

Axioms for Constant Function Market Makers*

Jan Christoph Schlegel¹, Mateusz Kwaśnicki², and Akaki Mamageishvili³

¹Department of Economics, City, University of London[†]

²Department of Pure Mathematics, Wrocław University of Science and Technology

³Offchain Labs

Abstract

We study axiomatic foundations for different classes of constant-function automated market makers (CFMMs). We focus particularly on separability and homogeneity properties and give axiomatic characterizations of a natural generalization of constant product market makers (CPMMs) that we call constant elasticity market makers (CEMMs). Moreover, we characterize the CPMM as an extremal point within the class of homogeneous, independent, symmetric AMMs with non-concentrated liquidity provision. Our results add to a formal analysis of mechanisms that are currently used for decentralized exchanges and introduce new tools to the topic.

1 Introduction

One of the first and so far most successful applications of Decentralized Finance (DeFi) are so-called Automated Market Makers (AMMs). They are used to trade cryptocurrencies algorithmically without relying on a custodian or trusted third party. The average daily volume of AMMs used in DeFi reached \$3.5B in 2022, while the total value locked in DeFi protocols at the time of writing this paper¹ is estimated to be \$45B. The considerable volume of assets traded on AMMs contrasts with their simple economic design which is notably different from the design of traditional financial exchanges. The state of a typical AMM used in DeFi consists of the current inventories of the traded tokens. Trades are made such that some invariant of these inventory sizes is kept constant. Traders who want to exchange tokens of type A for tokens of another type B , add A tokens to the inventory and in return obtain an amount of B tokens from the inventory so that the invariant is

*We thank Maxim Bichuch, Federico Echenique, Zach Feinstein, Tim Roughgarden, Ludvig Sinander and workshop and seminar participants at several venues for valuable comments.

[†]Corresponding author: jansc@alumni.ethz.ch

¹January 20th, 2023, data obtained from defilama.com.

maintained. The simplicity of these so-called constant function market makers (CFMMs) stems from the limited storage and computation capabilities of smart contract blockchains. In comparison to more conventional market designs such as limit order books, updating a simple function and inventories is relatively inexpensive to implement and scalable on smart contract blockchains such as Ethereum. Moreover, AMMs allow market participants to provide liquidity passively without having to trade themselves. This makes liquidity provision in AMMs a popular way of getting (negative) exposure to volatility while being compensated by a steady stream of fee income.

While CFMMs proved to be very popular and reliable, the construction of invariants to define them seems in many ways ad-hoc and not founded in much theory.² In this paper, we fill this gap and propose an axiomatic approach to constructing CFMMs which is inspired by axiomatic theories of measurement as developed for example in Krantz et al. (1971). The approach is, as in any axiomatic theory, to formalize simple principles that are implicitly or explicitly used when constructing trading functions in practice and to check which classes of functions satisfy these principles, beyond those functions already used in practice.

The constant product rule (CPMM) originally introduced by Uniswap, the most popular DeFi AMM by trading volume, has been particularly focal in DeFi applications. Our main results characterize a natural superclass of the CPMM resp. of its multi-dimensional analog, the (weighted) geometric mean,³ by three natural axioms. The CPMM rule is characterized by being trader optimal within this class. This gives a possible normative justification for the use of this rule. Our axioms formulate broad and natural design principles for the construction of CFMMs for DeFi.

The first is scale invariance, or, in a stronger form, homogeneity of the trading function, and guarantees that liquidity positions are fungible. Practically, the fungibility of liquidity positions allows tokenizing them in order to use them in other applications, for example as collateral or to combine them with other assets to new financial products. This is an instance of what is usually called the "composability" property of DeFi protocols. Geo-

²This contrasts with the earlier literature on AMMs for prediction markets where various theoretical contributions have been made. However, prediction markets are practically and theoretically different as we argue in Subsection 1.1.1.

³Weighted geometric means are for example used by Balancer, (Martinelli and Mushegian, 2019), the third largest DeFi AMM by trading volume. The constant product rule was used by Uniswap before its update to Version 3 in 2021 and is still in use in many other AMMs. The CPMM was replaced in V3 by a new design (Adams et al., 2021) that abandons fungibility of liquidity to allow for customized liquidity positions that can be chosen by individual liquidity providers. Fungibility of liquidity positions is captured by the scale invariance axioms that we discuss subsequently. The second largest DeFi AMM by trading volume, the Curve protocol (Egorov, 2019), is specifically designed to trade highly correlated tokens (such as stable coins or different representations of the same cryptocurrency). Our second main axiom, independence, is violated by the curve AMM. As we will argue, our main characterization implies separability of the market-making function, which is mainly appealing for situations where the price correlation between the traded tokens is imperfect. However, for the two-dimensional case, Theorem 3 characterizes a broad class (including the two-dimensional version of the curve formula) of generally non-separable CFMMs.

metrically, scale invariance means that liquidity curves through different liquidity levels can be obtained from each other, by projection along rays through the origin, analogous to how homothetic preferences in consumer theory can be constructed.

The second is independence which requires that the terms of trade for trading a subset of token types should not depend on the inventory level of not-traded token types. In the case of smooth liquidity curves, this is equivalent to requiring that the exchange rate for a token pair does not depend on the inventory levels of tokens not involved in the trade. Independence can be interpreted as a robustness property that helps to secure the AMM against certain kinds of price manipulation attacks (e.g. for the purpose of front- or back-running) where an exchange rate for a token pair is manipulated by adding or removing liquidity for a token not involved in the trading pair or by trading a different token pair. Independence can also naturally occur when different token pairs are traded in independently run AMMs.

The combination of scale invariance (or homogeneity) and independence leads to constant inventory elasticity: the terms of trade are fully determined by the inventory ratio of the pair traded, and, at the margin, percentage changes in exchange rates are proportional to percentage changes in inventory ratio. Combining the axioms we obtain the class of constant inventory elasticity⁴ market makers (CEMMs) (Theorem 1). This general class contains as special cases constant products, weighted geometric means as well as weighted means. We can combine the two axioms with one of two other axioms to obtain two characterization results: If we impose aversion to (im)permanent loss, which requires that liquidity curves are convex, then the elasticity in the above characterization is positive (Corollary 1). Alternatively, if we require un-concentrated liquidity⁵ then the elasticity in the above characterization is positive but smaller or equal 1 (Corollary 2).

If we further add symmetry in market making⁶, the AMMs in the class of scale invariant (or homogeneous), independent AMMs with un-concentrated liquidity can be ranked by the curvature of their liquidity curves which determines how favorably the terms of trade are from the point of view of traders; the constant product rule is characterized by being trader optimal within this class (Theorem 2).

The above characterizations are obtained for the case of more than two tokens traded in the AMM. For the case of exactly two tokens, the independence axiom is trivially satisfied and we generally obtain a much larger class of trading functions satisfying the above axioms of homogeneity, aversion to (im)permanent loss, un-concentrated liquidity and symmetry (Theorem 3). The class can no longer be completely ranked by the convexity of the induced

⁴The inventory elasticity of an AMM is a measure of how marginal prices change with the ratio of the inventories of the traded tokens. If the inventory elasticity is ϵ when the AMM holds x amount of A tokens and y amount of B tokens, then changing the inventory ratio y/x by 1% corresponds to changing the exchange rate of token A and B by $1/\epsilon\%$. For example, for the constant product rule, the inventory elasticity is 1 since the exchange rate is simply given by the inventory ratio y/x .

⁵Mathematically this means that liquidity curves do not intersect the axes.

⁶An AMM is symmetric if the names of the token types can be changed without changing how the market is made.

liquidity curves. However, if we focus on separable CFMMs we obtain the same kind of characterizations (Theorem 4 and Corollaries 5 and 6) as in the multi-dimensional case, as well as the same kind of optimality result for the CPMM (Theorem 5). In the two-dimensional case, separability of the trading function is a consequence of an additivity property for liquidity provision that we call LP additivity.

The axiomatic approach leads us to considerations and classes of functions familiar from other fields in economics, consumer theory, and production theory in particular where constant elasticity functions play an important role.⁷ A main technical contribution of the present paper is to derive the constant elasticity functional form from two natural properties, without relying on any differentiability or on convexity assumptions.

The paper is organized in the following way. In the next subsection, we briefly review the literature. In Section 2 we introduce notation and introduce various axioms. In Section 3, we provide characterization results for the case of more than two token types. In Section 4, we provide results for the case of two token types. In Appendix A, we show that the axioms used in the various characterizations are logically independent. In Appendix B we show how our result fails to hold for discontinuous liquidity curves.

1.1 Related Work

1.1.1 AMMs for prediction markets

Automated market makers have first been analyzed scientifically in the context of prediction markets (Hanson, 2007; Othman and Sandholm, 2010; Chen and Pennock, 2007; Chen et al., 2008; Abernethy et al., 2011; Othman et al., 2013). There are several important differences between the prediction market and the DeFi application that lead to different design considerations: Assets in a prediction market are artificially created Arrow-Debreu securities. Moreover, the market is sufficiently complete so that traders can hold a risk-less portfolio consisting of one unit of each security so that the portfolio always pays out one unit of numéraire in every state of the world. As a consequence of this, AMMs for a prediction market are usually assumed to satisfy "translation invariance" which means that the marginal prices of the traded assets measured in the numéraire always add up to one (see e.g. Chen and Pennock (2007)). Translation invariance is necessary for the equivalence between the trading (cost) function approach to AMMs and the original definition in terms of scoring rules (Hanson, 2007; Chen and Pennock, 2007), as well as for the formal equivalence to risk measures from finance (Othman and Sandholm, 2011). In contrast to that, the assets traded in DeFi are tokens with more complicated cross-price correlations and the market is highly incomplete. Therefore, translation invariance is usually violated by CFMMs used in DeFi and other axioms play a role in DeFi applications.

⁷Other connections to classical economic theory can be drawn as well. In Angeris et al. (2021), the authors introduce a dual way of defining AMMs through "portfolio value functions". The concept is mathematically equivalent to the concept of an expenditure function familiar from consumer theory with the completely analogous duality theory of expenditure minimization and preference maximization.

Related to the previous point, there is a difference in the choice of numéraire and its role in trading between the two applications. In prediction markets, the numéraire is usually a regular currency such as US dollars and traders exchange assets against the numéraire rather than swapping assets for each other. The counterparty at settlement is the prediction market organizer who sells the securities to traders and therefore is the sole liquidity provider. In the DeFi application, the numéraire is an "LP token" which is a derivative product that is a claim to a fraction of the pooled liquidity and the accrued trading fees of the AMM.

Finally, prediction market AMMs are usually constructed so that the prices converge quickly to an extreme. In contrast to this, AMMs used in DeFi are constructed so that it is much harder/costlier to move the price in an extreme way. For example, the AMM based on Hanson's logarithmic scoring rule (Hanson, 2007) is frequently discussed in the literature on prediction markets. The rule induces very concave liquidity curves, whereas typical AMMs for DeFi such as the constant product rule induces convex liquidity curves.

1.1.2 AMMs for DeFi

There are also similarities between prediction market AMMs and DeFi AMMs. DeFi AMMs can be used as "price oracles" which provide exchange rates between tokens to other blockchain applications, such as lending protocols, eliminating the need to obtain price information from an off-chain source. In Angeris and Chitra (2020) the authors study how well different AMMs function as a price oracle. Engel and Herlihy (2021) study axiomatization of composable AMMs. AMMs allowing exchanges of more than two tokens arise naturally by merging different AMMs exchanging only two token types. That is, a trader can split his trade across different AMMs. The problem of optimizing the order flow over different AMMs has been studied in Angeris et al. (2022c). Several papers consider trading and liquidity provision behavior for CPMMs. Park (2021) argues that CPMMs are susceptible to arbitrage opportunities in the presence of multiple competing exchanges. To fix the potential drain of resources from the AMM, Krishnamachari et al. (2021) proposes dynamic curves that use an additional input from a market price oracle to dynamically adjust the liquidity curve. Aoyagi (2020) determines equilibrium liquidity and expected profits for liquidity providers for CPMMs. Lehar and Parlour (2021) provide an empirical study of liquidity provision and pricing in a decentralized exchange (Uniswap) in comparison to a centralized exchange (Binance). Capponi and Jia (2021) study the incentives of liquidity providers and investors in AMMs in the presence of arbitrage. They also link it to design, the curvature of the trading function, and the number of pooled tokens. In independent work from ours,⁸ Bichuch and Feinstein (2022) introduce several properties of two-dimensional AMMs, check whether popular examples satisfy these properties, and study fees and impermanent loss. Our paper also relates to the earlier literature in eco-

⁸The original working paper version was published only a couple of days after our original working paper on arxiv.

nomics on CES functions in utility and production theory. In particular, Rader (1981) shows in the context of consumption choices over time that separable, homothetic, and quasi-concave utility functions are of the CES type.

2 Model and Axioms

A constant function market maker (CFMM) for a finite set of tokens $\mathcal{A} = \{A, B, \dots\}$ maintains an **inventory** $I \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathcal{A}}$ of tokens and makes a market according to a **trading function** $f : \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ where $f(I)$ is the value of the inventory measured in a numéraire. In decentralized exchanges, the inventory itself is usually tokenized and the unit of liquidity provider (LP) tokens can be used as numéraire. We make two assumptions throughout: The trading function is **strictly increasing** in all variables for strictly positive inventories and **continuous** in the sense that for each $J \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathcal{A}}$ the sets $\{I : f(I) \geq f(J)\}$ and $\{I : f(I) \leq f(J)\}$ are closed.⁹

Traders interact with the AMM by making **trades** $r \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{A}}$ which can take two forms

1. swapping tokens without involving the numéraire. Without transaction fees, this corresponds to trades $r \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{A}}$ with

$$f(I - r) = f(I).$$

The set of all inventory levels $I - r$ for trades r satisfying the previous equation is called a **liquidity curve** (or surface).

2. adding or removing liquidity in exchange for the numéraire. Without transaction fees this corresponds to trades r that are multiples of the current inventory

$$r = \lambda I \quad \text{for } \lambda \geq -1,$$

where the trader obtains $f(I - r) - f(I)$ units of the numéraire if he provides liquidity ($\lambda < 0$) and pays $f(I) - f(I - r)$ units of the numéraire if he removes liquidity ($\lambda > 0$).

The new inventory of the AMM after trading is $I - r$.¹⁰ Without transaction fees and assuming that the trader is endowed with enough numéraire good (or can borrow it), the restriction to two types of trades is without loss of generality: Any trade $r \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{A}}$ such that $I \geq r$ can be realized by a combination of swaps, liquidity addition and removal. In particular, a trader can exchange any token $A \in \mathcal{A}$ for the numéraire by first swapping some amount of A tokens for other tokens and afterward providing liquidity.

⁹Some of our results only require continuity on the boundary, see Appendix B.

¹⁰In the prediction market literature, AMMs are often defined in terms of cost functions $C : \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (Abernethy et al., 2011). Here $C(r)$ is the cost measured in the numéraire and incurred by traders from executing trade $r \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{A}}$. This formulation is equivalent to ours as can be seen as follows: Suppose that the initial inventory of the AMM before trading is I^0 . Then we can define a cost function by $C(r) = -f(I^0 - r)$. The cost of executing a trade r is equal to the loss of value of inventory if the inventory changes from I^0 to $I^0 - r$, which is $f(I^0 - r) - f(I^0)$.

Remark 1. *Our model implicitly assumes path independence of the AMM. This refers to the assumption that the trading function is a function only of the current inventory, but not of the past history of trades. See Abernethy et al. (2011) for a general model of path-dependent AMMs and a formal statement of the path independence axiom that we implicitly assume by focusing on trading functions that are a function of current inventories alone. CFMMs used in DeFi usually satisfy path independence if we abstract away from transaction fees.*

We introduce the following equivalence notion for CFMMs: two trading functions f, g are **equivalent** (for market making) if for all inventories I, J we have

$$f(I) = f(J) \Leftrightarrow g(I) = g(J).$$

Two equivalent CFMMs will always make the market in the same way in the sense that they induce the same family of liquidity curves and therefore offer the same terms of trade at the same inventory levels. However, they can differ in the cardinal measure of liquidity, e.g. by using different numéraires. Since trading functions f, g are increasing in all arguments, f and g are equivalent if and only if there is a strictly increasing function M on the range of f such that $M(f(I)) = g(I)$ for each $I \in \mathbb{R}_+^A$.

Popular examples of trading functions used in practice are:

- (weighted) geometric means Martinelli and Mushegian (2019) where

$$f_{\text{product}}(I) = \prod_{A \in \mathcal{A}} I_A^{\alpha_A},$$

which for the case of equal coefficients $\alpha_A = \alpha_B$ for $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$ contain the popular constant product rule,

- (weighted) means

$$f_{\text{mean}}(I) = \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} c_A I_A,$$

- "Uniswap V3" rules Adams et al. (2021) defined for the case of two tokens

$$f_{V3}(I_A, I_B) = \sqrt{(I_A + \alpha)(I_B + \beta)},$$

for $\alpha, \beta \geq 0$.

- "curve" rules Egorov (2019) which are implicitly defined by

$$\alpha n^n \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} I_A + f_{\text{curve}}(I) = \alpha n^n f_{\text{curve}}(I) + \frac{f_{\text{curve}}(I)^{n+1}}{n^n \prod_{A \in \mathcal{A}} I_A},$$

where $n := |\mathcal{A}|$, $\alpha > 0$ is a constant, and $f_{\text{curve}}(I)$ corresponds to the unique positive real solution of the above equation for inventory $I \in \mathbb{R}_+^A$ with $I > 0$.¹¹




Figure 1: Different CEMMs: elasticity of 1/2 (green), i.e. elasticity of 1 (blue) equivalent to constant product, the elasticity of 2 (yellow), infinite elasticity (orange) equivalent to constant sum.

Next, we define a class of AMMs that has been introduced under different names in DeFi (Niernerg et al., 2020; Othman, 2021; Wu and McTighe, 2022).¹² They are characterized by the property that, at the margin, the same percentage change in the exchange rate of two token types A and B always corresponds to the same percentage change in inventory ratio I_A/I_B (See Remark 1). The mean and geometric means are special cases.

- **Constant inventory elasticity AMMs (CEMMs)** parameterized by $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$f(I) = c \left(\sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \alpha_A I_A^\gamma \right)^{1/\gamma}, \quad \text{for } \gamma \neq 0,$$

and

$$f(I) = c \prod_{A \in \mathcal{A}} I_A^{\alpha_A}, \quad \text{for } \gamma = 0,$$

for constants c and $\alpha_A > 0$ with $\sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \alpha_A = 1$. We call $\frac{1}{1-\gamma}$ the **inventory elasticity** of the AMM, see also Remark 2. A CEMM has **positive** constant inventory elasticity if $\gamma \leq 1$.

¹¹In the following we use the notation $I > 0$ to denote that all inventories are positive, i.e. $I_A > 0$ for each $A \in \mathcal{A}$.

¹²The functional form is of course well known in economics, in particular in the theory of production to describe production processes where percentage changes in choices of production factors change proportionally to percentage changes in factor prices.

2.1 Basic properties of AMMs

Next, we introduce several axioms on trading function. First, we consider a differentiability condition that allows us to define marginal prices. Importantly, our characterization results will not assume differentiability, but it will be a consequence of the combination of other axioms that the characterized trading functions are smooth or equivalent to a smooth trading function.

Existence of Marginal Prices: The function f is differentiable everywhere.

Note that all of the above examples satisfy this property. Under this assumption, the **marginal price** of token $A \in \mathcal{A}$ measured in the numéraire is $\frac{\partial f}{\partial I_A}$. Thus, the **marginal exchange rate** of tokens A and B for $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$ is

$$p_{A,B}(I) \equiv \frac{\frac{\partial f}{\partial I_A}}{\frac{\partial f}{\partial I_B}}.$$

This means that if the current inventory of the AMM is I , then swapping token A for token B has, at the margin, an exchange rate of $p_{A,B}(I)$.

Remark 2. For the CEMMs defined above, there is a proportional relation between the inventory ratio I_B/I_A and changes in the relative marginal price of tokens A and B : In general, for any trading function f for which marginal prices exist, we can define the **inventory elasticity** between two token types $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$ at an inventory level I along the liquidity curve $I_B(I_A)$ through I , keeping inventory levels $I_{-A,B}$ of other token types fixed, by

$$\frac{d \log(I_B/I_A)}{d \log(p_{A,B}(I))} = \frac{d(I_B/I_A)}{dp_{A,B}(I)} \frac{p_{A,B}}{I_B/I_A},$$

where $I_B \equiv I_B(I_A)$. CEMMs are characterized by the property that the inventory elasticity is independent of the inventory level. For the CPMM a one percent increase in the inventory ratio leads to a one percent increase in the marginal exchange rate. More generally, for a CEMM with parameter γ , a one percent increase in the inventory ratio leads to an increase of $1 - \gamma$ percent in the marginal exchange rate.

Related to this, the CPMM is characterized by the feature that the value of the inventory of type A tokens measured in the numéraire $\frac{\partial f}{\partial I_A} I_A$ is always equal to the value of the inventory of type B tokens measured in the numéraire $\frac{\partial f}{\partial I_B} I_B$.

It is a desirable property of an AMM to have an increasing marginal cost for swapping tokens as the trade size increases. In other words, liquidity curves should be convex. This is related to the notion of (im)permanent loss for liquidity providers: The (im)permanent loss of a liquidity provider is given by the market exposure of the liquidity position: If the exchange rate of the two tokens moves a lot, holding and providing liquidity performs

worse than keeping the equivalent amount of A and B tokens without providing liquidity. If the marginal cost for the appreciating token is increasing then inducing a price change that induces (im)permanent loss is more expensive for the market.

Aversion to permanent loss: For each constant $k > 0$ the curve

$$f(\cdot) = k$$

is convex, i.e., for each $0 < \lambda < 1$, $I, J \in \mathbb{R}_+^A$ with $f(I) = f(J)$ we have

$$f(\lambda I + (1 - \lambda)J) \geq f(I) = f(J).$$

If the trading function f satisfies the existence of marginal prices, then aversion to permanent loss for two token types is equivalent to assuming that the relative marginal price is decreasing as a function of I_A along each liquidity curve, i.e. $p_{A,B}(I_A, I_B(I_A), I_{-A,B})$ is decreasing in I_A . All examples of trading functions considered above, except for CEMMs with negative elasticity, satisfy aversion to permanent loss. Aversion to permanent loss is assumed as a basic assumption in large parts of the literature on CFMMs, see Angeris and Chitra (2020); Angeris et al. (2021, 2022b,a); Capponi and Jia (2021).

Next, we consider the property that the AMM is always able to make the market no matter how large the trade size is. Geometrically this means that liquidity curves do not intersect the axes. Recall that we use $I > 0$ to indicate that all dimensions of $I \in \mathbb{R}_+^A$ are strictly positive and define:

Sufficient Funds: For each $I, J \in \mathbb{R}_+^A$ with $f(I) = f(J)$ we have

$$I > 0 \Rightarrow J > 0.$$

Remark 3. *If the sufficient funds condition is violated, then we have concentrated liquidity, which means that the AMM accepts trades only up to a bounded size. This sometimes is desirable, for example for the purpose of risk management for liquidity providers. The Uniswap V3 rules are an example of a trading function with concentrated liquidity and therefore of a violation of the sufficient funds' condition. CEMMs satisfy it for positive inventory elasticity smaller or equal 1 and violate it for negative inventory elasticity and for inventory elasticity of more than 1.*

The next requirement is that liquidity curves should be invariant under the scaling of the inventory. The interpretation is straightforward: If liquidity is added or removed from the AMM proportionally to the current inventory levels for each token then the exchange rate of the token should not change.

Scale invariance: For each $I, J \in \mathbb{R}_+^A$ and $\lambda > 0$

$$f(I) = f(J) \Rightarrow f(\lambda I) = f(\lambda J).$$

Invariance under scaling of the inventory has been assumed or discussed in previous work, usually in the stronger form of (positive) homogeneity (Capponi and Jia, 2021) or (positive) linear homogeneity (Othman, 2021; Angeris et al., 2022a). In practice, liquidity is tokenized so that it becomes fungible and tradable. For this to be possible we need that the value of the inventory (that is tokenized) scales proportionally with the inventory.

Homogeneity in Liquidity: For each $I \in \mathbb{R}_+^A$ and $\lambda > 0$

$$f(\lambda I) = \lambda f(I).$$

It is straightforward to see that each scale-invariant trading function is equivalent to a (linearly) homogeneous trading function. So we can obtain our subsequent results alternatively for equivalence classes of scale invariant trading functions or for homogeneous trading functions (analogously if we would require positive homogeneity of degree k instead we would obtain the same classes of functions re-scaled by a monotonic transformation with the k -th power function).

Remark 4. *From the above examples, the Uniswap V3 rule violates scale invariance whereas the other rules satisfy it. This means that liquidity can be made fungible for all of these rules except for the Uniswap V3.*

Finally, we consider a symmetry axiom that requires that in the absence of additional information on the nature of the tokens, the market should be made in the same way if the names of the tokens are flipped:

Symmetry For each permutation $\pi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ and $I \in \mathbb{R}_+^A$ we have

$$f(I) = f((I_{\pi(A)})_{A \in \mathcal{A}}).$$

All above examples (for the CEMMs and geometric means coefficients need to be chosen the same for all tokens, $c_A = c_B$ for $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$) satisfy symmetry.

3 Characterization for more than two token types

In this section, we provide several characterizations of AMMs for more than two token types. In Section 4 we consider extensions to the case of exactly two token types where it is necessary to introduce a different axiom.

Many popular AMMs used in practice, can be equivalently described with a separable liquidity curve of the form:

$$\sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \phi_A(I_A) = k.$$

Also, CPMs, or more generally weighted geometric means, belong to this class because the curve can be brought to the above form by using a logarithmic transformation.¹³ Separability turns out to be a consequence of an independence property that can be a desirable feature of an AMM: we call the marginal exchange rate between two tokens *independent* from other token types if the marginal exchange rate is a function of the inventories of these two tokens alone and does not depend on the inventory of a third token type.

Example 1. Consider the following non-separable trading function for three token types:

$$f(I) = I_A I_B + I_A I_C + I_B I_C.$$

The marginal exchange rate between A and B is given by

$$p_{A,B}(I) = \frac{I_B + I_C}{I_A + I_C},$$

which depends on the inventory of token C .

Independence occurs naturally if different token pairs are traded in autonomous AMMs that do not directly influence each other, which is a common design choice of DeFi protocols. Independence can also be desirable as a robustness property: Price manipulation, e.g. for the purpose of a front and back-running attack, is a frequent concern in decentralized finance. Independence eliminates the possibility of certain types of such attacks; for example it is not possible to manipulate an exchange rate for a token pair by providing liquidity for a different token or by trading another token pair not involved in the original pair. Generally, independence is a desirable property, unless the traded tokens are highly correlated in value or are different representation of the same underlying type of asset. This would for example be the case for stable coin pairs. In the latter case, it is often desirable that each trade affects all tokens involved in the AMM.

Independence can more generally be formulated without the assumption of the existence of marginal prices which allowed us to refer to marginal exchanges rates. In the more general formulation, independence requires that the terms of trade for trading a subset of tokens $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ does not depend on the inventory levels for the other tokens $\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{B}$.

Independence: For each subset of token types $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ and inventories I, J we have

$$f(I_{\mathcal{B}}, J_{-\mathcal{B}}) = f(J) \Leftrightarrow f(I) = f(J_{\mathcal{B}}, I_{-\mathcal{B}}).$$

¹³To cover the case of 0 inventories, we would allow for negatively infinite values of f on the boundary in that case.

The independence axiom only has a bite for more than two token types. In that case, independence and monotonicity allow us to obtain an equivalent separable representation (see Krantz et al. (1971), Section 6.11) of the trading function. The possibility of such representation crucially depends on the assumption of more than two tokens. In Section 4, we show that we need an additional axiom, LP additivity, which we do not need for the case of more than two tokens.

Combining separability with scale invariance imposes additional structure on the functions $\{\phi_A\}_{A \in \mathcal{A}}$. With scale invariance, we can show that the functions $\{\phi_A\}_{A \in \mathcal{A}}$ have to be of the power form ($\phi_A = c_A I_A^\gamma$) or logarithmic form. In particular, the combination of scale invariance and separability implies the existence of marginal prices everywhere, i.e. smoothness of the liquidity curve is a consequence of scale invariance and independence. This is the content of the following theorem:

Theorem 1. *A trading function for $|\mathcal{A}| > 2$ tokens satisfies independence and scale invariance if and only if it is equivalent to a CEMM.*

Proof. One readily checks that CEMMs satisfy both axioms.

Continuity, monotonicity, and independence imply by a classical result (see Krantz et al. (1971) Section 6.11) that f is equivalent to a trading function \tilde{f} satisfying the separability condition: there are one-dimensional, continuous, increasing functions $\{\phi_A\}_{A \in \mathcal{A}}$ such that

$$\tilde{f}(I) = \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \phi_A(I_A).$$

The major part of the proof consists in showing that the functions $\{\phi_A\}_{A \in \mathcal{A}}$ are monomials or logarithms, up to addition by a constant.

We choose a token type $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and we fix arbitrary inventory levels J . For $t > 0$ we define $\alpha(t)$ and $\beta(t)$ implicitly by

$$\tilde{f}(e^{\alpha(t)} J) = \tilde{f}(e^t J_A, J_{-A}), \quad \tilde{f}(e^{\beta(t)} J) = \tilde{f}(J_A, e^t J_{-A}).$$

Recall that \tilde{f} is continuous and, by monotonicity,

$$\tilde{f}(J) < \tilde{f}(e^t J_A, J_{-A}) < \tilde{f}(e^t J).$$

Thus, $\alpha(t)$ is well-defined and $0 < \alpha(t) < t$. Similarly, $\beta(t)$ is well-defined and $0 < \beta(t) < t$.

By scale invariance, we find that for every real s ,

$$\tilde{f}(e^{s+\alpha(t)} J) = \tilde{f}(e^{s+t} J_A, e^s J_{-A}), \quad \tilde{f}(e^{s+\beta(t)} J) = \tilde{f}(e^s J_A, e^{s+t} J_{-A}),$$

and separability implies that

$$\tilde{f}(e^{s+t} J_A, e^s J_{-A}) + \tilde{f}(e^s J_A, e^{s+t} J_{-A}) = \tilde{f}(e^s J) + \tilde{f}(e^{s+t} J).$$

It follows that

$$\tilde{f}(e^{s+\alpha(t)}J) + \tilde{f}(e^{s+\beta(t)}J) = \tilde{f}(e^sJ) + \tilde{f}(e^{s+t}J).$$

In other words, if we define

$$\phi(t) = \tilde{f}(e^tJ),$$

then ϕ is increasing and for every real s and every $t > 0$,

$$\phi(s + \alpha(t)) - \phi(s) = \phi(s + t) - \phi(s + \beta(t)), \quad (1)$$

where $0 < \alpha(t) < t$ and $0 < \beta(t) < t$. We claim that the above properties imply that, up to addition by a constant, ϕ is an exponential function or a linear function.

Suppose first that ϕ has continuous second-order derivatives, and ϕ' is everywhere positive. By a direct calculation and continuity of ϕ'' ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\phi(s + \alpha(t) + \beta(t)) - \phi(s + \beta(t)) - (\phi(s + \alpha(t)) - \phi(s))}{\alpha(t)\beta(t)} \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \int_0^1 \frac{\phi'(s + \alpha(t) + \beta(t)y) - \phi'(s + \beta(t)y)}{\alpha(t)} dy \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \phi''(s + \alpha(t)x + \beta(t)y) dx dy = \phi''(s). \end{aligned}$$

By combining the previous identity with equation (1), we obtain

$$\phi''(s) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\phi(s + \alpha(t) + \beta(t)) - \phi(s + t)}{\alpha(t)\beta(t)}.$$

However, since ϕ' is positive and continuous, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\phi(s + \alpha(t) + \beta(t)) - \phi(s + t)}{\alpha(t)\beta(t)} \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\phi(s + \alpha(t) + \beta(t)) - \phi(s + t)}{\alpha(t) + \beta(t) - t} \frac{\alpha(t) + \beta(t) - t}{\alpha(t)\beta(t)} \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \int_0^1 \phi'(s + t + (\alpha(t) + \beta(t) - t)x) dx \times \frac{\alpha(t) + \beta(t) - t}{\alpha(t)\beta(t)} \\ &= \phi'(s) \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\alpha(t) + \beta(t) - t}{\alpha(t)\beta(t)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the limit $\gamma := \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\alpha(t) + \beta(t) - t}{\alpha(t)\beta(t)}$ exists and for every real s we have

$$\phi''(s) = \gamma\phi'(s).$$

By solving this differential equation, we conclude that for some real constants c, d ,

$$\phi(s) = \begin{cases} ce^{\gamma s} + d & \text{if } \gamma \neq 0, \\ cs + d & \text{if } \gamma = 0. \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

In the general case, when ϕ is not assumed to be smooth, we use an approximation argument. Let η_n be an approximation to the identity: $\eta_n(x) = n\eta(nx)$, where η is a non-negative smooth compactly supported function, and let ϕ_n be the convolution of ϕ and η_n :

$$\phi_n(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \phi(s)\eta_n(t-s)ds.$$

Then ϕ_n is smooth, and since ϕ is increasing, ϕ_n' is everywhere positive. Furthermore, it is straightforward to check that ϕ_n satisfies (1). By the argument given above under the assumption that ϕ is smooth, there is a real number γ such that we have

$$\phi_n(s) = \begin{cases} c_n e^{\gamma s} + d_n & \text{if } \gamma \neq 0, \\ c_n s + d_n & \text{if } \gamma = 0, \end{cases}$$

where c_n, d_n are appropriate constants. Since ϕ_n converges pointwise to ϕ , we conclude that (2) also holds in the general case, and our claim is proved.

Finally, we consider the extension of the ray through the origin and J . Recall that $\phi(t) = \tilde{f}(e^t J)$, and that $\alpha(t)$ was defined in such a way that

$$\tilde{f}(e^{s+t} J_A, e^s J_{-A}) = \tilde{f}(e^{s+\alpha(t)} J) = \phi(s + \alpha(t)).$$

By separability,

$$\phi_A(e^{s+t} J_A) - \phi_A(e^s J_A) = \tilde{f}(e^{s+t} J_A, e^s J_{-A}) - \tilde{f}(e^s J) = \phi(s + \alpha(t)) - \phi(s).$$

Let $I_A > 0$ and let $s > 0$ such that $I_A = e^s J_A$. We already know that ϕ' is continuous and everywhere positive and that $0 < \alpha(t) < t$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\phi_A(e^t I_A) - \phi_A(I_A)}{t} &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\phi(s + \alpha(t)) - \phi(s)}{t} \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\alpha(t)}{t} \int_0^1 \phi'(s + \alpha(t)x) dx \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\alpha(t)}{t} \phi'(s). \end{aligned}$$

Formally, in the above identity we pass to the limit as $t \rightarrow 0^+$ along a subsequence such that $\frac{\alpha(t)}{t}$ converges to some limit α_0 . It follows that ϕ_A is differentiable, and

$$I_A \phi'_A(I_A) = \alpha_0 \phi'(s) = \alpha_0 \phi'(\log(I_A/J_A)).$$

We conclude that

$$\phi_A(I_A) = \begin{cases} c_A I_A^\gamma + d_A & \text{if } \gamma \neq 0, \\ c_A \log I_A + d_A & \text{if } \gamma = 0, \end{cases}$$

where c_A and d_A are appropriate constants. Since ϕ_A is increasing, we have $c_A > 0$ when $\gamma \geq 0$, and $c_A < 0$ when $\gamma < 0$.

The token type A was chosen arbitrarily, and therefore

$$\tilde{f}(I) = \begin{cases} d + \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} c_A I_A^\gamma & \text{if } \gamma \neq 0, \\ d + \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} c_A \log I_A & \text{if } \gamma = 0, \end{cases}$$

where $d = \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} d_A$.

Let $c = \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} c_A$. By applying the monotonic transformation

$$M(z) = \begin{cases} (z - d)^{1/\gamma} & \text{when } \gamma > 0, \\ e^{(z-d)/c} & \text{when } \gamma = 0, \\ (d - z)^{1/\gamma} & \text{when } \gamma < 0, \end{cases}$$

we see that \tilde{f} and therefore f is equivalent to a trading function with constant inventory elasticity with parameter γ and coefficients $\alpha_A := |c_A|$ when $\gamma \neq 0$ or $\alpha_A := c_A/c$ when $\gamma = 0$. \square

It is straightforward to see that if the trading function additionally satisfies aversion to permanent loss then the inventory elasticity is positive:

Corollary 1. *A trading function for $|\mathcal{A}| > 2$ tokens satisfies independence, scale invariance, and aversion to permanent loss if and only if it is equivalent to a CEMM with positive inventory elasticity.*

Proof. Note that the liquidity curves defined by constant inventory elasticity are convex if and only if $\gamma \leq 1$. Thus, by the aversion to permanent loss, the inventory elasticity $\frac{1}{1-\gamma}$ is positive. \square

Constant elasticity liquidity curves intersect with the axes only if the elasticity is greater than 1. Therefore we have the following corollary:

Corollary 2. *A trading function for $|\mathcal{A}| > 2$ tokens satisfies independence, scale invariance, and sufficient funds if and only if it is equivalent to a CEMM with inventory elasticity $0 < 1/(1-\gamma) \leq 1$.*

Proof. This follows from the fact that the surface defined by $\sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} I_A^\gamma = k$ for $k > 0$ intersects with the axes for $\gamma > 0$ but not for $\gamma < 0$. For $\gamma = 0$ one immediately sees that geometric averages satisfy the sufficient funds' condition. \square

It is straightforward to see that if scale invariance is replaced by homogeneity in the above characterizations the AMM is not only equivalent to a CEMM, but it actually *is* a CEMM. We get the following version of Corollary 1, an analogous version of Corollary 2 also holds.

Corollary 3. *A trading function for $|\mathcal{A}| > 2$ tokens satisfies independence, homogeneity in liquidity, and aversion to permanent loss if and only if it is a CEMM with positive inventory elasticity.*

Proof. We have a homogeneous liquidity function f and a strictly increasing function M such that

$$f(I) = M\left(\sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \alpha_A I_A^\gamma\right)$$

with $0 \neq \gamma \leq 1$ respectively

$$f(I) = M\left(\prod_{A \in \mathcal{A}} I_A^{\alpha_A}\right)$$

for constants $\alpha_A > 0$ with $\sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \alpha_A = 1$. In the first case, by homogeneity in liquidity, the monotone transformation M is of the form

$$M(z) = cz^{1/\gamma}$$

for a constant $c > 0$. For $\gamma = 0$, by homogeneity in liquidity, the monotone transformation is of the form $M(z) = cz$. Therefore the AMM defined by f is of the constant elasticity form. \square

The class of functions can be further narrowed down by adding the symmetry axiom which is natural in most applications. In the case of symmetry, the coefficients in the constant inventory formula are the same, i.e. $\alpha_A = \alpha_B$ for $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$. CFMMs in the class of scale-invariant, independent, symmetric, and sufficiently funded AMMs can be ranked (e.g. according to the Arrow-Pratt criterion) by the convexity of their induced liquidity curves. Convexity of liquidity curves has a natural interpretation: If a liquidity curve is more convex than another liquidity curve than starting from a balanced inventory, the latter offers better terms of trade to the trader than the former and vice versa for liquidity providers.¹⁴ More formally, define a partial order on trading functions such that $f \succsim g$ if for each pair $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$, for each inventory level I with $I_A = I_B$, f offers more favorable terms of trade than g , i.e. for $x > 0$ and $y, y' > 0$ such that $f(I_A + x, I_B - y, I_{-A,B}) = f(I)$ and $g(I_A + x, I_B - y', I_{-A,B}) = g(I)$ we have $y \geq y'$. Then we have the following theorem:

¹⁴The issue becomes more complex when liquidity provision is endogenous and fee revenues are considered. Capponi and Jia (2021) study the optimal choice of curvature among convex combinations of the constant sum and the constant product rule in an environment where liquidity providers, investors and arbitrageurs interact. In their model, equilibrium payoffs for liquidity providers and investors are non-monotone in the curvature.

Theorem 2. *Let $|\mathcal{A}| > 2$. The constant product rule $f_{product}$ is trader optimal within the class of scale-invariant, independent, symmetric, and sufficiently funded AMMs, that is for each scale-invariant, independent, symmetric, and sufficiently funded g we have $f_{product} \succsim g$ where $f_{product} \sim g$ if and only if g equivalent to $f_{product}$.*

Proof. Let $J \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathcal{A}}$ with $J_A = J_B =: \bar{I}$ for $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$. Let $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$ be two token types and consider the curve $I_B(I_A)$ implicitly defined by $f_{product}(I_{A,B}, J_{-A,B}) = f_{product}(J)$. The curve is given by the equation

$$I_B(I_A) = \frac{\bar{I}^2}{I_A}.$$

Similarly, consider the curve $I_B(I_A)$ implicitly defined by $g(I_{A,B}, J_{-A,B}) = g(J)$ for an AMM g with constant inventory elasticity $0 < 1/(1 - \gamma) < 1$. The curve is given by the equation

$$I_B(I_A) = (2\bar{I}^\gamma - I_A^\gamma)^{1/\gamma}.$$

Next note that for each $I_A > \bar{I}$ we have a larger inventory of type B tokens after trading $I_A - \bar{I}$ type A tokens for type B tokens under g than under $f_{product}$, since (as $\gamma < 0$ and $I_A > \bar{I}$)

$$(2\bar{I}^\gamma - I_A^\gamma)^{1/\gamma} \geq \frac{\bar{I}^2}{I_A}.$$

Since the inventory of type B is smaller under the product rule than under g , the trader has obtained more type B tokens in exchange for $x = I_A - \bar{I}$ type A tokens under the product rule than under g . \square

Remark 5. *We can alternatively consider the price impact a trader has on the AMM when trading against it. This has been formalized in Angeris et al. (2022b). Starting with an inventory I , f is locally more price-stable than g if there is a $\bar{x} > 0$ such that for each $\bar{x} > x > 0$ and $y, y' > 0$ with $f(I_A + x, I_B - y, I_{-A,B}) = f(I)$ and $g(I_A + x, I_B - y', I_{-A,B}) = g(I)$ the exchange rate under f has moved less through the trade than under g :*

$$p_{A,B}^f(I_A + x, I_B - y, I_{-A,B}) - p_{A,B}^f(I) \leq p_{A,B}^g(I_A + x, I_B - y', I_{-A,B}) - p_{A,B}^g(I).$$

It is a straightforward calculation that starting from a balanced inventory I with $I_A = I_B$ the product rule is locally more price-stable than any other CEMM with $\gamma < 0$.

3.1 Duality and Portfolio Value Functions

There is a dual description of trading functions satisfying the aversion to permanent loss in terms of portfolio value functions, see Angeris et al. (2021). Next, we show that we can alternatively reformulate Corollary 3 in a dual way by imposing an independence property on the portfolio value function.

A **portfolio value function** induced by the trading function f at a level $k > 0$ is defined for each $p \in \mathbb{R}_+^A$ by

$$V_k(p) := \inf\{p \cdot I : f(I) \geq k\}.$$

The interpretation is as follows: if an arbitrageur has access to an infinitely liquid external market where prices measured in some numéraire are currently given by p , then starting from any inventory level J with $f(J) = k$, the arbitrageur can maximally extract $p \cdot J - V_k(p)$ units of the numéraire good. Equivalently, the value of the inventory of the AMM measured in the numéraire on the external market and after interaction with the arbitrageur is $V_k(p)$.

Similarly to the independence axiom for trading functions, we can formulate an independence axiom for portfolio value functions that states that the value of a portfolio is separable in the different token types.

Independence for portfolio value functions: For each subset of token types $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ and price vectors p, q we have

$$V_k(p_{\mathcal{B}}, q_{-\mathcal{B}}) = V_k(q) \Leftrightarrow V_k(p) = V_k(q_{\mathcal{B}}, p_{-\mathcal{B}}).$$

We can reformulate the content of Corollary 3 in a dual way, by characterizing AMMs with positive constant inventory elasticity by independence. The result is a straightforward consequence of Corollary 3:

Corollary 4 (Dual version of Corollary 3). *Let f be a trading function satisfying the aversion to permanent loss so that it can be equivalently described by a family of portfolio value function $\{V_k\}_{k \geq 0}$. The following statements are equivalent:*

1. *The portfolio value functions $\{V_k\}_{k > 0}$ are re-scaled versions of each other, $V_k(p) = kV_1(p)$ for each $k > 0$, strictly increasing in prices and independent.*
2. *The trading function f is of constant inventory elasticity with parameter $\gamma < 1$.*
3. *The portfolio value functions $\{V_k\}_{k > 0}$ are of the form*

$$V_k(p) = c \left(\sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \alpha_A p_A^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}} \right)^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}} k,$$

when $0 \neq \gamma < 1$ resp.

$$V_k(p) = c \left(\prod_{A \in \mathcal{A}} p_A^{\alpha_A} \right) k,$$

when $\gamma = 0$ for $c > 0$ and $\alpha_A > 0$ with $\sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \alpha_A = 1$.

Proof. First note that, by definition, the portfolio value function is homogeneous in prices $V_k(\lambda p) = \lambda V_k(p)$. By the same mathematical argument as in the proof of Theorem 1 and Corollary 3, independence, strict monotonicity in prices, and homogeneity of V_1 imply that it is of the form

$$V_1(p) = \begin{cases} c (\sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} p_A^\rho)^{1/\rho}, & \rho \neq 0, \\ c \prod_{A \in \mathcal{A}} p_A^{\alpha_A}, & \rho = 0, \end{cases}$$

for a parameter $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$. By definition, portfolio value functions are concave in prices and therefore $\rho \leq 1$. Since the trading function f is strictly increasing, we have strict inequality $\rho < 1$. Define $\gamma = \frac{\rho}{\rho-1}$. Then we get that V_1 is of the form in (3). If the portfolio functions are a re-scaled version of each other, we also get that all V_k are of the form in (3). The opposite direction that (3) implies (1) can be verified immediately. The equivalence between (2) and (3) follows from straightforward calculations. \square

Remark 6. *Note that the constant mean AMMs (the case $\gamma = 1$) are excluded in the above characterization. Since exchange rates are constant for the mean, the portfolio value function is not strictly increasing in prices in that case. Furthermore, portfolio value functions that are linear in prices are also excluded because there is no strictly increasing trading function that induces this value function. In both cases, the dual function of the linear function would be given by a weighted minimum.*

4 Characterizations for two tokens

In this section, we provide axiomatizations of different classes of CFMMs for the case of two tokens. An important difference to the multi-dimensional case is that independence does not put any restriction on the trading function. On the other hand separability is still with loss of generality.¹⁵ Therefore, we subsequently explore two directions. First we study axiomatizations for the general, non-separable case, while otherwise maintaining the axioms from the previous section. This leads to a large class of "concave" CFMMs that can be described by concave increasing bijections on the unit interval. Second we consider the separable case, where similar results as in the higher dimensional case can be obtained. To obtain separability, we introduce a new axiom "LP additivity" that is sufficient (and necessary) for the separability of trading functions.

4.1 Characterization without Separability

The next characterization result states that the space of all symmetric, homogeneous, sufficiently funded CFMMs satisfying aversion to permanent loss can be described by concave increasing bijections on the unit interval. The bijection encodes how the AMM should react to imbalances in the liquidity ratio I_B/I_A , see Figure 2.

¹⁵Examples of non-separable and homogeneous CFMMs are the two-dimensional version of the curve family f_{curve} defined above.




Figure 2: The left plot displays a liquidity curve and the right plot the function g for a) the two-dimensional curve rule f_{curve} with $\alpha = 1$ (red) b) the rule defined by $f(I) = \sqrt[3]{I_A^2 I_B + I_A I_B^2}$ (yellow), c) the constant product rule (green) d) the constant elasticity rule with $\gamma = -1$ (blue). The steeper the function in the beginning and the flatter the function in the end the more the exchange rate changes with trading if the inventory is imbalanced and the less it changes with trading if the inventory is balanced. The dashed black line gives the upper envelope of permissible functions g .

Theorem 3. *A trading function f satisfies homogeneity in liquidity, symmetry, sufficient funds, and aversion to permanent loss if and only if it is of the form*

$$f(I) = \begin{cases} cI_A g\left(\frac{I_B}{I_A}\right), & \text{for } I_A \geq I_B \\ cI_B g\left(\frac{I_A}{I_B}\right), & \text{for } I_B \geq I_A \end{cases}$$

for a constant $c > 0$ and an increasing and concave bijection $g : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$, with $\lim_{z \rightarrow 1^-} g'(z) = \frac{1}{2}$ where the limit is along a sequence of points where g is differentiable.

Proof. It is straightforward to see that an AMM that is represented in this way satisfies the axioms. For the opposite direction, note that aversion to permanent loss means that f is quasi-concave. By a theorem of Friedman (1973), monotonicity, homogeneity, and quasi-concavity of f imply that f is a concave function. Next define $g(z) := f(1, z)/f(1, 1)$ and $c := f(1, 1)$. By homogeneity we have

$$cI_A g\left(\frac{I_B}{I_A}\right) = I_A f\left(1, \frac{I_B}{I_A}\right) = f(I).$$

Concavity implies coordinate-wise concavity, and therefore concavity of f implies that g is concave. By symmetry, the representation also works for $I_B \geq I_A$. By sufficient funds, for

each $k > 0$ the curve $I_B(I_A)$ implicitly defined by $f(I) = k$ satisfies $\lim_{I_A \rightarrow 0^-} I_B(I_A) = \infty$, where we take the limit along a sequence of inventories where the liquidity curve is differentiable. This is possible as convex real-valued functions are almost everywhere differentiable. Therefore we have $\lim_{z \rightarrow 0^+} g(z) = \lim_{I_A \rightarrow 0^+} g(I_A/I_B(I_A)) = \lim_{I_A \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{k}{cI_B(I_A)} = 0$ where the first limit is along a sequence of inventory ratios where g is differentiable (this is possible as concave real-valued functions are almost everywhere differentiable). By continuity and homogeneity of f we have $f(0,0) = 0$. By monotonicity and continuity of f , $0 = f(0,0) \leq f(1,0)/f(1,1) = g(0) \leq \lim_{z \rightarrow 0^+} g(z) = 0$ and therefore $g(0) = 0$. By construction we have $g(1) = 1$. Since g is increasing this implies that g is a bijection of $[0, 1]$. For any inventory I where the liquidity curve is differentiable, we have with $z = I_B/I_A$ that

$$p_{A,B}(I) \equiv p_{A,B}(z) = \frac{g(z)}{g'(z)} - z.$$

Consider a sequence of inventory ratios approaching 1 on which g is differentiable (which exists by the same logic as above). By aversion to permanent loss and symmetry, the exchange rate along this sequence needs to approach 1. Therefore

$$1 = \lim_{z \rightarrow 1^-} p_{A,B}(z) = \lim_{z \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{g(z)}{g'(z)} - z = \frac{1}{\lim_{z \rightarrow 1^-} g'(z)} - 1 \Rightarrow \lim_{z \rightarrow 1^-} g'(z) = \frac{1}{2}.$$

□

With the representation above the CPMM can be obtained through the function $g(z) = \sqrt{z}$, as

$$p_{A,B}(z) = \frac{g(z)}{g'(z)} - z$$

where $z \equiv I_B/I_A$ is the inventory ratio. The expression is linear in z for the square root function.

4.2 Separability Axioms

Separability is more natural as an assumption for more than two token types, since it is related to independence in that case (see Section 3). For two tokens, independence has no bite. To guarantee separability in the two-dimensional case, instead, we need that liquidity provision is additive in the following sense: imagine that a liquidity provider wants to provide liquidity in either of the two tokens.¹⁶ Suppose that starting from an inventory level I , the liquidity provider obtains the same amount of numéraire (LP tokens) by either providing x units of type A tokens or by providing y units of type B tokens. Suppose furthermore that starting from an inventory level $(I_A + x, I_B + y)$, the liquidity provider

¹⁶As argued above, exchanging one token for the numéraire (LP tokens), i.e. providing liquidity in one token, can always be emulated by first swapping some amount of that token for the other token and afterwards providing liquidity for both tokens.




Figure 3: Three liquidity curves from the additivity axiom.

obtains the same amount of numéraire by either providing \tilde{x} units of type A tokens or by providing \tilde{y} units of type B tokens. Then starting from I , the liquidity provider should obtain the same amount of numéraire by providing $x + \tilde{x}$ units of type A tokens as by providing $y + \tilde{y}$ units of type B tokens. This leads to the following condition which is often called the Thomsen condition Krantz et al. (1971) in decision theory:

Liquidity Provision (LP) Additivity: For each I and quantities $x, y, \tilde{x}, \tilde{y}$ such that

$$f(I_A, I_B + y) = f(I_A + x, I_B), \quad f(I_A + x + \tilde{x}, I_B + y) = f(I_A + x, I_B + y + \tilde{y})$$

we have

$$f(I_A + x + \tilde{x}, I_B) = f(I_A, I_B + y + \tilde{y}).$$

Replacing the independence axiom with the LP additivity axiom we obtain the following characterization for the two-dimensional case:

Theorem 4. *A trading function satisfies LP additivity and scale invariance if and only if it is equivalent to a CEMM.*

Proof. One readily checks that constant inventory elasticity AMMs satisfy both axioms.

Monotonicity, continuity, and LP additivity imply by a classical result (see Krantz et al. (1971) Section 6.2) that f is equivalent to a trading function \tilde{f} for which there are one-dimensional, increasing functions ϕ_A, ϕ_B such that

$$\tilde{f}(I) = \phi_A(I_A) + \phi_B(I_B).$$

The construction of the additive representation proceeds by constructing a self-mapping of the plane that maps liquidity curves into lines with a negative slope, and lines parallel to the axes into lines parallel to the axes. The remainder of the proof follows the same logic as the proof of Theorem 1. \square

We also obtain corresponding corollaries to Corollaries 1, 2 and 3. The proofs are completely analogous to the multi-dimensional case with independence replaced by LP additivity.

Corollary 5. *A trading function satisfies LP additivity, scale invariance, and aversion to permanent loss if and only if it is equivalent to a CEMM with positive inventory elasticity.*

Corollary 6. *A trading function satisfies LP additivity, scale invariance, and sufficient funds if and only if it is equivalent to an AMM with positive constant inventory elasticity $\frac{1}{1-\gamma} \leq 1$.*

Corollary 7. *A trading function satisfies LP additivity, homogeneity in liquidity, and aversion to permanent loss if and only if it is a CEMM with positive inventory elasticity.*

We also get an analogous result to Theorem 2. The proof is also analogous to the multi-dimensional case.

Theorem 5. *The constant product rule $f_{product}$ is trader optimal within the class of scale invariant, LP additive, symmetric, and sufficiently funded AMMs, that is for each scale invariant, LP additive, symmetric, and sufficiently funded g we have $f_{product} \succsim g$ where $f_{product} \sim g$ if and only if g equivalent to $f_{product}$.*

References

- Jacob Abernethy, Yiling Chen, and Jennifer Wortman Vaughan. 2011. An optimization-based framework for automated market-making. In *Proceedings of the 12th ACM conference on Electronic commerce*. 297–306.
- Hayden Adams, Noah Zinsmeister, Moody Salem, River Keefer, and Dan Robinson. 2021. *Uniswap v3 core*. Technical Report.
- Guillermo Angeris, Akshay Agrawal, Alex Evans, Tarun Chitra, and Stephen Boyd. 2022a. *Constant Function Market Makers: Multi-asset Trades via Convex Optimization*. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 415–444.

- Guillermo Angeris and Tarun Chitra. 2020. Improved Price Oracles: Constant Function Market Makers. In *AFT '20: 2nd ACM Conference on Advances in Financial Technologies, New York, NY, USA, October 21-23, 2020*. ACM, 80–91.
- Guillermo Angeris, Tarun Chitra, and Alex Evans. 2022b. When does the tail wag the dog? Curvature and market making. (2022).
- Guillermo Angeris, Alex Evans, and Tarun Chitra. 2021. Replicating market makers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.14769* (2021).
- Guillermo Angeris, Alex Evans, Tarun Chitra, and Stephen Boyd. 2022c. Optimal routing for constant function market makers. In *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*. 115–128.
- Jun Aoyagi. 2020. Liquidity provision by automated market makers. (2020).
- Maxim Bichuch and Zachary Feinstein. 2022. Axioms for automated market makers: A mathematical framework in fintech and decentralized finance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.01227* (2022).
- Agostino Capponi and Ruizhe Jia. 2021. The adoption of blockchain-based decentralized exchanges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.08842* (2021).
- Yiling Chen, Lance Fortnow, Nicolas Lambert, David M Pennock, and Jennifer Wortman. 2008. Complexity of combinatorial market makers. In *Proceedings of the 9th ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce*. 190–199.
- Yiling Chen and David M Pennock. 2007. A utility framework for bounded-loss market makers. In *23rd Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence, UAI 2007*. 49–56.
- Michael Egorov. 2019. StableSwap-efficient mechanism for Stablecoin liquidity.
- Daniel Engel and Maurice Herlihy. 2021. Composing networks of automated market makers. In *AFT '21: 3rd ACM Conference on Advances in Financial Technologies, Arlington, Virginia, USA, September 26 - 28, 2021*, Foteini Baldimtsi and Tim Roughgarden (Eds.). ACM, 15–28.
- James W Friedman. 1973. Concavity of production functions and non-increasing returns to scale. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society* (1973), 981–984.
- Robin Hanson. 2007. Logarithmic Market Scoring Rules for Modular Combinatorial Information Aggregation. *Journal of Prediction Markets* 1 (2007), 3–15.
- David H Krantz, Patrick Suppes, R Duncan Luce, and Amos Tversky. 1971. *Foundations of Measurement: Additive and polynomial representations*. Vol. 1. Academic Press.

- Bhaskar Krishnamachari, Qi Feng, and Eugenio Grippo. 2021. Dynamic Automated Market Makers for Decentralized Cryptocurrency Exchange. In *IEEE International Conference on Blockchain and Cryptocurrency, ICBC 2021, Sydney, Australia, May 3-6, 2021*. IEEE, 1–2.
- Alfred Lehar and Christine A Parlour. 2021. *Decentralized exchanges*. Technical Report.
- Fernando Martinelli and Nikolai Mushegian. 2019. A non-custodial portfolio manager, liquidity provider, and price sensor.
- Allan Niemerg, Dan Robinson, and Lev Livnev. 2020. YieldSpace: An Automated Liquidity Provider for Fixed Yield Tokens.
- Abraham Othman. 2021. New Invariants for Automated Market Making.
- Abraham Othman, David M Pennock, Daniel M Reeves, and Tuomas Sandholm. 2013. A practical liquidity-sensitive automated market maker. *ACM Transactions on Economics and Computation (TEAC)* 1, 3 (2013), 1–25.
- Abraham Othman and Tuomas Sandholm. 2010. Automated market-making in the large: the gates hillman prediction market. In *Proceedings 11th ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce (EC-2010), Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA, June 7-11, 2010*, David C. Parkes, Chrysanthos Dellarocas, and Moshe Tennenholtz (Eds.). ACM, 367–376.
- Abraham Othman and Tuomas Sandholm. 2011. Liquidity-sensitive automated market makers via homogeneous risk measures. In *Internet and Network Economics: 7th International Workshop, WINE 2011, Singapore, December 11-14, 2011. Proceedings 7*. Springer, 314–325.
- Andreas Park. 2021. The conceptual flaws of constant product automated market making. *Available at SSRN 3805750* (2021).
- Trout Rader. 1981. Utility over time: The homothetic case. *Journal of Economic Theory* 25, 2 (1981), 219–236.
- Mike Wu and Will McTighe. 2022. Constant Power Root Market Makers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.07452* (2022).

A Logical Independence of Axioms

We now show that the axioms in the different characterizations are all necessary to obtain the results.

For the logical independence of axioms in Theorem 1 we can use the following examples: First, the trading function from Example 1 is not independent but satisfies scale invariance. Note that this trading function does not have constant inventory elasticity. The example can also be easily generalized to more than three token types. Second, consider the following example:

$$f(I) := \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} I_A + \sqrt{I_A}.$$

The trading function is independent but violates scale invariance. Note that this function does not have constant inventory elasticity.

For the logical independence of axioms in Corollary 1 note that the above examples all satisfy aversion to permanent loss. Moreover, a trading function of constant but negative inventory elasticity, i.e. with $\gamma > 1$ is independent, satisfies scale invariance, but does not satisfy aversion to permanent loss.

For the logical independence of axioms in Corollary 3, we can use the same examples as above, up to "rescaling" - by which we mean monotonically transforming the trading function from Example 1 into a homogeneous one by applying the square root function.

For the logical independence of axioms in Corollary 2, consider the example

$$f(I) = I_A I_B I_C (I_A I_B + I_B I_C + I_A I_C).$$

It satisfies all axioms except for independence and does not have constant inventory elasticity. Second, consider the sum of two AMMs with constant inventory elasticities with parameters $\gamma_1 < 0$ and $\gamma_2 < 0$. If $\gamma_1 \neq \gamma_2$ then the sum is independent and sufficiently funded but violates scale invariance. Third, an AMM with constant inventory elasticity larger than 1 is independent and scale invariant but not sufficiently funded.

For the logical independence of axioms in Theorem 3 we can use the following examples: The un-scaled product rule $f(I) = I_A I_B$ does not satisfy homogeneity but satisfies all other axioms. The function does not have a representation as in the statement of the theorem. The function $f(I) = I_A^\theta I_B^{1-\theta}$, where $0 < \theta < \frac{1}{2}$ satisfies all axioms except for symmetry and does not have a representation as in the statement of the theorem. The function $f(I) = I_A + I_B$ satisfies all axioms but sufficient funds. The function does not have a representation as in the statement of the theorem. The function

$$f(I) = \begin{cases} \sqrt{I_A^2 + I_B^2}, & I_B/2 \leq I_A \leq 2I_B \\ \sqrt{\frac{5}{2} I_A I_B} & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

satisfies all axioms but aversion to permanent loss. The function does not have a representation as in the statement of the theorem.

For the logical independence of axioms in Theorem 4 we can use the following examples:
The trading function

$$f(I) = (I_A I_B^2 + I_A^2 I_B)^{1/3}$$

satisfies scale invariance, but not LP-additivity. The function does not have positive constant inventory elasticity. For Corollaries 5 and 6 note that the above examples also satisfy aversion to permanent loss and sufficient funds. The logical independence of the other axioms in the corollaries can be established by two-dimensional analogs of the examples that established logical independence for the multidimensional case. For Corollary 7 note furthermore that the above example is also homogeneous.

B Discontinuous Liquidity Curves

Continuity of f is generally necessary to obtain our results. However, Theorem 3, Corollaries 3 and 7, can alternatively be obtained under the assumption that f is continuous on the boundary, i.e. $\lim_{I_A \rightarrow 0} f(I) = f(0, I_{-A})$ for each $A \in \mathcal{A}$, since continuity on the boundary, aversion to permanent loss and homogeneity imply that f is concave (see Friedman (1973)) and therefore continuous. The main characterization results fail to hold without continuity. In two dimensions the following example shows this: Choose ϕ_A and ϕ_B to be increasing functions that take on values in null sets $A \subset \mathbb{R}_{++}$ and $B \subset \mathbb{R}_{++}$ that have the property that

$$\alpha, \alpha' \in A, \beta, \beta' \in B : \alpha + \beta = \alpha' + \beta' \Rightarrow \alpha = \alpha' \text{ and } \beta = \beta'.$$

Such sets are easy to construct using decimal expansions: To define $\phi_A(I_A)$ consider a binary expansion of I_A and let $\phi_A(I_A)$ be the real number defined by the binary expansion interpreted as decimal expansion (so, for example, we can choose $\phi_A(1) = 1$, $\phi_A(1.5) = 1.1$ and $\phi_A(2) = 10$, etc.). Define $\phi_B(I_B) = 2\phi_A(I_A)$. Let $f(I) = \phi_A(I_A) + \phi_B(I_B)$. By construction, $f(I) = f(J)$ if and only if $I = J$. Thus, properties such as scale invariance and sufficient funds are trivially satisfied. The trading function also satisfies LP additivity. For the case of more than two token types a similar trading function can be constructed that satisfies independence, and trivially, scale invariance and the sufficient funds' condition.