

# CLVR Ordering of Transactions on AMMs

Work in Progress

August 6, 2024

Robert McLaughlin<sup>1</sup>, Nir Chemaya<sup>2</sup>, Dingyue Liu<sup>2</sup>, and Dahlia Malkhi<sup>13</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Computer Science, University of California, Santa Barbara

<sup>2</sup> Department of Economics, University of California, Santa Barbara

<sup>3</sup> Chainlink Labs

**Abstract.** Trading on decentralized exchanges via an Automated Market Maker (AMM) mechanism has been massively adopted, with a daily trading volume reaching \$1B. This trading method has also received close attention from researchers, central banks, and financial firms, who have the potential to adopt it to traditional financial markets such as foreign exchanges and stock markets. A critical challenge of AMM-powered trading is that transaction order has high financial value, so a policy or method to order transactions in a “good” (optimal) manner is vital. We offer economic measures of both price stability (low volatility) and inequality that inform how a “social planner” should pick an optimal ordering. We show that there is a trade-off between achieving price stability and reducing inequality, and that policymakers must choose which to prioritize. In addition, picking the optimal order can often be costly, especially when performing an exhaustive search over trade orderings (permutations). As an alternative we provide a simple algorithm, Clever Look-ahead Volatility Reduction (CLVR). This algorithm constructs an ordering which approximately minimizes price volatility with a small computation cost. We also provide insight into the strategy changes that may occur if traders are subject to this sequencing algorithm.

**Keywords:** Blockchain · DeFi · Decentralized Exchange · Automated Market Makers · Ordering · Price Stability · Inequality

## 1 Introduction

A new financial market has surfaced in the past decade on Ethereum and other blockchain platforms. The financial activities on these platforms represent around \$1T value, some of it collateralized by traditional capital reserves and/or real-world assets, and some of it matured through financial activity on blockchain systems themselves [15]. This market, referred to as Decentralized Finance (“DeFi”), completely changes the rules of the financial “game” in several ways, and in particular: (i) settlement on these platforms is transparent and immediate, allowing for continuous price updates, and (ii) the platform itself can see and (re)order trades with no regulatory restrictions. This paper is focused on the following question: suppose that a “social planner” could set rules that benefit social welfare and provide financial protection in DeFi, what would planning look like?

One important DeFi application is the Decentralized Exchange (DEX), which allows users to swap digital assets (tokens) on the blockchain in a trustless setting. DEX trading mechanisms vary greatly, but can be broadly summarized into the following categories: Limit-Order Book, batch settlement and – our central focus – the Automated Market Maker (AMM) [39]. This work focuses on the last category – the AMM – given its massive adoption on DeFi and its primary use as a trading mechanism. AMMs are extremely popular, with daily trading volume has reaching over \$1 billion [16]. Alongside the massive adoption of AMMs in the DeFi environment has arisen an extensive discussion of the advantages of adopting this new trading innovation in traditional financial markets, such as stock markets and foreign exchanges [1,25,33].

An AMM is a smart contract that enables users to swap one token for another at a price that is determined fully automatically by the smart contract itself. Unlike the other DEX mechanisms, AMMs do not match trading parties with counterparties, but instead custody and oversee a “liquidity pool” of reserve assets, which they use to service these swaps. An AMM’s price updates continuously as swaps are executed – put simply, prices rise with ‘buy’ orders, and fall with ‘sell’ orders. Consequently, each transaction’s effective execution price is influenced by the transactions that precede it. The ability to insert, re-order, and/or censor transactions is thus highly *financially* valuable: one can use this power to both manipulate users’ swap prices, and to exploit opportune prices. An example of the former is a *sandwich attack*, which involves extracting profit by forcing a user to swap at a price that was manipulated to be higher than expected [38,23,13]. An example of the latter is *arbitrage*, which involves buying an asset for a low price in one market, and selling it for a higher price in another market, yielding a profit [30,34].

In Ethereum, transactions are sequenced into batches, known as *blocks*. Each block is produced by a single leader in the network, and the network rotates the leader every block. The block producer is given exclusive authority to sequence transactions within the block that they construct, and thus, are able to insert, re-order, and/or censor transactions, as mentioned above. Using this ability to extract value from the network is extremely common, and is conceptually known as Maximum Extractable value (MEV) [14]. MEV extraction requires specialized knowledge and tooling, so block producers often outsource block production to a third-party via MEV-Boost, an auction system whereby third-parties bid for sequencing rights [11].

There has been significant recent research regarding the impact of MEV extraction, both in terms of the welfare of blockchain users and the technical operation of the blockchain itself [41,12]. In particular, one thread of research seeks to address the critical question of transaction ordering by proposing “fair ordering” policies that blockchain protocols can use to mitigate MEV activity [41,40]. However, imposing those policies on a blockchain can be challenging, and does not always achieve the desired outcome; for example, [37] shows the presence of MEV extraction techniques even in first-come, first-serve transaction ordering blockchains.

In this work, we attempt to answer a slightly different question: supposing that ordering rules can be enacted and enforced on AMM protocols, then what ordering is most desirable under various economic measures? Concretely, we examine the impact of ordering on (1) inequality (who benefits) and (2) price stability (volatility) on AMMs.

We also examine the block size itself, which represents the duration that the social planner sets for trading frequency on an AMM. We investigate whether, if given more time (a larger block size), the planner can order trades to meet objectives more effectively.

After addressing these questions, we devise practical methods for constructing transaction orderings which optimize both inequality and price stability. Furthermore, we study their practicality and examine their ability to satisfy their objectives.

Using our economic measures, we apply a simulation and empirical data analysis in many different environments, varying block size, liquidity available, and transaction size. The analysis allows us to draw the following conclusions, which are the main contribution of our paper:

1. Under some conditions, the optimal order of transactions to minimize the trader’s inequality results in the highest price volatility.
2. We offer a simple and fast algorithm to order transactions for minimal price volatility, Clever Look-ahead Volatility Reduction (CLVR). This algorithm outputs an ordering that approximates the minimal price volatility with a polynomial-time computational cost ( $O(n^2)$ ), while forbidding certain predatory trading practices (i.e., sandwich attacks). Our algorithm demonstrates superior performance compared to previous solutions and gives a good approximation for the optimal outcome.
3. Larger blocks give the ordering algorithm such as (CLVR) more flexibility to organize trades and improve price volatility.
4. Price volatility can be further reduced when traders split their transactions under an ordering algorithm. We show that when using our ordering algorithm (CLVR), traders fare better when they break down trades into smaller orders (which our system can sequence between other orders), implying that CLVR is incentive-compatible for splitting transactions.

## 2 Background and Motivation

Our primary motivation for this work comes from observing the massive popular adoption of AMMs and their disruption of traditional, order-book driven markets. However, in order to achieve true mass adoption at scale, we must discover solutions to the ordering problems that are inherent to an AMM’s design.

When trading with an AMM, traders interact directly with a market-making smart contract, which updates prices continuously after each trade. In contrast, in traditional markets, execution ordering mechanisms are often enforced by regulatory bodies (typically, on a first-come-first-served basis) [21]. This is difficult to enforce within a distributed system. Indeed, the concept of ordering events by time in a distributed context is often not well-defined (e.g., [27,8,28,44]). Ethereum makes no attempt at enforcing ordering fairness, and instead gives the block-builder a monopoly power that they can use to order the transactions as they wish.

However, even if there existed a private blockchain that could, for example, enforce a time-priority ordering mechanism, then we could still have fairness issues: some traders may have faster hardware, a lower latency internet connection, or more efficient software applications. This enables privileged actors to respond faster to changes in

price, and thus achieve preferential sequencing positions. To deal with this issue in the traditional market, researchers offer to use batching auctions to attack this problem[6].

This leads to the following question: If a social planner can decide the order of transactions on AMM, which economic goal would they want to achieve? Furthermore, how can we measure this economic goal, and which ordering algorithms can provide the desired outcome? What if a social planner is given a collection of switches and levers, including breaking large transactions into smaller ones, batching power, etc. Given the issues observed in the traditional financial markets due to high-frequency traders, which suggest that first come first serve order does not always give the optimal outcome for everyone, the best ordering solution is not obvious[6].

Ferreira et al. in [40] were the first to offer an ordering mechanism for AMMs, known as the Greedy Sequencing Rule (GSR). Their first goal is to reduce unnecessary price deviation from the initial price and prevent sandwich attacks; an additional, pragmatic concern was to develop an ordering rule that would be easy to verify so that agents could monitor its implementation on the blockchain, ensuring that block builders follow this rule, and make it resist the classic sandwich attacks that traders are exposed to on an AMM.

In GSR, when a buy/sell transaction is executed and causes the liquidity pool price to deviate from the initial price, the algorithm subsequently picks a transaction in the “opposite direction” (if one exists), which ensures that the price does not continue diverting to extremes (when possible). If the subsequent price movement pushes the price beyond the initial price, the algorithm will again alternate from buy(sell) to sell(buy). Ferreira et al. demonstrate that this strategy is resistant to sandwich attacks. In addition GSR has a low computational cost: it only needs to classify pending transactions as ‘buy’ or ‘sell’, and pick ones trading in the right direction. This low computational cost and straightforward design allows anyone to monitor and verify easily compliance with the sequencing rule. GSR is further enhanced in [3], where they offer the Volume Heuristic Greedy Sequencing Rule (VHGSR), which, on top of the GSR method (namely, alternate between buy and sell), the algorithm prioritizes selecting small transactions before bigger ones. They also show that VHGSR can give a reasonable approximately optimal price volatility for a small set of pending transactions  $n < 8$ .

Inspired by the VHGSR, our investigation to find the optimal ordering for price stability leads us to one of this paper’s main contributions. For some pending transactions (especially in big blocks), the optimal solution to order transactions violates the GSR and VHGSR, as covered in section 5.2. Therefore, we offer a new approximation method, CLVR, which we detail in section 4.3. The main idea of this method is to always pick the next transaction in the set that minimizes the *price volatility* relative to the initial prices. CLVR outperforms VHGSR with a marginal computational cost and gives a good approximate optimal ordering to achieve price stability. Moreover, we demonstrate in Appendix B that this strategy is also resistant to sandwich attacks.

Besides price stability, we check another possible goal of ordering transactions – improving inequality. We show that the optimal order for achieving lower inequality comes with a trade-off in price stability. Another exciting result from our paper comes from exploring what happens once we give the social planner the power to change the number of transactions executed in a given block, which can have a direct impact

on price stability. We hypothetically test it on empirical data in section 5.5, where we could reduce price volatility up to 85%.

Transaction splitting is a critical aspect of AMMs that is closely connected to the ordering mechanism. We show that transaction splitting can dramatically improve price stability due to its flexibility in the ordering mechanism such as CLVR. An ordering algorithm that encourages traders to split their transactions into smaller ones could substantially impact price stability, underscoring the importance of this decision. We show that under CLVR, even in a small block with only two transactions, traders can enjoy a reduction of price volatility of 6 orders of magnitude just from splitting their transaction into small ones. In section 5.4, we test whether CLVR is incentive-compatible, and found that all traders benefit from splitting their transactions, and the market achieves lower price volatility.

Our work highlights the importance of transaction ordering beyond the scope of mitigating MEV and price manipulation, in terms of a public good that improves the price stability and inequality of the system. Our work shows that even today, when the number of transactions executed in a given block in an AMM is still relatively low, ordering transactions can help improve price stability. If an AMM is to scale up to the traffic observed in traditional financial markets, then a better ordering mechanism is necessary because ordering matters, and has a large impact on the economy that can be leveraged in a positive way. In Section 6, we offer some direction for future work and implementations.

## 2.1 Related Work

Many papers explored AMMs in different directions, including comparing them to centralized exchanges and limit order book mechanisms, risks and benefits for providing liquidity in those markets, and more [4,29,21,19,36,22,10]. Our main contribution to this area of research is to shed light on how an AMM can improve price stability and inequality while imposing a transaction ordering mechanism.

[14,38,30] introduce the economic value of ordering transactions in an AMM, and MEV opportunities that it creates for the block producer to order the transaction in their favor. Many different solutions are offered to this ordering problem in order to protect traders from sandwich attacks and price manipulations. One way is to protect traders by setting a slippage tolerance, which only executes a transaction if the trader gets at least a minimum amount of tokens back as described in [13,23]. However, while this approach can protect traders from price manipulation and sandwich attacks, it does not account for the advantage that traders can get from imposing a transaction ordering mechanism, as we offer in this work.

An alternative way is to generate an auction between the traders on the exact priority of their transactions in the spirit of [18]. Still, this approach will not leverage the main benefit of ordering a transaction to optimally achieve economic goals such as reducing price deviation or inequality. One way to address this issue is to offer batch auctions, which first mitigate high-frequency trading on traditional markets[6]. The main idea of this approach is to collect all the pending transactions and run an auction to determine a single price that clears the market in a way that does not give any traders a better exchange price relative to the other. [43,9] offer a models to

implement this idea on AMMs. Our approach is similar to the batch auction in that it leverages the idea of executing transactions together to clear the market better and provide better prices; however, we offer to achieve this goal on an AMM by implementing an optimal ordering mechanism.

Another way is to adopt a norm of ordering transactions using a credible rule that is easy to monitor and find a way to punish any block producer that deviates from this norm. As mentioned above, such rules were introduced, e.g., in GSR [40,31] to protect traders from sandwich attacks and provide better exchange prices for traders.

Finally, our approach is most closely related to [3], which evaluates empirically how liquidity pools on the Uniswap protocol are ordering transactions relatively to an optimal order that minimizes price volatility. Their results support the idea that block producers are deviating from this objective function, and manipulate the order of the transaction in their favor. They also show that the VHGSR differs slightly from the optimal price volatility in blocks that contain less than eight transactions.

### 3 Model

There are several different AMM designs. For this work we will focus only on the Uniswap V2 [2] AMM mechanism (known as a “Constant-Product Market Maker”, or CPMM), as it is both popular and relatively simple. A CPMM’s pricing rule is defined as follows:

$$k = x_t y_t \tag{1}$$

where  $k$  represents a *potential* which remains constant, and  $x_t$  and  $y_t$  represent the quantity of tokens X and Y in the AMM’s liquidity pool at time  $t$ . The current spot price of the pool is simply the ratio of tokens held in the AMM’s reserve at time  $t$ .

$$p_t = \frac{y_t}{x_t} \tag{2}$$

Without loss of generality, when a trader wishes to swap token X for token Y at time  $t$ , the trader will add  $\Delta x_t$  tokens X to the pool, and withdraw  $\Delta y_{out,t}$  tokens Y from the pool, according to the following invariant:

$$k = (x_t + \Delta x_t(1 - f))(y_t - \Delta y_{out,t}) \tag{3}$$

Where  $f$  is the *fee rate* (set to 0.003 on Uniswap V2). For simplicity, we consider a frictionless trading environment with  $f = 0.0$ , giving:

$$k = (x_t + \Delta x_t)(y_t - \Delta y_{out,t}) \tag{4}$$

Prices update continuously as trades are processed. In this work we will be examining several methods of ordering these trades, and will make use of the following notation. We notate the set of available trades as  $M = \{\alpha: \text{sell } a, \beta: \text{buy } b, \dots\}$ . Each

trade indicates a direction (sell or buy) and a quantity ( $a$  and  $b$ ), which is the amount of token the trader will pay for the trade. We refer to each trade by its *label* ( $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ , etc.) for convenience. Transactions that ‘sell’ send some quantity of X tokens to the AMM and receive a quantity of Y tokens; transactions that ‘buy’ do the opposite.

We notate a particular sequence (ordering) of trades with the bijection  $\sigma : \{1, \dots, n\} \rightarrow \{\alpha, \beta, \dots\}$ , which maps a position in the sequence to a specific trade. Following from Equation 4, the number of tokens received for the  $i^{\text{th}}$  trade in ordering  $\sigma$  is defined as:

$$y_{\text{out}}(\sigma, i) = \begin{cases} x_{\text{in}} \frac{Y(\sigma, i-1)}{X(\sigma, i-1) + x_{\text{in}}} & \text{if } \sigma(i) = \text{sell } x_{\text{in}} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

$$x_{\text{out}}(\sigma, i) = \begin{cases} y_{\text{in}} \frac{X(\sigma, i-1)}{Y(\sigma, i-1) + y_{\text{in}}} & \text{if } \sigma(i) = \text{buy } y_{\text{in}} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

Where functions  $X(\sigma, i)$  and  $Y(\sigma, i)$  refer to the reserves of tokens X and Y after trade  $i$ , as follows:

$$X(\sigma, i) = \begin{cases} x_0 & \text{if } i=0 \\ X(\sigma, i-1) + x_{\text{in}} & \text{if } i>0 \text{ and } \sigma(i) = \text{sell } x_{\text{in}} \\ X(\sigma, i-1) - x_{\text{out}}(\sigma, i) & \text{if } i>0 \text{ and } \sigma(i) = \text{buy } y_{\text{in}} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

$$Y(\sigma, i) = \begin{cases} y_0 & \text{if } i=0 \\ Y(\sigma, i-1) + y_{\text{in}} & \text{if } i>0 \text{ and } \sigma(i) = \text{buy } y_{\text{in}} \\ Y(\sigma, i-1) - y_{\text{out}}(\sigma, i) & \text{if } i>0 \text{ and } \sigma(i) = \text{sell } x_{\text{in}} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

Finally, the price updates as follows:

$$P(\sigma, i) = \frac{Y(\sigma, i)}{X(\sigma, i)} \quad (9)$$

Critically, Equation 9 states that the price updates continuously as transactions are processed. This directly implies that the order in which transactions are processed determines the exchange price for each trade. The following example illustrates a situation where transaction ordering significantly impacts execution price. Let  $x_0 = y_0 = 100$ , then  $k = x_0 y_0 = 10,000$ . Now, consider a set of two pending transactions  $\{\alpha: \text{sell } 10, \beta: \text{sell } 10\}$ , which we order as  $\sigma: \{1 \mapsto \alpha, 2 \mapsto \beta\}$ . By applying Equation 4, we compute the amount of token received for each transaction:  $y_{\text{out}}(\sigma, 1) = 9.09$ ,  $y_{\text{out}}(\sigma, 2) = 7.58$ . Observe that despite each trader spending the same quantity of token X (10), they each receive significantly different amounts of token Y, depending on execution order.

In the above example, execution ordering impacts which trader receives 9.09 units of Y, and which trader receives 7.58 units of Y. However, ordering a larger number of transactions involves a much more complex set of price decisions. Consider, for example, a sequence of four pending transactions:  $\{\alpha: \text{buy } 10, \beta: \text{buy } 10,$

$\gamma$ : sell 10,  $\delta$ : sell 10}. Let’s consider two possible orderings:  $\sigma_1$  process all sell orders then process all buy orders, and  $\sigma_2$  alternate between processing ‘buy’ and ‘sell’ transactions. In ordering  $\sigma_1$  we compute the sequence of outputs:  $y_{\text{out}}(\sigma_1,1)=9.09$ ,  $y_{\text{out}}(\sigma_1,2) = 7.58$ ,  $x_{\text{out}}(\sigma_1,3) = 12.86$ , and  $x_{\text{out}}(\sigma_1,4) = 10.37$ . However, in ordering  $\sigma_2$  we compute the sequence of outputs:  $y_{\text{out}}(\sigma_2,1) = 9.09$ ,  $x_{\text{out}}(\sigma_2,2) = 10.90$ ,  $y_{\text{out}}(\sigma_2,3)=9.25$ , and  $x_{\text{out}}(\sigma_2,4)=10.73$ . These two sequences demonstrate outcomes that differ not just in which execution price is awarded to whom, but it also significantly impacts the execution price levels themselves. In Section 4 we discuss the direct implications that this has on fairness, inequality, and price volatility.

## 4 Optimal Ordering of Transactions

In this section, we introduce economic measures against which we will seek to optimize transaction ordering. An intuitive way to think about this is to imagine that a social planner gets a set of pending transactions and an objective function that it needs to optimize. The social planner’s role is only to pick the order of the transactions, and they cannot censor or insert transactions. Sections 4.1 and 4.2 offer some economic measures that social planners may decide to optimize. However, finding the optimal ordering can be costly. In Section 4.3 we describe our mechanism, CLVR, that provides a fast method to approximate a good transaction ordering.

### 4.1 Price Stability

For a given set of pending transactions  $M$ , the ordering of transactions  $\sigma$  that will give the economy optimal price stability is the one that minimizes the *volatility* of traders’ exchange prices from the “status-quo” price. We set this “status-quo” price to be the opening price, before any trades in  $M$  begin to execute. We expect that traders consider this price to be fair, as they were able to observe and consider this price before broadcasting their trade.<sup>4</sup> In this case, the price volatility for a particular ordering  $\sigma$  can be captured by using the following function:

$$\text{VOL}(\sigma) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\ln p_0 - \ln P(\sigma, i))^2 \quad (10)$$

Where  $n = |M|$  and  $p_0$  is the “status-quo” spot price. This function is a standard measure of price volatility [32]. Also note that this measure is insensitive to the choice of spot price direction – i.e., whether  $p_0 = x_0/y_0$  or  $p_0 = y_0/x_0$ . A brief proof is provided in Appendix A.

In order to achieve maximal price stability the social planner will need to *minimize* this function over all such possible  $\sigma$ .

<sup>4</sup> On most AMM protocols like Uniswap, the slippage setting refers to the opening price, which means that managing price stability around those prices will reduce the chance of transaction failures. However, other potential ways exist to set the “status-quo” price as described in Section 6.



## 4.2 Inequality

This ordering strategy seeks to give pricing preference to certain traders at the expense of others. Abstractly, this involves organizing trades such that those given preferential treatment execute at higher prices when selling, and lower prices when buying.

There are different ways to evaluate inequality, depending on the assumptions the policymaker may make, and the objectives that they want to achieve. Consider the following two measurements. First, one can assume that users' transaction sizes correlate with their initial wealth, and then order transactions in a way that favors small trades relative to big ones. This approach also incentivizes the execution of small transactions, which can positively affect market stability. Given that significant transactions on AMM have a massive price impact, this incentivizes traders to split significant transactions into small ones.

Second, one can evaluate inequality by the total wealth of the user, regardless of the transaction size. A user's wealth can be measured by examining their wallet's balance. This measurement is somewhat challenging due to the fact that accounts are pseudonymous, and users can make and control multiple accounts in an effort to hide their true wealth (i.e., a *sybil* attack).

In this paper, we will focus on the first approach, which is more relevant for use in the Blockchain environment. The second approach can be seen as what a social planner could achieve in an ideal world, which we know can be less realistic; this approach and measurement can be found in Appendix D.

### Traders' Inequality Based On Their Transaction Size - Gini Post Trade

**Wealth:** For a given set of pending transactions  $M$  in a given block, the transaction order that reduces traders' inequality while accounting for transaction size is the one that results in the lowest Gini coefficient (lowest inequality) after the transactions are executed.<sup>5</sup> Intuitively, this works by ensuring that smaller transactions receive a "good" exchange price, while larger transactions receive a "bad" exchange price, thus reducing inequality from both ends.

In a simple example when the exchange rate between token X and token Y is one-to-one ( $p_0 = 1$ ), the amount of tokens each trader redeems from a transaction ( $x_{\text{out}}(\sigma, i)$  or  $y_{\text{out}}(\sigma, i)$ ) can represent its "wealth". The "wealth" and corresponding Gini Coefficient are given in the formulas below:

$$W_i = x_{\text{out}}(\sigma, j) \text{ or } y_{\text{out}}(\sigma, j) \quad (11)$$

$$\text{GINI}(\sigma) = \frac{2 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n i \cdot W_i}{n \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n W_i} - \frac{n+1}{n} \quad (12)$$

Where  $W_1 \leq W_2 \leq \dots \leq W_n$ . The social planner will need to minimize the Gini coefficient by ordering the transactions in  $M$  in a way that minimizes this function.

<sup>5</sup> The Gini Coefficient is a well-known economic measurement of inequality. Gini Coefficient ranges from 0 to 1, with higher values indicating greater inequality [42].

### 4.3 Approximating and Verifying the Optimal Ordering

While ideally, the social planner will pick the optimal ordering of transactions, the computational cost of exhaustively going through all permutations of  $n$  transactions is prohibitive: even at one billion evaluations carried per second, it will take one hundred hours to exhaustively scan all orderings for (say) 17 transactions. Therefore, we explored ways to approximate the optimal ordering with reduced computational complexity. We also want the ordering rule to be easy to verify, so that agents can monitor its implementation.

We considered the GSR method of Ferreira et al. in [40], which is described in Section 2. The GSR has several significant advantages: it is simple to implement, computationally efficient, and verifiable. Secondly, it is proven to be resilient against sandwich attacks. However, the GSR does not produce a unique ordering and, particularly for large blocks, still too many orderings may satisfy it, leaving open the question which one the social planner should choose. Therefore, to test the GSR method as a baseline, we use the VHGSR method from [3], which is a modified version of GSR that forces the GSR to prefer selecting smaller transactions first. As demonstrated below in the experimental evaluation (Section 4), GSR may be far from optimal with respect to price stability (minimizing volatility). Therefore, we offer a new method, CLVR, that can perform better with a small computation cost.

**CLVR Look-ahead Volatility-Minimizing (“CLVR”) Rule:** Consider the following rule: at step  $t$ , select as the next trade the transaction that minimizes  $(\ln p_0 - \ln P(\sigma, t))^2$ . That is, the rule picks at each step  $t$  as next trade that causes minimal local one-step price-volatility from the status quo price,  $p_0$ .

In Appendix B we provide a proof that CLVR protects traders from the traditional 3-transaction sandwich attacks. Additionally, Section 5.2 shows that the CLVR is approximately optimal in many cases, even with larger numbers of pending transactions.

**On the Quality of CLVR:** A natural question to ask is whether, given a block of transactions, the CLVR rule always achieves the globally minimal price volatility. Unfortunately, we can find a counter examples showing it does **not**. For example, consider three trades:  $\{\alpha: \text{sell } 2, \beta: \text{sell } 5, \gamma: \text{buy } 10\}$  when the initial liquidity available is  $x_0 = y_0 = 100$ . The optimal ordering for minimizing aggregate price-volatility is **not** to start with sell 2, as CLVR would dictate. Rather, it is sell 5, buy 10, sell 2. The CLVR ordering is illustrated in Figure 1 (right) against the optimal volatility-minimizing ordering (left). In this case, the average price volatility of the CLVR is  $8.2 \times 10^{-3}$ , while the optimal ordering can reduce this volatility to  $7.9 \times 10^{-3}$ .

This example highlights why CLVR only approximately minimizes price volatility. However, even in this example, we can still see that the CLVR order gives very low price volatility, which is nonetheless close to optimal. In section 5.2, we show that CLVR achieves nearly-optimal orderings in many cases.




Fig. 1: Optimal sequence minimizing price volatility, OPT (left) vs CLVR sequence (right)

## 5 Simulations and Results

In this section we describe a series of empirical experiments performed to show the effects of the economic measures discussed in Section 4. We perform these simulations on a machine with dual Intel Xeon Gold 6330 CPUs (56 total cores, 112 threads) and 512 GB of RAM.

### 5.1 Optimal Ordering of Transactions

We now consider the following research question: Given a set of pending transactions, which orderings optimize for (a) price stability and (b) inequality? To investigate this we perform an empirical experiment with the following setup.

We aim to perform this experiment with synthetic trades that nonetheless closely mimic real-world workloads. In order to achieve this, we collected all 4,192 swaps that executed on Uniswap V2’s USDC-USDT AMM between June 19, 2024 and July 19, 2024 (UTC).<sup>6</sup> We identify each swap’s total quantity of tokens traded, and fit the data to a log-normal distribution, with parameters  $\mu=4.93$  and  $\sigma=2.05$ . A Kolmogorov–Smirnov goodness-of-fit test yields  $p<0.001$ . We also find that during this time period the AMM’s mean reserves of USDC and USDT is about 2 million tokens, each.

We create a simulated AMM following the model as described in Section 3. The AMM trades tokens X and Y, each starting with reserves  $x_0 = y_0 = 2,000,000$  – this also has the convenient effect of setting the initial spot price  $p_0$  to 1. For each trial in this experiment we generate a workload of  $n$  pending transactions. Each transaction is randomly assigned to either ‘sell’ or ‘buy’, each with 50% probability. The transaction’s quantity of tokens is then drawn from the log-normal distribution described above. In Appendix C, we run some robustness checks to ensure that our results can be generalized even when we have different amounts of liquidity available  $(x_0, y_0)$  or different distributions of the transaction sizes. We repeat the experiment 100 times for each block size  $n$  equal to 2, 5, 10, 12 and 13.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>6</sup> Smart contract: 0x3041CbD36888bECc7bbCBc0045E3B1f144466f5f

<sup>7</sup> Computing this metric for larger block sizes is not tractable, owing to combinatorial explosion.

We use a brute-force search strategy to identify sequences that either minimize volatility (optimal price stability) or minimize the Gini coefficient (optimal inequality). As this is a search by brute-force, we must iterate over all  $n!$  permutations of pending transactions. The search is written in approximately 500 lines of Rust code.

First, we plot the price walks of different objective functions for each simulation and observe a systematic pattern. For example, see the results of one simulation in Figure 2. The main observation from Figure 2 leads to our first non-trivial conclusion: In many cases, minimizing price volatility is at odds with the economic goal of giving better exchange prices to smaller traders (i.e., reducing inequality). Said simply, smaller traders can be helped by forcing bigger traders to push the price into a more favorable position before the smaller trader executes. This gives smaller buyers access to lower prices, and sellers access to higher prices.

Moreover, Figure 2 shows that the converse also holds: an ordering that maximizes the Gini coefficient has a high price volatility. This ordering provides better prices to the big trades, which can be seen as an example of an environment where a block producer can manipulate the order in her favor. We will likely observe an ordering pattern in this spirit in places where MEV occurs.

Both of these facts imply a dilemma for policymakers, as they must select which objective to fulfill: minimizing price volatility or minimizing inequality.<sup>8</sup>




Fig. 2: Price walk of different objective functions for a set  $M$  of 10 synthetic transactions. Each point represents the AMM's spot price after executing the  $i^{\text{th}}$  transaction in the sequence.

<sup>8</sup> An alternative option is that policymakers may want to adopt a policy that considers both objectives instead of picking one objective to minimize, aiming at a middle ground.

To further shed light on how transaction are ordered to achieve minimum inequality, Figure 3 shows the Gini post-trade wealth traders wealth distribution before and after the execution of the trades.



Fig. 3: Wealth distributions pre- and post-trade, assuming a spot price of 1.0, drawn from the sequence that minimizes the Gini coefficient in Figure 2

Finally, Table 1 and Table 2 show summary statistics of both price stability and inequality objectives from all simulations, which demonstrates that optimizing for one objective produces poor outcomes for the other objective.

Table 1: Relative Gini coefficient of price stability objectives. Each score is computed as a relative percentage, where 0% is the minimum Gini coefficient, and 100% is the maximum. Taken as the mean of 100 trials.

	Number of Trades				
	3	5	10	12	13
Price Stability (when maximizing Gini Coef.)	45.02	45.30	48.76	46.93	48.89
Price Stability (when minimizing Gini Coef.)	56.47	55.08	52.25	53.05	51.88

## 5.2 Sequencing Algorithm Performance Metrics

In section 4.3 we described how, given the high computation cost of finding the optimal ordering of the transaction, policymakers may use sequencing algorithms

Table 2: Relative volatility of Gini objectives. Each score is computed as a relative percentage, where 0% is the minimum price volatility (maximum stability), and 100% is the maximum price volatility. Taken as the mean of 100 trials.

	Number of Trades				
	3	5	10	12	13
Gini Coef. (when maximizing Vol.)	48.53	50.97	52.64	50.71	50.31
Gini Coef. (when minimizing Vol.)	47.31	43.07	37.93	37.98	38.05

that approximate the optimal results with a much lower computation cost. We will focus on such algorithms to reduce price volatility and check their performance.

First we test the VHGSR, a modified version of the GSR. We evaluate these measures compared with our proposed rule, CLVR, which picks the next trade that minimizes the price volatility and can improve performance with a small additional computation cost. To draw a general conclusion about CLVR’s performance compared to VHGSR, we ran many different simulations on different block sizes ranging from 2 up to 1,000 transactions per block, as can be seen in Table 3. The main conclusion from Table 3 is that CLVR performs better and gives a better approximation to the optimal ordering to reduce price volatility for any given number of transactions  $n$  (block size).

Table 3: Comparison of VHGSR vs CLVR. When tractable, relative volatility is computed as a percentage where 0% is the minimum volatility, and 100% is the maximum. Reported relative volatility is a mean over all trials. Performed over 100 trials for each number of transactions  $n$ . The  $p$ -value is computed from a paired, one-sided t-test of the VHGSR and CLVR volatilities.

	Best Price Stability (%)			Relative Vol. (%) <sup>9</sup>		
	CLVR	VHGSR	Tie	CLVR	VHGSR	$p$ -value
2	0	0	100	0.00	0.00	-
5	59	0	41	0.19	6.62	0.026
10	86	6	8	0.10	3.93	0.091
12	95	1	4	0.08	3.89	0.020
50	91	9	0	-	-	0.076
100	80	20	0	-	-	<0.001
500	83	17	0	-	-	<0.001
1000	79	21	0	-	-	<0.001

To provide insight into the differences between VHGSR and CLVR, we pick one example and show VHGSR and CLVR orderings step by step. Figure 4 is an example where, with respect to price volatility, there can be a significant difference between

<sup>9</sup> Minimum volatility is the lowest volatility achieved from all the ordering permutations available.

orderings: the VHGSR ordering (orange line) deviates significantly from the baseline price. When we compared VHGSR with our new method, the CLVR (blue line), we can observe much lower price volatility in CLVR.




Fig. 4: Example of a workload where VHGSR performs poorly vs CLVR with respect to maintaining price stability. In this example, the VHGSR is forced to place a large trade in position 2, which harms price stability.

### 5.3 Price Stability and Block Sizes

In traditional financial markets, there is an extensive discussion on what the optimal trading frequency is [17,5,26,20]. Trading frequency means setting the time that the market will operate. When performing batch auctions, for example, it sets the duration of the auction. Setting the trading frequency can directly impact the number of transactions in a given auction. High-speed frequency can be seen as a first come, first serve system, while a slower frequency can increase the number of transactions in the auction. In that sense, we can think about “block size” as the duration that the social planner sets for trading frequency on an AMM. Having a lower frequency can allow more trades to be executed in a given block, which we say are “bigger” blocks.

We run the following experiment to test block size’s impact on price stability. We generate a set of 100 transactions using the same randomization process based on the transaction distribution in section 5.1. Each transaction is given a sequential timestamp, which indicates the order of the transaction’s arrival in the “mempool”. For simplicity, we will assume that during this process, the spot market price and pool initial price are the same, and equal to 1, as we set in the previous simulations.

Now we can test what will happen if the social planner executes all the transactions using a first come, first served policy, which can be seen as having 100 blocks (one transaction per block). We also examine what would happen if there were batches of different block sizes, for example, ten blocks with ten transactions each, or one big block with 100 transactions. We test this over a variety of block sizes. We run this simulation over 1,000 trials to reach a more general conclusion.

Figure 5 shows the main advantage of batching transactions together when we want to improve the price stability of the system. When we have a first come, first serve approach (on the left), this gives the highest median price volatility with a very high variance. In contrast, price volatility is significantly reduced when all transactions are batched into one big block (on the right). This allows the CLVR ordering mechanism can archive a much lower median of price volatility with much lower variance. In summary, transaction ordering has a significant impact on price volatility when the block size is very large. A social planner may want to take this into consideration when deciding the block size.




Fig. 5: Price volatility achieved by CLVR with varying block sizes. Computed over 1,000 trials, error bars drawn at 25th and 75th percentiles, marker placed at median.

#### 5.4 Splitting Transactions

Traders may split their transactions into small trades, also known as order splitting [38], to strategically improve their exchange prices and avoid price manipulations. It's essential to notice that transaction splitting is beneficial for maintaining price stability. In short, splitting transactions into smaller ones will provide more flexibility with respect to ordering possibilities, which is crucial in improving the system's price stability.



To explain the idea behind let’s consider the following example: Suppose there are only two pending transactions in a block. One is buying ( $\Delta x_1 = 1,000$ ), and the other is selling ( $\Delta y_2 = 1,000$ ). Suppose that  $x_0 = y_0 = 100,000$  and, thus,  $p_0 = 1$ . In this example, if we execute both transactions, we will have a price volatility of  $2.0 \times 10^{-4}$ . However, if both traders split their transactions into 1000 small transactions of 1 each, an optimizing algorithm can improve the price volatility to  $2.0 \times 10^{-10}$  – an improvement of 6 orders of magnitude. The optimal ordering interleaves smaller buy and sell orders, alternating between each, in order to maintain the status-quo price. The more users split their transactions, the more this price volatility will decrease and eventually converge to 0.

The social planner may want to consider and find a way to encourage splitting orders, especially in significant transactions that can impact price volatility.<sup>10</sup> We perform the following two experiments to test whether CLVR is incentive compatible with transaction splitting. First, we check if a trader can expect better execution (in expectation) when splitting the transaction into two or more. We start by generating a ‘buy’ trade of size  $s$ , which we will refer to as  $t^*$ . Then, we generate 9 additional trades randomly, according to the log-normal distribution described above. We sequence these 10 trades using CLVR, and compute the amount of token received by  $t^*$ . Then, we split  $t^*$  into  $n$  equally-sized trades  $t_1^*, \dots, t_n^*$ , and again sequence the trades and sum the amount of token received by each trade  $t_i^*$ . This process is repeated 1,000 times for each combination of  $s$  and  $n$ . The results of this experiment are drawn in Figure 6 in the Appendix. We find that for all 10 trade sizes tested (varying from 10 to 10 million), the trader experiences a slight increase in amount out, on average, which is increasing in the number of splits  $n$ .

Next, we examine what would happen to the ecosystem if *all* traders split their transactions given the benefits that we show in Figure 6. We perform the following experiment. First, we generate 10 trades at random using the log-normal distribution described above. Then, we sequence the trades using CLVR and compute the amount out for each trade. Finally, we split each trade into  $n$  equally-sized trades, sequence them using CLVR, and again compute the amount out that each original trader would receive from their several trades. The process is repeated 1,000 times. We plot the results in Figure 7 in the Appendix. We find an average increase in amount out, which increases in the number of splits  $n$ . To conclude, if one trader splits his transaction (no matter the transaction size), they can get better execution (in expansion) by splitting the transaction. Therefore, if all traders adopt this strategy, we show that all traders could get better execution after splitting their transactions, which suggests that CLVR is incentive compatible with transaction splitting.

## 5.5 CLVR Applied to Empirical Data

We evaluate CLVR’s performance on the 4,192 swaps collected above (Uniswap V2’s USDC-USDT AMM). We start with an AMM that has reserves  $x_0 = y_0 = 2,000,000$ .

<sup>10</sup> In an environment where network(gas) fees need to be paid for each transaction’s execution, splitting the transactions may have boundaries that both traders and the social planner will need to take into account in this decision.

Then, we compute the volatility after executing each transaction in its observed, real-world ordering. Since this pool allows traders to trade two stablecoins, their exchange rate is relatively stable ( $p_0=1$ ), which theory suggests impacts trading frequency given the asset types[17]. We indeed observe less active trading in a given block in this pool during our data collection, with most trading blocks containing one transaction. In that case, the ordering does not matter, and testing the CLVR performance is meaningless, so we use the following approach. We collect the swaps into 420 blocks of size 10 (which simulates increased AMM activity), ordered in their real-world ordering, and execute CLVR in a multi-round fashion. We measure an 85% reduction in volatility, which shows the potential benefit of implementing ordering mechanisms on AMMs.

We also evaluate VHGSR vs. CLVR as applied to the Uniswap V2 USDC-WETH AMM swaps, collected over the same time range as above.<sup>11</sup> This pool has a much higher trading frequency compared to Uniswap V2’s USDC-USDT AMM, which allows us to test VHGSR vs. CLVR performances on blocks with more than 3 transactions. This is evaluated in Table 5 in the Appendix, where we also find CLVR good performance same as section 5.2 and the potential to reduce price volatility on AMM by around 50% compared to the current volatility observed in this pool.

## 6 Conclusions

This work explores the impact of ordering transactions on AMMs against two economic measures of “social goodness”: (1) inequality and (2) price stability. Given those measures, we show that if a social planner wants to pick the optimal order to achieve the best price stability, it may need to trade-off minimizing inequality. Additionally, finding the optimal order for a set of transactions can be costly using a dumb search algorithm; therefore, a social planner may need to use an algorithm that approximates the optimal ordering. We offer the CLVR algorithm that can achieve a good approximation of the optimal price stability. This algorithm performs better than the VHGSR and GSR methods. In addition, we show that a social planner may want to order transactions in bigger blocks (a larger number of transactions) to improve the system’s price stability. Finally, we show that CLVR is also incentive-compatible for splitting transactions, which can have a good impact on the price stability of the AMM market.

This work has broad implications for AMM design and, in general, market design for trading. First, in the DeFi space, AMM protocol designers can adopt our ordering approach and implement an AMM protocol that will commit to an ordering algorithm such as CLVR at the liquidity pool level via the smart contract. In a competitive market where AMM protocols and liquidity providers want to attract users to use their platform, ordering mechanisms can be super appealing for traders. However, block builders do not commit to sending all pending transactions to the liquidity pool smart contract in this environment. They can manipulate and remove transactions, impacting the ordering mechanism performance. There is promising work on inclusion lists today to tackle this problem [35,24], which could help implement the ordering mechanism method that we provide.

<sup>11</sup> Smart contract: 0xB4e16d0168e52d35CaCD2c6185b44281Ec28C9Dc

In addition, besides the DeFi space, our social planner can be more realistic in a setting with a private AMM run by a centralized authority. Private AMMs are a possible implementation when adopting AMMs to traditional markets. In that case, the AMM can be regulated, and an ordering mechanism will be enacted and enforced.

We invite more researchers to explore this idea and hope that it could be helpful to improve AMM development. In the next section, we provide future research directions and some limitations of our work.

### 6.1 Limitations and Future Directions

1. Our work does not account for the slippage tolerance decisions of users (the limit exchange price they are willing to swap). Future work can include this aspect in the ordering mechanism and explore its effect.
2. Our work does not account for the fact that users may trade using routers, which will split their transactions over several pools. Future work can explore how to order transactions via routers. In addition, it will be interesting to explore the impact of competition among AMMs, each one enforcing a different ordering mechanism or not, and the equilibrium in those markets, similar to the idea in [7].
3. It would be interesting to explore the impact of gas prices on players' strategic decisions (like transaction splitting) on how to trade in environments where AMMs order transactions using our approach.
4. Transaction ordering in AMM and its impact on financial markets should also be explored in terms of price discovery over time. This work did not examine the performance of transaction ordering and block sizes on price movement over time. More research is required to test this and also explore the following questions. How does transaction ordering in AMM work in different environments with different types of traders, such as noisy and informed traders, and under which conditions will the AMM transaction ordering mechanism such as CLVR perform better in terms of price discovery than, for example, a first come first serve policy?
5. Future work can explore and offer new price stability measures and a new "status-quo" price as a reference. While we choose the opening price of the pool, there are other potential ways to go. For example, the spot market prices (using Oracles) can be set as the "status-quo" or the price after executing all the transactions. These measures can be tested on a more dynamic model where we test market movement when the fundamental value of the assets changes over time.

## 7 Acknowledgment

The authors would like to thank Andreas Park for helpful comments and suggestions. The authors thank Daniel Chu and Ethan Sayag for their excellent assistance with this research.

## References

1. Adams, A., Lader, M.C., Liao, G., Puth, D., Wan, X.: On-chain foreign exchange and cross-border payments. Available at SSRN 4328948 (2023)
2. Adams, H., Zinsmeister, N., Robinson, D.: Uniswap v2 core (2020)
3. Ankile, L., Ferreira, M.X., Parkes, D.: I see you! robust measurement of adversarial behavior. In: Multi-Agent Security Workshop@ NeurIPS'23 (2023)
4. Aoyagi, J., Ito, Y.: Coexisting exchange platforms: Limit order books and automated market makers (2021)
5. Budish, E., Cramton, P., Shim, J.: Implementation details for frequent batch auctions: Slowing down markets to the blink of an eye. *American Economic Review* **104**(5), 418–424 (2014)
6. Budish, E., Cramton, P., Shim, J.: The high-frequency trading arms race: Frequent batch auctions as a market design response. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **130**(4), 1547–1621 (2015)
7. Budish, E., Lee, R.S., Shim, J.J.: A theory of stock exchange competition and innovation: Will the market fix the market? *Journal of Political Economy* **132**(4), 1209–1246 (2024)
8. Cachin, C., Mičić, J., Steinhauer, N., Zanolini, L.: Quick order fairness (2022), <https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.06615>
9. Canidio, A., Fritsch, R.: Arbitrageurs' profits, lvr, and sandwich attacks: batch trading as an amm design response. arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.02074 (2023)
10. Capponi, A., Jia, R.: The adoption of blockchain-based decentralized exchanges. arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.08842 (2021)
11. Capponi, A., Jia, R., Olafsson, S.: Proposer-builder separation, payment for order flows, and centralization in blockchain. *Payment for Order Flows, and Centralization in Blockchain* (February 12, 2024) (2024)
12. Capponi, A., Jia, R., Wang, Y.: Maximal extractable value and allocative inefficiencies in public blockchains. Available at SSRN 3997796 (2023)
13. Chemaya, N., Liu, D., McLaughlin, R., Ruaro, N., Kruegel, C., Vigna, G.: The power of default: Measuring the effect of slippage tolerance in decentralized exchanges. Available at SSRN 4585229 (2023)
14. Daian, P., Goldfeder, S., Kell, T., Li, Y., Zhao, X., Bentov, I., Breidenbach, L., Juels, A.: Flash boys 2.0: Frontrunning in decentralized exchanges, miner extractable value, and consensus instability. In: 2020 IEEE symposium on security and privacy (SP). pp. 910–927. IEEE (2020)
15. defillama: Defi tvl 1.06t- june 1th 2024. <https://defillama.com/> (2024)
16. defillama: Dexes tvl and volume. <https://defillama.com/protocols/dexes/Ethereum> (2024)
17. Du, S., Zhu, H.: What is the optimal trading frequency in financial markets? *The Review of Economic Studies* **84**(4), 1606–1651 (2017)
18. Ernst, T., Spatt, C.S., Sun, J.: Would order-by-order auctions be competitive? Available at SSRN 4300505 (2022)
19. Exchanges, C.V.D., Barbon, A., Ranaldo, A.: On the quality of cryptocurrency markets (2022)
20. Fricke, D., Gerig, A.: Too fast or too slow? determining the optimal speed of financial markets. *Quantitative Finance* **18**(4), 519–532 (2018)
21. Harvey, C.R., Hasbrouck, J., Saleh, F.: The evolution of decentralized exchange: Risks, benefits, and oversight. *Benefits, and Oversight* (June 15, 2024) (2024)
22. Hasbrouck, J., Rivera, T.J., Saleh, F.: The need for fees at a dex: How increases in fees can increase dex trading volume. Available at SSRN 4192925 (2022)

23. Heimbach, L., Wattenhofer, R.: Sok: Preventing transaction reordering manipulations in decentralized finance. In: Proceedings of the 4th ACM Conference on Advances in Financial Technologies. pp. 47–60 (2022)
24. <https://ethresear.ch/>: Unconditional inclusion lists. <https://ethresear.ch/t/unconditional-inclusion-lists/18500> (2024)
25. for International Settlements, B.: Project mariana: Cross-border exchange of wholesale cbdc's using automated market-makers (final report) (2023), <https://www.bis.org/publ/othp75.htm>
26. Jagannathan, R.: On frequent batch auctions for stocks. *Journal of Financial Econometrics* **20**(1), 1–17 (2022)
27. Kelkar, M., Deb, S., Kannan, S.: Order-fair consensus in the permissionless setting. Cryptology ePrint Archive, Paper 2021/139 (2021), <https://eprint.iacr.org/2021/139>, <https://eprint.iacr.org/2021/139>
28. Kelkar, M., Deb, S., Long, S., Juels, A., Kannan, S.: Themis: Fast, strong order-fairness in byzantine consensus. In: Proceedings of the 2023 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security. pp. 475–489 (2023)
29. Lehar, A., Parlour, C.A.: Decentralized exchange: The uniswap automated market maker. Available at SSRN 3905316 (2021)
30. Lehar, A., Parlour, C.A.: Battle of the bots: Flash loans, miner extractable value and efficient settlement. *Miner Extractable Value and Efficient Settlement* (March 8, 2023) (2023)
31. Li, Y., Zhang, M., Li, J., Chen, E., Chen, X., Deng, X.: Mev makes everyone happy under greedy sequencing rule. In: Proceedings of the 2023 Workshop on Decentralized Finance and Security. pp. 9–15 (2023)
32. Liu, Y., Gopikrishnan, P., Stanley, H.E., et al.: Statistical properties of the volatility of price fluctuations. *Physical review e* **60**(2), 1390 (1999)
33. Malinova, K., Park, A.: Learning from defi: Would automated market makers improve equity trading? Available at SSRN 4531670 (2023)
34. McLaughlin, R., Kruegel, C., Vigna, G.: A large scale study of the ethereum arbitrage ecosystem. In: 32nd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 23). pp. 3295–3312 (2023)
35. mike (@michaelneuder), (@vbuterin), V., (@fradamt), F., (@terencechain), T., potuz (@potuz), (@manav2401), M.: Eip-7547: Inclusion lists [draft]. <https://eips.ethereum.org/EIPS/eip-7547> (2023)
36. Milionis, J., Moallemi, C.C., Roughgarden, T., Zhang, A.L.: Automated market making and loss-versus-rebalancing. arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.06046 (2022)
37. Öz, B., Rezabek, F., Gebele, J., Hoops, F., Matthes, F.: A study of mev extraction techniques on a first-come-first-served blockchain. In: Proceedings of the 39th ACM/SIGAPP Symposium on Applied Computing. pp. 288–297 (2024)
38. Park, A.: The conceptual flaws of decentralized automated market making. *Management Science* **69**(11), 6731–6751 (2023)
39. Werner, S.M., Perez, D., Gudgeon, L., Klages-Mundt, A., Harz, D., Knottenbelt, W.J.: Sok: decentralized finance (defi)(2021). arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.08778 (2021)
40. Xavier Ferreira, M.V., Parkes, D.C.: Credible decentralized exchange design via verifiable sequencing rules. In: Proceedings of the 55th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing. pp. 723–736 (2023)
41. Yang, S., Zhang, F., Huang, K., Chen, X., Yang, Y., Zhu, F.: Sok: Mev countermeasures: Theory and practice. arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.05111 (2022)
42. Yitzhaki, S., Schechtman, E.: *The Gini methodology: a primer on a statistical methodology*. Springer Series in Statistics, Springer, New York, NY (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-4720-7>

43. Zhang, M., Li, Y., Sun, X., Chen, E., Chen, X.: Computation of optimal mev in decentralized exchanges. Working paper-<https://mengqian-zhang.github.io/papers/batch.pdf> (2024)
44. Zhang, Y., Setty, S., Chen, Q., Zhou, L., Alvisi, L.: Byzantine ordered consensus without byzantine oligarchy. In: 14th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 20). pp. 633–649 (2020)

## A CLVR Insensitivity to Token Choice

When considering a CPMM liquidity pool that trades tokens  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , the spot-price can be computed either as  $\alpha_0/\beta_0$  or as  $\beta_0/\alpha_0$ . In a nutshell, this is equivalent to choosing whether to quote the USD-JPY exchange rate in dollars per yen, or yen per dollar. This becomes important when measuring how much the price has deviated from the starting point. A naïve approach would be to simply compute the absolute difference, however this makes the computation sensitive to which way the spot price is quoted. Put explicitly,

$$\left(\frac{\alpha_0}{\beta_0} - \frac{\alpha_0 + \Delta\alpha}{\beta_0 - \Delta\beta}\right)^2 \neq \left(\frac{\beta_0}{\alpha_0} - \frac{\beta_0 - \Delta\beta}{\alpha_0 + \Delta\alpha}\right)^2 \quad (13)$$

The CLVR's computation is insensitive to this choice, as it considers instead the absolute difference in *log* prices, thus making the computation insensitive to the quote direction. We prove this statement below.

$$\left(\ln \frac{\alpha_0}{\beta_0} - \ln \frac{\alpha_0 + \Delta\alpha}{\beta_0 + \Delta\beta}\right)^2 = \left(-\left(\ln \frac{\alpha_0}{\beta_0} - \ln \frac{\alpha_0 + \Delta\alpha}{\beta_0 + \Delta\beta}\right)\right)^2 \quad (14)$$

$$= \left(\left(-\ln \frac{\alpha_0}{\beta_0}\right) - \left(-\ln \frac{\alpha_0 + \Delta\alpha}{\beta_0 + \Delta\beta}\right)\right)^2 \quad (15)$$

$$= \left(\ln \left[\left(\frac{\alpha_0}{\beta_0}\right)^{-1}\right] - \ln \left[\left(\frac{\alpha_0 + \Delta\alpha}{\beta_0 + \Delta\beta}\right)^{-1}\right]\right)^2 \quad (16)$$

$$= \left(\ln \frac{\beta_0}{\alpha_0} - \ln \frac{\beta_0 + \Delta\beta}{\alpha_0 + \Delta\alpha}\right)^2 \quad (17)$$

## B Sandwich Attacks

The CLVR algorithm prevents 3-transaction sandwich attacks. In this section we provide a proof.

The three transactions involved in a sandwich attack are (1) the *front-running* transaction, (2) the *victim* transaction, and (3) the *back-running* transaction. The front-running and back-running transactions are inserted by an attacker in order to manipulate the victim into buying at an inflated price. The attacker is thus able to extract risk-free profit.

In an attack, the transactions execute in exactly the order listed above. In order for this manipulation to be profitable, the front-running transaction must push the price toward one less favorable for the victim, thus causing them to overpay. Finally, the back-running transaction swaps in the opposite direction in order to recover a risk-free profit denominated in the token originally sold to the AMM.

Without loss of generality (see Appendix A), consider that the victim transaction sells token X to the AMM in order to receive token Y. Then, the front-running transaction also sells X to receive Y, and the back-running transaction sells Y to receive X.

We define the following variables. The amounts paid to the AMM by the front-running, and back-running transactions are  $\Delta x_f$  and  $\Delta y_b$ , respectively, and the amounts received from the AMM are  $\Delta y_f$  and  $\Delta x_b$ , respectively (the victim transaction size is not important for the proof). Let  $x_0$  and  $y_0$  be the liquidity pool's reserves of token X and token Y, respectively, before transactions execute. Let  $p_0 = y_0/x_0$  be the initial price.

The attacker receives a risk-free profit when  $\Delta x_f < \Delta x_b$  and  $\Delta y_b \leq \Delta y_f$  – i.e., when the front-running transaction pays less X than the back-running transaction receives, *and* the attacker's back-running transaction does not spend more token Y than the attacker received when executing the front-running transaction. The former condition guarantees profit, and the latter condition guarantees that it is risk-free – i.e., the attacker does not lose any token Y.

Now, our task is determine whether it is possible to perform a risk-free sandwich attack when also subject to the CLVR sequencing rule. We proceed by contradiction. Start by considering how to sequence the three transactions involved in the sandwich attack. According to the sequencing rule, the first transaction must move the log-price the least.

Let  $p_f$  and  $p_b$  be the prices after executing the front-running and back-running transactions first (before any other transactions execute), respectively. Then we must ensure that  $(\ln p_0 - \ln p_f)^2 \leq (\ln p_0 - \ln p_b)^2$  (or else the back-running transaction would be sequenced first, violating the sandwich attack order). Since we know that  $p_f < p_0 < p_b$  (given the trade directions), it must be that  $\ln p_0 - \ln p_f \leq \ln p_b - \ln p_0$  or, equivalently,  $p_0^2 \leq p_b p_f$ , which is expressed as:

$$\left(\frac{y_0}{x_0}\right)^2 \leq \left(\frac{\Delta y_b + y_0}{-\frac{\Delta y_b x_0}{\Delta y_b + y_0} + x_0}\right) \left(\frac{-\frac{\Delta x_f y_0}{\Delta x_f + x_0} + y_0}{\Delta x_f + x_0}\right) = \frac{(\Delta y_b + y_0)^2}{(\Delta x_f + x_0)^2} \quad (18)$$

$$(19)$$

Since all values are positive,

$$\frac{y_0}{x_0} \leq \frac{\Delta y_b + y_0}{\Delta x_f + x_0} \quad (20)$$

Then, we must also satisfy  $\Delta y_b \leq \Delta y_f$  (the back-running transaction cannot spend more Y than the front-running transaction purchases, or else violate risk-free profit). Expanding  $\Delta y_f$  yields:

$$\Delta y_b \leq \frac{\Delta x_f y_0}{\Delta x_f + x_0} \quad (21)$$

Combining Inequality 20 and Inequality 21 gives:



$$\frac{y_0}{x_0} \leq \frac{\frac{\Delta x_f y_0}{\Delta x_f + x_0} + y_0}{\Delta x_f + x_0} \quad (22)$$

$$\frac{y_0}{x_0} \leq \frac{y_0(2\Delta x_f + x_0)}{(\Delta x_f + x_0)^2} \quad (23)$$

$$(\Delta x_f + x_0)^2 \leq x_0(2\Delta x_f + x_0) \quad (24)$$

$$\Delta x_f^2 + 2\Delta x_f x_0 + x_0^2 \leq 2\Delta x_f x_0 + x_0^2 \quad (25)$$

$$\Delta x_f^2 \leq 0 \quad (26)$$

which is a contradiction, as  $\Delta x_f$  is a positive real value.

## C Robustness checks

In this section, we run some robustness checks to ensure our results will hold in different economic environments. First, we change the liquidity available in the pool. Second, we shift the transaction distribution from log normal to uniform.

Table 4: Comparison of VHGSR vs CLVR. When tractable, relative volatility is computed as a percentage where 0% is the minimum volatility, and 100% is the maximum. Reported relative volatility is a mean over all blocks. The  $p$ -value is computed from a paired, one-sided t-test of the VHGSR and CLVR volatilities.

Lower Liquidity $x_0 = y_0 = 100,000$						
Block Size	Winner Count			Mean Relative Volatility		$p$ -value
	VHGSR	CLVR	Tie	VHGSR	CLVR	
3	0	18	82	8.55	0.27	0.078
5	0	58	42	10.14	0.19	0.017
10	3	89	8	2.96	0.08	0.009
12	3	93	4	1.74	0.07	0.021
13	4	88	8	2.36	0.09	0.038
Uniform Distribution, trade size selected uniformly on (0, 100,000)						
Block Size	Winner Count			Mean Relative Volatility		$p$ -value
	VHGSR	CLVR	Tie	VHGSR	CLVR	
3	0	9	91	3.12	0.20	0.004
5	1	37	62	2.78	0.67	<0.001
10	6	61	33	0.75	0.40	<0.001
12	8	76	16	0.60	0.30	<0.001
13	11	73	16	0.43	0.27	<0.001

## D Traders' Inequality Based on their account balance (Initial Wealth) - Gini Post Trade Wallet

A different equality goal is as follows: To find the optimal transaction order that minimizes traders' post-trade inequality while accounting for user "wealth", which is their initial balance in their wallet address. This mechanism ensures that agents with small initial balances receive a "good" exchange price, while wealthier users receive the a "bad" exchange prices to improve inequality. The process of calculating this Gini coefficient is similar to the process offered in section 4.2. We just define and use  $\hat{W}_i$  instead of  $W_i$ .

$$\hat{W}_i = W_{i,0} + \Delta x_i \text{ or } \Delta y_i \quad (27)$$

Where  $W_{i,0}$  is the initial balance in the wallet address before executing the transaction.

## E Trade Splitting




Fig. 6: Trade-splitting experiment outcome. For various trade sizes, we compare the amount out (without splitting) vs the amount out after splitting the single trade  $n$  equally-sized trades.




Fig. 7: Trade-splitting experiment outcome (every trader splits). We show the mean percent increase in amount out when every trader splits into  $n$  trades.

## F Empirical Evaluation: VHGSR vs CLVR

Table 5: Comparison of VHGSR vs CLVR over blocks taken from the USDC-WETH Uniswap V2 pool between June 19 2024 and July 19 2024. Relative volatility is computed as a percentage where 0% is the minimum volatility, and 100% is the maximum. Reported relative volatility is a mean over all blocks. Blocks of size less than 3 have trivial ordering, and are thus excluded. Block sizes with fewer than 30 examples available were excluded, to avoid spurious outcomes. The  $p$ -value is computed from a paired, one-sided t-test of the VHGSR and CLVR volatilities.

Block Size	$n$	Winner Count			Mean Relative Volatility			$p$ -value
		VHGSR	CLVR	Tie	Current	VHGSR	CLVR	
3	1432	0	263	1169	55.45	7.74	0.16	<0.001
4	277	0	95	182	52.84	9.05	0.24	0.092
5	66	1	25	40	44.11	6.84	0.14	0.105