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Abstract. Blockchain has many benefits including decentralization, availability, persistency, consistency, anonymity, auditability and accountability, and it also covers a wide spectrum of applications ranging from cryptocurrency, financial services, reputation system, Internet of Things, sharing economy to public and social services. Not only may blockchain be regarded as a by-product of Bitcoin cryptocurrency systems, but also it is a type of distributed ledger technology through using a trustworthy, decentralized log of totally ordered transactions. By summarizing the literature of blockchain, it is found that more papers focus on engineering implementation and realization, while little work has been done on basic theory, for example, mathematical models (Markov processes, queueing theory and game models), performance analysis and optimization of blockchain systems. In this paper, we develop queueing theory of blockchain systems and provide system performance evaluation. To do this, we design a Markovian batch-service queueing system with two different service stages, while the two stages are suitable to well express the mining process in the miners pool and the building of a new blockchain. By using the matrix-geometric solution, we obtain a system stable condition and express three key performance measures: (a) The number of transactions in the queue, (b) the number of transactions in a block, and (c) the transaction-confirmation time. Finally, we use numerical examples to verify computability of our theoretical results. Although our queueing model is simple under exponential or Poisson assumptions, our analytic method will open a series of potentially promising research in queueing theory of blockchain systems.
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1 Introduction

In this paper, we develop queueing theory of blockchain systems under a dynamic behavior setting. Such a blockchain queue in general is very necessary
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and useful in performance analysis and optimization of blockchain systems, and it will be helpful in design and optimization of blockchain technologies. To this end, we propose and analyze a Markovian batch-service queueing system with two different service stages, in which the two stages are suitable to well express the mining process in the miners pool and the building of a new blockchain. By using the matrix-geometric solution, we obtain a system stable condition and express three key measures: The average number of transactions in the queue, the average number of transactions in a block, and the average transaction-confirmation time. At the same time, we use some numerical examples to verify effective computability of our theoretical results. Different from the previous works in the literature, this paper gives a complete solution with respect to analysis of the blockchain queue: Markovian batch-service queue with two service stages. We hope that our approach opens a new avenue to queueing analysis of more general blockchain systems in practice, and can motivates a series of promising future research.

Blockchain is one of the most popular issues discussed extensively in recent years, and it has already changed people’s lifestyle in some real areas due to its great impact on finance, business, industry, transportation, healthcare and so forth. Since the introduction of Bitcoin by Nakamoto [22], blockchain technologies have become widely adopted in many real applications, for example, survey work of applications by NRI [24] and Foroglou and Tsilidou [9]; finance by Tsai et al. [29]; business and information systems by Beck et al. [1]; applications to companies by Montemayor et al. [21]; Internet of Things and shared economy by Huckle et al. [11]; healthcare by Mettler [20]; and the others.

So far blockchain research has obtained many important advances, readers may refer to a book by Swan [28]; survey papers by Tschorsch and Scheuermann [30], Zheng et al. [34] and [35], Lin and Liao [18] and Constantinides et al. [6]; a key research framework shown by Yli-Huumo et al. [32], Lindman et al. [19] and Risius and Spohrer [27]; blockchain economics by Catalini and Gans [5] and Davidson et al. [7]; and the others by Vranken [31] and Dinh et al. [8].

However, little work has been done on basic theory of blockchain systems so far, for example, developing mathematical models (e.g., optimal methods, Markov processes, queueing theory and game models), providing performance analysis and optimization, and setting up useful relations among key factors or basic parameters.

Our blockchain queueing model focuses on analysis of the block-generation and blockchain-building processes, in which the sum of the block-generation and blockchain-building times is equal to the transaction-confirmation time. For convenience of reader’s understanding, it is necessary to simple recall some papers which discussed the miners pool and the mining process. The blockchain is maintained and updated by mining process in which many nodes, called miners, compete for finding answers of a very difficult puzzle-like problem. While transactions are grouped into a block, and then the block is built to the blockchain when an algorithmic puzzle specialized for the block is solved. For such a mining process, readers may refer to, for example, Bitcoin by Nakamoto [22], Bhaskar
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and Chuen [3] and Böhme et al. [4]; blockchain by Section 2 in Zheng et al. [33] and Section 2 in Dinh et al. [8] for more details. In addition, it may be useful to see transaction graph and transaction network by Ober et al. [25] and Kondor et al. [15]. Finally, the mining processes were also discussed by game theory, e.g., see Houy [10], Lewenberg et al. [16], Kiayias et al. [14] and Biais et al. [2].

Kasahara and Kawahara provided an early research (in fact, so far there have been only their two papers in the literature) on applying queueing theory to deal with the transaction-confirmation time for Bitcoin, and they gave some interesting idea and useful numerical results to heuristically motivate future promising research. See Kasahara and Kawahara [12] and Kawahara and Kasahara [13] for more details. In those two papers, Kasahara and Kawahara assumed that the block-generation times follow a general continuous probability distribution function. Then they used the supplementary variable method to set up a system of differential difference equations (see Section 3 of Kawahara and Kasahara [13]), which is related to the elapsed service time. However, they have not correctly given the unique solution of the system of differential difference equations yet, although they used the generating function technique to provide some formalized computation. For example, the average number $E[N]$ of transactions in the system and the average transaction-confirmation time: $E[T] = E[N]/\lambda$ given in (17) of Kawahara and Kasahara [13], depend on infinitely-many unknown numbers: $\alpha_n$ for $n = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$, but the unknown numbers $\alpha_n$ are impossible to be obtained by their ordinary technique. In fact, we also believe that analysis of the Bitcoin queueing system with general block-generation times, given in Kawahara and Kasahara [13], is still an interesting open problem in the future queueing research.

To overcome the difficulties involved in Kawahara and Kasahara [13], this paper introduce two different exponential service stages corresponding to the block-generation and blockchain-building times, respectively. As seen in Section 2, such two service stages are very reasonable in description of the block-generation and blockchain-building processes. Although our blockchain queueing model is simple under exponential or Poisson assumptions, it is easy to see that this model is still very interesting due to its two stages of batch services: a block of transactions is generated and then a new blockchain is built. At the same time, we obtain several useful results as follows:

(a) Stability: This system is positive recurrent if and only if

$$\frac{(b+1)\mu_1\mu_2}{\mu_1 + \mu_2} > \lambda.$$  

Note that this stable condition is not intuitive, and it can not be obtained by means of some simple observation. For example, for a special case with $\mu_1 = \mu_2$, that is, for the queueing model of Kawahara and Kasahara [13], the stable condition is given by $(b+1)\mu/2 > \lambda$, which is different from that condition: $\lambda E[S] < b$ (i.e., $\lambda < b\mu$), given in Page 77 of Kawahara and Kasahara [13].

(b) Expressions: By using the matrix-geometric solution, we provide simple expressions for the average number of transactions in the queue, the average
number of transactions in a block, and the average transaction-confirmation
time. At the same time, we use numerical examples to verify computability of
our theoretical results.

The structure of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes an
interesting blockchain queue. Section 3 establishes a continuous-time Markov
process of GI/M/1 type, and derive a system stable condition and the stationary
probability vector by means of the matrix-geometric solution. Section 4 provides
three key performance measures, and gives some numerical examples to verify
computability of our theoretical results. Finally, some concluding remarks are
given in Section 5.

2 Model Description for a Blockchain Queue

In this section, based on the real background of blockchain, we design an
interesting blockchain queue, in which the block-generation and blockchain-
building processes are expressed by means of a two stages of batch services.

From the real background of blockchain, the block-generation and blockchain-
building processes can be understand easily, e.g., see Bitcoin by Nakamoto [22]
and Bhaskar and Chuen [3]; and blockchain by Section 2 in Zheng et al. [33]
and Section 2 in Dinh et al. [8]. Thus we can abstract the mining process (in-
cluding the block-generation and blockchain-building processes of the blockchain
as a Markovian batch service queue with two different service stages, which is
depicted in Figure 1.

![Fig. 1. A blockchain queueing system](image)

Now, from Figure 1 we provide some model descriptions as follows:

**Arrival process:** Transactions arrive at the blockchain system according to
a Poisson process with arrival rate \( \lambda \). Each transaction must first enter and queue
at an waiting room of infinite size. Note that the arrival process of transactions
is denoted in the left part of Figure 1.
**Service process:** Each arrival transaction first queues up in the waiting room. Then it waits for being successfully mined as a block, this is regarded as the first stage of service, called block generation, see the middle part of Figure 1. Finally, the block with this transaction is built into the blockchain, this is regarded as the second stage of service, called blockchain building, see the right part of Figure 1. Thus the mining process of transactions include two stages of batch services: Block generation and blockchain building, both of which are denoted in the middle and right parts of Figure 1.

In the blockchain system, we assume that the block-generation times in the first stage are i.i.d and exponential with service rate $\mu_2$; the blockchain-building times in the second stage are i.i.d and exponential with the service rate $\mu_1$.

**The block-generation discipline:** A block can consist of several transactions but at most $b$ transactions. The transactions mined into a block are not completely based on the First Come First Choose (FCFC) from the arrival order of transactions at the waiting room, that is, some transactions in the back of this queue may be preferentially chosen into the block, as seen in the middle part of Figure 1.

For simplification of description, our later computation will be based on the FCFC discipline. This may be a better approximation for analyzing the blockchain queueing system once the transactions are regarded as the same ones under a dynamic behavior setting.

Note that this block-generation discipline results from the fact that a newly generated block is confirmed by solving a difficult mathematical problem by means of a cryptographic hash algorithm. This confirmation process is called mining while a number of nodes who compete for finding the answer is called miners. The winner will be awarded reward, which consists of some fixed values and fees of transactions included in the block, and he still has the right to add a new block to the blockchain.

**Maximum block size:** To avoid the spam attack, the maximum block size is limited. We assume that there are at most $b$ transactions in each block. If the resulting block size is smaller than the maximum block size $b$, then the transactions newly arriving during the mining process of a block can be accepted in the block again. If there are more than $b$ transactions in the waiting room, then we assume that a new block will include $b$ transactions through the full blocks to maximize the batch service ability in the blockchain system.

**Independence:** We assume that all the random variables defined above are independent of each other.

**Remark 1:** The arrival process of transactions at the blockchain system may be non-Poisson (for example, Markov arrival process and renewal process). On the other hand, the two stages of batch service processes may be non-exponential (for example, phase-type distribution and general distribution). However, analysis of the blockchain queues with renewal arrival process or with general service time distribution is an interesting open problem in queueing research of blockchain systems.
Remark 2: In the blockchain system, there are key factors, such as the maximum block size $b$, reward of winning miners, fees of transactions, security of blockchain and so on. Based on some of them, we may develop reward queueing models, decision queueing models, and game queueing models in the study of blockchain systems. This will be very useful in improving blockchain technologies in the future.

3 A Markov Process of GI/M/1 Type

In this section, for the blockchain queueing system, we establish a continuous-time Markov process of GI/M/1 type. Based on this, we derive a system stable condition and the stationary probability vector of this system by means of the matrix-geometric solution.

Let $I(t)$ and $J(t)$ be the numbers of transactions in the block and in the queue at time $t$, respectively. Then, $(I(t), J(t))$ may be regarded as a state of the blockchain queueing system at time $t$. Note that $i = 0, 1, \ldots, b$ and $j = 0, 1, \ldots$, for various cases of $(I(t), J(t))$ we write

$$
\Omega = \{(i, j) : i = 0, 1, \ldots, b, \quad j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots\} = \{(0, 0), (1, 0), \ldots, (b, 0); (0, 1), (1, 1), \ldots, (b, 1); \ldots; (0, b), (1, b), \ldots, (b, b); (0, b + 1), (1, b + 1), \ldots, (b, b + 1); \ldots\}. \quad (1)
$$

![Fig. 2. State transition relation of a Markov process](image_url)

Let $X(t) = (I(t), J(t))$. Then $\{X(t) : t \geq 0\}$ is a continuous-time Markov process of GI/M/1 type on the state space $\Omega$. Figure 2 denotes the state transition relation of the Markov process $\{X(t) : t \geq 0\}$, thus its infinitesimal gener-
ator is given by

\[
Q = \begin{pmatrix}
B_0 & A_0 \\
B_1 & A_1 & A_0 \\
B_2 & A_1 & A_0 \\
\vdots & \ddots & \ddots \\
B_b & A_1 & A_0 \\
A_{b+1} & A_1 & A_0 \\
\vdots & \ddots & \ddots \\
\end{pmatrix},
\]

where

\[
A_0 = \lambda I, \quad A_1 = \begin{pmatrix}
-(\lambda + \mu_2) \\
\mu_1 & -(\lambda + \mu_1) \\
\vdots & \ddots \\
\mu_1 & -(\lambda + \mu_1)
\end{pmatrix}, \quad A_{b+1} = \begin{pmatrix}
0 & \cdots & 0 & \mu_2 \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & \mu_2
\end{pmatrix},
\]

and

\[
B_0 = \begin{pmatrix}
-\lambda \\
\mu_1 - (\lambda + \mu_1) \\
\vdots & \ddots \\
\mu_1 & -(\lambda + \mu_1)
\end{pmatrix},
\]

\[
B_1 = \begin{pmatrix}
0 & \mu_2 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
0 & \mu_2 & \cdots & 0 \\
\end{pmatrix}, \quad B_2 = \begin{pmatrix}
0 & \mu_2 & \cdots & 0 \\
0 & \mu_2 & \cdots & 0 \\
\end{pmatrix}, \ldots, \quad B_b = \begin{pmatrix}
0 & \cdots & 0 & \mu_2 \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & \mu_2
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

For the continuous-time Markov process of GI/M/1 type, now we use the mean drift method to discuss its system stable condition. Note that the mean drift method for checking system stability is given a detailed introduction in Chapter 3 of Li [17].

From Chapter 1 of Neuts [23] or Chapter 3 of Li [17], for the Markov process of GI/M/1 type, we write

\[
A = A_0 + A_1 + A_{b+1} = \begin{pmatrix}
-\mu_2 & \mu_2 \\
\mu_1 & -\mu_1 \\
\vdots & \ddots \\
\mu_1 & -\mu_1 \\
\mu_1 & -\mu_1
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

Clearly, the Markov process \( A \) with finite states is irreducible, aperiodic and positive recurrent. In this case, we denote by its stationary probability vector \( \theta = (\theta_0, \theta_1, \ldots, \theta_b) \). Also, \( \theta \) is the unique solution to the system of linear equations:
\[ \theta A = 0 \text{ and } \theta e = 1, \text{ where } e \text{ is a column vector of ones with proper dimension.} \]

It is easy to check that

\[ \theta = \left( \frac{\mu_1}{\mu_1 + \mu_2}, 0, \ldots, 0, \frac{\mu_2}{\mu_1 + \mu_2} \right) \]

The following theorem provides a necessary and sufficient conditions under which the Markov process \( Q \) is positive recurrence.

**Theorem 1** The Markov process \( Q \) of GI/M/1 type is positive recurrent if and only if

\[ \frac{(b+1)\mu_1\mu_2}{\mu_1 + \mu_2} > \lambda. \]

**Proof.** By using the mean drift method, it is easy to see that the Markov process \( Q \) of GI/M/1 type is positive recurrent if and only if

\[ \theta A_0 e < (b+1)\theta A_{b+1} e. \]  \( (3) \)

Note that

\[ \theta A_0 e = \lambda, \]  \( (4) \)

and

\[ (b+1)\theta A_{b+1} e = (b+1)\theta_0 \mu_2 = \frac{(b+1)\mu_1\mu_2}{\mu_1 + \mu_2}, \]  \( (5) \)

thus we obtain

\[ \frac{(b+1)\mu_1\mu_2}{\mu_1 + \mu_2} > \lambda. \]

This completes the proof. \( \blacksquare \)

**Remark 3:** It may be useful to consider a special case with \( \mu_1 = \mu_2 \). In this case, the Markov process \( Q \) of GI/M/1 type is positive recurrent if and only if

\[ \frac{(b+1)\mu}{2} > \lambda, \]

which is different from that condition: \( \lambda ES < b \) (i.e., \( \lambda < b\mu \)), given in Page 77 of Kawahara and Kasahara [13].

When the Markov process \( Q \) of GI/M/1 type is positive recurrent, we write its stationary probability vector as

\[ \pi = (\pi_0, \pi_1, \pi_2, \ldots), \]

where

\[ \pi_0 = (\pi_{0,0}, \pi_{1,0}, \ldots, \pi_{b,0}), \]

\[ \pi_1 = (\pi_{0,1}, \pi_{1,1}, \ldots, \pi_{b,1}), \]

\[ \pi_k = (\pi_{0,k}, \pi_{1,k}, \ldots, \pi_{b,k}), \quad k \geq 2. \]
For the Markov process $Q$ of GI/M/1 type, to compute its stationary probability vector, we need to first obtain the rate matrix $R$, which is the minimal nonnegative solution to the following nonlinear matrix equation

$$R^{b+1} A_{b+1} + RA_1 + A_0 = 0. \quad (6)$$

In general, it is very complicated to solve this nonlinear matrix equation due to the term $R^{b+1} A_{b+1}$ of size $b+1$. In fact, for the blockchain queueing system, here we can not also provide an explicit expression for the rate matrix $R$. For example, we consider a special case with $b = 1$. In this case, we have

$$A_0 = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda \\ \mu \end{pmatrix}, \quad A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} - (\lambda + \mu) \\ \mu_1 \\ - (\lambda + \mu_1) \end{pmatrix}, \quad A_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mu_2 \\ \mu_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} r_{0,0} & r_{0,1} \\ r_{1,0} & r_{1,1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then

$$R^2 = \begin{pmatrix} r_{0,0}^2 + r_{0,1} r_{1,0} & r_{0,0} r_{0,1} + r_{0,1} r_{1,1} \\ r_{1,0} r_{0,0} + r_{1,1} r_{1,0} & r_{1,0} r_{0,1} + r_{1,1}^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus by computing $R^2 A_2 + RA_1 + A_0 = 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{cases} - (\lambda + \mu_1) (\lambda + \mu_2) r_{0,0} + \frac{\lambda (\lambda + \mu_1)}{\mu_1} r_{0,1} + \frac{\mu_1 \mu_2}{\lambda + \mu_2} r_{1,1} + (\lambda + \mu_1) r_{1,1} + \lambda = 0, \\
\frac{\mu_1 \mu_2}{\lambda + \mu_2} r_{0,0} r_{1,1} + \frac{\mu_1 \mu_2}{\lambda + \mu_2} r_{1,1}^2 + (\lambda + \mu_1) r_{1,1} + \lambda = 0. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see that for the maximal block size $b = 1$, we can not provide an explicit expression for the rate matrix $R$ of size 2 yet.

Although the rate matrix $R$ has not an explicit expression, we can use some iterative algorithms, given in Neuts [23], to give its numerical solution. Here, an effective iterative algorithm is described as

$$R_0 = 0,$$

$$R_{N+1} = (R^{b+1} A_{b+1} + A_0) (-A_1)^{-1}.$$

Note that this algorithm is fast convergent, that is, after a finite number of iterative steps, we can numerically given a solution of higher precision for the rate matrix $R$.

The following theorem directly comes from Theorem 1.2.1 of Chapter 1 in Neuts [23]. Here, we restate it without a proof.

**Theorem 2** If the Markov process $Q$ of GI/M/1 type is positive recurrent, then the stationary probability vector $\pi = (\pi_0, \pi_1, \pi_2, \ldots)$ is given by

$$\pi_k = \pi_0 R^k, \quad k \geq 1, \quad (7)$$

where the vector $\pi_0$ is positive, and it is the unique solution to the following system of linear equations:

$$\pi_0 B [R] = \pi_0, \quad (8)$$

$$\pi_0 (I - R)^{-1} e = 1,$$

and the matrix $B [R] = \sum_{k=0}^b R^k B_k$ is irreducible and stochastic.
4 Performance Analysis

In this section, we provide performance analysis of the blockchain queueing system. To this end, we provide three key performance measures and give their simple expressions by means of the vector \( \pi_0 \) and the rate matrix \( R \). Finally, we use numerical examples to verify computability of our theoretical results, and show how the performance measures depend on the main parameters of this system.

When blockchain queueing system is stable, we write

\[
I = \lim_{t \to +\infty} I(t), \quad J = \lim_{t \to +\infty} J(t).
\]

(a) The average number of transactions in the queue

It follows from (8) and (7) that

\[
E[J] = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} j \sum_{i=0}^{b} \pi_{i,j} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} j \pi_j e = \pi_0 (I - R)^{-2} e.
\]

(b) The average number of transactions in the block

Let \( h = (0, 1, 2, \ldots, b)^T \). Then

\[
E[I] = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} j \sum_{i=0}^{b} \pi_{i,j} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \pi_j h = \pi_0 (I - R)^{-1} h.
\]

(c) The average transaction-confirmation time

In the blockchain system, the transaction-confirmation time is the time interval from the time epoch that a transaction arrives at the waiting room to the point that the block including the transaction is confirmed and the block is built in the blockchain. In fact, the transaction-confirmation time is the sojourn time of the transaction in the blockchain system, and it is also the sum of the block-generation and blockchain-building times.

Let \( T \) denote the transaction-confirmation time of any transaction when the blockchain system is stable.

The following theorem provides expression for the average transaction-confirmation time when the blockchain system is stable.

**Theorem 3** If the blockchain queueing system is stable, then the average transaction-confirmation time \( E[T] \) is given by

\[
E[T] = \sum_{k=0}^{b-1} \sum_{l=0}^{b-1} \pi_0, kb+l (k + 1) \left( \frac{1}{\mu_1} + \frac{1}{\mu_2} \right) + \sum_{k=0}^{b-1} \sum_{l=0}^{b-1} \sum_{i=1}^{0} \pi_{i,kb+l} \left[ \frac{1}{\mu_1} + (k + 1) \left( \frac{1}{\mu_1} + \frac{1}{\mu_2} \right) \right].
\]

**Proof.** It is clear that \((i, kb+l)\) is a state of the blockchain system for \(i = 0, 1, \ldots, b, k = 0, 1, \ldots, \) and \(l = 0, 1, \ldots, b - 1\).

When a transaction arrives at the blockchain system at time \(t\), it observes and finds that there are \(i\) transactions in the block and \(kb+l\) transactions in
the queue. Based on the two stages exponential service times and by using the stationary probability vector \( \pi \), we apply the law of total probability to be able to compute the average transaction-confirmation time. For this, our computation will have two different cases as follows:

**Case one:** \( i = 0 \). In this case, the transaction finds that there is no transaction in the block at the beginning moment, thus its transaction-confirmation time includes \( k + 1 \) block-generation times \((k+1)/\mu_2\) and \( k + 1 \) blockchain-building times \((k+1)/\mu_1\). We obtain

\[
E[T_{i=0}] = \pi_{0,kb+l} (k+1) \left( \frac{1}{\mu_1} + \frac{1}{\mu_2} \right).
\]

**Case two:** \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, b \). In this case, the transaction finds that there are \( i \) transactions in the block, thus its transaction-confirmation time includes \( k + 1 \) block-generation times \((k+1)/\mu_2\) and \( k + 2 \) blockchain-building times \((k+2)/\mu_1\). We obtain

\[
E[T_{i\neq0}] = \sum_{i=1}^{b} \pi_{i,kb+l} \left[ \frac{1}{\mu_1} + (k+1) \left( \frac{1}{\mu_1} + \frac{1}{\mu_2} \right) \right].
\]

Therefore, by means of considering all the different cases, the average transaction-confirmation time \( E[T] \) is given by

\[
E[T] = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l=0}^{b-1} \pi_{0,kb+l} (k+1) \left( \frac{1}{\mu_1} + \frac{1}{\mu_2} \right) + \sum_{i=1}^{b} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l=0}^{b-1} \pi_{i,kb+l} \left[ \frac{1}{\mu_1} + (k+1) \left( \frac{1}{\mu_1} + \frac{1}{\mu_2} \right) \right].
\]

This completes the proof. \( \square \)

Let \( \langle x \rangle_{i=0} \) be the 1st element of the vector \( x \). The following theorem provides a simple expression for the average transaction-confirmation time \( E[T] \) by means of the vector \( \pi_0 \) and the rate matrix \( R \).

**Theorem 4** If the blockchain queueing system is stable, then the average transaction-confirmation time \( E[T] \) is given by

\[
E[T] = \frac{1}{\mu_1} \left[ \pi_0 (I - R)^{-1} e - \left( \pi_0 (I - R)^{-1} \right)_{i=0} \right] + \left( \frac{1}{\mu_1} + \frac{1}{\mu_2} \right) \pi_0 (I - R^b)^{-1} (I - R)^{-1} e.
\]

**Proof.** By using Theorem 3, we give some corresponding computation. Note that

\[
\frac{1}{\mu_1} \sum_{i=1}^{b} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l=0}^{b-1} \pi_{i,kb+l} e = \frac{1}{\mu_1} \left[ \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l=0}^{b-1} \pi_{kb+l} e - \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l=0}^{b-1} \pi_{0,kb+l} e \right],
\]

\[
\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l=0}^{b-1} \pi_{kb+l} e = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l=0}^{b-1} \pi_0 R^{kb+l} e = \pi_0 (I - R)^{-1} e.
\]
\[
\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b^{-1} \pi_{0, k} = \left( \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b^{-1} \pi_{k} \right) \bigg|_{i=0} = \left( \pi_{0} (I - R)^{-1} \right) \bigg|_{i=0},
\]

we obtain
\[
\frac{1}{\mu_1} \sum_{i=1}^{b} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \pi_{i,k} = \frac{1}{\mu_1} \left[ \pi_{0} (I - R)^{-1} e - \left( \pi_{0} (I - R)^{-1} \right) \bigg|_{i=0} \right].
\]

On the other hand, since
\[
\sum_{i=0}^{b} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \pi_{i,k} (k + 1) \left( \frac{1}{\mu_1} + \frac{1}{\mu_2} \right) = \left( \frac{1}{\mu_1} + \frac{1}{\mu_2} \right) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (k + 1) \pi_{kb+l} e
\]
we get
\[
\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (k + 1) \pi_{kb+l} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (k + 1) \pi_{0} R_{kb+l}
\]
\[
= \pi_{0} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (k + 1) R_{kb} (I - R^b) (I - R)^{-1}
\]
\[
= \pi_{0} \left( I - R^b \right)^{-1} (I - R)^{-1}.
\]

This leads our desired result. The proof is completed. \[\square\]

In the remainder of this section, we provide some numerical examples to verify computability of our theoretical results and to analyze how the three performance measures \(E[J]\), \(E[I]\) and \(E[T]\) depend on some crucial parameters of the blockchain queueing system.

In the numerical examples, we take some common parameters: The blockbuilding service rate \(\mu_1 \in [0.05, 1.5]\), the block-generation service rate \(\mu_2 = 2\), the arrival rate \(\lambda = 0.3\), the maximum block size \(b = 40, 80, 320\).

From the left part of Figure 3, it is seen that \(E[J]\) and \(E[I]\) decrease, as \(\mu_1\) increases. At the same time, from the right part of Figure 3, \(E[J]\) decreases as \(b\) increases, but \(E[I]\) increases as \(b\) increases.

From Figure 4, it is seen that \(E[T]\) decreases, as \(\mu_1\) increases; while it decreases, as \(b\) increases.

From Figure 5, it is seen that \(E[T]\) decreases, as \(b\) increases. In addition, it is observed that there exists a critical value \(b_0\) such that when \(b \leq b_0\), \(E[T]\) increases, as \(\lambda\) increases; while when \(b > b_0\), \(E[T]\) increases, as \(\lambda\) decreases, it is also intuitive that the block generation time becomes bigger as \(\lambda\) decreases.

5 Concluding Remarks

In this paper, our aim is to focus on how to develop queueing theory of blockchain systems. To do this, we design an interesting Markovian batch-service
queueing system with two different service stages, while the two stages can well express the mining process in the miners pool and the building of a new blockchain. By using the matrix-geometric solution, we not only obtain a system stable condition but also express three key performance measures: The average number of transactions in the queue, the average number of transactions in a block, and the average transaction-confirmation time. Finally, we use numerical examples to verify computability of our theoretical results. Along these lines, we will continue our future research on the following directions:

– Considering more general blockchain queueing systems, for example, the Markov arrival process of transactions, and two stages of phase-type batch services.
– Analyzing multiple classes of transactions in the blockchain systems. Also, the transactions are dealt with in the block-generation and blockchain-building processes according to a priority service discipline.

– When the arrivals of transactions are a renewal process, and the block-generation times or the blockchain-building times follow general probability distributions, an interesting future research is to focus on fluid and diffusion approximations of blockchain queueing systems.

– Setting up reward function with respect to cost structures, transaction fees, payment mechanism and so forth. Our aim is to find optimal policies in the blockchain systems.

– Further developing stochastic optimization and control, Markov decision processes and stochastic game theory in the blockchain systems.
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