

FairRelay: Fair and Cost-Efficient Peer-to-Peer Content Delivery through Payment Channel Networks

Jingyu Liu

jingyuliu@hkust-gz.edu.cn
The Hong Kong University of Science
and Technology (Guangzhou)
Guangzhou, Guangdong, China

Yingjie Xue

yingjiexue@hkust-gz.edu.cn
The Hong Kong University of Science
and Technology (Guangzhou)
Guangzhou, Guangdong, China

Zifan Peng

zpengao@connect.hkust-gz.edu.cn
The Hong Kong University of Science
and Technology (Guangzhou)
Guangzhou, Guangdong, China

Chao Lin

cschaolin@163.com
Jinan University
Guangzhou, Guangdong, China

Xinyi Huang

xyhuang81@gmail.com
Jinan University
Guangzhou, Guangdong, China

ABSTRACT

Peer-to-Peer (P2P) content delivery, known for scalability and resilience, offers a decentralized alternative to traditional centralized Content Delivery Networks (CDNs). A significant challenge in P2P content delivery remains: the fair compensation of relayers for their bandwidth contributions. Existing solutions employ blockchains for payment settlements, however, they are not practical due to high on-chain costs and over-simplified network assumptions. In this paper, we introduce *FairRelay*, a fair and cost-efficient protocol that ensures all participants get fair payoff in complex content delivery network settings. We introduce a novel primitive, *Enforceable Accumulative Hashed TimeLock Contract (Enforceable A-HTLC)*, designed to guarantee payment atomicity —ensuring all participants receive their payments upon successful content delivery.

The fairness of FairRelay is proved using the Universal Composability (UC) framework. Our evaluation demonstrates that, in optimistic scenarios, FairRelay employs *zero* on-chain costs. In pessimistic scenarios, the on-chain dispute costs for relayers and customers are constant, irrespective of the network complexity. Specifically, empirical results indicate that the on-chain dispute costs for relayers and customers are 24,902 gas (equivalent to 0.01 USD on Optimism L2) and 290,797 gas (0.07 USD), respectively. In a 10-hop relay path, FairRelay introduces less than 1.5% additional overhead compared to pure data transmission, showcasing the efficiency of FairRelay.

CCS CONCEPTS

• Security and privacy → Distributed systems security.

KEYWORDS

Fair Exchange, Payment Channel Networks, P2P Content Delivery

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

Conference'17, July 2017, Washington, DC, USA

© 2024 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.
ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/18/06...\$15.00
<https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 INTRODUCTION

Peer-to-Peer (P2P) content delivery embraces a decentralized approach that has fundamentally transformed the landscape of digital content distribution. Distinct from centralized content delivery networks (CDNs), P2P systems reduce dependence on centralized infrastructures, thereby achieving enhanced robustness, resilience, and cost-efficiency in distributing content [36]. Due to its effectiveness, this paradigm has gained immense popularity and led to the development of various protocols, such as BitTorrent [21], FairDownload [17], and Bitstream [22]. BitTorrent, as a remarkable representative protocol, has a substantial user base with more than 150 million monthly active users since 2012¹, manifesting the widespread interest from the general public.




Figure 1: A digital content delivery process with multiple pathways succeeds only if all relayers are paid.

A fundamental challenge in P2P content delivery is the assurance of fair payoff for each participant. Consider a scenario where a customer C seeks to purchase digital content m from a content provider P . There are three roles: a customer C , a content provider P and multiple relayers R . Content m is transmitted through many relayers. To optimize the relay service, the transmission of m which comprises multiple data chunks, is divided into several *delivery jobs*. Each job corresponds to a multi-hop pathway, leveraging the computing power and bandwidth of relayers' devices [1, 18, 31], as shown in Fig. 1. To make sure every party gets a fair payoff, the following properties should be achieved :

¹<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/BitTorrent>

- (1) C pays a *content fee* to \mathcal{P} only if C receives the content m ;
- (2) \mathcal{P} provides the content m to C only if \mathcal{P} gets the *content fee*;
- (3) \mathcal{R} gets *relay fee* only if it provides relay service;
- (4) The relayers should not know the content of m .

By (4), the content m should be encrypted during transmission. Then, by (1) and (2), the content delivery process between C and \mathcal{P} is a two-party *fair exchange* problem, where C pays \mathcal{P} only if \mathcal{P} reveals the encryption key for content m .

It is important to recognize that two models exist to incentivize participation in P2P content delivery: the altruistic player model and the rational player model. BitTorrent [21] employs a reputation-based framework, effective in an altruistic setting where participants share contents based on personal interests. Here, we would like to explore the rational player model. By introducing monetary incentives, we anticipate that a greater number of rational players will join in the P2P content delivery network, thereby promoting the widespread adoption of this decentralized technology.

Existing fee-related P2P content delivery protocols can be categorized into two classes: 1) Using a centralized party to distribute fees. Protocols like Floodgate [28], Meson[26], and Saturn[35] rely on a trusted node or committee to distribute rewards. This leads to potential issues such as a single point of failure, where the trusted entity could become a target for attacks or manipulation. 2) Using a blockchain to distribute fees. Various researches [7, 11, 16, 17] leverage public blockchain to serve as a decentralized trusted third party to facilitate fair exchanges. For example, *Zero-knowledge Contingent Payment (ZKCP)* [7] and *FairSwap* [11] allow parties to perform fair exchange utilizing on-chain payment. However, the on-chain payments result in high costs and latency. In *FairSwap*, a single exchange costs 1,050,000 gas (0.24 USD on Optimism L2) and at least three on-chain communication rounds (around 6s on Optimism L2). This on-chain overhead is unacceptable considering a user might retrieve hundreds of videos per day.

To avoid the costly on-chain payments, many solutions [22, 27] adopt payment channels. However, payment channels typically solve the problem of fair exchange between two parties. They are not able to address the relay fee problem in (3) as there are no relayers in their models.

Consider a simple case where m is relayed by a set of relayers in a single path. The relayers must get relay fee for providing bandwidth for relaying. A straightforward attempt would be including relayers in a multi-hop payment channel network to relay payments, which would fail to solve the problem. The challenge lies in the inability to materialize the completion of a relay job. *FairDownload* [17] proposed the encryption of incoming data by relayers before relaying, which shifts the settlement of the relay job to the release of each relayer's decryption key. The protocol succeeds to solve the relay fee problem with on-chain settlements when a single relayer is involved in the delivery jobs. For complex delivery jobs where m is relayed by multiple relayers and multiple paths, the following challenges remain to be tackled.

The costs. The costs would be unacceptable if every payment is settled on-chain. For example, in *FairDownload*, each relayer additionally requires at least 171,591 gas (0.05 USD in Optimism L2) to get their relay fee. Thus, it is desirable to move the payments off-chain using payment channel networks. When operations are

moved to off-chain payment channels, providing fair payments for every participant becomes challenging due to the lack of public synchronized state.

Payment atomicity in complex networks. A desired protocol should guarantee the *atomicity* of payments for all participants. Atomicity means that, for relayers, once the customer gets the content m implying all relayers' delivery jobs are successfully completed, then all relayers should get their relay fees. Otherwise, the delivery jobs fail, and no relayer gets relay fee and the customer does not get the content, either. In a network where there are multiple relayers, relayers may exhibit complex behaviors, such as colluding relayers launching a *wormhole attack* [25] to avoid paying some intermediate relayers. Therefore, **guaranteeing the atomicity of paying all relayers is an open problem.**

When the content is delivered through multiple paths, the problem becomes more intricate. Each channel updates independently off-chain, necessitating a synchronization scheme to ensure all paths are settled atomically.

Contributions. In this paper, we address the fairness problem in P2P content delivery involving multiple relayers and multiple paths, which is common in practice. We provide *FairRelay*, a fair and cost-efficient protocol for P2P content delivery through payment channel networks. Our contributions are summarized as follows.

- **An atomic multi-hop payment scheme to pay all relayers in a single path.** To facilitate the fair payment for all participants, we design *Accumulative Hashed TimeLock Contract (A-HTLC)*, based on which we construct a multi-hop payment scheme. Compared to traditional HTLC, A-HTLC enables hashlocks to accumulate along the path, which is essential to guarantee all relayers get fair payment.
- **An atomic multi-path payment scheme to settle all paths' payments.** To ensure all payments on multiple paths are settled atomically —all paths are settled or none is settled, we further introduce *Enforceable A-HTLC* where an *acknowledge-pay-enforce* procedure is introduced to enforce all sub-payments of all paths. If any party fails to settle the payment, the provider can submit a challenge on-chain. The challenged party is enforced to settle the payment to avoid a penalty.
- **A fair and cost-efficient content delivery protocol.** We introduce *FairRelay*, a cost-efficient protocol enabling fair content delivery. When all participants are honest, no on-chain costs are introduced. If some participants are dishonest, a *proof of misbehavior* scheme is designed to tackle the dishonest behavior. In the worst case, the on-chain overheads for dispute are constant for customers and relayers, regardless of the network complexity.
- **Security analysis, implementation and evaluation.** We prove the protocol's fairness in the *Universal Composability (UC)* framework. We implement *FairRelay*, and conduct performance evaluation. The evaluation results manifest the protocol's practicality and efficiency.

Organization. The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 introduces necessary background and primitives. Section 3 delineates the protocol's security and privacy objectives. Section 4 offers a technical overview of *FairRelay*. Detailed construction of the protocol is elaborated in Section 5. Section 6 sketches a security analysis,

and Section 7 evaluates the efficiency of our protocol. Related works are reviewed in Section 8. The paper concludes in Section 9.

2 PRELIMINARIES

We intend to enable fair content delivery through PCNs. In this section, we first introduce the payment channels and an important primitive *Hashed TimeLock Contracts (HTLCs)*, then introduce commitment schemes and proof of misbehavior mechanisms to uphold the integrity of all participants. zk-SNARKs are used as tools to reduce computational overhead in verifying proof of misbehavior. We also provide a brief introduction to the universal composability framework, setting the context for our subsequent security analysis. Some basic cryptographic primitives are given in the end.

Payment Channels and HTLC. Payment channel provides an off-chain solution enabling two parties to transact without involving the blockchain. Two parties can open a payment channel by depositing funds into a multi-signature address and then update the channel balance by exchanging signed transactions. Parties within a payment channel can perform complex conditioned payment [12] via HTLC. With HTLC, a party can pay another party if the latter reveals a preimage of a hash value before a deadline. In this work, we employ conditioned payment and model payment channel as a single ideal functionality $\mathcal{F}_{Channel}$.

Commitment and Proof of Misbehavior. A commitment scheme allows one to commit a chosen value or statement while keeping it hidden to others, with the ability to reveal the committed value/statement later [29]. *Proof of misbehavior (PoM)* scheme is a cryptographic construction that enables a prover to demonstrate that an entity has violated its previous claim. PoM schemes can be combined with commitment schemes, serving to substantiate inconsistencies between revealed information and commitments.

zk-SNARKs. *Zero-Knowledge Succinct Non-interactive Argument of Knowledge* (zk-SNARKs) are cryptographic paradigms that enables a prover to validate the truthfulness of a statement to a verifier without divulging any private witness pertaining to the statement itself [5]. Our research adopts a zk-SNARK system to construct succinct validity proofs within the proof of misbehavior framework, significantly reducing the computational and storage overheads associated with the on-chain verification of misbehavior proofs.

Universal Composability. We model the security of a *real world* protocol Π within the framework of universal composability [8], considering static corruptions where the adversary \mathcal{A} declares which parties are corrupted at the outset. To analyze the security of Π in the real world, we "compare" its execution with the execution of an ideal functionality \mathcal{F} in an *ideal world*, where \mathcal{F} specifies the protocol's interface and can be considered as an abstraction of what properties Π shall achieve. In the ideal world, the functionality can be "attacked" through its interface by an ideal world adversary called simulator *Sim*. Intuitively, a protocol Π realizes an ideal functionality \mathcal{F} when the environment \mathcal{E} , acting as a distinguisher, cannot distinguish between a real execution of the protocol and a simulated interaction with the ideal functionality. In the UC framework, \mathcal{E} use session id (sid) to distinguish different instances.

Fundamental cryptographic primitives. Our research builds upon some cryptographic primitives, including a commitment scheme (*Commit, Open*) that relies on a hash function ($Commit(\cdot) = \mathcal{H}(\cdot)^2$), a symmetric encryption scheme (*SE.KGen, Enc, Dec*), and an asymmetric encryption scheme (*AE.KGen, Enc, Dec, Sign, Ver*). We assume that each participant possesses a set of key pairs, and the public key is known to all. We use $K(u)$ to denote the private key of a user u , $Pk(u)$ to denote the public key of a user u . Furthermore, our protocol employs *Merkle Trees (MT.Root, Member, Ver)* with *Merkle Multi-proof* for efficient membership verification and integrity check [32].

3 ASSUMPTIONS AND GOALS

In this section, we elaborate on the assumptions underlying the content delivery system and outline the security and privacy objectives, namely fairness and confidentiality.

3.1 Assumptions

- **Path Existence.** Consider a content delivery with multiple relayers over a PCN: a content provider \mathcal{P} connects to a customer C through multiple payment paths. We assume the existence of a content relay network that overlaps with a PCN. Specifically, we assume a valid payment path from C to \mathcal{P} with sufficient liquidity to pay the content fee \mathfrak{B}_m , and η multi-hop payment paths with enough bandwidth and liquidity for transferring content from \mathcal{P} to C , covering the relay fees.
- **Adversarial Model.** We consider a static adversary \mathcal{A} that operates in *probabilistic polynomial time*. The adversary \mathcal{A} has the ability to corrupt any participant in this content delivery process before the protocol begins.
- **Communication Model.** All communication between parties occurs over an authenticated communication channel \mathcal{F}_{auth} [9]. We assume a synchronous communication model, where all parties are constantly aware of the current round, which is modeled by a global clock functionality [20]³. If a party (including the adversary \mathcal{A}) sends a message to another party in round i , then that message is received by the recipient before the start of the next round.
- **TTP Model.** We deploy a smart contract called *Judge Contract* on a public-verifiable Turing-complete decentralized ledger as the *trusted third party (TTP)*. Any node in this delivery can interact with the smart contract to settle any dispute.

3.2 Security and Privacy Goals

Notation. We model \mathcal{P} delivering a content m to C through η delivery paths as a directed graph \mathcal{G} . Content m consists of n chunks $(\{m_1, \dots, m_n\})$, and is committed by com_m , where com_m is the merkle root built on all chunks ($com_m := MT.Root(m)$). Each path p is assigned with a delivery job $Job(p)$. $\mathcal{R}_{k,i}$ is the i -th relayer in the k -th path (p_k). \mathfrak{B}_m is the content fee paid to \mathcal{P} , and $\mathfrak{B}_{k,i}$ is the relay fee paid to $\mathcal{R}_{k,i}$. We denotes $|p_k|$ as the number of relayers

²A standard commitment scheme employs a collision-resistant hash function along with random padding.

³In the real world, the global clock can be achieved through the block height of a specific public blockchain

in path p_k . In this work, we focus on two fundamental properties, fairness and confidentiality, which we define below.

Definition 3.1 (Fairness for \mathcal{P}). The fairness for \mathcal{P} is guaranteed if both of the following conditions are satisfied.

- For any corrupted PPT $C, \mathcal{R} \in \mathcal{G}$ controlled by \mathcal{A} , honest \mathcal{P} reveals m to C only if \mathcal{P} gets the content fee \mathfrak{B}_m .
- For any corrupted PPT $C, \mathcal{R} \in \mathcal{G}$ controlled by \mathcal{A} , if an honest entity \mathcal{P} does not receive the content fee \mathfrak{B}_m , it does not pay any relay fee.

Definition 3.2 (Fairness for C). For any corrupted PPT $\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R} \in \mathcal{G}$ controlled by \mathcal{A} , honest C pays \mathfrak{B}_m to \mathcal{P} only if C learns m .

Definition 3.3 (Fairness for \mathcal{R}). For any corrupted PPT $C, \mathcal{R} \in \mathcal{G}$ controlled by \mathcal{A} , C learns the data chunks relayed through paths p_k only if every $\mathcal{R}_{k,i} \in p_k$ gets the relay fee $\mathfrak{B}_{k,i}$.

Definition 3.4 (Confidentiality). For any corrupted PPT $\mathcal{R} \in \mathcal{G}$ controlled by \mathcal{A} , \mathcal{A} can not learn m if \mathcal{P} and C are honest.

4 TECHNICAL OVERVIEW

4.1 Key idea

In order to keep the content confidential during the relay process, \mathcal{P} encrypts all chunks in m with its symmetric encryption key. For simplicity, let us first consider a single delivery path where a data chunk m_i is relayed through multiple relayers. To ensure that relayers receive a relay fee, each relayer in the multi-hop path encrypts the relayed content before delivering it to the customer C . This encryption reduced the content delivery problem into two fair exchange problems: the fee-key exchange between \mathcal{P} and C and the fee-key exchange between \mathcal{P} and each relayer \mathcal{R} , since \mathcal{P} pays the relay fee.

The introduction of multiple hops poses challenges to ensure the atomicity of key distribution and payment. To decrypt the encrypted content received by the customer in the last hop, the customer must obtain all encryption keys along the path. A straightforward solution is using HTLC: the customer escrows its content fee and locks it using the hashes of all encryption keys. The provider sends the encryption keys to redeem the payment. However, this trivial solution compromises the confidentiality of the content: the encryption key used for redemption might be revealed on-chain, leading the encrypted content accessible to all relayers and network eavesdroppers⁴. To address this issue, we design a sophisticated key delivery scheme by masking the encryption key with a secret, and then using the secret to redeem the payment. This approach allows the secrets to be released for content fee redemption without compromising the confidentiality of the content. At this point, the problem is formally modeled as a multi-party fee-secret exchange as shown in Fig. 2.

However, another challenge remains. By exchanging a secret with a content fee using HTLC, it only guarantees that the secret corresponds to the lock specified in the HTLC. The validity of the secret for decryption is not guaranteed in the aforementioned process. To tackle this challenge, we construct a *proof of misbehavior* scheme to ensure the validity of the provided secret. In this scheme,

⁴In case of dispute, the provider might submit the keys on-chain to redeem the payment.

both the content provider and relayers are required to make a deposit. Before the content delivery, the provider and all relayers make commitments on the secret they used for decryption. When a payment is made and the secret is released, if the secret is not consistent with the commitment, it can be uploaded to an on-chain *Judge Contract* along with the commitment which will penalize the provider/relayer by slashing their deposits.

In a P2P content delivery instance as shown in Fig. 2, a protocol achieves fairness if all payments and secret reveals are settled atomically.




Figure 2: Multi-party Money-Secret Exchange

Fair Multi-hop Payment. To ensure atomicity in multi-hop fair payments, we propose an enhanced HTLC scheme called *Accumulative Hashed TimeLock Contract (A-HTLC)*. Instead of directly revealing secrets to the customer C , each relayer progressively reveals its secret to the preceding hop through the payment channel. While following HTLC's lock-unlock procedure, the unlock condition propagates incrementally from the last relayer to the provider of the payment path.




Figure 3: A-HTLC Workflow

Fig. 3 illustrates the workflow of one specific path in A-HTLC. In this scheme, C locks the content fee payment to the provider \mathcal{P} , requiring the revelation of all secrets $\{s_0, s_1, \dots, s_n\}$ before a timeout. Subsequently, \mathcal{P} locks a conditioned payment to \mathcal{R}_1 with the unlocking condition being the release of all secrets $\{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n\}$. This sequential process continues until the last relayer \mathcal{R}_n in this path, where the relayer \mathcal{R}_{n-1} locks the payment using \mathcal{R}_n 's secret s_n . The lock time for each conditioned payment reduces linearly from left to right, ensuring strong atomicity against the *wormhole attack*, where no one can unlock their outcome payments until all their incoming payments are unlocked. In general, A-HTLC consolidates atomic secret reveals in a multi-hop payment, and overcomes the *weak atomicity* [25] of HTLC in multi-hop payments, thereby preventing relayers from exploiting intermediate relay fees.

Fair Multi-path Payment. While *A-HTLC* addresses the atomicity problem in multi-hop payments, the challenge of achieving atomicity over multiple paths persists due to the asynchronous nature of updates in different paths. To overcome this challenge, we introduce an *acknowledge-pay-enforce* paradigm based on *A-HTLC*: all relayers reach an "agreement" with the provider on a global deadline T by which all sub-paths must be settled (all payments are unlocked). If any sub-path remains unsettled by T , \mathcal{P} has the authority to request the relayers' secrets on-chain, thereby enforcing the settlement of the remaining payment path. The following outlines the workflow of *acknowledge-pay-enforce* paradigm.

To ensure payment settlement only after reaching an "agreement", \mathcal{P} generates a synchronizer secret s_{sync} and incorporates its commitment h_{sync} into the unlock condition for each *A-HTLC* payment initiated from \mathcal{P} . A relayer \mathcal{R}_i sends a *lock receipt* to \mathcal{P} when its incoming channel is locked. The *lock receipt* states that "If all subsequent relayers reveal their secrets and s_{sync} is revealed on-chain, I will reveal my secret s_i ". Once \mathcal{P} gathers all receipts, \mathcal{P} distributes s_{sync} , and then each path commences unlocking the payment channel from the last relayer to the first. If a path is not unlocked as expected, \mathcal{P} initiates an on-chain challenge with all receipts to enforce the unlock process in this path, requiring each relayer to sequentially reveal its secret on-chain. Failure to reveal a secret in time results in punishment for the corresponding relayer, with a compensation transferred towards \mathcal{P} .

4.2 Protocol Overview

Here is the sketch of our protocol. We transform the content delivery problem into multi-party fee-secret exchanges. To ensure the correct release of secrets, we propose a commitment scheme along with proof of misbehavior mechanism. Our protocol proceeds in four main phases: *setup*, *delivery*, *payment* and *decryption*, with two additional *challenge* mechanisms if misbehavior occurs, as described below and visualized in Fig. 4.




Figure 4: Protocol Overview

During the setup phase, each party involved, excluding C , generates an encryption key and masks the key with a secret. The results after masking are delivered to C privately, and the hash values of these secrets are utilized as hashlocks in *A-HTLC*. In the delivery phase, \mathcal{P} encrypts the plaintext chunks and transmits them to the first relayer along with its encryption commitments. Each subsequent relayer further encrypts the incoming chunks and appends encryption commitments before forwarding them. Once all ciphertexts are delivered, exchanges happen in the payment phase, where C buys all encryption keys from \mathcal{P} , and \mathcal{P} buys keys from \mathcal{R} s. We utilize *Enforceable A-HTLC* to achieve atomic multi-hop fee-secret exchange. In the decryption phase, C un.masks all the secrets to obtain the encryption keys and verifies them against the commitments. C decrypts the ciphertexts with the encryption keys and verifies the decryption results against the commitments. If any inconsistency is detected, C can submit a proof of misbehavior on-chain to request a compensation.

5 PROTOCOL CONSTRUCTION

5.1 Building Blocks

Ledger and Channels. We utilize a ledger \mathcal{L} modeled in [14] and payment channel networks $\mathcal{F}_{Channel}$ based on the model in [2]. The corresponding functionalities are elaborated in Fig. 5 and 6. \mathcal{L} publicly maintains the balances of each user and provides two interfaces, namely *transfer* and *query*. The *transfer* interface allows other ideal functionalities to transfer balances from one user to another, while the *query* interface enables anyone to query a user's latest balance. $\mathcal{F}_{Channel}$ enables two parties to perform arbitrary off-chain conditioned payments. $\mathcal{F}_{Channel}$ supports two core operations: the *query* interface allows the participants in a payment channel to look up the latest balance, while the *update* interface allows two parties to reach an agreement on a new balance update with a specific condition ϕ . Once the condition is fulfilled, any party can update the channel by submitting this agreement with the parameters to $\mathcal{F}_{Channel}$. For example, in a channel utilizing a HTLC as the update condition, ϕ could specify "provide a preimage of h before time t ". The condition $\phi(s, ct) = 1$ holds only if the *redeem parameter* s is the preimage of h and the current round time ct is less than t . To simplify the notation, we define two functions to build such agreements (detailed in Appendix B.3, Algorithm 7):

- *lock*(v, sid, cid, amt, ϕ): This function allows one party v in channel cid to compose a partially-signed update agreement tx , transferring amt tokens to the other party w . The transferring can be further redeemed by w only if the condition ϕ is met.
- *unlock*(tx, w, s): This function allows the other party w to generate an update message (*update*, $sid, cid, lb', rb', \phi, s$) from the partially-signed update agreement tx and a *redeem parameter* s . If the current round is ct and $\phi(s, ct) = 1$, w can update the latest channel state to (lb', rb') , which represents the updated balances in the channel. Specifically, amt tokens are transferred from v 's balance lb to w 's balance rb .

A-HTLC and Enforceable A-HTLC. Extending HTLC's single-hash lock, *A-HTLC* introduces a multi-hash lock mechanism where the payment condition ϕ_{A-HTLC} is defined by a list of hashes \mathbb{H} and a timelock t ($\phi_{A-HTLC} := \text{Construct}(\mathbb{H}, t)$). A payment locked by *A-HTLC* can only be released if all preimages \mathbb{S} corresponding to

\mathcal{L}
<p>Local Variable: $\mathcal{F}_{Channel}$ maintains a map $Balance[uid] \mapsto x$, where x is the balance of user with uid. $Balance$ is public to all parties.</p> <p>API</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Transfer.</i> Upon receiving $(transfer, sid, uid_s, uid_r, amt)$ from an ideal functionality of session sid: If $Balance[uid_s] \geq amt$, then $Balance[uid_s] := Balance[uid_s] - amt$, $Balance[uid_r] := Balance[uid_r] + amt$, send $(transferred, sid, uid_s, uid_r, amt)$ to the session sid. Otherwise, send $(insufficient, sid, uid_s, uid_r, amt)$ to the session sid. • <i>Query.</i> Upon receiving $(query, sid, uid)$ from a party of session sid: send $(sid, uid, Balance[uid])$

Figure 5: Ideal Functionality of Ledger

$\mathcal{F}_{Channel}$
<p>Local Variable:</p> <p>\mathbb{C} : a map $\mathbb{C}[cid] \mapsto \gamma$, where $\gamma = \{lu, ru, lb, rb\}$. Here, cid is the channel identifier, lu is the left user id, ru is the right user id, lb is the left user balance, rb is the right user balance.</p> <p>ct : current round time retrieved from the global clock \mathcal{F}_{clk}.</p> <p>API:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Update.</i> Upon receiving $(update, sid, cid, lb', rb', \phi, s)$ from $\mathbb{C}[cid].lu$ or $\mathbb{C}[cid].ru$, where (lb', rb') is the new state balance of channel cid, ϕ is the update condition, and s is the condition parameters. If both party agree the payment condition (cid, lb', rb', ϕ) and the update condition is satisfied $(\phi(s, ct) = 1)$, $\mathcal{F}_{Channel}$ updates $\mathbb{C}[cid].lb = lb'$, $\mathbb{C}[cid].rb = rb'$, and sends $(updated, sid, cid, s)$ to both parties in the channel. Otherwise, $\mathcal{F}_{Channel}$ sends $(update-fail, sid, cid, s)$. $\mathcal{F}_{Channel}$ will leak the $update/update-fail$ message to Sim. • <i>Query.</i> Upon receiving $(query, sid, cid)$ from $\mathbb{C}[cid].lu$ or $\mathbb{C}[cid].ru$, $\mathcal{F}_{Channel}$ returns the latest channel state $(sid, cid, \mathbb{C}[cid].lb, \mathbb{C}[cid].rb)$.

Figure 6: Ideal Functionality of Payment Channels

\mathbb{H} are provided before the deadline t . This framework supports an atomic multi-hop payment scheme. In this context, the provider \mathcal{P} disburses a relay fee \mathfrak{B}_i to each relayer \mathcal{R}_i in a sequence of n relayers, where each \mathcal{R}_i holds the secret s_i (with corresponding hash h_i), and the channel between \mathcal{R}_{i-1} (\mathcal{R}_0 denotes the provider \mathcal{P}) and \mathcal{R}_i is denoted as cid_i .

\mathcal{P} initiates a conditional payment to \mathcal{R}_1 by creating the condition payment tx_1 ($tx_1 := lock(\mathcal{P}, sid, cid_1, \sum_{j=1}^n \mathfrak{B}_j, \phi_1)$), where $\phi_1 := Construct(\{h_1, \dots, h_n\}, t_1)$. Each subsequent relayer \mathcal{R}_i forwards a sub-payment tx_{i+1} to \mathcal{R}_{i+1} , requiring the disclosure of secrets $\{s_i, \dots, s_n\}$ before round t_i . Upon receiving tx_n , \mathcal{R}_n redeems the payment by submitting $unlock(tx_n, \mathcal{R}_n, s_n)$, thereby disclosing s_n to \mathcal{R}_{n-1} . This cascade ensures each relayer redeems its incoming payment, allowing secrets to accumulate from \mathcal{R}_n back to \mathcal{P} .

Leveraging the "acknowledge-pay-enforce" paradigm (introduced in Section 4.1), we introduce the *Enforceable A-HTLC* to guarantee the atomicity of all payments across multiple paths. In this scheme, \mathcal{P} selects a random synchronizer secret s_{sync} and incorporates its hash (h_{sync}) into the hashlock of its all outgoing *A-HTLC* payments. Upon receiving a valid payment tx_i locked with h_{sync} , each \mathcal{R}_i includes h_{sync} in the subsequent payment's hashlock and sends a *lock receipt* back to \mathcal{P} . This receipt asserts that \mathcal{R}_i will disclose its secret s_i if all subsequent secrets $\{s_{i+1}, \dots, s_n\}$ and s_{sync} are revealed on-chain. Once \mathcal{P} collects all *lock receipts*,

\mathcal{P} releases s_{sync} , initiating the payment redemption process. Each payment must be sequentially redeemed by all relayers from \mathcal{R}_n to \mathcal{R}_1 . If the redemption process stalls, \mathcal{P} can enforce the disclosure by submitting an *enforcement* request along with s_{sync} to *Judge Contract*, requesting relayers to reveal their secrets on-chain. Non-compliance results in penalties.

Commitment and PoM Construction To ensure that the customer can access the content once certain secrets are revealed, we introduce commitment and proof of misbehavior schemes for masking and encryption. The commitment scheme on masking (*MCOM*) allows a node v to generate a commitment asserting that " v possesses a key sk and a mask secret s , and the mask result is ck ($ck := s \oplus sk$)". The commitment com_{mask} consists of $(h_{sk}, h_s, ck, \sigma)$, where $h_{sk} := Commit(sk)$, $h_s := Commit(s)$, and σ represents the signature of v for (h_{sk}, h_s, ck) . Once the mask secret s is revealed, the holder of com_{mask} can decrypt ck and obtain an encryption key sk' ($sk' := ck \oplus s$). The commitment scheme on encryption (*ECOM*) enables a node v to generate a commitment asserting that " v encrypts a data chunk m_i in content with index i using the key sk , and the encryption result is c ". The commitment com_{enc} consists of $(h_m, h_c, h_{sk}, i, \sigma)$, where $h_m := Commit(m_i)$, $h_c := Commit(c)$, h_{sk} denotes the commitment of the key sk , and σ refers to the signature of v on (h_m, h_c, h_{sk}) . When the encryption key sk and the ciphertext c committed by h_c are revealed, the recipient of com_{enc} can unveil a plaintext m'_i . If the decryption result is inconsistent with the commitment on masking or encryption, the recipient can generate a proof of misbehavior against v (using PoM scheme *PoME* or *PoMM*) and submit to the *Judge Contract*, alleging this inconsistency. The commitment and PoM scheme on masking and encryption formally defined in Appendix B.2.1 and B.2.2.

Judge Contract. We present the *Judge Contract* as an ideal functionality \mathcal{F}_{jc} , depicted in Fig. 8, which manages disputes and facilitates content registration. For global content integrity, any content m intended for sale must be registered on the *Judge Contract's registration table* \mathbb{RT} using the *register* interface. Each provider and relayer must have a sufficient deposit locked on \mathcal{L} accessible by \mathcal{F}_{jc} for accountability. The *PoMM/PoME* interfaces accept valid proofs of misbehavior related to masking/encryption issues involving a provider or a relayer. Upon receiving such proofs of misbehavior, it initiates a compensation process, returning a pre-determined amount \mathfrak{B}_{max} to the customer (compensation amount \mathfrak{B}_{max} is greater than any content price \mathfrak{B}_m , restricted by the *register* interface). The *Enforcement Handler* manages the enforcement logic in the *Enforceable A-HTLC*.

5.2 Protocol Details

Consider a customer C seeks to obtain a digital content m (comprises n fixed-size data chunks denoted as $\{m_1, \dots, m_n\}$) with a price of \mathfrak{B}_m . This price is determined by a Merkle root com_m and is offered by a provider \mathcal{P} . Assuming that multiple relay paths can be found, the content delivery process involves the participation of several relayers who contribute their bandwidth in exchange for relay fees over the PCN. The delivery graph \mathcal{G} is publicly accessible to all participants. For ease of exposition, we will first describe the fair content delivery over a singular relay path p . Then, we will discuss the extension of this solution to multi-path scenarios.




Figure 7: Encryption and Commitments in FairRelay: chunk m is relayed from \mathcal{P} to \mathcal{C} through 2 relays. Each relay appends its encryption commitment to ciphertext and the commitments in a relay path form a chain com_m .

Ideal Functionality of Judge Contract \mathcal{F}_{jc}
<p>All providers and relayers should have a sufficient security deposit locked in \mathcal{L}.</p> <p>Local variables:</p> <p>\mathbb{RT} : the registration table mapping the content commitment com_m to the committers' IDs and content price.</p> <p>\mathfrak{B}_{max} : maximum price for a content.</p> <p>$Logs$: a set of challenges submitted.</p> <p>ct : the current global round in the global clock.</p> <p>API</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Register</i>. Upon receiving $(register, sid, com_m, \mathfrak{B}_m)$ from uid: query balance $(sid, uid, x) \leftarrow \mathcal{L}$, if $x \gg \mathfrak{B}_{max} \gg \mathfrak{B}_m$, set $COM[com_m] = (uid, \mathfrak{B}_m)$. • <i>PoMM</i>. Upon receiving $(pomm, sid, \pi_{pomm}, tid)$ from a user uid: If $PoMM.Ver(\pi_{pomm}, tid) = 1$: $(transfer, sid, tid, uid, \mathfrak{B}_{max}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$. • <i>PoME</i>. Upon receiving $(pome, sid, \pi_{pome}, tid)$ from a user uid: If $PoME.Ver(\pi_{pome}, tid) = 1$: $(transfer, sid, tid, uid, \mathfrak{B}_{max}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$. <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Enforcement Handler</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Enforce</i>. (Round t_r) Upon receiving $(enforce, sid, Ch, \Sigma, s')$ from \mathcal{P}: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - $n := Ch.ADDR - 1$, parse $\{h_1, \dots, h_n\} := Ch.H$. Parse identity of all participants from $Ch.ADDR$, $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}_1, \dots, \mathcal{R}_n)$ - If $(t_r < Ch.T) \wedge (Ch \notin Logs) \wedge (Open(s', Ch.h_0) = 1)$, and $(\Sigma$ contains all parties' lock receipt): $Logs := Logs \cup \{Ch\}$, broadcast $(enforced, sid, s')$. Create a new empty log \mathbb{S}. • <i>Response</i>. (Round $t_r + n - i + 1$) Upon receiving (log, sid, i, s_i) from \mathcal{R}_i: if $Open(s_i, h_i) = 1$ and $(\mathbb{S}[i+1] \neq \perp$ or $i = n)$, set $\mathbb{S}[i] := s_i$, and broadcast $(logged, sid, i, \mathbb{S})$ to all parties. If no valid log message received in this round, set $\mathbb{S}[i] := \perp$. • <i>Punishment</i>. (Round $t_r + n + 1$) Upon receiving $(punish, sid)$ from \mathcal{P}, if not all relayers log their secrets, let \mathcal{R}_x be the relayer that fails to log the secret and has the highest index. Send $(transfer, sid, \mathcal{R}_x, \mathfrak{P}, \mathfrak{B}_{max}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$. Upon receiving $(transferred, sid, \mathcal{R}_x, \mathfrak{P}, \mathfrak{B}_{max})$ from \mathcal{L}, broadcast $(punished, sid, \mathcal{R}_x, \mathfrak{P}, \mathfrak{B}_{max})$.

Figure 8: Ideal functionality of Judge Contract

5.2.1 FairRelay in the single-path scenario. The singular path solution operates as follows.

Setup Phase. \mathcal{C} initiates the protocol by broadcasting an *init* message to \mathcal{P} and all relayers, triggering the setup phase. Denotes all relayers and the provider as $\mathbb{R} \cup \mathcal{P}$, a node v in $\mathbb{R} \cup \mathcal{P}$ generates: (1) a symmetric encryption key sk for encrypting all chunks and its commitment $h_{sk} := Commit(sk)$, (2) a secret s used to mask the encryption key and its commitment $h_s := Commit(s)$, (3) a commitment on masking $(com_{mask} := (h_{sk}, h_s, ck)_\sigma)$ including the mask result ck ($ck := s \oplus sk$) signed by v . Afterward, v privately sends com_{mask} to \mathcal{C} by encrypting it using \mathcal{C} 's public key. Upon receiving all valid commitments on masking and hashes, \mathcal{C} triggers the delivery phase. A formal decryption is demonstrated in Fig. 9.

Delivery Phase. To ensure the integrity of the selling content m , the provider \mathcal{P} first sends the hashes (\mathbb{H}_m) of all content chunks to \mathcal{C} through the relay path p . \mathbb{H}_m serves as the digest for the chunks being relayed, ensuring that the final decryption result will match the content m . Upon receiving them, \mathcal{C} constructs a Merkle root com'_m from these hashes and checks if $com'_m = com_m$. A match indicates that once the preimages (chunks of the content) for all these hashes are revealed, \mathcal{C} must have received all the chunks of m . Next, \mathcal{P} encrypts each content chunk using its encryption

key and forwards the encrypted chunks to the next hop, along with its encryption commitment. Each relayer then encrypts the incoming chunks again using its own key, attaches its encryption commitment, and forwards them to the next hop. The encryption commitments accumulate with the chunks relayed hop-by-hop, forming a *commitment chain*, where each commitment in this chain mapping to a layer of encryption.

Let's consider the j -th chunk m_j as an example. \mathcal{P} first encrypts it using its own key sk_0 , generating ciphertext $c_{0,j}$. \mathcal{P} then constructs a commitment on the encryption, denoted as $com_{enc}^{0,j}$, for this chunk. \mathcal{P} forwards $c_{0,j}$ and $com_{enc}^{0,j}$ to the first relayer \mathcal{R}_1 . \mathcal{R}_1 encrypts the ciphertext $c_{0,j}$ using its own key sk_1 , resulting in ciphertext $c_{1,j}$, and generates a commitment $com_{enc}^{1,j}$ for this encryption. \mathcal{R}_1 then forwards $c_{1,j}$ and $\{com_{enc}^{0,j}, com_{enc}^{1,j}\}$ to the customer \mathcal{C} . Upon receiving the ciphertext and the commitment chain, \mathcal{C} verifies the following: (1) each encryption commitment is properly signed by each encoder, (2) the *commitment chain* linked from the ciphertext $c_{1,j}$ to the j -th hash in the hash list \mathbb{H}_m (detailed on customer \mathcal{C} 's description in Fig. 10). A valid linked *commitment chain* guarantees that once \mathcal{C} gets all the encryption keys committed in this chain, \mathcal{C} can properly decrypts the ciphertext $c_{1,j}$ layer-by-layer, generating

chunk m_j . Otherwise, C can locate the dishonest encoder and submit a proof of misbehavior to \mathcal{F}_{jc} , seeking a compensation (detailed on the Extract function in Appendix 10). Fig. 7 demonstrates how a plaintext chunk is committed and encrypted in a two-hop path, and formal descriptions are demonstrated in Fig. 10.

Payment Phase. To pay the content fee \mathfrak{B}_m , there exists a payment path from C to \mathcal{P} . For better clarity of the protocol description, we consider this payment path as a direct payment channel, as its security is not affected (see Appendix D). Once the relay path completes the delivery of all ciphertext chunks, C enters the payment phase. C initiates a conditioned payment of \mathfrak{B}_m to \mathcal{P} , with the unlocking condition that \mathcal{P} must reveal all mask secrets s from \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{P} before round t_0 . Subsequently, \mathcal{P} makes a conditioned payment to the first relay \mathcal{R}_1 with an amount equal to the total relay fees in the path. The unlocking condition is that \mathcal{R}_1 must reveal all subsequent secrets (\mathcal{R}_2 to \mathcal{P}) before round t_1 . This process stops at the last relay in the path, where the unlocking condition reduces one hash at each lock (as shown in Fig. 3). Once the incoming channel for the last relay $\mathcal{R}_{|\rho|}$ is properly locked, $\mathcal{R}_{|\rho|}$ redeems this payment by calling the *update* interface of $\mathcal{F}_{Channel}$, revealing its mask secret $s_{|\rho|}$ to $\mathcal{R}_{|\rho|-1}$. The secrets accumulated from $\mathcal{R}_{|\rho|}$ to \mathcal{P} through the payment channel update process, and once \mathcal{P} 's outgoing channel is updated, \mathcal{P} gathers all necessary secrets to unlock C 's payment, redeeming the content fee \mathfrak{B}_m . If any relay \mathcal{R}_i fails to redeem its incoming payment, all its left party ($\mathcal{R}_r, r < i$) will refuse to reveal its secrets, expiring the conditioned payment, resulting the termination of the protocol, see Fig. 11.

Decryption Phase. Upon redeem of payment from C , C obtains all necessary mask secrets to derive the encryption keys: $sk' := ck \oplus s$. C then verifies whether the revealed sk' match the corresponding mask commitment (see Fig. 12). If not, C will generate and submit a proof of misbehavior on masking on-chain to punish the dishonest node and seek a compensation. (*ExtKey* in Algorithm 9) Once all keys are validated, C proceeds to decrypt each ciphertext chunk layer by layer using these keys to recover the content m . At each decryption layer, C confirms the encryption commitment with the intermediate decryption result. If the encryption commitment is not consistent with the decryption result, C can submit a proof of misbehavior on encryption on-chain to punish the dishonest node then request a compensation (*Extract* in Algorithm 10).

5.2.2 FairRelay in the multi-path scenario. Consider the multi-path content delivery \mathcal{G} , which consists of η relay paths. In the k -th relay path p_k , $\mathcal{R}_{k,i}$ denotes the i -th relay, $\mathfrak{B}_{k,i}$ denotes the corresponding relay fee, $t_{k,i}$ denotes the incoming payment timelock to $\mathcal{R}_{k,i}$. The maximum length of the relay path determines the publicly known ciphertext delivery deadline T_1 and the payment deadline T_2 (ensuring protocol *liveness*). Next, we outline the differences between the multi-path solution and the single-path solution.

Setup Phase. (Detailed in Fig. 14) In the single-path scenario, $v \in \mathbb{R} \cup \mathcal{P}$ only needs to send the commitment on masking to C privately. However, in the multi-path case, v needs to additionally broadcast the hashes of the mask secret ($h_s := \text{Commit}(s)$), which will be used to construct the *enforcement challenges* Ch in the *enforceable A-HTLC* scheme. Furthermore, \mathcal{P} will generate a synchronizer secret s_{sync} and broadcast its hash $h_{\text{sync}} := \text{Commit}(s_{\text{sync}})$ to

all nodes. This synchronizer secret is used to ensure the atomicity of all payments. Each relay path p_k has its own *enforcement challenge* Ch_k , which consists of the enforcement deadline T_2 , the hashes of all mask secrets (\mathbb{H}_k) from each relay in this path, the hash h_{sync} , and the addresses $ADDR_k$ of the provider and all relays in p_k .

Delivery Phase. (Detailed in Fig. 15) Instead of delivering hashes of all chunks in one path, \mathcal{P} distributes hashes along with a Merkle multi-proof π_{merkle}^k to C in each relay path p_k . The chunk delivery process remains the same as in the single-path solution.

Payment Phase. (Detailed in Fig. 16) Once all η paths have completed the ciphertext delivery, C enters the payment phase. C initiates a conditioned payment of \mathfrak{B}_m to \mathcal{P} in exchange for all mask secrets s from each relay \mathcal{R} and the provider \mathcal{P} . For each relay path, \mathcal{P} locks a payment to the first relay $\mathcal{R}_{k,1}$ in p_k with an amount of $\sum_{i=1}^{|p_k|} \mathfrak{B}_{k,i}$ (the sum of relay fees in path p_k). In the multi-path case, the first relay additionally is required to reveal s_{sync} to unlock this payment, enabling \mathcal{P} to control the initiation of the redeem process.

Once a relay $\mathcal{R}_{k,i}$ confirms the proper locking of its incoming channel, it acknowledges this by sending a *lock receipt* (a signature on Ch_k) back to \mathcal{P} and locks the next channel. Upon collecting all receipts from all relays, \mathcal{P} broadcasts s_{sync} , allowing $\mathcal{R}_{k,|p_k|}$ to unlock the payment by revealing their own secret along with s_{sync} to $\mathcal{F}_{Channel}$. Intermediate relays append their own secret to unlock their incoming channel upon receiving the corresponding secrets from the update of their outgoing channel. If all paths are successfully unlocked, \mathcal{P} obtains all secrets to unlock C 's payment.

If a payment path p_k fails to redeem the payment within the specified time, \mathcal{P} has the option to submit Ch_k (including s_{sync}) and all receipts from the stalled path on-chain. This submission triggers a request for all relays in the path to reveal their mask secrets on-chain within a designated time window. The revealing process starts from the last relay and proceeds towards the first, with each intermediate relay disclosing their secret only after all subsequent relays have done so. Upon completion of the revealing process, \mathcal{P} can unlock the payment from C . The first relay who fails to reveal their secret on-chain will face consequences. This includes a predefined compensation $\mathfrak{B}_{\text{max}}$ ($\mathfrak{B}_{\text{max}}$ is greater than the sum of relay fees) being transferred from the non-compliant relay to the provider.

Decryption Phase. The decryption phase is the same as the single solution, illustrated on Fig. 17.

5.2.3 Timelocks. In this section, we will discuss the timelocks in single-path and multi-path solutions.

Single-path scenario: In the single-path protocol, C first makes the conditioned payment redeemable until round t_0 . Once \mathcal{P} receives this payment, if the payment amount and the redeem condition, including the revelation of s_0 , are satisfied, \mathcal{P} makes a new conditioned payment to \mathcal{R}_1 with a timelock of $t_0 - 1$. This ensures that once \mathcal{R}_1 redeems \mathcal{P} 's payment, \mathcal{P} has an additional round to redeem the payment from \mathcal{P} , ensuring fairness for \mathcal{P} . Each honest relay \mathcal{R}_i applies the same logic to handle the incoming conditioned payment, ensuring that the outgoing timelock is earlier than the incoming one.

Multi-path scenario: In the multi-path protocol, each participant in a delivery instance \mathcal{G} configures a delivery deadline $T_1 := 5 + \max(|p_k|)_{p_k \in \mathcal{G}}$ and an enforcement deadline $T_2 := T_1 + 2 \max(|p_k|)_{p_k \in \mathcal{G}} + 5$ based on the length of the longest relay path. Honest \mathcal{P} accepts its incoming payment only if the corresponding timelock $t_0 := T_2 + \max(|p_k|)_{p_k \in \mathcal{G}} + 2$, and honest $\mathcal{R}_{k,i}$ accepts its incoming payment only if its timelock $t_{k,i} = T_2 + |p_k| - i + 2$. This configuration ensures the following: (1) For a provider or a relay, the outgoing payment timelock is smaller than the incoming payment timelock. This is evident as $t_0 = T_2 + \max(|p_k|)_{p_k \in \mathcal{G}} + 2 > t_{k,1} = T_2 + |p_k| + 1$, and $t_{k,i} > t_{k,i+1}$. (2) Once a relay $\mathcal{R}_{k,i}$ is enforced to reveal its secret on-chain, it has additional rounds to redeem its incoming payment. In our protocol, the provider can only submit an enforcement against a path p_k before round T_2 . Therefore, the deadline for $\mathcal{R}_{k,i}$ to reveal its secret on-chain is round $T_2 + |p_k| - i$, where $t_{k,i} = T_2 + |p_k| - i + 2 > T_2 + |p_k| - i$.

6 SECURITY ANALYSIS IN SKETCH

The formal security analysis is comprehensively detailed in Appendix C. In the analysis, we initially demonstrate that our *Enforceable A-HTLC* protocol *UC-realizes* the ideal functionality \mathcal{F}_{mex} . Subsequently, we elucidate the security properties addressed by \mathcal{F}_{mex} , which tackle the atomicity issue in multi-path fee-secret exchanges. Finally, we assert the fairness and confidentiality as defined in Section 3.2. This section provides an intuitive, high-level overview of the security analysis.

Intuitively, the *A-HTLC* payment scheme ensures fairness in a single-path fee-secret exchange: \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{R} reveal their secrets only when their incoming channels are updated, enabling the transfer of content/relay fees to these nodes. Moreover, \mathcal{C} 's payment can only be updated if \mathcal{P} provides the preimages of the targeted hashes. The *Enforceable A-HTLC* scheme further guarantees fairness for \mathcal{P} in a multi-path fee-secret exchange: If any payment issued from \mathcal{P} is redeemed, \mathcal{P} can ensure that all payments are redeemed, or alternatively, \mathcal{P} can guarantee a compensation exceeding the total sum of all relay fees from \mathcal{F}_{jc} . The commitment and proof of misbehavior in masking/encryption schemes ensure that once \mathcal{C} has acquired all mask secrets, it can obtain the encryption key and decrypt the content m from the ciphertext chunks. The encryption key remains masked by the mask secret, preventing leakage to adversaries and guaranteeing confidentiality. By combining all these schemes, the requirements for fairness and confidentiality defined in Section 3.2 are effectively addressed.

7 IMPLEMENTATION AND EVALUATION

Implementation We have implemented, tested, and evaluated our decentralized content delivery protocol within a simulated environment⁵. Regarding encryption for content chunks, we adopt *Ciminion* [10], a scheme compatible with zero-knowledge proofs. For the generation and verification of the zk-SNARK proofs, we utilize the *Groth16* [15] proof system, with the corresponding circuits designed in *Circum* [4].

Contract	Operation	Tx Gas	ETH/\$	Optimism L2/\$
JC	Deploy	2,421,188	93.44	0.55
	Join	46,175	1.78	0.01
	Leave	28,783	1.11	0.01
	Withdraw	25,966	1.00	0.01
	Add	90,924	3.51	0.02
	Remove	30,159	1.16	0.01
	PoMM	35429	1.37	0.01
	PoME	290,797	11.22	0.07
	Enforce	267,325	10.31	0.07
	Response	24,902	0.96	0.01
PC	Punish	27,458	1.06	0.01
	Deploy	1,215,909	46.92	0.28
	Update	90,912	3.50	0.02
	Close	43,611	1.68	0.01
ENS	Withdraw	22,547	0.87	0.01
	Register	266,996	10.30	0.06
	Transfer	54,128	2.09	0.01
ERC20	Deploy	1,311,213	50.60	0.30

Table 1: Gas cost of on-chain operations: on-chain section consists of Judge Contract (JC) and Payment Channel (PC), USD cost on Ethereum (ETH) and Optimism L2. Compare with deploying an ERC-20 contract, registering an ENS domain, and performing a USD transfer.

7.1 On-chain Evaluation

Table 1 provides an overview of the on-chain gas costs and their corresponding USD costs for all operations in our protocol. The table assumes that the price of Ether is set to 2270.13 USD (as of February 5, 2024). Additionally, the gas prices used in the calculations are set to 17 GWei on the Ethereum mainnet and 0.1 GWei on the Optimism Rollup [30].

One-time Costs. The deployment of the *Judge Contract* is a one-time global occurrence and incurs a gas cost of 2,421,188. In contrast, deploying a simple ERC-20 Contract typically costs 1,311,213 gas. For each content provider or relay participating in decentralized content delivery and earning profits, there is a total one-time gas cost of 107,099, which covers joining, leaving, and withdrawing deposits from the network. The total one-time gas cost for deploying a payment channel contract is 1,282,069. It's worth noting that a payment channel can be utilized for multiple off-chain payments. If a content provider intends to deliver content using our protocol, a one-time content register operation is necessary, incurring a gas cost of 90,924. In comparison, it costs roughly 266,996 gas to register a domain name in ENS⁶. In summary, the one-time costs of FairRelay are acceptable.

Optimistic Costs. If content delivery concludes without any dispute, our protocol requires no on-chain operations, resulting in zero on-chain costs for all participants in a content delivery job. The optimistic costs are consistently zero and independent of the content chunk size, content chunk number, and the number of participants.

Pessimistic Costs. If a customer observes misbehavior by certain nodes during the decryption phase, they have the option to file a complaint with the *Judge contract*. The gas cost of verifying the

⁵FairRelay source code: <https://github.com/7ujgt6789i/FairRelay>

⁶Ethereum Name Service: <https://ens.domains/>




Figure 9: Setup Phase of FairRelay in single path scenario




Figure 10: Delivery Phase of FairRelay in single path scenario

proof of misbehavior $PoME$ on encryption on-chain remains constant at 290,797 gas (equivalent to 0.07 USD on Optimism L2) and is unaffected by the content chunk size, the number of content chunks, or the number of participants. Similarly, the gas cost of verifying the proof of misbehavior on masking $PoMM$ on-chain is also constant at 35,429 gas (0.01 USD). Consider a withdraw operations in Tornado Cash [33] cost 301,233 gas (0.07 USD), the pessimistic costs of our protocol are acceptable.

7.2 Off-chain Efficiency

All efficiency tests are conducted on a customer-level laptop with 32GB memory and Intel i7-9750H CPU(2.60GHz).

zk-SNARK Efficiency. In our protocol, only one zero-knowledge proof needs to be generated and verified in the proof of misbehavior on encryption stage. Fig. 13(b) illustrates the time and memory costs on generating and verifying the $PoME$ along with content chunk size. For instance, when proving misbehavior on encrypting a 2KB chunk, the circuit contains 26,633 constraints. In comparison, FileBounty [19] requires 29,339 constraint circuits to verify




Figure 11: Payment Phase of FairRelay in single path scenario




Figure 12: Decryption Phase of FairRelay in single path scenario




Figure 13: Off-chain Evaluation

a 64-byte chunk, which demonstrates the efficiency of our implementation. The time and memory costs of generating and verifying *PoME* increase linearly with the size of the circuits to be proven, whereas the proof size, verification memory usage, and verification time remain constant are independent of the content chunk size, approximately 805B, 170MB, and 0.6s, respectively.

Encryption Efficiency. To accelerate the proof generation in the *PoME* generation, we use a zero-knowledge proof friendly symmetric encryption scheme *Ciminion* in our protocol. The efficiency of off-chain encryption/decryption is about 110KB/s per thread, which could be accelerated through multi-threading optimization.

7.3 Overhead

To demonstrate the efficiency of FairRelay, we initially compare our protocol with blockchain-based fair exchange protocols, FairSwap[11], FDE[34], Bitstream[22], and FairDownload[17]. Since most of protocols do not support multiple relayers, we compare the overheads of these protocols with FairRelay in scenarios involving the content provider \mathcal{P} and the customer C . Table 2 illustrates that our protocol achieves zero optimistic on-chain cost and constant pessimistic on-chain cost in two-party fair exchange.

Next, we consider the overheads in relation to the number of hops in a relay path. For instance, let's consider a 1GB content m relayed through an n_r -hop relay path. Before \mathcal{P} delivers the ciphertext, it conveys the hashes of each chunk to C . Subsequently, each hop encrypts its incoming data and appends an encryption commitment $com_{enc} := (h_m, h_c, h_{sk}, id, \sigma)$. Since h_m is included in the last encryption commitment and h_{sk} is received during the setup phase, the index info is already reveal in the merkle proof stage, the size of com_{enc} is $|h| + |\sigma|$. Along the relay path, the data overheads increase linearly with the number of previous hops: $total_overheads = n_r |com_{enc}| + setup_overheads$. Fig. 13(c) depicts the bandwidth efficiency (i.e., the bandwidth used to transfer ciphertext divided by the total bandwidth usage) as a function of the number of hops for different chunk sizes. In the practical range of zero-knowledge chunk sizes (2KB - 64KB), it is feasible to select a chunk size that achieves high bandwidth efficiency.

8 RELATED WORKS

There are two technological approaches to achieve fair P2P content delivery. One is using a centralized trusted third party (TTP) to observe the resource usages and distribute fees. Such solutions include FloodGate [28], Meson [26] and Saturn [35]. Once the centralized trusted third party is compromised, their approach will fail. Thus, many researchers turn to using a decentralized trusted third party, usually a blockchain, yielding a decentralized approach. The problem we study in the P2P content delivery context is related to the research of blockchain-based fair exchange, fair exchange using payment channels and atomic multiple channel updates. Here we review the related works in these research lines.

Blockchain-based Fair Exchange. Protocols [7, 11, 13, 17, 19, 23, 34] such as Zero-Knowledge Contingent Payment (ZKCP) and FairSwap [11] epitomize the blockchain-based fair exchange paradigm, wherein the content provider \mathcal{P} encrypts the content m into a verifiable ciphertext, and then finalizes the payment by disclosing the decryption key to C . ZKCP employs zero-knowledge proofs to ensure the correctness of \mathcal{P} 's encryption, whereas FairSwap utilizes a proof of misbehavior scheme, thereby reducing the cost introduced by zero-knowledge proofs. Subsequent researches, including OptiSwap [13], FileBounty [19], and *Fair Data Exchange* [34], have focused on reducing the on-chain and off-chain overheads. Nevertheless, even in the absence of disputes, these protocols invariably necessitate at least one on-chain transaction to conclusively settle the fair exchange.

Payment Channel and Two-Party Fair Exchanges. Notably, a straightforward HTLC-based off-chain payment embodies an off-chain fair exchange, wherein the payer pays the payee in exchange for a predefined preimage. Bitstream[22] capitalizes on this concept,

utilizing the HTLC preimage as a means of delivering the decryption key. However, Bitstream does not include relayers, which cannot be directly extended to solve the problem addressed in this paper.

Atomic Multi-channel Updates. Atomic multi-channel update schemes [2, 3, 14, 24, 25, 27] primarily focus on achieving atomic settlement of payments within payment channels. Single-path multi-channel update schemes like AMHL [25] and Blitz [3] provide "strong atomicity" [25] for all sub-payments by replacing HTLC with homomorphic one-way functions and signatures, respectively. Multi-path multi-channel update schemes, such as Sprites [27] and Thora [2], offer a more versatile approach by utilizing a global on-chain event to ensure atomicity for all channel updates. However, these schemes primarily address the atomicity of one-way payments and do not fully support two-way exchanges. For instance, Thora's "revoke-unless-all-paid" paradigm [2] is not suitable for the key release process since once a key is released, it cannot be revoked. Consequently, existing atomic multi-channel update frameworks are not well-suited for atomic multi-party exchanges within PCNs.

FairDownload [17] is most relevant to our work. Like our proposed scheme, FairDownload asks every relayer to encrypt the data for transmission to the subsequent node. However, unlike our work which employs multiple relayers per path, their scheme is restricted to delivery jobs where there is only one relayer in each delivery path. What's more, compare with our protocol, FairDownload incurs high on-chain costs even in the optimistic scenario.

9 CONCLUSION

In this work, we presents FairRelay, the first fair and cost-efficient P2P content delivery protocol built on payment channel networks. We transform the fair content delivery problem into an *atomic multi-party fee-secret exchange* problem. On top of that, we propose a multi-hop payment scheme based on *A-HTLC*, ensuring that all participants get corresponding fees when the content is delivered by a single path. When the content is delivered via multiple paths, we design *Enforceable A-HTLC*, which involves a *acknowledge-pay-enforce* procedure to enforce the atomicity of all payments.

FairRelay has several positive impacts. On the one hand, FairRelay motivates owners of payment channels to use their idle bandwidth for profit, enhancing active participation in PCNs. The liquidity of locked funds in PCNs are also increased when those funds are used for relay fee payments. On the other hand, *Enforceable A-HTLC* provides solutions for some related problems in PCNs. For example, it can be used to enforce atomic multi-path payments.

Here, we outline several interesting questions for future work.

- *Eliminating on-chain deposits.* An interesting optimization involves freeing the provider and relayers from making on-chain deposits, thereby lower the barrier to be a relayer.
- *Fault tolerance.* Current FairRelay requires all relay paths to complete their tasks for fee settlement. A fault-tolerant payment scheme that accommodates node failures would be desirable.
- *Defending front-running attack.* FairRelay makes use of on-chain deposits for punishment. A possible attack is that an adversary drains its deposit before an honest party asks for compensation (known as front-running attack). In this work, we address this problem by slashing some compensation and require a large deposit to defend such attack (more discussion in Appendix D).

Protocol	Rounds	Commitment Scheme	P->C comm.	Onchain operations (Opt., Pess.)	Optimistic On-chain cost	Pessimistic On-chain cost	Dynamic chunk size	Content Integrity
FairSwap	5	Merkle Tree	$ m + h $	4,4	$O(1)$	$O(\log(n))$	✓	✓
FairBounty	n	Merkle-Damgård	$ m + n h $	3,5	$O(n)$	$O(n)$	✓	✗
FDE-ElGammal	3	KZG	$8 m + 6\mathbb{G}$	4,4	$O(1)$	$O(1)$	✓	✓
FairDownload	n	Merkle tree	$ m + 2n \sigma + (2n - 2) h $	4,6	$O(1)$	$O(\log(n))$	✓	✓
Bitstream	3	Merkle Tree	$2 m + h + \sigma $	0,1	0	$O(\log(n))$	✗	✓
Our protocol	3	Merkle Tree	$ m + (2n + 3) h + (n + 1) \sigma $	0,2	0	$O(1)$	✓	✓

Table 2: Compare FairRelay with related works. n denotes the number of content chunks in m , $|h|$ denotes the size of hash, $|\mathbb{G}|$ denotes a group element, $|\sigma|$ denotes the signature size, $|m|$ denotes the size of the content. Content integrity means C only pays to \mathcal{P} if the whole content is delivered correctly. In FDE-ElGammal, the ciphertext size $|ct|$ of a content chunk is about 8 times of the plaintext size [34]; In Bitstream, the content size is fixed to 32-bytes.

In the future, we are interested in exploring other approaches to defend the attack, for example, removing the use of on-chain deposits.

REFERENCES

- [1] Nasreen Anjum, Dmytro Karamshuk, Mohammad Shikh-Bahaei, and Nishanth Sastry. 2017. Survey on peer-assisted content delivery networks. *Computer Networks (CN)*.
- [2] Lukas Aumayr, Kasra Abbaszadeh, and Matteo Maffei. 2022. Thora: Atomic and Privacy-Preserving Multi-Channel Updates. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS)*.
- [3] Lukas Aumayr, Pedro Moreno-Sanchez, Aniket Kate, and Matteo Maffei. 2021. Blitz: Secure Multi-Hop Payments Without Two-Phase Commits. In *Proceedings of 30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security)*.
- [4] M. Belles-Munoz, M. Isabel, J. Munoz-Tapia, A. Rubio, and J. Baylina. 2023. Circom: A Circuit Description Language for Building Zero-Knowledge Applications. *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing (TDSC)*.
- [5] Nir Bitansky, Ran Canetti, Alessandro Chiesa, and Eran Tromer. 2012. From extractable collision resistance to succinct non-interactive arguments of knowledge, and back again. In *Proceedings of the 3rd innovations in theoretical computer science conference (ITCS)*.
- [6] Jan Camenisch, Manu Drijvers, Tommaso Gagliardoni, Anja Lehmann, and Gregory Neven. 2018. The Wonderful World of Global Random Oracles. *Cryptology ePrint Archive*.
- [7] Matteo Campanelli, Rosario Gennaro, Steven Goldfeder, and Luca Nizzardo. 2017. Zero-Knowledge Contingent Payments Revisited: Attacks and Payments for Services. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS)*.
- [8] R. Canetti. 2001. Universally composable security: a new paradigm for cryptographic protocols. In *Proceedings 42nd IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*.
- [9] Ran Canetti. 2004. Universally composable signature, certification, and authentication. In *Proceedings. 17th IEEE Computer Security Foundations Workshop, 2004. (CSFW)*.
- [10] Christoph Dobraunig, Lorenzo Grassi, Anna Guinet, and Daniël Kuijsters. 2021. Ciminion: symmetric encryption based on toffoli-gates over large finite fields. In *Proceedings of Annual International Conference on the Theory and Applications of Cryptographic Techniques (EUROCRYPT)*.
- [11] Stefan Dziembowski, Lisa Ecekey, and Sebastian Faust. 2018. FairSwap: How To Fairly Exchange Digital Goods. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS)*.
- [12] Stefan Dziembowski, Sebastian Faust, and Kristina Hostáková. 2018. General State Channel Networks. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS)*.
- [13] Lisa Ecekey, Sebastian Faust, and Benjamin Schlosser. 2020. OptiSwap: Fast Optimistic Fair Exchange. In *Proceedings of the 15th ACM Asia Conference on Computer and Communications Security (Asia CCS)*.
- [14] Christoph Egger, Pedro Moreno-Sanchez, and Matteo Maffei. 2019. Atomic Multi-Channel Updates with Constant Collateral in Bitcoin-Compatible Payment-Channel Networks. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS)*.
- [15] Jens Groth. 2016. On the size of pairing-based non-interactive arguments. In *Proceedings of 35th Annual International Conference on the Theory and Applications of Cryptographic Techniques, Vienna, Austria, May 8-12, 2016, Proceedings, Part II 35 (EUROCRYPT)*.
- [16] Songlin He, Yuan Lu, Qiang Tang, Guiling Wang, and Chase Qishi Wu. 2021. Fair Peer-to-Peer Content Delivery via Blockchain. In *Proceedings of Computer Security (ESORICS)*.
- [17] Songlin He, Yuan Lu, Qiang Tang, Guiling Wang, and Chase Qishi Wu. 2023. Blockchain-Based P2P Content Delivery With Monetary Incentivization and Fairness Guarantee. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems (TPDS)*.
- [18] Sushant Jain, Michael Demmer, Rabin Patra, and Kevin Fall. 2005. Using redundancy to cope with failures in a delay tolerant network. In *Proceedings of the 2005 Conference on Applications, Technologies, Architectures, and Protocols for Computer Communications (SIGCOMM)*.
- [19] S. Janin, K. Qin, A. Mamageishvili, and A. Gervais. 2020. FileBounty: Fair Data Exchange. In *Proceedings of IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy Workshops (EuroS&P)*.
- [20] Jonathan Katz, Ueli Maurer, Björn Tackmann, and Vassilis Zikas. 2013. Universally composable synchronous computation. In *Proceedings of Theory of Cryptography Conference (TCC)*.
- [21] Dave Levin, Katrina LaCurts, Neil Spring, and Bobby Bhattacharjee. 2008. Bit-torrent is an auction: analyzing and improving bittorrent's incentives. *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review*.
- [22] Robin Linus. 2023. BitStream: Decentralized File Hosting Incentivised via Bitcoin Payments. <https://robinlinus.com/bitstream.pdf>
- [23] Yunqi Ma and Satoshi Fujita. 2023. Decentralized Incentive Scheme for Peer-to-Peer Video Streaming using Solana Blockchain. *Transactions on Information and Systems (IEICE)*.
- [24] Giulio Malavolta, Pedro Moreno-Sanchez, Aniket Kate, Matteo Maffei, and Srivatsan Ravi. 2017. Concurrency and Privacy with Payment-Channel Networks. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS)*.
- [25] Giulio Malavolta, Pedro Moreno-Sanchez, Clara Schneidewind, Aniket Kate, and Matteo Maffei. 2019. Anonymous Multi-Hop Locks for Blockchain Scalability and Interoperability. In *Proceedings of 2019 Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS)*.
- [26] meson.network. 2024. *Meson Network*. <https://docs.meson.network/nodes/>
- [27] Andrew Miller, Iddo Bentov, Surya Bakshi, Ranjit Kumaresan, and Patrick McCorry. 2019. Sprites and State Channels: Payment Networks that Go Faster Than Lightning. In *Proceedings of Financial Cryptography and Data Security (FC)*.
- [28] S.K. Nair, E. Zentveld, B. Crispo, and A.S. Tanenbaum. 2008. Floodgate: A Micropayment Incentivized P2P Content Delivery Network. In *Proceedings of 17th International Conference on Computer Communications and Networks (CCN)*.
- [29] Goldreich Oded. 2009. *Foundations of Cryptography: Volume 2, Basic Applications*. Cambridge University Press.
- [30] Optimism Team. 2024. *Optimism Documentation*. <https://docs.optimism.io/>
- [31] V.N. Padmanabhan, H.J. Wang, and P.A. Chou. 2003. Resilient peer-to-peer streaming. In *Proceedings of 11th IEEE International Conference on Network Protocols (ICNP)*.
- [32] Lum Ramabaja and Arber Avdullahu. 2020. Compact Merkle Multiproofs. arXiv:2002.07648
- [33] Roman Storm Roman Semenov, Alexey Pertsev. 2019. Tornado Cash. <https://github.com/tornadocash/tornado-core>
- [34] Ertem Nusret Tas, István András Seres, Yinuo Zhang, Márk Melczer, Mahimna Kelkar, Joseph Bonneau, and Valeria Nikolaenko. 2024. Atomic and Fair Data Exchange via Blockchain. *Cryptology ePrint Archive*.
- [35] Saturn Team. 2024. *Saturn Aliens Project*. <https://saturn.tech/>
- [36] Behrouz Zolfaghari, Gautam Srivastava, Swapnoneel Roy, Hamid R. Nemat, Fatemeh Afghah, Takeshi Koshiba, Abolfazl Razi, Khodakhast Bibak, Pinaki Mitra, and Brijesh Kumar Rai. 2021. Content Delivery Networks: State of the Art, Trends, and Future Roadmap. *Comput. Surveys*.

A FAIRRELAY IN MULTI-PATH SCENARIO

Fig. 14, 15, 16 and 17 formally demonstrate the FairRelay protocol in the multi-path scenario.




Figure 14: Setup Phase of FairRelay in multi-path scenario.

B AUXILIARY PRIMITIVES, BUILDING BLOCKS AND FUNCTIONS

In this section, we first outline the construction of cryptographic primitives and building blocks essential to our protocol. Subsequently, we elaborate on the auxiliary functions employed in the FairRelay protocol.

B.1 Primitives

Global Random Oracle. We utilize a *restricted-programmable* global random oracle, modeled as ideal functionality \mathcal{H} . \mathcal{H} responds to all queries with uniformly random sampled λ -bit string $r \leftarrow \{0, 1\}^\lambda$. Every party has oracle access to the global functionality \mathcal{H} , and \mathcal{H} is implemented by a hash function in the real world. \mathcal{H} will logs all query response pairs (q, r) in a query history set (denoted as Q). If a new query is logged in Q before, such that $(q, r) \in Q$, \mathcal{H} will return the logged random r . In the global random oracle settings, \mathcal{H} would return the same random value for all the same query no matter which session it comes from. *restricted-programmable* refers to the capability of an ideal adversary Sim to inspect and alter the log history of the random oracle within the confines of its session, while an honest user retains the ability to verify if a query history mapping (q, r) has been programmed. We devise the *restricted-programmable* global random oracle in accordance with the framework delineated in [6], as delineated below.

Random Oracle Ideal Functionality \mathcal{H}

Local Var: \mathcal{H} maintains the input history query set Q , mapping query value $q \in \{0, 1\}^*$ to the output $r \in \{0, 1\}^\lambda$. \mathcal{H} also stores set P as programmed set and Q_{sid} for all sessions sid .

Query. Upon receiving $(query, sid, q)$ from sid' :

- If (sid, q, r) no in Q , randomly sample $r \leftarrow \{0, 1\}^\lambda$, add (sid, q, r) to Q . Output $(query, sid, q, r)$.
- If $sid' \neq sid$ or query from an adversary, store (q, r) in Q_{sid}

Program.

- Upon receiving $(program, sid, q, r)$ from an adversary \mathcal{A} in session sid , if there exists a record (sid, q, r') in Q , abort. Otherwise, if $r \in \{0, 1\}^\lambda$ store (sid, q, r) in Q and (sid, q) in P .
- Upon receiving $(isProgrammed, sid, q)$ from a party of session sid , if $(sid, q) \in P$, return $(programmed, sid, q)$

Observe Upon receiving $(lookup, sid)$ from the adversary of session sid , respond with $(lookupid, sid, Q_{sid})$

Commitment Scheme. We build a commitment scheme based on \mathcal{H} , defined in Algorithm 1:

Algorithm 1 Commitment Scheme

```

function COMMIT(x) ▷  $x \in \{0, 1\}^*$ 
   $d \leftarrow \{0, 1\}^K$  s.t.  $\mathcal{H}(isProgrammed, sid, x||d) \neq 1$  ▷ Choose an
  un-corrupted  $d$ 
   $c \leftarrow \mathcal{H}(query, sid, x||d)$ 
  return  $(c, d)$ 
end function

```

```

function OPEN(m, h)
  parse  $(c, d) \leftarrow h$  ▷  $c \in \{0, 1\}^\lambda, d \in \{0, 1\}^K$ 

```



Figure 15: Delivery Phase of FairRelay in multi-path scenario.

```

c' = H(query, sid, x||d)
if c = c' ∧ H(isProgrammed, sid, x||d) ≠ 1 then
  return 1
end if
return 0
end function

```

Encryption Scheme. We utilize a symmetric encryption scheme SE , which satisfies the IND-CPA security [29], and provides following interfaces.

- $(Sk, nonce) := SE.KGen(1^\mu)$, where Sk is the master encryption key and $nonce$ is randomly sampled. We use sk to denotes this tuple, l is the security parameters where $|sk| = \mu$
- $c := SE.Enc(m, sk.Sk, r)$. Encrypt a message m with a random nonce r . $\forall c := SE.Enc(m, sk.Sk, r)$, $c' := SE.Enc(m', sk.Sk, r')$, if $m' \neq m \wedge r' \neq r$, then this encryption holds the IND-CPA security.
- $m := SE.Dec(c, sk.Sk, r)$. Decrypt a ciphertext c uses a master encryption key $sk.Sk$ and a nonce r .

Asymmetric encryption scheme. We use an asymmetric encryption scheme captured by an ideal functionality \mathcal{F}_{Sig} , presented in work [9]. \mathcal{F}_{Sig} has following interfaces:

- $(iPk, iK) := AE.KGen(\lambda)$. Generate keypair with security parameter λ , where iPk is the public key, iK is the secret key.
- $\sigma := AE.Sign(m, iK)$. Sign message m and generate signature σ .
- $AE.Ver(m, \sigma, iPk) \mapsto \{0, 1\}$. Verify the signature σ of m with a public key iPk .
- $c := AE.Enc(m, iPk)$ Encrypt a message m with public key iPk .
- $m := AE.Dec(c, iK)$ Decrypt a ciphertext c with private key iK .

zk-SNARK. A zk -SNARK system Snk can demonstrate that a specific witness (comprising a public witness x and a private witness w) validates a given claim C , where $C(x, w) = 1$, without disclosing the confidential witness. This system upholds the principles of *correctness*, *soundness*, and *zero knowledge* [15]. Snk has following interfaces:

- $(vp, pp) := Snk.Setup(C)$ Setup the *verification parameter* vp and *proving parameter* pp .
- $\pi := Snk.Proof(pp, x, w)$. Create a proof π claiming $C(x, w) = 1$.




Figure 16: Payment Phase of FairRelay




Figure 17: Decryption Phase of FairRelay

- $Snk.Verify(vp, x, \pi) \mapsto \{0, 1\}$.

Merkle Multi-proof. A Merkle Multi-proof system MT can prove a set x is a subset of y , where y is commitment by a merkle root [32]. The Merkle Multi-proof MT provides following interfaces:

- $root := MT.Root(y)$. Compute the Merkle root of an ordered list y .
- $(\mathbb{H}, \pi_{merkle}) := MT.Member(x, y)$. Generate a proof π_{merkle} claiming x is a subset of y , where \mathbb{H} is the hashes of all elements in x .
- $MT.Ver(\mathbb{H}, \pi_{merkle}, root) \mapsto \{0, 1\}$. Verify if \mathbb{H} is a subset of merkle leaves committed by $root$.

B.2 Building Blocks

B.2.1 Commitment and PoM on Masking. Here we formally define the commitment scheme $MCOM$ (shown in Algorithm 2) and the proof of misbehavior scheme $POMM$ on masking (shown in Algorithm 3).

Algorithm 2 Mask Commitment

```

1: function MCOM.GEN( $sk, s, iK$ )
2:    $h_{sk} \leftarrow Commit(sk)$ 
3:    $h_s \leftarrow Commit(s)$ 
4:    $ck \leftarrow s \oplus sk$  ▷ mask result
5:    $\sigma \leftarrow AE.Sign(\{h_{sk}, h_s, ck\}, iK)$ 
6:    $com_{mask} \leftarrow \{h_{sk}, h_s, ck, \sigma\}$ 
7:   return  $com_{mask}$ 
8: end function

9: function MCOM.VER( $com_{mask}, iPk, h'_{sk}, h'_s$ )
10:  Parse  $\{h_{sk}, h_s, ck, \sigma\} \leftarrow com_{mask}$ 
11:  if  $AE.Ver(\{h_{sk}, h_s, ck\}, \sigma, iPk) = 1 \wedge h'_{sk} = h_{sk} \wedge h'_s = h_s$  then
12:    return 1
13:  end if
14:  return 0
15: end function

```

Algorithm 3 Proof of Misbehavior on Masking (POMM)

```

1: function POMM.GEN( $com_{mask}, iPk, s'$ )
2:    $tid \leftarrow iPk$ 
3:   Parse  $\{h_{sk}, h_s, ck, \sigma\} \leftarrow com_{mask}$ 
4:    $\pi_{pomm} \leftarrow (h_{sk}, h_s, ck, \sigma, s')$ 
5:   return  $(\pi_{pomm}, tid)$ 
6: end function

7: function POMM.VER( $\pi_{pomm}, tid$ )
8:   Parse  $(h_{sk}, h_s, ck, \sigma, s') \leftarrow \pi_{pomm}$ 
9:   if  $AE.Ver(\{h_{sk}, h_s, ck\}, \sigma, tid) = 1 \wedge Open(s', h_s) = 1 \wedge$ 
      $Open(ck \oplus s', h_{sk}) = 1$  then
10:    return 1
11:  end if
12:  return 0
13: end function

```

We now formally define the properties secured by the $MCOM$ and $PoMM$.

Lemma 1. For any mask commitment com_{mask} correctly signed by a public key iPk , and the secret s is correctly revealed: If com_{mask} is accurately generated from function $MCOM.Gen()$, the correct encryption key sk committed by $com_{mask} \cdot h_{sk}$ can be extracted. Otherwise, a valid π_{pomm} could be generated. In other words, P_1 with probability 1 when the committer is honest, P_2 with probability 1 when the committer is dishonest. The sum of P_1 and P_2 has a probability of 1.

$$P_1 = \Pr \left[Open(sk, h_{sk}) = 1 \mid \begin{array}{l} (h_{sk}, h_s, ck, \sigma) \leftarrow com_{mask} \\ AE.Ver(\{h_{sk}, h_s, ck\}, \sigma, iPk) = 1 \wedge \\ Open(s', h_s) = 1 \wedge \\ sk' = ck \oplus s' \end{array} \right]$$

$$P_2 = \Pr \left[PoMM.Ver(\pi, tid) = 1 \mid \begin{array}{l} (h_{sk}, h_s, ck, \sigma) \leftarrow com_{mask} \\ AE.Ver(\{h_{sk}, h_s, ck\}, \sigma, iPk) \\ = 1 \wedge \\ Open(s', h_s) = 1 \wedge \\ sk' = ck \oplus s' \\ (\pi, tid) \leftarrow \\ PoMM.Gen(com_{mask}, iPk, s') \end{array} \right]$$

PROOF. This property holds if the commitment scheme and the signature scheme are secure, and the zk -SNARK scheme used in proof generation holds the *correctness*. \square

Lemma 2. For any mask commitment com_{mask} honestly constructed, PPT adversary can learn the encryption key sk and the mask secret s with a negligible probability, shown below.

$$\Pr \left[\mathcal{A}(com_{mask}) = (sk, s) \mid com_{mask} \leftarrow MCOM.Gen(sk, s, iK) \right]$$

PROOF. It is evident that this property holds true if the commitment scheme and the one-time pad encryption are secure. \square

B.2.2 Commitment and PoM on Encryption. We formally define encryption scheme and proof of misbehavior on encryption scheme.

Algorithm 4 Encryption Commitment

```

1: function ECOM.GEN( $m_i, sk, id, iK$ )
2:    $c \leftarrow SE.Enc(m, sk, Sk, TweakNonce(sk, nonce, id))$ 
3:    $h_m \leftarrow Commit(m_i)$ 
4:    $h_c \leftarrow Commit(c)$ 
5:    $h_{sk} \leftarrow Commit(Sk)$ 
6:    $\sigma \leftarrow AE.Sign(\{h_m, h_c, h_{sk}, id\}, iK)$ 
7:    $com_{enc} \leftarrow \{h_m, h_c, h_{sk}, id, \sigma\}$ 
8:   return  $com_{enc}$ 
9: end function

10: function ECOM.VER( $com_{enc}, iPk, h'_{sk}, id'$ )
11:  Parse  $\{h_m, h_c, h_{sk}, id, \sigma\} \leftarrow com_{enc}$ 
12:  return 1 if  $AE.Ver(\{h_m, h_c, h_{sk}, id\}, \sigma, iPk) = 1$  and  $id = id'$ 
     and  $h_{sk} = h'_{sk}$ 
13:  return 0
14: end function

```

Algorithm 5 Proof of Misbehavior on Encryption (POME)

```

1: require Claim  $C(x, w)$ :
2:    $(h_m, h_c, h_{sk}, id) \leftarrow x, (c', sk') \leftarrow w$ 

```

```

3:    $Open(c', h_c) = 1$  ▷ Ciphertext is correct
4:    $Open(sk', h_{sk}) = 1$  ▷ Key is correct
5:    $m' \leftarrow SE.Dec(c', sk'.Sk, TweakNonce(sk'.nonce, id))$ 
6:    $Open(m', h_m) = 0$  ▷ Decryption result is incorrect
7:   require  $(pp, vp) \leftarrow Snk.Setup(C)$ 
8:   function  $PoME.Gen(com_{enc}, c', iPk, sk')$  ▷  $c'$  and  $sk'$  are secret witness
9:      $tid \leftarrow iPk$ 
10:    Parse  $\{h_m, h_c, h_{sk}, id, \sigma\} \leftarrow com_{enc}$ 
11:     $x \leftarrow (h_m, h_c, h_{sk}, id)$ ,  $w \leftarrow (c', sk')$ 
12:     $\pi \leftarrow Snk.Prove(pp, x, w)$ ,  $\pi_{pome} \leftarrow (x, \sigma, \pi)$ 
13:    return  $(\pi_{pome}, tid)$ 
14:  end function

15: function  $PoME.Ver(\pi_{pome}, tid)$ 
16:   Parse  $(x, \sigma, \pi) \leftarrow \pi_{pome}$ 
17:   Parse  $(h_m, h_c, h_{sk}, id) \leftarrow x$ 
18:   if  $AE.Ver(\{h_m, h_c, h_{sk}, id\}, \sigma, tid) = 1$  then
19:     return  $Snk.Verify(vp, x, \pi)$ 
20:   end if
21:   return 0
22: end function

```

We then formally define the security properties secured by the $MCOM$ and $POMM$.

Lemma 3. For any encryption commitment com_{enc} correctly signed by public key iPk , once the encryption key sk' and ciphertext c' are correctly revealed: If com_{enc} is generated honestly, a plaintext m committed by $com_{enc}.h_m$ can be extracted. Otherwise, a proof of misbehavior on encryption can be generated towards iPk . In other words, P_3 with *probability* 1 when the committer is honest, P_4 with *probability* 1 when the committer is dishonest. The sum of P_3 and P_4 has a *probability* of 1.

$$P_3 = \Pr \left[\begin{array}{l} Open(m', h_m) = 1 \\ \left(\begin{array}{l} (h_m, h_c, h_{sk}, i, \sigma) \leftarrow com_{enc} \\ AE.Ver(\{h_m, h_c, h_{sk}, i\}, \sigma, iPk) \\ = 1 \wedge \\ Open(c', h_c) = 1 \wedge \\ Open(sk', h_{sk}) = 1 \\ m' \leftarrow SE.Dec(c', sk'.Sk, \\ TweakNonce(sk'.nonce, i)) \end{array} \right) \end{array} \right]$$

$$P_4 = \Pr \left[\begin{array}{l} PoME.Ver(\pi, tid) = 1 \\ \left(\begin{array}{l} (h_m, h_c, h_{sk}, id, \sigma) \leftarrow com_{enc} \\ AE.Ver(\{h_m, h_c, h_{sk}, id\}, \\ \sigma, iPk) = 1 \wedge \\ Open(c', h_c) = 1 \wedge \\ Open(sk', h_{sk}) = 1 \\ (\pi, tid) \leftarrow PoME.Gen(\\ com_{enc}, c', iPk, sk') \end{array} \right) \end{array} \right]$$

PROOF. This property holds if the encryption scheme, commitment scheme, the signature scheme are secure, and the zk -SNARK scheme used in proof generation guarantees the *correctness*. \square

Lemma 4. Consider an adversary holding an encryption commitment com_{enc} honestly constructed and the corresponding ciphertext c . The probabilistic polynomial-time adversary can learn the plaintext m and the encryption key sk with a negligible probability:

$$\Pr \left[\begin{array}{l} \mathcal{A}(com_{enc}, c) = (m, sk) \\ \left(\begin{array}{l} com_{enc} \leftarrow \\ ECOM.Gen(m, sk, i, iK) \\ c \leftarrow SE.Enc(m, sk.Sk, \\ TweakNonce(sk.nonce, i)) \end{array} \right) \end{array} \right]$$

PROOF. This property holds if the commitment scheme and the symmetric encryption are secure. \square

B.2.3 Encryption Commitment Chain. For a commitment pair (com_{mask}, com_{enc}) committed by the same committer with public key iPk , we consider a commitment pair is *paired* if:

- parse $(h_m, h_c, h_{sk}, id, \sigma) \leftarrow com_{enc}$
- parse $(h'_{sk}, h_s, ck, \sigma') \leftarrow com_{mask}$
- $h_{sk} = h'_{sk} \wedge AE.Ver(\{h'_{sk}, h_s, ck\}, \sigma', iPk) = 1 \wedge$
- $AE.Ver(\{h_m, h_c, h_{sk}, id\}, \sigma, iPk) = 1$

COROLLARY 1. For a paired commitment pair (com_{mask}, com_{enc}) committed by iPk , once the mask secret s' and ciphertext c' are correctly opened: If (com_{mask}, com_{enc}) are generated honestly, a plaintext m committed by $com_{enc}.h_m$ can be extracted. Otherwise, a proof of misbehavior can be generated towards iPk .

PROOF. This corollary follows directly from Lemmas 1, 3. \square

For a plaintext chunk c_0 with index id , there exist n encoders u_1, \dots, u_n : u_i has encryption key sk_i , encrypting c_0 layer by layer and delivering the content to u_{n+1} . We consider u_{n+1} knows all public keys of each user u_i and receives a *valid* tuple $(c_n, \mathbb{C}_1, \mathbb{C}_2, id)$ from u_n . We consider a tuple to be *valid* if $(c_n, \mathbb{C}_1, \mathbb{C}_2, id)$ satisfies:

- Parse $\{com_{enc}^i\} \leftarrow \mathbb{C}_1$, $\{com_{mask}^i\} \leftarrow \mathbb{C}_2$
- $Open(c_n, com_{enc}^n.h_c) = 1 \wedge$
- For $i \in [1, n-1]$, $com_{enc}^i.h_c = com_{enc}^{i+1}.h_m \wedge$
- For $i \in [1, n]$:
 - $com_{enc}^i.id = id \wedge$
 - Parse $\{h_m, h_c, h_{sk}, i, \sigma\} \leftarrow com_{enc}^i$
 - Parse $(h'_{sk}, h_s, ck, \sigma') \leftarrow com_{mask}^i$
 - $h_{sk} = h'_{sk} \wedge AE.Ver(\{h'_{sk}, h_s, ck\}, \sigma', Pk(u_i)) = 1 \wedge$
 - $AE.Ver(\{h_m, h_c, h_{sk}, i\}, \sigma, Pk(u_i)) = 1$

COROLLARY 2. For u_{n+1} who holds a valid tuple $(c_n, \mathbb{C}_1, \mathbb{C}_2, id)$, once all u_i ($i \in [1, n]$) open their secrets committed by $com_{mask}^i.h_s$: If all commitments in $\mathbb{C}_1, \mathbb{C}_2$ are honestly constructed, u_{n+1} can get the content committed m by $com_{enc}^1.h_m$: Otherwise, a proof of misbehavior can be generated towards user u_r , where u_r is the closest cheater to u_{n+1} .

PROOF. This corollary follows directly from applying Corollary 1 and Lemma.3 recursively. \square

B.3 Functions used in FairRelay

In this section we details functions used in our protocol.

Algorithm 6 Nonce Tweak

```

function  $TWEAKNONCE(nonce, id)$  ▷  $nonce \in \{0, 1\}^\mu$ 
   $h \leftarrow \mathcal{H}(query, sid, nonce || id)$ 
  return  $h[\mu : ]$  ▷ Cut first  $\mu$  bits
end function

```

Algorithm 7 Lock and Unlock

```

function LOCK( $v, sid, cid, amt, \phi$ )
  ( $sid, cid, lb, rb$ )  $\leftarrow \mathcal{F}_{Channel}(query, sid, cid)$ 
  if  $v$  is the left party of channel  $cid$  then
     $x \leftarrow (cid, lb - amt, rb + amt, \phi)$ 
  else
     $x \leftarrow (cid, lb + amt, rb - amt, \phi)$ 
  end if
   $\sigma \leftarrow AE.Sign(x, K(v))$ 
   $tx \leftarrow \{x, \sigma\}$ 
  return  $tx$ 
end function

function UNLOCK( $tx, w, s$ )
  Parse ( $x, \sigma$ )  $\leftarrow tx$ 
  Parse ( $sid, cid, lb, rb, \phi$ )  $\leftarrow x$ 
   $\sigma' \leftarrow AE.Sign(x, K(w))$ 
  ( $update, sid, cid, lb, rb, \phi, s$ )  $\leftarrow \mathbf{Compose}(x, \sigma, \sigma', s)$   $\triangleright$ 
  Generate acceptable calls to  $\mathcal{F}_{Channel}$ 
  return ( $update, sid, cid, lb, rb, \phi, s$ )
end function

```

Algorithm 8 Payment Condition Construction

```

function CONSTRUCT( $\mathbb{H}, t$ )
  return Function  $\phi(x, ct)$ :
    store  $\phi.\mathbb{H} \leftarrow \mathbb{H}, \phi.t \leftarrow t$ 
    parse  $s_1, \dots, s_n \leftarrow x$ 
    parse  $h_1, \dots, h_n \leftarrow \mathbb{H}$ 
    for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $n$ 
      if  $Open(s_i, h_i) = 0$ , return 0
    EndFor
    if  $ct > t$ , return 0
    return 1
end function

```

Algorithm 9 Extract Encryption Keys

```

function EXTKEY( $\mathbb{S}, \mathbf{COM}_{mask}, \mathcal{G}$ )  $\triangleright$  Pass identities of parties
  in  $\mathcal{G}$ 
  Parse  $s_0, \{s_{1,1}, \dots, s_{1,|p_1|}\}, \dots, \{s_{\eta,1}, \dots, s_{\eta,|p_\eta|}\} \leftarrow \mathbb{S}$ 
  Parse  $com_m^0, \{com_m^{1,1}, \dots, com_m^{1,|p_1|}\}, \dots, \{com_m^{\eta,1}, \dots, com_m^{k,|p_\eta|}\} \leftarrow$ 
   $\mathbf{COM}_{mask}$ 
   $\mathbb{K} \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
  if  $Open(com_m^0.pk \oplus s_0, com_m^0.hs_k) = 0$  then
    ( $\pi, tid$ )  $\leftarrow POMM.Gen(com_m^0, Pk(\mathcal{P}), s_0)$ 
    return ( $\emptyset, tid, \pi$ )
  else
     $\mathbb{K} \leftarrow \mathbb{K} \cup (com_m^0.pk \oplus s_0)$ 
  end if
  for  $k \leftarrow 1$  to  $\eta$  do
    for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $|p_k|$  do
      if  $Open(com_m^{k,i}.ck \oplus s_{k,i}, com_m^{k,i}.hs_k) = 0$  then
        ( $\pi, tid$ )  $\leftarrow POMM.Gen(com_m^{k,i}, Pk(\mathcal{R}_{k,i}), s_{k,i})$ 
        return ( $\emptyset, tid, \pi$ )
      else
         $\mathbb{K} \leftarrow \mathbb{K} \cup (com_m^{k,i}.ck \oplus s_{k,i})$ 
      end if
    end for
  end for

```

```

end for
return ( $\mathbb{K}, \perp, \perp$ )
end function

```

Algorithm 10 Extract Content

```

function EXTCHUNK( $c', \mathbb{C}, j, \mathbb{Sk}$ )  $\triangleright$  Decrypt a ciphertext chunk layer by
  layer
   $n \leftarrow |\mathbb{Sk}|$ 
  parse  $sk_0, \dots, sk_n \leftarrow \mathbb{Sk}$ 
  parse  $com_{enc}^0, \dots, com_{enc}^n \leftarrow \mathbb{C}$ 
   $c \leftarrow c'$ 
  for  $i \leftarrow n$  to 0 do
     $com_{enc} \leftarrow com_{enc}^i$ 
     $c_p \leftarrow SE.Dec(c, sk_i.Sk, TweakNonce(sk_i.nonce, j))$ 
    if  $Open(c_p, com_{enc}.h_m) = 0$  then return ( $\perp, i, c_p, com_{enc}$ )
    end if
     $c \leftarrow c_p$ 
  end for
  return ( $c, \perp, \perp, \perp$ )
end function

```

function EXTPATH($\mathbf{CT}, \mathbf{COM}_{enc}, \mathbb{Sk}$)

```

 $n \leftarrow |\mathbf{CT}|$   $\triangleright$  Get chunk numbers
  parse  $c_1, \dots, c_n \leftarrow \mathbf{CT}$ 
  parse  $\mathbb{C}_1, \dots, \mathbb{C}_n \leftarrow \mathbf{COM}_{enc}$ 
   $PT \leftarrow \emptyset$   $\triangleright$  Plaintext chunk list
  for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $n$  do  $\triangleright$  Range each ciphertext chunk
     $idx \leftarrow \mathbb{C}_i[0].id$   $\triangleright$  Get the chunk index in content
    ( $m, cht, c, com_{enc}$ )  $\leftarrow ExtChunk(c_i, idx, \mathbb{Sk})$ 
    if  $cht \neq \perp$  then return ( $\perp, cht, c, com_{enc}$ )
    end if
     $PT \leftarrow PT \cup (m, idx)$ 
  end for
  return ( $PT, \perp, \perp, \perp$ )
end function

```

function EXTRACT($\mathbb{K}, \mathbf{CT}, \mathbf{COM}_{enc}, \mathcal{G}$)

```

  parse  $\mathbf{CT}_1, \dots, \mathbf{CT}_{n_f} \leftarrow \mathbf{CT}$ 
   $sk_0, \{sk_{1,1}, \dots, sk_{1,|p_1|}\}, \dots, \{sk_{\eta,1}, \dots, sk_{\eta,|p_\eta|}\} \leftarrow \mathbb{K}$ 
   $\mathbf{COM}_{enc}^1, \dots, \mathbf{COM}_{enc}^\eta \leftarrow \mathbf{COM}_{enc}$ 
   $Chunks \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
  for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $\eta$  do
     $\mathbb{Sk} \leftarrow \{sk_0, sk_{i,1}, \dots, sk_{i,|p_i|}\}$ 
    ( $PT, cht, c, com_{enc}$ )  $\leftarrow ExtPath(\mathbf{CT}_i, \mathbf{COM}_{enc}^i, \mathbb{Sk})$ 
    if  $cht \neq \perp \wedge cht \neq 0$  then  $\triangleright$  a relay cheats on encryption
      return  $PoME.Gen(com_{enc}, c, Pk(\mathcal{R}_{i,cht}), sk_{i,cht})$ 
    end if
    if  $cht \neq \perp \wedge cht = 0$  then  $\triangleright$  provider cheats on encryption
      return  $PoME.Gen(com_{enc}, c, Pk(\mathcal{P}), sk_0)$ 
    end if
     $Chunks \leftarrow PT \cup Chunks$ 
  end for
  return  $Rebuild(Chunks)$   $\triangleright$  Rebuild full content from chunks
end function

```

C SECURITY PROOF

In this section, we first analyze our *Enforceable A-HTLC* protocol in the UC framework, addressing the security properties ensured by *Enforceable A-HTLC*. We then use the *Enforceable A-HTLC* ideal

Ideal Functionality of \mathcal{F}_{mex}
<p>Consider a <i>Enforceable A-HTLC</i> consisting of a payer u_0 (provider \mathcal{P}), and n payees $\{u_1, \dots, u_n\}$ (u_i is the i-th relay \mathcal{R}_i). u_0 pays \mathfrak{B}_i to u_i in exchange of a secret s_i committed by h_i ($Open(s_i, h_i) = 1$). u_0 and u_i had an agreed-on enforcement deadline T. We denote $\{h_1, \dots, h_n\}$ as \mathbb{H}_i. cid_i denotes the payment channel identifier between u_{i-1} and u_i, and $ADDR : \{Pk(u_0), Pk(u_1), \dots, Pk(u_n)\}$. We consider n, $ADDR$ as public knowledge configured on a trusted setup (e.g. a PKI). \mathcal{F}_{mex} owns the private key of each party.</p> <p>Local variables</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • $states$: is a n-tuple, where $states[i]$ is the state of the i-th channel. Each state is initialized as \perp. • \mathfrak{B}_{max}: Refund amount configured globally. • $cheater$: Identity of the cheater, initialized as \perp. • $ifEnf$: Enforcement phase flag; eid: Enforcement identifier, initialized as 0. • ct: Current round retrieved from global clock \mathcal{F}_{clk} <p style="text-align: center;">Lock Phase</p> <p>(Round 1) Upon receiving $(lock, sid, \mathbb{H}_1, T, h_0, amt, tx_1) \leftarrow u_0$:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If u_0 is honest: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – $\phi := Construct(\{h_0\} \cup \mathbb{H}_1, T + n + 1)$, $tx_1 := lock(u_0, sid, cid_1, amt, \phi)$ • Save T, h_0, \mathbb{H}_1, leak $(lock, sid, u_0, tx_1)$ to Sim, set $states[1] := locked$, set $ifEnf := 0$. <p>(Round 1 + i) ($0 < i$) Upon receiving $(lock, sid, T^*, h_0^*, \mathbb{H}_1^*, h_i, \mathfrak{B}_i, tx_{i+1}) \leftarrow u_i$:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If u_i is honest: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Check if tx_i is properly signed by u_i and $tx_i.\phi.t = T + n - i + 2$. – $(sid, cid_i, lb, rb) \leftarrow \mathcal{F}_{Channel}(query, sid, cid_i)$, check $tx_i.lb + tx_i.rb = lb + rb \wedge tx_i.rb > rb + \mathfrak{B}_i$. Set $amt_i = tx_i.rb - rb$. – Parse $h_1^*, \dots, h_n^* := \mathbb{H}_1^*$, $h_0^*, h_1^*, \dots, h_n^* := tx_i.\phi.\mathbb{H}$. For $j \in [1, n]$ check if $h_j^* = h_j^*$. Check if $h_0^* = h_0^*$. If any check fails, \mathcal{F}_{mex} aborts. – If $i < n$, set $\phi := Construct(tx_i.\phi.\mathbb{H} \setminus h_i, tx_i.\phi.t - 1)$, $tx_{i+1} := lock(u_i, sid, cid_i, amt_i - \mathfrak{B}_i, \phi)$. • If $T^* = T \wedge h_0^* = h_0 \wedge \mathbb{H}_1^* = \mathbb{H}_1$, set $ifEnf := ifEnf + 1$, and set $Ch := (h_0, \mathbb{H}_1^*, T^*, ADDR)$, $\sigma_i := AE.Sign(Ch, K(u_i))$. Leak (ack, u_i, σ_i) to Sim. • Save tx_{i+1}, if $i < n$, set $states[i + 1] := locked$, leak $(locked, sid, u_i, tx_{i+1})$ to Sim. <p style="text-align: center;">Unlock Phase</p> <p>(Round T') Upon receiving $(release, sid, s_0) \leftarrow u_0$: If $Open(s_0, h_0) = 1 \wedge T' < T \wedge ifEnf = n$, save s_0, leak $(release, sid, u_0, s_0)$ to Sim, and set $states[n] := unlockable$.</p> <p>Upon receiving $(unlock, sid, s_n) \leftarrow u_n$: if $states[n] = unlockable$ and $tx_n.\phi(\{s_0, s_n\}, ct) = 1$, save s_n, send $unlock(tx_n, u_n, \{s_0, s_n\}) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{Channel}$, then set $states[n] := unlocked$.</p> <p>Upon receiving $(unlock, sid, s_i) \leftarrow u_i$ ($i < n$): if $states[i] = locked$, and $states[i + 1] = unlocked$, set $\mathbb{S} = \{s_0, s_i, \dots, s_n\}$. If $tx_i.\phi(\mathbb{S}, ct) = 1$, send $unlock(tx_i, u_n, \{s_i\} \cup \mathbb{S}) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{Channel}$, then set $states[i] := unlocked$.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Enforcement Phase</p> <p>(Round T'') Upon receiving $(challenge, sid, s_0) \leftarrow u_0$: If $T'' < T \wedge Open(s_0, h_0) = 1 \wedge ifEnf = n$, leak $(challenge, sid, u_0, s_0)$ to Sim. If $states[n] = locked$, set $states[n] := unlockable$. Parse $h_1', \dots, h_n' := \mathbb{H}_1$, and set $eid := n$, $ifEnf := 0$.</p> <p>(Round $T'' + 1$) Upon receiving $(response, sid, s_n, ifUnlock) \leftarrow u_n$:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If $Open(s_n, h_n') = 1 \wedge ifUnlock = 1 \wedge states[n] = unlockable$ and $tx_n.\phi(\{s_0, s_n\}, T'' + 1) = 1$, save s_n, send $unlock(tx_n, u_n, \{s_0, s_n\}) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{Channel}$, then set $states[n] := unlocked$. • If $Open(s_n, h_n') = 1 \wedge eid = n$, save s_n, leak $(response, sid, s_n, u_n)$ to Sim, $eid := n - 1$ • If no valid <i>response</i> message received in this round, set $cheater := u_n$. <p>(Round $T'' + n - i + 1$) Upon receiving $(reponse, sid, s_i, ifUnlock) \leftarrow u_i$ ($0 < i < n$):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If $Open(s_i, h_i') = 1 \wedge eid := i \wedge states[n] = locked \wedge ifUnlock = 1 \wedge cheater = \perp \wedge tx_i.\phi(\{s_0, s_i, \dots, s_n\}, T'' + n - i + 1) = 1$: send $unlock(tx_n, u_n, \{s_0, s_n\}) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{Channel}$, and set $states[i] := unlocked$. • If $Open(s_i, h_i') = 1 \wedge eid := i$, save s_i, leak $(reponse, sid, s_i, \mathcal{R}_i)$ to Sim, and set $eid := eid - 1$. • If no valid <i>response</i> message received in this round and $cheater = \perp$, set $cheater := u_i$, $eid := 0$ <p>(Round $T'' + n + 1$) Upon receiving $(punish, sid) \leftarrow u_0$: If $cheater \neq \perp$, send $(transfer, sid, cheater, u_0, \mathfrak{B}_{max}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$, and leak $(punished, sid)$.</p>

Figure 18: Ideal Functionality of \mathcal{F}_{mex}

functionality as building blocks, arguing for the fairness and confidentiality defined in Section 3.2.

C.1 Enforceable A-HTLC in UC

Here, we define the *Enforceable A-HTLC* protocol (denoted as Π) in UC framework, and then define the ideal functionality \mathcal{F}_{mex} .

C.1.1 The UC-security definition. We define Π as a *hybrid* protocol that accesses a list of preliminary ideal functionalities: secure communication channel \mathcal{F}_{auth} , global clock \mathcal{F}_{clk} , *restricted-programmable* global random oracle \mathcal{H} , signature scheme \mathcal{F}_{Sig} , public ledger \mathcal{L} , *Judge Contract* \mathcal{F}_{jc} , and payment channel $\mathcal{F}_{Channel}$.

We denote these functionalities as \mathcal{F}_{prelim} . The environment \mathcal{E} supplies inputs to all parties in Π and the adversary \mathcal{A} with a security parameter λ and auxiliary input z , $z \in \{0, 1\}^*$. The

Enforceable A-HTLC Protocol Π
<p>Consider an <i>Enforceable A-HTLC</i> protocol involving a payer u_0 (referred to as the provider \mathcal{P}), n payees denoted as $\{u_1, \dots, u_n\}$ (where u_i represents the i-th relay \mathcal{R}_i). In this protocol, u_0 makes a payment of \mathfrak{B}_i to u_i in exchange for a secret s_i that is committed by h_i (where $Open(s_i, h_i) = 1$). Both u_0 and u_i agree upon an enforcement deadline denoted as T. We use $\{h_1, \dots, h_n\}$ to represent the set of commitments, which is denoted as \mathbb{H}_i. The payment channel identifier between u_{i-1} and u_i is denoted as cid_i, and the addresses are represented by $ADDR : \{Pk(u_0), Pk(u_1), \dots, Pk(u_n)\}$. In this protocol, we assume that the values of n and $ADDR$ are public knowledge and are configured as part of a trusted setup, such as a Public Key Infrastructure (PKI).</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Lock Phase</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Round 1) u_0 : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Upon receiving $(lock, sid, \mathbb{H}_1, T, h_0, amt) \leftarrow \mathcal{E}$, u_0 set $\phi := Construct(\{h_0\} \cup \mathbb{H}_1, T + n + 1)$, $tx_1 := lock(u_0, sid, cid_1, amt, \phi)$, and send $(channel-lock, sid, tx_1) \rightarrow u_1$. Then u_0 will enter the unlock/enforcement phase. If no valid <i>release</i> or <i>challenge</i> message arrives before round $T + n + 1$, u_0 terminates. - If no valid <i>lock</i> message received in this round, u_0 terminates. • u_i ($i > 0$) in round $(i + 1)$: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Upon receiving $(lock, sid, T, h_i, \mathfrak{B}_i, h_0, \mathbb{H}_1) \leftarrow \mathcal{E}$ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Check if u_i had received lock message $(channel-lock, sid, tx_i) \leftarrow u_{i-1}$, where tx_i should be signed by u_{i-1} and $tx_i.\phi.t = T + n - i + 2$. * Parse $h_1, \dots, h_n := \mathbb{H}_1$. * $(sid, cid_i, lb, rb) \leftarrow \mathcal{F}_{Channel}(query, sid, cid_i)$, check if $tx_i.lb + tx_i.rb = lb + rb \wedge tx_i.rb > rb + \mathfrak{B}_i$. set $amt = tx_i.rb - rb$. * Parse $h'_0, h'_1, \dots, h'_n := tx_i.\phi.\mathbb{H}$. For $j \in [1, n]$, check if $h'_j = h_j$. Check if $h'_0 = h_0$. * If any check fail, u_i aborts the protocol. * Set $st_i := locked$, $Ch := (h_0, \mathbb{H}_1, T, ADDR)$, $\sigma_{Ch}^i := AE.Sign(Ch, K(u_i))$, $\sigma_{Ch}^i \rightarrow u_0$. * If $i < n$, $\phi := Construct(tx_i.\phi.\mathbb{H} \setminus h_i, tx_i.\phi.t - 1)$, $tx_{i+1} := lock(u_i, sid, cid_{i+1}, amt - \mathfrak{B}_i, \phi)$, $(channel-lock, sid, tx_{i+1}) \rightarrow u_{i+1}$. * Then u_i will enter the next phase. If no new <i>unlock</i> or <i>release</i> message received until round $tx_i.\phi.t$, u_i aborts the protocol. - If no valid <i>lock</i> message received in round $1 + i$, u_i terminates. <p style="text-align: center;">Unlock Phase</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • u_0: Upon receiving $(release, sid, s_0) \leftarrow \mathcal{E}$ in round T'. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If $T' < T \wedge Open(s_0, h_0) = 1$ and u_0 had received all σ_{Ch}^i from u_i, where $Ch := (h_0, \mathbb{H}_1, T, ADDR)$, $AE.Ver(Ch, \sigma_{Ch}^i, Pk(u_i)) = 1$, send $(released, sid, s_0) \rightarrow u_n$. • u_n: Upon receiving $(unlock, sid, s_n) \leftarrow \mathcal{E}$ in round ct: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If u_i had received $(released, sid, s_0)$ from u_0, u_i sets $\mathbb{S}_n := \{s_0, s_n\}$. - If $tx.\phi(\{s_0, s_n\}, ct) = 1 \wedge st_n = locked$, u_i sends $unlock(cid_n, tx_n, u_n, \mathbb{S}_n) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{Channel}$, and sets $st_n := unlocked$. • u_i ($0 < i < n$): Upon receiving $(unlock, sid, s_i) \leftarrow \mathcal{E}$: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If u_i had received $(updated, sid, cid_{i+1}, \mathbb{S}_{i+1}) \leftarrow \mathcal{F}_{Channel}$, u_i sets $\mathbb{S}_i := \mathbb{S}_{i+1} \cup \{s_i\}$. - If $st_i = locked \wedge tx.\phi(\mathbb{S}_i, ct) = 1$, u_i sends $unlock(tx_i, u_i, \mathbb{S}_i) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{Channel}$, then set $st_i := unlocked$. <p style="text-align: center;">Enforcement phase</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • u_0: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Upon receiving $(challenge, sid, s_0) \leftarrow \mathcal{E}$ in round (T''), if $T'' < T \wedge Open(s_0, h_0) = 1$ and u_0 had received all σ_{Ch}^i from u_i, where $Ch := (h_0, \mathbb{H}_1, T, ADDR)$, $AE.Ver(Ch, \sigma_{Ch}^i, Pk(u_i)) = 1$: set $\Sigma := \{\sigma_{Ch}^1, \dots, \sigma_{Ch}^n\}$, $(enforce, sid, Ch, \Sigma, s_0) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{jc}$. - In round $(T'' + n + 1)$: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Upon receiving $(punish, sid) \leftarrow \mathcal{E}$, send $(punish, sid) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{jc}$, then terminate. * If no <i>punish</i> message received in this round, u_n terminates. • In round $(T'' + 1)$, u_n: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Upon receiving $(response, sid, s_n) \leftarrow \mathcal{E}$, if u_n had received $(enforced, sid, s') \leftarrow \mathcal{F}_{jc}$: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * If $st_n = locked \wedge tx_n.\phi(\{s', s_n\}, ct) = 1$, send $unlock(cid_n, tx_n, \mathcal{R}_i, \{s', s_n\}) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{Channel}$, set $st_n := unlocked$ * send $(log, sid, i, s_n) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{jc}$, then u_n terminates. - If no <i>response</i> message received in this round, u_n terminates. • In round $(T'' + n - i + 1)$, u_i ($0 < i < n$): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Upon receiving $(response, sid, s_i) \leftarrow \mathcal{E}$, if u_i had received $(logged, sid, i, \mathbb{S})$ from \mathcal{F}_{jc}: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * If $st_i = locked \wedge tx_i.\phi(\{\mathbb{S}, s_i\}, ct) = 1$, send $unlock(cid_i, tx_i, u_i, \mathbb{S} \cup \{s_i\}) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{Channel}$, set $st_i := unlocked$ * Send $(log, sid, i, s_i) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{jc}$, then u_i terminates. - If no <i>response</i> message received in this round, u_i terminates.

Figure 19: Enforceable A-HTLC Protocol Formal Description Π

ensemble of outputs of executing protocol Π are represented as $EXEC_{\Pi, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}}^{\mathcal{F}_{prelim}} \{\lambda, z\}$.

In the ideal world, all parties do not interact with each other but simply forwarding the message from \mathcal{E} to \mathcal{F}_{mex} . \mathcal{F}_{mex} has access to following ideal functionalities: global clock \mathcal{F}_{clk} , *restricted-programmable* random oracle \mathcal{H} , public ledger \mathcal{L} , and payment channel $\mathcal{F}_{Channel}$. We denotes these ideal functionalities as \mathcal{F}_{ideal} .

Let $EXEC_{\mathcal{F}_{mex}, Sim, \mathcal{E}}^{\mathcal{F}_{ideal}} \{\lambda, z\}$ be the ensemble of outputs of executing ideal functionality \mathcal{F}_{mex} .

Definition C.1 (UC Security). A protocol Π *UC-realizes* an ideal functionality \mathcal{F}_{mex} if, for any probabilistic polynomial-time (PPT) adversary \mathcal{A} , there exists a simulator Sim such that, for any environment \mathcal{E} with $z \in \{0, 1\}^*$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$, $EXEC_{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{E}}$ and $EXEC_{\tau, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}}$

Simulator
Lock Phase
<p>(Round 1) Upon receiving $(lock, sid, \mathbb{H}_1, T, h_0, amt) \leftarrow \mathcal{E}$ in the ideal world:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If u_0 is honest: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – If Sim learns $(lock, sid, u_0, tx_1)$ from \mathcal{F}_{mex} leakage, Sim simulates the lock message by sending (sid, tx_1) to u_1 on behalf of u_0. • If u_0 is dishonest: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Sim learns the locking message $(sid, tx_1^*) \rightarrow u_1$ in the real world. Then Sim sends $(lock, sid, \mathbb{H}_1, T, h_0, tx_1^*) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{mex}$. If no locking message is captured, Sim aborts the simulation. – Sim then simulates messages by replaying the captured messages in the ideal world. <p>(Round $i + 1$) Upon receiving $(lock, sid, T, h_i, \mathfrak{B}_i, h_0, \mathbb{H}_1) \leftarrow \mathcal{E}$:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If u_i is honest: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – If Sim learns (ack, u_i, σ_i) from \mathcal{F}_{mex} leakage, Sim sends $(sid, \sigma_i) \rightarrow u_0$ on behalf of u_i. If Sim learns $(locked, sid, u_i, tx_{i+1})$ from \mathcal{F}_{mex}, Sim sends $(sid, tx_{i+1}) \rightarrow u_{i+1}$ on behalf of u_i. • If u_i is dishonest: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Sim learns if u_i sent (sid, tx_{i+1}) in the real world. If no tx_{i+1} is sent in this round, Sim sets $tx'_{i+1} = \perp$. Sim then learns if u_i sends σ_{Ch}^i towards u_0. As u_i is corrupted, Sim extracts Ch^i from σ_{Ch}^i. After the extraction, Sim sends $(lock, sid, CH^i.T, Ch^i.h_0, Ch^i.\mathbb{H}_1, \perp, \perp, tx'_{i+1}) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{mex}$. If u_i does not send σ_{Ch}^i, Sim sends $(lock, sid, \perp, \perp, \perp, \perp, \perp, tx'_{i+1}) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{mex}$. – Sim then simulates the communication by replaying the captured messages in the ideal world. <p style="text-align: center;">Unlock Phase</p> <p>(Round T') Upon \tilde{u}_0 receiving $(release, sid, s_0) \leftarrow \mathcal{E}$:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • u_0 is honest: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – As \mathcal{F}_{mex} leaks $(release, sid, u_0, s_0)$ to Sim, Sim simulates communication by sends $(released, sid, s_0)$ to u_n on behalf of u_0. • u_0 is dishonest: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – If Sim learns $(release, sid, s_0^*)$ sent from u_0, Sim will send $(release, sid, s_0^*) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{mex}$. If no message captured, Sim send nothing to \mathcal{F}_{mex}. – Sim then simulates the communication by replaying captured message in ideal world. <p>Upon \tilde{u}_i ($i \in [1, n]$) receiving $(release, sid, s_i) \leftarrow \mathcal{E}$:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If u_i is honest: Sim learns $(release, u_i, sid, s_i)$ from \mathcal{F}_{mex}'s leakage, simulating the release message by sending $(release, sid, s_0)$ to u_n. • If u_i is dishonest: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – If u_i sends $(release, sid, s_0^*)$ to u_n, Sim sends $(release, sid, s_0^*) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{mex}$. Otherwise, Sim sends nothing to \mathcal{F}_{mex}. <p style="text-align: center;">Enforcement Phase</p> <p>(Round T'') Upon \tilde{u}_0 receiving $(challenge, sid, s_0) \leftarrow \mathcal{E}$:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If u_0 is honest: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – If Sim learns the s_0 and σ_i from \mathcal{F}_{mex}'s leakage, set $\Sigma := \{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n\}$, $Ch := (h_0, \mathbb{H}_1, T, ADDR)$, Sim will simulate \mathcal{F}_{jc}'s execution by running $(enforced, sid, s_0) \leftarrow \mathcal{F}_{jc}(enforce, sid, Ch, \Sigma, s_0)$. • If u_0 is dishonest: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – If u_0 sends $(enforce, sid, Ch^*, \Sigma^*, s_0')$ to \mathcal{F}_{jc} in real world, Sim sends $(challenge, sid, s_0') \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{mex}$. Sim then simulates \mathcal{F}_{jc}'s execution in the ideal world $((enforce, sid, Ch^*, \Sigma^*, s_0') \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{jc})$. If \mathcal{F}_{jc} leaks the challenge message, Sim simulates \mathcal{F}_{jc}'s response: $(enforced, sid, s_0') \leftarrow \mathcal{F}_{jc}$. <p>(Round $T'' + n - i + 1$) Upon \tilde{u}_i receiving $(responce, sid, s_i) \leftarrow \mathcal{E}$ ($i \in [1, n]$):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If u_i is honest: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – If Sim learns $(responce, sid, s_i, u_i)$ from \mathcal{F}_{mex}, Sim will simulate the \mathcal{F}_{jc} by running $(logged, sid, \mathbb{S}) \leftarrow \mathcal{F}_{jc}(log, sid, i, s_i)$. • If u_i is dishonest: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – If Sim captures the $(log, sid, i, s_i') \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{jc}$ message sent by u_i in real world, and the channel cid_i updated from tx_i, Sim sends $(responce, sid, s_i', 1) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{mex}$. If $\mathcal{F}_{Channel}$ does not captured updated message from Sim, Sim sends $(responce, sid, s_i', 0) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{mex}$. – Sim replays the contract execution in the ideal world. <p>(Round $T'' + n + 1$) Upon \tilde{u}_0 receiving $(punish, sid) \leftarrow \mathcal{E}$:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If u_0 is honest: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – If Sim learns $punished$ message from \mathcal{F}_{mex}, Sim will simulates the contract execution $(punished, sid) \leftarrow \mathcal{F}_{jc}(punish, sid)$. If Sim learns $punished-fail$ message from \mathcal{F}_{mex}, Sim will simulate $(punish, sid) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{jc}$ without any output from \mathcal{F}_{jc}. • If u_n is dishonest: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Sim watches if u_n calls the \mathcal{F}_{jc} in real world, if yes, $(punish, sid) \leftarrow \mathcal{F}_{mex}$. Sim also simulates the \mathcal{F}_{jc} to relay the \mathcal{F}_{jc} execution in the ideal world. If no message sent from u_n, Sim will forward nothing to \mathcal{F}_{mex}.

Figure 20: Simulator Construction

are computationally indistinguishable:

$$\text{EXEC}_{\Pi, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}}^{\mathcal{F}_{\text{prelim}}} \{\lambda, z\} \approx_c \text{EXEC}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{mex}}, \text{Sim}, \mathcal{E}}^{\mathcal{F}_{\text{ideal}}} \{\lambda, z\}$$

C.1.2 Ideal functionality of Enforceable A-HTLC. In this section, we present the ideal functionality \mathcal{F}_{mex} , shown in Fig.18.

C.1.3 Enforceable A-HTLC Protocol. In this section, we formally present the Enforceable A-HTLC Protocol, shown in Fig.19.

C.1.4 Simulator Construction. In this section, we present the simulator construction in Fig.20 and formal proof that Π UC-realize the ideal functionality \mathcal{F}_{mex} . We denote a dummy party in the ideal world as \tilde{u}_i . Fig. 21 demonstrates the real world execution and the ideal world execution.

C.1.5 UC Proof. In this section, we formally argue that Π UC-realizes \mathcal{F}_{mex} . In our description, we write m^i as the message observed at round i .

Lemma 5. The lock phase of Π UC-realizes the lock phase of \mathcal{F}_{mex} .

PROOF. We assume the protocol Π starts on round 1, and note that in the real world \mathcal{E} controls \mathcal{A} . We first define the messages used in the lock phase:

- m_1 : the *lock* message sent from \mathcal{E} to u_i .
- m_2 : the *locked* message sent from u_i to u_{i+1} .
- m_3 : the *ack* message sent from u_{i+1} to u_0 .

We proceed to compare the messages received by \mathcal{E} in the real world and the ideal world, considering various adversary assumptions. During the lock phase, the output of u_0 is only relevant to \mathcal{E} 's input m_1 , while the output of u_i ($i > 0$) is relevant to \mathcal{E} 's input m_1 and the output of u_{i-1} . Thus, we consider the following cases:

- (Round 1): we consider \mathcal{E} sends m_1 to u_0 in this round.
 - Case 1: Assuming u_0 is honest. Once \mathcal{E} sends m_1 to u_0 in round one, an honest u_0 will send the *lock* message m_2 to u_1 , resulting in $\text{EXEC}_{\Pi, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}} := \{m_1^1, m_2^1, \dots\}$. In the ideal world, the Simulator will learn tx_1 from the leakage of \mathcal{F}_{mex} and simulate the *locked* message, achieving the same output.
 - Case 2: Assuming u_0 is corrupted. *Sim* captures the message m_2 sent from u_0 in the real world and extracts tx_1' from m_2 . *Sim* will then forward tx_1' to \mathcal{F}_{mex} .
- (Round $1+i$): we consider \mathcal{E} sends m_1 to u_i ($i \in [1, n]$) in this round.
 - Case 1: Assuming u_{i-1} is corrupted, while u_i remains honest. In the real world, during round i , if the corrupted u_{i-1} sends an invalid m_2^i to u_i , u_i will refuse to proceed to the next lock and abort the protocol, resulting in $\text{EXEC}_{\Pi, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}} := \{\dots, m_1^i, m_2^i, m_1^{1+i}\}$. In the ideal world, *Sim* captures the m_2^i sent from u_i , extracts tx_i' , and forwards tx_i' to \mathcal{F}_{mex} . Since \mathcal{F}_{mex} follows the same logic as Π , when u_i is honest, the execution result in the ideal world is: $\text{EXEC}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{mex}}, \text{Sim}, \mathcal{E}} := \{\dots, m_1^i, m_2^i, m_1^{1+i}\}$.
 - Case 2: Assuming u_{i-1} and u_i are both honest. In the real world, during round i , u_{i-1} sends a valid m_2^i to u_i , and u_i proceeds to the next lock, resulting in $\text{EXEC}_{\Pi, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}} := \{\dots, m_1^i, m_2^i, m_3^i, m_1^{1+i}, m_2^{1+i}, m_3^{1+i}, \dots\}$. In the ideal world, *Sim* learns the leakage from \mathcal{F}_{mex} and

constructs m_2 and m_3 , resulting in $\text{EXEC}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{mex}}, \text{Sim}, \mathcal{E}} := \{\dots, m_1^i, m_2^i, m_3^i, m_1^{1+i}, m_2^{1+i}, m_3^{1+i}, \dots\}$.

- Case 3: Assuming u_i is corrupted. *Sim* can observe everything sent by the corrupted u_i and simulate the communication in the ideal world. Then *Sim* will extract the corresponding input from the messages sent by u_i and forward it to \mathcal{F}_{mex} . □

Lemma 6. The lock-unlock phase of protocol Π UC-realizes the lock-unlock phase of \mathcal{F}_{mex} .

PROOF. We first define new messages used in the unlock phase:

- m_4 : the *release* message sent from \mathcal{E} to u_0 .
- m_5 : the *released* message sent from u_0 to u_n .
- m_6 : the *unlock* message sent from \mathcal{E} to u_i $i \in [1, n]$.
- m_7 : the *updated* message leaked from $\mathcal{F}_{\text{Channel}}$ to \mathcal{A} and *Sim*.

We subsequently compare the messages received by \mathcal{E} in both the real world and the ideal world, considering different assumptions regarding the adversary. It is assumed that \mathcal{E} transmits m_4 during round T' . The output of u_0 is solely pertinent to \mathcal{E} 's input and the m_3 transmitted during the lock phase. The update message m_7 concerning channel cid_n solely pertains to u_0 's *released* message and the environment's input to u_n , while m_7 concerning channel cid_i solely pertains to u_{i+1} 's *unlock* message and the environment's input to u_i . Therefore, the following conditions are considered:

- (Round T'): we consider \mathcal{E} sends m_4 to u_0 in round T' .
 - Case 1: Assuming u_0 is honest, along with all u_i being honest during the lock phase. In the real world, upon receiving m_4 , u_0 will send m_5 , resulting in the execution $\text{EXEC}_{\Pi, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}} := \{m_4^{T'}, m_5^{T'}, \dots\}$. In the ideal world, \mathcal{F}_{mex} will disclose s_0 to *Sim*, which will simulate this execution with the output $\text{EXEC}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{mex}}, \text{Sim}, \mathcal{E}} := \{m_4^{T'}, m_5^{T'}, \dots\}$.
 - Case 2: Assuming u_0 is honest, but at least one u_i is corrupted during the lock phase. In the real world, u_0 will refrain from sending m_4 if not all signatures are received during the lock phase, resulting in $\text{EXEC}_{\Pi, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}} := \{m_4^{T'}, \dots\}$. In the ideal world, \mathcal{F}_{mex} will also prevent the transmission of m_4 from \mathcal{E} (the *ifEnf* flag maintained by \mathcal{F}_{mex} is less than n), resulting in $\text{EXEC}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{mex}}, \text{Sim}, \mathcal{E}} := \{m_4^{T'}, \dots\}$.
 - Case 3: Assuming u_0 is corrupted. If u_0 sends an invalid s_0' in m_5 in the real world, *Sim* will forward s_0' to \mathcal{F}_{mex} and simulate m_5 , resulting in $\text{EXEC}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{mex}}, \text{Sim}, \mathcal{E}} := \{m_4^{T'}, m_5^{T'}, \dots\}$. If u_0 fails to send any m_5 in round T' , *Sim* will not provide any input to \mathcal{F}_{mex} .
- (Round $T'+1$): we consider \mathcal{E} sends m_6 to u_n in this round.
 - Case 1: Assuming both u_0 and u_n are honest. In the real world, u_0 will send m_5 to u_n , and u_n will update its channel, resulting in $\text{EXEC}_{\Pi, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}} := \{m_4^{T'}, m_5^{T'}, m_6^{T'+1}, m_7^{T'+1}, \dots\}$. In the ideal world, *Sim* will forward s_0 to \mathcal{F}_{mex} and simulate m_6 , while m_7 will be generated by \mathcal{F}_{mex} , resulting in $\text{EXEC}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{mex}}, \text{Sim}, \mathcal{E}} := \{m_4^{T'}, m_5^{T'}, m_6^{T'+1}, m_7^{T'+1}, \dots\}$.
 - Case 2: Assuming u_0 is corrupted and u_n is honest. In the real world, u_n will be unable to send m_7 as u_0 don't reveal the correct secrets, resulting $\text{EXEC}_{\Pi, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}} := \{m_4^{T'}, m_5^{T'}, m_6^{T'+1}\}$. In the ideal world, \mathcal{F}_{mex} will also refuse to submit m_7 , resulting $\text{EXEC}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{mex}}, \text{Sim}, \mathcal{E}} := \{m_4^{T'}, m_5^{T'}, m_6^{T'+1}\}$




Figure 21: Setup of a Simulation with honest parties. The left part is the real \mathcal{F}_{prelim} hybrid world, while the right part is the \mathcal{F}_{ideal} ideal world.

- Case 3: Assuming u_n is corrupted. Sim captures all message sent in the real world and relay in the ideal world, resulting the same outputs.
- (Round $T_r + 1$): we consider \mathcal{E} sends m_6 to u_{i+1} in this round.
 - Case 1: Assuming u_i is honest, while u_{i+1} is corrupted. If u_{i+1} fails to trigger the *updated* message m_7 in the real world during round T_r , u_i would never trigger the channel update of cid_i since the unlock condition would never be satisfied, resulting in $EXEC_{\Pi, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}} := \{m_6^{T_r}, m_6^{T_r+1}, \dots\}$. In the ideal world, \mathcal{F}_{mex} would maintain $states[i + 1]$ as *locked*, preventing u_i from triggering the update call, resulting in $EXEC_{\Pi, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}} := \{m_6^{T_r}, m_6^{T_r+1}, \dots\}$.
 - Case 2: Assuming both u_i and u_{i+1} are honest ($i \in [1, n - 1]$). If u_{i+1} sends m_7 , u_i will also send m_7 , resulting in $EXEC_{\Pi, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}} := \{m_6^{T_r}, m_7^{T_r}, m_6^{T_r+1}, m_7^{T_r+1}, \dots\}$. In the ideal world, \mathcal{F}_{mex} will send m_7 , resulting in $EXEC_{\mathcal{F}_{mex}, Sim, \mathcal{E}} := \{m_6^{T_r}, m_7^{T_r}, m_6^{T_r+1}, m_7^{T_r+1}, \dots\}$.
 - Case 3: Assuming u_{i+1} is corrupted ($i \in [1, n - 1]$). Sim can observe everything sent by corrupted u_i in the real world and simulate the communication in the ideal world.

□

Lemma 7. The lock-enforcement phase of protocol Π UC-realizes the lock-enforcement phase of \mathcal{F}_{mex} .

PROOF. First define messages used in the enforcement phase:

- m_8 : the *challenge* message sent from \mathcal{E} to u_0 .
- m_9 : the *enforce* message sent from u_0 to \mathcal{F}_{jc} .
- m_{10} : the *enforced* message leaked from \mathcal{F}_{jc} .
- m_{11} : the *response* message sent from \mathcal{E} to u_i .
- m_{12} : the *log* message sent from u_i to \mathcal{F}_{jc} .
- m_{13} : the *logged* message leaked from \mathcal{F}_{jc} .
- m_{14} : the *punish* message sent from \mathcal{E} to u_0 .
- m_{15} : the *punish* message sent from u_0 to \mathcal{F}_{jc} .
- m_{16} : the *transfer* message sent from \mathcal{F}_{jc} to \mathcal{L}
- m_{17} : the *punished* message leaked from \mathcal{F}_{jc}

We then compare the messages that \mathcal{E} receives in the real world and ideal world under different adversary assumptions. We assume that \mathcal{E} sends m_8 in round T'' . In the real world, m_9 is solely pertinent to \mathcal{E} 's input and the m_3 messages transmitted during the

lock phase. u_n 's output is solely pertinent to \mathcal{E} 's input and the message m_{10} , and u_i 's output ($i \in [1, n - 1]$) is solely pertinent to \mathcal{E} 's input, the message m_{10} , and u_{i+1} 's output. The punishment result (m_{15}, m_{16}, m_{17}) is pertinent to \mathcal{E} 's input and the message m_{13} sent from u_i . Since the enforcement phase follows a round-by-round setting, we can demonstrate the comparison as follows:

- (Round T''): we consider \mathcal{E} sends m_8 to u_0 in this round.
 - Case 1: Assuming u_0 is honest, and all user u_i are honest in the lock phase. In the real world, u_0 will submit m_9 to \mathcal{F}_{jc} , then \mathcal{F}_{jc} will broadcast m_{10} , resulting $EXEC_{\Pi, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}} := \{m_8^{T''}, m_9^{T''}, m_{10}^{T''}, \dots\}$. In the ideal world, Sim will simulate \mathcal{F}_{jc} 's execution, resulting $EXEC_{\mathcal{F}_{mex}, Sim, \mathcal{E}} := \{m_8^{T''}, m_9^{T''}, m_{10}^{T''}, \dots\}$.
 - Case 2: Assuming u_0 is honest, and there exist corrupted u_i in the lock phase. In the real world, honest u_0 will never send m_8 to \mathcal{F}_{jc} since not all valid m_3 messages are received. The same applies to \mathcal{F}_{mex} in the ideal world. In the following cases, we assume all user u_i are honest in the lock phase.
 - Case 3: Assuming u_0 is corrupted. If u_0 reveals an incorrect secret s'_0 ($Open(s'_0, h_0) \neq 1$) in message m_9 , \mathcal{F}_{jc} will refuse to send m_{10} , and no further outputs will be observed: $EXEC_{\Pi, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}} := \{m_8^{T''}, m_9^{T''}\}$. In the ideal world, Sim will simulate the \mathcal{F}_{jc} interaction m_9 , and \mathcal{F}_{mex} will refuse to send further response messages m_{11} from \tilde{u}_i : $EXEC_{\mathcal{F}_{mex}, Sim, \mathcal{E}} := \{m_8^{T''}, m_9^{T''}\}$.
- (Round $T'' + 1$): we consider \mathcal{E} sends m_{11} to u_n in this round.
 - Case 1: Assuming u_0 is corrupted, and u_n is honest. If u_0 reveals an incorrect secret s'_0 ($Open(s'_0, h_0) \neq 1$) in message m_9 , \mathcal{F}_{jc} will refuse to send m_{10} , and no further outputs will be observed: $EXEC_{\Pi, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}} := \{m_8^{T''}, m_9^{T''}, \dots, m_{11}^{T''+i+1}, \dots\}$. In the ideal world, Sim will simulate the \mathcal{F}_{jc} interaction m_9 , and \mathcal{F}_{mex} will refuse to send further response messages m_{11} from \tilde{u}_i : $EXEC_{\mathcal{F}_{mex}, Sim, \mathcal{E}} := \{m_8^{T''}, m_9^{T''}, \dots, m_{11}^{T''+i+1}, \dots\}$.
 - Case 2: Assuming u_0 is honest, and u_n is honest. In the real world, u_n will send s_n to \mathcal{F}_{jc} , and \mathcal{F}_{jc} will broadcast the *log* message, resulting $EXEC_{\Pi, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}} := \{m_8^{T''}, m_9^{T''}, m_{10}^{T''}, m_{11}^{T''+1}, m_{12}^{T''+1}, m_{13}^{T''+1}, \dots\}$. In the ideal world, Sim leaks s_n to Sim , while in turn, Sim simulates the execution of \mathcal{F}_{jc} , resulting $EXEC_{\mathcal{F}_{mex}, Sim, \mathcal{E}} := \{m_8^{T''}, m_9^{T''}, m_{10}^{T''}, m_{11}^{T''+1}, m_{12}^{T''+1}, m_{13}^{T''+1}, \dots\}$. If the payment

channel is not updated, u_n in the real world will send $m_7^{T''+1}$, so as the \mathcal{F}_{mex} in the ideal world.

- Case 3: Assuming u_n is corrupted. If u_n sends an invalid m_12 to \mathcal{F}_{jc} , the real world execution is: $\text{EXEC}_{\Pi, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}} := \{\dots, m_{11}^{T''+1}, m_{12}^{T''+1}\}$. In the ideal world, Sim will simulate the invalid interaction, resulting $\text{EXEC}_{\mathcal{F}_{mex}, Sim, \mathcal{E}} := \{\dots, m_{11}^{T''+1}, m_{12}^{T''+1}\}$.
- (Round $T''+n-i+1$): we consider \mathcal{E} sends m_{11} to u_i ($i \in [1, n-1]$) in this round.
 - Case 1: Assuming u_0 is honest, u_i, \dots, u_n are honest. In the real world, u_i will send s_i to \mathcal{F}_{jc} , and \mathcal{F}_{jc} will broadcast the *log* message, resulting $\text{EXEC}_{\Pi, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}} := \{\dots, m_{11}^{T''+n-i+1}, m_{12}^{T''+n-i+1}, m_{13}^{T''+n-i+1}, \dots\}$. In the ideal world, Sim leaks s_i to Sim , while in turn, Sim simulates the execution of \mathcal{F}_{jc} , resulting $\text{EXEC}_{\mathcal{F}_{mex}, Sim, \mathcal{E}} := \{\dots, m_{11}^{T''+n-i+1}, m_{12}^{T''+n-i+1}, m_{13}^{T''+n-i+1}, \dots\}$.
 - Case 2: Assuming u_0 is honest, u_i is honest, and there exist a u_r ($r > i$) is corrupted. In the real world, u_i will refuse to send m_12 to \mathcal{F}_{jc} . resulting $\text{EXEC}_{\Pi, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}} := \{\dots, m_{11}^{T''+n-i+1}, \dots\}$. In the ideal world, \mathcal{F}_{mex} will leak nothing to Sim in this round, and Sim will do nothing, resulting $\text{EXEC}_{\mathcal{F}_{mex}, Sim, \mathcal{E}} := \{\dots, m_{11}^{T''+n-i+1}, \dots\}$.
 - Case 3: Assuming u_0 is corrupted, u_i is honest. As u_0 is corrupted, u_i will refuse to send m_12 to \mathcal{F}_{jc} , so the real world execution and ideal world execution is the same as Case 2.
 - Case 4: Assuming u_i is corrupted. Sim can observe everything sent by corrupted u_i in the real world and simulate the communication in the ideal world.
- (Round $T''+n+1$): we consider \mathcal{E} sends m_{14} to u_0 in this round.
 - Case 1: Assuming all users are honest. In the real world, u_0 will send m_{15} , but \mathcal{F}_{jc} will not trigger m_{16} and m_{17} as no party is corrupted, resulting $\text{EXEC}_{\Pi, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}} := \{\dots, m_{14}^{T''+n+1}, m_{15}^{T''+n+1}\}$. In the ideal world, \mathcal{F}_{mex} will not trigger m_{16} and Sim only simulates the message towards \mathcal{F}_{jc} with no response, resulting $\text{EXEC}_{\mathcal{F}_{mex}, Sim, \mathcal{E}} := \{\dots, m_{14}^{T''+n+1}, m_{15}^{T''+n+1}\}$.
 - Case 2: Assuming u_0 is honest, and there exist a u_r ($r > 0$) is corrupted. In the real world, u_0 will send m_{15} , and \mathcal{F}_{jc} will trigger m_{16} to \mathcal{L} and m_{17} , resulting $\text{EXEC}_{\Pi, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}} := \{\dots, m_{14}^{T''+n+1}, m_{15}^{T''+n+1}, m_{16}^{T''+n+1}, m_{17}^{T''+n+1}\}$. In the ideal world, \mathcal{F}_{mex} will send m_{16} to \mathcal{L} , and Sim will simulates the interaction between u_0 and \mathcal{F}_{jc} , resulting $\text{EXEC}_{\mathcal{F}_{mex}, Sim, \mathcal{E}} := \{\dots, m_{14}^{T''+n+1}, m_{15}^{T''+n+1}, m_{16}^{T''+n+1}, m_{17}^{T''+n+1}\}$.
 - Case 3: Assuming u_0 is corrupted. In the real world, u_0 submits an invalid m_{15} to \mathcal{F}_{jc} , \mathcal{F}_{jc} will do nothing about this call, so the execution output of both real world and ideal world is identical to Case 1. If u_0 sends nothing in this round, $\text{EXEC}_{\Pi, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}} := \{\dots, m_{14}^{T''+n+1}\}$. In the ideal world, Sim will forward nothing to \mathcal{F}_{mex} , resulting $\text{EXEC}_{\mathcal{F}_{mex}, Sim, \mathcal{E}} := \{\dots, m_{14}^{T''+n+1}\}$.

Theorem 3. *Enforceable A-HTLC protocol Π UC-realizes the ideal functionality \mathcal{F}_{mex} .*

PROOF. This theorem follows from Lemmas 5, 6 and 7. \square

C.1.6 Security properties of \mathcal{F}_{mex} . Let us discuss the security properties guaranteed by \mathcal{F}_{mex} in multi-party money-secret exchanges. Since our *enforceable A-HTLC* protocol realizes the ideal functionality \mathcal{F}_{mex} , these security properties are also achieved by our protocol in the real world. In a \mathcal{F}_{mex} with n payee and a deadline T :

Lemma 8. In \mathcal{F}_{mex} , an honest u_i reveals s_i only if it receives \mathfrak{B}_i .

PROOF. We first consider the unlock phase of \mathcal{F}_{mex} : For an honest payee u_i ($i \in [1, n-1]$) selling secret s_i , once the channel cid_{i+1} is updated (redeeming the payment $\sum_{j=i}^n \mathfrak{B}_j$ from u_i), $\mathcal{F}_{Channel}$ will send the redeem secret \mathfrak{S} to u_i . Since the transaction locking time $tx_i.\phi.t > tx_{i+1}.\phi.t$, u_i can update the channel cid_i , redeeming the payment $\sum_{j=i}^n \mathfrak{B}_j$ from u_{i-1} .

We then consider the enforcement phase of \mathcal{F}_{mex} : Once u_0 submits the *enforce* message to \mathcal{F}_{mex} at round T' ($T' < T$), u_i has to reveal its secret s_i in round $T' + n - i + 1$ if u_0 and all its last hops (u_{i+1}, \dots, u_n) reveal their secrets. Since the timelock for updating channel cid_i is $t_i := T + n - i + 2$, and $t_i > T' + n - i + 1$, u_i has enough time to unlock its payment after revealing its secret.

In summary, in the unlock phase, once u_{i+1} updates channel cid_{i+1} , u_i can always update channel cid_i . In the enforcement phase, even if u_i has to reveal its secret, u_i can still update channel cid_i . Therefore, an honest u_i reveals s_i only if it receives the fee \mathfrak{B}_i . \square

Lemma 9. In \mathcal{F}_{mex} , an honest u_0 pays $\sum_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{B}_i$ only if it receives all the secrets $\{s_1, \dots, s_n\}$ from all payees.

PROOF. In the lock phase, an honest u_0 requires u_i to provide s_0, \dots, s_n in order to redeem this payment, protected by $\mathcal{F}_{Channel}$. Once this payment is redeemed, u_0 will receive these secrets from $\mathcal{F}_{Channel}$. \square

Lemma 10. Controllable. In \mathcal{F}_{mex} , an honest u_0 pays nothing until u_0 sends the *release* or *enforce* message.

PROOF. In the lock phase, an honest u_0 adds $h_0 := \text{Commit}(s_0)$ to u_1 's redeem condition. Since the secret s_0 is kept private in u_0 , u_1 cannot update this payment in $\mathcal{F}_{Channel}$ until u_0 sends the *release* or *enforce* message, which includes s_0 . \square

Lemma 11. Enforceable. If \mathcal{F}_{mex} completes the *lock* phase with $ifEnf = n$, \mathcal{F}_{mex} guarantees that the payer u_0 can enforce all payees to reveal their secrets before round $T + n$, or \mathcal{P} will receive a refund of amount \mathfrak{B}_{\max} .

PROOF. Once $ifEnf = n$, \mathcal{F}_{mex} allows u_0 to reveal s_0 by sending an *enforce* message to \mathcal{F}_{mex} in round T' ($T' < T$). Then, each payee u_i has to reveal its secret s_i to \mathcal{F}_{mex} . If a payee u_r is the first to fail in revealing its secret, \mathcal{F}_{mex} allows u_0 to submit a *punish* message to \mathcal{F}_{mex} at the end of the enforcement phase, transferring \mathfrak{B}_{\max} from u_r to u_0 . \square

Lemma 12. Consider a payer u_0 initiating η instances of \mathcal{F}_{mex} with different payees in η payment paths at round T'' , and all u_0 sets the same enforcement deadline T for each instance. We assume each path p_i has n_i payees. If all \mathcal{F}_{mex} instances complete the *lock* phase with $ifEnf = n_i$, the payer u_0 can enforce all payees in all \mathcal{F}_{mex} instances to reveal their secrets before round $T + \max(n_i) + 1$, or u_0 will receive a refund of at least amount \mathfrak{B}_{\max} .

PROOF. The lemma follows directly from Lemma 11. \square

C.2 Fairness and Confidentiality in FairRelay

In this section, we formally argue that FairRelay guarantees the fairness and confidentiality properties defined in Section 3.2.

Consider a relay-assisted content exchange \mathcal{G} in the FairRelay protocol, where \mathcal{P} delivers content $m = \{m_1, \dots, m_n\}$ committed by com_m to C through η delivery paths. Each relay path p is assigned a delivery job $Job(p)$, where $Job(p) \subset m$. All paths should complete their delivery job before time T_1 . \mathcal{P} generates a new encryption key sk_0 and a mask s_0 . The i^{th} relayer in path p_k , denoted as $\mathcal{R}_{k,i}$, generates its encryption key $sk_{k,i}$ and the mask secret $s_{k,i}$. All participants agree on the delivery deadline T_1 and the challenge deadline T_2 . At round T_1 , if η paths (\mathbb{P}) finish the ciphertext delivery, C issues a conditioned payment to \mathcal{P} . In the next round, \mathcal{P} issues η \mathcal{F}_{mex} for each relay path in \mathbb{P} in exchange for their secret $s_{k,i}$.

Theorem 4. FairRelay guarantees the fairness for the customer C (Definition 3.3).

PROOF. Before C makes the payment in round T_1 , C receives one mask commitment from each user, ciphertext of chunks along with encryption commitment chain, and the Merkle multi-proof for each plaintext chunk.

C can compose the following tuple for any chunk $m_{idx} \in m$ with index idx relayed in path p_k : $(idx, c_{|p_k|,idx}, \mathbb{C}_1, \mathbb{C}_2, \pi_{merkle})$, where: - $c_{|p_k|,idx}$ is the ciphertext encrypted $(|p_k| + 1)$ times by $\{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}_{k,1}, \dots, \mathcal{R}_{k,|p_k|}\}$ sequentially; - \mathbb{C}_1 is the encryption commitment chain $\{com_{enc}^{0,idx}, com_{enc}^{1,idx}, \dots, com_{enc}^{|p_k|,idx}\}$; - \mathbb{C}_2 is the mask commitments $\{com_{mask}^{0,k,1}, com_{mask}^{k,1}, \dots, com_{mask}^{k,|p_k|}\}$; - π_{merkle} proves that $com_{enc}^{0,idx} \cdot h_m$ is the idx^{th} leaf of the Merkle tree with root com_m .

Additionally, $(c_{|p_k|,idx}, \mathbb{C}_1, \mathbb{C}_2, idx)$ forms a *valid* (defined in B.2.3) tuple signed by $\{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}_{k,1}, \dots, \mathcal{R}_{k,|p_k|}\}$.

Then C performs a conditioned off-chain payment of amount \mathfrak{B}_m to \mathcal{P} in exchange for all secrets in \mathbb{P} . $\mathcal{F}_{Channel}$ guarantees that once this conditioned payment is redeemed by \mathcal{P} and updated on $\mathcal{F}_{Channel}$, C will receive all requested mask secrets to decrypt these *valid* tuples. According to Corollary 2, once all mask secrets $s_0, s_{k,1}, \dots, s_{k,|p_k|}$ are revealed, C can either obtain m'_{idx} committed by $com_{enc}^{0,idx} \cdot h_m$ when all nodes in this path are honest, or C can generate a proof of misbehavior towards the closest corrupted node.

If all providers and relayers are honest, C will obtain all chunks $m_{idx} \in m$ and compose the content m committed by com_m . Otherwise, C can generate at least one proof of misbehavior towards the *Judge Contract*, which will refund an amount of \mathfrak{B}_{max} to C . Since the *Judge Contract* requires all content prices to be lower than \mathfrak{B}_{max} , we can consider C pays nothing when C does not receive m . \square

Theorem 5. FairRelay guarantees the fairness for the honest content provider \mathcal{P} (Definition 3.1).

PROOF. We contend that the revelation of m is contingent upon \mathcal{P} receiving payment. Each constituent chunk $m_r \in m$ undergoes encryption using sk_0 and is subsequently masked by s_0 . The inherent hiding properties (Lemma 2, 4) ensure that the disclosure of m_r remains unattainable as long as s_0 is kept confidential. Only upon

the redemption of payment by \mathcal{P} from C , will s_0 be disclosed to C via $\mathcal{F}_{Channel}$.

Subsequently, we argue that \mathcal{P} refrains from remitting relay fees until it receives payment from C . As C first initiates a conditioned payment in return for all secrets within \mathbb{P} . Consequently, \mathcal{P} issues η \mathcal{F}_{mex} messages to each path in exchange for the relayers' mask secrets. In the event that not all paths successfully complete the lock phase, \mathcal{P} terminates the protocol by ceasing to transmit *release* or *enforce* messages to \mathcal{F}_{mex} . In such instances, no party involved in this transaction receives payment. Conversely, if all paths progress to the unlock or enforcement phase, the veracity of Lemma 12 ensures that \mathcal{P} receives all secrets atomically, prior to a predetermined deadline, after which \mathcal{P} can update the payment from C .

Furthermore, the *soundness* of *zk-SNARK* guarantees that no party can submit a proof of misbehavior to an honest \mathcal{P} , thereby reducing its balance. Consequently, we stipulate that \mathcal{P} only pays the relay fee upon receiving payment from C . \square

Theorem 6. FairRelay guarantees the fairness for any relayer \mathcal{R} (Definition 3.2).

PROOF. Within path p_k , it is imperative that the ciphertext received by C is encrypted using the encryption key $sk_{k,i}$ belonging to $\mathcal{R}_{k,i}$. The underlying hiding properties (Lemma 2, 4) ensure that the ciphertext transmitted along this path remains incompletely decryptable as long as $s_{k,i}$ is kept confidential. Lemma 8 guarantees that an honest $\mathcal{R}_{k,i}$ only discloses its secret $s_{k,i}$ upon receiving the payment $\mathfrak{B}_{k,i}$. Consequently, the content relayed on path p_k (Job_{p_k}) can only be unveiled if all $\mathcal{R}_{k,i}$ entities receive a payment of $\mathfrak{B}_{k,i}$.

Additionally, the *soundness* of *zk-SNARK* guarantees that no party can present a proof of misbehavior to an honest $\mathcal{R}_{k,i}$, resulting in a reduction of its balance. As a consequence, we establish that C cannot gain access to the ciphertext chunks relayed by \mathcal{R} unless \mathcal{R} receives its relay fee. \square

Theorem 7. FairRelay guarantees the Confidentiality (Definition 3.4).

PROOF. Since each chunk $m_r \in m$ is encrypted using sk_0 and masked with s_0 , the hiding properties (Lemma 2, 4) ensure that no one can obtain m_r as long as s_0 remains confidential.

The honest \mathcal{P} privately sends the mask commitment to the honest C by encrypting the commitment with C 's public key. Considering that the masked secret s_0 is publicly revealed over the payment channel, only \mathcal{P} and C possess the encryption key sk_0 . Consequently, as long as \mathcal{P} and C act honestly, no relayer collision can access the plaintext content m . \square

D DISCUSSIONS

Termination. In the worst case, an honest party participating in FairRelay terminates the protocol when the round reaches the expiration time of its incoming conditioned payment. However, if the incoming channel is not even locked, an honest party is able to abort the protocol earlier than the worst case scenario.

From a single payment channel to a multi-hop payment. In section 5.2 we assumed that the payment path between C to \mathcal{P} can be considered as a single payment channel. We can simply expand this condition to the full payment path by utilizing multi-hop payment schemes. The most naive solution is to repeat the condition payment hop by hop with incremental timelock (similar to HTLC multi-hop payment). We can also integrate this payment with advanced multi-hop payment schemes like AMHL[25], Sprites[27] or Blitz[3], ensuring the *strong atomicity* over this multi-hop payment.

Tackle Front-running Attacks. In our protocol, both relayers and providers have a global security deposit locked on-chain, which is shared among multiple FairRelay instances. However, this setting enables dishonest relayers or providers to conduct front-running attacks against honest customers. In a front-running attack, a dishonest party (denoted as v) sends a proof of misbehavior against itself to a colluded party. The colluded party can then submit these proofs of misbehavior to the *Judge Contract*, constantly draining the security deposit. To mitigate this problem, a slashing scheme

can be added to the proof of misbehavior handler in the Judge Contract. This ensures that no rational party would attempt such attacks, as their security deposit would be burned. Additionally, the customer checks the service provider's deposit before making the conditioned payment, and the payment has an expiration time. This means that the dishonest node has only a limited time-window to perform such attacks. Moreover, the throughput of the blockchain is limited, which restricts the extractable deposit. By increasing the amount of the security deposit, we can guarantee that there is always a sufficient amount for the customer to claim a refund. By combining these two solutions, the front-running attack can be effectively mitigated.

Fault Tolerance. In our current multi-path FairRelay protocol, the protocol will securely terminate if a single relayer fails to fulfill its task. In future iterations, fault tolerance schemes could be integrated into our existing design to enhance the robustness of the content delivery protocol.