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Abstract

Decentralized exchanges (DEXs) provide a means for users to trade pairs of assets on-chain without the need of a trusted third party to effectuate a trade. Amongst these, constant function market maker (CFMM) DEXs such as Uniswap handle the most volume of trades between ERC-20 tokens. With the introduction of Uniswap v3, liquidity providers are given the option to differentially allocate liquidity to be used for trades that occur within specific price intervals. In this paper, we formalize the profit and loss that liquidity providers can earn when providing specific liquidity positions to a contract. With this in hand, we are able to compute optimal liquidity allocations for liquidity providers who hold beliefs over how prices evolve over time. Ultimately, we use this tool to shed light on the design question regarding how v3 contracts should partition price space for permissible liquidity allocations. Our results show that a richer space of potential partitions can simultaneously benefit both liquidity providers and traders.
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1 Introduction

A key application in the decentralized finance (DeFi) space is that of decentralized exchanges (DEXs). DEXs are smart contracts that allow users to trade tokens without the need of a trusted-third party to effectuate the trade. A key benefit of such an implementation is the fact that it reduces hacking risks typically suffered by centralized off-chain exchanges. Amongst DEXs, there are two prevailing algorithmic paradigms for implementing a trading contract: order book DEXs and automated market maker (AMM) DEXs. Order book DEXs maintain a list of buy and sell orders from users at distinct prices for a given pair of assets to be traded. These orders are received, matched and executed. On the other hand, an AMM contract provides buy and sell prices for trades, where said prices are typically computed as a function of the contract’s assets.
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Currently, AMMs are the most common form of DEXs, amongst which Uniswap contracts handle a substantial proportion of trading volume. Uniswap contracts serve as constant function market makers (CFMM), which are a popular subset of AMMs. In CFMMs, the contract computes the price of buying and selling between two assets by preserving a functional invariant of its existing liquidity reserves.

To briefly describe the operation of a CFMM, let $x$ and $y$ denote the liquidity reserves the contract has of each of two assets, say token $A$ and token $B$ respectively. The trading invariant can be expressed as $F(x, y) = C$, for a given function $F$ and constant $C$ provided by the contract. A trader who wishes to sell $\Delta x > 0$ of token $A$ must send $\Delta x$ units of $A$ tokens to the contract, and the amount of token $B$ they receive is the value, $\Delta y > 0$, such that the functional invariant is maintained, i.e. $F(x + \Delta x, y - \Delta y) = C$. The quantity $\Delta y / \Delta x$ represents the per-unit price of token $A$ for the trade (in terms of token $B$). As $\Delta x \to 0$, this ratio gives the instantaneous price of token $A$ in terms of token $B$ for a contract with with a bundle of assets given by $(x, y)$.

Liquidity providers (LPs) provide assets to the contract and enable trade. An LP lends the contract a bundle of both $A$ and $B$ tokens, which is traded against as the relative price of token $A$ (or equivalently token $B$) changes. Liquidity provision is rewarded by means of transaction fees on trades. In 2021 Uniswap v3 introduced a new family of AMMs where LPs can differentially allocate liquidity to a v3 contract [1]. More specifically, v3 contracts allow users to allocate liquidity to be used for trades in a specific price interval. Fees for trades are shared proportionally amongst LPs who provide liquidity on intervals that contain a price change. On the other hand, if the price exits the interval of an LP’s liquidity position, their liquidity no longer earns fees on trades. With this change, LPs can use the same capital to obtain more aggressive liquidity positions around tight price intervals, and thus potentially earn more fees, albeit at the risk of losing out on fees all together if prices exceed the given price interval. Another important consideration for LPs is the fact that as external prices of token $A$ and token $B$ evolve, trades occur on the contract to match said prices, which ultimately changes the composition of capital an LP has a claim to if they wish to remove their liquidity from the contract. If the prices return to where they were when liquidity was lent, then the provider can withdraw its liquidity in the same quantities as initially lent. On the other hand, if the prices have changed, the bundle of tokens to which an LP has claim has a lower value, when taking into account the new price. This phenomenon is called the *impermanent loss* of a liquidity position, and is a crucial consideration for liquidity provision which we consider in this work.

Given the rapid increase in DEX usage, it is important to understand the strategic considerations facing LPs. This paper builds off existing work to providing a new empirical and theoretical understanding of LP behavior, and consequently uses these techniques to provide concrete design recommendations for Uniswap v3 contracts.

### 1.1 Our Contributions

We begin by providing an overview of Uniswap dynamics for v2 and v3 contracts in Section 2. In Section 3 we provide an expression for LP profit and loss over a sequence of price changes in the contract. In addition, we provide a formalization for the intuition that v3 positions provide
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1As per the writing time of this paper, the daily average trade volume in Uniswap v2 and v3 contracts is approximately 160 Million USD and 1.25 Billion USD respectively. In addition, the total liquidity locked by users to facilitate trades in v2 and v3 contracts is 2.8 Billion USD and 4.4 Billion USD respectively. v2: [https://v2.info.uniswap.org/home](https://v2.info.uniswap.org/home) v3: [https://v3.info.uniswap.org/home](https://v3.info.uniswap.org/home)
higher rewards at potentially higher risk for LPs. In Section 4 we show how risk-neutral LPs can optimize their profit and loss over a finite time horizon if they hold stochastic beliefs of how prices will evolve. In addition, we apply these tools to the concrete design question of how v3 contracts should partition price space into potential liquidity positions. We provide empirical and computational evidence for the fact that a richer space of potential partitions can benefit both LPs and traders. Finally, in Section 5 we extend our results to the setting where LPs are risk-averse and provide insights to how this impacts the tradeoffs exemplified in risk-neutral setting, as well as how risk-aversion impacts individual LP behavior.

1.2 Related Work

Our work extends a growing body of literature around liquidity provision incentives stemming from on-chain implementations of CFMMs. Most related to this paper is the work of Neuder et al. [15], which studies strategic liquidity provision in Uniswap v3. As in our work, they assume LPs hold beliefs that contract prices will evolve according to a Markov chain, and they provide a method for LPs to maximize fees earned in the steady state of the chain. The main difference in our work is that we model the potential loss an LP can suffer as the price of assets change with trades (dubbed *impermanent loss*). By modeling LP profit and loss in terms of both fees earned and impermanent loss suffered, we seek to understand decision-theoretic implications faced by LPs seeking to allocate liquidity optimally with respect to beliefs they may hold on how prices may evolve. Moreover, we use this methodology to glean insight into the design of how v3 contracts should discretize price space for potential liquidity positions, a problem which to our knowledge has not been considered before in the CFMM literature.

With regards to Uniswap v2, Angeris et al. [7] show that under reasonable conditions v2 exchanges closely track reference markets. Their work involves modeling potential arbitrage opportunities for traders, even as they are faced with trading fees in CFMMs. In addition, their work also provides expressions for potential LP earnings under simple price changes in v2 contracts. This work is extended in [3], where the authors provide similar guarantees for a more general class of CFMMs, as well as in [2], where similar results and techniques are extended to CFMMs supporting multi-asset trades. In [1] the authors also study the implications of the curvature in reserve curves for traders and LPs, providing concrete tradeoffs for when high and low curvature regimes favor each of these two classes of agents. All these results focus on v2 contracts however and not on the richer space of liquidity allocations presented by v3, nor on the design questions related to v3 contracts as in our work. A related branch of work also studies how LPs can replicate the payoffs of financial derivatives. Evans [12] focuses on geometric mean market makers (CFMMs with functional invariants which preserve a weighted geometric mean of assets held in the contract), and more general results are shown in a series of papers by Angeris et al. [5] and [6] for a larger class of financial derivatives.

The liquidity-provision problem in Uniswap also shares similarities with the market making problem in traditional limit-order book markets. Avellaneda [10], for example, sets up the market making problem of posting bid and ask quotes in a maximized exponential utility framework and solves it in a two step approach. Our study of LP revenue as a function of fidelity in setting liquidity positions is related, also, to the tick size design problem in traditional limit order markets, which draws great attention from both an economics and regulatory perspective. European exchanges, for example, compete directly on the minimum pricing increment in the limit order book to capture market shares of quoted and executed volumes [14]. In 2016, the US Securities and Exchange
Commission (SEC) launched the *Tick Size Pilot Program* to assess the impact of increasing tick sizes on the market quality for illiquid stocks.

## 2 Overview of Uniswap

A core functionality of Uniswap contracts is to provide a family of CFMM DEXs for trading between ERC-20 token pairs. In this section, we provide a brief overview of the mechanics of Uniswap v2 and Uniswap v3 to lay the groundwork for subsequent sections.

### 2.1 Uniswap v2: Providing Liquidity at all Prices

A Uniswap v2 contract facilitates trades between a pair of ERC-20 tokens, say Token A and Token B. LPs provide liquidity in the form of bundles of A and B tokens to the contract. Let \( x > 0 \) and \( y > 0 \) denote the number of A tokens and B tokens provided by LPs to the contract respectively. We refer to \((x, y)\) as the *v2 contract state*.

#### 2.1.1 v2 Reserve Curve

As trades are made, Uniswap maintains a functional invariant on the liquidity held in the contract. The number of assets in the contract is to satisfy \( F(x, y) = C \), for function \( F \) and constant \( C \). We refer to the collection of all states \((x, y)\) \( \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+ \) that satisfy \( F(x, y) = C \) as the *reserve curve*. In particular, if a trader sells \( \Delta x > 0 \) units of A, they receive \( \Delta y > 0 \) units of B, such that \( F(x + \Delta x, y - \Delta y) = C \) is maintained. For Uniswap, \( F(x, y) = xy \), and the reserve curve is visualized in Figure 1.

Let \( L = \sqrt{xy} \) denote the number of *liquidity units* in a contract, which is a convenient single-valued measure of how much liquidity is held. With this, the reserve curve is the set of states \((x', y')\) that satisfy \( x'y' = L^2 \). In this sense, liquidity \( L \) controls the set of trades that are possible.

**Definition 1** (Uniswap v2 Reserve Curve). For \( L > 0 \) units of liquidity held in the contract, we let \( \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(L) \) denote the v2 reserve curve at liquidity \( L \) between token A and token B, with

\[
\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(L) = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+ \mid xy = L^2\}.
\]

#### 2.1.2 Contract Price

The infinitesimal price \( P \) of token A in terms of token B is the *contract price* and depends on the contract state \((x, y)\). For an amount of liquidity \( L \), the amount of token B held in the contract depends functionally on the amount of token A, with \( y = f_L(x) \) for \( f_L(x) = L^2/x \). With this, the instantaneous price of token A given liquidity \( L \) is \(-df_L(x)/dx\) and we have,

\[
P = -\frac{df_L(x)}{dx} = \frac{L^2}{x^2} = \frac{y}{x}.
\]

The constant-product function can also be re-written as \((x/L)(y/L) = 1\), from which we see that when \( L \) is higher, the contract price, \( P = (y/L)/(x/L) \) slips less in response to trades; i.e., changing the price from \( P \) to \( P' \) requires a larger change in the contract state (in terms of \( \Delta x \) or \( \Delta y \)) when the liquidity, \( L \), is larger.
Figure 1: The $x,y$ coordinates on the $xy = L^2$ reserve curve, with points illustrated for prices $P_a < P_m < P_b$. In order to increase the price from $P_m$ to $P_b$, $(y_b - y_m)$ units of token $B$ need to be sent to the contract (to receive $x_r$ units of token $A$). Similarly, to decrease the price from $P_m$ to $P_a$, $x_a - x_m$ units of token $A$ need to be sent to the contract (to receive $y_r$ units of token $B$).

Based on the following correspondence, each point on reserve curve $R^{(2)}(L)$ can be identified by $(x, y)$ assets of token $A$ and token $B$ or equivalently $(L, P)$ and the amount of liquidity and the contract price.

**Proposition 1.** If a Uniswap v2 contract has $L$ units of liquidity and a contract price $P$, it must be the case that the contract state is given by $(x, y)$ such that:

$$x = L \sqrt{P}, \quad y = L \sqrt{P}.$$  \hfill (2.3)

**Proof.** Immediate, by verifying $(x, y) \in R^{(2)}(L)$ and $P = y/x$.

A consequence of Proposition 1 is that a contract’s state can be represented by the bundle of $A$ and $B$ tokens the contract holds as liquidity, $(x, y)$, or equivalently by how much liquidity is held in the contract, and at what contract price, i.e. $(L, P)$. We call the former the **token-bundle** contract state, and the latter the **liquidity-price** contract state.

For a given liquidity-price state, $(L, P)$, we refer to the corresponding token-bundle contract state as the **v2 bundle value of $L$ units of liquidity at price $P$** and denote this as $\mathcal{V}^{(2)}(L, P) = (L/\sqrt{P}, L\sqrt{P})$. From Proposition 1, the bundle value of $L$ units of liquidity is linear in $L$, and we also write $\mathcal{V}^{(2)}(P) = \mathcal{V}^{(2)}(1, P)$ for the bundle value of 1 unit of liquidity, with $\mathcal{V}^{(2)}(L, P) = L \cdot \mathcal{V}^{(2)}(P)$.

### 2.1.3 Providing and Removing Liquidity

LPs can add liquidity to the contract, or remove liquidity that they own, while keeping the price $P$ unchanged. For example, an LP who wants to add $L'$ units of liquidity to the contract with current liquidity-price state of $(L, P)$ and token-bundle state of $(x, y)$ must deposit $\mathcal{V}^{(2)}(L', P) = (x', y')$, with $x' = x + L'/\sqrt{P}$ and $y' = y + L'^2/P$. Similarly, to remove $L''$ units of liquidity, they must deposit $\mathcal{V}^{(2)}(L - L'', P) = (x' - L''/\sqrt{P}, y - L''\sqrt{P})$. The **swap rate** formula $x' = \frac{x + L'}{x + L''} \sqrt{\frac{P}{P'}}$ captures how much token $A$ is exchanged for token $B$. When $L' = L''$, the swap rate is $x' = x$. This formula is the key to understanding how liquidity is added or removed, and it is used to compute the new contract state $(x', y')$. The swap rate is essentially the ratio of the new liquidity to the old liquidity, scaled by the square root of the price ratio, which reflects the relative change in value of $A$ and $B$.

**Proposition 2.** If an LP adds $L'$ units of liquidity to a Uniswap v2 contract with current state $(x, y)$ and price $P$, the new state $(x', y')$ is given by:

$$x' = \frac{x + L'}{x + L''} \sqrt{P/P'}, \quad y' = \frac{x + L'}{x + L''} \sqrt{y \cdot \frac{P}{P'}}.$$

**Proof.** Immediate, by verifying $x' = \frac{x + L'}{x + L''} \sqrt{P/P'}$ and $y' = \frac{x + L'}{x + L''} \sqrt{y \cdot \frac{P}{P'}}$.

A consequence of Proposition 2 is that the contract state $(x', y')$ is linear in $L'$.

**Proposition 3.** If an LP removes $L''$ units of liquidity from a Uniswap v2 contract with current state $(x, y)$ and price $P$, the new state $(x', y')$ is given by:

$$x' = \frac{x + L'}{x + L''} \sqrt{P/P'}, \quad y' = \frac{x + L'}{x + L''} \sqrt{y \cdot \frac{P}{P'}}.$$

**Proof.** Immediate, by verifying $x' = \frac{x + L'}{x + L''} \sqrt{P/P'}$ and $y' = \frac{x + L'}{x + L''} \sqrt{y \cdot \frac{P}{P'}}$.

A consequence of Proposition 3 is that the contract state $(x', y')$ is linear in $L''$.
which is a bundle of \( A \) tokens and \( B \) tokens. The effect is to change the token-bundle state to \((x + x', y + y')\) and the liquidity-price state to \((L + L', P)\). Similarly, an LP with claim to \( L' \) units of liquidity may remove a token bundle consisting of \( V^{(2)}(L', P) = (x', y')\), from the contract. The resulting token-bundle state is \((x - x', y - y')\) and the liquidity-price state is \((L - L', P)\). This is formalized in the following proposition whose proof we have included in Appendix A.

**Proposition 2.** Suppose that \((x, y) \in V^{(2)}(L)\), with \( P = y/x\). In addition, let us suppose that \((x', y') \in V^{(2)}(L')\) such that \( P' = y'/x' = P\). Then \((x + x', y + y') \in V^{(2)}(L + L')\), and in addition, \((y + y')/(x + x') = P\). If \( L' < L\), then \((x - x', y - y') \in \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(L - L')\) and \((y - y')/(x - x') = P\).

### 2.1.4 Trading Fees

When a trade occurs in Uniswap v2, a portion goes to LPs as fees. There is a *fee rate*, \( \gamma \in (0, 1)\). Without loss of generality, we suppose a trader sends \( \Delta x \) units of token \( A \) to purchase units of token \( B \). The case where the roles of \( A \) and \( B \) are reversed is identical. In this case, \( \gamma \Delta x \) units of \( A \) are skimmed as trade fees and allocated to LPs in proportion to how much liquidity they have contributed; i.e., the \( j \)-th LP receives \( \left( \frac{L_j}{L} \right) \gamma \Delta x \), for contribution \( L_j \) (and \( \sum_{j=1}^{k} L_i = L\), for \( k \) LPs altogether). The remaining \((1 - \gamma) \Delta x \) units of \( A \) sent from the trader are used to move along the reserve curve, shifting the contract’s token-bundle state to \((x', y')\), where \( x' = x + (1 - \gamma) \Delta x \), and \( y' \) is such that \((x', y') \in \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(L)\). The trader receives \( y' - y \) units of token \( B \) in return for this trade. In Appendix C.1 we provide an in-depth example of v2 trade dynamics.

### 2.2 Uniswap v3: Concentrated Liquidity Provision

In v2 contracts, LPs provide assets to the contract to facilitate trades at all contract prices. A given LP’s contributions to the contract are measured in \( L \) units of v2 liquidity. In v3 contracts, LPs are given the option to allocate liquidity to be used for trades in a finite price interval \([a, b]\). As we will see in this section, we use analogous single-valued measure of an LP’s contribution to prices in this range, called units of \([a, b]\)-liquidity.

At a high level, providing \( L \) units of \([a, b]\)-liquidity has two key consequences for an LP: (i) this liquidity only earns fees when the contract price is in \([a, b]\), where fees are split proportionally amongst all LPs who have allocated liquidity at intervals including the contract price (ii) the bundle value of \( L \) units of \([a, b]\)-liquidity is smaller as the interval \([a, b]\) becomes smaller. Combining these two points, if an LP has a certain initial capital in terms of token \( A \) and token \( B \), they can potentially obtain more liquidity units over smaller intervals, and hence increase the fees they potentially accrue. However, this comes at the risk of not earning fees all together when prices exit the liquidity’s given interval.

#### 2.2.1 \([a, b]\)-Liquidity

In Uniswap v3, an LP provides liquidity for a specific price interval, and for interval \([a, b]\) we quantify a user’s contribution in terms of \([a, b]\)-liquidity units. First, we introduce the following notation:

\[
\Delta_{P, P'}^{x} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{P'}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{P}}, \quad \Delta_{P, P'}^{y} = \sqrt{P'} - \sqrt{P}. \tag{2.4}
\]
Here, $\Delta^x_a,b$ and $\Delta^y_a,b$ represent the change in $x$ and $y$ values, respectively, along the unit liquidity v2 reserve curve $R^{(2)}(1)$ as the contract price changes from $P$ to $P'$. We now provide a mapping from $[a,b]$-liquidity to token position, for Uniswap v3, that is analogous to the v2 bundle value function.

**Definition 2** ($[a,b]$-Liquidity value). Suppose that the contract price is given by $P \in (0, \infty)$. We let $\mathcal{V}^{(3)}(L,a,b,P) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+$ denote the bundle value of $L$ units of $[a,b]$-liquidity as a bundle of $A$ and $B$ tokens respectively, i.e., the number of tokens that is equivalent to liquidity $L$ on this interval at price $P$, with

$$
\mathcal{V}^{(3)}(L,a,b,P) = \begin{cases} 
(L\Delta^x_a,b,0) & \text{if } P < a \\
(0,L\Delta^y_a,b) & \text{if } P > b \\
(L\Delta^x_{b,p},L\Delta^y_{a,p}) & \text{if } P \in [a,b]
\end{cases} \quad (2.5)
$$

As with the v2 value function, this expression is linear in $L$, hence we also use the shorthand for $\mathcal{V}^{(3)}(a,b,P) = \mathcal{V}^{(3)}(1,a,b,P)$ so that $\mathcal{V}^{(3)}(L,a,b,P) = L \cdot \mathcal{V}^{(3)}(a,b,P)$. In particular, an LP who wants to add $L'$ units of $[a,b]$-liquidity to a v3 contract, when the contract price is $P$, must send the bundle $\mathcal{V}^{(3)}(L',a,b,P)$ to the contract. An LP who wants to remove $L'$ units of $[a,b]$-liquidity will receive the bundle $\mathcal{V}^{(3)}(L',a,b,P)$.

As mentioned previously, when the interval $[a,b]$ becomes smaller, the bundle value of $L'$ units of $[a,b]$-liquidity falls; i.e., $L'$ units can be added with fewer $A$ and $B$ tokens. At the same time, $[a,b]$-liquidity is only used for trades at prices $P \in [a,b]$, and so fees are limited in this way. In the converse, as the interval $[a,b]$ approaches the entire price interval, we recover the v2 liquidity value. The proof of the following is in Appendix [A]

**Proposition 3.** The value of Uniswap v3 liquidity is the value of Uniswap v2 liquidity, in the limit of an $[a,b]$-interval that approaches the entire price interval,

$$
\lim_{a \to 0,b \to \infty} [\mathcal{V}^{(3)}(a,b,P)] = \mathcal{V}^{(2)}(P). \quad (2.6)
$$

### 2.2.2 v3 Reserve Curves

Suppose that a v3 contract has $L$ units of $[a,b]$-liquidity. In v2, trades moved contract state along the reserve curve, $R^{(2)}(L)$, which in turn ensures the total liquidity units in the contract remains constant. The same holds for v3 contracts, albeit for trades for which the contract price remains in the interval. We begin by defining the reserve curve corresponding to these $L$ units of $[a,b]$-liquidity. For this, we define $\phi_a^A(z) = z + \frac{L}{\sqrt{b}}$ and $\phi_b^B(z) = z + L\sqrt{a}$, and write $\phi_{a,b}(w,z) = (\phi_a^A(w), \phi_b^B(z))$.

**Definition 3** (Uniswap v3 reserve curve). Given $L$ units of $[a,b]$-liquidity, we denote the reserve curve at $[a,b]$-liquidity $L$ by $R^{(3)}(L,a,b)$, with

$$
R^{(3)}(L,a,b) = \{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+ | \phi_a^A(x) \cdot \phi_b^B(y) = L^2\}. \quad (2.7)
$$

For a given v3 reserve curve, $R^{(3)}(L,a,b)$, we call $R^{(2)}(L)$ the virtual reserve curve of the assets, appealing here to the v2 reserve curve. As the following proposition shows, the v3 reserve curve is in fact an affine transformation of the portion of $R^{(2)}(L)$ that corresponds to token-bundle states with a contract price in $[a,b]$. An example of a v3 reserve curve and its virtual reserve curve can be visualized in Figure 2.
Figure 2: The affine shift of the Uniswap v2 reserve curve. The blue line is the virtual reserve curve and the red is the v3 reserve curve. With this, the v3 curve is only defined when the current price is in the closed interval $[a, b]$, where $a < b$ are the price bounds specified by the liquidity provider.

Proposition 4. Suppose that $(x, y) \in \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(L, a, b)$. It follows that $\phi_{a,b}(x, y) \in \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(L)$ and if we let $P = \phi^B_{a,b}(y)/\phi^A_{a,b}(x)$, then $P \in [a, b]$ and $(x, y) = \mathcal{V}^{(3)}(L, a, b, P)$.

The proof of Proposition 4 can be found in Appendix A. It shows that the affine map $\phi_{a,b}$ naturally maps $\phi_{a,b}$ to $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(L)$. In this regard, we say a token bundle $(x, y) \in \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(L, a, b)$ has a contract price given by $P = \frac{\phi^B_{a,b}(y)}{\phi^A_{a,b}(x)}$.

2.2.3 Trading and Fees

In the previous sections we described how LPs can provide and remove liquidity over different price intervals by sending a v3 contract required token bundles. Here we describe trade dynamics for a v3 contract. Let us assume that $k$ LPs have provided liquidity to the contract, where we assume that the $j$-th LP has provided $L_j$ units of $[a_j, b_j]$. In addition, let us suppose that the v3 contract has a current price given by $P \in (0, \infty)$. In what follows we will show the dynamics of a trade that moves the contract price to $P' < P$ (the case where price increases is symmetric). Before continuing, we make two key assumptions on the positions provided by LPs:

- If the $j$-th and $r$-th LPs have positions given by intervals $[a_j, b_j]$ and $[a_r, b_r]$ respectively, then either $[a_j, b_j] = [a_r, b_r]$ or $|[a_j, b_j] \cap [a_r, b_r]| \leq 1$.
- Each price in $[P', P]$ lies in some $[a_i, b_i]$.

Justification of Assumptions. Before continuing, we briefly explain why such assumptions are without loss of generality. Doing so for the first assumption hinges on the following proposition with proof in Appendix A which tells us that if an LP has a position worth $L$ units of $[a, b]$-liquidity, the token-bundle value of such a position can be decomposed into that of $L$ units of $[a, c]$ and $[c, b]$ liquidity for any $c \in (a, b)$. Furthermore, this decomposition holds at any price.
Proposition 5. Consider an arbitrary closed interval \([a, b]\) and a value \(c \in (a, b)\). Let \(P\) be an arbitrary contract price, then
\[
\mathcal{V}^{(3)}(L, a, c, P) + \mathcal{V}^{(3)}(L, c, b, P) = \mathcal{V}^{(3)}(L, a, b, P).
\]

To apply this result to our given scenario, suppose that the \(j\)-th and \(r\)-th LP do not satisfy the assumption above. Let the non-trivial intersection over their positions be \([a', b'] = [a_j, b_j] \cap [a_r, b_r]\). For each LP, we can decompose their liquidity to be over \([a', b']\) and at most two other price segments. The resulting positions, when treated as different LPs, satisfy our first assumption.

With regards to the second assumption, when a v3 contract is created, an LP position is implicitly created on the entire price space. This corresponds to a v2 position of some small amount of liquidity. After we decompose LP positions as per the process above, we are in fact left with some positions over intervals of the form \((0, a] \) or \([b, \infty)\), which do not correspond to v3 positions for closed price intervals. If the contract price reaches such an interval, it trades as per v2 price dynamics described before.

Trading with Active Liquidity. Let us return to our example at hand. We have a contract price \(P\) and wish to consider a trade which moves the contract price to \(P' < P\) by sending \(A\) tokens to the contract (the case of a price increase is symmetrical). If the \(j\)-th LP has a position \([a_j, b_j]\) containing \(P\), then we say the LP is active and that their \(L_j\) units of \([a_j, b_j]\)-liquidity are also active. In addition, our assumptions above imply the existence of common values, \(a^*\) and \(b^*\), such that if the \(j\)-th LP is active, then \(a_j = a^*\) and \(b_j = b^*\). We call \([a^*, b^*]\) the active interval at price \(P\). Without loss of generality, let us suppose that the first \(s\) of \(k\) LPs are active, then we let \(L = \sum_{j=1}^{s} L_i\) be the total active liquidity for the given price. We let \((x, y) = \mathcal{V}^{(3)}(L, a^*, b^*, P) \in \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(L, a^*, b^*)\) be the active bundle at the given price. As we will see shortly, traders will send assets to the v3 contract which in turn move the active bundle along the v3 reserve curve given by \(\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(L, a^*, b^*)\), which, to continue with our naming conventions, we call the active v3 reserve curve. Finally, we let \(x^* = \frac{L}{\sqrt{a^*}}\) and \(y^* = L\sqrt{b^*}\). The values \(x^*\) and \(y^*\) represent the maximal amount of \(A\) tokens and \(B\) tokens respectively that can be achieved by bundles on the active reserve curve.

We recall that that \(\gamma \in (0, 1)\) is the trade fee rate of the contract and begin by considering a trader who sends \(\Delta x \leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma}(x^* - x)\) units of token \(A\) to the contract. As we will see shortly, such a bound on the trade amount ensures that the active bundle can move to another bundle on the active reserve curve. Before such an amount is used for trading, fees are skimmed for liquidity providers, which in this case amounts to \(\gamma \Delta x\) units of token \(A\). This is in turn shared amongst the active LPs, proportionally, such that if the \(j\)-th LP is active, they will receive \(\frac{\Delta x}{L} \gamma \Delta x\) units of token \(A\). The remaining \((1 - \gamma)\Delta x \leq x^* - x\) is then used to move the active bundle to a new bundle with \(x' = x + (1 - \gamma)\Delta x \leq x^*\) units of \(A\) tokens. The fact that \(x' \leq x^*\) ensures that there is a corresponding \(y'\) such that the bundle \((x', y')\) lies on the active reserve curve and has a contract price of \(P' = \frac{\phi_{a^*, b^*}(y')}{\phi_{a^*, b^*}(x')} \in [a^*, b^*]\). The trader receives \(y - y'\) units of \(B\) tokens for the trade.

If the trader sends \(\Delta x > \frac{1}{1-\gamma}(x^* - x)\) units of token \(A\), then the contract first trades \(\frac{1}{1-\gamma}(x^* - x)\) such tokens to move the contract bundle to the boundary of the active reserve curve. To trade the remaining tokens, the contract has to exit the current active interval. Before doing so, the contract establishes the new active interval, along with the set of active providers and active liquidity. It is worth noting that whatever gas fees are needed for the re-computation of aforementioned active quantities within the contract are also charged to the trader in question. Ultimately, The
remaining \( \frac{1}{\gamma} (x^* - x) - \Delta x \) units of \( B \) tokens are then traded iteratively as per the outlined process. In Appendix C.2 we provide an in-depth example of v3 dynamics.

**Price Buckets.** A Uniswap v3 contract partitions the space of all prices, \((0, \infty)\) into small intervals, which are called buckets. The effect is that an LP can only provide \([a, b]\)-liquidity for \(a\) and \(b\) that are endpoints of buckets. Equivalently, an interval over which liquidity is provided is a set of contiguous buckets. We assume that there are \(n + m + 1\) buckets, with indices from the set \(\{-m, \ldots, 0, \ldots, n\}\), where the \(i\)-th bucket is denoted by \(B_i\) and represents the interval \([a_i, b_i]\) (with \(a_i < b_i\)). We have \(\bigcup B_i = (0, \infty)\), and \(b_i = a_{i+1}\) for all \(i < n\). By convention, the unit price, where token \(A\) and token \(B\) are at parity within the contract, lies in the 0-th bucket (and \(a_0 < 1 < b_0\)). In addition, we let \(\mu = \{B_{-m}, \ldots, B_0, \ldots, B_n\}\) denote the set of buckets in the v3 contract.

### 3 Liquidity Provider Profit and Loss on a Price Sequence

Now that we have described the core dynamics of Uniswap contracts, we can focus on the profit and loss of an LP over a sequence of price changes. In what follows, we consider the perspective of an LP who borrows capital to create a liquidity position in a v3 contract.

As per the previous section, we assume that the contract has a set of \((m + n + 1)\) buckets denoted by \(\mu = \{B_{-m}, \ldots, B_0, \ldots, B_n\}\), where the \(i\)-th bucket represents the price interval \([a_i, b_i]\), and the 0-th bucket contains the parity price \(P = 1\). We let \(\ell = (\ell_{-m}, \ldots, \ell_0, \ldots, \ell_n)\) denote the liquidity distribution or liquidity position of the provider over the \(m + n + 1\) buckets, where \(\ell_i\) denotes the units of \([a_i, b_i]\)-liquidity held by the provider.

#### Token B Worth of Liquidity.

Let \(\mathcal{B} : (\mathbb{R}^+) \times \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+\) be the function that returns how much a bundle of \(A\) and \(B\) tokens is worth in units of token \(B\) under the assumption that token \(A\) has a price of \(P\). More specifically:

\[
\mathcal{B}(x, y, P) = Px + y. \quad (3.1)
\]

To obtain \(L'\) units of \([a_i, b_i]\)-liquidity when the contract price is \(P\) requires an LP to send a bundle of \(A\) and \(B\) tokens given by \(\mathcal{V}^{(3)}(L', a_i, b_i, P) = L' \cdot \mathcal{V}^{(3)}(a_i, b_i, P)\) to the contract. At price \(P\), this bundle has an equivalent token \(B\) worth of \(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{V}^{(3)}(L', a_i, b_i, P), P)\) in \(B\) tokens.

#### 3.1 Transaction Fees over a Price Sequence

We want to express the fees accrued by an LP with liquidity distribution \(\ell\) over a finite sequence of prices \(p_0, \ldots, p_T\). Without loss of generality, we assume that each individual price movement from \(p_t\) to \(p_{t+1}\) occurs within a single bucket, for if this is not the case, we can simply split the price movement accordingly. Let us focus on a single price movement from \(p_t \rightarrow p_{t+1}\), where \(p_t, p_{t+1} \in [a_i, b_i]\). We let \(L'_{t \rightarrow t+1} = \ell_i\) denote the liquidity the LP has in the bucket pertaining to the price movement from \(p_t\) to \(p_{t+1}\), and let \(L_{t \rightarrow t+1}\) denote the total liquidity that all LPs have in that bucket.

We first consider an upward price movement \(p_t \rightarrow p_{t+1}\), where \(p_{t+1} > p_t\). It must be the case that \(\Delta y = L_{t \rightarrow t+1} \Delta y_{p_t, p_{t+1}}\) units of token \(B\) are used for trading with the contract. Since a \(\gamma\) proportion of all funds sent to the contract are skimmed for LP fees, this means \((1/(1-\gamma))L_{t \rightarrow t+1} \Delta y_{p_t, p_{t+1}}\) units of token \(B\) must be sent to the contract to move the price. Of this, a proportional \(L'_{t \rightarrow t+1} / L_{t \rightarrow t+1}\)
quantity of $\Delta y$ is traded using the $L'_{t\rightarrow t+1}$ units of liquidity of the LP (liquidity that is active in the interval $[p_t, p_{t+1}]$), and of this a subsequent $\gamma$ is skimmed as fees. Combining, the LP earns

$$F^B_{p_t\rightarrow p_{t+1}}(\ell) = L'_{t\rightarrow t+1} \left( \frac{\gamma}{1 - \gamma} \Delta y_{p_t, p_{t+1}} \right)$$

units of token $B$ for this price movement and $F^A_{p_t\rightarrow p_{t+1}}(\ell) = 0$ units of $A$ tokens.

The analysis for a downward price movement from $p_t$ to $p_{t+1}$ with $p_{t+1} < p_t$ is almost identical. In this case, some number of units of token $A$ have to be sent to the contract by traders, to move the contract price. In particular, $\Delta x = (1/(1 - \gamma))L_{t\rightarrow t+1}\Delta x_{p_t, p_{t+1}}$ units of token $A$, of which the LP also receives a $\gamma L'_{t\rightarrow t+1}/L_{t\rightarrow t+1}$ portion. Putting everything together, the LP earns

$$F^A_{p_t\rightarrow p_{t+1}}(\ell) = L'_{t\rightarrow t+1} \left( \frac{\gamma}{1 - \gamma} \Delta x_{p_t, p_{t+1}} \right)$$

units of token $A$ for this price movement and $F^B_{p_t\rightarrow p_{t+1}}(\ell) = 0$ units of $B$ tokens.

Finally, if the price does not move, then no transaction fees are accrued. In other words, if $p_t = p_{t+1}$, then $F^A_{p_t\rightarrow p_{t+1}}(\ell) = F^B_{p_t\rightarrow p_{t+1}}(\ell) = 0$.

Note that the transaction fee earned by the LP is totally decided given $p_t, p_{t+1}$ and $L'_{t\rightarrow t+1}$, regardless of the total liquidity $L_{t\rightarrow t+1}$ that is active for this price movement. Similarly, in Uniswap v2, the transaction fee an LP earns from a single price movement is totally decided given $p_t, p_{t+1}$ and $L'$, where $L'$ is the LP’s liquidity over the entire price interval $[0, \infty)$, regardless of the total liquidity $L$ over the entire price interval. This means that 1 unit of liquidity over $[0, \infty)$ in v2 and 1 unit of liquidity over a price interval $[a, b]$ in v3 would incur the same amount of transaction fees if the same price movement $p_t$ to $p_{t+1}$ happens in v2 and v3 pools (given $p_t, p_{t+1} \in [a, b]$).

With this in hand, we can express the total transaction fees earned under liquidity distribution $\ell$ and price sequence $p = (p_0, \ldots, p_T)$. In what follows, we let $\mathbb{1}(A)$ denote the indicator function for event $A$.

**Definition 4.** Suppose that a provider has liquidity position $\ell$ over the price sequence given by $p = (p_0, \ldots, p_T)$. We let $F^A(\ell, p)$ and $F^B(\ell, p)$ denote the accrued amounts of token $A$ and token $B$ to the provider respectively as trade fees, expressed as follows:

$$F^B(\ell, p) = \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} F^B_{p_t\rightarrow p_{t+1}}(\ell) \cdot \mathbb{1}(p_{t+1} > p_t), \quad F^A(\ell, p) = \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} F^A_{p_t\rightarrow p_{t+1}}(\ell) \cdot \mathbb{1}(p_{t+1} < p_t). \quad (3.4)$$

In addition, we let $F(\ell, p)$ denote the accrued fees in terms of token $B$ value at the final price, $z_T$, which is given by:

$$F(\ell, p) = B((F^A(\ell, p), F^B(\ell, p))|p_T) = p_T F^A(\ell, p) + F^B(\ell, p). \quad (3.5)$$

Notice that $F(\ell, p)$ is linear in $\ell$ for all price sequences $p$.

### 3.2 Impermanent Loss

Suppose that an LP borrows the initial capital (a bundle of token $A$ and token $B$) to purchase $\ell_i$ units of $[a_i, b_i]$-liquidity in a v3 contract, and needs to repay this initial bundle in the future.
We assume the initial contract price is given by $P$, in which case the capital borrowed to obtain said units of $[a_i, b_i]$-liquidity is precisely the bundle $V^{(3)}(\ell_i, a_i, b_i, P) = \ell_i \cdot V^{(3)}(a_i, b_i, P)$. Suppose the contract price changes to $P' \neq P$. At this price, the capital borrowed to purchase $\ell_i$ units of $[a_i, b_i]$-liquidity has a token $B$ worth, given by $v^{(3)}_h(\ell_i, B_i, P, P') = B(\nu^{(3)}(\ell_i, a_i, b_i, P), P')$. We call this the token $B$ holding value for the $v_3$ asset. On the other hand, at price $P'$, the $\ell_i$ units of $[a_i, b_i]$-liquidity have a token $B$ worth of $v^{(3)}_p(\ell_i, B_i, P') = B(\nu^{(3)}(\ell_i, a_i, b_i, P'), P')$. We call this the token $B$ purchase value for the $v_3$ asset.

The discrepancy in these two values represents a loss suffered by the LP, as they have to repay the equivalent token $B$ value of the initial borrowed capital. This phenomenon is not unique to $v_3$ contracts. We can define similar expressions for $v_2$ contracts by letting $v^{(2)}_h(\ell, P, P') = B(\nu^{(2)}(\ell, P), P')$ be the token $B$ holding value and letting $v^{(2)}_p(\ell, P') = B(\nu^{(2)}(\ell, P'), P')$ be the token $B$ purchase value of $\ell > 0$ units of $v_2$ liquidity. With this in hand, we can formally define $v_2$ and $v_3$ impermanent loss.

**Definition 5 (Impermanent Loss).** Suppose that for a given bucket, $B_i = [a_i, b_i]$ an LP has obtained $\ell_i$ units of $[a_i, b_i]$-liquidity at initial price $P$. As the contract price shifts from $P$ to $P'$, we say the LP suffers a $v_3$ impermanent loss of $IL^{(3)}(\ell_i, B_i, P, P')$, defined as:

$$IL^{(3)}(\ell_i, B_i, P, P') = v^{(3)}_h(\ell_i, B_i, P, P') - v^{(3)}_p(\ell_i, B_i, P').$$

(3.6)

If instead, an LP has obtained $\ell > 0$ units of $v_2$ liquidity at initial price $P$. As the contract price shifts from $P$ to $P'$, we say the LP suffers a $v_2$ impermanent loss of $IL^{(2)}(\ell, P, P')$, defined as:

$$IL^{(2)}(\ell, P, P') = v^{(2)}_h(\ell, P, P') - v^{(2)}_p(\ell, P').$$

(3.7)

For a given liquidity distribution $\ell$ obtained at an initial contract price $P$, We let $IL^{(3)}(\ell, P, P')$ denote the overall impermanent loss an LP suffers from the price movement from $P$ to $P'$.

$$IL^{(3)}(\ell, P, P') = \sum_{i=-m}^{n} IL(\ell_i, B_i, P, P').$$

(3.8)

**Proposition 6.** For any choice of initial price $P$ and end price $P'$, $IL^{(3)}(\ell, P, P')$ is linear in $\ell$ and non-negative for any $\ell$. Similarly, for any choice of initial price $P$ and end price $P'$, $IL^{(2)}(\ell, P, P')$ is linear in $\ell$ and non-negative for any choice of $\ell > 0$.

### 3.3 Profit and Loss

Now we are in a position to describe the overall profit and loss of an LP with liquidity position $\ell$ as contract prices follow sequence $p = (p_0, ..., p_T)$. The LP borrows the capital required to create their position $\ell$. Upon creating this position, they accrue fees over the price sequence, and at the end of the sequence, they remove their position $\ell$ from the contract, thereby receiving an overall bundle of $A$ and $B$ tokens that is a function of the end price, which in this case is $p_T$. Finally, the LP must repay the capital used to initially create the position, hence the overall profit and loss of the LP’s position simply consists of their accrued fees minus their impermanent loss.
Definition 6 (Profit and Loss). We denote \( PnL(\ell, p) \) as the overall profit and loss of an LP with liquidity distribution \( \ell \) over price sequence \( p = (p_0, \ldots, p_T) \), i.e.,

\[
PnL(\ell, p) = F(\ell, p) - IL(\ell, p). \tag{3.9}
\]

Since \( F \) and \( IL \) are both linear in \( \ell \), so is \( PnL \) for any price sequence \( p \).

3.4 Equivalence of Capital Efficiency and Impermanent Loss

In this section, we consider the relative capital efficiency of an \([a, b]\)-position in a v3 contract over that of a position in a v2 contract. Given some price sequence, this is defined as the ratio of capital required to provide liquidity on Uniswap v2 to the capital required to provide \([a, b]\)-liquidity on v3 to earn the same amount of transaction fees. As an example, if the relative capital efficiency is 10, then putting $10 of capital into a v2 pool would earn the same fees as a v3 \([a, b]\)-position created with $1 of capital under the same price sequence. Note that \( L' \) units of v2 liquidity will earn the same fees as \( L' \) units of v3 \([a, b]\)-liquidity if the contract prices remain in the interval \([a, b]\) (see the discussion in Subsection 3.1).

Specifically, consider a price sequence \( p = (p_0, p_1, \ldots, p_T) \), where \( p_t \in [a, b] \) for all \( t = 0, 1, \ldots, T \), so that all prices are within the interval \([a, b]\). We consider the following two cases for an LP:

1. The LP provides \( L' \) units of liquidity in a v2 pool.
2. The LP provides \( L' \) units of \([a, b]\)-liquidity in a v3 pool.

For simplicity, we will assume \( L' = 1 \). There is without loss of generality, since the amount of token \( A \) and \( B \) needed to purchase a liquidity position, the transaction fee obtained by the LP, and the impermanent loss suffered by the LP are all linear in \( L' \).

3.4.1 Relative Capital Efficiency

In the v2 case, the LP obtains 1 unit of liquidity by sending the bundle \((x, y) = V^{(2)}(p_0)\) to the v2 contract at time \( t = 0 \). As for v3, the LP obtains 1 unit of \([a, b]\) liquidity by sending the bundle \((x', y') = V^{(3)}(a, b, p_0)\) to the v3 contract at time \( t = 0 \). Assuming that the LP’s capital is measured in units of token \( B \), let \( v_c^{(2)} \) be the token \( B \) worth of the initial bundle \((x, y)\) in the v2 case and \( v_c^{(3)} \) be the token \( B \) worth of the initial bundle \((x', y')\) in the v3 case. Then the initial capital used in the two cases are given by

\[
v_c^{(2)} = B(V^{(2)}(p_0), p_0), \quad v_c^{(3)} = B(V^{(3)}(a, b, p_0), p_0). \tag{3.10}
\]

For each price movement, e.g., from \( p_{t-1} \) to \( p_t \) (where both prices lie in \([a, b]\) by assumption), there is a swap in the Uniswap pool. The LP’s positions in both the v2 and v3 cases will obtain the same amount of transaction fees with each price movement, since the amount of the two tokens swapped and the amount of liquidity the LP has on the interval \([p_{t-1}, p_t]\) are the same in the two cases.

Definition 7 (Capital Efficiency). Consider the price interval \([a, b]\), and a price sequence given by \( p = (p_0, p_1, \ldots, p_T) \). Here \( p_0 \in [a, b] \) is the contract price when the LP purchases a liquidity position, whether on v2 or v3. In addition, let \( F^{(2)}(p) = (f_A, f_B) \) be the transaction fees (in token \( A \) and
token $B$) collected by 1 unit of liquidity in v2 with the price sequence $p$, and $F^{(3)}(a, b, p) = (f_A', f_B')$ be the transaction fees collected by 1 unit of liquidity on interval $[a, b]$ in v3 with the price sequence $p$. We define the capital efficiency of v2 liquidity with price sequence $p$ as the ratio of the token $B$ worth of the transaction fee collected at the final price $p_T$ and the token $B$ worth of the initial bundle at the final price $p_T$. This is given by

$$CE^{(2)}(p) = \frac{B(F^{(2)}(p), p_T)}{B(V^{(2)}(p_0), p_T)}.$$  

(3.11)

Similarly, we denote the capital efficiency of v3 $[a, b]$-liquidity by $CE^{(3)}(a, b, p)$, and its value is given by:

$$CE^{(3)}(a, b, p) = \frac{B(F^{(3)}(a, b, p), p_T)}{B(V^{(3)}(a, b, p_0), p_T)}.$$  

(3.12)

With this in hand, we define the relative capital efficiency between v2 and v3.

**Definition 8** (Relative Capital Efficiency). Consider the price interval $[a, b]$, and a price sequence $p = (p_0, p_1, \ldots, p_T)$. Here $p_0 \in [a, b]$ is the contract price when the LP purchases an liquidity position, whether on v2 or v3. We denote the relative capital efficiency of v3 $[a, b]$-liquidity against v2 liquidity by $RCE(a, b, p)$, and its value is given by:

$$RCE(a, b, p) = \frac{CE^{(3)}(a, b, p)}{CE^{(2)}(p)} = \frac{B(F^{(3)}(a, b, p), p_T) \cdot B(V^{(2)}(p_0), p_T)}{B(F^{(2)}(p), p_T) \cdot B(V^{(3)}(a, b, p_0), p_T)}.$$  

(3.13)

**Lemma 1.** In the case where the entire price sequence $p$ is within the price interval $[a, b]$ ($p_i \in [a, b]$ for $i = 0, \ldots, T$), the transaction fees collected by 1 unit of v2 liquidity and 1 unit of v3 $[a, b]$-liquidity are the same. That is, $F^{(2)}(p) = F^{(3)}(a, b, p)$. Then we have

$$RCE(a, b, p) = \frac{B(F^{(3)}(a, b, p), p_T) \cdot B(V^{(2)}(p_0), p_T)}{B(F^{(2)}(p), p_T) \cdot B(V^{(3)}(a, b, p_0), p_T)} = \frac{B(V^{(2)}(p_0), p_T)}{B(V^{(3)}(a, b, p_0), p_T)}.$$  

(3.14)

### 3.4.2 Relative Impermanent Loss

As a result of a price movement from $p_0$ to $p_T$, for $p_T \neq p_0$, an LP’s liquidity position in each of the v2 and v3 contracts suffers an impermanent loss.

**Definition 9** (Normalized Impermanent Loss). Suppose the initial price is $p_0$ and the final price is $p_T$. The impermanent loss for one unit of v2 liquidity and one unit of v3 $[a, b]$-liquidity is $IL^{(2)}(1, p_0, p_T)$ and $IL^{(3)}(\bar{\ell}, p_0, p_T)$ respectively, where $\bar{\ell}$ is the liquidity profile which represents 1 unit of liquidity on the interval $[a, b]$ and no liquidity elsewhere. The normalized impermanent loss to the initial capital, for one unit of v2 liquidity and one unit of v3 $[a, b]$-liquidity is denoted by $NIL^{(2)}(p_0, p_T)$ and $NIL^{(3)}(a, b, p_0, p_T)$ respectively, and is expressed as

$$NIL^{(2)}(p_0, p_T) = \frac{IL^{(2)}(1, p_0, p_T)}{B(V^{(2)}(p_0), p_T)} \quad NIL^{(3)}(a, b, p_0, p_T) = \frac{IL^{(3)}(\bar{\ell}, p_0, p_T)}{B(V^{(3)}(a, b, p_0), p_T)}.$$  

(3.15)
Definition 10 (Relative Impermanent Loss). The relative impermanent loss of $v3$, $[a,b]$-liquidity against $v2$ liquidity is

$$ RIL(a,b,p_0,p_T) = \frac{NIL^{(3)}(a,b,p_0,p_T)}{NIL^{(2)}(p_0,p_T)}. $$

(3.16)

Now we show that the impermanent losses in $v2$ and $v3$, $IL^{(2)}(1,p_0,p_T)$ and $IL^{(3)}(\ell,p_0,p_T)$, are the same if both the initial price $p_0$ and the final price $p_T$ are within the interval $[a,b]$. Firstly, we have

$$ \mathcal{V}^{(2)}(p_0) - \mathcal{V}^{(2)}(p_T) = \mathcal{V}^{(3)}(a,b,p_0) - \mathcal{V}^{(3)}(a,b,p_T), $$

(3.17)

since the change of the bundle associated with the LP’s liquidity position is the same for the $v2$ and $v3$ cases at every step of price movement, with the amount of tokens $A$ and $B$ swapped exactly the same across the two pools. Moreover, we have,

$$ IL^{(2)}(1,p_0,p_T) = v_h^{(2)}(1,p_0,p_T) - v_p^{(2)}(1,p_T) = B(\mathcal{V}^{(2)}(p_0) - \mathcal{V}^{(2)}(p_T)), $$

(3.18)

$$ IL^{(3)}(\ell,p_0,p_T) = v_h^{(3)}(1,[a,b],p_0,p_T) - v_p^{(3)}(1,[a,b],p_T) = B(\mathcal{V}^{(3)}(a,b,p_0) - \mathcal{V}^{(3)}(a,b,p_T)). $$

(3.19)

Therefore, it holds that

$$ IL^{(2)}(1,p_0,p_T) = IL^{(3)}(\ell,p_0,p_T). $$

(3.20)

It is further implied by Eq. (3.20) and Lemma 1 that there is an equivalence between the relative capital efficiency and the ratio of relative divergence losses. We have proved the following.

Theorem 7. If the entire price sequence $p = (p_0, \ldots, p_T)$ is within the price interval $[a,b]$, i.e., $p_i \in [a,b]$ for $i = 0, \ldots, T$, then we have

$$ RIL(a,b,p_0,p_T) = RCE(a,b,p). $$

(3.21)

Theorem 7 implies that normalized impermanent loss scales in the same way as capital efficiency in the $v2$ and $v3$ contracts. For example, if the relative capital efficiency is 100, then an LP will earn 100x more return from fees on the same investment in $v3$ compared to $v2$, but the LP’s normalized impermanent loss will also be 100x greater in $v3$. Informally, this implies that higher returns come with higher risk.

4 Optimal Liquidity Provision: The Risk Neutral Case

In the previous section, we provided expressions for an LP’s profit and loss for a specific price sequence $p = (p_0, \ldots, p_T)$ given by $PnL(\ell,p)$. Indeed if $p$ is fixed, then $PnL$ is a linear function in $\ell$, making it simple for an LP to compute liquidity positions that maximize $PnL$. In this section, we model the stochastic optimization problem facing an LP who believes that prices will evolve according to a stochastic process, and focus on the risk neutral case. In Section 5, we consider an LP who is risk averse.
4.1 LP Beliefs on Exogenous Price Movements

We assume that price changes are exogenous to the contract, i.e. dictated by external markets and independent of the liquidity held in the contract. Furthermore, we also assume that prices take on a finite set of \((r + s + 1)\) discrete values given by: \(Z = \{Z_{-r}, \ldots, Z_0, \ldots, Z_s\}\), where \(Z_0 = 1\) is the parity price between token \(A\) and token \(B\). We take \(Z_0\) to be the initial price, i.e. the contract price when the LP is deciding how to allocate funds. This is without loss of generality, as prices can be normalized by dividing by the initial price, which in turn does not change our analysis. Finally, we assume that price changes in \(Z\) evolve with respect to a stationary Markov chain, governed by a transition matrix, \(M \in \text{mat}(r + s + 1, r + s + 1)\), where \(M_{i,j}\) corresponds to the probability that the price transitions from \(Z_j\) to \(Z_i\), where \(i' = i - r - 1\) and \(j' = j - r - 1\). Such transitions occur over discrete time steps, and we let \(x_t\) denote the distribution exhibited by price indices after \(t\) transitions of \(M\) when starting at price \(Z_0\). Algebraically, this is initialized with \(x_0 = e_{r+1}\), where \(e_{r+1}\) is the \((r + 1)\)-th unit vector (corresponding to the index of the initial parity price). By the Markovian property, we have \(x_t = M^t x_0\). Given the notation used for discrete price space above, going forward we will denote price sequences over a time horizon of \(T\) time steps by \(z = (z_0, \ldots, z_T)\), where lowercase \(z_t\) denote the price at a specific time within the stochastic process, and uppercase \(Z_j\) denote a specific price exhibited within \(Z\).

In all that follows, we will assume that an LP holds stochastic beliefs over prices governed by \(Z\) and transition matrix \(M\) for a time horizon of \(T\) time steps. In such a setting, we say that \(P = (Z, M, T)\) denotes a fixed LP belief profile. We note that this framework is very general, and indeed all our analysis going forward holds for a large class of LP belief profiles. In Section 4.6 however, we provide a specific class of LP belief profiles for approximating geometric random walks (GRW), typically used to model real-world time series data such as financial markets.  

4.2 Maximizing Expected Profit and Loss: Risk Neutral LP

As in Section 3 we assume that an LP borrows the capital required to create a liquidity position over a time horizon of \(t = 1, \ldots, T\) time steps. Once the time horizon ends, the LP removes their liquidity from the contract, and uses this capital alongside accrued fees to pay the amount owed for creating the position. For a risk-neutral LP, the relevant quantity is the expected profit and loss over a distribution of price sequences generated by the belief profile \(P = (Z, M, T)\):

\[
P_{\text{PnL}}(\ell) = \mathbb{E}_z(P_{\text{PnL}}(\ell, z)),
\]

where the expectation is over price sequences \(z = (z_0, \ldots, z_T)\) generated from the belief profile \(P\). Since \(P_{\text{PnL}}(\ell, z)\) is linear for any choice of \(z\), it follows that \(P_{\text{PnL}}(\ell)\) is also linear in \(\ell\). With this in hand, we consider an LP that has an initial budget of \(W\) units of token \(B\) and wishes to create an optimal liquidity position. For each bucket \(B_i\), we let \(w_i = B(V(3)(1, a_i, b_i, Z_0), Z_0)\) denote the token \(B\) worth of 1 unit of liquidity at initial price \(Z_0\). Summing over buckets, the budget constraint

\[2\] For instance, the classical Black-Scholes formula [13] for option pricing uses GRW as an important underlying assumption.
is $\sum_i \ell_i w_i \leq W$. Given this, the optimization problem is as follows:

$$\max_{\ell} \ PnL_P(\ell)$$

s.t. $\sum_i \ell_i w_i \leq W$  \hspace{1cm} (4.2)

$\ell_i \geq 0$, for all $i$

This is a linear optimization problem and has a simple solution. First, the linearity of the objective function allows us to write $PnL_P(\ell) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i \ell_i$, where $\alpha_i$ is the expected PnL of a single unit of liquidity in bucket $B_i$. Based on this, the optimal bucket has index $i^* = \text{argmax}_i [\alpha_i/w_i]$, and the optimal PnL is given by $W\alpha_i^*/w_i^*$. This is linear in $W$ and so we can assume without loss of generality that $W = 1$. We denote the resulting optimal normalized PnL by $\text{OPT}(P, \mu)$, given by the expression:

$$\text{OPT}(P, \mu) = \max_{i \in \{-m,...,n\}} \alpha_i/w_i.$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.3)

### 4.3 Optimal Normalized PnL as a function of Bucket Characteristics

$\text{OPT}(P, \mu)$ is intricately tied to the characteristics of the buckets available in a v3 contract. In practice, the Uniswap v3 contract uses bucket endpoints $\mu = \{B_{-m},...,B_0,...,B_n\}$ that correspond to multiplicative increases and decreases of the parity price $P = 1$. The contract maintains a fixed set of price ticks $\{t(-q)...t(0)...t(q)\}$, where $t(i) = 1.001^i$ and $q = 2^{23}$. In addition, each contract has a positive integer variable called tickspacing, which we denote by $\Delta$ and dictates which of all possible tick values can be used as bucket endpoints. A tick can only be a bucket endpoint if $i \equiv 0 \mod \Delta$. This means that we can express this bucket structure by letting the $i$-th bucket, $B_i$, represent an interval $[a_i,b_i]$ such that $a_i = 1.001^{\Delta i}$ and $b_i = 1.001^{\Delta(i+1)}$.

**Proposition 8.** Suppose that $\mu(\Delta)$ is the bucket list that results from setting tickspacing to $\Delta \geq 1$. Furthermore, let $\Delta' = k\Delta$ for any integer $k > 2$. For any choice of LP belief profile $P$, we have:

$$\text{OPT}(P, \mu(\Delta')) \leq \text{OPT}(P, \mu(\Delta)).$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.4)

**Proof.** These bucket designs are nested, with $\mu(\Delta')$ a coarsened version of $\mu(\Delta)$, which means that any liquidity position over $\mu(\Delta')$ can also be represented by a position over $\mu(\Delta)$. Suppose a position over $\mu(\Delta')$ consists of allocating $\ell_i$ units of liquidity to $B_i$. It is straightforward to check that if an LP creates a position with $\ell_i$ units of liquidity in each of the $k$ buckets in $\mu(\Delta)$ that correspond to this bucket, then the overall bundle value of the position is identical to $\ell_i$ units of liquidity in $B_i$ (in a similar vein to Proposition 5). Furthermore, as per Section 3.1, doing so results in the same fees for the LP. \hfill $\Box$

### 4.4 Trader Gas Fees

Finer bucket lists allow LPs to create more complicated liquidity positions that potentially make use of more active endpoints. Furthermore, as seen in Proposition 8, this generally leads to larger
expected PnL for LPs in v3 contracts. However, said refinement also results in increased gas fees for traders, for if a desired trade is to push a contract price outside of the current active interval of the v3 contract, a new active interval must be computed, alongside the set of active and active liquidity. This computational overhead is passed on to traders as they must cover gas fees for the trade to be processed.

For each bucket, \( B_i \in \mu \), we can first compute the expected number of crossings of its left endpoint, \( a_i \), over the course of the the stochastic process dictated by LP belief profile \( P = (Z, M, T) \). We denote this quantity \( c_i(P, \mu) \). What matters for gas fees, though, is the number of active bucket endpoints that are crossed. For there to be computational overhead, there needs to be an LP with a position that uses the endpoint. To proceed, we assume that each bucket endpoint is active, in this sense. We call this the bucket coverage assumption. This is justified empirically. We find that the liquidity placed in Uniswap v3 contracts by the population of LPs almost invariably covers the spread of buckets around the market price of an asset (which in turn closely matches the contract price otherwise an arbitrage opportunity arises). In particular, for buckets close to the contract price, we find empirically that almost invariably there exists at least one LP who has a position ending in that bucket’s endpoint. We provide empirical evidence in Appendix D.

**Definition 11 (Trader Gas Cost).** Let us consider a liquidity provision instance dictated by LP belief profile \( P \) and buckets given by \( \mu \). We let \( \text{GAS}(P, \mu) \) denote the expected gas fees incurred by all traders over the time horizon \( T \). Under the bucket coverage assumption, this is given by:

\[
\text{GAS}(P, \mu) = \sum_{i=-m}^{n} c_i(P, \mu) \tag{4.5}
\]

In our definition of GAS, we have normalized the gas fees per crossing of an active endpoint to be 1. Indeed the per-crossing gas fees can fluctuate, but our expression is correct up to a calibration constant. Furthermore, we will ultimately only be interested in the relative gas cost between distinct bucketing schemes, hence linearly scaling GAS does not change our results.

### 4.5 The Uniswap V3 Contract Design Problem

We are interested in how choices for bucket design \( \mu \) impact both OPT and GAS, for fixed LP belief profiles \( P = (Z, M, T) \). Both objectives are important to a contract, for higher PnL may attract liquidity providers to reduce slippage in trades. On the other hand, increased gas costs can dissuade traders from participating in the contract, thereby reducing rewards for LPs in fees. There is a rich space of potential partitions of price space into buckets, but we typically focus on parametrized families of bucket sets, such as the following:

**Definition 12 (Exponential Bucket Scheme).** Suppose that \( \theta \geq 1 \) is a real number and \( \Delta \geq 1 \) is an integer. We let \( \mu(\theta, \Delta) \) be a bucket set over the price space \( Z = \{Z_{-r}, \ldots, Z_0, \ldots, Z_s\} \) consisting of \( m^* + n^* + 1 \) buckets, where \( m^* = \left\lceil \frac{\log_a(Z_{-r})}{\Delta} \right\rceil \) and \( n^* = \left\lfloor \frac{\log_a(Z_s)}{\Delta} \right\rfloor \). Bucket indices correspond to the set \( \{-m^*, \ldots, n^*\} \) and the i-th bucket, \( B_i \) has endpoints given by \( [a_i, b_i] \) such that \( a_i = \min(\theta^{\Delta i}, Z_{-r}) \) and \( b_i = \min(\theta^{\Delta(i+1)}, Z_s) \). We call \( \mu(\theta, \Delta) \) a \((\theta, \Delta)\)-exponential bucketing scheme.

Exponential bucket schemes are a natural extension of the existing bucketing scheme used by v3 contracts in Uniswap.
In particular, a v3 contract with \( \text{tickspacing} = \Delta \) is equivalent to a \((1.001, \Delta)\)-exponential bucketing scheme. With parametrized bucket schemes, we can conveniently express the Pareto frontier of such bucketings with respect to the objectives OPT and GAS.

**Definition 13** (The Uniswap v3 OPT-GAS Pareto Frontier). Suppose that we fix an LP optimization profile given by \( \mathcal{P} = (M, \mathcal{Z}, T) \) and a parametrized family of bucket sets \( \mu(\lambda) \). Furthermore, let \( \lambda' \neq \lambda \) be such that:

\[
\text{GAS}(\mathcal{P}, \mu(\lambda')) \leq \text{GAS}(\mathcal{P}, \mu(\lambda)), \quad \text{OPT}(\mathcal{P}, \mu(\lambda')) \geq \text{OPT}(\mathcal{P}, \mu(\lambda)),
\]

where one of the inequalities is strict. We say that bucketing scheme \( \mu(\lambda') \) Pareto dominates \( \mu(\lambda) \) for the LP optimization profile \( \mathcal{P} \). We denote this relationship over the parameter space of \( \mu \) by \( \lambda' \succ \mathcal{P} \lambda \). In addition, we let \( \text{Pareto}(\mathcal{P}, \mu) \) denote the set of all parameters, \( \lambda \) which are not Pareto dominated.

### 4.6 Computational Methods

In this section, we describe how we can compute OPT and GAS for a given LP belief profile \( \mathcal{P} \) and bucketing scheme \( \mu \). We recall that \( x_t \) denotes the distribution over price indices in \( \mathcal{Z} \) at time \( t \). In general we let \( z_t \) denote the \( t \)-th price. Without loss of generality, we overload \( x_t \) to also denote the distribution over prices in \( \mathcal{Z} \) at the \( t \)-th time step of the stochastic process governed by \( \mathcal{P} \) (there is after all a one-to-one correspondence between price indices in \( \mathcal{Z} \) and prices values in \( \mathcal{Z} \)), so that \( z_t \sim x_t \). In what follows, we will need the distribution of \( x_t \) conditional on a final price \( z_T \sim x_T \).

We can compute conditional probabilities via Bayes’ rule:

\[
\mathbb{P}(z_t = Z_i \mid z_T = Z_j) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(z_t = Z_i, z_T = Z_j)}{\mathbb{P}(z_T = Z_j)}.
\]

To compute the numerator, the transition probabilities from time \( t \) to time \( T \) are governed by the transition matrix \( M^{T-t} \), in which case we can express the conditional probability entirely in terms of \( M \) and the initial price distribution \( x_0 \), and thus

\[
\mathbb{P}(z_t = Z_i \mid z_T = Z_j) = \frac{(M^{T-t})_{j,i}}{(M x_0)_j}.
\]

**Trading Fees.** Let us fix a time-step \( t < T \), and end price \( z_T = Z_j \). We outline a per-bucket computation of expected token \( B \) worth of fees accrued in the transition from \( z_t \) to \( z_{t+1} \). We can use the distribution of \( z_t \) conditional on the end price \( z_T = Z_i \) to compute the the distribution of price transitions from time \( t \) to time \( t + 1 \), conditional on a final price \( z_T = Z_j \), as follows:

\[
\mathbb{P}(z_t = Z_i, z_{t+1} = Z_k \mid z_T = Z_j) = \mathbb{P}(z_t = Z_i \mid z_T = Z_j) \cdot M_{k,i}.
\]
liquidity they were due to. Furthermore, since we condition on $z_T = Z_j$, we also have a means of converting fees from downward price movements, which are necessarily in terms of token $A$, in terms of token $B$ as desired. With this in hand, we can compute expected token $B$ worth of fees over all time-steps, conditional on an end price $z_T = Z_j$. Finally, the distribution of $z_t$ is in fact governed by $x_T = M^T x_0$, hence we can take an expectation over $z_T$ to get the expected token $B$ worth of fees accrued per-bucket in $\mu$.

**Impermanent Loss.** We outline a method for computing the expected impermanent loss for one unit of liquidity in a given bucket $B_i \in \mu$. The random realization of impermanent loss given an initial price $z_0$ and final price $z_T$ is given by,

$$IL^{(3)}(\ell_i, B_i, z_0, z_T) = v^{(3)}_h(\ell_i, B_i, z_0, z_T) - v^{(3)}_p(\ell_i, B_i, z_T).$$

Once again, $z_T$ is distributed according to $x_T = M^T x_0$, hence we can directly compute the expected impermanent loss.

**Optimal Normalized PnL.** We can compute the token $B$ worth of 1 unit of liquidity for each bucket $B_i \in \mu$. For initial price $Z_0$, this is $w_i = B(v^{(3)}(1, a_i, b_i, Z_0), Z_0)$. Furthermore, since we have described how to compute per-bucket expected transaction fees and impermanent loss, we can compute the per-bucket PnL as the difference of these two, which we previously denoted by $\alpha_i$ for each bucket. This is all we need to compute $OPT(P, \mu) = \max_i [\alpha_i / w_i]$.

**Gas cost.** We compute endpoint traversals in a similar way to fees. We condition on an end price $z_T = Z_j$, and for each time step $t < T$, compute the distribution of potential price transitions from $t$ to $t+1$ given the end price $z_T = Z_j$. For each such jump, we count the bucket end-points traversed, and sum these counts over all time steps to get the expected traversals each bucket endpoint sees when conditioning on a final price. Finally, we compute the distribution of the final price, and the overall expected number of traversals per bucket endpoint, which is precisely $c_i(P, \mu)$, and from this we compute $GAS(P, \mu)$.

**Transition matrix and Price Dynamics.** As mentioned at the beginning of this section, we use LP belief profiles that suitably approximate Geometric Random Walks (GRW). To begin, we consider price spaces defined by three parameters $(r, s, \omega)$ and denoted by $Z(r, s, \omega)$. As before, our price space has $(r + s + 1)$ prices given by $\{Z_{-r}, \ldots, Z_0, \ldots, Z_s\}$, however the difference in this case is the fact that we assume that consecutive prices satisfy a multiplicative ratio of $\omega > 1$, i.e. $Z_{i+1}/Z_i = \omega$ for all $i \in \{-r, \ldots, s - 1\}$. Furthermore, this implies that each price is in fact given by $Z_j = \omega^j$.

As for price transitions, we assume that conditional on the price being $z_i = Z_i$ at time step $t$, the price will move to $z_{i+1} = Z_j$ where $j - i$ is distributed according to a binomial distribution, suitably truncated under the constraint that $Z_j \in Z$. More formally, we assume an integral bandwidth parameter of $W \geq 1$. Let $Y' \sim Binom(2W, p)$ such that $Y = Y' - W$ encodes the
maximal change in index from the current price $Z_i$. This means that price transitions to $Z_j$ as per the following:

$$z_{t+1} = \begin{cases} Z_{-r} & \text{if } i + Y < -r \\ Z_s & \text{if } i + Y > s \\ Z_{i+Y} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$ (4.11)

By imposing a constant price ratio of $\omega$ in $Z$ and having price indices transition according to a binomial distribution, the stochastic price process approximately follows a geometric binomial random walk (GBRW). Where the process fails to completely follow the paradigm of a GBRW is close to the boundaries of $Z$ due to truncation. Our only remaining requirement for the price ratio stochastic process to be on average stable ($E[z_{t+1} z_t] = 1$), and we can approximately ensure this by suitably choosing a value of $p \in [0, 1]$ that governs the draw $Y' \sim \text{Binom}(2W, p)$ (and subsequently, $Y = Y' - W$) above.

**Proposition 9** (Informal). Suppose that $m = \log(\omega)$. If we let $p = \frac{m + 2 - \sqrt{m^2 + 4}}{2m}$, then for large bandwidth values, it follows that $E[z_{t+1} z_t] \approx 1$. Consequently, the price ratio stochastic process is approximately on average stable.

**Proof (informal).** First of all, we make use of the fact that if $X_n \sim \text{Binom}(n, p)$, then as $n \to \infty$, $X_n \xrightarrow{d} X$, where $X \sim \mathcal{N}(np, np(1 - p))$. We recall that $Y + W \sim \text{Binom}(2W, p)$, hence it follows that we can approximate $Y$ as being distributed according to $\mathcal{N}(2Wp - W, 2Wp(1 - p))$. Let $Q = \omega^{Y' = \frac{Z_{t+1}}{Z_t}}$, which in turn can be approximated as distributed according to a Log Normal distribution with parameters $(\mu, \sigma^2) = (2Wp - W, 2Wp(1 - p))$. Under the approximation, it follows that $E[Q] = e^{m\mu + \frac{m^2\sigma^2}{2}}$. The given choice of $p$ ensures that this is in turn equal to 1.

Putting everything together, we require 5 parameters to define an LP belief profile. The parameters $(r, s, \omega)$ above give rise to the price space, $Z(r, s, \omega)$. The parameters $\omega > 1$ and $W \geq 1$ ultimately define the approximate GBRW that dictates random transitions over $Z(r, s, \omega)$. Finally, $T \geq 1$ dictates the time horizon the LP will consider for their optimization. Proposition 9 implies that our design choice mostly depends on the multiplicative ratio $\omega$, and is not dependent on the total number of price ticks: $(r + s + 1)$. It provides an elegant way to obtain a price sequence that approximates an on-average stable geometric random walk, where $\omega$ and $W$ govern the overall volatility of the price sequence, as larger values of $\omega$ imply that price index changes result in larger multiplicative price changes, and larger bandwidth values, $W$ imply that the random walk can jump to further prices in a given time step. Furthermore, these values can be computed from historical price data via a Maximum Likelihood Estimation (MLE) approach. We provide further details regarding the MLE approach in Appendix E.

### 4.7 Computational Results

In this section we explore the relationship that LP belief profiles and v3 contract bucket characteristics have with respect to an LP’s expected PnL and trader gas fees. The main tools we employ are outlined in the previous section.3 We begin by describing the empirical work we employ to inform our choice of LP belief profiles in different regimes of price volatility.

---

3Our implementations can be found at: [https://github.com/Evensgn/uniswap-modeling](https://github.com/Evensgn/uniswap-modeling)
4.7.1 Informing LP Belief Profiles Empirically

We recall from the previous section that we consider LP belief profiles that are approximate geometric binomial random walks (GBRW). As such, the parameters we require to define an LP belief profile are the following:

- $r, s \geq 1$: the number of discrete prices above and below the initial parity price respectively.
- $\omega > 1$: the multiplicative ratio between prices from $\mathbb{Z}$.
- $W$: the finite bandwidth of the GBRW
- $T$: the time horizon an LP considers during optimization.

Of these parameters, $\omega$ and $W$ directly impact the volatility of the resulting GBRW. For this reason, we fit these two parameters using historical price data via a maximum likelihood estimate which is detailed in Appendix E. More specifically, we use two token pairs to inform a “low” and “high” volatility regimes for the GBRW above. We use prices between Ethereum (ETH) and Tether (USDT) for the low volatility regime, as the latter token is a stablecoin. We use prices between Ethereum (ETH) and Bitcoin (BTC) for the high volatility regime. For ETH/USDT prices, we fit values resulting in $\omega = 1.005$ and $W = 3$, and for ETH/BTC, we fit values resulting in $\omega = 1.005$ and $W = 7$. Given this result, we let $\omega = 1.005$ in all the LP belief profiles we consider and we let $W \in \{3, 5, 7\}$ to allow us to interpolate between the low and high volatility regimes based on empirical data.

Finally, we let $r = s = 150$ so that the GBRW takes prices in the interval $[\omega^{-r}, \omega^s] \approx [0.4733, 2.1130]$, and let the time horizon be $T = 100$. These latter choices are for two reasons. On one hand, using a GBRW as a discrete approximation to potentially more fine-grained price movements runs the risk of losing information regarding smaller price oscillations, which in turn impact LP profit and loss (in terms of fees mostly), hence smaller time horizons and price spaces mitigate this risk. In addition, we consider optimal LP PnL with respect to strategies that consist of introducing liquidity at time $t = 0$ and removing it at time $t = T$. In practice we expect such simple strategies to be more prevalent at smaller time scales.

4.7.2 Effects of Fine-grained Bucketing

The first observation we can make is that irrespective of whether LPs hold high-volatility or low-volatility price beliefs, as bucket sizes decrease, their optimal PnL increases, in line with our result from Proposition 8. In Figure 3 each plot corresponds to an LP belief profile of different price volatility (with $W \in \{3, 5, 7\}$). For each of these belief profiles, we plot an LP’s optimal PnL for a $(\theta, \Delta)$-exponential bucketing scheme where $\theta$ is fixed to 1.002 and we let $\Delta \in \{1, 2, 4, 8, 32\}$. Indeed, smaller values of $\Delta$ (which correspond to finer bucket partitions) result in higher PnL as expected. In addition, our plots also show the expected PnL the LP can achieve with the same amount of capital, albeit in a v2 pool. We see that in this regard v3 pools outperform v2, but once more, this is expected as the space of potential LP positions in a v3 contract is much larger than that of a v2 contract, and in fact any v2 position can be simulated in a v3 contract. Indeed if we were to continue the graphs for larger values of $\Delta$, eventually they would meet the v2 PnL, for when $\Delta$ is large enough, a $(\theta, \Delta)$-exponential bucketing scheme results in a single bucket over the price space, which is in turn a v2 contract.
Figure 3: Figures 3a, 3b, 3c each correspond to LP belief profiles with $W = 3, 5, 7$ respectively. Each graph shows the optimal expected PnL of an LP over a $(\theta, \Delta)$-exponential bucketing scheme with fixed $\theta = 1.002$ and $\Delta = 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32$. The dotted horizontal line shows the optimal expected PnL of using the same amount of capital to provide liquidity in Uniswap v2.

In a similar vein, we also see that as buckets become more fine-grained, the expected gas cost to traders accordingly increases, as finer partitions result in more crossings of active price ticks. In Figure 4, each plot corresponds to an LP belief profile of different price volatility (with $W \in \{3, 5, 7\}$). For each of these belief profiles, we plot expected trader gas cost for a $(\theta, \Delta)$-exponential bucketing scheme where $\theta$ is fixed to 1.002 and $\Delta \in \{1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 16, 32\}$. Indeed we see that smaller $\Delta$ values (which correspond to smaller tickspacing values in existing v3 contracts) result in more expected gas fees for traders as expected.
Figure 4: Figures 4a, 4b, 4c each correspond to LP belief profiles with $W = 3, 5, 7$ respectively. Each graph shows expected gas cost to traders over a $(\theta, \Delta)$-exponential bucketing scheme with fixed $\theta = 1.002$ and $\Delta = 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32$.

4.7.3 The Pareto Frontier

In Figure 3, we simultaneously plot the performance of multiple $(\theta, \Delta)$-exponential bucketing schemes in different price volatility regimes. More specifically, each plot corresponds to LP belief profiles with $W \in \{3, 5, 7\}$. For a given plot corresponding to a fixed value of $W$, each point in the plot represents the the performance of a given $(\theta, \Delta)$-exponential bucketing scheme. More specifically, each $(\theta, \Delta)$ value is plotted at coordinates given by $(\text{OPT}(P, \mu(\theta, \Delta)), \text{GAS}(P, \mu(\theta, \Delta)))$. In each plot, points of the same color have the same $\theta$ value in the bucketing scheme but different $\Delta$ values from the set $\{1, \ldots, 10\}$. Figure 5 is identical, except that it highlights which parameter values amongst those explored lie on the Pareto Frontier of exponential bucketing schemes for a given LP belief profile. The most salient observation from these results is the fact that multiple parameter settings for $(\theta, \Delta)$-exponential bucketing schemes lie on the Pareto frontier, and this is irrespective of the price volatility regime. This tells us that a concrete design improvement for Uniswap v3
contracts lies in allowing more expressive bucketing schemes than the status quo, which as we’ve seen before is equivalent to $(\theta, \Delta)$-exponential bucketing schemes with $\theta = 1.001$. Indeed it could be the case that agents interacting with a contract (both LPs and traders) wish to strike different tradeoffs along the Pareto curve exemplified in Figure 5 and to do so, richer partitions of price space for buckets are needed.

![Exponential Bucketing Performance, Risk-neutral LP, W = 3](a)

![Exponential Bucketing Performance, Risk-neutral LP, W = 5](b)

![Exponential Bucketing Performance, Risk-neutral LP, W = 7](c)

Figure 5: Figures 5a, 5b, 5c each correspond to LP belief profiles with $W = 3, 5, 7$ respectively. Each plots GAS and OPT for different values of $\theta$ and $\Delta$ for the given volatility regime. Each point represents a $(\theta, \Delta)$-exponential bucketing scheme. Points of the same color have the same $\theta$ value in the bucketing scheme but different $\Delta$ values from the set $\{1, \ldots, 10\}$. The $x$ and $y$ value of the point corresponding to a $(\theta, \Delta)$-exponential bucketing scheme corresponds to the corresponding trader gas cost and optimal PnL for an LP under the given LP belief profile.
Figure 6: Figures 6a, 6b, 6c each correspond to LP belief profiles with $W = 3, 5, 7$ respectively. Each plot is identical to that of Figure 5 however points marked red are those that lie on the Pareto frontier of $(\theta, \Delta)$-exponential bucketing schemes with respect to the given LP belief profile.

5 Optimal Liquidity Provision: The Risk Averse Case

From Section 4 we know that risk neutral LPs optimize for PnL by completely allocating their liquidity to the single bucket with the highest normalized PnL. Though this maximizes expected PnL, such a position is inherently very risky, for if over the time horizon $T$, the price ever falls outside of the optimal bucket, not only does the LP miss out on fees, but if the price greatly deviates from the bucket, they also suffer a large impermanent loss. Indeed, empirical evidence shows that LPs tend to use liquidity positions that make use of multiple buckets, spreading their liquidity over a large range of prices.

For these reasons, we introduce the notion of risk-aversion and use the exponential (constant absolute risk aversion) utility function [8, 16]. The exponential utility captures comprehensive sources of risks by modeling higher moments of PnL.
Definition 14. Let $u_a(x)$ denote the exponential utility function, i.e.,

$$u_a(x) = \begin{cases} 
(1 - e^{-ax})/a & a \neq 0 \\
x & a = 0,
\end{cases} \quad (5.1)$$

If $a < 0$ the LP is risk-seeking, if $a > 0$ the provider is risk-averse, and if $a = 0$ the LP is risk-neutral.

We can now express the utility of an LP obtains for a given price sequence as follows.

Definition 15 (Risk-averse PnL). Suppose that an LP has a liquidity position given by $\ell$ over a bucket instance $\mu$. For a given price sequence, $z = (z_0, \ldots, z_T)$, we denote the risk-averse profit and loss of the LP by $\text{PnL}^a(\ell, z)$ for risk-profile $a > 0$, given by:

$$\text{PnL}^a(\ell, z) = u_a(\text{PnL}(\ell, z)). \quad (5.2)$$

If $z$ is in addition generated according to an LP belief profile given by $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{M}, T)$, then we let $\text{PnL}^a_\mathcal{P}$ denote the expected risk-averse profit and loss of the LP at risk-profile $a > 0$:

$$\text{PnL}^a_\mathcal{P}(\ell) = E_z(\text{PnL}^a(\ell, z)) \quad (5.3)$$

Lemma 2. $\text{PnL}^a_\mathcal{P}(\ell)$ is concave in $\ell$ for any choice of $a$ and $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{M}, T)$.

Proof. It is clear that $u_a(x)$ is smooth and concave for any choice of $a$, as $e^{-ax}$ within the expression is convex. We have previously seen that $\text{PnL}(\ell, z)$ is linear in $\ell$ for any choice of $z$, hence $\text{PnL}^a(\ell, z)$ is itself concave in $\ell$ for any choice of $z$. Finally, concavity is preserved over the expectation in the definition, hence the claim holds. \qed

With the above in hand, we can define a corresponding optimization problem for a risk-averse LP seeking to optimally create a liquidity position, subject to budget-constraints:

$$\min_{\ell} \quad - \text{PnL}^a_\mathcal{P}(\ell)$$

s.t. $\sum_i \ell_i w_i \leq W \quad (5.4)$

$$\ell_i \geq 0, \quad \text{for all } i$$

As before, we focus on the scenario where $W = 1$, and in such a setting, we let $\text{OPT}_a(\mathcal{P}, \mu)$ denote the value of the optimal solution, and we let $\ell^*$ denote this liquidity position. Notice that as a consequence of Lemma 2 the optimization problem is convex, and we can efficiently solve for $\text{OPT}_a(\mathcal{P}, \mu)$. As in the risk-neutral setting, we will focus on understanding the tradeoffs in the design of the bucketing scheme in a Uniswap v3 contract between LP utility and trader gas cost. The modeling and computation of $\text{GAS}(\mathcal{P}, \mu)$ does not change when introducing risk-averse LPs (as this pertains to bucket crossings with respect to the underlying price distribution).
5.1 Computational Methods

The main difficulty in solving the optimization problem corresponding to Equation 5.4 lies in the fact that the objective function is an expectation over a large set of price paths that can arise from \( M \) over the given time horizon. In this regard, we approximate \( PnL^a(\ell) \) as the average \( PnL \) over a sample of price paths from the stochastic process governing price movements.

More specifically, we begin by taking \( k \) i.i.d. sample price paths, \( p_1, \ldots, p_k \), by using the transition matrix \( M \) over the price space \( Z \) with starting price \( Z_0 \). With this in hand, we define the following objective function

\[
PnL^a(\ell | p_1, \ldots, p_k) = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} PnL^a(\ell, p_i) \tag{5.5}
\]

Notice that if we take expectations over the random realization of the price sequences, we get:

\[
E_{p_1, \ldots, p_k}(PnL^a(\ell | p_1, \ldots, p_k)) = PnL^a(\ell) \tag{5.6}
\]

We can define a corresponding optimization problem for a risk-averse LP seeking to approximately optimally create a liquidity position, subject to budget-constraints:

\[
\begin{align*}
\min_{\ell} & \quad -PnL^a(\ell | p_1, \ldots, p_k) \\
\text{s.t.} & \quad \sum_i \ell_i w_i \leq W \\
& \quad \ell_i \geq 0, \text{ for all } i
\end{align*} \tag{5.7}
\]

This is a convex optimization problem, and we can evaluate gradients for the objective function via standard methods. As before, we focus on the case where \( W = 1 \), and use projected gradient descent to solve Equation 5.7.

5.2 Computational Results

In this section we explore the added impact risk-aversion has multiple aspects of optimal liquidity provision in v3 contracts.

5.2.1 Empirically Fitting Price Beliefs

The same empirical analysis we used to model LP belief profiles in Section 4.7.1 holds in the risk-averse setting. This means that we model price as a GBRW with empirically-informed parameters given by: \( r, s = 15, \omega = 1.005, W \in \{3, 5, 7\} \) (corresponding to different price volatility regimes), and \( T = 100 \). Finally, in each setting, we use \( k = 1000 \) randomly sampled price paths from the LP belief profile to solve the optimization from Section 5.1.
5.2.2 Pareto Frontier

In Figure 7, we simultaneously plot the performance of multiple $(\theta, \Delta)$-exponential bucketing schemes in different price volatility regimes and for different values of LP risk-aversion. More specifically, plots 7a and 7b result from LP belief profiles with $W = 3$, the difference being that the former plot corresponds to a risk-neutral LP and the latter to an LP with risk-aversion parameter given by $a = 1$. Similarly, 7a and 7b result from LP belief profiles with $W = 5$, the difference once more being that the former plot corresponds to a risk-neutral LP and the latter to an LP with risk-aversion parameter given by $a = 1$. As in the plots from Section 4.7.3, each $(\theta, \Delta)$ value is plotted at coordinates given by $(\text{OPT}_a(P, \mu(\theta, \Delta)), \text{GAS}_a(P, \mu(\theta, \Delta)))$. In each plot, points of the same color have the same $\theta$ value in the bucketing scheme but different $\Delta$ values from the set $\{1, \ldots, 10\}$. Figure 8 is identical, except that it highlights which parameter values amongst those explored lie on the Pareto frontier of exponential bucketing schemes for a given LP belief profile. As in Section 4.7.3, the most salient feature of the plots is the fact that multiple parameter settings for $(\theta, \Delta)$-exponential bucketing schemes lie on the Pareto frontier, and this is irrespective of the price volatility regime and level of LP risk-aversion. Once more, this lends credence to the fact that a concrete design improvement for v3 contracts lies in allowing more expressive bucketing regimes, such as those inherent in $(\theta, \Delta)$-exponential bucketing schemes, which are a generalization of the current design paradigm for v3 contracts. Indeed, it could be the case that agents within a contract (traders and LPS of different levels of risk-aversion) wish to strike different tradeoffs along the Pareto curves exemplified in Figure 8, and to do so richer partitions of price space for buckets are needed.

5.2.3 Effects of Risk-aversion

In this section, we see how risk-aversion affects an LP’s expected profit and loss, the standard deviation of said profit and loss, and the space of optimal liquidity allocations they provide given their belief profiles.

PnL and Standard Deviation in Earnings as Function of $a$. In Figure 9, we plot the expected PnL of an LP as a function of their risk-aversion. All plots in the Figure correspond to a $(\theta, \Delta)$-exponential bucketing scheme given by $\theta = 1.002$ and $\Delta = 1$, and each specific plot corresponds to a different price volatility regime ($W \in \{3, 5, 7\}$). For each plot, we vary an LP’s risk aversion parameter to take values $a \in \left\{ \frac{1}{10} i \right\}_{i=1}^{10}$ along the $x$-axis and map expected PnL on the $y$-axis. Figure 10 is almost identical in nature, the only difference being that we map the standard deviation of an LP’s PnL on the $y$-axis. As the figures show, increased risk-aversion has the intended effect on LP rewards: as their risk-aversion increases, they decrease the variance in their earnings at the cost of lower overall expected PnL. Most notable is the fact that these results are robust to the price volatility regime.
Figure 7: Figures 7a and 7b result from LP belief profiles with $W = 3$, the difference being that the former plot corresponds to a risk-neutral LP and the latter to an LP with risk-aversion parameter given by $a = 1$. Similarly Figures 7c and 7d result from LP belief profiles with $W = 7$, the difference once more being that the former plot corresponds to a risk-neutral LP and the latter to an LP with risk-aversion parameter given by $a = 1$. Each plots GAS and OPT for different values of $\theta$ and $\Delta$ for the given volatility regime. Each point represents a $(\theta, \Delta)$-exponential bucketing scheme. Points of the same color have the same $\theta$ value in the bucketing scheme but different $\Delta$ values from the set $\{1, \ldots, 10\}$. The $x$ and $y$ value of the point corresponding to a $(\theta, \Delta)$-exponential bucketing scheme corresponds to the corresponding trader gas cost and optimal PnL for an LP under the given LP belief profile.
Figure 8: Figures 8a and 8b result from LP belief profiles with \( W = 3 \), the difference being that the former plot corresponds to a risk-neutral LP and the latter to an LP with risk-aversion parameter given by \( a = 1 \). Similarly Figures 8c and 8d result from LP belief profiles with \( W = 7 \), the difference once more being that the former plot corresponds to a risk-neutral LP and the latter to an LP with risk-aversion parameter given by \( a = 1 \). Each plot is identical to that of Figure 7, however points marked red are those that lie on the Pareto frontier of \((\theta, \Delta)\)-exponential bucketing schemes with respect to the given LP belief profile.
Figure 9: Figures 9a, 9b, 9c each correspond to LP belief profiles with $W = 3, 5, 7$ respectively. Each graph shows expected PnL of an LP’s optimal liquidity allocation as their risk-aversion parameter is varied to take values in $\{\frac{i}{10}\}_{i=1}^{10}$. For each of these plots, we use the fixed $(\theta, \Delta)$-exponential bucketing scheme given by $\theta = 1.002$ and $\Delta = 1$. 
Figure 10: Figures 10a, 10b, 10c each correspond to LP belief profiles with $W = 3, 5, 7$ respectively. Each graph shows the standard deviation of PnL in an LP’s optimal liquidity allocation as their risk-aversion parameter is varied to take values in $\left\{ \frac{i}{10} \right\}_{i=1}^{10}$. For each of these plots, we use the fixed $(\theta, \Delta)$-exponential bucketing scheme given by $\theta = 1.002$ and $\Delta = 1$.

**Optimal Liquidity Allocations.** In Figure 11 we visualize an LP’s optimal liquidity allocation as we vary their risk-aversion parameter $a$ in different price volatility regimes. Figure 11a corresponds to the low volatility regime, $W = 3$ and Figure 11b corresponds to the high volatility regime $W = 7$. Within each plot, each bar chart represents the optimal liquidity allocation returned by projected gradient descent in a $(\theta, \Delta)$-exponential bucketing scheme with $\theta = 1.002$ and $\Delta = 1$ as risk-aversion is varied to take values in the set $\left\{ \frac{i}{10} \right\}_{i=0}^{11}$. Each bar represents the proportional amount of an LP’s initial capital that is allocated to a given bucket in the optimal liquidity allocation. The main take-away from the plots is the fact that as an agents risk-aversion increases, their optimal liquidity allocation becomes more dispersed across multiple buckets. This makes intuitive sense, for we’ve seen that in the risk-neutral setting, optimal allocations must necessarily correspond to placing all capital in a single optimal bucket, but this comes with large risks, for if a price leave the bucket, fees are no longer accrued. In addition, we see that in a larger price volatility...
regime, an LP with the same level of risk-aversion spreads their liquidity across a wider range of buckets. Once more, this is not surprising, as doing so is necessary to decrease variance in earnings in a higher volatility price regime.

Figure 11: Figure 11a corresponds to the low volatility regime, $W = 3$ and Figure 11b corresponds to the high volatility regime $W = 7$. Within each plot, each bar chart represents the optimal liquidity allocation returned by projected gradient descent in a $(\theta, \Delta)$-exponential bucketing scheme with $\theta = 1.002$ and $\Delta = 1$ as risk-aversion is varied to take values in the set $\{10^i\}_{i=0}^{11}$. Each bar represents the proportional amount of an LP’s initial capital that is allocated to a given bucket in the optimal liquidity allocation.

6 Conclusion and Future Work

In this paper, we provide a detailed decision-theoretic framework for the tradeoffs LPs are faced with regards to how to optimally allocate liquidity in Uniswap v3 contracts. We do so by providing explicit expressions for LP profit and loss that incorporate profits from fees accrued from traders as well as potential impermanent loss from deviations in contract price. On a theoretical level, this allows us to relate the capital efficiency to the relative impermanent loss between v2 and v3 contracts, providing further evidence for the fact that the richer liquidity provision space in v3 contracts has the potential to provide higher LP returns at a higher risk given more concentrated positions. Finally, and most importantly, we explore optimal liquidity provision strategies when LPs are endowed with stochastic beliefs over how prices will evolve over a finite time horizon as well as potential aversion to risk in earnings. In this setting, we provide algorithms for computing optimal expected PnL (in both the risk-neutral and risk-averse setting), as well as a measure of the Gas fees incurred by traders for a given bucketing scheme in a v3 contract. We apply these techniques to study optimal LP profit and loss for empirically-informed belief profiles of differing
price volatility. At a high level, we see that LP PnL is maximized for smaller bucket sizes, but this comes at the cost of higher gas fees for traders. At the same time, if we treat the choice of how to partition prices into buckets as a multi-objective optimization problem where we aim to simultaneously optimize for LP PnL and trader Gas Cost, we see that a rich space of bucketing schemes maximally exemplify tradeoffs between these two objectives, strongly indicating that v3 contracts should permit users the flexibility in having richer bucketing schemes beyond that which is currently available. Finally, we explore how risk-aversion can affect LP behavior, and we see that our evidence for providing richer bucketing schemes persists, and in addition we see optimal LP behavior which involves spreading liquidity over more buckets.

This paper contributes to a growing body of work on differential liquidity provision available to LPs in Uniswap v3 contracts. We hope that our models can serve as initial progress towards answering relevant questions surrounding strategic LP behavior in v3 contracts. Indeed, our work leaves open many interesting directions to pursue. One such natural direction is that of making our analysis game-theoretic rather than decision-theoretic, as is the case in this work where each LP separately optimizes for PnL given their belief profile. At first sight, it seems surprising that an LP can optimize for their PnL independent of what actions other LPs take, but the reason we can do so in our model fundamentally lies in our exogenous price assumption and the derivations that ensue in Section 3.1. As such, a natural next step is to relax this assumption. One way to do so is to consider model price changes via specific trade dynamics which incorporate trade volume. For example, if a bucket happened to have an inordinate amount of liquidity, then moving the price through that bucket would require a larger volume of trading to do so, thereby affecting price movements (at least in the short term). In this scenario, the fact that LP liquidity allocations affect price movements make their actions interdependent, and thus require a game-theoretic analysis.

Another means by which LP liquidity allocations can influence price dynamics is by indirectly signaling their own beliefs about how prices may evolve over time. Indeed our work is an initial step in this direction, for we can interpret the optimal liquidity allocation provided (for the simple liquidity strategies we consider) as an on-chain signal of an LP’s belief profile. In fact a broader and fundamental question in this regard is how to interpret the liquidity profile of all LPs who have locked assets into a given v3 contract, and whether such information which is openly available on chain can signal collective price beliefs of LPs which interact with a contract.

Finally, as we’ve mentioned multiple times in the paper, our work focuses on a family of relatively simple and short-term liquidity allocation strategies whereby an LP allocates liquidity for fixed amount of time and then removes their liquidity and collects their fees for potential profit and loss. A direct follow-up to this work could involve studying more complicated liquidity provision strategies, especially those which involve LPs actively re-allocating liquidity as prices evolve over time. Indeed this thread of work has been explored in [15], but a novel direction would involve incorporating our expressions for impermanent loss, as well as further linking the potential gas fees LPs would pay to reallocate liquidity to our notion of gas cost incurred by traders over more exotic bucketing regimes.
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A Omitted Proofs from Section 2

Proposition 2. Suppose that \((x, y) \in \mathcal{V}(2)(L)\), with \(P = y/x\). In addition, let us suppose that \((x', y') \in \mathcal{V}(2)(L')\) such that \(P' = y'/x' = P\). Then \((x + x', y + y') \in \mathcal{V}(2)(L + L')\), and in addition, \((y + y')/(x + x') = P\). If \(L' < L\), then \((x - x', y - y') \in \mathcal{R}(2)(L - L')\) and \((y - y')/(x - x') = P\).

Proof. We work with the product \((x + x')(y + y') = xy + x'y + x'y + xy'\). The first two terms are equal to \(L^2\) and \((L')^2\) respectively, since \((x, y) \in \mathcal{V}(2)(L)\) and \((y, x') \in \mathcal{V}(2)(L')\). We have \(L = \sqrt{xy}\) and \(L' = \sqrt{x'y'}\), and \(LL' = \sqrt{xyx'y'}\). However, we can invoke the fact that \(P = P'\), to get \(x'y = xy'\), and thus \(LL' = (x'y)^2 = x'y = xy'\). Putting everything together, we have:

\[
(x + x')(y + y') = L^2 + 2LL' + (L')^2 = (L + L')^2,
\]

and \((x + x', y + y') \in \mathcal{R}(2)(L + L')\), as desired. As for \((y + y')/(x + x') = P\), we have \(y = Px\) and \(y' = Px'\), and thus \((y + y')/(x + x') = P(x + x')/(x + x') = P\). The case where we remove \((x', y')\) from the bundle \((x, y)\) is identical.

Proposition 3. The value of Uniswap v3 liquidity is the value of Uniswap v2 liquidity, in the limit of an \([a, b]\)-interval that approaches the entire price interval,

\[
\lim_{a \to 0, b \to \infty} \mathcal{V}^{(3)}(a, b, P) = \mathcal{V}^{(2)}(P).
\]

Proof. Since we take the limit as \(a \to 0\) and \(b \to \infty\), we can suppose that \(a < P < b\), in which case \(\mathcal{V}^{(3)}(a, b, P) = (\Delta_{a, P}^x, \Delta_{a, P}^y)\). We have \(\lim_{b \to \infty} \Delta_{b, P}^x = \lim_{b \to \infty} [1/\sqrt{P} - 1/\sqrt{b}] = 1/\sqrt{P}\), and \(\lim_{a \to 0} \Delta_{a, P}^x = \lim_{a \to 0} [\sqrt{P} - \sqrt{a}] = \sqrt{P}\). Altogether, we have \(\lim_{a \to 0, b \to \infty} \mathcal{V}^{(3)}(a, b, P) = [1/\sqrt{P}, \sqrt{P}] = \mathcal{V}^{(2)}(P)\).

Proposition 4. Suppose that \((x, y) \in \mathcal{R}(3)(L, a, b)\). It follows that \(\phi_{a, b}(x, y) \in \mathcal{V}(2)(L)\) and if we let \(P = \phi_{a, b}^B(y)/\phi_{a, b}^A(x)\), then \(P \in [a, b]\) and \((x, y) = \mathcal{V}^{(3)}(L, a, b, P)\).

Proof. The correspondence to the v2 revenue curve follows directly from Definition 3. For the rest of the proof, we notice that for \((w, z) \in \mathcal{R}(2)(L)\), we can use the fact that \(wz = L^2\), to express the price \(P = z/w\) in terms of \(w\) or \(z\) only: \(P = L^2/w^2 = z^2/L^2\). We have \(\phi_{a, b}(x, y) \in \mathcal{R}(2)(L)\), and as a point on the v2 reserve curve, it has an associated price \(P = \phi_{a, b}^B(y)/\phi_{a, b}^A(x)\), which we now know is equivalent to \(L^2/\phi_{a, b}^A(x)^2\). Thus, when we treat \(P\) as a function of \(x\), we see that it is a decreasing, injective function. Furthermore, it is easy to check that at extremal bundles on the v3 reserve curve, i.e., \((\Delta_{a, b}^x, 0), (0, L\Delta_{a, b}^y) \in \mathcal{V}^{(3)}(L, a, b)\), we get \(P\) values of \(a\) and \(b\) respectively. It thus follows that for all \((x, y) \in \mathcal{V}^{(3)}(L, a, b)\), \(P = \phi_{a, b}^B(y)/\phi_{a, b}^A(x) \in [a, b]\). This, along with Definition 2, gives \(\mathcal{V}^{(3)}(L, a, b, P) = (L\Delta_{b, P}^x, L\Delta_{a, P}^y)\). Let us focus on the first term in the bundle: \(L\Delta_{b, P}^x = L/\sqrt{P} - L/\sqrt{b}\). From before, we know that \(P = L^2/\phi_{a, b}^A(x)^2\), hence \(\sqrt{P} = L/\phi_{a, b}^A(x)\). It follows that \(L\Delta_{b, P}^x = \phi_{a, b}^A(x) - L/\sqrt{b} = x\) as desired. The same argument holds for \(L\Delta_{a, b}^y\), albeit using substitution \(P = \phi_{a, b}^B(y)^2/L^2\).

Proposition 5. Consider an arbitrary closed interval \([a, b]\) and a value \(c \in (a, b)\). Let \(P\) be an arbitrary contract price, then

\[
\mathcal{V}^{(3)}(L, a, c, P) + \mathcal{V}^{(3)}(L, c, b, P) = \mathcal{V}^{(3)}(L, a, b, P).
\]
Proof. We recall that $V^{(3)}$ is linear in $L$, hence it suffices to prove the statement for $L = 1$. We begin by considering the scenario where $a < P < c < b$, in which case $V^{(3)}(a, c, P) = (\Delta_x^{c, P}, \Delta_y^{a, P})$ and $V^{(3)}(c, b, P) = (\Delta_x^{b, P}, \Delta_y^{a, P})$.

\[ V^{(3)}(a, c, P) + V^{(3)}(c, b, P) = (\Delta_x^{c, P}, \Delta_y^{a, P}) + (\Delta_x^{b, P}, \Delta_y^{a, P}) = (\Delta_x^{b, P} + \Delta_x^{c, P}, \Delta_y^{a, P}) = (\Delta_x^{c, a}, \Delta_y^{a, P}) = V^{(3)}(a, b, P) \] (A.2)

The scenario where $a < c < P < b$ is almost identical to that above, hence we continue to the case where $P < a < c < b$:

\[ V^{(3)}(a, c, P) + V^{(3)}(c, b, P) = (\Delta_x^{c, P}, \Delta_y^{a, P}) + (\Delta_x^{b, c}, \Delta_y^{a, P}) = (\Delta_x^{b, c} + \Delta_x^{c, a}, \Delta_y^{a, P}) = (\Delta_x^{b, c}, \Delta_y^{a, P}) = V^{(3)}(a, b, P) \] (A.3)

The final case where $a < c < b < P$ is almost identical.

\[ \square \]

B Omitted Proofs from Section 3

Proposition 6. For any choice of initial price $P$ and end price $P'$, $IL^{(3)}(\ell, P, P')$ is linear in $\ell$ and non-negative for any $\ell$. Similarly, for any choice of initial price $P$ and end price $P'$, $IL^{(2)}(\ell, P, P')$ is linear in $\ell$ and non-negative for any choice of $\ell > 0$.

Proof. For the entirety of this proof we focus on the claims for $v^3$ impermanent loss. The results for $v^2$ hold for the same reason that they hold for $v^3$ in the special case when the beginning and end price $P, P'$ lie in the bucket for which liquidity has been obtained.

Since $IL^{(3)}(\ell, P, P')$ is a linear combination of $IL^{(3)}(\ell_i, B_i, P, P')$ terms, it suffices to show that $IL(\ell_i, B_i, P, P')$ is linear in $\ell_i$. We recall that in Section 2.2, we showed that $\nu^3(L, a, b, P) = L \cdot \nu^3(a, b, P)$ Furthermore, we also recall we defined $B((x, y), P) = Px + y$ as the token $B$ worth of a bundle $(x, y)$ when token A has price $P$. Combining these two facts, it is clear that

\[ IL^{(3)}(\ell_i, B_i, P, P') = \ell_i(\nu^3_h(1, B_i, P, P') - \nu^3_p(1, B_i, P')) = \ell_i \cdot IL(1, B_i, P, P'), \] (B.1)

which establishes our desired linearity.

As for non-negativity, we will show that $IL^{(3)}(\ell, P, P') = \sum_{i=m}^{n} IL^{(3)}(\ell_i, B_i, P, P') \geq 0$ by showing that it is always the case that $IL^{(3)}(\ell_i, B_i, P, P') \geq 0$. We can expand the left hand side of the inequality to see that this boils down to showing that $\nu^3_h(\ell_i, B_i, P, P') \geq \nu^3_p(\ell_i, B_i, P')$, which given the linearity of each of these terms in $\ell_i$, is further equivalent to showing that
\( v_h^{(3)}(1, B_i, P, P') \geq v_p^{(3)}(1, B_i, P') \). We prove this statement by showing that the function \( v_p^{(3)}(1, B_i, P') \) is in fact differentiable and concave in \( P' \), and that \( v_h^{(3)}(1, B_i, P, P') \) is in fact the tangent to \( v_p^{(3)}(1, B_i, P') \) at \( P' = P \), hence the inequality holds. We can expand the expression for \( v_p^{(3)}(1, B_i, P') \) as follows:

\[
v_p^{(3)}(1, B_i, P') = \begin{cases} 
  P' \cdot \Delta^x_{b_i,a_i} & \text{if } P' < a_i \\
  \Delta^y_{a_i,b_i} & \text{if } P' > b_i \\
  P' \cdot \Delta^x_{b_i,P'} + \Delta^y_{a_i,P'} & \text{if } P' \in [a_i, b_i].
\end{cases}
\] (B.2)

We begin by considering the third case of the piece-wise definition above. I.e. \( P' \in [a_i, b_i] \), which in turn gives \( v_p^{(3)}(1, B_i, P') = P' \cdot \Delta^x_{b_i,P'} + \Delta^y_{a_i,P'} \). If we simplify the expression, we obtain:

\[
v_p^{(3)}(B_i, P') = P' \cdot \Delta^x_{b_i,P'} + \Delta^y_{a_i,P'}
= P' \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{P'}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{b_i}} \right) + (\sqrt{P'} - \sqrt{a_i})
= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{b_i}} P' + 2\sqrt{P'} - \sqrt{a_i}
\] (B.3)

From this, we obtain the first and second derivatives of the expression:

\[
\frac{d}{dP'} v_p^{(3)}(B_i, P') = \frac{1}{\sqrt{P'}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{b_i}} = \Delta^x_{b_i,P'}, \quad \frac{d^2}{dP'^2} v_p^{(3)}(B_i, P') = -\frac{1}{2P'^{3/2}}.
\] (B.4)

From this, we have that \( v_p^{(3)}(B_i, P') \) is differentiable for all \( P' \), as derivatives match over the piece-wise definition of the function, furthermore, the only non-linear component (when \( P' \in [a_i, b_i] \)) is smooth and concave from the negative second derivative above.

Finally, we expand the expression for \( v_h^{(3)}(1, B_i, P, P') \):

\[
v_h^{(3)}(1, B_i, P, P') = \begin{cases} 
  P' \cdot \Delta^x_{b_i,a_i} & \text{if } P < a_i \\
  \Delta^y_{a_i,b_i} & \text{if } P > b_i \\
  P' \cdot \Delta^x_{b_i,P} + \Delta^y_{a_i,P} & \text{if } P \in [a_i, b_i].
\end{cases}
\] (B.5)

This is linear in \( P' \) and that \( v_h^{(3)}(1, B_i, P, P') = v_p^{(3)}(1, B_i, P) \). To show that this is tangent to \( v_p^{(3)}(1, B_i, P') \) at \( P' = P \), it suffices to consider where the initial price \( P \) lies relative to \( a_i \geq b_i \). In all cases though, from the above we see that the gradient of \( v_h^{(3)}(1, B_i, P, P') \) as a function of \( P' \) matches up with the gradient of \( v_p^{(3)}(1, B_i, P') \) at \( P' = P \), hence \( v_h^{(3)}(1, B_i, P, P') \) is indeed tangent at \( P' = P \) as desired.

C Example Uniswap Dynamics

C.1 Example v2 Dynamics

In all that follows, we suppose that a Uniswap v2 contract has been set up to trade between token \( A \) and token \( B \). In addition, we assume that the trade fee rate is given by \( \gamma = 0.5 \).
**Initial Liquidity**  Let us suppose that a first LP, denoted by $LP_1$, provides a token bundle given by $(x, y) = (10, 10)$ to initialize the contract's bundle state, which must necessarily also be $(10, 10)$. The corresponding liquidity-price state of this contract is thus given by $(10, 1)$ and we denote the liquidity units owned by this LP with $L_1 = 10$.

**Moving Price from $P = 1$ to $P = \frac{1}{4}$**  Let us suppose a trader sends $\Delta x = 20$ units of token $A$ to the contract. Of this, $\gamma \Delta x = 10$ is skimmed for liquidity providers, and since $LP_1$ is the only provider, they receive the entirety of this amount. The remaining $(1 - \gamma) \Delta x = 10$ is used to trade with the contract. The token bundle state of the contract changes to $(20, 5)$, with a corresponding liquidity-price state of $(10, 1\frac{1}{4})$. This implies that the trader receives $-\Delta y = 10 - 5 = 5$ units of $B$ tokens in return for the $\Delta x = 20$ units of $A$ tokens they sent.

**$LP_2$ enters the contract**  Now let us suppose a new liquidity provider, $LP_2$ wishes to provide $L_2 = 40$ units of liquidity given the current contract price $P = \frac{1}{4}$. To do so, they must send a token bundle consisting of $V(2)(L_2, P) = (80, 20)$ to the contract. Upon doing so, the contract's token-bundle state becomes $(100, 25)$ and the liquidity-price state becomes $(50, 1\frac{1}{4}) = (L_1 + L_2, P)$.

**Moving Price from $P = \frac{1}{4}$ to $P = 25$**  Suppose a trader sends $\Delta y = 400$ units of $B$ tokens to the contract. Of this $\gamma \Delta y = 200$ are skimmed for liquidity providers. $LP_1$ receives $\frac{L_1}{L_1 + L_2} 200 = 40$ $B$ tokens and $LP_2$ receives the remaining $160$ $B$ tokens. The remaining $(1 - \gamma) \Delta y = 100$ $B$ tokens are used to move the token-bundle state of the contract along the reserve curve $R(2)(50)$. The token-bundle state of the contract changes to $(10, 250)$, with a corresponding liquidity-price state of $(50, 1\frac{1}{4})$. This implies that the trader receives $-\Delta x = 50 - 10 = 40$ $A$ tokens in return for the $\Delta y = 200$ $B$ tokens they sent the contract.

**$LP_1$ exits with their Liquidity**  We recall that $LP_1$ has $L_1 = 10$ units of liquidity in the contract. Let us suppose they remove this liquidity at the given price $P = 25$. This means that they receive a token bundle consisting of $V(2)(L_1, P) = (2, 50)$. Notice that at the contract price $P = 25$, the token $B$ worth of this bundle is $V(2)((2, 50), 25) = 100$ $B$ tokens. On the other hand, the initial bundle they had provided to create this position (when price was $P = 1$) consisted of $(10, 10)$. The token $B$ worth of this bundle at the given price $P = 25$ is given by $B((10, 10), 25) = 260$. In this example, $LP_1$ has suffered an impermanent loss of $260 - 25 = 245$ units of $B$ tokens.

### C.2 Example v3 Dynamics

Hopefully this example is enough to walk readers through the intricacies of liquidity provision, fees, price dynamics, etc. In what follows we will follow closely the activity of 3 liquidity providers as they provide and remove liquidity at different price intervals. We will also see what fees they accrue and how the value of their assets change as traders interact with the system. In all that follows, we suppose that the contract fee rate is given by $\gamma = 0.5$.

**Initial Liquidity.**  Let us suppose that our first liquidity provider, which we denote $LP_1$, provides $L_1 = 60$ units of liquidity over the price range $I_1 = [a_1, b_1] = [1/16, 16]$. Furthermore, we suppose that they have allocated a bundle at price $P = 1$. This means that they have sent the contract the
following bundle:

\[ \gamma(3)(L_1, a_1, b_1, P) = (45, 45). \]

Since \( LP_1 \) is the only liquidity provider and \( P \in [a_1, b_1] \), it follows that they are the only active LP in the system. Furthermore, the minimal active price interval, \([a^*, b^*]\) is also trivially \([a_1, b_1]\). Similarly, \( L = L_1 \) is the total amount of active liquidity, and the contract’s active bundle is the same as \( LP_1 \)’s active bundle, which as we have seen is \((45, 45)\).

**Moving Contract Price from** \( P = 1 \) to \( P = 9 \). Let us suppose that a trader sends \( \Delta y = 240 \) units of token \( B \) to the contract. Given the fee rate, \( \gamma \), it follows that \( \gamma 240 = 120 \) units of token \( B \) are proportionally allocated to all active liquidity providers, which in this scenario is only \( LP_1 \). The remaining 120 units of token \( B \) are to be used for trading via the v3 reserve curve given by \( R^{(3)}(L, a^*, b^*) \). The resulting active bundle of the system changes from \((45, 45)\) to \((5, 165)\), where the latter can be verified to also lie on \( R^{(3)}(L, a^*, b^*) \). In fact, the corresponding point on the virtual reserve curve is \( \phi_{a^*, b^*}(5, 165) = (20, 180) \), for which it is simple to verify that the contract price is indeed \( P = 9 \). In concrete terms, this means that the trader received \( 45 - 5 = 40 \) \( A \) tokens in exchange for the \( 240 \) \( B \) tokens they sent to trade and that \( LP_1 \) received 120 \( B \) tokens in fees for their liquidity provision.

**\( LP_2 \) enters the contract.** Now let us suppose that a new liquidity provider, which we dub \( LP_2 \) wishes to provide \( L_2 = 120 \) units of liquidity over the price range \( I_2 = [a_2, b_2] = [1/25, 4] \). Given the fact that the current contract price is \( P = 9 \), which is above their price interval, this means that they need to provide a token bundle which only consists of \( B \) tokens. More specifically, they send the following bundle:

\[ \gamma^{(3)}(L_2, a_2, b_2, P) = (0, 216) \]

which has 216 \( B \) tokens to be exact. Notice however that the minimal active price interval is now given by \([a^*, b^*] = [4, 16] \), for at a price of \( P = 4 \), \( LP_2 \)’s liquidity becomes active. At the current price \( P = 9 \), only \( LP_1 \) has active liquidity, which in turn implies that the total active liquidity in the contract is given by \( L = L_1 \). At the same time, the contract’s active bundle is now different from \( LP_1 \)’s overall assets in the pool for the minimal active price interval has changed. The active bundle of the contract is given by \( \gamma^{(3)}(L, a^*, b^*, 9) = (5, 60) \), all of which belongs to \( LP_1 \).

**Moving Contract Price from** \( P = 9 \) to \( P = 1/16 \). In what follows, let us assume that a trader has sent \( \Delta x = 1280 \) units of token \( A \) to the contract. As we will see shortly, this will indeed move the contract price from \( P = 9 \) to \( P = 1/16 \), however such a price movement must necessarily involve a change in active liquidity, for the price movement traverses the price \( P = 4 \), where the \( L_2 \) units of \([a_2, b_2]-\)liquidity of \( LP_2 \) become active. For this reason, we break up the \( \Delta x \) into two smaller trades: \( \Delta x_\alpha = 20 \) and \( \Delta x_\beta = 1260 \), each consisting of \( A \) tokens to be sent to the contract by the trader.

For the first trade, we recall that the active price interval is given by \([a^*, b^*] \) and that the total active liquidity in the contract is \( L = L_1 \). Furthermore, the active bundle of the contract is also given by \((5, 60) \in R^{(3)}(L, a^*, b^*) \). Of the \( \Delta x_\alpha = 20 \) \( A \) tokens sent for trading, a \( \gamma \) portion is accrued as fees. This amounts to 10 \( A \) tokens, which go entirely to \( LP_1 \). The remaining \( (1 - \gamma)\Delta x_\alpha = 10 \) \( A \) tokens are used for trading along \( R^{(3)}(L, a^*, b^*) \). This changes the active contract bundle to \((15, 0) \), which means that the trader receives 60 \( B \) tokens for such an exchange. We also notice that
(15, 0) ∈ V^3(L, a^*, b^*) corresponds to the bundle φ_{a^*, b^*}(15, 0) = (30, 120) ∈ R^2(L) on the virtual reserve curve. This bundle can easily be verified to exhibit a contract price of 4 = a^*, which means that to continue trading the remaining Δx_β = 1260 A tokens, the contract must update its set of active LPs.

As we continue trading from price P = 4, it is straightforward to see that the new active price interval is given by \([a^*, b^*] = [1/16, 4]\), and that both LP_1 and LP_2 are active liquidity providers. This in turn means that \(L = L_1 + L_2\) is the new total active liquidity in the contract. In addition, contract’s active bundle can be expressed by:

\[V^3(L, a^*, b^*, P) = (0, 315).\]

This bundle in fact is the aggregation of the active bundles of LP_1 and LP_2, which are each given by \(V^3(L_1, a^*, b^*, P) = (0, 105)\) and \(V^3(L_2, a^*, b^*, P) = (0, 210)\) respectively. Now we can return to the question of trading \(Δx_β = 1260\) A tokens. As before, \(γΔx_β = 630\) is taken as fees for active LPs. Notice however, that in this case we have 2 active LPs, hence this quantity must be split proportionally amongst them. LP_1 receives \(\frac{L_1}{L}630 = 210\) A tokens and LP_2 receives the remaining \(420\) A tokens as fees. Now let us consider using the remaining 630 A tokens to change the contract bundle along the v3 reserve curve, \(R^3(L, a^*, b^*)\). We can quickly verify that indeed \((630, 0) ∈ R^3(L, a^*, b^*)\), and has a corresponding bundle on the virtual reserve curve given by \(φ_{a^*, b^*}(630, 0) = (720, 45)\) which can quickly be verified to exhibit a contract price of \(P = 1/16\). As the contract bundle went from \((0, 315)\) to \((630, 0)\) in this second trade, we see that the trader receives 315 B tokens in exchange for the \(Δx_β\) A tokens they sent for trading. In summary, the trader sent \(Δx = Δx_α + Δx_β = 1280\) units of A tokens and received \(60 + 315 = 375\) B tokens in exchange.

**LP3 enters the contract.** Now let us suppose that a new liquidity provider, LP_3 wishes to provide \(L_3 = 180\) units of liquidity over the range \(I_3 = [a_3, b_3] = [1/9, 36]\). We recall the current contract price is \(P = 1/16\), which is below the LP_3’s desired price range. For this reason, LP_3 will have to deposit a bundle consisting entirely of A tokens to establish this liquidity position. More specifically, they will provide the contract with the following bundle:

\[V^3(L_3, a_3, b_3, P) = (510, 0).\]

Notice that at the current price \(P = 1/16\), the liquidity of LP_3 is not active. Indeed it does not become active until a price of \(P = 1/9\) is reached. For this reason, the contract has a new minimal active price interval given by \([a^*, b^*] = [1/16, 1/9]\). It follows that the contract still has a total active liquidity given by \(L = L_1 + L_2\). At the same time, the contract’s active bundle is also given by

\[V^3(L, a^*, b^*) = (180, 0).\]

This bundle is also the aggregation of the active bundles of LP_1 and LP_2 over \([a^*, b^*]\), which are given by \(V^3(L_1, a^*, b^*, P) = (60, 05)\) and \(V^3(L_2, a^*, b^*, P) = (120, 0)\) respectively.

**Moving Contract Price from \(P = 1/16\) to \(P = 1\).** In what follows, we will assume that a trader has sent \(Δy = 510\) units of token B to the contract to exchange for A tokens. As we will see shortly, this will indeed move the contract price from \(P - 1/16\) to \(P = 1\). Such a price movement however, must necessarily involve changes of active liquidity, for at price \(P = 1/9\) the liquidity of
$LP_3$ becomes active. For this reason, similar to before, we break up $\Delta y$ into tow smaller trades: $\Delta y_\alpha = 30$ and $\Delta y_\beta = 480$, each consisting of $B$ tokens to be sent to the contract by the trader.

For the first trade, we recall that the active price interval is given by $[a^*, b^*]$ and that the total active liquidity in the contract is given by $L = L_1 + L_2$. In addition, as we’ve previously seen, the active bundle of the contract is given by $(180, 0) \in R^{(3)}(L, a^*, b^*)$. Of the $\Delta y_\alpha = 30$ tokens, $\gamma \Delta y_\alpha = 15$ are skimmed for fees, which are shared between $LP_1$ and $LP_2$. $LP_1$ receives $\frac{L_1}{L} 15 = 5 B$ tokens and $LP_2$ receives the remaining $10 B$ tokens. After such fees are levied, the remaining $(1 - \gamma) \Delta y_\alpha = 15 B$ tokens are used to move active bundle along the v3 reserve curve, $R^{(3)}(L, a^*, b^*)$. The resulting active bundle is thus $(0, 15) \in R^{(3)}(L, a^*, b^*)$, which corresponds to the bundle $\phi_{a^*, b^*}(0, 15) = (540, 60) \in cR^{(2)}(L)$ on the virtual reserve curve. This bundle can easily be verified to exhibit a contract price of $P = 1/9 = a^*$, which means that to continue trading the remaining $\Delta y_\beta = 480$ units of token $B$, the contract must update its set of active $LP$s.

As we continue trading from $P = 1/9$, it is straightforward to see that the new active price interval is given by $[a^*, b^*] = [1/9, 4]$. In this price range all $LP$s are active, hence the total active liquidity is given by $L = L_1 + L_2 + L_3 = 360$. As before, we can also compute the contract’s new active bundle as:

$$V^{(3)}(L, a^*, b^*) = (900, 0).$$

This bundle is made of the smaller active bundles of each $LP$, which are given by $V^{(3)}(L_1, a^*, b^*) = (150, 0)$, $V^{(3)}(L_2, a^*, b^*) = (300, 0)$, and $V^{(3)}(L_3, a^*, b^*) = (450, 0)$ respectively for $LP_1$, $LP_2$ and $LP_3$. Now let us focus on the $\Delta y_\beta = 480$ units of token $B$ sent to the contract by the trader. As before, we first skim provider fees, which amount to $\gamma \Delta y_\beta = 240 B$ tokens to be split proportionally amongst active $LP$s. In this case, $LP_1$ receives $\frac{L_1}{L} 240 = 40 B$ tokens, $LP_2$ receives $\frac{L_2}{L} 240 = 80 B$ tokens, and $LP_3$ receives the remaining $80 B$ tokens. Now let us consider using the remaining $240 B$ tokens to change the contract bundle along the v3 reserve curve, $R^{(3)}(L, a^*, b^*)$. We can quickly verify that indeed $(180, 240) \in R^{(3)}(L, a^*, b^*)$, which has a corresponding token bundle on the virtual reserve curve given by $\phi_{a^*, b^*}(180, 240) = (360, 360)$, which exhibits a price of $P = 1$ as desired. The contract bundle changed from $(900, 0)$ to $(180, 240)$, meaning that the trader receives $720 A$ tokens in exchange for the $\Delta y_\beta$ sent to the contract. Putting everything together, the trader receives $900 A$ tokens in exchange for $510 B$ tokens.

**$LP_1$ exits with their liquidity.** In what follows, we assume that $LP_1$ removes their liquidity from the contract. Before doing so, we recall that after the previous trade, the contract price is given by $P = 1$. In addition, the active price interval is still $[a^*, b^*] = [1/9, 4]$, and all $LP$s contribute to the active liquidity and active price bundle of the contract. We recall that $LP_1$ has $L_1 = 60$ units of $[a_1, b_1]$-liquidity for $a_1 = 1/16$ and $b_1 = 16$. By removing their liquidity from the contract, they receive a bundle given by:

$$V^{(3)}(L_1, a_1, b_1, P) = (45, 45).$$

Notice that this is the same as the bundle they used to open their liquidity position. This is due to the fact that they are withdrawing their liquidity when the contract price is given by $P = 1$, which is the same as the contract price when they created their position. In this example however, removing $LP_1$’s liquidity has no effect on the active price range. What does change however is the active liquidity in the contract, and consequently, the active token bundle of the contract. The contract’s active liquidity comes from $LP_2$ and $LP_3$, hence the active liquidity is $L = L_2 + L_3 = 300$. 
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In addition, the active bundle is once again given by:

\[ \mathcal{V}(3)(L, a^*, b^*) = (150, 200). \]

This can be further split into the active bundle of each \( LP \), \( LP_2 \) has an active bundle given by \( \mathcal{V}(3)(L_2, a^*, b^*) = (60, 80) \) and \( \mathcal{V}(3)(L_3, a^*, b^*) = (90, 120) \) respectively for \( LP_2 \) and \( LP_3 \).

**Moving Contract Price from** \( P = 1 \) **to** \( P = 1/4 \). Let us suppose that a trader sends \( \Delta x = 600 \) \( A \) tokens to the contract. \( \gamma \Delta x = 300 \) \( A \) tokens are skimmed as fees for \( LP_2 \) and \( LP_3 \) who are both active. \( LP_1 \) earns \( \frac{L_2}{2} \times 300 = 120 \) \( A \) tokens and \( LP_2 \) gets the remaining 180 \( A \) tokens as fees. The remaining \( (1 - \gamma) \Delta x = 300 \) \( A \) tokens are used to trade against the v3 reserve curve. At price \( P = 1 \), the active token bundle of the contract is given by \((150, 200)\), however the trade shifts the active token bundle to \((450, 50)\) which has a corresponding bundle on the virtual reserve curve given by \( \phi_{a^*,b^*}(450, 50) = (600, 150) \), which clearly has a contract price of \( P = 1/4 \) as desired. Overall, the trader sent \( \Delta x = 600 \) \( A \) tokens to the contract and received 150 \( B \) tokens in exchange.

**LP_2 exits with their liquidity** After the previous price move, the contract still has the same active price interval \([a^*, b^*] = [1/9, 4]\), and the contract’s active bundle is \((450, 50)\). Furthermore, the current contract price is given by \( P = 1/4 \). We assume that \( LP_2 \) wishes to remove their \( L_2 \) units of \([a_2, b_2]\)-liquidity, where \( a_2 = 1/25 \), and \( b_2 = 4 \). In this case, \( LP_2 \) receives the following bundle upon extracting their liquidity:

\[ \mathcal{V}(3)(L_2, a_2, b_2, P) = (180, 36). \]

Consequently, the active price interval changes to \([a^*, b^*] = [1/9, 36]\), which is in fact the interval over which \( LP_3 \) lent liquidity, for they are the only remaining \( LP \). As a final point, note that the bundle received by \( LP_2 \) is different from what they used to create their liquidity position, which was \((0, 216)\). In fact, notice that at the current price \( P = 1/4 \), the bundle \((180, 36)\) is worth 81 \( B \) tokens, which is much less than the original 216 \( B \) tokens used to create the liquidity position. This is the impermanent loss suffered by \( LPs \) as the contract price fluctuates.

**D Empirical Findings on Liquidity Provision**

We focus on providing empirical evidence in favor of our **bucket coverage assumption** from Section 4.4. To this end, Figure 12 provides a typical snapshot of locked liquidity in a USDC/ETH v3 pool taken on February 6, 2022. The snapshot was reconstructed from transactions on the Ethereum blockchain. Each bar in the image corresponds to a bucket, and the height of each bar represents the amount of liquidity locked in that bucket. As we can see, buckets near the contract price, which is the bar in red, have different amounts of liquidity. Specific liquidity amounts are shown in Table 1 where the index of the bucket in the first column represents the bucket position relative to the contract price (which is in bucket \( B_0 \)). This typical difference in liquidity values for buckets around the contract price in turn implies that said buckets’ endpoints must in turn be active, providing credence to our bucket coverage assumption.

---

4Our code used to scrape the Ethereum blockchain: [https://github.com/Evensgn/uniswap-modeling](https://github.com/Evensgn/uniswap-modeling)
E Maximum Likelihood Estimation (MLE)

Let us suppose that we are given a price sequence given by \( p = (p_1, \ldots, p_{n+1}) \) where each \( p_i \in \mathbb{R}^+ \). As per Section 4.6, we model price evolution as a geometric binomial random walk with two relevant parameters: \( \omega \) and \( W \). The parameter \( \omega \) represents the multiplicative ratio between discrete prices the random walk evolves over, and \( W \) is the bounded bandwidth that limits how far prices can deviate in the random walk conditional on a given price.

It is important to note that empirical price data given by the sequence \( p \) need not adhere to a single multiplicative ratio, as said prices are only constrained to lie in \( \mathbb{R}^+ \). However, as in Proposition 5, we use the approximation that \( x_t = \log_\omega(p_t/p_{t+1}) \sim \mathcal{N}(2Wp - W, 2Wp(1 - p)) \), with \( p = \frac{m+2+\sqrt{m^2+4}}{2m} \), where \( m = \log(\omega) \). With this normal approximation, we can then perform a maximum likelihood estimate over the sequence \( x_1, \ldots, x_n \), where each \( x_t = \log_\omega(p_t/p_{t+1}) \) is assumed to be i.i.d normal with mean \( \mu = 2Wp - W \) and variance \( \sigma^2 = 2Wp(1 - p) \). With this in hand, we can express the likelihood of a choice of \( \omega \) and \( W \) for the given price sequence \( p \) as follows:

\[
L(\omega, W \mid p) = \mathbb{P}(x_1, \ldots, x_n \mid \omega, W)
\]

(E.1)

As is standard we maximize this expression by taking logarithms and minimizing the negative log-likelihood given by:

\[
NLL(\omega, W \mid p) = \frac{n}{2} \log(2\pi\sigma^2) + \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i - \mu)^2
\]

(E.2)

Lemma 3. The unique \( W^* \) that minimizes \( NLL \) for a fixed \( \omega \) is given by:
Table 1: Locked liquidity around the contract price

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bucket</th>
<th>Units of Liquidity Locked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$B_{-5}$</td>
<td>14308585389682429965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_{-4}$</td>
<td>13699020740164778906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_{-3}$</td>
<td>13704199306520970180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_{-2}$</td>
<td>13761114721595607988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_{-1}$</td>
<td>14169372155386979909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_0$</td>
<td>16389750355923557295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_1$</td>
<td>10795735828654461424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_2$</td>
<td>10786362926145864699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_3$</td>
<td>10730695468843515712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_4$</td>
<td>1084757389753112431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_5$</td>
<td>10865194479196829563</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
W^\ast = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i^2}{n(p(1-p) + \sqrt{p^2(1-p)^2} + \frac{1}{n} \sum x_i^2(2p-1)^2)}
\] (E.3)

**Proof.** Going forward, we re-write the negative log-likelihood as a function of $W$:

\[
f(W) = NLL(\omega, W | p) = \frac{n}{2} \log(aW) + \frac{b}{W} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i - cW)^2
\] (E.4)

where $a = 4\pi p(1-p)$, $b = \frac{1}{4p(1-p)}$, $c = 2p - 1$. After some collecting terms, the derivative of $f$ has the following form:

\[
f'(W) = -\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i^2}{4p(1-p)} \frac{1}{W^2} + \frac{n}{2W} + \frac{n(2p-1)^2}{4p(1-p)}
\] (E.5)

We can solve for $f''(W^\ast) = 0$ under the constraint given by $W^\ast > 0$. We get a unique closed form solution given by:

\[
W^\ast = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i^2}{n(p(1-p) + \sqrt{p^2(1-p)^2} + \frac{1}{n} \sum x_i^2(2p-1)^2)}
\] (E.6)

as desired. Furthermore, we can compute the second derivative of $f$:

\[
f''(W) = \frac{(n \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i^2) - n^2 p(1-p)w}{2np(1-p)W^3}
\] (E.7)
Clearly the second derivative depends on the data (i.e. the values of \(x_i\)), but if we plug the given \(W^*\) into the expression, we obtain:

\[
f''(W^*) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i^2}{2p(1-p)(W^*)^3} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{1 + \sqrt{1 + \frac{(2p-1)^2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i^2}{np^2(1-p)^2}}} \right) > 0 \tag{E.8}
\]

Hence \(W^*\) is a minimum as desired.

### E.1 Empirical Results

In this section we outline our methods for obtaining relevant \(\omega\) and \(W\) values to be used as LP belief profiles in our computational results from Sections 4.6.

**Baseline Price Sequences.** As mentioned in Section 4.6, \(\omega\) and \(W\) both govern the volatility of the stochastic process dictating asset prices relevant to an LP. In this regard, we looked historical prices between Ethereum (ETH) and Bitcoin (BTC), as well as historical prices between Ethereum (ETH) and and Tether (USDT). The former pair was chosen as a low volatility representative, as most cryptocurrencies have prices correlated to Bitcoin. The latter pair was chosen for its relatively higher volatility, for USDT is pegged to the dollar. For each of these price pairs, we obtained a baseline price sequence from [https://www.binance.com/en/landing/data](https://www.binance.com/en/landing/data) of per-minute prices for the month of February 2020.

**Sub-sampling from Price Sequences.** Let us denote the baseline price sequence for the ETH-BTC pair by \(X_1',\ldots,X_T'\), and that of the ETH-USDT pair by \(Y_1',\ldots,Y_T'\). Our first step of price-processing involves sampling a collection of prices from each sequence at a desired frequency to then apply MLE estimates from the previous section to obtain \(\omega\) and \(W\) values. To this end, let \(t_0 \in \{1,\ldots,T\}\), and \(g,k \geq 1\) be integers. Let us focus on the ETH-USDT sequence given by \(X'_1\). A choice of \((t_0,g,k)\) implies we take a subsequence from \(\{X'_i\}_{i=1}^{T}\) given by \(\{X'_{t_j}\}_{j=1}^{k}\), where \(t_j = t_0 + g \cdot j\). Clearly this implies that we impose the constraint \(t_0 + g \cdot k \leq T\). Ultimately, we are interested in optimal liquidity allocations from LPs as per the methodology of Sections 4 and 5. As we focus on LP strategies that consist of allocating liquidity over \(T\) time-steps of a stochastic process and subsequently removing said liquidity (and extracting fees), we are interested in sub-sampling over smaller time horizons at smaller values of \(g\), as it is in this regime where such LP strategies are reasonable. Though this does imply that we are interested in smaller values of \(k\), at the same time, too small of values of \(k\) would give us poor MLE estimates as per the previous section, as we would ultimately not have many samples to work with.

**MLE Computation.** Once we choose values of \((t_0,g,k)\), we obtain a price subsequence as per the exposition above, which for ETH-BTC is given by \(\{X'_{t_j}\}_{j=1}^{k}\), where \(t_j = t_0 + g \cdot j\). To proceed, assume a fixed value of \(\omega > 1\), and use this to generate the sequence \(X_1,\ldots,X_{k-1}\), where \(X_j = \log_\omega \left( \frac{X'_{t_j+1}}{X'_{t_j}} \right)\). For such a sequence, we can compute \(W^*\) as per the closed form of Lemma 3, and from this obtain \(NLL(\omega, W^* | X_1,\ldots,X_{k-1})\). We can repeat this computation for multiple choices of \(\omega\) to find an \(\omega^*\) such that the negative log-likelihood is minimized via grid search. In summary, once we fix sub-sampling parameters \((t_0,g,k)\), we can obtain MLE estimates \(\omega^*, W^*\) as above.
Results. For both price pairs, we used sub-sampling parameters given by $(t_0, g, k) = (0, 1, 256)$. The reason for this is that we want to computationally explore the impact of price volatility on LP PnL and trader gas fees given an LP belief profile, hence it is important to maintain these sub-sampling parameters fixed over both price pairs of different real-world volatility. Our resulting MLE estimates were $(\omega^*, W^*) = (1.005, 3.0607)$ for ETH-USDT and $(\omega^*, W^*) = (1.005, 6.7695)$ for ETH-BTC. For reference, Figure 13 contains a visualization of the fit of the MLE normal distribution over empirical log price ratios. Ultimately, LP beliefs are constructed via an approximate Geometric Binomial Random Walk, hence we require integral values of $W$. For this reason, our computational results in Sections 4.7 and 4.7 use $W$ values from the set \{3, 5, 7\}, where the lower and upper bounds on $W$ are precisely informed by our empirical results of this section.