Sparse Merkle Trees

Introducing the concept and benchmarking libraries available in Rust

Table of contents

- Introduction
- What is a Merkle Tree
- Usage in Massa
- Why **S**parse **M**erkle **T**ree is what we need
- The frameworks for SMT in Rust
- Conclusion

What is the problem

In decentralization where we rely on untrusted parties, exchanges requires **integrity** and **authenticity**, at a very **big scale**.

What is the problem

In decentralization where we rely on untrusted parties, exchanges requires **integrity** and **authenticity**, at a very **big scale**.

Integrity: The property that data or information have not been altered or destroyed.

Solved using a **hash function**, changing a single bit of data will change the hash.

What is the problem

In decentralization where we rely on untrusted parties, exchanges requires **integrity** and **authenticity**, at a very **big scale**.

Integrity: The property that data or information have not been altered or destroyed.

Solved using a **hash function**, changing a single bit of data will change the hash.

Authenticity: The property that data originated from its purported source.

Solved using **cryptographic signatures** (RSA, ECDSA), generated using a *secret key* only the owner has, can be verified by anyone using the *public key* associated to the secret key.

Let's hash everything ! ... No ?

Bitcoin: 2500 to 4600 transactions per block

Let's hash everything ! ... No ?

Bitcoin: 2500 to 4600 transactions per block

Situation

Alice paid a pizza 10 BTC in "Hacker Pizza" using her smartphone, want to check if transaction accepted. Hacker Pizza's WIFI **alters the data** she receives

Let's hash everything ! ... No ?

Bitcoin: 2500 to 4600 transactions per block

Situation

Alice paid a pizza 10 BTC in "Hacker Pizza" using her smartphone, want to check if transaction accepted. Hacker Pizza's WIFI **alters the data** she receives

Only solution to protect herself

Hash all the transactions, compare with hash given in block header, then verify the block header's signature is correct.

Hash large data, pieces by pieces, without compromises on integrity.

Alice wants to verify the transaction L2

- \bullet Hash the transaction: $H0-1$
- Ask H1 and H0-0, verify signatures
- \bullet H \odot = Hash(H \odot - \odot , H \odot -1)
- \bullet TopHash = Hash(H θ , H $\ddot{}$ 1)
- Compare Top hash to the one in block header
- Verify signature of the hash in block header

Merkle Proof: All the data needed to verify a leaf of the tree

For Alice's tx: $Hash(L2) + HO-0 + H1$ (concatenated)

Merkle Proof: All the data needed to verify a leaf of the tree

For Alice's tx: $Hash(L2) + HO-0 + H1$ (concatenated)

To compute hash of tree with 256 leaves, 8 hashes needed

Merkle Proof: All the data needed to verify a leaf of the tree

For Alice's tx: $Hash(L2) + H0-0 + H1$ (concatenated)

To compute hash of tree with 256 leaves, 8 hashes needed

Simplifies a $O(N)$ operation to $O(\log(N))$

Merkle Proof: All the data needed to verify a leaf of the tree

For Alice's tx: $Hash(L2) + HO-0 + H1$ (concatenated)

To compute hash of tree with 256 leaves, 8 hashes needed

Simplifies a $O(N)$ operation to $O(\log(N))$

Have hash of a modified datastore with N elements requires $O(log(N))$ hashes operations.

Want to have a fingerprint of the Ledger Check its integrity

Want to have a fingerprint of the Ledger Check its integrity

Ledger of Massa: 1TB of data

Want to have a fingerprint of the Ledger Check its integrity

Ledger of Massa: 1TB of data

Current implementation

Add new data to the ledger: $F' = F X0R$ Hash(new data) Remove data off the ledger: $F' = F XOR Hash(rm data)$

Want to have a fingerprint of the Ledger Check its integrity

Ledger of Massa: 1TB of data

Current implementation

Add new data to the ledger: $F' = F X0R$ Hash(new data) Remove data off the ledger: $F' = F XOR Hash(rm data)$

Simple, fast, incremental

Want to have a fingerprint of the Ledger Check its integrity

Ledger of Massa: 1TB of data

Current implementation

Add new data to the ledger: $F' = F X0R$ Hash(new data) Remove data off the ledger: $F' = F XOR Hash(rm data)$

Simple, fast, incremental

Not a hash function, not suited for integrity checks If A XOR $B = 0$, then C XOR (A XOR B) = C

Why we want it in Massa So let's use Merkle Trees ! Why Sparse ?

What if we want to add a new data between L1 and L2 ?

Sparse Merkle Trees - Timothée Cercueil © Massa Labs 2023 9 / 20

Why Sparse Merkle Tree is what we need Additions to Merkle Trees

Allows for null leaves (with Hash(null) a known constant)

Why Sparse Merkle Tree is what we need Additions to Merkle Trees

Allows for null leaves (with Hash(null) a known constant)

Populate all the possible keys with a leaf of value null

Can know if a key is not present, go through the tree, check if value is null

Why Sparse Merkle Tree is what we need Additions to Merkle Trees

Allows for null leaves (with Hash(null) a known constant)

Populate all the possible keys with a leaf of value null

Can know if a key is not present, go through the tree, check if value is null

Proof of **non-inclusion**

Why Sparse Merkle Tree is what we need

Proof of inclusion

Proof of non-inclusion

Integrity check over the whole data

No compromises

Why Sparse Merkle Tree is what we need

Proof of inclusion

Proof of non-inclusion

Integrity check over the whole data

No compromises

Note: Incremental hash was also a different posibility, look at the discussion on Github to find more details on why SMT was chosen.

Why Sparse Merkle Tree is what we need

Proof of inclusion

Proof of non-inclusion

Integrity check over the whole data

No compromises

Note: Incremental hash was also a different posibility, look at the discussion on Github to find more details on why SMT was chosen. Or ask to Varun, he explains it very well :-)

Sparse Merkle Trees - Timothée Cercueil © Massa Labs 2023 12 / 12 / 20 and 12 / 20 and 12 / 20 and 12 / 20 and 12 / 20

struct SparseMerkleTree<H: Hasher, D: Database> { ... }

struct SparseMerkleTree<H: Hasher, D: Database> { ... }

```
trait Database {
  fn get(...)
  fn put(...)
  fn remove(...)
}
```
struct SparseMerkleTree<H: Hasher, D: Database> { ... }

```
trait Database {
  fn get(...)
  fn put(...)
  fn remove(...)
}
```

```
trait Hasher {
  fn new(...)
  fn update(...)
 fn finalize(...)
}
```
Sparse Merkle Trees - Timothée Cercueil © Massa Labs 2023 12 / 12 / 20 Archives 12 / 2

Huge tree with null values everywhere

Huge tree with null values everywhere

Can be heavily optimized in **space** and in **computation**

Huge tree with null values everywhere

Can be heavily optimized in **space** and in **computation**

Underlying database calls can also be optimized

Huge tree with null values everywhere

Can be heavily optimized in **space** and in **computation**

Underlying database calls can also be optimized

Very implementation-dependant

The frameworks for SMT in Rust Benchmarks

Implemented Blake3Hasher, MemoryStorage, RockSdbStorage

The frameworks for SMT in Rust Benchmarks

Implemented Blake3Hasher, MemoryStorage, RockSdbStorage

The frameworks for SMT in Rust Benchmarks

Implemented Blake3Hasher, MemoryStorage, RockSdbStorage

cw-merkle-tree was ignored as it's too tied to CosmWasm smart contract framework

Benchmarks

On MemoryStore (storage in RAM)

monotree/memstore+blake3 time: [17.473 µs 17.619 µs 17.770 µs]

sparse-merkle-tree/memstore+blake3 time: [119.37 µs 120.63 µs 122.11 µs]

lsmtree/memstore+blake3 time: [25.587 µs 25.768 µs 25.952 µs]

Benchmarks

On RocksDB (storage on the disk)

monotree/rocksdb+blake3 time: [153.27 µs 155.79 µs 158.37 µs]

sparse-merkle-tree/rocksdb+blake3 time: [1.3083 ms 1.3135 ms 1.3190 ms]

lsmtree/rocksdb+blake3 time: [248.28 µs 249.85 µs 251.47 µs]

Read / Write operations benchmark

On MemoryStore (storage in RAM)

monotree/memstore+blake3/read time: [2.7194 µs 2.7374 µs 2.7564 µs]

lsmtree/memstore+blake3/read time: [174.66 ns 178.09 ns 181.79 ns]

monotree/memstore+blake3/write time: [14.213 µs 14.318 µs 14.423 µs]

lsmtree/memstore+blake3/write time: [24.849 µs 25.431 µs 26.049 µs]

Read / Write operations benchmark

On RocksDB (storage on the disk)

monotree/rocksdb+blake3/read time: [10.370 µs 10.646 µs 10.938 µs]

lsmtree/rocksdb+blake3/read time: [581.90 ns 609.57 ns 638.72 ns]

monotree/rocksdb+blake3/write time: [150.39 µs 161.96 µs 172.92 µs]

```
lsmtree/rocksdb+blake3/write
 time: [233.95 µs 239.78 µs 245.64 µs]
```
I recommend Monotree

I recommend Monotree

Optimization on database access, $N \rightarrow \log 2(N)$

I recommend Monotree

Optimization on database access, $N \rightarrow \log(2(N))$

Very simple Database and Hasher traits

I recommend Monotree

Optimization on database access, $N \rightarrow \log(2(N))$

Very simple Database and Hasher traits

Fully featured already

Simple but efficient

Can be maintained by our own means

[Benchmark code](https://github.com/litchipi/smt_benchmark)

[Article on a performance-oriented SMT implementation](https://ouvrard-pierre-alain.medium.com/sparse-merkle-tree-86e6e2fc26da)

[How Merkle trees is used in Bitcoin](https://learnmeabitcoin.com/technical/merkle-root)

[Github discussions about implementing SMT in Massa](https://github.com/massalabs/massa/discussions/3852)

[Why use binary trees over trees with more children](https://bitcoin.stackexchange.com/questions/42624/are-bitcoin-merkle-trees-always-binary)

[Libra whitepaper, contains optimizations for SMT](https://diem-developers-components.netlify.app/papers/the-diem-blockchain/2020-05-26.pdf)