

Byzantine Agreement with Optimal Resilience via Statistical Fraud Detection

Shang-En Huang
University of Michigan

Seth Pettie
University of Michigan

Leqi Zhu
University of Michigan

Abstract

Since the mid-1980s it has been known that Byzantine Agreement can be solved with probability 1 asynchronously, even against an omniscient, computationally unbounded adversary that can adaptively *corrupt* up to $f < n/3$ parties. Moreover, the problem is insoluble with $f \geq n/3$ corruptions. However, Bracha’s [Bra87] 1984 protocol (see also Ben-Or [Ben83]) achieved $f < n/3$ resilience at the cost of *exponential* expected latency $2^{\Theta(n)}$, a bound that has never been improved in this model with $f = \lfloor (n-1)/3 \rfloor$ corruptions.

In this paper we prove that Byzantine Agreement in the asynchronous, full information model can be solved with probability 1 against an adaptive adversary that can corrupt $f < n/3$ parties, while incurring only *polynomial latency with high probability*. Our protocol follows earlier polynomial latency protocols of King and Saia [KS16, KS18] and Huang, Pettie, and Zhu [HPZ22], which had *suboptimal* resilience, namely $f \approx n/10^9$ [KS16, KS18] and $f < n/4$ [HPZ22], respectively.

Resilience $f = (n-1)/3$ is uniquely difficult as this is the point at which the influence of the Byzantine and honest players are of roughly equal strength. The core technical problem we solve is to design a collective coin-flipping protocol that *eventually* lets us flip a coin with an unambiguous outcome. In the beginning the influence of the Byzantine players is too powerful to overcome and they can essentially fix the coin’s behavior at will. We guarantee that after just a polynomial number of executions of the coin-flipping protocol, either (a) the Byzantine players fail to fix the behavior of the coin (thereby ending the game) or (b) we can “blacklist” players such that the blacklisting rate for Byzantine players is at least as large as the blacklisting rate for good players. The blacklisting criterion is based on a simple statistical test of *fraud detection*.

1 Introduction

In the Byzantine Agreement problem [PSL80, LSP82], n players begin with input values in $\{-1, 1\}$ and each must *decide* an output value in $\{-1, 1\}$ subject to:

Agreement. All uncorrupted players must **decide** the same value (and only that value).

Validity. If all uncorrupted players **decide** v , then at least one such player had v as its input.

Termination. Each uncorrupted player terminates the protocol with probability 1.

The difficulty of this problem depends on the *strength* of the adversary and assumptions on the communication medium. We consider a standard asynchronous model of communication against a *strong* adversary. Each player can send point-to-point messages to other players, which can be *delayed* arbitrarily by the adversary, but not dropped or forged. In addition, the adversary is aware of the internal state of every player, is computationally unbounded, and may adaptively *corrupt* up to f players; these are also known as *Byzantine* players. Once corrupted, the behavior of a player is arbitrary, and assumed to be controlled by the adversary. Following Ben-Or [Ben83], Bracha [Bra87] proved that Byzantine Agreement can be solved in this model when $f < n/3$. The protocols of Ben-Or and Bracha are not entirely satisfactory because they have latency *exponential* in n . (In the asynchronous model, a protocol has *latency* L if, in an execution in which every message delay is bounded by Δ and all local computation is instantaneous, each player halts by time $L\Delta$.¹)

¹Note that Δ is unknown to the players and cannot be used to detect crash-failures. Moreover, since there is no *minimum* message delay, these conditions place no constraints on message delivery order.

The Byzantine Agreement problem has been solved satisfactorily in stronger communication models or against a weaker adversary than the ones we assume.

Synchronized Communication. Lamport et al. [LSP82] proved that if communication occurs in *synchronized* rounds, Byzantine Agreement can be obtained deterministically in $f + 1$ rounds, where $f < n/3$. Fischer and Lynch proved that round complexity $f + 1$ is optimal [FL82]. The communication complexity of [LSP82] is exponential, and was later reduced to polynomial by Garay and Moses [GM98]. Dwork, Lynch, and Stockmeyer [DLS88] developed agreement protocols under weakly synchronous models.

Impossibility Results. Fischer, Lynch, and Patterson [FLP85] proved that the problem cannot be solved deterministically, in an *asynchronous* system in which just *one* player is subject to a crash failure. This result is commonly known as *FLP Impossibility*. Thus, to solve Byzantine Agreement we must assume some level of synchronization *or* randomization. Even with randomization, the problem is insoluble when $f \geq n/3$. The proof of this result is straightforward in the asynchronous model [BT85, Thm. 3] and more complicated in the synchronized model [PSL80, FLM86].

Cryptographic Solutions. Against a computationally bounded adversary cryptography becomes useful. Byzantine Agreement can be solved against such an adversary in $O(1)$ latency against an adversary controlling $f < n/3$ players² [CKS05, CR93]; see also [BG93, FM97].

Non-Adaptive Adversaries. The ability to *adaptively* corrupt players is surprisingly powerful. Goldwasser, Pavlov, and Vaikuntanathan [GPV06], improving [BOPV06], considered a *synchronized*, full information model in which the adversary corrupts up to f players up front, i.e., it is *non-adaptive*. They proved that Byzantine Agreement can be solved with resiliency $f < n/(3 + \epsilon)$ in $O(\log n/\epsilon^2)$ rounds. See Chor and Coan [CC85] for prior results in similar adversarial models [CC85].

Kapron et al. [KKK⁺10] developed a Byzantine Agreement protocol in the *asynchronous*, full information model, in which the adversary corrupts $f < n/(3 + \epsilon)$ players non-adaptively. Their protocol has different parameterizations, and can achieve agreement in quasipolynomial latency with probability $1 - 1/\text{poly}(n)$, or polylogarithmic latency with probability $1 - 1/\text{poly}(\log n)$. When these protocols err, they do not satisfy the **Agreement** and **Termination** criteria, and may deadlock or terminate without agreement.

Limits of Fully Symmetric Protocols. Lewko [Lew11] proved that in the asynchronous, full information model, a certain class of “fully symmetric” Byzantine Agreement protocols has latency $2^{\Omega(n)}$ when $f = \Theta(n)$. This class was designed to capture Ben-Or [Ben83] and Bracha [Bra87] but is broader. Protocols in this class make state transitions that depend on the *set* of validated messages received, but may not take into account the transaction history of the sender. In retrospect, Lewko’s result can be seen as justifying two strikingly different approaches for improving [Ben83, Bra87] in the asynchronous, full information model. The first is to break symmetry by having the players take on different roles: this is necessary to implement Feige’s *lightest bin* rule and other routines in Kapron et al.’s [KKK⁺10] protocol. The second is to stay broadly within the Ben-Or–Bracha framework, but periodically *blacklist* players after accumulating statistical evidence of fraudulent coin flips in their transaction history. This is the approach taken by King and Saia [KS16, KS18] and Huang et al. [HPZ22].

Fraud Detection. King and Saia [KS16, KS18] presented two Byzantine Agreement protocols with polynomial latency. The first uses *exponential* local computation and is resilient to $f < n/400$ adaptive corruptions. The second uses polynomial local computation and is resilient to $n/(0.87 \times 10^9)$ adaptive corruptions. Huang, Pettie, and Zhu [HPZ22] recently proposed a different fraud detection mechanism, which lead to a Byzantine Agreement protocol with polynomial latency and polynomial local computation that is resilient to $f < n/4$ adaptive corruptions. However, the specific statistical tests used by Huang et al. [HPZ22] are incapable of closing the gap from $f < n/4$ to $f < n/3$. See Section 2.

²This assumes that RSA encryption cannot be broken by a polynomially bounded adversary.

1.1 New Results

One feature of the asynchronous model is that every player must perpetually entertain the possibility that f players have *crashed* and will never be heard from again. Thus, when $n = 3f + 1$, the number of fully participating players at any stage is $n - f = 2f + 1$ and up to f of these players may be corrupt! Among the set of *participating* players, the good players hold the thinnest possible majority: $f + 1$ vs. f .

We develop a special coin-flipping protocol to be used in Bracha’s framework [Bra87, Ben83] when the corrupt and non-corrupt players have roughly equal influence. Initially all players have weight 1. The coin-flipping protocol has the property that if the corrupt players repeatedly foil its attempts to flip a global coin, then we can fractionally *blacklist* players (reduce their weights) in such a way that the blacklisting rate for good players is only infinitesimally larger than the blacklisting rate for corrupt players. Specifically, we guarantee that among any $n - f = 2f + 1$ participating players, the total weight of the good players minus the total weight of the corrupt players is bounded away from zero. Eventually all corrupt players have their weights reduced to zero (meaning they have no influence over the global coin protocol) and at this point, the *scheduling* power of the adversary is insufficient to fix the behavior of the global coin. Agreement is reached in a few more iterations of Bracha’s algorithm, with high probability.

The final result is a randomized f -resilient Byzantine Agreement protocol with latency (expected and with high probability) $\tilde{O}(n^4\epsilon^{-8})$, where $n = (3 + \epsilon)f$, $\epsilon \geq 1/f$. In other words, the latency ranges between n^4 and n^{12} , depending on ϵ . This latency-resiliency tradeoff is always at least as good as [HPZ22], but is slower than [KS16, KS18] when $f < n/400$ or $f < n/(0.87 \times 10^9)$ is sufficiently small; see Table 1.

Citation	Resilience	Latency	Local Computation per Message
Ben-Or [Ben83]	$f < n/5$	$2^{\Theta(n)}$	$\text{poly}(n)$
	$f = O(\sqrt{tn})$	$\exp(t^2)$	$\text{poly}(n)$
Bracha [Bra87]	$f < n/3$	$2^{\Theta(n)}$	$\text{poly}(n)$
King & Saia [KS16, KS18]	$f < n/400$	$\tilde{O}(n^{5/2})$	$\exp(n)$
	$f < n/(0.87 \times 10^9)$	$O(n^3)$	$\text{poly}(n)$
Huang, Pettie & Zhu [HPZ22]	$f < n/(4 + \epsilon)$	$\tilde{O}(n^4/\epsilon^4)$	$\text{poly}(n)$
new	$f < n/(3 + \epsilon)$	$\tilde{O}(n^4/\epsilon^8)$	$\text{poly}(n)$

Table 1: Randomized Byzantine Agreement protocols in the asynchronous, full information model against an adaptive adversary. Here $\epsilon = \Omega(1/n)$.

1.2 Organization of the Paper

In Section 2 we review Bracha’s algorithm [Bra87], the coin-flipping protocols of King & Saia and Huang et al. [KS16, HPZ22], and the fraud detection mechanism of Huang et al. [HPZ22]. We then walk through a few failed attempts to improve its resiliency to $f < n/3$. The specific structure of these failures motivates several design choices in our final protocol, many of which will not make sense without understanding the vulnerabilities of alternate solutions. Section 3 presents the protocol and its analysis. We conclude in Section 4 with some remarks and open problems.

2 Preliminaries, Misfires, and Dead Ends

Bracha’s protocol [Bra87] is based on Ben-Or’s protocol [Ben83]. It improves the resiliency of [Ben83] from $f < n/5$ to $f < n/3$ by introducing two mechanisms that constrain the misbehavior of corrupt players.

Reliable Broadcast. The point-to-point communication network can be used to implement a simple Reliable-Broadcast primitive [Bra87] resilient to $f < n/3$ corruptions. It guarantees that if any good player attempts to broadcast a value v , then every good player eventually *accepts* v and only v . Moreover,

if any corrupt player initiates a broadcast, then either all good players accept the same value v , and only v , or all good players accept nothing. See [Bra87] for details of this primitive.

Validation. The Reliable-Broadcast primitive allows us to assume that all relevant communication is public, via broadcasts. Fix any protocol \mathcal{P} based on broadcasts. Informally, a player p *validates* a message m originating from q if p has already accepted and validated a set of broadcasts that, were they to be received by q , would have caused q to make a suitable state transition according to \mathcal{P} and broadcast m . See [Bra87] for details of validation.

The reliable broadcast primitive prevents the adversary from sending conflicting messages to different players, or convincing one player to accept a broadcast and another not to. The validation mechanism prevents it from making state transitions logically inconsistent with the protocol \mathcal{P} . Note, however, that in general \mathcal{P} is *probabilistic* and validation permits a series of transitions that are logically possible but statistically unlikely. In summary, the adversary is characterized by the following powers.

Full Information & Scheduling. The adversary knows the internal state of all players and controls the order in which messages are delivered. It may delay messages arbitrarily.

Corruption & Coin Flipping. The adversary may *adaptively* corrupt up to f players as the execution of the protocol progresses. Once corrupted, a player continues to follow protocol, except the adversary now chooses the outcomes of all of its coin flips.

Algorithm 1 Bracha-Agreement() *from the perspective of player p*

Require: $v_p \in \{-1, 1\}$.

- 1: **loop**
 - 2: Reliable-Broadcast v_p and **wait** until $n - f$ messages are validated from some set of players S_p .
 set $v_p \leftarrow \text{sgn}(\sum_{q \in S_p} v_q)$. $\triangleright \text{sgn}(x) = 1$ if $x \geq 0$ and -1 otherwise.
 - 3: Reliable-Broadcast v_p and **wait** until $n - f$ messages are validated.
 if more than $n/2$ messages have some value v^* **then** set $v_p \leftarrow v^*$, **otherwise** set $v_p \leftarrow \perp$.
 - 4: Reliable-Broadcast v_p and **wait** until $n - f$ messages are validated.
 let x_p be the number of $v^* \neq \perp$ messages validated by p .
 - 5: **if** $x_p \geq 1$ **then**
 - 6: set $v_p \leftarrow v^*$.
 - 7: **if** $x_p \geq f + 1$ **then**
 - 8: **decide** v^* .
 - 9: **if** $x_p = 0$ **then**
 - 10: $v_p \leftarrow \text{Coin-Flip}()$. \triangleright Returns value in $\{-1, 1\}$.
-

The Bracha-Agreement protocol loops until all players **decide** a value. As we will see, if any non-corrupt player **decides** in iteration i , then all non-corrupt players will **decide** by iteration $i + 1$. Suppose that, at Line 2, a supermajority of at least $(n + f + 1)/2$ players hold the same value v^* . It follows that in any set S_p of $n - f$ messages, v^* will be in the majority, and all players will be forced to adopt v^* .³ Thus, after Line 3, all players will see $n - f > n/2$ messages containing v^* and again broadcast v^* in Line 4, setting $x_p = n - f \geq f + 1$ and **deciding** v^* in Line 8. In other words, if the adversary is to prolong the execution of this protocol, it must avoid supermajorities of $(n + f + 1)/2$ or more in every iteration.

Suppose the populations holding -1 and 1 at Line 2 are more balanced. The scheduling power of the adversary is sufficient to fix v_p arbitrarily in Lines 2 and 3. Note, however, that regardless of how the messages are delivered, it is always the case that $|x_p - x_q| \leq f$ for any p, q . Thus, if $A_{\text{keep}}, A_{\text{dec}}, A_{\text{flip}}$ are the populations with $x_p \in [1, f]$, $x_p \in [f + 1, n - f]$, and $x_p = 0$, respectively, then either $A_{\text{flip}} = \emptyset$ or $A_{\text{dec}} = \emptyset$. In the former case, a supermajority of players hold the majority value v^* and will **decide** in the current or following iteration. In the latter case, the A_{keep} population keeps the value v^* and the remaining population A_{flip} chooses their new value on the basis of a coin flip (Line 10). The key insight of [Ben83, Bra87] is

³A corrupt player may successfully broadcast the message $-v^*$ in Line 3 of Bracha-Agreement, but no good player will *validate* this message as it cannot be justified by any $n - f$ messages broadcast in Line 2.

that if *all* good players in the second population A_{flip} happen to have Coin-Flip return v^* , then at least $n - f \geq (n + f + 1)/2$ players will go into the next iteration with the same value, and, according to the argument above, **decide** v^* in that iteration.

The probability that private coin-flipping creates a sufficiently large supermajority by chance is $2^{-\Theta(n)}$ when $f = \Theta(n)$. In expectation the number of trials is $2^{\Theta(n)}$, hence the exponential expected latency of [Ben83, Bra87]. The protocols of Rabin [Rab83] and Toueg [Tou84] operate in a similar fashion, but assume away the difficulty by supposing there is some mechanism to flip a shared coin, or reliably distribute shared randomness to players before the protocol begins.

The protocols of King and Saia [KS16, KS18] and Huang et al. [HPZ22] follow Bracha-Agreement, but implement Coin-Flip (Line 10) as a “global” coin, which aims for two desirable, but ultimately unattainable guarantees:

Property (i) all players agree on the *same* value returned by Coin-Flip(), and

Property (ii) the output of Coin-Flip() is close to unbiased.

The problem of flipping a bounded-bias coin against adversarial manipulation is well studied. The problem can be solved against surprisingly large coalitions of corrupt players [BL85, AL93, Sak89, AN93, RSZ02, HK20, KKL88, Fei99, BN00]. This body of work assumes reliable communication (no dropped or delayed messages) and reliable computation (no crash failures). Aspnes [Asp98] gave a lower bound that models aspects of an adaptive adversary in an asynchronous network. In his coin-flipping game, a vector of values (v_1, \dots, v_N) is generated as follows. Once (v_1, \dots, v_{i-1}) are known, a random value v'_i is generated⁴ and the adversary may set $v_i \leftarrow v'_i$ or *suppress* it, setting $v_i \leftarrow \perp$. The outcome of the coin flip is some function $g(v_1, \dots, v_N) \in \{-1, 1\}$. If the adversary can suppress t values, then $N = \Omega(t^2)$ for g to have constant bias and $N = \Omega(t^2 / \log^2 t)$ if the probability that $g = 1$ and -1 are at least $1/\text{poly}(t)$. Aspnes [Asp98] proved that this result implies $\tilde{\Omega}(n)$ latency lower bounds on Byzantine Agreement in the asynchronous model, which was improved to $\Omega(n)$ by Attiya and Censor-Hillel [AC08]. The moral of [Asp98, AC08] and related lower bounds against *adaptive* adversaries, such as Haitner and Karidi-Heller’s [HK20], is that the aggregation function g that implements majority voting is at least close to optimal. However, the Byzantine Agreement protocols against *non-adaptive* adversaries, such as [BOPV06, GPV06, KKK⁺10] can afford to implement clever coin-flipping protocols that are not based exclusively on majority voting [Fei99, RSZ02].

The coin-flipping protocols of King and Saia [KS16] and Huang et al. [HPZ22] do not attempt to guarantee Properties (i) and (ii) immediately. Rather, after a sufficiently large number of invocations of Coin-Flip, if the adversary foils Properties (i,ii), it will leave behind enough statistical evidence that proves incriminating, allowing us to *blacklist* suspicious players, removing their explicit influence over subsequent calls to Coin-Flip. When all corrupt players are blacklisted, the adversary still has the power of scheduling, but this power is insufficient to significantly delay agreement.

The basis of King and Saia’s [KS16] implementation of Coin-Flip is a shared *blackboard* primitive, which was improved by Kimmett [Kim20], and again by Huang et al. [HPZ22]. A blackboard is an $m \times n$ matrix BB , initially all blank (\perp). The goal is to have each player i write m values successively to column i (via Reliable-Broadcasts), and once the blackboard is full, to have all players agree on its contents. Because up to f players may crash, a *full* blackboard is one in which $n - f$ columns have m writes, and the remaining f columns may be *partial*. Due to the scheduling power of the adversary, every player p sees a slightly different version $\text{BB}^{(p)}$ of the “true” blackboard BB , which is derived by replacing with \perp the last write in some of the f partial columns. Thus, $\text{BB}^{(p)}$ and $\text{BB}^{(q)}$ differ in at most f entries. In [KS16, HPZ22] the Coin-Flip routine is implemented as follows: every write to BB is a value in $\{-1, 1\}$ chosen uniformly at random. When p finishes participating in the construction of BB it has a view $\text{BB}^{(p)}$ and sets the output of Coin-Flip to be $\text{sgn}(\Sigma^{(p)})$, where $\Sigma^{(p)} = \sum_{j,q} \text{BB}^{(p)}(j, q)$, treating \perp s as zero. Note that whenever $\Sigma^{(p)} \notin [-f, f]$, p can be sure that Coin-Flip generates the same output for all players, even corrupt ones.⁵

We can of course execute the blackboard primitive iteratively [KS16], but two players may disagree on the contents of *each* blackboard in up to f cells. The Iterated-Blackboard protocol of Huang et al. [HPZ22]

⁴The distribution and range of v'_i are arbitrary, and may depend on (v_1, \dots, v_{i-1}) .

⁵In particular, in Line 2 of Bracha-Agreement, if a message v_q broadcast from q is purportedly the output of the last iteration’s call to Coin-Flip(), player p will validate it only if it is *possible* that $\text{sgn}(\Sigma^{(q)}) = v_q$.

guarantees a stronger form of agreement. An iterated blackboard is an endless sequence $(\text{BB}_1, \text{BB}_2, \dots)$ of blackboards, where BB_t is an $m(t) \times n$ matrix. After player p finishes participating in the construction of BB_t , it has a view $\text{BB}^{(p,t)} = (\text{BB}_1^{(p,t)}, \dots, \text{BB}_t^{(p,t)})$ of the first t blackboards. It is guaranteed that $\text{BB}_t^{(p,t)}$ and $\text{BB}_t^{(q,t)}$ differ in at most f cells in partial columns; it is also guaranteed that $\text{BB}^{(p,t)}$ and $\text{BB}^{(q,t)}$ differ in at most f cells *in total*, over all t blackboards. In order to make this type of guarantee, during the construction of BB_{t+1} , p may record *retroactive updates* to an earlier $\text{BB}_{t'}$, $t' \leq t$, so that $\text{BB}_{t'}^{(p,t+1)}$ records some writes to cells that were still \perp in $\text{BB}_{t'}^{(p,t)}$.

Theorem 1. *There is a protocol for n players to generate an iterated blackboard BB that is resilient to $f < n/3$ Byzantine failures. For $t \geq 1$, the following properties hold:*

1. Upon completion of the matrix BB_t , each column consists of a prefix of non- \perp values and a suffix of all- \perp values. Let $\text{last}(i) = (t', r)$ be the position of the last value written by player i , i.e., $\text{BB}_{t'}(r, i) \neq \perp$ and if $t' < t$ then i has not written to any cells of BB_t . When BB_t is complete, it has at least $n - f$ full columns and up to f partial columns, i.e., $\text{last}(i) \geq (t, m(t))$ for at least $n - f$ values of i .
2. Once p finishes participating in the construction of BB_t , it forms a historical view of the first t blackboards $\text{BB}^{(p,t)} = (\text{BB}_1^{(p,t)}, \dots, \text{BB}_t^{(p,t)})$ such that for every $t' \in [t]$, $i \in [n]$, $r \in [m(t)]$,

$$\text{BB}_{t'}^{(p,t)}(r, i) \begin{cases} = \text{BB}_{t'}(r, i) & \text{if } \text{last}(i) \neq (t', r), \\ \in \{\text{BB}_{t'}(r, i), \perp\} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Moreover, $\text{BB}_{t'}^{(p,t)}(r, i) \neq \text{BB}_{t'}(r, i)$ for at most f tuples (t', r, i) .

3. If q writes any non- \perp value to BB_{t+1} , then by the time any player p fixes $\text{BB}^{(p,t+1)}$, p will be aware of q 's view $\text{BB}^{(q,t)}$ of the history up to blackboard t .
4. The latency of constructing $\text{BB}^{(p,t)}$ is $O(\sum_{t' \leq t} m(t'))$.

2.1 Coin Flipping and Fraud Detection

The King-Saia [KS16, KS18] and Huang et al. [HPZ22] protocols rely on the fact that the f corrupt players, being a small minority, must collectively generate coin flips whose sum is conspicuously large, as they must often *counteract* the coin flips of $n - 2f$ good players.⁶ At the end of the t th iteration of Bracha-Agreement, the [KS16, HPZ22] protocols call Coin-Flip, which populates the blackboard BB_t with random $\{-1, 1\}$ coin flips. Define $X_i(t)$ to be the sum of the coin flips in $\text{BB}_t(\cdot, i)$ generated by player i . (Recall that the players are partitioned into $A_{\text{keep}}, A_{\text{flip}}$, where those in A_{keep} will keep the majority value $v^* \in \{-1, 1\}$, regardless of the outcome of Coin-Flip. Nonetheless, *every* player in $A_{\text{keep}} \cup A_{\text{flip}}$ participates in the Coin-Flip protocol.)

At the very least the adversary wants at least one player in A_{flip} to believe the outcome of the global coin is $\sigma(t) = -v^*$, which is called the *adversarial direction*. Let $\Sigma_G(t)$ and $\Sigma_B(t)$ be the sum of the good and bad (corrupt) coin flips written to BB_t . If $\text{sgn}(\Sigma_G(t)) = \sigma(t)$ then the adversary is happy, and if $\text{sgn}(\Sigma_G(t)) = -\sigma(t)$ then the adversary needs to counteract the good coin flips and get the total sum $\Sigma_G(t) + \Sigma_B(t)$ in the interval $[-f, f]$ in order for at least one player believe the coin flip outcome (sign of the sum) is $\sigma(t)$. Thus,

$$|\Sigma_B(t)| \geq \max\{0, -\sigma(t)\Sigma_G(t) - f\}.$$

$\Sigma_G(t)$ is the sum of at least $m(n - 2f) = \Omega(mn)$ coin flips; suppose for simplicity that $\Sigma_G(t)$ is the sum of *exactly* this many flips. When $m \gg n > 3f$, f is much smaller than the standard deviation of $\Sigma_G(t)$, so let us also ignore the “ $-f$ ” term for simplicity. By symmetry, $\Sigma_G(t)$ is positive and negative with equal probability, so up to these simplifications, $\mathbf{E}[\Sigma_B(t)^2] \geq \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{E}[\Sigma_G(t)^2] = \frac{1}{2}m(n - 2f)$.⁷ On the other hand, if these f bad players *were* flipping fair coins then $\mathbf{E}[\Sigma_B(t)^2] \leq mf$.

⁶Recall that the adversary can fail to deliver messages of up to f players in a timely fashion, so there can be as few as $f + (n - 2f)$ players fully participating in any given blackboard/coin-flip.

⁷It is a small abuse of notation to measure the expectation of $\Sigma_B(t)^2$ since it has no well defined distribution. The expectation is naturally w.r.t. *any* fixed adversarial strategy that convinces at least one player that the outcome of the global coin is $\sigma(t)$.

The statistics tracked by Huang et al. [HPZ22] are pairwise *correlations* and individual *deviations* over a series of calls to Coin-Flip.

$$\begin{aligned}\text{corr}(i, j) &= \langle X_i, X_j \rangle = \sum_t X_i(t)X_j(t), \\ \text{dev}(i) &= \langle X_i, X_i \rangle = \sum_t (X_i(t))^2.\end{aligned}$$

Note that $(\Sigma_B(t))^2$ can be decomposed into terms that contribute to $\text{corr}(i, j)$ scores ($X_i(t)X_j(t)$, $i \neq j$) and $\text{dev}(i)$ scores ($X_i(t)^2$). When $f < n/4$ there is a *gap* between $\frac{1}{2}m(n - 2f)$ and mf , which implies that after a sufficient number of iterations, either some bad player i has an unusually large $\text{dev}(i)$ score, or two bad players i, j have an unusually large $\text{corr}(i, j)$ score [HPZ22, Lemma 5]. *Unusually large* here means one beyond what any good players flipping fair coins could generate, with high probability. If $\text{corr}(i, j)$ is unusually large, it follows that *at least one* of i, j must be bad. The Huang et al. [HPZ22] protocol “blacklists” players according to a fractional matching in a graph on $[n]$ weighted by correlation and deviation scores, which ensures that bad players are blacklisted at the same or higher rate than the good players.

2.2 Misfires and Dead Ends

Our goal is to improve the resilience from $f < n/4$ to the optimal $f < n/3$. As f tends towards $n/3$, many natural statistics worth tracking lose traction, and “ $n/3$ ” is the point at which coin-flipping games become perfectly balanced between the influence of $n - 2f$ good and f bad players. For example, when $f = n/4$, $mf = \frac{1}{2}m(n - 2f)$, and bad players may not be detected by tracking $\text{dev}(i)$ and $\text{corr}(i, j)$ scores alone. When $n = 3f + 1$, we can assume $n - f = 2f + 1$ players fully participate in the coin-flipping protocol, at least $f + 1$ of which are good and at most f of which are bad. To illustrate why this is a uniquely difficult setting to perform fraud detection, consider a simple **Mirror-Mimic** strategy deployed by the adversary.

Mirror-Mimic Strategy. When $\text{sgn}(\Sigma_G(t)) = -\sigma(t)$, the adversary sets $\Sigma_B(t) = -\Sigma_G(t)$ (mirror). When $\text{sgn}(\Sigma_G(t)) = \sigma(t)$, it sets $\Sigma_B(t) = \Sigma_G(t)$ (mimic). There is some flexibility in the mirror case as it only needs $\Sigma_B(t) + \Sigma_G(t)$ to hit the interval $[-f, f]$. In any case, we do not expect to see large good-good $\text{corr}(i, j)$ scores outside of random noise, nor large bad-bad correlations since they are mirroring/mimicking the distribution of good players. Because the mirror/mimic cases occur about equally often, the aggregate positive correlations between good and bad players in the mimic case and negative correlations between good and bad players in the mirror case cancel out. Thus, against the mirror-mimic adversary, tracking pairwise correlations *alone* seems insufficient to detect fraud.

σ -Correlation. When we attempt to flip a global coin, the good players are generally unaware of the adversarial direction $\sigma(t)$ ⁸ but we can ensure that $\sigma(t)$ eventually becomes known, and can estimate σ -correlation over the long term. In the context of Bracha-Agreement, $\sigma(t)$ should be defined as:

$$\sigma(t) = \begin{cases} -v^* & \text{if } A_{\text{keep}} \neq \emptyset \text{ keeps the majority value } v^* \in \{-1, 1\}, \\ 0 & \text{if } A_{\text{keep}} = \emptyset. \end{cases}$$

Define the σ -correlation score as:

$$\sigma\text{-corr}(i) = \langle \sigma, X_i \rangle = \sum_t \sigma(t)X_i(t).$$

Note that good players flip fair coins, so values of $\sigma\text{-corr}(i)$ that are inconsistent with random noise should indicate that i is corrupt. However, it is rather easy for the adversary to keep $\sigma\text{-corr}(i)$ scores close to zero for corrupt players as well. Regardless of $\text{sgn}(\Sigma_G(t))$, set $\Sigma_B(t) = -\Sigma_G(t)$, or at least put $\Sigma_B(t) + \Sigma_G(t)$ in the interval $[-f, f]$. One may easily verify that this strategy is consistent with mirror-mimic when $\text{sgn}(\Sigma_G(t)) = -\sigma(t)$, but that it prescribes exactly the *opposite* behavior when $\text{sgn}(\Sigma_G(t)) = \sigma(t)$! In fact,

⁸(if they all knew what it was, there would be no need to flip a coin)

there is no general strategy for setting $\Sigma_B(t)$ as a function of $\Sigma_G(t)$ and $\sigma(t)$ that keeps *all* $\text{corr}(i, j)$ and $\sigma\text{-corr}(i)$ scores close to zero.⁹

Tracking $\text{corr}(i, j)$ and $\sigma\text{-corr}(i)$ scores seems to be a winning combination, that will eventually let us blacklist individual players for having large $\sigma\text{-corr}(i)$ scores, or pairs of players for having large $-\text{corr}(i, j)$ scores. In the latter case, we are blacklisting good and bad players at the same rate, which is fine so long as good players retain their slim majority ($f + 1$ vs. f initially) among any set of $n - f = 2f + 1$ participating players.

A Scheduling Attack. There is a serious flaw in the reasoning above. Recall that $\sigma(t) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$, where $\sigma(t) = 0$ means that in **Bracha-Agreement**, the population $A_{\text{keep}} = \emptyset$ committed to keeping the true majority value v^* is empty. The value v^* is determined by the scheduling of messages in Line 2. Whether v^* becomes *known* to any particular player in Line 3 is generally at the discretion of the adversarial scheduler. Thus, in general the adversary can control whether $A_{\text{keep}} = \emptyset$, and hence whether $\sigma(t) = -v^*$ or 0. Moreover, because the protocol is asynchronous, it can even do so *after* BB_t is populated with coin flips.¹⁰

These observations give rise to the following attack. The adversary targets two good players i_0, i_1 . When **Coin-Flip** is initiated the adversary has two choices for $\sigma(t) \in \{-v^*, 0\}$ and can decide which late in the game. If $\text{sgn}(X_{i_0}(t)) = \text{sgn}(X_{i_1}(t)) = -v^*$, it sets $\sigma(t) = -v^*$; otherwise it sets $\sigma(t) = 0$. In general it makes sure $\Sigma_B(t) + \Sigma_G(t) \in [-f, f]$ so it can force roughly equal numbers of players to have **Coin-Flip** return -1 and 1 . Players i_0, i_1 will show unusually large σ -correlation and be blacklisted, and any other blacklisting (from negative correlations) will apply equally to good and bad players. At this point the *corrupt* players have now attained a slim majority, and are entirely content to let further blacklisting hurt good and bad players equally.

The problem here is that $\sigma(t)$ and $X_{i_0}(t)$ are *not* independent. In reality $\sigma(t)$ can be chosen maliciously *after* $X_{i_0}(t)$ is known.

A Finger on the Scale. The issue with the previous scheme is that the notions of $\sigma(t)$, the population A_{keep} , and even v^* are too indeterminate. On the other hand, if any good player p finds itself with $x_p \in [1, f]$, there is nothing indeterminate from p 's perspective about the fact that $\{p\} \subseteq A_{\text{keep}} \neq \emptyset$ or that $\sigma(t) = -v^*$. This leads to a natural question: why should p participate in the **Coin-Flip** protocol *as if it were ignorant of the desired outcome v^** ? Why not “put a finger on the scale” and just write v^* to every entry in column $\text{BB}_t(\cdot, p)$? (We would naturally refrain from judging such special columns according to statistical tests, e.g. deviations and correlations.)

The problem with this simple minded scheme is that if $|A_{\text{keep}}|$ is small, the adversary has the discretion to suppress or allow $p \in A_{\text{keep}}$ to write its column, or any prefix thereof. This allows for a mirror-mimic type attack, in which the sum of BB_t always lies in $[-f, f]$, and yet there are no negative correlations in aggregate between good players flipping fair coins and bad players.

2.3 Overview of the Protocol

To simplify the description of the coin-flipping problem, in [Section 2.1](#) we originally stated the adversary chooses $\sigma(t) = -v^*$, and has the goal to convince *one* player to believe the output of **Coin-Flip** is $\sigma(t)$. This is too conservative, and in fact makes the coin-flipping problem needlessly difficult.

Consider the sizes of the sets A_{keep} and A_{flip} . There are two relevant cases to consider:

Case $|A_{\text{keep}}| \in [0, f]$. When $A_{\text{keep}} \neq \emptyset$, $\sigma(t) = -v^*$ is defined, and it would be bad for the adversary if everyone agreed the output of **Coin-Flip** were v^* , i.e., $\text{sgn}(\Sigma^{(p)}) = v^*$ for all $p \in [n]$. In fact, it would be equally bad for the adversary if $\text{sgn}(\Sigma^{(p)}) = -v^*$ for all p . Since $A_{\text{flip}} \geq n - f$, the next iteration of **Bracha-Agreement** would end in agreement since now a supermajority of $n - f \geq (n + f + 1)/2$ holds

⁹When $\text{sgn}(\Sigma_G(t)) = -\sigma(t)$, the adversary is *forced* to set $\sigma(t)\Sigma_B(t) \geq -\sigma(t)\Sigma_G(t)$, increasing the aggregate σ -correlation of bad players and increasing the aggregate negative good-bad correlation. When $\text{sgn}(\Sigma_G(t)) = \sigma(t)$, the adversary can choose to reverse either of these trends and exacerbate the other, i.e., reduce good-bad negative correlations but increase bad σ -correlations, or reduce bad σ -correlations but increase good-bad negative correlations.

¹⁰One player p will be allowed to set $v_p = v^*$ in Line 3, and p will execute Line 4 slowly, either validating its own message among the first $n - f$ or not, at the discretion of the scheduler. In this way the scheduler decides if $A_{\text{keep}} = \{p\}$ or \emptyset .

the value $-v^*$. To summarize, when $|A_{\text{keep}}| \leq f$, it is *critical* for the adversary to create *disagreement* on the outcome of the global coin flip.

Case $|A_{\text{keep}}| \geq f + 1$. If this is the case, then some kind of “finger on the scale” strategy should force the outcome of the coin flip to be v^* . Any player that validates the state of $n - f$ players must necessarily validate the state of some $p \in A_{\text{keep}}$, and hence learn the value of v^* . If any player that knows v^* writes only v^* to its entries in the blackboard, this will surely be the outcome of the global coin flip.

In light of this dichotomy on the size of A_{keep} , we design a coin-flipping protocol that (i) forces all players to see the same outcome v^* whenever $|A_{\text{keep}}| \geq f + 1$ — thereby letting **Bracha-Agreement** terminate — or (ii) reverts to a more standard collective coin-flipping game in which the adversary is obligated to land the sum in the interval $[-f, f]$. Because of the certainty of the outcome in case (i) and the specific strategy forced upon the adversary in case (ii), fraud can now be detected by tracking just one statistic: the *weighted* correlation scores $\text{corr}(i, j)$ between all pairs of players.

3 A Protocol with Optimal Resilience

The protocol consists of $O(f)$ epochs. Each epoch consists of T iterations of **Bracha-Agreement**, the last step of which is to execute **Coin-Flip** (Algorithm 2). The t th execution of **Coin-Flip** constructs two blackboards BB_{2t-1} and BB_{2t} , where the odd blackboards have $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{m})$ rows and the even blackboards have m rows, for an $m \gg n$ to be determined. We write $n = (3 + \epsilon)f$, where we assume without loss of generality that $\epsilon \in [1/f, 1/2]$.

Each player i has a *weight* $w_i \in [0, 1]$, initially 1 and non-increasing over time. (The coin flips generated by player i will be weighted by w_i .) At the end of each epoch the weights of some players will be reduced, which one can think of as *fractional blacklisting*. Let $(w_{i,k})$ denote the weights used throughout epoch k , and (w_i) be the current weights if k is understood from context. We guarantee that **Invariant 1** is maintained, with high probability. Let G and B be the good and bad (Byzantine) players at a given point in time.

Invariant 1. *At all times,*

$$\sum_{i \in G} (1 - w_i) \leq \sum_{i \in B} (1 - w_i) + \epsilon^4 f.$$

Organization. In [Section 3.1](#) we explain how **Coin-Flip** is implemented using the **Iterated-Blackboard** protocol [[HPZ22](#)]. In [Section 3.2](#) we prove that if the adversary persistently manipulates the outcome of the **Coin-Flip** protocol, then there will be a detectable negative correlation between some bad player and some good player. In [Section 3.3](#) we give the procedure for reducing weights between epochs, and prove that it maintains **Invariant 1** with high probability. (The weight reduction routine uses the same fractional matching method as [[HPZ22](#)].) In [Section 3.4](#) we prove that agreement is reached after $O(f)$ epochs, with high probability.

3.1 Implementation of Coin-Flip

Consider the t th iteration of **Bracha-Agreement** and the t th execution of **Coin-Flip**. When each player p begins executing **Coin-Flip**, it has a value $v_p \in \{-1, 1, \perp\}$, where $v_p \in \{-1, 1\}$ indicates that $v_p = v^*$ is the majority value at [Line 3](#) of **Bracha-Agreement**, and $v_p = \perp$ indicates that p did not learn the majority value and will adopt the output of **Coin-Flip** as its value going into the next iteration of **Bracha-Agreement**.

Recall that x_p is the number of $v^* \in \{-1, 1\}$ messages validated by p in [Line 4](#) of **Bracha-Agreement** and A_{keep} is the set of all p such that $x_p \in [1, f]$ before executing **Coin-Flip**. The first stage of **Coin-Flip** is to populate a blackboard BB_{2t-1} that will help end the game quickly if $|A_{\text{keep}}| \geq f + 1$ and cause no harm if $|A_{\text{keep}}| \in [0, f]$. The contents of BB_{2t-1} are used to generate a *bias*. The second stage of **Coin-Flip** populates a blackboard BB_{2t} with random values in $\{-1, 1\}$. Let

$$\Sigma = \sum_{j,q} w_q \cdot \text{BB}_{2t}(j, q)$$

be the *weighted* sum of the contents of BB_{2t} (mapping \perp to 0). The output of Coin-Flip is $\text{sgn}(\text{bias} + \Sigma)$. Due to the scheduling power of the adversary, each player has a slightly different view of these two blackboards. Naturally p outputs $\text{sgn}(\text{bias}^{(p)} + \Sigma^{(p)})$, where a superscript of (p) in any variable indicates p 's opinion of its value.

Algorithm 2 Coin-Flip() *from the perspective of player p*

Require: $v_p \in \{v^*, \perp\}$, $v^* \in \{-1, 1\}$, and $t \geq 1$ is current iteration of Bracha-Agreement.

1: **Stage 1:**

2: Reliable-Broadcast v_p and wait for $n - f$ messages to be validated from some set S_p of players.

3: $\text{val}_p \leftarrow \begin{cases} v^* & \text{if } v_q = v^* \text{ for some } q \in S_p, \\ 0 & \text{if } v_q = \perp \text{ for all } q \in S_p. \end{cases}$

4: Construct BB_{2t-1} , writing val_p to every cell in column p .

5: **Stage 2:**

6: Construct BB_{2t} , writing independent coin flips in $\{-1, 1\}$ to cells in column p .

7: $\text{bias}^{(p)} \leftarrow \sum_{j,q} \text{BB}_{2t-1}^{(p,2t)}(j, q)$ ▷ Substitute $\perp = 0$

8: $\Sigma^{(p)} \leftarrow \sum_{j,q} w_q \cdot \text{BB}_{2t}^{(p,2t)}(j, q)$ ▷ Substitute $\perp = 0$

9: **return** $(\text{sgn}(\text{bias}^{(p)} + \Sigma^{(p)}))$

The even and odd blackboards BB_{2t} and BB_{2t-1} have the following number of rows

$$\begin{aligned} m(2t) &= m, \\ m(2t-1) &= m_0 = \sqrt{m \cdot c \ln n}. \end{aligned}$$

Here c is a parameter, and *with high probability* means an event holds with probability $1 - n^{-\Omega(c)}$.

Lemma 2. *If $|A_{\text{keep}}| \geq f + 1$ then $v^* \cdot \text{bias} > (n - f)m_0 > \frac{2}{3}n\sqrt{m \cdot c \ln n}$. If $|A_{\text{keep}}| = 0$ then $\text{bias} = 0$. If $|A_{\text{keep}}| \in [1, f]$ then $v^* \cdot \text{bias} \in [0, nm_0]$, and can be selected by the adversary.*

Proof. If $|A_{\text{keep}}| \geq f + 1$ then for every player p , there exists a $q \in S_p$ with $q \in A_{\text{keep}}$ and $v_q = v^*$, hence $\text{val}_p = v^*$. By [Theorem 1](#), the number of values written to BB_{2t-1} is at least $(n - f)m_0$. and hence $v^* \cdot \text{bias} \geq (n - f)m_0 > \frac{2}{3}n\sqrt{m \cdot c \ln n}$.

If $|A_{\text{keep}}| = 0$ then every player will set $\text{val}_p = 0$ hence $\text{bias} = 0$. □

In the second stage of Coin-Flip, the players will populate BB_{2t} with coin flips in $\{-1, 1\}$. Redefine $X_i(t)$ be the sum of all non- \perp entries in column $\text{BB}_{2t}(\cdot, i)$. By Chernoff bounds, if i is uncorrupted then $|X_i(t)| \leq X_{\max}$ with high probability, where

$$X_{\max} = m_0 = \sqrt{m \cdot c \ln n}.$$

We will force $|X_i(t)| \leq X_{\max}$ to hold with probability 1 by rounding $X_i(t)$ to $\pm X_{\max}$ if it lies outside $[-X_{\max}, X_{\max}]$.

Lemma 3. *If $|A_{\text{keep}}| \geq f + 1$, the output of Coin-Flip will be v^* for all players, with high probability.*

Proof. By [Lemma 2](#), $|\text{bias}| \geq (n - f)m_0 > \frac{2}{3}n\sqrt{m \cdot c \ln n}$. The number of good coin flips in BB_{2t} is between $m(n - 2f)$ and mn , which we model as a martingale with an optional stopping time controlled by the adversary. By Azuma's inequality, the sum of all $\Theta(mn)$ good coin flips is $\sqrt{mn \cdot c \ln n}$ in absolute value, with high probability. Due to the X_{\max} ceiling, the contribution of corrupt players to the sum is at most $fX_{\max} < \frac{1}{3}n\sqrt{m \cdot c \ln n}$ in absolute value. Since $\frac{1}{3}n\sqrt{m \cdot c \ln n} + \tilde{O}(\sqrt{mn}) + f < \frac{2}{3}n\sqrt{m \cdot c \ln n}$, the contribution of corrupt and non-corrupt players will be much smaller than bias, with high probability, and $\text{sgn}(\text{bias}^{(p)} + \Sigma^{(p)}) = v^*$ for all p . □

Lemma 4. *If $|A_{\text{keep}}| \leq f$, and for some player p , $\text{bias}^{(p)} + \Sigma^{(p)} \notin [-f, f]$, all players will **decide** the value $\text{sgn}(\text{bias}^{(p)} + \Sigma^{(p)})$ by the next iteration of Bracha-Agreement.*

Proof. By [Theorem 1](#), two players p and q disagree in at most f locations in BB_{2t-1} and BB_{2t} . Since the absolute value of any cell in either matrix is at most 1, if $\text{bias}^{(p)} + \Sigma^{(p)} \notin [-f, f]$ then for any p, q , $\text{sgn}(\text{bias}^{(p)} + \Sigma^{(p)}) = \text{sgn}(\text{bias}^{(q)} + \Sigma^{(q)})$. Thus, at the end of this iteration of Bracha-Agreement, at least $|\mathcal{A}_{\text{flip}}| \geq n - f \geq (n + f + 1)/2$ players will hold a supermajority and reach agreement in the next iteration of Bracha-Agreement. \square

3.2 Negative Correlations

Hereafter $t \in [T]$ refers to the iteration index within the current epoch k , and $(w_i) = (w_{i,k})$ is the current weight vector used in epoch k . In each epoch we track weighted pairwise correlations, defined as:

$$\text{corr}(i, j) = \langle w_i X_i, w_j X_j \rangle = w_i w_j \sum_{t \in [T]} X_i(t) X_j(t).$$

Recall that $n = (3 + \epsilon)f$, $\epsilon \in [1/f, 1/2]$, and G, B are the good and bad players.

Lemma 5. *Suppose the weight vector $(w_i)_{i \in [n]}$ used in an epoch satisfies [Invariant 1](#), but Bracha-Agreement fails to reach agreement within the epoch. Let $m = \Omega(n \ln n / \epsilon^4)$ and $T = \Omega(n^2 \ln^3 n / \epsilon^4)$. Then, with high probability,*

1. Every pair of distinct $i, j \in G$ has $-\text{corr}(i, j) \leq w_i w_j \beta$, where $\beta = m \sqrt{T(c \ln n)^3}$.
2. If the adversary does not corrupt any new players during the epoch, then

$$\sum_{(i,j) \in G \times B} \max\{0, -\text{corr}(i, j) - w_i w_j \beta\} \geq \frac{1}{8} \epsilon^2 f m T.$$

Proof of Part 1. Fix an iteration $t \in [T]$. If $i \in G$, let $\delta_{t,r}^i \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ be the outcome of i 's r th coin flip in iteration t , where 0 indicates the coin was never flipped. For any $r, s \geq 1$ and $i, j \in G$, $\mathbf{E}[\delta_{t,r}^i \delta_{t,s}^j] = 0$ since each of $\delta_{t,r}^i, \delta_{t,s}^j$ is either 0 or a fair coin flip independent of the other. By linearity of expectation this implies $\mathbf{E}[X_i(t) X_j(t)] = 0$ as well.

Consider the martingale $(S_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$, where $S_0 = 0$ and $S_t = S_{t-1} + X_i(t) X_j(t)$. For any t , $|S_t - S_{t-1}| \leq X_{\max}^2$. By Azuma's inequality, $|S_T| \leq X_{\max}^2 \sqrt{T \cdot c \ln n} = m \sqrt{T(c \ln n)^3}$ with high probability. Therefore, by a union bound, for every pair of distinct $i, j \in G$, $-\text{corr}(i, j) \leq w_i w_j m \sqrt{T(c \ln n)^3} = w_i w_j \beta$ with high probability. \square

Part 2 of [Lemma 5](#) will be proved following [Lemmas 6–10](#). It only applies to epochs in which the adversary corrupts no one, so we shall assume that G, B are stable throughout the epoch.

In the Coin-Flip algorithm, the construction of BB_{2t-1} *logically* precedes the construction of BB_{2t} , but because of asynchrony some of the contents of BB_{2t-1} may actually depend on the coin flips written to BB_{2t} .¹¹ We eliminate these mild dependencies as follows. Suppose that \hat{p} is the *first* player in G to fix its historical view $\text{BB}^{(\hat{p}, 2t-1)}$. At this moment, define $\overline{\text{bias}}(t)$ as

$$\overline{\text{bias}}(t) = \sum_{j, q} \text{BB}_{2t-1}^{(\hat{p}, 2t-1)}(j, q) \quad (\text{Treating } \perp \text{ as } 0)$$

Write $\Sigma(t) = \Sigma_G(t) + \Sigma_B(t)$, where $\Sigma_G(t)$ and $\Sigma_B(t)$ are the sum of coin flips of the good and bad players, respectively.

Lemma 6. *In any iteration t ,*

1. For any player q , $|\overline{\text{bias}}(t) - \text{bias}^{(q)}(t)| \leq f$.
2. $\mathbf{E}[\overline{\text{bias}}(t) \Sigma_G(t)] = 0$.

¹¹The construction of BB_{2t} can proceed as soon as $n - f$ players are finished with BB_{2t-1} . Thus, a group of f slow and corrupt players can choose whether to perform their last write in BB_{2t-1} based on the contents of BB_{2t} .

3. If Bracha-Agreement does not terminate by iteration $t + 1$, then

$$-\Sigma_G(t)\Sigma_B(t) \geq \Sigma_G(t)^2 + \overline{\text{bias}}(t)\Sigma_G(t) - 2f|\Sigma_G(t)|.$$

Proof. Part 1. By [Theorem 1](#), $\text{BB}_{2t-1}^{(p,2t-1)}$ and $\text{BB}_{2t-1}^{(q,t')}$ disagree in at most f cells, for any $q \in [n]$ and $t' \geq 2t - 1$, hence $|\overline{\text{bias}}(t) - \text{bias}^{(q)}(t)| \leq f$. *Part 2.* By definition, $\overline{\text{bias}}(t)$ is fixed before any good players have written anything to BB_{2t} . Thus $\mathbf{E}[\overline{\text{bias}}(t)\Sigma_G(t)] = \overline{\text{bias}}(t) \cdot \mathbf{E}[\Sigma_G(t)] = 0$. *Part 3.* By [Lemma 4](#), if the adversary avoids termination then $\text{sgn}(\text{bias}^{(p)}(t) + \Sigma^{(p)}(t)) \neq \text{sgn}(\text{bias}^{(q)}(t) + \Sigma^{(q)}(t))$ for two players p, q . Since $|\overline{\text{bias}}(t) - \text{bias}^{(p)}(t)| \leq f$ and $|\Sigma(t) - \Sigma^{(p)}(t)| \leq f$, it follows from $\Sigma(t) = \Sigma_G(t) + \Sigma_B(t)$ that

$$-2f \leq \overline{\text{bias}}(t) + \Sigma_G(t) + \Sigma_B(t) \leq 2f.$$

Rearranging terms, we have both

$$-\Sigma_B(t) \geq -2f + \overline{\text{bias}}(t) + \Sigma_G(t)$$

and

$$\Sigma_B(t) \geq -2f - \overline{\text{bias}}(t) - \Sigma_G(t).$$

Depending on $\text{sgn}(\Sigma_G(t))$, we multiply the first inequality by $\Sigma_G(t) \geq 0$ or the second by $-\Sigma_G(t) \geq 0$, which implies the following.

$$-\Sigma_G(t)\Sigma_B(t) \geq \Sigma_G(t)^2 + \overline{\text{bias}}(t)\Sigma_G(t) - 2f|\Sigma_G(t)|. \quad (1)$$

□

Since $\mathbf{Var}(|\Sigma_G(t)|) = \mathbf{E}[\Sigma_G(t)^2] - \mathbf{E}[|\Sigma_G(t)|]^2 \geq 0$, $\mathbf{E}[|\Sigma_G(t)|] \leq \sqrt{\mathbf{E}[\Sigma_G(t)^2]}$. Lemmas [7–10](#) analyze the terms of [\(1\)](#).

Lemma 7. For any $\hat{G} \subseteq G$ with $|\hat{G}| = n - 2f = (1 + \epsilon)f$, $\sum_{i \in \hat{G}} w_i^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^2 f$.

Proof. We compute:

$$\sum_{i \in \hat{G}} w_i = |\hat{G}| - \sum_{i \in \hat{G}} (1 - w_i) \geq |\hat{G}| - \sum_{i \in B} (1 - w_i) - \epsilon^4 f \geq |\hat{G}| - (1 + \epsilon^4) f = (\epsilon - \epsilon^4) f \geq \frac{7\epsilon}{8} f.$$

The first inequality follows from [Invariant 1](#) and the fact that the total weight deduction of \hat{G} is at most that of G . The second inequality follows from $w_i \in [0, 1]$, so the total weight deduction of B is at most f . The equality follows from $|\hat{G}| = n - 2f = (1 + \epsilon)f$. Finally, the last inequality follows from the assumption that $\epsilon \leq 1/2$. Consequently:

$$\sum_{i \in \hat{G}} w_i^2 = |\hat{G}| \sum_{i \in \hat{G}} w_i \frac{1}{|\hat{G}|} \geq |\hat{G}| \left(\sum_{i \in \hat{G}} w_i \frac{1}{|\hat{G}|} \right)^2 \geq |\hat{G}| \left(\frac{7\epsilon}{8(1 + \epsilon)} \right)^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^2 f,$$

where the first inequality is Jensen's inequality, the middle inequality is from above, and the last inequality follows from $|\hat{G}| = (1 + \epsilon)f$ and the assumption $\epsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}$. □

Lemma 8 (Cf. [\[HPZ22\]](#)). No matter how the coin flips of G are scheduled in iteration t , $\mathbf{E}[\Sigma_G(t)^2] \geq \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^2 m f$.

Proof. The good players write between $m(n - 2f)$ and mn coin flips to BB_{2t} , at the adversary's discretion. For $r \in [0, 2mf]$, let S_r be the sum of the first $m(n - 2f) + r$ coin flips generated by the good players. Then $\mathbf{E}[\Sigma_G(t)^2] = \mathbf{E}[S_{2fm}^2]$, which we claim is at least $\mathbf{E}[S_0]$. In general $S_r = S_{r-1} + w_i \delta_r$, where $\delta_r \in \{-1, 1\}$ if the adversary lets player i flip the next coin and $\delta_r = 0$ if the adversary chooses to stop allowing coin flips. If $\delta_r = 0$ then $S_r = S_{r-1}$ and if $\delta_r \in \{-1, 1\}$ then

$$S_r^2 = \begin{cases} (S_{r-1} + w_i)^2 = S_{r-1}^2 + 2w_i S_{r-1} + w_i^2 & \text{with probability } \frac{1}{2}, \\ (S_{r-1} - w_i)^2 = S_{r-1}^2 - 2w_i S_{r-1} + w_i^2 & \text{with probability } \frac{1}{2}. \end{cases}$$

Thus, $\mathbf{E}[S_r^2 \mid \delta_r \neq 0] = S_{r-1}^2 + w_i^2 > S_{r-1}^2$, and in general, $\mathbf{E}[S_r^2] \geq \mathbf{E}[S_{r-1}^2] \geq \mathbf{E}[S_0^2]$. Thus, the adversarial strategy minimizing $\Sigma_G(t)^2$ is to allow as few coin flips as possible, and from those $n - 2f$ players \hat{G} with the smallest weights. By [Lemma 7](#) we have

$$\mathbf{E}[S_0^2] \geq m \sum_{i \in \hat{G}} w_i^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^2 m f.$$

□

Lemma 9 (Cf. [\[HPZ22\]](#)). *With high probability, $\sum_{t \in [T]} \Sigma_G(t)^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^2 m f T - mn \sqrt{T(c \ln n)^3}$.*

Proof. Consider the sequence $(A_t)_{t \in [T]}$, where $A_0 = 0$, $A_t = A_{t-1} + \Sigma_G(t)^2 - \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^2 m f$. By [Lemma 8](#), $\mathbf{E}[\Sigma_G(t)^2] \geq \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^2 m f$, so $(A_t)_t$ is a submartingale. Since $\Sigma_G(t)$ is a sum of at most mn coin flips, $|A_t - A_{t-1}| = \Sigma_G(t)^2 \leq mn \cdot c \ln n$ with high probability. By Azuma's inequality, with high probability, $A_T \geq -(mn c \ln n) \sqrt{T c \ln n}$ and

$$\sum_{t \in [T]} \Sigma_G(t)^2 = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^2 m f T + A_T \geq \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^2 m f T - mn \sqrt{T(c \ln n)^3}.$$

□

Lemma 10. *With high probability, $\sum_{t \in [T]} \overline{\text{bias}(t)} \Sigma_G(t) \leq mn \sqrt{nT(c \ln n)^3}$.*

Proof. By [Lemma 6](#), $\mathbf{E}[\overline{\text{bias}(t)} \Sigma_G(t)] = 0$ and hence the sequence $(A_t)_{t \in [T]}$ is a martingale, where $A_0 = 0$ and $A_t = A_{t-1} + \overline{\text{bias}(t)} \Sigma_G(t)$. With high probability $|\Sigma_G(t)| \leq \sqrt{mn(c \ln n)}$ and $\overline{\text{bias}(t)} \leq nm_0 = n \sqrt{m(c \ln n)}$, hence by Azuma's inequality, $\sum_{t \in [T]} \overline{\text{bias}(t)} \Sigma_G(t) \leq mn \sqrt{nT(c \ln n)^3}$ with high probability. □

We are now equipped to prove the second part of [Lemma 5](#).

Proof of Part 2 of Lemma 5. Recall G, B are the sets of good and bad players, which, by assumption, do not change during the epoch.

$$\begin{aligned} - \sum_{(i,j) \in G \times B} \text{corr}(i,j) &= - \sum_{t \in [T]} \Sigma_G(t) \Sigma_B(t) \\ &\geq \sum_{t \in [T]} (\Sigma_G(t)^2 - 2f |\Sigma_G(t)| + \overline{\text{bias}(t)} \Sigma_G(t)) && \text{(Lemma 6)} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^2 m f T - \tilde{O}(mn \sqrt{T}) - 2f \tilde{O}(\sqrt{mn} T) - \tilde{O}(mn \sqrt{nT}) \quad (\text{W.h.p., by Lemmas 9, 10}) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2} \epsilon^2 - \tilde{O}\left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{m}}\right) \right) m f T - \tilde{O}(mn \sqrt{nT}) \\ &\geq \left(\frac{1}{2} \epsilon^2 - o(\epsilon^2) \right) m f T - \tilde{O}(mn \sqrt{nT}) \quad (\text{whenever } m = \Omega(n \ln n / \epsilon^4)) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4} \epsilon^2 f m T \quad (\text{whenever } T = \Omega(n \ln^3 n / \epsilon^4)) \end{aligned}$$

Finally, since $\max\{0, -\text{corr}(i,j) - w_i w_j \beta\} \geq -\text{corr}(i,j) - w_i w_j \beta$, [Lemma 5\(2\)](#) follows from the above inequality and the fact that

$$\sum_{(i,j) \in G \times B} w_i w_j \beta \leq |G| \cdot |B| \cdot \beta \leq n f \cdot \tilde{O}(m \sqrt{T}) \leq \frac{1}{8} \epsilon^2 f m T$$

holds whenever $T = \Omega(n^2 \ln^3 n / \epsilon^4)$. □

3.3 Blacklisting via Fractional Matching

When the T iterations of epoch k are complete, we reduce the weight vector (w_i) in preparation for epoch $k+1$. According to [Lemma 5](#), if a correlation score $-\text{corr}(i, j)$ is too large, $B \cap \{i, j\} \neq \emptyset$ w.h.p., so reducing *both* i and j 's weights by the *same* amount preserves [Invariant 1](#). With this end in mind, [Weight-Update \(Algorithm 3\)](#) constructs a complete, vertex- and edge-capacitated graph H on $[n]$, finds a fractional maximal matching μ in H , then docks the weights of i and j by $\mu(i, j)$, for each edge (i, j) . This is essentially the same as the blacklisting routine of [\[HPZ22\]](#), except we are paying attention to large *negative* correlations instead of large positive correlations and individual deviations.

Definition 1 (Fractional Maximal Matching). Let $H = (V, E, c_V, c_E)$ be a graph where $c_V : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ are vertex capacities and $c_E : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ are edge capacities. A function $\mu : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is a *feasible fractional matching* if $\mu(i, j) \leq c_E(i, j)$ and $\sum_j \mu(i, j) \leq c_V(i)$. It is *maximal* if it is not strictly dominated by any feasible μ' .

Rounding Weights Down. At the end of epoch k , player p generates a local weight vector $(w_{i,k+1}^{(p)})_{i \in [n]}$, which is a function of $(w_{i,k})_{i \in [n]}$ and its historical view $\text{BB}^{(p, 2kT)}$. (There are $2T$ blackboards in each epoch.) The consensus weight vector $(w_{i,k+1})_{i \in [n]}$ is obtained by everyone adopting the weight of i according to player i 's local view, and rounding down if it is too close to zero.

$$w_{i,k+1} = \begin{cases} w_{i,k+1}^{(i)} & \text{if } w_{i,k+1}^{(i)} > w_{\min} = \frac{\sqrt{n}}{T}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Recall from [Theorem 1](#) that if i writes anything to any blackboard in epoch $k+1$, that every player can deduce what its view $\text{BB}^{(i, 2kT)}$ looked like at the end of epoch k , and hence what $w_{i,k+1}^{(i)}$ and $w_{i,k+1}$ are. By ensuring that all participating players use exactly the *same* weight function, we eliminate one source of potential numerical disagreement.

We will see that the maximum pointwise disagreement in the local weight vectors $|w_{i,k+1}^{(p)} - w_{i,k+1}^{(q)}|$ is at most w_{\min} . As a consequence, if any p thinks that $w_{i,k+1}^{(p)} = 0$ then all players will agree that $w_{i,k+1} = 0$.

Excess Graph. The *excess correlation graph* $H = (V, E, c_V, c_E)$ used in [Algorithm 3](#) is a complete undirected graph on $V = [n]$, capacitated as follows:

$$c_V(i) = w_i, \\ c_E(i, j) = \frac{8}{\epsilon^2 f m T} \cdot \max\{0, \text{corr}(i, j) - w_i w_j \beta\},$$

where β is the quantity from [Lemma 5](#). By Part 1 of [Lemma 5](#), $c_E(i, j) = 0$ whenever both i and j are good.

The [Weight-Update](#) algorithm from the perspective of player p is presented in [Algorithm 3](#). We want to ensure that the fractional matchings computed by good players are numerically very close to each other, and for this reason, we use a specific maximal matching algorithm called [Rising-Tide \(Algorithm 4\)](#) that has a continuous Lipschitz property [\[HPZ22, Lemma 13\]](#), i.e., bounded perturbations to its input yield bounded perturbations to its output. Other natural maximal matching algorithms such as *greedy* do not have this property.

3.3.1 Rising Tide Algorithm

The [Rising-Tide](#) algorithm initializes $\mu = 0$ and simply simulates the continuous process of increasing all $\mu(i, j)$ -values in lockstep, so long as i , j , and (i, j) are not saturated. At the moment one becomes saturated, $\mu(i, j)$ is frozen at its current value.

Recall that $c_V(i)$ is initialized to be the old weight $w_{i,k}$ and the new weight in p 's local view is set to $w_{i,k+1}^{(p)} = c_V(i) - \sum_j \mu_k^{(p)}(i, j)$. We are mainly interested in differences in the new weight vector computed by players that begin with slightly different graphs $H^{(p)}, H^{(q)}$. [Lemma 11 \[HPZ22\]](#) bounds the distance between outputs in terms of the distance between inputs.

Algorithm 3 Weight-Update *from the perspective of player p .*

Output: Weights $(w_{i,k})_{i \in [n], k \geq 0}$ where $w_{i,k}$ refers to the weight w_i after processing epoch $k - 1$, and is used throughout epoch k .

- 1: Set $w_{i,1} \leftarrow 1$ for all i . ▷ All weights are 1 in epoch 1.
- 2: **for** epoch $k = 1, 2, \dots, K_{\max}$ **do** ▷ $K_{\max} =$ last epoch
- 3: Execute T iterations of Bracha-Agreement, using weights $(w_{i,k})$ in Coin-Flip. Let $\text{corr}^{(p)}$ be the resulting correlation scores known to p . Construct the excess correlation graph $H_k^{(p)}$ with capacities:

$$c_V(i) = w_{i,k},$$

$$c_E^{(p)}(i, j) = \frac{8}{\epsilon^2 f m T} \cdot \max \left\{ 0, \text{corr}^{(p)}(i, j) - w_{i,k} w_{j,k} \beta \right\}.$$

- 4: $\mu_k^{(p)} \leftarrow \text{Rising-Tide}(H_k^{(p)})$ ▷ A maximal fractional matching
- 5: For each i , once $w_{i,k}$ is known, set

$$w_{i,k+1}^{(p)} \leftarrow w_{i,k} - \sum_j \mu_k^{(p)}(i, j).$$

- 6: Once the vector $(w_{j,k+1}^{(i)})_{j \in [n]}$ is known for $i \in [n]$, set

$$w_{i,k+1} = \begin{cases} w_{i,k+1}^{(i)} & \text{if } w_{i,k+1}^{(i)} > w_{\min} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\sqrt{n}}{T}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Lemma 11 ([HPZ22, Lemma 13]). *Let $H^{(p)} = (V, E, c_V^{(p)}, c_E^{(p)})$ and $H^{(q)} = (V, E, c_V^{(q)}, c_E^{(q)})$ be two capacitated graphs, which differ by $\eta_E = \sum_{i,j} |c_E^{(p)}(i, j) - c_E^{(q)}(i, j)|$ in their edge capacities and $\eta_V = \sum_i |c_V^{(p)}(i) - c_V^{(q)}(i)|$ in their vertex capacities. Let $\mu^{(p)}$ and $\mu^{(q)}$ be the fractional matchings computed by Rising-Tide (Algorithm 4). Then:*

$$\sum_i \left| \left(c_V^{(p)}(i) - \sum_j \mu^{(p)}(i, j) \right) - \left(c_V^{(q)}(i) - \sum_j \mu^{(q)}(i, j) \right) \right| \leq \eta_V + 2\eta_E.$$

3.4 Error Accumulation and Reaching Agreement

The maximum number of epochs is $K_{\max} = 3f$. Let $k \in [1, K_{\max}]$ be the index of the current epoch, and let $(w_{i,k})$ be the weights that were used in the execution of Coin-Flip during epoch k . Upon completing epoch k , each player p applies Algorithm 3 to update the consensus weight vector $(w_{i,k})_{i \in [n]}$ to produce a local weight vector $(w_{i,k+1}^{(p)})_{i \in [n]}$, and then the consensus weight vector $(w_{i,k+1})_{i \in [n]}$ used throughout epoch $k + 1$.

Lemma 12 (Maintaining Invariant 1). *Suppose for some $\epsilon > 0$ that $n = (3 + \epsilon)f$, $m = \Omega(n \ln n / \epsilon^4)$, and $T = \Omega(n^2 \ln^3 n / \epsilon^4)$. At any point in epoch $k \in [1, K_{\max}]$, with high probability,*

$$\sum_{i \in G} (1 - w_{i,k}) \leq \sum_{i \in B} (1 - w_{i,k}) + \frac{\epsilon^4}{\sqrt{n \ln^6 n}} \cdot (k - 1).$$

Proof. By induction on k . For the base case $k = 1$ all the weights are 1 so the claim clearly holds. Now suppose the claim holds for k and consider $k + 1$. Fix any good player p . A consequence of Part 1 of Lemma 5 is that with high probability, player p 's view of the weight vector, $(w_{i,k+1}^{(p)})$, is derived from $(w_{i,k})$ by deducting at least as much weight from bad players as from good players. By the inductive hypothesis,

$$\sum_{i \in G} (1 - w_{i,k+1}^{(p)}) \leq \sum_{i \in B} (1 - w_{i,k+1}^{(p)}) + \frac{\epsilon^4}{\sqrt{n \ln^6 n}} \cdot (k - 1).$$

Algorithm 4 Rising-Tide($H = (V, E, c_V, c_E)$)

- 1: $E' \leftarrow \{(i, j) \in E \mid c_E(i, j) > 0\}$.
 - 2: $\mu(i, j) \leftarrow 0$ for all $i, j \in V$.
 - 3: **while** $E' \neq \emptyset$ **do**
 - 4: Let $\mu_{E'}(i, j) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (i, j) \in E' \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$.
 - 5: Choose maximum $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\mu' = \mu + \epsilon\mu_{E'}$ is a feasible fractional matching.
 - 6: Set $\mu \leftarrow \mu'$.
 - 7: $E' \leftarrow E' - \{(i, j) \mid i \text{ or } j \text{ or } (i, j) \text{ is saturated}\}$ $\triangleright \mu(i, j)$ cannot increase
 - 8: **return** μ .
-

Subsequently, player p derives the consensus weight vector $(w_{i,k+1})$ from $(w_{i,k+1}^{(q)})_{q \in [n], i \in [n]}$ by setting $w_{i,k+1} = w_{i,k+1}^{(i)}$, rounding the value down to 0 if it is at most w_{\min} . Therefore,

$$\sum_{i \in G} (1 - w_{i,k+1}) \leq \sum_{i \in B} (1 - w_{i,k+1}) + \frac{\epsilon^4}{\sqrt{n \ln^6 n}} \cdot (k-1) + \sum_{i \in [n]} |w_{i,k+1}^{(p)} - w_{i,k+1}^{(i)}| + w_{\min} n_0,$$

where n_0 is the number of players whose weight is rounded down to 0 after epoch k .

Hence, it suffices to show that $\sum_{i \in [n]} |w_{i,k}^{(p)} - w_{i,k}^{(i)}| + w_{\min} n_0 \leq \epsilon^4 / \sqrt{n \ln^6 n}$. By [Lemma 11](#), the computed weight difference between player p and any player q can be bounded by twice the sum of all edge capacity differences (η_E), since they agree on the vertex capacities ($\eta_V = 0$).¹² According to [Algorithm 3](#), the edge capacities differ due to underlying disagreement on the $\text{corr}(i, j)$ values. Thus,

$$|w_{q,k+1}^{(p)} - w_{q,k+1}^{(q)}| \leq 2\eta_E \leq 2 \cdot \frac{8}{\epsilon^2 f m T} \sum_{i \neq j} \left| \text{corr}^{(p)}(i, j) - \text{corr}^{(q)}(i, j) \right|. \quad (2)$$

By [Theorem 1](#), two players may only disagree in up to f cells of the blackboards

$$(\text{BB}_{2(k-1)T+2}, \text{BB}_{2(k-1)T+4}, \dots, \text{BB}_{2kT}),$$

i.e., those used to compute corr -values in epoch k . Since the sum of each column in each blackboard is bounded by X_{\max} , $|X_i^{(p)}(t)X_j^{(p)}(t) - X_i^{(q)}(t)X_j^{(q)}(t)| \leq 2X_{\max}$. Each of the f cells that p and q disagree about affects $n-1$ corr -values. Therefore, the right hand side of (2) is upper bounded by:

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq 2 \cdot \frac{8}{\epsilon^2 f m T} \cdot n f \cdot 2X_{\max} \\ &\leq \frac{32nX_{\max}}{\epsilon^2 m T} \\ &\leq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{T} \quad (m = \Omega(n \ln n / \epsilon^4) \text{ and } X_{\max} = \Theta(\sqrt{m \ln n})) \\ &= w_{\min} \end{aligned}$$

Now the inductive step for $k+1$ holds by noticing that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in [n]} |w_{i,k+1}^{(p)} - w_{i,k+1}^{(i)}| + w_{\min} n_0 &\leq 2w_{\min} n \\ &\leq \frac{\epsilon^4}{n^{3/2} \ln^3 n} \cdot n \quad (T = \Omega(n^2 \ln^3 n / \epsilon^4)) \\ &= \frac{\epsilon^4}{\sqrt{n \ln^6 n}}. \end{aligned}$$

¹²Strictly speaking one player can know $c_V(i)$ and another player may be ignorant of it, but in this case all the edges incident to i have capacity zero. This situation is indistinguishable from all players knowing and agreeing on c_V .

Since $k \leq K_{\max} = 3f$, we conclude that [Invariant 1](#) holds in every epoch, with high probability. That is, if $(w_i), G, B$ are the weight vector, good players, and bad players at any point in time, then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in G} (1 - w_i) &\leq \sum_{i \in B} (1 - w_i) + \frac{\epsilon^4}{\sqrt{n \ln^6 n}} \cdot K_{\max} \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in B} (1 - w_i) + \epsilon^4 f. \end{aligned} \quad (\sqrt{n \ln^6 n} \geq 3)$$

□

The next observation and [Lemma 13](#) shows that the weight of every bad player becomes 0 after running K_{\max} epochs of [Weight-Updates](#) without reaching agreement.

Observation 1. For any i and k , if there exists a player p such that $w_{i,k}^{(p)} = 0$, then $w_{i,k} = 0$.

Proof. In the proof of [Lemma 12](#) it was shown that $|w_{i,k}^{(p)} - w_{i,k}^{(i)}| \leq \sqrt{n}/T = w_{\min}$, hence if $w_{i,k}^{(p)} = 0$, $w_{i,k}^{(i)} \leq w_{\min}$ and $w_{i,k}$ is rounded down to 0. See [Algorithm 3](#). □

Lemma 13. If agreement has not been reached after $K_{\max} = 3f$ epochs, then with high probability, there are f bad players with weight 0.

Proof. There are at most f epochs in which the adversary corrupts at least one player. We argue below that for all other epochs, in the call to [Weight-Update](#), the sum of the capacities of edges with at least one endpoint in B is at least 1. This implies that in each iteration of [Weight-Update](#), either some $i \in B$ with $c_V(i) = w_i > w_{\min}$ becomes saturated (and thereafter $w_i = 0$ by [Observation 1](#)), or the total weight of all players in B drops by at least 1. Each of these cases also occurs at most f times, hence $K_{\max} = 3f$ epochs suffice to push the weight of f bad players to zero, with high probability.

We now prove that the sum of the capacities of edges with at least one endpoint in B is at least 1.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{(i,j) \in [n] \times B} c_E(i,j) &= \frac{8}{\epsilon^2 f m T} \sum_{(i,j) \in [n] \times B} \max\{0, \text{corr}(i,j) - w_{i,k} w_{j,k} \beta\} \\ &\geq \frac{8}{\epsilon^2 f m T} \sum_{(i,j) \in G \times B} \max\{0, \text{corr}(i,j) - w_{i,k} w_{j,k} \beta\} \\ &\geq \frac{8}{\epsilon^2 f m T} \left(\frac{1}{8} \epsilon^2 f m T \right) \quad (\text{by Lemma 5(2)}) \\ &= 1. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Lemma 14. Suppose [Invariant 1](#) holds in an epoch in which bad players have zero weight. With high probability, [Bracha-Agreement](#) terminates with agreement in this epoch.

Proof. The proof of [Lemma 5\(2\)](#) states that with high probability, $-\sum_{(i,j) \in G \times B} \text{corr}(i,j) \geq \frac{1}{4} \epsilon^2 f m T > 0$ in any epoch in which [Bracha-Agreement](#) fails to reach agreement. On the other hand, by assumption $-\sum_{(i,j) \in G \times B} \text{corr}(i,j) = 0$. Thus, with high probability [Bracha-Agreement](#) reaches agreement in this epoch. □

Remark 1. Assuming the preconditions of [Lemma 14](#), only good players participate and flip fair coins. Nonetheless, the output of [Coin-Flip](#) need not be close to unbiased. The scheduling power of the adversary is still strong enough to heavily bias the outcome of the coin flip or create disagreement on the outcome. More careful calculations show the probability of an unambiguous -1 or unambiguous $+1$ outcome are each $\Omega(1/\sqrt{n})$. This occurs when $f + 1$ good players have total weight about 1 and the remaining f good players each have weight 1.

Theorem 15. Suppose $n = (3 + \epsilon)f$ where $\epsilon > 0$, $m = \Theta(n \ln n / \epsilon^4)$, and $T = \Theta(n^2 \ln^3 n / \epsilon^4)$. Using the implementation of [Coin-Flip](#) from [Section 3.1](#), [Bracha-Agreement](#) solves Byzantine agreement with probability 1 in the full information, asynchronous model against an adaptive adversary. In expectation the total latency is $\tilde{O}(n^4 / \epsilon^8)$. The local computation of each player is polynomial in n .

Proof. By Lemma 13, if the players have failed to reach agreement after $K_{\max} = 3f$ epochs, all bad players' weights are zero with high probability. By Lemma 14, the players reach agreement in the next epoch with high probability. If, by chance, the players have not reached agreement after epoch $K_{\max} + 1$, they reset all weights to 1 and restart the algorithm at epoch 1. Thus, the algorithm terminates with probability 1.

By Theorem 1 the latency to construct $\mathbb{B}\mathbb{B}_{t'}$ is $O(m(t'))$, so if the algorithm is not restarted, the total latency is $O((K_{\max} + 1)mT) = O(fmT) = \tilde{O}(n^4/\epsilon^8)$. Even after incorporating the possibility of restarts, this latency bound holds with high probability and in expectation. \square

4 Conclusion

Our main result is a randomized agreement protocol in the full-information model resilient to $f = n/(3 + \epsilon)$ adaptive Byzantine failures. When ϵ is bounded away from zero it has expected latency $\tilde{O}(n^4)$ and in the extreme case when $\epsilon = 1/f$ ($n = 3f + 1$) it has latency $\tilde{O}(n^{12})$. This is the first improvement to Bracha's [Bra87] 1984 protocol when $n = 3f + 1$, which had exponential expected latency $2^{O(n)}$. The prior results of King and Saia [KS16, KS18] and Huang, Pettie, and Zhu [HPZ22] offer different tradeoffs between resiliency, latency, and local computation time; see Table 1.

Our goal was to present the simplest possible protocol with polynomial latency and resiliency $f < n/3$, so we have made no attempt to optimize the latency prematurely.¹³ We see several interesting directions for future work.

- If one tried to stay broadly within our coin-flipping framework but maximally optimize the parameters, one would find that $m = \Omega(n)$ and $T = \Omega(n^2)$. The bound on m is necessary to overcome the $\pm f$ discrepancies introduced by the adversarial scheduler, and the bound on T is the time needed for the small negative aggregate good-bad correlations to dwarf the random noise of good-good correlations. Thus, $\Omega(n^3)$ latency seems to be baked into this approach when $n = 3f + 1$, even just to reliably blacklist *any* pair of players and maintain Invariant 1. Is it possible to solve Byzantine Agreement in *close* to $O(n^3)$ latency?
- Let $n^{g(\epsilon)}$ be the optimum latency of a Byzantine Agreement protocol with resiliency $f = n/(3 + \epsilon)$ against an adaptive adversary. What does the function g look like and what is $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow \infty} g(\epsilon)$? From [KS16] we know that $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow \infty} g(\epsilon) \leq 2.5$, at least for protocols with exponential local computation, and from [Asp98, AC08] we know $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow \infty} g(\epsilon) \geq 1$. What is the correct limit of $g(\epsilon)$? Are there qualitatively different protocols achieving latency $n^{g(\epsilon)}$ for various ranges of ϵ ? One can also look at the optimal latency-resiliency tradeoff when $f = n^\gamma$, $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, is expressed as a polynomial of n .
- Each step in the protocols we use (Bracha's [Bra87] Reliable-Broadcast, Huang et al.'s [HPZ22] Iterated-Blackboard, and the Coin-Flip protocol of Section 3.1) typically consists of sending a message to all players and waiting for $n - f$ messages before making some state transition. If we were to wait for $n - f + 1$ messages, we may wait forever if f players crashed and never sent any messages. On the other hand, once we introduce *blacklisting* it is not clear that waiting for just $n - f$ messages is necessary anymore. For example, suppose that $\sum_i w_i = n - 2\rho f$ and that we have reduced the weight of good and bad players each by ρf , with high probability. Rather than wait for $n - f$ messages, we could wait for messages from players whose *total weight* is at least $n - (\rho + 1)f$.¹⁴ This would help speed up later epochs since we could then access the weight advantage of good players. However, since there is *some* non-zero probability of blacklisting pairs of good players, there is *some* non-zero probability that a protocol will deadlock if it waits for $n - (\rho + 1)f$ weight before proceeding. This raises the possibility that there is a complexity separation between *Las Vegas* (which never err) and *Monte Carlo* protocols (which may deadlock) for Byzantine Agreement in our model. Cf. [KKK⁺10].

¹³For example, there is a mismatch in the two terms of Lemma 9 ($\frac{1}{4}\epsilon^2 m f T - mn\sqrt{T(c \ln n)}$), the first achieves its worst case in later epochs, after close to $2f$ units of weight have been deducted from (w_i) , and the second achieves its worst case in the beginning, when $w_i = 1$. Similarly Lemma 10 achieves its worst case when $w_i = 1$. These mismatches lead to the introduction of additional ϵ^{-1} factors in the proof of Lemma 5(2).

¹⁴More generally, players should make a state transition only when it is *plausible*, *w.h.p.*, that all un-received messages were to be sent by Byzantine players.

References

- [AC08] Hagit Attiya and Keren Censor. Tight bounds for asynchronous randomized consensus. *J. ACM*, 55(5):1–26, 2008.
- [AL93] Miklós Ajtai and Nathan Linial. The influence of large coalitions. *Comb.*, 13(2):129–145, 1993.
- [AN93] Noga Alon and Moni Naor. Coin-flipping games immune against linear-sized coalitions. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 22(2):403–417, 1993.
- [Asp98] James Aspnes. Lower bounds for distributed coin-flipping and randomized consensus. *J. ACM*, 45(3):415–450, 1998.
- [Ben83] Michael Ben-Or. Another advantage of free choice: Completely asynchronous agreement protocols (extended abstract). In *Proceedings 2nd Annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC)*, pages 27–30, 1983.
- [BG93] Piotr Berman and Juan A. Garay. Randomized distributed agreement revisited. In *Proceedings 23rd Annual International Symposium on Fault-Tolerant Computing (FTCS)*, pages 412–419, 1993.
- [BL85] Michael Ben-Or and Nathan Linial. Collective coin flipping, robust voting schemes and minima of Banzhaf values. In *Proceedings 26th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 408–416, 1985.
- [BN00] Ravi B. Boppana and Babu O. Narayanan. Perfect-information leader election with optimal resilience. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 29(4):1304–1320, 2000.
- [BOPV06] Michael Ben-Or, Elan Pavlov, and Vinod Vaikuntanathan. Byzantine agreement in the full-information model in $O(\log n)$ rounds. In *Proceedings of the 38th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 179–186, 2006.
- [Bra87] Gabriel Bracha. Asynchronous Byzantine agreement protocols. *Inf. Comput.*, 75(2):130–143, 1987.
- [BT85] Gabriel Bracha and Sam Toueg. Asynchronous consensus and broadcast protocols. *J. ACM*, 32(4):824–840, 1985.
- [CC85] Benny Chor and Brian A Coan. A simple and efficient randomized Byzantine agreement algorithm. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, (6):531–539, 1985.
- [CKS05] Christian Cachin, Klaus Kursawe, and Victor Shoup. Random oracles in Constantinople: Practical asynchronous Byzantine agreement using cryptography. *J. Cryptol.*, 18(3):219–246, 2005.
- [CR93] 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)*, pages 42–51, 1993.
- [DLS88] Cynthia Dwork, Nancy Lynch, and Larry Stockmeyer. Consensus in the presence of partial synchrony. *J. ACM*, 35(2):288–323, 1988.
- [Fei99] Uriel Feige. Noncryptographic selection protocols. In *Proceedings 40th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 142–153, 1999.
- [FL82] Michael J. Fischer and Nancy A. Lynch. A lower bound for the time to assure interactive consistency. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 14(4):183–186, 1982.
- [FLM86] Michael J. Fischer, Nancy A. Lynch, and Michael Merritt. Easy impossibility proofs for distributed consensus problems. *Distributed Comput.*, 1(1):26–39, 1986.

- [FLP85] Michael J. Fischer, Nancy A. Lynch, and Mike Paterson. Impossibility of distributed consensus with one faulty process. *J. ACM*, 32(2):374–382, 1985.
- [FM97] Peasech Feldman and Silvio Micali. An optimal probabilistic protocol for synchronous Byzantine agreement. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 26(4):873–933, 1997.
- [GM98] Juan A. Garay and Yoram Moses. Fully polynomial Byzantine agreement for $n > 3t$ processors in $t + 1$ rounds. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 27(1):247–290, 1998.
- [GPV06] Shafi Goldwasser, Elan Pavlov, and Vinod Vaikuntanathan. Fault-tolerant distributed computing in full-information networks. In *Proceedings 47th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 15–26, 2006.
- [HK20] Iftach Haitner and Yonatan Karidi-Heller. A tight lower bound on adaptively secure full-information coin flip. In *Proceedings 61st Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 1268–1276, 2020.
- [HPZ22] Shang-En Huang, Seth Pettie, and Leqi Zhu. Byzantine agreement in polynomial time with near-optimal resilience. In *Proceedings 54th ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, 2022.
- [Kim20] Ben Kimmett. Improvement and partial simulation of King & Saia’s expected-polynomial-time Byzantine agreement algorithm. Master’s thesis, University of Victoria, Canada, 2020.
- [KKK⁺10] Bruce M. Kapron, David Kempe, Valerie King, Jared Saia, and Vishal Sanwalani. Fast asynchronous Byzantine agreement and leader election with full information. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 6(4):68:1–68:28, 2010.
- [KKL88] Jeff Kahn, Gil Kalai, and Nathan Linial. The influence of variables on boolean functions (extended abstract). In *Proceedings of the 29th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 68–80, 1988.
- [KS16] Valerie King and Jared Saia. Byzantine agreement in expected polynomial time. *J. ACM*, 63(2):13:1–13:21, 2016.
- [KS18] Valerie King and Jared Saia. Correction to Byzantine agreement in expected polynomial time, JACM 2016. *CoRR*, abs/1812.10169, 2018.
- [Lew11] Allison B. Lewko. The contest between simplicity and efficiency in asynchronous Byzantine agreement. In *Proceedings 25th International Symposium on Distributed Computing (DISC)*, volume 6950 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 348–362, 2011.
- [LSP82] Leslie Lamport, Robert E. Shostak, and Marshall C. Pease. The Byzantine generals problem. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.*, 4(3):382–401, 1982.
- [PSL80] Marshall C. Pease, Robert E. Shostak, and Leslie Lamport. Reaching agreement in the presence of faults. *J. ACM*, 27(2):228–234, 1980.
- [Rab83] Michael O. Rabin. Randomized Byzantine generals. In *Proceedings 24th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 403–409, 1983.
- [RSZ02] Alexander Russell, Michael E. Saks, and David Zuckerman. Lower bounds for leader election and collective coin-flipping in the perfect information model. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 31(6):1645–1662, 2002.
- [Sak89] Michael E. Saks. A robust noncryptographic protocol for collective coin flipping. *SIAM J. Discret. Math.*, 2(2):240–244, 1989.
- [Tou84] Sam Toueg. Randomized Byzantine agreements. In *Proceedings 3rd Annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC)*, pages 163–178, 1984.