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Abstract
Byzantine Fault Tolerant (BFT) consensus exhibits higher throughput in comparison to Proof of Work (PoW) in blockchains. But BFT-based protocols suffer from scalability problems with respect to the number of replicas in the network. The main reason for this limitation is the quadratic message complexity of BFT protocols. Previously, proposed solutions improve BFT performance for normal operation, but will fall back to quadratic message complexity once the protocol observes a certain number of failures. This makes the protocol performance unpredictable as it is not guaranteed that the network will face a certain number of failures.

As a result, such protocols are only scalable when conditions are favorable (i.e., the number of failures are less than a given threshold). To address this issue we propose Proteus, a new BFT-based consensus protocol which elects a subset of nodes \( c \) as a root committee. Proteus guarantees stable performance, regardless of the number of failures in the network and it improves on the quadratic message complexity of typical BFT-based protocols to \( O(cn) \), where \( c << n \), for large \( n \).

Thus, message complexity remains small and less than quadratic when \( c \) is asymptotically smaller than \( n \), and this helps the protocol to provide stable performance even during the view change process (change of root committee). Our view change process is different than typical BFT protocols as it replaces the whole root committee compared to replacing a single primary in other protocols. We deployed and tested our protocol on 200 Amazon EC2 instances, with two different baseline BFT protocols (PBFT and Bchain) for comparison. In these tests, our protocol outperformed the baselines by more than 2x in terms of throughput as well as latency.

1 Introduction
A Blockchain is a distributed ledger in which blocks of transactions are stored in sequential order. Participants in blockchain networks use consensus through a peer-to-peer network to agree on each block of transactions. Each block contains an ordered set of transactions and a link (hash) to the previous block in the chain. Traversal of the hashes to previous blocks allows us to move through the history of transactions. Immutability for blocks “buried” in the blockchain is probabilistically guaranteed, since modifying a block invalidates the hashes of all newer blocks in the chain. Recently there has been a lot of work to address the scalability (number of replicas in the network), throughput (in terms number of transactions per second) and latency (time to insert the block of a transaction in the blockchain) issues of blockchains [6, 9–11, 14]. But increasing the number of replicas (participants) in the network can have negative affects on latency and throughput due to the increase in the number of messages being exchanged and processed within the network.

Protocols based on Proof of Work (PoW) are suffering from high latency and throughput, but have high scalability. The main bottleneck of performance for PoW protocols lies in solving the cryptographic puzzle before proposing a block for inclusion in the chain. Bitcoin is an example of a PoW based protocol that has shown to accommodate thousands of replicas, but its throughput is 6-10 transactions per second and it takes an average of 10 minutes to generate a new block [18, 20]. Bitcoin’s PoW is very CPU-intensive and is responsible for the high consumption of electricity in Bitcoin (comparable to the entire electricity consumption of Ireland) [1, 8, 19]. Ethereum is another well known blockchain ledger that uses PoW [21]. While Ethereum’s approach to PoW is somewhat different than Bitcoin’s, primarily in an attempt to stop ASIC-enhanced mining, it suffers from some of the same drawbacks as Bitcoin. In general, PoW-based protocols do not appear to be suitable for applications that require low latency and high throughput. Furthermore, according to Luu et al. [16] 95% of Bitcoin and 80% of Ethereum networks’ mining power resides within less than ten and six mining pools respectively, making the networks susceptible to possible 51% attacks, since these pools operate in a centralized fashion, with pool owners directly controlling the work of individual miners.

In PoW protocols there is also the risk of multiple forks that can result in double-spends. Thus, even after a transaction is committed, clients have to wait a specific number of blocks to make sure the transaction is “finalized” in the longest fork. For Bitcoin, this usually amounts to six blocks (requiring 60 minutes) [18], For Ethereum, this threshold is generally 37 blocks (due to a much faster block commit rate) [22].

On the other hand, Byzantine Fault Tolerant (BFT) protocols [13] are able to achieve block consensus in the presence of Byzantine (malicious) replicas with the exchange of a few rounds of messages. Byzantine replicas may fail in arbitrary ways by sending malicious messages, crashing, or coordinating malicious attacks, in order to prevent the network from reaching consensus. BFT protocols have been shown to process thousands of requests per second [10, 12], and are known to have higher throughput than PoW-based protocols. BFT-based protocols typically use a single replica as a primary to serialize requests/blocks during each epoch of creating blocks. Once consensus is achieved on the request proposed by the primary, the block will be added to the chain at the end of the epoch. If more than one third of replicas observe malicious behavior by the primary replica, a view change will be triggered. In the view change process the failed/malicious primary will be replaced with a new primary. Another attraction of BFT protocols is their finality property. Finality means that once a block is committed it will never be revoked. That means BFT protocols do not develop forks during the consensus process, thus once a transaction and its block are committed, the application layer can use the result without waiting for further confirmation.
The scalability of BFT-based protocols is a major concern. One of the main factors negatively affecting the scalability and performance of BFT-based protocols is that they require \( n \times n \) broadcast for \( n \) replicas (quadratic message complexity) \([4, 15, 20]\). This high overhead on communication is to guarantee that consensus will always be reached even after under Byzantine failures. Typically the protocols guarantee that agreement will be reached if the total number of Byzantine nodes is less than a third of the total number of nodes. However, the BFT protocols usually do not distinguish the cases where there are failures or not, resulting in high message overhead in any case.

In practice, the reliability or fault tolerance of a protocol depends on the actual number of faults (\( f \)) it can tolerate while providing desired throughput. Since the number of faults tolerated by BFT is bounded by \( f < n/3 \) \([7]\), the other way to increase \( f \) is to increase \( n \), in other words, to design a scalable protocol.

### 1.1 Related Work

Jalalzai et al. \([11]\) have recently presented the Musch BFT protocol that addresses BFT scalability where the message complexity has been reduced to \( O(f' + n) \), where \( f' \) is the actual number of Byzantine nodes \((f' < n/3)\). The message complexity for small \( f' \) is linear in \( n \), making their protocol scalable. SBFT \([9]\) is another protocol that uses sets of collectors called \( c \) and \( e \), which are randomly selected and collect signatures for the prepare and commit phases of consensus for the block proposed by the primary. These collectors, help to avoid all-to-all broadcast. During optimistic execution, SBFT achieves \( O(cn) \) message complexity. But it switches to PBFT if optimistic execution fails (i.e., if the collectors fail). This causes severe degradation in SBFT performance and results in \( O(n^2) \) message complexity. On the other hand, our protocol never switches to PBFT.

FastBFT \([14]\) also tried to address the scalability and performance issues. In FastBFT the replicas are arranged in a tree structure where the primary node acts as the root of the tree. The message complexity in FastBFT in optimistic execution is \( O(n \log n) \), but can switch to \( O(n^2) \) in case of failures. Additionally, during optimistic execution signature collection (aggregation) is done over the tree and each tree node is responsible for collecting signatures from its children. The improvement in message complexity and reduction in signature size occurs with cost of latency, as the critical path length grows to \( O(\log n) \).

In chain-based BFT protocols \([5, 10]\), the nodes in the network are arranged serially in a chain order. Message complexity during normal execution is \( O(n) \) but can grow to \( O(n^2) \) in the worst case (a view change of primary). These protocols have shown high throughput but the latency is proportional to the length of the critical path, which reaches \( O(n) \).

All of the aforementioned solutions switch to \( O(n^2) \) message complexity once a certain number of failures are detected in the network (this threshold varies among protocols). Thus, reaching the failure threshold causes the protocol to switch to broadcast mode (fallback mode), resulting in unusable performance for large-scale systems. As a result, these protocols only provide desired performance when failure thresholds have not been met.

Hot-stuff \([17]\) is another BFT-based protocol that improves the view change message complexity of PBFT by a factor of \( O(n) \) (drops view change message complexity from \( O(n^2) \) to \( O(n^2) \)). But during normal execution its message complexity matches that of PBFT \((O(n^2))\). It also relaxes the BFT finality condition to merge the prepare phase of the next proposal with the current commit phase. Tendermint \([2]\) is also a BFT-based protocol, but it suffers liveness issue due to conflicting proposals \([3]\).

### 1.2 Contributions

Our proposed protocol’s performance is not bounded by any threshold on the number of failures. In other words, protocol performance is not affected by the number of failures detected in the network and remains constant (guarantees stable performance) during normal execution. This is a very important and strong characteristic that enables the protocol to provide consistent performance guarantees. Additionally, our protocol provides constant latency in terms of critical path length, which is the number of one-way messages from block proposal to completion of consensus.

These improvements are achieved by randomly selecting \( c \) number of replicas from a large set of replicas with total size \( n \), where \( n \) are regular replicas. Typically \( c \) is small and with very large \( n \), we will have \( c << n \). Our algorithm can tolerate up to \( f < n/3 \) failures. In each epoch, the BFT consensus is first executed among the \( c \) replicas of the root committee, instead of the overall \( n \) replicas.

The block proposed by the root committee will then be validated by the \( n - f \) correct replicas. Since the main BFT process will be executed within \( c \), which is much smaller than \( n \), this gives us improved performance. The message complexity in our protocol is \( O(c^2 + cn) \) for normal as well as view change mode, and when \( n \) is large, where \( c << n \), it becomes \( O(cn) \). Through experimental evaluation we also show that our protocol outperforms both PBFT (by factor of \( 2.6 \)) and Bchain (by factor of \( 2 \)) in terms of throughput and latency.

Our protocol can tolerate up to \( 2c/3 \) Byzantine failures in the root committee. Therefore, the root committee is more resilient than the typical case which tolerates less than \( c/3 \) nodes failing. The \( n \) regular replicas keep an eye on failures of the \( c \) root committee replicas that generate a block. In case \( 2c/3 \) or more nodes fail, a view change will occur and another root committee is selected. This is another unique aspect of our protocol in that during a view change the whole root committee is changed, while other BFT-based protocols replace only the primary node. However, the view change should be less frequent in our protocol than others.

### Paper Outline

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we give our system model, in Section 3 we present the Proteus protocol. Its formal analysis appears in Section 4 and the message complexity analysis in Section 5. Section 6 contains the experimental analysis. We conclude in Section 7.

### 2 System Model

We consider the Byzantine fault model for the replicas. Under this model, servers and clients may deviate from their normal behavior in arbitrary ways, which includes hardware failures, software bugs, and other malicious behavior. Our protocol can tolerate up to \( f \) Byzantine replicas where the total number of replicas in the
network is \( n \) such that \( n = 3f + 1 \). The size of the root committee \( c \) can be chosen based on a security guarantee requirement \( (P_f) \) for the committee executing the BFT consensus.

This model also assumes that replicas will not be able to break collision resistant hashes, encryptions and signatures. We assume that all messages sent by the replicas are signed. To ensure liveness in the asynchronous network we use a timeout to place an upper bound on the block generation time.

### 3 Protocol

In Proteus, we have moved the burden of consensus to the root committee with size \( c \). The root committee is running a customized BFT based algorithm (Algorithm 1). Regular replicas that are not members of the root committee simply verify the result of consensus, i.e. the proposed block. If \( 2c/3 + 1 \) root committee replicas agree on the block proposed by the root committee, and \( 2f + c + 1 \) regular replicas agree on the proposed block, then the block is committed and will be added to the blockchain. It should be noted that our protocol can tolerate up to two thirds \((2c/3)\) Byzantine replicas in the root committee. Upon failure of the BFT protocol in root committee, the whole root committee is replaced by the view change process. Normal execution of the protocol can be summarized as:

1. The BFT protocol in the root committee successfully generates a block (collects more than two thirds prepare as well as commit messages for the block) and proposes it to regular replicas through broadcast.
2. Upon receipt of a block, regular replicas verify the block against its history and check if the block is signed by \( 2c/3 + 1 \) replicas from root committee.
3. If the block is valid, each regular replica signs the block and sends back the signature to the root committee.
4. Upon receipt of \( 2f + 1 \) signatures from regular replicas as well as root committee members, each root committee member commits the block and broadcasts the proof of acceptance \((2f + 1 \text{ signatures})\) of the block to regular replicas.

5. Upon receipt of proof, each regular replica commits the block, which is permanently added to the local history.

### 3.1 Selecting root committee members

Members of the root committee are chosen randomly from the total number of replicas (\( n \)). Suppose that out of the \( n \) nodes \( f \) are adversaries (bad nodes) such that \( f < n/3 \). The size \( c \) is a predetermined number that specifies the average size of root committee. Let \( V \) be the set of nodes in the network with \( |V| = n \). We can write \( V = A \cup B \), where \( A \) is the set of good nodes and \( B \) is the set of bad nodes (adversaries), such that \( |A| = n - f \) and \( |B| = f \).

Let \( C \) denote the root-committee, such that \( |C| = c \). We assume that \( C \) is formed by randomly and uniformly picking a set of \( c \) nodes out of \( n \). Therefore, the number of possible ways to pick any specific set of \( c \) nodes is \( \binom{n}{c} \). The probability to pick exactly \( a \) good nodes and \( b \) bad nodes in \( C \), such that \( a + b = c \), is:

\[
\frac{\binom{a}{c} \binom{b}{c}}{\binom{n}{c}}.
\]

Thus, the probability of having more than \( 2 \cdot c/3 \) bad nodes \((b)\) in root committee will be, the sum of all probabilities from \( 2c/3 + 1 \) to \( c \):

\[
P_f = \begin{cases} 
\sum_{b=2c/3+1}^{c} \frac{\binom{a-f}{c} \binom{b}{c}}{\binom{n}{c}}, & \text{if } f > 2 \cdot c/3 \\
0, & \text{otherwise}.
\end{cases}
\]

The safety of our algorithm is independent of the number of malicious/faulty replicas in the root committee. But for liveness we need at least one honest/correct replica to be a member of \( 2c/3 + 1 \) quorum that generates the block. We will discuss this in more detail in Section 3.3.

For the root committee to operate, it is randomly chosen from a set of \( n \) replicas and the size \( c \) is such that the failure probability having less than \( c/3 \) honest replicas is negligible as shown in Figure 1. If the root committee fails to generate a valid block, it is replaced by another randomly chosen committee. Replacing the root committee with a newly chosen committee is called a view change. In our protocol, a view change is different from a typical BFT protocol view change, where only the primary replica is being replaced, while in our protocol, the entire root committee is replaced. Under normal circumstances, this is a rare event.

### 3.2 A secret recipe for high scalability and throughput

The secret for higher scalability and throughput of this protocol can be discovered by plotting values of \( n \) against \( c \) for an appropriate range of values for \( P_f \) in Equation 2. Figure 2 plots the growth of \( c \) against \( n \) for \( P_f \leq 8.9 \cdot 10^{-7} \). We can see that \( c \) follows sublinear growth against \( n \), such that for very large \( n \), \( c \) becomes negligible compared to \( n \). Thus, as the growth of \( c \) slows down compared to the total number of replicas in the network, it also diminishes the effect of quadratic communication \((c^2)\) in the root committee on protocol scalability and throughput. We designed our protocol to leverage this property.
3.3 Detailed Protocol Operation

Algorithm 1, Algorithm 2, and Algorithm 3 describe the normal execution between root committee and regular replicas. If normal execution fails, then our protocol switches to view change mode executing algorithms 4 and 5 to recover from failure. Note that the root committee members also run the protocols for regular replica nodes in the normal mode.

**Normal mode.** A designated primary node in the root committee proposes a block by broadcasting a pre-prepare message to other root committee members (Algorithm 1, lines 1-4). A replica $i$ in root committee begins a customized BFT algorithm after receipt of pre-prepare message. Then, replica $i$ broadcasts a prepare message if it finds the pre-prepare message to be valid. The validity check of the pre-prepare message includes checking the block sequence number, previous block hash, and valid transactions inside the block proposal (Algorithm 1, lines 5-7). The prepare message includes a proposed block hash, primary $id$ and its signature and signature of replica $i$. Upon receipt of more than $2c/3$ prepare messages from other root committee members, the replica $i$ broadcasts a commit message to the root committee (Algorithm 1, lines 8-10). The commit message includes replica $i$’s signature for the block along with primary $id$ and block number. If replica $i$ receives more than $2c/3$ commit messages from other root committee members, then it will return success to Algorithm 2 (Algorithm 1, lines 11-13).

Since our protocol can tolerate up to $2c/3$ Byzantine nodes in the root committee, then the $2c/3 + 1$ nodes involved above have to include at least one correct replica in root committee in consensus process to generate a block. While other correct replicas (at most $c/3 - 1$) may not be included in the consensus process. These
Algorithm 3: Regular member replica k

upon receipt of valid block from root committee (until timeout) do
  1. Sign block hash and broadcast it to root committee
  end
if timeout for current block then
  1. Broadcast timeout complaint to root committee
end
upon receipt of a message from root committee member with
  2. 2f + 1 signatures for block do
  // Initiate view change actions
  upon receipt of a message with f + 1 timeout complains or
  receipt of invalid message (block or signatures) do
    // Transition to new view, based on common
    randomly select c members of root committee from set of n replicas
    if replica k is not member of root committee then
      Execute Algorithm 4
    else
      Execute Algorithm 5
    end
end
Commit block

Algorithm 4: ViewChange for regular replica i

Broadcast local history V_j to new root committee
upon Receipt of V_i from replica i do
  Q ← Q ∪ V_i
if Q contains at least 2f + 1 same histories) then
  Broadcast Q to all replicas
end
upon Receipt of R_i do
  P ← P ∪ R_i
if P has accumulated at least 2f + 1 distinct READY messages then
  Broadcast P to all replicas
end
Return to Algorithm 2

Algorithm 5: ViewChange for new root committee member j

Broadcast local history V_j to new committee
upon Receipt of V_i from replica i do
  Q ← Q ∪ V_i
if Q contains at least 2f + 1 same histories) then
  Broadcast Q to all replicas
end
upon Receipt of R_i do
  P ← P ∪ R_i
if P has accumulated at least 2f + 1 distinct READY messages then
  Broadcast P to all replicas
end
Return to Algorithm 2

If root committee members successfully generated block then they will broadcast it to regular committee members (Algorithm 2, lines 1-3).

Upon receipt of block from root committee, regular replicas check if it is signed by at least 2c/3 + 1 root committee members and if verified, regular replica signs the block hash and sends it back to the root committee (Algorithm 3, lines 1-3). Each member of root committee aggregates 2f + 1 signatures from regular committee members and then commit the block and broadcast it to regular replicas (Algorithm 2, lines 7-10).

Upon receipt of 2f + 1 valid signatures, regular committee members also commit the block (Algorithm 3, lines 7-9). But there is a possibility that root committee might behave in malicious way.

Furthermore, the primary replica in root committee might be malicious, thus, even if the number of honest replicas are majority still the primary can cause the root committee to fail. In case of not being able to commit a block, our protocol switches to view change mode in order to select a new root committee.

BFT failure cases. Based on our assumption, there are at least c/3 honest replicas in root committee. This causes various failure cases to be discussed:

1. Number of malicious replicas in root committee are more than c/3: If number of malicious replicas are at least c/3+1, and they chose to behave maliciously, no block will be generated as it will not be possible to collect 2c/3 + 1 signatures for the block. Thus, regular replicas will timeout and will start the view change process.

2. Primary in root committee is malicious: If the primary replica is malicious then the root committee might not be able to generate a block successfully, as the primary might simply not initiate the block proposal. In such a case, a timeout will trigger view change.

3. Primary in root committee as well as at most additional (2c/3 − 1 root committee members are malicious: In this case, the malicious replicas in root committee can collude with malicious primary to force honest replicas in the root.
We prove that the algorithm either produces a block in an epoch with our protocol is achieved by replacing the root committee members during each epoch, a regular replica waits timeout a new committee immediately takes over and continues to generate a new valid block. If no new block is generated, then after that the root committee has failed and then it reports it to the root replica. Local history include latest block (i.e. transaction not in blockchain).

More details of these cases and others are addressed in Section 4.

View change. Unlike ordinary BFT protocols view change in our protocol is achieved by replacing the root committee members with c new members. View change occurs if root committee fails to generate a new valid block. If no new block is generated, then after timeout a new committee immediately takes over and continues to generate a new valid block. If a regular replica i does not receive the block after a timeout then it considers that the root committee has failed and then it reports it to the root committee. If a regular replica i does not receive the block after a timeout then it considers that the root committee has failed and then it reports it to the root committee. If f + 1 node report timeout then this triggers the view change process. In the view change, each node selects another set of c replicas for the new root committee (using a pre-specified random seed which guarantees that every replica selects the same root committee). Each replica broadcasts its local history \( V_j \) to the new root committee members. Local history include latest block sequence number, its hash and signature evidence of at least 2f+1 replicas that have approved the block.

The new root committee members waits to receive 2f + 1 local histories \( V_j \) from all replicas. Once it receives \( V_j \) from replica i it local history \( H_i \) (latest committed block) is extracted from \( V_j \). Out of 2f + 1, it is guaranteed, that at least f + 1 are honest replicas. Thus, the most recent history in these f + 1 replicas will match and this will be the starting point for the next block to be generated. Among other information, \( V_j \) also contains the latest block sequence number (height of the block) and the replica id that proposed the block.

Since it is not guaranteed that at least 2c/3 + 1 replicas in the root committee will be honest, it is difficult to transfer the transactions that have been previously agreed in the previous view by 2c/3 + 1 root members during the preparation phase. To guarantee all transactions are executed properly, clients can resend their transactions to the new primary of new root committee, after they realize that they have not receive any response for their transaction (i.e. transaction not in blockchain).

4 Proof of Correctness

We prove that the algorithm either produces a block in an epoch or view change occurs.

Lemma 4.1. If a block is signed by 2c/3 + 1 root committee nodes then it is guaranteed that all correct replicas will receive it.

Proof. Since the root committee consists of c/3 correct nodes, then one of the 2c/3 + 1 nodes that sign the block has to be a correct node. That correct node will broadcast the block to all replicas. □

Lemma 4.2. If at least 2f + 1 correct replicas agree on the same block then it gets committed to local histories of all correct nodes, otherwise view change will occur.

Proof. From Lemma 4.1, if a block is signed by at least 2c/3 + 1 committee members then it is broadcasted to all replicas.

In order for a block to be committed it must be signed by at least 2f + 1 regular replicas (Algorithm 2, lines 7-10). Otherwise, if this does not happen then there are two possible scenarios:

- Two different blocks have been proposed by the root committee. This can happen if 2c/3 Byzantine nodes from C and one additional correct committee node \( u \in C \) decide one block, while again 2c/3 Byzantine and one correct node \( v \in C, v \neq u \) decide another block. The blocks may be sent to different replica sets, or replicas may pick one of the two to sign. In either case, some correct node of the root committee receives two different block signed hashes from the replicas (2, line 11).

- f + 1 replicas have not received any valid block, and therefore f + 1 timeout complaint messages are reported to the root committee (2, line 11).

Both of these cases will create a proof of maliciousness which will trigger a view change (Algorithm 2, lines 12-18 and Algorithm 3 line 10.).

Therefore, if view change does not occur then a block was signed by 2f + 1 regular replicas. This causes the block to be committed by the correct replicas in root committee (2, lines 7-9) and also by the correct regular replicas (Algorithm 3 line 7-9).

Lemma 4.3. After view change completes, all histories of correct nodes are consistent.

Proof. During view change each replica sends its local history \( V_i \) to new root committee (First line in Algorithms 4 and 5). Each member of the root committee \( j \) collects at least 2f + 1 local histories and aggregates them into a single message \( Q \) which it broadcasts to all replicas (Algorithm 5, lines 2-7). Each replica \( i \) receives the \( Q \) messages from all members of new root committee, and verifies that at least 2f + 1 replicas have agreed on the same history and most recent block, and then it broadcasts the READY message to new root committee (Algorithm 4, lines 3-4). Each node \( j \) of the new root committee accumulates in \( P \) the READY messages that it receives, and when it receives at least 2f + 1 messages then it broadcasts \( P \) (Algorithm 5, lines 8-12). When the regular replica \( i \) receives message \( P \) with at least 2f + 1 READY messages, then it updates its local history (Algorithm 4, lines 5-10).

Suppose that two different histories \( H_1 \in V_{j_1} \) and \( H_2 \in V_{j_2} \) appear in \( Q_{j_1} \) and \( Q_{j_2} \) respectively, where \( j_1, j_2 \in C \). Since each of \( Q_{j_1} \) and \( Q_{j_2} \) are constructed from 2f + 1 replicas’ common histories, then it has to be that \( f + 1 \) are common nodes for \( H_1 \) and \( H_2 \). Since there are at most \( f \) Byzantine nodes, there is a common correct node that has proposed two different histories \( H_1 \) and \( H_2 \), which is impossible. Thus, each correct node will update its local history to the agreed history of at least 2f + 1 replicas. □

From Lemmas 4.2 and 4.3 we obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 4.4. Under normal operation and after view change, all correct nodes maintain a consistent history which includes the latest committed block.

5 Message Complexity Analysis

The root committee nodes executes a BFT protocol among them with quadratic message complexity with respect to the committee
Figure 3: Protocol latencies with block sizes 5000, 10000 and 15000

Figure 4: Protocol throughput with Block size 5000, 10000 and 15000

c, where both the prepare and commit phases cause $O(c^2)$ messages. The communication between the root committee $C$ and regular replicas requires $O(cn)$ messages: the $c$ root committee nodes send the block to $n$ regular replicas ($cn$ messages), and then the root committee nodes receive back regular replicas signatures ($cn$ messages) and upon aggregation of signatures root committee members broadcast at least $2f + 1$ aggregated signatures to regular replicas ($cn$ messages). Thus, total message complexity during normal operation will be:

Message complexity: $O(c^2 + cn)$

For large $n$, we have $n >> c$, we will get:

Message complexity ($n >> c$): $O(cn)$

View change mainly occurs either due to timeout or if there is enough proof of maliciousness against the root committee. Since all view change communication as described in Algorithm 4 and 5, which includes lodging complaints to root committee, receiving proof of maliciousness from root committee, sharing recent history $V_t$ new root committee, receiving collection of histories $Q$ and sending back ready message include communication between root committee and regular replicas. The message complexity we get is:

View change message complexity: $O(cn)$

6 Experiments and Evaluations

We have implemented the Proteus protocol in about 2.5k lines of Golang code. We also implemented PBFT to be used as baseline. We selected PBFT because other protocols that have improved on the PBFT performance, they usually switch to $nxn$ broadcast (legacy PBFT) as a fallback measure if certain threshold number of failures have occurred. Additionally we also implemented Bchain-3 which belongs to the family of chain based BFT protocols, where instead of a broadcast the protocols propagates messages along a predetermined chain order. Bchain-3 has the potential to decrease the
number of messages that are sent in the network, however, latency may increase due to a possibly long chain of message relay. Both BFT and Bchain-3 are also implemented in Golang for the experiments. We think comparing our protocol with different flavors of BFT-based protocols (broadcast and chain based BFT) provide better insight of the performance of Proteus.

We conducted our experiments in the Amazon Web Services (AWS) cloud. For each replica in the network we used instances of type t2.large in AWS. Each t2.large instance has 2 virtual CPU cores with 8Gb of memory. The experiments were performed with network sizes ranging from 10, 40, 70, 100 and 130 number of replicas. We used Equation 2, to get suitable value for the root committee size $c$, for the different number of replicas. Given $n$ and maximum failure probability of $P_f \leq 8.9 \cdot 10^{-7}$, we selected the various root committee sizes to be 5 (10), 18 (40), 27 (70), 30 (100), 33 (130), 36(200).

We also used different block sizes with 5,000, 10,000 and 15,000 transactions. The transactions in the block are simple blockchain transactions, they are randomly generated and transfer funds from one account to another account. The other messages to obtain consensus are smaller in size since they contain only hashes of the block, signatures and other information that do not take as much space. Replicas perform regular operations on the blocks they receive and they also maintain complete history of block (complete blockchain). Namely, operations performed by each replica include checking its history, hashes and signatures to verify the validation of transactions in the block.

6.1 Analysis of experimental results

We measure latency in an epoch as the time between that the primary in the root committee proposes a block until the time that the block is inserted in all the local histories. We average the latency over several epochs. Figure 3 provides a comparison of latency measurements among Bchain-3, PBFT and Proteus. The difference in latency is small for smaller network sizes, but it increases as the network size grows. Additionally, we observe that the latency is affected by the block size, so that if the block size increases then the latency increases as well. For example in Figure 3 (a), the latency difference among protocols are smaller, but as the block size increases (Figure 3 (b) and (c)) we can see that the latency of PBFT increases much faster (due to its high message complexity) followed by Bchain-3 (due to longer length of the critical chain path). In all cases Proteus provides better latency than PBFT and Bchain-3, which demonstrates the better scalability of our protocol. We also measure the throughput, which the number of committed transactions per second which are appended in the blockchain (Figure 4). Similarly to latency, by observing Figure 4 we can see that Proteus outperforms PBFT and Bchain-3 during all test cases. Performance superiority of Proteus is more visible (two times better than other two protocols), with respect to the growth in network size, block size, or both when network size increases. For network size 200 and blocksize 15000 throughput for Bchain, PBFT and Proteus are 560tx/sec,422 tx/sec, 1119 tx/sec. For size 10000 throughput for Bchain, PBFT and Proteus is 513 tx/sec,394 tx/sec, 1123 tx/sec respectively. For blocksize 5000, throughput for Bchain, PBFT and Proteus is 402 tx/sec, 418 tx/sec and 1086 respectively. This also demonstrates the scalability potential of our protocol.

7 Conclusion and Future Work

In this paper we presented Proteus, a BFT-based consensus protocol for blockchains that provides better latency and throughput than the state of the art BFT protocols (Bchain and PBFT). Proteus, provides consistent performance regardless of number of failures encountered in the network whereas other BFT improvements suffer from fall back performance degradation as the number of failures in the network reach the threshold. Our future work will mainly focus on how to further improve scalability and security of BFT-based protocols while having minimum effects on throughput and latency. This also include leveraging efficient mechanism for sharding and inter shard communication.
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