

Self-stabilizing Byzantine- and Intrusion-tolerant Consensus (preliminary version)

Romaric Duvignau ^{*} Michel Raynal [†] Elad M. Schiller

October 19, 2021

One of the most celebrated problems of fault-tolerant distributed computing is the consensus problem. It was shown to abstract a myriad of problems in which processes have to agree on a single value. Consensus applications include fundamental services for the environments of the Cloud or Blockchain. In such challenging environments, malicious behavior is often modeled as adversarial Byzantine faults. At OPODIS 2010, Mostéfaoui and Raynal, in short, MR, presented a Byzantine- and intrusion-tolerant solution to consensus in which the decided value cannot be a value proposed only by Byzantine processes. In addition to this validity property, MR has optimal resilience since it can deal with up to $t < n/3$ Byzantine processes, where n is the number of processes. We note that MR provides this multivalued consensus object (which accepts proposals taken from a set with a finite number of values) assuming the availability of a single Binary consensus object (which accepts proposals taken from the set $\{0, 1\}$).

This work, which focuses on multivalued consensus, aims at the design of an even more robust solution than MR. Our proposal expands MR's fault-model with self-stabilization, a vigorous notion of fault-tolerance. In addition to tolerating Byzantine and communication failures, self-stabilizing systems can automatically recover after the occurrence of *arbitrary transient-faults*. These faults represent any violation of the assumptions according to which the system was designed to operate (provided that the algorithm code remains intact). We propose, to the best of our knowledge, the first self-stabilizing solution for intrusion-tolerant multivalued consensus for asynchronous message-passing systems prone to Byzantine failures.

1 Introduction

1.1 Background and motivation

The consensus problem is one of the most challenging tasks in fault-tolerant distributed computing. The problem definition is rather simple. It assumes that each non-faulty process advocates

^{*}Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Chalmers University of Technology, Gothenburg, SE-412 96, Sweden. Email: {duvignau, elad}@chalmers.se

[†]IRISA, University Rennes 1, France and Polytechnic University, Hong Kong. Email: michel.raynal@irisa.fr

for a single value from a given set V . The problem requires *MVC-Completion*, *i.e.*, all non-faulty processes decide a value, *MVC-Agreement*, *i.e.*, no two non-faulty processes can decide different values, and *MVC-Validity*, *i.e.*, only a value that was proposed can be decided. When the set, V , from which the proposed values are taken is $\{0, 1\}$, the problem is called Binary consensus. Otherwise, it is named multivalued consensus. This work studies robust solutions to the problem of multivalued consensus that assume access to a single Binary consensus object. We aim at designing solutions that have higher degrees of dependability than the existing implementations.

1.2 Byzantine fault-tolerance

Lamport, Shostak, and Pease [30] say that a process commits a Byzantine failure if it deviates from the algorithm instructions, say, by deferring (or omitting) messages that were sent by the algorithm or sending messages that it never sent. Such malicious behavior can be the result of hardware malfunctions or software errors as well as coordinated malware attacks. In order to safeguard against such attacks, Mostéfaoui and Raynal [36, 37] as well as Correia, Neves, and Veríssimo [16, 38] suggested the *MVC-no-intrusion* validity requirement (aka *intrusion-tolerance*). Specifically, the decided value cannot be a value that was proposed only by faulty processes. Also, when it is not possible to decide on a value, the transient error symbol, Ψ , is returned.

For the sake of deterministic solvability [26, 30, 39, 40], we assume that there are at most $t < n/3$ Byzantine processes in the system, where n is the total number of processes. It is also well-known that no deterministic (multivalued or binary) consensus solution exists for asynchronous systems in which at least one process may crash (or one process can be Byzantine) [27]. The studied multivalued consensus algorithms circumvent this impossibility by assuming that the system model is enriched with a Byzantine-tolerant object that solves binary consensus. *I.e.*, the studied solutions [37] reduce multivalued consensus to binary consensus.

1.3 Self-stabilization

We study an asynchronous message-passing system that has no guarantees on the communication delay and the algorithm cannot explicitly access the local clock. Our fault model includes (i) undetectable Byzantine failures, and (ii) communication failures, such as packet omission, duplication, and reordering.

In addition to the failures captured by our model, we also aim to recover from *arbitrary transient-faults*, *i.e.*, any temporary violation of assumptions according to which the system and network were designed to operate. This includes the corruption of control variables, such as the program counter and packet payloads, as well as operational assumptions, such as that at most $t < n/3$ processes are not faulty. Since the occurrence of these failures can be arbitrarily combined, we assume that these transient-faults can alter the system state in unpredictable ways. In particular, when modeling the system, Dijkstra [18] assumes that these violations bring the system to an arbitrary state from which a *self-stabilizing system* should recover, see [19, 2] for details. *I.e.*, Dijkstra requires recovery after the last occurrence of a transient-fault and once the system has recovered, it must never violate the task requirements.

1.4 Related work

Ever since the seminal work of Lamport, Shostak, and Pease [30] four decades ago, Byzantine-tolerant consensus has been an active research subject, see [17]. The recent rise of distributed




Figure 1: Our architecture assumes the availability of Byzantine-tolerant binary consensus. The studied problems appear in boldface fonts. The other layers mentioned in the text above are in plain font.

ledger technologies, *e.g.*, [1], brought phenomenal attention to the subject since Blockchain technology market worth is expected to reach 395 B USD by 2028. ¹ Therefore, we aim to provide a degree of dependability that is higher than existing solutions.

Ben-Or, Kelmer, and Rabin [3] presented the first reduction from multivalued consensus to binary consensus, in the presence of asynchrony and Byzantine processes. They do not consider intrusion tolerance. As mentioned, Mostéfaoui and Raynal [36, 37] as well as Correia, Neves, and Veríssimo [16, 38] proposed the notion of intrusion tolerance. Our contribution is a self-stabilizing variation on the solution by Mostéfaoui and Raynal [36].

There are (non-self-stabilizing) Byzantine fault-tolerant solutions [41] and (non-Byzantine fault-tolerant) self-stabilizing solutions [6, 21, 33, 32]. Mostéfaoui, Moumen, and Raynal [35, 34] presented Byzantine-tolerant algorithms for solving Binary consensus using common coins. Recently, Georgiou *et al.* [28] proposed a self-stabilizing variation on the one in [34] that satisfies the safety requirements, *i.e.*, agreement and validity, with an exponentially high probability that depends only on a predefined constant. Georgiou *et al.*'s solution can be used as the self-stabilizing Byzantine-tolerant Binary consensus object needed for our solution. In the broader context of self-stabilizing Byzantine-tolerant solutions for message-passing systems, we find solutions for topology discovery [22], storage [11, 10, 9, 8, 7], clock synchronization [24, 31, 29], approximate agreement [12], asynchronous unison [25] to name a few. Also, Byzantine-tolerant state-machine replication by Binun *et al.* [4, 5] for synchronous systems and Dolev *et al.* [20] for practically-self-stabilizing partially-synchronous systems.

1.5 The studied architecture

Many Cloud computing and distributed ledger technologies are based on state-machine replication. Following Raynal [41, Ch. 16 and 19], Figure 1 illustrates how total order broadcast can facilitate the ordering of the automaton's state transitions. This order can be defined by instances of multivalued consensus objects, which in turn, invokes binary consensus, such as the one by Georgiou *et al.* [28]. This work focuses on transforming the non-self-stabilizing solution for Byzantine- and intrusion-tolerant multivalued consensus by Mostéfaoui and Raynal [36, 37] into one that is self-stabilizing and Byzantine- and intrusion-tolerant. Just as Mostéfaoui and Raynal, we do not consider the management of multivalued consensus invocations via sequence numbers. However, we assume that such mechanisms eventually recycle all consensus objects, see [28, 33] for details. Thus, as long as all invocations of consensus objects complete eventually, the system reaches a state after which all invocations of consensus objects are completed, and *their state is not corrupted*.

¹www.grandviewresearch.com/industry-analysis/blockchain-technology-market

1.6 Our contribution

We present a fundamental module for dependable distributed systems: a self-stabilizing Byzantine-tolerant algorithm for multivalued consensus for asynchronous message-passing systems. We obtain this new self-stabilizing algorithm via a transformation of the non-self-stabilizing MR algorithm by Mostéfaoui and Raynal [36]. MR offers optimal resilience by assuming $t < n/3$, where t is the number of faulty processes and n is the total number of processes. The proposed solution preserves this optimality.

In the absence of transient-faults, our solution achieves consensus within a constant time as in the MR algorithm. After the occurrence of any finite number of arbitrary transient-faults, the system recovers eventually (while assuming execution fairness).

The communication costs of the studied and proposed algorithms are similar. The main difference is that our solution unifies all the types of messages sent by the different MR's algorithms into a single message that is repeatedly sent. Note that this repetition is imperative since self-stabilizing systems cannot stop sending messages [19, Chapter 2.3]. Also, as there is a constant number of message types, the message size is a constant that depends only on $\log_2 |V|$, where V is the set of values that can be proposed.

To the best of our knowledge, we propose the first self-stabilizing Byzantine- and intrusion-tolerant algorithm for solving multivalued consensus in asynchronous message-passing systems that are enriched by a single Binary consensus object. We believe that our solution can stimulate research for the design of algorithms for the environments of the Cloud and distributed ledger technologies that are far more robust than the existing implementations since the latter cannot recover after the occurrence of transient faults.

2 System Settings

We consider an asynchronous message-passing system that has no guarantees on the communication delay. Also, the algorithm cannot explicitly access the (local) clock (or use timeout mechanisms). The system consists of a set, \mathcal{P} , of n fail-prone nodes (or processes) with unique identifiers. Any pair of nodes $p_i, p_j \in \mathcal{P}$ has access to a bidirectional communication channel, $channel_{j,i}$, that, at any time, has at most $channelCapacity \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ packets on transit from p_j to p_i (this assumption is due to a known impossibility [19, Chapter 3.2]).

In the *interleaving model* [19], the node's program is a sequence of (*atomic*) *steps*. Each step starts with an internal computation and finishes with a single communication operation, *i.e.*, a message *send* or *receive*. The *state*, s_i , of node $p_i \in \mathcal{P}$ includes all of p_i 's variables and $channel_{j,i}$. The term *system state* (or configuration) refers to the tuple $c = (s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n)$. We define an *execution (or run)* $R = c[0], a[0], c[1], a[1], \dots$ as an alternating sequence of system states $c[x]$ and steps $a[x]$, such that each $c[x + 1]$, except for the starting one, $c[0]$, is obtained from $c[x]$ by $a[x]$'s execution.

2.1 The fault model and self-stabilization

The *legal executions (LE)* set refers to all the executions in which the requirements of the task T hold. In this work, T_{MVC} denotes the task of multivalued consensus, which Section 1 specifies, and the executions in the set LE_{MVC} fulfill T_{MVC} 's requirements.

2.1.1 Benign failures

A failure occurrence is a step that the environment takes rather than the algorithm. When the occurrence of a failure cannot cause the system execution to lose legality, *i.e.*, to leave LE , we refer to that failure as a benign one.

- *Communication failures and fairness.* We consider solutions that are oriented towards asynchronous message-passing systems and thus they are oblivious to the time at which the packets arrive and depart. We assume that any message can reside in a communication channel only for a finite period. Also, the communication channels are prone to packet failures, such as omission, duplication, and reordering. However, if p_i sends a message infinitely often to p_j , node p_j receives that message infinitely often. We refer to the latter as the *fair communication* assumption.

We note that studied algorithms assume reliable communication channels whereas the proposed solution does not make any assumption regarding reliable communications. Section 4.1.2 provides further details regarding the reasons why the proposed solution cannot make this assumption.

- *Arbitrary node failures.* Byzantine faults model any fault in a node including crashes, and arbitrary malicious behaviors. Here the adversary lets each node receive the arriving messages and calculate its state according to the algorithm. However, once a node (that is captured by the adversary) sends a message, the adversary can modify the message in any way, delay it for an arbitrarily long period or even remove it from the communication channel. The adversary can also send messages spontaneously. Note that the adversary has the power to coordinate such actions without any limitation about his computational or communication power. For the sake of solvability [30, 39, 42], the fault model that we consider limits only the number of nodes that can be captured by the adversary. That is, the number, t , of Byzantine failures needs to be less than one-third of the number, n , of nodes in the system, *i.e.*, $3t + 1 \leq n$. The set of non-faulty nodes is denoted by *Correct* and called the set of correct nodes.

2.1.2 Arbitrary transient-faults

We consider any temporary violation of the assumptions according to which the system was designed to operate. We refer to these violations and deviations as *arbitrary transient-faults* and assume that they can corrupt the system state arbitrarily (while keeping the program code intact). The occurrence of a transient fault is rare. Thus, we assume that the last arbitrary transient fault occurs before the system execution starts [19]. Also, it leaves the system to start in an arbitrary state.

2.2 Dijkstra's self-stabilization

An algorithm is *self-stabilizing* with respect to LE , when every execution R of the algorithm reaches within a finite period a suffix $R_{legal} \in LE$ that is legal. Namely, Dijkstra [18] requires $\forall R : \exists R' : R = R' \circ R_{legal} \wedge R_{legal} \in LE \wedge |R'| \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, where the operator \circ denotes that $R = R' \circ R''$ is the concatenation of R' with R'' .

2.2.1 Execution fairness and wait-free guarantees

Given a step a , we say that a is *applicable* to system state c if there exists system state c' , such that a leads to c' from c . We say that a system execution is *fair* when every step of a correct

Algorithm 1: ND- and BRB-broadcast; code for p_i .

```

1 operation brbBroadcast( $m$ ) do broadcast INIT( $m$ );
2 upon INIT( $mJ$ ) first arrival from  $p_j$  do broadcast ECHO( $j, mJ$ );
3 upon ECHO( $k, mJ$ ) arrival from  $p_j$  do { if ECHO( $k, mJ$ ) received from at least
   ( $n+t$ )/2 nodes  $\wedge$  READY( $k, mJ$ ) not yet broadcast then brbDeliver( $j, mJ$ );
   broadcast READY( $k, mJ$ ) } ;
4 upon READY( $k, mJ$ ) arrival from  $p_j$  begin
5   if READY( $k, mJ$ ) received from ( $t+1$ ) nodes  $\wedge$  READY( $k, mJ$ )
   not yet broadcast then broadcast READY( $k, mJ$ );
6   if READY( $k, mJ$ ) received from at least ( $2t+1$ ) nodes  $\wedge$   $\langle k, mJ \rangle$ 
   not yet BRB-Delivered then brbDeliver ( $k, mJ$ );

```

node that is applicable infinitely often is executed infinitely often and fair communication is kept.

Self-stabilizing algorithms often assume that their executions are fair [19]. Wait-free algorithms guarantee that operations (that were invoked by non-failing nodes) always complete in the presence of asynchrony and any number of node failures. This work assumes execution fairness during the period in which the system recovers from the occurrence of the last arbitrary transient fault.

3 The studied algorithms

As depicted by Figure 1, the solution by Mostéfaoui and Raynal [37] includes the layers presented in sections 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3.

3.1 Byzantine reliable broadcast (BRB)

Bracha and Toueg [15] proposed this communication abstraction, which allows every node to invoke the $\text{brbBroadcast}(v)$ operation and raise the $\text{brbDeliver}()$ event upon message arrival, such that the following requirements hold.

- **BRB-validity.** Suppose a correct node BRB-delivers message m from a correct node p_i . Then, p_i BRB-broadcast m .
- **BRB-integrity.** No correct node BRB-delivers more than once.
- **BRB-no-duplicity.** No two correct nodes BRB-deliver different messages from p_i (who might be faulty).
- **BRB-Completion-1.** Suppose p_i is a correct sender. All the correct nodes BRB-deliver its message eventually.
- **BRB-Completion-2.** Suppose a correct node BRB-delivers a message from p_i (who might be faulty). All correct nodes BRB-deliver a message from p_i eventually.

We note that BRB-no-duplicity and BRB-Completion-2 implies that if a correct node BRB-delivers m from node p_i (faulty or not), all correct nodes eventually BRB-deliver m . Also, the studied BRB-broadcast algorithm is based on a simpler communication abstraction called no-duplicity broadcast (ND-broadcast) by Toueg [42, 41]. It includes all of the above requirements

Algorithm 2: VBB-broadcast; code for p_i

```
7 operation vbbBroadcast( $v$ ) begin
8   | brbBroadcast INIT( $i, v$ );
9   | wait  $|rec| \geq n-t$  where  $rec$  is the multiset of BRB-delivered values;
10  | brbBroadcast VALID( $i, (equal(v, rec) \geq n-2t)$ );
11 foreach  $p_j \in \mathcal{P}$  execute concurrently do
12  | wait VALID( $j, x$ ) and INIT( $j, v$ ) BRB-delivered from  $p_j$ ;
13  | if  $x$  then {wait ( $equal(v, rec) \geq n-2t$ );  $d \leftarrow v$ };
14  | else {wait ( $differ(v, rec) \geq t+1$ );  $d \leftarrow \Psi$ };
15  | vbbDeliver( $d$ ) at  $p_i$  as the value VBB-broadcast by  $p_j$ ;
```

except BRB-Completion-2. Just like Bracha [13, 14], we study the BRB-broadcast algorithm after studying the ND-broadcast algorithm.

3.1.1 No-Duplicity Broadcast

Algorithm 1 brings the algorithm by Toueg [42]. The `boxed` code lines 3 to 6 are irrelevant to the implementation of ND-broadcast but the `striketrough` code (line 3's consequent clause of the if-statement) is part of the ND-broadcast implementation. Algorithm 1 assumes that every correct node invokes ND-broadcast at most once. Node p_i initiates the ND-broadcasts of m_i by sending INIT(i, m_i) to all nodes (line 1). Upon this message's first arrival to node p_j , it disseminates the fact that p_i has initiated m 's ND-broadcast by sending ECHO(j, m_i) to all nodes (line 2). Upon this message arrival to p_k from more than $(n+t)/2$ different nodes, p_k is ready to ND-deliver $\langle j, m_i \rangle$ (line 3).

3.1.2 Byzantine Reliable Broadcast

As mentioned, we present the BRB-broadcast algorithm as an extension of the ND-broadcast algorithm. Algorithm 1 satisfies the requirements of reliable broadcast assuming $t < n/3$. The `boxed` code lines 3 to 6 are part of the BRB-broadcast algorithm and the `striketrough` code (the consequent clause of the if-statement in line 3) is irrelevant.

The first difference between the ND-broadcast and BRB-broadcast algorithms is in the consequent clause of the if-statement in line 3, where ND-delivery of $\langle j, m \rangle$ is replaced with the broadcast of READY(j, m). This broadcast indicates that p_i is ready to BRB-deliver $\langle j, m \rangle$ as soon as it receives sufficient support, *i.e.*, the arrival of READY(j, m), which tells that correct nodes can BRB-deliver $\langle j, m \rangle$. Note that the BRB-no-duplicity property protects Algorithm 1 from the case in which p_i broadcasts READY(j, m) while p_j broadcasts READY(j, m'), such that $m = m'$.

The new part of the BRB-broadcast algorithm (lines 4 to 6) includes two if-statements. The first one (line 5) makes sure that every correct node receives READY(j, m) from at least one correct node before BRB-delivering $\langle j, m \rangle$. This is done via the broadcasting of READY(j, m) as soon as p_i received it from at least $(t+1)$ different nodes (since t of them can be Byzantine).

The second if-statement (line 6) makes sure that no two correct nodes BRB-deliver different pairs (in the presence of plausibly fake READY($j, -$) messages sent by Byzantine nodes, where the $-$ simple stand for any legal value). That is, the delivery of a BRB-broadcast is done only after the first reception of the pair $\langle j, m \rangle$ from at least $(2t+1)$ (out of which at most t are

Byzantine). The receiver then knows that there are at least $t+1$ correct nodes that can make sure that the condition in line 5 holds eventually for all correct nodes.

3.2 Validated Byzantine Broadcast (VBB)

This communication abstraction sends messages from all nodes to all nodes. It facilitates the implementation of the studied consensus solution. It offers the operation, $\text{vbbBroadcast}(v)$ and raises the event $\text{vbbDeliver}(d)$, for VBB-broadcasting, and respect., VBB-delivering messages. A complete VBB-broadcast instance includes the invocation of $\text{vbbBroadcast}_i(m_i)$ by every correct node $p_i \in \mathcal{P}$. It also includes $\text{vbbDeliver}()$ of, m' , from at least $(n-t)$ distinct nodes, where m' is either $m_j : j \in \text{Correct}$ or the transient error symbol, Ψ . The latter value is returned when a message from a given sender cannot be validated. This validation requires m_j to be VBB-broadcast by at least one correct node. That is, to be VBB delivered from at least $(t+1)$ different nodes (including its sender p_j), because no node p_i can foresee its prospective failures, *e.g.*, due to unexpected crashes. We detail VBB-broadcast requirements below.

- **VBB-validity.** VBB-delivery of messages needs to relate to VBB-broadcast of messages in the following manner.

- **VBB-justification.** Suppose $p_i : i \in \text{Correct}$ VBB-delivers message $m \neq \Psi$ from some (faulty or correct) node. There is at least one correct node that VBB-broadcast m .
- **VBB-obligation.** Suppose all correct nodes VBB-broadcast the same v . All correct nodes VBB-delivers v from each correct node.

- **VBB-uniformity.** Suppose $p_i : i \in \text{Correct}$ VBB-delivers $m' \in \{m, \Psi\}$ from a (possibly faulty) node $p_j \in \mathcal{P}$. All the correct nodes VBB-deliver the same message m' from p_j .

- **VBB-Completion.** Suppose $p_i : i \in \text{Correct}$ VBB-broadcasts m . All the correct nodes VBB-deliver from p_i .

3.2.1 Implementing VBB-broadcast

Algorithm 2 presents the studied VBB-broadcast. Note that the line numbers of Algorithm 2 continue the ones of Algorithm 1.

Notation: Let $|rec|$ denote the number of elements in the multiset rec . We use $\text{equal}(v, rec)$ and $\text{differ}(v, rec)$ to return the number of occurrences in rec that are equal to, and respect., different from v .

Algorithm overview: Algorithm 2 presents the studied VBB-broadcast implementation. It invokes BRB-broadcast twice in the first part of the algorithm (lines 7 to 10) and then VBB-delivers messages from nodes in the second part (lines 11 to 15).

Node p_i first BRB-broadcasts $\text{INIT}(i, v_i)$ (where v_i is the VBB-broadcast message), and suspends until the arrival of $\text{INIT}()$ from at least $(n-t)$ different nodes (lines 8 to 9), which p_i collects in the multiset rec_i . In line 8, node p_i tests whether v_i was BRB-delivered from at least $n-2t \geq t+1$ different nodes. Since this means that v_i was BRB-broadcast by at least one correct node, p_i attests to the validity of v_i (line 10). Recall that each time $\text{INIT}()$ arrives at p_i , the message is added to rec_i . Therefore, the fact that $|rec_i| \geq n-t$ holds (line 9) does not keep rec_i from growing.

Algorithm 2's second part (lines 11 to 15) includes n concurrent background tasks. Each task aims at VBB-delivering a message from a different node, say, p_j . It starts by waiting until p_i BRB-delivered both $\text{INIT}(j, v_j)$ and $\text{VALID}(j, x_j)$ from p_j so that p_i has both p_j 's VBB's values, v_j , and the result of its validation test, x_j .

Algorithm 3: Multivalued consensus; code for p_i

```

16 macro  $bp()$  do return  $\exists v \neq \Psi : equal(v, rec) \geq n-2t \wedge rec = \{v' \neq \Psi\}$  where  $rec$  is
    a multiset of the values VBB-delivered (line 19)
17 operation  $propose(v)$  begin
18    $vbbBroadcast$   $EST(v)$ ;
19   wait  $EST(\bullet)$  messages VBB-delivered from  $(n-t)$  different nodes;
20   if  $\neg bvO.binPropose(bp())$  then return  $\perp$ ;
21   else wait  $(\exists v \neq \perp : equal(v, rec) \geq n-2t)$  return  $(v)$ ;

```

- **The case of $x_j = \text{True}$ (line 13).** Since p_j might be faulty, we cannot be sure that v_j was indeed validated. Thus, p_i re-attests v_j by waiting until $equal(v_j, rec_i) \geq n-2t$ holds. If this ever happens, p_i VBB-delivers v_j as a message from p_j , because the wait condition implies that $equal(v_j, rec_i) \geq t+1$ since $n-2t \geq t+1$.
- **The case of $x_j = \text{False}$ (line 14).** For similar reasons to the former case, p_i needs to wait until rec_i contains at least $t+1$ items that are not v_j , because this implies that at least one correct node cannot attest v_j 's validity. If this ever happens, p_i VBB-delivers the transient error symbol, Ψ , as the received message from p_j .

3.3 Multivalued Byzantine-tolerant Consensus

Algorithm 3 reduces any instance of the multivalued consensus problem to binary consensus in message-passing systems that have up to $t < n/3$ Byzantine nodes and are enriched by a single Byzantine fault-tolerant Binary consensus object [28] and the VBB-broadcast communication abstraction (Algorithm 2).

Note that the line numbers of Algorithm 3 continue the ones of Algorithm 2. The operation $propose(v)$ allows the multivalued consensus operation to advocate value $v \in V : 1 < |V|$ whereas $binPropose(v')$ allows the Binary consensus object to advocate value $v' \in \{\text{False}, \text{True}\}$ (rather than the more traditional assumption of $v' \in \{0, 1\}$). Recall that the task of multivalued Byzantine- and intrusion-tolerant consensus includes the requirements of MVC-validity, MVC-agreement and, MVC-Completion as well as the MVC-no-Intrusion property (Section 1).

Algorithm overview: Node p_i has to wait for $EST()$ messages from $(n-t)$ different nodes after it as VBB-broadcast its own value (lines 18 to 19). It holds all the VBB-delivered values in the multiset rec_i (line 16) before testing whether rec_i includes (1) non- Ψ replies from at least $(n-2t)$ different nodes, and (2) exactly one non- Ψ value v (line 16). The test result is proposed to the binary consensus object, bcO (line 20).

Once consensus was reached, p_i decides according to the consensus result, $bcO_i.result()$. Specifically, if $bcO_i.result() = \text{False}$, p_i returns the transient error symbol, Ψ , since there is no guarantee that any correct node was able to attest to the validity of the proposed value. Otherwise, p_i waits until it received $EST(v)$ messages that have identical values from at least $(n-2t)$ different nodes (line 21) before returning that value v . Note that some of these $(n-2t)$ messages were already VBB-delivered at line 19. The proof in [36] shows that any correct node that invokes $bcO_i.result(\text{True})$ does so if all correct nodes eventually VBB-deliver identical values at least $(n-2t)$ times and then decide.

Algorithm 4: Self-stabilizing Byzantine- and intrusion-tolerant multivalued consensus via BRB- and VBB-broadcast; code for p_i

22 **types:** $brbMSG := \{\text{init}, \text{echo}, \text{ready}\}$; $vbbMSG := \{\text{init}, \text{valid}\}$; **constants:** $resetState$ /* denotes the system reset state */

23 **variables:** $bcO := \perp$; /* a binary consensus object */ $msg[\mathcal{P}][vbbMSG][brbMSG] := [[[\emptyset, \dots, \emptyset]]]$ /* most recently sent/received message per node/type */

24 **macros:** $\boxed{^1 vbbEq(typ, v) := \exists S \subseteq \mathcal{P}: n-2t \leq |S| \forall p_\ell \in S ((-, v) = brbDeliver(typ, \ell))}$;
 $\boxed{^1 vbbDiff(typ, v) := \exists S \subseteq \mathcal{P}: t+1 \leq |S| \forall p_\ell \in S ((-, v) \neq brbDeliver(typ, \ell))}$;

25 $\boxed{^1 vbbEcho(typ) \text{ do return } \exists S \subseteq \mathcal{P}: n-t \leq |S| \forall p_k \in S brbDeliver(typ, k) \neq \perp}$

26 $\boxed{^2 bp() \text{ do return } (\exists v \notin \{\perp, \Psi\} \exists S' \subseteq \mathcal{P}: n-2t \leq |S'| \forall p_{k'} \in S' vbbDeliver(k') = v) \wedge$
 $\boxed{^2 (|\{vbbDeliver(k) \notin \{\perp, \Psi\} : p_k \in \mathcal{P}\}| = 1)}$

27 **operations:** $brbBroadcast(typ, v) \text{ do } \{\text{if } msg[i][typ][init] = \emptyset \text{ then } msg[i][typ][init] \leftarrow \{v\}\}$;

28 $\boxed{^1 vbbBroadcast(v) \text{ do } brbBroadcast(\text{init}, (i, v))}$; $\boxed{^2 \text{propose}(v) \text{ do } vbbBroadcast(v)}$;

29 $brbDeliver(typ, k) \text{ do } \{\text{if } \exists_m (2t+1) \leq |\{p_\ell \in \mathcal{P} : (k, m) \in msg[\ell][typ][ready]\}| \text{ then return } m \text{ else return } \perp\}$;

30 $\boxed{^1 vbbDeliver(k) \{\text{if } msg[k][init][init] = \emptyset \wedge msg[k][valid][init] \neq \emptyset \text{ then return } \Psi; \text{ if } \neg(brbDeliver(\text{init}, k) =$
 $\boxed{^1 (k, v) \wedge brbDeliver(\text{valid}, k) = (k, x)) \text{ then return } \perp; \text{ if } x \wedge vbbEq(\text{valid}, v) \text{ then return } v;$
 $\boxed{^1 \text{ if } \neg x \wedge vbbDiff(\text{valid}, v) \text{ then return } \Psi; \text{ if } vbbEcho(\text{valid}) \text{ then return } \Psi; \text{ return } \perp;\}}$

31 $\boxed{^2 \text{result}() \{\text{if } bcO = \perp \vee bcO.\text{result}() = \perp \vee msg[i][init][init] = \emptyset \text{ then return } \perp;$
 $\boxed{^2 \text{ if } ((\exists S \subseteq \mathcal{P}: n-t \leq |S| \forall p_k \in S vbbDeliver(k) \neq \perp) \wedge \neg bp()) \vee bcO.\text{result}() \neq \text{True} \text{ then return } \Psi;$
 $\boxed{^2 \text{ if } \exists v \notin \{\perp, \Psi\} \exists S' \subseteq \mathcal{P}: n-2t \leq |S'| \forall p_{k'} \in S' vbbDeliver(k') = v \text{ then return } v; \text{ return } \perp;\}}$

32 **do-forever begin**

33 **foreach** $typ \in vbbMSG$ **do**

34 $\text{if } \exists_{(j,m) \in msg[i][typ][echo]} m \notin msg[j][typ][init] \vee \exists_{(j,m) \in msg[i][typ][ready]} \neg((n+t)/2 < |\{p_\ell \in \mathcal{P} : (j, m) \in msg[\ell][typ][echo]\}| \vee (t+1) \leq |\{p_\ell \in \mathcal{P} : (j, m) \in msg[\ell][typ][ready]\}|) \text{ then foreach } s \in brbMSG \text{ do}$
 $msg[i][typ][s] \leftarrow \emptyset$;

35 $\text{if } \boxed{^1 (\exists_{(j,m) \in msg[i][valid][init]} \wedge \neg((\exists S \subseteq \mathcal{P}: n-t \leq |S| \forall p_k \in \mathcal{P} brbDeliver(\text{init}, k) \neq \perp) \wedge$
 $\boxed{^1 (m = (\exists v \neq \perp \forall p_k \in S brbDeliver(\text{init}, k) = v))))}$ **then**
 $\boxed{^1 \text{foreach } s \in brbMSG \text{ do } msg[i][typ][s] \leftarrow \emptyset}$

36 **foreach** $p_k \in \mathcal{P}$ **do**

37 $\text{if } msg[k][typ][init] \notin \{\emptyset, \{(k, -)\}\} \vee \exists_{s \neq \text{init}} \exists_{p_j \in \mathcal{P}} \exists_{(j,m), (j,m') \in msg[k][typ][s]} m \neq m' \text{ then}$
 $msg[k][typ][s] \leftarrow \emptyset$;

38 $\text{if } \exists_m \in msg[k][typ][init] msg[i][typ][echo] = \emptyset \text{ then } msg[i][typ][echo] \leftarrow \{(k, m)\}$;

39 $\text{if } \exists_m (n+t)/2 < |\{p_\ell \in \mathcal{P} : (k, m) \in msg[\ell][typ][echo]\}| \text{ then}$
 $msg[i][typ][ready] \leftarrow msg[i][typ][ready] \cup \{(k, m)\}$;

40 $\text{if } \exists_m (t+1) \leq |\{p_\ell \in \mathcal{P} : (k, m) \in msg[\ell][typ][ready]\}| \text{ then}$
 $msg[i][typ][ready] \leftarrow msg[i][typ][ready] \cup \{(k, m)\}$;

41 $\text{if } \exists_m (t+1) \leq |\{p_\ell \in \mathcal{P} : (k, m) \in msg[\ell][typ][ready]\}| \text{ then}$
 $msg[i][typ][ready] \leftarrow msg[i][typ][ready] \cup \{(k, m)\}$;

42 $\boxed{^1 \text{ if } vbbEcho(\text{init}) \wedge \{v\} = msg[i][init][init] \text{ then } brbBroadcast(\text{valid}, (i, vbbEq(\text{init}, v)))}$;

43 $\boxed{^2 \text{ if } bcO = \perp \wedge \exists S \subseteq \mathcal{P}: n-t \leq |S| \forall p_k \in S vbbDeliver(k) \neq \perp \text{ then } bcO.\text{propose}(bp())}$;

44 **broadcast** $MSG(msg[i])$;

45 **upon** $MSG(mJ)$ **arrival from** p_j **do** **ForEach** $typ \in vbbMSG, s \in brbMSG, p_k \in \mathcal{P} : s \neq \text{init} \vee$
 $\exists_{s \neq \text{init}, (k,m), (k,m') \in (msg[j][typ][s] \cup mJ[typ][s])} m \neq m' \text{ do } msg[j][typ][s] \leftarrow msg[j][typ][s] \cup mJ[typ][s]$

4 Self-stabilizing Byzantine-tolerant Multivalued Consensus

Before proposing our solution, we review the challenges that we face when transforming the non-self-stabilizing algorithm by Mostéfaoui and Raynal [37] in to a self-stabilizing one.

4.1 Challenges and approaches

We analyze the behavior of the algorithms proposed by Mostéfaoui and Raynal [37] in the presence of transient-faults. We clarify that our analysis is relevant only in the context of self-stabilization since Mostéfaoui and Raynal do not consider transient-faults.

4.1.1 Query-based returned values

Algorithm 3's implementation of operation `propose()` blocks until the decided value is ready to be returned. The proposed algorithm considers all three layers in one implementation. Therefore, we provide a non-blocking implementation in which the decided value is retrieved via the invocation of `result()`, where \perp is returned as long as no value was decided. Similarly, we redefine the events `brbDeliver()` and `vbbDeliver()` of algorithms 1, and respect., 2, as non-blocking operations.

4.1.2 Datagram-based end-to-end communications

Algorithms 1 to 3 assume reliable communication channels when broadcasting in a quorum-based manner, *i.e.*, sending the same message to all nodes and then waiting for a reply from $n-f$ nodes. Next, we explain why, for the sake of a simpler presentation, we choose not to follow this assumption. Self-stabilizing end-to-end communications require a known bound on the capacity of the communication channels [19, Chapter 3]. In the context of self-stabilization and quorum systems, we must avoid situations in which communicating in a quorum-based manner can lead to a contradiction with the system assumptions. Dolev, Petig, and Schiller [23] explain that there might be a subset of nodes that are able to complete many round-trips with a given sender, while other nodes merely accumulate messages in their communication channels. The channel bounded capacity implies that the system has to either block or omit messages before their delivery. Thus, the proposed solution does not assume access to reliable channels. Instead, communications are simply repeated by the algorithm's do-forever loop.

4.1.3 Dealing with memory corruption and desynchronized system states

Recall that transient faults can corrupt the system state in any manner (as long as the program code remains intact). For example, the corruption of the program counter can cause it to point to a wait-until statement (lines 9, 12, 14, 19, and 21) before the broadcast of any message. This will result in an indefinite blocking. The proposed solution avoids such a situation by: (1) unifying all messages into a single `MSG(mJ)`, where the field `mJ` includes all the fields of the messages of algorithms 1 to 3, and (2) using if-statements for testing the conditions in lines 9, 12, 14, 19, and 21 (where wait-until condition used to be).

4.2 The proposed solution

Algorithm 4 is a self-stabilizing Byzantine- and intrusion-tolerant solution to the problem of multivalued consensus. Note that the line numbers of Algorithm 4 continue the ones of Algorithm 3. The code unifies the self-stabilizing variation of algorithms 1 to 3. Specifically, the (non-boxed) plain font text is a self-stabilizing version of BRB-broadcast, the ¹ boxed text is a self-stabilizing version of VBB-broadcast, and the ² boxed text is a self-stabilizing version of multivalued consensus by Mostéfaoui and Raynal [37].

4.2.1 Types, constants, variables, and message structure

As mentioned, the message $\text{MSG}()$ unifies the messages of algorithms 1 to 3. The array $\text{msg}[][]$ stores both the information that is sent and arrived by these messages. Specifically, $\text{msg}_i[i][][]$ stores the information that node p_i broadcasts (line 44) and for any $j \neq i$ the entry $\text{msg}_i[j][][]$ stores the information coming from p_j (lines 45 to 45). Also, we define the types $\text{brbMSG} := \{\text{init}, \text{echo}, \text{ready}\}$ and $\text{vbbMSG} := \{\text{init}, \text{valid}\}$ (line 22) for storing information related to BRB- and VBB-broadcast messages, *e.g.*, $\text{msg}_i[i][\text{valid}][\text{init}]$ stores the information that VBB-broadcast disseminate of $\text{VALID}()$ messages and the results of the content of $\text{READY}()$ messages appears in $\text{msg}_i[i][\text{-}][\text{ready}]$. The state of Algorithm 4 also includes the Byzantine-tolerant binary object, bcO_i , where $\text{bcO}_i = \perp$ denotes a inactive object, which becomes active via the invocation of $\text{bcO}_i.\text{propose}()$, and $\text{bcO}_i.\text{result}()$ returns the decided value eventually. The constant resetState denotes the system reset state, *i.e.*, $\text{bcO}_i = \perp$ and every entry of $\text{msg}_i[i][][]$ stores the empty set.

4.2.2 Self-stabilizing BRB-broadcast

The $\text{brbBroadcast}(\text{typ}, v)$ operation (line 27) allows Algorithm 4 to invoke BRB-broadcast instances with v , where $\text{typ} \in \text{brbMSG}$ is the type of the instance. Such an invocation causes Algorithm 4 to follow the logic presented by Algorithm 1 in lines 29 and 39 to 41. We note that our solution also includes consistency tests in line 34.

4.2.3 Self-stabilizing VBB-broadcast

The $\text{vbbBroadcast}(v)$ allows the invocation of a VBB-broadcast instance with value v . Node p_i VBB-delivers messages from p_k via the $\text{vbbDeliver}_i(k)$ operation. The logic of Algorithm 2 is implemented by lines 30 and 42. The consistency is tested in line 35. The implementation of $\text{vbbDeliver}()$ (line 30) also includes consistency tests. Specifically, the first if-statement considers the (inconsistent) case in which the state of node p_i encodes that VBB-broadcast of the $\text{VALID}()$ message occurred before the one of $\text{INIT}()$ message. Also, the fourth if-statement considers the case in which the variable x_i is corrupted, and thus, there is a need to return the transient error symbol, Ψ , once p_i was VBB-delivered $\text{VALID}()$ messages from at least $n-t$ nodes.

4.2.4 Self-stabilizing multivalued consensus

The $\text{propose}(v)$ allows the invocation of a VBB-broadcast instance with value v . Node p_i VBB-delivers messages from p_k via the $\text{result}_i()$ operation. The logic of Algorithm 3 is implemented by lines 31 and 43.

5 Correctness

We provide correctness proof for Algorithm 4. The proof is organized as follows. Definition 5.1 defines the terms active nodes and consistent executions. Theorem 5.1 shows that consistency is regained within a finite time. Then, for every layer of the algorithm, *i.e.*, BRB-broadcast, VBB-broadcast, and multivalued consensus, we provide a proof of completion (theorems 5.2, 5.8, and respect., 5.13) before demonstrating the closure properties (theorems 5.3, 5.9, and respect., 5.16), which includes requirements of every task. The main difference between the completion and the closure proofs is that the latter considers well-initialized starting system states and complete invocation of operations (Definition 5.2).

Definition 5.1 (Active nodes and consistent executions) We use the term *active* for node $p_i \in \mathcal{P}$ when referring to the case of $msg_i[i][init][init] \neq \emptyset$. Let R be an Algorithm 4's execution, $p_i, p_k \in \mathcal{P} : i \in \text{Correct}$, $c \in R$, and $typ \in \text{vbbMSG}$. Suppose in c :

- **(brb.i)** $msg_i[k][typ][init] \in \{\emptyset, \{(k, -)\}\}$ and $\nexists_{t \in \{\text{echo}, \text{ready}\}} \exists_{p_j \in \mathcal{P}} \exists_{(j, m), (j, m') \in msg_i[k][typ][t]} m \neq m'$.
- **(brb.ii)** for any message $MSG(msg = mJ)$ in transient from p_j to p_i , it holds that for any $p_k \in \mathcal{P}$, $typ \in \text{vbbMSG}$, and $t \neq \text{init}$ there are no $(k, m), (k, m') \in msg_i[j][typ][t] \cup mJ[typ][t]$, such that $m \neq m'$.
- **(vbb)** $\nexists_{(j, m) \in msg_i[i][typ][echo]} m \notin msg_i[j][typ][init]$.
- **(mvc)** $\nexists_{(j, m) \in msg_i[i][typ][ready]} \neg((|\{p_\ell \in \mathcal{P} : (j, m) \in msg_i[\ell][typ][echo]\}| > (n+t)/2) \vee (t+1) \leq |\{p_\ell \in \mathcal{P} : (j, m) \in msg_i[\ell][typ][ready]\}|)$.

In this case, we say that c is consistent. Suppose every system state in R is consistent. In this case, we say that R is consistent.

Note the term *active* (Definition 5.1) does not distinguish between the case in which a node is active due to the occurrence of a transient fault and the invocation of $\text{brbBroadcast}(\text{init}, v)$ (or $\text{vbbBroadcast}(-, v)$ and $\text{propose}(v)$).

Definition 5.2 (Well-initialized system states and complete invocation of operations)

We say that the system state c is well-initialized if $\forall i \in \text{Correct} : (bcO_i, msg_i) := \text{resetState}$ (line 22) holds and no communication channel between two correct nodes includes $MSG()$ messages. Suppose that during a well-initialized execution R , every correct node p_i invokes $\text{brbBroadcast}_i(\text{init}, v)$ exactly once. In this case, we say that R includes a complete invocation of BRB-broadcast. We define the complete invocations of VBB-broadcast and multivalued consensus in similar manners.

Note that a well-initialized system state (Definition 5.2) is also a consistent one (Definition 5.1).

5.1 Consistency regaining for Algorithm 4

Theorem 5.1 (Algorithm 4's Convergence) Let R be a fair execution of Algorithm 4 in which all correct nodes are active eventually. The system reaches eventually a state $c \in R$ that starts a consistent execution (Definition 5.1).

Proof of Theorem 5.1 Suppose that R 's starting state is not consistent, specifically, with respect to invariant (brb.i), (vbb), or (mvc). In other words, at least one of the if-statement conditions in lines 34, 36, and 38 holds. Since R is fair, eventually every correct node p_i takes a step that includes the execution of lines 34 to 38, which assures that p_i becomes consistent with respect to (brb.i), (vbb), and (mvc). We observe from the code of Algorithm 4 that once invariants (brb.i), (vbb), and (mvc) hold with respect to p_i in c , it holds that any state $c' \in R$ that follows c is consistent, cf. lines 39 to 45 as well as the updates of $msg[\square\square\square]$ according to the arriving information in line 45. Due to the above, the rest of the proof assumes, without the loss of generality, that all correct nodes are consistent with respect to (brb.i), (vbb), and (mvc) in any state of R . Let m be a message that in R 's starting system state resides in the communication

channels between any pair of correct nodes. Any message that appears in the starting system state can reside in a communication channel only for a finite time (Section 2.1.1). Thus, by the definition of complete iterations, the system reaches a state in which m does not appear in the communication channels eventually. Therefore, when observing that (brb.ii) holds eventually, we can consider only messages, $\text{MSG}(mJ = m)$, that were sent during R by the consistent node p_i . $\square_{\text{Theorem 5.1}}$

5.2 Completion of BRB-broadcast

Theorem 5.2 (BRB-Completion-1) *Let $\text{typ} \in \text{brbMSG}$ and R be a consistent execution of Algorithm 4 where all correct nodes are active eventually. Eventually, $\forall i, j \in \text{Correct} : \text{brbDeliver}_j(\text{typ}, i) \neq \perp$.*

Proof of Theorem 5.2 Since p_i is correct, it broadcasts $\text{MSG}(mJ = \text{msg}_i[i])$ infinitely often. By the fair communication assumption, every correct $p_j \in \mathcal{P}$ receives $\text{MSG}(mJ)$ eventually. Thus, $\forall j \in \text{Correct} : \text{msg}_j[i][\text{typ}][\text{init}] = \{m\}$ due to line 45. Also, $\forall j \in \text{Correct} : \text{msg}_j[j][\text{typ}][\text{echo}] \supseteq \{(i, m)\}$ since node p_j observes that the if-statement condition in line 39 holds (for the case of $k_j = i$). Thus, p_j broadcasts $\text{MSG}(mJ = \text{msg}_j[j])$ infinitely often. By the fair communication assumption, every correct node $p_\ell \in \mathcal{P}$ receives $\text{MSG}(mJ)$ eventually. Thus, $\forall j, \ell \in \text{Correct} : \text{msg}_\ell[j][\text{typ}][\text{echo}] \supseteq \{(i, m)\}$ (line 45). Since $n-t > n+t$, node p_ℓ observes that $(n+t)/2 < |\{p_x \in \mathcal{P} : (i, m) \in \text{msg}_\ell[x][\text{typ}][\text{echo}]\}|$ holds, *i.e.*, the if-statement condition in line 40 holds for the case of $k_\ell = i$, and thus, $\text{msg}_\ell[\ell][\text{typ}][\text{ready}] \supseteq \{(i, m)\}$ holds.

Note that, since $t < (n+t)/2$, faulty nodes cannot prevent a correct node from broadcasting $\text{MSG}(mJ) : mJ[\text{typ}][\text{ready}] \supseteq \{(i, m)\}$ infinitely often, say, by colluding and sending $\text{MSG}(mJ) : mJ[\text{typ}][\text{ready}] \supseteq \{(i, m')\} \wedge m' \neq m$. By fair communication, every correct $p_y \in \mathcal{P}$ receives $\text{MSG}(mJ)$ eventually. Thus, $\forall j, y \in \text{Correct} : \text{msg}_y[j][\text{typ}][\text{ready}] \supseteq \{(i, m)\}$ holds (line 45). Therefore, whenever p_y invokes $\text{brbDeliver}_y(\text{typ}, i)$ (line 29), the condition $\exists_m(2t+1) \leq |\{p_\ell \in \mathcal{P} : (k_y = i, m) \in \text{msg}_y[\ell][\text{typ}][\text{ready}]\}|$ holds, and thus, m is returned. $\square_{\text{Theorem 5.2}}$

5.3 Closure of BRB-broadcast

Theorem 5.3 (BRB closure) *Let R be a well-initialized execution of Algorithm 4 in which all correct nodes are active eventually via the complete invocation of BRB-broadcast. The system demonstrates in R a construction of BRB-broadcast.*

Proof of Theorem 5.3 BRB-Completion-1 holds (Theorem 5.2).

Lemma 5.4 (BRB-Completion-2) *BRB-Completion-2 holds.*

Proof of Lemma 5.4 By line 29, p_i can BRB-deliver m from p_j only once $\exists_m(2t+1) \leq |\{p_\ell \in \mathcal{P} : (k, m) \in \text{msg}_i[\ell][\text{typ}][\text{ready}]\}|$ holds. During well-initialized execution, only lines 40 to 41 and 45 can add items to $\text{msg}_i[i][\text{typ}][\text{ready}]$ and $\text{msg}_i[\ell][\text{typ}][\text{ready}]$, respectively. Let $\text{MSG}(mJ)$ be such that $mJ[\text{typ}][\text{ready}] \supseteq \{(j, m)\}$. Specifically, line 45 adds to $\text{msg}_i[\ell][\text{typ}][\text{ready}]$ items according to information in $\text{MSG}(mJ)$ messages coming from p_ℓ . This means, that at least $t+1$ distinct and correct nodes broadcast $\text{MSG}(mJ)$ infinitely often. By the fair communication assumption and line 45, all correct nodes, p_x , eventually receive $\text{MSG}(mJ)$ from at least $t+1$ distinct nodes and make sure that $\text{msg}_x[\ell][\text{typ}][\text{ready}]$ includes (j, m) . Also, by line 41, we know that $\text{msg}_x[x][\text{typ}][\text{ready}] \supseteq \{(j, m)\}$, *i.e.*, every correct node broadcast $\text{MSG}(mJ)$ infinitely

often. By fair communication and line 45, all correct nodes, p_x , receive $\text{MSG}(mJ)$ from at least $2t + 1$ distinct nodes eventually, because there are at least $n - t \geq 2t + 1$ correct nodes. This implies that $\exists_m(2t+1) \leq |\{p_\ell \in \mathcal{P} : (k, m) \in \text{msg}_i[\ell][\text{typ}][\text{ready}]\}|$ holds (due to line 45). Hence, $\forall i \in \text{Correct} : \text{brbDeliver}_i(\text{typ}, j) \notin \{\perp, \Psi\}$. $\square_{\text{Lemma 5.4}}$

Lemma 5.5 *The BRB-integrity property holds.*

Proof of Lemma 5.5 Suppose $\text{brbDeliver}(\text{typ}, k) = m \neq \perp$ holds in $c \in R$. Also, (towards a contradiction) $\text{brbDeliver}(\text{typ}, k) = m' \notin \{\perp, m\}$ holds in $c' \in R$, where c' appears after c in R . I.e., $\exists_m(2t+1) \leq |\{p_\ell \in \mathcal{P} : (k, m) \in \text{msg}_i[\ell][\text{typ}][\text{ready}]\}|$ in c and $\exists_{m'}(2t+1) \leq |\{p_\ell \in \mathcal{P} : (k, m') \in \text{msg}_i[\ell][\text{typ}][\text{ready}]\}|$ in c' . For any $i, j, k \in \text{Correct}$ and any $\text{typ} \in \text{brbMSG}$ it holds that $(k, m), (k, m') \in \text{msg}_i[j][\text{typ}][\text{ready}]$ (since R is well-initialized, and thus, consistent). Thus, $m = m'$, cf. invariant (brb.ii). Also, observe from the code of Algorithm 4 that no element is removed from any entry $\text{msg}[\ell][\text{typ}][\text{ready}]$ during consistent executions. This means that $\text{msg}_i[\ell][\text{typ}][\text{ready}]$ includes both (k, m) and (k, m') in c' . However, this contradicts the fact that c' is consistent. Thus, $c' \in R$ cannot exist and BRB-integrity holds. $\square_{\text{Lemma 5.5}}$

Lemma 5.6 (BRB-validity) *BRB-validity holds.*

Proof of Lemma 5.6 Let $p_i, p_j : i, j \in \text{Correct}$. Suppose that p_j BRB-delivers message m from p_i . The proof needs to show that p_i BRB-broadcasts m . In other words, suppose that the adversary, who can capture up to t (Byzantine) nodes, sends the “fake” messages of $\text{msg}_j[j][\text{typ}][\text{echo}] \supseteq \{(i, m)\}$ or $\text{msg}_j[j][\text{typ}][\text{ready}] \supseteq \{(i, m)\}$, but p_i , who is correct, never invoked $\text{brbBroadcast}(m)$. In this case, our proof shows that no correct node BRB-delivers $\langle i, m \rangle$. This is because there are at most t nodes that can broadcast “fake” messages. Thus, $\text{brbDeliver}(\text{typ}, k)$ (line 29) cannot deliver $\langle i, m \rangle$ since $t < 2t + 1$, which means that the if-statement condition $\exists_m(2t+1) \leq |\{p_\ell \in \mathcal{P} : (k, m) \in \text{msg}_i[\ell][\text{typ}][\text{ready}]\}|$ cannot be satisfied. $\square_{\text{Lemma 5.6}}$

Lemma 5.7 (BRB-no-duplicity) *Suppose $p_i, p_j : i, j \in \text{Correct}$, BRB-broadcast $\text{MSG}(mJ) : mJ[\text{typ}][\text{ready}] \supseteq \{(k, m)\}$, and respect., $\text{MSG}(mJ) : mJ[\text{typ}][\text{ready}] \supseteq \{(k, m')\}$. We have $m = m'$.*

Proof of Lemma 5.7 Since R is well-initialized, there must be a step in R in which the element $(k, -)$ is added to $\text{msg}_x[x][\text{typ}][\text{ready}]$ for the first time during R , where $p_x \in \{p_i, p_j\}$. The correctness proof considers the following two cases.

- **Both p_i and p_j add $(k, -)$ due to line 40.** Suppose, towards a contradiction, that $m \neq m'$. Since the if-statement condition in line 40 holds for both p_i and p_j , we know that $\exists_m(n+t)/2 < |\{p_\ell \in \mathcal{P} : (k, m) \in \text{msg}_i[\ell][\text{typ}][\text{echo}]\}|$ and $\exists_{m'}(n+t)/2 < |\{p_\ell \in \mathcal{P} : (k, m') \in \text{msg}_j[\ell][\text{typ}][\text{echo}]\}|$ hold. Since R is well-initialized, this can only happen if p_i and p_j received $\text{MSG}(mJ) : mJ[\text{typ}][\text{echo}] \supseteq \{(k, m)\}$, and respect., $\text{MSG}(mJ) : mJ[\text{typ}][\text{echo}] \supseteq \{(k, m')\}$ from $(n+t)/2$ distinct nodes. Note that $\exists p_x \in Q_1 \cap Q_2 : x \in \text{Correct}$, where $Q_1, Q_2 \subseteq \mathcal{P} : |Q_1|, |Q_2| \geq 1 + (n+t)/2$ (as in [41], item (c) of Lemma 3). But, any correct node, p_x , has at most one element in $\text{msg}_x[\ell][\text{typ}][\text{echo}]$ (line 39) during R . Thus, $m = m'$, which contradicts the case assumption.

- **There is $p_x \in \{p_i, p_j\}$ that adds $(k, -)$ due to line 41.** I.e., $\exists_{m''}(t+1) \leq |\{p_\ell \in \mathcal{P} : (k, m'') \in \text{msg}[\ell][\text{typ}][\text{ready}]\}| \wedge m'' \in \{m, m'\}$. Since there are at most t faulty nodes, p_x received $\text{MSG}(mJ) : mJ[\text{typ}][\text{ready}] \supseteq \{(k, m'')\}$ from at least one correct node, say p_{x_1} , which received $\text{MSG}(mJ) : mJ[\text{typ}][\text{ready}] \supseteq \{(k, m'')\}$ from p_{x_2} , and so on. This chain cannot be longer than n and it must be originated by the previous case in which $(k, -)$ is added due to line 40. Thus, $m = m'$. $\square_{\text{Lemma 5.7}}$ $\square_{\text{Theorem 5.3}}$

5.4 Completion of VBB-broadcast

Theorem 5.8 (VBB-Completion) *Let R be an Algorithm 4's consistent execution in which all correct nodes are active eventually. Eventually, $\forall_{i,j \in \text{Correct}} \text{vbbDeliver}_j(i) \neq \perp$.*

Proof of Theorem 5.8 Suppose either $p_i : i \in \text{Correct}$ VBB-broadcasts m during R or $\text{msg}_i[i][\text{init}][\text{init}] = \{m\}$ holds in R 's starting state. We show that all correct nodes VBB-deliver $m' \in \{m, \Psi\}$ from p_i . Node p_i cannot BRB-broadcast $(\text{valid}, -)$ before $(\text{init}, -)$ without having $\forall j \in \text{Correct} : \text{vbbDeliver}_j(i) = \Psi$ to hold eventually, due to lines 27 to 28 as well as the first if-statement of $\text{vbbDeliver}()$, *i.e.*, $\text{msg}_i[k][\text{init}][\text{init}] = \emptyset \wedge \text{smmsg}_i[k][\text{valid}][\text{init}] \neq \emptyset$ implies the return of Ψ . Therefore, by the assumption that all correct nodes are active eventually and that there are at least $(n-t)$ correct nodes, the if-statement condition in line 42 holds eventually. *I.e.*, p_i makes sure that, eventually, the second if-statement condition does not hold, say, by invoking $\text{brbBroadcast}(\text{valid}, -)$. Note that the third, fourth, and fifth if-statement conditions of $\text{vbbDeliver}()$ imply completion. The proof is completed since, eventually, the fifth if-statement condition holds (Theorem 5.2), the presence of at least $n-t$ correct nodes, and $\text{vbbEcho}()$'s definition (line 25). $\square_{\text{Theorem 5.8}}$

5.5 Closure of VBB-broadcast

Theorem 5.9 (VBB-Closure) *Let R be a well-initialized Algorithm 4's consistent execution in which all correct nodes are active eventually. The VBB properties hold.*

Proof of Theorem 5.9 VBB-Completion holds (Theorem 5.8).

Lemma 5.10 (VBB-uniformity) *VBB-uniformity holds.*

Proof of Lemma 5.10 Suppose that $p_i : i \in \text{Correct}$ VBB-delivers $m' \in \{m, \Psi\}$ from a (possibly faulty) $p_j \in \mathcal{P}$. The proof shows that all the correct nodes VBB-deliver the same message m' from p_j .

Since R is well-initialized and p_i VBB-delivers m' from node p_j , $\text{msg}_i[j][\text{init}][\text{init}] = \emptyset \wedge \text{msg}_i[j][\text{valid}][\text{init}] \neq \emptyset$ cannot hold and $(\text{brbDeliver}_i(\text{init}, j) = (j, v_{j,i}) \wedge \text{brbDeliver}_i(\text{valid}, j) = (j, x_{j,i}))$ holds due to the second if-statement in line 30. Also, $\text{msg}_k[j][\text{init}][\text{init}] = \emptyset \wedge \text{msg}_k[j][\text{valid}][\text{init}] \neq \emptyset$ cannot hold and $(\text{brbDeliver}_k(\text{init}, j) = (j, v_{j,i}) \wedge \text{brbDeliver}_k(\text{valid}, j) = (j, x_{j,k}))$ holds, such that $v_{j,i} = v_{j,k}$ and $x_{j,i} = x_{j,k}$, because R is well-initialized, BRB-no-duplication, and BRB-Completion-2, which means that every $p_k : k \in \text{Correct}$ eventually BRB-delivers messages that p_i delivers. Due to the same reasons, depending on the value of $x_{j,i} = x_{j,k}$, we know that the third or the fourth if-statement conditions of line 30 must hold. *I.e.*, p_k eventually VBB-delivers the same value as p_i does. $\square_{\text{Lemma 5.10}}$

Lemma 5.11 (VBB-obligation) *VBB-obligation holds.*

Proof of Lemma 5.11 Suppose all correct nodes, p_j , VBB-broadcast the same value v . The proof shows that every correct node, p_i , VBB-delivers v from p_j . Since all correct (and active) nodes invoke $\text{vbbBroadcast}(v)$, p_j invokes $\text{brbBroadcast}_j(\text{init}, (j, v))$ (line 28). Thus, the if-statement condition in line 42 holds eventually for any correct node p_i , *i.e.*, it is true that $\exists_{S \subseteq \mathcal{P} : n-t \leq |S|} \forall_{p_k \in \mathcal{P}} \text{brbDeliver}(\text{init}, k) \neq \perp$. Also, there are at least $(n-2t)$ appearances of $(-, v)$ in the multi-set $\{\text{brbDeliver}(\text{init}, k)\}_{p_k \in \mathcal{P}}$. Thus, p_i BRB-broadcasts the message $(\text{valid}, (i, \text{True}))$ (line 42). Thus, for any $k, \ell \in \text{Correct}$, we have $\text{brbDeliver}_k(\text{valid}, \ell) = (j, \text{True})$ eventually (due to BRB-validity and BRB-Completion-1). This means that the first

and second if-statement conditions at line 30 cannot hold eventually. However, the third if-statement condition must hold eventually and only for the value v . Once that happens, every correct node p_k VBB-delivers v as the value VBB-broadcast by p_j . $\square_{\text{Lemma 5.11}}$

Lemma 5.12 (VBB-Justification) *VBB-justification holds.*

Proof of Lemma 5.12 Suppose $p_i : i \in \text{Correct}$ VBB-delivers $m \notin \{\perp, \Psi\}$ in step $a_i \in R$. The proof shows that a correct node, p_j , invokes $\text{vbbBroadcast}_j(v) : m = (j, v)$ in step $a_j \in R$, such that a_j appears before a_i in R . Since $m \notin \{\perp, \Psi\}$, we know that $\exists_{S \subseteq \mathcal{P}: n-2t \leq |S|} \forall_{p_k \in S} (m = \text{brbDeliver}_i(k))$ due to $\text{vbbDeliver}()$'s definition (line 30). Since $n-2t \geq t+1$, at least one correct node, say, p_j that had BRB-broadcast m , because R is a well-initialized execution. Thus, R includes an invocation of $\text{vbbBroadcast}_j(v)$ (Algorithm 4's code). $\square_{\text{Lemma 5.12}} \quad \square_{\text{Theorem 5.9}}$

5.6 Completion of multivalued consensus

Theorem 5.13 (MVC-Completion) *Let R be a consistent Algorithm 4's execution in which any correct node is active eventually. The MVC-Completion property holds during R .*

Proof of Theorem 5.13 The proof needs to show that every correct node decides eventually, i.e., $\forall i \in \text{Correct} : \text{result}_i() \neq \perp$.

Any correct node, p_i , makes sure that $bcO_i \neq \perp$, say, by invoking $bcO_i.\text{propose}(bp_i)$ (line 43). This is due to the assumption that all correct nodes $p_i \in \mathcal{P}$ are active, the definition of $\text{propose}()$ (line 28), VBB-Completion, and since there are at least $(n-t)$ correct nodes, which implies that $\exists_{S \subseteq \mathcal{P}: n-t \leq |S|} \forall_{p_k \in S} \text{vbbDeliver}(k) \neq \perp$ holds eventually and the if-statement condition in line 43 holds whenever $bcO_i = \perp$. Eventually $bcO_i.\text{result}() \neq \perp$ (completion of binary consensus). Thus, $\text{result}_i()$ cannot return \perp due to its first if-statement (line 31). If $\text{result}_i()$ returns (a non- \perp value) due to the second or third if-statement conditions in line 31, $\text{result}_i() \neq \perp$. The rest of the proof focuses on showing that eventually one of these two if-statement conditions must hold and thus the last return statement (of a \perp value) cannot occur eventually, see Lemma 5.14.

Lemma 5.14 considers invariants (i.a) and (ii.a). Invariant (i.a) is $\text{msg}[i][\text{init}][\text{init}] = \emptyset$ or $(\exists_{S \subseteq \mathcal{P}: n-t \leq |S|} \forall_{p_k \in S} \text{vbbDeliver}(k) \neq \perp) \wedge \neg bp()$ or $bcO.\text{result}() \neq \text{True}$. Invariant (ii.a) is $\exists_{v \notin \{\perp, \Psi\}} \exists_{S' \subseteq \mathcal{P}: n-2t \leq |S'|} \forall_{p_{k'} \in S'} \text{vbbDeliver}(k') = v$.

Lemma 5.14 *Eventually (i.a) or (ii.a) holds.*

Proof of Lemma 5.14 Suppose, towards a contradiction, that neither (i.a) nor (ii.a) hold. We simplify the presentation of (i.a) and (ii.a) as follows. Let $A := (\text{msg}[i][\text{init}][\text{init}] = \emptyset)$, $B := (\exists_{S \subseteq \mathcal{P}: n-t \leq |S|} \forall_{p_k \in S} \text{vbbDeliver}(k) \neq \perp)$, $C := (bcO.\text{result}() \neq \text{True})$, as well as $D := (\exists_{v \notin \{\perp, \Psi\}} \exists_{S' \subseteq \mathcal{P}: n-2t \leq |S'|} \forall_{p_{k'} \in S'} \text{vbbDeliver}(k') = v)$, and $E := (|\{\text{vbbDeliver}(k) \notin \{\perp, \Psi\} : p_k \in \mathcal{P}\}| = 1)$.

We can express the above assumption in a simpler manner by rewriting (i.a) and (ii.a). I.e., we always have that neither (i.b) $A \vee (B \wedge \neg bp()) \vee C$ nor (ii.b) D hold, where $bp() := D \wedge E$. We can further simplify the negation of assumption, and rewrite: we always have that $(\neg A \wedge (\neg B \vee (D \wedge E))) \wedge \neg C \wedge \neg D$ holds. By opening the expression we get $\neg A \wedge \neg B \wedge \neg C \wedge \neg D$ or $\neg A \wedge D \wedge E \wedge \neg C \wedge \neg D$. The latter clause cannot hold since it includes both D and $\neg D$. Thus, we write $\neg A \wedge \neg B \wedge \neg C \wedge \neg D$. Claim 5.15 implies the needed contradiction, because $\neg A$ and $\neg B$ cannot hold simultaneously.

Claim 5.15 (a) $\neg A$ holds when p_i is correct and active, (b) if $\neg A$ always holds, then B always holds eventually, (c) once $\neg C$ holds, it always holds, and (d) $\neg D$ means that $\text{result}() \in \{\perp, \Psi\}$ always holds.

Proof of Claim 5.15 (a) $\neg A$ is necessary condition for MVC-Completion. (b) By assuming that $\neg A$ always holds, B eventually always holds due to VBB-Completion (Theorem 5.8) and since there are at least $n-t$ correct and active nodes. (c) By the integrity property of binary consensus, once $\neg C = bcO.\text{result}() = \text{True}$ holds, it always holds. (d) The proof is implied by the definition of $\text{result}()$ (line 31). $\square_{\text{Claim 5.15}}$ $\square_{\text{Lemma 5.14}}$ $\square_{\text{Theorem 5.13}}$

5.7 Closure of multivalued consensus

Theorem 5.16 (MVC closure) *Let R be a well-initialized Algorithm 4's execution in which any correct node is active eventually. The MVC requirements hold during R .*

Proof of Theorem 5.16 MVC-Completion holds (Theorem 5.13).

Lemma 5.17 *The MVC-agreement property holds.*

Proof of Lemma 5.17 The proof shows that no two correct nodes decide differently. For every correct node, p_i , $bcO_i.\text{result}() \neq \perp$ holds eventually (Theorem 5.13). By the agreement and integrity properties of binary consensus, $bcO_i.\text{result}() = \text{False}$ implies MVC-agreement (line 31). Suppose $bcO_i.\text{result}() = \text{True}$. By the fact that there is no correct node, p_i and node $p_k \in \mathcal{P}$ (faulty or not) for which there is a value $w \notin \{\perp, \Psi, v\}$, such that $\text{vbbDeliver}_i(k) = w$. This is due to $n-2t \geq t+1$ and $pb()$'s second clause (line 26), which requires v to be unique. $\square_{\text{Lemma 5.17}}$

Lemma 5.18 *The MVC-validity property holds.*

Proof of Lemma 5.18 Suppose that all the correct nodes propose the same value, v . The proof needs to show that v is decided. Since all correct nodes propose v , we know that v is validated (VBB-obligation). Also, all correct nodes VBB-deliver v from at least $n-2t$ different nodes (VBB-Completion). Since $n-2t > t$, value v is unique. Note that no value v' can be VBB-broadcast only by faulty nodes and still be validated (VBB-justification). Thus, the non- \perp values that correct nodes can VBB-deliver are v and Ψ . This means that $\forall i \in \text{Correct} : bp_i() = \text{True}$, $bcO_i.\text{result}() = \text{True}$ (binary consensus validity), and correct nodes decide v . $\square_{\text{Lemma 5.18}}$

Lemma 5.19 *The MVC-no-intrusion property holds.*

Proof of Lemma 5.19 Suppose $w \neq \Psi$ is proposed only by faulty nodes. The proof shows that no correct node decides w . By VBB-justification, no $p_i : i \in \text{Correct}$ VBB-delivers w . Suppose that $bcO_i.\text{result}() \neq \text{True}$. Thus, w is not decided due to the last clause of the second if-statement condition in $\text{result}()$'s definition (line 31). Suppose that $bcO_i.\text{result}() = \text{True}$. There must be a node p_j for which $pb_j() = \text{True}$. *I.e.*, v is decided due to the last if-statement condition of $\text{result}()$ and since there are at least $n-2t$ VBB-deliveries of v . This implies that $w \neq v$ cannot be decided since $n-2t > t$. $\square_{\text{Lemma 5.19}}$ $\square_{\text{Theorem 5.16}}$

6 Discussion

To the best of our knowledge, this paper presents the first self-stabilizing Byzantine- and intrusion-tolerant algorithm for solving multivalued consensus in asynchronous message-passing systems. This solution is devised by layering a couple of broadcast protocols, such as Byzantine reliable broadcast and validated Byzantine broadcast. Our solution is based on a code transformation of existing (non-self-stabilizing) Byzantine-tolerant algorithms into the proposed

self-stabilizing Byzantine-tolerant algorithm. This transformation is achieved via careful analysis of the effect that arbitrary transient faults can have on the system’s state as well as via rigorous proof for demonstrating consistency regaining and completion. We hope that the proposed solution and studied techniques can facilitate the design of new building blocks, such as state-machine replication, for the Cloud and distributed ledgers.

References

- [1] Ittai Abraham, Dahlia Malkhi, Kartik Nayak, Ling Ren, and Maofan Yin. Sync hotstuff: Simple and practical synchronous state machine replication. In *IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, SP’20*, pages 106–118, 2020.
- [2] Karine Altisen, Stéphane Devismes, Swan Dubois, and Franck Petit. *Introduction to Distributed Self-Stabilizing Algorithms*. Synthesis Lectures on Distributed Computing Theory. Morgan & Claypool Publishers, 2019.
- [3] Michael Ben-Or, Boaz Kelmer, and Tal Rabin. Asynchronous secure computations with optimal resilience. In *ACM Principles of Distributed Computing*, pages 183–192, 1994.
- [4] Alexander Binun, Thierry Coupaye, Shlomi Dolev, Mohammed Kassi-Lahlou, Marc Lacomte, Alex Palesandro, Reuven Yagel, and Leonid Yankulin. Self-stabilizing Byzantine-tolerant distributed replicated state machine. In *Stabilization, Safety, and Security of Distributed Systems SSS’16*, pages 36–53, 2016.
- [5] Alexander Binun, Shlomi Dolev, and Tal Hadad. Self-stabilizing Byzantine consensus for blockchain. In *Cyber Security Cryptography and Machine Learning CSCML’19*, pages 106–110, 2019.
- [6] Peva Blanchard, Shlomi Dolev, Joffroy Beauquier, and Sylvie Delaët. Practically self-stabilizing Paxos replicated state-machine. In *NETYS*, volume 8593 of *LNCS*, pages 99–121. Springer, 2014.
- [7] Silvia Bonomi, Shlomi Dolev, Maria Potop-Butucaru, and Michel Raynal. Stabilizing server-based storage in Byzantine asynchronous message-passing systems. In *ACM Principles of Distributed Computing, PODC’15*, pages 471–479, 2015.
- [8] Silvia Bonomi, Maria Potop-Butucaru, and Sébastien Tixeuil. Stabilizing Byzantine-fault tolerant storage. In *IEEE Parallel and Distributed Processing Symposium, IPDPS’15*, pages 894–903, 2015.
- [9] Silvia Bonomi, Antonella Del Pozzo, Maria Potop-Butucaru, and Sébastien Tixeuil. Optimal mobile Byzantine fault tolerant distributed storage. In *ACM Principles of Distributed Computing, PODC’16*, pages 269–278, 2016.
- [10] Silvia Bonomi, Antonella Del Pozzo, Maria Potop-Butucaru, and Sébastien Tixeuil. Optimal storage under unsynchronized mobile Byzantine faults. In *IEEE Reliable Distributed Systems, SRDS’17*, pages 154–163, 2017.
- [11] Silvia Bonomi, Antonella Del Pozzo, Maria Potop-Butucaru, and Sébastien Tixeuil. Optimal self-stabilizing mobile Byzantine-tolerant regular register with bounded timestamps. In *Stabilization, Safety, and Security of Distributed Systems, SSS’18*, pages 398–403, 2018.

- [12] Silvia Bonomi, Antonella Del Pozzo, Maria Potop-Butucaru, and Sébastien Tixeuil. Approximate agreement under mobile Byzantine faults. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 758:17–29, 2019.
- [13] Gabriel Bracha. An asynchronous $[(n-1)/3]$ -resilient consensus protocol. In *ACM Principles of Distributed Computing PODC'84*, pages 154–162, 1984.
- [14] Gabriel Bracha. Asynchronous byzantine agreement protocols. *Inf. Comput.*, 75(2):130–143, 1987.
- [15] Gabriel Bracha and Sam Toueg. Asynchronous consensus and broadcast protocols. *J. ACM*, 32(4):824–840, 1985.
- [16] Miguel Correia, Nuno Ferreira Neves, and Paulo Veríssimo. From consensus to atomic broadcast: Time-free byzantine-resistant protocols without signatures. *Comput. J.*, 49(1):82–96, 2006.
- [17] Miguel Correia, Giuliana Santos Veronese, Nuno Ferreira Neves, and Paulo Veríssimo. Byzantine consensus in asynchronous message-passing systems: a survey. *Int. J. Crit. Comput. Based Syst.*, 2(2):141–161, 2011.
- [18] Edsger W. Dijkstra. Self-stabilizing systems in spite of distributed control. *Commun. ACM*, 17(11):643–644, 1974.
- [19] Shlomi Dolev. *Self-Stabilization*. MIT Press, 2000.
- [20] Shlomi Dolev, Chryssis Georgiou, Ioannis Marcoullis, and Elad Michael Schiller. Self-stabilizing Byzantine tolerant replicated state machine based on failure detectors. In *Cyber Security Cryptography and Machine Learning - Second International Symposium CSCML'18*, pages 84–100, 2018.
- [21] Shlomi Dolev, Ronen I. Kat, and Elad Michael Schiller. When consensus meets self-stabilization. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 76(8):884–900, 2010.
- [22] Shlomi Dolev, Omri Liba, and Elad Michael Schiller. Self-stabilizing Byzantine resilient topology discovery and message delivery. In *Networked Systems NETYS'13*, pages 42–57, 2013.
- [23] Shlomi Dolev, Thomas Petig, and Elad Michael Schiller. Self-stabilizing and private distributed shared atomic memory in seldomly fair message passing networks. *CoRR*, abs/1806.03498, 2018.
- [24] Shlomi Dolev and Jennifer L. Welch. Self-stabilizing clock synchronization in the presence of Byzantine faults. In *ACM Principles of Distributed Computing PODC'95*, page 256, 1995.
- [25] Swan Dubois, Maria Potop-Butucaru, Mikhail Nesterenko, and Sébastien Tixeuil. Self-stabilizing Byzantine asynchronous unison. *J. Parallel Distributed Comput.*, 72(7):917–923, 2012.
- [26] Cynthia Dwork, Nancy A. Lynch, and Larry J. Stockmeyer. Consensus in the presence of partial synchrony. *J. ACM*, 35(2):288–323, 1988.
- [27] Michael J. Fischer, Nancy A. Lynch, and Mike Paterson. Impossibility of distributed consensus with one faulty process. *J. ACM*, 32(2):374–382, 1985.

- [28] Chryssis Georgiou, Ioannis Marcoullis, Michel Raynal, and Elad Michael Schiller. Loosely-self-stabilizing byzantine-tolerant binary consensus for signature-free message-passing systems. *CoRR*, abs/2103.14649, 2021. Also in NETYS’21.
- [29] Pankaj Khanchandani and Christoph Lenzen. Self-stabilizing Byzantine clock synchronization with optimal precision. *Theory Comput. Syst.*, 63(2):261–305, 2019.
- [30] Leslie Lamport, Robert E. Shostak, and Marshall C. Pease. The byzantine generals problem. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.*, 4(3):382–401, 1982.
- [31] Christoph Lenzen and Joel Rybicki. Self-stabilising Byzantine clock synchronisation is almost as easy as consensus. *J. ACM*, 66(5):32:1–32:56, 2019.
- [32] Oskar Lundström, Michel Raynal, and Elad Michael Schiller. Self-stabilizing indulgent zero-degrading binary consensus. In *Distributed Computing and Networking, ICDCN’21*, pages 106–115, 2021.
- [33] Oskar Lundström, Michel Raynal, and Elad Michael Schiller. Self-stabilizing multivalued consensus in asynchronous crash-prone systems. *CoRR*, abs/2104.03129, 2021. Also in EDCC’21.
- [34] Achour Mostéfaoui, Moumen Hamouma, and Michel Raynal. Signature-free asynchronous Byzantine consensus with $t < n/3$ and $o(n^2)$ messages. In *ACM Principles of Distributed Computing, PODC ’14*, pages 2–9, 2014.
- [35] Achour Mostéfaoui, Hamouma Moumen, and Michel Raynal. Signature-free asynchronous binary Byzantine consensus with $t < n/3$, $o(n^2)$ messages, and $O(1)$ expected time. *J. ACM*, 62(4):31:1–31:21, 2015.
- [36] Achour Mostéfaoui and Michel Raynal. Intrusion-tolerant broadcast and agreement abstractions in the presence of byzantine processes. *IEEE Trans. Parallel Distributed Syst.*, 27(4):1085–1098, 2016.
- [37] 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*, 54(5):501–520, 2017.
- [38] Nuno Ferreira Neves, Miguel Correia, and Paulo Veríssimo. Solving vector consensus with a wormhole. *IEEE Trans. Parallel Distributed Syst.*, 16(12):1120–1131, 2005.
- [39] Marshall C. Pease, Robert E. Shostak, and Leslie Lamport. Reaching agreement in the presence of faults. *J. ACM*, 27(2):228–234, 1980.
- [40] Kenneth J. Perry. Randomized byzantine agreement. In *Fourth Symposium on Reliability in Distributed Software and Database Systems, SRDS 1984, Silver Spring, Maryland, USA, October 15-17, 1984, Proceedings*, pages 107–118, 1984.
- [41] Michel Raynal. *Fault-Tolerant Message-Passing Distributed Systems - An Algorithmic Approach*. Springer, 2018.
- [42] Sam Toueg. Randomized byzantine agreements. In *Proceedings of the Third Annual ACM Principles of Distributed Computing, Vancouver, B. C., Canada, August 27-29, 1984*, pages 163–178, 1984.