

# A Simple Byzantine Agreement Protocol

JONATHAN KATZ\*

October 23, 2013

Berman, Garay, and Perry [1] give a simple BA protocol for single-bit inputs with polynomial complexity and optimal resilience. The protocol involves running the following *phase-king* subroutine with parties  $P_1, \dots, P_{t+1}$  successively playing the role of the king.

**Round 1** Each party  $P_i$  sends their input  $v_i$  to all other parties.

$P_i$  then sets  $C_i^b := 1$  (for  $b \in \{0, 1\}$ ) iff at least  $n - t$  parties sent it the bit  $b$ .

**Round 2** Each party  $P_i$  sends  $C_i^0$  and  $C_i^1$  to all other parties. Let  $C_{i \rightarrow j}^b$  denote the relevant value received by  $P_j$  from  $P_i$ .

Each party  $P_i$  sets  $D_i^b := \left| \left\{ j : C_{j \rightarrow i}^b = 1 \right\} \right|$ . If  $D_i^1 > t$ , it sets  $v_i := 1$ ; otherwise, it sets  $v_i := 0$ .

**Round 3** The king  $P_k$  sends  $v_k$  to all parties. Each party  $P_i$  then updates their input as follows: If  $D_i^{v_i} < n - t$  then set  $v_i$  equal to the value the king sent to  $P_i$ ; otherwise, leave  $v_i$  unchanged.

We begin with two lemmas about the phase king (sub-)protocol.

**Lemma 1** *Let  $t < n/2$ , and assume all  $n - t$  honest parties begin the phase-king subroutine holding the same input  $b$ . Then all honest parties terminate that subroutine with the same output  $b$ .*

**Proof** Since all honest parties begin with input  $b$ , in the first round each honest party receives  $b$  from at least  $n - t$  parties, and receives  $1 - b$  from at most  $t < n - t$  parties. So each honest  $P_i$  sets  $C_i^b := 1$  and  $C_i^{1-b} := 0$ . It follows that in round 2, each honest  $P_i$  has  $D_i^b \geq n - t > t$  and  $D_i^{1-b} \leq t$ , and  $v_i = b$  at the end of that round. Since  $D_i^{v_i} = D_i^b \geq n - t$  for an honest  $P_i$ , all honest parties ignore the value sent by the king and terminate the phase-king subroutine with output  $b$ . ■

**Lemma 2** *Let  $t < n/3$ . If the king is honest in some execution of the phase-king subroutine, then the outputs of all honest parties agree at the end of that subroutine.*

**Proof** An honest king sends the same value  $v_k$  to all parties. So the only way agreement can possibly fail to hold is if some honest party  $P_i$  does not set their input to the king's value, i.e., if  $D_i^{v_i} \geq n - t$ . We claim that if there exists an honest party  $P_i$  for whom  $D_i^{v_i} \geq n - t$ , then  $v_i = v_k$  and so agreement holds anyway. To see this, consider the two possibilities:

- **Case 1:  $v_i = 1$ .** Since  $D_i^1 \geq n - t$  we have  $D_k^1 \geq n - 2t > t$ , and so  $v_k = 1$  as well.

---

\*jkatz@cs.umd.edu. Department of Computer Science, University of Maryland.

- **Case 2:  $v_i = 0$ .** The fact that  $D_i^0 \geq n - t$  implies  $D_k^0 \geq n - 2t > t$ . So at least one honest party  $P_j$  sent  $C_{j \rightarrow k}^0 = 1$  to  $P_k$ , implying that at least  $n - t$  parties sent the bit ‘0’ to  $P_j$  in round 1 and consequently at most  $t$  parties sent ‘1’ to  $P_j$  in round 1. But then any honest party received a ‘1’ from at most  $2t < n - t$  parties in round 1, and so any honest party  $P_i$  has  $C_i^1 = 0$ . It follows that each honest party, and  $P_k$  in particular, has  $D_k^1 \leq t$ ; we conclude that  $v_k = 0$  as desired. ■

**Theorem 1** *The above protocol achieves Byzantine agreement for any  $t < n/3$ .*

**Proof** Say all honest parties begin holding the same input. Then Lemma 1 implies that none of the honest parties ever change their input value in any of the phase-king subroutines, and so in particular they all terminate with the same output.

In any other case, we know that there must be at least one execution of the phase-king subroutine in which the king is honest. Following that execution, Lemma 2 guarantees that all honest parties hold the same input. Lemma 1 ensures that this will not change throughout the rest of the protocol. ■

## References

- [1] P. Berman, J. Garay, and K. Perry. Bit Optimal Distributed Consensus. In *Computer Science Research*, pp. 313–322, Plenum Publishing Corporation, 1992.