

Smart Contract Parallel Execution with Fine-Grained State Accesses

Xiaodong Qi, Jiao Jiao, Yi Li Nanyang Technological University xiaodong.qi@ntu.edu.sg

Smart Contract Parallel Execution with Fine-Grained State Accesses

1

Introduction

> Blockchain

- Ledger maintained by every validators
- Smart contract
 - Self-enforcing computer program
 - States: persistent storage, e.g., variables
- Consensus protocols
 - Proof-of-Work



Serial execution

- Ensure state consistency across all validators
- No parallelism between transaction executions
- Bottleneck shifting

Serial execution

- Ensure state consistency across all validators
- No parallelism between transaction executions
- Bottleneck shifting
- Parallel solutions
 - Directed acyclic graph (DAG), Optimistic
 Concurrency Control (OCC)





Serial execution

- Ensure state consistency across all validators
- No parallelism between transaction executions
- Bottleneck shifting
- Parallel solutions
 - Directed acyclic graph (DAG), Optimistic
 Concurrency Control (OCC)

OCC-base Approach



Serial execution

- Ensure state consistency across all validators
- No parallelism between transaction executions
- Bottleneck shifting

Parallel solutions

- Directed acyclic graph (DAG), Optimistic Concurrency Control (OCC)
- Unrealistic assumption of read/write set
- Low parallelism caused by coarse-grain analysis

```
State of Contract
pragma solidity ^0.6.12;
2 contract Example
    mapping(address => uint) public A;
    uint[] public B;
5
    function UpdateB(address x, uint y) public
6
  \hookrightarrow
      uint_idx = A[x];
      if(idx > 1) {
         for (uint i = idx; i > 1; i--) {
           \beta[i] = B[i-2] + y;
10
11
        else
12
         B[0] = 0;
13
         assert (y <= 10);
14
         B[1] = B[1] + y;
15
16
17
18 }
```

Fig. 1: Example contract highlighting state access dependencies.

Naïve solution: access entire array B exclusively Low parallelism!

Contribution

> Deterministic multi-version concurrency control (DMVCC):

- Analyze smart contract code to determine the precise read/write sets of each program statement and enable more find-grained state accesses
- Eliminate the write-write conflicts between transactions by preserving effects of all write operations as separate versions, which is referred to as *write versioning*
- Allow transactions to read uncommitted writes through *early-write visibility* feature.

Workflow

- SAG analyzer: *state access graph* anaylsis
- Packer: transaction packing
- Executor: transaction execution



Tead

State Access Graph

Partial state access graph (P-SAG)

- A simplified control flow graph
- Nodes: read /write, loop, release point



State Access Graph



Access sequences

Access sequence construction

• Record all possible conflicts between transactions



Block B_l

Schedule Generation



Schedule Generation



Schedule Generation

- Q_{ready} : queue for *ready transactions*
- Multiple EVM instances
- Read/write access sequences



Snapshot of states at B_{l-1}



Early Write Visibility

Transaction- vs. statement-level synchronization



Commutative write

- > Increment same state item without reading original value
- > Perform commutative writes in parallel
- > Merge increments to recover a complete value





Optimized Schedule Generation





Evaluation

Comparisons

- DAG-based approach
- OCC-based approach

> Workload

- Transactions from Ethereum Mainnet
- Jan 1, 2022 -- April 30, 2022 (769,020 blocks in total)
- 122 million transactions and 84 million transactions (69%) made contract calls

Festbed

- Ubuntu 18.04.3 LTS desktop equipped with an Intel Core i7 16-core and 32GB memory
- Up to 32 threads per validator

Evaluation

> Research questions

- **RQ1:** How well do the parallel execution results of DMVCC meet the deterministic serializability criteria?
- **RQ2:** How much speedup can DMVCC achieve over the serial execution and how does it compare with other existing approaches?
- **RQ3:** How efficient is DMVCC in a real-world blockchain environment?

Experiment

- RQ1: how well do the parallel execution results of DMVCC meet the deterministic serializability criteria?
 - Compare the execution results of DMVCC and serial execution
 - Matched results for 121,210 blocks

Experiment

- RQ2: How much speedup can DMVCC achieve over the serial execution and how does it compare with other existing approaches?
 - Performance of EVM execution without taking the impact of consensus into account
 - 1000 transactions per block
 - 21.35x (DMVCC), 11.04x (DAG), 13.86x (OCC)
 - High-contention setting: 1% hot contracts, 50% hot contract access
 - 13.73x (DMVCC), 3.05x (DAG), 3.48x (OCC)



Fig. 7: Speedup of all parallel execution approaches. The x-axis shows the number of threads, and y-axis shows the speedup achieved.

Experiment

- **RQ3:** How efficient is DMVCC in a real-world blockchain environment?
 - A micro Ethereum testnet with 20 validators
 - Mining cycle 12s
 - Low-contention setting: 19.79x, execution is not the bottleneck
 - High-contention setting: 18.35x, DAG and OCC process 60% transactions of DMVCC



Fig. 8: Throughput speedup for blockchain of all parallel execution approaches.

Conclusion

Introduce a novel scheduling framework, DMVCC, which improves parallelism for highcontention transactions with more fine-grained state accesses.

Support write versioning, which helps avoid write-write conflicts, and early write visibility, which makes writes visible to other transactions.

Thank You

Smart Contract Parallel Execution with Fine-Grained State Accesses

Q&A

