions enter the system before the next block is formed, the new $(N + 1)^{th}$ bid will be b_{2N} . Conversely, if any new transaction enters the system, and if its bid is higher, it will further push back the ranking of b_{2N} . Consequently, $b'_N > b_{2N}$ can be deduced. Employing the inequality manipulation further yields $\mathcal{P}_m^{fake} < b_N - 2b_{2N}$. During congestion, the difference between b_N and b_{2N} is often small, making $b_N < 2b_{2N}$ likely to hold. This implies that \mathcal{P}_m^{fake} is likely to be less than 0, meaning that in the long run, miners are unlikely to gain positive profits from engaging in fake bidding behavior.
2. $b_{N-1} \geq b_{fake} \geq b_N$: In this scenario, the fake bid submitted by the miner displaces b_N from the previous top N bids, resulting in users needing to pay a transaction fee of b_{fake} instead of b_N . Simultaneously, the miner must also pay b_{fake} as a transaction fee for this fake bid. As b_N becomes the $N + 1^{th}$ bid in the sequence of all bids, the miner's payoff function becomes $(\sum_0^{N-1} b_{N+i}) - b_{fake}$. Comparing this with Equation 1, it's evident that the profit brought by the fake bid for the miner is $\mathcal{P}_m^{fake} = b_N - b_{2N} - b_{fake}$. Since $b_N \leq b_{fake}$, $\mathcal{P}_m^{fake} \leq 0$, indicating that the miner cannot gain positive profits from engaging in fake bidding behavior.

3. $b_{fake} > b_{N-1} > b_N$: Similarly to the previous scenario, the transaction fee for users shifts to b_{N-1} , while the miner's payoff function transforms into $(\sum_0^{N-1} b_{N+i}) - b_{N-1}$. Consequently, it can be further inferred that the profit yielded by the fake bid for the miner is $\mathcal{P}_m^{fake} = b_N - b_{2N} - b_{N-1} \leq 0$. Clearly, the miner also cannot generate positive profits in this situation.

Building on the earlier examination, it's apparent that the BNP mechanism stands a good chance of meeting the conditions for MIC.

4.3 Miner-user Side Contract Proofness

Finally, this section analyzes whether the BNP mechanism can satisfy the condition of c -SCP.

The primary distinction between collusion and miners engaging in fake bidding individually lies in the nature of the action. In the latter case, miners fabricate a transaction when there is no actual demand, resulting in their expenditure being the full transaction fee associated with the fake bid. However, in the case of collusion, miners seek out users with transaction demands and negotiate to increase the bid of such users. This implies that, following collusion, the expenditure of the coalition comprising miners and users is the difference between the transaction fees after collusion and those before collusion. The reduction in expenditure incentivizes miners to collude with users more actively.

Following the principle of starting from simplicity to complexity, we first analyze the scenario where a miner colludes with one user, known as 1-Collusion. In this scenario, a user increases their bid b_i to b_i^c , potentially benefiting the miner, and the two parties negotiate the distribution of profits. We consider the user and the miner as a coalition and analyze their collective payoff. If the user's original bid $b_i \geq b_N$, collusion does not alter the miner's profits; instead, it might increase the user's expenses. Therefore, miners would not opt for collusion with such users. When $b_i < b_N$, although t_i may not be packaged immediately, it will inevitably be packaged in the future with a transaction fee $b'_N < b_i$. We can further infer that the payoff function of the coalition is $\mathcal{P}_c^{honest} = \sum_1^N b_{i+N} + b_i - b'_N$ in the absence of collusion. To delve deeper into the potential scenarios involving b_i and b_i^c , let's analyze each of the following cases separately:

1. $b_i^c \geq b_N > b_i \geq b_{2N}$: Before collusion, t_i remains unpackaged, but its bid b_i impacts the miner's payoff \mathcal{P}_m . Post-collusion, t_i will be packaged, yet its impact on \mathcal{P}_m diminishes. Instead, the transaction t_N corresponding to b_N becomes unpackaged, and b_N affects \mathcal{P}_m . This signifies that u_i incurs a cost of $\min\{b_{N-1}, b_i^c\}$ to ensure the packaging of t_i , yielding a profit of b_i . Meanwhile, the miner's payoff transforms into $\sum_0^N b_{N+i} - b_i$. The payoff function of the collusion coalition is then expressed as $\mathcal{P}_c^{SCP-1} = \sum_0^N b_{N+i} - b_i + b_i - \min\{b_{N-1}, b_i^c\}$.
2. $b_i^c \geq b_N > b_{2N} > b_i$: This also implies that u_i incurs a cost of $\min\{b_{N-1}, b_i^c\}$ to ensure the packaging of t_i and obtain a profit of b_i . The difference from

the previous scenario is that since b_i no longer affects \mathcal{P}_m , the miner's payoff changes to $\sum_0^{N-1} b_{N+i}$. The payoff function of the collusion coalition in this case is $\mathcal{P}_c^{SCP-2} = \sum_0^{N-1} b_{N+i} + b_i - \min\{b_{N-1}, b_i^c\}$.

3. $b_N > b_i^c > b_i \geq b_{2N}$: Regardless of collusion, t_i remains unpackaged, and both b_i and b_i^c influence \mathcal{P}_m . Consequently, after collusion, the miner's payoff becomes $\sum_1^N b_{N+i} - b_i + b_i^c$. On the other hand, since t_i will be packaged by other miners in the future, requiring u_i to pay $b'_N \leq b_i^c$. Thus, in the long run, collusion implies that the user incurs a cost of b''_N in exchange for a profit of b_i . The payoff function of the collusion coalition in this scenario is $\mathcal{P}_c^{SCP-3} = \sum_1^N b_{N+i} - b_i + b_i^c + b_i - b''_N$.
4. $b_N > b_i^c > b_{2N} > b_i$: Similarly, b_i does not affect \mathcal{P}_m , while t_i will be packaged in the future. Consequently, after collusion, the miner's payoff becomes $\sum_1^{N-1} b_{N+i} + b_i^c$, while the user incurs a cost of b''_N in exchange for a profit of b_i . The payoff function of the collusion coalition in this scenario is $\mathcal{P}_c^{SCP-4} = \sum_1^{N-1} b_{N+i} + b_i^c + b_i - b''_N$.

Upon comparison of the four scenarios outlined above, it becomes evident that $\mathcal{P}_c^{SCP-1} > \mathcal{P}_c^{SCP-2}$, $\mathcal{P}_c^{SCP-3} > \mathcal{P}_c^{SCP-4}$ and $\mathcal{P}_c^{SCP-3} > \mathcal{P}_c^{SCP-1}$. Clearly, to maximize the coalition's revenue, the miner would opt to collude with users whose bid $b_i \geq b_{2N}$, and subsequently, elevate the user's bid to $b_i^c < b_N$ (as in case 3). Analogous to the approach in Section 4.2, the miner would aspire for $b_i^c \rightarrow b_N$, thereby maximizing their profit to the fullest extent. Employing inequality manipulation, we can also deduce that $\mathcal{P}_c^{SCP-3} - \mathcal{P}_c^{honest}$ is likely to trend below 0. This suggests that over the long term, miners collaborating with a single user are improbable to attain higher payoffs through collusion.

When we broaden our analysis to scenarios involving collusion between miners and c users, it becomes clear that the most effective strategy for miners is to target c users whose bids fall within the range of b_{2N} and b_N , convincing them to elevate their bids to $b_i^c \rightarrow b_N$. Likewise, given that users' transactions will likely incur future transaction fees exceeding their psychological thresholds, it follows that collusion is likely to yield a negative payoff for the coalition comprising miners and c users.

Drawing from the preceding analysis, it's reasonable to infer that the BNP mechanism has a strong likelihood of fulfilling the requirements for c -SCP.

5 Experiment Analysis

In this section, we further study the expenditures and revenues under different behaviours of users and miners under the BNP mechanism through experiments to verify the above theoretical analysis. The experimental environment is as follows:

- Hardware environment: the memory used is Intel(R) Xeon(R) Silver 4214R CPU @ 2.40GHz, the RAM is 50GB DDR4, and the storage is 1.5TB SSD.
- Software environment: Ubuntu22.04LTS, Python3.8.18, Numpy1.24.4, pandas2.0.3, matplotlib3.7.5, nodejs12.22.9, mysql 8.0.36-0ubuntu0.22.04.1.

We used the official interactive interface provided by Geth, the JSON-RPC API, to capture all transactions from 7,200 blocks on the Ethereum blockchain, ranging from block 15357273 to 15364473. Additionally, we analyzed transaction pool data from block 19946372 to 19952631, spanning the period from May 25, 2024, 10:43:35 AM (UTC) to May 26, 2024, 07:42:47 AM (UTC). Since this paper focuses on the BNP mechanism’s performance during periods of congestion, we further filtered out the 532 blocks from the aforementioned data that experienced transaction congestion for detailed analysis.




Fig. 2. User’s transaction fee without BNP v.s. with BNP. **Fig. 3.** Miner’s payoff without BNP v.s. with BNP.

We first analyzed the impact of the BNP mechanism on both users and miners. We applied the BNP mechanism to all transactions in 532 blocks and compared the difference in user earnings before and after implementing the mechanism. As shown in Fig. 2, the use of the BNP mechanism resulted in an average reduction of 17.08% in transaction fees. In the block with the greatest reduction, the BNP mechanism lowered the transaction fee by 3.9 ETH (a decrease of 93.75%). In the figure, the horizontal axis represents the block number, while the vertical axis indicates the transaction fees that users need to pay in each block.

We also compared the difference in miner earnings before and after using the mechanism. As shown in Fig. 3, the BNP mechanism led to a slight reduction in miner earnings (an average decrease of 1.39%), with the maximum reduction being 65.76% and the minimum reduction being zero. In the figure, the horizontal axis represents the block number, while the vertical axis indicates the revenue that miners received.

From the above experiments, it can be seen that the use of the BNP mechanism significantly reduces user expenses while causing only a minimal decrease in miner earnings.

Next, we verified whether the BNP mechanism satisfies UIC by randomly selecting transactions and altering their bids. As shown in Fig. 4, in 532 blocks,




Fig. 4. The graph of pay-off for users from dishonest behavior. **Fig. 5.** The graph of pay-off for miners from dishonest behavior. **Fig. 6.** The graph of pay-off for 1-collusion coalition from dishonest behavior.

only 138 blocks had users who could slightly reduce their transaction fees through dishonest behavior. In the remaining blocks, users faced higher transaction fees due to dishonest behavior. This indicates that, in the long run, the BNP mechanism satisfies UIC. In the figure, the horizontal axis represents the block number, and the vertical axis represents the change in transaction fees resulting from dishonest behavior.

Fig. 5 demonstrates that the BNP mechanism satisfies MIC. In the figure, the horizontal axis represents the block number, and the vertical axis represents the gains for miners from dishonest behavior. In 532 blocks, only 165 blocks had miners who could achieve higher payoffs through dishonest behavior. Overall, dishonest behavior led to an average reduction of 0.01 ETH in miner earnings per block. This indicates that, in the long run, the BNP mechanism satisfies MIC.

As shown in Fig. 6, in 532 blocks, there are 208 blocks where the miner-user coalition can slightly increase its gain through dishonest behavior. In the remaining 324 blocks, the coalition has lower gains due to dishonest behavior (the final gasPrice is reduced by 0.74gWei per block on average). This shows that in the long run, the BNP mechanism satisfies 1-SCP. In the figure, the horizontal axis represents the block number and the vertical axis represents the change in transaction fees caused by dishonest behavior.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a burning N -price auction TFM named BNP, which divides the transaction fee submitted by users into a base fee that is burned and a priority fee that goes to the miners. This mechanism is proven to satisfy UIC, MIC, and c -SCP even under conditions of transaction congestion, effectively addressing the shortcomings of EIP-1559. Experimental results demonstrate that the BNP mechanism reduces user expenses by an average of 17.8%, while only slightly decreasing miner earnings by an average of 1.39%. Furthermore, the BNP mechanism is not constrained by the type of blockchain consensus, making it applicable to a wider range of use cases.

References

1. Chen, X., Simchi-Levi, D., Zhao, Z., Zhou, Y.: Bayesian mechanism design for blockchain transaction fee allocation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.13099 (2022)
2. Chung, H., Roughgarden, T., Shi, E.: Collusion-resilience in transaction fee mechanism design (2024)
3. Chung, H., Shi, E.: Foundations of transaction fee mechanism design (2022)
4. Dai, W., Dai, C., Choo, K.K.R., Cui, C., Zou, D., Jin, H.: Sdte: A secure blockchain-based data trading ecosystem. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security* **15**, 725–737 (2019)
5. Guo, H., Xu, M., Zhang, J., Liu, C., Ranjan, R., Yu, D., Cheng, X.: Bft-dsn: A byzantine fault tolerant decentralized storage network. arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.12889 (2024)
6. Guo, H., Xu, M., Zhang, J., Liu, C., Yu, D., Dustdar, S., Cheng, X.: Filedag: A multi-version decentralized storage network built on dag-based blockchain. *IEEE Transactions on Computers* (2023)
7. Landis, D., Schwartzbach, N.I.: Stackelberg attacks on auctions and blockchain transaction fee mechanisms [abs/2305.02178](https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.02178), 2073–2080 (2023)
8. Lavi, R., Sattath, O., Zohar, A.: Redesigning bitcoin’s fee market. *ACM Transactions on Economics and Computation* **10**(1), 1–31 (2022)
9. Liu, Y., Lu, Y., Nayak, K., Zhang, F., Zhang, L., Zhao, Y.: Empirical analysis of eip-1559: Transaction fees, waiting times, and consensus security. pp. 2099–2113 (2022)
10. Liu, Y., Fang, Z., Cheung, M.H., Cai, W., Huang, J.: A social welfare maximization mechanism for blockchain storage [abs/2103.05866](https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.05866) (2021)
11. Nakamoto, S.: Bitcoin: A peer-to-peer electronic cash system (2008)
12. Roughgarden, T.: Transaction fee mechanism design (2023)
13. Tang, W., Yao, D.D.: Transaction fee mechanism for proof-of-stake protocol (2023)
14. V.Buterin, E.Conner, R.Dudley, M.Slipper, I.Norden, A.Bakhta: Fee market change for eth 1.0 chain (2019), <https://eips.ethereum.org/EIPS/eip-1559>
15. Wang, Z., Hu, Q., Li, R., Xu, M., Xiong, Z.: Incentive mechanism design for joint resource allocation in blockchain-based federated learning. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems* **34**(5), 1536–1547 (2023)
16. Wu, K., Shi, E., Chung, H.: Maximizing miner revenue in transaction fee mechanism design. arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.12895 (2023)
17. Xu, M., Zhang, J., Guo, H., Cheng, X., Yu, D., Hu, Q., Li, Y., Wu, Y.: Filedes: A secure, scalable and succinct decentralized encrypted storage network. *Cryptology ePrint Archive* (2024)
18. Xu, M., Zou, Z., Cheng, Y., Hu, Q., Yu, D., Cheng, X.: Spdl: A blockchain-enabled secure and privacy-preserving decentralized learning system. *IEEE Transactions on Computers* **72**(2), 548–558 (2022)
19. Zheng, S., Pan, L., Hu, D., Li, M., Fan, Y.: A blockchain-based trading platform for big data. In: *IEEE INFOCOM 2020-IEEE Conference on Computer Communications Workshops (INFOCOM WKSHPs)*. pp. 991–996. IEEE (2020)