# DEthna: Accurate Ethereum Network Topology Discovery with Marked Transactions

Chonghe Zhao<sup>1, 2</sup>, Yipeng Zhou<sup>2</sup>, Shengli Zhang<sup>1</sup>, Taotao Wang<sup>1</sup>, Quan Z. Sheng<sup>2</sup>, Song Guo<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>College of Electronic and Information Engineering, Shenzhen University, Shenzhen, China

<sup>2</sup>School of Computing, Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia

<sup>3</sup>Department of Computer Science and Engineering, The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Hong Kong

Email: zhaochonghe\_szu@163.com, yipeng.zhou@mq.edu.au, {zsl, ttwang}@szu.edu.cn

michael.sheng@mq.edu.au, songguo@cse.ust.hk

Abstract—In Ethereum, the ledger exchanges messages along an underlying Peer-to-Peer (P2P) network to reach consistency. Understanding the underlying network topology of Ethereum crucial for network optimization, security and scalability. is However, the accurate discovery of Ethereum network topology is non-trivial due to its deliberately designed security mechanism. Consequently, existing measuring schemes cannot accurately infer the Ethereum network topology with a low cost. To address this challenge, we propose the Distributed Ethereum Network Analyzer (DEthna) tool, which can accurately and efficiently measure the Ethereum network topology. In DEthna, a novel parallel measurement model is proposed that can generate marked transactions to infer link connections based on the transaction replacement and propagation mechanism in Ethereum. Moreover, a workload offloading scheme is designed so that DEthna can be deployed on multiple distributed probing nodes so as to measure a large-scale Ethereum network at a low cost. We run DEthna on Goerli (the most popular Ethereum test network) to evaluate its capability in discovering network topology. The experimental results demonstrate that DEthna significantly outperforms the state-of-the-art baselines. Based on DEthna, we further analyze characteristics of the Ethereum network revealing that there exist more than 50% low-degree Ethereum nodes that weaken the network robustness.

Index Terms—Blockchain, Ethereum, Peer-to-Peer Network, Network Measurement, Network Robustness

## I. INTRODUCTION

Blockchain, which was first proposed by Nakamoto in Bitcoin [1], is a prominent technology integrating the advances of cryptography, distributed computing and Peerto-Peer (P2P) communication. Following Bitcoin, various blockchain systems emerged to tackle different technical challenges. Ethereum [2] is one of the most successful and influential blockchains, which can support the logic computation of various applications (*e.g.*, Decentralized Finance [3], Non-Fungible Token [4] and Metaverse [5]) via smart contracts. As a fully distributed Internet system, Ethereum exploits a P2P network to build its communication infrastructure. A new node participates in the system by discovering and connecting with other nodes in the P2P network. All nodes send and receive pending transactions and confirmed blocks over the P2P network to maintain the consistency of the data recorded on the blockchain. As the wide adoption of Ethereum, understanding its network topology becomes extremely important for network optimization, security, and scalability. For example, Zhao *et al.* [6] applied the knowledge of network topology measured in [7] to verify its "Bodyless Block Propagation" scheme for speeding up block propagation in blockchain networks adopting Proof-of-Work (PoW) consensus algorithm [8].

However, Ethereum is vulnerable to malicious attacks if its network topology information is unveiled. For instance, an attacker aware of the network topology can link blocks to originating nodes, and the decentralization of Ethereum can be compromised by performing Denial-of-Service (DoS) attacks or eclipsing attacks on these nodes [9]–[12]. In [13], a broadcast "advantage" can be set up if the network topology knowledge is available, which enables an attacker to pull off double-spending attacks. To prevent potential attacks using network topology information, Ethereum is designed to conceal its network topology from onlookers.

Despite the invisibility of the underlying network topology in Ethereum, significant research efforts have been dedicated to indirectly measuring the topological characteristics of the Ethereum network, such as [14]–[17]. Unfortunately, none of them can accurately discover the network topology of a large-scale Ethereum with a low cost. In prior works [14]-[16], discovery table based methods were designed to infer connections between nodes. For a specific node, remote nodes stored in its discovery table are inferred as its neighbors. Yet, the accuracy of such methods is inferior because each node only selects a small subset of remote nodes in its discovery table to establish connections. In [17], Li et al. proposed to measure the Ethereum topology by issuing a few marked transactions plus more than 5,000 invalid transactions to infer the connection between two nodes. Although this approach can achieve a high measurement accuracy, it floods the network with an excessive number of invalid transactions, which is prohibited by countermeasure used to prevent network con-

The corresponding author is Shengli Zhang (zsl@szu.edu.cn). The research is supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (62171291), in part by the Shenzhen Key Research Project (JSGG20220831095603007, JCYJ20220818100810023, JCYJ20220818101609021), in part by the Shenzhen Science and Technology Program (JCYJ20210324094609027), in part by the Australian Research Council (ARC) Discovery Project (DP210101723), and in part by the Hong Kong RGC Research Impact Fund (No. R5060-19, No. R5034-18), Areas of Excellence Scheme (AoE/E-601/22-R) and General Research Fund (No. 152203/20E, 152244/21E, 152169/22E, 152228/23E).

gestion [18]. In addition, its single probing node architecture makes the measurement of large networks inefficient.

To overcome deficiencies in the existing methods, we propose a Distributed Ethereum Network Analyzer (DEthna) to accurately and efficiently discover the network topology of a large-scale Ethereum network. Compared with prior works, DEthna has two advantages: 1) The number of transactions required per link inference is low; 2) DEthna is scalable by offloading the measuring workload among multiple probing nodes. More specifically, DEthna exploits the transaction replacement and propagation mechanism in Ethereum to infer multi-links by only generating a certain number of real transactions without generating invalid transactions. Based on our design, a proposal [25] is submitted to the Ethereum community by fixing a defect in the standard Ethereum software, which has been accepted and committed to the software. To improve DEthna's scalability, a workload offloading scheme is designed to deploy multiple distributed probing nodes to jointly measure a large-scale Ethereum network in which Ethereum nodes may reside in various ISPs (Internet Service Providers).

We implement DEthna and the state-of-the-art baselines by modifying the standard Ethereum software Geth [26] and deploy them on Goerli, the most popular Ethereum test network. We conducted extensive experiments. The experimental results demonstrate that DEthna significantly outperforms baselines in terms of link inference accuracy. Based on our measurement study, we further analyze the characteristics of the Ethereum network to unveil that more than 50% are low-degree nodes that are probably behind NAT (network address translation) or firewall incurring the "long tail" communication latency, and hence weakening the network robustness.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section II discusses related works. Section III presents the background of the transactions and node discovery mechanism in Ethereum. The link inference model and our distributed measurement architecture are elaborated in Section IV and Section V, respectively. The experimental results together with network characteristics analysis are presented in Section VI before we finally conclude our work in Section VII.

## II. RELATED WORK

Topology knowledge plays a vital role in optimizing, securing, and scaling the blockchain network. In particular, Bitcoin and Ethereum are the two most representative public blockchain networks. Accurately measuring their topology has attracted tremendous research attention in recent works.

Bitcoin employs a random node discovery mechanism to establish an unstructured network [27]. A gossip message broadcast protocol is used to exchange blocks and transactions between nodes [10]. Several prior works [9], [19], [22], [23] have contributed to measuring Bitcoin network topology and analyzing its network characteristics. Miller *et al.* [19] proposed a Bitcoin network analyzer (AddressProbe) to infer each connection between nodes for reconstructing the network topology by using timestamps recorded in node address messages. But countermeasures [20], [21] updated in Bitcoin Core nodes make AddressProbe not feasible anymore. Neudecker *et al.* [9] performed a timing analysis of transaction propagation to measure Bitcoin network topology with inferior precision and recall (both around 40%). To improve [9], Grundmann *et al.* [22] presented two inference methods by exploiting the accumulation of multiple transactions and the behavior of dropping double-spending transactions. Delgado-Segura *et al.* [23] introduced a novel technique (TxProbe) for reconstructing network topology by "orphaned" transactions [28].

Measuring the network topology of Ethereum is also challenging but essential. There are two differences between Ethereum and Bitcoin making the aforementioned measurement methods invalid in Ethereum. Firstly, Ethereum adopts the K-bucket data structure in the Kademlia DHT protocol [14] to discover network nodes and maintain node address information. Secondly, the account model of transactions used in Ethereum is very different from the UTXO transaction model in Bitcoin [29]. In view of these differences, [7], [14]-[17] devised new methods to measure the network topology of Ethereum. The studies in [14]–[16] reconstructed the network topology by node information stored in the K-bucket data structure, though their measurement accuracy is unsatisfactory. The work [7] exploited the Ethereum network degree distribution and the number of hops for transmitting messages by using the block and transaction propagation protocol. However, it cannot exactly infer each link between nodes, and thus the inferred entire network topology is inaccurate. The work [17] inferred each link between two nodes to discover the network topology by issuing marked transactions. Yet, this method is harmful to the network system performance with a large number of actual links that are missed for detection.

To better understand our contribution, we summarize typical blockchain network measurement studies with their methodologies and weaknesses in Table I. From the table, we can find that no existing work can accurately and efficiently discover Ethereum topology, which is to be addressed by our work.

## **III. ETHEREUM BACKGROUND**

Before we introduce the design of DEthna, we provide the background of Ethereum in this section.

## A. Transaction Fields

In Ethereum, a transaction, to be executed by Ethereum Virtual Machine (EVM), binds a sender account to a receiver account [30]. Each computational step in EVM is priced in the unit of *gas*. Field values in each transaction specify the implementation of the cryptocurrency ether (ETH) transfer and execution of smart contracts. In particular, four key fields in Ethereum are used for designing DEthna after the effectiveness of the Improvement Proposal EIP-1559 [31] in 2021:

- *nonce*: It is a monotonically increasing counter indicating the number of transactions issued from a sender account. Transactions from the same sender account must be packaged and executed in an ascending order of *nonce*.
- *data*: It stores the code related to smart contracts or any content meaningful to the sender. For example, the

 TABLE I

 Methods and Weaknesses of the works aiming to measure network topology of public blockchain systems

Reference	Methodology	Blockchain	Weakness
[19]	Exploit random node discovery mechanism	Bitcoin	Restricted by Countermeasure [20], [21]
[9]	Perform timing analysis of transaction propagation	Bitcoin	Low precision and recall
[22], [23]	Issue and monitor marked transactions	Bitcoin	[22]: Low recall; [23]: Restricted by Countermeasure [24]
[14]–[16]	Exploit the node discovery mechanism based on Kademlia DHT protocol	Ethereum	Low precision and recall
[7]	Analyze blocks and transactions propagation	Ethereum	Fail to exactly infer each link between nodes
[17]	Issue marked and fake transactions, and monitor marked transactions	Ethereum	Harmful for network performance and not scalable in a large-scale network

transaction issued by DEthna includes the word "DEthna" in data to label the transaction.

- gasTipCap ( $g_t$ ): It is the maximum price of consumed gas that a sender wishes to incentivize proposers/miners to include the transaction in the next block.
- gasFeeCap  $(g_f)$ : It is the maximum price per gas unit that a sender would like to pay for a particular transaction.

According to EIP-1559, the effective price per gas that miners can get is  $\min\{g_f - b_f, g_t\}$  by including a transaction in a block. Here,  $b_f$  is *baseFee* indicating the minimum price per gas unit burned by a transaction, which is recorded in the block header and adjusted dynamically according to network conditions. In other words, the transaction fee has two parts: Part 1 is paid to miners which is equal to the effective price per gas ( $\min\{g_f - b_f, g_t\}$ ) multiplied by the total gas consumed to execute the transaction; Part 2 removed from circulation is equal to  $b_f$  multiplied by the total gas consumed. Usually, a marked transaction in DEthna [32] consumes 24,152 gas.

# B. Transaction Processing

Transactions are propagated between Ethereum nodes before they are confirmed and recorded in a block. Each transaction before confirmed is processed by an Ethereum node by the following rules:

Transaction Store: Each Ethereum node maintains a transaction pool consisting of a Pending submodule and a Queue submodule to store received unconfirmed transactions. According to the order of nonce, transactions are classified as pending and future transactions. Pending transactions are with continuous nonces (i.e., transactions issued from the same account contain a consecutive sequence of *nonces*) and stored in the Pending submodule. Future transactions are with discontinuous nonces and stored in the Queue submodule. For example, if an account has issued n transactions,  $TX_1$  issued by this account is regarded as a pending transaction when the *nonce* of  $TX_1$  is n and other transactions with *nonces* equal to  $1, 2, \ldots n-1$  have been received. Otherwise, if the *nonce* of a transaction  $TX_2$  issued by the same account is n+1, and the Ethereum node has not received  $TX_1$  with nonce = nyet,  $TX_2$  is regarded as a future transaction.  $TX_2$  will not be transformed into a pending transaction until  $TX_1$  is received.

**Transaction Propagation Mechanism:** When an Ethereum node receives a pending transaction, *e.g.*,  $TX_1$ , it stores  $TX_1$  in the Pending submodule and then forwards  $TX_1$  to its neighbor nodes. When an Ethereum node receives a future

transaction, *e.g.*,  $TX_2$ ,  $TX_2$  will be stored in the Queue submodule without further forwarding. Only when all transactions with a smaller *nonce* arrive,  $TX_2$  can be transformed into a pending transaction for further forwarding.

**Transaction Replacement Mechanism:** If the effective price of a transaction is too low, it cannot be packaged into a new block quickly. In this case, the sender may issue a new transaction with the same *nonce* but a higher effective price to replace the old one. The relation of effective price between these two transactions must satisfy:

$$(b_{t2} - b_{t1})/b_{t1} \ge \alpha,$$
 (1)

where  $b_{t1}$  and  $b_{t2}$  are the old and new effective price, respectively. The replacement rate  $\alpha$  is a constant fixed at node startup. Otherwise, if Eq. (1) cannot be satisfied, the new transaction will be discarded.

#### IV. LINK INFERENCE MODEL IN ETHEREUM

In this section, we introduce the link inference model in DEthna, and analyze its failure probability and overhead cost.

#### A. Single Link Inference Model

To ease the understanding of the link inference model, we firstly discuss the simplest scenario to infer a single link between two particular nodes. Suppose that there is a measurement node M that can be controlled by DEthna, and our objective is to infer whether the target node A is directly linked with another target node B for exchanging blockchain messages. Let C denote all the rest nodes in the Ethereum network. Note that the measurement node M is a full Ethereum node that can monitor unconfirmed transactions from the network and store them in its local transaction pool.

**Marked Transactions:** Marked transactions are real transactions that are generated by node M dedicated for discovering links. To infer the link between nodes A and B, node Mneeds to generate four marked transactions (denoted by  $TX_M$ ,  $TX_A$ ,  $TX_B$  and  $TX_C$ ) with a well defined relationship. These transactions should be sent to Ethereum nodes in a deliberately designed order, which is further explained as follows:

- All four marked transactions are issued by the same account of node M. Without loss of generality, we suppose that the account has issued n-1 historical transactions;
- Each marked transaction like [32] records the IDs of nodes A and B in the data field;
- $TX_M$  is set with the effective price  $b_t$  and the nonce n;



Fig. 1. Single Link inference model to infer a link between nodes A and B: (a)  $TX_A$ ,  $TX_B$  and  $TX_C$  with nonce n+1 are regarded as future transactions and not forwarded over the network before  $TX_M$  with nonce n is sent out; (b)  $TX_A$ ,  $TX_B$  obeying **P1**, **P2&P3**, and  $TX_C$  are transformed to pending transactions and forwarded after  $TX_M$  arrives, and  $TX_B$  can arrive at node A only when there is a link between nodes A and B.

- $TX_A$  is set with the effective price  $b_t$  and the nonce n+1;
- $TX_B$  is set with the effective price  $(1 + \alpha)b_t$  and the nonce n + 1;
- $TX_C$  is set with the effective price  $(1+0.5\alpha)b_t$  and the nonce n+1.

**Inference Steps:** The core idea of our link inference model is to isolate the exchange of transaction  $TX_B$  between node B and other nodes except A, and  $TX_B$  can only be further forwarded by A to M. It is conducted in two steps. In the first step, node M distributes  $TX_A$ ,  $TX_B$  and  $TX_C$  to nodes A, Band C, respectively, as future transactions, which will not be exchanged between nodes. In the second step, node M sends out  $TX_M$  which can trigger the exchange of  $TX_A$ ,  $TX_B$  and  $TX_C$  between nodes. Then, node M infers the link between A and B by monitoring whether  $TX_B$  can be forwarded back to node M. Each step in more detail is presented as follows.

**Step 1:** Node M sends  $TX_A$ ,  $TX_B$  and  $TX_C$  to nodes A, B and C, respectively. Since they do not have  $TX_M$  with nonce n, these transactions with nonce n + 1 are regarded as future transactions that will be only stored in their Queues submodules without being further forwarded.

Since there may exist thousands of nodes C, M waits for  $t_w$  seconds after the first step to ensure all these marked transactions can successfully reach nodes A, B and C.

**Step 2:** Node M sends  $TX_M$  to nodes C to trigger the exchange of  $TX_A$ ,  $TX_B$  and  $TX_C$  in the system. In other words, once nodes C receive  $TX_M$ ,  $TX_C$  becomes a pending transaction, which will be forwarded to nodes A and B along with the forwarding of  $TX_M$ . Then, node M monitors the system and infers that the direct link between A and B exists if  $TX_B$  is forwarded back to node M.

The effectiveness of the link inference model is guaranteed by the following properties for forwarding  $TX_B$ :

• **Property 1 (P1).**  $TX_B$  cannot reach nodes C given that  $TX_M$  is sent by M to nodes C first before  $TX_B$  becomes pending and the effective price of  $TX_B$  is not enough to

replace  $TX_C$ .

- **Property 2 (P2).**  $TX_C$  cannot replace  $TX_A$  or  $TX_B$  because its effective price  $(1 + 0.5\alpha)b_t$  is lower than the threshold (*i.e.*,  $(1 + \alpha)b_t$ ) for replacement.
- **Property 3 (P3).**  $TX_B$  can exactly replace  $TX_A$  given its price is above the threshold to replace  $TX_A$ , and thus A can further forward  $TX_B$  to other nodes.

Based on **P1, P2&P3**,  $TX_B$  will not be forwarded to M unless a direct link between A and B exists so that  $TX_B$  can be forwarded to M along the path  $B \rightarrow A \rightarrow M$ . Meanwhile, our inference model can guarantee that  $TX_B$  cannot be forwarded to node A via node(s) C according to **P1**.

To better understand its effectiveness, we show the link inference process in Fig. 1(a). In particular, the inference step is presented in Fig. 1(b), in which **P1&P2** guarantee the forward isolation of  $TX_A$ ,  $TX_B$  and  $TX_C$ , while **P3** guarantees that  $TX_B$  can be forwarded to M if a direct link connecting A and B exists.

**Inference Cost Analysis.** In our link inference model, it takes 4 marked transactions to infer the existence of a single link. In comparison, it takes more than 5,120 transactions for measuring a link in [17]. Thereby, the communication overhead of DEthna is much lighter. However, in DEthna,  $TX_M$  and one of  $TX_A$ ,  $TX_B$  and  $TX_C$  will be recorded into the blockchain by measuring a single link, which costs transaction fees. As discussed in Section III-A, transaction fees are determined by the variable baseFee ( $b_f$ ). During off-peak hours when there are fewer transactions in the system,  $b_f$  tends to be smaller. Thus, to minimize the price cost of DEthna, it is suggested to execute DEthna during off-peak hours.

## B. Multi-link Inference Model

Since  $TX_M$  consumes transaction fees for measuring a single link, we further propose the multi-link inference model, which can measure multi-links with a single  $TX_M$ . Thereby, we can discover the Ethereum network topology with a lower fee cost by implementing the multi-link inference model.



Fig. 2. Multi-link inference model: at Step 1, three marked transactions with the same nonce but different effective prices in each column are used to infer a link. k marked transactions with continuous nonces and the same effective price in each row are sent to different nodes; at Step 2,  $TX_M$  is sent to nodes C, which are the nodes in the network except  $A_k$  and  $B_k$ .

Suppose that our objective is to consume a single  $TX_M$  to measure K links. The design principle is very similar to that of the single link inference model. We generate  $TX_A^k$ ,  $TX_B^k$ and  $TX_C^k$  with effective prices  $b_t$ ,  $(1+\alpha)b_t$ , and  $(1+0.5\alpha)b_t$ , respectively, for measuring link k connecting node  $A_k$  and node  $B_k$ . Their nonce value is set to n + k. The multi-link inference model also has two steps, which are briefly described as follows by emphasizing its difference from the single link inference model.

**Step 1.** Node M distributes  $TX_A^k$ ,  $TX_B^k$  and  $TX_C^k$  to nodes  $A_k$ ,  $B_k$  and  $C_k$ , respectively, for k = 1, ..., K. Note that all these transactions with nonce n + K are future transactions, which will not be exchanged between nodes.

After **Step 1**, node M waits for  $t_w$  seconds to ensure that all these future transactions can arrive at corresponding nodes successfully before **Step 2** is executed.

**Step 2.** Node M sends  $TX_M$  to all nodes C excluding any  $A_k$  or node  $B_k$  to transform these future transactions to pending transactions sequentially. In other words,  $TX_M$  triggers the exchange of  $TX_C^1$  along with  $TX_M$  first. When receiving  $TX_M$  and  $TX_C^1$ ,  $TX_C^2$  becomes a pending transaction that will be forwarded to other nodes. Based on the discussion of the single link inference model, the link connecting  $A_k$  and  $B_k$  exists if  $TX_B^k$  can be forwarded to node M.

To have a holistic overview of the multi-link inference model, we present its process in Fig. 2. In **Step 1**, K sets of marked transactions are distributed to corresponding nodes as future transactions. In **Step 2**,  $TX_M$  is sent out to trigger the exchange of these marked transactions so that node M can make link inference based on whether  $TX_B^k$  can be forwarded back to M. Here, the effective price of these marked transactions is set the same as that in the single link inference model so that the forward of  $TX_B^k$  is isolated except the link connecting  $A_k$  and  $B_k$ .

**Improvement of Multi-link Inference.** How much cost can be reduced by the multi-link inference model is dependent on the value of K. In theory, the maximum value of K is

15 because by default each node can store up to 16 pending transactions generated by the same account [26], including a single  $TX_M$  with nonce n and 15 marked transactions with nonce from n+1 to n+15. In this case, the multi-link inference model can roughly reduce 25% of marked transactions and  $\frac{14}{15}$  transaction fees for issuing  $TX_M$  to measure a single link.

#### C. Inference Failure Analysis

There exist exceptional cases in which our link inference model fails to correctly infer the existence of a link. In this subsection, we describe three such cases and also explain that the occurrence probability of these cases is very low implying that DEthna can achieve high inference accuracy.

1) Exceptional Case 1: In the design of Geth, which is one of the original implementations of the Ethereum protocol, with version before v1.10.18, a node will discard newer future transactions with a higher priority if its Queue is full, which can store at most 1,024 future transactions. Therefore, it is possible that target nodes A and B discard marked transactions before link inference is completed if their Queues are full. In this case, DEthna fails to infer the existence of the link connecting A and B.

In reality, this exceptional case almost does not impair the effectiveness of DEthna for two reasons. First, discarding newer transactions with a higher priority is a glitch in the design of Geth [33]. Geth has addressed the glitch of discarding newer high-priority transactions since v1.10.18 [34], prioritizing staler transactions when the Queue is full. Second, executing DEthna during off-peak hours reduces the likelihood of a Queue being fully occupied by valid transactions.

2) Exceptional Case 2: The second exceptional case is rooted in node churn in the Ethereum network. In Ethereum, the churn of target nodes, *i.e.*, nodes A and B to be measured, can fail link inference due to the lack of synchronization with the global state. In other words, it is possible that a newly arrival node or an existing node with its connection temporarily lost cannot complete its synchronization with the global state. Such nodes cannot verify and forward transactions due to the lack of necessary information about the state of the Ethereum network. It implies that the measurement of links connecting unsynchronized nodes fails.

Fortunately, we design DEthna with the capability to identify and select synchronized nodes in Ethereum, which can effectively mitigate the chance of this exceptional case. In DEthna, node M is a synchronized node that can monitor and verify the transactions from other nodes in the network. Thus, only nodes that send verifiable transactions after connecting to node M are identified by DEthna as synchronized nodes. For unsynchronized nodes, DEthna waits until they finish synchronization before including them for topology discovery.

3) Exceptional Case 3: The last exceptional case is from the limited connection capacity of the measurement node M. As presented in Fig. 3, there may exist nodes C' which are invisible to node M. Recall that our link inference model is based on the property that the forward of  $TX_B$  from B to other nodes except A is isolated. Due to the existence of nodes C',



Fig. 3. The workflow when there exist nodes C' not connecting with node M can lead to the absence of  $TX_C$ .  $TX_B$  is still isolated by nodes C' when  $TX_C$  arrives at node C' earlier than  $TX_B$ .

our link inference may fail because  $TX_B$  can be relayed by C' from node B to node A. Once node A receives  $TX_B$  from C', it can further forward it to M, making M incorrectly infer a direct link between A and B.

In fact, DEthna can mitigate the disturbance of nodes C'on link inference because it is more likely that  $TX_C$  can be propagated to nodes C' before  $TX_B$ , and thus isolate the forward of  $TX_B$  from B to C'. The reason is that  $TX_M$  is only sent to nodes C by M. In other words, when  $TX_C$  is forwarded between nodes,  $TX_B$  is still a future transaction that will not be forwarded to other nodes until  $TX_M$  together with  $TX_C$  can be forwarded to node B. Then, it takes at least a further forward action from B to C', which likely consumes a longer time. In contrast, if  $TX_C$  can arrive at C' before  $TX_B$ , it can isolate the forward of  $TX_B$  from B to C'.

To better understand how DEthna isolates  $TX_B$  from B to C', let  $t_{CC'}$  and  $t_{CBC'} = t_{CB} + t_{BC'}$  denote the consumed propagation time for  $C \to C'$  and  $C \to B \to C'$ , respectively, which have been highlighted in Fig. 3. Note that  $TX_B$  will not be forwarded to C', *i.e.*, isolated by  $TX_C$ , as long as  $t_{CC'} < t_{CBC'}$ , which is guaranteed by **P1** of our link inference model and the triangle inequality between  $t_{CC'}$ ,  $t_{BC'}$  and  $t_{CB}$ .

The influence of C' can be further alleviated by DEthna which can expand the connection capacity of node M with multiple probing nodes. If C can include most nodes in Ethereum, the influence of C' can be ignored. In the next section, we will introduce a lightweight distributed implementation method of our multi-link inference model, through which we can significantly expand the connection capacity of node M without incurring a heavy deployment cost.

## V. DISTRIBUTED IMPLEMENTATION

In this section, we propose a low-cost approach to deploying multiple measurement nodes for Ethereum network discovery in a parallel and distributed mode to: 1) overcome the limited connection capacity of a single measurement node; and 2) expand the population of C to avoid the occurrences of *Exceptional Case 3*.

It is known that Ethereum nodes are scattered worldwide residing in different ISPs [35]. It is possible that connections between the measurement node and other nodes are not established due to traffic blocking from ISPs, which can hinder the efficiency of a single measurement node in discovering



Fig. 4. The distributed measurement architecture consisting of 9 modified Ethereum nodes located around the world to act as node M.

a large-scale Ethereum network. Intuitively speaking, this challenge can be overcome if multiple measurement nodes in different ISPs can be deployed to cooperatively measure the Ethereum network topology. However, a straightforward multi-node measurement architecture can incur significant and even unaffordable deployment costs. For example, the cost of a single high-performance node Alibaba cloud server (equipped with 8-core CPU, 16GB RAM, 1TB SSD, and 32 Mbit/s bandwidth) is \$180 for a week (specific cost information can be referred at https://www.alibabacloud.com/).

To minimize the deployment cost of multiple measurement nodes, we propose to only offload network discovery workload to rented cloud servers, but locally retain memory and computation resource consuming workload as much as possible. To be exact, our design has three layers as shown in Fig. 4, *i.e.*, the performer layer, the controller layer, and the relay layer, and the functionality of each layer is described as follows:

- **Performer Layer.** Multiple nodes are deployed in the performer layer by renting low-performance cloud servers geographically located in different regions over the world. Each measurement node pretends a standard Ethereum node to communicate with others in the network. To reduce the consumption of cloud resources, measurement nodes will not spend resources on maintaining the global state of Ethereum, but mainly focus on two key processes. One is discovering and connecting Ethereum nodes in the network by conducting the routing table download algorithm in [14]; the other is executing link inference tasks from the controller layer to send and monitor marked transactions according to the link inference model.
- **Relay Layer.** Nodes in the relay layer are also rented from cloud providers that are strategically located geographically near the node in the controller layer with two roles. On the one hand, relay nodes perform the network discovery function and link inference tasks like nodes in the performer layer. On the other hand, relay nodes act as intermediaries for message forwarding between the controller layer and the performer layer if any performer layer node fails to directly communicate with the controller layer node due to traffic blocking by ISPs.
- Controller Layer. The node in the controller layer is

implemented on a local high-performance server not rented from cloud providers, which is used as the central control point of the distributed network measurement task. It is responsible for generating link inference tasks and maintaining the global state of Ethereum by exchanging blocks and transactions with the Ethereum network. Additionally, it coordinates the parallel link inference measurement tasks executed on multiple measurement nodes by sharing the information of connecting nodes to eliminate duplicated link measurement tasks.

Based on the three-layer design, the cost of a measurement node in the relay or performer layer is thereby decreased from \$180 to \$30 by renting a low-performance cloud server (2-core CPU, 4GB RAM, 40GB SSD, 8Mbit/s) for a week.

## VI. EXPERIMENT STUDY

In this section, we evaluate the performance of DEthna on Goerli, the most popular Ethereum test network. Then, we analyze the network characteristics of Ethereum based on the network topology discovered by DEthna.

## A. Settings of DEthna Evaluation

Key Parameter Settings. In our experiments, we control node M to discover the network topology by setting four key parameters as follows: 1) n ( $TX_M$ 's nonce) is set according to node M's local database. Here, M is a full Ethereum node that can synchronize the global state. 2)  $b_t$  ( $TX_M$ 's effective price) is set to match that of the  $1429^{th}$  transaction (ranked by a descending order of effective price of transactions) in the transaction pool of node M by cloning gasFeeCap and qasTipCap of the 1429<sup>th</sup> transaction. 3)  $\alpha$  (Replacement Rate) is set to 0.1, which is the default replacement rate widely used by Ethereum software like Geth, Erigon, Besu, and Nethermind. 4)  $t_w$  (Waiting Interval) is the time required for node M to upload all future transactions  $(TX_A, TX_B, and$  $TX_C$ ) at Step 1. In our experiments, this interval is set to 3.5 seconds, allowing node M to use multiple accounts to infer 160 links in parallel.

Note that DEthna sets  $b_t$  as the minimum value to complete link inference. On the one hand, the transaction pool of a node is limited. Only the transaction with its effective price higher than a threshold can be stored and forwarded over the network when competing with other transactions. On the other hand, if  $b_t$  is too high, marked transactions issued by M will be packed in the block instantly without being forwarded over the network until the link inference process is completed. In Ethereum, there is a fixed gas limit of 30,000,000 to restrict the number of transactions packed in a block. The minimal gas consumed by a transaction is 21,000. A block can thereby contain 30,000,000/21,000  $\approx$  1,429 transactions at most. Thereby, the price of the 1,429-th transaction is the minimum value to guarantee the propagation of our transactions.

**Ground Truth Collection.** To collect the ground truth knowledge for evaluating inference performance of DEthna, we run a standard full Ethereum node with the typical configuration in [26] on Goerli. This Ethereum node plays the role of node

 TABLE II

 Link inference performance of different schemes

Metrics Scheme	Precision	Recall	F1-Score
K-Bucket	0.026	0.061	0.036
Basic TopoShot	0.977	0.325	0.488
Improved TopoShot	0.980	0.536	0.693
DEthna	0.983	0.889	0.934

A in DEthna by randomly connecting to other nodes on Goerli and synchronizing the global state by exchanging blocks and transactions from Goerli. It records all connected nodes during the period from November 17, 2022 to December 1, 2022.

We run DEthna on November 19, 2022 to infer links connecting with the standard full Ethereum node every 8 hours. Based on collected ground truth knowledge, we can thereby evaluate the link inference performance.

**Baselines.** Other than DEthna, we implement three link inference schemes on Goerli as baselines. The first one is the **k-bucket** scheme that uses the node information stored in the k-bucket data structure [14]–[16] to infer links. The second one is a basic **TopoShot** scheme [17] that infers links by generating marked transactions with a single measurement node. However, a notable drawback of this scheme is that a large number of invalid transactions will be generated to evict valid transactions in a node's transaction pool. The last one is the **improved TopoShot** scheme, which implements the original TopoShot scheme based on our distributed architecture so that the link inference process can be accelerated with multiple measurement nodes. In our experiments, we implement these three baselines every 8 hours on November 22, 28 and December 1, 2022, respectively.

# B. Experimental Results of DEthna Evaluation

**Comparing Link Inference Performance.** The experimental results are presented in Table II by comparing precision, recall and F1-Score achieved by different link inference models. From Table II, we can see that: 1) DEthna is the best one achieving the highest precision, recall and F1-Score; 2) In particular, the recall of DEthna is much higher than baselines implying that a large number of links in the Ethereum network cannot be discovered by baselines; 3) The k-bucket scheme is the worst one with very low precision and recall. The reason lies in that most of the remote nodes in the k-bucket are not really connected for establishing the links; 4) Improved TopoShot is the second best one, and this result also indicates that the multi-node discovery architecture proposed by us can effectively improve link inference accuracy.

**Comparing Scalability of Link Inference Schemes.** To validate the supreme scalability of DEthna using multiple nodes for network discovery, we compare the network size discovered by each link inference scheme versus measurement duration. The network size is defined as the number of Ethereum nodes connecting to measurement nodes in DEthna. The discovered network size is crucial for discovering the network topology accurately and completely. We execute DEthna



Fig. 5. The network size of Goerli measured by DEthna and Basic TopoShot.

 TABLE III

 BASIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE GOERLI TESTNET

Statistics Network	Network Size	# of Links	Average Degree	Average Shortest Path	Diameter
Goerli-0102	1,193	10,552	17.6	2.69	6
Goerli-0116	1,265	11,828	18.7	2.72	6

on Goerli to measure its network size for 48 hours (from November 3, 2022 to November 5, 2022). As a comparison, we also set up a single measurement node (used in basic TopoShot and executed on a high-performance Alibaba Cloud server) for discovering network topology over the same period.

The discovered network sizes of Goerli measured by the multi-node architecture of DEthna and the single-node architecture used in basic TopoShot are shown in Fig. 5. We can see that the network size increases with respect to the elapsed measurement time, and becomes relatively stable after 30 hours. DEthna can discover about 1,150 nodes in Goerli for 30 hours. In comparison, the inference model with a single measurement node used in basic TopoShot can only discover about 400 Ethereum nodes over the same period. Therefore, the distributed measurement architecture of DEthna can greatly improve its network discovery efficiency and accuracy.

#### C. Network Characteristics Analysis

Given the highly accurate link inference results of DEthna, we further analyze the characteristics of the Ethereum network based on which we can exploratively discuss how to improve the security and robustness of Ethereum.

We execute DEthna on Goerli on January 2, 2023 and January 16, 2023, respectively, to discover two slightly different network topologies, which are named Goerli-0102 and Goerli-0116. The network characteristics to be analyzed include node degree distribution, broadcasting hops and network robustness. **Basic Network Characteristics.** Table III presents the summary of basic characteristics of the Goerli-0102 and Goerli-0116 networks in terms of network size (*i.e.*, the number of nodes), link population, average degree, average of the shortest path length (between any two nodes) and the network diameter (defined as the maximum value of the shortest path length between any two nodes in the network). From Table III, we can find that the basic characteristics of Goerli-0102 and Goerli-0116 are very similar with the network diameter equals to 6, *i.e.*, any node takes no more than 6 hops for broadcasting



Fig. 6. The empirical PDF and CDF of node degree in two Goerli networks.



Fig. 7. Broadcasting hops for different nodes to broadcast the messages in Goerli-0102 and Goerli-0116.

messages to all other nodes. This result verifies the conjecture on the Ethereum network in [7]. Moreover, compared to [7], our work takes one more step to further analyze the robustness and security of the Ethereum network hereafter.

**Degree Distribution and Node Classification.** Compared to the average degree, degree distribution can provide a deeper understanding of node importance and network structures. Fig. 6 presents the empirical probability density functions (PDF) and cumulative distribution functions (CDF) of node degrees in Goerli-0102 and Goerli-0116, respectively. From Fig. 6, we can see that the majority of nodes in the network have a degree less than 50. Specifically, the degree of more than 93% nodes is less than 50 in both networks.

Based on Fig. 6, we can classify all nodes into three types. In Ethereum network, the default maximum degree of a node is 50 [7]. Each node at most establishes  $50/3 \approx 16$  outbound connections and  $50 * 2/3 \approx 34$  inbound connections to prevent "false friends" attacks. It is also possible that the degree of a node exceeds 50 if the node targets to make more profit or conduct specific monitoring activities in Ethereum by locally modifying the default 50 degree constraint. For example, [3] set up a monitoring node with a degree of around 1,000 in Ethereum to analyze the private behavior of miners.

Based on node degrees, nodes can be classified into three types: low-degree nodes with a degree no more than 16, ordinary nodes with a degree in (16, 50], and super nodes with a degree greater than 50. For low-degree nodes, it is likely that they are Ethereum nodes behind NAT or firewalls who can only establish outbound connections with other nodes. As a result, their degrees are no more than 16.

We will conduct more analysis for the three types of nodes separately to understand how each type of nodes affects the Ethereum network robustness and security.

**Broadcasting Hops.** The number of broadcasting hops is the number of hops required for a node to broadcast messages

(*e.g.*, transactions and blocks) to reach all other nodes in the Ethereum network. It is a crucial factor reflecting network efficiency and security [36]–[38]. To analyze different message broadcasting capabilities of different types of nodes, we show the number of broadcasting hops for each type of nodes in Goerli-0102 and Goerli-0116, respectively, in Fig. 7.

From Fig. 7, for both Goerli-0102 and Goerli-0116 networks, we can observe that: 1) It takes fewer hops for super nodes to broadcast messages than ordinary and low-degree nodes. 2) The network topology of Goerli leads to "long tail" broadcasting latencies because it takes about 3 hops to broadcast messages to about 90% nodes, but takes more than 1 hop to further reach the remaining nodes in the network. It is worth noting that broadcasting by super nodes cannot get rid of the "long tail" latency problem.

**Network Robustness.** Network robustness is the ability to maintain network structural integrity and functionality after being attacked or experiencing node failures. It is particularly important for the Ethereum network to maintain a high level of security and stability to defend against various attacks, such as double spending attacks, 51% attacks and DDoS attacks [39]. According to [40], the network robustness can be evaluated by simulating attacks to remove nodes from the network. Then the network robustness is measured by the size of the remaining largest connected component relative to its original size.

Intuitively speaking, the network robustness is negatively influenced by low-degree nodes. To show this point, we generate Goerli-0102R and Goerli-0116R networks which are generated by removing low-degree nodes from Goerli-0102 and Goerli-0116, respectively. Meanwhile, we generate two classic networks, called ER and BA, to quantify the influence of attacks on Goerli based networks. Both ER and BA are generated by NetworkX [41] with the same network size as Goerli based networks. Links in ER and BA are generated by the Erdos-Renyi model [42] and the Barabasi-Alber model [43], respectively. Finally, we generate ER-0102, BA-0102, ER-0116, BA-0116, ER-0102R, BA-0102R, ER-0116R and BA-0116R networks, to compare with Goerli based networks.

We implement two types of attacks on different networks. From previous experimental results, we can observe that the two networks sampled on 0102 and 0116 are very similar to each other. Due to limited space, we just implement random attacks on networks sampled on 0102 and targeted attacks on networks sampled on 0116, respectively. The random attack randomly selects a node from a network, while the targeted attack ranks nodes by a descending order of their degrees and removes the node with a larger degree with a higher priority. The experimental results are presented in Fig. 8 for the random attack and Fig. 9 for the targeted attack, respectively. The xaxis represents the proportion of removed nodes while the yaxis represents the size of the largest connected component relative to the original network size after removing nodes, and a larger area under the line indicates a more robust network.

From Fig. 8 and Fig. 9, we can conclude that: 1) Goerli based networks are robust to random attack because the relative network size is very close to that of BA or ER based



Fig. 8. Robustness of different networks against random attacks.



Fig. 9. Robustness of different networks against targeted attacks.

networks after removing nodes. 2) Goerli based networks are vulnerable to the targeted attack, evidenced by the gap between Goerli based network size and BA/ER based network size after removing a certain fraction of large-degree nodes. 3) The robustness of the Goerli network can be significantly improved if we can increase the degree of low-degree nodes because the curves of Goerli-0116R (which are generated by removing low-degree nodes from Goerli) are very close to these of BA/ER based networks.

In summary, our robustness study reveals that the robustness of Ethereum is impaired by low-degree nodes, which are likely nodes behind NAT or firewalls. There are two effective approaches to enhancing Ethereum network robustness. The first one is to expand the degree of these low-degree nodes. The second one is to make the link inference schemes unavailable to make it difficult for attackers to detect low-degree nodes.

#### VII. CONCLUSION

Discovering Ethereum network topology is vital for improving network efficiency, scalability, and security. In this work, we propose DEthna, a novel scheme to discover Ethereum network topology by generating marked transactions. Compared with existing schemes, DEthna is of the following advantages: 1) DEthna is friendly for implementation which averts flooding the Ethereum network with invalid transactions; 2) The link inference accuracy of DEthna is much higher than existing schemes; 3) DEthna is efficient which can leverage multiple decentralized probing nodes to discover network topology in a parallel mode. By measuring Goerli with DEthna, we further analyze Ethereum network characteristics and reveal that Ethereum network robustness is compromised by low-degree nodes. Our initial research provides a better understanding of the Ethereum network, and lays the foundation to optimize it. For example, based on the network topology measured by DEthna, in the future we can study how to design a more advanced message propagation protocol to speed up the message propagation in the Ethereum network.

#### REFERENCES

- S. Nakamoto, "Bitcoin: A peer-to-peer electronic cash system," Decentralized business review, 2008.
- [2] V. Buterin *et al.*, "A next-generation smart contract and decentralized application platform," *white paper*, vol. 3, no. 37, pp. 2–1, 2014.
- [3] K. Qin, L. Zhou, and A. Gervais, "Quantifying blockchain extractable value: How dark is the forest?" in 2022 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP). IEEE, 2022, pp. 198–214.
- [4] L. Ante, "Non-fungible token (nft) markets on the ethereum blockchain: Temporal development, cointegration and interrelations," *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*, pp. 1–19, 2022.
- [5] H. Duan, J. Li, S. Fan, Z. Lin, X. Wu, and W. Cai, "Metaverse for social good: A university campus prototype," in *Proceedings of the 29th ACM international conference on multimedia*, 2021, pp. 153–161.
- [6] C. Zhao, S. Zhang, T. Wang, and S. C. Liew, "Bodyless block propagation: Tps fully scalable blockchain with pre-validation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.08769*, 2022.
- [7] T. Wang, C. Zhao, Q. Yang, S. Zhang, and S. C. Liew, "Ethna: Analyzing the underlying peer-to-peer network of ethereum blockchain," *IEEE Transactions on Network Science and Engineering*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 2131–2146, 2021.
- [8] L. Shi, T. Wang, J. Li, S. Zhang, and S. Guo, "Pooling is not favorable: Decentralize mining power of pow blockchain using age-of-work," *IEEE Transactions on Cloud Computing*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 2756–2769, 2022.
- [9] T. Neudecker, P. Andelfinger, and H. Hartenstein, "Timing analysis for inferring the topology of the bitcoin peer-to-peer network," in 2016 Intl IEEE Conferences on Ubiquitous Intelligence & Computing, Advanced and Trusted Computing, Scalable Computing and Communications, Cloud and Big Data Computing, Internet of People, and Smart World Congress (UIC/ATC/ScalCom/CBDCom/IoP/SmartWorld). IEEE, 2016, pp. 358–367.
- [10] E. Heilman, A. Kendler, A. Zohar, and S. Goldberg, "Eclipse attacks on {Bitcoin's}{peer-to-peer} network," in 24th USENIX security symposium (USENIX security 15), 2015, pp. 129–144.
- [11] C. Decker and R. Wattenhofer, "Information propagation in the bitcoin network," in *IEEE P2P 2013 Proceedings*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 1–10.
- [12] M. Saad, J. Spaulding, L. Njilla, C. Kamhoua, S. Shetty, D. Nyang, and D. Mohaisen, "Exploring the attack surface of blockchain: A comprehensive survey," *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 1977–2008, 2020.
- [13] G. O. Karame, E. Androulaki, and S. Capkun, "Double-spending fast payments in bitcoin," in *Proceedings of the 2012 ACM conference on Computer and communications security*, 2012, pp. 906–917.
- [14] Y. Gao, J. Shi, X. Wang, Q. Tan, C. Zhao, and Z. Yin, "Topology measurement and analysis on ethereum p2p network," in 2019 IEEE Symposium on Computers and Communications (ISCC). IEEE, 2019, pp. 1–7.
- [15] S. Maeng, M. Essaid, C. Lee, S. Park, and H. Ju, "Visualization of ethereum p2p network topology and peer properties," *International Journal of Network Management*, vol. 31, no. 6, p. e2175, 2021.
- [16] Z. Li, W. Xia, M. Cui, P. Fu, G. Gou, and G. Xiong, "Mining the characteristics of the ethereum p2p network," in *Proceedings of the* 2nd ACM International Symposium on Blockchain and Secure Critical Infrastructure, 2020, pp. 20–30.
- [17] K. Li, Y. Tang, J. Chen, Y. Wang, and X. Liu, "Toposhot: uncovering ethereum's network topology leveraging replacement transactions," in *Proceedings of the 21st ACM Internet Measurement Conference*, 2021, pp. 302–319.
- [18] "Add change counter," https://github.com/ethereum/go-ethereum/pull /23095, accessed January, 2023.
- [19] A. Miller, J. Litton, A. Pachulski, N. Gupta, D. Levin, N. Spring, B. Bhattacharjee *et al.*, "Discovering bitcoin's public topology and influential nodes," *et al*, 2015.
- [20] "Guessing bitcoin's p2p connections," https://jonasnick.github.io/ blog/2015/03/06/guessing-bitcoins-p2p-connections/, accessed January, 2023.
- [21] "The bitcoin core developers: Bitcoin core 0.10.1 release notes," https:// github.com/bitcoin/bitcoin/blob/v0.10.1/doc/release-notes.md, accessed January, 2023.
- [22] M. Grundmann, T. Neudecker, and H. Hartenstein, "Exploiting transaction accumulation and double spends for topology inference in bitcoin," in *Financial Cryptography and Data Security: FC 2018 International* Workshops, BITCOIN, VOTING, and WTSC, Nieuwpoort, Curaçao,

March 2, 2018, Revised Selected Papers 22. Springer, 2019, pp. 113-126.

- [23] S. Delgado-Segura, S. Bakshi, C. Pérez-Solà, J. Litton, A. Pachulski, A. Miller, and B. Bhattacharjee, "Txprobe: Discovering bitcoin's network topology using orphan transactions," in *International Conference* on Financial Cryptography and Data Security. Springer, 2019, pp. 550–566.
- [24] "Select orphan transaction uniformly for eviction," https://github.com /bitcoin/bitcoin/pull/14626, accessed January, 2023.
- [25] "Fix the order of address in queue," https://github.com/ethereum/go-e thereum/pull/24908, accessed January, 2023.
- [26] "Go-ethereum," https://github.com/ethereum/go-ethereum, accessed January, 2023.
- [27] Y. Aoki, K. Otsuki, T. Kaneko, R. Banno, and K. Shudo, "Simblock: A blockchain network simulator," in *IEEE INFOCOM 2019-IEEE Conference on Computer Communications Workshops (INFOCOM WKSHPS)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 325–329.
- [28] D. Ding, X. Jiang, J. Wang, H. Wang, X. Zhang, and Y. Sun, "Txilm: Lossy block compression with salted short hashing," Cryptology ePrint Archive, Paper 2019/649, 2019, https://eprint.iacr.org/2019/649. [Online]. Available: https://eprint.iacr.org/2019/649
- [29] J. Zahnentferner, "Chimeric ledgers: Translating and unifying utxo-based and account-based cryptocurrencies," *Cryptology ePrint Archive*, 2018.
- [30] T. Chen, Y. Zhu, Z. Li, J. Chen, X. Li, X. Luo, X. Lin, and X. Zhange, "Understanding ethereum via graph analysis," in *IEEE INFOCOM 2018-IEEE Conference on Computer Communications*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 1484–1492.
- [31] V. Buterin et al., "Eip-1559: Fee market change for eth 1.0 chain," [Online].Available: https://eips.ethereum.org/EIPS/eip-1559, 2019.
- [32] "Marked transaction," https://goerli.etherscan.io/tx/0x2ae1ae988a76b 22d25263e954bd462bd38f6d8690ecc085d25020fa77cc269c9, accessed January, 2023.
- [33] "Truncatequeue method drops the newest txs rather than the oldest ones," https://github.com/ethereum/go-ethereum/issues/24907, accessed January, 2023.
- [34] "Go-ethereum v1.10.18 stable," https://github.com/ethereum/go-ethereu m/tree/v1.10.18, accessed January, 2023.
- [35] "Ethereum mainnet statistics," https://ethernodes.org/, accessed January, 2023.
- [36] U. Klarman, S. Basu, A. Kuzmanovic, and E. G. Sirer, "bloxroute: A scalable trustless blockchain distribution network whitepaper," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 2018.
- [37] L. Zhang, T. Wang, and S. C. Liew, "Speeding up block propagation in bitcoin network: Uncoded and coded designs," *Computer Networks*, vol. 206, p. 108791, 2022.
- [38] Z. Hu and Z. Xiao, "Dino: A block transmission protocol with low bandwidth consumption and propagation latency," in *IEEE INFOCOM* 2022-IEEE Conference on Computer Communications. IEEE, 2022, pp. 1319–1328.
- [39] H. Chen, M. Pendleton, L. Njilla, and S. Xu, "A survey on ethereum systems security: Vulnerabilities, attacks, and defenses," ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR), vol. 53, no. 3, pp. 1–43, 2020.
- [40] L. Tipton, C. L. Müller, Z. D. Kurtz, L. Huang, E. Kleerup, A. Morris, R. Bonneau, and E. Ghedin, "Fungi stabilize connectivity in the lung and skin microbial ecosystems," *Microbiome*, vol. 6, pp. 1–14, 2018.
- [41] A. Hagberg and D. Conway, "Networkx: Network analysis with python," URL: https://networkx. github. io, 2020.
- [42] P. Erdős, A. Rényi et al., "On the evolution of random graphs," Publ. math. inst. hung. acad. sci, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 17–60, 1960.
- [43] R. Albert and A.-L. Barabási, "Statistical mechanics of complex networks," *Reviews of modern physics*, vol. 74, no. 1, p. 47, 2002.