

A General Theory of Liquidity Provisioning for Automated Market Makers

Adithya Bhaskara, Rafael Frongillo, and Maneesha Papireddygari

November 16, 2023

Abstract

In decentralized finance, it is common for automated market makers to provision liquidity from external parties. The market maker rewards these liquidity providers with a cut of the trading fees, in exchange for the risk they take on. A handful of protocols for liquidity provisioning have been proposed, such as Uniswap V2 and V3, with specific and sometimes complex rules for collecting liquidity deposits, executing trades, and dividing up fees. Beyond these examples, and a broader understanding of liquidity provisioning, and particularly the design space from which one could choose a different protocols, has been out of reach. In this work, we show that one can view liquidity provisioning very broadly as the practice of running several market makers “in parallel”: each market maker provides its own liquidity, yet the combined group can operate as a single coherent market. We prove that this general protocol, when restricted to specific forms of the constituent market makers, recovers Uniswap V2 and V3 as special cases. We then go on to propose a new restriction which may have advantages over Uniswap V3. In the context of prediction markets, where computation costs are less constrained, our general protocol gives a maximally flexible way to provision liquidity. We conclude with remarks about the nature of liquidity and fees in markets with more than 2 assets, and several open questions.

1 Introduction

The concept of an automated market maker was originally introduced by [Hanson \(2003\)](#) to solve thin market problems in combinatorial prediction markets. In contrast to order books and continuous double-auctions, where buyers are matched to sellers, automated market makers are central authorities which are willing to price any bundle of securities to buy or sell. In this original form, and for the subsequent 20 years, the same entity that provided the automated market maker also provided the requisite liquidity for the market. In other words, the market creator and the liquidity provider was the same entity.

More recently, automated market makers have gained in popularity in the context of decentralized finance, as a low-gas way to implement a market on a blockchain. Along with this trend came the decoupling of the two roles above: the market creator need not provide any significant liquidity. Instead, the market creator exposes another interface to potential liquidity providers (LPs), now different entities, which may deposit funds for market liquidity in exchange for fees on the trades using those funds.

Thus far, however, the design of this liquidity provisioning interface has been somewhat ad-hoc. In the Uniswap V2 interface, LPs must deposit funds proportional to the current reserves. While this approach is natural, and follows similar developments from the prediction markets literature,

it is quite restrictive. Uniswap V3 adds significant flexibility, but the interface is still somewhat cumbersome, as LPs must contend with discrete “buckets” in the price space to allocate their funds. More broadly, it has been far from clear what the full design space of this liquidity provisioning interface is, and what other practical options might be.

In this paper, we introduce a general framework for liquidity provisioning in automated market makers. We give a general protocol based on the idea of running market makers “in parallel”, with essentially infinite flexibility. We then show how various restrictions naturally give rise to the existing protocols above, as well as new ones. More generally, our framework can be made practical using the known equivalence to scoring rule markets via convex conjugate duality.

1.1 Liquidity as competing market makers

In traditional financial markets, such as continuous double-auctions, a market maker is an entity that offers both to buy and sell an asset. Typically the buy price is lower than the sell price, the difference comprising the *bid-ask spread*. Market makers earn a profit equal to the bid-ask spread whenever both buy and sell orders are executed, while remaining even with respect to the asset. In essence then, market making is all about providing liquidity for a small premium, or “fee”, as given by the spread. Automated market makers with transaction fees behave similarly to their traditional counterparts: a price is offered to buy and sell, but once one factors in the fee on both transactions, the effective buy and sell prices differ by a spread.

In traditional markets, liquidity provisioning happens naturally, as often multiple market makers coexist. Rational traders will only buy or sell from the most favorable price offered, switching at will between different market makers. Turning again to automated market makers, one may naturally ask: What if we tried to implement liquidity provisioning in the same way, with multiple coexisting automated market makers? That is, what if we implement an LP as simply another “competing” market maker, and we let traders interact with them in parallel?

There are at least two natural ways to imagine this parallel transaction proceeding. (See § 5 for more.) First, a trader could select a valid trade \mathbf{r}^i for the automated market maker of LP i , i.e. one satisfying $C^i(\mathbf{q}^i + \mathbf{r}^i) = C^i(\mathbf{q}^i)$ given its convex potential C^i and current liability (negative reserve) vector \mathbf{q}^i , resulting in a net trade $\mathbf{r} = \sum_i \mathbf{r}^i$. Second, a trader could start trading in infinitesimal amounts with each LP, each time taking the most favorable price, and stopping at some point, yielding a net trade \mathbf{r} . Perhaps surprisingly, by fundamental results in convex analysis, these two approaches are identical. Taken together, we can see that any Pareto-optimal trade leaves the combined market in a coherent state, with the price of each LP matching the global market price.

At first glance, it might appear that a major downside of this approach is the need for traders to interact directly with all LPs. Yet this is not the case: there is an combined automated market maker which emerges that captures the available combined trades. Specifically, given the convex potential functions C_i defining each market maker, the valid trades in the combined market are exactly those of the convex potential C given by the *infimal convolution* $C = \wedge_i C_i$. Thus, the trader can simply choose any trade satisfying $C(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{r}) = C(\mathbf{q})$, and behind the scenes, the split $\mathbf{r} = \sum_i \mathbf{r}^i$ can be computed along with the corresponding fees.

Through this observation, we can relate this parallel market maker approach to more traditional ways of thinking about liquidity. As we justify in § 5, one can view $(\nabla^2 C)^{-1}$, the (matrix) inverse of the Hessian of C , as a measure of liquidity. In particular, letting $G = C^*$ be the convex conjugate of C , we have $\nabla^2 G(\mathbf{p}) = (\nabla^2 C)^{-1}(\mathbf{q})$ is the liquidity matrix at the price vector \mathbf{p} at market state

q.¹ (In the two-asset case, one can consider just the convex function $g(p)$ where p is the price of the first asset, and let $\ell(p) := g''(p)$ be the liquidity function.) By results in convex analysis, the dual of an infimal convolution is the sum of the duals, giving $G = C^* = (\wedge_i C_i)^* = \sum_i C_i^* = \sum_i G_i$; as a consequence, the total liquidity of the combined market is $\nabla^2 G = \sum_i \nabla^2 G_i$. In other words, just as one would hope, adding another parallel market maker C_i literally adds the corresponding liquidity $\nabla^2 G_i$ to the pool.

1.2 Overview of our results

We begin by presenting a simplified version of our framework in the case of two assets (§ 3). In this case, our framework is equivalent to a more familiar interpretation, where LPs specify a real-valued liquidity level they wish to provide at any given price. In the general, unrestricted protocol, an LP i may specify essentially any liquidity function $\ell_i : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$, mapping a normalized market price p (i.e., price of asset 1 divided by the sum of both prices) to a liquidity level. The protocol then determines how much the LP needs to deposit for this choice ℓ_i . When trades occur, all LPs providing nonzero liquidity in the interval of prices before and after the trade share the fees.

In § 4 we show that this general 2-asset protocol recovers Uniswap V2 and V3 for particular restrictions on the class of allowed liquidity functions ℓ_i . We then propose a new variant of Uniswap V3 with continuous liquidity functions ℓ_i , as opposed to the piecewise-continuous functions of Uniswap V3.

In § 5 we give a general n -asset protocol based on parallel scoring rule markets. In this protocol, traders only implicitly specify trades by choosing the next global market price, a feature we argue could have significant computational advantages. We then prove that this protocol, along with several other interpretations of the phrase “running automated market makers in parallel”, are equivalent.

Finally, we conclude in § 6 with a discussion of liquidity in higher dimensions. When more than 2 assets are at play, we argue that liquidity as a concept is inherently multi-dimensional. In particular, the liquidity at a given price is perhaps best understood as a symmetric positive-definite matrix, allowing one to assess the liquidity in each “direction”, i.e., for each possible trade. Related to this dimensionality, as we show with an example, it remains a nontrivial problem to divide the global transaction fees for general parallel market makers.

1.3 Related work

Our work builds on [Frongillo et al. \(2023\)](#) which establishes the equivalence of (non-parallelized) automated market makers as used for prediction markets and those used in decentralized finance. We direct readers to [Chen and Pennock \(2007\)](#); [Abernethy et al. \(2013\)](#) and [Angeris and Chitra \(2020\)](#), respectively, for an overview of these two literatures. Our work is also related to a recent independent exploration of geometric aspects of automated market makers ([Angeris et al., 2023](#)); in particular, their Minkowski sum operations can be seen as implicitly computing an infimal convolution, which they also view as a combined market maker, though the connections to implementing liquidity provisioning are not explored beyond a very restricted setting.

¹In our case C will be flat in the $\mathbf{1}$ direction, so $\nabla^2 C$ will never be invertible, and similarly, G will not be differentiable; we address these technical issues in § 6.

2 Background

2.1 Notation

Vectors are denoted in bold, e.g. $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $q_i \in \mathbb{R}$ denotes the i th coordinate of \mathbf{q} . The all-zeros vector is $\mathbf{0} = (0, \dots, 0)$ and the all-ones vector is $\mathbf{1} = (1, \dots, 1)$. We define the indicator vector $\boldsymbol{\delta}^i$ by $\delta_i^i = 1$ and $\delta_j^i = 0$ for $j \neq i$.

Comparison between two vectors is pointwise, e.g. $\mathbf{q} \succ \mathbf{q}'$ if $q_i > q'_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, and similarly for \succeq . We say $\mathbf{q} \succeq \mathbf{q}'$ when $q_i \geq q'_i$ for all i and $\mathbf{q} \neq \mathbf{q}'$. Define $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n = \{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \mathbf{q} \succeq \mathbf{0}\}$, $\mathbb{R}_{> 0}^n = \{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \mathbf{q} \succ \mathbf{0}\}$, et cetera. Finally, we denote the probability simplex by $\Delta_n = \{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \mid \langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{1} \rangle = 1\}$.

2.2 Convex analysis

Let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We will use the following conditions.

- *convex*: $\forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \lambda \in [0, 1], f(\lambda \mathbf{x} + (1 - \lambda)\mathbf{y}) \leq \lambda f(\mathbf{x}) + (1 - \lambda)f(\mathbf{y})$.
- *1-invariant*: $f(\mathbf{q} + \alpha \mathbf{1}) = f(\mathbf{q}) + \alpha$ for all $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \alpha \in \mathbb{R}$.
- *1-homogeneous (on $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$)*: $f(\alpha \mathbf{q}) = \alpha f(\mathbf{q})$ for all $\mathbf{q} \succeq \mathbf{0}$ and $\alpha > 0$.

We use f' to indicate differentiation when f is 1-dimensional.

Definition 1 (Convex conjugate). *For a function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ we define its convex conjugate $f^* : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty, -\infty\}$ by $f^*(\mathbf{x}^*) = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \langle \mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x} \rangle - f(\mathbf{x})$.*

Definition 2 (Subgradient). *For a function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ and $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we define the set of subgradients of f at \mathbf{x} by $\partial f(\mathbf{x}) = \{\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \forall \mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{R}^n f(\mathbf{x}') - f(\mathbf{x}) \geq \langle \mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x} \rangle\}$.*

Proposition 1 (Rockafellar (1997, Theorem 23.5)). *Let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ be a closed convex function and f^* its conjugate. Then for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ the following are equivalent:*

1. $\mathbf{x}^* \in \partial f(\mathbf{x})$
2. $\mathbf{x} \in \partial f^*(\mathbf{x}^*)$
3. $f(\mathbf{x}) + f^*(\mathbf{x}^*) = \langle \mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x} \rangle$

Definition 3 (Infimal convolution). *For functions $f_i : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ we define their infimal convolution $f = \wedge_i f_i$ by $f(\mathbf{x}) = \inf\{\sum_i f_i(\mathbf{x}^i) \mid \sum_i \mathbf{x}^i = \mathbf{x}\}$, where the \mathbf{x}^i range over \mathbb{R}^n .*

Proposition 2. *Let $f_i : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ be convex for $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that $\bigcap_i \text{relint dom } f_i \neq \emptyset$. Let $f = \sum_i f_i$. Then $f^* = \wedge_i f_i^*$, and the infimum in \wedge in the definition of f^* is always attained. Moreover, for $\mathbf{v} \in \text{relint dom } f^*$, and any split $\mathbf{v} = \sum_i \mathbf{v}^i$, we have $f^*(\mathbf{v}) = \sum_i f_i^*(\mathbf{v}^i)$ if and only if $\bigcap_i \partial f_i(\mathbf{v}^i) \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. The first statement follows from Rockafellar (1997, Theorem 16.4); we will prove the second. First suppose $f^*(\mathbf{v}) = \sum_i f_i^*(\mathbf{v}^i)$ for $\mathbf{v} \in \text{relint dom } f^*$ and $\mathbf{v} = \sum_i \mathbf{v}^i$. From Rockafellar (1997, Theorem 23.4), $\partial f^*(\mathbf{v}) \neq \emptyset$. Now Strömberg (1994, Theorem 3.6) gives $\bigcap_i \partial f_i^*(\mathbf{v}^i) = \partial f^*(\mathbf{v}) \neq \emptyset$.

2

²As needed for that result to apply, the assumption that there exists some $\mathbf{x} \in \bigcap_i \text{relint dom } f_i$ implies that f_i^* is bounded from below by the same affine function, namely one with gradient \mathbf{x} .

For the converse, let $\mathbf{x} \in \bigcap_i \partial f_i^*(\mathbf{v}^i)$ and define $\mathbf{v} = \sum_i \mathbf{v}^i$. From Proposition 1, $\mathbf{v}^i \in \partial f_i(\mathbf{x})$ for all i . Now Rockafellar (1997, Theorem 23.8) gives $\mathbf{v} = \sum_i \mathbf{v}^i \in \partial f(\mathbf{x})$. Proposition 1 again implies gives $f^*(\mathbf{v}) = \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v} \rangle - f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_i \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}^i \rangle - \sum_i f_i(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_i f_i^*(\mathbf{v}^i)$. \square

2.3 Automated market makers

An automated market maker (AMM) is a mechanism that is willing to trade a collection of n assets for some price. In contrast to traditional order book settings, where traders are waiting to be matched with sellers, traders can trade with AMMs directly. AMMs always maintain a reserve vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ of assets, x_i of asset i , available to trade—or as we equivalently use in this paper, a *liability* vector $\mathbf{q} = -\mathbf{x}$.

AMMs have recently been used in a widespread manner in decentralized finance (DeFi) to trade cryptocurrencies. AMMs take on an additional risk of price fluctuations for the ability to run such a market. The DeFi implementations of AMMs have outsourced provisioning these reserves, and hence liquidity, to external parties called liquidity providers (LPs). Liquidity, intuitively, can be thought of as a measure of ease to trade assets without affecting the price significantly.

In this paper, our discussion of AMMs will be limited to constant-function market makers (CFMMs) as are prominent in the literature. Frongillo et al. (2023); Angeris and Chitra (2020); Schlegel et al. (2022) argue that for various restrictions on φ , CFMMs satisfy desirable market-making axioms.

Definition 4 (Constant-function market maker). *A constant-function market maker (CFMM) is a market based on a potential function $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that maintains a liability vector $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and at the current liability, the set of trades \mathbf{r} available are those that satisfy $\varphi(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{r}) = \varphi(\mathbf{q})$. The liability vector then updates to $\mathbf{q} \leftarrow \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{r}$.*

Consistent with this definition, as we discuss again below, in this paper we adopt the sign convention that trades are always oriented toward the trader. For example, a trade $\mathbf{r} = (1, -1)$ corresponds to giving the trader a unit of asset 1 in exchange for a unit of asset 2.

As explored in Frongillo et al. (2023) and other works, the classic cost-function market makers commonly employed in prediction markets are a special case of CFMMs but which retain the full flexibility of general potential functions φ .

Definition 5 (Cost function market maker). *A cost-function market maker is a CFMM with a convex potential $\varphi = C$ which is $\mathbf{1}$ -invariant.*

As cost functions have more mathematical structure, yet without loss of expressiveness, we use them throughout. For example, while for any potential φ one can take ratios of partial derivatives to compute relative prices, this task is even easier for cost functions, as prices are normalized. In the context of prediction markets (see below) this normalization means that prices $\mathbf{p} \in \partial C(\mathbf{q})$ can be thought of as a probability distribution over outcomes. With or without that interpretation, we frequently use the fact that $\partial C(\mathbf{q}) \subseteq \Delta_n$ for all $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Some examples of CFMMs include the constant-product market maker $\varphi(\mathbf{q}) = q_1 \cdot q_2 \cdots q_n$ and the logarithmic market scoring rule (LMSR) $\varphi(\mathbf{q}) = b \log(\sum_{i=1}^n e^{q_i/b})$ for a constant $b > 0$. The constant product potential φ is not a cost function (but is equivalent to one) while the LMSR is.

The proto form of automated market makers described above allows us to understand the trade dynamics when liquidity is fixed. In these dynamics, traders can exchange assets with the market

maker in a way that keeps the reserves/liability on the same invariant curve of φ or C . Protocols like Uniswap V2 and Uniswap V3 also allow liquidity providers (LPs) to change the market’s liquidity while keeping the price \mathbf{p} invariant. LPs may either add, or *mint*, liquidity to the market or remove, or *burn*, liquidity from the market. LPs make it easier for the CFMM to conduct trades by absolving the market maker of the risk of providing liquidity. As compensation for their risk, LPs are rewarded using trading fees. Whenever a trader provides assets to the market while making a trade, some small amount of the assets are skimmed as trading fees. This provides a pool to be distributed proportionally to LPs as the liquidity they allocated is used. See Protocol 1 for how fees are incorporated in our general protocols, and § 4 for Uniswap V2 and V3.

2.4 Prediction markets

An interesting special case of CFMMs are the case where the n assets to be traded are securities contingent on the outcome of an event happening, commonly called a prediction market. Let $\mathcal{Y} = \{y_1, \dots, y_n\}$ be the set of outcomes, and let Y be the future event, a random variable taking values in \mathcal{Y} . A (complete) prediction market for \mathcal{Y} is a market with n assets A_1, \dots, A_n : when the outcome of Y is observed, each unit of A_i pays off to the owner one unit of cash (some fixed currency, such as US dollars) if $Y = y_i$, and pays off zero otherwise. Buying and selling of these securities is enabled in prediction markets which also aim at eliciting probability distribution over future events. Some common prediction markets include horse betting, Iowa electronic markets and more recently Manifold markets (Manifold, 2022). Abernethy et al. (2013) characterize these prediction markets and show that they should be implemented by a cost-function C based market maker where C is convex and $\mathbf{1}$ -invariant. While we do not discuss prediction markets or securities specifically in this paper, the setting represents an important special case where our results could apply.

2.5 Conventional differences

There are several conventional differences to note between the automated market maker literatures in prediction markets and decentralized finance; we discuss them here as they will help the reader understand our protocols. As noted above, in this paper we consider all trades to be oriented towards the trader, even though in the decentralized finance literature trades are typically oriented toward the market maker. A trade $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ oriented towards the AMM means that the positive coordinates of the n -dimensional vector signify the amounts of assets given to the AMM and negative coordinates signify the amounts of assets taken away from the AMM and given to the trader.

CFMMs in decentralized finance tend to track the reserves held by the market maker, whereas cost function prediction markets typically track their liabilities as a function of the eventual outcome. Hence, a vector \mathbf{x} of reserves corresponds to vector $-\mathbf{q}$ of liabilities. We have attempted to use both conventions, clearly marked, to keep the protocols as close to their respective literatures as possible.

With regard to prices, decentralized finance typically uses an “exchange-rate” version of the contract price, the rate at which one can exchange one asset for another. As alluded to above, taking advantage of the structure of cost functions, we instead adopt a *normalized price* convention. As noted by Frongillo et al. (2023) and others, one can view normalized prices $\mathbf{p} \in \Delta_n$ as an exchange

Protocol 1 General protocol as parallel market makers

- 1: **global constant** $\beta > 0$, $\mathcal{C}_{\text{init}} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_n^*$, $\mathcal{C}_{\text{LP}} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_n$
 - 2: **global variables** $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\{\mathbf{q}^i \in \mathbb{R}^n\}_{i=0}^k$, $\{C_i \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{LP}}\}_{i=0}^k$
 - 3: **liability**(C) := $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ s.t. $\nabla C^0(\mathbf{q}^0) \in \partial C(\mathbf{q})$ and $C(\mathbf{q}) = 0$ ▷ Price matching, no-liability
 - 4: **function** Initialize($\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^n, C \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{init}}$)
 - 5: $(k, \mathbf{q}^0, C^0) \leftarrow (0, \mathbf{q}, C)$
 - 6: **check** $\mathbf{q}^0 = \text{liability}(C^0)$
 - 7: **function** RegisterLP($i = k + 1$)
 - 8: $(k, \mathbf{q}^i, C_i) \leftarrow (k + 1, 0, \max)$
 - 9: **function** ModifyLiquidity($i \in \mathbb{N}, C \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{LP}}$)
 - 10: **request** $\mathbf{r}^i = \mathbf{q}^i - \text{liability}(C)$ from LP i
 - 11: $(\mathbf{q}^i, C_i) \leftarrow (\mathbf{q}^i - \mathbf{r}^i, C)$
 - 12: **function** ExecuteTrade($\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}^n$)
 - 13: $\mathbf{q} \leftarrow \sum_{i=0}^k \mathbf{q}^i$
 - 14: **check** $C(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{r}) = C(\mathbf{q})$ where $C = \wedge_{i=0}^k C_i$
 - 15: **pay** $\mathbf{r} - \beta(-\mathbf{r})_+$ to the trader
 - 16: write $\mathbf{r} = \sum_{i=0}^k \mathbf{r}^i$ s.t. $\forall i, C_i(\mathbf{q}^i + \mathbf{r}^i) = C_i(\mathbf{q}^i)$
 - 17: **for** each LP i **do**
 - 18: **pay** $\beta(-\mathbf{r}^i)_+$ in fees to LP i
 - 19: $\mathbf{q}^i \leftarrow \mathbf{q}^i + \mathbf{r}^i$
-

rate between assets and the “grand bundle” $\mathbf{1}$ of all assets. That is, p_i denotes the instantaneous price, in units of $\mathbf{1}$, to purchase asset i .

Converting between the two conventions is straightforward. Given normalized prices \mathbf{p} , one can simply define the exchange rate between i and j as $\hat{p}_{ij} = p_i/p_j$. Conversely, given pairwise exchange rates, one can define $\mathbf{x} = (1, \hat{p}_{21}, \hat{p}_{31}, \dots, \hat{p}_{n1})$ and take $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{x}/\|\mathbf{x}\|_1$. The conversion simplifies in the case of two assets, as $\hat{p}_{12} = \frac{p}{1-p}$ and $p = p_{12}/(p_{12} + 1)$.

3 General protocol and specialization to two assets

We begin by presenting our general framework. We then derive an equivalent protocol for the case of two assets, based on a more familiar approach where LPs assign liquidity levels to prices. We defer the formal proof of this equivalence to § 5, where we establish it for the general n -asset setting. There we also define the classes of cost functions \mathcal{C}_n and “generating” functions $\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{G}_n$ we use throughout.

3.1 Parallel market maker protocol

Informally, the general protocol for n assets works as follows. The market creator also acts as the initial LP, giving reserves \mathbf{q}^0 to the liquidity pool and specifying the initial cost function C^0 . When an additional LP i enters, their liability vector and cost function are initialized to the trivial

values $\mathbf{q}^i = 0$ and $C_i(\mathbf{q}) = \max(\mathbf{q}) := \max_j q_j$, so that they initially provide no liquidity.³ The `ModifyLiquidity` function handles an LP adding, removing, or otherwise altering their liquidity: they simply replace their cost function with a different one, and are charged up-front the minimal deposit to ensure *no-liability*, i.e., that they will never owe the market maker in any future state. When removing all liquidity, the LP simply sets $C_i = \max$ once again, and is given back their deposit. `ExecuteTrade` checks if a trade \mathbf{r} is allowed trade for the overall cost function $C = \wedge_{i=0}^k C_i$, and if so, requests an additional fee $\beta(-\mathbf{r})_+$ from the trader. (Recall that negative entries of \mathbf{r} represent assets given to the market maker; the fee is an additional β fraction of these.) Under the hood, it then finds the optimal split $\mathbf{r} = \sum_i \mathbf{r}^i$ into smaller trades, executing each with the corresponding LP and doling out $\beta(-\mathbf{r}^i)_+$ in fees.

A key step in this protocol is the computation of liabilities. In particular, if an LP wishes to provide liquidity using C , and the current price is \mathbf{p} , what do they need to deposit? We would like to compute the minimal deposit which ensures no-liability. The restriction $C \in \mathcal{C}_n$ in particular (see § 5.2) will require that the 0-level set of C to suffice: the liability vectors \mathbf{q} with $C(\mathbf{q}) = 0$ satisfy $\mathbf{q} \preceq 0$.

Several questions arise from this protocol: Does the required split $\mathbf{r} = \sum_i \mathbf{r}^i$ always exist? Do the individual fees to each LP add up to the overall fee collected from the trader? Can the various quantities be computed efficiently? It turns out that we have an affirmative answer to all of these questions, at least in the case $n = 2$, i.e., with only two assets. (The computational efficiency will depend on the computational properties of the constituent cost functions, but in § 4 we will see how to implement the protocol efficiently in practice for several examples.) To proceed, we will first use convex conjugate duality to present an equivalent protocol in terms of prices.

3.2 Liquidity as price insensitivity

In the above, we have argued that adding a parallel market maker could be considered providing liquidity to the combined market. But how can one quantify this liquidity? One way to think of liquidity, locally, is the extent to which the price stays stable during a transaction. In other words, the lower the rate of change of the price, the higher the liquidity.

Let us make this idea more formal in the case of 2 assets, using our cost function formulation above. It is convenient in this case to work with 1-dimensional functions; after all, by $\mathbf{1}$ -invariance, a 2-dimensional cost function is really specified by only a 1-dimensional function. More formally, given any $\mathbf{1}$ -invariant cost function $C : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we may write $C(\mathbf{q}) = c(q_1 - q_2) + q_2$ for some convex $c : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by $c(q) = C((q, 0))$. Letting $\mathbf{q} = (q, 0)$, then, the price of asset 1 is $\nabla C(\mathbf{q})_1 = c'(q)$.

By the above, we may define the liquidity at price p to be the reciprocal of the rate of change of the price when the price is p . While not required in general, for the purposes of this intuitive derivation, let us suppose that $c'' > 0$ everywhere. Then formally, we can define the liquidity at price $p \in [0, 1]$ as $\ell(p) = 1/c''(q) > 0$, where $p = c'(q)$. Integrating twice, we find that $\ell(p) = g''(p)$ for some convex function $g : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. This relationship is in essence a special case of convex conjugate duality: we may simply take $g = c^*$. From this duality, we have $g' = (c')^{-1}$, which is

³To see why this choice is correct, note that the “bid-ask spread” of C_i at $\mathbf{q}^i = 0$ is maximal; every price vector in Δ_n is consistent, and any trade occurs at the worst feasible price. More technically, adding the max function to the infimal convolution $C = \wedge_{i=0}^k C_i$ does not change the result. Dually, the conjugate of max is the convex indicator of Δ_n , so this choice adds liquidity $G_i = 0$; see § 5.

Protocol 2 General two-asset protocol via liquidity functions

- 1: **global constant** $\beta > 0, \mathcal{G}_{\text{init}} \subseteq \mathcal{G}^*, \mathcal{G}_{\text{LP}} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$
 - 2: **global variables** $k \in \mathbb{N}, \{\mathbf{q}^i \in \mathbb{R}^2\}_{i=0}^k, \{g_i \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{LP}}\}_{i=0}^k$
 - 3: $\text{price}(g, \mathbf{q}) := (g')^{-1}(q_1 - q_2)$
 - 4: $\text{liability}(g, p) := (g'(p), 0) + (g(p) - p \cdot g'(p))\mathbf{1}$.
 - 5: **function** $\text{Initialize}(\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^2, g \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{init}})$ ▷ Equivalently, the market creator can specify $\ell = g''$
 - 6: $(k, \mathbf{q}^0, g^0) \leftarrow (0, \mathbf{q}, g)$
 - 7: **check** $\mathbf{q}^0 = \text{liability}(g^0, \text{price}(g^0, \mathbf{q}))$
 - 8: **function** $\text{RegisterLP}(i = k + 1)$
 - 9: $(k, \mathbf{q}^i, g_i) \leftarrow (k + 1, 0, 0)$
 - 10: **function** $\text{ModifyLiquidity}(i \in \mathbb{N}, g \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{LP}})$ ▷ Equivalently, the LP can specify $\ell = g''$
 - 11: **request** $\mathbf{r}^i = \mathbf{q}^i - \text{liability}(g, \text{price}(g^0, \mathbf{q}^0))$ from LP i
 - 12: $(\mathbf{q}^i, g_i) \leftarrow (\mathbf{q}^i - \mathbf{r}^i, g)$
 - 13: **function** $\text{ExecuteTrade}(\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}^2)$
 - 14: $p' \leftarrow \text{price}(\sum_{j=0}^k g_j, \sum_{i=0}^k \mathbf{q}^i + \mathbf{r})$ ▷ The price after this trade
 - 15: **check** $\sum_{i=0}^k \mathbf{q}^i + \mathbf{r} = \text{liability}(\sum_{j=0}^k g_j, p')$
 - 16: **pay** $\mathbf{r} - \beta(-\mathbf{r})_+$ to the trader
 - 17: **for each** LP i **do**
 - 18: $\mathbf{r}^i \leftarrow \text{liability}(g_i, p') - \mathbf{q}^i$.
 - 19: **pay** $\beta(-\mathbf{r}^i)_+$ in fees to LP i
 - 20: $\mathbf{q}^i \leftarrow \mathbf{q}^i + \mathbf{r}^i$
-

well-defined as c' is strictly monotone; by the inverse function theorem, we could equivalently derive ℓ as $\ell(p) = ((c')^{-1})'(p) = g''(p)$.

In practice, it is perhaps more natural to *start* with a liquidity function $\ell : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$ and arrive at a cost function, using the formula $c = (\iint \ell)^*$. (For the reader curious why ∞ is included as a possible liquidity level, indeed we often have $\ell(0) = \ell(1) = \infty$, as in the constant-product market maker, and $\ell(p) < \infty$ for $p \in (0, 1)$.) As these integrals are definite, $g = \iint \ell$ is only determined by ℓ up to an affine function, and similarly c up to a shift and translation. We revisit this flexibility below.

3.3 Ensuring no liability

To capture no-liability, the amount i owes the market maker of each asset should be nonpositive. Given the cost function C for LP i , we must ask i to deposit some funds $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$, therefore setting its liability to $\mathbf{q}^i = -\mathbf{x}$, so that $C(\mathbf{q}) = C(\mathbf{q}^i) \implies \mathbf{q} \preceq 0$ for all possible future states \mathbf{q} .

In principle, if an LP provides C where some level set satisfies no-liability, the protocol could compute it and request a corresponding deposit to cover the liability. More formally, if $C^{-1}(\alpha) := \{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid C(\mathbf{q}) = \alpha\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{\leq 0}^n$, i.e. every liability vector in the α -level set $C^{-1}(\alpha)$ is nonpositive, the protocol could compute this α and request (minus) the element $\mathbf{q} \in C^{-1}(\alpha)$ such that $\nabla C(\mathbf{q}) = \mathbf{p}$, the current price. Yet it seems more natural for the LP to specify this α . Or equivalently, we could insist that the LP encode the valid trades in the zero level set, and the LP could submit $\tilde{C} := C - \alpha$,

so that $C^{-1}(\alpha) = \hat{C}^{-1}(0)$; this is the approach we take in Protocol 1.

For example, with two assets, the constant product potential $\varphi(\mathbf{q}) = q_1 q_2$ has an equivalent cost function (Chen and Pennock, 2007; Frongillo et al., 2023) given by

$$C(\mathbf{q}) = \frac{1}{2} \left(q_1 + q_2 + \sqrt{4\alpha^2 + (q_1 - q_2)^2} \right) .$$

Taking the 0-level set, we have $q_1 + q_2 + \sqrt{4\alpha^2 + (q_1 - q_2)^2} = 0$ which implies $q_1 + q_2 < 0$. Then $(q_1 + q_2)^2 = 4\alpha^2 + (q_1 - q_2)^2$, which reduces to $q_1 q_2 = \alpha$. By the first observation, we must have $\mathbf{q} \prec \mathbf{0}$, giving no liability. While one could take $\hat{C}(\mathbf{q}) = C(\mathbf{q}) + 1$ as well, to arrive at the same liquidity level, one can check that C gives rise to the minimal deposit required for that level.

3.4 An equivalent two-asset protocol

In the two-asset case, one can visualize this no-liability condition, and indeed arrive at a more tractable protocol, using the well-known duality between scoring rule markets and cost function markets. Let $S(p, y) = g(p) + g'(p)(\mathbf{1}\{y = 1\} - p)$ be the proper scoring rule generated by g , where $\mathbf{1}\{\cdot\}$ is the indicator function, and consider $S(p, \cdot) := (S(p, 1), S(p, 0)) \in (\mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\})^2$. By Fenchel's inequality, we have $c(q) + g(p) \geq qp$, with equality if $p = c'(q)$ or equivalently $q = g'(p)$. In particular, $c(g'(p)) + g(p) = g'(p)p$. It follows that

$$C(S(p, \cdot)) = c(S(p, 1) - S(p, 0)) + S(p, 0) = c(g'(p)) + g(p) - g'(p)p = 0 .$$

In other words, the vectors $S(p, \cdot)$ trace out the 0-level set of C as we vary $p \in [0, 1]$, or $p \in (0, 1)$ if S takes on infinite values. Moreover, the price of asset 1 at liability vector $S(p, \cdot)$ is

$$\nabla C(S(p, \cdot))_1 = c'(S(p, 1) - S(p, 0)) = c'(g'(p)) = p ,$$

as one would hope. (Recall that $g' = (c')^{-1}$ by convex duality.)

Using this dual approach, we can also simplify the no-liability condition to $g \leq 0$: we have $S(1, 1) = g(1) \leq 0$ and $S(0, 0) = g(0) \leq 0$, and since S is proper, all other values of S can only be smaller. Thus, to specify a liquidity function $\ell : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$ and ensure the no-liability condition is satisfied, an LP can specify some convex $g \leq 0$ with $g'' = \ell$, and set $c = g^*$. For example, the constant product market maker corresponds to the choice $g(p) = -2\sqrt{p(1-p)}$.

The above observations give rise to Protocol 2. The fact that $C(S(p, \cdot)) = 0$ combined with the fact that $\nabla C(S(p, \cdot)) = (p, 1 - p)$ means that one can replace $\text{liability}(C)$ in Protocol 1 line 3 with $\text{liability}(g, p) := S(p, \cdot) = (g'(p), 0) + (g(p) - p \cdot g'(p))\mathbf{1}$, where p is the current price of asset 1. Similarly, the trade check (line 14) and optimal split (line 16) in Protocol 1 can be done more straightforwardly using $S(p, \cdot)$, without the need to compute infimal convolutions explicitly. We defer the formal proof of the equivalence of Protocols 1 and 2 to § 5, as it readily follows from a slightly weaker equivalence between the corresponding n -asset protocols (Theorem 2).

Let \mathcal{G} be the set of functions $g : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\leq 0}$ which are convex, continuously differentiable, and bounded. Let $\mathcal{G}^* \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ be those which additionally have $|g'(p)| \rightarrow \infty$ as $p \rightarrow 0$ or $p \rightarrow 1$.

Theorem 1. *Let $\mathcal{G}_{\text{init}} \subseteq \mathcal{G}^*$ be a set of functions which are strictly convex. Then for $n = 2$ Protocol 1 is equivalent to Protocol 2 for the choices $c_i = g_i^*$ where $C_i(\mathbf{q}) = c_i(q_1 - q_2) + q_2$.*

3.5 Optimal deposits

The dual representation above also allows us to determine the “most efficient” cost function corresponding to a given liquidity function ℓ , meaning the one corresponding to the minimal deposit needed to ensure no-liability. In particular, the optimal choice is for $c = g^*$ where g is the unique convex function such that $g'' = \ell$ and $g(0) = g(1) = 0$. That is, given any \hat{g} , we take $g(p) = \hat{g}(p) - p\hat{g}(1) - (1-p)\hat{g}(0)$, which clearly has $g'' = \hat{g}''$ and $g(0) = g(1) = 0$. For this optimal choice, we have $S(1, 1) = S(0, 0) = 0$. Hence $S(p, \cdot)$ is the tightest possible deposit needed to obtain liquidity ℓ and ensure no-liability. Note that this choice will exactly run out of asset 1 as $p \rightarrow 1$, and of asset 2 when $p \rightarrow 0$. With other choices with $g \leq 0$ but not necessarily tight at 0 or 1, one achieves no-liability but with more reserves than needed.

Determining this optimal g is straightforward when given ℓ . One can simply define

$$g(p) = \int_0^p \int_0^t \ell(s) ds dt - p \int_0^1 \int_0^t \ell(s) ds dt, \quad (1)$$

which is the result of the above transformation for the choice $\hat{g}(p) = \int_0^p \int_0^t \ell(s) ds dt$. We use this formula extensively in § 4.

4 Instantiations of the protocol

We now present three special cases of Protocol 2, for particular choices of the sets of allowed generating functions $\mathcal{G}_{\text{init}}$ and \mathcal{G}_{LP} . The first two correspond to the popular Uniswap protocols. The third is a new proposal.

4.1 Uniswap V2

Introduced by Adams et al. (2020), Uniswap V2 with the functional invariant $\varphi_\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = x_1 x_2 = \alpha^2$, is a common implementation that allows users to trade two assets in the Ethereum ecosystem. To remain closer to the original protocol, we track the reserve vector \mathbf{x} , so that x_1 and x_2 represent the amount of assets 1 and 2, respectively, held by the market maker. We will still use normalized prices, however, so will need to take care to convert between the two. In particular, the normalized price of the first asset can be computed as $p = \frac{x_2}{x_1 + x_2}$. Fan et al. (2022, 2023) provide a detailed breakdown of the mechanics of Uniswap V2.

We now state the Uniswap V2 protocol and show that it is a special case of Protocol 2. Readers familiar with Uniswap V2 may see similarities in Protocol 3 immediately. Recall that from Fan et al. (2022), the bundle needed to change liquidity from α^i to α' while keeping the prices constant is $\left(\frac{\Delta L}{\sqrt{p}}, \Delta L \sqrt{p}\right) = \left((\alpha' - \alpha^i) \sqrt{\frac{1-p}{p}}, (\alpha' - \alpha^i) \sqrt{\frac{p}{1-p}}\right)$, as is stated in the protocol. We also note that instead of skimming γ from $(-\mathbf{r})_+$, we ask for $\beta(-\mathbf{r})_+$ from the trader when they request the trade \mathbf{r} as a trading fee. These two schemes are equivalent when $\beta = \frac{\gamma}{1+\gamma}$.

To show that Protocol 3 is indeed a special case of Protocol 2, we first that the liability vectors from the latter indeed satisfy the constant product invariant for our choice of generating functions.

Proposition 3. *For $\mathcal{G}_{\text{init}} = \{\alpha g_0 \mid \alpha > 0\}$, $\mathcal{G}_{\text{LP}} = \{\alpha g_0 \mid \alpha \geq 0\}$ where $g_0(p) = -2\sqrt{p(1-p)}$, the vector \mathbf{q} of liability in Protocol 2 always satisfies $x_1 \cdot x_2 = \alpha^2$ for some $\alpha > 0$, where $\mathbf{x} = -\mathbf{q}$.*

Protocol 3 Uniswap V2

- 1: **global constants** β .
 - 2: **global variables** $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\{\alpha^i \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\}_{i=0}^k$.
 - 3: $\text{price}(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{x_2}{x_1 + x_2}$
 - 4: **function** Initialize($\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^2, \alpha > 0, \beta$)
 - 5: $(k, \beta) \leftarrow (0, \beta)$
 - 6: ModifyLiquidity($0, \mathbf{x}, \alpha$)
 - 7: **function** RegisterLP($i = k + 1$)
 - 8: $(k, q^i, \alpha^i) \leftarrow (k + 1, 0, 0)$
 - 9: **function** ModifyLiquidity($i \in \mathbb{N}, \alpha' \geq 0$)
 - 10: $p = \text{price}(\mathbf{x})$
 - 11: **request** $\mathbf{x}' = \left((\alpha' - \alpha^i) \sqrt{\frac{1-p}{p}}, (\alpha' - \alpha^i) \sqrt{\frac{p}{1-p}} \right)$ from LP i .
 - 12: $(\mathbf{x}, \alpha^i) \leftarrow (\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{x}', \alpha')$
 - 13: **function** ExecuteTrade($\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}^2$)
 - 14: **check** $\varphi(\mathbf{x}) = \varphi(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{r})$, where $\varphi(\mathbf{x}) = x_1 x_2$.
 - 15: **pay** $\frac{\beta \alpha^i}{\alpha} (-\mathbf{r})_+$ to LP i , where $\alpha = \sum_i \alpha^i$.
 - 16: $\mathbf{x} \leftarrow \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{r}$.
-

Proof. Observe that any change in liability vector in the ModifyLiquidity or Initialize phases results in a liability vector that results in the vector taking the form $\text{liability}(g, p)$ for some $g \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{LP}}$, $p \in [0, 1]$. Let this $g(p) = \alpha g_0(p) = -2\alpha \sqrt{p(1-p)}$ and thereby $g'(p) = -\alpha \frac{1-2p}{\sqrt{p(1-p)}}$. So,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{liability}(g, p) &= (g(p) - p \cdot g'(p)) \mathbf{1} + \begin{pmatrix} g'(p) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \\
 &= \alpha \left(\left(-2\sqrt{p(1-p)} + p \frac{1-2p}{\sqrt{p(1-p)}} \right) \mathbf{1} - \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1-2p}{\sqrt{p(1-p)}} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right) \\
 &= \alpha \left(-\sqrt{\frac{p}{1-p}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\frac{1-2p}{p(1-p)}} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right) \\
 &= \alpha \begin{pmatrix} -\sqrt{\frac{1-p}{p}} \\ -\sqrt{\frac{p}{1-p}} \end{pmatrix}.
 \end{aligned}$$

From here, we can easily see that $x_1 \cdot x_2 = \left(\alpha \sqrt{\frac{1-p}{p}} \right) \left(\alpha \sqrt{\frac{p}{1-p}} \right) = \alpha^2$. □

Proposition 4. *Protocol 3 is equivalent to Protocol 2 for $\mathcal{G}_{\text{init}} = \{\alpha g_0 \mid \alpha > 0\}$, $\mathcal{G}_{\text{LP}} = \{\alpha g_0 \mid \alpha \geq 0\}$ where $g_0(p) = -2\sqrt{p(1-p)}$.*

Proof. Showing that Protocol 2 gives Protocol 3, for the choices of g specified, involves showing three specific components are equivalent for it. That is, we wish to show that the initialization check satisfies and the request vectors in ModifyLiquidity and ExecuteTrade routines match.

Firstly, as we have shown, $x_1 \cdot x_2 = \alpha^2$ for some α . Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
(g')^{-1}(q_1 - q_2) &= \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{q_1 - q_2}{\sqrt{4\alpha^2 + (q_1 - q_2)^2}} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{q_1 - q_2}{\sqrt{4q_1 \cdot q_2 + (q_1 - q_2)^2}} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{q_1 - q_2}{-(q_1 + q_2)} \right) \\
&= \frac{q_2}{q_1 + q_2} \\
&= \frac{x_2}{x_1 + x_2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Next, to check the liability vector of the initialization phase of Protocol 2, we use the some of the derivations in Proposition 3. From this, we can also see that if $g^0(p) = -2\alpha^0\sqrt{p(1-p)}$ for some $\alpha^0 > 0$, then $x_1^0 \cdot x_2^0 = (\alpha^0)^2$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{liability}(g^0, \text{price}(g^0, q^0)) &= \alpha^0 \begin{pmatrix} -\sqrt{\frac{1 - \text{price}(g^0, q^0)}{\text{price}(g^0, q^0)}} \\ -\sqrt{\frac{\text{price}(g^0, q^0)}{1 - \text{price}(g^0, q^0)}} \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \alpha^0 \begin{pmatrix} -\sqrt{\frac{x_1^0}{x_2^0}} \\ -\sqrt{\frac{x_2^0}{x_1^0}} \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \alpha^0 \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{x_1^0}{\alpha^0} \\ -\frac{x_2^0}{\alpha^0} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} q_1^0 \\ q_2^0 \end{pmatrix},
\end{aligned}$$

so, the check is satisfied.

Now we show that the quantity of assets requested from a LP to change the liquidity level from α^i to α' given by Line 11 in Protocol 3 is equivalent to Line 11 of Protocol 2.

We first note that the price, say p , doesn't change in this operation as liquidity must be added by keeping the price constant. Another way to see it is that $\text{price}(g^0, \mathbf{q}^0)$ remains unchanged. A liquidity change of α^i to α' at price p reflects a change of g_i from $-2 \cdot \alpha^i \sqrt{p(1-p)}$ to $\hat{g} = -2 \cdot \alpha' \sqrt{p(1-p)}$ in Uniswap V2. The quantity of asset requested by Protocol 2 is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
-(\text{liability}(\hat{g}, p) - \mathbf{q}^i) &= -(\text{liability}(\hat{g}, p) - \text{liability}(g_i, p)) \\
&= - \left(\alpha' \begin{pmatrix} -\sqrt{\frac{1-p}{p}} \\ -\sqrt{\frac{p}{1-p}} \end{pmatrix} - \alpha^i \begin{pmatrix} -\sqrt{\frac{1-p}{p}} \\ -\sqrt{\frac{p}{1-p}} \end{pmatrix} \right) \\
&= (\alpha' - \alpha^i) \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\frac{1-p}{p}} \\ \sqrt{\frac{p}{1-p}} \end{pmatrix}
\end{aligned}$$

Now, we show that the check in Line 18 of Protocol 2 for the given g gives us the condition $x_1 \cdot x_2 = (x_1 + r_1) \cdot (x_2 + r_2)$ that appears in Uniswap V2.

Let $\mathbf{q} = \sum_i \mathbf{q}^i$ and $\mathbf{r} = \sum_i \mathbf{r}^i$. The check in Protocol 2 can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{r} &= \text{liability}\left(\sum_{j=0}^k g_j, p'\right) \\ &= -\left(\sum_{j=0}^k \alpha^j\right) \left(\frac{\sqrt{\frac{1-p'}{p'}}}{\sqrt{\frac{p'}{1-p'}}}\right) \\ &= -\alpha \left(\frac{\sqrt{\frac{1-p'}{p'}}}{\sqrt{\frac{p'}{1-p'}}}\right) \quad \text{as } \alpha = \sum_{j=0}^k \alpha^j. \end{aligned}$$

We can easily see that $(q_1 + r_1)(q_2 + r_2) = (-x_1 + r_1)(-x_2 + r_2) = \alpha^2 = x_1 \cdot x_2$. Again the note the difference in sign conventions for liability and reserves.

The last fact we want to show to complete the proof is that $r^i = \frac{\alpha^i}{\alpha} r$ for Uniswap V2. We see that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{r}^i &= -\alpha^i \left(\frac{\sqrt{\frac{1-p'}{p'}}}{\sqrt{\frac{p'}{1-p'}}}\right) - \mathbf{q}^i \\ &= -\alpha^i \left(\frac{\sqrt{\frac{1-p'}{p'}}}{\sqrt{\frac{p'}{1-p'}}}\right) + \alpha^i \left(\frac{\sqrt{\frac{1-p}{p}}}{\sqrt{\frac{p}{1-p}}}\right) \\ &= \frac{\alpha^i}{\alpha} \left(-\alpha \left(\frac{\sqrt{\frac{1-p'}{p'}}}{\sqrt{\frac{p'}{1-p'}}}\right) + \alpha \left(\frac{\sqrt{\frac{1-p}{p}}}{\sqrt{\frac{p}{1-p}}}\right)\right) \\ &= \frac{\alpha^i}{\alpha} (\text{liability}(g, p') - \mathbf{q}) \quad \text{where } g = \sum_{j=0}^k g_j \text{ and } \mathbf{q} = \sum_{j=0}^k \mathbf{q}_j \\ &= \frac{\alpha^i}{\alpha} \mathbf{r}, \end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

4.2 Uniswap V3

Uniswap V3 was introduced by [Adams et al. \(2021\)](#) and is a generalization of Uniswap V2. Uniswap V3 allows LPs to provide liquidity on specific intervals instead of the entire price space. The motivation for Uniswap V3 is that in Uniswap V2, the reserves deposited to create liquidity not near the current price were not used; therefore, it was suboptimal for LPs to provide liquidity for all of the price range. [Fan et al. \(2022, 2023\)](#) provide a thorough analysis of Uniswap V3 mechanics. We soon state our version of the mechanism in Protocol 4.

Readers familiar with the original protocol may recognize Protocol 4 as Uniswap V3 mechanics but with minor changes coming from using normalized prices. Line 14 comes from [Fan et al. \(2022\)](#)'s analysis of Uniswap V3, and Line 19 comes from the shifted reserve curve characteristic

Protocol 4 Uniswap V3

- 1: **global constants** $\beta, m, \{B^j = [a_j, b_j]\}_{j=0}^m$.
 - 2: **global variables** $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^2, k \in \mathbb{N}, \{\alpha^{ij} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\}_{i \in \{0, \dots, k\}, j \in \{0, \dots, m\}}$
 - 3: **function** $\text{price}(\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^2)$
 - 4: **return** $\frac{x_2 + \alpha_j \sqrt{\frac{a_j}{1-a_j}}}{x_1 + \alpha_j \sqrt{\frac{1-b_j}{b_j}} + x_2 + \alpha_j \sqrt{\frac{a_j}{1-a_j}}}$
 - 5: **function** $\text{Initialize}(\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^2, \alpha > 0, \beta)$
 - 6: $(k, \beta) \leftarrow (0, \beta)$
 - 7: $\text{ModifyLiquidity}(0, \mathbf{x}, \alpha, [0, 1])$ \triangleright We technically have to split this into function call for each price interval.
 - 8: **function** $\text{RegisterLP}()$
 - 9: $k \leftarrow k + 1$
 - 10: $\alpha^{kj} \leftarrow 0, \forall j \in \{0, \dots, m\}$
 - 11: **return** k \triangleright ID of the new LP
 - 12: **function** $\text{ModifyLiquidity}(i \in \mathbb{N}, \alpha' \geq 0, j \in \{0, \dots, m\})$
 - 13: $p = \text{price}(\mathbf{x})$
 - 14: **request** $\mathbf{x}' = \begin{cases} ((\alpha' - \alpha^{ij}) \left(\sqrt{\frac{1-a_j}{a_j}} - \sqrt{\frac{1-b_j}{b_j}} \right), 0) & \text{if } p < a_j \\ (0, (\alpha' - \alpha^{ij}) \left(\sqrt{\frac{b_j}{1-b_j}} - \sqrt{\frac{a_j}{1-a_j}} \right)) & \text{if } p > b_j \\ ((\alpha' - \alpha^{ij}) \left(\sqrt{\frac{1-p}{p}} - \sqrt{\frac{1-b_j}{b_j}} \right), (\alpha' - \alpha^{ij}) \left(\sqrt{\frac{p}{1-p}} - \sqrt{\frac{a_j}{1-a_j}} \right)) & \text{if } p \in [a_j, b_j] \end{cases}$
 - 15: $(\mathbf{x}, \alpha^{ij}) \leftarrow (\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{x}', \alpha')$
 - 16: **function** $\text{ExecuteTrade}(\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}^2)$
 - 17: Let $p = \text{price}(\mathbf{x}), p' = \text{price}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{r})$ ⁴
 - 18: Let l, u be such that $a_l \leq p \leq b_l$ and $a_u \leq p' \leq b_u$.
 - 19: **check**
 - 20: **pay** $\beta \frac{\sum_j \alpha^{ij}}{\sum_j \sum_o \alpha^{oj}} (-\mathbf{r})_+$ to each LP i where j sums over baskets in $[B^l, B^u]$. \triangleright WLOG assume that the B^u bucket comes later than B^l
 - 21: $\mathbf{x} \leftarrow \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{r}$
-

of Uniswap V3 as seen in both [Fan et al. \(2022\)](#) and [Adams et al. \(2021\)](#). For clarity, we want to reiterate that [Fan et al. \(2022\)](#) uses an exchange rate price \hat{p} , and we use its normalized version p . The two quantities are related by $\hat{p} = \frac{p}{1-p}$.

Proposition 5. For $\mathcal{G}_{\text{init}} = \{\sum_j \alpha_j g^{(j)} \mid \alpha_j > 0\}$, $\mathcal{G}_{\text{LP}} = \{\sum_j \alpha_j g^{(j)} \mid \alpha_j \geq 0\}$ where

$$g^{(j)}(p) = \begin{cases} p(\sqrt{\frac{1-b_j}{b_j}} - \sqrt{\frac{1-a_j}{a_j}}) & \text{if } p \leq a_j \\ -2\sqrt{p(1-p)} + p\sqrt{\frac{1-b_j}{b_j}} + (1-p)\sqrt{\frac{a_j}{1-a_j}} & \text{if } a_j \leq p \leq b_j, \\ (1-p)(\sqrt{\frac{a_j}{1-a_j}} - \sqrt{\frac{b_j}{1-b_j}}) & \text{if } p \geq b_j \end{cases}$$

the vector \mathbf{q} of liability in Protocol 2 always satisfies $(x_1 + \alpha_j \sqrt{\frac{1-b_j}{b_j}}) \cdot (x_2 + \alpha_j \sqrt{\frac{a_j}{1-a_j}}) = \alpha_j^2$ for some $\alpha_j > 0$, where $\mathbf{x} = -\mathbf{q}$.

Proof. Observe that any change in liability vector in the `ModifyLiquidity` or `Initialize` phases results in a liability vector that results in the vector taking the form $\text{liability}(g, p)$ for some $g \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{LP}}$, $p \in [0, 1]$. Let this g be $\alpha_j g^{(j)}(p)$ where α_j is the total liquidity in j th price interval which is $\sum_i \alpha_i^{ij}$ in Protocol 4. We have

$$g'(p) = \begin{cases} \alpha_j(\sqrt{\frac{1-b_j}{b_j}} - \sqrt{\frac{1-a_j}{a_j}}) & \text{if } p \leq a_j \\ \alpha_j(-\frac{1-2p}{\sqrt{p(1-p)}} + \sqrt{\frac{1-b_j}{b_j}} - \sqrt{\frac{a_j}{1-a_j}}) & \text{if } a_j \leq p \leq b_j \\ (\sqrt{\frac{b_j}{1-b_j}} - \sqrt{\frac{a_j}{1-a_j}}) & \text{if } p \geq b_j \end{cases}$$

Solving for $\text{liability}(g, p) = (g(p) - p \cdot g'(p))\mathbf{1} + \begin{pmatrix} g'(p) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ for these three cases gives us

$$\text{liability}(g, p) = \begin{cases} \alpha_j \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\frac{1-b_j}{b_j}} - \sqrt{\frac{1-a_j}{a_j}} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} & \text{if } p \leq a_j \\ \alpha_j \begin{pmatrix} -\sqrt{\frac{1-p}{p}} + \sqrt{\frac{1-b_j}{b_j}} \\ -\sqrt{\frac{p}{1-p}} + \sqrt{\frac{a_j}{1-a_j}} \end{pmatrix} & \text{if } a_j \leq p \leq b_j. \\ \alpha_j \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ (\sqrt{\frac{a_j}{1-a_j}} - \sqrt{\frac{b_j}{1-b_j}}) \end{pmatrix} & \text{if } p \geq b_j \end{cases}$$

In each of these cases, with a bit of algebra we can see that

$$\left(q_1 - \alpha_j \sqrt{\frac{1-b_j}{b_j}}\right) \cdot \left(q_2 - \alpha_j \sqrt{\frac{a_j}{1-a_j}}\right) = \left(x_1 + \alpha_j \sqrt{\frac{1-b_j}{b_j}}\right) \cdot \left(x_2 + \alpha_j \sqrt{\frac{a_j}{1-a_j}}\right) = \alpha_j^2,$$

as \mathbf{q} in Protocol 2 is liability which is negative of reserves in Protocol 4. \square

⁴We also note that price in Uniswap V3 is not calculated on demand like we do here but is a state variable that's maintained throughout the implementation. Uniswap V3 also implements the Line 19 by passing through all price ranges consecutive to p and checking which price interval satisfies this check. We abstract away from this to avoid being caught up in technicalities as this is not the main problem we tackle.

Proposition 6. Protocol 4 is equivalent to Protocol 2 for $\mathcal{G}_{\text{init}} = \{\sum_j \alpha_j g^{(j)} \mid \forall j \alpha_j > 0\}$, $\mathcal{G}_{\text{LP}} = \{\sum_j \alpha_j g^{(j)} \mid \forall j \alpha_j \geq 0\}$ where

$$g^{(j)}(p) = \begin{cases} p(\sqrt{\frac{1-b_j}{b_j}} - \sqrt{\frac{1-a_j}{a_j}}) & \text{if } p \leq a_j \\ -2\sqrt{p(1-p)} + p\sqrt{\frac{1-b_j}{b_j}} + (1-p)\sqrt{\frac{a_j}{1-a_j}} & \text{if } a_j \leq p \leq b_j \\ (1-p)(\sqrt{\frac{a_j}{1-a_j}} - \sqrt{\frac{b_j}{1-b_j}}) & \text{if } p \geq b_j \end{cases} .$$

Proof. To show that Protocol 2 gives us Protocol 4, for the choices of g specified, involves showing three specific components are equivalent. They include showing that the initialization check satisfies and the request vectors in `ModifyLiquidity` and `ExecuteTrade` routines match.

We saw α_j to mean total liquidity in j th interval i.e. $\sum_{i=0}^k \alpha^{ij}$ and let $g(p) = \alpha_j g^{(j)}$. Firstly, to show the initialization check, we derive that

$$(g')^{-1}(q_1 - q_2) = (g')^{-1}(x_2 - x_1) = \frac{x_2 + \alpha_j \sqrt{\frac{a_j}{1-a_j}}}{x_1 + \alpha_j \sqrt{\frac{1-b_j}{b_j}} + x_2 + \alpha_j \sqrt{\frac{a_j}{1-a_j}}}.$$

We consider only the case when this price falls in a bucket j as for all other buckets, $(g')^{-1}$ would not give a definitive result.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{liability}(g^0, \text{price}(g^0, q^0)) &= \alpha_j \begin{pmatrix} -\sqrt{\frac{x_1^0 + \alpha_j \sqrt{\frac{1-b_j}{b_j}}}{x_2^0 + \alpha_j \sqrt{\frac{a_j}{1-a_j}}} + \sqrt{\frac{1-b_j}{b_j}}} \\ -\sqrt{\frac{x_2^0 + \alpha_j \sqrt{\frac{a_j}{1-a_j}}}{x_1^0 + \alpha_j \sqrt{\frac{1-b_j}{b_j}}} + \sqrt{\frac{a_j}{1-a_j}}} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \alpha_j \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{x_1^0 + \alpha_j \sqrt{\frac{1-b_j}{b_j}}}{\alpha_j} + \sqrt{\frac{1-b_j}{b_j}} \\ -\frac{x_2^0 + \alpha_j \sqrt{\frac{a_j}{1-a_j}}}{\alpha_j} + \sqrt{\frac{a_j}{1-a_j}} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} -x_1^0 \\ -x_2^0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} q_1^0 \\ q_2^0 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

The first two steps are a result of Proposition 5.

Now, we show that the quantity of assets requested from a LP to change the liquidity level from α^{ij} to α' given by Line 14 in Protocol 4 is equivalent to Line 11 of Protocol 2.

We first note that the price, say p , doesn't change in this operation, as liquidity must be added by keeping the price constant. Another way to see it is that $\text{price}(g^0, \mathbf{q}^0)$ remains unchanged. A liquidity change of α^{ij} to α' at price $p \in B_j$ reflects a change of g_i from $\alpha^{ij} g^{(j)}$ to $\hat{g} = \alpha' g^{(j)}$ in

Uniswap V3. The quantity of asset requested by Protocol 2 is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
-(\text{liability}(\hat{g}, p) - \mathbf{q}^i) &= \text{liability}(g_i, p) - \text{liability}(\hat{g}, p) \\
&= \begin{cases} \alpha^{ij} \left(-\sqrt{\frac{1-a_j}{a_j}} + \sqrt{\frac{1-b_j}{b_j}}, 0 \right) - \alpha' \left(-\sqrt{\frac{1-a_j}{a_j}} + \sqrt{\frac{1-b_j}{b_j}}, 0 \right) & \text{if } p < a_j \\ \alpha^{ij} \left(0, \sqrt{\frac{a_j}{1-a_j}} + \sqrt{\frac{b_j}{1-b_j}} \right) - \alpha' \left(0, \sqrt{\frac{a_j}{1-a_j}} + \sqrt{\frac{b_j}{1-b_j}} \right) & \text{if } p > b_j \\ (\alpha^{ij} - \alpha') \left(-\sqrt{\frac{1-p}{p}} + \sqrt{\frac{1-b_j}{b_j}}, \sqrt{\frac{p}{1-p}} + \sqrt{\frac{a_j}{1-a_j}} \right) & \text{if } p \in [a_j, b_j] \end{cases} \\
&= \begin{cases} \left((\alpha' - \alpha^{ij}) \left(\sqrt{\frac{1-a_j}{a_j}} - \sqrt{\frac{1-b_j}{b_j}} \right), 0 \right) & \text{if } p < a_j \\ \left(0, (\alpha' - \alpha^{ij}) \left(\sqrt{\frac{b_j}{1-b_j}} - \sqrt{\frac{a_j}{1-a_j}} \right) \right) & \text{if } p > b_j \\ \left((\alpha' - \alpha^{ij}) \left(\sqrt{\frac{1-p}{p}} - \sqrt{\frac{1-b_j}{b_j}} \right), (\alpha' - \alpha^{ij}) \left(\sqrt{\frac{p}{1-p}} - \sqrt{\frac{a_j}{1-a_j}} \right) \right) & \text{if } p \in [a_j, b_j] \end{cases}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, we show that the check in Line 15 of Protocol 2 for the given g gives us the condition $(x_1 + \alpha_l \sqrt{\frac{1-b_l}{b_l}}) (x_2 + \sqrt{\frac{a_l}{1-a_l}} \alpha_l) = (x_1 - r_1 + \alpha_u \sqrt{\frac{1-b_u}{b_u}}) (x_2 - r_2 + \sqrt{\frac{a_u}{1-a_u}} \alpha_u)$ where $\alpha_x = \sum_{i=0}^k \alpha^{ix}$ that appears in Uniswap V3.

Let $\mathbf{q} = \sum_i \mathbf{q}^i$ and $\mathbf{r} = \sum_i \mathbf{r}^i$. The check in Protocol 2 can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{r} &= \text{liability} \left(\sum_{i=0}^k g_i, p' \right) \\
&= \text{liability} \left(\sum_{i=0}^k \alpha^{iu} g^{(j)}, p' \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^k \alpha^{iu} \text{liability}(g^{(j)}, p').
\end{aligned}$$

From Proposition 5, we can see that

$$\left(x_1 - r_1 + \left(\sum_{i=0}^k \alpha^{iu} \right) \sqrt{\frac{1-b_u}{b_u}} \right) \cdot \left(x_2 - r_2 + \left(\sum_{i=0}^k \alpha^{iu} \right) \sqrt{\frac{a_u}{1-a_u}} \right) = \left(\sum_{i=0}^k \alpha^{iu} \right)^2$$

and

$$\left(x_1 + \sum_{i=0}^k \alpha^{il} \sqrt{\frac{1-b_l}{b_l}} \right) \cdot \left(x_2 + \sum_{i=0}^k \alpha^{il} \sqrt{\frac{a_l}{1-a_l}} \right) = \left(\sum_{i=0}^k \alpha^{il} \right)^2,$$

proving what we need.

The last fact we want to show to complete the proof is that $r^i = \frac{\alpha^i}{\alpha} r$ for Uniswap V3, where $\alpha_i = \sum_j \alpha^{ij}$, $\alpha = \sum_j \sum_{o=0}^k \alpha^{oj}$ for j summing over baskets B^l to B^u . We see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{r}^i &= \text{liability}(g_i, p') - \mathbf{q}^i \\
&= \alpha^i (\text{liability}(g^{(j)}, p') - \text{liability}(g^{(j)}, p)) \\
&= \frac{\alpha^i}{\alpha} (\text{liability}(g, p') - \mathbf{q}) \quad \text{where } g = \sum_{i=0}^k g_i \text{ and } \mathbf{q} = \sum_{i=0}^k \mathbf{q}_i \\
&= \frac{\alpha^i}{\alpha} \mathbf{r},
\end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

4.3 A new protocol

We now propose a new protocol using our framework which can be regarded as a variant of Uniswap V3. The basic idea is to use “soft” liquidity buckets which, instead of being a partition of the price space, continuously “fade” in and out around a target price a_j .

Define a set $a_0 < a_1 = 0 < a_2 < \dots < a_k = 1 < a_{k+1}$. Our “buckets” B_j will be supported on the interval $[a_{j-1}, a_{j+1}]$. To capture the continuous fading, define the triangular function $T_j : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ as

$$T_j(p) = \begin{cases} 0 & p \notin (a_{j-1}, a_{j+1}) \\ \frac{p-a_{j-1}}{a_j-a_{j-1}} & p \in (a_{j-1}, a_j) \\ \frac{a_{j+1}-p}{a_{j+1}-a_j} & p \in [a_j, a_{j+1}) \end{cases} .$$

The graph of T_j is thus a triangle, with unit height, centered at a_j with value 1 and base endpoints at a_{j-1} and a_{j+1} with value 0. Elsewhere, $T_j = 0$.

We now define the corresponding base liquidity functions ℓ_j as

$$\ell^{(j)}(p) = (\ell T_j)(p) = \begin{cases} 0 & p \notin (a_{j-1}, a_{j+1}) \\ \frac{1}{2(p(1-p))^{\frac{3}{2}}} \frac{p-a_{j-1}}{a_j-a_{j-1}} & p \in (a_{j-1}, a_j) \\ \frac{1}{2(p(1-p))^{\frac{3}{2}}} \frac{a_{j+1}-p}{a_{j+1}-a_j} & p \in [a_j, a_{j+1}) \end{cases} ,$$

where $\ell(p) = \frac{1}{2(p(1-p))^{\frac{3}{2}}}$, to again use the same base “shape” as the constant product invariant $\varphi_\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = x_1 x_2 = \alpha^2$. Let $g^{(j)}$ then be the corresponding base generating functions, given by applying eq. (1) to each $\ell^{(j)}$.

Now letting $\mathcal{G}_{\text{init}} = \{\sum_j \alpha_j g^{(j)} \mid \forall j \alpha_j > 0\}$ and $\mathcal{G}_{\text{LP}} = \{\sum_j \alpha_j g^{(j)} \mid \forall j \alpha_j \geq 0\}$, exactly as in Uniswap V3, Protocol 2 gives a new liquidity provisioning protocol. While the corresponding computations appear to be essentially as light-weight as Uniswap V3, the liquidity function is better behaved. We can characterize the possible liquidity functions $\{g'' \mid g \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{LP}}\}$ as the functions $f\ell$ where f is an arbitrary nonnegative continuous function that is affine on each interval $[a_j, a_{j+1}]$. (Simply take $\alpha_j = f(a_j)$.) Thus, we have in particular that liquidity is always continuous in the price in this new protocol. One can additionally innovate from here, adding more flexibility, while taking care to keep the various computations manageable.

5 General asset setting

We now return to the general setting of n assets. To begin, we revisit the interpretation of liquidity provisioning as running many market makers in parallel, and show that three natural interpretations of this idea lead to equivalent protocols. In particular, we will leverage the equivalence to parallel scoring rule market makers to prove Theorem 1, the equivalence of our two-asset protocol which we used extensively in § 4. We then discuss the meaning of liquidity in higher dimensions, and justify why liquidity is inherently directional, and requires specifying a full matrix. Finally, we highlight an interesting open problem regarding budget balanced fees, which only arises when $n > 2$.

Protocol 5 General protocol as parallel scoring rule markets

- 1: **global constant** $\beta > 0$
 - 2: **global variables** $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbf{p} \in \text{relint } \Delta_n$, $\{G_i \in \mathcal{G}_n\}_{i=0}^k$
 - 3: $S_G(\mathbf{p}, \cdot) := \nabla \overline{G}(\mathbf{p}) = \mathbf{d}G_{\mathbf{p}} + (G(\mathbf{p}) - \langle \mathbf{d}G_{\mathbf{p}}, \mathbf{p} \rangle) \mathbf{1}$
 - 4: **function** Initialize($\mathbf{p} \in \text{relint } \Delta_n, G \in \mathcal{G}^*$)
 - 5: $(k, \mathbf{p}, G_0) \leftarrow (0, \mathbf{p}, G)$
 - 6: market creator holds $-S_{G_0}(\mathbf{p}, \cdot)$ in reserve
 - 7: **function** RegisterLP($i = k + 1$)
 - 8: $(k, G_k) \leftarrow (k + 1, 0)$
 - 9: **function** ModifyLiquidity($i \in \mathbb{N}, G' \in \mathcal{G}_n$)
 - 10: **request** $S_{G_i}(\mathbf{p}, \cdot) - S_{G'}(\mathbf{p}, \cdot)$ from LP i
 - 11: $G_i \leftarrow G'$
 - 12: **function** ExecuteTrade($\hat{\mathbf{p}} \in \text{relint } \Delta_n$) \triangleright Trade specified indirectly by desired next price $\hat{\mathbf{p}}$
 - 13: $\mathbf{r} \leftarrow S_G(\hat{\mathbf{p}}, \cdot) - S_G(\mathbf{p}, \cdot)$ where $G = \sum_i G_i$
 - 14: **pay** trader $\mathbf{r} - \beta(-\mathbf{r})_+$
 - 15: **for** each LP i **do**
 - 16: **pay** $\beta(S_{G_i}(\mathbf{p}, \cdot) - S_{G_i}(\hat{\mathbf{p}}, \cdot))_+$ in fees to LP i
 - 17: $\mathbf{p} \leftarrow \hat{\mathbf{p}}$
-

5.1 Four interpretations of parallel market making

As we have argued informally, one can regard liquidity provisioning as (a) recruiting multiple market makers, which then (b) process trades in parallel. We now study (b) formally, how multiple market makers processing trades in parallel, showing that four natural ways to interpret this parallelism are all equivalent. The equivalence of (a) in these interpretations, the process of recruiting market makers and securing deposits, is then straightforward (§ 5.4).

In interpretations 1-3, each market maker i is specified by a cost function C_i , and the state by the collection of liability vectors \mathbf{q}^i for each. In 3, market makers instead have a scoring rule S_i generated by a convex function $G_i = C_i^*$, and maintain a price \mathbf{p}^i . In all cases we assume the trader behaves rationally, in the sense that the overall trade is Pareto optimal: if \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}' are both valid trades, and $\mathbf{r} \succeq \mathbf{r}'$, the trader chooses \mathbf{r} . (Recall that trades are oriented toward the trader, so here \mathbf{r} gives the trader weakly more of each asset.)

In each interpretation, we capture the market state by the collection of liability vectors $\{\mathbf{q}^i \in \mathbb{R}^n\}_i$. After a trade $\mathbf{r} = \sum_i \mathbf{r}^i$, the state updates to $\{\mathbf{q}^i + \mathbf{r}^i\}_i$. The set of consistent market prices are defined to be $\partial C_i(\mathbf{q}^i)$ for interpretations 1-3, and an analogous definition for 4. We say the overall market state is *coherent* if there is a consistent price $\mathbf{p} \in \text{relint } \Delta_n$ for all market makers simultaneously.

1. **The trader selects a valid trade from each market maker and executes them all.**
Formally, for each market maker i the trader selects \mathbf{r}^i such that $C_i(\mathbf{q}^i + \mathbf{r}^i) = C_i(\mathbf{q}^i)$, for a total trade of $\mathbf{r} = \sum_i \mathbf{r}^i$.
2. **The trader continuously trades at the most favorable price and at some point stops.** Recall that we can interpret a cost function C_i as quoting a cost $C_i(\mathbf{q}^i + \mathbf{v}^i) - C_i(\mathbf{q}^i)$

for each bundle of assets $\mathbf{v}^i \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Formally, in this interpretation, the trader specifies a direction $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and a stopping point α , and continuously purchases $\mathbf{v}dt$ for the smallest price $C'_i(\mathbf{q}^i; \mathbf{v})$ over all i , for α units of time. Here $C'_i(\mathbf{q}^i; \mathbf{v}) := \lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{C_i(\mathbf{q}^i + h\mathbf{v}) - C_i(\mathbf{q}^i)}{h}$ is the directional derivative of C_i . In other words, the trades are of the form $(\mathbf{v} - C'_i(\mathbf{q}^i; \mathbf{v})\mathbf{1})dt$, where we recall that the numeraire is simply $\mathbf{1}$.

3. **A fully centralized market maker using the infimal convolution.** This interpretation corresponds to the rules for trade in Protocol 1. Formally, the trader must choose some $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $C(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{r}) = C(\mathbf{q})$ where $C = \wedge_i C_i$ and $\mathbf{q} = \sum_i \mathbf{q}^i$. The central market maker computes a split $\mathbf{r} = \sum_i \mathbf{r}^i$ such that $C_i(\mathbf{q}^i + \mathbf{r}^i) = C_i(\mathbf{q}^i)$, whose existence we establish below, and executes these trades in each constituent market maker.
4. **Each market maker uses a market scoring rule, and the trader is paid according to the sum of them.** Formally, each market maker has a scoring rule $S_i(\mathbf{p}, y) = G_i(\mathbf{p}) + \langle dG_{\mathbf{p}}, \delta^y - \mathbf{p} \rangle$ where $G_i = C_i^*$ and $\{dG_{\mathbf{p}} \in \partial G(\mathbf{p}) \mid \mathbf{p} \in \text{relint } \Delta_n\}$ is an arbitrary selection of subgradients. Market maker i maintains a price vector $\mathbf{p}^i \in \text{relint } \Delta_n$, and the trader may choose any $\hat{\mathbf{p}}^i \in \text{relint } \Delta_n$, resulting in the trade $\mathbf{r}^i = S_i(\hat{\mathbf{p}}^i, \cdot) - S_i(\mathbf{p}^i, \cdot) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. See Protocol 5. For the purposes of comparing interpretations, define the set of consistent prices as $\{\mathbf{p} \in \text{relint } \Delta_n \mid \forall i S_i(\mathbf{p}, \cdot) = S_i(\mathbf{p}^i, \cdot)\}$.

5.2 Technical conditions and lemmas

Definition 6 (1-homogeneous extension \bar{G}). *Given $G : \Delta_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we define its 1-homogeneous extension $\bar{G} : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $\bar{G}(\mathbf{x}) := \|\mathbf{x}\|_1 G(\mathbf{x}/\|\mathbf{x}\|_1)$ for $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}$ and $\bar{G}(\mathbf{0}) = 0$.*

Definition 7 (Smoothness of G). *We say a convex function $G : \Delta_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is smooth if its 1-homogenous extension $\bar{G} : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ is differentiable.*

The following term was coined in Abernethy et al. (2013) and used similarly to our setting: ensuring that the market price remains in the relative interior of the simplex.

Definition 8 (Pseudobarrier). *A generating function G is a pseudobarrier if for any sequence $\{\mathbf{p}^j \in \text{relint } \Delta_n\}_j$ limiting to the relative boundary of Δ_n , and any $\mathbf{q}^j \in \partial G(\mathbf{p}^j)$, we have $\|\mathbf{q}^j\| \rightarrow \infty$.*

A common example of a pseudobarrier is (negative) Shannon entropy $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{p}) = \sum_y p_y \log p_y$. Another is thue dual of the constant product market maker $G(\mathbf{p}) = -n(\prod_y p_y)^{1/n}$.⁵

The key class of the functions G we restrict to is as follows.

Definition 9 (Generating function). *We will say $G : \Delta_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a generating function if it is convex, smooth, and bounded on Δ_n .*

We now give the sets of cost and generating functions used in the general protocols. Let \mathcal{G}_n be the set of nonpositive generating functions $G : \Delta_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\leq 0}$, and $\mathcal{G}_n^* \subseteq \mathcal{G}_n$ those which are pseudobarriers.⁶ Let \mathcal{C}_n and \mathcal{C}_n^* be the sets of conjugates of \mathcal{G}_n and \mathcal{G}_n^* , respectively.

⁵To see that this dual is correct, one can observe that it is 1-homogeneous, and thus $S(\mathbf{p}, y) = -(\prod_{y'} p_{y'})^{1-1/n} (\prod_{y' \neq y} p_{y'})$. Now letting $\mathbf{x} = -S(\mathbf{p}, \cdot)$ be the corresponding reserve vector, and computing the product, we have $\prod_y q_y = \prod_y (\prod_{y'} p_{y'})^{1-1/n} (\prod_{y' \neq y} p_{y'}) = 1$.

⁶Similar to the remark in § 3.5, given any bounded generating function G , to obtain the optimal liability, we can simply replace it by the function $\mathbf{p} \mapsto G(\mathbf{p}) - \langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle$ where $q_i = G(\delta^i)$.

Lemma 1. *Let G be a pseudobarrier and $C = G^*$. Then for all $\mathbf{q}, \hat{\mathbf{q}} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we have $\partial C(\mathbf{q}) \subseteq \text{relint } \Delta_n$ and $\hat{\mathbf{q}} \succcurlyeq \mathbf{q} \implies C(\hat{\mathbf{q}}) > C(\mathbf{q})$.*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{p} \in \partial C(\mathbf{q})$. By Proposition 1, $\mathbf{q} \in \partial G(\mathbf{p})$. If $\mathbf{p} \notin \text{relint } \Delta_n$, then we have an interior sequence $\{\mathbf{p}^j\}_j$ such that $\mathbf{p}^j \rightarrow_j \mathbf{p}$ and subgradients $\mathbf{q}^j \rightarrow_j \mathbf{q}$, violating the definition of a pseudobarrier. For this \mathbf{p} , we have $p_y > 0$ for all $y \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. As $\hat{\mathbf{q}} \succcurlyeq \mathbf{q}$, we have $\hat{q}_y \geq q_y$ for all y , with at least one inequality strict. Thus by the subgradient inequality, $C(\hat{\mathbf{q}}) - C(\mathbf{q}) \geq \langle \mathbf{p}, \hat{\mathbf{q}} - \mathbf{q} \rangle > 0$, as desired. \square

The following lemma is essentially a restatement of results due to Ovcharov (2018, 2015). It says that subgradients of generating functions G are unique modulo $\mathbf{1}$.

Lemma 2. *Let G be a generating function. Then for all $\mathbf{p} \in \Delta_n$, and all $\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}' \in \partial G(\mathbf{p})$, there exists $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\mathbf{q}' = \mathbf{q} + \alpha \mathbf{1}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{q} \in \partial G(\mathbf{p})$. We will show $\hat{\mathbf{q}} \in \partial \bar{G}(\mathbf{p})$, where $\hat{\mathbf{q}} = \mathbf{q} + (G(\mathbf{p}) - \langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p} \rangle) \mathbf{1}$. By construction, $\langle \hat{\mathbf{q}}, \mathbf{p} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p} \rangle + G(\mathbf{p}) - \langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p} \rangle = G(\mathbf{p})$. For all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{G}(\mathbf{x}) &= \|\mathbf{x}\|_1 G(\mathbf{x}/\|\mathbf{x}\|_1) \\ &\geq \|\mathbf{x}\|_1 (G(\mathbf{p}) + \langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{x}/\|\mathbf{x}\|_1 - \mathbf{p} \rangle) \\ &= \|\mathbf{x}\|_1 (G(\mathbf{p}) + \langle \hat{\mathbf{q}}, \mathbf{x}/\|\mathbf{x}\|_1 - \mathbf{p} \rangle) \\ &= \|\mathbf{x}\|_1 (\langle \hat{\mathbf{q}}, \mathbf{x}/\|\mathbf{x}\|_1 \rangle + G(\mathbf{p}) - \langle \hat{\mathbf{q}}, \mathbf{p} \rangle) \\ &= \langle \hat{\mathbf{q}}, \mathbf{x} \rangle \\ &= \bar{G}(\mathbf{p}) - \langle \hat{\mathbf{q}}, \mathbf{p} \rangle + \langle \hat{\mathbf{q}}, \mathbf{x} \rangle \\ &= \bar{G}(\mathbf{p}) + \langle \hat{\mathbf{q}}, \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{p} \rangle . \end{aligned}$$

Thus, every element of $\partial G(\mathbf{p})$, up to a shift by $\mathbf{1}$, is an element of $\partial \bar{G}(\mathbf{p})$. As the latter is a singleton set, by assumption on G , the result follows. \square

Lemma 3. *Let $C = \wedge_i C_i$ where C_i^* are generating functions. Then for all $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the infimum in the definition of $C(\mathbf{q})$ is attained, and $C(\mathbf{q}) = \sum_i C_i(\mathbf{q}^i)$ if and only there exists $\mathbf{p} \in \Delta_n$ such that $\mathbf{p} \in \partial C_i(\mathbf{q}^i)$ for all i .*

Proof. We have $\text{dom } C_i^* = \Delta_n$ and $\text{dom } C_i = \mathbb{R}^n$ for all i , so Proposition 2 applies. \square

Lemma 4. *Let $C = G^*$ where G is a generating function. For $\mathbf{p} \in \text{relint } \Delta_n$, let $S(\mathbf{p}, y) = G(\mathbf{p}) - \langle \mathbf{d}G_{\mathbf{p}}, \delta^y - \mathbf{p} \rangle$, where $\{\mathbf{d}G_{\mathbf{p}} \in \partial G(\mathbf{p}) \mid \mathbf{p} \in \text{relint } \Delta_n\}$ is a selection of subgradients. Then for all $\mathbf{p} \in \text{relint } \Delta_n$ and $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have $(\mathbf{p} \in \partial C(\mathbf{q}) \wedge C(\mathbf{q}) = 0) \iff \mathbf{q} = S(\mathbf{p}, \cdot)$. In particular, $\{S(\mathbf{p}, \cdot) \mid \mathbf{p} \in \text{relint } \Delta_n\} = \{\mathbf{q} \in C^{-1}(0) \mid \partial C(\mathbf{q}) \cap \text{relint } \Delta_n \neq \emptyset\}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{q} = S(\mathbf{p}, \cdot)$. Then $C(\mathbf{q}) = C(\mathbf{d}G_{\mathbf{p}} + (G(\mathbf{p}) - \langle \mathbf{d}G_{\mathbf{p}}, \mathbf{p} \rangle) \mathbf{1}) = G(\mathbf{d}G_{\mathbf{p}}) + G(\mathbf{p}) - \langle \mathbf{d}G_{\mathbf{p}}, \mathbf{p} \rangle = 0$ by Proposition 1. Furthermore, by the same theorem, $\mathbf{d}G_{\mathbf{p}} \in \partial G(\mathbf{p}) \iff \mathbf{p} \in \partial C(\mathbf{d}G_{\mathbf{p}})$, and by $\mathbf{1}$ -invariance, $\partial C(\mathbf{d}G_{\mathbf{p}}) = \partial C(S(\mathbf{p}, \cdot))$. Thus, $\mathbf{p} \in \partial C(\mathbf{q})$.

Now let \mathbf{q} such that $C(\mathbf{q}) = 0$, and take $\mathbf{p} \in \partial C(\mathbf{q})$; we will show $\mathbf{q} = S(\mathbf{p}, \cdot)$. By Proposition 1, $\mathbf{q} \in \partial G(\mathbf{p})$. From Lemma 2, we have $\partial G(\mathbf{p}) = \{\mathbf{d}G_{\mathbf{p}} + \alpha \mathbf{1} \mid \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\}$. Thus $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{d}G_{\mathbf{p}} + \alpha \mathbf{1}$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Now $0 = C(\mathbf{q}) = C(\mathbf{d}G_{\mathbf{p}} + \alpha \mathbf{1}) = C(\mathbf{d}G_{\mathbf{p}}) + \alpha = \langle \mathbf{d}G_{\mathbf{p}}, \mathbf{p} \rangle - G(\mathbf{p}) + \alpha$ by Proposition 1. Thus $\alpha = G(\mathbf{p}) - \langle \mathbf{d}G_{\mathbf{p}}, \mathbf{p} \rangle$, and we have $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{d}G_{\mathbf{p}} + (G(\mathbf{p}) - \langle \mathbf{d}G_{\mathbf{p}}, \mathbf{p} \rangle) \mathbf{1} = S(\mathbf{p}, \cdot)$, as desired. \square

5.3 Equivalence of the interpretations

Before stating the equivalence of these interpretations, we must address an important technical point. Lemma 4 essentially says that, by our assumptions on G , the resulting scoring rule vectors are unique for each price $\mathbf{p} \in \text{relint } \Delta_n$. This statement can fail to hold, however, on the relative boundary of the simplex Δ_n . Taking $G(\mathbf{p}) = \|\mathbf{p}\|_2^2$, or any LP that does not provide infinite liquidity at the boundary of Δ_n , the resulting G will not have a unique subgradient (even modulo $\mathbf{1}$) at those boundary points, meaning we will have $\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}' \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\mathbf{p} \in \partial C(\mathbf{q}) \cap \partial C(\mathbf{q}')$, but with $\mathbf{q}' - \mathbf{q} \neq \alpha \mathbf{1}$ for any α . The scoring rule S must pick just one of these vectors, meaning the scoring rule market (interpretation 4) will be strictly less expressive than the others. Somewhat conversely, consider G to be negative Shannon entropy, which gives rise to the log scoring rule $S(\mathbf{p}, y) = \log p_y$. Here the liquidity does become infinite on the boundary, and consequently the scoring rule vectors have infinite entries. These vectors cannot be captured by any $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, only in the limit.

For these two reasons, we restrict to the relint Δ_n in Lemma 4. The first issue is somewhat surmountable, however: if one defines $\mathbf{d}G_{\mathbf{p}}$ to be the most favorable \mathbf{q} (modulo $\mathbf{1}$) tangent to G at a boundary point \mathbf{p} , then all of the Pareto optimal trades will still be available to the scoring rule market trader. Indeed, the only trades missing are those at the maximum possible price, which is Pareto-suboptimal for the trader anyway—consider a two asset example when the price of the first asset is 1, the maximum possible, so that purchasing the first asset at this price is weakly worse than simply refraining from trade. Thus, while in Theorem 2 we assume there is a “log-like” LP, typically the market creator, which keeps the price away from the boundary, in principle one could generalize this statement using the ideas above to the case where liquidity runs out.

Theorem 2. *Let $C_i = G_i^*$ for generating functions G_i , where at least one G_i is a pseudobarrier. Then the interpretations 1-4 above are equivalent in the following sense: given a coherent market state, the set of valid trades is identical, and the resulting market state is coherent.*

Proof. We will show that 1 and 2 are each equivalent to 3, and 4 is equivalent to 1. For each, let $\{\mathbf{q}^i\}_i$ be the current market state, $\mathbf{q} = \sum_i \mathbf{q}^i$, \mathbf{p} a consistent price, and $C = \wedge_i C_i$. From Lemma 3, price consistency implies $C(\mathbf{q}) = \sum_i C_i(\mathbf{q}^i)$, i.e., the \mathbf{q}^i vectors achieve the infimum in the definition of the infimal convolution.

1. A trade for 3 satisfies the conditions for 1, so we only need to show that this choice is Pareto optimal for the trader; coherence will then follow by Lemma 3. More formally, let $\{\mathbf{r}^i\}_i$ satisfy $C_i(\mathbf{q}^i + \mathbf{r}^i) = C_i(\mathbf{q}^i)$ for all i . Letting $\mathbf{r} = \sum_i \mathbf{r}^i$, from the definition of infimal convolution, $C(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{r}) \leq \sum_i C_i(\mathbf{q}^i + \mathbf{r}^i) = \sum_i C_i(\mathbf{q}^i) = C(\mathbf{q})$. We wish to show that \mathbf{r} is Pareto optimal if and only if $C(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{r}) = C(\mathbf{q})$.

Suppose first that we had some $\hat{\mathbf{r}} \succcurlyeq \mathbf{r}$ such that $C_i(\mathbf{q}^i + \hat{\mathbf{r}}^i) = C_i(\mathbf{q}^i)$ where $\hat{\mathbf{r}} = \sum_i \hat{\mathbf{r}}^i$. From the same argument as above, we have $C(\mathbf{q} + \hat{\mathbf{r}}) \leq \sum_i C_i(\mathbf{q}^i + \hat{\mathbf{r}}^i) = \sum_i C_i(\mathbf{q}^i) = C(\mathbf{q})$. By Lemma 1, $C(\mathbf{q} + \hat{\mathbf{r}}) > C(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{r})$, giving $C(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{r}) < C(\mathbf{q})$.

Conversely, suppose $C(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{r}) \neq C(\mathbf{q})$, which from the inequality above implies $C(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{r}) < C(\mathbf{q})$. Let $\hat{\mathbf{r}} = \mathbf{r} + (C(\mathbf{q}) - C(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{r}))\mathbf{1} \succcurlyeq \mathbf{r}$. By $\mathbf{1}$ invariance, we have $C(\mathbf{q} + \hat{\mathbf{r}}) = C(\mathbf{q})$. From part 3 of the proof below, there exists a split $\hat{\mathbf{r}} = \sum_i \hat{\mathbf{r}}^i$ such that $C_i(\mathbf{q}^i + \hat{\mathbf{r}}^i) = C_i(\mathbf{q}^i)$. Thus, \mathbf{r} was not a Pareto-optimal total trade.

3. Let \mathbf{r} such that $C(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{r}) = C(\mathbf{q})$. We must show that there exist $\{\mathbf{r}^i\}_i$ such that $C_i(\mathbf{q}^i + \mathbf{r}^i) = C_i(\mathbf{q}^i)$ and $\mathbf{r} = \sum_i \mathbf{r}^i$. From the definition of infimal convolution, $C(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{r}) = \inf\{\sum_i C_i(\mathbf{v}^i) \mid$

$\sum_i \mathbf{v}^i = \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{r}$. By Lemma 3, this infimum is attained by some $\{\mathbf{v}^i\}_i$. Define $\mathbf{r}^i := \mathbf{v}^i - \mathbf{q}^i + (C_i(\mathbf{q}^i) - C_i(\mathbf{v}^i))\mathbf{1}$. For the first condition, $C_i(\mathbf{q}^i + \mathbf{r}^i) = C_i(\mathbf{v}^i + (C_i(\mathbf{q}^i) - C_i(\mathbf{v}^i))\mathbf{1}) = C_i(\mathbf{q}^i)$. For the second,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_i \mathbf{r}^i &= \sum_i \mathbf{v}^i - \sum_i \mathbf{q}^i + \sum_i (C_i(\mathbf{q}^i) - C_i(\mathbf{v}^i))\mathbf{1} \\ &= (\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{r}) - \mathbf{q} + \left(\sum_i C_i(\mathbf{q}^i) - \sum_i C_i(\mathbf{v}^i) \right) \mathbf{1} \\ &= \mathbf{r} + (C(\mathbf{q}) - C(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{r}))\mathbf{1} = \mathbf{r} . \end{aligned}$$

Coherence again follows from Lemma 3.

4. We will show equivalence to interpretation 1. Let $\alpha_i = C_i(\mathbf{q}^i)$ for all i , so that $C(\mathbf{q}^i - \alpha_i\mathbf{1}) = 0$. By Lemma 4, we may therefore write $\mathbf{q}^i = S(\hat{\mathbf{p}}^i, \cdot) + \alpha_i\mathbf{1}$. From Lemma 3, we again have $C(\mathbf{q}) = \sum_i C(\mathbf{q}^i)$. From Lemma 4 again, and $\mathbf{1}$ -invariance,

$$\begin{aligned} &\{\mathbf{r}^i \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid C_i(\mathbf{q}^i + \mathbf{r}^i) = C_i(\mathbf{q}^i)\} \\ &= \{\mathbf{r}^i \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid C_i(\mathbf{q}^i + \mathbf{r}^i - \alpha_i\mathbf{1}) = C_i(\mathbf{q}^i - \alpha_i\mathbf{1})\} \\ &= \{\mathbf{r}^i \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid C_i(S_i(\hat{\mathbf{p}}^i, \cdot) + \mathbf{r}^i) = C_i(S_i(\hat{\mathbf{p}}^i, \cdot))\} \\ &= \{\mathbf{r}^i \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid C_i(S_i(\hat{\mathbf{p}}^i, \cdot) + \mathbf{r}^i) = 0\} \\ &= \{\hat{\mathbf{q}}^i - S(\hat{\mathbf{p}}^i, \cdot) \mid C_i(\hat{\mathbf{q}}^i) = 0\} \\ &= \{S(\hat{\mathbf{p}}^i, \cdot) - S(\hat{\mathbf{p}}^i, \cdot) \mid \hat{\mathbf{p}}^i \in \text{relint } \Delta_n\} . \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that the possible trades $\{\mathbf{r}^i\}_i$ in interpretation 1, such that $C_i(\mathbf{q}^i + \hat{\mathbf{r}}^i) = C_i(\mathbf{q}^i)$ for all i , are exactly the same as the trades $\{S_i(\hat{\mathbf{p}}^i, \cdot) - S_i(\hat{\mathbf{p}}^i, \cdot)\}_i$ allowed in interpretation 4; we have simply reparameterized the trades by $\{\hat{\mathbf{p}}^i\}_i$. \square

Proposition 7. *In interpretations 1, 2, and 4, if the market state is not coherent, it becomes coherent after a sufficiently large trade.*

5.4 Equivalence of the full protocols and practical considerations

Theorem 2 tells us that the process of trading in Protocols 1 and 5 are the same. The equivalence of the rest of the protocol follows from Lemma 4, as $\text{liability}(C) = S_G(\mathbf{p}, \cdot)$ where $\mathbf{p} \in \partial C(\mathbf{q})$.

The two-asset case is similar; we need only verify the translation from G and C to their 1-dimensional counterparts. Letting $G(\mathbf{p}) = g(p_1)$, we have $\overline{G}(\mathbf{x}) = (x_1 + x_2)g(x_1/(x_1 + x_2))$ which is differentiable. Lemma 2 now gives $\partial G(\mathbf{p}) = \{(g'(p_1), 0) + \alpha\mathbf{1} \mid \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\}$ and thus $S_G(\mathbf{p}, \cdot) = \mathbf{d}G_{\mathbf{p}} + (G(\mathbf{p}) + \langle \mathbf{d}G_{\mathbf{p}}, \mathbf{p} \rangle)\mathbf{1} = (g'(p_1), 0) + (g(p_1) - p_1g'(p_1))\mathbf{1} = \text{liability}(g, p_1)$. Computing the conjugate, we have

$$\begin{aligned} G^*(\mathbf{q}) &= \sup_{\mathbf{p} \in \Delta_2} \langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle - G(\mathbf{p}) \\ &= \sup_{p \in [0,1]} pq_1 + (1-p)q_2 - g(p) \\ &= \left(\sup_{p \in [0,1]} p(q_1 - q_2) - g(p) \right) + q_2 \\ &= g^*(q_1 - q_2) + q_2 , \end{aligned}$$

as desired. Finally, to verify price, note that $c' = (g')^{-1}$ whenever both derivatives are defined. By assumption on $\mathcal{G}_{\text{init}}$, any argument to price is both differentiable and strictly convex, and thus c is differentiable. We have now established Theorem 1.

In many ways, for blockchain applications, Protocol 5 is the more practically appealing of the two. Instead of specifying a trade directly, the “inversion” from proposed trades to implied prices is handled off-chain by the trader. In practice, the price function from Protocol 2 is computationally expensive; an implementation in line with Protocol 5 where traders specify a new price would alleviate this burden on the market maker, while still giving just as flexible an interface. The remaining computation, of the implied liability vectors, is more straightforward.

6 Liquidity and fees in higher dimensions

The literature on automated market makers often refers to liquidity offered at a given price as a real-valued quantity. (E.g. the “market depth” value in [Abernethy et al. \(2013\)](#).) We now argue that liquidity is inherently higher-dimensional when working with more than 2 assets. Moreover, as a result, the fees in our general protocols may fail to be budget balanced in some cases: the global fee may not sum to the individual fees owed to the LPs.

6.1 Liquidity as a Hessian matrix

Let us first consider the Hessian matrix that arises from the 2-asset constant product market maker, which corresponds to the choice $G(\mathbf{p}) = -2\sqrt{p_1 p_2}$. As this function is already 1-homogeneous, we can simply compute its Hessian:

$$\nabla^2 \overline{G}(\mathbf{p}) = \frac{1}{2(p_1 p_2)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \begin{bmatrix} p_2^2 & -p_1 p_2 \\ -p_1 p_2 & p_1^2 \end{bmatrix} .$$

This matrix is rank 1, with a 0 eigenvalue in direction \mathbf{p} , as a result of $G = \overline{G}$ being 1-homogeneous. Looking in the direction $\mathbf{v} = (1, -1)^\top$, i.e., purchasing asset 1, we obtain liquidity

$$\mathbf{v}^\top \nabla^2 \overline{G}(\mathbf{p}) \mathbf{v} = \frac{(p_1 + p_2)^2}{2(p_1 p_2)^{3/2}} = \frac{1}{2(p_1(1 - p_1))^{3/2}} = g''(p_1) ,$$

where $g(p) = -2\sqrt{p(1-p)}$ as in § 4. Thus, for 2 assets, liquidity is indeed 1-dimensional.

Now consider two scoring rule market makers for 3 assets, both based on the constant product market maker. The first is the dual of the usual constant product market maker, and the second the sum of pair-wise constant products for all 3 pairs of assets.

$$\begin{aligned} G^{(1)}(\mathbf{p}) &= -3(p_1 p_2 p_3)^{1/3} , \\ G^{(2)}(\mathbf{p}) &= -2\sqrt{p_1 p_2} - 2\sqrt{p_2 p_3} - 2\sqrt{p_1 p_3} . \end{aligned}$$

We will examine their liquidity as a function of \mathbf{p} . Both functions are written in a 1-homogenous

form already, so may simply compute their Hessians to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla^2 \overline{G}^{(1)} &= \frac{1}{3(p_1 p_2 p_3)^{2/3}} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{2p_2 p_3}{p_1} & -p_3 & -p_2 \\ -p_3 & \frac{2p_1 p_3}{p_2} & -p_1 \\ -p_2 & -p_1 & \frac{2p_1 p_2}{p_3} \end{bmatrix}, \\ \nabla^2 \overline{G}^{(2)} &= \frac{1}{2(p_1 p_2 p_3)^{1/2}} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{p_2 \sqrt{p_3 + \sqrt{p_2 p_3}}}{p_1} & -\sqrt{p_3} & -\sqrt{p_2} \\ -\sqrt{p_3} & \frac{p_1 \sqrt{p_3 + \sqrt{p_1 p_3}}}{p_2} & -\sqrt{p_1} \\ -\sqrt{p_2} & -\sqrt{p_1} & \frac{p_1 \sqrt{p_2 + \sqrt{p_1 p_2}}}{p_3} \end{bmatrix}.\end{aligned}$$

These matrices are rank 2, again with a 0 eigenvalue in direction \mathbf{p} .

Now let us imagine a trader wishing to purchase asset 1 in exchange for asset 3. Letting $\mathbf{v} = (1, 0, -1)^\top$, the liquidity in these two markets in this direction, meaning the price insensitivity as a trader purchases asset 1 for 3, can be calculated simply as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{v}^\top \nabla^2 \overline{G}^{(1)} \mathbf{v} &= \frac{2p_2 \left(\frac{p_1}{p_3} + \frac{p_3}{p_1} + 1 \right)}{3(p_1 p_2 p_3)^{2/3}} = p_2^{1/3} \frac{2 \left(\frac{p_1}{p_3} + \frac{p_3}{p_1} + 1 \right)}{3(p_1 p_3)^{2/3}}, \\ \mathbf{v}^\top \nabla^2 \overline{G}^{(2)} \mathbf{v} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{p_1 p_3}} + \frac{\sqrt{p_1 p_2} + \sqrt{p_1 p_3}}{2p_1^2} + \frac{\sqrt{p_1 p_3} + \sqrt{p_2 p_3}}{2p_3^2}.\end{aligned}$$

We can now see that as the $p_2 \rightarrow 0$, the price of asset 2 approaches 0, the liquidity between the other two assets is also driven to 0 for $G^{(1)}$. As first observed by [Grugett \(2023\)](#), this behavior can be undesirable, and is alleviated by considering $G^{(2)}$ instead, since there the liquidity is lower bounded by $1/\sqrt{p_1 p_3}$ regardless of the price of asset 2. Simply summarizing the liquidity or “depth” of these markets by a single real value could miss this nuance.

6.2 Budget balance of fees

A similar example shows why the fees in [Protocols 1 and 5](#) may not be budget-balanced: the market maker may not charge enough in fees to cover those owed to the LPs. To illustrate why, consider a market with two LPs $G = G_1 + G_2$ where $G_1(\mathbf{p}) = -2\sqrt{p_1 p_2}$ and $G_2(\mathbf{p}) = -2\sqrt{p_2 p_3}$. In other words, G has two LPs, one which is constant-product between assets 1 and 2, and the other between 2 and 3. Per [Protocol 5](#), a trade $\mathbf{p} \rightarrow \mathbf{p}'$ is given by $\mathbf{r} = S_G(\mathbf{p}', \cdot) - S_G(\mathbf{p}, \cdot)$, where

$$S_G(\mathbf{p}, \cdot) = \nabla \overline{G}(\mathbf{p}) = \nabla \overline{G}_1(\mathbf{p}) + \nabla \overline{G}_2(\mathbf{p}) = (\sqrt{p_1/p_2}, \sqrt{p_2/p_1} + \sqrt{p_2/p_3}, \sqrt{p_3/p_2}). \quad (2)$$

The trade is then split among the two LPs, as

$$\mathbf{r}^1 = \nabla G_1(\mathbf{p}') - \nabla G_1(\mathbf{p}) = (\sqrt{p'_1/p'_2} - \sqrt{p_1/p_2}, \sqrt{p'_2/p'_1} - \sqrt{p_2/p_1}, 0), \quad (3)$$

$$\mathbf{r}^2 = \nabla G_2(\mathbf{p}') - \nabla G_2(\mathbf{p}) = (0, \sqrt{p'_2/p'_3} - \sqrt{p_2/p_3}, \sqrt{p'_3/p'_2} - \sqrt{p_3/p_2}). \quad (4)$$

Let us start the market at the uniform price $\mathbf{p} = (1/3, 1/3, 1/3)$, and consider a trader wishing to purchase asset 1 in exchange for asset 3, as above. Intuitively, as there is liquidity between assets 1 and 2 (provided by LP 1) and between assets 2 and 3 (provided by LP 2), there should be “combined” liquidity between 1 and 3. And indeed that is the case: if the trader selects

$\mathbf{p}' = \left(\frac{3/2+\sqrt{2}}{3+\sqrt{2}}, \frac{1}{3+\sqrt{2}}, \frac{1}{2(3+\sqrt{2})} \right)$, an expression chosen for arithmetic convenience, we have a resulting trade $\mathbf{r} = \nabla G(\mathbf{p}') - \nabla G(\mathbf{p}) = (\sqrt{3/2} - 1, 0, \sqrt{1/2} - 1)$. The split $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r}^1 + \mathbf{r}^2$ between the LPs is also roughly as one would expect, each \mathbf{r}^i being between the corresponding pair of assets:

$$\mathbf{r}^1 = \nabla G_1(\mathbf{p}') - \nabla G_1(\mathbf{p}) = (0, \sqrt{2} - 1, \sqrt{1/2} - 1) , \quad (5)$$

$$\mathbf{r}^2 = \nabla G_2(\mathbf{p}') - \nabla G_2(\mathbf{p}) = (\sqrt{3/2} - 1, 1 - \sqrt{2}, 0) . \quad (6)$$

When one considers the fees, however, an issue becomes apparent. The fee charged the trader, $\beta(-\mathbf{r})_+ = \beta(0, 0, 1 - \sqrt{1/2})$, ignores the fact that LP 2 provided liquidity that facilitated the trade. Indeed, looking at the fees paid to LPs, we see this same fee $\beta(-\mathbf{r}^1)_+ = \beta(0, 0, 1 - \sqrt{1/2})$ paid to LP 1, plus an additional fee of $\beta(-\mathbf{r}^2)_+ = \beta(0, \sqrt{2} - 1, 0)$ to LP 2.

Fortunately, this issue is not present in 2-asset protocols like Protocol 2, but clearly it can emerge beyond 2 assets. Moreover, it seems to emerge precisely when there is “synergy” among the LPs, enabling trades that fruitfully combine their liquidity. While one could easily fix this issue by directly charging the trader for the sum of the fees to the LPs, doing so may be problematic. For example, this proposal would break the abstraction barrier, in the sense that the fees would depend intimately on the LP profile, not just their combined liquidity. Resolving this issue adequately is an interesting direction for future work.

Acknowledgments

This material is based upon work supported by the Ethereum Foundation, and the National Science Foundation under Grant Nos. IIS-2045347 and DMS-1928930, the latter while the second author was in residence at the Mathematical Sciences Research Institute in Berkeley, California, during the Fall 2023 semester. We thank James Grugett, Alex Solleiro, and Bo Waggoner for several interesting discussions and ideas.

References

- Jacob Abernethy, Yiling Chen, and Jennifer Wortman Vaughan. Efficient market making via convex optimization, and a connection to online learning. *ACM Transactions on Economics and Computation*, 1(2):12, 2013. URL <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=2465777>.
- Hayden Adams, Noah Zinsmeister, and Dan Robinson. Uniswap v2 core, 2020. URL <https://uniswap.org/whitepaper.pdf>.
- Hayden Adams, Noah Zinsmeister, Moody Salem, River Keefer, and Dan Robinson. Uniswap v3 core, 2021. URL <https://uniswap.org/whitepaper-v3.pdf>.
- Guillermo Angeris and Tarun Chitra. Improved price oracles: Constant function market makers. In *Proceedings of the 2nd ACM Conference on Advances in Financial Technologies*, pages 80–91, 2020.
- Guillermo Angeris, Tarun Chitra, Theo Diamandis, Alex Evans, and Kshitij Kulkarni. The geometry of constant function market makers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.08066*, 2023.
- Y. Chen and D.M. Pennock. A utility framework for bounded-loss market makers. In *Proceedings of the 23rd Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 49–56, 2007.
- Zhou Fan, Francisco Marmolejo-Cossío, Ben Altschuler, He Sun, Xintong Wang, and David C. Parkes. Differential liquidity provision in uniswap v3 and implications for contract design, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.00464>.
- Zhou Fan, Francisco Marmolejo-Cossío, Daniel J. Moroz, Michael Neuder, Rithvik Rao, and David C. Parkes. Strategic liquidity provision in uniswap v3, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.12033>.
- Rafael Frongillo, Maneesha Papireddygar, and Bo Waggoner. An axiomatic characterization of cfms and equivalence to prediction markets, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.00196>.
- James Grugett. Multiple choice markets, 2023. URL <https://news.manifold.markets/p/multiple-choice-markets>. Retrieved 11/14/2023.
- R. Hanson. Combinatorial Information Market Design. *Information Systems Frontiers*, 5(1):107–119, 2003.
- Manifold. Maniswap. <https://www.notion.so/Maniswap-ce406e1e897d417cbd491071ea8a0c39>, 2022.
- Evgeni Y. Ovcharov. Existence and uniqueness of proper scoring rules. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 16: 2207–2230, 2015. ISSN 1532-4435,1533-7928.
- Evgeni Y. Ovcharov. Proper scoring rules and Bregman divergence. *Bernoulli*, 24(1):53 – 79, 2018. doi: 10.3150/16-BEJ857. URL <https://doi.org/10.3150/16-BEJ857>.
- R.T. Rockafellar. *Convex analysis*, volume 28 of *Princeton Mathematics Series*. Princeton University Press, 1997.

Jan Christoph Schlegel, Mateusz Kwaśnicki, and Akaki Mamageishvili. Axioms for constant function market makers, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.00048>.

Thomas Strömberg. *A study of the operation of infimal convolution*. PhD thesis, Lule tekniska universitet, 1994.