

SAMM: Sharded Automated Market Maker

Hongyin Chen
Peking University
Technion

Amit Vaisman
Technion

Ittay Eyal
Technion

Abstract

Automated Market Makers (AMMs) are a cornerstone of decentralized finance. They are *smart contracts* (stateful programs) running on blockchains. They enable virtual token exchange: Traders swap tokens with the AMM for a fee, while *liquidity providers* supply liquidity and earn these fees. Demand for AMMs is growing rapidly, but our experiment-based estimates show that current architectures cannot meet the projected demand by 2029. This is because the execution of existing AMMs is non-parallelizable.

We present *SAMM*, an AMM comprising multiple *shards*. All shards are AMMs running on the same chain, but their independence enables parallel execution. Unlike classical sharding solutions, here security relies on *incentive compatibility*. Therefore, *SAMM* introduces a novel fee design. Through analysis of Subgame-Perfect Nash Equilibria (SPNE), we show that *SAMM* incentivizes the desired behavior: Liquidity providers balance liquidity among all shards, overcoming destabilization attacks, and trades are evenly distributed. We validate our game-theoretic analysis with a simulation using real-world data.

We evaluate *SAMM* by implementing and deploying it on local testnets of the Sui and Solana blockchains. To our knowledge, this is the first quantification of “hot-contract” performance. *SAMM* improves throughput by 5x and 16x, respectively, potentially more with better parallelization of the underlying blockchains. It is directly deployable, mitigating the upcoming scaling bottleneck.

1 Introduction

Decentralized Finance (DeFi) encompasses a variety of financial *smart contracts*: stateful programs operating on blockchain platforms. Their users issue transactions (txs) to generate, loan, and exchange virtual digital tokens. *Automated Market Makers (AMMs)* are a cornerstone of the DeFi ecosystem [25, 26]. They enable users to immediately exchange between token pairs by maintaining *liquidity pools*:

tokens of both types supplied by other users serving as *liquidity providers*. The demand for AMMs is growing rapidly: The prominent Uniswap [3, 4, 68] exchanged \$1 trillion in its first 42 months of operation and an additional \$1 trillion within only 24 months [37].

If the current trend continues, by 2029 demand would surpass 200 tps (§A). This raises two security concerns. First, users defer workload to expansion systems called layer-2 protocols [2, 39] for lower latency and fees; but this entails additional security assumptions.¹ Second, insufficient AMM capacity leads to longer queues for AMM trades, exacerbating front-running vulnerabilities like sandwich attacks [35, 69].

Previous work (§2) all but removed the consensus protocol limitations on throughput (e.g., [1, 7, 18, 21, 28, 34, 47, 53]). Subsequent work addresses execution throughput by employing parallel processing [11, 20, 33]. However, AMMs necessitate sequential handling of transactions since the outcome of each transaction depends on the current state of the AMM and, in turn, alters this state. Therefore, AMM operations are not executed in parallel. For the first time (to the best of our knowledge), we show AMM performance does not scale in state-of-the-art blockchain systems, namely Sui [11] and Solana [64]. The throughput is limited by a single CPU core at 214tps for Sui (Figure 1, $n = 1$) and 129tps for Solana. Since CPU core improvement is slow [23], by 2029 neither system could satisfy AMM demand.

To address the throughput limitation, we employ *sharding* [30, 60, 65], that is, use multiple AMM instances (*shards*). This allows for throughput scaling in blockchains supporting parallel executions, such as Sui [11], Solana [52], and Aptos [33] (though not Bitcoin [43] or Ethereum [61]).

However, unlike classical work on sharding, in a decentralized system we cannot rely on benign behavior even of a subset of the participants. Instead, as common in blockchain protocols [14, 29, 42, 66] and applications [40, 57], security stems from correct incentives of traders and liquidity providers. We

¹Blockchains are secured by financially-invested nodes. A layer-2 protocol relies on an additional set of nodes, with significantly less at stake [19]. It is thus vulnerable to cheaper attacks, at least in terms of fairness and progress.

therefore model the system (§3) as a set of AMM shards and rational users of two kinds. *Traders* purchase tokens, they use the available AMMs and pay fees as required, aiming to minimize their expenses. *Liquidity providers* deposit tokens into AMMs and earn fees based on their contributions.

The shards are AMMs based on the standard Constant Product Market Maker (CPMM) contract (See §B for background): Roughly, the contract maintains the product of the two tokens constant after each trade. Thus, purchasing a larger amount of a token increases its unit cost, an effect called *slippage*.

We present SAMM (§4), an AMM protocol that uses multiple *shards* operating on the same blockchain, each with an independent liquidity pool. Ideally, all shards should be *balanced*, with the same liquidity; and traders should randomly select a shard to trade. Traders should not split trades across multiple shards, multiplying their overhead. Liquidity providers should not cause imbalances in shard sizes, making some shards less attractive to traders and reducing parallelism. Additionally, the system should re-stabilize if attackers unbalance the shards.

Existing AMM designs do not achieve this and balancing cannot rely on a dispatch contract, which would undermine parallelization. To overcome this, SAMM diverges from the traditional approach of using a fixed-ratio fee. Instead, it employs a trading fee function that incentivizes traders to use the smallest shard.

The model gives rise to a game (§5) played among the users. In each step, either a liquidity provider adds liquidity to a subset of the shards, or a trader executes a trade using a subset of the shards. We assume myopic liquidity provider behavior, reducing the analysis to a Stackelberg game [58] where the liquidity provider adds liquidity to maximize her revenue from a subsequent trade. We observe that naively using a set of independent CPMMs results in all trades being split among all CPMMs, increasing system overhead without improving the satisfied demand. Our analysis of SAMM shows that, indeed, in all best responses, traders use one of the smallest shards. This implies that when shards are balanced, traders will randomly select a shard to trade, as intended. In addition, we prove that shards converge (e.g., following intentional destabilization) to a balanced state in all subgame-perfect Nash Equilibria (SPNE) and present a specific SPNE. Thus, SAMM achieves the incentive-based security goals.

Before validating the theoretical analysis with a simulation, we turn our attention to the performance evaluation of SAMM, which will inform this simulation. We implement the protocol and deploy it in Sui and Solana local test networks. We test *tps* and latencies of trades under different demand rates and numbers of shards. In Sui, the throughput increase is limited by the serial elements of Sui’s transaction processing, following Amdahl’s Law. In Solana, the throughput increases linearly with the number of shards up to a limit due to the blockchain’s constraints. SAMM achieves over a fivefold throughput increase in Sui and a sixteenfold increase




Figure 1: Sui trade latency as a function of demand with n SAMM shards.

in Solana, compared to a standard single-contract AMM. Figure 1 shows that with more shards in Sui, SAMM achieves higher throughput (X axis) with low average latency (Y axis). Error bars show additional experiments, \times marking failure due to overload. We observe similar results in Solana (§I). Improving the blockchains’ parallelism would allow for even better performance. The Mysten Labs Team reproduced our results and intends to make it part of their benchmark suite.²

Finally, we confirm the effects of our incentive design through a simulation using real trade data (§7). The results match those of our theoretical model. Furthermore, SAMM significantly enhances liquidity providers’ revenue with only a slight increase in traders’ costs, due to its improved throughput that enables more trades. The results demonstrate this is not a zero-sum game—higher throughput means more revenue to share.

In summary, our contributions are: (1) Quantification of the blockchain performance bottleneck due to “hot” contracts, (2) SAMM: A sharded AMM contract, (3) generalization of the AMM trading fee function and a novel function to incentivize SAMM’s desired behavior and ensure security, (4) game-theoretic analysis showing Subgame-Perfect Nash Equilibrium (SPNE), (5) evaluation in Sui and Solana, demonstrating a fivefold (in Sui) and sixteenfold (in Solana) increase in throughput (up to the blockchain’s limit), and (6) simulation with real trade data confirming the effects of SAMM’s incentive design.

These results hint at an upcoming challenge (§8) in smart-contract platform design: minimizing the serial elements of transaction processing. But SAMM can already be employed to scale AMM performance both for direct usage and as part of DeFi smart contracts.

²From personal communication. The authors are not affiliated with Mysten Labs (or with Solana) and have no financial interest in their tokens.

2 Related Work

The introduction of the Constant Product Market Maker model by Uniswap v1 [68] enabled asset exchange without relying on traditional order books. Subsequent iterations, Uniswap v2 [4] and v3 [3], further developed the CPMM model by improving the price oracle mechanism (reference of the token exchange rate) and the returns for liquidity providers, respectively. Other AMMs adopted further extended the trading mechanism [17, 44, 55].

Angeris et al. [5] expanded the understanding of AMMs by delving into constant function market makers (CFMMs). Following this, research has increasingly focused on trading utility maximization [6], advanced arbitrage techniques [8, 31, 59, 69], improving liquidity providers' returns [26, 41], ensuring transaction privacy [16], eliminating Miner Extractable Value (MEV) for fair trades [13, 15, 62], and examining the synergy between blockchain-based AMMs and prediction market mechanisms [49]. To the best of our knowledge, previous work did not address AMM throughput scaling.

Like other smart contracts, AMM throughput is limited by the blockchain's constraints. Some AMM contracts (e.g., ZkSwap [32] and QuickSwap [46]) are deployed on so-called layer-2 solutions [2, 9, 12, 27] to defer some workload off-chain, but this merely creates a separate environment for AMM contracts, with scaling issues persisting within this realm while introducing additional security assumptions.¹

Thus, AMM throughput largely depends on the underlying blockchain. The first generation of blockchains, starting with Bitcoin [43], suffered from throughput limitations due to their consensus protocols. A body of work overcame this with a variety of protocols [1, 7, 18, 21, 28, 34, 47, 53, 64, 67]. With consensus constraints out of the way, the serial execution of blockchain transactions became the bottleneck.

Several works propose blockchain sharding [30, 60, 65], i.e., dividing the blockchain into smaller, interconnected chains (shards) allowing parallelism. However, sharding only parallelizes an independent contract and does not benefit AMMs. In SMM we use multiple AMM contracts, which can run on a single-shard blockchain, or in separate shards of a sharded blockchain.

An alternative approach identifies read and write set conflicts and parallelizes non-conflicting smart contract transaction execution [11, 20, 24, 33, 38, 45, 51, 64]. While these methods do enhance the overall throughput of smart contract execution, they are ineffective for non-parallelizable "hot" smart contracts like AMMs.

3 Model

We abstract away the blockchain details for our analysis and model the system as a set of participants interacting directly with AMMs, exchanging tokens. The system progresses in

discrete steps and there exists an external market used by arbitrageurs to arbitrage in our system. The model uses a generic AMM, which we will later instantiate based on previous work and with SMM.

Participants There are two types of participants, *liquidity providers* and *traders*. Each liquidity provider holds some *token A* and *token B*. They aim to increase their holdings. Traders are either *AB* or *BA*, based on their goals. Each *BA* trader occasionally wishes to get a certain amount of *token A*, and vice versa for *AB* traders. They have sufficiently many tokens of the opposite type to complete their trade, but they aim to minimize the cost of obtaining the desired tokens. Both liquidity providers and traders can send and receive tokens to and from the smart contracts.

Automated Market Makers. The system also includes Automated Market Makers, stateful programs that facilitate *depositing* and *trading* of tokens. Each AMM maintains some deposited amounts R^A of *token A* and R^B of *token B*. We call these tokens liquidity.

Within an AMM, there are three primary operations: *liquidity addition*, *liquidity removal*, and *trade*.

- *Liquidity Addition*: The liquidity provider deposits I^A *token A* and I^B *token B* to the contract.
- *Liquidity Removal*: The liquidity provider withdraws O^A *token A* and O^B *token B* from the contract.
- *Trade*: The trader sends I^A *token A* (resp., I^B *token B*) to the contract and gets O^B *token B* (resp., O^A *token A*) from the contract.

In a trade operation, the required input amount for a trader to receive a specific output amount of another token depends on both the output amount and the AMM's current state. We define the gross amount of a *BA* trader as the required input amount of *token B* to get O^A *token A* in the AMM. We denote it by $G(R^A, R^B, O^A)$ (resp., $G(R^B, R^A, O^B)$ for *AB* traders). Within the gross amount, traders pay a so-called *trading fee* which contributes to the liquidity providers' revenue.

Liquidity providers supply liquidity by depositing their tokens in the contract. Once contributing to the AMM, a provider receives tokens from trading fees, hence earning revenue. Liquidity providers can later withdraw their tokens from the AMM.

Following prior work [26, 41] we assume that the trading fee is directly paid to the liquidity providers. Although some practical AMMs (e.g., Uniswap v2 [4]) reinvest the trading fees into themselves, allowing liquidity providers to withdraw more tokens than they deposited as utilities, the trading fee's impact is negligible relative to the deposited amount: The average ratio of the output amount to the deposited amount is nominal (less than 0.036% as we find in §C), and automated

market makers (AMMs) typically charge a low trading fee relative to the gross amount (e.g., 0.3% in Uniswap), so the trading fee’s impact is negligible relative to the amount of deposited tokens.

System State and Progress. There are n independent AMM shards $shard_1, shard_2, \dots, shard_n$ in the system. The system progresses in discrete steps $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ and is orchestrated by a *scheduler*. In each step, the scheduler randomly selects a participant and this participant executes transactions. It chooses a liquidity provider with probability $P_{lp} \geq 0$ and a trader with probability $P_t \geq 0$, where $P_{lp} + P_t = 1$.

The scheduler assigns the liquidity provider l^A token A and l^B token B, where (l^A, l^B) follows a random distribution D_{lp} .

The trader is either a BA trader aiming to obtain token A or an AB trader aiming to obtain token B. The probability of drawing an AB trader (resp., BA trader) is $P_t^{AB} \geq 0$ (resp., $P_t^{BA} \geq 0$), with $P_t^{AB} + P_t^{BA} = P_t$. To avoid repetition, we only show the case of BA traders, the expressions for AB traders are symmetric. The scheduler assigns the BA trader an amount of b^{BA} token A to obtain, following a random distribution D^{BA} .

External Market and Arbitrageurs. Following prior work [26, 41], we assume there is an *external market* providing the price of token A and token B, p^A and p^B , respectively. These prices do not change due to trades; they serve as objective prices for token A and token B.

If the AMM sells tokens at a price lower than the external market, a principal can buy tokens from the AMM and sell them in the external market to make profits, or vice versa if the price is higher in the AMM; this is called an *arbitrage*. Previous work [13, 15, 26, 41] assumes active and rational arbitrageurs who can use the external market and arbitrage to maximize their utility. We follow the assumption [41] that there are immediate arbitrages without trading fees when the token price in the AMM is different from the external market.

Our Goal. The throughput of a single AMM contract is limited due to the underlying blockchain. Our goal is to design a set of AMM contracts to improve the overall throughput of the system, despite the individual rational behavior of all participants.

4 SAMM: Sharded AMM

We present SAMM, an AMM comprising multiple shards. Each shard is an independent AMM (§4.1), and SAMM’s goal is to have operations distributed among the different shards (§4.2). To enforce this desired behavior despite attacks and untrusted users, we present a novel trading fee function (§4.3) and find parameters to fulfill SAMM’s goal (§4.4).

4.1 SAMM Structure

SAMM enables parallel processing by deploying multiple AMM shards, each with an independent liquidity pool. There is no data dependency among the shards and there are no global elements. The operation of each shard is based on the common Constant Product Market Maker (See detailed overview in §B), which maintains the product of the two tokens constant.

When liquidity providers add tokens to a shard, they receive *share tokens*, which signify their portion of its liquidity. Assume the shard has R^A token A and R^B token B deposited, and R^S is the number of all share tokens distributed before the operation. The amount of share tokens acquired by the liquidity provider is $O^S = R^S \times \min\left\{\frac{l^A}{R^A}, \frac{l^B}{R^B}\right\}$. If a liquidity provider pays I^S share tokens to withdraw deposited tokens, she gets $O^A = \frac{I^S}{R^S} \times R^A$ token A and $O^B = \frac{I^S}{R^S} \times R^B$ token B.

When a trader wants to get O^A token A from the AMM, ignoring trading fees, she needs to pay the *net amount*

$$net(R^A, R^B, O^A) = \frac{R^B \times O^A}{R^A - O^A}. \quad (1)$$

The *net price* for a single token A is $\frac{R^B}{R^A - O^A}$ token B. This value increases as the output amount of token A, O^A , increases, which is the *Slippage* of the trade.

4.2 Desired Properties

Most operations in an AMM are trades (We observe 99.5% in historical blockchain records, see §C). Our main goal is therefore that traders distribute the workload evenly among the shards. The following properties will suffice.

c-non-splitting property. Our first goal is that trades use a single shard only, i.e., traders do not split a trade into smaller ones on multiple shards. This avoids the overhead caused by trade splits. So, the cost of a single trade transaction should be less than the combined cost of multiple, split-trade transactions. However, this principle faces a significant challenge as highlighted by Equation 1: When the output amount is not small enough in comparison to the shard’s reserve amount, the resulting slippage could incentivize traders to split their transactions to mitigate this slippage. Consequently, we refine our requirement to ensure that this principle is adhered to only when the output amount is relatively small compared to the deposited amount, specifically when the ratio is below a predefined constant, c . Indeed, the prominent pairs in Ethereum’s Uniswap v2 data support this approach, with 99% of trades having a ratio of output amount to deposited amount below 0.0052 (See §C for more details). We call this the *c-Non-Splitting* property.

Property 4.1 (*c*-Non-Splitting). *Let $m \geq 2$. Given a set of output amount by $\{O_j^A | 1 \leq j \leq m, O_j^A > 0\}$, denote by \tilde{O}^A the sum of the amounts in the set, $\tilde{O}^A = \sum_{j=1}^m O_j^A$. For the constant $0 < c < 1$ and the deposited amount of tokens R^A and R^B , if $\frac{\tilde{O}^A}{R^A} \leq c$, then the cost of trading \tilde{O}^A token A is less than the sum of the cost of trading O_j^A token A for $1 \leq j \leq m$, i.e.,*

$$G_{SMM}(R^A, R^B, \tilde{O}^A) < \sum_{j=1}^m G_{SMM}(R^A, R^B, O_j^A)$$

***c*-smaller-better property.** Our second goal is to maintain balanced volumes in all shards. This is crucial because the volume directly affects the slippage. When there are stark differences in shard sizes, with some being much smaller than others, the slippage in trading within these smaller shards is significantly greater than in larger ones. This discrepancy can result in transactions clustering in the larger shards rather than spread evenly, reducing parallelism. Moreover, an attacker could disrupt the system by adding or removing liquidity from certain shards, thereby harming overall system performance.

We address this by incentivizing liquidity providers to allocate their tokens to the shards with lower volumes. Intuitively, this ensures that smaller shards receive more frequent fees from traders when the volumes of shards are not balanced, which incentivizes liquidity providers to deposit tokens in these smaller shards. Therefore, the system would converge to the state where all shards have balanced volumes, and traders then randomly select shards for trading. As with the *c*-Non-Splitting property, large transactions suffer from high slippage, resulting in an advantage for larger shards. So here too, we refine this requirement to scenarios where the ratio of the traded amount and the deposited amount is below a threshold *c*. We call this the *c*-smaller-better property.

Property 4.2 (*c*-smaller-better). *Given an output amount $O^A > 0$, for any two shards with deposited token amounts (R_i^A, R_i^B) and (R_j^A, R_j^B) , respectively, and $R_i^A < R_j^A$. For the constant $0 < c < 1$, if $\frac{O^A}{R_i^A} < \frac{O^A}{R_j^A} \leq c$ and $\frac{R_i^A}{R_i^B} = \frac{R_j^A}{R_j^B}$, then the cost of trading O^A token A in the smaller shard is less than that in the larger shard, i.e.,*

$$G_{SMM}(R_i^A, R_i^B, O^A) < G_{SMM}(R_j^A, R_j^B, O^A).$$

***c* value** If the above properties are satisfied for a particular *c* but a trade occurs with a larger ratio of output amount to the deposited amount, traders may split their transactions or tend to larger shards to minimize their cost. Therefore, *c* should be as large as possible to ensure such occurrences are rare.

Note CPMMs charge a constant ratio of the net amount as the trading fee (§B.3). Therefore, their cost function does not satisfy either property due to slippage (§D).

4.3 Trading Fee Design

To satisfy properties 4.1 and 4.2, we first generalize the trading fee function to provide flexibility in the incentive design. Then, we propose a specific trading fee function.

Generic Trading Fee Function. The gross amount of a trade comprises the trading fee and the net amount, with the latter being determined by the CPMM curve. To maintain the foundational characteristics of AMMs, we do not modify the CPMM curve. Instead, we generalize the trading fee function beyond simply taking a ratio of the net amount as in previous work (e.g., [5, 6, 26]).

Denote the trading fee function of the AMM by $tf(R^A, R^B, O^A)$, which takes the deposited amount of token A , R^A , and token B , R^B , in the shard and the output amount of token A , O^A , and outputs the amount of token B the trader needs to pay as the trading fee. Then, the gross amount of getting O^A token A is:

$$G(R^A, R^B, O^A) = tf(R^A, R^B, O^A) + net(R^A, R^B, O^A). \quad (2)$$

Bounded-Ratio Trading Fee Function. In order to achieve the desired properties, we need flexibility for the trading fee function design. A monomial function is sufficient to achieve most of our goals. The function takes the variables available on a trade, R^A, R^B, O^A . It is parameterized by four values, $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4$:

$$tf(R^A, R^B, O^A; \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4) := \beta_1 (R^A)^{\beta_2} (R^B)^{\beta_3} (O^A)^{\beta_4}.$$

While the monomial function offers a straightforward approach to calculating trading fees, its lack of bounds poses a challenge. Without limits, the trading fee might become excessively high, deterring traders, or too low, diminishing the revenue for liquidity providers. To address this, there is a need for adjustable boundaries similar to setting a single fixed ratio in previous work. The limits allow for the fine-tuning of the trading fee's absolute value. We thus introduce the bounded-ratio polynomial function based on the monomial, with parameters r_{\min} and r_{\max} to control the trading fee range and β_5 to adjust the trading fee's base value:

$$tf_{BRP}(R^A, R^B, O^A; \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4, \beta_5) := \frac{R^B}{R^A} O^A \times \max\{r_{\min}, \min\{r_{\max}, \beta_1 (R^A)^{\beta_2} (R^B)^{\beta_3} (O^A)^{\beta_4} + \beta_5\}\} \quad (3)$$

The ratio R^A/R^B represents the market price of token A relative to token B (See §B.2). The product $\frac{R^B}{R^A} O^A$ is thus the trader's net payment in terms of token B without slippage. Then $\max\{r_{\min}, \min\{r_{\max}, \beta_1 (R^A)^{\beta_2} (R^B)^{\beta_3} (O^A)^{\beta_4} + \beta_5\}\}$ acts as the constrained ratio of the trading fee to that net payment. We hereinafter omit the parameters and write $tf_{BRP}(R^A, R^B, O^A)$ for brevity.

4.4 Parameter Selection

Now we turn to the selection of parameters for the SAMM trading fee function. First, we identify the necessary conditions under which the bounded-ratio polynomial trading fee function aligns with the c -smaller-better property.

Proposition 4.3. *Let $tf_{SAMM}(R^A, R^B, O^A) = tf_{BRP}(R^A, R^B, O^A)$, then the following conditions are necessary for c -smaller-better to hold for $G_{SAMM}(R^A, R^B, O^A)$: (1) $\beta_3 = 0$; (2) $\beta_2 + \beta_4 = 0$; (3) $\beta_1 < 0$; (4) $0 < \beta_4 \leq 1$; (5) $r_{\min} < \beta_5 \leq r_{\max}$; and (6) $\frac{\beta_5 - r_{\min}}{-\beta_1} \geq c^{\beta_4}$.*

We require the polynomial value to be between r_{\min} and r_{\max} . Then, we need to make sure that the derivative of the gross amount on the size of the shard is non-negative to ensure the c -smaller-better property. Required items come directly from these two restrictions. We defer the proof to §E.

Based on Proposition 4.3, we require that $\beta_1 < 0$, $\beta_2 + \beta_4 = 0$, $\beta_3 = 0$, $0 < \beta_4 \leq 1$, and $r_{\min} < \beta_5 \leq r_{\max}$. Next, we identify additional conditions that are sufficient for both properties to hold.

Theorem 4.4. *Let $tf_{SAMM}(R^A, R^B, O^A) = tf_{BRP}(R^A, R^B, O^A)$, if $\beta_1 < 0$, $\beta_2 + \beta_4 = 0$, $\beta_3 = 0$, $0 < \beta_4 \leq 1$, $r_{\min} < \beta_5 \leq r_{\max}$ and $\frac{\beta_5 - r_{\min}}{-\beta_1} \geq c^{\beta_4}$, then following items are sufficient for the c -Non-Splitting and c -smaller-better properties to hold for $G_{SAMM}(R^A, R^B, O^A)$: (1) $\beta_1 \beta_4 (\beta_4 + 1) c^{\beta_4 - 1} (1 - c)^3 \leq -2$; and (2) $-\beta_1 \beta_4 \geq \frac{c^{1 - \beta_4}}{(1 - c)^2}$.*

The c -smaller better property is satisfied when the derivative of the gross amount is positive. It is sufficient to ensure the c -Non-Splitting property when the gross amount is concave to the output amount, which is ensured by a negative second derivative over the output amount. The proof is in §F.

By setting $\beta_2 = -1$, $\beta_3 = 0$, $\beta_4 = 1$, $\beta_5 = r_{\max}$, and choosing $\beta_1 < -1$, the fee function satisfies the above requirements, leaving just three parameters:

$$tf_{SAMM}(R^A, R^B, O^A) = \frac{R^B}{R^A} \times O^A \times \max \left\{ r_{\min}, \beta_1 \times \frac{O^A}{R^A} + r_{\max} \right\}.$$

By setting $\beta_4 = 1$ and $\beta_5 = r_{\max}$ in the sufficient condition of the c -Non-Splitting and c -smaller-better properties (Theorem 4.4), the sufficient condition becomes:

Corollary 4.5. *For any $\beta_1 < -1$ and c satisfying*

$$c \leq \min \left\{ 1 - (-\beta_1)^{-\frac{1}{3}}, \frac{r_{\max} - r_{\min}}{-\beta_1} \right\},$$

the SAMM cost function $G_{SAMM}(R^A, R^B, O^A)$ satisfies the c -Non-Splitting and c -smaller-better properties.

For instance, the parameters $\beta_1 = -1.05$, $r_{\max} = 0.012$, $r_{\min} = 0.001$, and $c = 0.0104$ meet the specified criteria. According to historical records (§C), over 99% of Uniswap v2 transactions have a ratio below 0.0052, suggesting that if its liquidity is split into two shards, 99% of transactions would fall within our targeted range. Specifically, in the AMMs with the highest trading volumes, USDC-ETH and USDT-ETH, the ratio remains below 0.00128, which can manage eight shards. Increasing the number of shards could be achieved by adjusting the value of c by increasing r_{\max} and β_1 .

5 Game-theoretic Analysis

The model gives rise to a game (§5.1) played among traders and liquidity providers. Our goal (§5.2) is to ensure that at equilibrium, traders randomly select shards to trade in without splits, thereby enhancing throughput. SAMM achieves this (§5.3) and converges to a state where all shards have balanced volumes, overcoming attacks that unbalance the shards.

5.1 Game Model

We derive from the model a sequential game with discrete steps $k = 0, 1, \dots$. Denote the game, parameterized by the number n of shards and their trading fee function tf , by $\Gamma_n(tf)$.

System State. In $\Gamma_n(tf)$, the state of each shard $shard_i$ in step k consists of the amount of deposited *token A*, the amount of deposited *token B* and the amount of share tokens, $R_i^A(k), R_i^B(k), R_i^S(k)$, respectively. Recall that share tokens are not deposited in the shard but are held by liquidity providers, so R_i^S is the total amount of $shard_i$'s share tokens held by liquidity providers. Denote by $\mathbf{R}(k)$ the state of all AMM contracts in step k , $((R_1^A(k), R_1^B(k), R_1^S(k)), \dots, (R_n^A(k), R_n^B(k), R_n^S(k)))$.

Liquidity Provider Actions. The liquidity provider decides the amount of tokens she deposits in each shard. Denote the amount of *token A* and *token B* she deposits in $shard_i$ by $l_i^A, l_i^B \geq 0$, respectively. Recall that the scheduler assigns the liquidity provider l^A *token A* and l^B *token B*. The total amount of tokens deposited should not exceed the amount she holds:

$$\forall 1 \leq i \leq n, l_i^A, l_i^B \geq 0, \sum_{i=1}^n l_i^A \leq l^A, \sum_{i=1}^n l_i^B \leq l^B.$$

The action of a liquidity provider is thus the vector $a_{lp} = ((l_1^A, l_1^B), \dots, (l_n^A, l_n^B))$. When the liquidity provider takes this action with the system state $\mathbf{R}(k)$, the liquidity provider receives O_i^S share token from $shard_i$, where $O_i^S = R_i^S(k) \times \min \left\{ \frac{l_i^A}{R_i^A(k)}, \frac{l_i^B}{R_i^B(k)} \right\}$.

There is no arbitrage opportunity only if $R_i^A/R_i^B = p^B/p^A$ (§B.2), so arbitrageurs enforce this equality. When $l_i^A/l_i^B = p^B/p^A$, increasing just one of l_i^A or l_i^B would not increase the share token the liquidity provider receives, which means more payment without more revenue. Therefore, we only consider actions where $l_i^A/l_i^B = p^B/p^A$ and require $l^A/l^B = p^B/p^A$. The action space of a liquidity provider is denoted by $\mathcal{A}_{lp}(l^A, l^B)$; it is the set of all feasible actions:

$$\mathcal{A}_{lp}(l^A, l^B) = \left\{ a_{lp} \left| \begin{array}{l} \forall 1 \leq i \leq n, l_i^A = \frac{p^B}{p^A} l_i^B \geq 0, \\ \sum_{i=1}^n l_i^A \leq l^A, \sum_{i=1}^n l_i^B \leq l^B \end{array} \right. \right\}.$$

We denote the updated state of shards from the previous state \mathbf{R} and the action of a liquidity provider a_{lp} by $\mathbf{R} + a_{lp}$. Then for $\mathbf{R}' = \left((R_1^A, R_1^B, R_1^S), \dots, (R_n^A, R_n^B, R_n^S) \right) = \mathbf{R} + a_{lp}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_i^A &= R_i^A + l_i^A, \\ R_i^B &= R_i^B + l_i^B, \\ R_i^S &= R_i^S + O_i^S = \left(1 + \frac{l_i^A}{R_i^A} \right) R_i^S. \end{aligned}$$

After the liquidity addition operation, there is no arbitrage opportunity for the arbitrageurs since $\frac{R_i^A + l_i^A}{R_i^B + l_i^B} = \frac{R_i^A}{R_i^B} = \frac{p^B}{p^A}$ (§B.2). Then the update of state in step $k+1$ is $\mathbf{R}(k+1) = \mathbf{R}(k) + a_{lp}$.

Trader Actions. The action of a *BA* trader determines the amount of *token A* she acquires from each shard. Denote by $b_i^{BA} \geq 0$ the amount of *token A* she acquires in *shard_i*. Recall that the scheduler assigns the *BA* trader b^{BA} *token A* to acquire in total. The action of a *BA* trader is thus the vector $a^{BA} = (b_1^{BA}, \dots, b_n^{BA})$. The action space of a *BA* trader is denoted by $\mathcal{A}^{BA}(b^{BA})$, which is the set of all feasible actions:

$$\mathcal{A}^{BA}(b^{BA}) = \left\{ a^{BA} \left| \forall 1 \leq i \leq n, b^{BA} \geq 0, \sum_{i=1}^n b_i^{BA} = b^{BA} \right. \right\} \quad (4)$$

After the trade operation and the arbitrage, R_i^A and R_i^B remain unchanged (§B.2). Consequently, the state of the shards remains unchanged in the subsequent step: $\forall 1 \leq i \leq n, R_i^A(k+1) = R_i^A(k), R_i^B(k+1) = R_i^B(k)$.

Utility and Strategies. For traders and liquidity providers, we first discuss their revenue and then define their strategies and utility, respectively. Players determine the value of tokens according to the external market, namely p^A and p^B .

Consider a *BA* trader whose goal is to acquire b^{BA} units of *token A*. This trader needs to pay the gross amount and may derive some fixed reward from getting these tokens. We

consider her revenue only as the inverse of the gross amount in terms of token B times the value of each *token B*:

$$\begin{aligned} U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, a^{BA}) &= -p^B \times \sum_i G(R_i^A, R_i^B, b_i^{BA}) \\ &= -p^B \times \sum_i G(R_i^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B} R_i^A, b_i^{BA}). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

For the trader aiming to get b^{BA} *token A*, the strategy of the trader $\pi^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, a^{BA})$ takes \mathbf{R}, b^{BA} and an action a^{BA} as input, then outputs the probability of taking action a^{BA} . The total probability of all feasible actions should be 1: $\sum_{a^{BA} \in \mathcal{A}^{BA}(b^{BA})} \pi^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, a^{BA}) = 1$.

The utility of the trader over the strategy is a function of the system state \mathbf{R} , the assigned requirement b^{BA} , and the strategy of the trader π^{BA} . It is the expected revenue under the distribution of actions,

$$U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, \pi^{BA}) = \sum_{a^{BA} \in \mathcal{A}^{BA}(b^{BA})} (\pi^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, a^{BA}) \times U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, a^{BA})). \quad (6)$$

The revenue of liquidity providers comes from the trading fees paid by traders. We consider the *myopic* setting (as in, e.g., [22, 48]) where the liquidity provider would measure her utility in the next step as her long-term revenue.

Denote the revenue of a liquidity provider with her action $a_{lp} = ((l_1^A, l_1^B), \dots, (l_n^A, l_n^B))$, the action of the *BA* trader in the next step $a^{BA} = (b_1^{BA}, \dots, b_n^{BA})$ and the system state $\mathbf{R} = ((R_1^A, R_1^B, R_1^S), \dots, (R_n^A, R_n^B, R_n^S))$, by the function $U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a_{lp}, a^{BA})$. In the next step, *shard_i* receives a trading fee of $tf(R_i^A + l_i^A, R_i^B + l_i^B, b_i^{BA})$. The liquidity provider receives a fraction of that fee proportional to her fraction of share tokens out of all shares in the shard. Therefore, the revenue function is

$$\begin{aligned} &U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a_{lp}, a^{BA}) \\ &= p^B \times \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ tf(R_i^A + l_i^A, R_i^B + l_i^B, b_i^{BA}) \times \frac{\frac{l_i^A}{R_i^A} R_i^S}{\left(1 + \frac{l_i^A}{R_i^A} \right) R_i^S} \right\} \\ &= p^B \times \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ tf(R_i^A + l_i^A, R_i^B + l_i^B, b_i^{BA}) \times \frac{l_i^A}{l_i^A + R_i^A} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

For the liquidity provider with l^A *token A* and l^B *token B*, the strategy of the liquidity provider $\pi_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B)$ takes \mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B and an action a_{lp} as input, and outputs the probability of taking action a_{lp} . The total probability of all feasible actions should be 1,

$$\sum_{a_{lp} \in \mathcal{A}_{lp}(l^A, l^B)} \pi_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, a_{lp}) = 1. \quad (8)$$

The utility of the liquidity provider over strategies is a function of the system state \mathbf{R} , the amount of tokens she is assigned l^A, l^B , and the strategy of the liquidity provider and traders, $\pi_{lp}, \pi^{BA}, \pi^{AB}$; denote it by $U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, \pi_{lp}, \pi^{BA}, \pi^{AB})$. Before calculating this, we show the revenue given the action of the liquidity provider and the strategies of traders, denoted by $U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, a_{lp}, \pi^{BA}, \pi^{AB})$. It takes the system state \mathbf{R} , the action of the liquidity provider a_{lp} , the strategies of traders π^{BA} and π^{AB} as input, then outputs the expected utility over the strategies and distributions of traders. The strategy of traders is affected by the state after the liquidity provider's action, namely $\mathbf{R} + a_{lp}$. Denote by $E_{b^{BA} \sim D^{BA}}[f(\cdot)]$ the expected value of $f(\cdot)$ with b^{BA} is sampled from D^{BA} . The revenue is:

$$U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, a_{lp}, \pi^{BA}, \pi^{AB}) = P_t^{BA} \times E_{b^{BA} \sim D^{BA}} \left[\sum_{a^{BA} \in \mathcal{A}^{BA}(b^{BA})} \left(\frac{\pi^{BA}(\mathbf{R} + a_{lp}, b^{BA}, a^{BA}) \times}{U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a_{lp}, a^{BA})} \right) \right] + P_t^{AB} \times E_{b^{AB} \sim D^{AB}} \left[\sum_{a^{AB} \in \mathcal{A}^{AB}(b^{AB})} \left(\frac{\pi^{AB}(\mathbf{R} + a_{lp}, b^{AB}, a^{AB}) \times}{U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a_{lp}, a^{AB})} \right) \right].$$

To simplify the presentation, we assume the liquidity provider is always followed by a BA trader. The expressions for an AB trader are symmetric. Then, the above equation can be simplified as

$$U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, a_{lp}, \pi^{BA}) = E_{b_i^{BA} \sim D^{BA}} \left[\sum_{a^{BA} \in \mathcal{A}^{BA}(b^{BA})} \left(\frac{\pi^{BA}(\mathbf{R} + a_{lp}, b^{BA}, a^{BA}) \times}{U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a_{lp}, a^{BA})} \right) \right]. \quad (9)$$

Then, the utility function of the liquidity provider over strategies is the expected utility under the distribution of actions:

$$U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, \pi_{lp}, \pi^{BA}, \pi^{AB}) = \sum_{a_{lp} \in \mathcal{A}_{lp}(l^A, l^B)} \left(\frac{\pi_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, a_{lp})}{\times U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, a_{lp}, \pi^{BA}, \pi^{AB})} \right). \quad (10)$$

Solution Concept. In a subgame perfect Nash equilibrium (SPNE), players cannot gain higher utility by changing strategies at any step [50], knowing subsequent players will take their best responses.

When a trader takes an action in a given step, her utility is influenced solely by her immediate strategy and the current state of AMMs, as outlined in Equation 5. Crucially, future actions do not affect this calculation, allowing the trader to directly optimize her utility, thereby establishing dominant strategies.

In the case of a liquidity provider being chosen in a step, the situation is different. Given their myopic viewpoint, liquidity

providers only need to account for the strategy of the trader in the ensuing step. Their actions in subsequent steps do not affect their own utility. Thus the sequential game is reduced to a two-stage Stackelberg game and SPNE to a Stackelberg Equilibrium [58].

To formalize this, we denote the strategies of the liquidity provider, the BA trader, and the AB trader in the SPNE by τ_{lp}, τ^{BA} and τ^{AB} , respectively. The BA trader would always get the optimal utility in equilibrium, namely $\forall \mathbf{R}, b^{BA}$, we have $U^{BA}(\tau^{BA}, \mathbf{R}, b^{BA}) = \max_{\pi^{BA}} U^{BA}(\pi^{BA}, \mathbf{R}, b^{BA})$.

Note that τ^{BA} is a best response for the BA trader. The strategy of liquidity provider in equilibrium is just the optimal strategy when traders adopt their best response, namely for all \mathbf{R}, l^A , and l^B , we have

$$U_{lp}(\tau_{lp}, \mathbf{R}, \tau^{BA}, \tau^{AB}, l^A, l^B) = \max_{\tau_{lp}} U_{lp}(\tau_{lp}, \mathbf{R}, \tau^{BA}, \tau^{AB}, l^A, l^B).$$

Game Assumptions. We briefly discuss two non-trivial model assumptions.

First, In a blockchain, each transaction consumes resources measured in a metric called *gas*. The transaction pays a fee according to its gas consumption. In practice, gas fees are volatile, often nominal in high-performance blockchains (e.g., in Sui under \$0.005 per transaction on average [54, 56]). The model conservatively neglects gas fees to avoid arbitrary assumptions on gas costs. Gas fees disincentivize trade splitting, which helps with parallelization. In particular, with a set gas fee, Properties 4.1 and 4.2 continue to hold. Therefore, it can only strengthen the equilibrium analysis.

Second, perfect arbitrageurs are a common assumption in the literature [13, 15, 26, 41]. We nonetheless demonstrate later (Section 7) that our results hold with real workloads, without this assumption.

5.2 Desired Property

Our goal is to improve the throughput by allowing parallelism. Specifically, we would like traders to evenly distribute their transactions among all AMM shards without splitting them. That is, a dominant strategy for the BA trader should be to randomly select an AMM shard to acquire all her needed *token A*. Denote the action of getting all b^{BA} *token A* in *shard*_{*i*} by

$$a_i^{BA}(b^{BA}) = (0, \dots, b_i^{BA} = b^{BA}, \dots, 0). \quad (11)$$

Denote the set of these actions by $\mathcal{A}_1(b^{BA}) \subset \mathcal{A}_i^{BA}(b^{BA})$:

$$\mathcal{A}_1(b^{BA}) = \{a_i^{BA}(b^{BA}) | 1 \leq i \leq n\}.$$

The strategy that uniformly at random selects an AMM contract to acquire all her needed *token A* is the *perfect parallelism strategy*:

Definition 5.1. The perfect parallelism strategy of the BA trader is $\hat{\tau}^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, a^{BA})$, where

$$\hat{\tau}^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, a^{BA}) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{n}, & \text{if } a^{BA} \in \mathcal{A}_1(b^{BA}) \\ 0, & \text{Otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Our goal is thus to have the perfect parallelism strategy be a dominant strategy:

Property 5.2. The perfect parallelism strategy of the BA trader is a dominant strategy, namely

$$\forall \pi^{BA} : U^{BA}(\pi^{BA}, \mathbf{R}, b^{BA}) \leq U^{BA}(\hat{\tau}^{BA}, \mathbf{R}, b^{BA}).$$

Using multiple CPMMs does not satisfy the perfect parallelism property and would be counterproductive: Each trader would split her transactions among all AMM contracts. Thus, although the total number of trades increases due to parallelism, the satisfied trade demand is not higher than a single AMM contract and possibly lower since the total throughput might only increase sublinearly in the number of AMM contracts. §G provides details of this analysis.

5.3 SAMM Equilibrium

We analyze the SPNE of the above game. We only provide a roadmap here, from trader strategy to liquidity provider strategy, and defer the full analysis to §H.

5.3.1 Trader Strategy

Consider the case that the system state is $\mathbf{R} = ((R_1^A, R_1^B, R_1^S), \dots, (R_n^A, R_n^B, R_n^S))$. As discussed in Section 4.4, the SAMM gross amount satisfies the c -non-splitting property and c -smaller-better property for a certain $0 < c < 1$. We assume that the required amount of token A , b^{BA} , is at most a fraction c of the amount of deposited token A in all shards, i.e., $\forall 1 \leq i \leq n, b^{BA} \leq cR_i^A$.

The c -non-splitting property and c -smaller-better property give a trader the incentive to randomly select one of the smallest shards to trade all her required tokens. Recall that $a_i^{BA}(b^{BA})$ is the action of acquiring all b^{BA} token A in shard i (Equation 11). We define the set of actions that trade in one of the smallest shards:

Definition 5.3. The Smallest Shard Action Set is the set of actions that acquire all b^{BA} token A in one of the smallest shards under state \mathbf{R} : $\mathcal{A}_{1, \min}(b^{BA}, \mathbf{R}) = \{a_i^{BA}(b^{BA}) \mid \forall j, R_i^A \leq R_j^A\}$.

The cardinality of $\mathcal{A}_{1, \min}(b^{BA}, \mathbf{R})$ is the number of smallest shards in \mathbf{R} . We denote this by $n_{\min}(\mathbf{R}) = |\mathcal{A}_{1, \min}(b^{BA}, \mathbf{R})|$.

We prove that randomly selecting a shard to trade without splitting is a dominant strategy for the trader, and it is strictly better than splitting or trading in a larger shard:

Theorem 5.4. In $\Gamma_n(t_{fS_{AMM}})$, considering the following dominant strategy of the BA trader which randomly selects one of the smallest shards to acquire all required tokens:

$$\tau^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, a^{BA}) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{n_{\min}(\mathbf{R})}, & \text{if } a^{BA} \in \mathcal{A}_{1, \min}(b^{BA}, \mathbf{R}) \\ 0, & \text{Otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

then for all strategies π^{BA} that have a positive probability of actions not trading in one of the smallest shards, i.e., $\exists a^{BA} = (b_1^{BA}, \dots, b_i^{BA}, \dots, b_n^{BA}) \notin \mathcal{A}_{1, \min}(b^{BA}, \mathbf{R})$, $\pi^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, a^{BA}) > 0$, the utility of the BA trader is strictly lower than with strategy τ^{BA} :

$$U^{BA}(\tau^{BA}, \mathbf{R}, b^{BA}) > U^{BA}(\pi^{BA}, \mathbf{R}, b^{BA}).$$

Proof Sketch. Due to the c -non-splitting property, trading in a single shard is strictly better than trading in multiple shards. Then the revenue of trading in one of the smallest shards is strictly better than that in any other shard due to the c -smaller-better property. \square

If shards are balanced, which means all shards have the same amount of deposited tokens, we have $n_{\min}(\mathbf{R}) = n$. Then it is a dominant strategy for the trader to randomly select one of the n shards to trade, as we intended:

Corollary 5.5. In $\Gamma_n(t_{fS_{AMM}})$, the system state is $\mathbf{R} = ((R_1^A, R_1^B, R_1^S), \dots, (R_n^A, R_n^B, R_n^S))$. If $\forall i, j, R_i^A = R_j^A$ and $R_i^B = R_j^B$, then the perfect parallelism strategy

$$\hat{\tau}^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, a^{BA}) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{n}, & \text{if } a^{BA} \in \mathcal{A}_1(b^{BA}) \\ 0, & \text{Otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

is a dominant strategy for the BA trader.

5.3.2 Liquidity Provider Strategy

Having shown that if the shards are balanced traders behave as intended, we consider the strategies of liquidity providers in equilibrium. They should maintain the shard balance. Moreover, their incentives should rebalance the system state even in the face of attacks that break this balance.

We want a liquidity provider to fill up smaller shards to keep shards balanced. We call such an action the *fillup action*, where if the liquidity provider adds tokens to a shard, then the shard is the smallest shard after this action. We denote the fillup action by $a_{lp}^{fill}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B)$. Note that there is only one such action.

Definition 5.6. The fillup action of a liquidity provider $a_{lp}^{fill}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B) = ((\hat{l}_1^A, \hat{l}_1^B), \dots, (\hat{l}_n^A, \hat{l}_n^B))$ is the action where if the liquidity provider adds tokens to a shard, then the shard

is one of the smallest shards after this action:

$$\begin{aligned} \forall 1 \leq i \leq n : \hat{l}_i^A &\geq 0, \\ \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{l}_i^A &= l^A; \\ \forall \hat{l}_i^A > 0, \forall j : \hat{l}_i^A + R_i^A &\leq \hat{l}_j^A + R_j^A. \end{aligned}$$

The *fillup strategy* only uses the fillup action:

Definition 5.7. The *fillup strategy* of a liquidity provider $\tau_{l_p}^{fill}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B)$ is the strategy that only takes the fillup action:

$$\tau_{l_p}^{fill}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, a_{l_p}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } a_{l_p} = \hat{a}_{l_p} \\ 0, & \text{Otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

We first prove that, when all shards have identical sizes, the fillup action is to add tokens to all shards evenly, which is the best response of the liquidity provider:

Theorem 5.8. Denote by $\hat{a}_{l_p} = ((\frac{1}{n}l^A, \frac{1}{n}l^B), \dots)$ the action of evenly depositing tokens in all shards. In $\Gamma_n(tf_{S\text{AMM}})$, if for all i and j that the liquidity amounts are the same, $R_i^A = R_j^A$ and $R_i^B = R_j^B$, the liquidity provider strategy which only takes action \hat{a}_{l_p} ,

$$\tau_{l_p}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, a_{l_p}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } a_{l_p} = \hat{a}_{l_p} \\ 0, & \text{Otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

and any best response of the trader constitutes an SPNE.

Proof Sketch. Traders prefer trading in smaller shards to reduce their costs. At the same time, fees are higher in larger shards. So the liquidity provider should increase her share in the smallest shards. This dual objective is optimally achieved by uniformly distributing tokens across all shards. \square

The above theorem indicates that once the system reaches a balanced state, this state is stable. We now show that even if the system reaches an unbalanced state, maybe due to an attacker, it converges to a balanced state since the liquidity provider uses the fillup strategy.

We show that the fillup strategy is the only best response in all SPNE:

Theorem 5.9. In $\Gamma_n(tf_{S\text{AMM}})$, in all SPNE, the liquidity provider's best response is the fillup strategy:

$$\tau_{l_p}^{fill}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, a_{l_p}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } a_{l_p} = a_{l_p}^{fill}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B) \\ 0, & \text{Otherwise.} \end{cases}.$$

Proof Sketch. Given any action a_{l_p} that is not the fillup action, we can construct a new action a'_{l_p} that is strictly better than a_{l_p} . By ensuring the smallest shard in $\mathbf{R} + a'_{l_p}$ is larger than that in $\mathbf{R} + a_{l_p}$, we increase trading fees garnered from each transaction. Moreover, this smallest shard is also the smallest before




Figure 2: An example construction of a'_{l_p} .

the action, maximizing the liquidity provider's share. Consequently, the liquidity provider earns higher revenue under a'_{l_p} than under a_{l_p} . Thus, any strategy incorporating an action other than the fillup action is not optimal. Figure 2 illustrates an example of the a'_{l_p} construction. \square

Theorem 5.9 does not prove the existence of an SPNE. We prove one exists by constructing an SPNE for a general (perhaps unbalanced) starting state (§H): Liquidity providers follow the fillup strategy, and traders use the smallest shard with the largest share of the previous liquidity provider.

In summary, we showed that the system achieves a stable state with perfect parallelism. Moreover, following events that result in heterogeneous shard sizes, liquidity providers rebalance the shard as soon as they have introduced sufficient liquidity, showing robustness against attacks.

6 Evaluation

To evaluate the performance of SAMM we use the state-of-the-art blockchains Sui and Solana (§6.1). We find that the throughput of a single contract AMM is limited (§6.2), and that it improves with the number of SAMM shards (§6.3). Our analysis shows that further improvement is possible by increasing the platform's parallelism (§6.4).

6.1 Experimental Setup

We conduct experiments on the Sui [11] and Solana [64] blockchains, which support parallel execution. We first introduce the setup of the two blockchains separately and then describe the setup of the performance tests.

6.1.1 Sui Setup

Smart contracts in Sui are independent *objects*, and Sui executes transactions on different objects in parallel. We implement SAMM³ in the Move language [10]. We deploy a local testnet, which follows the default configuration, consisting of 4 validators maintaining the consensus of the blockchain. The latency of transactions is always higher than 1 second

³<https://github.com/MountainGold/SAMM-Sui-Evaluation>

due to Sui’s consensus protocol. We issue transactions using Sui’s Rust RPC interface.

As a baseline, we test the latency of simple token transfers. As expected, unencumbered by smart-contract coordination constraints, the latency is consistently smaller than 200 msec (Figure 1) in Sui at 2360tps (outside the figure range). This throughput is approximately twice the maximum rate observed in our AMM experiments on Sui. The latency remains under one second because token transfers in Sui do not require immediate consensus among validators for confirmation.

6.1.2 Solana Setup

Each smart contract in Solana has an associated account, allowing transactions using different accounts to be executed in parallel. We implement SAMM⁴ in Rust and deploy it on a Solana testnet with one validator. The average latency of transactions is around 0.3 seconds with low demand. We issue transactions using Solana’s JavaScript RPC interface.

Solana’s performance is artificially limited [52]. Specifically, Solana’s mainnet and default testnet limit the gas used by a single account within a block, and the total gas used in a block to four times the single-account gas limit. We conducted experiments using these standard settings, marked *Solana-Default*. In addition, to evaluate the architecture’s limits, we conducted experiments where we compiled Solana with the gas limit for the whole block removed, marked *Solana-NoBlockLimit*. We note that removing the gas limit for a single account results in unstable performance, with no useful results.

As with Sui, we tested the throughput of simple token transfers on Solana as a baseline, reaching a throughput above 2500tps with latency under one second (§I). This is higher than the maximum observed in our AMM experiments.

6.1.3 Performance Test Setup

For all reported results, we use a machine with 2TB of memory and 256 CPU cores. We run 50 trader processes for Solana and 100 for Sui. Several experiments deploying the testnet on one machine and sending transactions from another produce similar results. Several experiments with more traders did not affect the results. This shows that bottlenecks are not due to workload generation.

Each trader sends transactions at random intervals following an exponential distribution with an expected frequency of λ . The traders send each transaction and wait for the transaction to be confirmed. They can send another transaction before the previous one is confirmed. Note this experiment is only for performance evaluation, so traders follow the perfect parallelism strategy. We vary the overall frequency of transactions by setting different values of the individual λ values.

⁴<https://github.com/MountainGold/spl-samm/tree/main/token-swap>

In each test, we set a target throughput. We first warm up the system by sending transactions for 500 seconds and then measure actual frequencies and latencies for the following 100 seconds. If the latency is stable within the 100 measurement seconds, we report the mean value.

6.2 Single-Contract Bottleneck

To demonstrate the bottleneck of a single AMM, we first deploy a standard CPMM. We use the OmniSwap contract [44] in Sui and the token-swap contract from the Solana Program Library [36], which are generalizations of Uniswap v2.

For the Sui experiment, Figure 1 ($n = 1$) shows latencies of transaction processing (Y axis) in workloads with varying transaction frequencies (X axis) using a single OmniSwap contract. We test each frequency 5 times and calculate the truncated average, excluding the two extreme values. Error bars show all measured values. The average latency increases gradually with the transaction frequency up to 214tps before crossing the 3-second line. With higher frequencies, transactions frequently fail.

Our Solana experiments produce similar results (§I). The throughput bottleneck of a single CPMM contract in both Solana-Default and Solana-NoBlockLimit is 129tps.

6.3 SAMM Evaluation

We implement SAMM by modifying the trading fee mechanism of CPMM contracts and deploying a varying number of shards (contracts). When a trader sends a transaction, she randomly selects a SAMM contract.

6.3.1 Sui Evaluation

Figure 1 shows the average latency for varying demand (tps) on different numbers of SAMM contracts. The latency in the case of one SAMM contract is indistinguishable from a single CPMM contract. In some instances, more than half of the transactions failed, which is marked with \times in the graph. As the number of SAMM contracts increases, the system can process higher demand.

To quantify SAMM’s performance enhancements in Sui, we evaluate the throughput with a varying number of shards. We set a latency cap of 3 seconds. As depicted in Figure 1, the latency rises rapidly once it surpasses 2 seconds. Therefore, choosing other latency caps beyond 2 seconds does not significantly affect the results. The throughput with n shards is thus the highest frequency that produced a latency lower than 3 seconds. Figure 3 shows the throughput increases almost linearly in the beginning and then converges to a bound. With 32 shards, the maximal throughput exceeds 1185tps, more than five times the throughput of a single OmniSwap contract.




Figure 3: Maximal throughput as a function of the number of SAMM shards in Sui.




Figure 4: Maximal throughput as a function of the number of SAMM shards in Solana.

6.3.2 Solana Evaluation

The results of the Solana experiments show a similar latency behavior for a set number of shards (§I). With $n \leq 4$ contracts, the latencies in Solana-Default and Solana-NoBlockLimit are indistinguishable. To analyze the system’s capacity, we again set a latency cap of 3 seconds to determine the throughput. Figure 4 shows that Solana-NoBlockLimit achieves a linear throughput increase up to 16 shards, while Solana-Default scales linearly up to 4 shards, reflecting the unencumbered architecture’s capacity and gas limit, respectively. Beyond 4 shards, Solana-Default’s throughput remains flat even up to 32 shards (beyond the range), whereas Solana-NoBlockLimit’s throughput declines after 16 shards, with 17 shards failing to reach the maximum *tps* of 16 shards, marked with \times in the figure.

6.4 Parallelization in the Underlying Platform

When there are n concurrently operating AMM shards, each with a maximum throughput of T_{\max} , the total maximum throughput, $T_{\text{total}}(n)$, is influenced by the fraction P of the transaction that can be parallelized, according to Amdahl’s Law. This law states that the speedup ratio, $S(n)$, is the total throughput relative to a single AMM’s throughput, according to the expression $S(n) = \frac{1}{(1-P) + \frac{P}{n}}$. Consequently, the effective system throughput, $T_{\text{total}}(n)$, is calculated as $T_{\max} \times S(n)$. For fully sequential systems like Ethereum, $P = 0$, resulting in no throughput gain. For stability, Solana sets a gas limit that keeps throughput well below its serial bottleneck. Its throughput is thus linear in n , up to the artificial limit (Figure 4).

In Sui, we fit the experimental data with Amdahl’s law and conclude the parallelizable part of a transaction is $P = 0.80$

($R^2 = 0.99$). Since the serial components of transactions are invariant to the number of shards, throughput improvements are inherently limited. According to the fitted curve, the improvement is bounded by 1330tps . We find that if transactions in Sui have a larger parallelizable portion, the throughput improvement due to SAMM is even better (§J).

7 Empirical Validation

Our game-theoretic analysis used non-trivial assumptions. To validate it, we conduct simulations using real trading data (§7.1) and our measured performance gains. We confirm (§7.2) that incentive compatibility is maintained for the vast majority of trades, which are not too large, and throughput balance is maintained without our theoretical assumption of perfect arbitrageurs. We see that SAMM traders’ costs are similar to a CPMM, but the larger throughput results in more liquidity provider revenue (§7.3); it is not a zero-sum game. Nevertheless, this benefit is subject to a trade-off, as increasing trader fees reduces splits, thus improving overall throughput (§7.4).

7.1 Simulation Setup

We simulate SAMM with workload from publicly available CPMM trading data, namely the Uniswap v2 Ethereum AMM for the pair of tokens USDC and ETH (hereinafter Uniswap), from block 12,000,000 to 19,500,000 (from 2021-03-08 to 2024-03-23, about 3 years). We conservatively choose the throughput of SAMM according to the performance evaluation of Sui since its throughput improves sublinearly with the number of shards. We simulate Uniswap v2 and SAMM using 1 to 32 shards. We test three different values of c , namely 0.003, 0.005, and 0.01, and choose SAMM’s parameters accordingly (§K).

In the simulation, we do not add synthetic arbitrage transactions. There are some trades that have a larger than c ratio of the shard size, especially with large shard numbers, when the shard sizes are small. We still do not consider the gas fee in the simulation, which would only make the results better since it discourages trade splitting (See Section 5.1).

We run each simulation instance as follows. We uniformly at random select a point in Uniswap v2’s history (before 16,500,000, to ensure there are enough trades) as the starting point. For SAMM with n shards, we evenly distribute the liquidity of the Uniswap contract at that point among the n shards to establish the initial state of SAMM. We then simulate the real trades from that time point onward. Each trade in the real data is simulated as a trading demand with the required amount of tokens matching the output amount and tokens of the actual trade. To minimize costs, the trader selects the shard offering the lowest price and may split the trade into several smaller trades if this reduces her costs. We assume both the Uniswap and SAMM operate at maximal





Figure 5: Distribution of transactions in SAMM



(a) The ratio of transaction splits. (b) Additional trades due to splits.


Figure 6: Trade Splits in SAMM.

throughput, consistent with the throughput in our performance evaluation. We count trade splits, the number of transactions in different SAMM shards, liquidity provider revenue, and trader costs over 1 second, following a 1-second warm-up period. We repeat each simulation 100 times and calculate averages. Note that 1 second in our simulation corresponds to several hours in the real world. We get historical prices of ETH to USDC from the Yahoo Finance webpage [63] and use it as the external market price. We calculate the revenue for liquidity providers and costs for traders in USDC, converting ETH amounts at the real-time price.

7.2 Trade Distribution and Splits

We first confirm that the distribution of trades in SAMM is balanced and that trade splits are infrequent. Figure 5 illustrates the number of trades executed in each shard compared to the average. Error bars show the range of relative trade numbers in each shard compared to the average. The difference from the average is always under 5%.

Next, we analyze the proportion of trades that are split into multiple transactions within SAMM. With $c = 0.01$, trade splits are infrequent, occurring in less than 8% of trades, even with 32 shards (Figure 6a). Furthermore, the total number of trades (the trader might split a trade to more than 2 parts) results in less than a 45% increase in overall trade volume (Figure 6b), a relatively minor increment given the five-fold throughput improvement. When the number of shards is larger or c is smaller, the proportion of trade splits is higher.



(a) Traders' costs relative to the external market. (b) Liquidity providers' revenue relative to Uniswap.

Figure 7: SAMM revenue and cost with experimental *tps* results and trading data.

This confirms the efficacy of our theoretical analysis, showing that SAMM is incentive compatible with real workloads.

7.3 Cost and Revenue

We compare the revenue and cost of liquidity providers and traders, respectively. Figure 7a shows the average ratio of traders' costs in SAMM compared to the costs in the external market, considering different numbers of shards and varying values of c . We observe that with larger c , the cost for traders increases, as expected. With a fixed c , the cost for traders decreases as the number of shards increases, aligning with SAMM's c -smaller-better property, where more shards result in less liquidity in each shard. Additionally, we compare the cost for traders in Uniswap, depicted by the black line. In all cases, the cost of SAMM is either smaller ($c = 0.003$ with at least 2 shards) or slightly larger than that of Uniswap, differing by less than 1% with $c = 0.01$ and 0.3% with $c = 0.005$ and at least 2 shards. We aggregate trading fees across all shards to evaluate the revenue of liquidity providers. Figure 7b shows SAMM consistently generates higher revenue than Uniswap, with $c = 0.01$ and 7 shards yielding over 15 times the revenue. Initially, revenue in SAMM rises with more shards due to increased throughput but with even more shards it declines as trading fees per trade decrease in smaller shards (See §H, Lemma H.7).

SAMM significantly outperforms Uniswap in terms of liquidity provider revenue while maintaining comparable costs for traders. This increase without major cost hikes demonstrates this is not a zero-sum game; SAMM's higher throughput allows for more trades and more total trading fees.

7.4 Throughput and Incentive Trade-off

Note that the results above imply a trade-off between participant incentives and system performance. When c is larger, there are fewer trade splits and higher revenue for liquidity providers, but the cost for traders increases. Conversely, fixing c and increasing the number of shards results in lower trader costs but more trade splits, which can negatively impact

system performance. Additionally, liquidity provider revenue peaks at a certain number of shards. System designers can tune c and the number of shards to balance participant incentives and system performance.

8 Conclusion

We present SAMM, a scalable AMM. The key enabler of SAMM is the design of a trading fee mechanism that incentivizes parallel operations. We analyze trader and liquidity provider behaviors as a game, showing that parallel operations are the best response, and validate by simulation with real trade traces. We implement and deploy SAMM in local testnets of Sui and Solana, demonstrating more than 5x and 16x throughput improvement, up to the underlying system’s limits. Our results indicate that reducing serial bottlenecks of independent contracts should be a focus of smart-contract platforms to allow for AMM scaling (See §J). Meanwhile, SAMM can be directly deployed to scale AMMs on existing platforms, for direct use and as part of the DeFi ecosystem.

References

- [1] Ittai Abraham, Danny Dolev, Ittay Eyal, and Joseph Y Halpern. Colordag: An incentive-compatible blockchain. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.11379*, 2023.
- [2] Austin Adams. Layer 2 be or layer not 2 be: Scaling on uniswap v3. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.09494*, 2024.
- [3] Hayden Adams, Noah Zinsmeister, Moody Salem, River Keefer, and Dan Robinson. Uniswap v3 core. *Tech. rep., Uniswap, Tech. Rep.*, 2021.
- [4] Hayden Adams, Noah Zinsmeister, River Salem, and Dan Robinson. Uniswap v2 core. *Tech. rep., Uniswap, Tech. Rep.*, 2020.
- [5] 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.
- [6] Guillermo Angeris, Alex Evans, Tarun Chitra, and Stephen Boyd. Optimal routing for constant function market makers. In *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 115–128, 2022.
- [7] Vivek Bagaria, Sreeram Kannan, David Tse, Giulia Fanti, and Pramod Viswanath. Prism: Deconstructing the blockchain to approach physical limits. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 585–602, 2019.
- [8] Massimo Bartoletti, James Hsin-yu Chiang, and Alberto Lluch Lafuente. Maximizing extractable value from automated market makers. In *International Conference on Financial Cryptography and Data Security*, pages 3–19. Springer, 2022.
- [9] Mihailo Bjelic, Sandeep Nailwal, Amit Chaudhary, and Wenxuan Deng. Pol: One token for all polygon chains. <https://polygon.technology/papers/pol-whitepaper>, 2023. Accessed, April 2024.
- [10] Sam Blackshear, Evan Cheng, David L Dill, Victor Gao, Ben Maurer, Todd Nowacki, Alistair Pott, Shaz Qadeer, Dario Russi Rain, Stephane Sezer, et al. Move: A language with programmable resources. *Libra Assoc*, page 1, 2019.
- [11] Same Blackshear, Andrey Chursin, George Danezis, Anastasios Kichidis, Lefteris Kokoris-Kogias, Xun Li, Mark Logan, Ashok Menon, Todd Nowacki, Alberto Sonnino, et al. Sui lutris: A blockchain combining broadcast and consensus. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.18042*, 2023.
- [12] Lee Bousfield, Rachel Bousfield, Chris Buckland, Ben Burgess, Joshua Colvin, Edward W. Felten, Steven Goldfeder, Daniel Goldman, Braden Huddleston, Harry Kalodner, Frederico Arnaud Lacs, Harry Ng, Aman Sanghi, Tristan Wilson, Valeria Yermakova, and Tsahi Zidenberg. Arbitrum nitro: A second-generation optimistic rollup. <https://github.com/OffchainLabs/nitro/blob/master/docs/Nitro-whitepaper.pdf>, 2022. Accessed, April 2024.
- [13] Andrea Canidio and Robin Fritsch. Batching trades on automated market makers. In *5th Conference on Advances in Financial Technologies (AFT 2023)*. Schloss-Dagstuhl-Leibniz Zentrum für Informatik, 2023.
- [14] Miles Carlsten, Harry Kalodner, S Matthew Weinberg, and Arvind Narayanan. On the instability of bitcoin without the block reward. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security*, pages 154–167, 2016.
- [15] TH Chan, Ke Wu, and Elaine Shi. Mechanism design for automated market makers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.09357*, 2024.
- [16] Tarun Chitra, Guillermo Angeris, and Alex Evans. Differential privacy in constant function market makers. In *International Conference on Financial Cryptography and Data Security*, pages 149–178. Springer, 2022.
- [17] Curve.fi. Curve documentation release 1.0.0. <https://docs.sushi.com/pdf/whitepaper.pdf>, 2022. Accessed: April 2024.

- [18] George Danezis, Lefteris Kokoris-Kogias, Alberto Sonnino, and Alexander Spiegelman. Narwhal and tusk: a dag-based mempool and efficient bft consensus. In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth European Conference on Computer Systems*, pages 34–50, 2022.
- [19] DefiLlama. Total value locked all chains. <https://defillama.com/chains>, 2024. Accessed, July 2024.
- [20] Thomas Dickerson, Paul Gazzillo, Maurice Herlihy, and Eric Koskinen. Adding concurrency to smart contracts. In *Proceedings of the ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*, pages 303–312, 2017.
- [21] Ittay Eyal, Adem Efe Gencer, Emin Gün Sirer, and Robert Van Renesse. Bitcoin-NG: A scalable blockchain protocol. In *13th USENIX symposium on networked systems design and implementation (NSDI 16)*, pages 45–59, 2016.
- [22] Matheus VX Ferreira, Daniel J Moroz, David C Parkes, and Mitchell Stern. Dynamic posted-price mechanisms for the blockchain transaction-fee market. In *Proceedings of the 3rd ACM Conference on Advances in Financial Technologies*, pages 86–99, 2021.
- [23] Samuel H Fuller and Lynette I Millett. Computing performance: Game over or next level? *Computer*, 44(1):31–38, 2011.
- [24] Péter Garamvölgyi, Yuxi Liu, Dong Zhou, Fan Long, and Ming Wu. Utilizing parallelism in smart contracts on decentralized blockchains by taming application-inherent conflicts. In *Proceedings of the 44th International Conference on Software Engineering*, pages 2315–2326, 2022.
- [25] Bikramaditya Ghosh, Hayfa Kazouz, and Zaghum Umar. Do automated market makers in defi ecosystem exhibit time-varying connectedness during stressed events? *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*, 16(5):259, 2023.
- [26] Mohak Goyal, Geoffrey Ramseyer, Ashish Goel, and David Mazières. Finding the right curve: Optimal design of constant function market makers. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 783–812, 2023.
- [27] Lewis Gudgeon, Pedro Moreno-Sanchez, Stefanie Roos, Patrick McCorry, and Arthur Gervais. Sok: Layer-two blockchain protocols. In *Financial Cryptography and Data Security: 24th International Conference, FC 2020, Kota Kinabalu, Malaysia, February 10–14, 2020 Revised Selected Papers 24*, pages 201–226. Springer, 2020.
- [28] Guy Golan Gueta, Ittai Abraham, Shelly Grossman, Dahlia Malkhi, Benny Pinkas, Michael Reiter, Dragos-Adrian Seredinschi, Orr Tamir, and Alin Tomescu. Sbt: A scalable and decentralized trust infrastructure. In *2019 49th Annual IEEE/IFIP international conference on dependable systems and networks (DSN)*, pages 568–580. IEEE, 2019.
- [29] Charlie Hou, Mingxun Zhou, Yan Ji, Phil Daian, Florian Tramer, Giulia Fanti, and Ari Juels. Squirrl: Automating attack analysis on blockchain incentive mechanisms with deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.01798*, 2019.
- [30] Eleftherios Kokoris-Kogias, Philipp Jovanovic, Linus Gasser, Nicolas Gailly, Ewa Syta, and Bryan Ford. Omniledger: A secure, scale-out, decentralized ledger via sharding. In *2018 IEEE symposium on security and privacy (SP)*, pages 583–598. IEEE, 2018.
- [31] Kshitij Kulkarni, Theo Diamandis, and Tarun Chitra. Routing mev in constant function market makers. In *International Conference on Web and Internet Economics*, pages 456–473. Springer, 2023.
- [32] L2 Lab. Zkswap: A layer-2 token swap protocol based on zk-rollup. https://github.com/l2labs/zkswap-whitepaper/blob/master/zkswap_en.pdf, 2020. Accessed: April 2024.
- [33] Aptos Labs. The aptos blockchain: Safe, scalable, and upgradeable web3 infrastructure. https://aptosfoundation.org/whitepaper/aptos-whitepaper_en.pdf, 2022. Accessed, April 2024.
- [34] Chenxin Li, Peilun Li, Dong Zhou, Zhe Yang, Ming Wu, Guang Yang, Wei Xu, Fan Long, and Andrew Chi-Chih Yao. A decentralized blockchain with high throughput and fast confirmation. In *2020 {USENIX} Annual Technical Conference ({USENIX}{ATC} 20)*, pages 515–528, 2020.
- [35] Zihao Li, Jianfeng Li, Zheyuan He, Xiapu Luo, Ting Wang, Xiaoze Ni, Wenwu Yang, Xi Chen, and Ting Chen. Demystifying defi mev activities in flashbots bundle. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 165–179, 2023.
- [36] Solana Program Library. Token swap program. <https://spl.solana.com/>, 2024. Accessed, July 2024.
- [37] Brayden Lindrea. Uniswap tops \$2t in trading volume, larger than australia’s gdp. <https://cointelegraph.com/news/uniswap-tops-two-trillion-trading-volume>, 2024. Accessed: April 2024.

- [38] Jian Liu, Peilun Li, Raymond Cheng, N Asokan, and Dawn Song. Parallel and asynchronous smart contract execution. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, 33(5):1097–1108, 2021.
- [39] MK Manoylov. Arbitrum surpasses \$150 billion in total transaction volume on uniswap. <https://www.theblock.co/post/292655/>, 2024. Accessed: June 2024.
- [40] Patrick McCorry, Alexander Hicks, and Sarah Meiklejohn. Smart contracts for bribing miners. In *Financial Cryptography and Data Security: FC 2018 International Workshops, BITCOIN, VOTING, and WTSC, Nieuwpoort, Curaçao, March 2, 2018, Revised Selected Papers 22*, pages 3–18. Springer, 2019.
- [41] Jason Milonis, Ciamac C Moallemi, Tim Roughgarden, and Anthony Lee Zhang. Automated market making and loss-versus-rebalancing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.06046*, 2022.
- [42] Michael Mirkin, Yan Ji, Jonathan Pang, Aariah Klages-Mundt, Ittay Eyal, and Ari Juels. Bdos: Blockchain denial-of-service. In *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM SIGSAC conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 601–619, 2020.
- [43] Satoshi Nakamoto. Bitcoin: A peer-to-peer electronic cash system. *Decentralized business review*, 2008.
- [44] OmniBTC. Omniswap. <https://github.com/OmniBTC/OmniSwap>, 2024. Accessed, April 2024.
- [45] George Prlea, Amrit Kumar, and Ilya Sergey. Practical smart contract sharding with ownership and commutativity analysis. In *Proceedings of the 42nd ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*, pages 1327–1341, 2021.
- [46] QuickSwap. Quickswap documentation. <https://docs.quickswap.exchange/>, 2023. Accessed: April 2024.
- [47] Team Rocket, Maofan Yin, Kevin Sekniqi, Robbert van Renesse, and Emin Gün Sirer. Scalable and probabilistic leaderless bft consensus through metastability. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.08936*, 2019.
- [48] Tim Roughgarden. Transaction fee mechanism design. *ACM SIGecom Exchanges*, 19(1):52–55, 2021.
- [49] Jan Christoph Schlegel, Mateusz Kwasnicki, and Akaki Mamagishvili. Axioms for constant function market makers. In Kevin Leyton-Brown, Jason D. Hartline, and Larry Samuelson, editors, *Proceedings of the 24th ACM Conference on Economics and Computation, EC 2023, London, United Kingdom, July 9-12, 2023*, page 1079. ACM, 2023.
- [50] Reinhard Selten. Spieltheoretische behandlung eines oligopolmodells mit nachfrageträgheit: Teil i: Bestimmung des dynamischen preisgleichgewichts. *Zeitschrift für die gesamte Staatswissenschaft/Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics*, (H. 2):301–324, 1965.
- [51] Ilya Sergey and Aquinas Hobor. A concurrent perspective on smart contracts. In *Financial Cryptography and Data Security: FC 2017 International Workshops, WAHC, BITCOIN, VOTING, WTSC, and TA, Sliema, Malta, April 7, 2017, Revised Selected Papers 21*, pages 478–493. Springer, 2017.
- [52] Solana. How to optimize compute usage on solana. <https://solana.com/developers/guides/advanced/how-to-optimize-compute#what-are-the-current-compute-limitations>, 2024. Accessed, July 2024.
- [53] Alexander Spiegelman, Neil Giridharan, Alberto Sonnino, and Lefteris Kokoris-Kogias. Bullshark: Dag bft protocols made practical. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 2705–2718, 2022.
- [54] suiscan. Average gas fee. <https://suiscan.xyz/mainnet/analytics/avg-gas-fee>, 2024. Accessed, September 2024.
- [55] Sushi. Be a crypto chef with sushi. <https://docs.sushi.com/pdf/whitepaper.pdf>, 2023. Accessed: April 2024.
- [56] TheBlock. Sui price (sui): Price index and live chart. <https://www.theblock.co/price/248445/sui-sui-eur>, 2024. Accessed, September 2024.
- [57] Itay Tsabary, Matan Yechieli, Alex Manuskin, and Ittay Eyal. Mad-htlc: because htlc is crazy-cheap to attack. In *2021 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 1230–1248. IEEE, 2021.
- [58] Heinrich Von Stackelberg. *Market structure and equilibrium*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2010.
- [59] Jianhuan Wang, Jichen Li, Zecheng Li, Xiaotie Deng, and Bin Xiao. n-mvlt attack: Optimal transaction re-ordering attack on defi. In *European Symposium on Research in Computer Security*, pages 367–386. Springer, 2023.
- [60] Jiaping Wang and Hao Wang. Monoxide: Scale out blockchains with asynchronous consensus zones. In *16th USENIX symposium on networked systems design and implementation (NSDI 19)*, pages 95–112, 2019.

- [61] Gavin Wood et al. Ethereum: A secure decentralised generalised transaction ledger. *Ethereum project yellow paper*, 151(2014):1–32, 2014.
- [62] Matheus Venturyne Xavier Ferreira and David C Parkes. Credible decentralized exchange design via verifiable sequencing rules. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 723–736, 2023.
- [63] YahooFinance. Ethereum usd (eth-usd). <https://finance.yahoo.com/quote/ETH-USD/history/>, 2024. Accessed, April 2024.
- [64] Anatoly Yakovenko. Solana: A new architecture for a high performance blockchain v0. 8.13. <https://solana.com/solana-whitepaper.pdf>, 2018. Accessed, April 2024.
- [65] Mahdi Zamani, Mahnush Movahedi, and Mariana Raykova. Rapidchain: Scaling blockchain via full sharding. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security*, pages 931–948, 2018.
- [66] Ren Zhang and Bart Preneel. Lay down the common metrics: Evaluating proof-of-work consensus protocols’ security. In *2019 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 175–192. IEEE, 2019.
- [67] Ren Zhang, Dingwei Zhang, Quake Wang, Shichen Wu, Jan Xie, and Bart Preneel. NC-max: Breaking the security-performance tradeoff in nakamoto consensus. In *Proceedings 2022 Network and Distributed System Security Symposium*, pages 1–18. NDSS, 2022.
- [68] Yi Zhang, Xiaohong Chen, and Daejun Park. Formal specification of constant product ($xy=k$) market maker model and implementation. <https://github.com/runtimeverification/publications/blob/main/reports/smart-contracts/Uniswap-V1.pdf>, 2018. Accessed, April 2024.
- [69] Liyi Zhou, Kaihua Qin, Christof Ferreira Torres, Duc V Le, and Arthur Gervais. High-frequency trading on decentralized on-chain exchanges. In *2021 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 428–445. IEEE, 2021.




Figure 8: Monthly trades in Uniswap 1-3

A Growing Demand for AMM

We analyze the demand for AMMs by calculating the number of trades per second on the prominent Uniswap versions 1-3, from its deployment in November 2018 to March 2024. We use data from Dune⁵, a comprehensive database for blockchain data. Figure 8 illustrates the exponentially increasing demand, from 0.78 average trades per second in 2020 to 9.54 in 2024. On the Ethereum blockchain, most Uniswap transactions are executed through versions 2 and 3, incurring gas costs of 152,809 and 184,523 respectively. Given that the average total gas per block is 15,000,000 and the block interval is 12 seconds, Ethereum can facilitate up to 8.18 trades per second for v2 and 6.77 trades per second for v3. However, in March 2024, the average monthly trades on Uniswap reached 13.9 per second, nearly doubling Ethereum’s processing capacity. Therefore, most demand of Uniswap is processed through off-chain solutions [2].

The demand curve matches an exponential function, reflecting its rise in popularity since 2020 and consistent growth rate, yielding a yearly demand growth of 76.3 ($R^2 = 0.999$). The fitted curve suggests that demand for Uniswap will surpass the single CPU processing capacity of 214tps by 2029. As we show this is beyond what even the state-of-the-art Sui can sustain.

B Constant Product Market Maker (CPMM)

The basis of SAMM is the Constant Product Market Maker AMM (CPMM, e.g. [3, 17, 44, 55]). We review its operation here. It uses a share-based solution to manage liquidity addition and removal operations (§B.1) and keeps the product of the deposited amount of two tokens constant in trade operations (§B.2). Liquidity providers earn revenue from the trading fees (§B.3).

⁵<https://dune.com/>

B.1 Liquidity Addition and Removal

Most CPMMs (e.g., [4, 44, 46, 68]) use a fungible share token to manage liquidity addition and removal. These tokens represent a liquidity provider's share in the AMM.

When liquidity providers add tokens to an AMM, they receive *share tokens* which signify their portion of the AMM. To recall, R^A and R^B denote the amounts of *token A* and *token B* already deposited in the AMM. Similarly, I^A and I^B represent the quantities of *token A* and *token B* that the liquidity provider contributes through a liquidity addition operation. Let R^S represent the total amount of all share tokens distributed before the operation. The amount of share tokens acquired by the liquidity provider in this operation, O^S , is given by

$$O^S = R^S \times \min \left\{ \frac{I^A}{R^A}, \frac{I^B}{R^B} \right\}.$$

The term $\min \left\{ \frac{I^A}{R^A}, \frac{I^B}{R^B} \right\}$ signifies the ratio of the input token to the deposited token. The min function serves to ensure that the ownership accurately reflects the liquidity provider's contribution relative to the scarcer asset. It prevents situations where a liquidity provider adds a large amount of a certain token to unfairly obtain a larger share of tokens in the AMM.

Liquidity providers have the option to withdraw tokens from the AMM with the liquidity removal operation, which takes the number of share tokens as input and outputs *token A* and *token B*. Let I^S represent the amount of input share tokens, and R^S denote the total amount of all share tokens referred to the AMM before the execution. The amounts of *token A* and *token B* withdrawn are O^A and O^B :

$$O^A = \frac{I^S}{R^S} \times R^A, O^B = \frac{I^S}{R^S} \times R^B.$$

Note that R^S is not the amount of share tokens deposited in the AMM, but the total amount of share tokens owned by all liquidity providers.

B.2 CPMM Trades

Recall that in a trade operation, a trader sends I^A *token A* (resp., I^B *token B*) and gets O^B *token B* (resp., O^A *token A*). A trade is thus defined by a tuple (I^A, O^A, I^B, O^B) , where all values are non-negative, $I^A, O^A, I^B, O^B \geq 0$. The trade is either *Token A for Token B* or *Token B for Token A*, i.e., $I^A = O^B = 0$ or $I^B = O^A = 0$.

After the trade, the amount of deposited tokens is updated to $R^A + I^A - O^A$ and $R^B + I^B - O^B$, respectively. Ignoring fees, the CPMM chooses the outputs (O^A and O^B) by setting an invariant called the *trading function* $\Phi_{CPMM}^{net}(R^A, R^B, I^A, O^A, I^B, O^B)$ [5] which is the product of the amount of *token A* and *token B* after the trade, i.e.,

$$\Phi_{CPMM}^{net}(R^A, R^B, I^A, O^A, I^B, O^B) := (R^A + I^A - O^A) \times (R^B + I^B - O^B).$$

Note that $\Phi_{CPMM}^{net}(R^A, R^B, 0, 0, 0, 0)$ is the product of the amount of *token A* and *token B* before the trade.

A trade (I^A, O^A, I^B, O^B) is legal if the trading function remains constant, i.e.,

$$\Phi_{CPMM}^{net}(R^A, R^B, I^A, O^A, I^B, O^B) = \Phi_{CPMM}^{net}(R^A, R^B, 0, 0, 0, 0). \quad (12)$$

It indicates that the product of the amounts of *token A* and *token B* after the trade is the same as the product of the amounts before the trade, hence then names Constant Product Market Maker, i.e.,

$$(R^A + I^A - O^A) \times (R^B + I^B - O^B) = R^A \times R^B. \quad (13)$$

If the trader gets O^A *token A* (resp., O^B *token B*), according to Equation 13, she pays

$$I^B = \frac{R^A \times R^B}{R^A - O^A} - R^B = \frac{R^B \times O^A}{R^A - O^A}, \quad (14)$$

and similarly for an AB trader.

Note that we ignored fees in the above equations. We call the payment without fees (Equation 14) *net amount*, and denote by

$$net(R^A, R^B, O^A) = \frac{R^B \times O^A}{R^A - O^A}.$$

Denote the amount of *token B* that the trader needs to pay to get a single *token A* by $p^{AB} = \frac{I^B}{O^A}$. From the above equation, $p^{AB} = \frac{R^B}{R^A - O^A}$. This value increases as the output amount of *token A*, O^A , increases, which is the *Slippage* of the trade. When the output amount of *token A*, O^A , approaches zero, the token price is not influenced by the slippage. We call it the *reported price* of *token A* relative to *token B* and denote it by

$$p_{reported}^{AB} := \lim_{O^A \rightarrow 0} \frac{R^B}{R^A - O^A} = \frac{R^B}{R^A}.$$

When the reported price of an AMM is different from the price in the external market without trading fees, i.e. $p_{reported}^{AB} \neq \frac{p^A}{p^B}$, there is an arbitrage opportunity for arbitrageurs to make profits. Therefore, due to the arbitrageurs, the reported price of the AMM is always equal to the price in the external market without trading fees [41]. That is:

$$\frac{p^A}{p^B} = p_{reported}^{AB} = \frac{R^B}{R^A}. \quad (15)$$

Since trading fees are not added to the AMM (as defined in Section 3), the product of R^A and R^B remains constant after each trade (Equation 13). Then, arbitrageurs keep the ratio of R^A and R^B equal to $\frac{p^A}{p^B}$ (Equation 15). Therefore, R^A and R^B remain the same after the trade and arbitrage.

B.3 CPMM Trading Fee

AMMs charge a trading fee for each trade operation, which the trader pays. These trading fees form the revenue of liquidity providers. In CPMMs, the trading fee is a constant fraction $1 - \gamma \in [0, 1]$ of input tokens [5]. This is achieved by selecting the trading function $\Phi_{CPMM}(R^A, R^B, I^A, O^A, I^B, O^B)$ as [5]

$$\Phi_{CPMM}(R^A, R^B, I^A, O^A, I^B, O^B) := (R^A + \gamma I^A - O^A) \times (R^B + \gamma I^B - O^B).$$

Since a trade (I^A, O^A, I^B, O^B) is legal if the trading function remains constant (Equation 12), to get O^A token A, the trader pays the gross amount

$$\begin{aligned} G_{CPMM}(R^A, R^B, O^A) &= \frac{1}{\gamma} \left(\frac{R^A \times R^B}{R^A - O^A} - R^B \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\gamma} \left(\frac{R^B \times O^A}{R^A - O^A} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Compared to the net amount (Equation 14), the trader pays additional tokens to complete the trade; this is the *trading fee*. In the CPMM case, it is

$$\frac{1 - \gamma}{\gamma} \left(\frac{R^B \times O^A}{R^A - O^A} \right). \quad (17)$$

In the prominent Uniswap v2 [4], the ratio is $1 - \gamma = 0.003$.

C Uniswap v2 Statistics

We analyze the five Uniswap v2 AMMs with different pairs of tokens with the highest number of trade transactions from Ethereum block 12,000,000 to 19,500,000 (from 2021-03-08 to 2024-03-23, about 3 years). First, we find that more than 99.5% of the transactions are trade operations. Therefore, we only focus on the throughput of trade operations. Second, we calculate the ratio of output tokens to deposited tokens for each transaction and find that most transactions are small compared with the liquidity size. Among all trades, the average ratio of output tokens to deposited tokens is less than 0.036%, and more than 99% of the trades have a ratio of less than 0.52%. Such a phenomenon is consistent in all token pairs. Specifically, in the most active ones, USDC-ETH and USDT-ETH, over 99% of trades exhibit a ratio of output to deposited tokens below 0.00128%. Figure 9 shows in log scale the one-complement of the cumulative distribution function of the ratio of output tokens to deposited tokens in all token pairs and in five selected pairs.

D CPMM Does Not Satisfy Either property

Simply deploying multiple CPMM shards does not satisfy our desired properties.




Figure 9: The ratio of output tokens to deposited tokens in Uniswap v2

Theorem D.1. For any value of $0 < c < 1$, the CPMM cost function $G_{CPMM}(R^A, R^B, O^A)$ does not satisfy either the c -Non-Splitting or the c -smaller-better properties.

Proof. For any $0 < c < 1$, it is sufficient to find a single case where each property does not hold. For the c -Non-Splitting property, we consider the cost of getting $\tilde{O}^A = cR^A$ token A and $O_1^A = O_2^A = \frac{c}{2}R^A$, the gross amount of getting $\tilde{O}^A = cR^A$ is larger than getting O_1^A and O_2^A respectively:

$$\begin{aligned} &G_{CPMM}(R^A, R^B, \tilde{O}^A) \\ &\stackrel{(16)}{=} \frac{1}{\gamma} \left(\frac{R^B \times cR^A}{R^A - cR^A} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\gamma} \left(\frac{R^B \times \frac{c}{2}R^A}{R^A - cR^A} \right) + \frac{1}{\gamma} \left(\frac{R^B \times \frac{c}{2}R^A}{R^A - cR^A} \right) \\ &> \frac{1}{\gamma} \left(\frac{R^B \times \frac{c}{2}R^A}{R^A - \frac{c}{2}R^A} \right) + \frac{1}{\gamma} \left(\frac{R^B \times \frac{c}{2}R^A}{R^A - \frac{c}{2}R^A} \right) \\ &\stackrel{(16)}{=} G_{CPMM}(R^A, R^B, O_1^A) + G_{CPMM}(R^A, R^B, O_2^A). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the CPMM cost function does not satisfy the c -Non-Splitting property.

Next, we turn to the c -smaller-better property. Considering two shards with deposited token amounts (R_i^A, R_i^B) and (R_j^A, R_j^B) , respectively, where $R_i^A < R_j^A$, $\frac{R_i^A}{R_i^B} = \frac{R_j^A}{R_j^B}$, for any output amount $0 < O^A \leq cR_i^A$, consider the gross amount of get-

ting O^A token A , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
G_{CPMM}(R_i^A, R_i^B, O^A) &\stackrel{(16)}{=} \frac{1}{\gamma} \left(\frac{R_i^B \times O^A}{R_i^A - O^A} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{\gamma} \left(\frac{\frac{R_i^B}{R_i^A} \times O^A}{1 - \frac{O^A}{R_i^A}} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{\gamma} \left(\frac{\frac{R_j^B}{R_j^A} \times O^A}{1 - \frac{O^A}{R_i^A}} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{\gamma} \left(\frac{R_j^B \times O^A}{R_j^A - \frac{R_j^A}{R_i^A} O^A} \right) \\
&> \frac{1}{\gamma} \left(\frac{R_j^B \times O^A}{R_j^A - O^A} \right) \\
&\stackrel{(16)}{=} G_{CPMM}(R_j^A, R_j^B, O^A).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the CPMM cost function does not satisfy the c -smaller-better property as well. \square

E Proof of Proposition 4.3

Proposition 4.3 (restated). *Let $tf_{SAMM}(R^A, R^B, O^A) = tf_{BRP}(R^A, R^B, O^A)$, then the following conditions are necessary for c -smaller-better to hold for $G_{SAMM}(R^A, R^B, O^A)$:*

1. $\beta_3 = 0$,
2. $\beta_2 + \beta_4 = 0$,
3. $\beta_1 < 0$,
4. $0 < \beta_4 \leq 1$,
5. $r_{\min} < \beta_5 \leq r_{\max}$, and
6. $\frac{\beta_5 - r_{\min}}{-\beta_1} \geq c^{\beta_4}$.

Proof. We would first give some common prefixes for the required items, and then obtain them one by one.

The c -smaller-better property considers two shards i and j , assuming their reported prices are identical. Denote the inverse of this price by c^{AB} , so $\frac{R_i^A}{R_i^B} = \frac{R_j^A}{R_j^B} = \frac{1}{c^{AB}} > 0$. The property requirement (Equation 4.2) becomes

$$G_{SAMM}(R_i^A, c^{AB} R_i^A, O^A) < G_{SAMM}(R_j^A, c^{AB} R_j^A, O^A).$$

The function $G_{SAMM}(R^A, c^{AB} R^A, O^A)$ is differentiable, and by assumption $R_i^A < R_j^A$, therefore a necessary condition for this inequality to hold is

$$\frac{dG_{SAMM}(R^A, c^{AB} R^A, O^A)}{dR^A} \geq 0. \quad (18)$$

If the polynomial value is greater than the bound, $\beta_1 (R^A)^{\beta_2} (R^B)^{\beta_3} (O^A)^{\beta_4} + \beta_5 > r_{\max}$, then from Equations 1, 2, and 3, the gross amount becomes

$$G_{SAMM}(R^A, c^{AB} R^A, O^A) = c^{AB} r_{\max} O^A + \frac{c^{AB} R^A \times O^A}{R^A - O^A}, \quad (19)$$

so the derivative is

$$\frac{dG_{SAMM}(R^A, c^{AB} R^A, O^A)}{dR^A} = -\frac{c^{AB} (O^A)^2}{(R^A - O^A)^2} < 0, \quad (20)$$

contradicting Equation 18. Therefore, for the property to hold we need $\beta_1 (R^A)^{\beta_2} (R^B)^{\beta_3} (O^A)^{\beta_4} + \beta_5 \leq r_{\max}$. A similar situation occurs when $\beta_1 = 0$ or $\beta_1 (R^A)^{\beta_2} (R^B)^{\beta_3} (O^A)^{\beta_4} + \beta_5 < r_{\min}$, where

$$G_{SAMM}(R^A, c^{AB} R^A, O^A) = c^{AB} \max\{r_{\min}, \min\{r_{\max}, \beta_5\}\} O^A + \frac{c^{AB} R^A \times O^A}{R^A - O^A}, \quad (21)$$

or

$$G_{SAMM}(R^A, c^{AB} R^A, O^A) = c^{AB} r_{\min} O^A + \frac{c^{AB} R^A \times O^A}{R^A - O^A}. \quad (22)$$

Therefore, we also need $\beta_1 \neq 0$, and $\beta_1 (R^A)^{\beta_2} (R^B)^{\beta_3} (O^A)^{\beta_4} + \beta_5 \geq r_{\min}$, to avoid a similar contradiction with Equation 20. Thus, we require $\beta_1 \neq 0$ and the polynomial to be in the range

$$r_{\min} \leq \beta_1 (R^A)^{\beta_2} (c^{AB} R^A)^{\beta_3} (O^A)^{\beta_4} + \beta_5 \leq r_{\max}. \quad (23)$$

Since the output amount O_A can be arbitrarily close to zero, for $(O^A)^{\beta_4}$ to be bounded we require

$$\beta_4 \geq 0. \quad (24)$$

Since O^A can be arbitrarily close to zero, $\beta_1 (R^A)^{\beta_2} (c^{AB} R^A)^{\beta_3} (O^A)^{\beta_4}$ can be arbitrarily close to zero, so from Equation 23 we require that

$$r_{\min} \leq \beta_5 \leq r_{\max}. \quad (25)$$

Here, we start to drive necessary items from the properties. We rewrite Equation 23 as

$$r_{\min} \leq (c^{AB})^{\beta_3} \beta_1 (R^A)^{\beta_2 + \beta_3 + \beta_4} \left(\frac{O^A}{R^A} \right)^{\beta_4} + \beta_5 \leq r_{\max}. \quad (26)$$

The c -Smaller-Better property should hold for all reported prices, that is, this inequality should hold for all c^{AB} . But if $\beta_3 \neq 0$, the first element $(c^{AB})^{\beta_3}$ can be arbitrarily large, and since $\beta_1 (R^A)^{\beta_2 + \beta_3 + \beta_4} \left(\frac{O^A}{R^A} \right)^{\beta_4} \neq 0$, the whole expression

$(c^{AB})^{\beta_3} \beta_1 (R^A)^{\beta_2 + \beta_3 + \beta_4} \left(\frac{O^A}{R^A}\right)^{\beta_4} + \beta_5$ is unbounded. Therefore, we obtain Item 1:

$$\beta_3 = 0. \quad (27)$$

Similarly, we need to bound the expression $(R^A)^{\beta_2 + \beta_3 + \beta_4} \left(\frac{O^A}{R^A}\right)^{\beta_4}$. Since all positive values for R^A are possible and all output ratios are bounded $0 < \frac{O^A}{R^A} < c$, to keep the expression bounded for all such values we require $\beta_2 + \beta_3 + \beta_4 = 0$, and since we already saw $\beta_3 = 0$, we obtain Item 2:

$$\beta_2 + \beta_4 = 0. \quad (28)$$

Now, if $\beta_2 = \beta_4 = 0$, the expression of Equation 23 becomes $\beta_1 (R^A)^{\beta_2} (c^{AB} R^A)^{\beta_3} (O^A)^{\beta_4} + \beta_5 = \beta_1 + \beta_5$, so the gross amount is

$$G_{SMM}(R^A, c^{AB} R^A, O^A) = c^{AB} \max\{r_{\min}, \min\{r_{\max}, \beta_1 + \beta_5\}\} O^A + \frac{c^{AB} R^A \times O^A}{R^A - O^A}. \quad (29)$$

So, as in Equation 19, the derivative is negative, a contradiction. Therefore, we have $\beta_4 \neq 0$, and due to Equation 24 we obtain

$$\beta_4 > 0, \beta_2 < 0. \quad (30)$$

Combining the constraints we just found (Equations 27 and 28) into the gross amount expression (Equations 2 and 3) we have

$$G_{SMM}(R^A, c^{AB} R^A, O^A) = c^{AB} O^A \times \left(\beta_1 (R^A)^{-\beta_4} (O^A)^{\beta_4} + \beta_5\right) + \frac{c^{AB} R^A \times O^A}{R^A - O^A} \quad (31)$$

and its derivative is

$$\frac{dG_{SMM}(R^A, c^{AB} R^A, O^A)}{dR^A} = -c^{AB} \beta_1 \beta_4 \left(\frac{O^A}{R^A}\right)^{\beta_4 + 1} - \frac{c^{AB} (O^A)^2}{(R^A - O^A)^2} \quad (32)$$

The second element $\frac{c^{AB} (O^A)^2}{(R^A - O^A)^2}$ is positive, so to keep the derivative non-negative, the first element $c^{AB} \beta_1 \beta_4 \left(\frac{O^A}{R^A}\right)^{\beta_4 + 1}$ must be negative. Since $c^{AB} > 0$, $\beta_4 > 0$, and $\left(\frac{O^A}{R^A}\right)^{\beta_4 + 1} > 0$, we obtain Item 3:

$$\beta_1 < 0. \quad (33)$$

Since the derivative is non-negative, from Equation 32 we have

$$-c^{AB} \beta_1 \beta_4 \left(\frac{O^A}{R^A}\right)^{\beta_4 + 1} \geq \frac{c^{AB} (O^A)^2}{(R^A - O^A)^2}$$

Since $O^A < c \times R^A < R^A$, we have $(R^A - O^A)^2 < (R^A)^2$. Therefore, we have

$$-c^{AB} \beta_1 \beta_4 \left(\frac{O^A}{R^A}\right)^{\beta_4 + 1} \geq \frac{c^{AB} (O^A)^2}{(R^A)^2}. \quad (34)$$

By multiplying both sides by $\frac{(R^A)^{\beta_4 + 1}}{c^{AB} (O^A)^{\beta_4 + 1}}$ which is positive, the above inequality is equal to:

$$-\beta_1 \beta_4 \geq \left(\frac{O^A}{R^A}\right)^{1 - \beta_4}. \quad (35)$$

Since $\frac{O^A}{R^A}$ can be arbitrarily close to zero, if $\beta_4 > 1$, the right side of the above inequality can be arbitrarily large, so we require $\beta_4 \leq 1$. Combining equation 30, we obtain Item 4:

$$0 < \beta_4 \leq 1.$$

From Equation 23, we have

$$\beta_1 (R^A)^{\beta_2} (R^B)^{\beta_3} (O^A)^{\beta_4} + \beta_5 \geq r_{\min}. \quad (36)$$

And since $\beta_1 < 0$, we have $\beta_1 (R^A)^{\beta_2} (R^B)^{\beta_3} (O^A)^{\beta_4} < 0$ so $\beta_5 > r_{\min}$. This allows us to make the first inequality of Equation 25 strict, which gives us Item 5:

$$r_{\min} < \beta_5 \leq r_{\max}. \quad (37)$$

From Equations 23 and 28, we have

$$r_{\min} \leq \beta_1 \left(\frac{O^A}{R^A}\right)^{\beta_4} + \beta_5 \leq r_{\max}. \quad (38)$$

Since $\beta_1 < 0$ and $\beta_5 \leq r_{\max}$, the right side of the above inequality always holds. From the left side, we have

$$\frac{\beta_5 - r_{\min}}{-\beta_1} \geq \left(\frac{O^A}{R^A}\right)^{\beta_4}. \quad (39)$$

Since the above equation holds for for all $\frac{O^A}{R^A} \in (0, c)$, we obtain Item 6:

$$\frac{\beta_5 - r_{\min}}{-\beta_1} \geq c^{\beta_4}. \quad (40)$$

We have now shown all constraints 1–6 hold. \square

F Proof of Theorem 4.4

Theorem 4.4 (restated). *Let $tf_{SMM}(R^A, R^B, O^A) = tf_{BRP}(R^A, R^B, O^A)$, if $\beta_1 < 0, \beta_2 + \beta_4 = 0, \beta_3 = 0, 0 < \beta_4 \leq 1, r_{\min} < \beta_5 \leq r_{\max}$ and $\frac{\beta_5 - r_{\min}}{-\beta_1} \geq c^{\beta_4}$, then following items are sufficient for the c -Non-Splitting and c -smaller-better properties to hold for $G_{SMM}(R^A, R^B, O^A)$:*

1. $\beta_1 \beta_4 (\beta_4 + 1) c^{\beta_4 - 1} (1 - c)^3 \leq -2$

$$2. -\beta_1\beta_4 \geq \frac{c^{1-\beta_4}}{(1-c)^2}$$

Proof. Initially, we expand and simplify the form of the gross amount function according to our assumptions. Then, we prove that Item 1 is sufficient for the c -Non-Splitting property to hold. Finally, we prove that Item 2 is sufficient for the c -smaller-better property to hold.

Since $\beta_1 < 0, r_{\min} < \beta_5$, we have $\beta_1(R^A)^{\beta_2}(c^{AB}R^A)^{\beta_3}(O^A)^{\beta_4} + \beta_5 \leq r_{\max}$. Since $\frac{\beta_5 - r_{\min}}{-\beta_1} \geq c^{\beta_4}$, we have $r_{\min} \leq \beta_5 + \beta_1 c^{\beta_4}$.

Since $\beta_2 = -\beta_4, \beta_3 = 0, \frac{O^A}{R^A} \leq c$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_1(R^A)^{\beta_2}(c^{AB}R^A)^{\beta_3}(O^A)^{\beta_4} + \beta_5 &= \beta_1 \times \left(\frac{O^A}{R^A}\right)^{\beta_4} + \beta_5 \\ &\geq \beta_5 + \beta_1 c^{\beta_4} \\ &\geq r_{\min} \end{aligned}$$

Then we can expand the trading fee function and the gross amount function to:

$$tf_{SMM}(R^A, R^B, O^A) = \frac{R^B}{R^A} \times O^A \times \left(\beta_1 \times \left(\frac{O^A}{R^A}\right)^{\beta_4} + \beta_5 \right)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} G_{SMM}(R^A, R^B, O^A) &= \\ &= \frac{R^B}{R^A} \times O^A \times \left(\beta_1 \times \left(\frac{O^A}{R^A}\right)^{\beta_4} + \beta_5 \right) + \frac{R^B \times O^A}{R^A - O^A}. \quad (41) \end{aligned}$$

Now we start to prove the c -Non-Splitting property holds. We first show that if the c -Non-Splitting property holds for $m = 2$, then it holds for any $m > 2$. Then, we prove that it holds for $m = 2$ when Item 1 holds.

Consider the case of $m = 2$, where for $O_1^A, O_2^A > 0$, the gross amount of acquiring $O_1^A + O_2^A$ is less than the sum of the gross amounts of acquiring O_1^A and O_2^A :

$$\begin{aligned} G_{SMM}(R^A, R^B, O_1^A + O_2^A) &< \\ &G_{SMM}(R^A, R^B, O_1^A) + G_{SMM}(R^A, R^B, O_2^A), \quad (42) \end{aligned}$$

For $m = 3$, we can get that the total gross amount of acquiring O_1^A, O_2^A and O_3^A separately is less than the gross amounts of acquiring $O_1^A + O_2^A + O_3^A$ in one time:

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j=1}^3 G_{SMM}(R^A, R^B, O_j^A) \\ &= (G_{SMM}(R^A, R^B, O_1^A) + G_{SMM}(R^A, R^B, O_2^A)) \\ &\quad + G_{SMM}(R^A, R^B, O_3^A) \\ &\stackrel{(42)}{>} G_{SMM}(R^A, R^B, O_1^A + O_2^A) + G_{SMM}(R^A, R^B, O_3^A) \\ &\stackrel{(42)}{>} G_{SMM}(R^A, R^B, O_1^A + O_2^A + O_3^A) \quad (43) \end{aligned}$$

This can be easily generalized to any $m > 2$. Therefore, we only need to prove the c -Non-Splitting property for $m = 2$, which is shown in Equation 42.

Since $G_{SMM}(R^A, R^B, 0) = 0$, Equation 42 is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} G_{SMM}(R^A, R^B, 0) + G_{SMM}(R^A, R^B, O_1^A + O_2^A) &< \\ G_{SMM}(R^A, R^B, O_1^A) + G_{SMM}(R^A, R^B, O_2^A). \end{aligned}$$

The above inequality holds when $G_{SMM}(R^A, R^B, O^A)$ is strictly concave over O^A . A sufficient condition for strict concavity is the second derivative of $G_{SMM}(R^A, R^B, O^A)$ to be negative for all $0 < O^A < c \times R^A$:

$$\frac{d^2 G_{SMM}(R^A, R^B, O^A)}{d(O^A)^2} < 0 \quad (44)$$

From Equation 41, the second derivative of the gross amount function is

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d^2 G_{SMM}(R^A, R^B, O^A)}{d(O^A)^2} \\ &= \beta_1 \beta_4 (\beta_4 + 1) (R^A)^{-\beta_4 - 1} R^B (O^A)^{\beta_4 - 1} + \frac{2R^A R^B}{(R^A - O^A)^3} \\ &< \beta_1 \beta_4 (\beta_4 + 1) (R^A)^{-\beta_4 - 1} R^B (O^A)^{\beta_4 - 1} + \frac{2R^A R^B}{(R^A - cR^A)^3} \\ &= \beta_1 \beta_4 (\beta_4 + 1) (R^A)^{-\beta_4 - 1} R^B (O^A)^{\beta_4 - 1} + \frac{2R^B}{(1-c)^3 (R^A)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, a sufficient condition to make the second derivative negative is

$$\beta_1 \beta_4 (\beta_4 + 1) (R^A)^{-\beta_4 - 1} R^B (O^A)^{\beta_4 - 1} + \frac{2R^B}{(1-c)^3 (R^A)^2} \leq 0.$$

The above inequality is equal to

$$\beta_1 \beta_4 (\beta_4 + 1) (1-c)^3 \left(\frac{O^A}{R^A}\right)^{\beta_4 - 1} \leq -2. \quad (45)$$

The above condition is sufficient for the c -Non-Splitting property.

Since $\beta_4 \leq 1$ and $\frac{O^A}{R^A} < c$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_1 \beta_4 (\beta_4 + 1) (1-c)^3 \left(\frac{O^A}{R^A}\right)^{\beta_4 - 1} &\leq \\ \beta_1 \beta_4 (\beta_4 + 1) c^{\beta_4 - 1} (1-c)^3. \quad (46) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, Item 1 is sufficient for Equation 45, which indicates that the c -Non-Splitting property holds under Item 1.

Now we turn to the c -smaller-better property. The c -smaller-better property considers two shards i and j , assuming their reported prices are identical. Denote the inverse of this price

by c^{AB} , so $\frac{R_i^A}{R_j^B} = \frac{R_j^A}{R_i^B} = \frac{1}{c^{AB}} > 0$. A sufficient condition for the c -smaller-better property is the derivative of the gross amount function over R^A to be positive for all $0 < O^A < c \times R^A$:

$$\frac{dG_{SMM}(R^A, c^{AB}R^A, O^A)}{dR^A} > 0 \quad (47)$$

From Equation 41, we have the derivative:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dG_{SMM}(R^A, c^{AB}R^A, O^A)}{dR^A} = \\ -c^{AB}\beta_1\beta_4 \left(\frac{O^A}{R^A}\right)^{\beta_4+1} - \frac{c^{AB}(O^A)^2}{(R^A - O^A)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $O^A < c \times R^A$, we have a lower bound of the derivative:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dG_{SMM}(R^A, c^{AB}R^A, O^A)}{dR^A} > \\ -c^{AB}\beta_1\beta_4 \left(\frac{O^A}{R^A}\right)^{\beta_4+1} - \frac{c^{AB}(O^A)^2}{(R^A - cR^A)^2}. \quad (48) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, it is a sufficient condition for Equation 47 to hold if the lower bound is non-negative:

$$-c^{AB}\beta_1\beta_4 \left(\frac{O^A}{R^A}\right)^{\beta_4+1} - \frac{c^{AB}(O^A)^2}{(R^A - cR^A)^2} \geq 0. \quad (49)$$

The above equation is equivalent to

$$-\beta_1\beta_4 \geq \frac{1}{(1-c)^2} \left(\frac{O^A}{R^A}\right)^{1-\beta_4}. \quad (50)$$

Since $0 < \frac{O^A}{R^A} < c$ and $\beta_4 \leq 1$, we have

$$\frac{c^{1-\beta_4}}{(1-c)^2} \geq \frac{1}{(1-c)^2} \left(\frac{O^A}{R^A}\right)^{1-\beta_4}. \quad (51)$$

Therefore, Item 2 is sufficient for Equation 50 to hold, which indicates the c -smaller-better property holds under Item 2.

In summary, we have shown that Item 1 is sufficient for the c -Non-Splitting property to hold, and Item 2 is sufficient for the c -smaller-better property to hold. \square

G CPMM Equilibrium

In CPMM, the gross amount is linear to the net amount. Since traders can suffer less from slippage by splitting a trade, the gross amount of splitting a trade is less than the gross amount of trading the same amount at one time.

Theorem G.1. In $\Gamma_n(\text{tfCPMM})$, the following strategy $\tau^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA})$ is the only dominant strategy for the BA trader, where

$$\tau^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } a^{BA} = \left(\frac{R_1^A}{\sum R_i^A} b^{BA}, \dots, \frac{R_n^A}{\sum R_i^A} b^{BA}\right) \\ 0, & \text{Otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (52)$$

Proof. We start by calculating the best response for the BA trader. Since the utility $U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, \pi^{BA})$ is a linear combination of the revenue over actions $U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, a^{BA})$ (Equation 6), we can first calculate the optimal action for the BA trader. Combining the CPMM gross amount (Equation 16) and the revenue function (Equation 5), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, a^{BA}) &= -\sum_i \frac{1}{\gamma} \frac{P^A R_i^A b_i^{BA}}{R_i^A - b_i^{BA}} \\ &= -\frac{P^A}{\gamma P_B} \sum_i \frac{R_i^A b_i^{BA}}{R_i^A - b_i^{BA}}, \quad (53) \end{aligned}$$

where the sum of b_i^{BA} is the total required amount of token A (Equation 4).

We first consider the case of two shards and then extend it to the general case. We define the function $f(\cdot, \cdot)$ which is proportional to the utility of the trader in shard_{*i*} and shard_{*j*}:

$$f(b_i^{BA}, b_j^{BA}) := -\left(\frac{R_i^A b_i^{BA}}{R_i^A - b_i^{BA}} + \frac{R_j^A b_j^{BA}}{R_j^A - b_j^{BA}}\right),$$

. Denote by $z := b_i^{BA} + b_j^{BA} \leq b^{BA}$. Then, we have

$$f(b_i^{BA}, z - b_i^{BA}) = -\left(\frac{R_i^A b_i^{BA}}{R_i^A - b_i^{BA}} + \frac{R_j^A (z - b_i^{BA})}{R_j^A - (z - b_i^{BA})}\right).$$

The derivative of the above function is

$$\frac{df(b_i^{BA}, z - b_i^{BA})}{db_i^{BA}} = \frac{(R_i^A)^2}{(R_i^A - b_i^{BA})^2} - \frac{(R_j^A)^2}{(R_j^A - (z - b_i^{BA}))^2}.$$

If $0 \leq b_i^{BA} < \frac{R_i^A}{R_i^A + R_j^A} z$, then $\frac{df(b_i^{BA}, z - b_i^{BA})}{db_i^{BA}} > 0$; if $\frac{R_i^A}{R_i^A + R_j^A} z < b_i^{BA} \leq z$, then $\frac{df(b_i^{BA}, z - b_i^{BA})}{db_i^{BA}} < 0$. Therefore, $f(b_i^{BA}, z - b_i^{BA})$ is maximized only when $b_i^{BA} = \frac{R_i^A}{R_i^A + R_j^A} z = \frac{R_i^A}{R_i^A + R_j^A} (b_i^{BA} + b_j^{BA})$.

The revenue $U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, a^{BA})$ reaches the maximum only when $\forall i, j, \frac{b_i^{BA}}{b_j^{BA}} = \frac{R_i^A}{R_j^A}$, or the trader can replace b_i^{BA} and b_j^{BA} with $\frac{R_i^A}{R_i^A + R_j^A} (b_i^{BA} + b_j^{BA})$ and $\frac{R_j^A}{R_i^A + R_j^A} (b_i^{BA} + b_j^{BA})$ to get higher utility.

Therefore, the only optimal action of the BA trader is

$$a^{BA} = \left(\frac{R_1^A}{\sum R_i^A}, \dots, \frac{R_n^A}{\sum R_i^A}\right). \quad (54)$$

Then, the only dominant strategy of the BA trader is

$$\tau^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } a^{BA} = \left(\frac{R_1^A}{\sum R_i^A}, \dots, \frac{R_n^A}{\sum R_i^A} \right) \\ 0, & \text{Otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (55)$$

□

H SAMM Equilibrium

We analyze the behavior of players in the game with SAMM. We first prove that the trader randomly selects a shard to trade when the states of shards are balanced (§H.1). Then, we show the system tends to the balanced state since liquidity providers invest their tokens in the smallest shards, reducing the difference in the volume of shards (§H.2).

H.1 Trader Strategy

Consider the case that the system state is $\mathbf{R} = ((R_1^A, R_1^B, R_1^S), \dots, (R_n^A, R_n^B, R_n^S))$. As discussed in Section 4.4, the SAMM gross amount satisfies the c -non-splitting property and c -smaller-better property for a certain $0 < c < 1$. We assume that the required amount of *token A*, b^{BA} , is at most a fraction c of the amount of deposited *token A* in all shards, i.e.,

$$\forall 1 \leq i \leq n, b^{BA} \leq cR_i^A.$$

H.1.1 Traders' optimal action

The c -non-splitting property and c -smaller-better property give a trader the incentive to randomly select one of the smallest shards to trade all her required tokens. Recall that $a_i^{BA}(b^{BA})$ is the action of acquiring all b^{BA} *token A* in *shard* $_i$ (Equation 11). We define the set of actions that trade in one of the smallest shards:

Definition H.1. *The Smallest Shard Action Set is the set of actions that acquire all b^{BA} *token A* in one of the smallest shards under state \mathbf{R} :*

$$\mathcal{A}_{1,\min}(b^{BA}, \mathbf{R}) = \{a_i^{BA}(b^{BA}) \mid \forall j, R_i^A \leq R_j^A\}.$$

The cardinality of $\mathcal{A}_{1,\min}(b^{BA}, \mathbf{R})$ is the number of smallest shards in \mathbf{R} . We denote this by

$$n_{\min}(\mathbf{R}) = |\mathcal{A}_{1,\min}(b^{BA}, \mathbf{R})|.$$

When the trader selects one of the actions in the smallest shard action set $\mathcal{A}_{1,\min}(b^{BA}, \mathbf{R})$, she gets the highest revenue:

Lemma H.2. *In $\Gamma_n(tf_{SAMM})$, a trader wants to get b^{BA} *token A* when the system state is \mathbf{R} . Then for the action which obtains all b^{BA} *token A* in one of the smallest shards with index i^* , where $a_{i^*}^{BA}(b^{BA}) \in \mathcal{A}_{1,\min}(b^{BA}, \mathbf{R})$, the trader has no less than the revenue of any other actions:*

$$\forall a^{BA} \in \mathcal{A}^{BA}(b^{BA}), U^{BA}(a_{i^*}^{BA}, \mathbf{R}) \geq U^{BA}(a^{BA}, \mathbf{R}). \quad \square$$

Proof Sketch. Due to the c -non-splitting property, trading in a single shard is better than trading in multiple shards. Then the revenue of trading in one of the smallest shards is no less than that in any other shard due to the c -smaller-better property. □

Proof. Consider an arbitrary action acquiring b^{BA} *token B*, $a^{BA} = (b_1^{BA}, \dots, b_n^{BA}) \in \mathcal{A}^{BA}(b^{BA})$. Given the state of the shard $\mathbf{R} = ((R_1^A, R_1^B, R_1^S), \dots, (R_n^A, R_n^B, R_n^S))$, the utility of the trader following action a^{BA} is

$$U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, a^{BA}) = -p^B \times \sum_{j=1}^n G_{SAMM}(R_j^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B} R_j^A, b_j^{BA}). \quad (56)$$

Since $a_{i^*}^{BA}(b^{BA}) \in \mathcal{A}_{1,\min}(b^{BA}, \mathbf{R})$, we have $R_{i^*}^A \leq R_j^A$. From the c -smaller-better property, for all j , the gross amount of getting b_j^{BA} in *shard* $_{i^*}$ is no larger than that in *shard* $_j$:

$$G_{SAMM}(R_{i^*}^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B} R_{i^*}^A, b_j^{BA}) \leq G_{SAMM}(R_j^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B} R_j^A, b_j^{BA}). \quad (57)$$

Summing over all j , we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^n G_{SAMM}(R_{i^*}^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B} R_{i^*}^A, b_j^{BA}) \leq \sum_{j=1}^n G_{SAMM}(R_j^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B} R_j^A, b_j^{BA}). \quad (58)$$

From c -non-splitting property, since $\sum_{j=1}^n b_j^{BA} = b^{BA}$, the gross amount of trading b^{BA} in a shard is no larger than the sum of gross amount of trading b_j^{BA} in the same shard:

$$G_{SAMM}(R_{i^*}^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B} R_{i^*}^A, b^{BA}) \leq \sum_{j=1}^n G_{SAMM}(R_{i^*}^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B} R_{i^*}^A, b_j^{BA}) \quad (59)$$

Combining with Equation 58, we obtain

$$G_{SAMM}(R_{i^*}^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B} R_{i^*}^A, b^{BA}) \leq \sum_{j=1}^n G_{SAMM}(R_j^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B} R_j^A, b_j^{BA}). \quad (60)$$

We thus conclude that the revenue of action $a_{i^*}^{BA}(b^{BA}) = (0, \dots, b_{i^*}^{BA} = b^{BA}, 0, \dots, 0)$ is maximal:

$$\begin{aligned} U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, a_{i^*}^{BA}(b^{BA})) &= -p^B \times G(R_{i^*}^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B} R_{i^*}^A, b^{BA}) \\ &\geq -p^B \times \sum_{j=1}^n G_{SAMM}(R_j^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B} R_j^A, b_j^{BA}) \\ &\stackrel{(56)}{=} U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, a^{BA}). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

H.1.2 Using smallest shards is a dominant strategy

Lemma H.2 indicates that when multiple AMM shards have the same smallest amount of deposited tokens, acquiring all tokens in any one of them has the highest utility. Since the utility of a trader's strategy is the linear combination of the utility of actions, it is a dominant strategy for the trader to randomly select one of the smallest shards to acquire all required tokens:

Corollary H.3. *In $\Gamma_n(tf_{SMM})$, a dominant strategy for a BA trader is to randomly select one of the smallest shards to acquire all required tokens:*

$$\tau^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, a^{BA}) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{n_{\min}(\mathbf{R})}, & \text{if } a^{BA} \in \mathcal{A}_{1, \min}(b^{BA}, \mathbf{R}) \\ 0, & \text{Otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

If $n_{\min}(\mathbf{R}) = n$, then all shards have the same amount of deposited tokens, and the trader randomly selects one of the n shards.

Corollary 5.5 (restated). *In $\Gamma_n(tf_{SMM})$, the system state is $\mathbf{R} = ((R_1^A, R_1^B, R_1^S), \dots, (R_n^A, R_n^B, R_n^S))$. If $\forall i, j, R_i^A = R_j^A$ and $R_i^B = R_j^B$, then the perfect parallelism strategy*

$$\hat{\tau}^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, a^{BA}) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{n}, & \text{if } a^{BA} \in \mathcal{A}_1(b^{BA}) \\ 0, & \text{Otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

is a dominant strategy for the BA trader.

H.1.3 All dominant strategies use smallest shards

We have shown that only trading in one of the smallest shards is the dominant strategy for the trader. However, to later determine the best response of liquidity providers, we need to know whether there are other dominant strategies. We show that if the trader has a positive probability of taking the action of splitting a transaction or trading in a shard with not the smallest amount of deposited tokens, then she has strictly lower utility than randomly selecting one of the smallest shards to trade, as we intended:

Theorem 5.4 (restated). *In $\Gamma_n(tf_{SMM})$, considering the following dominant strategy of the BA trader which randomly selects one of the smallest shards to acquire all required tokens:*

$$\tau^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, a^{BA}) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{n_{\min}(\mathbf{R})}, & \text{if } \exists i, a^{BA} \in \mathcal{A}_{1, \min}(b^{BA}, \mathbf{R}) \\ 0, & \text{Otherwise.} \end{cases}, \quad (61)$$

then for all strategies π^{BA} that have a positive probability of actions not trading in one of the smallest shards, i.e., $\exists a^{BA} = (b_1^{BA}, \dots, b_i^{BA}, \dots, b_n^{BA}) \notin \mathcal{A}_{1, \min}(b^{BA}, \mathbf{R})$, $\pi^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, a^{BA}) > 0$, the utility of the BA trader is strictly lower than with strategy τ^{BA} :

$$U^{BA}(\tau^{BA}, \mathbf{R}, b^{BA}) > U^{BA}(\pi^{BA}, \mathbf{R}, b^{BA}).$$

Proof Sketch. Since the utility of the BA trader is a linear combination of the utility of actions, we only need to show that the action of not trading in one of the smallest shards has strictly lower revenue than the action of trading in one of the smallest shards, which can be deduced from c -smaller-better property and c -non-splitting property. \square

Proof. Denote the minimal amount of deposited token A among all shards by $R_{\min}^A = \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} R_i^A$, then all smallest shards have R_{\min}^A deposited token A and $\frac{p^A}{p^B} R_{\min}^B$ deposited token B . Then, from Equation 6, the utility of the BA trader under strategy τ^{BA} is

$$U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, \tau^{BA}) = \sum_{a^{BA} \in \mathcal{A}^{BA}(b^{BA})} \tau^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, a^{BA}) \times U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, a^{BA}).$$

From the definition of τ^{BA} (Equation 61), the above equation can be expanded to

$$U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, \tau^{BA}) = \sum_{a_i^{BA}(b^{BA}) \in \mathcal{A}_{1, \min}(b^{BA})} \frac{1}{n_{\min}(\mathbf{R})} \times U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, a_i^{BA}) \quad (62)$$

The revenue of the BA trader under action $a_i^{BA} \in \mathcal{A}_{1, \min}(b^{BA})$ is (using Equation 5)

$$\begin{aligned} U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, a_i^{BA}) &= -p^B \times \sum_{i=1}^n G_{SMM}(R_i^A, R_i^B, b_i^{BA}) \\ &= -p^B \times G_{SMM}(R_i^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B} R_i^B, b^{BA}). \end{aligned}$$

Since $a_i^{BA} \in \mathcal{A}_{1, \min}(b^{BA})$, we have $R_i^A = R_{\min}^A$, which means

$$U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, a_i^{BA}) = -p^B \times G_{SMM}(R_{\min}^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B} R_{\min}^B, b^{BA}). \quad (63)$$

Combining Equation 62 and 63, we find the utility of the BA trader with strategy τ^{BA}

$$\begin{aligned} U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, \tau^{BA}) &= \sum_{a_i^{BA}(b^{BA}) \in \mathcal{A}_{1, \min}(b^{BA})} \frac{(-p^B \times G_{SMM}(R_{\min}^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B} R_{\min}^B, b^{BA}))}{n_{\min}(\mathbf{R})} \\ &= -p^B \times G_{SMM}(R_{\min}^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B} R_{\min}^B, b^{BA}). \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

Combining Equation 63, we have

$$U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, a_i^{BA}) = U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, \tau^{BA}). \quad (65)$$

Now, consider the utility of a strategy π^{BA} . Considering any strategy π^{BA} that splits the trade, i.e., $\exists a^{BA} =$

$(b_1^{BA}, \dots, b_i^{BA}, \dots, b_n^{BA}) \in \mathcal{A}^{BA}(b^{BA}), \pi^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, a^{BA}) > 0, \exists i \neq j, b_i^{BA} > 0, b_j^{BA} > 0.$

Now we consider the revenue of the deviation actions. Considering any strategy π^{BA} where $\exists \tilde{a}^{BA} \in \mathcal{A}^{BA}(b^{BA}) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{1}, \min}(b^{BA}, \mathbf{R}), \pi^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, a^{BA}) > 0.$ There are two kinds of deviation actions. One is that the trader splits the transaction, namely $\tilde{a}^{BA} \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{1}}(b^{BA}, \mathbf{R}). \exists i \neq j, b_i^{BA} > 0, b_j^{BA} > 0.$ The other is that the trader trades in a non-smallest shard, that is, $\tilde{a}^{BA} \in \mathcal{A}^S(b^{BA}) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{1}, \min}(b^{BA}, \mathbf{R}).$

For the first case where $a^{BA} \in \mathcal{A}^{BA}(b^{BA}) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{1}, \min}(b^{BA}, \mathbf{R}),$ we have $\exists i \neq j, b_i^{BA} > 0, b_j^{BA} > 0.$ The revenue of the BA trader under this action is

$$U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, \tilde{a}^{BA}) = -p^B \times \sum_{i=1}^n \left(G_{SMM}(R_i^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B} R_i^A, b_i^{BA}) \right) \quad (66)$$

From the c -smaller-better property, since $\forall 1 \leq i \leq n, R_i^A \geq R_{\min}^A,$ we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \left(G_{SMM}(R_i^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B} R_i^A, b_i^{BA}) \right) \geq \sum_{i=1}^n \left(G_{SMM}(R_{\min}^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B} R_{\min}^A, b_i^{BA}) \right). \quad (67)$$

Since $\exists i \neq j, b_i^{BA} > 0, b_j^{BA} > 0,$ according to the c -non-splitting property, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \left(G_{SMM}(R_{\min}^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B} R_{\min}^A, b_i^{BA}) \right) > G_{SMM}(R_{\min}^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B} R_{\min}^A, b^{BA}).$$

Therefore, $\forall \tilde{a}^{BA} \in \mathcal{A}^{BA}(b^{BA}) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{1}, \min}(b^{BA}, \mathbf{R}),$ the revenue of the action \tilde{a}^{BA} (Equation 66) can be expanded as

$$U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, \tilde{a}^{BA}) = -p^B \times \sum_{i=1}^n \left(G_{SMM}(R_i^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B} R_i^A, b_i^{BA}) \right) < -p^B \times G_{SMM}(R_{\min}^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B} R_{\min}^A, b^{BA}). \quad (68)$$

Since the right part of the above inequality is the revenue of the action a_i^{BA} (Equation 63), the revenue of action \tilde{a}^{BA} is strictly smaller than the revenue of action a_i^{BA} :

$$U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, \tilde{a}^{BA}) < U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, a_i^{BA}). \quad (69)$$

Now we turn to the second case of an action that acquiring all tokens in a non-smallest shard, i.e., $\tilde{a}^{BA} \in \mathcal{A}^S(b^{BA}) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{1}, \min}(b^{BA}, \mathbf{R}).$ Here, we rewrite \tilde{a}^{BA} as $\tilde{a}_j^{BA},$ the action acquiring all b^{BA} in $shard_j,$ where $R_j^A > R_{\min}^A.$ Then, the revenue of the BA trader is

$$U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, \tilde{a}_j^{BA}) = -p^B \times G_{SMM}(R_j^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B} R_j^A, b^{BA}). \quad (70)$$

From the c -smaller-better property, since $R_j^A > R_{\min}^A,$ we have

$$G_{SMM}(R_j^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B} R_j^A, b^{BA}) < G_{SMM}(R_{\min}^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B} R_{\min}^A, b^{BA}).$$

Therefore, from Equation 70, we have

$$U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, \tilde{a}_j^{BA}) < -p^B \times G_{SMM}(R_{\min}^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B} R_{\min}^A, b^{BA})$$

Since the right part of the above inequality is the utility of the action a_i^{BA} (Equation 63), the revenue of the action \tilde{a}_j^{BA} is strictly lower than the revenue of the action a_i^{BA} when $\tilde{a}_j^{BA} \in \mathcal{A}^S(b^{BA}) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{1}, \min}(b^{BA}, \mathbf{R}):$

$$U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, \tilde{a}_j^{BA}) < U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, a_i^{BA}). \quad (71)$$

Combining the conditions for Equation 69 and 71, then $\forall \tilde{a}^{BA} \in \mathcal{A}^{BA}(b^{BA}) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{1}, \min}(b^{BA}, \mathbf{R}),$ we have

$$U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, \tilde{a}^{BA}) < U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, a_i^{BA}). \quad (72)$$

Now we return to the utility of the BA trader with strategy $\pi^{BA}.$ We tease out the deviating action:

$$\begin{aligned} & U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, \pi^{BA}) \\ &= \sum_{a^{BA} \in \mathcal{A}^{BA}(b^{BA})} \pi^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, a^{BA}) \times U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, a^{BA}) \\ &= \sum_{a^{BA} \in \mathcal{A}^{BA}(b^{BA}) \setminus \{\tilde{a}^{BA}\}} \pi^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, a^{BA}) \times U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, a^{BA}) \\ & \quad + \pi^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, \tilde{a}^{BA}) \times U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, \tilde{a}^{BA}). \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

From lemma H.2, the revenue of any action $a_i^{BA} \in \mathcal{A}^{BA}(b^{BA})$ is no larger than the revenue of the action $a_i^{BA} \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{1}, \min}(b^{BA}).$ Combining Equation 63, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{a^{BA} \in \mathcal{A}^{BA}(b^{BA}) \setminus \{\tilde{a}^{BA}\}} \pi^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, a^{BA}) \times U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, a^{BA}) \leq \\ & \sum_{a^{BA} \in \mathcal{A}^{BA}(b^{BA}) \setminus \{\tilde{a}^{BA}\}} \pi^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, a^{BA}) \times U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, a_i^{BA}) \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

Combining Equations 72 and 74, we expand the utility of the BA trader under strategy π^{BA} in Equation 73 as

$$\begin{aligned}
& U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, \pi^{BA}) \\
&= \sum_{a^{BA} \in \mathcal{A}^{BA}(b^{BA}) - \{\tilde{a}^{BA}\}} \pi^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, a^{BA}) \times U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, a^{BA}) \\
&+ \pi^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, \tilde{a}^{BA}) \times U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, \tilde{a}^{BA}) \\
&\stackrel{(74)}{\leq} \sum_{a^{BA} \in \mathcal{A}^{BA}(b^{BA}) - \{\tilde{a}^{BA}\}} \pi^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, a^{BA}) \times U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, a_i^{BA}) \\
&+ \pi^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, \tilde{a}^{BA}) \times U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, \tilde{a}^{BA}) \\
&\stackrel{(72)}{<} \sum_{a^{BA} \in \mathcal{A}^{BA}(b^{BA}) - \{\tilde{a}^{BA}\}} \pi^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, a^{BA}) \times U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, a_i^{BA}) \\
&+ \pi^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, \tilde{a}^{BA}) \times U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, a_i^{BA}) \\
&= \sum_{a^{BA} \in \mathcal{A}^{BA}(b^{BA})} \pi^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, a^{BA}) \times U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, a_i^{BA}) \\
&= U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, a_i^{BA}) \times \sum_{a^{BA} \in \mathcal{A}^{BA}(b^{BA})} \pi^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, a^{BA}) \\
&= U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, a_i^{BA}) \\
&\stackrel{(65)}{=} U^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, \pi^{BA})
\end{aligned}$$

The above inequality indicates that the utility of the BA trader under strategy π^{BA} is strictly lower than the utility of the BA trader under strategy τ^{BA} . \square

From the above theorem, all the best responses of the trader should only have a positive probability of taking an action that trades in exactly one of the smallest shards:

Corollary H.4. *Considering any best response strategy $\tau^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, a^{BA})$ of the BA trader, the strategy should only have a positive probability of taking an action that trades in one of the smallest shards:*

$$\forall a_i^{BA}(b^{BA}) \in \mathcal{A}^{BA}(b^{BA}) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{1,\min}(b^{BA}), \tau^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, a_i^{BA}) = 0.$$

In other words, the sum of the probabilities of all actions that trade in one of the smallest shards should be 1:

$$\sum_{a_i^{BA}(b^{BA}) \in \mathcal{A}_{1,\min}(b^{BA})} \tau^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, a_i^{BA}(b^{BA})) = 1. \quad (75)$$

H.2 Liquidity Provider Strategy and SPNE

Our analysis of the trader strategy shows that if the shards are balanced, traders behave as intended. Next, we consider the strategies of liquidity providers in equilibrium. They should maintain the shard balance. Moreover, their incentives should rebalance the system state even in the face of attacks that break this balance.

H.2.1 Scaffolding

We want a liquidity provider to fill up smaller shards to keep shards balanced. We call such an action the *fillup action*, where if the liquidity provider adds tokens to a shard, then the shard is the smallest shard after this action. We denote the fillup action by $a_{lp}^{fill}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B)$:

Definition 5.6 (restated). *The fillup action of a liquidity provider $a_{lp}^{fill}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B) = ((\hat{l}_1^A, \hat{l}_1^B), \dots, (\hat{l}_n^A, \hat{l}_n^B))$ is the action where if the liquidity provider adds tokens to a shard, then the shard is one of the smallest shards after this action:*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \forall 1 \leq i \leq n : \hat{l}_i^A \geq 0, \\
& \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{l}_i^A = l^A; \\
& \forall \hat{l}_i^A > 0, \forall j : \hat{l}_i^A + R_i^A \leq \hat{l}_j^A + R_j^A.
\end{aligned}$$

We also define the strategy that only takes the fillup action as the *fillup strategy*:

Definition H.5. *The fillup strategy of a liquidity provider $\tau_{lp}^{fill}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B)$ is the strategy that only takes the fillup action:*

$$\tau_{lp}^{fill}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, a_{lp}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } a_{lp} = \hat{a}_{lp} \\ 0, & \text{Otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Denote the minimal amount of deposited *token A* among all shards of status $\mathbf{R} = ((R_1^A, R_1^B, R_1^S), \dots, (R_n^A, R_n^B, R_n^S))$ by

$$\rho^A(\mathbf{R}) = \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} R_i^A.$$

We show that a_{lp}^{fill} is unique and has the maximal volume of the smallest shard in the next step.

Lemma H.6. *For any action of liquidity provider $a_{lp} = ((l_1^A, l_1^B), \dots, (l_n^A, l_n^B)) \in \mathcal{A}_{lp}(l^A, l^B)$, if $\rho^A(\mathbf{R} + a_{lp}) \geq \rho^A(\mathbf{R} + a_{lp}^{fill})$, then $a_{lp} = a_{lp}^{fill}$.*

Proof Sketch. If another action results in a higher minimum reserve of *token A*, then this action must add a larger amount of tokens into each shard compared to the fill-up action, contrary to the assumption that actions have identical total input amounts. \square

Proof. Consider any j s.t. $l_j^{A*} > 0$, from the definition of a_{lp}^{fill} (Definition 5.6), $l_j^{A*} + R_j^A$ is the minimal among all shards with state $\mathbf{R} + a_{lp}$, i.e.,

$$\rho^A(\mathbf{R} + a_{lp}^{fill}) = \hat{l}_j^A + R_j^A. \quad (76)$$

Since then all shards in $\mathbf{R} + a_{lp}$ have no less than $\rho^A(\mathbf{R} + a_{lp})$ deposited *token A*, if $\rho^A(\mathbf{R} + a_{lp}) \geq \rho^A(\mathbf{R} + a_{lp}^{fill})$, we have

$$l_j^A + R_j^A \geq \rho^A(\mathbf{R} + a_{lp}) \geq \rho^A(\mathbf{R} + a_{lp}^{fill}) = \hat{l}_j^A + R_j^A. \quad (77)$$

Therefore, we have

$$l_j^A \geq \hat{l}_j^A. \quad (78)$$

Considering the sum of l_j^A and \hat{l}_j^A , we have

$$\sum_{l_j^A > 0} l_j^A \geq \sum_{\hat{l}_j^A > 0} \hat{l}_j^A = l^A. \quad (79)$$

For a_{lp} , the sum of input tokens in all shards is l^A :

$$\sum_{i=1}^n l_i^A = l^A. \quad (80)$$

And $\forall 1 \leq i \leq n$, l_i^A is non-negative,

$$l_i^A \geq 0. \quad (81)$$

Combining Expressions 78, 79, 80 and 81, all inequation holds with equality, which indicates that $a_{lp} = a_{lp}^{full}$:

$$\forall 1 \leq i \leq n, l_i^A = \hat{l}_i^A. \quad (82)$$

□

We have shown that traders are incentivized to trade in smaller shards in Section H.1, which incentivizes liquidity providers to add their tokens to smaller shards. Additionally, if the liquidity provider makes small shards larger, she would get more trading fees, which further incentivizes them to add liquidity to small shards:

Lemma H.7. For any two shards i and j , if $R_i^A < R_j^A$, for any output amount b^{BA} of token B, the trading fee of shard i is strictly smaller than the trading fee of shard j :

$$tfs_{AMM}(R_i^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B} R_i^A, b^{BA}) < tfs_{AMM}(R_j^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B} R_j^A, b^{BA}).$$

Proof Sketch. Due to the c -smaller-better property, the gross amount in a larger shard is larger than that in a smaller shard. However, the net amount of a larger shard is smaller than that of a smaller shard (Equation 14). Therefore, the trading fee of a larger shard is larger than that of a smaller shard since the gross amount is the sum of the net amount and the trading fee. □

Proof. From c -smaller-better property, since $R_i^A < R_j^A$, the gross amount of shard i is strictly smaller than the gross amount of shard j ,

$$G_{S_{AMM}}(R_i^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B} R_i^A, b^{BA}) < G_{S_{AMM}}(R_j^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B} R_j^A, b^{BA}).$$

Since the gross amount is the sum of the net amount and the trading fee, by expanding the above inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} tfs_{AMM}(R_i^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B} R_i^A, b^{BA}) + net^B(R_i^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B} R_i^A, O^A) < \\ tfs_{AMM}(R_j^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B} R_j^A, b^{BA}) + net^B(R_j^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B} R_j^A, O^A). \end{aligned} \quad (83)$$

Considering the net amount of these two shards, since $R_i^A < R_j^A$, shard i has higher slippage than shard j :

$$net^B(R_i^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B} R_i^A, O^A) > net^B(R_j^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B} R_j^A, O^A). \quad (84)$$

Combining Equation 83 and 84, we conclude that the trading fee of shard i is strictly smaller than the trading fee of shard j :

$$tfs_{AMM}(R_i^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B} R_i^A, b^{BA}) < tfs_{AMM}(R_j^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B} R_j^A, b^{BA}). \quad (85)$$

□

H.2.2 Perfect parallelism under balanced shards

When all shards have identical sizes, the fillup action is to add tokens to all shards evenly, which is the best response of the liquidity provider:

Theorem 5.8 (restated). Denote by $\hat{a}_{lp} = ((\frac{1}{n}l^A, \frac{1}{n}l^B), \dots)$ the action of evenly depositing tokens in all shards. In $\Gamma_n(tfs_{AMM})$, if for all i and j that the liquidity amounts are the same, $R_i^A = R_j^A$ and $R_i^B = R_j^B$, the liquidity provider strategy which only takes action \hat{a}_{lp} ,

$$\tau_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, a_{lp}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } a_{lp} = \hat{a}_{lp} \\ 0, & \text{Otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

and any best response of the trader constitutes an SPNE.

Proof Sketch. Traders prefer trading in smaller shards to reduce their costs. At the same time, fees are higher in larger shards. So the liquidity provider should increase her share in the smallest shards. This dual objective is optimally achieved by uniformly distributing tokens across all shards. □

Proof. Without loss of generality, we only consider BA traders since actions of AB traders are symmetric.

Since the traders have given the best response, we only need to prove that τ_{lp} is also the best response.

Consider any action of liquidity provider $a_{lp} = ((l_1^A, l_1^B), \dots, (l_n^A, l_n^B)) \in \mathcal{A}_{lp}(l^A, l^B)$, the shard state after this action is $\mathbf{R} + a_{lp}$. From Corollary H.4, any best response of the trader only has a positive probability of taking an action that trades in exactly one of the smallest shards. Therefore, from Equation 9, when the trader use any best response τ^{BA} , the liquidity provider's revenue with action a_{lp} is

$$\begin{aligned} U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, a_{lp}, \tau^{BA}, \tau^{AB}) = \\ E_{b^{BA} \sim D^{BA}} \left[\sum_{\substack{a_i^{BA}(b^{BA}) \\ \in \mathcal{A}_{i, \min}(b^{BA}, \mathbf{R} + a_{lp})}} (\tau^{BA}(\mathbf{R} + a_{lp}, b^{BA}, a_i^{BA}(b^{BA})) \times U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a_{lp}, a_i^{BA}(b^{BA}))) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (86)$$

Since $\forall 1 \leq i, j \leq n, R_i^A = R_j^A$. Therefore, the minimal deposited amount of *token A* among all shards in $\mathbf{R} + a_{lp}$ is:

$$\rho^A(\mathbf{R} + a_{lp}) = R_1^A + l_{\min}^A. \quad (87)$$

From Equation 7, the revenue of a liquidity provider due to action a_{lp} and the *BA* trader action $a_i^{BA}(b^{BA}) \in \mathcal{A}_{1,\min}(b^{BA}, \mathbf{R} + a_{lp})$ is acquiring all b^{BA} in one of the smallest shard after the liquidity provider's action, say *shard_i*, is

$$\begin{aligned} & U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a_{lp}, a_i^{BA}(b^{BA})) \\ &= p^B \times tf(R_i^A + l_i^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B}(R_i^A + l_i^A), b^{BA}) \times \frac{l_i^A}{l_i^A + R_1^A} \\ &= p^B \times tf(R_1^A + l_{\min}^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B}(R_1^A + l_{\min}^A), b^{BA}) \times \frac{l_{\min}^A}{l_{\min}^A + R_1^A}. \end{aligned} \quad (88)$$

When $a_{lp} = \hat{a}_{lp}$, the liquidity provider adds tokens to all shards evenly, i.e., $l_i^A = \frac{1}{n}l^A$. Then each shard is identical, the trader's choice of *shard_i* has the same revenue for the liquidity provider as *shard₁*:

$$U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, \hat{a}_{lp}, a_i^{BA}(b^{BA})) = U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, \hat{a}_{lp}, a_1^{BA}(b^{BA}))$$

Therefore, from Equation 86, the revenue of the liquidity provider under action \hat{a}_{lp} is

$$U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, \hat{a}_{lp}, \tau^{BA}, \tau^{AB}) = E_{b^{BA} \sim D^{BA}} [U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, \hat{a}_{lp}, a_i^{BA}(b^{BA}))] \quad (89)$$

Since $\sum_{i=1}^n l_i^A = l^A$, when $\forall 1 \leq i \leq n, l_i^A = \frac{1}{n}l^A$, we have for any action $a_{lp} \in \mathcal{A}_{lp}(l^A, l^B), l_{\min}^A \leq \frac{1}{n}l^A$. Then,

$$\frac{l_{\min}^A}{l_{\min}^A + R_1^A} \leq \frac{\frac{1}{n}l^A}{\frac{1}{n}l^A + R_1^A}. \quad (90)$$

From Lemma H.7, the trading fee of the smallest shard is no larger than the trading fee of any other shard:

$$\begin{aligned} & tf_{SMM}(R_1^A + l_{\min}^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B}(R_1^A + l_{\min}^A), b^{BA}) \leq \\ & tf_{SMM}(R_i^A + \frac{1}{n}l^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B}(R_i^A + \frac{1}{n}l^A), b^{BA}). \end{aligned} \quad (91)$$

Combining Equation 90 and 91, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & p^B \times tf(R_1^A + l_{\min}^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B}(R_1^A + l_{\min}^A), b^{BA}) \times \frac{l_{\min}^A}{l_{\min}^A + R_1^A} \leq \\ & p^B \times tf(R_i^A + \frac{1}{n}l^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B}(R_i^A + \frac{1}{n}l^A), b^{BA}) \times \frac{\frac{1}{n}l^A}{\frac{1}{n}l^A + R_1^A}, \end{aligned} \quad (92)$$

which indicates that the revenue of the liquidity provider under action \hat{a}_{lp} is not smaller than any other action when traders take action $a_i^{BA}(b^{BA})$, i.e.,

$$U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a_{lp}, a_i^{BA}(b^{BA})) \leq U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, \hat{a}_{lp}, a_i^{BA}(b^{BA})). \quad (93)$$

Combining Equation 86 and 93, the revenue of the liquidity provider under action \hat{a}_{lp} is not smaller than the revenue of the liquidity provider under any other action when traders use any best response τ^{BA} .

$$\begin{aligned} & U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a_{lp}, \tau^{BA}, \tau^{AB}, l^A, l^B) \\ & \stackrel{(93)}{\leq} E_{b^{BA} \sim D^{BA}} \left[\sum_{\substack{a_i^{BA}(b^{BA}) \\ \in \mathcal{A}_{1,\min}(b^{BA}, \mathbf{R} + a_{lp})}} \left(\pi_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, a_{lp}) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. \times U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, \hat{a}_{lp}, a_i^{BA}(b^{BA})) \right) \right] \\ & \stackrel{(93)}{\leq} E_{b^{BA} \sim D^{BA}} [U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, \hat{a}_{lp}, a_i^{BA}(b^{BA}))] \\ & \stackrel{(89)}{=} U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, \hat{a}_{lp}, \tau^{BA}, \tau^{AB}, l^A, l^B). \end{aligned} \quad (94)$$

Consider the utility of the liquidity provider under action \hat{a}_{lp} of evenly depositing tokens in all shards, system state \mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B , and the *BA* trader strategy τ^{BA} . From the definition of the utility function of the liquidity provider (Equation 10), the utility of the liquidity provider's strategy τ_{lp} is equal to the revenue of the liquidity provider under action \hat{a}_{lp} :

$$\begin{aligned} & U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, \tau_{lp}, \tau^{BA}, \tau^{AB}) \\ &= \sum_{a_{lp} \in \mathcal{A}_{lp}(l^A, l^B)} \left(\pi_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, a_{lp}) \right. \\ & \quad \left. \times U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, a_{lp}, \tau^{BA}, \tau^{AB}) \right) \\ &= U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, \hat{a}_{lp}, \tau^{BA}, \tau^{AB}) \end{aligned} \quad (95)$$

Then the liquidity provider strategy τ_{lp} has no smaller utility than π^{BA} :

$$\begin{aligned} & U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, \pi_{lp}, \tau^{BA}, \tau^{AB}) \\ & \stackrel{(10)}{=} \sum_{a_{lp} \in \mathcal{A}_{lp}(l^A, l^B)} \left(\pi_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, a_{lp}) \right. \\ & \quad \left. \times U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, a_{lp}, \tau^{BA}, \tau^{AB}) \right) \\ & \stackrel{(94)}{\leq} \sum_{a_{lp} \in \mathcal{A}_{lp}(l^A, l^B)} \left(\pi_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, a_{lp}) \right. \\ & \quad \left. \times U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, \hat{a}_{lp}, \tau^{BA}, \tau^{AB}) \right) \\ & = U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, \hat{a}_{lp}, \tau^{BA}, \tau^{AB}) \\ & \stackrel{(95)}{=} U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, \tau_{lp}, \tau^{BA}, \tau^{AB}, l^A, l^B). \end{aligned}$$

That is, the liquidity provider strategy τ_{lp} is the best response to the trader strategy τ^{BA} .

Therefore, the liquidity provider strategy τ_{lp} and any best response of the *BA* trader τ^{BA} are an SPNE. \square

The above theorem indicates that the liquidity provider keeps the same amount of deposited tokens in the shard after

her action. Therefore, the system always works in a state where all shards have the same amount of deposited tokens.

Since randomly choosing one of the smallest shards to trade is a dominant strategy for the trader, the system always works in perfect parallelism:

Corollary H.8. Denote by $\hat{a}_{lp} = ((\frac{1}{n}l^A, \frac{1}{n}l^B), \dots)$ the action of evenly depositing tokens in all shards. In $\Gamma_n(tf_{SMM})$, if for all i and j that the liquidity amounts are the same, $R_i^A = R_j^A$ and $R_i^B = R_j^B$, the liquidity provider strategy which only takes action \hat{a}_{lp} ,

$$\tau_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, a_{lp}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } a_{lp} = \hat{a}_{lp} \\ 0, & \text{Otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

and the BA trader strategy of randomly selecting one of the smallest shards to trade,

$$\tau^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, a^{BA}) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{n_{\min}(\mathbf{R})}, & \text{if } a^{BA} \in \mathcal{A}_{1, \min}(b^{BA}, \mathbf{R}) \\ 0, & \text{Otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

constitute an SPNE.

H.2.3 Convergence to Balanced Shards

We now show that even if the system reaches an unbalanced state, maybe due to an attacker, it converges to a balanced state since the liquidity provider uses the fillup strategy. We can conclude that the fillup strategy is the only best response in all SPNE:

Theorem 5.9 (restated). In $\Gamma_n(tf_{SMM})$, in all SPNE, the liquidity provider's best response is the fillup strategy:

$$\tau_{lp}^{fill}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, a_{lp}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } a_{lp} = a_{lp}^{fill}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B) \\ 0, & \text{Otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof Sketch. Given any action a_{lp} that is not the fillup action, we can construct a new action a'_{lp} that is strictly better than a_{lp} . By ensuring the smallest shard in $\mathbf{R} + a'_{lp}$ is larger than that in $\mathbf{R} + a_{lp}$, we increase trading fees garnered from each transaction. Moreover, this smallest shard is also the smallest before the action, maximizing the liquidity provider's share. Consequently, the liquidity provider earns higher revenue under a'_{lp} than under a_{lp} . Thus, any strategy incorporating an action other than the fillup action is not optimal. Figure 2 illustrates an example of the a'_{lp} construction. \square

Proof. We prove this by contradiction. (1)Initially, for any action that is not the fillup action, we construct another action resulting in a larger smallest shard. (2)Second, we prove that the constructed action has higher utility than the original action. (3)Third, for any strategy that does not always take the fillup action, we construct a new strategy based on the constructed action. (4)Finally, we prove that the new strategy

has a higher utility than the original strategy, which means that the original strategy is not the best response.

(1) Construction of the new action: Consider any action of a liquidity provider $a_{lp} = ((l_1^A, l_1^B), \dots, (l_n^A, l_n^B)) \in \mathcal{A}_{lp}(l^A, l^B)$. We construct another action a'_{lp} . First, we want the smallest shard in $\mathbf{R} + a'_{lp}$ to be larger than the smallest shard in $\mathbf{R} + a_{lp}$, which lead to a higher trading fee in a single trade according to Lemma H.7. Second, we want the smallest shard in $\mathbf{R} + a'_{lp}$ to be unique and also the smallest in \mathbf{R} to make the liquidity provider have more shares in the smallest shard than in $\mathbf{R} + a_{lp}$.

Denote by i^* the smallest shard in \mathbf{R} with the smaller index, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \forall j, R_{i^*}^A &\leq R_j^A \\ \forall j, R_{i^*}^A = R_j^A &\Rightarrow i^* \leq j. \end{aligned} \quad (96)$$

Consider the fillup action $a_{lp}^{fill}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B) = ((\hat{l}_1^A, \hat{l}_1^B), \dots, (\hat{l}_n^A, \hat{l}_n^B))$. If $a_{lp} = a_{lp}^{fill}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B)$, we take $a'_{lp} = a_{lp}$ and we are done. If $a_{lp} \neq a_{lp}^{fill}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B)$, from Lemma H.6, we have $\rho^A(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B + a_{lp}) < \rho^A(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B + a_{lp}^{fill}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B))$.

Denote this difference by $z = \rho^A(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B + a_{lp}^{fill}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B)) - \rho^A(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B + a_{lp})$.

We construct the action $a'_{lp} = ((l_1^{A'}, l_1^{B'}), \dots, (l_n^{A'}, l_n^{B'}))$ as follows. Figure 2 shows an example of the construction.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{for } i = i^* : l_i^{A'} &= \hat{l}_i^A - \frac{1}{2}z, \\ \text{for } i \neq i^* : l_i^{A'} &= \hat{l}_i^A + \frac{1}{2(n-1)}z. \end{aligned} \quad (97)$$

Then, shard i^* in $\mathbf{R} + a'_{lp}$ is the only shard with the minimal amount of deposited token A, make it the best choice for the subsequent trader.

$$\mathcal{A}_{1, \min}(b^{BA}, \mathbf{R} + a'_{lp}) = \{a_{i^*}^{BA}(b^{BA})\}. \quad (98)$$

From the Definition 5.6, $\rho^A(\mathbf{R} + a'_{lp}) = l_{i^*}^{A'} + R_{i^*}^A$. Then, the smallest amount of deposited token A in $\mathbf{R} + a'_{lp}$ is larger than that in $\mathbf{R} + a_{lp}$:

$$\begin{aligned} l_{i^*}^{A'} + R_{i^*}^A &= \hat{l}_{i^*}^A - \frac{1}{2}z + R_{i^*}^A \\ &= (\hat{l}_{i^*}^A + R_{i^*}^A) - \frac{1}{2}z \\ &= \rho^A(\mathbf{R} + a_{lp}^{fill}) - \frac{1}{2}z \\ &> \rho^A(\mathbf{R} + a_{lp}) - z \\ &= \rho^A(\mathbf{R} + a_{lp}). \end{aligned} \quad (99)$$

(2) The revenues of actions a_{lp} and a'_{lp} : To compare the revenue due to both actions, we consider the strategies and utility

of the subsequent trader. Any best response of the trader $\tau^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, a^{BA})$ uses the smallest shard (Lemma H.4):

$$\sum_{a_i^{BA}(b^{BA}) \in \mathcal{A}_{1,\min}(b^{BA}, \mathbf{R})} \tau^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, a_i^{BA}(b^{BA})) = 1. \quad (100)$$

For the shard state $\mathbf{R} + a'_{lp}$, combining Equation 98, the probability of taking action $a_{i^*}^{BA}(b^{BA})$ is 1:

$$\begin{aligned} & \tau^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, a_{i^*}^{BA}(b^{BA})) \\ &= \sum_{a_i^{BA}(b^{BA}) \in \mathcal{A}_{1,\min}(b^{BA}, \mathbf{R})} \tau^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, a_i^{BA}(b^{BA})) \\ &= 1. \end{aligned} \quad (101)$$

Therefore, from Equation 9, the utility of the liquidity provider following action a'_{lp} and trader's best response strategy τ^{BA} is

$$U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a'_{lp}, \tau^{BA}, \tau^{AB}, l^A, l^B) = E_{b^{BA} \sim D^{BA}} [U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a'_{lp}, a_{i^*}^{BA}(b^{BA}))]. \quad (102)$$

Similarly, the utility following action a_{lp} is

$$U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a_{lp}, \tau^{BA}, \tau^{AB}, l^A, l^B) = E_{b^{BA} \sim D^{BA}} \left[\sum_{\substack{a_i^{BA}(b^{BA}) \\ \in \mathcal{A}_{1,\min}(b^{BA}, \mathbf{R})}} \left(U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a_{lp}, a_i^{BA}(b^{BA})) \right) \right]. \quad (103)$$

Thus, the revenue following action a'_{lp} is (using Equation 7):

$$\begin{aligned} & U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a'_{lp}, a_{i^*}^{BA}(b^{BA})) = \\ & p^B \times tf(R_{i^*}^A + l_{i^*}^{A'}, \frac{p^A}{p^B}(R_{i^*}^A + l_{i^*}^{A'}), b^{BA}) \times \frac{l_{i^*}^{A'}}{l_{i^*}^{A'} + R_{i^*}^A}. \end{aligned} \quad (104)$$

Similarly, we can expand the expression of $U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a_{lp}, a_i^{BA}(b^{BA}))$ for $a_i^{BA} \in \mathcal{A}_{1,\min}(b^{BA}, \mathbf{R} + a_{lp})$ as

$$\begin{aligned} & U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a_{lp}, a_i^{BA}(b^{BA})) = \\ & p^B \times tf(R_i^A + l_i^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B}(R_i^A + l_i^A), b^{BA}) \times \frac{l_i^A}{l_i^A + R_i^A}. \end{aligned} \quad (105)$$

Since $a_i^{BA} \in \mathcal{A}_{1,\min}(b^{BA}, \mathbf{R} + a_{lp})$, $shard_i$ has the smallest amount of deposited *token A* in $\mathbf{R} + a_{lp}$:

$$R_i^A + l_i^A = \rho^A(\mathbf{R} + a_{lp}). \quad (106)$$

Interpreting Equation 99, the smallest shard in $\mathbf{R} + a'_{lp}$ is larger than the smallest shard in $\mathbf{R} + a_{lp}$:

$$l_{i^*}^{A'} + R_{i^*}^A > R_i^A + l_i^A. \quad (107)$$

From lemma H.7, the trading fee of trading in a larger shard is larger,

$$tf(R_{i^*}^A + l_{i^*}^{A'}, \frac{p^A}{p^B}(R_{i^*}^A + l_{i^*}^{A'}), b^{BA}) > tf(R_i^A + l_i^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B}(R_i^A + l_i^A), b^{BA}). \quad (108)$$

From the definition of i^* in Equation 96, we have

$$R_{i^*}^A \leq R_i^A. \quad (109)$$

Combine Equations 107 and 109, we have

$$\frac{l_{i^*}^{A'}}{l_{i^*}^{A'} + R_{i^*}^A} = 1 - \frac{R_{i^*}^A}{l_{i^*}^{A'} + R_{i^*}^A} > 1 - \frac{R_i^A}{l_i^A + R_i^A} = \frac{l_i^A}{l_i^A + R_i^A}. \quad (110)$$

Combining Equations 104, 105, 108 and 110, the revenue of the liquidity provider with action a'_{lp} is higher than with action $a_{lp} \neq a_{lp}^{fill}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B)$:

$$U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a'_{lp}, a_{i^*}^{BA}(b^{BA})) > U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a_{lp}, a_i^{BA}(b^{BA})). \quad (111)$$

Combining Equations 102 and 103, the utility of the liquidity provider under action a'_{lp} is higher than that under action $a_{lp} \neq a_{lp}^{fill}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B)$:

$$U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a'_{lp}, \tau^{BA}, \tau^{AB}, l^A, l^B) > U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a_{lp}, \tau^{BA}, \tau^{AB}, l^A, l^B). \quad (112)$$

When $a_{lp} = a_{lp}^{fill}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B)$, we have $a'_{lp} = a_{lp}$. Therefore, the following inequality holds for all $a_{lp} \in \mathcal{A}_{lp}(l^A, l^B)$:

$$U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a'_{lp}, a_{i^*}^{BA}(b^{BA})) \geq U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a_{lp}, a_i^{BA}(b^{BA})). \quad (113)$$

(3) Construction of a new strategy: We showed that for any action $a_{lp} \neq a_{lp}^{fill}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B)$, the constructed action a'_{lp} has a higher revenue. Now, for any liquidity provider strategy π_{lp} , we can construct a new strategy π'_{lp} where for every action a_{lp} , the probability of constructed action a'_{lp} in the new strategy is the same as the original action a_{lp} in the original strategy:

$$\pi'_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, a'_{lp}) = \pi_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, a_{lp}).$$

If the original strategy is different from the fillup strategy $\pi_{lp} \neq \pi_{lp}^{fill}$, then $\exists \tilde{a}_{lp} \in \mathcal{A}_{lp}(l^A, l^B)$, s.t. $\tilde{a}_{lp} \neq a_{lp}^{fill}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B)$ and $\pi_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, \tilde{a}_{lp}) > 0$.

(4) Comparison of utilities: From the definition (Equation 10), the utility of the liquidity provider under π_{lp} is

$$U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, \pi_{lp}, \tau^{BA}, \tau^{AB}, l^A, l^B) = \sum_{a_{lp} \in \mathcal{A}_{lp}(l^A, l^B)} \left(\pi_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, a_{lp}) \times U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a_{lp}, \tau^{BA}, \tau^{AB}, l^A, l^B) \right). \quad (114)$$

Similarly, the utility of the liquidity provider under π'_{lp} is

$$\begin{aligned}
& U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, \pi'_{lp}, \tau^{BA}, \tau^{AB}, l^A, l^B) \\
&= \sum_{a'_{lp} \in \mathcal{A}_{lp}(l^A, l^B)} \left(\begin{array}{c} \pi'_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, a'_{lp}) \\ \times U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a'_{lp}, \tau^{BA}, \tau^{AB}, l^A, l^B) \end{array} \right) \\
&= \sum_{a'_{lp} \in \mathcal{A}_{lp}(l^A, l^B) \setminus \{\tilde{a}'_{lp}\}} \left(\begin{array}{c} \pi'_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, a'_{lp}) \\ \times U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a'_{lp}, \tau^{BA}, \tau^{AB}, l^A, l^B) \end{array} \right) \\
&\quad + \pi'_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, \tilde{a}'_{lp}) \times U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, \tilde{a}'_{lp}, \tau^{BA}, \tau^{AB}, l^A, l^B) \quad (115)
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\pi'_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, \tilde{a}'_{lp}) = \pi_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, \tilde{a}_{lp}) > 0$, from Equation 111, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \pi'_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, \tilde{a}'_{lp}) \times U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, \tilde{a}'_{lp}, \tau^{BA}, \tau^{AB}, l^A, l^B) > \\
& \pi_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, \tilde{a}_{lp}) \times U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, \tilde{a}_{lp}, \tau^{BA}, \tau^{AB}, l^A, l^B). \quad (116)
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\pi'_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, a'_{lp}) = \pi_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, a_{lp}) > 0$, from Equation 113, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \pi'_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, a'_{lp}) \times U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a'_{lp}, \tau^{BA}, \tau^{AB}, l^A, l^B) \geq \\
& \pi_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, a_{lp}) \times U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a_{lp}, \tau^{BA}, \tau^{AB}, l^A, l^B). \quad (117)
\end{aligned}$$

Combining Equations 114 115 , 116 and 117, the utility of the liquidity provider under π'_{lp} is higher than that under π_{lp} :

$$\begin{aligned}
& U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, \pi'_{lp}, \tau^{BA}, \tau^{AB}, l^A, l^B) > \\
& U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, \pi_{lp}, \tau^{BA}, \tau^{AB}, l^A, l^B).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, any liquidity provider strategy $\pi_{lp} \neq \tau^{fill}_{lp}$ is not the best response when the trader follows any best response. Therefore, in all SPNE, the liquidity provider's best response is the fillup strategy τ^{fill}_{lp} . \square

H.2.4 Specific SPNE under deviation

The above theorem does not prove the existence of an SPNE. We settle this by finding a specific SPNE in $\Gamma_n(tf_{S\text{AMM}})$. In this SPNE, if there are multiple smallest shards, the trader uses the smallest shard in the last step. If there is more than one smallest shard in the last step, the trader selects the one with the smallest index. Denote by $i_{\min}(\mathbf{R})$ the index of the shard with the smallest amount of deposited *token A* in \mathbf{R} . When $i^* = i_{\min}(\mathbf{R})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \forall j, R_{i^*}^A \leq R_j^A \\
& \forall j, R_{i^*}^A = R_j^A \Rightarrow i^* \leq j. \quad (118)
\end{aligned}$$

If the shard with index $i_{\min}(\mathbf{R})$ is the only shard, the *BA* trader would only trade in that shard. Then the liquidity provider only taking the fill-up action is the best response strategy:

Theorem H.9. In $\Gamma_n(tf_{S\text{AMM}})$, assume that the shard state in step k is $\mathbf{R}(k)$, $i^* = i_{\min}(\mathbf{R}(k))$ is the index of the shard with the smallest amount of deposited *token A* in $\mathbf{R}(k)$. Then the trader strategy to trade in the smallest shard in the last step if it is the smallest one, or randomly select one of the smallest shards, namely,

$$\tau^{BA}(\mathbf{R}, b^{BA}, a^{BA}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } R_{i^*} = \rho^A(\mathbf{R}(k), l^A, l^B) \\ & \text{and } a^{BA} = a_{i^*}^{BA}(b^{BA}) \\ \frac{1}{n_{\min}(\mathbf{R})}, & \text{if } R_{i^*} = \rho^A(\mathbf{R}(k), l^A, l^B) \\ & \text{and } a^{BA} \in \mathcal{A}_{1, \min}(b^{BA}, \mathbf{R}) \\ 0, & \text{Otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (119)$$

and the liquidity provider's fillup strategy:

$$\tau_{lp}^{fill}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, a_{lp}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } a_{lp} = a_{lp}^{fill}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B) \\ 0, & \text{Otherwise.} \end{cases},$$

are an SPNE in step k .

Proof Sketch. Since the trader always trades in one of the smallest shards, τ^{BA} is a dominant strategy for her. Therefore, we only need to prove that τ_{lp} is the best response to τ^{BA} . If the liquidity provider does not take the fill-up action, then the trader trades in the smallest shard with a smaller amount of deposited *token A* than that under the fill-up action. Since larger shards have a higher trading fee under a fixed trade, the utility of the liquidity provider is higher when she takes the fill-up action. \square

Proof. Considering the revenue of the liquidity provider under the action $a_{lp}^{fill}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B)$. The amount of deposited *token A* of shard i^* in $\mathbf{R} + a_{lp}^{fill}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B)$ is $R_{i^*}^A + \hat{l}_{i^*}^A$.

We first prove that $\hat{l}_{i^*}^A > 0$ by contradiction. If $\hat{l}_{i^*}^A = 0$, then $R_{i^*}^A + \hat{l}_{i^*}^A = R_{i^*}^A$. Then for any input amount $\hat{l}_j^A > 0$, we have $R_j^A + \hat{l}_j^A > R_j^A$. From the definition of $i^* = i_{\min}(\mathbf{R})$ (Equation 118), we have $R_{i^*}^A \leq R_j^A$. Therefore, the amount of deposited *token A* of shard i^* in $\mathbf{R} + a_{lp}^{fill}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B)$ is strictly smaller than shard j

$$R_j^A + \hat{l}_j^A > R_j^A \geq R_{i^*}^A = R_{i^*}^A + \hat{l}_{i^*}^A. \quad (120)$$

This contradicts the definition of $a_{lp}^{fill}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B)$ (Definition 5.6) since $\hat{l}_j^A > 0$. Therefore, $\hat{l}_{i^*}^A > 0$. Then also from that definition, the amount of deposited *token A* of shard i^* after the fillup action is smallest among all shards:

$$R_{i^*}^A + \hat{l}_{i^*}^A = \rho^A(\mathbf{R} + a_{lp}^{fill}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B)). \quad (121)$$

Therefore, from the definition of τ^{BA} (Equation 119), we have $\tau^{BA}(\mathbf{R} + a_{lp}^{fill}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B), b^{BA}, a_{lp}^{BA}) = 1$.

Then, we turn to the revenue of the liquidity provider with the fillup action and prove that it is no smaller than any other

action. From Equation 9, the utility of the liquidity provider under the fill-up action and the trader's best response τ^{BA} is:

$$U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a_{lp}^{fill}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B), \tau^{BA}, \tau^{AB}, l^A, l^B) = E_{b^{BA} \sim D^{BA}} \left[U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a_{lp}^{fill}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B), a_{i^*}^{BA}(b^{BA})) \right]. \quad (122)$$

Similarly, the utility of the liquidity provider under any action $a_{lp} \in \mathcal{A}_{lp}(l^A, l^B)$ and the trader's best response τ^{BA} is

$$U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a_{lp}, \tau^{BA}, \tau^{AB}, l^A, l^B) = E_{b^{BA} \sim D^{BA}} \left[\sum_{\substack{a_i^{BA}(b^{BA}) \\ \in \mathcal{A}_{1, \min}(b^{BA}, \mathbf{R})}} \left(U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a_{lp}, a_i^{BA}(b^{BA})) \right) \times \tau^{BA}(\mathbf{R} + a_{lp}, b^{BA}, a_i^{BA}) \right]. \quad (123)$$

From the definition of $U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a_{lp}, a^{BA})$ (Equation 7), we have

$$U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a_{lp}^{fill}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B), a_{i^*}^{BA}(b^{BA})) = p^B \times tf(R_{i^*}^A + \hat{l}_{i^*}^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B}(R_{i^*}^A + \hat{l}_{i^*}^A), b^{BA}) \times \frac{\hat{l}_{i^*}^A}{\hat{l}_{i^*}^A + R_{i^*}^A}, \quad (124)$$

and

$$U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a_{lp}, a_i^{BA}(b^{BA})) = p^B \times tf(R_i^A + l_i^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B}(R_i^A + l_i^A), b^{BA}) \times \frac{l_i^A}{l_i^A + R_i^A}. \quad (125)$$

Since $a_i^{BA} \in \mathcal{A}_{1, \min}(b^{BA}, \mathbf{R})$, $shard_i$ has the smallest amount of deposited *token A* in $\mathbf{R} + a_{lp}$:

$$R_i^A + l_i^A = \rho^A(\mathbf{R} + a_{lp}). \quad (126)$$

From Lemma H.6, the minimal amount of deposited *token A* in $\mathbf{R} + a_{lp}^{fill}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B)$ is no less than that in $\mathbf{R} + a_{lp}$ for any $a_{lp} \in \mathcal{A}_{lp}(l^A, l^B)$:

$$\rho^A(\mathbf{R} + a_{lp}^{fill}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B)) \geq \rho^A(\mathbf{R} + a_{lp}). \quad (127)$$

Combining Equations 121, 126 and 127, we have

$$R_{i^*}^A + \hat{l}_{i^*}^A \geq R_i^A + l_i^A. \quad (128)$$

From Lemma H.7, the trading fee of trading in a larger shard is larger:

$$tf(R_{i^*}^A + \hat{l}_{i^*}^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B}(R_{i^*}^A + \hat{l}_{i^*}^A), b^{BA}) > tf(R_i^A + l_i^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B}(R_i^A + l_i^A), b^{BA}). \quad (129)$$

From the definition of $i^* = i_{\min}(\mathbf{R})$ (Equation 118), we have $R_{i^*}^A \leq R_i^A$. Combining with Equation 128, we have

$$\frac{R_{i^*}^A}{\hat{l}_{i^*}^A + R_{i^*}^A} \leq \frac{R_i^A}{l_i^A + R_i^A}. \quad (130)$$

Therefore, the liquidity provider has more share in $shard_i$ in $\mathbf{R} + a_{lp}^{fill}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B)$ than any smallest shard in $\mathbf{R} + a_{lp}$:

$$\frac{\hat{l}_{i^*}^A}{\hat{l}_{i^*}^A + R_{i^*}^A} = 1 - \frac{R_{i^*}^A}{\hat{l}_{i^*}^A + R_{i^*}^A} \geq 1 - \frac{R_i^A}{l_i^A + R_i^A} = \frac{l_i^A}{l_i^A + R_i^A}. \quad (131)$$

Combining Equations 129 and 131, we have

$$p^B \times tf(R_{i^*}^A + \hat{l}_{i^*}^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B}(R_{i^*}^A + \hat{l}_{i^*}^A), b^{BA}) \times \frac{\hat{l}_{i^*}^A}{\hat{l}_{i^*}^A + R_{i^*}^A} \geq p^B \times tf(R_i^A + l_i^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B}(R_i^A + l_i^A), b^{BA}) \times \frac{l_i^A}{l_i^A + R_i^A}. \quad (132)$$

Then, the revenue of the liquidity provider with the fill-up action is no less than any other action given the trader's best response τ^{BA} :

$$\begin{aligned} & U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a_{lp}^{fill}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B), a_{i^*}^{BA}(b^{BA})) \\ & \stackrel{(124)}{=} p^B \times tf(R_{i^*}^A + \hat{l}_{i^*}^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B}(R_{i^*}^A + \hat{l}_{i^*}^A), b^{BA}) \times \frac{\hat{l}_{i^*}^A}{\hat{l}_{i^*}^A + R_{i^*}^A} \\ & \stackrel{(132)}{\geq} p^B \times tf(R_i^A + l_i^A, \frac{p^A}{p^B}(R_i^A + l_i^A), b^{BA}) \times \frac{l_i^A}{l_i^A + R_i^A} \\ & \stackrel{(125)}{=} U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a_{lp}, a_i^{BA}(b^{BA})) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, from Equations 122 and 123, the revenue of the liquidity provider with the fill-up action is no less than any other action given the trader's best response τ^{BA} :

$$U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a_{lp}^{fill}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B), \tau^{BA}, \tau^{AB}, l^A, l^B) \geq U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a_{lp}, \tau^{BA}, \tau^{AB}, l^A, l^B). \quad (133)$$

After analyzing actions, we consider the utility of the liquidity provider with strategy τ_{lp} and any mixed strategy π_{lp} . From the definition of the utility of the liquidity provider under π_{lp} (Equation 10), we have


$$\begin{aligned} & U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, \tau_{lp}, \tau^{BA}, \tau^{AB}, l^A, l^B) \\ & = \sum_{a_{lp} \in \mathcal{A}_{lp}(l^A, l^B)} \left(\tau_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, a_{lp}) \times U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a_{lp}, \tau^{BA}, \tau^{AB}, l^A, l^B) \right) \\ & = U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a_{lp}^{fill}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B), a_{i^*}^{BA}(b^{BA})), \end{aligned} \quad (134)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, \pi_{lp}, \tau^{BA}, \tau^{AB}, l^A, l^B) \\ & = \sum_{a_{lp} \in \mathcal{A}_{lp}(l^A, l^B)} \left(\pi_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, a_{lp}) \times U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a_{lp}, \tau^{BA}, \tau^{AB}, l^A, l^B) \right) \\ & \stackrel{(133)}{\leq} \sum_{a_{lp} \in \mathcal{A}_{lp}(l^A, l^B)} \left(\pi_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, a_{lp}) \times U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a_{lp}^{fill}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B), \tau^{BA}, \tau^{AB}, l^A, l^B) \right) \\ & = U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, a_{lp}^{fill}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B), a_{i^*}^{BA}(b^{BA})) \\ & \quad \times \sum_{a_{lp} \in \mathcal{A}_{lp}(l^A, l^B)} \tau_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, l^A, l^B, a_{lp}) \end{aligned} \quad (135)$$

$$= U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, \tau_{lp}, \tau^{BA}, \tau^{AB}, l^A, l^B). \quad (136)$$

Figure 10: Solana trade latency as a function of demand with n SAMM shards.



Therefore, the liquidity provider strategy τ_{lp} is the best response to the trader strategy τ^{BA} :

$$U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, \tau_{lp}, \tau^{BA}, \tau^{AB}, l^A, l^B) \geq U_{lp}(\mathbf{R}, \pi_{lp}, \tau^{BA}, \tau^{AB}, l^A, l^B). \quad (137)$$

Since τ^{BA} is also a best response to the trader strategy τ_{lp} , the liquidity provider strategy τ_{lp} and the trader strategy τ^{BA} are an SPNE. \square

In summary, we showed that the system achieves a stable state where the perfect parallelism strategy is the dominant strategy for traders. Moreover, the system demonstrates robustness against deviations, particularly due to attacks.

I Solana Experiment Details

Figure 10 details the results of the Solana experiments. We only test each frequency twice since the results are stable. For each throughput value (X axis) we calculate the average latency (Y axis). Error bars show all measured values.

For a single CPMM contract ($n = 1$), similar to the OmniSwap experiment, the average latency increases gradually with the transaction frequency up to $129tps$ before crossing the 3-second line. With higher frequencies, transactions frequently fail. Solana-Default and Solana-NoBlockLimit are not distinguishable since they have the same gas limit for a single contract. The latency for a single SAMM contract, whether on Solana-Default or Solana-NoBlockLimit, is comparable to that of a single CPMM contract.

With $n \leq 4$ contracts, the latency in Solana-Default and Solana-NoBlockLimit is indistinguishable. However, for $n \geq 5$, Solana-Default does not improve due to the gas limit. Therefore, we only present the results for Solana-NoBlockLimit. With $n = 16$, beyond $2099tps$, the throughput starts declining when increasing the expected frequency. We therefore consider the latency to be "Inf" above 2099, marking it with \times .

We also tested the throughput of simple token transfers on Solana as a baseline, reaching a throughput above $2500tps$ (outside the figure range) with latency under one second, higher than the maximum observed in our AMM experiments.




Figure 11: Maximal throughput as a function of the number of shards in SAMM / heavier SAMM.

J Evaluation of Increasing Parallel Component

We posit that enhancing the performance of SAMM necessitates mitigating the serial bottlenecks within the platform. While modifications to the core architecture of Sui are beyond the scope of this study, we enhance the parallelizable aspects of SAMM by introducing superfluous operations into each trade. This methodology follows the experimental setup described in Section 6.

Figure 11 presents the maximum throughput results for standard SAMM transactions as previously discussed in Section 8, alongside results from transactions with added operations with three repetitions. Although the inclusion of additional operations reduces overall performance due to increased overhead, it significantly enhances the parallel component, with $P = 0.9$ ($R^2 = 0.968$). Remarkably, the throughput with 32 shards is ten times that of a single shard, a substantial improvement over the ratios observed in Section 6.

Consequently, addressing the serial bottlenecks within blockchain platforms is vital for future improvements in SAMM performance.

K Parameter Selection in Simulation

We select different values of c for SAMM, namely 0.003, 0.005 and 0.01. We set $r_{\max} = 5 \times r_{\min}$. We choose r_{\max}, r_{\min} and β_1 (See Section 4.4) to minimize the maximal trading fee ratio. This is to limit the maximal cost for traders. Hence, we set $r_{\max} = 5 \times r_{\min}$ to minimize them at the same time. Together with the restrictions of satisfying c -smaller-better and c -larger-better (Corollary 4.5), the optimization problem is

$$\begin{aligned}
& \min_{r_{\max}, r_{\min}, \beta_1} && r_{\max} \\
\text{subject to} &&& r_{\max} = 5 \times r_{\min} , \\
&&& c \leq 1 - (-\beta_1)^{-\frac{1}{3}} , \\
&&& c \leq \frac{r_{\max} - r_{\min}}{-\beta_1} .
\end{aligned}$$

Hence we get r_{\max}, r_{\min} and β_1 given c .