

Order but Not Execute in Order

Tiantian Gong [†] (✉)  and Aniket Kate ^{†*}

[†]Purdue University

*Supra

{tg, aniket}@purdue.edu

Abstract. We explore combining batch order-fair atomic broadcast (of-ABC) and frequent batch auction (FBA) as a defense against general order manipulations in blockchain-based decentralized exchanges (DEX). To justify FBA, we compare the welfare loss of decentralized exchanges under two market designs: continuous limit order book (CLOB), where transactions are processed sequentially, and FBA, where transactions are arranged into batches and a uniform price double auction decides execution order. We model three types of players, common investors, privately informed traders, and arbitrageurs who can provide liquidity and front-run, along with a decentralized exchange. Assuming that the exchange is realized over an of-ABC protocol, we find that FBA can achieve better social welfare compared to CLOB when (1) public information affecting the fundamental value of an asset is revealed more frequently, or (2) the block generation interval is sufficiently large, or (3) the priority fees are small compared to the asset price changes, or (4) fewer privately informed parties exist. Intrinsic reasons are that first, blockchains already treat time as discrete and ensuring order fairness there is non-trivial, allowing even more room for latency arbitrage rents under CLOB; second, sufficiently large block creation interval allows for information dispersion; third, higher priority fees discourage front-running under CLOB; additionally, FBA prioritizes price in deciding execution order and fewer informed traders mean less adverse price impact.

1 Introduction

Classic transaction order manipulation. High-frequency trading (HFT) describes automatic trading implemented by machines with algorithms whose positions usually are held intraday at a high frequency, e.g., microseconds. It is essentially transaction order manipulation with speed technology. As a means for executing trading strategies without human intervention, it promotes automated markets [36], providing liquidity (via market-making strategies) and improving market efficiency (via arbitrage strategies)¹. Nevertheless, HFTs can take advantage of common investors and reduce market quality [23], e.g., price discovery and volatility. Overall, HFTs can increase liquidity [14,26,23] but may cause self-destructive HFT arms race [39], market crashes [25], and market injustice [31].

The diverging effects mostly originate from the trading strategies implemented with HFT. As mentioned above, market making (i.e., continuously placing standing orders on both sides of the market price), statistical arbitrage (based on the similarities in price movements of similar instruments), and directional trading (i.e., riding the tide of short-term momentum such as price movement) usually increase liquidity and facilitate price discovery. Front-running (i.e., acting on anticipation of large orders), spoofing and layering (i.e., submitting orders on the other side of the true trade to test the water and swiftly withdrawing the orders after the completion of the true order), and quote stuffing (i.e., submitting nonexecutable quotes and canceling to occupy the bandwidth and slow down competitors) are usually harmful, increasing transaction costs for common investors [36]. Close attention needs to be given to harmful strategies.

Another possibly more controversial reason is from a mechanism design perspective. Budish, Cramton, and Shim [9] view the HFT arms race as a market design flaw: latency arbitrage rents are inherent to CLOB where “even symmetrically observed public information creates arbitrage opportunities due to serial processing”. We note in advance that in decentralized exchanges (DEX), even a transaction reflecting privately observed

¹ A liquid market allows an asset to be traded at a higher pace. An efficient market has prices fully reflect available information [19].

information can become others’ observed public information. Because intuitively, without the global fair ordering of transactions, one can see and act on the “future”.

Serial-process VS batch-process limit order book. A limit order specifies the direction, price and quantity of trade. The set of outstanding limit orders is called a limit order book (LOB). The current predominant financial market design adopts the CLOB model [18] or continuous double auction (DA) where the exchanges process the transactions serially in the received order. Farmer and Skouras [20] and Budish et al. [9] propose an alternative frequent batch auction (FBA) or uniform price double auction (UPDA) where orders are processed in batches using uniform-price auctions. There, trades are matched according to price, and all matched counterparties settle trades at the same price.

Compared with CLOB, on the positive side, FBA can lead to lower transaction costs [1], decrease adverse selection and spreads [37,41], achieve an optimal trade-off between liquidity and price discovery [4], and provide a “safe haven” for slower traders [43]. Existing work [32,17,27] also indicates that FBA can increase market quality. On the negative side, risk-averse traders can suffer from increased execution uncertainty if the clearing frequency is too large [16,21]. FBA may also discourage HFTs from participation, hindering price discovery [7]. Moreover, the severity of the inefficiency of liquidity provision under FBA can exceed the inefficiency from latency arbitrage under CLOB [18]. This liquidity provision inefficiency of FBA originates from bid shading² in UPDA: every equilibrium in multi-unit uniform price auctions is inefficient due to bid shading [2].

Front-running in DEXes. The aforementioned harmful HFT strategies are not easily implementable in their traditional forms in blockchain-based exchanges, due to network and block generation latencies and nuances in canceling orders. Front-running can be realized, and its variant, general transaction order manipulations, become practical due to the decentralized nature of such exchanges. When we refer to front-running in DEXes in the following contents, we mean manipulating transaction order in general instead of the traditional front-running arbitrage strategy.

In general blockchain systems, validators consistently order and execute transactions submitted by users. The distributed transaction ordering problem is not new: traditional Byzantine fault-tolerant (BFT) state machine replication (or atomic broadcast) problem also studies maintaining a consistent transaction log among replicas in a distributed system. But traditionally, security requires safety and liveness; the validity of a proposed transaction batch does not specifically concern the explicit order of transactions or whether the proposer has inserted or disregarded certain transaction(s). However, for blockchain applications, such as DEXes, the order of transactions matters because transactions therein are interdependent and bear social, financial, or other interpretations.

In particular, maximal extractable value (MEV) [15] quantifies the profits from inserting, censoring, and reordering transactions in a proposed batch. Such manipulations can be from validators or/and external adversarial users observing the transaction mempool. There are mainly three lines of work mitigating the MEV problem: (1) Extend the security definitions of traditional consensus or atomic broadcast protocols to include batch order fairness [30,11]; (2) Blind transactions through encryption [33,38,6]. Blinding does not necessarily eliminate MEV opportunities because the contents of transactions may be inferred, e.g., when there is positive or negative news about a cryptocurrency, the nature of transaction influx to an automatic market maker or exchange is correctly deducible with high probability. Besides, front-running can already be implemented before observing the explicit future actions of a victim splitting whale orders into small volumes; (3) Tax the front-runners by charging priority fees [15], similar to centralized exchanges charging co-location fees from HFTs. This does not solve the front-running problem but leaves the market to reach equilibrium through actions carried out by interdependent players in an ever-changing environment.

1.1 Contribution

FBA as a defense. In this work, we explore combining of-ABC and FBA as a market design response to order manipulation attacks and analyze the social welfare under CLOB and FBA in an order-fair DEX. Since FBA prioritizes price instead of the exact order intra-block, **batch order fairness** suffices to mitigate

² Bidders’ tendency to bid less than true valuations for later units.

the manipulations: of-ABC ensures that a transaction broadcast first by a sufficient number of parties than another transaction is not delivered later than the latter; FBA ensures that trades in the same batch are executed at the same price. The exchange can then be implemented with any such protocol, e.g., the atomic broadcast protocol achieving batch order fairness [29] or equivalently, differential order fairness [11]. Note that without fair batch ordering or other tools, FBA alone is *not* an effective countermeasure. Because a victim transaction may not be committed and processed even if FBA prioritizes price. Also, note that we do not discuss how to express limit order books practically in blockchains.

Overall, we find that in equilibrium, FBA imposes less welfare loss (1) if public information concerning an asset’s fundamental value changes is released more often compared with private information. Because first, under FBA, market-makers have time to respond to public information and do not need to mark up the price. BCS [9] also shows that FBA is welfare-optimal if there is no private information. Second, under CLOB, an arbitrageur can front-run the liquidity providers in case of both public and private information releases, the market-maker then demands more markups in equilibrium to counter the risk. (2) Sufficient length for the batch auction frequency compatible with the arrival rates of different types of trading parties also decreases the welfare loss for FBA. Besides, (3) smaller priority fees for submitting transactions into the blockchain system also increase the markups under CLOB. Because front-running market-makers is more profitable, resulting in the liquidity providers charging higher markups.

Intuition. We consider the alternative processing model FBA for another reason aside from the inspiration of discussions in the literature. Blockchains inherently already treat time as discrete when ordering and batching transactions into blocks as in FBA. But they execute transactions sequentially as in CLOB. This allows even more space for latency arbitrage rents, by publicizing private information and allowing general order manipulations owing to network latency and (optional) priority fees to validators. Essentially, instead of competing on the speed of submitting orders, arbitrageurs compete on sending just-in-time transactions with higher fee rates and validators compete to exert sequential ordering powers of the exchanges without submitting to lawful regulatory forces. The arms race is not in HFT technologies but priority fees or controlling more nodes in a blockchain to earn the right to “dictate” an order.

Organization of contents. In §2.1, we summarize the model details of the trading system, including the DEX, three types of trading players, and the trading asset. We present the security definitions of the of-ABC protocol underlying the DEX and solution concepts adopted for solving the trading game equilibria under both market designs in §2.2. In §3, we describe the order of events, solve for the equilibria under CLOB and FBA, and compute and compare their welfare loss. We then summarize related work in §4 before concluding the discussion in §5.

2 Model and preliminaries

In this section, we specify the DEX and the underlying of-ABC protocol, the players in the trading system, the trading target asset, and how its price and fundamental values evolve, and provide game theory concepts relevant to the equilibria in the trading game.

2.1 System and adversary model

Distributed exchange. For the blockchain system implementing a distributed exchange, we assume a set of n processes called validators $N = \{P_1, \dots, P_n\}$ instantiate a secure κ -differentially order-fair atomic broadcast protocol (Definition 1). Up to f of the validators can be Byzantine and may behave arbitrarily but are computationally bounded, thus cannot break cryptographic primitives. They may communicate via reliable authenticated channels. The network can be asynchronous where an unknown arbitrary message delay exists or partial synchronous where the network imposes some known bounded message delay only after a global stabilization time (GST). In the system, the block generation interval is a constant $I > 0$ measured in time units consistent with the trading system.

Trading system. For the trading system, we blend the dynamic models in Eibelshäuser and Smetak [18] and BCS [9] with the blockchain-based decentralized exchanges. There is a secure exchange and users submit

transaction orders to it by sending messages to one or more validators running the corresponding system. We assume that each communication link delivers a user’s order to the destination, i.e., a validator, with the same latency distribution F_{lt} . Batch length in FBA equals the block generation interval I . The limit orders are finite and divisible, meaning that they can be split into smaller-unit orders.

We consider an asset X with changing fundamental value V_t at time t ($t \in [0, T], T > 0$). We assume an observable signal is equal to the asset’s fundamental value and evolves according to a compound Poisson jump process, drawn from a symmetric distribution F_{jp} with arrival rate λ_{jp} , bounded support and zero mean. The fundamental value jump can be observed in the form of public or private information. We capture the absolute value of the jump with random variable J .

There are three types of risk-neutral³ trading players: (1) investors who arrive stochastically with probability λ_i and have inelastic demand, with buying and selling being equally likely; (2) informed traders who can observe both public information that arrives stochastically with probability λ_{pb} and private information arriving stochastically with probability λ_{pr} (both affect V_t positively or negatively with equal probability); (3) r arbitrageurs who intend to sell at price higher than V_t or buy at price lower than V_t . The exchange collects fees from both sides of each settled trade. Here, we consider both arbitrageurs and privately informed traders to more comprehensively capture adverse selection risks. We assume that communication links between arbitrageurs and validators have the same latency distribution F_{lt}^a . If F_{lt}^a is the same as F_{lt} , then arbitrageurs have the same network connections as common users, i.e., investors and traders. We assume the arbitrageurs invest $cost \geq 0$ in establishing the communication links and other setups.

The exchanges have a base fee f and priority fee F which can lift the order of a transaction during tie-breaking. In the analysis, we disregard the base fee as it is the same for all transactions. Note that the arbitrageurs here can be trading firms, arbitrage bots, etc. All players except for the exchanges are rational and only arbitrageurs may actively strategize. They can apply market-making or front-running strategies. They are addressed as market makers (or liquidity providers), and front-runners accordingly. Specifically, a front-running arbitrageur can front-run market makers, investors, or traders. We let an arbitrageur successfully front-run in the base of-ABC protocol with probability p^* under CLOB, and describe how to calculate it after introducing of-ABC in Definition 1.

We capture the history information at time t with \mathcal{H}_t , and it is observable by all. The state of the trading system at time t is $S_t = (P_t, J_t, (\mathbf{b}_t, \mathbf{a}_t), \mathbf{p}_{fr})$ where $P_t = \mathbb{E}[V_t | \mathcal{H}_t]$, $J_t \sim J$, $(\mathbf{b}_t, \mathbf{a}_t)$ are the bid and ask prices, and \mathbf{p}_{fr} are the probabilities that arbitrageurs respond to investors’ and traders’ orders with front-running.

2.2 Definitions

As mentioned in §1, FBA alone is not effective in countering order manipulations. We adopt the following of-ABC security definition in [11] because κ -differential order fairness is shown to be equivalent to batch order fairness [29], and it simplifies the expression of p^* .

Definition 1 (Differentially Order-Fair ABC [11]). *A secure κ -differentially order-fair atomic broadcast protocol satisfies the following properties:*

1. **Agreement:** *If a message m is delivered by some correct process, then m is eventually delivered by every correct process.*
2. **Integrity:** *No message is delivered more than once.*
3. **Weak validity:** *If all processes are correct and broadcast a finite number of messages, every correct process eventually delivers these broadcast messages.*
4. **Total order:** *Let m and m_0 be two messages, P_i and P_j be correct processes that deliver m, m_0 . If P_i delivers m before m_0 , P_j also delivers m before m_0 .*
5. **κ -differential order fairness:** *If $b(m; m_0) > b(m_0; m) + 2f + \kappa$, then no correct process delivers m_0 before m .*

Here $b(m_1; m_2)$ captures the number of processes broadcasting m_1 before m_2 .

³ Obtaining return amount x for sure and in expectation generate the same utility.

Suppose arbitrageur j decides to front-run user i after seeing i 's transaction m_i with transaction m_j . Let D be the difference of two independent random variables capturing transaction delivering latencies of i and j on each communication link. Let D follow distribution \tilde{F}_{lt} . For example, if F_{lt} and F_{lt}^a are instantiated with normal distribution $N(1, 1)$, then \tilde{F}_{lt} is normal distribution $N(0, 2)$. Let \tilde{F}_{lt}^C be the CDF of \tilde{F}_{lt} . Assuming the worst case that j sees m_i immediately after it arrives at some validator and always wins when neither transaction is broadcast first by more than $2f + \kappa$ validators, we can compute p^* as follows:

$$p^* = 1 - \mathbb{P}[b(m_i; m_j) > b(m_j; m_i) + 2f + \kappa] = 1 - \sum_{s=2f+\kappa-1}^{n-1} \binom{n-1}{s} [\tilde{F}_{lt}^C(0)]^s [1 - \tilde{F}_{lt}^C(0)]^{n-1-s}$$

If Byzantine validators do not relay messages, we replace $n - 1$ in the equation with $n - f - 1$. Note that if each node's communication links impose latencies that follow different distributions, we can still compute p^* , e.g., [12].

Solution concepts. In the trading game, r arbitrageurs are the strategic players and aim to maximize their returns. A strategy is a probabilistic distribution over possible actions, with all mass condensed at one action for a pure strategy. A solution concept captures a profile or snapshot of all players' strategies in an equilibrium. In the trading game, the solution concept essentially gives the equilibrium trading prices of the asset X . We are interested in the markups from the fundamental value of X in equilibrium when arbitrageurs play market-making strategies or in other words, provide liquidity.

We naturally adopt stationary Markov Perfect Equilibria (MPE) for CLOB and utilize a weaker notion, Order Book Equilibrium (OBE) for FBA since stationary MPE may not exist for FBA. Intuitively, under FBA, suppose some arbitrageur provides liquidity at some bid-ask spread that equals potential costs from not updating quotes in time when the asset's fundamental value changes. Other arbitrageurs do not have the incentive to undercut. But since others do not undercut, the arbitrageur has the incentive to widen the spread to increase profits. But this would result in others undercutting the widened quotes.

Definition 2 (MPE [34]). *A Nash equilibrium (NE) is a strategy profile \mathbf{s} where no player increases utility by unilaterally deviating from \mathbf{s} . A subgame perfect equilibrium (SPE) is a strategy profile \mathbf{s} that forms a NE for any subgame of the original game. An MPE is an SPE in which all players play Markov strategies, i.e., strategies that depend only on the current state of the game.*

Definition 3 (OBE [10]). *Given state S_t , an OBE at time t is a set of orders submitted by all arbitrageurs such that the following conditions hold: there exist (1) no safe profitable price improvements and (2) no other robust profitable deviations.*

Here, a profitable price improvement is safe if it remains strictly profitable after other arbitrageurs take profitable responses, e.g., liquidity withdrawals, after the improvement. A profitable deviation is robust if it remains strictly profitable after other arbitrageurs react with profitable price improvements or liquidity withdrawals. Price improvements are liquidity provisions improving current quotes and liquidity withdrawals are cancellations of limit orders. More formal justifications for OBE can be found in [10]. OBE is weaker than MPE in the sense that it allows the existence of unilateral deviations that increase utility as long as they can be made unprofitable by others' reactions.

Exogenous and endogenous entry. Exogenous entry to the trading game means that all arbitrageurs automatically join. When we consider endogenous entry, arbitrageurs first decide whether to enter into the trading game by balancing costs and profits. Those who decide entry participate in the game. In this case, we need to first solve for the number of arbitrageurs who enter.

3 DEX under CLOB and FBA

We now model the DEXes under the CLOB and FBA market designs. We first detail the events and then provide equilibrium analysis with a focus on welfare loss in both transaction execution models.

Order of events. Here step \textcircled{C} achieves κ -differential order fairness.

- ① The exchange sets base fee f and priority fee F .
- ② Repeat the following trading game for X with initial fundamental value V_0 .
 - Ⓐ Arbitrageurs submit orders to the exchange: They can submit standard limit orders, withdrawals, and immediate-or-cancel (IOC) orders which automatically withdraw the portion not executed immediately.
 - Ⓑ Nature then moves to trigger one of the following events:
 - (1) An investor arrives with probability λ_i and submits an IOC order to the exchange. This may change order book quotes $(\mathbf{b}_t, \mathbf{a}_t)$ according to Bayesian updating but not the fundamental value.
 - (2) A private information event occurs with probability λ_{pr} , resulting in a fundamental value jump, and an informed trader submits an IOC order to the exchange. This may change the order book quotes.
 - (3) A public information event occurs with probability λ_{pb} , resulting in a fundamental value jump, and all arbitrageurs submit IOCs to provide liquidity or snipe quotes. They potentially submit necessary withdrawals to the exchange. This may change the order book quotes.
 - (4) Null event. The fundamental value and order books do not change.
 - Ⓒ The validators order the transactions according to the of-ABC protocol. Attached priority fees help break ties, e.g., order messages in the same strongly connected component in of-ABC algorithms [11,29].
 - Ⓓ **CLOB.** After outputting a block, the validators running the exchange execute the transactions sequentially in the proposed order.
FBA. After outputting a block, the validators in the exchange execute the transactions by clearing the market with a UPDA: (1) the validators first batch the orders in the current block and all previous outstanding orders; (2) they compute the aggregate demand and supply; (3) if there are intersections, the market clears where supply meets demand, at a uniform price. When there are conflicting ties, priority fees can lift the orders of transaction executions and further ties can be broken uniformly at random. Unmatched orders enter into the next trading game as outstanding orders.

3.1 MPE under CLOB

We denote the expected fundamental value conditioned on history and a new sell or buy order with $\mathbb{E}[V_t|\mathcal{H}_t, buy]$ and $\mathbb{E}[V_t|\mathcal{H}_t, sell]$. Arbitrageurs can provide liquidity, front-run other liquidity providers by sniping their stale quotes, or front-run other investors and traders. Let Q be the maximum number of units needed and p_j be the probability of a common investor transacting j units ($j = 1, \dots, Q$).

Theorem 1. *There exists an MPE under CLOB with exogenous entry. Bid and ask prices at the k -th level of the LOB in equilibrium satisfy*

$$b_t^k = \mathbb{E}[V_t|\mathcal{H}_t, sell] = P_t - \frac{s_k}{2}, a_t^k = \mathbb{E}[V_t|\mathcal{H}_t, buy] = P_t + \frac{s_k}{2}$$

where s_k satisfies

$$\lambda_i \sum_{j=1}^Q p_j \frac{s_k}{2} - \lambda_{pr} \left(1 + p^* \frac{\mathbf{P}_{fr,k}}{\mathbf{p}_{fr,k}(r-2)+1}\right) \bar{J}_k - \lambda_{pb} \bar{J}_k + (\lambda_i + \lambda_{pr}) \mathbf{p}_{fr,k} F = 0$$

Here, $\bar{J}_k = \mathbb{P}[J > \frac{s_k}{2}] \mathbb{E}[J - \frac{s_k}{2} | J > \frac{s_k}{2}]$, and $\mathbf{p}_{fr,k}$ is the probability that an arbitrageur front-runs traders and investors at the k -th level. In equilibrium, $\mathbf{p}_{fr,k}$ takes the value that maximizes front-running profits, i.e., $\lambda_{pb} \frac{1}{r} \bar{J}_k - \lambda_{pb} F + \lambda_{pr} p^* \frac{\mathbf{P}_{fr,k}}{\mathbf{p}_{fr,k}(r-2)+1} \bar{J}_k - (\lambda_i + \lambda_{pr}) \mathbf{p}_{fr,k} F$.

The expected price impact of the first unit of an incoming order is $\Delta = \tilde{J}_1 \frac{\lambda_{pr}}{\lambda_{pr} + \lambda_i}$ where $\tilde{J}_k = \mathbb{P}[J > \frac{s_k}{2}] \mathbb{E}[J | J > \frac{s_k}{2}]$; its expected markup from liquidity providers is $(\lambda_{pr} + \lambda_i) (\frac{s_1}{2} - \Delta)$.

Interpretations. The markups are the extra transaction costs. They are affected by the arrival rates of investors (λ_i), traders (λ_{pr}), and public information (λ_{pb}), the front-running success probability (p^*), the priority fee F , the jump size, the number of arbitrageurs (r), and the transaction size distributions. The effects that they have on the markups are correlated and not necessarily linear. For example, more arrivals

of investors compared to informed traders decrease $\mathbf{p}_{fr,k}$, which decreases the markup, but also decreases price impact, which increases the markup. We give more comparisons after discussing the markups under FBA.

Proof. Let s_k denote the spread at the k -th level. In equilibrium, liquidity provision and front-running have the same profits because arbitrageurs can choose their roles freely. In a DEX, unlike in centralized exchanges, an arbitrageur can also front-run privately informed traders. Since a transaction may be submitted by a common investor or privately informed trader, the front-runner can expect premiums when privately informed traders arrive. This happens with probability $\frac{\lambda_{pr}}{\lambda_{pr} + \lambda_i}$ if the arbitrageur always front-runs ($\mathbf{p}_{fr} = \mathbf{1}$). More meaningfully, the arbitrageur front-runs at the k -th level with probability $\mathbf{p}_{fr,k} \in [0, 1]$. As described, the front-running transaction beats a target transaction with probability p^* .

Suppose there are $q \leq Q$ ($Q \in N$) quantities needed, we need for each $k = 1, \dots, Q$, s_k satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
& \overbrace{\lambda_i \sum_{j=k}^Q p_j \frac{s_k}{2}}^{\text{Returns from investor}} - \underbrace{\lambda_{pr} \bar{J}_k}_{\text{Private info induced loss}} - \underbrace{\left(\lambda_{pb} \frac{r-1}{r} \bar{J}_k + \lambda_{pb} F \right)}_{\text{Public info induced loss}} \\
& = \underbrace{\lambda_{pb} \frac{1}{r} \bar{J}_k - \lambda_{pb} F}_{\text{Front-run market makers}} + \underbrace{\lambda_{pr} p^* \frac{\mathbf{P}_{fr,k}}{\mathbf{P}_{fr,k}(r-2) + 1} \bar{J}_k - (\lambda_i + \lambda_{pr}) \mathbf{p}_{fr,k} F}_{\text{Front-run private traders}} \quad (1)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{J}_k = \mathbb{P}[J > \frac{s_k}{2}] \mathbb{E}[J - \frac{s_k}{2} | J > \frac{s_k}{2}]$ is the expected extra value change uncovered by the spread (induced by the asset fundamental value jump), and p_j is the probability of an investor transacting j units.

In Equation (1), the left-hand side is the profits from market-making and the right-hand side is the returns from sniping stale quotes of market-makers and front-running private traders, which are the extra rents present in DEXes. The bid and ask prices at k -th level of LOB in equilibrium then satisfy this spread s_k . To update $\mathbf{p}_{fr,k}$ stored in the current state, we can lay out the right-hand side as a function of $\mathbf{p}_{fr,k}$ and solve for $\mathbf{p}_{fr,k}$ that maximizes the function value in range $[0, 1]$ for a front-running arbitrageur, by taking the first and second derivatives of the function. More specifically, after solving Equation (1), we can express each $\frac{s_k}{2}$ and \bar{J}_k . Maximizing the right-hand side of Equation (1) gives the value for $\mathbf{p}_{fr,k}$:

$$\arg \max_{0 \leq \mathbf{p}_{fr,k} \leq 1} \left(\lambda_{pb} \frac{1}{r} f_k(\mathbf{p}_{fr,k}) - \lambda_{pb} F + \lambda_{pr} p^* \frac{\mathbf{P}_{fr,k}}{\mathbf{P}_{fr,k}(r-2) + 1} f_k(\mathbf{p}_{fr,k}) - (\lambda_i + \lambda_{pr}) \mathbf{p}_{fr,k} F \right)$$

We can solve it analytically or numerically if closed-form formulas do not exist.

We next discuss the additional transaction costs for common investors. When one front-runs common investors, the fundamental value does not change, so the front-runner only earns premiums when private traders arrive, which happens with probability $\frac{\lambda_{pr}}{\lambda_{pr} + \lambda_i}$. To compute the welfare loss for investors, we can then treat front-running orders as part of private traders' orders. Depending on the size of the jump, they can place multi-unit orders profitably, and we first consider one unit. Let Δ be the expected price impact of an incoming unit order. Since one cannot distinguish between informed traders from investors, we have

$$\Delta = \pm \mathbb{E}[V_t | \mathcal{H}_t, \lambda_i \vee \lambda_{pr}] \mp P_t = \pm \mathbb{E}[V_t | \mathcal{H}_t, \lambda_i \vee \lambda_{pr}] \mp \mathbb{E}[V_t | \mathcal{H}_t] = \tilde{J}_1 \frac{\lambda_{pr}}{\lambda_{pr} + \lambda_i}$$

where $+, -$ indicate buy, sell order and $\tilde{J}_k = \mathbb{P}[J > \frac{s_k}{2}] \mathbb{E}[J | J > \frac{s_k}{2}]$ (for $1 \leq k \leq Q$). After absorbing the price impact, the additional markup from the market maker for the first unit is then $M_{CLOB} = \frac{s_1}{2} - \Delta$. The expected markup is then $(\lambda_{pr} + \lambda_i) M_{CLOB}$. We can calculate for other units in the same way. Finally, the welfare loss for arbitrageurs is $(r \cdot cost + \mathbf{p}_{fr,k}(r-1) \cdot p^* F)$.

3.2 OBE under FBA

In the following, we focus on excessive demand and analyze the ask quotes for simplicity. We only need to adapt signs to analyze bid quotes. Let Z_I denote the excess demand (demand minus supply) during a batch interval and $Z_I \leq Q + 1$ ($Q \in N$) is bounded. We borrow \bar{J}_k and \tilde{J}_k from Theorem 1. Note that depending

on implementation details, withdrawals and updates of existing transactions may or may not be completed in time during the batch auction interval. But we will focus on describing the equilibrium first.

Theorem 2. *There exists an OBE in pure strategies under FBA with exogenous entry. If $|Z_I| \leq Q + 1$, bid and ask quotes in equilibrium satisfy*

$$b_{(I)}^k = P_I - \Delta_k - M_k, a_{(I)}^k = P_I + \Delta_k + M_k, k = 1, \dots, Q + 1$$

where $\Delta_k = \tilde{J}_k \frac{\lambda_{pr}}{\lambda_{pr} + \lambda_i}$ is the expected price impact from informed traders, $M_k = \sum_{u=k}^Q \Delta_u \prod_{v=k}^u \alpha_v$ ($k = 1, \dots, Q$) and $M_{Q+1} = 0$ are the markups from liquidity providers, $\alpha_k = \frac{q_{k+1}}{q_k + q_{k+1}}$ and $q_k = \mathbb{P}[Z_I = k | |Z_I| \leq Q + 1]$. The expected markup per unit time is $\frac{2}{I} \sum_{k=1}^Q k q_k M_k$.

Interpretations. If we fix the probability distribution of the excessive demand and the jump distribution, the markups then increase with the arrival of privately informed traders, λ_{pr} , and decrease with the arrival of investors, λ_i .

Proof. We show by induction that the markups $\{M_k\}_{k=1, \dots, Q+1}$ are the largest such that there exist (i) neither strictly profitable safe price improvements (ii) nor strictly profitable robust deviations. More specifically, (i) means that for a targeted quote at the k -th level, an arbitrageur cannot safely insert a new profitable quote at this level, i.e., pushing the original k -th quote to be the new $(k + 1)$ -th quote and so forth, and the current k -th quote issuer cannot improve this quote to safely increase profits. (ii) means that the k -th quote issuer cannot robustly increase profits by issuing or updating quotes deviating from the stated markups, considering that others can react with quote withdrawals and updates.

$(Q + 1)$ -th level. We first show that $M_{Q+1} = 0$ is the OBE, i.e., $a^{Q+1} = P_I + \Delta_{Q+1}$. (i) We show that safe profitable price improvements on the last quote with zero markups do not exist. First, an arbitrageur inserting a new $(Q + 1)$ -th quote with a price lower than a^{Q+1} experiences a loss in expectation. Because the spread does not cover the potential jump in asset value. Similarly, the current $(Q + 1)$ -th quote issuer does not have the incentive to lower the quote. Second, the issuer is not incentivized to increase the quote either, i.e., to $\bar{a}^{Q+1} = P_I + \Delta_{Q+1} + \epsilon$ for even a small $\epsilon > 0$. Because this is not a safe price improvement: another arbitrageur can safely insert a quote at price a^{Q+1} and push this issuer's new quote to be the $(Q + 2)$ -th quote but $Z_I \leq Q + 1$. The expected profit after others' reaction is zero, which is less than the original profit.

(ii) We next show that robust profitable deviations do not exist. Similar to the above reasoning, the owner of the $(Q + 1)$ -th quote is not incentivized to insert a new quote or update another quote to be the $(Q + 1)$ -th that deviates from zero markups.

$(k + 1)$ -th level. Suppose there do not exist safe profitable price improvements or robust profitable deviations on the $(k + 1)$ -th quote as stated in the theorem. The markups on $(k + 1)$ -th level and onwards to the $(Q + 1)$ -th level are as stated.

k -th level. We show that the stated M_k is the OBE. (i) Suppose there exists a safe profitable price improvement on the k -th quote by ϵ , i.e., $\bar{a}^k = a^k - \epsilon$. First, consider an arbitrageur who does not own quotes and inserts a new k -th quote. If $Z_I = k$, then the arbitrageur expects profits, and if $Z_I > k$, then a loss is expected because the settlement price would be below \bar{a}^k . Let $\Delta_k = \tilde{J}_k \frac{\lambda_{pr}}{\lambda_{pr} + \lambda_i}$, and we can express the profits as follows:

$$A_k = q_k(M_k - \epsilon) + \sum_{i=k+1}^{Q+1} q_i(M_{i-1} - \Delta_{i-1})$$

For this improvement to be safe, the largest markup needs to be achieved, i.e., $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, so that no other arbitrageurs have the incentive to undercut again. If this undercutting is profitable, then $A_k \geq 0$. We know that the analog inequality for the $(k + 1)$ -th level ask quote is

$$A_{k+1} = q_{k+1}(M_{k+1} - \epsilon) + \sum_{i=k+2}^{Q+1} q_i(M_{i-1} - \Delta_{i-1}) < 0$$

For contradiction, we let the left-hand side equal to A for $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. This gives us $M_k = \alpha_k \Delta_k + \alpha_k M_{k+1}$. Applying this recursively, we obtain $M_k = \sum_{u=k}^Q \Delta_u \prod_{v=k}^u \alpha_v$.

Next, consider an arbitrageur who owns some existing quotes. To implement price improvements, she can insert a new k -th quote, which results in even more loss when $Z_I > k$, compared with a loss in A . If she moves up a lower quote at the k^* -th ($k^* < k$) level to the k -th (if she owns one), the expected profit is lower because some profits are lost for $k^* \leq Z_I < k$. If she moves down one of the quotes to be the new k -th quote (if she owns one), then the extra profit generated is bounded by A_k . Because A_k is the extra profits of an arbitrageur who originally expects 0 returns.

(ii) Suppose there exists a robust profitable deviation for the issuer of the k -th quote. To allow the issuer to deviate other than improve quotes (which we have already discussed), we let the issuer own some quotes under the k -th level. The issuer can update the k -th quote to be the k' -th quote ($k' \geq k$) with a markup higher than the original $M_{k'}$ but still lower than $\Delta_{k'+1} + M_{k'+1}$. This is profitable but not robust: another arbitrageur can re-issue the original k -th level quote and push the updated k' -th quote to be the $(k' + 1)$ -th. This arbitrageur's price improvement is safe because it restores the original k -th quote.

The expected markup of the liquidity providers per unit of time can then be calculated as $\frac{2}{I} \sum_{k=1}^Q k q_k M_k$. The arbitrageurs do not experience welfare loss.

3.3 Welfare loss comparison

The arbitrageurs experience welfare loss ($r \cdot cost + \mathbf{p}_{fr,k}(r-1) \cdot p^* F$) under CLOB and zero welfare loss under FBA. When there are no privately informed traders ($\lambda_{pr} = 0$) but exists public information, FBA is strictly better than CLOB because the markup in FBA becomes 0 while the markups for CLOB are still positive. When there is no public information ($\lambda_{pb} = 0$) but exists privately informed traders, the markup for CLOB decreases with λ_{pr} while FBA has positive markups that increase with λ_{pr} .

For a more straightforward comparison of transaction costs, we can let the jump J be a constant instead of a random variable and consider unit orders. Under CLOB, let $a = 1 + p^* \frac{\mathbf{p}_{fr,k}}{\mathbf{p}_{fr,k}(r-2)+1}$ and the spread in Equation (1) is $\frac{s}{2} = \frac{(\lambda_{pb}+a\lambda_{pr})J-(\lambda_i+\lambda_{pr})\mathbf{p}_{fr,k}F}{\lambda_{pb}+a\lambda_{pr}+\lambda_i}$. And the price impact from informed trader $\Delta = J \frac{\lambda_{pr}}{\lambda_{pr}+\lambda_i}$, the markup $M_{CLOB} = J \frac{\lambda_i \lambda_{pb} + (a-1)\lambda_i \lambda_{pr}}{(\lambda_i + a\lambda_{pr} + \lambda_{pb})(\lambda_{pr} + \lambda_i)} - \frac{(\lambda_i + \lambda_{pr})\mathbf{p}_{fr,k}F}{\lambda_{pb} + a\lambda_{pr} + \lambda_i}$, and the expected markup is $J \frac{\lambda_i \lambda_{pb} + (a-1)\lambda_i \lambda_{pr}}{\lambda_i + a\lambda_{pr} + \lambda_{pb}} - \frac{(\lambda_i + \lambda_{pr})^2 \mathbf{p}_{fr,k}F}{\lambda_{pb} + a\lambda_{pr} + \lambda_i}$. This increases with the jump size J and decreases with priority fee F . For simplicity, we can measure F relative to the jump, i.e., let $F = xJ$ for some $x < 1$. We let $a = 1 + p^* \frac{\mathbf{p}_{fr,k}}{\mathbf{p}_{fr,k}(r-2)+1}$.

Under FBA, $\Delta_k = J \frac{\lambda_{pr}}{\lambda_{pr} + \lambda_i}$, and $\frac{2}{I} \sum_{k=1}^Q k q_k M_k$ is the expected markups per unit time. It is straightforward to see that if block generation interval I is sufficiently large, FBA can always have smaller markups. If we consider cutoff $Q = 2$, then it becomes $\frac{2}{I} J \frac{\lambda_{pr}}{\lambda_{pr} + \lambda_i} (q_1(\alpha_1 + \alpha_1 \alpha_2) + q_2 \alpha_2)$. Simply let $q_3 = q_2 = 1/4, q_1 = 1/2$, FBA is better if $\frac{\lambda_i \lambda_{pb} + (a-1)\lambda_i \lambda_{pr} - (\lambda_i + \lambda_{pr})^2 \mathbf{p}_{fr,k}x}{\lambda_i + a\lambda_{pr} + \lambda_{pb}} > \frac{3\lambda_{pr}}{4I(\lambda_{pr} + \lambda_i)}$, i.e.,

$$\lambda_{pb} > \frac{3\lambda_{pr}(\lambda_i + a\lambda_{pr}) - 4I(\lambda_i + \lambda_{pr})[(a-1)\lambda_i \lambda_{pr} - (\lambda_i + \lambda_{pr})^2 \mathbf{p}_{fr,k}x]}{4I\lambda_i(\lambda_{pr} + \lambda_i) - 3\lambda_{pr}}$$

We depict the regions where FBA induces less welfare loss for common investors and traders in Figure 1. We intentionally let x or F be not too small, i.e., $x = 0.15$, in the figure to make the regions where CLOB imposes fewer markups more visible in this example. This means that if the price jump $J = \$1$, the priority fee is $\$0.15$. When the priority fee F decreases, the region where FBA has fewer markups expands.

Endogenous entry for arbitrageurs. We can adapt the analysis to model endogenous entry. This involves first solving for the number of arbitrageurs in equilibrium, r^* , via the zero entry condition with the left-hand side being the profits (from liquidity provision or front-running) and the right-hand side being the costs in setup, e.g., establishing communication links with validators. Arbitrageurs' welfare loss under CLOB is then ($r^* \cdot cost + \mathbf{p}_{fr,k}(r^* - 1) \cdot p^* F$).

4 Related work

Mitigating MEV problem. Except for taxing front-running [15] like centralized exchanges charging fees for co-location and proprietary data feeds, there are two major lines of research in this aspect. The first




Fig. 1: Example regions where FBA has less welfare loss when $F = 0.15J, p^* = 0.8, r = 35$, truncated at $\lambda_{pr} = 3, \lambda_{pb} = 3$. An interactive graph for tuning parameters can be found on this page [24].

mitigation approach is extending the security definition of consensus or atomic broadcast problem to include order fairness [30,11]. Here the order fairness informally means that if a transaction tx_1 is broadcast by a sufficient number of honest parties before another transaction tx_2 , then tx_1 is ordered with an index no greater than tx_2 's index (the indices grow upwards as time passes). Achieving general order fairness, i.e., the index of a transaction being its explicit location in a batch, is not always possible due to the Condorcet paradox where collective non-transitive voting preferences occur. Kelkar [30] et al. define batch-order fairness where the index of a transaction is the index of the batch it is located in. The authors present an asynchronous atomic broadcast protocol additionally achieving block order-fairness with $n > 4f$ Byzantine fault resilience and $O(n^4)$ communication complexity, which is later improved to linear [29]. Here n is the total number of parties and f is the number of Byzantine faults. Cachin et al. [11] introduce a similar concept, differential order fairness, and present a quick order-fair atomic broadcast primitive in an asynchronous network, achieving quadratic communication complexity and optimal resilience $n > 3f$.

The second approach is blinding the transaction contents until after they have been committed [33,38]. This does not eliminate order manipulations based on inference of transaction contents and anticipations of future orders. Fino [33] adds to a DAG-based BFT SMR protocol a secret sharing and threshold encryption layer. The user encrypts the transactions using an ephemeral symmetric key and commits to this key. The user then secret-shares (for happy path) and threshold-encrypts (as fallback) the symmetric key among the parties running the protocol. The transactions need to be decrypted individually. FairBlock [38] employs an Identity-based Encryption (IBE) scheme for blinding transactions: a committee of keepers runs a distributed key generation [40,22,28] (DKG) protocol to generate master secret key shares for each keeper, which are tied to a master public key. For each height, an ephemeral encryption key is generated, and the decryption procedure involves each keeper providing a share of the ephemeral decryption key. We note that although the employed DKG protocol itself is not yet proven to be adaptively secure, the composed protocol could possibly be proven secure against an adaptive adversary as in [3]. Ferveo [6] combines publicly verifiable DKG and threshold encryption schemes for Tendermint-based [8] Proof-of-Stake protocols to achieve mempool privacy.

MEV-aware DEX design. Fair-TraDEX [35] combines FBA with commit-then-reveal style transaction masking. Each user needs to make deposits in an escrow service so that they are incentivized to post correct commitments. We consider time-based order fairness instead of blinding transactions mainly because one can infer contents in masked transactions or even future transactions like in traditional HFT. Other reasons include reducing constraints imposed by the encryption schemes deployed, e.g., an escrow service or a committee managing keys, and more explicitly quantifying front-running success probability. P2DEX [5] matches orders with servers running a secure multi-party computation (MPC) protocol. This introduces computation overhead and latencies and adds constraints inherent to the adopted MPC machinery. For automatic market maker designs like FairMM [13], we refer the readers to more comprehensive surveys.

The good and bad of HFT. The effects of the classical order manipulation method, HFT, are two-fold and sometimes mixed: (1) Cvitanic and Kirilenko [14] find that the existence of HFT actors without information

advantage increase liquidity; Jovanovic and Menkveld [26] find that the effects become mixed when the HFT players are better informed than normal traders; Gomber et al. [23] consider HFT to be a natural evolution of the market and the market failures like the flash crash to be rooted in the U.S. market structure; (2) on the other side, Johnson et al. [25] show that the all-machine market undergoes frequent black swan events⁴ with ultrafast durations; Patterson [39] considers the phenomenon to promote self-destructive algorithm wars; Lewis [31] thinks it leads to market injustice; Menkveld [36] through empirical evidence finds that HFTs in limit-order markets hurt the market if they only have a speed advantage but increase liquidity if they also have an information advantage and that HFTs preying on large orders increase transaction costs.

5 Concluding remarks and future directions

We explore FBA as a market design response for mitigating general order manipulations in DEXes constructed from of-ABC. The key idea is that FBA settles trades in the same batch at the same price and of-ABC ensures time-based batch order fairness or its equivalent (Definition 1). To show one other benefit of adopting FBA, we compute and compare the welfare loss under FBA and the current mainstream processing model, CLOB, in respective market equilibria. FBA imposes less welfare loss if public information concerning an asset’s valuation is revealed more often compared with private information, if the batch auction takes place at an appropriate frequency, or if the priority fees for validators are small compared to the asset’s valuation jump size.

Further discussions in this direction include: (1) analyzing the benefits and downsides of front-running in terms of market efficiency and quality, (2) comparing other aspects of the FBA and CLOB processing models in the DEX context, e.g., price discovery, and (3) introducing competition among DEXes instead of modeling a single exchange.

References

1. Aldrich, E.M., López Vargas, K.: Experiments in high-frequency trading: comparing two market institutions. *Experimental Economics* **23**(2), 322–352 (2020)
2. Ausubel, L.M., Cramton, P.: Demand reduction and inefficiency in multi-unit auctions (2002)
3. Bacho, R., Loss, J.: On the adaptive security of the threshold bls signature scheme. In: *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. pp. 193–207 (2022)
4. Baldauf, M., Mollner, J.: High-frequency trading and market performance. *The Journal of Finance* **75**(3), 1495–1526 (2020)
5. Baum, C., David, B., Frederiksen, T.K.: P2dex: privacy-preserving decentralized cryptocurrency exchange. In: *Applied Cryptography and Network Security: 19th International Conference, ACNS 2021, Kamakura, Japan, June 21–24, 2021, Proceedings, Part I*. pp. 163–194. Springer (2021)
6. Bebel, J., Ojha, D.: Ferveo: Threshold decryption for mempool privacy in bft networks. *Cryptology ePrint Archive* (2022)
7. Bellia, M., Pelizzon, L., Subrahmanyam, M.G., Uno, J., Yuferova, D.: Low-latency trading and price discovery without trading: Evidence from the tokyo stock exchange in the pre-opening period and the opening batch auction (2016)
8. Buchman, E.: Tendermint: Byzantine fault tolerance in the age of blockchains. Ph.D. thesis, University of Guelph (2016)
9. 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)
10. Budish, E., Lee, R.S., Shim, J.J.: A theory of stock exchange competition and innovation: Will the market fix the market? Tech. rep., National Bureau of Economic Research (2019)
11. Cachin, C., Mičić, J., Steinhauer, N.: Quick order fairness. In: *International Conference on Financial Cryptography and Data Security*. Springer (2022)
12. Chung, K.L.: On the probability of the occurrence of at least m events among n arbitrary events. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* **12**(3), 328–338 (1941)

⁴ “Highly consequential but unlikely events that are easily explainable - but only in retrospect”[42].

13. Ciampi, M., Ishaq, M., Magdon-Ismael, M., Ostrovsky, R., Zikas, V.: Fairmm: A fast and frontrunning-resistant crypto market-maker. In: *Cyber Security, Cryptology, and Machine Learning: 6th International Symposium, CSCML 2022, Be'er Sheva, Israel, June 30–July 1, 2022, Proceedings*. pp. 428–446. Springer (2022)
14. Cvitanic, J., Kirilenko, A.A.: High frequency traders and asset prices. Available at SSRN 1569067 (2010)
15. 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: *IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*. pp. 910–927. IEEE (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1109/SP40000.2020.00040>
16. Du, S., Zhu, H.: What is the optimal trading frequency in financial markets? *The Review of Economic Studies* **84**(4), 1606–1651 (2017)
17. Economides, N., Schwartz, R.A.: Electronic call market trading. In: *The Electronic Call Auction: Market Mechanism and Trading*, pp. 87–99. Springer (2001)
18. Eibelshäuser, S., Smetak, F.: Frequent batch auctions and informed trading (2022)
19. Fama, E.F.: Efficient capital markets: A review of theory and empirical work. *The Journal of Finance* **25**(2), 383–417 (1970)
20. Farmer, D., Skouras, S.: Review of the benefits of a continuous market vs. randomised stop auctions and of alternative priority rules (policy options 7 and 12). Manuscript, Foresight. Government Office for Science (2012)
21. Fricke, D., Gerig, A.: Too fast or too slow? determining the optimal speed of financial markets. *Quantitative Finance* **18**(4), 519–532 (2018)
22. Gennaro, R., Jarecki, S., Krawczyk, H., Rabin, T.: Secure distributed key generation for discrete-log based cryptosystems. *Journal of Cryptology* **20**, 51–83 (2007)
23. Gomber, P., Haferkorn, M.: High frequency trading. In: *Encyclopedia of Information Science and Technology, Third Edition*, pp. 1–9. IGI Global (2015)
24. Gong, T.: Interactive graph with desmos, <https://www.desmos.com/calculator/gf3fdufsan>
25. Johnson, N., Zhao, G., Hunsader, E., Meng, J., Ravindar, A., Carran, S., Tivnan, B.: Financial black swans driven by ultrafast machine ecology. arXiv preprint arXiv:1202.1448 (2012)
26. Jovanovic, B., Menkveld, A.J.: Middlemen in limit order markets. Available at SSRN 1624329 (2016)
27. Kandel, E., Rindi, B., Bosetti, L.: The effect of a closing call auction on market quality and trading strategies. *Journal of Financial Intermediation* **21**(1), 23–49 (2012)
28. Kate, A., Goldberg, I.: Distributed private-key generators for identity-based cryptography. In: *International Conference on Security and Cryptography for Networks*. pp. 436–453. Springer (2010), https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-15317-4_27
29. Kelkar, M., Deb, S., Long, S., Juels, A., Kannan, S.: Themis: Fast, strong order-fairness in byzantine consensus. *Cryptology ePrint Archive* (2021)
30. Kelkar, M., Zhang, F., Goldfeder, S., Juels, A.: Order-fairness for byzantine consensus. In: *Annual International Cryptology Conference*. pp. 451–480. Springer (2020), https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-56877-1_16
31. Lewis, M.: *Flash boys: a Wall Street revolt*. WW Norton & Company (2014)
32. Madhavan, A.: Trading mechanisms in securities markets. *The Journal of Finance* **47**(2), 607–641 (1992)
33. Malkhi, D., Szalachowski, P.: Maximal Extractable Value (MEV) Protection on a DAG. arXiv e-prints pp. arXiv–2208 (2022), <https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.00940>
34. Maskin, E., Tirole, J.: Markov perfect equilibrium: I. observable actions. *Journal of Economic Theory* **100**(2), 191–219 (2001)
35. McMenamin, C., Daza, V., Fitzi, M., O’Donoghue, P.: Fairtradex: A decentralised exchange preventing value extraction. In: *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM CCS Workshop on Decentralized Finance and Security*. pp. 39–46 (2022)
36. Menkveld, A.J.: The economics of high-frequency trading. *Annual Review of Financial Economics* **8**, 1–24 (2016)
37. Menkveld, A.J., Zoican, M.A.: Need for speed? exchange latency and liquidity. *The Review of Financial Studies* **30**(4), 1188–1228 (2017)
38. Momeni, P.: Fairblock: Preventing blockchain front-running with minimal overheads. Master’s thesis, University of Waterloo (2022), https://uwspace.uwaterloo.ca/bitstream/handle/10012/18554/Momeni_Peyman.pdf
39. Patterson, S.: Dark pools: The rise of the machine traders and the rigging of the US stock market. *Currency* (2013)
40. Pedersen, T.P.: A threshold cryptosystem without a trusted party. In: *Advances in Cryptology—EUROCRYPT’91: Workshop on the Theory and Application of Cryptographic Techniques Brighton, UK, April 8–11, 1991 Proceedings* 10. pp. 522–526. Springer (1991)
41. Riccò, R., Wang, K.: Frequent batch auctions vs. continuous trading: Evidence from taiwan. *Continuous Trading: Evidence from Taiwan* (November 19, 2020) (2020)
42. Taleb, N.N.: *The black swan: The impact of the highly improbable*, vol. 2. Random house (2007)
43. Zhang, Z., Ibikunle, G.: Latency arbitrage and frequent batch auctions. Available at SSRN 3984570 (2021)