

Two More Algorithms for Randomized Signature-Free Asynchronous Binary Byzantine Consensus with $t < n/3$ and $O(n^2)$ Messages and $O(1)$ Round Expected Termination

Tyler Crain¹

¹tcrainwork@gmail.com

March 14, 2024

Abstract

This work describes two randomized, asynchronous, round based, Binary Byzantine faulty tolerant consensus algorithms based on the algorithms of [25] and [26]. Like the algorithms of [25] and [26] they do not use signatures, use $O(n^2)$ messages per round (where each message is composed of a round number and a constant number of bits), tolerate up to one third failures, and have expected termination in constant number of rounds.

The first, like [26], uses a weak common coin (i.e. one that can return different values at different processes with a constant probability) to ensure termination. The algorithm consists of 5 to 7 message broadcasts per round. An optimization is described that reduces this to 4 to 5 broadcasts per round for rounds following the first round. Comparatively, [26] consists of 8 to 12 message broadcasts per round.

The second algorithm, like [25], uses a strong common coin (i.e. one that returns the same value at all non-faulty processes) for both termination and correctness. Unlike [25], it does not require a fair scheduler to ensure termination. Furthermore, the algorithm consists of 2 to 3 message broadcasts for the first round and 1 to 2 broadcasts for the following rounds, while [26] consists of 2 to 3 broadcasts per round.

1 Introduction and related work.

Binary byzantine consensus concerns the problem of getting a set of distinct processes distributed across a network to agree on a single binary value 0 or 1 where processes can fail in arbitrary ways. It is well known that this problem is impossible in an asynchronous network with at least one faulty process [17]. To get around this, algorithms can employ randomization [1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 19, 20, 25, 26, 30, 32, 34], or rely on an additional synchrony assumption [13, 14]. Randomized algorithms largely rely on the existence of a local or common random coin. The output of local coin is only visible to an individual process, while the output of a common coin is visible to all processes, but only once a threshold of processes have participated in computing the coin. A strong common coin is one that outputs the same value at all processes while a weak one may output different values at different processes with a fixed probability [32].

This work presents two algorithms that do not use signatures, use $O(n^2)$ messages per round (where each message is composed of a round number and a constant number of bits), tolerate up to one third failures (a well know lower bound [21]), and have expected termination in a constant number of rounds.

The first algorithm uses a weak common coin and is based on the BV-Broadcast and SBV-Broadcast abstractions of [26]. It consists of two invocations of SBV-Broadcast per round with an additional normal message broadcast in between. In the algorithm processes perform between 5 and 7 message broadcasts per round. An optimization is described that reduces this to 5 to 6 broadcasts for the first round and 4 to 5 broadcasts for following rounds. Comparatively, the algorithm in [26] that solves Byzantine Binary Consensus with the same guarantees and uses between 8 and 12 message broadcasts per round.

The second algorithm uses a strong common coin which allows a reduction of the number of messages processes broadcast per round to between 2 to 3 for the first round and 1 to 2 for all following rounds. In each round processes either decide the same value as the output of the common coin for that round or continue to the next round without deciding. It is based on the algorithm of [25] that solves Byzantine Binary Consensus with the same guarantees, but requires a fair scheduler to ensure termination and uses between 2 and 3 message broadcasts per round. The algorithms of [11, 10, 12] all follow similar designs except with different assumptions, where [10, 11] uses signatures with [11] relying on a synchrony assumption for termination, and [12] does not use signatures but also relies on a synchrony assumption for termination. Note that [23] presents a modification of [25] that uses an additional message broadcast to remove the fair scheduler requirement, bringing up the number of broadcasts per round to between 3 and 4.

Note that one of the notable properties of the algorithms presented in this work, as well as those in [25] and [26] is that they do not use signatures within the description of the consensus. Although it is common knowledge that common coins are implemented using signatures, such as the efficient coin of [7], and that encrypted communication is often setup using signatures, such as with TLS, signatures do have disadvantages such as that they require expensive computations and increase message size by a non-insignificant number of bytes. Therefore, while in practice these algorithms will still require the use of signatures, not using signatures within the consensus remains beneficial. Still, many asynchronous binary consensus algorithms exist that use signatures and signatures have many advantages. Apart from the advantages provided directly by signatures themselves such as irrefutable, algorithms using them can be less complex, for example in the algorithm of [7], which uses a weak common coin, processes perform 2 broadcasts per round and in the algorithm of [10], which uses a strong common coin, processes broadcast 1 message per round. Given the different tradeoffs of using signatures or not there are many randomized algorithms that use them [10, 32, 34, 8, 7] and many that do not [5, 3, 10, 18, 33].

While the binary consensus problem only allows process to agree on a single binary value, there exist many reductions to multi-value consensus [27, 28, 35, 36] allowing processes to agree on arbitrary values. Furthermore many algorithms [4, 9] exist that solve multi-value consensus directly through the use of types of synchrony assumptions to ensure termination. Additionally, algorithms exist that make many different assumptions about the model such as synchrony [15], different fault models [22, 24, 31], solve different definitions of consensus [29], and so on.

2 A Byzantine Computation Model.

This section describes the assumed computation model.

Asynchronous processes. The system is made up of a set Π of n asynchronous sequential processes, namely $\Pi = \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$; i is called the “index” of p_i . “Asynchronous” means that each process proceeds at its own speed, which can vary with time and remains unknown to the other processes. “Sequential” means that a process executes one step at a time. This does not prevent it

from executing several threads with an appropriate multiplexing. Both notations $i \in Y$ and $p_i \in Y$ are used to say that p_i belongs to the set Y .

Communication network. The processes communicate by exchanging messages through an asynchronous reliable point-to-point network. “Asynchronous” means that there is no bound on message transfer delays, but these delays are finite. “Reliable” means that the network does not lose, duplicate, modify, or create messages. “Point-to-point” means that any pair of processes is connected by a bidirectional channel. A process p_i sends a message to a process p_j by invoking the primitive “**send** TAG(m) to p_j ”, where TAG is the type of the message and m its content. To simplify the presentation, it is assumed that a process can send messages to itself. A process p_i receives a message by executing the primitive “**receive**()”. The macro-operation **broadcast** TAG(m) is used as a shortcut for “**for each** $p_i \in \Pi$ **do** **send** TAG(m) to p_j **end for**”.

Failure model. Up to t processes can exhibit a *Byzantine* behavior [31]. A Byzantine process is a process that behaves arbitrarily: it can crash, fail to send or receive messages, send arbitrary messages, start in an arbitrary state, perform arbitrary state transitions, etc. Moreover, Byzantine processes can collude to “pollute” the computation (e.g., by sending messages with the same content, while they should send messages with distinct content if they were non-faulty). A process that exhibits a Byzantine behavior is called *faulty*. Otherwise, it is *non-faulty*. Moreover, it is assumed that the Byzantine processes do not fully control the network in that they can not corrupt the messages sent by non-faulty processes. Byzantine processes can control the network by modifying the order in which messages are received, but they cannot postpone forever message receptions.

A Common Coin. The model is enriched with the same *common coin* (CC) as in [26] that was originally defined in [32]. The common coin outputs a binary value at each non-faulty process for each round. All non-faulty processes output 0 in round r with probability $1/d$ and output 1 in round r with probability $1/d$. Non-faulty processes output different values in round r with probability $(d-2)/d$, where $d \geq 2$ is a known constant. The output of the coin is revealed by calling a function **random**() provided by a random oracle. The output of the coin is unpredictable and random and its output is only revealed for a round r once at least one non-faulty process has called **random**() in that round (i.e. faulty processes cannot compute the output of the coin entirely themselves).

A Strong $(t+1)$ Common Coin. A *strong common coin* (SCC) is defined as a common coin that has $d = 2$ meaning that in every round all non-faulty processes receive the same output from the common coin. Furthermore $t+1$ means the output of the coin for round r is not revealed until at least $t+1$ non-faulty processes have called **random**() in that round.

Notations.

- The acronym $\mathcal{BAMP}_{n,t}[\emptyset]$ is used to denote the basic Byzantine Asynchronous Message-Passing computation model; \emptyset means that there is no additional assumption.
- The basic computation model strengthened with the additional constraint $t < n/3$ is denoted $\mathcal{BAMP}_{n,t}[t < n/3]$.
- $\mathcal{BAMP}_{n,t}[t < n/3]$ enriched with the common coin is denoted $\mathcal{BAMP}_{n,t}[t < n/3, CC]$.
- $\mathcal{BAMP}_{n,t}[t < n/3]$ enriched with the strong $(t+1)$ common coin is denoted $\mathcal{BAMP}_{n,t}[t < n/3, SCC]$.

Before presenting the algorithms, the BV-Broadcast and SBV-Broadcast abstractions from [26] are recalled. Note that within the consensus algorithms multiple instances of these abstractions may be used, so to differentiate between these instances they are called with unique tags (denoted as TAG in the presentation of the abstractions).

2.1 The BV-Broadcast abstraction from [26] in $\mathcal{BAMP}_{n,t}[t < n/3]$

```

operation BV_broadcast TAG( $v_i$ ) is
(01)  $bin\_values_i \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
(02) broadcast B_VAL( $v_i$ )
(03) return  $bin\_values_i$  //  $bin\_values_i$  has not necessarily obtained its final value when returned

when B_VAL( $v$ ) is received
(04) if (B_VAL( $v$ ) received from  $(t + 1)$  different processes and B_VAL( $v$ ) not yet broadcast)
(05)   then broadcast B_VAL( $v$ ) // a process echos a value only once
(06) end if;
(07) if (B_VAL( $v$ ) received from  $(2t + 1)$  different processes)
(08)   then  $bin\_values_i \leftarrow bin\_values_i \cup \{v\}$  // local delivery of a value
(09) end if.

```

Figure 1: An algorithm implementing BV-broadcast in $\mathcal{BAMP}_{n,t}[t < n/3]$ from [26].

For each instance of BV-Broadcast, each non-faulty process p_i calls the abstraction with a unique tag TAG for that instance and a binary value as input. It returns a set of binary values bin_values , which has not necessarily achieved its final state when returned (i.e. the implementation of the abstraction may add items later). The abstraction ensures the following properties:

- BV-Termination. The invocation of BV_broadcast() by a non-faulty process terminates.
- BV-Justification. If p_i is non-faulty and $v \in bin_values_i$, then v has been BV-Broadcast by a non-faulty process.
- BV-Uniformity. If a value v is added to the set bin_values_i of a non-faulty process p_i , eventually $v \in bin_values_j$ at every non-faulty process p_j .
- BV-Obligation. Eventually the set bin_values_i of a non-faulty process is non empty.
- BV-Single-value. If all non-faulty processes BV-Broadcast the same value v , v is eventually added to the set bin_values_i of each non-faulty process p_i .

Note that the values input by non-faulty processes for a specific instance need not be from the set $\{0, 1\}$, they can be any values as long as the size of the set of values input by non-faulty processes is between 1 and 2. An algorithm implementing the BV-Broadcast abstraction is presented in Figure 1. The reader is referred to [26] for proofs and a description of the code.

2.2 The SBV-Broadcast abstraction from [26] in $\mathcal{BAMP}_{n,t}[t < n/3]$

For each instance of SBV-Broadcast, each non-faulty process p_i calls the abstraction with a unique tag TAG for that instance and a binary value as input. It returns two sets of binary values, the first being *view* and the second being bin_values . While the set *view* has achieved its final state when returned, bin_values may not have (i.e. the implementation of the abstraction may add items later). The abstraction ensures the following properties: (Note that the original SBV-Broadcast

```

operation SBV_broadcast TAG( $v_i$ ) is
(01)  $bin\_values_i \leftarrow BV\_broadcast\ TAG(v_i);$ 
(02) wait_until( $bin\_values_i \neq \emptyset$ )
//  $bin\_values_i$  has not necessarily obtained its final value when the wait terminates
(03) broadcast AUX( $w$ ) where  $w \in bin\_values_i$ 
(04) wait_until( $\exists$  a set  $view_i$  such that its values (i) belong to  $bin\_values_i$  and
(ii) come from messages AUX() received from  $(n - t)$  distinct processes);
(05) return( $view_i, bin\_values_i$ )

```

Figure 2: An algorithm implementing SBV-Broadcast in $\mathcal{BAMP}_{n,t}[t < n/3]$ from [26].

from [26] only returned a single set $view$, but the algorithms presented in this work will need an additional property ensured by bin_values . Also note that this set already exists in the original implementation, here it is simply returned.)

- SBV-Termination. The invocation of SBV_broadcast TAG() by a non-faulty process terminates.
- SBV-Obligation. The set $view_i$ returned by a non-faulty process p_i is not empty.
- SBV-Justification. If p_i is non-faulty and $v \in view_i$ then a non-faulty process called SBV_broadcast v .
- SBV-Inclusion. If p_i and p_j are non-faulty processes and $view_i = \{v\}$ then $v \in view_j$.
- SBV-Uniformity. If all non-faulty processes SBV_broadcast the same value v , then $view_i = \{v\}$ at every non-faulty process p_i .
- SBV-Singleton. If p_i and p_j are non-faulty, $[(view_i = \{v\}) \wedge (view_j = \{w\})] \implies (v = w)$

In this work the following additional property is introduced that was not originally included in [26]:

- SBV-Binvalues. The set bin_values_i returned by a non-faulty process p_i satisfies the BV-Broadcast abstraction where non-faulty processes input the same values to this abstraction as they did to the SBV-Broadcast abstraction. Furthermore the set bin_values_i at a non-faulty process p_i eventually contains every value returned in $view_j$ at every non-faulty process p_j .

An algorithm implementing the SBV-Broadcast abstraction is presented in Figure 2. The reader is referred to [26] for full proofs and a description of the code. Here the SBV-Binvalues is proved as it is added in this work.

Lemma 1. *The algorithm of Figure 2 implements the SBV-Broadcast abstraction in $\mathcal{BAMP}_{n,t}[t < n/3]$.*

Proof. All properties other than SBV-Binvalues are proved in [26]. Proof of the SBV-Binvalues property: By line 04 the set $view_i$ returned on line 04 is the set bin_values_i returned by the call to BV_broadcast which satisfies the BV-Broadcast abstraction. By BV-Uniformity all processes will eventually have the same set of values in their set bin_values_i which is the set returned by SBV-Broadcast, the proof then follows. \square

3 Binary Byzantine Consensus.

3.1 The Binary Consensus Problem.

In the binary consensus problem processes input a value to the algorithm, called their *proposal*, run an algorithm consisting of several rounds, and eventually output a binary value called their *decision*. Let \mathcal{V} be the set of values that can be proposed. While \mathcal{V} can contain any number (≥ 2) of values in multi-valued consensus, it contains only two values in binary consensus, e.g., $\mathcal{V} = \{0, 1\}$. Assuming that each non-faulty process proposes a value, the binary Byzantine consensus (BBC) problem is for each of them to decide on a value in such a way that the following properties are satisfied:

- BBC-Termination. Every non-faulty process eventually decides on a value.
- BBC-Agreement. No two non-faulty processes decide on different values.
- BBC-Validity. If all non-faulty processes propose the same value, no other value can be decided.

3.2 A Safe and Live Binary Byzantine Consensus Algorithm in $\mathcal{BAMP}_{n,t}[t < n/3, CC]$.

This section presents a Binary Byzantine Consensus algorithm using SBV-Broadcast in addition to a weak common coin.

Message types. The following message types are used by the consensus (in addition to those used by SBV-Broadcast).

- $\text{AUXSET}[r](s)$. An AUXSET message contains a round number r and a set of binary values s .

Local variables. The following local variables are used at each process.

- r_i . The current round at process i .
- $\text{view}_i[]$. A map of sets of binary values at process i indexed by a round and an integer $0 - 2$.
- $\text{bin_values}_i[]$. A map of sets of binary values at process i indexed by a round.
- est_i . The current binary estimate at process i .

3.2.1 Algorithm Description.

Figure 3 presents the algorithm. Non-faulty process call $\text{PROPOSE}()$ with an initial binary proposal. Line 01 initializes the processes' estimate to its proposal and the round to 0. Non-faulty processes then repeat lines 02-15 for each round.

First the round number is incremented on line 02. Non-faulty processes then call S_broadcast with tag $\text{STAGE}[r_i, 0]$ and input est_i . By SBV-Singleton this call will output $\text{view}_i[r_i, 0]$ with a single unique value v or both binary values at all non-faulty processes.

The idea behind this SBV-Broadcast is that (i) if $\text{view}_i[r_i, 0] = \{v\}$ at least 1 non-faulty process then the remaining code if the round will ensure only v may be decided and additionally, if the

```

operation PROPOSE( $v_i$ ) is
(01)  $est_i \leftarrow v_i; r_i \leftarrow 0;$ 
repeat forever
(02)  $r_i \leftarrow r_i + 1;$ 
(03)  $(view_i[r_i, 0], bin\_values_i[r_i]) \leftarrow SBV\_broadcast\ STAGE[r_i, 0](est_i);$ 
//  $bin\_values_i$  has not necessarily obtained its final value
(04) broadcast AUXSET[ $r_i$ ]( $view_i[r_i, 0]$ ) // broadcast a set of binary values
(05) wait_until( $\exists$  a set  $view_i[r_i, 1]$  such that its values (i) belong to  $bin\_values_i[r_i]$  and
(ii) come from messages AUXSET[ $r_i$ ]() received from  $(n - t)$  distinct processes);
(06) if ( $view_i[r_i, 1] = \{w\}$ )
(07)   then  $est_i \leftarrow w$ 
(08)   else  $est_i \leftarrow \perp$ 
(09) end if
(10)  $(view_i[r_i, 2], s) \leftarrow SBV\_broadcast\ STAGE[r_i, 1](est_i);$ 
(11)  $s \leftarrow random();$ 
(12) case ( $view_i[r_i, 2] = \{v\} \wedge v \neq \perp$ ) then  $est_i \leftarrow v$ ; decide( $v$ ) if not yet done
(13)   ( $view_i[r_i, 2] = \{v, \perp\}$ ) then  $est_i \leftarrow v$ 
(14)   ( $view_i[r_i, 2] = \{\perp\}$ ) then  $est_i \leftarrow s$ 
(15) end case
end repeat.

```

Figure 3: An algorithm implementing binary consensus in $\mathcal{BAMP}_{n,t}[t < n/3, CC]$.

output of the coin is also v at all non-faulty processes, then they will set their estimate to v and decide by the following round.

Otherwise, (ii) if $view_i[r_i, 0] = \{0, 1\}$ at non-faulty processes before the value of the coin is revealed then lines 04-05 are important to help non-faulty processes reach a decision. On line 04, non-faulty processes broadcast $AUXSET[r_i](view_i[r_i, 0])$ and on line 05 wait for $(n - t)$ of these messages from distinct processes where the values are contained in bin_values_i . The set $view_i[r_i, 1]$ is then computed as the set of these values. If $view_i[r_i, 1]$ contains a single value then a process sets its estimate to this value otherwise it sets its estimate to \perp . If $(t + 1)$ non-faulty processes have $view[i, 0] = \{0, 1\}$, and broadcast $AUXSET[r](\{0, 1\})$, then given $t < n/3$, any set of $(n - t)$ $AUXSET[r]()$ messages will contain at least one of these messages meaning all non-faulty process will set their estimate to \perp . The remaining code of the round will then ensure all processes set their estimate to the output of the coin and decide in the following round if the coin outputs the same value at all non-faulty processes.

Non-faulty processes then make a second call to $SBV_broadcast$ with tag $STAGE[r, 1]$ and their current estimate as input. This returns the set $view[r, 2]$ (line 10). A call to $random()$ is then made on line 11. The purpose of this call to $SBV_broadcast$ is to ensure that through SBV-Uniformity if a non-faulty process decides then all non-faulty processes set their estimates to the same value and decide in the following round. For this, if $view[r, 2]$ is a single value then this value is decided and is set as the processes' estimate (line 12), otherwise if view contains both a binary value and \perp then the binary value is set to the processes' estimate (line 13), otherwise $view[r, 2] = \{\perp\}$ and the process sets its output to the value of the coin (line 14). Non-faulty processes then continue on to the next round.

3.2.2 Proofs.

This section shows that the algorithm of Figure 3 solves Binary Byzantine consensus and terminates in an expected constant number of rounds.

Lemma 2. *At the start of every round each non-faulty process has a binary estimate proposed by a non-faulty process.*

Proof. The initial estimate at non-faulty processes is set to its binary proposal v on line 01. The estimate is then input to `SBV_broadcast` `STAGE[r, 0]` on line 03. SBV-Justification and SBV-Binvalues then ensure both $view[r, 0]$ and $view[r, 1]$ only contain binary values proposed by non-faulty processes. The estimate is then set to either a binary value from $view[r, 1]$ or \perp if both 0 and 1 are contained in $view[r, 1]$ on lines 07-08. The estimate is then input to `SBV_broadcast` `STAGE[r, 1]` on line 10. By SBV-Justification $view[r, 2]$ can only contain binary values or \perp where \perp means both 1 and 0 were proposed by non-faulty processes. On lines 12-14 the estimate is then set to either the binary value in $view[r, 2]$, or the value of `random()` if $\perp \in view[r, 2]$, where in either case the value must have been proposed by a non-faulty process. From this the next round is then started with a binary estimate proposed by a non-faulty process and the proof is the same for all following rounds. \square

Lemma 3. *Only \perp or binary values can be input to `SBV_broadcast` `STAGE[r, 1]` on line 10 by non-faulty processes. The binary values input have been proposed by non-faulty processes or if \perp is input then both 0 and 1 have been proposed by non-faulty processes.*

Proof. By Lemma 2 all non-faulty processes start each round with a binary estimate proposed by a non-faulty process which is input to `SBV_broadcast` `STAGE[r, 0]` on line 03. Now by SBV-Binvalues, *bin_values* will only contain binary values at non-faulty processes. Thus $view[r, 1]$ will only contain binary values (line 05) proposed by non-faulty processes and lines 06-08 will ensure only \perp (if both 0 and 1 have been proposed by a non-faulty process) or a binary value is input to `SBV_broadcast` `STAGE[r, 1]` on line 10 by non-faulty processes. \square

Lemma 4. *Non-faulty processes will only decide binary values proposed by non-faulty processes.*

Proof. From line 12 non-faulty processes can only decide binary values output by `SBV_broadcast` `STAGE[r, 1]` (lines 10-12). By Lemma 3 and SBV-Justification these values must have been proposed by non-faulty processes. \square

Lemma 5. *If in a round r , $view[r, 0]$ contains a single binary value w at a non-faulty process, then all non-faulty processes either input w or \perp to `SBV_broadcast` `STAGE[r, 1]`.*

Proof. If $view[r, 0] = \{w\}$ at a non-faulty process, then by Lemma 2 and SBV-Singleton either $view[r, 0] = \{w\}$ or $view[r, 0] = \{0, 1\}$ at all non-faulty processes. Now non-faulty processes will either broadcast either `AUXSET[r]({w})` or `AUXSET[r]({0, 1})` on line 04. Given $t < n/3$ no non-faulty process will receive $n - t$ `AUXSET[r]({¬w})` messages from distinct processes and as a result $view[r, 1]$ will be set to either $\{w\}$ or $\{0, 1\}$ at all non-faulty processes on line 05. Now by lines 06-08 all non-faulty processes will set their estimate to w or \perp which is then input to `SBV_broadcast` `STAGE[r, 1]`. \square

Lemma 6. *For any round r , if a non-faulty process inputs a binary value v to `SBV_broadcast` `STAGE[r, 1]` on line 10 then all non-faulty processes either input v or \perp to `SBV_broadcast` `STAGE[r, 1]`.*

Proof. By Lemma 2, Lemma 5 and SBV-Justification this holds true for all cases except where all non-faulty processes have $view[r, 0] = \{0, 1\}$. In this case and given $t < n/3$ all non-faulty processes will receive at least $t + 1$ `AUXSET[r]({0, 1})` messages from distinct processes and as a result $view[r, 1] = \{0, 1\}$ at all non-faulty processes (line 05). All non-faulty processes then set their estimate to \perp on line 08 which is then input to `SBV_broadcast` `STAGE[r, 1]` and the lemma holds. \square

Lemma 7. *Non-faulty processes complete each round.*

Proof. By Lemma 2 all non-faulty processes start each round with a binary estimate which is input to `SBV_broadcast STAGE[r, 0]` on line 03. By SBV-Termination all processes will complete the call to `SBV_broadcast STAGE[r, 0]` line 03 and broadcast `AUXSET[r](view[r, 0])` on line 04. By Lemma 2 and SBV-Binvalues the set `view[r, 0]` will contain binary values from `bin_values`. Given this, all non-faulty processes will then receive $(n - t)$ `AUXSET[r](s)` messages from distinct processes where $s \in \text{bin_values}$ and complete line 05. Non-faulty processes will then call and complete `SBV_broadcast STAGE[r, 1]` on line 10 by SBV-Termination. All non-faulty processes will then call `random()` on line 11 which will return a binary value.

From Lemma 6 which ensure no two distinct binary values will be input to `SBV_broadcast STAGE[r, 1]` on line 10 and from SBV-Justification `view[r, 2]` will contain either a single binary value or a single binary value and \perp , which will then match a valid case on lines 12-15. Processes will then continue to the next round where the same proof construction applies. \square

Lemma 8. *If all non-faulty processes start a round r with the same binary estimate v then they all decide v in round r (if not already done) and never decide a different value in following rounds.*

Proof. By definition of the lemma, in round r all non-faulty processes input the same estimate v to `SBV_broadcast STAGE[r, 0]` on line 03. By SBV-Uniformity all non-faulty processes have `view[r, 0] = {v}` and by SBV-Binvalues only v can be contained in `bin_values` at non-faulty processes. All non-faulty processes then broadcast `AUXSET[r]({v})` on line 04 and set `view[r, 1]` to `{v}` on line 05. Following this `est` is set to v on line 07. All non-faulty processes then input v to `SBV_broadcast STAGE[r, 1]` on line 10 and by SBV-Uniformity have `view[r, 2] = {v}`. All non-faulty processes then set `est` to v and decide v (line 12) if not yet done and then start round $r + 1$ with the same binary estimate v for which the same proof holds. \square

Lemma 9. *No two non-faulty processes decide different values.*

Proof. Let r be the first round where a non-faulty process decides. By line 12 for a process to decide, a single binary value v must have been returned from `SBV_broadcast STAGE[r, 1]` on line 10. Given this and SBV-Justification a non-faulty process must have input v to `SBV_broadcast STAGE[r, 1]` on line 10. Furthermore by Lemma 6 only v or \perp could have been input by non-faulty processes to `SBV_broadcast STAGE[r, 1]`. Now given SBV-Justification and SBV-Singleton `view[r, 2]` must be either `{v}` or `{v, \perp }` at all non-faulty processes. Thus on lines 12-13 all non-faulty processes will set `est = v` and either decide v or not decide in round r . Lemma 8 then ensures that in following rounds all non-faulty processes decide only v . \square

Lemma 10. *Non-faulty processes decide in expected $O(1)$ rounds.*

Proof. By definition, the value output by the coin will not be revealed in a round r until at least 1 non-faulty processes has called `random()`, i.e. a non-faulty process has reached line 11. For a non-faulty process to reach this line it must have received $n - t$ messages from distinct processes on line 05 meaning at least $t + 1$ non-faulty processes have reached line 04 in round r before the coin is revealed. Consider the following two possible cases at the point where the $t + 1$ th non-faulty process reaches this line, and before the value of the coin for round r is revealed (note that by Lemma 7 all non-faulty processes will eventually reach this line).

- First assume that at least one of the $t + 1$ non-faulty processes had `view[r, 0]` returned from `SBV_broadcast STAGE[r, 0]` (line 03) containing a single binary value w . Now by Lemma 5 all non-faulty processes will input either \perp or w into `SBV_broadcast STAGE[r, 1]` (line 10).

Then by SBV-justification all non-faulty processes will have either $\{w\}$ or $\{w, \perp\}$ or $\{\perp\}$ as $view[r, 2]$. Now if the output of the coin is w at all non-faulty processes then by lines 12-14 they all will set their estimates to w . Thus with probability of at least $1/d$ all non-faulty processes will set their estimate to the same binary value and by Lemma 8 will decide by the following round.

- Otherwise, given Lemma 2 and SBV-Justification the $t+1$ non-faulty processes must have had $view[r, 0]$ returned from `SBV_broadcast` `STAGE[r, 0]` (line 03) as the set $\{0, 1\}$ and broadcast `AUXSET[r](\{0, 1\})` on line 04. Now given $t < n/3$, at all non-faulty processes on line 05 any set of messages from $(n-t)$ distinct processes will contain at least one `AUXSET[r](\{0, 1\})` message. With this and by SBV-Binvalues all non-faulty processes will eventually have $view[r, 1] = \{0, 1\}$ and will set $est \leftarrow \perp$ on line 08. All non-faulty processes will then input \perp into `SBV_broadcast` `STAGE[r, 1]` on line 10 and will return $\{\perp\}$ as $view[r, 2]$ by SBV-Uniformity. All non-faulty processes will then set their estimates to the output of the coin on line 14. Thus with probability of at least $1/d$ all non-faulty processes will set their estimate to the same binary value and by Lemma 8 will decide by the following round.

In both cases in round r non-faulty processes reach a state where they will reach a decision with probability of at least $1/d$, or decision is ensured with probability $1 - \prod_{r=1}^{\infty} 1/d = 1$. From this, the expected number of rounds to reach a state from which a decision is ensured is $\sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \frac{r}{d}(1 - \frac{1}{d})^{r-1} = d$ with all non-faulty processes deciding by round $d + 1$. \square

Theorem 1. *The algorithm presented in Figure 3 solves the Binary consensus problem in $\mathcal{BAMP}_{n,t}[t < n/3, CC]$.*

Proof. First recall the definition of Binary Byzantine Consensus.

- BBC-Termination. Every non-faulty process eventually decides on a value.
- BBC-Agreement. No two non-faulty processes decide on different values.
- BBC-Validity. If all non-faulty processes propose the same value, no other value can be decided.

BBC-Termination is ensured by Lemma 10. BBC-Agreement and BBC-Validity are ensured by Lemmas 9 and 4 respectively. \square

Message broadcasts. As defined in [26], the implementation of the SBV-Broadcast abstraction consists of 2 to 3 message broadcasts. The algorithm of Figure 3 consists of a single message broadcast and two instances of SBV-Broadcasts, or 5 to 7 message broadcasts. Section 3.5 describes a way to reduce this to 4 to 5 broadcasts.

3.3 The S-Broadcast abstraction in $\mathcal{BAMP}_{n,t}[t < n/3]$

The following sections present a Binary Byzantine consensus algorithm based on the Algorithm of [26] that uses a strong $(t + 1)$ common coin for correctness and termination. Each round of the algorithm of [26] consists of a call to BV-Broadcast followed by a normal message broadcast. Unfortunately here, in order to remove the fair scheduler requirement of [26] without increasing the number of message broadcasts the BV-Broadcast abstraction can no longer be used. Instead an S-Broadcast abstraction is introduced that can be thought of as breaking the BV-Broadcast

```

operation S_broadcast TAG( $v_i$ , should_broadcasti) is
(01)  $s\_value_i \leftarrow \text{false}$ 
(02) if (should_broadcasti = true) then broadcast TAG, S_VAL( $v_i$ ) end if
(03) return  $s\_value_i$ 
// the Boolean pointed to by  $s\_value_i$  has not necessarily obtained its final value when returned

when TAG, S_VAL( $v$ ) is received where ( $v = v_i$ )
(04) if (TAG, S_VAL( $v$ ) received from  $(t + 1)$  different processes and TAG, S_VAL( $v$ ) not yet broadcast)
(05)   then broadcast TAG, S_VAL( $v$ ) // a process echos a value only once
(06) end if;
(07) if (TAG, S_VAL( $v$ ) received from  $(2t + 1)$  different processes)
(08)   then  $s\_value_i \leftarrow \text{true}$  // local delivery of a value
(09) end if.

```

Figure 4: An algorithm implementing S-broadcast in $\mathcal{BAMP}_{n,t}[t < n/3]$.

abstraction into two separate instances of S-Broadcast, one for each binary value. Note that it follows a classical approach of broadcast/echo used in many similar abstractions.

The S-Broadcast abstraction takes as input a value v , and a Boolean value *should_broadcast*. It returns a pointer to a Boolean variable s_value . It is expected that if a non-faulty process calls S-Broadcast for a value v then all non-faulty processes call S-Broadcast for value v . The S-Broadcast abstraction ensures the following properties.

- S-Termination. The invocation of S_broadcast() by a non-faulty process terminates.
- S-Justification. If s_value_i returned by a call to S-Broadcast with value v at a non-faulty process p_i has $s_value_i = \text{true}$, then a non-faulty process has called S_broadcast(v , **true**)
- S-Uniformity. If s_value_i returned by a call to S-Broadcast with value v at a non-faulty process p_i has $s_value_i = \text{true}$, then eventually $s_value_j = \text{true}$ at every non-faulty process p_j .
- S-Obligation. If at least $t + 1$ non-faulty processes have called S_broadcast(v , **true**), then eventually $s_value_i = \text{true}$ at every non-faulty process p_i .

An implementation of S-Broadcast is described in Figure 4. Here non-faulty processes call S-Broadcast with an input v and a Boolean *should_broadcast*. On line 01 non-faulty processes initiate the s_value variable to false. If *should_broadcast* is true, then non-faulty processes broadcast a message TAG, S_VAL(v). A pointer to s_value is then returned, note that s_value may become true at a later point in time.

Lines 04-09 describe what happens when a message TAG, S_VAL(v) is received with a value v equal to the input given during the invocation of S-Broadcast. If message TAG, S_VAL(v) has been received from $(t + 1)$ distinct processes then the process broadcasts the same message if it has not already done so (lines 04-05) (i.e. it echos the message). Next, if messages TAG, S_VAL(v) has been received from $(2t + 1)$ distinct processes then the process sets s_value to true (lines 07-08).

Lemma 11. *Figure 4 satisfies the SBC-Broadcast abstraction.*

Proof. Proof of S-Termination: Figure 4 has no blocking operations. Proof of S-Justification: If no non-faulty process calls SBC-Broadcast with *should_broadcast* = **true** then no non-faulty process broadcasts TAGS_VAL(v) on line 02. Given t , no non-faulty process receives $(t + 1)$ TAGS_VAL(v) message from distinct processes and no non-faulty process broadcasts TAGS_VAL(v) on line 05. From this and given $2t + 1 > t + 1$ no non-faulty process sets s_value to true on line 08. Proof of

S-Uniformity: If a non-faulty process sets s_value to true on line 08 then it has received $(2t + 1)$ TAGS_VAL(v) messages from distinct processes. From this and given $t < n/3$ all non-faulty processes will receive at least $(t+1)$ TAGS_VAL(v) messages from distinct processes and broadcast TAGS_VAL(v) if not already done (line 05). From this all non-faulty processes will receive at least $(2t+1)$ messages from distinct processes and set $s_value \leftarrow \text{true}$ (line 08). **Proof of S-Obligation:** If at least $(t + 1)$ non-faulty processes call S-Broadcast with $should_broadcast = \text{true}$ then these processes broadcast TAGS_VAL(v) on line 02 (if not already done) and all non-faulty processes receive at least $(t + 1)$ messages from distinct processes. The proof follows using the same arguments as S-Uniformity. \square

3.4 A Safe and Live Consensus Algorithm in $\mathcal{BAMP}_{n,t}[t < n/3, SCC]$.

This section presents a Binary Byzantine Consensus algorithm using S-Broadcast in addition to a strong $(t + 1)$ common coin.

Message types. The following message types are used by the consensus.

- $AUX[r](s)$. An AUX message contains a round number r and a binary value s .

Local variables. The following local variables are used at each process.

- r_i . The current round at process i .
- s_i . The binary value returned by the most recent call to `random()` at process i .
- $support_coin_i$. A Boolean variable that indicates if the current estimate at processes i is equal to the value of the most recent coin flip.
- bin_ptr_i . A list of two pointers to Boolean variables returned by calls to S-Broadcast at process i , where $bin_ptr_i[0]$ represents the pointer returned by a call to `S_broadcast(0,)` and $bin_ptr_i[1]$ represents the pointer returned by a call to `S_broadcast(1,)`.

Algorithm description. Figure 5 presents the algorithm. Before describing the algorithm line by line some key points are introduced. First note that, given lines 12-13, only the value of the coin can be decided in a round. Second, given line 04, only the negation of the coin from the previous round is S-Broadcast in all rounds following the first round. These two points help support the intuition of the design of the algorithm as follows (assume it is given that the output of the coin in a round r is s): (i) given that $\neg s$ could not have been decided in round r , if s was a possible valid decision in round r then it remains so in round $r + 1$, so a process can immediately support s in round $r + 1$ and (ii) given that s could have been decided in round r , $\neg s$ must be checked in round $r + 1$ to see if it is still a valid value to decide. Using this and various thresholds (including the $t + 1$ threshold of the coin) and broadcasts liveness and correctness is then ensured.

The algorithm is now briefly described. Non-faulty processes call `PROPOSE()` with their initial proposal v . Line 01 initiates the local variables so that on lines 02-04 non-faulty processes call $bin_ptr[\neg v] \leftarrow \text{S_broadcast_EST}[1](\neg v, \text{false})$ and $bin_ptr[v] \leftarrow \text{S_broadcast_EST}[1](v, \text{true})$, (i.e. in round 1 they call the S-Broadcast abstraction for both 0 and 1, but with $support_coin = \text{true}$ only for their initial proposal). Given $t < n/3$ and S-Obligation at at least one of the bin_ptr variables point to a Boolean variable that becomes true and by S-Justification was proposed by a non-faulty process in the first round.

```

operation PROPOSE( $v_i$ ) is
(01)  $s_i \leftarrow \neg v_i$ ;  $r_i \leftarrow 0$ ;  $support\_coin_i = \text{false}$ ;
(02)  $bin\_ptr_i[s_i] \leftarrow \text{S\_broadcast EST}[1](s_i, \text{false})$ ;
    // the Boolean pointed to by  $bin\_ptr_i[s_i]$  has not necessarily obtained its final value at this point
repeat forever
(03)  $r_i \leftarrow r_i + 1$ ;
(04)  $bin\_ptr_i[\neg s_i] \leftarrow \text{S\_broadcast EST}[r_i](\neg s_i, \neg support\_coin_i)$ ;
    // the Boolean pointed to by  $bin\_ptr_i[\neg s_i]$  has not necessarily obtained its final value at this point
(05) wait_until( $bin\_ptr_i[0] = \text{true} \vee bin\_ptr_i[1] = \text{true}$ );
(06) case ( $support\_coin_i = \text{true}$ ) then  $w \leftarrow s_i$ 
(07)      ( $bin\_ptr_i[0] = \text{true}$ ) then  $w \leftarrow 0$ 
(08)      ( $bin\_ptr_i[1] = \text{true}$ ) then  $w \leftarrow 1$ 
(09) end case;
(10) broadcast AUX[ $r_i$ ]( $w$ );
(11) wait_until( $\exists$  a set  $view_i[r_i]$  such that (i) for  $v \in view_i[r_i]$ ,  $bin\_ptr_i[v] = \text{true}$ 
    (ii) its values come from messages AUX[ $r_i$ ]() received from  $(n - t)$  distinct processes);
(12)  $s_i \leftarrow \text{random}()$ ;
(13) case ( $view_i[r_i] = \{s_i\}$ ) then  $support\_coin_i = \text{true}$ ; decide( $s_i$ ) if not done yet;
(14)      ( $view_i[r_i] = \{0, 1\}$ ) then  $support\_coin_i = \text{true}$ 
(15)      else  $support\_coin_i = \text{false}$ 
(16) end case;
end repeat

```

Figure 5: An algorithm implementing binary consensus in $\mathcal{BAMP}_{n,t}[t < n/3, SCC]$.

Lines 03-16 are repeated for each round. The round starts by incrementing the round variable (line 03). Non-faulty processes then make a call to `S_broadcast` on line 04 with the negation of the coin from the previous round and the negation of the Boolean variable `support_coin` set on the previous round as inputs. This ensures that the input `should_broadcast` to `S_broadcast` is only true if the process decided not to support the output coin from the previous round. Given that the coin could have been decided in the previous round, this call to the `S-Broadcast` abstraction is to check if the negation of the coin remains a possible value to decide in round $r + 1$. The `bin_ptr` pointer to the Boolean variable corresponding to the coin is not changed as its state of being a value that can be decided remains the same as the previous round. Non-faulty processes then wait on line 05 until at least one of the `bin_ptr` variables point to a `true` Boolean value. On lines 06-09 processes compute the value w that they broadcast in an `AUX[r]()` message on line 10. This value w is either the value of the coin from the previous round if `support_coin = true` or a binary value for which `bin_ptr[w] = true`. The set `view[r]` is then computed on line 11 from the the values included with `AUX[r]()` messages received from $(n - t)$ distinct processes for which the corresponding `bin_ptr` variables point to a true Boolean. The strong $(t + 1)$ common coin is then computed on line 14. If `view[r]` contains a single value equal to the output of the coin then that value is decided on line 13 and `support_coin` is set to true. Otherwise if `view[r] = {0, 1}`, `support_coin` is set to true and no value is decided (line 14). Otherwise `support_coin` is set to false and no value is decided (line 15). Given $t < n/3$, if a non-faulty process decided then any set of $(n - t)$ `AUX[r]()` messages contain at least one message supporting the coin, thus ensuring all non-faulty processes set `support_coin` $\leftarrow \text{true}$. The round is then complete and the next round is started.

3.4.1 Proofs.

This section shows that the algorithm of Figure 5 solves Binary Byzantine consensus and terminates in an expected constant number of rounds.

Lemma 12. *Non-faulty processes complete each round.*

Proof. Each non-faulty process proposes an initial binary value v . By S-Termination all non-faulty processes will reach line 05 calling S-Broadcast with both 0 and 1 on lines 02,04. On line 03 each non-faulty process calls $\text{bin_ptr}[\neg v] \leftarrow \text{S_broadcast_EST}[1](v, \text{true})$ (note that here the variables are replaced to show that non-faulty processes are calling S-Broadcast with their proposal and true as input). Given that $t < n/3$ at least one of the S-broadcast instances will be called with $\text{should_broadcast} = \text{true}$ for a single binary value by at least $t + 1$ non-faulty processes, and by S-Obligation the condition on line 06 will be satisfied. It follows that either line 08 or line 09 (or both) be satisfied at all non-faulty processes and they will broadcast $\text{AUX}[1](w)$ where $\text{bin_ptr}[w] = \text{true}$. Now given S-Obligation all non-faulty processes will receive at least $(n - t)$ $\text{AUX}[1]()$ messages with values w that satisfy $\text{bin_ptr}[w] = \text{true}$. All non-faulty processes will then call $\text{random}()$ and the value of the coin will be output. The case on lines 13-15 will then be completed and non-faulty processes will continue onto round 2.

Now consider by induction that all non-faulty processes have completed round r . Let the output of the coin in round r be binary value s . If a non-faulty process sets $\text{support_coin} = \text{true}$ in round r it must have had $\text{bin_values}[s] = \text{true}$ (lines 13,14), and given the pointer $\text{bin_values}[s]$ is not modified in round $r + 1$, $\text{bin_values}[s] = \text{true}$ at all non-faulty processes in round $r + 1$ by S-Obligation. Call this note property (a).

Consider the following two cases representing the values of support_coin set in round r at non-faulty processes:

- At least $t + 1$ non-faulty processes set $\text{support_coin} \leftarrow \text{false}$ in round r on line 15. Now given the strong property of the coin, these processes will then call $\text{bin_ptr}[\neg s] \leftarrow \text{S_broadcast_EST}[r + 1](\neg s, \text{true})$ and by S-Obligation eventually $\text{bin_ptr}[\neg s] = \text{true}$ at all non-faulty processes in round $r + 1$ and the wait condition on line 05 will be satisfied. From this and by (a) all non-faulty processes will broadcast messages $\text{AUX}[r + 1](v)$ where $\text{bin_ptr}[v] = \text{true}$ on line 10 which will ensure the wait on line 11 will be completed and all non-faulty processes will continue to round $r + 2$.
- Otherwise less than $t + 1$ non-faulty processes set $\text{support_coin} \leftarrow \text{false}$ in round r on line 15. In this case less than $t + 1$ non-faulty processes will call $\text{bin_ptr}[\neg s] \leftarrow \text{S_broadcast_EST}[r + 1](\neg s, \text{true})$ and by S-Justification $\text{bin_ptr}[\neg s] = \text{false}$ in round $r + 1$. Furthermore given $t < n/3$ and by (a) $\text{bin_values}[s] = \text{true}$ at all non-faulty processes, all non-faulty processes will set $w \leftarrow s$ on lines 06-08 and broadcast $\text{AUX}[r + 1](s)$ on line 10. The wait on line 10 will then be satisfied and all non-faulty processes will continue to round $r + 2$.

This completes the proof by induction. □

Lemma 13. *If a non-faulty process decides a binary value v in a round r , then at every non-faulty process (i) in every round $\geq r$, $\text{bin_ptr}[v] = \text{true}$ (eventually) and no non-faulty process decides $\neg v$ and (ii) in every round $> r$, $\text{bin_ptr}[\neg v] = \text{false}$.*

Proof. Let r be the first round where a non-faulty process decides and v be the binary value it decides. For this to happen the following must be true: $\text{bin_ptr}[v] = \text{true}$ by line 11 and $s = v$ by line 13. Additionally, by the strong property of the coin, and by S-Obligation these will be true at all non-faulty processes. Furthermore, by line 11 a process that decides must have received $(n - t)$ $\text{AUX}[r](v)$ messages from $(n - t)$ distinct processes. Now given that $t < n/3$, any set of $(n - t)$ $\text{AUX}[r]()$ messages from distinct processes must contain at least one $\text{AUX}[r](v)$ message. Thus by lines 13-14 all non-faulty processes will set $\text{support_coin} = \text{true}$ and no non-faulty process will

decide $\neg v$ in round r . Now in round $r+1$ all non-faulty processes will call $bin_ptr[\neg v] \leftarrow \text{S_broadcast EST}[r+1](\neg v, \text{false})$ and by S-Justification $bin_ptr[\neg v] = \text{false}$ at all non-faulty processes. From this non-faulty processes will compute $view[r+1] = \{v\}$ on line 11. Furthermore given $bin_ptr[v]$ is not modified from round r , $bin_ptr[v] = \text{true}$ in round $r+1$.

Now consider by induction that the lemma is true in a round ρ . First note that given $bin_ptr[v] = \text{true}$ and $bin_ptr[\neg v] = \text{false}$ in round ρ , $view[\rho] = \{v\}$ at all non-faulty processes by lines 10-11. Consider the two possible cases for the output of the coin in round ρ :

- The output of $\text{random}()$ in round ρ is v . Here the case on line 13 is satisfied and all non-faulty processes set $support_coin = \text{true}$ and decide(v) if not done already. In round $\rho+1$ all non-faulty processes call $bin_ptr[\neg v] \leftarrow \text{S_broadcast EST}[\rho+1](\neg v, \text{false})$ and by S-Justification $bin_ptr[\neg v] = \text{false}$ at all non-faulty processes. Furthermore given $bin_ptr[v]$ is not modified from round ρ , $bin_ptr[v] = \text{true}$ in round $\rho+1$. From this non-faulty processes compute $view[\rho+1] = \{v\}$ on line 11 and do not decide $\neg v$.
- Otherwise the output of $\text{random}()$ in round ρ is $\neg v$. Here the case on line 15 is satisfied and all non-faulty processes set $support_coin \leftarrow \text{false}$. In round $\rho+1$ all non-faulty processes call $bin_ptr[v] \leftarrow \text{S_broadcast EST}[\rho+1](v, \text{true})$ and by S-Obligation $bin_ptr[v] = \text{true}$ (eventually) at all non-faulty processes. Furthermore given $bin_ptr[\neg v]$ is not modified from round ρ , $bin_ptr[\neg v] = \text{false}$ in round $\rho+1$. From this non-faulty processes compute $view[\rho+1] = \{v\}$ on line 11 and do not decide $\neg v$.

This completes the proof by induction. □

Lemma 14. *No two non-faulty processes decide different values.*

Proof. This follows directly from 13. □

Lemma 15. *Non-faulty processes only call $\text{S_broadcast}(v, \text{true})$ if v was proposed by a non-faulty process.*

Proof. In round 1 this is true as non-faulty processes only call $\text{S_broadcast}(v, \text{true})$ for their proposal v . Now assume the lemma holds true in round r . In round $r+1$ processes only call $\text{S_broadcast}(v, \text{true})$ if it set $support_coin$ to false on line 15 in round r . For this to happen by line 11 $bin_ptr[v]$ must be true in round r . The proof then follows by S-Justification and induction. □

Lemma 16. *Non-faulty processes only decide binary values proposed by non-faulty processes.*

Proof. By Lemma 15 and S-Justification the pointers bin_ptr at non-faulty processes only have value true if $\text{S_broadcast}(v, \text{true})$ was called by a non-faulty process with their corresponding binary value v . By lines 11 and 13 a non-faulty process can only decide a binary value v if $bin_ptr[v] = \text{true}$, the proof follows. □

Lemma 17. *Given a binary value s as the output of the call to $\text{random}()$ in a round r . If all non-faulty processes start round $r+1$ with $support_coin = \text{true}$, then all non-faulty processes decide (if they have not done so already) in the first round $\rho > r$ where the output of $\text{random}()$ in round ρ is s .*

Proof. Given by definition that $support_coin = \text{true}$ at all non-faulty processes in round $r+1$, they must have executed either line 13 or 14 in round r and must have $bin_ptr[s] = \text{true}$. Given $bin_ptr[s]$ is not modified in round r it remains true in round $r+1$. Now all non-faulty processes

call $\text{bin_ptr}[\neg s] \leftarrow \text{S_broadcast EST}[r+1](\neg s, \text{false})$ on line 04 and by S-Justification $\text{bin_ptr}[\neg s] = \text{false}$ at all non-faulty processes in round $r+1$. Notice now that $\text{bin_ptr}[\neg s] = \text{false}$ and $\text{bin_ptr}[s] = \text{true}$ at all non-faulty processes, call this state (a).

From state (a) in round $r+1$ all non-faulty processes will broadcast $\text{AUX}[r+1](s)$ on line 10 and have $\text{view}[r+1] = \{v\}$ from line 11.

Now if the call to $\text{random}()$ returns s then all non-faulty processes decide on line 13.

Otherwise the call $\text{random}()$ returns $\neg s$ in round $r+1$ and all non-faulty processes set $\text{support_coin} = \text{false}$ on line 15. In round $r+2$ $\text{bin_ptr}[\neg s] = \text{false}$ at all non-faulty processes given it is not changed from round $r+1$. All non-faulty processes then call $\text{bin_ptr}[s] \leftarrow \text{S_broadcast EST}[r+2](\neg s, \text{true})$ on line 04 and by S-Obligation $\text{bin_ptr}[s] = \text{true}$ at all non-faulty processes in round $r+2$. Notice that the non-faulty processes are once again in state (a) except in round $r+2$, the proof then follows. \square

Lemma 18. *Non-faulty processes decide in expected $O(1)$ rounds.*

Proof. Consider a round r . Given the $t+1$ property of the coin, at least $t+1$ non-faulty processes have reached line 12 before the output of $\text{random}()$ is revealed. Consider the following two cases when the $t+1$ th non-faulty process reaches this line:

- At least one of these non-faulty processes has computed $\text{view}[r] \leftarrow \{v\}$ on line 11, i.e. $\text{view}[r]$ contains a single binary value v . In this case if the output of the call to $\text{random}()$ is v then the process will decide v on line 13 and decide in the next round where the output of the coin is v (if not done already) by Lemmas 13 and 17.
- Otherwise given $t < n/3$ all $t+1$ of these non-faulty processes have set $\text{view}[r] \leftarrow \{0,1\}$ on line 11. Let the output of the call to $\text{random}()$ be s in round r . Note that the wait on line 11 and S-Uniformity ensure $\text{bin_ptr}[s] = \text{true}$ at all non-faulty processes in round r and given the pointer is not changed in round $r+1$, this remains true in round $r+1$. Now on line 14 the same $t+1$ non-faulty processes set $\text{support_coin} \leftarrow \text{true}$ and in round $r+1$ broadcast $\text{AUX}[r+1](s)$. Given $t < n/3$ all sets of $(n-t)$ distinct $\text{AUX}[r+1](s)$ messages will contain at least one $\text{AUX}[r+1](s)$ message. It then follows that $s \in \text{view}[r+1]$ at all non-faulty processes. Now if the output of $\text{random}()$ is s in round $r+1$ then all non-faulty processes will set $\text{support_coin}_i \leftarrow \text{true}$ on lines 13 or line 14 and by Lemma 17 all non-faulty processes will decide by the next round where the output of the call to $\text{random}()$ is s .

In both cases in round r non-faulty processes reach a state where they will reach a decision with probability of at least $1/2$ by the strong property of the coin, or decision is ensured with probability $1 - \prod_{r=1}^{\infty} 1/2 = 1$. From this, the expected number of rounds to reach a state from which a decision is ensured is $\sum_{r=1}^{\infty} r \frac{1}{2^r} = 2$, and by Lemmas 17 and 13 all processes will decide by the next round where the coin flip results in the same value, i.e. another expected 2 rounds. \square

Theorem 2. *The algorithm presented in Figure 5 solves the Binary consensus problem in $\mathcal{BAMP}_{n,t}[t < n/3, CC]$.*

Proof. First recall the definition of Binary Byzantine Consensus.

- BBC-Termination. Every non-faulty process eventually decides on a value.
- BBC-Agreement. No two non-faulty processes decide on different values.

- BBC-Validity. If all non-faulty processes propose the same value, no other value can be decided.

BBC-Termination is ensured by Lemma 18. BBC-Agreement and BBC-Validity are ensured by Lemmas 14 and 16 respectively. \square

Message broadcasts. The S-Broadcast consists of at most 1 message broadcast. The first round of the consensus algorithm consists of 2 instances of S-Broadcast (where non-faulty processes perform a normal broadcast within at least one of these), followed by a normal message broadcast, or 2 to 3 message broadcasts. All following rounds consist of a call to S-Broadcast followed by a normal message broadcast, or 1 to 2 message broadcasts.

3.5 Optimization for the Safe and Live Consensus Algorithm in $\mathcal{BAMP}_{n,t}[t < n/3, CC]$ from Figure 3.

Notice that the strong $(t + 1)$ common coin algorithm from Figure 5 uses the fact that a binary value may remain valid from the previous round in order to only perform a single S-Broadcast per round in rounds following the first round. A similar technique can be used to reduce the number of broadcasts used by the SBV-Abstractions of the algorithm in Figure 3. Consider the binary value v ($v \perp$) from $view[r, 2]$ which may be set to non-faulty processes' estimates on lines 12-13. By Lemma 6 and SBV-Binvalues this can only be a single binary value and if such a value exists then all non-faulty processes have it in their bin_values returned from the call to $SBV_broadcast\ STAGE[r, 1]$. With this, non-faulty processes can skip the initial broadcast of the value in the following round and broadcast it directly within an aux message in $SBV_broadcast\ STAGE[r + 1, 0]$, where the bin_values returned by $SBV_broadcast\ STAGE[r, 1]$ ensures its validity. Furthermore notice that this does not affect termination as this binary value is only used in the termination proof when it is equal to the value output by the coin at all non-faulty processes, in which case all non-faulty processes take this value as the estimate regardless.

This optimization then can be further applied to \perp when input to the $SBV_broadcast\ STAGE[r, 1]$ on line 10. Here processes can immediately broadcast \perp in the AUX message, using the fact that all non-faulty processes will $bin_values[r] = \{0, 1\}$ (the bin_values returned by $SBV_broadcast\ STAGE[r, 0]$) as support. Again termination is not effected using a similar argument as before.

This optimization reduces the number of message broadcast performed by the SBV-Broadcast abstraction from between 2 and 3 to between 1 and 2. Notice that if $SBV_broadcast\ STAGE[r, 1]$ only uses a single broadcast, then $SBV_broadcast\ STAGE[r, 2]$ will use 2 broadcasts, as the single broadcast of $SBV_broadcast\ STAGE[r, 2]$ can only be used for \perp which requires $SBV_broadcast\ STAGE[r, 1]$ to use 2 broadcasts. Thus the number of message broadcasts performed per round becomes 4 to 5.

Note that a similar optimization could be applied to the algorithm of [12] that uses a similar construction but relies on a synchrony assumption for termination.

References

- [1] James Aspnes. Randomized protocols for asynchronous consensus. *Distrib. Comput.*, 16(2-3):165-175, September 2003.
- [2] Michael Ben-Or. Another advantage of free choice (extended abstract): Completely asynchronous agreement protocols. *In Proceedings of the Second Annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing, PODC '83*, pages 27-30, 1983

- [3] Berman P. and Garay J.A., Randomized distributed agreement revisited. *33rd Annual Int'l Symposium on Fault-Tolerant Computing (FTCS' 93)*, IEEE Computer Press, pp. 412-419, 1993.
- [4] Alyson Bessani, Joao Sousa, and Eduardo E. P. Alchieri. State machine replication for the masses with bft-smart. In *2014 44th Annual IEEE/IFIP International Conference on Dependable Systems and Networks*, pages 355-362, June 2014.
- [5] Gabriel Bracha. An $o(\log n)$ expected rounds randomized byzantine generals protocol. *J. ACM*, 34(4):910-920, October 1987
- [6] Gabriel Bracha and Sam Toueg. Asynchronous consensus and byzantine protocols in faulty environments. Technical Report TR83-559, Cornell University, 1983.
- [7] Christian Cachin, Klaus Kursawe, and Victor Shoup. Random oracles in constantinople: Practical asynchronous byzantine agreement using cryptography. *Journal of Cryptology*, 18(3):219-246, 2005.
- [8] Ran Canetti and Tal Rabin. Fast asynchronous byzantine agreement with optimal resilience. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-fifth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC '93*, pages 42-51, 1993.
- [9] Miguel Castro and Barbara Liskov. Practical byzantine fault tolerance and proactive recovery. *ACM Trans. Comput. Syst.*, 20(4):398-461, November 2002.
- [10] Tyler Crain. A Simple and Efficient Asynchronous Randomized Binary Byzantine Consensus Algorithm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.04393*, 2020.
- [11] Tyler Crain. A Simple and Efficient Binary Byzantine Consensus Algorithm using Cryptography and Partial Synchrony. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.07867*, 2020.
- [12] Tyler Crain, Vincent Gramoli, Mikel Larrea, and Michel Raynal. Dbft: Efficient leaderless byzantine consensus and its applications to blockchains. In *Proceedings of the 17th IEEE International Symposium on Network Computing and Applications (NCA'18)*. IEEE, 2018.
- [13] Danny Dolev, Cynthia Dwork, and Larry Stockmeyer. On the minimal synchronism needed for distributed consensus. *J. ACM*, 34(1):77-97, January 1987.
- [14] Cynthia Dwork, Nancy A. Lynch, and Larry J. Stockmeyer. Consensus in the presence of partial synchrony. *J. ACM*, 35(2):288-323, 1988.
- [15] PESECH FELDMAN and SILVIO Micali. An optimal probabilistic protocol for synchronous byzantine agreement. *SIAM J. Computing*, 26(4):873-933, 1997.
- [16] Fischer M.J. and Lynch N.A., A lower bound for the time to assure interactive consistency. *Information Processing Letters*, 14(4):183-186 (1982)
- [17] Fischer M.J., Lynch N.A., and Paterson M.S., Impossibility of distributed consensus with one faulty process. *Journal of the ACM*, 32(2):374-382 (1985)
- [18] Friedman R., Mostéfaoui A., Rajsbaum S., and Raynal M., Distributed agreement problems and their connection with error-correcting codes. *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, 56(7):865-875, 2007.
- [19] Oded Goldreich and Erez Petrank. The best of both worlds: Guaranteeing termination in fast randomized byzantine agreement protocols. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 36(1):45-49, 1990.
- [20] Valerie King and Jared Saia. Byzantine agreement in expected polynomial time. *J. ACM*, 63(2):13, 2016.
- [21] Leslie Lamport, Robert Shostak, and Marshall Pease. The byzantine generals problem. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.*, 4(3):382-401, July 1982.
- [22] Shengyun Liu, Paolo Viotti, Christian Cachin, Vivien Quéma, and Marko Vukolic. XFT: practical fault tolerance beyond crashes. In *12th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation, OSDI 2016*, Savannah, GA, USA, November 2-4, 2016., pages 485-500, 2016.
- [23] Ethan MacBrough. Cobalt: BFT Governance in Open Networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.07240*, 2018.

- [24] Jean-Philippe Martin and Lorenzo Alvisi. Fast byzantine consensus. *IEEE Trans. Dependable Sec. Comput.*, 3(3):202-215, 2006.
- [25] Achour Mostéfaoui, Hamouma Moumen, and Michel Raynal. Signature-free asynchronous byzantine consensus with $T < N/3$ and $O(N^2)$ messages. In *Proceedings of the 2014 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing, PODC '14*, pages 2-9, New York, NY, USA, 2014. ACM.
- [26] Achour Mostfaoui, Hamouma Moumen, and Michel Raynal. Signature-Free Asynchronous Binary Byzantine Consensus with $t \leq n/3$, $O(n^2)$ Messages, and $O(1)$ Expected Time. *J. ACM* 62, 4. Article 31. 2015.
- [27] Achour Mostéfaoui and Michel Raynal. Signature-free asynchronous byzantine systems: from multivalued to binary consensus with $t < n/3$, $O(n^2)$ messages, and constant time. *Acta Informatica*, 2017. Accepted: 19 April 2016
- [28] Achour Mostéfaoui, Michel Raynal, and Frédéric Tronel. From binary consensus to multivalued consensus in asynchronous message-passing systems. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 73(5-6):207-212, March 2000.
- [29] N. F. Neves, M. Correia, and P. Verissimo. Solving vector consensus with a wormhole. *IEEE Trans. on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, 16(2):1120-1131, 2005.
- [30] Arpita Patra, Ashish Choudhury, and C. Pandu Rangan. Asynchronous byzantine agreement with optimal resilience. *Distributed Computing*, 27(2):111-146, 2014.
- [31] M. Pease, R. Shostak, and L. Lamport. Reaching agreement in the presence of faults. *J. ACM*, 27(2):228-234, April 1980
- [32] Michael O. Rabin. Randomized byzantine generals. In *Proceedings of the 24th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, SFCS '83*, pages 403-409, 1983.
- [33] Srikanth T.K. and Toueg S., Simulating authenticated broadcasts to derive simple fault-tolerant algorithms. *Distributed Computing*, 2:80-94, 1987.
- [34] Sam Toueg. Randomized byzantine agreements. In *Proceedings of the Third Annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing, PODC '84*, pages 163-178, 1984.
- [35] Russell Turpin and Brian A. Coan. Extending binary byzantine agreement to multivalued byzantine agreement. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 18(2):73- 76, 1984.
- [36] Jialin Zhang and Wei Chen. Bounded cost algorithms for multivalued consensus using binary consensus instances. *Information Processing Letters*, 109(17):1005-1009, 2009.