

# The Curses of Blockchain Decentralization

Shumo Chu, Sophia Wang\*

University of Washington and Epichain.io  
shumo.chu@acm.org, wangxiao@cs.washington.edu

## ABSTRACT

Decentralization, which has backed the hyper growth of many blockchains, comes at the cost of scalability. To understand this fundamental limitation, this paper proposes a quantitative measure of blockchain decentralization, and discusses its implications to various trust models and consensus algorithms. Further, we identify the major challenges in blockchain decentralization. Our key findings are that true decentralization is hard to achieve due to the skewed mining power and that a fully decentralized blockchain inherently limits scalability as it incurs a throughput upper bound and prevents scaling smart contract execution. To address these challenges, we outline three research directions to explore the trade-offs between decentralization and scalability.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Since the invention of Bitcoin [18], cryptocurrencies are gaining enormous popularity. As of April 2018, two most popular cryptocurrencies, Bitcoin and Ethereum [25], have 135.8 and 49.8 billions USD market capitalization, respectively [4]. One key innovation pioneered by Bitcoin and adopted by many other cryptocurrencies is running consensus protocols with open membership on top of cryptographic data structures called *blockchains*. As a result, trust of the currencies can be shifted from centralized control to crypto properties together with the consensus protocol.

The idea of combining consensus protocols and blockchains reaches far beyond cryptocurrencies. This idea was extended to build secure ledgers for generalized transactions, namely, *smart contracts*. And according to the *decentralization level* of blockchain providers, blockchain systems can be classified into public chains, consortium chains, and private chains. Public chains usually use incentivized consensus protocols, such as Nakamoto consensus [18], that allow anyone to join. Consortium chains only allow permissioned participants join the consensus process. And there is only a single participant or dictator in consensus of private chains.

Strong decentralization enables the freedom of not trusting any particular blockchain providers or authorities while still ensuring the trustworthiness of the whole system. However, this freedom is not free. In this paper, we aim to address the following questions.

**How to quantify decentralization?** We first define *centralization level*, a quantitative measure that captures the extent of centralization of blockchains. This measure reflects the distributions of transactions contributed by blockchain providers. Then, we conduct case studies and compare the centralization levels of different blockchains. (Sec. 3).

**What are the problems with decentralization?** We discuss blockchains in details by breaking down its system stack into multiple layers: physical nodes, platform software, smart contracts, and clients. We report three major problems with decentralization in these layers: 1) In physical layer, the assumption of decentralization of mining power does not hold since the real-world mining power distribution is highly skewed. 2) In platform software layer, decentralization causes inherent scalability problems of transaction throughput. We prove a low upper bound of transaction throughput of decentralized blockchains, which is independent of the choices of specific protocols. 3) In smart contract layer, current decentralized blockchains do not fully replicated execution and sequential programming models, which prevent scaling the smart contract execution. (Sec. 4).

**Research opportunities.** These problems highlight key challenges in blockchain research. There are several worth exploring directions. For example, to democratize mining powers, new crypto hash algorithms that are hard for ASIC exploit significant marginal performance could be used. In order to overcome the scalability of transaction throughput, we should explore alternative means of ensuring trust, for example, formal verification, verifiable computation, and secured hardware, rather than purely rely on decentralization. To scale smart contract execution, a promising direction is to co-design new programming model and runtime for smart contract that allows parallel execution (Sec. 5).

## 2 BACKGROUND

A blockchain is a distributed ledger of transactions that provides both a trusted computing platform and a tamper-proof history. To provide a trusted computing platform, a blockchain often requires multiple system nodes to perform the same transaction and builds consensus on the majority. To provide a tamper-proof history, a blockchain uses chained hashes to provide crypto proofs of serialized transactions to defend against double-spending attacks.


\*This work doesn't represent the opinion of the authors' employers. Epichain is a blockchain initiative started by the authors (<http://epichain.io>).

**Bitcoin** [18] is generally considered the first widely used blockchain. To perform a transaction, a user requests system nodes to send Bitcoins from her address to another address, and also attaches a signature to prove its authenticity. A system node (a.k.a., miner) makes sure that Bitcoins are spent by rightful owners and if so execute the transaction. To commit the results of transactions to the ledger, an honest miner selects the longest chain produced by all miners, validates existing transactions on the chain, appends a block of transactions to the chain, and produces a hash that wraps the new block and the hash of the previous block. Miners are required to solve crypto-puzzles, known as Proof of Work (PoW), to make sure that one block is built about every ten minutes globally. To reach consensus from open pools of miners, Bitcoin economically incentivizes miners to append to the longest chain, which is called Nakamoto consensus [18]. Nakamoto consensus tolerates Byzantine faults as long as more than 50% computing power is controlled by honest system nodes.

**Ethereum** [25] is a blockchain that generalizes transactions of cryptocurrencies into generic state transitions, while sticking to most system components being proposed in Bitcoin. To support generic state transitions, Ethereum proposed smart contracts written in the Solidity programming language [21]. Transaction fees (a.k.a., gas) depend on the amount of system resources being consumed, which are calculated by Ethereum virtual machine. Smart contracts are abstracted as accounts; running a smart contract is similar to depositing to an account. Similar to Bitcoin, the Ethereum system makes sure that a smart contract is correctly executed and that state of a smart contract is tamper-proof. There are blockchain platforms that provides similar functionalities like Ethereum but uses different consensus protocols. For example, EOS [8] replaces Ethereum’s Nakamoto consensus with delegated proof of stake (see more details in Sec. 3.2).

**Hyperledger Fabric.** Not all applications require the mining process to be open. IBM introduced Hyperledger Fabric [13] that uses permissioned nodes to build blockchains and that supports smart contracts written in regular programming languages. There are two key differences between Fabric and fully open blockchains. One, Fabric does not include economics in its design, meaning that the system runs without economic incentives. Two, the permissioned Fabric does not need Nakamoto consensus but instead uses traditional consensus algorithms (e.g., practical Byzantine fault tolerance). Hyperledger Fabric is favored by closed consortiums (e.g., financial institutions).

**Summary.** Depending on the openness of system nodes, blockchains can be classified into public, consortium, and private chains. Bitcoin and Ethereum are public blockchains that run on P2P networks. Public chains do not require app



**Figure 1: Cumulative distributions of the number of transactions by providers (mining power).**

developers or app users to trust miners, as long as more than 50% of computing power is not compromised. Hyperledger Fabric is consortium blockchains that are run by permissioned nodes. In consortium chains, a system node is often a member of a consortium. Private chains run on a single system node, and are thus permissioned. Both app developers and app users have to trust the node not to compute wrong results, not to deny a transaction, and not to tamper the history. Therefore, the trust model that private chains provide is indifferent from that of a cloud provider.

### 3 AN ANALYSIS OF DECENTRALIZATION

Decentralization has been a key component of blockchains to democratize trust. Specifically, much attention has been paid to the decentralization of system nodes. This section formally defines decentralization as a quantitative measure, and uses this measure to analyze a few blockchain improvements.

#### 3.1 Measure

We use *centralization level* to formally define decentralization of blockchains. A blockchain is  $N_\epsilon$  centralized if the top  $N$  nodes performed more than  $1 - \epsilon$  fraction of transactions. Given the same  $\epsilon$ , a blockchain is more centralized if it has a smaller  $N$ . Fig. 1 shows the centralization of public, consortium, and private chains respectively. As long as a small enough  $\epsilon$  is given, a public chain’s centralization level can incur a large  $N$ , meaning a low level of centralization. However, a consortium chain often incurs a small centralization level  $N_0$  when  $\epsilon = 0$ . An extreme case of consortium chain is private chain, which is fully centralized ( $N_0 = 1$ ).

Based on the definition of centralization level, we further look at the level of central trust. Nakamoto consensus requires 51% of compute power, or any form of mining, to be trusted in order to tolerate Byzantine faults. Thus, a public chain’s level of central trust is  $T = N_{0.49}$ . Practical Byzantine fault tolerance (PBFT) requires  $(2n + 1)/(3n + 1) \approx 67\%$  nodes to be trusted to tolerate Byzantine faults. Thus, a consortium chain’s central trust level is  $T = N_{0.33}$ . Similarly, a private

Type	Centralization Level	Central Trust	Consensus	Mining	Examples
Public	$N_\epsilon, \exists c, \epsilon > 0 \rightarrow N_\epsilon > c$	$N_{0.49}$	Nakamoto	PoW, PoS, DPoS	Bitcoin, Ethereum, EOS
Consortium	$N_\epsilon, \exists c \rightarrow N_0 < c$	$N_{0.33}$	PBFT	N/A	Hyperledger Fabric
Private	$N_0 = 1$	1	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Table 1: Centralization levels, trust models, and consensus algorithms of three kinds of blockchains.**

chain’s central trust level is  $T = 1$ . Here, lower trust level means more central trust.

Table 1 summarizes centralization levels, central trust, and consensus algorithms of the three kinds of blockchains. The formal definition of decentralization enables us to quantitatively analyze decentralization and scalability of multiple blockchain improvements.

### 3.2 Analysis of PoS and DPoS

The process to solve a crypto-puzzle (Proof of Work) is computationally intensive. Thus, Proof of Stake (PoS) is proposed to save compute power. When building a block, a miner needs to deposit stake into a contract to win the block-building chance, which is proportional to the amount of stake. A faulty participant’s deposit (stake) will be taken to penalize misbehavior. The centralization level of a PoS blockchain depends on the distribution of stake, instead of that of compute power which is highly skewed (Sec. 4.1).

Delegated Proof of Stake (DPoS) does not require every participant to directly build blocks. Instead, participants can delegate a miner. DPoS reduced the number of miners in consensus, but at the same time makes a participant harder to directly build a block, which incurs an impact to the trust model. As Delegated Proof of Stake reduced the number of miners to build blocks, the centralization level would increase. For example, EOS allows twenty-one large entities to build blocks, incurring a centralization level of  $N_0 = 21$  which is more centralized than fully open blockchains that run PoW or PoS.

### 3.3 Analysis of Sharding

It is well known that Bitcoin and Ethereum have limited scalability, with less than fifteen transactions per second [10, 19]. A key issue is that all the system nodes work on one blockchain. Similar to other distributed systems, *sharding* [11], or partitioning, would be a promising approach to improve scalability. With sharding, the system requires a transaction to be verified only by a small subset of nodes, and thus handles multiple transactions in parallel. Although no implementation is finished yet, blockchain communities consider sharding as the future of blockchains.

Let us assume that a blockchain system is evenly sharded into  $k$  partitions. If the throughput (transactions per second) of a blockchain without sharding is  $t$ , that of the sharded blockchain would be  $kt$ . Because only  $1/k$  nodes would join

the process of performing a transaction, the centralization level with sharding would be  $N_\epsilon/k$ . This means that the *centralization-throughput product (CTP)* stays constant given an evenly sharded blockchain. If a blockchain is not evenly sharded, the worst case would incur a smaller CTP, meaning either more centralized or less scalable.

### 3.4 Analysis of Lightning Network

Lightning Network [20] improved scalability by offloading transactions off the blockchain (off-chain). To do so, two clients can set up a channel on the main blockchain (on-chain) indicating an upper bound of payments and a timeout. It is guaranteed cryptographically that payments within the upper bound and the timeout would be secure even if payments were taken off-chain. As of the setup, the two clients can make payments off-chain. When the channel times out, the two clients need another on-chain transaction to settle the payments. If two clients perform transactions frequently, they would benefit from the batch processing which only incurs two on-chain transactions. In addition to batch processing, Lightning Network enables a third party to relay payments as long as it has set up channels with the involved users. Relaying payments would save setting up direct channels on-chain, further reducing on-chain transactions.

If the throughput of a blockchain without Lightning Network is  $t$ , that with Lightning Network and no relays would be  $t\alpha$  where  $\alpha$  is the compression level benefited from batch processing. Lightning Network further improves throughput with payment relays, which adds an additional layer of relay nodes that could withhold transactions. No matter what the topology of the payment graph is, Lightning Network with  $n$  clients can at most reduce the number of on-chain transactions to  $O(n)$ , by using one relay node to relay all payments. Thus, a fully connected payment graph ( $O(n^2)$ ) would benefit most in throughput. At the same time, the centralization level of relay nodes would change from  $N_0 = n$  to  $N_0 = 1$ . The *centralization-throughput product* in this extreme case would be  $nt\alpha$ , the improvement of which comes only from batch processing. Note that centralization of the relay nodes can only withhold transactions without the ability of tampering the transaction or history.

## 4 PROBLEMS WITH DECENTRALIZATION

We argue that blockchain decentralization introduce several inherent problems. These problems do not occur only in blockchain providers (physical nodes), which much attention has been paid to, but in the full stack. Fig. 2 summarizes decentralizations in different layers of public blockchains:

**Physical Nodes.** The physical nodes, which are in the bottom layer, consist of a P2P network of miners. Physical nodes in a public blockchain like Bitcoin and Ethereum are assumed decentralized. However, this assumption does not entirely hold since ASIC miners and mining pools skew the mining power distribution (Sec. 4.1).

**Platform Software.** The platform software layer runs on top of physical nodes. It includes the implementation of the consensus algorithm and the smart contract runtime. Public blockchain’s platform software is often developed, maintained, and open sourced by a community of contributors. The impact is in many folds: First, the governing and decision making is usually led by a “core” development community, leaders of which have significant influences on the platform software development. Second, since the trust of the platform software is critical and economically rewarded, the development community, in many cases, has strong incentives to make the platform reliable. Third, the platform software layer needs to be supported by the mining network. For example, a new update of the platform software will not happen or will fork the blockchain if it is rejected by the mining network owners.


**Smart Contract.** Smart contracts or DApps [6] are the applications deployed on the blockchain platforms. The application logics are encoded in smart contract code. The execution of smart contracts is triggered by function calls from clients or other smart contracts. The result of execution is reflected in the state changes of blockchains (e.g., a change in user’s account balance). As to be discussed in Sec. 4.3, the execution of smart contract is fully replicated and sequential.

**Client.** The client layer serves the end users of smart contracts. It takes user inputs and displays the end results to users. The client layer only needs to interact with the platform layer using standard APIs. It is completely open since anyone is free to implement their own client.

In the rest of this section, we discuss three major problems with blockchain decentralization, one in each layer.

### 4.1 Skewed Mining Power

The first problem brought by blockchain decentralization is skewed mining power in PoW mining network. This problem lays in the physical nodes layer, which stays in the bottom of the blockchain stack. To leverage the decentralization of the



**Figure 2: Decentralization of full-stack blockchains.**

P2P mining network to reach consensus, a key assumption of Nakamoto consensus [18] is that each mining node has similar computation power thus similar probability to extend the blockchain. However, there are two trends in mining networks of the major blockchain systems: First, incentivized by the surging price of cryptocurrencies, the mining power of a single mining hardware grows exponentially, especially since the introduction of ASICs that are purely designed for performing crypto hashing. Second, since the number of mining nodes increases dramatically, although the expected profit of mining is still high ( thanks to the high price of cryptocurrencies ), the variance of mining profit increase significantly<sup>1</sup>. Thus, miners form mining pools in order to stabilize profit.

As a result, the distribution of mining power is *highly skewed* in real world. For example, as shown in a recent measuring study [12], 90% of the mining power is controlled by 16 miners in Bitcoin (16<sub>0,1</sub> decentralized) and 11 miners of Ethereum (11<sub>0,1</sub> decentralized). Moreover, top 4 Bitcoin miners have more than 53% of the mining power in total (4<sub>0,47</sub> decentralized), and top 3 Ethereum miners have more than 61% of the mining power in total (3<sub>0,39</sub> decentralized).

This means the blockchain is effectively maintained by very few distinct entities. Although happens rarely, 51% attack does occur in real world. One example is the recent 51% attack [24] to Bitcoin Gold [2] which leads to 18 million us dollar worth loss. The skewed mining power demonstrate considerable vulnerability of current public chains.

### 4.2 Scalability of Transaction Throughput

Second, we argue that the decentralized consensus algorithms cause *inherent scalability* of blockchain transaction throughput, regardless of detailed protocol implementations. Scalability of blockchain transactions has been witnessed in practice. For example, the peak transaction throughput of Bitcoin and Ethereum are 3 txn/sec and 15 txn/sec [10], which are insufficient for many performance critical applications. Here, for the first time, we show that this scalability bottleneck is unavoidable, as long as the consensus algorithm

<sup>1</sup>One analogy is a lottery with positive expected return. Even if the return is positive, for an individual, it is still a high probability to lose money (invest on mining hardware and electricity but get zero block reward).

requires consensus from all participants, e.g. PoW or PoS<sup>2</sup>. To demonstrate that, we prove upper bounds of transaction throughput of distributed consensus algorithms and show that this upper bound is very low in real world settings.

To derive the upper bounds bound formally, we first review the essential definitions of terms in blockchain systems. In public blockchains, every participant shares a single global state and reaches an agreement (with high probability) on any computations on the global state. As a result, the latency of a transaction,  $\mathcal{L}$ , is determined<sup>3</sup> by the number of confirmations required (usually 6 in practice),  $C$ , and the time interval of block generation,  $p$ :

$$\mathcal{L} = C \times p$$

For example,  $p_{\text{Bitcoin}} = 10$  mins, which leads to  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Bitcoin}} = 60$  mins;  $p_{\text{Ethereum}} = 15$  secs (10 ~ 20 secs in practice), which leads to  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Ethereum}} = 1.5$  mins.

Similarly, the max transaction throughput  $\mathcal{R}$ , is determined by the time interval of block generation  $p$  and the number of transactions in a block  $N$ . And  $N = b/s$ , where  $b$  is the block size and  $s$  is size of each transaction:

$$\mathcal{R} = \frac{b}{s \times p} \tag{1}$$

For example, the average transaction size on the Bitcoin blockchain is 513.86 bytes over the last 6 years [22], and the Bitcoin block size is 1 MB. It is easy to calculate that  $R_{\text{Bitcoin}} \approx 3.4$  txn/sec. Similarly, we can get that  $R_{\text{Ethereum}} \approx 15$  txn/sec, which is close to Ethereum’s peak performance observed ( 15 txn/sec, Jan. 4, 2018) [10].

Below, we give an upper bound on the ideal transaction throughput that a decentralized blockchain can achieve.

**THEOREM 4.1.** *Even ignoring the local computation time, the transaction throughput a decentralized blockchain system can achieve is less than:*

$$R \leq \frac{w}{s}$$

where  $s$  is the size of a transaction on blockchain,  $w$  is the access bandwidth.

**PROOF.** Let’s take a closer look at Eq. (1).  $p$  cannot be infinitely small since it takes time to broadcast a block to each node. Thus:

$$p \geq l + \frac{b}{w}$$

where  $l$  is the network latency. Using the back of the envelope calculation, we have:

$$R \leq \frac{b}{s(l + \frac{b}{w})}$$

<sup>2</sup>DPoS sacrifices decentralization, and thus can achieve better scalability.

<sup>3</sup>Given the transaction is successfully written to the blockchain.

```
contract TokenContractFragment {
// Balances for each account
mapping(address=>uint256) balances;
// Get the token balance for account `tokenOwner`x
function balanceOf(address tokenOwner)
    public constant returns (uint balance) {
    return balances[tokenOwner];
}
// Transfer the balance from owner's account
// to another account
function transfer(address to, uint tokens)
    public returns (bool success) {
    ...
}
```

**Figure 3: An Example ERC20 Token Contract [9].**

The only thing that we can adjust here is  $b$ . Let’s look at the derivative on  $b$ :

$$\frac{dR}{db} = \frac{lw^2}{s(lw + b)^2}$$

The derivative is always positive. Thus,  $R$  is monotonically increasing with  $b$ . The upper bound of the transaction throughput is when  $b \rightarrow \infty$ :

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{x}{s(l + \frac{x}{w})} = \frac{w}{s}$$

□

It is worth noting that  $w$  should be reasonably and conservatively chosen so that the system allows the majority of the mining nodes to be able to collect mining rewards. In a recent measurement study [12], 67% Bitcoin mining nodes have larger than 23.3 Mbps access bandwidth; 90% Bitcoin mining nodes have larger than 5.7 Mbps access bandwidth; the access bandwidth for 67% and 90% Ethereum nodes are 11.2 Mbps and 3.4 Mbps, respectively. So even if we ignore network congestion control, block verification time, and assuming infinite block size, the Bitcoin throughput is at most 1.1K txn/sec and Ethereum throughput is at most 700 txn/sec (using the 90% users’ bandwidth). In fact, the actual throughput is much smaller than this theoretical limit.

### 4.3 Scalability of Smart Contract Execution

Apart from the scalability of transaction throughput, smart contract execution in current decentralized blockchain systems does not scale as well. In particular, the following two problems prevent scaling smart contract execution.

**Fully Replicated and Single Threaded Execution** In current decentralized blockchain systems like Bitcoin or Ethereum, the effective execution of smart contracts (the execution result that is eventually included in the blockchain) is repeated in every mining node. So the effective computation power of the entire blockchain system is essentially the same as single node. In addition, the runtimes of smart contracts (VMs) are single threaded. Thus, it is impossible to leverage parallelism

within a single node as well. As a result, the computation power of the entire Bitcoin or Ethereum network, which consists of more than hundreds of thousands machines, is less than a modern mobile phone.

**Sequential Programming Model** Even if the smart contract execution is parallelized, we argue that it is still hard to scale smart contract execution since the current smart contracts are written using a sequential programming model. For example, Fig. 3 shows the ERC20 token contract [9], one of the most popular smart contracts used in Ethereum for many ICOs. It is written in Solidity [21], a JavaScript-style language. It has global variables, such as balances, which stores the token balance of each account. Given the generality of the smart contract language (Solidity is Turing complete), it is challenging to scale up the execution of smart contracts as they are currently written.

## 5 RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES

We propose three research directions to solve or circumvent problems with decentralization.

- Mining power should be more decentralized by design.
- Other forms of trust should be considered, when possible, to replace decentralization.
- Smart contract should be scaled to achieve a higher scalability in overall.

### 5.1 Democratizing Mining Power

One key factor that leads to skewed mining power is the emergence of specialized mining hardware, especially ASICs. Specialized mining hardware has outperformed personal computers by orders of magnitude in terms of both mining power (number of hashes per second) and mining energy efficiency (number of hashes per watt). In addition, specialized mining hardware is usually very expensive. As a result, they mostly end up in the hands of a small number of groups, such as owners of big mining farms and ASIC miner manufacturers.

One possible approach to democratizing mining power is to design ASIC proof hashing algorithms for PoW. For example, Litecoin [16] and Dogecoin [7] use scrypt, a hash algorithm that is designed to be ASIC proof by its high memory consumption. However, this proved to be extremely difficult since the ASIC improved as well. As an example, in 2014, specialized ASIC mining hardware was launched for scrypt-based cryptocurrencies [3].

### 5.2 Trust, Not Necessary Decentralization

As shown in Sec. 4.2, there is an inherent trade-off between decentralization and transaction throughput. Ultimately, decentralization is a means to democratize trust rather than the goal. There are other ways of ensuring trust. For example,

*verifiable computation* and *secured hardware* [5, 23] allows clients to run code on untrusted platforms. In doing so, an untrusted platform generates verifiable proofs for clients to vet the correctness of computation. With verifiable computation, trusting the majority of system nodes does not need to be assumed any more.

As another example, *formal verification* and *certified programming* [14, 15] allow programmers to provide a mathematical proof showing that a blockchain implementation meets its specification by construction. This could be used to eliminate the unintended behaviors in blockchain implementations.

### 5.3 Scaling Smart Contract Execution

To achieve scalable execution of smart contracts, it is time to rethink the design of both the programming model and the runtime. First, new programming primitives need to be introduced to make parallel execution of smart contracts possible. For example, many programming constructs, such as concurrent data structures [17], can be borrowed from extensive programming languages research in past decades. Second, the smart contract runtime needs to be redesigned to support parallel execution of smart contracts and at the same time still maintains a deterministic transaction order and keeps all the transactional guarantees. Many existing approaches in databases and systems should be revisited and adopted to smart contract runtime [1].

## 6 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we defined a quantitative measure of blockchain decentralization and comprehensively compared the decentralization aspect of current blockchain systems using this measure. We identified key challenges in blockchain decentralization: skewed mining power distribution, inherent conflicts between decentralization and scalability (we proved the first upper bound of transaction throughput of decentralized blockchain systems), and fully replicated and single threaded execution and sequential programming model prevent scaling smart contract execution. Finally, we proposed three possible research directions towards solving these challenges. We believe that adopting ideas from many other fields, such as formal methods, programming languages/compilers, and databases, could provide new approaches to address the trade-offs between scalability and decentralization.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank Dr. Xi Wang for his detailed and constructive comments.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Philip A. Bernstein and Eric Newcomer. 1996. *Principles of Transaction Processing for Systems Professionals*. Morgan Kaufmann.
- [2] bitcoingold.org. 2018. Bitcoin Gold. <https://bitcoingold.org/>. (2018).
- [3] Caleb Chen. 2014. Zeusminer Delivers Lightning, Thunder, and Cyclone Script ASICs For Litecoin And Dogecoin Mining. <https://tinyurl.com/y8o9j7t3>. (2014).
- [4] coinmarketcap.com. 2018. Cryptocurrency Market Capitalizations. <https://coinmarketcap.com/>. (2018).
- [5] Victor Costan and Srinivas Devadas. 2016. Intel SGX Explained. *IACR Cryptology ePrint Archive 2016* (2016), 86.
- [6] dappradar.com. 2018. Ethereum Dapps List. <https://dappradar.com/>. (2018).
- [7] dogecoin.com. 2018. Dogecoin. <http://dogecoin.com/>. (2018).
- [8] EOS. 2018. EOSIO. <https://eos.io/>. (2018).
- [9] Ethereum. 2018. ERC20 Token Standard. [https://theethereum.wiki/w/index.php/ERC20\\_Token\\_Standard](https://theethereum.wiki/w/index.php/ERC20_Token_Standard). (2018).
- [10] etherscan.io. 2018. Ethereum Transaction History. <https://etherscan.io/chart/tx>. (2018).
- [11] Ethereum Foundation. 2018. On Sharding Blockchains. <https://github.com/ethereum/wiki/wiki/Sharding-FAQ>. (2018).
- [12] Adem Efe Gencer, Soumya Basu, Ittay Eyal, Robbert van Renesse, and Emin Gün Sirer. 2018. Decentralization in Bitcoin and Ethereum Networks. *CoRR* abs/1801.03998 (2018).
- [13] IBM. 2018. Hyperledger Fabric. <https://www.hyperledger.org/projects/fabric>. (2018).
- [14] Gerwin Klein, Kevin Elphinstone, Gernot Heiser, June Andronick, David Cock, Philip Derrin, Dhammika Elkaduwe, Kai Engelhardt, Rafal Kolanski, Michael Norrish, Thomas Sewell, Harvey Tuch, and Simon Winwood. 2009. seL4: formal verification of an OS kernel. In *SOSP*. ACM, 207–220.
- [15] Xavier Leroy. 2009. Formal verification of a realistic compiler. *Commun. ACM* 52, 7 (2009), 107–115.
- [16] liecoin.org. 2018. Litecoin. <https://litecoin.org/>. (2018).
- [17] Mark Moir and Nir Shavit. 2004. Concurrent Data Structures. In *Handbook of Data Structures and Applications*. Chapman and Hall/CRC.
- [18] Satoshi Nakamoto. 2008. Bitcoin: A peer-to-peer electronic cash system. (2008).
- [19] Arvind Narayanan, Joseph Bonneau, Edward W. Felten, Andrew Miller, and Steven Goldfeder. 2016. *Bitcoin and Cryptocurrency Technologies - A Comprehensive Introduction*. Princeton University Press.
- [20] Lightning Network. 2018. Lightning Network. <https://lightning.network/>. (2018).
- [21] Solidity. 2018. Solidity. <https://solidity.readthedocs.io>. (2018).
- [22] tradeblock.com. 2018. Bitcoin Blockchain History. [https://tradeblock.com/bitcoin/historical/1w-f-tsize\\_per\\_avg-11101](https://tradeblock.com/bitcoin/historical/1w-f-tsize_per_avg-11101). (2018).
- [23] Michael Walfish and Andrew J. Blumberg. 2015. Verifying computations without reexecuting them. *Commun. ACM* 58, 2 (2015), 74–84.
- [24] Joon Ian Wong. 2018. Every cryptocurrency’s nightmare scenario is happening to Bitcoin Gold. <https://qz.com/1287701/bitcoin-golds-51-attack-is-every-cryptocurrencys-nightmare-scenario/>. (2018).
- [25] Gavin Wood. 2018. Ethereum: A Secure Decentralised Generalised Transaction Ledger. <https://ethereum.github.io/yellowpaper/paper.pdf>. (2018).