

It's not easy to relax: liveness in chained BFT protocols

Ittai Abraham

VMware Research

Natacha Crooks

UC Berkeley

Neil Giridharan¹

UC Berkeley

Heidi Howard

Microsoft Research Cambridge

Florian Suri-Payer

Cornell University

Abstract

Modern *chained* Byzantine Fault Tolerant (BFT) protocols leverage a combination of pipelining and leader rotation to maximize both efficiency and fairness. Unfortunately, this approach compromises liveness. We observe that even simple leader failures such as crashes can prevent the system from making progress, both theoretically, and practically. The root cause is simple: these protocols require a sequence of three or four consecutive honest leaders to commit operations. This paper makes two contributions: first, we show that, in the presence of arbitrary failures, consecutive honest leaders are *necessary*. When nodes fail by omission however, one can do better. As second contribution, we thus propose Siesta, a novel chained BFT protocol that successfully commit blocks that span multiple non-consecutive leaders. Siesta reduces the expected commit latency of Hotstuff by a factor of three under failures, and the worst-case latency by a factor of eight.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of Computation; Distributed Algorithms

Keywords and phrases Consensus, blockchain, BFT

Digital Object Identifier 10.4230/LIPIcs...

1 Introduction

Blockchain systems have emerged as a promising way for mutually distrustful parties to compute over shared data. Byzantine Fault Tolerant (BFT) state machine replication (SMR), the core protocol in each blockchain, provides to applications the abstraction of a centralized, trusted, and always available server. BFT SMR guarantees that a set of replicas will agree on a common sequence of operations, even though some nodes may misbehave. Blockchain systems add two additional constraints over prior work. First, only *valid* operations should be committed. For instance, a withdrawal operation in a banking application should only commit if there are sufficient funds. Second, operation ordering should be *fair*: it must closely follow the order in which operations are submitted and offer no single party undue influence in the process. Protocols without fairness can be abused by the application: participants may censor or front-run to gain economic advantages.

To address these concerns, recent BFT SMR protocols targeted at blockchains such as Casper FFG [8], HotStuff [30], DiemBFTv4 [29], Fast-Hotstuff [21] are structured around two key building blocks:

¹ Lead author.



- **Chaining.** To ensure validity, existing protocols evaluate proposed blocks against the full sequential history of the chain and check application-level preconditions are satisfied. Every BFT protocol requires a (worst-case) minimum of two voting rounds (henceforth *phases*). Each voting phase aims to establish a *quorum certificate (QC)* by collecting a set of signed votes from a majority of honest replicas. Blockchain systems *pipeline* the voting phases of consecutive proposals to avoid redundant coordination and cryptography: the system can use the quorum certificate of the second voting phase of block i to certify the first phase of block $i + 1$. Each block requires (on average) generating and verifying the signatures of a single QC. This is especially important for large participant sets as QC sizes grow linearly with the number of replicas, increasing cryptographic costs.
- **Leader-Speaks-Once (LSO).** To minimize fairness concerns associated with leader-based solutions and to decrease the influence of adaptive adversaries (adversaries who control the network), BFT protocols targeted at blockchains adopt a *leader-speak-once (LSO)* model. In LSO, each leader proposes and certifies a single block after which the leader is immediately rotated out as part of a new *view*. Electing a different leader per block limits the leader’s influence; it can manipulate transactions in the proposed block only. Traditional BFT protocols (such as PBFT [13]), in contrast, adopt a *stable-leader* paradigm in which leaders are only replaced if they fail to make progress through *view change*. View changes are intentionally costly procedures and assumed to be infrequent. Complex view changes allow for a simpler and more efficient failure-free steady state. LSO protocols instead perform view changes proactively in each round and thus require to place the view change on the critical path of the system.

While a joint chained leader-speak-once (CLSO) approach is desirable for blockchains, the combination of these two properties introduces a new liveness concern. We show in Section 3 that in some system configurations of HotStuff [30], the protocol at the core of the Diem blockchain [1], a single faulty leader suffices to prevent *any* block from being committed (under round-robin leader assignment). We further show that even for arbitrary number of replicas, faulty leaders can at the very least greatly reduce the throughput of *any* CLSO protocol. Worse, this attack does not require any explicit equivocation; it suffices for a faulty leader to delay responding, making it harder to detect.


The root cause of the problem is simple: CLSO protocols require the formation of k QCs in *consecutive* views in order to commit a block (where $k \in \{2, 3\}$ depending on protocol). If progress fails in a given view (a QC does not form), the protocol must restart the process of committing a block entirely to preserve safety. In the remainder of the paper, we refer to this constraint as the *consecutive honest leader condition (CHLC)*.

To the best of our knowledge, the aforementioned liveness concern is present in *all* CLSO protocols today, and thus represents a significant exploit opportunity for a Byzantine attacker. Even without malicious participants, expected network asynchrony can cause spurious view-changes, precluding the system from committing blocks. Consequently, this paper asks: is CHLC fundamental, or can it be relaxed?

We find that the answer is subtle. First, we show that *no* correct protocol can deterministically commit a block across non-consecutive views.

► **Theorem 1 (Gap-Tolerance).** *A BFT protocol achieves gap-tolerance if it requires k QCs in non-consecutive views to commit an operation. No deterministic, partially synchronous, CLSO protocol with $n = 3f + 1$ replicas can safely achieve gap-tolerance.*

We observe nonetheless that CLSO protocols *can* achieve gap-tolerance in some settings: commitment with non-consecutive QCs is possible when failures comprise of omission faults



only. This observation can be coupled with the active detection of commission failures to determine when to (and when not to) relax the CHLC constraint. Specifically, we prove the following theorem:

► **Theorem 2.** *There exists a CLSO protocol that is resilient to $f < n/3$ Byzantine replicas, is safe under asynchrony, and achieves gap-tolerance when failures are omission only.*

More specifically, after GST and view synchronization, if views $v < v' < v''$ have honest leaders, and block B is proposed in view v , then either block B will be committed in view v'' or a previously undetected faulty replica will be detected and the replica slashed (and excluded from any future participation).

In this paper we propose Siesta, a new consensus protocol that satisfies Theorem 2. Siesta either (i) allows blocks to commit in non-consecutive views or (ii) immediately and reliably detects equivocation and slashes (punishes and removes) a malicious leader. The combination of these two ideas drastically curbs the impact of a Byzantine leader on the system: no leader can equivocate without being removed from the system, while simple omission failures do not prevent a block from committing. Siesta achieves this without sacrificing performance: it maintains optimistic responsiveness, has optimal latency of two round-trips, and, when instantiated with threshold signatures, has quadratic word complexity.

Two fundamental ideas lie at the center of Siesta:

- *No-QC Proofs.* It is safe to commit a block in non-consecutive views as long as one can prove that no QC for a conflicting block could have formed in between views. Siesta carefully designs such proofs to be efficient.
- *Equivocation proofs.* Many BFT protocols do not include phase one messages in view changes as conflicting phase one messages can exist in the presence of malicious leaders. Although these messages cannot be used to successfully commit a block, we observe that they can be used as an explicit *proof of equivocation* to hold perpetrators accountable.

The remaining paper is structured as follows. We first introduce relevant background (§2, §3) before proving that gap-tolerance is not achievable in the presence of commission faults (§4). We then present Siesta, a new consensus protocol that satisfies Theorem 2 (§5). We experimentally validate our claims (§6), summarize related work (§7) and conclude (§8).

2 Preliminaries

We adopt the standard BFT system model of $n = 3f + 1$ replicas communicating through a reliable, authenticated, point-to-point network, where up to f replicas can be faulty. A strong but static adversary can coordinate faulty replicas' actions but cannot break standard cryptographic primitives. We adopt the partially synchronous model, where there exists a known upper bound Δ on the communication delay, and an unknown Global Stabilization Time (GST) after which all messages will arrive within Δ [18]. We assume the availability of standard digital signatures and a public-key infrastructure (PKI). We use $\langle m \rangle_r$ to denote a message m signed by replica r . A message is well-formed if all of its signatures are valid. We measure a protocol's *communication complexity* by the worst-case number of words transmitted by any honest replica, and define a word to consist of a constant number of signatures or bits.

► **Definition 3.** (*Byzantine Fault Tolerant State Machine Replication*). *A Byzantine fault tolerant state machine replication protocol commits client requests in a linearizable log, which satisfies the following properties [3] [4].*



- *Safety.* Honest replicas do not commit different values at the same log position.
- *Liveness.* All honest client requests are eventually committed by all honest replicas.
- *External Validity.* If an honest replica commits a value, v , then $EXVAL(v) = true$, where $EXVAL(v)$ is a predicate that checks whether v upholds all application invariants.

3 Liveness issues in CLSO protocols

All existing CLSO protocols follow the same general pattern. While we focus on on HotStuff here [30], our observations broadly apply to *any* CSLO protocol. For simplicity, we first describe how stable non-chained (*single-shot*) Hotstuff works (§3.1), before introducing the refinements of *chaining* and *leader-speaks-once* (§3.2). We then demonstrate the resulting liveness pitfall (§3.3), and show that it is non-trivial to address (§3.4).

3.1 Single-Shot HotStuff

HotStuff proceeds in a sequence of *views*. In each view, a designated leader proposes a batch of client operations, and drives agreement to safely order and commit these operations. To remain consistent with blockchain terminology, we refer to a batch of client operations as a *block*. Blocks contain a parent pointer to their predecessor block, thus forming a chain.

Steady-state Protocol. At a high level, the protocol proceeds as follows. The leader of view v aggregates a set of client operations into a block B , and proposes it to be ordered at log position i . Committing a block consists of three logical phases: a *non-equivocation* phase, a *persistence* phase, and an *execution* phase. The non-equivocation phase ensures that at most one block will be agreed on in this view at that position. This guarantee must continue to hold in the presence of malicious leader or replicas. The persistence phase ensures that any (possibly) agreed-upon decision is preserved across views and leader changes. Each phase makes use of *quorum certificates* (QC) to achieved the desired invariants. A QC, written $QC = (B, v, \sigma)$, refers to a set of unique signed replica votes σ for block B proposed in view v . A QC describes a *threshold* $|\sigma|$ of confirmations proving that a super-majority of distinct replicas voted for block B .

View-Change Protocol. The *view-change protocol* is responsible for replacing faulty leaders, and does so by moving to a new view. Crucially, this process must retain durability for all committed blocks in the chain. Intuitively, a new leader must preserve any earlier decision committed by a previous leader. View change protocols are notoriously tricky: they can be expensive and hard to get right [5]. The primary challenge stems from reconciling different participants’ beliefs about what *could have been committed*, as asynchrony and malicious leaders may cause replicas to consider different sets of blocks as potentially committed.

Hotstuff follows this pattern and consists of three voting rounds, one for the non-equivocation phase, and two for the persistence phase (Figure 1). In the *Prepare phase*, the leader proposes a block A with view v at position i and each replica votes to prepare if it has not already prepared a block at i with a higher view. If the leader successfully obtains a QC ($n - f$ distinct replica votes) in the Prepare phase, a *prepareQC* forms, and the leader moves on to the Pre-Commit phase. The existence of a prepareQC ensures agreement on A : no other block could have been certified for position i as any two prepareQC must overlap in at least one honest replica.

In the Pre-Commit phase, the leader broadcasts the prepareQC; replicas vote to accept the prepareQC and locally update their highest prepareQC. The leader waits to receive $n - f$ Pre-Commit votes to form a precommitQC. In the Commit phase, the leader broadcasts a






Figure 1 Hotstuff protocol overview.





Figure 2 Chained Hotstuff

final *precommitQC*. Replicas become *locked* on this QC: they will never vote for a conflicting block unless they receive a precommitQC in a higher view. The existence of a conflicting precommitQC is evidence that the locked QC could not have committed (honest replicas would not vote to support two conflicting blocks). Finally, the leader forms a commitQC upon receiving $n - f$ Commit votes. It attaches the commitQC in a *Decide phase* to inform replicas that the block committed, at which point they can execute the block's operations.

We remark that the Pre-Commit phase in HotStuff is necessary only for liveness rather than safety in order to solve the *hidden lock problem* [30]. Newer BFT protocols such as Fast-HotStuff [21] and Jolteon/Ditto [19] eschew the linear word complexity of HotStuff in order to remove the Pre-Commit phase.

3.2 Chaining and LSO

Chaining. The aforementioned protocol takes three phases to commit a block: each operation thus requires forming three individual QCs. To amortize these cryptographic costs and minimize latency, prior work observes that, while each step serves a different purpose, all have identical structure: the leader proposes a block, collects votes and forms a QC. It is then possible to leverage the chain structure to pipeline commands such that a single QC simultaneously serves as *prepareQC*, *precommitQC*, and *commitQC* for different blocks. The number of QCs in the chain that include a given block indicates whether a block has been prepared or committed.




■ **Figure 3** Chained LSO Hotstuff

Consider for example a scenario in which a chained protocol is attempting to commit four blocks B_1 , B_2 , B_3 , and B_4 . The view leader first proposes B_1 , collects $n - f$ votes for B_1 , and forms its first QC (QC_{B_1}). QC_{B_1} is the *prepareQC* for B_1 . Next, the leader proposes B_2 , indicating that (i) B_1 is the *parent block* of B_2 , and (ii) that B_1 has associated QC QC_{B_1} . It once again collects $n - f$ votes, forming QC_{B_2} . This QC acts as both the *precommitQC* for B_1 and the *prepareQC* for B_2 . Similarly, the leader proposes and obtains a QC for block B_3 . It marks B_2 as the parent block and uses QC_{B_2} to attest to the validity of both B_2 and B_1 (implicitly through B_2 's backpointer). It forms a QC_{B_3} which acts as a *commitQC* for B_1 , *precommitQC* for B_2 , and *prepareQC* for B_3 . As three *consecutive* QCs now attest to B_1 's presence in the chain, B_1 is now committed. In a fourth step, the leader certifies B_3 using QC_{B_3} and proposes B_4 . Upon receiving this QC, replicas learn that B_1 has been committed and can thus safely execute operations in the block (Figure 2).

LSO. In the previous example, a single leader drives the full protocol (we refer to this as a *stable leader*). It is responsible for deciding which block to include next in the chain, for collecting replica votes, for creating the corresponding QC and broadcasting it to all replicas. This raises fairness concerns; malicious leader can censor operations, penalize specific users or influence operation ordering. In the *leader-speak-once* (LSO) model, each view lasts for the duration of a single phase of the protocol only, thus minimizing each leader's influence on new proposals. A leader receives votes, forms a QC, proposes the next block, and is immediately rotated out (Figure 3). Upon receiving the block proposal, replicas then directly increment their view and send their votes to the *next* leader in the rotation.

3.3 Liveness Concerns

Existing CLSO protocols require k consecutive honest leaders to commit ($k = 3$ for Fast-Hotstuff and DiemBFTv4, $k = 4$ for HotStuff). For safety, these protocols commit blocks if and only if there exists two certified blocks (for Fast-HotStuff and DiemBFTv4) – or three certified blocks (for HotStuff) – in consecutive views. As distinct leaders start each new protocol phase, successful completion of a phase requires two honest leaders: one to propose a block, and another to collect the votes and form a QC for the block. For instance, successfully completing two phases (two consecutive certified blocks) requires three consecutive honest leaders. This consecutive-leader requirement introduces a significant liveness issue. In Hotstuff for instance, using a round-robin leader assignment with a total of $n = 4$ replicas, a single faulty leader can prevent the protocol from committing *any* block.



■ **Figure 4** Liveness issue with CLSO protocols


Consider replicas R_1, R_2, R_3 and R_4 , with R_4 being faulty (Figure 4). If leader R_1 initially proposes block A , R_4 might never broadcast the final QC (acting as $commitQC$) necessary for replicas to execute A . Likewise, if R_2 and R_3 propose blocks B and C respectively, R_4 may fail to form the corresponding $precommitQC$ (for B) and $prepareQC$ (for C).

This consecutive leader requirement remains an issue even for larger participant set as blocks must be re-proposed until they find a sequence of four consecutive honest leaders. We measure this danger through simulation in Figure 5, where we calculate the number of phases necessary to commit a block given a random assignment of faulty nodes and random leader election policy. In our experiment, Hotstuff requires an average of 12 phases to commit (a three-fold increase over the failure-free case), and has a worst-case latency of 129 rounds.

3.4 It's not easy to relax

Requiring k consecutive leaders is necessary for safety in all existing CSLO protocols. Past attempts at relaxing this requirement have proven unsuccessful [5]. Consider the following example: QC_1 and QC_2 , respectively for blocks B_1 and B_2 in views v_1 and v_2 both include block B in their history, but B is not the direct parent of either. It is perfectly possible for a quorum certificate QC' to form on a block B' in view v' , where $v_1 < v' < v_2$ and B' does not extend B . Indeed, a block B that has only been prepared (but not precommitted or committed) might not be known to all replicas if the leader is faulty. A future honest leader may then unwittingly propose a conflicting block B' . By requiring QCs to be in consecutive views, the commit rule ensures that no future view change quorum can contain a QC for a conflicting proposal, at the cost of reduced liveness.

Addressing this tension is the crux of this paper. We make two contributions. First, we prove that gap-tolerance is impossible to achieve in the presence of arbitrary failures, answering a long-standing open question in CLSO protocols [5]. Second, we find that the contiguous leader condition *can* be relaxed when faulty leaders suffer *omission faults* only: when a faulty leader fails only by crashing or timing out, we prove that it is safe for the *next* leader to certify or commit the block. When a faulty leader instead is explicitly malicious and equivocates, we show that it is *always* possible to detect misbehaviour. The faulty leader can then immediately be slashed and removed from the protocol.



■ **Figure 5** CDF of the number of views needed to commit an operation when $n = 100$, repeated 1M times with randomized malicious node assignment

4 On the impossibility of commits with non-consecutive rounds

Achieving gap-tolerance is key to improving the throughput and latency of CLSO protocols under Byzantine attacks. Prior work has (unsuccessfully) attempted to relax CHLC [5] and the degree to which any relaxation is possible remains unknown. This paper make significant progress towards answering what *is* safe in CLSO systems. Specifically, we show (and prove in Appendix C) that:

► **Theorem 4.** *Any authenticated partially synchronous LSO protocol that is resilient to $3 \leq f < \frac{n}{3}$ faults cannot always commit in 2 non-consecutive LSO rounds under partial synchrony.*


Otherwise said, it is never safe to commit blocks in non-contiguous views in the presence of arbitrary failures. Intuitively, as we detail in our proof, this strong result stems from the fact that, when a Byzantine leader equivocates, there is not always sufficient information to determine which block, if any, committed. A leader may thus be in a position where it has to propose a new block for liveness, but cannot reliably choose which block to extend.

5 Siesta

In this section, we present Siesta, a new partially synchronous CLSO protocol that satisfies Theorem 2. Siesta has optimal resilience ($f < n/3$), optimal latency of 2 round-trips, and optimistic responsiveness. We conduct a formal analysis of its worst-case and expected throughput under failures in Section 6.

Siesta provably achieves better latency and throughput than similar chained protocols. Our protocol addresses the liveness issue identified in Section 3: in the presence of omission faults, Siesta simply requires a sequence of three (possibly non-consecutive) honest leaders. When commission faults do occur, Siesta reliably detects equivocation and immediately slashes the faulty replica, removing it from the protocol. In contrast, prior work necessarily required three or four *consecutive honest* leaders.

Siesta’s primary technical innovation lies in its clever use of *Equivocation* and *No-QC* proofs to achieve gap-tolerance when possible. Equivocation proofs reliably indicate that a replica has misbehaved and should be slashed and removed from the system. No-QC proofs,



Quorum Certificate:

- B : block
- v : view in which B was proposed
- σ : set of $n - f$ VOTE-RESP messages in favor of B

■ **Figure 6** Quorum Certificate

on the other hand, indicate that a QC *could not have* formed for a specific block. The combination of these two proofs is powerful. Knowledge that a QC *definitely did not form* allows leaders to commit blocks that prior work could not have safely committed. When no such knowledge can be extracted, the replica directly learns that the previous leader equivocated; an explicit *equivocation proof* allows for this node to be safely slashed.

Interestingly, Siesta leverages VOTE-REQ messages to implement equivocation proofs. VOTE-REQ messages, in traditional BFT protocols, denote the first round of messages sent by the leader, prior to any agreement having been reached. As it is easy for a malicious leader to equivocate at this stage, VOTE-REQ messages are traditionally excluded from the view change; they do not convey sufficient information. In contrast, they are essential to Siesta, which uses VOTE-REQ messages to identify and blame faulty leaders, as well as prove that a QC could not have formed for a specific block.

We prove that Siesta is both safe and live in Appendix B.

5.1 Protocol Preliminaries

We first introduce terminology and background.

Views. Siesta progresses through a series of monotonically increasing *views* with each view v having a distinct leader L_v .

Fast View Change vs Slow View Change. Siesta replaces the leader on every view. As is standard in CLSO protocols, we distinguish between two types of view changes, the fast view change (FVC), and the slow view change (SVC). A FVC represents the steady state of the system: the leader of a new view certifies the block B proposed in the previous view and proposes a new block B' that has B as its parent. The slow-view change, in contrast, represents interrupted processing: sufficiently many honest participants indicated a belief that the past leader failed to respond. The new leader must aggregate sufficient information to reliably learn what happened in the previous view and continue the protocol.

Quorum Certificates. A QC consists of $n - f$ signatures on a block B and has the following format $QC_B := (v, B, \sigma)$ (Figure 6). B is the block that the QC certifies and v is the view of the QC. Note that v is always equal to $B.v$ and thus refers to the view in which the block was initially proposed rather than the view in which the QC was formed. Finally, σ is a signature or a set of signatures indicating $n - f$ replicas voted for B . A QC is valid if it is well-formed and contains valid signatures. We say that a block B has been *certified* once a QC for B has formed.

Blocks and Block Format. As is standard, Siesta batches client requests into *blocks*, with each block containing a hash pointer to its parent block (or to null in the case of the *genesis* block). An example chain of blocks is given in Figure 8. A block's position in the chain is known as its height. There are two types of blocks (Figure 7): blocks formed in the steady-state FVC, *fast blocks*, and blocks formed in the slow view change, *slow blocks*.




Block:

- h : the height of the block
- $H(B_{h-1})$: hash pointer to parent block
- b_h : batch of client transactions
- v : view in which block was proposed
- QC : QC attesting validity of parent block
- σ_l : leader signature

Additional state for a slow block:

- S : set of NEWVIEW messages
- π : optional equivocation proof

■ **Figure 7 Block Structure**



■ **Figure 8** Example chain of blocks in Siesta. The shaded boxes represent slow blocks and the unshaded boxes represent fast blocks. Note that the QC in a fast block is always for the parent block, however, this is not necessarily the case for slow blocks, as illustrated by block F.

- **Fast Blocks.** A fast block B has the following structure: $B := (h, H(B_{h-1}), b_h, v, QC, \sigma_\ell)$. h denotes the height of the block in the chain. $H(B_{h-1})$ is a hash pointer to its parent block (at height $h - 1$), b_h is a batch of client transactions, v is the view in which the block is proposed. QC is a quorum certificate attesting to the validity of an ancestor of B . Finally, σ_ℓ refers to the leader's signature of the block.
- **Slow Blocks.** Slow blocks contain two additional fields S and π . S refers to the set S of NEWVIEW messages sent by replicas to the leader during a slow view change (more detail later). π denotes either an equivocation proof (defined more formally in §5.4) or \perp if no equivocation is detected.

A block is valid if 1) its parent block, if it exists, is valid 2) all included client transactions b_h satisfy an application level validity predicate, and 3) all included signatures are valid.

Block extension and conflicts. A block B' extends a block B ($B \leftarrow B'$) if B is an ancestor of B' : there must exist a path of parent blocks from B' to B . Conversely, we say that B' conflicts with B if $\neg(B \leftarrow B' \vee B' \leftarrow B)$. Informally, if B' conflicts with B , these blocks are on separate forks of the chain and only one of them can commit. By convention, we say that blocks extend themselves ($B \rightarrow B$).

Replica Local State. Each replica r maintains the following local state (Figure 9): v_r , the current view number, QC_r , the QC received with the highest view, vr_r , the highest valid VOTE-REQ message received, and vp_r the highest VOTE-RESP message sent. We discuss what VOTE-REQ and VOTE-RESP messages are next.



Replica Local State:

- v_r : current view number
- QC_r : the QC contained in vr_r
- vr_r : highest (by view) VOTE-REQ message received
- vp_r : highest (by view) VOTE-RESP message sent

■ **Figure 9 Replica Local State**

5.2 Fast View Change

We first focus on the fast view change, which takes place in the absence of failures. Intuitively, the leader for view v forms a valid QC for a block b in view $v - 1$. As the views are contiguous, no conflicting proposal could have been certified. The leader can then safely extend b with a new proposal b' and propose b' . FVC in Siesta is identical to existing chained protocols, where each phase consists of two steps: 1) the leader proposes a block to all replicas, with evidence that this block is on a valid chain 2) replicas certify the block and forward their vote to the leader of the next view. We explain the protocol in more detail next and give pseudocode in Appendix 1.

Leader Logic. Let us assume that the leader for view v (we write L_v) has already received $n - f$ signed replica votes of the form $\langle \text{VOTE-RESP}, B_{v-1} \rangle$ (we describe how these messages are generated below). B_{v-1} is the proposal for view $v - 1$. L_v uses those replies to form a QC for B_{v-1} attesting that a majority of honest participants have validated the block (we denote this QC as QC_B). L_v then proposes a new block B_v that extends B_{v-1} . Extending B_{v-1} is safe as QC_B is necessarily the highest QC: 1) no QC could have formed between views $v - 1$ and v as these views are contiguous 2) a single QC can form per view as all QCs must overlap in at least one correct replica. The leader signs this block and broadcasts a $\langle \text{VOTE-REQ}, B \rangle$ message to all replicas.

Step 1: L_v to all R

Send $\langle \text{VOTE-REQ}, B_v \rangle$ where $B = (h, H(B_{v-1}), b_h, v, QC_B, \sigma_L)$

Replica Logic. When a replica receives a valid $\langle \text{VOTE-REQ}, B \rangle_{L_v}$ message, it validates that it is in the correct view, that it has not already voted in this view, and that the proposal is valid. Specifically, the replica checks that it is in the same view as the leader (that $B.v = v_r$), and that B 's QC attests a block in the preceding view $v - 1$ (that $B.QC.v = v_r - 1$). The replica then simply update its local state to reflect the received messages and votes to support the block. Specifically, it updates QC_r to $B.QC$ and highest received VOTE-REQ message $vr_r = \langle \text{VOTE-REQ}, B \rangle_{L_v}$. The replica then sends a signed VOTE-RESP message to the leader of view $v + 1$, acknowledging its support for B_v and stores the message locally (in vp_r).

Step 2: R to L_{v+1}

Send $\langle \text{VOTE-RESP}, B_v \rangle_{\sigma_R}$

We highlight that, unlike all other CLSO protocols, replicas in Siesta explicitly stores Vote-requests for a block B *before* B has achieved agreement. Replicas in Hotstuff for instance, only update their local state once a QC on block B has already formed. As we will see next, this small change is key to achieving gap-tolerance for omission faults.



5.3 Slow View Change

The fast view change in Siesta is simple: as views are contiguous, the new leader is guaranteed to learn the latest certified block and can thus easily extend the chain. There is no such continuity in the slow view change, which requires more care. A slow view change is triggered when sufficiently many replicas fail to receive a new block proposal before a specific timeout value; replicas vote to move on to the next view and transfer necessary state to new leader. It is no longer possible for a leader to simply extend a block, as conflicting blocks could have been proposed during views that did not complete. Siesta makes careful use of the stored highest VOTE-REQ message (vr_r) to address this challenge. To achieve gap-tolerance in the presence of crash failures, Siesta ensures that no block that *could have been certified* but for the crash/omission failure of a faulty node, will be repropose. We include pseudocode in Appendix 2.

Triggering a new view. Each replica in view $v - 1$ sets a local timer after sending a VOTE-RESP message. If no new block is received before the timer expired, the node votes to start a new view. Specifically, it increments its current view to $v_r = v$ (and will no longer process messages in lower views) and sends a signed NEWVIEW message to the leader of this new view v . NEWVIEW messages include the replica's current view v_r and the highest received QC (QC_r). Importantly, the message also includes the highest received VOTE-REQ message (vr_r) as well as the highest stored response (vp_r). As previously stated, sending VOTE-REQ messages as part of the view change is unique to Siesta.

Step 1: R to L_v
Send $\langle \text{NEWVIEW}, v, QC_r, vr_r, vp_r \rangle_{\sigma_R}$

New Leader Logic. The new leader L_v for view v waits to receive $n - f$ NEWVIEW messages from replicas voting to enter view v . We refer to this set as S . For safety, the leader must ensure that all blocks that could have been committed are included in the new view. This property is inherited from all prior CLSO protocols. To satisfy gap-tolerance in the presence of omission faults, the leader has additional responsibilities: it must also certify all QCs that *could have formed* in prior views that were led by faulty leaders, and who may have intentionally not completed the round. For example, a leader in view v_n will certify a block B proposed in view v if all replicas in v voted for B but the leader in view $v + 1$ may fail to form and disseminate the corresponding QC.

To account for this, in a slow view change the leader proceeds in two steps. First, it certifies any block that had been implicitly agreed upon but whose certification process had been interrupted by a faulty leader. To do so, it looks at the set of VOTE-REQ messages received:

- if all $n - f$ VOTE-REQ messages are for block B_i in view v_i , the leader forms a new $QC_i = (B_i, v_i, \sigma_S)$ where σ_S denotes the set of corresponding VOTE-RESP messages.
- otherwise, the leader identifies the greatest (by view) common ancestor of the $n - f$ blocks. If such a block B_{anc} exists (and is not the genesis block), the leader forms a new $QC_{anc} = (B_{anc}, v_{anc}, \sigma_S)$ where σ_S denotes the set of VOTE-RESP messages.

Next, the leader must determine which block to extend. The highest QC in the $n - f$ NEWVIEW messages (we call it QC_{high}) certifies a block that may have committed (any committed block's QC will appear at least once in $n - f$ messages). It is thus necessary for any subsequent proposal to extend QC_{high} . Unlike prior work however, the leader must also consider the new implicit QCs: QC_i and QC_{anc} . Specifically, it selects as its QC_{choice} the QC with the highest view whose associated block extends $QC_{high}.B$. In other words $QC_{choice} = \max(QC_i, QC_{anc}, QC_{high})$. Effectively, the leader upgrades its choice to one of



the new implicit QCs if and only if this QC a more recent QC on the same branch as QC_{high} .

Unfortunately, extending the latest QC only is not sufficient to achieve gap-tolerance in the presence of omission faults. Some of the associated blocks could have been received and acknowledged by $n - f$ replicas if the leader had not failed, and thus could have been implicitly certified. To preserve gap-tolerance, Siesta must extend any such block. We distinguish between three cases:

- The VOTE-REQ with the highest view (we write $highVote$) extends $QC_{choice}.B$ (we write $QC_{choice}.B \leftarrow highVote.B$). The leader directly extends $highVote$ in this case.
- $highVote.B$ does not extend $QC_{choice}.B$. The leader checks whether there exists $n - f$ VOTE-REQ messages that do not contain QC_{choice} ; if no such quorum exists, $QC_{choice}.B$ could not have committed. It is also safe for the leader to extend $highVote.B$.
- Otherwise, the leader sets $highVote$ to be the highest VOTE-REQ that contains QC_{choice} , since QC_{choice} could have committed.

If multiple vote messages exist with matching views but non-matching blocks, the new leader has proof that the previous leader (of view $v - 1$) equivocated. The leader collects these conflicting votes and creates an equivocation proof π against the leader for that view, ensuring that all replicas will slash this malicious node.

Finally, the leader collects this information and creates a new slow block B_v containing as parent $highVote.B$, a set of new transactions b_H , the set of NEWVIEW messages S and any equivocation proofs. The replica broadcasts this new block as part of a VOTE-REQ message.

Step 1: L to all R

Send $\langle \text{VOTE-REQ}, B \rangle_{\sigma_{L_v}}$ with $B = (h, H(highVote.B), b_h, v, QC_{choice}, S, \pi, \sigma_{L_v})$

Replica Logic. When a replica r receives a $\langle \text{VOTE-REQ}, B \rangle$ message with slow block B , it performs two steps. First, it checks whether a replica was slashed ($B.\pi \neq \perp$ and π is valid). r will ignore all subsequent messages received from a faulty replica. Second, it validates the vote message, confirming that the leader did in fact extend the correct block. If the check passes, the replica votes to support B and updates its local state as in the fast view change protocol.

Step 2: R to L_{v+1}

Send $\langle \text{VOTE-RESP}, B \rangle_{\sigma_R}$

Prior CLSO protocols such as HotStuff (§3) explicitly discard all proposed blocks for which a replica has not received confirmation that the block has been certified. Block certification enforces agreement: once a replica receives a QC for a block B , it can be certain that no conflicting block will commit at that height and in that view. Past protocols assume that only certified blocks should be included in the view-change. HotStuff, for instance, only includes *precommit* QCs in the view-change and discards prepared messages. This approach is not limited to CLSO protocols. PBFT includes only its equivalent *prepare certificates* ($n - f$) in the view-change and discards single PRE-PREPARE messages.

5.4 Commit Rule and Slashing

Unlike traditional BFT protocols, CLSO systems do not have an explicit commit phase. They must instead determine when it is safe to mark a block as committed using a *commit rule*. Committing a block implicitly also commits all of its ancestors.

Intuitively, a block B is safe to commit and execute if all replicas agree, across views, that this block is the only block at height h that could commit. Achieving this property necessarily requires at least two phases (and thus two QCs). The first QC certifies B and achieves agreement across replicas: no other QC can form for a conflicting block B' in the



same view v . The next QC achieves persistence across views: subsequent leaders in views $v' > v$ will extend B .


Traditionally, these QCs must form in consecutive views. The commit rule in Siesta, however, is more refined: it is safe to commit a block with non-consecutive QCs *as long* as one can prove that no conflicting QCs formed in intermediate views. Siesta once again leverages VOTE-REQ messages to generate No-QC proofs that precisely prove that no QC formed in a view. Siesta additionally uses these messages to reliably detect any leader that successfully caused a conflicting QC to form, and slashes this replica. Together, these properties allow Siesta to achieve gap-tolerance.

Specifically, when replica r receives a new block B_r with associated QC QC_r , it checks which blocks in the chain can now be committed and executed. Recall that two QCs are necessary to commit a block; the next block that can potentially be committed (we write B_{commit}) is then the block certified by the QC that QC_r extends. For instance, consider what happens when a replica receives block G in Figure 8. If $QC_r = QC_F$, G 's associated QC QC_G certifies block F , and F 's associated QC QC_D certifies block D , the first committable block. Note that these blocks are not necessarily direct parents of each other, as Siesta allows for leaders to extend blocks in VOTE-REQ messages directly. r can safely commit B_{commit} if there does not exist a QC that formed in a view between QC_{commit} and QC_r . We consider two scenarios: contiguous QCs and non-contiguous QCs.

- **Contiguous QCs.** Two QCs are contiguous if $QC_r.v = QC_{commit}.v + 1$. It is trivially safe to commit B_{commit} as there does not exist an intermediate view in which a conflicting QC could have formed.
- **Non-Contiguous QCs.** If the QCs are not contiguous, one must confirm that there does not exist a conflicting block $B_{conflict}$ with a view greater than v_{commit} that has been certified. In other words, there must not exist a QC of the form $QC_{conflict} = (v, B_{conflict}, \sigma)$ where $v > QC_{commit}.v$ and $v < QC_r.v$. If such QC exist, it is not safe to commit B_{commit} . In a later view, however, a different leader could observe both QC_{commit} and $QC_{conflict}$ as part of a later view-change and choose to extend $B_{conflict}$ as $QC_{conflict}$ has a higher view. This new leader would in effect be overwriting B_{commit} 's commit decision, violating safety. To convince itself that no such $QC_{conflict}$ exists, r leverages VOTE-REQ requests to generate an explicit *No-QC proof*. We know that, by quorum intersection, if a block $B_{conflict}$ has been certified, all subsequent leaders will observe at least one VOTE-REQ message for $B_{conflict}$ (certifying a block requires $n - f$ votes; at least one honest node's vote is guaranteed to be included in the next view). r thus checks every block on the chain between B_r (included) and B_{commit} to determine whether such a conflicting VOTE-REQ exists. Fast-blocks occur in contiguous views and thus do not need to be checked (they do not store VOTE-REQ messages). For slow blocks, r checks that there does not exist a VOTE-REQ message that is for a conflicting block B^* in the same or higher view; a block B^* conflicts with B_{commit} if $B_{commit} \leftrightarrow B^*$. The absence of such VOTE-REQ message constitutes a No-QC proof; r can safely commit B_{commit} .

Slashing The use of No-QC proofs guarantees gap-tolerance in the presence of omission faults, but may not succeed when malicious leaders explicitly equivocate. Fortunately, the commit logic described above can be repurposed to simultaneously reliably detect commission failures. If a malicious leader successfully causes subsequent leaders to create a QC for a conflicting block $B_{conflict}$, the same quorum intersection argument guarantees that at least one honest leader replica will observe conflicting VOTE-REQ messages in B_{commit} 's view. To understand this claim, let $B_{conflict}$ be the earliest certified block that does not extend B_{commit}





■ **Figure 10** CDF of the number of views needed to commit an operation $n = 100$.

and let $QC_{conflict}$ be the associated QC. As $QC_{commit.v} < QC_{conflict.v}$, it must be the case that the leader in $QC_{conflict.v}$ observed at least one vote for a block that extends B_{commit} (by quorum intersection). The only way in which a leader can legitimately propose $B_{conflict}$ is if it extends a VOTE-REQ message for a conflicting block B_{req} , such that $B_{req.v} \geq B_{commit.v}$. Let $vreq$ be the first such VOTE-REQ that does not extend B_{commit} . Since B_{commit} was certified, by quorum intersection $vreq$ must include a VOTE-REQ for B_{commit} , and $vreq$ is the earliest VOTE-REQ that does not extend B_{commit} with view $\geq B_{commit.v}$, $vreq$ must have the same view as $B_{commit.v}$. However, $vreq$ conflicts with B_{commit} , forming an equivocation proof.

These conflicting VOTE-REQ messages form an equivocation proof, which replicas will use as evidence to exclude the faulty replica from the protocol. After f equivocation attempts, all faulty replicas will be removed from the system, thus guaranteeing that the protocol will always successfully generate No-QC proofs and commit B_{commit} .

5.5 Communication Complexity.

Protocol logic is independent of the specific signature scheme chosen; protocol complexity, however, is tightly coupled with this choice. In the view change protocol, the leader sends a block containing $O(n)$ VOTE-REQ messages and $O(n)$ QCs to $O(n)$ replicas. Each QC consists of $O(n)$ words (each word consisting of a digital signature), thus resulting in $O(n^2)$ words. Each VOTE-REQ consists of $O(1)$ words, and thus a block contains $O(n^2)$ words in total, resulting in a total communication complexity of $O(n^3)$ words. If threshold signatures are used, each QC can be reduced $O(1)$ words, since a threshold signature is a single signature indicating a threshold of $k = n - f$ replicas signed a message. This reduces the complexity to $O(n^2)$ words. When instantiated with SNARKs, Siesta achieves $O(n)$ complexity.

6 Performance Results and Complexity

We formally quantify the performance gains made possible by relaxing the consecutive honest leader condition (CHLC). We compare Siesta to 1) two-round CLSO protocols (Diem-BFTv4 [29], Fast-Hotstuff [21], Jolteon [19]), 2) three-phase CLSO protocols (Hotstuff [30]). We assume a random leader election strategy; experiments with round-robin election convey

similar results. We calculate the expected number of rounds necessary to commit an operation, with and without the CHLC, before validating these claims through simulation.

► **Theorem 5.** *With a random leader election scheme, after GST, the expected number of rounds necessary to commit a block under the consecutive honest leader condition is $L = \frac{(1-p^k)}{(1-p)p^k}$ [16] where $p = \frac{n-f}{n}$ and k is the number of consecutive honest leaders needed.*

► **Theorem 6.** *With a random leader election scheme, after GST with only omission faults, the expected number of rounds necessary to commit a block in Siesta is $\frac{3n}{n-f}$*

Proof: Recall that two-round CLSO protocols require a sequence of three honest leaders to commit an operation. Let p be the probability of selecting an honest leader $p = \frac{n-f}{n}$. As leaders are independent, the number of rounds until selecting the first, second, and third honest leaders can be viewed as three independent random variables X_1 , X_2 , and X_3 with the same distribution. The expected number of rounds until the selecting the n th honest leader $\mathbb{E}(X_n)$ follows a geometric distribution; by definition $\mathbb{E}(X_n) = \frac{1}{p}$. For a three-round protocol, we have $L = \mathbb{E}(X_1) + \mathbb{E}(X_2) + \mathbb{E}(X_3) = \frac{3}{p}$.

Next, we simulate each protocol; we report how many protocol rounds were necessary to satisfy each protocol’s commit rule. In CLSO protocols, the number of rounds directly influences both latency and throughput. If a round has latency x , then commit latency for an operation will be $x * \text{rounds}$ while throughput is calculated by dividing the batch size by the expected commit latency. We write CHLC(4) for Hotstuff (requires four consecutive leaders), CHLC(3) for Fast-Hotstuff, Jolteon and DiemBFTv4, and finally Relaxed for our own protocol Siesta. Figure 10 shows the resulting commit latency CDF. As expected, Siesta achieves an expected commit latency of 4.5; CHLC(3) requires ≈ 7 rounds. CHLC(4) has worst the expected performance, taking 12 rounds to commit. Worst-case commit latency is especially interesting: Siesta has relatively low worst-case latency, with 18 rounds, while CHLC(3) protocols have a worst-case commit time of 76. CHLC(4) has seven times worst latency, with a worst-case commit time of 129 rounds.



7 Related Work

Existing BFT protocols can broadly be placed in three categories: stable leader protocols, chained LSO protocols, and partially synchronous protocols with asynchronous fallbacks.

Stable-Leader. Traditional stable leader protocols such as the seminal PBFT [13] protocol and its many derivatives (Zyzyva [23], Aardvark [14], SBFT [20], among others [24] [9] follow a primary/backup structure and require expensive view change mechanisms when leader failures do occur.

CLSO. Recent blockchain-focused chained BFT SMR systems (most notably Hotstuff [30], Casper FFG [8] and Tendermint [7]) instead move view changes onto the critical path of the protocol and rotate leaders preemptively. Such protocols improve fairness by spreading proposal responsibility evenly across replicas. They are frequently engineered to utilize signature aggregation schemes to achieve linear word complexity. Recent, more optimized variants (DiemBFTv4 [29], Fast-Hotstuff [21], Jolteon [19]) have gone back on this decision and favor more expensive solutions communication-wise, but with fewer number of rounds. Siesta also minimize the number of rounds necessary to commit an operation, but relaxes the commit rule to achieve better performance under failures.

Asynchronous Fallback. When network conditions or failures prevent blocks from being committed other BFT-SMR protocols like Ditto [19], Dumbo-Bolt Transformer [25],



and Bullshark [28] explicitly combine partially synchronous and fully asynchronous BFT-SMR protocols. In the common failure-free case, these systems follow a partially synchronous protocol but fallback to an asynchronous protocol run when failures occur or the network is poor. While the asynchronous fallback mechanism improves robustness, it also increases commit latency significantly. Additionally, there are fully asynchronous protocols such as HoneyBadgerBFT [26], BEAT [17], VABA [2], DAG-Rider [22], and more [10] [11]. While these protocols are more robust compared to partially synchronous protocols, they typically have higher communication complexity and latency.

Leader Election Schemes. Carefully optimizing the leader-selection process for Siesta is an orthogonal line of research that could benefit Siesta or any CLSO protocol. Rather than having a simple round-robin assignment of leaders to views, protocols like Carousel [15] implement a leader reputation scheme to detect and avoid potentially crashed leaders. This increases the probability that k consecutive honest leaders are elected. Carousel guarantees an honest block is committed in $O(f)$ rounds, whereas in $O(f)$ rounds we get x blocks committed and y equivocation detections, where $x + y = O(f)$.

8 Conclusion

This paper targets the liveness issues caused by the contiguous honest leader requirement, which all CLSO protocols requires. Our work is the first to show that no relaxation of the consecutive honest leader condition is safe under arbitrary failures. We demonstrate, however, that, under omission faults only, relaxations *are* possible. We present Siesta, the first CLSO BFT protocol that can commit blocks without always requiring k consecutive honest leaders. Siesta leverages NoQC proofs to commit a block when there is sufficient evidence that no intermediate block could have formed, as is the case with omission faults. In the presence of commission faults, Siesta can reliably detect this misbehaviour and will slash the faulty node and remove it from the system, thus bounding the maximum number of views needed to commit an operation.

References

- 1 Diem homepage. <https://www.diem.com>.
- 2 Ittai Abraham, Dahlia Malkhi, and Alexander Spiegelman. Asymptotically optimal validated asynchronous byzantine agreement. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*, PODC '19, page 337–346, New York, NY, USA, 2019. Association for Computing Machinery.
- 3 Ittai Abraham, Kartik Nayak, Ling Ren, and Zhuolun Xiang. Brief note: Fast authenticated byzantine consensus. 2021.
- 4 Ittai Abraham, Kartik Nayak, Ling Ren, and Zhuolun Xiang. Good-case latency of byzantine broadcast: A complete categorization. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*, PODC'21, page 331–341, New York, NY, USA, 2021. Association for Computing Machinery.
- 5 Shehar Bano, Alberto Sonnino, Andrey Chursin, Dmitri Perelman, and Dahlia Malkhi. Twins: White-glove approach for BFT testing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.10617*, 2020.
- 6 Manuel Bravo, Gregory Chockler, and Alexey Gotsman. Making byzantine consensus live (extended version). 2020.
- 7 Ethan Buchman. *Tendermint: Byzantine fault tolerance in the age of blockchains*. PhD thesis, 2016.
- 8 Vitalik Buterin and Virgil Griffith. Casper the friendly finality gadget. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.09437*, 2017.



- 9 Christian Cachin. Yet another visit to paxos. Technical report, IBM Research, 2011.
- 10 Christian Cachin, Klaus Kursawe, Frank Petzold, and Victor Shoup. Secure and efficient asynchronous broadcast protocols. In *Proceedings of the 21st Annual International Cryptology Conference on Advances in Cryptology*, CRYPTO '01, page 524–541, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2001. Springer-Verlag.
- 11 Christian Cachin, Klaus Kursawe, and Victor Shoup. Random oracles in constantinople: Practical asynchronous byzantine agreement using cryptography. In *in Proc. 19th ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC)*, pages 123–132, 2000.
- 12 Ran Canetti and Tal Rabin. Fast asynchronous byzantine agreement with optimal resilience, 1998.
- 13 Miguel Castro and Barbara Liskov. Practical byzantine fault tolerance. In *Proceedings of the Third Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation*, OSDI '99, page 173–186, USA, 1999. USENIX Association.
- 14 Allen Clement, Edmund Wong, Lorenzo Alvisi, Mike Dahlin, and Mirco Marchetti. Making byzantine fault tolerant systems tolerate byzantine faults. In *Proceedings of the 6th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation*, NSDI'09, page 153–168, USA, 2009. USENIX Association.
- 15 Shir Cohen, Rati Gelashvili, Lefteris Kokoris Kogias, Zekun Li, Dahlia Malkhi, Alberto Sonnino, and Alexander Spiegelman. Be aware of your leaders. 2021.
- 16 Steve Drekić and Michael Z. Spivey. On the number of trials needed to obtain k consecutive successes. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 176(C), 2021.
- 17 Sisi Duan, Michael K. Reiter, and Haibin Zhang. Beat: Asynchronous bft made practical. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, CCS '18, page 2028–2041, New York, NY, USA, 2018. Association for Computing Machinery.
- 18 Cynthia Dwork, Nancy Lynch, and Larry Stockmeyer. Consensus in the presence of partial synchrony. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 35(2):288–323, 1988.
- 19 Rati Gelashvili, Lefteris Kokoris-Kogias, Alberto Sonnino, Alexander Spiegelman, and Zhuolun Xiang. Jolteon and ditto: Network-adaptive efficient consensus with asynchronous fallback. *CoRR*, abs/2010.11454, 2021.
- 20 Guy Golan Gueta, Ittai Abraham, Shelly Grossman, Dahlia Malkhi, Benny Pinkas, Michael Reiter, Dragos-Adrian Seredinschi, Orr Tamir, and Alin Tomescu. Sbft: A scalable and decentralized trust infrastructure. In *2019 49th Annual IEEE/IFIP International Conference on Dependable Systems and Networks (DSN)*, pages 568–580, 2019.
- 21 Mohammad M. Jalalzai, Jianyu Niu, and Chen Feng. Fast-hotstuff: A fast and resilient hotstuff protocol. *CoRR*, abs/2010.11454, 2020.
- 22 Idit Keidar, Eleftherios Kokoris-Kogias, Oded Naor, and Alexander Spiegelman. All you need is dag. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*, PODC'21, page 165–175, New York, NY, USA, 2021. Association for Computing Machinery.
- 23 Ramakrishna Kotla, Lorenzo Alvisi, Mike Dahlin, Allen Clement, and Edmund Wong. Zyzzyva: Speculative Byzantine Fault Tolerance. *ACM Transactions on Computer Systems (TOCS)*, 27(4):7:1–7:39, January 2010.
- 24 Shengyun Liu, Paolo Viotti, Christian Cachin, Vivien Quéma, and Marko Vukolic. Xft: Practical fault tolerance beyond crashes. In *Proceedings of the 12th USENIX Conference on Operating Systems Design and Implementation*, OSDI'16, page 485–500, USA, 2016. USENIX Association.
- 25 Yuan Lu, Zhenliang Lu, and Qiang Tang. Bolt-dumbo transformer: Asynchronous consensus as fast as pipelined bft. 2021.
- 26 Andrew Miller, Yu Xia, Kyle Croman, Elaine Shi, and Dawn Song. The honey badger of bft protocols. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, CCS '16, page 31–42, New York, NY, USA, 2016. Association for Computing Machinery.

- 27 Oded Naor, Mathieu Baudet, Dahlia Malkhi, and Alexander Spiegelman. Cogsworth: Byzantine view synchronization. 2020.
- 28 Alexander Spiegelman, Neil Giridharan, Alberto Sonnino, and Lefteris Kokoris-Kogias. Bullshark: Dag bft protocols made practical. 2022.
- 29 The Diem Team. DiemBFT v4: State machine replication in the diem blockchain. Technical report, Diem, 2021. <https://developers.diem.com/papers/diem-consensus-state-machine-replication-in-the-diem-blockchain/2021-08-17.pdf>.
- 30 Maofan Yin, Dahlia Malkhi, Michael K. Reiter, Guy Golan Gueta, and Ittai Abraham. Hotstuff: BFT consensus with linearity and responsiveness. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*, PODC '19, page 347–356, New York, NY, USA, 2019. Association for Computing Machinery.



A Pseudocode

We summarize protocol pseudocode. By convention, we assume that each replica only ever accepts messages 1) whose signatures are valid 2) in matching views. We omit this check for clarity.

Algorithm 1 Fast-View Change

```
upon event  $2f+1 \langle \text{VOTE-RESP}, B_{v-1} \rangle$  do
   $b_h$  = set of submitted client operations
  Form  $QC_B = (B_{v-1}, B.v, 2f+1 \text{ VOTE-RESP msgs})$ 
   $h = B_{v-1}.h + 1$ 
   $B = (h, H(B_{v-1}), b_h, v, QC_B, \sigma_L)$  where  $\sigma_L$  is leader's signature and  $v$  the current view
  Send  $\langle \text{VOTE-REQ}, B \rangle$ 
end event
upon event  $\langle \text{VOTE-REQ}, B \rangle$  do
  if  $vp_r.v < B.v \wedge B.QC.v = v_r - 1$  then
     $vr_r = \langle \text{VOTE-REQ}, B \rangle$ 
     $QC_r = B.QC$ 
    Send  $\langle \text{VOTE-RESP}, B \rangle_{\sigma_r}$  to  $L_{v+1}$ 
     $vp_r = \langle \text{VOTE-RESP}, B \rangle$ 
     $v_r = v_r + 1$ 
  else
    Ignore message
end event
```

B Proofs

B.1 Safety

We first prove safety, defined below.

- **Definition 7.** (*Safety*). *Honest replicas do not commit conflicting blocks.*
- **Definition 8.** (*Block Extension*). *A block B' extends block B (denoted as $B \leftarrow B'$), if B is an ancestor for B' : there must exist a path of parent blocks from B' to B .*
- **Definition 9.** (*QC Extension*). *A block B' extends certificate QC_B (denoted as $QC_B \leftarrow B'$), if $B'.QC$ certifies a block, B^* such that $B \leftarrow B^*$*
- **Definition 10.** (*Conflicting blocks*). *Two blocks, B and B' conflict, if $\neg(B \leftarrow B' \vee B' \leftarrow B)$ (B and B' do not extend each other).*
- **Lemma 11.** *If a quorum certificate, QC_B forms for block B , then no other quorum certificate, $QC_{B'}$ can form for block $B' \neq B$ with $B'.v = B.v$.*

Proof: Suppose for the sake of contradiction that $QC_{B'}$ did form for block B' . This means that a quorum, Q' , containing $n - f$ replicas voted for B' . Denote the quorum of $n - f$ replicas that voted for B as Q . $Q' \cap Q$ in at least 1 honest replica. This honest replica voted for both B and B' even though they both have the same view, a contradiction.



■ **Algorithm 2** Slow View Change

upon event View $v - 1$ timeout expiring **do**
 Send $\langle \text{NEWVIEW}, v, vr_r, vp_r, QC_r \rangle_{\sigma_r}$ to L_v
end event

upon event $S = 2f+1$ $\langle \text{NEWVIEW}, v, vr_r, vp_r, QC_r \rangle$ **do**
if $2f + 1$ matching vp_r **then**
 $QC_i =$ set of matching vp_r
else
 $B_{anc} =$ earliest ancestor block of $2f + 1$ matching vp_r
 if B_{anc} uncommitted **then**
 $QC_{anc} =$ set of matching vp_r
 else
 $QC_{high} = \max(QC_r)_{r \in R}$
 $QC_{choice} = \max(QC_i, QC_{anc}, QC_{high})$
 $highVote = \max(vr_r)_{r \in R}$
 if $QC_{choice} \leftarrow highVote.B$ **then** \triangleright highVote is the correct block to extend
 else
 if $highVote.B.S$ contains $n - f$ NEWVIEW messages that do not contain
 QC_{choice} **then** $\triangleright QC_{choice}$ could not have committed
 $QC_{choice} = highVote.QC$
 else
 $highVote = vr_r$ that contains QC_{choice}
 $b_h =$ batch of transactions
 $votereqs =$ set of vr_r messages with the same view $vr_r.B.v$ but different $vr_r.B$
 if $votereqs \neq \perp$ **then** \triangleright Equivocation proof
 $\pi = votereqs$
 $B = (h, H(highVote.B), b_h, v, QC_{choice}, S, \pi)$
 $\sigma_{L_v} =$ signature on B
 Multicast $\langle \text{VOTE-REQ}, B \rangle_{\sigma_{L_v}}$ to all replicas
 end event
 upon event $\langle \text{VOTE-REQ}, B \rangle$ **do**
 if $v == B.v$ **then**
 if $B.\pi \neq \perp$ **then**
 Ignore messages from identified faulty leader
 goto line 4 using $B.S$ \triangleright Check if the leader did the view change correctly
 if result matches B **then**
 $vr_r = \langle \text{VOTE-REQ}, B \rangle$
 $QC_r = B.QC$
 Send $\langle \text{VOTE-RESP}, B \rangle_{\sigma_r}$ to L_{v+1}
 $vp_r = \langle \text{VOTE-RESP}, B \rangle_{\sigma_r}$
 $v_r = v_r + 1$
 else
 Ignore message
 else
 Ignore message
 end event

■ **Algorithm 3** Commit Rule

```

upon event Updating  $vr_r$  do
   $QC_r = vr_r.QC$ 
   $B_r = QC_r.B$ 
   $QC_{commit} = B_r.QC$ 
   $B_{commit} = QC_{commit}.B$ 
  if  $B_{commit}.v + 1 == B_r.v$  then ▷ Contiguous QCs
    Commit  $B_{commit}$ 
  else
     $B^* = B_r$ 
    while  $B^*.v \geq B_{commit}.v$  do
      if  $B^*.S$  contains a  $\langle \text{VOTE-REQ}, B_{conflict} \rangle$ , where  $B_{commit} \leftarrow B_{conflict}$  then
        return False ▷ Not safe to commit
       $B^* = B^*.parent$ 
    Commit  $B_{commit}$ 
end event

```

► **Lemma 12.** *If an honest replica r commits a block B , then let QC_B be the QC that certifies B and let QC_{B^*} be the QC that certifies block B^* with $B^*.v > B.v$ and $B \leftarrow B^*$, which causes r to commit B , then no conflicting QC can form in a view v' $B.v < v' < B^*.v$*

Proof: Assume for the sake of contradiction that a QC, $QC_{B'}$, formed for a conflicting block B' . This implies that a quorum Q' , s.t. $|Q'| = n - f$ voted for B' in view $B'.v$. In view v' , every replica in Q' must have updated its local vr_r to be a valid VOTE-REQ message containing B' . Let B_1 be the ancestor block of B^* with the lowest view such that $B_1.v > B'.v$. B_1 must conflict with B' , since B^* extends B . Since B_1 is the earliest block that conflicts with B' it must be the case that B_1 is a slow block containing a quorum of $n - f$ VOTE-REQ messages since it does not extend B' . This quorum must intersect Q' in at least one honest replica, implying that $B^*.S$ must contain a VOTE-REQ for a block that extends B' . Replica r , however, committed B which means that for all blocks in the path from B to B^* , there must not be a VOTE-REQ for a conflicting block, a contradiction since there must exist a VOTE-REQ that extends B' in B_1 .

► **Theorem 13.** *If an honest replica r commits a block B , then it must vote for a VOTE-REQ containing a QC_{B^*} for B^* , where $B \leftarrow B^*$ and $B^*.v > B.v$, which contains a QC_B for B . For any $\langle \text{VOTE-REQ}, B' \rangle$ such that $B'.v > B^*.v$, that an honest replica votes for, it must be the case that $QC_B \leftarrow B'$.*

Proof: We prove the theorem by induction.

Base Case: $v' = B^*.v + 1$. Since there exists a QC_{B^*} , it must be the case that at least $f + 1$ honest replicas have a vr_r for B^* . By quorum intersection at least one of these vr_r must be present in the view change for v' . This vr_r will have the highest view unless the leader of B^* equivocates and there are multiple VOTE-REQ messages with view $B^*.v$. Since there cannot exist a QC' for a block that conflicts with B and a higher view than B by Lemma 12, it must be the case that if the leader does not extend B^* it will extend a VOTE-REQ that contains a block that extends QC_B .



Step. We assume the theorem holds for all $v' - 1 > B^*.v$, and now we consider view v' . Suppose for the sake of contradiction there exists a $\langle \text{VOTE-REQ}, B' \rangle$ with view $B'.v = v'$ that does not extend QC_B . B' must be a slow block since by strong induction any certified block in $v' - 1$ must have extended B . Thus $B'.S$ must contain $n - f$ VOTE-REQ messages. From the base case there must be at least $f + 1$ vr_r VOTE-REQ messages that contain QC_B . In order for $f + 1$ honest replicas to vote for $\langle \text{VOTE-REQ}, B' \rangle$, $B'.S$ must contain a $\langle \text{VOTE-REQ}, B_1 \rangle$, where $B_1.v > B.v$ and B^* conflicts with B . By the base case and induction assumption $B_1.v \leq B^*.v$, and by quorum intersection B_1 must contain at least one VOTE-REQ that has view at least $B^*.v$ that contains a block that extends QC_B . However, B' extended a conflicting VOTE-REQ for B_1 with a lower view and lower QC, a contradiction.

► **Theorem 14.** *For any two committed blocks B and B' by an honest replica then either $B \leftarrow B'$ or $B' \leftarrow B$.*

Proof: By Theorem 13, if an honest replica commits B (B') then every valid VOTE-REQ that an honest replica votes for in a future view must contain a QC that extends QC_B . Since a QC requires at least $f + 1$ honest votes, it must be the case that every later certified block must extend B (B'). Since only certified blocks can be committed, any pair of certified blocks cannot conflict.

B.2 Liveness

Liveness depends on a critical component called the pacemaker or view synchronization mechanism. There are many pacemakers such as Cogsworth [27] and FastSync [6]. Any of these pacemakers can be used with this protocol. We assume the pacemaker satisfies the following theorem.

► **Theorem 15.** *Let v be a view with an honest leader after GST. Within time bound of T_f from when the first honest replica enters v , all honest replicas also enter v and receive a proposed block B .*

We now prove optimistic bounds for when there is no equivocation by faulty replicas.

► **Lemma 16.** *Assuming no malicious leader equivocates, after GST and view synchronization, if an honest leader multicasts $\langle \text{VOTE-REQ}, B \rangle$ then any valid $\langle \text{VOTE-REQ}, B' \rangle$, s.t. $B.v \leq B'.v \leq v$, must extend B .*

Proof: We prove the lemma by induction.

Base Case: $B'.v = B.v$. By theorem 15, it must be the case that all honest replicas will enter $B.v$ and receive $\langle \text{VOTE-REQ}, B \rangle_{L_{B.v}}$ within time bound T_f . Since the $L_{B.v}$ is honest, it will not equivocate and only send $\langle \text{VOTE-REQ}, B \rangle_{L_{B.v}}$ to all replicas. It will be the only valid $\langle \text{VOTE-REQ} \rangle$ message in view $B.v$ and all honest replicas will update their vr_r and send a $\langle \text{VOTE-RESP}, B \rangle$ message. The lemma is satisfied since $B \leftarrow B$.

Step. We assume the lemma holds $\forall v'$ s.t. $B.v < B'.v < v$ and now consider $B'.v = v$. Suppose for the sake of contradiction there does exist a valid $\langle \text{VOTE-REQ}, B' \rangle$ s.t. $B'.v = v$ and B' does not extend B . By strong induction all valid VOTE-REQ messages in $v - 1$ must extend B , therefore B' must be a slow block. Since B' does not extend B , $B'.S$ must contain a $\langle \text{VOTE-REQ}, B^* \rangle$ message, where B^* conflicts with B . By quorum intersection, $B'.S$ must contain a VOTE-REQ message with view at least $B.v$ that extends B . By strong induction $\langle \text{VOTE-REQ}, B^* \rangle$ must have the property that $B^*.v < B.v$. Since $\langle \text{VOTE-REQ}, B^* \rangle$ has a lower view, the only way $\langle \text{VOTE-REQ}, B' \rangle$ is valid is if $B^*.QC.v > B.QC.v$ and



$B.S$ contains at least one VOTE-REQ containing $B^*.QC$ out of $n - f$ messages. Since L_v is honest, $B.S$ must contain at least $n - f$ VOTE-REQ messages that do not contain $B^*.QC$, as otherwise B would have extended $B^*.QC.B$ and not $B.QC.B$, a contradiction.

We now prove the main theorem result of our paper (copied from the intro).

► **Theorem 17.** *After GST and view synchronization, if views $v < v' < v''$ have honest leaders, and block B is proposed in view v , then either block B will be committed in view v'' or a previously undetected faulty replica will be publicly detected and slashed (and excluded from any future participation).*

Proof: From theorem 15, after GST and view synchronization, once an honest replica r enters view v all honest replicas ($n - f$ in total) will enter v and receive a proposed block B from the leader of v within T_f , and send a VOTE-RESP message within $T_f + \Delta$. From Lemma 16, any VOTE-REQ message between view v and v' must extend B . If there is a fast view change in v' , then the leader of v' will receive $n - f$ VOTE-RESP messages that extend B , since by Lemma 16 any VOTE-REQ message in view $v' - 1$ must extend B . If there is a slow view change in v' , then the leader of v' be guaranteed to receive VOTE-RESP messages from all honest replicas after 2Δ . Since the leader of v was honest, all honest replicas will have a vp_r VOTE-RESP message that extends B . Since there are at least $n - f$ VOTE-RESP messages that extend B , the leader of v' will be able to certify B . It will then propose a block B' that extends B , since the highest VOTE-REQ message it receives extends B . By a similar argument, the leader of v'' will be able to certify B' . By Lemma 16 any valid VOTE-REQ message between views v and v'' must be for a block that extends B . Since there does not exist a conflicting VOTE-REQ message between views v and v' , the commit rule is satisfied, and B is committed.

In the worst case when there is equivocation, there may exist a VOTE-REQ message between views v and v' that does not extend B , and thus B cannot be committed. In this case, since there is a record of the VOTE-REQ messages, a malicious leader can be detected and slashed if there exists conflicting VOTE-REQ messages in the same view. Liveness of the protocol falls back to requiring two consecutive honest leaders and a third honest leader in a later view. With our equivocation detection mechanism and slashing, faulty replicas will be severely punished for equivocation, so this fallback will occur rarely.

We now bounds when there are commission faults (equivocation by faulty replicas).

► **Theorem 18.** *Let v be some view after GST. Every honest replica eventually commits some block B in view $v' > v$.*

Proof: Since we assume a round-robin leader rotation scheme, and the number of byzantine replicas is bounded by f , by the pigeonhole principle we can find some view v' such that v' and $v' + 1$ have honest leaders. From theorem 15 all honest replicas will enter v' and receive a proposal from the leader of v' within T_f . Since the leader of v' is honest. it will propose a block that is accepted by $n - f$ honest replicas, and they will send their votes to the leader of $v' + 1$ who is also honest after $T_f + \Delta$. The leader of $v' + 1$ will form a QC, and propose a block that extends it. After $T_f + 2\Delta$, $n - f$ replicas will update their vr_r and vp_r to reflect that they voted for it and send their votes to the leader of the next view. Now consider v'' , which is the next view after $v' + 1$, which has an honest leader. If $v'' = v' + 2$, the leader of v'' will receive $n - f$ votes within $T_f + 3\Delta$ form another QC, and broadcast a new block, B' to all of the honest replicas. These $n - f$ honest replicas receive this block within $T_f + 4\Delta$, and will see two QCs in consecutive views, and will therefore commit the block proposed in v . If $v'' > v' + 2$, the leader will receive $n - f$ VOTE-REQ messages that extend B' after T_f .



Since the leader of $v' + 1$ is honest, the highest VOTE-REQ that the leader receives will be for a block that extends B' . Even though there may be equivocation, it will only be for a child block of B' , and therefore extend B . The leader of v'' will then certify at least B' , and send a VOTE-REQ containing this QC to all honest replicas, who will commit B after $T_f + \Delta$, since v' and $v' + 1$ are in consecutive views.

C Impossibility of Committing in Non-Consecutive Rounds

Overview. Our barrier is that it is impossible for a partially synchronous LSO protocol to **always** safely commit in non-consecutive *LSO rounds*.

► **Definition 19.** (*LSO round*). An LSO round consists of 2 asynchronous rounds (defined in [12]) with the following properties.

- Each LSO round has a designated leader.
- In the first asynchronous round, round a , the designated leader waits for $n - f$ round b messages from the previous LSO round or $n - f$ recovery messages, and multicasts a round a message to all replicas.
- In the second asynchronous round, round b , the replicas receive a round a message, perform some local computation, and send a round b message to the designated leader of the next LSO round.

LSO rounds are numbered starting from 1. We say 2 LSO rounds are *non-consecutive* if their round numbers differ by more than 1. LSO rounds may fail to complete due to asynchrony or byzantine leader(s). In these situations, we assume that at the beginning of an LSO round the first leader receives $n - f$ recovery messages containing the local history of that replica.

► **Theorem 20.** Any authenticated partially synchronous LSO protocol that is resilient to $3 \leq f < \frac{n}{3}$ faults cannot always safely commit in 2 non-consecutive LSO rounds under partial synchrony.

Proof: Suppose there exists a partially synchronous LSO protocol Π that can always commit in 2 non-consecutive LSO rounds. We show that Π can always have an execution which results in a safety violation. We construct multiple worlds for LSO rounds 1 – 3, 4 – 6, and 7 – 8, and show an execution which results in conflicting proposals being committed after 2 completed non-consecutive LSO rounds.

LSO Rounds 1-3. We divide the set of replicas into eight non-overlapping sets: P , Q , R , X , Y , F , B_1 , B_2 . P contains $f - 7$ honest replicas, Q contains $f - 7$ honest replicas, R contains 5 honest replicas numbered R_1 , R_2 , R_3 , R_4 , and R_5 , X contains 5 honest replicas, Y contains 5 honest replicas, F contains $f - 2$ byzantine replicas, B_1 contains a byzantine replica, and B_2 contains a byzantine replica.



World 1a.

Setup: Leader of LSO rounds 1, 2, and 3 in P (honest)

Recovery Messages Received: N/A

Messages Sent:

- Leader of round 1 multicasts round 1a for x
- $P \cup X \cup R1 \cup R2 \cup R3 \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$ send round 1b message to leader of round 2
- Leader of round 2 multicasts round 2a for x (containing $n - f$ round 1b for x)
- $P \cup X \cup R1 \cup R2 \cup R3 \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$ send round 2b message to leader of round 3
- Leader of round 3 multicasts round 3a message

Messages Delayed:

- $Q \cup Y \cup R4 \cup R5$ do not receive round 1a for x
- $Q \cup Y \cup R4 \cup R5$ do not receive round 2a for x
- All replicas do not receive round 3a for x

World 1a. Since LSO round 1 is the first round, the leader does not wait for any messages from previous rounds. The leader is honest and multicasts a round 1a message containing a proposal for x to all replicas. Replicas in $P \cup X \cup R1 \cup R2 \cup R3 \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$, send a round 1b message to the leader of round 2. The leader of round 2 is honest. It receives $n - f$ round 1b messages for x and multicasts a round 2a message containing the $n - f$ round 1b messages for x . The replicas in $P \cup X \cup R1 \cup R2 \cup R3 \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$ send a round 2b message for x to the leader of round 3, who commits x since there are $n - f$ round 2b messages containing $n - f$ round 1b messages (two completed LSO rounds for x) but due to asynchrony the replicas do not receive a round 3a message so they timeout and move to round 4.

World 1b.

Setup: Leader of LSO round 1 in B_1 (Byzantine). Leader of rounds 2, and 3 in P (honest)

Recovery Messages Received: N/A


Messages Sent:

- Leader of round 1 sends round 1a for x to $P \cup X \cup R1 \cup R2 \cup R3 \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$.
- Leader of round 1 sends round 1a for y to $Q \cup Y \cup R4 \cup R5 \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$.
- $P \cup X \cup R1 \cup R2 \cup R3 \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$ send round 1b message to leader of round 2
- Leader of round 2 multicasts round 2a for x (containing $n - f$ round 1b for x)
- Leader of round 3 multicasts round 3a message

Messages Delayed:

- Leader of round 2 does not receive round 2b message for y from $Q \cup Y \cup R4 \cup R5$
- All replicas do not receive round 2a for x except for leader of round 2
- All replicas do not receive round 3a for x

World 1b. Starting with LSO round 1, the leader is Byzantine and equivocates by sending a round 1a message for proposal x to replicas in $P \cup X \cup R1 \cup R2 \cup R3 \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$, and a round 1a message for proposal y to replicas in $Q \cup Y \cup R4 \cup R5 \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$. The replicas in $P \cup X \cup R1 \cup R2 \cup R3 \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$ are faster and send a round 1b message for x to the leader of round 2 first. The leader of round 2 (in P) then multicasts a round 2a message for x containing $n - f$ round 1b messages for x but due to asynchrony these round 2a messages are not received before the replicas timeout and move to round 3. The leader of round 3 has all round 3a messages delayed indefinitely, and all replicas timeout and move to



round 4.

World 1c.

Setup: Leader of LSO round 1 in B_1 (Byzantine). Leader of rounds 2, and 3 in Q (honest)

Recovery Messages Received: N/A

Messages Sent:

- Leader of round 1 sends round 1a for x to $P \cup X \cup R1 \cup R2 \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$.
- Leader of round 1 sends round 1a for y to $Q \cup Y \cup R3 \cup R4 \cup R5 \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$.
- $Q \cup Y \cup R3 \cup R4 \cup R5 \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$ send round 1b message to leader of round 2
- Leader of round 2 multicasts round 2a for y (containing $n - f$ round 1b for y)
- Leader of round 3 multicasts round 3a message

Messages Delayed:

- Leader of round 2 does not receive round 2b message for x from $P \cup X \cup R1 \cup R2$
- All replicas do not receive round 2a for x
- All replicas do not receive round 3a for x

World 1c. Starting with LSO round 1, the leader is Byzantine and equivocates by sending a round 1a message for proposal x to replicas in $P \cup X \cup R1 \cup R2 \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$, and a round 1a message for proposal y to replicas in $Q \cup Y \cup R3 \cup R4 \cup R5 \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$. The replicas in $Q \cup Y \cup R3 \cup R4 \cup R5 \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$ are faster and send a round 1b message for y to the leader of round 2 first. The leader of round 2 then multicasts a round 2a message for y containing the $n - f$ round 1b messages but due to asynchrony these round 2a messages are not received before the replicas timeout and move to round 3. The leader of round 3 has all round 3a messages delayed indefinitely, and all replicas timeout and move to round 4.

LSO Rounds 4-7. LSO round 4 begins, and the leader collects at least $n - f$ recovery messages.



World 4a.

Setup: Leader of LSO round 4 in B_2 (Byzantine). Leader of rounds 5, and 6 in P (honest)

Recovery Messages Received:

- From $P \cup X \cup R1 \cup R2 \cup R3 \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$: $n - f$ round 1a and 1b messages for x , 1 round 2a and 2b message for x (from leader of round 2). Let this set of recovery messages be S_1 .
- From $Q \cup Y \cup R2 \cup R3 \cup R4 \cup R5 \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$: $2f$ round 1a and 1b messages for y , 2 round 1a and 1b messages for x . Let this set of recovery messages be S_2 .

Messages Sent:

- Leader of round 4 sends round 4a for x containing S_1 to $P \cup X \cup R1 \cup R2 \cup R3 \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$.
- Leader of round 4 sends round 4a for y containing S_2 to $Q \cup Y \cup R4 \cup R5 \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$.
- $P \cup X \cup R1 \cup R2 \cup R3 \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$ send round 1b message to leader of round 2
- Leader of round 5 multicasts round 5a for y (containing $n - f$ round 4b for x)
- Leader of round 6 multicasts round 6a message

Messages Delayed:

- Leader of round 5 does not receive round 4b message for y from $Q \cup Y \cup R4 \cup R5$
- All replicas do not receive round 5a for x except leader of round 5
- All replicas do not receive round 6a for x

World 4a. The leader of round 4 is Byzantine. It collects recovery messages from all replicas. It sends a round 4a message for proposal x containing $n - f$ recovery messages from replicas in $P \cup X \cup R1 \cup R2 \cup R3 \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$. The replicas in $F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$ are Byzantine, so they only include a round 1a and 1b message for x . The replicas in $P \cup X \cup R1 \cup R2 \cup R3$ also only include a round 1a and 1b message for x , since those are those only messages they received. The leader of round 2 (in P) includes a round 2a and 2b message for x containing $n - f$ round 1b messages for x . Even though world 1b actually occurred, based on this recovery information it is possible that world 1a occurred. This is because it is possible that the f Byzantine replicas withheld a round 2a and 2b message for x , and that f honest replicas were slow and did not receive a round 2a and 2b message for x before an honest replica committed x . So to preserve safety (since x committed in world 1a), the replicas in $P \cup X \cup R1 \cup R2 \cup R3 \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$ all send a round 4b message to the leader of round 5. The leader of round 4 equivocates, and also sends a round 4a message for proposal y containing recovery messages from replicas in $Q \cup Y \cup R4 \cup R5 \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$ to replicas in $Q \cup Y \cup R4 \cup R5 \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$. The replicas in $P \cup X \cup R1 \cup R2 \cup R3 \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$ are faster, so they send a round 4b message to the leader of round 5 first. The leader of round 5 will receive the $n - f$ round 4b messages, and commit x since there are $n - f$ round 4b messages containing $n - f$ round 1b messages for x (two completed non-consecutive LSO rounds). It multicasts a round 5a message for x but due to asynchrony, the round 5a messages are delayed indefinitely. The replicas timeout and move to round 6; however, due to asynchrony all round 6a messages are delayed indefinitely. All replicas timeout and move to round 7.



World 4b.

Setup: Leader of LSO round 4 in B_2 (Byzantine). Leader of rounds 5, and 6 in P (honest)

Recovery Messages Received:

- From $P \cup X \cup R1 \cup R2 \cup R3 \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$: $n - f$ round 1a and 1b messages for x , 1 round 2a and 2b message for x (from leader of round 2). Let this set of recovery messages be S_1 .
- From $Q \cup Y \cup R2 \cup R3 \cup R4 \cup R5 \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$: $2f$ round 1a and 1b messages for y , 2 round 1a and 1b messages for x . Let this set of recovery messages be S_2 .

Messages Sent:

- Leader of round 4 sends round 4a for x containing S_1 to $P \cup X \cup B_1 \cup B_2$.
- Leader of round 4 sends round 4a for y containing S_2 to $Q \cup Y \cup R \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$.
- $Q \cup Y \cup R \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$ send round 4b message to leader of round 5
- Leader of round 5 multicasts round 5a for y (containing $n - f$ round 4b for y)
- Leader of round 6 multicasts round 6a message

Messages Delayed:

- Leader of round 5 does not receive round 4b message for y from $Q \cup Y \cup R4 \cup R5$
- All replicas do not receive round 5a
- All replicas do not receive round 6a

World 4b. The leader of round 4 is Byzantine. It receives recovery messages from all replicas. It equivocates and sends a round 4a message containing recovery messages from $P \cup X \cup R1 \cup R2 \cup R3 \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$ for proposal x to replicas in X . It then sends a round 4a message for proposal y containing recovery messages from $Q \cup Y \cup R2 \cup R3 \cup R4 \cup R5 \cup F \cup B_2$ to all replicas in $Q \cup Y \cup R2 \cup R3 \cup R4 \cup R5 \cup F \cup B_2$, who send a round 4b message to the leader of round 5. The leader of round 5 multicasts a round 5a message containing $n - f$ round 4b messages for y . However, due to asynchrony, these messages are delayed indefinitely. The replicas move to round 6, for which all messages are delayed, and the replicas timeout and move to round 7.

World 4c.

Setup: Leader of LSO round 4 in Q (honest). Leader of rounds 5, and 6 in Q (honest)

Recovery Messages Received:

- From $Q \cup Y \cup R1 \cup R2 \cup R4 \cup R5 \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$: $2f$ round 1a and 1b messages for y , 2 round 1a and 1b messages for x . Let this set of recovery messages be S_1 .

Messages Sent:

- Leader of round 4 sends round 4a for y containing S_1 to $Q \cup Y \cup R1 \cup R2 \cup R4 \cup R5 \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$.
- $Q \cup Y \cup R1 \cup R2 \cup R4 \cup R5 \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$ send round 1b message to leader of round 2
- Leader of round 5 multicasts round 5a for y (containing $n - f$ round 4b for y)
- Leader of round 6 multicasts round 6a message

Messages Delayed:

- Leader of round 5 does not receive round 4b message for y from $P \cup X \cup R3$
- All replicas do not receive round 5a except for the leader of round 5
- All replicas do not receive round 6a



World 4c. The leader of round 4 is honest. It collects recovery messages from $Q \cup Y \cup R1 \cup R2 \cup R4 \cup R5 \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$. Since world 1b actually occurred, the replicas in $F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$ are Byzantine, so they only include a round 1a and 1b message for y . The replicas in $Q \cup Y \cup R4 \cup R5$ also only include a round 1a and 1b message for y since those are the only messages they received in world 1b. $R1 \cup R2$ include a round 1a and 1b message for x , since that is what they received in world 1b. Based on this recovery information, the leader knows the leader of round 1 is Byzantine (B_1) since there are conflicting round 1a messages. As a result, the leader can wait for a recovery message from another replica ($R2$). It also cannot distinguish between worlds 1b and 1c, since it receives recovery messages consistent with both worlds. In order to distinguish between worlds 1b and 1c it would need recovery messages from replicas in $P \cup X \cup R3$. The leader of round 4 decides to propose y since it believes that world 1c occurred. The leader can propose any value, since in world 1c no proposal was committed, so it picks y to propose. It multicasts a round 4a message containing the recovery messages and proposal for y to all replicas. The replicas in $Q \cup Y \cup R2 \cup R3 \cup R4 \cup R5 \cup F \cup B_2$ send a round 4b message to the leader of round 5. The leader of round 5 is honest. It multicasts a round 5a message containing the $n - f$ round 4b messages for y . The replicas in $Q \cup Y \cup R2 \cup R3 \cup R4 \cup R5 \cup F \cup B_2$ send a round 5b message to the leader of round 6. The leader of round 6 commits y since it receives $n - f$ round 5b messages containing $n - f$ round 4b messages for y . The round 6a messages multicasted by the leader are delayed indefinitely due to asynchrony. The replicas timeout and move to round 7.

LSO Rounds 7-8. LSO round 7 begins, and the leader collects at least $n - f$ recovery messages.

World 7a.

Setup: Leader of LSO round 7 in F (Byzantine). Leader of round 8 in P (honest)

Recovery Messages Received:

- From $P \cup X \cup R \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$: $2f - 2$ round 4a and 4b messages for x (from $P \cup X \cup R1 \cup R2 \cup R3 \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$), 5 round 4a and 4b messages for y (from R). Let this set of recovery messages be S_1 .
- From $Q \cup Y \cup R \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$: $2f$ round 4a and 4b messages for y , 2 round 4a and 4b messages for x . Let this set of recovery messages be S_2 .

Messages Sent:

- Leader of round 7 sends round 7a for x containing S_1 to $P \cup X \cup R \cup F$.
- Leader of round 7 sends round 7a for y containing S_2 to $Q \cup Y \cup F$.
- $P \cup X \cup R \cup F$ send round 7b message to leader of round 8
- Leader of round 8 multicasts round 8a for x (containing $n - f$ round 7b for x)

Messages Delayed:

- Leader of round 8 does not receive round 7b message for y from $Q \cup Y$
- All replicas do not receive round 8a except for leader of round 8

World 7a. The leader is Byzantine. It collects recovery messages from all replicas. It equivocates and sends a round 7a message containing a proposal for x and recovery messages from $P \cup X \cup R \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$ to all replicas in $P \cup X \cup F$. These replicas have in their local history a round 4a and 4b message for x , so they send a round 7b message for x since it is possible that world 4a occurred and x was committed. The leader of round 7 sends a round 7a message containing a proposal for y and recovery messages from $Q \cup Y \cup R \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$ to replicas in $Q \cup Y \cup R \cup F$. These replicas have in their local history a round 4a and 4b message containing $n - f$ round 3b messages for proposal y . Based on these recovery messages, it is possible that world 4c occurred, and that y was committed. So to preserve



safety the replicas in $Q \cup Y \cup F$ vote for y . The leader of round 8 receives $n - f$ round 7b messages, so it commits x since there are $n - f$ round 7b messages containing $n - f$ round 1b messages for x (proof that 2 rounds completed). The leader of round 8 multicasts a round 8a message but it is delayed indefinitely, and the replicas timeout and move to view 9.

World 7b.

Setup: Leader of LSO round 7 in F (Byzantine). Leader of round 8 in P (honest)

Recovery Messages Received:

- From $P \cup X \cup R \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$: $2f - 2$ round 4a and 4b messages for x (from $P \cup X \cup R1 \cup R2 \cup R3 \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$), 5 round 4a and 4b messages for y (from R). Let this set of recovery messages be S_1 .
- From $Q \cup Y \cup R \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$: $2f$ round 4a and 4b messages for y , 2 round 4a and 4b messages for x . Let this set of recovery messages be S_2 .

Messages Sent:

- Leader of round 7 sends round 7a for x containing S_1 to $P \cup X \cup F$.
- Leader of round 7 sends round 7a for y containing S_2 to $Q \cup Y \cup R \cup F$.
- $Q \cup Y \cup R \cup F$ send round 7b message to leader of round 8
- Leader of round 8 multicasts round 8a for y (containing $n - f$ round 7b for y)

Messages Delayed:

- Leader of round 8 does not receive round 7b message for x from $P \cup X$
- All replicas do not receive round 8a except for leader of round 8

World 7b. The leader is Byzantine. It collects recovery messages from all replicas. It equivocates and sends a round 7a message containing a proposal for x and recovery messages from $P \cup X \cup R \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$ to all replicas in $P \cup X \cup F$. These replicas have in their local history a round 4a and 4b message for x , so they send a round 7b message for x since it is possible that world 4a occurred and x was committed. The leader of round 7 sends a round 7a message containing a proposal for y and recovery messages from $Q \cup Y \cup R \cup F \cup B_1 \cup B_2$ to replicas in $Q \cup Y \cup R \cup F$. These replicas have in their local history a round 4a and 4b message containing $n - f$ round 3b messages for proposal y . Based on these recovery messages, it is possible that world 4c occurred, and that y was committed. So to preserve safety the replicas in $Q \cup Y \cup R \cup F$ vote for y . The leader of round 8 receives $n - f$ round 7b messages, so it commits x since there are $n - f$ round 7b messages containing $n - f$ round 4b messages for y (proof that 2 rounds completed). The leader of round 8 multicasts a round 8a message but it is delayed indefinitely, and the replicas timeout and move to view 9.

LSO round 9. The leader of round 9 is honest. It receives recovery messages from all replicas in $Q \cup Y \cup X \cup F$. The replicas in $Q \cup Y$ indicate they received a round 7a and 7b message for y . The replicas in $X \cup F$ indicate they received a round 7a and 7b message for x . Based on the recovery information, the leader does not know whether world 7a (commit for x) or world 7b occurred (commit for y). Since the replicas in F could have contributed to the commit for both x and y , and the leader does not hear from replicas in P , the leader cannot distinguish between both worlds. Since these worlds are indistinguishable the leader of round 9 can incorrectly think the wrong world occurred and propose the wrong value, leading to a safety violation, a contradiction.

