

Unveiling Decentralization: A Comprehensive Review of Technologies, Comparison, Challenges in Bitcoin, Ethereum, and Solana Blockchain

Han Song¹, Yihao Wei², Zhongche Qu³, Weihan Wang⁴

¹ University of Southern California, Los Angeles, US

² University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, Champaign, US

³ Columbia University, New York, US

⁴ Vanderbilt University, Nashville, US

hsong427@usc.edu¹, yihao4@illinois.edu², zq2172@columbia.edu³, weihan.wang@vanderbilt.edu⁴

Abstract—Bitcoin stands as a groundbreaking development in decentralized exchange throughout human history, enabling transactions without the need for intermediaries. By leveraging cryptographic proof mechanisms, Bitcoin eliminates the reliance on third-party financial institutions. Ethereum, ranking as the second-largest cryptocurrency by market capitalization, builds upon Bitcoin’s groundwork by introducing smart contracts and decentralized applications. Ethereum strives to surpass the limitations of Bitcoin’s scripting language, achieving full Turing-completeness for executing intricate computational tasks. Solana introduces a novel architecture for high-performance blockchain, employing timestamps to validate decentralized transactions and significantly boosting block creation throughput. Through a comprehensive examination of these blockchain technologies, their distinctions, and the associated challenges, this paper aims to offer valuable insights and comparative analysis for both researchers and practitioners.

I. INTRODUCTION

Mainstream frameworks in use today continue to lean heavily on centralization. For instance, in robotics, we find applications [1], [2], [3], [4] and in AI4Science [5], [6], as well as internet applications built on centralized Web2 architectures. Cryptocurrency, originating with the advent of Bitcoin in 2008 [7], represents a modern manifestation of humanity’s longstanding pursuit of decentralized exchange. The concept of decentralization itself boasts a historical trajectory spanning over two centuries [8], and it has been intricately interwoven into various academic disciplines, including economics, political science, and computer science. The proliferation of decentralized concepts gained momentum with the emergence of Bitcoin in 2009. However, despite the surge of interest and capital inflow into the cryptocurrency market, a significant proportion of participants exhibit a limited understanding of the fundamental principles of decentralization and blockchain technology.

This paper aims to thoroughly analyze the workings of decentralized exchanges, explaining the algorithms used to overcome challenges commonly managed by central authorities. Adopting a chronological approach, we examine the evolutionary progression of blockchain technology by scrutinizing the architectures and protocols of Bitcoin, Ethereum, and Solana.

Furthermore, this study delves into an in-depth exploration of the inherent limitations of these platforms relative to their respective offerings.

II. BITCOIN - ORIGIN OF CRYPTOCURRENCY

Introduced in 2008, Bitcoin stands as a seminal milestone in the evolution of decentralized exchange within human history. It adeptly facilitates transactions without the necessity of a central trust party, which traditionally acts as an intermediary connecting diverse clients. This electronic payment system circumvents the involvement of third-party financial institutions through the utilization of cryptographic proof mechanisms.

A. Double spending problem

The double spending problem constitutes a primary challenge in digital currency transactions. Unlike physical currency, such as coins and bills, which are minted by authorized financial institutions and possess inherent scarcity, digital assets are susceptible to duplication. This ease of replication can result in undesirable scenarios wherein a sender may send identical digital coins to multiple recipients, leaving the recipients unaware of potential simultaneous transactions to different addresses. In the absence of a central authority, a payer initiating a transaction must publicly broadcast this action to all participants. Subsequently, a consensus mechanism among the majority is required to validate the transaction’s completion. Upon consensus, the payee can then utilize this confirmation as verifiable proof of the transaction.

B. Peer to peer transaction




Fig. 1: key pair encryption

Prior to executing a Bitcoin transaction, a user generates a cryptographic key pair comprising a private key and a public key. The private key consists of random digits and remains exclusively accessible to its owner. Conversely, the public key is derived from the private key through elliptic curve multiplication [9] and is publicly viewable across the network. When initiating a transaction, the payer specifies a Bitcoin address, serving as the recipient's designation, which is derived from the public key via cryptographic hashing using SHA256. Both elliptic curve multiplication and SHA256 hashing are unidirectional encryption processes, as illustrated in Figure 1; the sole method to decrypt the private key entails exhaustive brute-force enumeration [10]. Within this encryption framework, a digital signature produced by the private key can be authenticated by the public key without compromising the confidentiality of the private key. Subsequent to transaction creation, the sender generates a hashed signature and appends the recipient's hashed public key. This transaction is then broadcast to the nearest Bitcoin network node, which subsequently relays it to multiple proximate nodes. Through exponential growth, all Bitcoin nodes typically receive this transaction within a few seconds. This dissemination process is termed 'broadcasting,' and a transaction can only be appended to the ledger if it is approved by nearly all nodes. Ultimately, the node engages in the mining process, consolidating a batch of transactions into a singular block, subsequently appending this newly mined block to the existing blockchain. Thereafter, the transactions are rendered transparent to all nodes within the network, precluding any further modifications.

C. Unspent Transaction Output Model

In contrast to conventional fiat currencies, Bitcoin lacks denominational units and does not operate through accounts or balances within its ledger. Instead, the Unspent Transaction Output Model (UTXO) [11] is employed to represent indivisible currency units that are scattered throughout the Bitcoin network. Each UTXO is associated with a specific address, and a wallet determines the balance by scanning the network and aggregating the distinct UTXO components. The conceptualization of UTXO can be analogized to purchasing goods at a retail store using cash and receiving change in return. For instance, when buying a \$2 soda at a store with a \$5 bill, the cashier would return \$3 in one-dollar bills as change. In the realm of Bitcoin, a similar transaction involving a \$5 UTXO as input would result in the creation of two outputs: one comprising a \$2 UTXO directed to the cashier's address, and another consisting of a \$3 UTXO sent to an address associated with the payer. As illustrated in Figure 2, each transaction is meticulously recorded, detailing the UTXO amounts and the corresponding input and output addresses. These transactions are sequentially appended to the blockchain, constituting the immutable ledger of the Bitcoin network.

D. Proof of work

Bitcoin's goal, fully decentralized exchange, is primarily facilitated through the mining process. In the absence of




Fig. 2: Transactions are made with UTXO and every movement is recorded in the ledger

a central authority, consensus mechanisms are crucial to safeguard against fraudulent transactions. The Proof of Work (PoW) algorithm [12] serves as the foundational mechanism for achieving this consensus. Miners, which are servers operating Bitcoin network nodes, are responsible for validating transactions and appending them to the Bitcoin ledger. By aggregating a sufficient number of transactions into a block and subsequently appending this block to the blockchain, miners are incentivized through two distinct mechanisms: firstly, through the generation of new bitcoins via the coinbase transaction, and secondly, through transaction fees associated with the block in question.

The mining process is characterized by the generation of new bitcoins, and the computational effort expended to solve cryptographic puzzles is termed as the 'Proof of Work'. Given the predetermined and finite supply of 21 million bitcoins, mining rewards undergo a halving process [13] approximately every 210,000 blocks, resulting in a reduction of 50%. Given that each block is generated, on average, every 10 minutes, this supply adjustment occurs approximately every four years. For instance, Starting from 2009, when the first block was mined, the mining incentives were 50 bitcoin. By April 2024, this reward had decreased to 3 bitcoins. As depicted in Figure 3, which illustrates the circulating supply of Bitcoin over time, it is projected that nearly all bitcoins will be mined by the year 2140.




Fig. 3: New Bitcoin generated rate decreases by half every four year

The algorithm behind the mining is hash calculation with

within the network. The gas fee can be conceptualized through a mathematical equation: **amount of effort expended** multiplied by **gas price per unit**. Furthermore, the gas fee is inherently variable, fluctuating in response to changes in the unit price, which is dynamically adjusted based on network demand [18]. Consequently, during periods of heightened popularity and increased network congestion, the gas fee tends to escalate, and conversely, it decreases during less congested periods. The implementation of the gas fee system enhances the security of the Ethereum network by deterring malicious activities that might exploit the network and by preventing the occurrence of infinite loops that could potentially deplete network resources.

C. Smart contract

It is noted that Ethereum contracts are not business-oriented entities; rather, they function as sets of rules that are executed upon invocation by a message or transaction. Smart contracts possess a balance and interact with transactions, constituting a distinct type of account within the Ethereum network. These smart contracts autonomously execute predefined rules through embedded programming [19]. Importantly, once deployed, smart contracts are immutable and neither the transactions they execute nor the contract itself can be reversed.

For instance, in a real-world scenario, a landlord could deploy a smart contract to facilitate a rental system. Within this smart contract, the landlord could set a fixed monthly rent and a specified due date. Subsequently, the smart contract would automatically execute each month to collect the predetermined rent from the tenant. Failure on the part of the tenant to remit payment, or submission of an incorrect amount, could trigger eviction proceedings. Furthermore, smart contracts can also establish an escrow mechanism for tenant deposits, ensuring that these funds remain inaccessible until the termination of the lease agreement.

However, smart contracts are not without limitations, primarily stemming from their incapacity to interact with off-chain data sources. Returning to the previous rental example, rental rates may fluctuate in response to real-world variables. The inherent design of smart contracts precludes them from autonomously accessing off-chain data to effectuate such adjustments. To circumvent this limitation, specialized tools known as oracles are employed to facilitate the integration of external data sources with the Ethereum blockchain.

D. Proof of stake

Ethereum has pioneered a novel consensus mechanism known as Proof of Stake (PoS). Distinct from the previously discussed Proof of Work (PoW) system, PoS removes the need for solving computational puzzles. Within the Ethereum network, nodes have the opportunity to participate as validators, selected at random, upon staking a minimum of 32 ETH within a designated smart contract to authenticate transactions. Validators are incentivized through transaction fees and penalized from destroying their stakes if they engage in fraudulent activities.

Upon the creation and signing of a transaction by a user, a gas fee is computed, serving as compensation for the selected validator responsible for generating and appending a block to the network [20]. As illustrated in Figure 5, the transaction undergoes scrutiny by an Ethereum execution client to ascertain the validity of the signature and to confirm the sufficiency of funds. Subsequently, the execution client disseminates the transaction to the public via the execution layer, whereupon the randomly selected validator works on adding such transaction to a block.

Within the validator’s node, the execution client aggregates multiple transactions, executing them as a batch to verify state changes, and subsequently conveys this information to the consensus client. Other nodes receive the block via consensus layer and then use their execution client to re-run those transaction locally for verification. If no mistakes are found, the validator client will play its role to attest the block is valid and this block is ready to be added to Ethereum blockchain.

This transition from PoW to PoS enhances both cost-effectiveness and energy efficiency, as PoS obviates the need for the continuous operation of high-performance CPUs tasked with solving computational puzzles, a hallmark feature of the PoW mechanism.




Fig. 5: Nodes have two layers as their clients communicates through different layers

IV. SOLANA - HIGH PERFORMANCE BLOCKCHAIN

With the proliferation of decentralized applications and the concomitant surge in transaction volumes, the imperative for high-performance blockchain platforms has become increasingly salient. Solana, launched in 2020, was conceptualized as an innovative architecture tailored to meet the demands of high-throughput blockchain operations. A distinctive feature of Solana’s design is the utilization of timestamps to validate decentralized transactions, a mechanism that markedly increases block creation throughput.

Yakovenko [21] explores that preceding blockchain implementations eschewed reliance on timestamps, thereby failing

TABLE I: overview of proof of history sequence hash

Sequence Id	Operation	Output Hash
1	sha256("Poh transaction input data")	5186766972...
2	sha256("5186766972...")	9e881c985e...
3	sha256("9e881c985e...")	df986bf947...

to ensure consistent decision-making across network nodes. Solana introduces the 'Proof of History' protocol, designed to construct a globally synchronized ledger with a verifiable passage of time. As illustrated in Figure 6, a node is selected at random to serve as the leader, entrusted with the task of block generation. The leader node sequentially processes transactions, generating a hash based on preceding hashes with each iteration. Subsequently, other nodes within the network can verify if the output hash is correct by recalculating the hash value from the transaction I as long as the system chooses a non-collision hash method.




Fig. 6: Proof of History Sequence

A. Proof of history

In contrast to Proof of work in bitcoin that takes about 10 minutes to generate the block, Proof of history algorithm solves this long waiting period by simultaneously creating and verifying the state in time ordering. In this case, time ordering is used as truth of source so the validators can still working on verification even they receive incorrect ordering. Table I provides an overview of hash sequence. We firstly take the random string "Poh transaction input data" as an input for hashing; then we take the hashed value as input for the next hash operation. The leader node does this operation perpetually and appends latest transaction as input $sha256(append(df986bf947..., sequence4))$. Since the sha256 is a non-collision hash method, the output hash values are always unique and consistent in time ordering. This ensures that leader node is not able to guess or make up a fake output hash overhead. On the other hand, leader node can not fasten the process by utilizing multi-thread because of lack knowledge of previous output hash.

When it comes to the validation part, a number of nodes selected as validators is responsible for verifying the final

output hash. The verification is straight forward as recalculating every hash from the start and check if the final output hash is same as the one generated from the leader node. It is noted that validation is able to be accelerated by enabling multi-threading. Although the output hash is based on previous hash and is unpredictable, every hash has been calculated and stored at this time and validators can re-calculate it in parallel. As depicted in 7, the validator utilizes four cores to verify four segments of output hashes. If Hash 20 output calculated is different than Hash 20 input, the validator will reject the leader's work and rest hash calculations follows the same pattern. As Yakovenko[21] indicates that these verifications are preferred to be implemented on GPU and modern GPU contains 4000 cores. Such run in parallel verifications are expected to only consume 1/4000 time compare to the generation time




Fig. 7: output hashes are verified by multi-threading in significantly less time

B. Consensus mechanism

As previously stated, Solana has incorporated the Proof of History mechanism for state transition and further integrates the Proof of Stake consensus mechanism for validations. Each validator is required to stake a certain amount of funds as collateral during the validation process. Analogous to Ethereum, Solana imposes both penalties and rewards to foster a constructive voting system. A pivotal concept introduced within this consensus mechanism is that of a 'Super Majority,' representing $\frac{2}{3}$ of validators weighted by their staked funds. Should a node endeavor to subvert the network by submitting invalid votes, the attacker would necessitate control over more than $\frac{1}{3}$ funds on the network. For instance, consider a scenario where three validators, denoted as V1, V2, and V3, each stake funds worth 100 dollars. Assuming V1 acts maliciously, the overall validation remains legitimate due to the super majority attained by V2 and V3, who collectively stake 200 dollars out of a total of 300 dollars. Conversely, if V1 were to stake 200 dollars, the validation would become invalid, as V2 and V3 would lack the requisite weighted funds. To mitigate such

scenarios, the network initiates a timeout period during which the three validators engage in repeated verification attempts. Should V1 consistently fail to validate during these attempts, it will be expelled from the validator group, and its staked funds will be confiscated.

V. CONCLUSION

Bitcoin, Ethereum, and Solana stand as prominent cryptocurrencies in the market. Each of these platforms introduces distinctive technological innovations designed to address and overcome the inherent limitations of preceding blockchain systems. Bitcoin pioneered the Proof of Work consensus mechanism, which eradicates the dependence on third-party financial intermediaries but inadvertently engenders the consumption of substantial electricity resources through the intensive computation puzzles. Ethereum, on the other hand, introduced the Proof of Stake algorithm to facilitate an economically efficient validation process. Nonetheless, the platform continues to struggle with block creation speeds compares to centralized transaction processors. In contrast, Solana's groundbreaking hybrid integration of the Proof of Stake and Proof of History mechanisms has significantly enhanced transaction throughput capabilities, offering a promising solution to the scalability challenges encountered by earlier blockchain architectures.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Song, C. Liu, and H. Dai, "Bundledslam: An accurate visual slam system using multiple cameras," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.19886*, 2024.
- [2] M. Xanthidis, B. Joshi, M. Roznere, W. Wang, N. Burgdorfer, A. Q. Li, P. Mordohai, S. Nelakuditi, and I. Rekleitis, "Towards mapping of underwater structures by a team of autonomous underwater vehicles," in *The International Symposium of Robotics Research*. Springer, 2022, pp. 170–185.
- [3] M. Xanthidis, B. Joshi, N. Karapetyan, M. Roznere, W. Wang, J. Johnson, A. Quattrini Li, J. Casana, P. Mordohai, S. Nelakuditi *et al.*, "Towards multi-robot shipwreck mapping," in *Advanced Marine Robotics Technical Committee Workshop on Active Perception at IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 2021.
- [4] Z. Chen, M. Fernando, and L. Liu, "A visual feature based obstacle avoidance method for autonomous navigation," in *2019 IEEE Applied Imagery Pattern Recognition Workshop (AIPR)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1–7.
- [5] F. Lin, X. Yuan, Y. Zhang, P. Sigdel, L. Chen, L. Peng, and N.-F. Tzeng, "Comprehensive transformer-based model architecture for real-world storm prediction," in *Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*. Springer, 2023, pp. 54–71.
- [6] F. Lin, S. Crawford, K. Guillot, Y. Zhang, Y. Chen, X. Yuan, L. Chen, S. Williams, R. Minvielle, X. Xiao, D. Gholson, N. Ashwell, T. Setiyono, B. Tubana, L. Peng, M. Bayoumi, and N.-F. Tzeng, "Mmst-vit: Climate change-aware crop yield prediction via multi-modal spatial-temporal vision transformer," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, October 2023, pp. 5774–5784.
- [7] S. Nakamoto, "Bitcoin whitepaper," URL: <https://bitcoin.org/bitcoin.pdf> (: 17.07. 2019), vol. 9, p. 15, 2008.
- [8] L. Cao, "Decentralized ai: Edge intelligence and smart blockchain, metaverse, web3, and descii," *IEEE Intelligent Systems*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 6–19, 2022.
- [9] J. W. Bos, J. A. Halderman, N. Heninger, J. Moore, M. Naehrig, and E. Wustrow, "Elliptic curve cryptography in practice," in *Financial Cryptography and Data Security: 18th International Conference, FC 2014, Christ Church, Barbados, March 3-7, 2014, Revised Selected Papers 18*. Springer, 2014, pp. 157–175.
- [10] N. T. Courtois, M. Grajek, and R. Naik, "Optimizing sha256 in bitcoin mining," in *Cryptography and Security Systems: Third International Conference, CSS 2014, Lublin, Poland, September 22-24, 2014. Proceedings 3*. Springer, 2014, pp. 131–144.
- [11] S. Delgado-Segura, C. Pérez-Sola, G. Navarro-Arribas, and J. Herrera-Joancomartí, "Analysis of the bitcoin utxo set," in *Financial Cryptography and Data Security: FC 2018 International Workshops, BITCOIN, VOTING, and WTSC, Nieuwpoort, Curaçao, March 2, 2018, Revised Selected Papers 22*. Springer, 2019, pp. 78–91.
- [12] D. Fullmer and A. S. Morse, "Analysis of difficulty control in bitcoin and proof-of-work blockchains," in *2018 IEEE conference on decision and control (CDC)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 5988–5992.
- [13] A. Meynkhard, "Fair market value of bitcoin: Halving effect," *Investment Management & Financial Innovations*, vol. 16, no. 4, p. 72, 2019.
- [14] K. J. O'Dwyer and D. Malone, "Bitcoin mining and its energy footprint," 2014.
- [15] V. P. Ranganathan, R. Dantu, A. Paul, P. Mears, and K. Morozov, "A decentralized marketplace application on the ethereum blockchain," in *2018 IEEE 4th International Conference on Collaboration and Internet Computing (CIC)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 90–97.
- [16] R. O'Connor, "Simplicity: A new language for blockchains," in *Proceedings of the 2017 Workshop on Programming Languages and Analysis for Security*, 2017, pp. 107–120.
- [17] G. Wood *et al.*, "Ethereum: A secure decentralised generalised transaction ledger," *Ethereum project yellow paper*, vol. 151, no. 2014, pp. 1–32, 2014.
- [18] A. Donmez and A. Karaivanov, "Transaction fee economics in the ethereum blockchain," *Economic Inquiry*, vol. 60, no. 1, pp. 265–292, 2022.
- [19] W. Metcalfe *et al.*, "Ethereum, smart contracts, dapps," *Blockchain and Crypt Currency*, vol. 77, pp. 77–93, 2020.
- [20] C. T. Nguyen, D. T. Hoang, D. N. Nguyen, D. Niyato, H. T. Nguyen, and E. Dutkiewicz, "Proof-of-stake consensus mechanisms for future blockchain networks: fundamentals, applications and opportunities," *IEEE access*, vol. 7, pp. 85 727–85 745, 2019.
- [21] A. Yakovenko, "Solana: A new architecture for a high performance blockchain v0. 8.13," *Whitepaper*, 2018.