

Zaptos: Towards Optimal Blockchain Latency

Zhuolun Xiang
daniel@aptoslabs.com
Aptos Labs
Palo Alto, USA

Zekun Li
zekun@aptoslabs.com
Aptos Labs
Palo Alto, USA

Balaji Arun
balaji@aptoslabs.com
Aptos Labs
Palo Alto, USA

Teng Zhang
teng@aptoslabs.com
Aptos Labs
Seattle, USA

Alexander Spiegelman
sasha@aptoslabs.com
Aptos Labs
Palo Alto, USA

Abstract

End-to-end blockchain latency has become a critical topic of interest in both academia and industry. However, while modern blockchain systems process transactions through multiple stages, most research has primarily focused on optimizing the latency of the Byzantine Fault Tolerance consensus component.

In this work, we identify key sources of latency in blockchain systems and introduce Zaptos, a parallel pipelined architecture designed to minimize end-to-end latency while maintaining the high-throughput of pipelined blockchains.

We implemented Zaptos and evaluated it against the pipelined architecture of the Aptos blockchain in a geo-distributed environment. Our evaluation demonstrates a 25% latency reduction under low load and over 40% reduction under high load. Notably, Zaptos achieves a throughput of 20,000 transactions per second with sub-second latency, surpassing previously reported blockchain throughput, with sub-second latency, by an order of magnitude.

1 Introduction

Modern blockchains are locked in a competitive race to push the boundaries of performance, focusing on maximizing throughput and minimizing latency to meet the demands of scalability and efficiency in decentralized systems.

The majority of research and innovation in both academia and the Web3 industry centers on enhancing the performance of Byzantine Fault Tolerant (BFT) consensus mechanisms [11, 12, 28].

However, BFT consensus is neither the throughput nor the latency bottleneck in modern blockchains. The end-to-end latency, which users care about, is measured from the moment a transaction is submitted to the point of receiving confirmation that it has been committed (applied to the blockchain state). Besides the consensus latency for agreeing on a block of transactions, this process encompasses several other stages: communication time between clients and validators, block execution time, certification of the final execution state, persisting the results to storage, and communicating the outcome back to the client.

In fact, modern consensus systems typically require around 300-400 milliseconds to order a transaction under low load [8, 59]. However, the end-to-end latency of the fastest blockchains is around 1 second in this case [5, 10] and increases substantially as the load rises.

This paper focuses on reducing end-to-end blockchain latency under both low and high load conditions. We propose Zaptos: a parallel pipelined architecture that maximizes resource utilization

for high throughput while parallelizing pipeline stages to achieve optimal blockchain latency.

Theoretically, our approach reduces end-to-end latency by 1 and 5 message hops under low and high loads, respectively. In practice, we demonstrated sub-second end-to-end blockchain latency with a throughput of 20,000 transactions per second (TPS) on a geo-distributed network of 100 validators. This represents a 40% improvement (over 0.5 second) compared to the Aptos Blockchain, which serves as the baseline for our work.

It is worth noting that, while much of the community’s focus has been on improving consensus latency under high-load conditions, our work achieves a total end-to-end latency reduction that is comparable to the entire consensus latency.

1.1 Technical overview

Our baseline is the Aptos blockchain [8], which builds upon the high-throughput, pipelined architecture introduced by Diem [27]. For DDoS protection, clients on the Aptos blockchain submit transactions to fullnodes, which then forward them to validators. Validators disseminate the transactions among themselves and reach consensus on a block of transactions. The block is subsequently executed by the execution engine, after which the validators communicate again to certify the final execution result^{*}. Next, the new state is persisted in the validators’ storage, and the block is propagated back to the fullnodes. The fullnodes re-execute the block[†] and verify that the final state is certified by the validators. Finally, the fullnodes send transaction confirmations back to the clients.

The pipelined Blockchain design aims to maximize throughput by utilizing all available resources. Note that transactions progress through multiple stages in the system, each mainly requiring distinct resources. For instance, the consensus stage is network-intensive, execution relies primarily on the CPU, and persisting data to storage demands significant IO capacity. Therefore, a block of transactions does not need to wait for its predecessor to complete all stages before starting its processing. Once a block advances to the next stage, the subsequent block can begin the current stage. As a result, at any given time, block_{*i*} is being ordered by consensus, block_{*i*-1} is being executed, and block_{*i*-2} is being persisted to storage.

^{*}Theoretically, this step is not strictly necessary. However, in practice, the certification stage is crucial for producing state proofs and preventing safety violations in the event of execution divergence due to software bugs.

[†]Fullnodes can alternatively synchronize the transaction outputs or the final state, but in most cases, re-executing the block proves to be faster.

This architecture achieves high system throughput but does not reduce end-to-end latency, as transactions must sequentially pass through all stages of processing.

Zaptos introduces a parallel pipelined architecture designed to reduce end-to-end latency while preserving the high throughput by optimistically *shadowing* most of the pipelining stages. In a nutshell, the three main optimizations are the following:

- (1) Optimistically execute the block immediately after receiving it in the consensus stage.
- (2) Optimistically persist the final state to storage once execution is done without waiting for the state certification phase to complete.
- (3) Piggyback the state certification stage onto the consensus protocol.

Note that the first two optimizations require handling the unhappy path, where consensus fails to order the block due to network issues or a faulty leader. The third optimization is more subtle, as it must prevent a scenario where a Byzantine validator obtains an execution state certificate before the block is ordered by consensus. This is because, if the block is eventually forked, a safety violation could occur.

Intuitively, to guarantee safety, validators attach their optimistic block execution certificate signatures to their final consensus messages. We prove that if an adversary manages to gather enough signatures to form an execution certificate, the block can no longer be forked and will eventually be ordered.

With these optimizations, Zaptos effectively shadows the execution, state certification, and storage stages under the consensus latency in the common case. This means that by the time a block is ordered, it has already been executed, the final state has been certified, and the data persisted to storage.

Additionally, in Zaptos, validators immediately forward blocks to fullnodes upon first receiving them. This enables fullnodes to apply the first two optimizations, further reducing end-to-end latency.

Hence, the end-to-end latency of Zaptos in this case is equal to

$$2\delta_{cf} + 2\delta_{fv} + T_{con},$$

where δ_{cf} represents the communication latency between clients and fullnodes, δ_{fv} is the communication latency between fullnodes and validators, and T_{con} is the consensus latency.

Notably, clients typically connect to the nearest fullnode, and fullnodes generally synchronize with the closest validator. As a result, $2\delta_{cf} + 2\delta_{fv}$ is relatively small compared to T_{con} , leaving little room for further latency optimizations.

All in all, the Zaptos parallel pipelined architecture is optimized for both latency and throughput. The throughput benefits from efficient pipelined resource utilization, while achieving optimal latency: if the blockchain employs an optimal-latency consensus protocol, then the overall blockchain latency is also optimal!

We extended the Aptos open-source with a production-ready implementation of Zaptos and compared both systems in a "mainnet-like" environment with 100 geographically distributed validators. Our evaluation demonstrates a 170ms latency reduction under low load and over 0.5s (40%) latency reduction under high load. To the best of our knowledge, Zaptos is the first end-to-end blockchain system to achieve sub-second latency at 20k TPS, surpassing all publicly available Blockchains by more than an order of magnitude.

2 Preliminary

2.1 Model Assumptions

The blockchain system consists of *clients*, and servers including *validator nodes* (referred to as *validators* for brevity) and *fullnodes*. Both validators and fullnodes are geo-distributed. Clients, typically users or applications, submit transactions to the system. Validators are servers that operate the core blockchain system, ensuring its security as long as a certain threshold of validators behave correctly. Fullnodes, which also operate the blockchain system, do not impact the overall correctness of the system but serve to support the network's performance and accessibility. Clients are restricted to interacting solely with fullnodes for Distributed Denial of Service (DDoS) protection and system scalability. Fullnodes communicate with both clients and validators, while validators communicate with fullnodes as well as with each other. All communication channels are assumed to be reliable and authenticated. The results of this paper can be easily extended to a model where clients directly communicate with the validators, as discussed in Section 4.5. The system assumes partial synchrony [29], meaning that after an unknown Global Stabilization Time (GST), message delays are bounded by a known upper bound. We define a *round* as a single network delay incurred when a message travels from a sender to a recipient.

For ease of presentation, we assume the standard Byzantine fault tolerance (BFT) model [44], allowing up to f of the total $n = 3f + 1$ validators to be malicious. A validator is *honest* if it is not malicious. We define a *quorum* as any group of $2f + 1$ validators. The results presented in this paper can be trivially extended to the proof-of-stake [33] setting, where validators hold non-zero stakes and fullnodes hold zero stake. Any client or fullnode may be malicious, and details of DDoS attack prevention [62] are omitted here for brevity.

For simplicity, we assume in this paper that each client connects to its nearest fullnode and each fullnode connects to the closest validator. Additionally, we assume that clients or fullnodes will switch to the next closest peer if the current peer becomes unresponsive or exhibits malicious behavior. The specific mechanisms for discovering the nearest peers or switching in response to malicious activity are beyond the scope of this paper.

2.2 Definitions

Definition 2.1 (BFT SMR). A Byzantine fault tolerant state machine replication (BFT SMR) protocol commits client transactions as a log akin to a single non-faulty server, and provides the following guarantees:

- Safety. Honest servers do not commit different transactions at the same log position.
- Liveness. Each transaction from honest client is eventually committed by all honest servers.

The server in the above definition can be any validator or fullnode. In addition to these requirements, a *validated* BFT SMR protocol must ensure *external validity* [17], where all committed transactions meet an application-specific predicate. This is achieved by validity checks inside consensus, but we omit these details for brevity, focusing instead on the BFT SMR formulation above. We also assume

Symbol	Description
V_i, F_i, C_i	validator node i , fullnode i , client i , respectively
txn	transaction
B	block as $B = (\text{id}, \text{proposer}, \text{height}, \text{parent}, \text{payload}, \sigma_B, \sigma_{\text{od}}, \text{state}, \Sigma_{\text{st}}, \sigma_{\text{st}})$
proposer	proposer of the block
height	block's height in the blockchain
parent	id of block's parent block
payload	list of transactions in the block
id	block's id as $\text{id} = \text{Hash}(\text{proposer} \text{height} \text{parent} \text{payload})$
σ_B	signature $\sigma_B = \text{Sign}(B.\text{id}, \text{sk}_i)$ where $B.\text{proposer} = V_i$
σ_{od}	block's ordering proof as an aggregated signature on B.id
state	blockchain state after block's execution
Σ_{st}	set of signatures on B.state
σ_{st}	block's state proof as an aggregated signature on B.state
\mathcal{P}	local in-memory buffer for blocks that are in the pipeline
H_{cmt}	height of latest committed block
S_{cmt}	state of latest committed block
π	transaction's inclusion proof, e.g., Merkle tree proof

Table 1: Notations.

honest clients will resubmit transactions that are previously failed to commit.

We summarize the notations used in the paper in Table 1.

2.3 Primitives

Multi-signature. We use standard multi-signature scheme such as BLS [14]. As a setup, each validator V_i is assigned with a pair of secret key and public key $(\text{sk}_i, \text{pk}_i)$, and knows the public keys of all other validators and the aggregated public key pk . We use the following standard protocol interfaces for the multi-signature. For brevity, we omit the security definitions, which can be found in [14].

- $\text{Sign}(m, \text{sk}_i) \rightarrow \sigma_i$. The signing protocol takes as input a message m , and the secret key sk_i and outputs a signature σ_i .
- $\text{Verify}(\sigma_i, m, \text{pk}_i) \rightarrow 0/1$. The verification protocol takes as input a validator V_i 's signature σ_i , a message m , and V_i 's public key pk_i . It outputs 1 (accept) or 0 (reject).
- $\text{Aggregate}(m, \{(\text{pk}_i, \sigma_i)\}) \rightarrow \sigma/\perp$. The combine protocol takes as input a message m , and a set of tuples (pk_i, σ_i) of public keys and signatures of parties. It outputs an aggregated σ or \perp .
- $\text{VerifyAgg}(\sigma, m, \text{pk}) \rightarrow 0/1$. The verification protocol takes as input an aggregated signature σ , a message m , and an aggregated public signature pk . It outputs 1 (accept) or 0 (reject).

Consensus. We build the system on top of a consensus protocol that has the following interfaces:

- $\text{Consensus.input}(\text{txn})$. The consensus protocol takes as input a transaction txn submitted by a client.

- $\text{Consensus.output}() \rightarrow B$. The consensus protocol outputs a block B , where B is defined in Table 1 [‡].

Consensus guarantees the following properties:

- *Safety.* If an honest validator outputs $\text{Consensus.output}() \rightarrow B$, then no honest validator outputs $\text{Consensus.output}() \rightarrow B'$ such that $B'.\text{height} = B.\text{height}$ and $B' \neq B$.
- *Liveness.*
 - If an honest validator inputs $\text{Consensus.input}(\text{txn})$, then after GST, all the honest validators eventually outputs $\text{Consensus.output}() \rightarrow B$ where $\text{txn} \in B$.
 - For every block height h , after GST, all the honest validators eventually output $\text{Consensus.output}() \rightarrow B$ where $B.\text{height} = h$.

In this paper, we consider consensus protocols that have the following properties.

- *Block Proposal.* The protocol has validators proposing block proposals, explicitly or implicitly [§]. To propose a block B , a validator V_i broadcasts a message $(\text{PROPOSAL}, B)$.
- *Order Proof.* When outputting a block B , the consensus protocol also outputs an order proof σ_B which is an aggregated signature on the metadata of B (e.g., $B.\text{id}$) signed by the validators.
- *Order Vote.* To produce the order proof, as the final step of consensus protocol, each validator V_i broadcasts a message $(\text{ORDERVOTE}, B.\text{id}, \sigma_i = \text{Sign}(B.\text{id}, \text{sk}_i))$ to vote for ordering a block B . A validator orders B upon receiving a quorum $(2f + 1)$ of ORDERVOTE messages that aggregate the order proof σ for B .

Numerous consensus protocols satisfy or can be easily adapted to satisfy the order vote property, such as PBFT [19], Tendermint [15], SBFT [38], HotStuff [61], Streamlet [20], Jolteon [35], Moonshot [28] and many others. Additionally, another series of DAG-based consensus protocols can also satisfy this property, such as Bullshark [57], Shoal [56], Shoal++ [11], Cordial miners [40] and Mysticeti [12].

We define a few consensus metrics that will be used in the paper.

- *Consensus latency.* The consensus latency equals the *consensus dissemination latency* plus the *consensus ordering latency*.
 - *Consensus dissemination latency.* The time duration between any validator V_i calling $\text{Consensus.input}(\text{txn})$ and any validator V_j calling $(\text{PROPOSAL}, B)$ such that $\text{txn} \in B$.
 - *Consensus ordering latency.* The time duration between any validator V_i calling $(\text{PROPOSAL}, B)$ and any validator V_j calling $\text{Consensus.output}() \rightarrow (B, \sigma)$.
- *Block interval.* The time duration between any validator V_i calling $\text{Consensus.output}() \rightarrow (B, \sigma)$ and the same validator V_i calling $\text{Consensus.output}() \rightarrow (B', \sigma)$ where $B'.\text{height} = B.\text{height} + 1$.

The consensus dissemination latency comprises the time taken to send the transaction to the leader, along with the block queuing

[‡]When Consensus outputs B , $B.\sigma_{\text{od}} = B.\text{state} = B.\sigma_{\text{st}} = \perp$, $B.\Sigma_{\text{st}} = \{\}$.

[§]For leader-based BFT protocols such as [19, 35], the leader of a given round can explicitly propose a block proposal extending the blockchain. For DAG-based BFT protocols such as [11, 12, 56, 57], there are also chosen leaders that can implicitly propose a block proposal which consists its proposed DAG node and all causally dependent DAG nodes that are not included in the previous implicit block proposal.

latency for the transaction to be included in a block proposal[¶]. If the consensus protocol disseminates transactions in batched fashion, which this paper does, the dissemination latency also includes the batch queuing latency for the transaction to be included in a payload batch.

Usually in the common case, the block interval equals the time duration between two subsequent block proposals. Several pipelined consensus protocols [11, 12, 20, 28, 35, 56, 57, 61] chain the block proposals (by hashes) to reuse protocol phases for consecutive proposals for pipelining. As a result, pipelining effectively reduce the block interval.

For the implementation and evaluation (Section 6), we use Jolteon* consensus protocol^{||} deployed by Aptos blockchain, additionally with techniques from Moonshot [28] to reduce the block interval to a single round. The resulting consensus protocol satisfies all the aforementioned properties, achieving a consensus dissemination latency of 1.5 rounds plus the batch queuing latency, a consensus ordering latency of 3 rounds, and a block interval of 1 round, while maintaining high throughput and robustness. The consensus ordering latency of Jolteon* is optimal [1, 41]). Similar to PBFT [19], it consists of 1 round of leader broadcasting block proposal, 1 round of vote for B, and another round of ORDERVOTE for B.

Execution. We build the system on top of an execution protocol that has the following interfaces:

- $\text{Execution}(\text{state}, B) \rightarrow \text{state}_B$. The execution protocol takes as input a blockchain state, a block B, and outputs the new blockchain state state_B after the execution of B on top of state.

The execution protocol should be deterministic, i.e., $\text{Execution}(\text{state}, B)$ always produces the same result. The blockchain state can have different representations depending on the concrete implementation. In this paper, we assume state_B contains inclusion proofs (such as Merkle proof [47]) for committed transactions and their versions (i.e., position in the committed log) in state_B .

For the implementation and evaluation (Section 6), we use BlockSTM [36] for parallel execution, and MoveVM [7] as the smart contract execution engine.

Storage. We build the system on top of a storage component that has the following interfaces:

- $\text{Storage.write}(k, v)$. Persist a pair of key and value into the storage.
- $\text{Storage.read}(k) \rightarrow v$. Read the value (can be \perp) of a given key from the storage.

For simplicity, we abstract the blockchain's commit phase as persisting the new blockchain state into storage following execution, as the specific implementation details are orthogonal to the opt-commit optimization discussed in this paper (Section 4.2). In reality, the commit phase may include (1) persisting, per transaction version of the executed block, the transaction itself along with its side effects (including events emitted, updates to the state, execution status and error info, gas usage, etc), so that such data can be

[¶]For a consensus protocol with block interval of T , the expected block queuing latency is $T/2$ assuming the transactions arrives uniformly at random time.

^{||}Jolteon* is an improved version of Jolteon [35] that reduces consensus dissemination latency [42] and consensus ordering latency [43].

queried by the transaction version; (2) calculating and persisting cryptographic summaries (Merkle Trees [47]) of such data from the executed block, so that any piece of the blockchain raw data is authenticated by an aggregated signature signed by the validators.

For the implementation and evaluation (Section 6), we use the RocksDB [32] as the key-value store and Jellyfish Merkle Tree [34] for data authentication.

2.4 Metrics

This paper focuses on reducing the *end-to-end latency* of the blockchain system while maintaining high *throughput*. The blockchain end-to-end latency (or simply *blockchain latency*) refers to the time from when a client submits a transaction to the blockchain system to when the client can receive confirmation that the transaction has been committed (cannot be reverted). The throughput represents the number of transactions that can be committed per unit of time, typically measured in transactions per second (TPS).

3 Pipelined Architecture of Aptos

In this section, we present the Aptos Blockchain [3] architecture, which is a popular blockchain architecture for high-performance blockchains [3, 13, 25, 50]. The Aptos Blockchain employs a *pipelined architecture*, allowing different stages of different blocks to execute in parallel. The design improves the blockchain performance by maximizing resource utilization. To the best of our knowledge, the concept of the pipelined architecture was first proposed and productionized by the Diem blockchain [45] (more details in Section 7), and this paper provides the first comprehensive description.

The original pipeline design of Diem and Aptos blockchains uses doubly linked list to represent the pipeline [26], which is conceptually unintuitive and challenging to implement. We simplify the design and implementation using an event-driven framework, as outlined in the pseudo-code in Algorithm 1, and illustrated in Figure 1. We collaborated with the Aptos Labs team to integrate the simplified pipeline design into the Aptos blockchain [9]. Notably, the event-driven framework also significantly streamlines both the design and implementation of Zaptos, as elaborated in Section 5.

The Aptos Blockchain architecture serves as the baseline for Zaptos, with pseudo-code structured to allow a straightforward description of Zaptos with minimal modifications.

For brevity, Algorithm 1 and its description omit implementation details such as message authentication, message verification (e.g., format correctness), error handling (e.g., crash recovery) and garbage collection.

3.1 The Architecture

We describe the Aptos Blockchain architecture by tracing the lifecycle of a transaction txn . A client can submit txn to the fullnode it connects to. The fullnode, upon receiving txn from the client, will forward it to the validator it connects to. The validator inputs txn to Consensus upon receipt of the transaction. If the blockchain system is not overloaded, i.e., transaction submission throughput is below the maximum capacity of the blockchain, Consensus will order txn in a few rounds by outputting a block B that includes txn , and its order proof (an aggregated signature σ on $B.\text{id}$). The




Figure 1: Illustration of the pipelined architecture of modern blockchains such as Aptos Blockchain [3]. The figure shows client C_i , fullnode F_i , and validator V_i . Each box represents a stage in the blockchain that a block of transactions needs to go through from left to right. The pipeline consists four stages, including consensus (which consists dissemination and ordering), execution, certification and commit.




Figure 2: Illustration of Zaptos. The left figure illustrates the Zaptos’s parallel pipeline architecture. It shows client C_i , fullnode F_i , and validator V_i , and each box represents a stage in the blockchain that a block of transactions needs to go through from left to right. The right figure illustrates the dependencies between stages of the same block. Solid arrow denotes direct dependency (a stage starts immediately once all its direct dependencies finishes), dotted arrow denotes indirect dependency (stages connected via more than one direct dependencies). The receipt of block proposal triggers opt-execution. The finishing of opt-execution triggers opt-commit, and triggers certification once ORDERVOTE is also sent. When the state is certified and opt-commit finishes, the commit is completed.




Figure 3: Illustration of the pipelining of consecutive blocks in the Aptos Blockchain. A validator can pipeline different stages of consecutive blocks, e.g., for blocks B_1, B_2, B_3 in the figure, in the dotted slot, the validator can perform in parallel the commit stage (IO-intensive) of B_1 , the certification stage of B_2 , the execution stage (CPU-intensive) of B_3 , and the consensus stage (network-intensive) of subsequent blocks. In practice, the durations of the stages may vary, leading to imperfect alignment. As long as the parallel stages utilize distinct resources, the pipeline improves throughput by maximizing resource utilization compared to non-pipelined designs.




Figure 4: Illustration of the pipelining of consecutive blocks in Zaptos. The left figure illustrates the pipelining. Similar to Figure 3, a validator can also pipeline different stages of consecutive blocks. The right figure illustrates the dependencies between stages of consecutive blocks, e.g., the execution and commit stages of block B_2 also depends on the execution and commit stages of its parent block B_1 , respectively. The boxes representing stages have been slimmed down for presentation purposes only.

ordered block B is then added to the pipeline (denoted by \mathcal{P}) to go through the following three stages.

- *Execution stage.* When there exists an unexecuted block B in the pipeline such that its parent block has been executed, the validator executes B . This stage mostly uses CPU resources.
- *Certification stage.* After execution, the validator signs the cryptographic digest of the execution state (represented by $\text{Hash}(B.\text{state})$ for brevity) and broadcasts the CERTIFYVOTE . When receiving a CERTIFYVOTE with valid signature, and the corresponding block B has been locally executed but not yet certified, the validator adds the vote to $B.\Sigma_{st}$. When the set $B.\Sigma_{st}$ reaches a quorum, the validator aggregates the signatures to obtain the aggregated signature that certifies $B.\text{state}$. This stage uses little computation or bandwidth resources as the CERTIFYVOTE is small and cheap to compute, but takes one round to receive the CERTIFYVOTE from a quorum of validators. The certification stage serves two primary purposes: ensuring safety in cases where the execution stage exhibits non-determinism, and producing a publicly verifiable proof of the new blockchain state which allows fullnodes and clients to independently verify the correctness of the blockchain state. Additional discussions are provided in Section 7.
- *Commit stage.* If the new certified block is the next in height to be committed, the validator updates the highest committed height and blockchain state, then saves both to storage. This stage mostly uses IO resources. When the commit finishes, the validator sends the newly committed block to the fullnode without including the new state, to reduce bandwidth consumption.

Algorithm 1 Pipelined Architecture of Aptos Blockchain

<p>Client C_i:</p> <pre> 1: upon submitting a txn do 2: send (SUBMIT, txn) to fullnode 3: upon querying a txn do 4: send (QUERY, txn) to fullnode 5: if receive (RESPONSE, pos, txn, π) within timeout such that π.Verify(pos, txn) = 1 then 6: return (success, pos) 7: else return failure ▷ Client may resubmit </pre> <hr/> <p>Fullnode F_i:</p> <pre> 1: upon receiving (SUBMIT, txn) from client do 2: send (SUBMIT, txn) to validator 3: upon receiving (QUERY, txn) from client do 4: if txn is committed in position pos of S_{cmt} then 5: let π be the inclusion proof of txn in position pos 6: send (RESPONSE, pos, txn, π) to client 7: upon receiving (COMMITTED, B) from validator do 8: if $B.\sigma_{st} = \perp$ then return 9: $\mathcal{P} \leftarrow \mathcal{P} \cup \{B\}$ ▷ Add the block to the pipeline 10: upon $\exists B \in \mathcal{P}$ s.t. $B.state = \perp, B'.state \neq \perp$ and $B'.id = B.parent$ do ▷ When parent of B has been executed 11: let $B.state \leftarrow Execution(B'.state, B)$ ▷ Execution stage 12: upon $\exists B \in \mathcal{P}$ s.t. $B.state \neq \perp, B.\sigma_{st} \neq \perp$ and $H_{cmt} = B.height - 1$ do 13: if $VerifyAgg(B.\sigma_{st}, Hash(B.state), pk) = 1$ then ▷ Commit stage </pre>	<pre> 14: let $H_{cmt} \leftarrow B.height, S_{cmt} \leftarrow B.state$ 15: Storage.write($H_{cmt}, (COMMITTED, S_{cmt})$) </pre> <hr/> <p>Validator V_i:</p> <pre> 1: upon receiving (SUBMIT, txn) from Fullnode do 2: Consensus.input(txn) ▷ Consensus stage 3: upon Consensus.output() $\rightarrow (B, \sigma)$ do 4: let $B.\sigma_{od} \leftarrow \sigma$ 5: $\mathcal{P} \leftarrow \mathcal{P} \cup \{B\}$ ▷ Add the block to the pipeline 6: upon $\exists B \in \mathcal{P}$ s.t. $B.state = \perp, B.\sigma_{od} \neq \perp, B'.state \neq \perp$ and $B'.id = B.parent$ do ▷ When parent of B has been executed 7: let $B.state \leftarrow Execution(B'.state, B)$ ▷ Execution stage 8: let $\sigma_i \leftarrow Sign(Hash(B.state), sk_i)$ 9: let $B.\Sigma_{st} \leftarrow B.\Sigma_{st} \cup \{(pk_i, \sigma_i)\}$ 10: send (CERTIFYVOTE, B.id, σ_i) to all validators 11: upon receiving (CERTIFYVOTE, id, σ_j) from validator V_j do 12: if $\exists B \in \mathcal{P}$ s.t. $B.id = id, B.state \neq \perp, B.\sigma_{st} = \perp$ and $Verify(\sigma_j, Hash(B.state), pk_j) = 1$ then ▷ Certification stage 13: $B.\Sigma_{st} \leftarrow B.\Sigma_{st} \cup \{(pk_j, \sigma_j)\}$ 14: if $B.\Sigma_{st} \geq 2f + 1$ then 15: let $B.\sigma_{st} \leftarrow Aggregate(B.state, B.\Sigma_{st})$ 16: upon $\exists B \in \mathcal{P}$ s.t. $B.\sigma_{st} \neq \perp$ and $H_{cmt} = B.height - 1$ do 17: let $H_{cmt} \leftarrow B.height, S_{cmt} \leftarrow B.state$ ▷ Commit stage 18: Storage.write($H_{cmt}, (COMMITTED, S_{cmt})$) 19: $B.state \leftarrow \perp$ ▷ To save bandwidth 20: send (COMMITTED, B) to fullnode </pre>
---	---

The fullnode, upon receiving the committed block (COMMITTED, B) from validators, it ensures the state is certified, and adds the block to its pipeline. The pipeline of a fullnode is similar to that of a validator, but without the certification stage. More specifically, the fullnode also executes the blocks **, and commits the local obtained states once they are certified by the state proof (aggregated signature) provided by the validator, i.e., $VerifyAgg(B.\sigma_{st}, Hash(B.state), pk) = 1$. The client can query whether a transaction txn is committed on the blockchain. The fullnode, upon receiving client's query on txn, will respond with the inclusion proof π of txn if txn is committed in some position pos according to the latest blockchain state. If the client receives the response within a timeout, it verifies if π is valid for txn, and returns success or failure, respectively. The client may resubmit the transaction upon failure or timeout.

** Fullnodes have two options of acquiring the new blockchain state: executing the block locally or synchronizing the execution output from the validators. In practice, the former approach is preferred as it reduces the bandwidth consumption of validators, given that execution outputs can be large. For fullnodes that opt to sync the execution output, Zaptos can also reduce the blockchain's end-to-end latency by enabling earlier synchronization following the validators' optimistic execution.

3.2 The Pipelining

As illustrated in Figure 3, the pipelined design achieves high blockchain throughput by fully utilizing the different resources of the validators and fullnodes. Recall that every block progresses through the consensus, execution, certification and commit stages in sequential. The Aptos Blockchain architecture uses a pipelined consensus protocol to further reduce the block interval of the consensus stage and therefore reduce the overall blockchain end-to-end latency. The vanilla Aptos Blockchain uses Jolteon [35], which has a consensus ordering latency of 5 rounds and a block interval of 2 rounds. For the implementation and evaluation of the Aptos Blockchain and Zaptos in our paper, as mentioned in Section 2.3, we use the improved version of Jolteon [35, 42, 43] deployed by Aptos blockchain, together with optimizations from Moonshot [28] to reduce block interval. The consensus protocol has an optimal consensus ordering latency of 3 rounds and a block interval of a single round.

Therefore, as illustrated in Figure 3, Consensus generates a new ordered block every round to enter the pipeline, ideally offset by one round per consecutive block in the pipeline. To achieve such pipelining, the execution block size can be calibrated to complete execution within approximately one round, matching the duration of the certification stage. This alignment allows different stages of consecutive blocks to execute concurrently. For example, as

Algorithm 2 ZaptosFullnode F_i :

```

1: upon receiving (PROPOSED, B) from validator do
2:    $\mathcal{P} \leftarrow \mathcal{P} \cup \{B\}$     $\triangleright$  Add to pipeline for opt-execution
3: upon  $\exists B \in \mathcal{P}$  s.t.  $B.state \neq \perp$  and  $H_{cmt} < B.height$  do
4:   Storage.write( $H_{cmt}, (OPTCOMMITTED, S_{cmt})$ )    $\triangleright$ 
   Opt-commit

```

Validator V_i :

```

1: upon receiving (PROPOSAL, B) in Consensus do
2:    $\mathcal{P} \leftarrow \mathcal{P} \cup \{B\}$     $\triangleright$  Add to pipeline for opt-execution
3:   send (PROPOSED, B) to fullnode
4: upon  $B \in \mathcal{P}$ ,  $B.state \neq \perp$ ,  $B.\sigma_{od} = \perp$ , and broadcasting
   (ORDERVOTE, B.id,  $\sigma_i = \text{Sign}(B.id, sk_i)$ ) in Consensus do
5:   let  $\sigma_i \leftarrow \text{Sign}(\text{Hash}(B.state), sk_i)$     $\triangleright$  Certification
6:   send (CERTIFYVOTE, B.id,  $\sigma_i$ ) to all validators
7: upon  $\exists B \in \mathcal{P}$  s.t.  $B.state \neq \perp$  and  $H_{cmt} < B.height$  do
8:   Storage.write( $H_{cmt}, (OPTCOMMITTED, S_{cmt})$ )    $\triangleright$ 
   Opt-commit

```

illustrated in Figure 3, the commit stage of B_1 , the certification stage of B_2 , and the execution stage of B_3 all start roughly round the same time and run in parallel with the consensus stage of later blocks. Since different stages use distinct resource types (CPU, network bandwidth, IO), the pipelined design maximizes resource utilization, significantly improving the blockchain throughput.

4 Zaptos Design

This section presents the design of Zaptos, which significantly reduces the blockchain latency of the Aptos Blockchain’s pipelined architecture (Algorithm 1) through three key optimizations. Meanwhile, Zaptos also maintains property of maximizing resource utilization to achieve high throughput. The pseudo-code of Zaptos is presented in Algorithm 2, building on the Aptos Blockchain’s pseudo-code in Algorithm 1. Only the differences are highlighted, which may initially appear simple – reflecting this paper’s goal of achieving elegance in architectural design, where protocol simplicity translates to ease of implementation. Despite this simplicity, the latency improvement is substantial – as discussed in Section 4.4, Zaptos can reduce the blockchain latency by 5 rounds compared to the Aptos Blockchain, and can achieve optimal blockchain latency when the underlying consensus protocol also has optimal latency.

Same as in Section 3, for brevity, Algorithm 2 and its description omit implementation details such as message authentication, message verification (e.g., format correctness) and error handling (e.g., crash recovery). We will discuss some of the details and considerations of real-world implementation in Section 5.

4.1 Optimistic Execution

The change is highlighted in **red**. The first optimization, called optimistic execution (or opt-execution), improves the pipeline latency of both validators and fullnodes, by optimistically running the execution stage.

We first explain the changes to the validators. When any validator receives the block proposal (PROPOSAL, B) in Consensus, the validator adds B to the pipeline immediately rather than waiting for B to be ordered. The validator also sends the proposal to the fullnodes which subscribes to the validator. Then, the validator can speculatively execute B once the parent block of B has been executed, as described in Algorithm 1. Since the consensus protocol with optimal consensus ordering latency of three rounds [1, 19, 41] consists one round of proposing and two rounds of voting, the optimistic execution allows the validators to start the execution stage of a block in parallel to the second round of the consensus. Since the optimistically executed block may not be ordered eventually, if done naively, the validators can still only start the certification stage after the ordering of the block, as in Algorithm 1. The optimization for the certification stage later will address this issue.

Now we explain the changes to the fullnodes. The fullnode, upon receiving the proposal (PROPOSED, B) forwarded by the validator, also adds B to the pipeline immediately to speculatively execute B once the parent block of B has been executed. Same as in the Aptos Blockchain, the locally computed state is then used for verifying the state proof received from the validator. Since the fullnode only commits B and responses to the client once B’s state is certified by the validators, the speculative execution before ordering does not violate safety.

4.2 Optimistic Commit

The change is highlighted in **green**. The second optimization, called optimistic commit (or opt-commit) reduces the commit stage latency for both validators and fullnodes, by allowing blocks to be optimistically committed to storage as soon as the execution stage completes, before the state is certified. More specifically, once the execution stage of a block B completes, the new state B.state to be persisted is already available, allowing the commit stage to initiate (also called opt-commit), abstracted as persisting the value (OPTCOMMITTED, B.state) in the storage for key B.height. When the validators certified the state, only a minimal update is needed to complete the commit stage, marking the storage entry from (OPTCOMMITTED, B.state) to (COMMITTED, B.state). In the case of opt-committed block that is not eventually ordered by consensus, the opt-committed state will be reverted from the storage for data consistency.

4.3 Certification Optimization

The change is highlighted in **yellow**. The final optimization further improves the pipeline latency of the validators, by allowing the validators to start the certification stage of an executed block earlier, rather than waiting for the block to be ordered. More specifically, the validators can broadcast CERTIFYVOTE for a block B when broadcasting ORDERVOTE for B, if B is executed. This enables the validators to run the certification stage in parallel with the last round of the consensus, effectively reducing the pipeline latency by one round in the common-case. Intuitively, the safety of the optimization is guaranteed by the fact that if B.state is certified, then B is guaranteed to be ordered. We provide the correctness analysis of the optimizations in Section 4.4.

4.4 Analysis

Correctness Analysis. We prove Zaptos satisfies *Safety* and *Liveness* defined in Definition 2.1.

An immediate corollary from the *order vote* property and definitions of Consensus in Section 2.3:

COROLLARY 4.1. *For any block B, if $f + 1$ honest validators have broadcasted (ORDERVOTE, B.id, σ), then all honest validators eventually order B after GST.*

PROOF. Consider any consensus protocol that satisfies the properties described in Section 2.3. Consider an execution where $f + 1$ honest validators have broadcasted (ORDERVOTE, B.id, σ). Let the f malicious validators send their (ORDERVOTE, B.id, σ) message to only a single honest validator V_i . By the *order vote* property of the consensus protocol, V_i orders B. Let V_i be indefinitely partitioned from rest of all honest validators after receiving the ORDERVOTE messages and ordering B. If any honest validator outputs B' such that $B'.height = B.height$ and $B' \neq B$, the *Safety* property of the consensus protocol is violated, contradiction. Then by the *Liveness* property, all honest validators eventually order B after GST. \square

THEOREM 4.2. *Zaptos as described in Algorithm 2 implements Byzantine fault tolerant state machine replication (BFT SMR) and achieves Safety and Liveness.*

PROOF. *Safety.* Equivalently, we prove that all honest validators and fullnodes commit the same sequence of blocks by showing that, at any height, only a single block is committed.

First, we prove safety for validators. Suppose for contradiction that two validators commit different blocks $B_i \neq B_j$ at height h . According to the pre-condition of commit, both $B_i.\sigma_{st}$ and $B_j.\sigma_{st}$ were aggregated. This implies two sets of $2f + 1$ validators, denoted S_i and S_j , must have sent CERTIFYVOTE messages for B_i and B_j respectively. Each set contains at least $f + 1$ honest validators.

We now examine the cases for when these votes are cast:

- (1) Suppose all $f + 1$ honest validators in S_i sent CERTIFYVOTE for B_i when $B_i.\sigma_{od} = \perp$. According to the protocol, these honest validators must also send ORDERVOTE for B_i , implying that all honest validators eventually order B_i by Corollary 4.1.
 - (a) If all $f + 1$ honest validators in S_j also sent CERTIFYVOTE for B_j when $B_j.\sigma_{od} = \perp$, then by Corollary 4.1, all honest validators eventually order B_j , contradicting the *Safety* property of the consensus protocol.
 - (b) If at least one honest validator $V_j \in S_j$ sent CERTIFYVOTE for B_j when $B_j.\sigma_{od} \neq \perp$, then V_j would output B_j in consensus, again contradicting the *Safety* property.
- (2) Suppose there exists an honest validator $V_i \in S_i$ who sent CERTIFYVOTE for B_i when $B_i.\sigma_{od} \neq \perp$.
 - (a) If all $f + 1$ honest validators in S_j sent CERTIFYVOTE for B_j when $B_j.\sigma_{od} = \perp$, this is symmetric to Case 1a and also leads to a *Safety* violation.
 - (b) If at least one honest validator $V_j \in S_j$ sent CERTIFYVOTE for B_j when $B_j.\sigma_{od} \neq \perp$, then V_j outputs B_j in consensus, again contradicting the *Safety* property.

Therefore, for any height h , all honest validators aggregate the same $B.\sigma_{st}$ and commit the same block B. Since only one $B.\sigma_{st}$ exists for each height, fullnodes also commit the same block.

Liveness. Recall that an honest client will keep resubmitting failed transactions, and clients or fullnodes will switch peers in response to any malicious activity. Eventually, if a transaction txn has not been committed before GST, the honest client will submit txn to an honest fullnode after GST, which will then forward txn to an honest validator. By the *Liveness* property of the consensus protocol, all honest validators will eventually output the same ordered block B containing txn . Since execution is deterministic, all honest validators will compute the same $B.state$ and sign the same message $Hash(B.state)$ in CERTIFYVOTE. Eventually, all honest validators will receive CERTIFYVOTE message from each other, allowing them to aggregate $B.\sigma_{st}$. By safety, for any height h , there exists a unique $B.\sigma_{st}$ where $B.height = h$, ensuring that all honest validators will commit B by writing the new blockchain state to storage. All honest fullnodes will eventually receive $B.\sigma_{st}$ and subsequently commit B. \square

Latency Analysis. For the latency analysis for the Aptos Blockchain's pipelined architecture (Algorithm 1) and Zaptos (Algorithm 2), we assume the following:

- The client is honest and submits a correctly formatted transaction.
- The client-to-fullnode, fullnode-to-validator and validator-to-validator latencies remain constant, and are denoted as δ_{cf} , δ_{fv} and δ_{vv} respectively. The network latency is symmetric for any single connection.
- Validators and fullnodes have same consensus, execution and commit stage latencies for a single block, denoted as T_{con} , T_{exe} and T_{cmt} respectively. The consensus stage latency T_{con} is the consensus latency mentioned in Section 2.3.
- Any delay in the execution stage due to waiting for the completion of the parent block's execution stage is assumed to be the same in both the Aptos Blockchain and Zaptos. Consequently, when analyzing Zaptos's improvement over the Aptos Blockchain, we disregard any execution-stage delays.
- We also disregard additional delays caused by "unhappy path" in both the Aptos Blockchain and Zaptos, such as the client reconnecting to an honest fullnode and resubmitting the transaction, or instances where the consensus re-proposes the block containing the transaction due to previous proposal not getting ordered.

THEOREM 4.3. *Let $T_{baseline}$ and T_{zaptos} denote the blockchain latency of the Aptos Blockchain (Algorithm 1) and Zaptos (Algorithm 2), respectively. We have*

$$T_{baseline} = 2\delta_{cf} + 2\delta_{fv} + \delta_{vv} + T_{con} + 2T_{exe} + 2T_{cmt} \quad (1)$$

$$T_{zaptos} = 2\delta_{cf} + 2\delta_{fv} + T_{con} + \max(T_{exe} + T_{cmt} - 2\delta_{vv}, 0) + \max(T_{exe} - \delta_{vv}, 0) + \max(T_{cmt} - \delta_{vv}, 0) \quad (2)$$

When $T_{exe} \leq \delta_{vv}$ and $T_{cmt} \leq \delta_{vv}$, we have $T_{zaptos} = 2\delta_{cf} + 2\delta_{fv} + T_{con}$.

Results from Section 6.2 under medium load also partially validates Theorem 4.3, where $T_{zaptos} \approx T_{con}$ when δ_{cf} and δ_{fv} are negligible. An immediately corollary of Theorem 4.3 is Corollary 4.4.

COROLLARY 4.4. *When $T_{\text{exe}} \geq \delta_{\text{vv}}$ and $T_{\text{cmt}} \geq \delta_{\text{vv}}$, we have $T_{\text{baseline}} - T_{\text{zaptos}} = 5\delta_{\text{vv}}$, namely Zaptos improves the blockchain latency of the Aptos Blockchain by 5 rounds.*

PROOF OF THEOREM 4.3. In the Aptos Blockchain’s pipelined architecture, as shown in Figure 1, the blockchain latency consists:

- (1) One client-to-fullnode network delay (denoted as δ_{cf}) and one fullnode-to-validator network delay (denoted as δ_{fv}) to send the transaction.
- (2) Validators’ consensus stage latency T_{con} .
- (3) Validators’ execution, certification and commit stages latencies, which is $T_{\text{exe}} + \delta_{\text{vv}} + T_{\text{cmt}}$.
- (4) One validator-to-fullnode network delay (same as δ_{fv}) to send certified blocks.
- (5) Fullnodes’ execution and commit stages latencies (same as T_{exe} and T_{cmt}).
- (6) One fullnode-to-client network delay (same as δ_{cf}) to send transaction commit confirmation.

The blockchain latency of the Aptos Blockchain can be approximated as

$$T_{\text{baseline}} = 2\delta_{\text{cf}} + 2\delta_{\text{fv}} + \delta_{\text{vv}} + T_{\text{con}} + 2T_{\text{exe}} + 2T_{\text{cmt}} \quad (3)$$

In Zaptos, as shown in Figure 2, the blockchain latency keeps (1), (2), (4) and (6) same as the Aptos Blockchain, but reduces the latencies of (3) and (5). More specifically, for validators in Zaptos, the execution stage starts upon receiving the block proposal (second last round of the consensus ordering), then the certification stage starts upon finishing execution and sending ORDERVOTE (last round of the consensus ordering), the commit stage starts upon finishing execution and completes once certification stage finishes. Hence the duration of validators for all stages will be $T_{\text{vn}} = T_{\text{con}} - 2\delta_{\text{vv}} + \max(\delta_{\text{vv}}, T_{\text{exe}}) + \max(\delta_{\text{vv}}, T_{\text{cmt}})$. For fullnodes in Zaptos, similarly, the execution stage starts upon receiving the block proposal from the validator (last round of the consensus ordering), and then the commit stage starts upon finishing execution and completes when receiving the committed blocks from the validator. Hence the time for fullnodes to commit a block since the validators committed the block will be $T_{\text{fn}} = \max(\delta_{\text{fv}} + T_{\text{exe}} + T_{\text{cmt}} - 2\delta_{\text{vv}}, \delta_{\text{fv}})$. The blockchain latency of Zaptos can be approximated as

$$T_{\text{zaptos}} = \delta_{\text{cf}} + \delta_{\text{fv}} + T_{\text{vn}} + T_{\text{fn}} + \delta_{\text{cf}} = 2\delta_{\text{cf}} + 2\delta_{\text{fv}} + T_{\text{con}} + \max(T_{\text{exe}} - \delta_{\text{vv}}, 0) + \max(T_{\text{cmt}} - \delta_{\text{vv}}, 0) + \max(T_{\text{exe}} + T_{\text{cmt}} - 2\delta_{\text{vv}}, 0) \quad (4)$$

□

4.5 Discussion

Latency Optimality. As in Theorem 4.3, when the execution and commit time is bounded by one round, Zaptos has a blockchain latency of $T_{\text{zaptos}} = 2\delta_{\text{cf}} + 2\delta_{\text{fv}} + T_{\text{con}}$. Since the round-trip latency of client-to-fullnode and fullnode-to-validator, i.e., $2\delta_{\text{cf}} + 2\delta_{\text{fv}}$, is inevitable, the blockchain latency achieves optimality when the consensus latency T_{con} is optimal. As discussed in Section 7, for consensus protocols with high throughput and robustness, the consensus latency is at least 4 rounds, even though the lower bound of consensus ordering latency is 3 rounds [1, 41]. It remains an interesting open question that if a consensus protocol with optimal 3-round latency can achieve high throughput and robustness, or there exists a latency lower bound of 4 rounds for such protocol.

Throughput. In the *common case* where the block proposals are ordered by consensus, Zaptos is capable of achieving the Aptos Blockchain’s throughput. As illustrated in Figure 3 and Figure 4, Zaptos pipelines different stages of consecutive blocks similar to the Aptos Blockchain. Assuming the stages are aligned in both the Aptos Blockchain and Zaptos, validators perform the consensus, execution, certification, and commit stages of consecutive blocks in parallel at any given time, maximizing resource utilization and supporting high throughput. Experimental evaluations in Section 6 will support the theoretical analysis of throughput.

Unhappy Path. We discuss the scenario in Zaptos when a block proposal is *not* ordered by consensus. There are two implications.

- In cases where a block is optimistically executed but not eventually ordered by consensus, the computed block state becomes obsolete, wasting computation and potentially degrading system performance. However, in such cases, during consensus, the proposer (leader) of the block times out, causing a more substantial performance degradation in consensus due to the lack of progress during the timeout. Thus, the waste of computational resources is not a primary performance bottleneck in such scenario.
- In cases where a block is optimistically committed but not eventually ordered by consensus, different honest validators or fullnodes may end up with inconsistent storage. This can occur if the leader is malicious or slow, or if the network becomes asynchronous, resulting in only a subset of honest servers optimistically executing and committing the block, which is eventually orphaned in consensus. To ensure data consistency across servers, any optimistically committed block will be reverted from storage if it is not eventually ordered by consensus.

Block Execution Time Calibration. We discuss how the blockchain system calibrates the execution time of each block under high load. This is achieved through two techniques: *instruction-level gas calibration* [6, 30] for smart contract transactions, and *block-level gas limit* [4, 31] for blocks. The gas assigned to each smart contract instruction measures its execution cost, which includes the cost of computation, I/O and storage. The total gas cost of a smart contract transaction is the sum of the gas costs of all its instructions. The block gas limit sets system parameters that cap the maximum gas allowed for computation, I/O and storage with a single block. During block execution, transactions are finalized^{††} in the order they appear in the block. When the accumulated gas of finalized transactions exceeds the block gas limit, block execution stops, and the executed transactions up to that point updates the new blockchain state. To calibrate block execution time, the gas costs for individual instructions must first be accurately calibrated to reflect actual computation time. Then, the block gas limit is set accordingly, ensuring that block execution will halt at the desired time duration once the gas limit is met.

Extension to Client-Validator Model. Some blockchain systems, such as Solana [55], allow clients to communicate directly with validators. In this model, Zaptos’s optimizations (opt-execution, opt-commit,

^{††}In parallel execution [36], the execution of transactions can happen in parallel but the finalization of transactions’ executions are sequential.

and certification optimization) can still be applied to the validators' pipeline, achieving a latency reduction of 3 rounds when the execution and commit stage latencies exceed one round (similar to Corollary 4.4).

5 Implementation

We implement the pipelined architectures of Zaptos (Algorithm 2) ^{‡‡} in Rust [52], atop the open-sourced Aptos blockchain codebase [8]. We collaborated with the Aptos Labs team to integrate the event-driven pipeline design (Algorithm 1) into the Aptos blockchain, and are currently working with them to deploy Zaptos (Algorithm 2) [9].

The implementation uses Tokio [53] for asynchronous networking, blstrs [51] for cryptography. The primitives for consensus, execution and storage are mentioned in Section 2.3. Next, we highlight several key aspects for modular and efficient implementation.

Modularity and Extensibility. The implementation generally follows the pseudo-code, modularizing the pipeline into distinct stages with well-defined interfaces between directly dependent stages, as illustrated in Figure 2 and Figure 4. These dependencies are managed using Rust's Future feature [54], enabling asynchronous computation to produce the output of each stage so that subsequent stages can start as soon as the future is fulfilled. Leveraging Rust's asynchronous programming, the implementation supports concurrent execution of pipeline stages, maximizing resource utilization for high throughput. This modular design not only promotes high performance but also enables extensibility: new stages can be added by adjusting the interfaces of adjacent stages without modifying the contents of other stages or the rest of the pipeline. Finally, the pipeline implementation can be reused by both validators and fullnodes, with each selecting specific stages to include.

More Stages. In the actual implementation, the pipeline stages are further subdivided to improve parallelism and reduce latency. For example, the execution stage is divided into two sub-stages: executing the block to generate the new blockchain state, and merklizing the new state (computing the Merkle Tree proofs). This subdivision allows the execution stage of a block to begin as soon as the first sub-stage of the parent block's execution stage completes, thereby reducing pipeline latency. The implementation also includes additional stages not detailed in Algorithm 2. For instance, prior to the execution stage, an execution preparation stage retrieves the transaction payloads corresponding to metadata ordered by the consensus stage; following the commit stage, a post-commit stage is responsible for notifying other system components about committed transactions to prevent duplication.

Error Handling. In the pipeline, each stage may fail with recoverable errors or unrecoverable errors. If a stage fails with a recoverable error, the stage itself will be retried. When a stage fails with an unrecoverable error, subsequent stages skip execution and only propagate the error. The validator will handle the error depending on its type. For example, for an unrecoverable error, the validator may fallback to syncing the latest committed state from other validators.

^{‡‡}<https://github.com/aptos-labs/aptos-core/tree/daniel-paper>

6 Evaluation

In this section, we evaluate the throughput-latency performance of Zaptos with geo-distributed experiments, and compare it with the Aptos Blockchain (Algorithm 1). For fair comparison, the implementation and evaluation use the same primitives for each pipeline stage, as described in Section 2.3.

6.1 Setup

Machine Specifications. We used virtual machines from the Google Cloud Platform for the experiments. We used two variants of n2d series machines, namely n2d-standard-32 with 32 cores and 128 GB memory and n2d-standard-64 with 64 cores and 256 GB memory. This is to show that the execution is compute-bound and the overall system throughput is bounded by execution - increasing compute increases throughput. Each machine has a 2TB network attached disk to guarantee enough IOPS for persistence.

Geo-distribution. The testbed consists of virtual machines in 10 different regions to mimic a globally decentralized network. This includes 2 regions in the US (us-west1 and us-east1), 2 regions in Europe (europe-west4 and europe-southwest1), 1 region each in South America (southamerica-east1), South Africa (afrika-south1) and Australia (australia-southeast1), and 3 in Asia (asia-northeast3, asia-southeast1, and asia-south1). The round-trip times between these regions range between 25ms and 317ms. For our experiments, we deployed 100 validators and 30 fullnodes evenly across 10 regions.

In our evaluation, we simplify the experiments by assuming constant and negligible latencies for both client-to-fullnode and fullnode-to-validator communication, as these latencies are identical for Zaptos and Aptos Blockchain and do not impact the comparative results. Therefore, we let each fullnode and client to be co-located with a validator.

Metrics. We measure the blockchain's end-to-end latency as the fullnode end-to-end latency, measured from the fullnode receives the client's transaction to fullnodes commits the client's transaction, as the client-to-fullnode latency is negligible. Unless otherwise stated, we measure the 50th percentile latencies.

Workload. Each client transaction consists of 300-byte payload encoding peer-to-peer transfer from a source account to a target account along with metadata such as max gas fees and expiration timestamp. The clients send transactions in an open-loop at the target throughput rate.

6.2 Common Case

We first compare the performance of Zaptos and Aptos Blockchain in the common case, where the validators, fullnodes and clients are non-faulty, and the network is well connected. We use the terms latency and blockchain latency interchangeably to refer to the blockchain's end-to-end latency.

Throughput-latency Graph. Figure 5 shows the latency with respect to throughput graph of Zaptos and Aptos Blockchain in the common case. The vertical bars for each data point represent the 25th and the 75th percentile latencies. As depicted, both systems have a gradual increase in blockchain latency as the system load grows.




Figure 5: Common case performance of Zaptos and Aptos Blockchain.

However, when reaching maximum capacity, blockchain latency spikes sharply due to a pronounced rise in block queuing latency. For instance, on 32-cpu machines, Aptos Blockchain’s latency rises from 0.75s at 1k TPS to 1.53s at 14k TPS, while Zaptos’s latency increases from 0.58s at 1k TPS to 0.85s at 15k TPS. Similarly, on 64-cpu machines, Aptos Blockchain’s latency grows from 0.74s at 1k TPS to 1.32s at 20k TPS, whereas Zaptos’s latency increases from 0.58s at 1k TPS to 0.78s at 20k TPS. Across both machine types, Zaptos outperforms Aptos Blockchain as expected, significantly reducing blockchain latency by 160 ms under low load and over 0.5 second under high load. Notably, Zaptos achieves subsecond blockchain latency at 20k TPS with a production-grade implementation tested in a realistic, mainnet-like environment.


Latency Breakdown. To further analyze system performance and validate the optimizations in Zaptos, in Figures 6 and 7, we provide a detailed latency breakdown of the data points from the throughput-latency graph (Figure 5). The latency breakdown graph depicts the duration of each pipeline stage for both validators and fullnodes.

For Aptos Blockchain, the latency breakdown includes the following stages: consensus dissemination, consensus ordering, execution preparation, execution, certification, commit, and fullnode stages including execution preparation, execution and commit (grouped and represented as a single bar in the graph for simplicity). The execution preparation stage involves fetching the transaction payloads corresponding to metadata ordered by the consensus stage, and waiting for the execution stages of ancestor blocks to finish. In Aptos Blockchain, all stages are processed sequentially for each block, as illustrated in Figure 7b.


In contrast, Zaptos introduces parallel pipelining. Similarly, its latency breakdown includes the following stages: consensus dissemination, consensus ordering, execution preparation, optimistic execution, certification, optimistic commit, and fullnode optimistic execution and optimistic commit. However, in Zaptos, stages for the same block can overlap and execute in parallel as long as their preconditions are met, as detailed in Algorithm 2. Dependencies between stages are illustrated in Figure 2. For instance, receipt of a block proposal triggers execution preparation and subsequently opt-execution; and opt-execution completion triggers opt-commit, and certification once an ORDERVOTE is sent (last round of consensus).

From Figures 6 and 7, we make the following key observations:

- The blockchain latency of Zaptos is approximately equal to the consensus latency, up to 5k TPS on 32-cpu machines and 10k TPS on 64-cpu machines. During this range, the execution, certification and commit stages for both validators and fullnodes are effectively "shadowed" within the consensus stage. This partially validates Theorem 4.3. For instance, Aptos Blockchain on 64-cpu machines at 10k TPS, the non-consensus stages contribute 338 ms, which is more than 50% of the consensus latency of 648ms (dissemination latency: 288ms, ordering latency: 360ms). In contrast, Zaptos achieves a 30% reduction in blockchain latency by compressing the pipeline.
- As TPS increases, the non-consensus stages are no longer fully shadowed within the consensus stage. This is primarily due to the increased execution preparation required to wait or fetch larger blocks, and the longer duration of the opt-execution stage. When execution becomes the primary bottleneck for TPS under heavy load, increasing the number of CPUs from 32 to 64 enables both Aptos Blockchain and Zaptos to achieve higher peak TPS. While the certification stage still completes within a single round, it can only begin after the opt-execution is finished. The opt-commit stage remains relatively short, since the peer-to-peer transaction workload used in evaluation is not commit-intensive. However, for workloads involving transactions that write substantial amounts of on-chain data, the opt-commit stage could emerge as a bottleneck as TPS increases. For fullnodes, the opt-execution and opt-commit stages follow shortly after those of the validators, effectively reducing the overall pipeline duration. Despite partial overlap of the stages at maximum throughput, Zaptos significantly reduces latency by shadowing majority of the stage durations. For instance, at 20k TPS on 64-core machines, Aptos Blockchain exhibits a total latency of 1.32s (consensus latency: 0.68s; other stages: 0.64s), whereas Zaptos reduces this to 0.78s (consensus latency: 0.67s; other stages: 0.11s).
- The consensus dissemination latency remains a bottleneck of the blockchain latency under high load. As described in Section 2.3, this latency comprises the following: Batch queuing latency which is the expected time for a transaction to be included in a payload batch (~110ms). This is caused by an intentionally high payload batch creation interval (~200ms) to prevent network overload; Block queuing latency which




(a) Zaptos




(b) Aptos Blockchain

Figure 6: Latency breakdown of common case: 32 CPUs.



(a) Zaptos



(b) Aptos Blockchain

Figure 7: Latency breakdown of common case: 64 CPUs.

is the expected time for a transaction payload batch to be included in a block (~80ms), arising from a block interval of ~150ms; Broadcast latency which is the time required for one round of broadcasting the payload batch (~120ms). These components collectively result in dissemination latencies of ~300ms under load. Further improving the dissemination latency presents an interesting engineering challenge for future work.

6.3 Under Byzantine Failures

We demonstrate that Zaptos achieves better average system performance even in presence of failures. The evaluation focuses on the leader equivocation failure scenario, where a faulty leader sends distinct block proposals to different validators. As discussed in Section 4.5, leader equivocation may result in resource wastage when a block is opt-executed and opt-committed but eventually not ordered. A partitioned or slow leader can be regarded as a special case of an equivocating leader, where the faulty leader sends its proposal to only a subset of the validators rather than the entire network. In the case of crash failures, Zaptos improves average performance, performing comparably to Aptos Blockchain under crashed leaders




Figure 8: Failure case performance of Zaptos and Aptos Blockchain, under leader equivocation and round-robin leader rotation (leader reputation [22] disabled).

and outperforming it under non-faulty leaders. Consequently, we focus our evaluation on scenarios with equivocating leaders.

We compare Zaptos and Aptos Blockchain in a small-scale network comprising of 10 validators and 10 fullnodes distributed evenly across 10 regions, as described in Section 6.1. Our evaluation includes scenarios with 1 and 3 faulty validators acting maliciously by

proposing distinct blocks to different validators during their turn as leaders. For these tests, we use n2d-standard-32 machines (32 cores, 128 GB memory). To reflect the impact of malicious leaders, we use a naive round-robin leader rotation schedule.

As shown in Figure 8, under equivocating leaders and round-robin leader rotation, the system performances of both Zaptos and Aptos Blockchain degrade significantly, compared to the common case (Section 6.2). Specifically, the peak throughput of both systems decreases to approximately 8k TPS with 1 faulty validator and 3.5k TPS with 3 faulty validators. In this case, Zaptos also demonstrates significantly better average blockchain latency than Aptos Blockchain. For example, with one faulty validator, Zaptos achieves a latency improvement of approximately 0.5s to 0.7s compared to Aptos Blockchain. Similarly, with three faulty validators, the latency improvements range from around 0.45s to 0.7s. This improvement is attributed to the fact that during rounds with faulty leaders, both systems experience consensus stalling as the primary bottleneck. However, in rounds with non-faulty leaders, Zaptos achieves a substantial reduction in pipeline latency.

While leader reputation protocols [22] are commonly employed in real-world deployments to select high-performing leaders and enhance system stability, we intentionally disable them in the evaluation above to focus on performance under failure scenarios. Our additional testing with the leader reputation protocol shows that once the mechanism is activated to filter out faulty leaders, the system's performance recovers to levels comparable to the common case. Therefore, we do not report the numbers in the paper.

7 Related Work

Blockchain architectures. We classify existing blockchain architectures into three categories based on how their pipeline stages interact: coupled-consensus-execution, execution-then-consensus, and consensus-then-execution. In the latter two categories, consensus and execution are decoupled as separate stages.

In the coupled-consensus-execution architecture (illustrated in Figure 9), the consensus stage is tightly integrated with the execution of blocks which determines the new blockchain state during consensus. For instance, in leader-based protocols, validators execute a block after the leader's proposal and vote on the resulting new blockchain state. The output of the consensus stage includes the finalized state. Representative chains that use this architecture include Ethereum PoS [33], Solana [55], Algorand [37], Cosmos [18], Redbelly [23], NEAR [49] and Bitcoin [48]. XRP [60] and Stellar [46] do not organize transactions as blocks but they also couple consensus together with execution of transactions.

The execution-then-consensus architecture is first introduced in HyperLedger [2]. As illustrated in Figure 10, validators first execute a list of transactions locally, producing execution outputs. These outputs are then subjected to a consensus process to agree on their ordering and, consequently, the new blockchain state.

In the consensus-then-execution architecture (illustrated in Figure 11), validators initially reach a consensus on a new block extending the blockchain. Execution of the ordered block follows, producing the updated blockchain state. Ideally, deterministic execution ensures consistency across validators. However, non-deterministic execution caused by software bugs or hardware issues can lead

to inconsistent states. To address this issue, some systems introduce a certification stage prior to commit, as seen in Diem [25], Aptos [3] and Sui [13]. This stage involves validators collectively signing the new state. Alternatively, other systems, such as Porygon [21] (illustrated in Figure 12), run a second consensus on the new state by piggybacking on subsequent consensus instances. The first approach has lower latency, but compromises liveness when non-deterministic execution occurs, and no majority of the validators sign the same state. Both approaches produce a publicly verifiable proof of the new blockchain state, enabling clients to confirm that their transaction has been successfully committed to the blockchain. In Sui Lutris [13], an additional consensusless path is introduced to bypass the consensus stage for a subset of transactions involving only single-writer operations.

To the best of our knowledge, the Diem blockchain [45] was the first to design and implement a pipelined architecture, which has since been adopted by several major blockchains, including Aptos [8], Avalanche [50] and Sui [59]. This paper employs Aptos Blockchain as the baseline for Zaptos. Recently, Porygon [21] proposes a 3D parallelism architecture aimed at improving blockchain system throughput and latency, which includes a transaction processing pipeline that pipelines the consensus, execution, and commit stages. The key differences between the pipeline architecture of Porygon [21] and Aptos Blockchain [45] are as follows: (1) The Aptos Blockchain [45] uses a pipelined consensus protocol (an improved version of Jolteon [35, 42, 43]), which pipelines internal consensus stages to reduce the number of consensus messages and block interval (2 rounds). In contrast, Porygon [21] employs a non-pipelined consensus protocol (BA* [37]) and has a block interval at least equal to the full consensus ordering latency (4 rounds). It is because without pipelining, each consensus instance begins only after the previous instance finishes. The longer block interval leads to higher blockchain end-to-end latency, as the expected queuing delay for consensus increases with block interval duration. (2) In Porygon [21], during the certification stage (part of the commit stage in their paper), the updated blockchain state after execution is piggybacked with the next consensus block proposal, for validators to reach agreement. This approach results in the certification stage taking as long as the consensus stage. In contrast, the Aptos Blockchain handles certification in a single round, significantly reducing latency.

Consensus latency. As mentioned in Section 2.3, consensus latency consists of consensus dissemination latency and consensus ordering latency. A significant body of research has focused on reducing the consensus ordering latency of Byzantine fault tolerant (BFT) consensus protocols under partial synchrony, which can broadly be categorized into leader-based and DAG-based approaches.

For leader-based protocols, PBFT [19] pioneered the field with an optimal consensus ordering latency of 3 rounds, though it lacked efficient data dissemination, leader rotation, and pipelining. Decoupling data dissemination is crucial for maximizing consensus throughput, as it allows reaching agreement solely on the metadata. In the blockchain era, leader rotation is crucial for ensuring fairness and aligning economic incentives within the network. Additionally, pipelining reduces message complexity and the variety

of message types, thereby simplifying the protocol's implementation. Since PBFT, various improvements have been made to address these limitations [15, 16, 24, 28, 35, 61]. HotStuff [61], in particular, achieves pipelining and leader rotation with linear message complexity, at the expense of increased consensus ordering latency. Subsequent works [28, 35, 43] improve the consensus ordering latency. DAG-based protocols are inherently designed for efficient data dissemination, seamless leader rotation, and effective pipelining. Recent works [11, 12, 24, 39, 56, 57] have focused on reducing latency while achieving high throughput.

It is well known that the lower bound of the consensus ordering latency is 3 rounds under partial synchrony and optimal fault tolerance [1, 41], and many leader-based BFT protocols [19, 28] achieves this optimal 3-round consensus ordering latency. However, these protocols require an additional round of dissemination to include transactions (or metadata of transaction batches) from all validators in the proposal to achieve high throughput, resulting in a total consensus latency of 4 rounds. Similarly, in the latest DAG-based BFT protocols [12, 40], the latency includes an implicit 1 round for dissemination followed by 3 rounds for ordering.

A multi-leader optimization has been proposed in several studies for both leader-based protocols [58] and DAG-based protocols [56], reducing dissemination latency by ordering proposals from multiple validators for the same round. Ideally, this approach could eliminate dissemination latency entirely by treating all validators as leaders. However, in practice, a large multi-leader setup is not resilient: if any validator in the set is slow or malicious, the entire set of proposals may fail. Consequently, even a small subset of slow or malicious validators could severely degrade system performance or even compromise liveness.

8 Conclusion

This paper introduces Zaptos, a novel blockchain pipeline architecture designed to achieve low latency by preemptively parallelizing pipeline stages, and high throughput by maximizing resource utilization through effective pipelining.

Acknowledgments

We thank the Aptos Labs Research team and Engineering team for valuable discussions and feedbacks, especially Rati Gelashvili, Alden Hu, Igor Kabiljo and Joshua Lind.

References

- [1] Ittai Abraham, Kartik Nayak, Ling Ren, and Zhuolun Xiang. 2021. Good-case latency of byzantine broadcast: A complete categorization. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*. 331–341.
- [2] Elli Androulaki, Artem Barger, Vita Bortnikov, Christian Cachin, Konstantinos Christidis, Angelo De Caro, David Enyeart, Christopher Ferris, Gennady Laventman, Yacov Manevich, et al. 2018. Hyperledger fabric: a distributed operating system for permissioned blockchains. In *Proceedings of the thirteenth EuroSys conference*. 1–15.
- [3] Aptos. 2022. The Aptos Blockchain: Safe, Scalable, and Upgradeable Web3 Infrastructure. https://aptosfoundation.org/whitepaper/aptos-whitepaper_en.pdf
- [4] Aptos. 2023. AIP-33 - Block Gas Limit. <https://github.com/aptos-foundation/AIPs/blob/main/aips/aip-33.md>
- [5] Aptos. 2024. E2E Latency Comparison Benchmark. <https://github.com/aptos-labs/e2e-latency-bench>
- [6] Aptos. 2024. Gas and Storage Fees. <https://aptos.dev/en/network/blockchain/gas-txn-fee>
- [7] Aptos. 2024. Move - A Web3 Language and Runtime. <https://aptos.dev/en/network/blockchain/move>
- [8] Aptos. 2024. Official implementation in Rust. <https://github.com/aptos-labs/aptos-core>
- [9] Aptos. 2024. The pipeline implementation. <https://github.com/aptos-labs/aptos-core/tree/main/consensus/src/pipeline>
- [10] Aptos. 2024. Real-time E2E Latency Comparison Dashboard of Major Blockchains. <https://aptoslabs.grafana.net/public-dashboards/f32a07a7ef01456cbb9f79ac975fb00e?orgId=1&refresh=15m>
- [11] Balaji Arun, Zekun Li, Florian Suri-Payer, Sourav Das, and Alexander Spiegelman. 2024. Shoal++: High Throughput DAG BFT Can Be Fast! *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.20488* (2024).
- [12] Kushal Babel, Andrey Chursin, George Danezis, Lefteris Kokoris-Kogias, and Alberto Sonnino. 2023. Mysticeti: Low-Latency DAG Consensus with Fast Commit Path. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.14821* (2023).
- [13] Sam Blackshear, Andrey Chursin, George Danezis, Anastasios Kichidis, Lefteris Kokoris-Kogias, Xun Li, Mark Logan, Ashok Menon, Todd Nowacki, Alberto Sonnino, et al. 2024. Sui lutris: A blockchain combining broadcast and consensus. In *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. 2606–2620.
- [14] Dan Boneh, Ben Lynn, and Hovav Shacham. 2001. Short signatures from the Weil pairing. In *Advances in Cryptology—ASIACRYPT 2001: 7th International Conference on the Theory and Application of Cryptology and Information Security Gold Coast, Australia, December 9–13, 2001 Proceedings 7*. Springer, 514–532.
- [15] Ethan Buchman. 2016. *Tendermint: Byzantine fault tolerance in the age of blockchains*. Ph.D. Dissertation.
- [16] Vitalik Buterin and Virgil Griffith. 2017. Casper the friendly finality gadget. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.09437* (2017).
- [17] Christian Cachin, Klaus Kursawe, Frank Petzold, and Victor Shoup. 2001. Secure and efficient asynchronous broadcast protocols. In *Annual International Cryptology Conference*. Springer, 524–541.
- [18] Daniel Cason, Enrique Fynn, Nenad Milosevic, Zarko Milosevic, Ethan Buchman, and Fernando Pedone. 2021. The design, architecture and performance of the tendermint blockchain network. In *2021 40th International Symposium on Reliable Distributed Systems (SRDS)*. IEEE, 23–33.
- [19] Miguel Castro and Barbara Liskov. 1999. Practical Byzantine fault tolerance. In *Proceedings of the third Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI)*. USENIX Association, 173–186.
- [20] Benjamin Y Chan and Elaine Shi. 2020. Streamlet: Textbook Streamlined Blockchains. In *Proceedings of the 1st ACM Conference on Advances in Financial Technologies (AFT)*.
- [21] Wuhui Chen, Ding Xia, Zhongteng Cai, Hong-Ning Dai, Jianting Zhang, Zicong Hong, Junyuan Liang, and Zibin Zheng. 2024. Porygon: Scaling Blockchain via 3D Parallelism. In *2024 IEEE 40th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*. IEEE, 1944–1957.
- [22] Shir Cohen, Rati Gelashvili, Lefteris Kokoris-Kogias, Zekun Li, Dahlia Malkhi, Alberto Sonnino, and Alexander Spiegelman. 2022. Be aware of your leaders. In *International Conference on Financial Cryptography and Data Security*. Springer, 279–295.
- [23] Tyler Crain, Christopher Natoli, and Vincent Gramoli. 2021. Red belly: A secure, fair and scalable open blockchain. In *2021 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 466–483.
- [24] George Danezis, Lefteris Kokoris-Kogias, Alberto Sonnino, and Alexander Spiegelman. 2022. Narwhal and Tusk: a DAG-based mempool and efficient BFT consensus. In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth European Conference on Computer Systems*. 34–50.
- [25] Diem. 2020. The Diem Blockchain. <https://developers.diem.com/docs/technical-papers/the-diem-blockchain-paper/>
- [26] Diem. 2020. The pipeline implementation. <https://github.com/diem/diem/tree/main/consensus/src/experimental>
- [27] Diem. 2024. Official implementation in Rust. <https://github.com/diem/diem>
- [28] Isaac Doidge, Raghavendra Ramesh, Nibesh Shrestha, and Joshua Tobkin. 2024. Moonshot: Optimizing Chain-Based Rotating Leader BFT via Optimistic Proposals. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.01791* (2024).
- [29] Cynthia Dwork, Nancy Lynch, and Larry Stockmeyer. 1988. Consensus in the presence of partial synchrony. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)* 35, 2 (1988), 288–323.
- [30] Ethereum. 2024. Gas and fees. <https://ethereum.org/en/developers/docs/gas/>
- [31] Ethereum. 2024. Gas and fees: block-size. <https://ethereum.org/en/developers/docs/gas/#block-size>
- [32] Facebook. 2013. RocksDB: A Persistent Key-Value Store for Fast Storage Environments. <https://rocksdb.org>
- [33] Ethereum Foundation. 2020. PROOF-OF-STAKE (POS). <https://ethereum.org/en/developers/docs/consensus-mechanisms/pos/>. (2020).
- [34] Zhenhuan Gao, Yuxuan Hu, and Qinfan Wu. 2021. Jellyfish Merkle Tree.
- [35] Rati Gelashvili, Lefteris Kokoris-Kogias, Alberto Sonnino, Alexander Spiegelman, and Zhuolun Xiang. 2022. Jolteon and ditto: Network-adaptive efficient consensus with asynchronous fallback. In *International conference on financial cryptography and data security*. Springer, 296–315.
- [36] Rati Gelashvili, Alexander Spiegelman, Zhuolun Xiang, George Danezis, Zekun Li, Dahlia Malkhi, Yu Xia, and Runtian Zhou. 2023. Block-stm: Scaling blockchain

- execution by turning ordering curse to a performance blessing. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGPLAN Annual Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming*, 232–244.
- [37] Yossi Gilad, Rotem Hemo, Silvio Micali, Georgios Vlachos, and Nickolai Zeldovich. 2017. Algorand: Scaling byzantine agreements for cryptocurrencies. In *Proceedings of the 26th symposium on operating systems principles*. 51–68.
- [38] Guy Golan Gueta, Ittai Abraham, Shelly Grossman, Dahlia Malkhi, Benny Pinkas, Michael Reiter, Dragos-Adrian Seredinschi, Orr Tamir, and Alin Tomescu. 2019. SBF: a scalable and decentralized trust infrastructure. In *2019 49th Annual IEEE/IFIP International Conference on Dependable Systems and Networks (DSN)*. IEEE, 568–580.
- [39] Idit Keidar, Eleftherios Kokoris-Kogias, Oded Naor, and Alexander Spiegelman. 2021. All you need is dag. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*. 165–175.
- [40] Idit Keidar, Oded Naor, Ouri Poupko, and Ehud Shapiro. 2022. Cordial miners: Fast and efficient consensus for every eventuality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.09174* (2022).
- [41] Petr Kuznetsov, Andrei Tonkikh, and Yan X Zhang. 2021. Revisiting optimal resilience of fast byzantine consensus. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*. 343–353.
- [42] Aptos Labs. 2024. AIP-106 - Optimistic Quorum Store. <https://github.com/aptos-foundation/AIPs/blob/main/aips/aip-106.md>
- [43] Aptos Labs. 2024. AIP-89 Consensus Latency Reduction using Order Votes. <https://github.com/aptos-foundation/AIPs/blob/main/aips/aip-89.md>
- [44] LESLIE LAMPORT, ROBERT SHOSTAK, and MARSHALL PEASE. 1982. The Byzantine Generals Problem. *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems* 4, 3 (1982), 382–401.
- [45] Zekun Li. 2021. [dip-213] decoupled execution. <https://github.com/diem/dip/pull/214>
- [46] David Mazieres. 2015. The stellar consensus protocol: A federated model for internet-level consensus. *Stellar Development Foundation* 32 (2015), 1–45.
- [47] Ralph C Merkle. 1987. A digital signature based on a conventional encryption function. In *Conference on the theory and application of cryptographic techniques*. Springer, 369–378.
- [48] Satoshi Nakamoto. 2008. Bitcoin whitepaper. URL: <https://bitcoin.org/bitcoin.pdf> (-: 17.07. 2019) 9 (2008), 15.
- [49] NEAR. 2024. Consensus. <https://nomicon.io/ChainSpec/Consensus>
- [50] Patrick O’Grady. 2024. Vryx: Fortifying Decoupled State Machine Replication. <https://hackmd.io/@patrickogrady/rys8mdl5p#Vryx-Fortifying-Decoupled-State-Machine-Replication>
- [51] Rust. 2024. blstrs library. <https://docs.rs/blstrs/latest/blstrs/>
- [52] Rust. 2024. Rust Programming Language. <https://www.rust-lang.org/>
- [53] Rust. 2024. tokio library. <https://docs.rs/tokio/latest/tokio/>
- [54] Rust. 2024. Trait Future. <https://doc.rust-lang.org/std/future/trait.Future.html>
- [55] Solana. 2024. Whitepaper. <https://solana.com/solana-whitepaper.pdf>
- [56] Alexander Spiegelman, Balaji Aurn, Rati Gelashvili, and Zekun Li. 2023. Shoal: Improving dag-bft latency and robustness. In *International Conference on Financial Cryptography and Data Security*. Springer.
- [57] Alexander Spiegelman, Neil Giridharan, Alberto Sonnino, and Lefteris Kokoris-Kogias. 2022. Bullshark: Dag bft protocols made practical. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. 2705–2718.
- [58] Chrysoula Stathakopoulou, Tudor David, and Marko Vukolic. 2019. Mir-bft: High-throughput bft for blockchains. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.05552* 92 (2019).
- [59] Sui. 2024. Official implementation in Rust. <https://github.com/MystenLabs/sui>
- [60] XRP. 2024. Consensus Protocol. <https://xrpl.org/docs/concepts/consensus-protocol>
- [61] Maofan Yin, Dahlia Malkhi, Michael K Reiter, Guy Golan Gueta, and Ittai Abraham. 2019. Hotstuff: Bft consensus with linearity and responsiveness. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*. ACM, 347–356.
- [62] Saman Taghavi Zargar, James Joshi, and David Tipper. 2013. A survey of defense mechanisms against distributed denial of service (DDoS) flooding attacks. *IEEE communications surveys & tutorials* 15, 4 (2013), 2046–2069.




Figure 9: Illustration of the coupled-consensus-execution pipeline architecture. The consensus stage is tightly integrated with the execution of blocks which determines the new blockchain state during consensus.




Figure 10: Illustration of the execution-then-consensus pipeline architecture. Validators first execute a list of transactions locally, producing execution outputs. These outputs are then subjected to a consensus process to agree on their ordering and, consequently, the new blockchain state.




Figure 11: Illustration of the consensus-then-execution pipeline architecture. Validators initially reach a consensus on a new block extending the current blockchain. Execution of the ordered block follows, producing the updated blockchain state. To produce publicly verifiable proof of the new blockchain state and avoid safety violation caused by non-deterministic execution, a certification stage is introduced prior to commit. When integrated with a pipelined consensus protocol, this architecture effectively becomes the pipelined architecture of Aptos Blockchain (Figure 1).




Figure 12: Illustration of the Porygon [21] pipeline architecture. Porygon falls under the consensus-then-execution pipeline architecture, but relies on subsequent consensus stage for certification. As a result, a block B_1 is committed only after the consensus instance for B_3 , which includes the piggybacked updated blockchain state following its execution, is completed.

A Existing Blockchain Pipeline Architectures

We provide illustrations of existing blockchain pipeline architecture, including coupled-consensus-execution in Figure 9, execution-then-consensus in Figure 10, and consensus-then-execution in Figure 11 and Figure 12. More details of can be found in Section 7.