

<sup>1</sup> **solana-pqzk-fullchain: Full on-chain verification of ZK-STARK proofs and post-quantum signatures on Solana**

<sup>4</sup> **Jotaro Yano**  

<sup>5</sup> **1** Independent Researcher, Japan  Corresponding author

DOI: [10.xxxxxx/draft](https://doi.org/10.xxxxxx/draft)

**Software**

- [Review](#) 
- [Repository](#) 
- [Archive](#) 

**Editor:** Neea Rusch  

**Reviewers:**

- [@ravikanthreddy89](#)
- [@amitkumarj441](#)
- [@Abinashbunty](#)

**Submitted:** 09 December 2025

**Published:** unpublished

**License**

Authors of papers retain copyright and release the work under a  Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License ([CC BY 4.0](#))

## **Summary**

<sup>7</sup> **solana-pqzk-fullchain** is an open-source, research-oriented reference implementation that  
<sup>8</sup> demonstrates **fully on-chain verification** of (i) a **hash-based zero-knowledge proof** (a STARK)  
<sup>9</sup> and (ii) a **post-quantum digital signature** (SLH-DSA / SPHINCS+) on **Solana L1** ([Yano, 2025b](#)).  
<sup>10</sup> The repository contains an on-chain verifier program (Anchor/SBF), a minimal  
<sup>11</sup> off-chain STARK prover (Winterfell), a TypeScript CLI demo that runs an end-to-end flow  
<sup>12</sup> (encrypt → prove → sign → upload → finalize → verify → receive), and benchmarking utilities  
<sup>13</sup> that record transaction-level compute units (CUs) for each verification phase.

## **Statement of need**

<sup>14</sup> Public blockchains preserve artifacts indefinitely, which creates a “record now, break later”  
<sup>15</sup> risk profile for protocols whose security relies on assumptions that may be weakened by future  
<sup>16</sup> capabilities, including Shor-type quantum attacks on discrete-log based systems ([Shor, 1999](#)).  
<sup>17</sup> In practice, many deployed succinct proof systems use pairing-based SNARKs (e.g., Groth16,  
<sup>18</sup> PLONK) because of small proofs and fast verification ([Gabizon et al., 2019; Groth, 2016](#)). In  
<sup>19</sup> contrast, STARKs are transparent (no trusted setup) and primarily hash-based, making them  
<sup>20</sup> attractive when long-term post-quantum orientation is a design goal ([Ben-Sasson et al., 2018b, 2018a](#)).  
<sup>21</sup> The trade-off is that STARK verification is typically hashing-heavy and proof sizes are  
<sup>22</sup> larger, so engineering feasibility depends strongly on the target execution environment.

<sup>23</sup> **Solana** is a useful platform for studying this feasibility because it exposes explicit transaction  
<sup>24</sup> compute accounting and strict runtime constraints (compute-unit limits, bounded stack, explicit  
<sup>25</sup> heap-frame requests, and transaction/instruction size limits) that directly shape what can be  
<sup>26</sup> verified on L1 ([Solana Foundation, 2025b, 2025a, 2025c](#)). However, implementing a full verifier  
<sup>27</sup> pipeline on Solana L1 is non-trivial: hashing costs dominate, stack pressure can trigger SBF  
<sup>28</sup> failures, memory allocation must be controlled, and large inputs require DoS- and fee-aware  
<sup>29</sup> streaming.

<sup>30</sup> **solana-pqzk-fullchain** addresses this gap by providing a complete, reproducible software  
<sup>31</sup> stack focused on **engineering practicality** rather than proposing a new proof system:

- <sup>32</sup> ▪ **CPI-friendly on-chain verifier surface:** a Solana program that verifies an **SLH-DSA (FIPS 205)** signature and a **Winterfell STARK proof** in separate phases to enable early rejection of malformed or unauthorized payloads ([Meta, 2025; National Institute of Standards and Technology, 2024b; Yano, 2025b](#)).
- <sup>33</sup> ▪ **Binding of proofs to application artifacts:** the verifier derives public inputs from SHA256(ciphertext) and verifies a minimal AIR (affine counter) as a baseline mechanism for binding a proof to the uploaded ciphertext ([Yano, 2025b](#)).

40     ▪ **DoS- and fee-aware streaming uploads:** payloads are uploaded in bounded chunks with  
41       fixed-offset appends and a rolling SHA-256 hash chain, so invalid uploads can be rejected  
42       with constant work per chunk ([Yano, 2025b](#)).  
43

44     ▪ **Runtime-aware adaptations for Solana SBF:** patched components route SHA-256 hashing  
45       through Solana's hashv syscall, suppress inlining in FRI hotspots to respect stack limits,  
46       and use a bump allocator synchronized to the requested heap frame for predictable  
47       memory behavior ([Yano, 2025b](#)).  
48

49     ▪ **End-to-end demo and benchmarking:** the repository includes a demo encryption path  
50       using a Kyber768/ML-KEM-style KEM for deriving an AEAD key (HKDF-SHA256)  
51       and AES-256-GCM encryption, plus scripts that repeatedly run the pipeline and log  
52       per-transaction compute units for the verification phases ([National Institute of Standards](#)  
53       and [Technology, 2024a](#); [Yano, 2025b](#)).  
54

55     This package is intended for researchers and engineers who need a reproducible baseline to  
56       (a) evaluate the feasibility and cost of PQ-oriented verification on Solana L1, (b) experiment  
57       with engineering levers (hashing path, stack discipline, heap sizing, streaming I/O), and (c)  
58       integrate a verifier via CPI into other Solana programs.  
59

60     A longer methods-and-measurement report describing the same artifacts is available as a  
61       preprint on Zenodo and IACR ePrint; the JOSS paper intentionally focuses on the software  
62       contribution, interfaces, and reproducibility rather than new scientific findings ([Yano, 2025a](#),  
63       [2025c](#)).  
64

## 65     Software design

66     The software is organized as an end-to-end reference stack for Solana L1: an on-chain verifier  
67       program (Anchor/SBF), an off-chain prover workflow, a CLI demo, and benchmark scripts.  
68       Verification is split into two phases—(1) SLH-DSA signature verification and (2) STARK proof  
69       verification—to reject unauthorized or malformed payloads before paying the higher STARK  
70       verification cost. Large inputs are handled via bounded, chunked uploads with constant work  
71       per chunk (including a rolling SHA-256 chain) to fit Solana transaction/account limits and  
72       improve predictability under adversarial inputs. To operate within Solana's SBF constraints,  
73       the implementation routes SHA-256 hashing through Solana's hashv syscall and manages  
74       stack/heap usage in line with requested heap frames.

75     Build vs. contribute: the cryptographic primitives come from existing standards and libraries;  
76       the contribution is the Solana-specific integration and reproducible workflow (program +  
77       client + benchmarks) that shows how to run these components under Solana's execution and  
78       transaction constraints.  
79

## 80     Research impact statement

81     This project provides credible near-term significance as a reproducible baseline for evaluating  
82       post-quantum-oriented verification on Solana L1. At the time of writing, we are not aware of  
83       many publicly available Solana L1 reference implementations that verify both a STARK proof  
84       and an NIST-standard post-quantum signature (SLH-DSA, FIPS 205) fully on-chain in a single  
85       end-to-end pipeline. The repository includes a runnable CLI demo and benchmark utilities  
86       that record transaction-level compute units for each verification phase, enabling others to  
87       reproduce results and compare engineering trade-offs (hashing strategy, memory settings, and  
88       I/O chunking). The documented adaptations for the Solana SBF environment are intended  
89       to help developers who are considering STARK verification or PQ signatures, and to support  
90       future CPI-friendly reuse.  
91

## 85 AI usage disclosure

86 Generative AI (ChatGPT) was used in a limited way. The core software design and  
87 implementation were created by the author. ChatGPT was occasionally used for small code  
88 snippets/boilerplate (e.g., helper functions or simple CLI handling); all AI-suggested code was  
89 reviewed, edited, and tested by the author. For the paper and documentation, the technical  
90 content and structure were written by the author, and ChatGPT was used to improve English  
91 wording. The author reviewed and corrected the final manuscript and takes responsibility for  
92 the code and paper.

## 93 Acknowledgements

94 This project builds on the Winterfell STARK ecosystem ([Meta, 2025](#)) and references the  
95 NIST post-quantum standards for ML-KEM and SLH-DSA ([National Institute of Standards](#)  
96 [and Technology, 2024a, 2024b](#)). It also relies on Solana's public documentation for compute  
97 budgeting and transaction constraints ([Solana Foundation, 2025b, 2025a, 2025c](#)). No specific  
98 financial support was received for this work. The author declares no conflicts of interest.

## 99 References

- 100 Ben-Sasson, E., Bentov, I., Horesh, Y., & Riabzev, M. (2018a). Fast reed-solomon interactive  
101 oracle proofs of proximity. *45th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and*  
102 *Programming (ICALP 2018)*. <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.ICALP.2018.14>
- 103 Ben-Sasson, E., Bentov, I., Horesh, Y., & Riabzev, M. (2018b). *Scalable, transparent, and*  
104 *post-quantum secure computational integrity*. Cryptology ePrint Archive, Report 2018/046.  
105 <https://eprint.iacr.org/2018/046>
- 106 Gabizon, A., Williamson, Z. J., & Ciobanu, O. (2019). *PLONK: Permutations over lagrange-*  
107 *bases for oecumenical noninteractive arguments of knowledge*. IACR Cryptology ePrint  
108 Archive, Report 2019/953. <https://eprint.iacr.org/2019/953>
- 109 Groth, J. (2016). On the size of pairing-based non-interactive arguments. *Advances in*  
110 *Cryptology – EUROCRYPT 2016*, 9665, 305–326. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-49896-5\\_11](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-49896-5_11)
- 112 Meta. (2025). *Winterfell: A STARK prover and verifier for arbitrary computations* (Version  
113 0.12.0). <https://github.com/facebook/winterfell>
- 114 National Institute of Standards and Technology. (2024a). *Module-lattice-based key-*  
115 *encapsulation mechanism standard (FIPS 203)*. NIST. <https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.FIPS.203>
- 117 National Institute of Standards and Technology. (2024b). *Stateless hash-based digital signature*  
118 *standard (FIPS 205)*. NIST. <https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.FIPS.205>
- 119 Shor, P. W. (1999). Polynomial-time algorithms for prime factorization and discrete logarithms  
120 on a quantum computer. *SIAM Review*, 41(2), 303–332. <https://doi.org/10.1137/S003614498347011>
- 122 Solana Foundation. (2025a). *How to request optimal compute budget*. <https://solana.com/developers/guides/advanced/how-to-request-optimal-compute>
- 124 Solana Foundation. (2025b). *Transaction fees — compute units and limits*. <https://solana.com/docs/core/fees>
- 126 Solana Foundation. (2025c). *Transactions and instructions — transaction size limit*. <https://solana.com/docs/core/transactions>

- 128 Yano, J. (2025a). *Full L1 on-chain ZK-STARK+PQC verification on solana: A measurement*  
129 study. IACR Cryptology ePrint Archive, Report 2025/1741. <https://eprint.iacr.org/2025/1741>
- 131 Yano, J. (2025b). *Pqzk-labs/solana-pqzk-fullchain: Full on-chain ZK-STARK + PQC*  
132 verification on solana (Version v0.1.2). <https://github.com/pqzk-labs/solana-pqzk-fullchain>
- 133 Yano, J. (2025c). *Full L1 on-chain ZK-STARK+PQC verification on solana: A measurement*  
134 study. Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17186800>

DRAFT