

Automated Market Makers for Cross-chain DeFi and Sharded Blockchains*

Mohsen Pourpouneh^{†1, 2}, Kurt Nielsen^{‡2, 3}, and Jesper Balman Gravgaard^{§3}

¹University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom

²University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark

³Partisia Blockchain Foundation

September 28, 2023

Abstract

In this paper we provide an execution framework for Automated Market Maker (AMM) to be deployed across independent blockchain platforms as well as concurrent sharding within the same blockchain platform. The framework provides economic incentives to participate through a mechanism that guarantee fixed prices across pairwise liquidity pools.

Keywords: DeFi, Automated Market Makers, Sharded Blockchains, Cross-chain DeFi.

1 Introduction

Automated Market Makers (AMMs) are an important part of DeFi and a major driver of the Web 3.0 adoption across different blockchain platforms. The initial motivation of AMM was the opportunity to exchange crypto assets without direct interaction and matching of buyers or sellers of crypto assets. This significantly reduces the complexity of the solution while at the same time, improving the security of the AMM as a truly decentralized application. Note that an AMM solution is essentially one of more smart contracts safeguarded by the underlying blockchain platform. Ethereum

*We wish to thank Jon Michael Aanes, Elie Naba, Burak Can, and Omri Ross for valuable comments on earlier version of this paper. Support by the Center for Blockchains and Electronic Markets, funded by the Carlsberg Foundation under grant no. CF18-1112, is gratefully acknowledged. Pourpouneh also gratefully acknowledges financial support by the Carlsberg Foundation Visiting Fellowships under grant no. CF21-0515.

[†]mohsen.pourpouneh@cs.ox.ac.uk

[‡]kn@partisia.com

[§]jg@partisia.com

has been the most used blockchain platform for AMM solutions, and token bridges as well as second layer blockchains have broadened the uptake. Recent developments take this development one step further and run AMMs across independent blockchain platforms i.e., cross-chain DeFi. This opens up a set of new challenges, such as the challenge of representing states and, hence data and tokens across independent blockchain platforms. Another challenge is to mimic the economic incentives cooked into the Ethereum version of AMMs. This is primarily the arbitrage opportunity that comes from the “all or nothing” execution i.e. atomic execution of the entire AMM solution “one user at a time”. As an example, with Uniswap a user can swap asset A to asset B and then swap asset B to asset C and then potentially swap asset C back to asset A without other users interfering. Sometimes this “multi-swap” returns profit to the user and since the public ledger allows anyone to constantly monitoring the AMM solution, this type of arbitrage essentially for free. This is, however, only feasible because of the atomic execution and sequential use of the AMM solution and cannot be transferred to a cross-chain AMM solution without additional built-in incentives.

The cross-chain situation is similar to the most efficient sharding model that essentially operates like independent blockchains where transactions are automatically off-loaded across different shards in an ideally way that favors unlimited parallelisation i.e. asynchronous and concurrent execution. Although very few blockchain networks comes with such real scalable sharding there is a few such as the Partisia Blockchain¹. Examples of other sharded blockchains are Elastico [Luu et al. \(2016\)](#), OmniLedger [Kokoris-Kogias et al. \(2018\)](#), and RapidChain [Zamani et al. \(2018\)](#).

In this paper we present a way to adjust AMMs (using the Uniswap V2 [Adams et al. \(2020\)](#) as an illusive example) to work across independent blockchains and shards and still allow for guaranteed multi-swap exchanges and arbitrage opportunities. This is done without the non-scalable sequential use of the entire AMM solution. The model introduce a “lock-swap” mechanism that guarantee a user fixed prices (as relative pairwise exchange prices) for a given swap. Such a lock-swap creates a “virtual liquidity pool” that other users face if they enters the AMM solution after a lock-swap has been placed. The virtual liquidity pool provides worse relative prices to the user than those given to the user holding the lock-swap, hence the mechanism favor first movers. Unlike the Ethereum sequential use, the “lock-swap” minimize the impact on the entire AMM solution such that assets can be exchanged in parallel and across independent blockchains and shards - also in liquidity pools with one or more lock-swap.

The lock-swap is an option where “instant-swap” is default. While the challenges in capturing and representing states across independent blockchains is time consuming, the use of lock-swap may become default. On the other hand with a scalable blockchain like Partisia Blockchain where transactions are executed as fast as information flow through the network, instant-swap may be sufficient. Also with an efficient market the multi-swap arbitrage opportunities may anyway only exist for very short periods. Finally, unlike Ethereum, the lock-swap is a simple add-on feature where the sequential use of AMMs on Ethereum is cooked into the very foundation i.e., the Ethereum blockchain platform. This might be relevant for the uptake of AMMs outside of the blockchain

¹<https://partisiablockchain.gitlab.io/documentation/>

ecosystem as build-in “free” arbitrage opportunities may no be acceptable for financial regulators.

2 Uniswap core model

Decentralized exchanges (DeX) are smart contracts that allows users to swap assets without the need for any third party or broker. A well studied category of DeXs are the so called automated market makers (AMMs). To execute swaps AMMs use a bonding curve that determines the price of the asset (with respect to each other) purly based on the amount of asset (liquidity) locked in the smart contract. In its simplest form, an AMM has two reserve pools, also known as *liquidity pools*, for a pair of assets say A and B . Users can exchange the asset A for asset B by depositing A asset in the smart contract and receiving B asset in return. Anyone can add liquidity to these pools by depositing A and B asset to each pool. To incentivize the liquidity providers for providing liquidity into the AMM, for each trade the pool charges a fee for every swap being executed, which is distributed (proportionally) among those who provided liquidity. The AMMs use a deterministic pricing rule to provide the exchange ratio (i.e., the price) between the two assets, hence they are also called “Constant Function Market Makers” [Angeris and Chitra \(2020\)](#). Uniswap [Adams \(2020\)](#) is one of the most prominent implementation of such models, that uses a constant product function to determine the price between the pair of assets. Other examples includes Stable Swap [Egorov \(2019\)](#), and Balancer [Martinelli and Mushegian \(2019\)](#).

The contract curve design for the core of Uniswap requires that at any time the reserves of two pools satisfy a *constant product* formula. That is, let A_t and B_t be the balances of the two pools at any time t , and $\Delta A > 0$ be a swap for the A asset in exchange for the B asset. Then the balances of the two pools (in the absence of swapping fees) should change in such a way that, $(A_t + \Delta A)(B_t - \Delta B) = A_t \times B_t$. This is illustrated in Figure 1.




Figure 1: Uniswap V2 curve and a swap of size ΔA .

3 The basic idea

As an example consider two shards. On the first shard there is a pool for exchanging A to B assets. Let $\langle A^1, B^1 \rangle = \langle 100, 10 \rangle$ denote the (actual) balances of the A and B assets on shard 1. On the second shard there is a pool for exchanging B and C assets. Let $\langle B^2, C^2 \rangle = \langle 200, 20 \rangle$ denote the balances of the B and C assets on shard 2. A user wants to swap 20 of the A asset for C asset. We assume that the user is only interested in either getting the C asset or keeping the A asset. In what follows, we consider two scenarios, one for the case that the user executes the swap by simply executing the swaps one by one; and the other using a lock mechanism.

3.1 Naive approach

By submitting the swap for $\Delta A = 20$, the user expects to get $\Delta B = 1.67$, of the B asset, and use those to exchange them for $\Delta C = 0.165$ of the C asset.

Consider a scenario where the user successfully, swaps the $\Delta A = 20$ on shard 1, and gets 1.67 of the B asset. Meanwhile, another user submits a swap for 1.67 of the B asset, which (in the absence of the fees) updates the AMM to $\langle A^1, B^1 \rangle = \langle 100, 10 \rangle$. Therefore, after these two swaps the AMM state is the same as of that before the first swap.

Now, assume that (after the user swaps ΔA to ΔB) the ratio of the $\langle B^2, C^2 \rangle$ on shard 2 changes to say $\langle B^2, C^2 \rangle = \langle 250, 16 \rangle$. This can be due to a swap that is being executed on shard 2 on the $\langle B^2, C^2 \rangle$ pool. This implies that the user with the input $\Delta B = 1.67$ to get $\Delta C = 0.1$ of the C asset, which is a lot less than the expected 0.165 of the C asset. Therefore, the user either has to get the 0.1 of the C asset, or he must trade the ΔB back to the A asset. However, due to the changes in shard 1, an input of size $\Delta B = 1.67$, implies $\Delta A = 14.3$. Therefore, the user is stuck between getting $\Delta C = 0.1$ of the C asset or $\Delta A = 14.3$ of the A asset in return for the 20 of the initial A asset.

3.2 Scalable AMM

We assume that the user submits a multi-swap of size $\langle \Delta A = 20, \Delta C \rangle$, with the minimum acceptable $\widetilde{\Delta C}$ of the C assets. Further we assume that no lock-swap is submitted by any user so far, hence the balances of the virtual AMM is the same as the actual AMM. That is, $\langle A_L^1, B_L^1 \rangle = \langle A^1, B^1 \rangle$. Since the A and C tokens are different shards, then the multi-swap is executed by a lock-swap for $A \rightarrow B$ on shard 1, followed by another lock-swap for $B \rightarrow C$ on shard 2.

$$\langle \Delta A, \Delta C \rangle \rightarrow \underbrace{\langle \Delta A, \Delta B \rangle}_{\text{lock-swap}} \text{ and } \underbrace{\langle \Delta B, \Delta C \rangle}_{\text{lock-swap}}$$

In what follows we describe the steps to execute such a multi-swap, using two lock-swaps on shard 1 and 2.

1. The lock-swap on shard 1 yields $\Delta B = 1.67$ for the given $\Delta A = 20$. Lock the ΔA and ΔB assets on shard 1. However as the lock-swap is not executed yet (and might be cancelled

later), the balances of the actual pool remains the same, i.e., $\langle A^1, B^1 \rangle = \langle 100, 10 \rangle$, however, the lock-swap changes the balances of the virtual pool that keeps track of the liquidity with the lock-swap being executed, i.e., $\langle A_L^1, B_L^1 \rangle = \langle 120, 8.33 \rangle$.


2. Perform a lock-swap of $\Delta B = 1.67$ for ΔC , on the shard 2 (the steps are similar to that of the lock-swap for ΔA to ΔB). For the above example this yields $\Delta C = 0.165$ of the C assets.
 - If $\Delta C \geq \widetilde{\Delta C}$, then all locks need to be resolved. The first lock is resolved by, ΔA assets being added to the A pool on shard 1. This implies the actual balances to be updated to $\langle A^1, B^1 \rangle = \langle 120, 8.33 \rangle$, while keeps the balances of the virtual pool untouched (since the lock-swap is already executed on the virtual pool). Given the output, i.e., ΔB , the assets are added to the B^2 pool on shard 2, and the ΔC are returned to the user, and the pool updates to $\langle B^2, C^2 \rangle = \langle 201.67, 19.835 \rangle$. Note that in this case the user gets at least $\widetilde{\Delta C}$.
 - If $\Delta C < \widetilde{\Delta C}$, then both lock-swaps must be cancelled. This implies the locked amounts to be removed/added to the virtual pools, i.e., $\langle A_L^1, B_L^1 \rangle = \langle 100, 10 \rangle$, whereas the actual balances of the pool remain untouched (since the lock-swap was not executed on the actual AMM). Note that, unlike the naive approach, in this case the user gets 20 of the A assets back.

The above example shows the execution of a multi-swap when no swap is executed after the lock-swap. Next we consider two cases, where an instant-swap is executed after the lock-swap.

3.3 Swap in the same direction as the lock-swap

Consider the case where an instant swap is submitted by a user after the lock-swap. That is let the first transaction be a multi-swap for A to C assets with $tx_1 = \langle \Delta A = 20, \Delta C \rangle$, and the second transaction to be an instant-swap of the form $tx_2 = \langle \overline{\Delta A} = 10, \overline{\Delta B} \rangle$, i.e., exchanging 10 of the A asset for the B asset. The following steps takes place,

1. The first transaction is a lock-swap, therefore it locks 1.67 of the B asset on shard 1, and the incoming 20 of the A asset from the user. This keeps the balances of the actual AMM the same, and updates the virtual AMM to $\langle A_L^1, B_L^1 \rangle = \langle 120, 8.33 \rangle$. Figure 2, shows the state of the curves before and after the lock-swap.



(a) AMM with instant-swap i.e., an executed transaction (actual AMM).

(b) AMM with lock-swap i.e., a potential executed transaction (virtual AMM).

Figure 2: Illustration of the instant-swap and lock-swap.


2. The second swap is an instant-swap, as the pool is partially-locked by transaction 1, we consider two situations: executing tx_2 with the lock-swap and without the lock-swap. The output asset will be the minimum of the two. That is,

- Swap without tx_1 , i.e., swap on the actual AMM. In this case, $\Delta B_1 = 0.9$.
- Swap with tx_1 , i.e., swap on the virtual AMM. In this case $\Delta B_2 = 0.64$.

Take $\Delta B = \min\{\Delta B_1, \Delta B_2\} = 0.64$, as the output of the instant-swap. Since the swap is an instant-swap it is executed on the actual pool, therefore the balances of the actual AMM updates to $\langle A^1, B^1 \rangle = \langle 110, 9.36 \rangle$, and the virtual AMM to $\langle A_L^1, B_L^1 \rangle = \langle 130, 7.69 \rangle$. Figure 3, shows the state of the curve after the instant-swap.

3. Given that transaction 1 locks the pool, to resolve the lock-swap, there are two possible cases: either transaction 1 can be completed (executed) with respect to the minimum acceptable by the user (i.e., $\widetilde{\Delta C}$), or it must be cancelled.

- tx_1 is executed. That is exchanging ΔB for the C asset on shard 2 yields at least as $\widetilde{\Delta C}$. In this case all the locks need to be resolved. Let $\langle B_L^2, C_L^2 \rangle = \langle B^2 + \Delta B, C^2 - \Delta C \rangle$. The actual pool updates to $\langle A^1, B^1 \rangle = \langle 130, 7.69 \rangle$, as the locked liquidities are added/removed from the pools. Note that, this is similar to the case that the lock-swap was executed in the first place. As a result, the two curves (i.e., the curves corresponding to $\langle A^1, B^1 \rangle$, and $\langle A_L^1, B_L^1 \rangle$ pools) are the same. Finally, ΔB is added to the actual AMM of $\langle B, C \rangle$ pair, and the ΔC is returned to the user, i.e., $\langle B^2, C^2 \rangle = \langle B^2 + \Delta B, C^2 - \Delta C \rangle$.
- tx_1 is cancelled. In this case the state of the pool remains the same as of that after transaction tx_2 , i.e., $\langle A^1, B^1 \rangle = \langle 110, 9.36 \rangle$. However, since the lock-swap is cancelled



(a) AMM with instant-swap i.e., an executed transaction (actual AMM).

(b) AMM with lock-swap i.e., a potential executed transaction (virtual AMM).

Figure 3: State of the curves after an instant-swap.

the liquidities that were added due to the lock-swap must be removed, hence the state is updated to $\langle A_L^1, B_L^1 \rangle = \langle 130 - 20, 7.69 + 1.67 \rangle$. Therefore this is similar to the case that the lock-swap did not exist in the first place. As a result, the two curves (i.e., the curves corresponding to $\langle A^1, B^1 \rangle$, and $\langle A_L^1, B_L^1 \rangle$ pools) are the same.

3.4 Swap in the opposite direction as the lock-swap

Consider the case where an instant swap is submitted by a user after the lock-swap. That is let the first transaction be a multi-swap for A to C assets with $tx_1 = \langle \Delta A = 20, \Delta C \rangle$, and the second transaction to be an instant-swap of the form $tx_2 = \langle \overline{\Delta A}, \overline{\Delta B} = 3 \rangle$, i.e., exchanging 3 of the B asset for the A asset. The following steps takes place,

1. The first transaction is a lock-swap, therefore it locks 1.67 of the B asset on shard 1, and the incoming 20 of the A asset from the user. This keeps the balances of the actual AMM untouched, and updates the virtual AMM to $\langle A_L^1, B_L^1 \rangle = \langle 120, 8.33 \rangle$.
2. The second swap is an instant-swap, as the pool is partially-locked by transaction 1, we consider two situations: executing tx_2 with the lock-swap and without the lock-swap. The output asset will be the minimum of the two. That is,
 - Swap without tx_1 , i.e., swap on the actual AMM. In this case $\Delta A_1 = 23.08$.
 - Swap with tx_1 , i.e., swap on the virtual AMM. In this case $\Delta A_2 = 31.76$.

Take $\Delta A = \min\{\Delta A_1, \Delta A_2\} = 23.08$. Since the swap is an instant-swap it is executed on the

actual pool, therefore the balances of the actual AMM updates to $\langle A^1, B^1 \rangle = \langle 76.92, 13 \rangle$, and the virtual AMM to $\langle A_L^1, B_L^1 \rangle = \langle 96.92, 11.33 \rangle$.

3. Given that transaction 1 locks the pool to resolve the lock-swap, there are two possible cases: either transaction 1 can be completed (executed) with respect to the minimum acceptable by the user (i.e., $\widetilde{\Delta C}$), or it must be cancelled.

- tx_1 is executed. That is exchanging ΔB for the C asset on shard 2 yields at least as $\widetilde{\Delta C}$. In this case all the locks need to be resolved. Let $\langle B_L^2, C_L^2 \rangle = \langle B^2 + \Delta B, C^2 - \Delta C \rangle$. The actual pool updates to $\langle A^1, B^1 \rangle = \langle 96.92, 11.33 \rangle$, as the locked liquidities are added/removed from the pools. Note that, this is similar to the case that the lock-swap was executed in the first place. As a result, the two curves (i.e., the curves corresponding to $\langle A^1, B^1 \rangle$, and $\langle A_L^1, B_L^1 \rangle$ pools) are the same. Finally, ΔB is added to the actual AMM of $\langle B, C \rangle$ pair, and the ΔC is returned to the user, i.e., $\langle B^2, C^2 \rangle = \langle B^2 + \Delta B, C^2 - \Delta C \rangle$.
- tx_1 is cancelled. In this case the state of the pool remains the same as of that after transaction tx_2 , i.e., $\langle A^1, B^1 \rangle = \langle 76.92, 13 \rangle$. However, since the lock-swap is cancelled the liquidities that were added due to the lock-swap must be removed, hence the state is updated to $\langle A_L^1, B_L^1 \rangle = \langle 96.92 - 20, 11.33 + 1.67 \rangle$. Therefore this is similar to the case that the lock-swap did not exist in the first place. As a result, the two curves (i.e., the curves corresponding to $\langle A^1, B^1 \rangle$, and $\langle A_L^1, B_L^1 \rangle$ pools) are the same.

4 Formal description

In this section we consider the general setup for the scalable swap, with two pools on two different shards. Let, A and B be a pair of asset on the first shard with balances $\langle A^1, B^1 \rangle$, and B, C be a pair of asset with a pool on the second shard with the balances of $\langle B^2, C^2 \rangle$. The aim is to execute a multi-swap of size ΔA from A to C , such that it guarantees an output of at least size $\widetilde{\Delta C}$ of the C asset. To guarantee the output we introduce the “locking” mechanism, which allows the pool to lock a part of the liquidity. The locking mechanism affects the liquidity of the pool, however as the swap might be canceled later, we can not immediately update the state of the pool. Therefore, we let $\langle A_L^1, B_L^1 \rangle$, to denote the state of the pool after a lock-swap. Initially, set $\langle A_L^1, B_L^1 \rangle = \langle A^1, B^1 \rangle$. In what follows we describe the procedure for any swap of the form $\Delta A \rightarrow \Delta B$. Note that, such a swap can be either a lock-swap or an instant-swap, and further it can be a part of a multi-swap. To simplify the notation we ignore the swap fees in the what follows.

Protocol 1, describes the case for an instant-swap. In case the pool is not partially-locked, the swap executed in a similar way as Uniswap V2. However, in case the pool is partially-locked the protocol considers the amount of the exchanged asset from both the actual pool and the virtual pool, and pays the user the minimum of the two, finally the state of the curves are updated accordingly.

Protocol 1 Instant-swap for $A \rightarrow B$ swap

Input: Asset ΔA

- 1: **if** pool is not partially-locked **then**
 - 2: Compute $\Delta B = B^1 - \frac{A^1 \times B^1}{A^1 + \Delta A}$
 - 3: Set $\langle A^1, B^1 \rangle = \langle A^1 + \Delta A, B^1 - \Delta B \rangle$.
 - 4: Set $\langle A_L^1, B_L^1 \rangle = \langle A_L^1 + \Delta A, B_L^1 - \Delta B \rangle$
 - 5: **if** the pool is partially-locked **then then**
 - 6: Compute $\Delta B^1 = B^1 - \frac{A^1 \times B^1}{A^1 + \Delta A}$.
 - 7: Compute $\Delta B^2 = B_L^1 - \frac{A_L^1 \times B_L^1}{A_L^1 + \Delta A}$.
 - 8: Let $\Delta B = \min\{\Delta B^1, \Delta B^2\}$.
 - 9: Set $\langle A^1, B^1 \rangle = \langle A^1 + \Delta A, B^1 - \Delta B \rangle$.
 - 10: Set $\langle A_L^1, B_L^1 \rangle = \langle A_L^1 + \Delta A, B_L^1 - \Delta B \rangle$.
-

Protocol 2, describes the case for an lock-swap. Since, the swap is a lock-swap, then a lock-swap affects the state of the virtual AMM.

Protocol 2 Lock-swap for $A \rightarrow B$ swap

Input: Asset ΔA

- 1: **if** pool is not partially-locked **then**
 - 2: Compute $\Delta B = B^1 - \frac{A^1 \times B^1}{A^1 + \Delta A}$
 - 3: Lock ΔA , and ΔB .
 - 4: Set $\langle A^1, B^1 \rangle = \langle A^1, B^1 \rangle$.
 - 5: Set $\langle A_L^1, B_L^1 \rangle = \langle A_L^1 + \Delta A, B_L^1 - \Delta B \rangle$.
 - 6: **if** the pool is partially-locked **then then**
 - 7: Compute $\Delta B^1 = B^1 - \frac{A^1 \times B^1}{A^1 + \Delta A}$.
 - 8: Compute $\Delta B^2 = B_L^1 - \frac{A_L^1 \times B_L^1}{A_L^1 + \Delta A}$.
 - 9: Let $\Delta B = \min\{\Delta B^1, \Delta B^2\}$.
 - 10: Lock ΔB .
 - 11: Set $\langle A^1, B^1 \rangle = \langle A^1, B^1 \rangle$.
 - 12: Set $\langle A_L^1, B_L^1 \rangle = \langle A_L^1 + \Delta A, B_L^1 - \Delta B \rangle$.
-

Finally, Protocol 9, shows the procedure for resolving a lock. Note that, there are two possible cases, either the user's criteria are met and the swap can be executed, or the the user's criteria are not met an the lock must be cancelled. In case the lock is executed, then the liquidity in the actual pool must be updated so that it reflects the execution of the swap. In case the lock is cancelled, the amounts in the virtual pool must be modified so that the trade swap is cancelled.

Protocol 3 Lock-resolve for $A \rightarrow B$ swap

- 1: **if** executing the lock **then**
 - 2: Let $\langle A^1, B^1 \rangle = \langle A^1 + \Delta A, B^1 - \Delta B \rangle$.
 - 3: **if** cancelling the lock **then**
 - 4: Let $\langle A_L^1, B_L^1 \rangle = \langle A_L^1 - \Delta A, B_L^1 + \Delta B \rangle$.
-

The aforementioned protocol, formally describes the protocol for a swap of the form $A \rightarrow B$. Appendix A.1 formally describes the protocol for a swap of the form $B \rightarrow A$.

5 Adding fees

In Section 4 we describe the protocol without swapping fees. In this section we extend the model to include fees. Let $(1 - \gamma)$ denote the swapping fees. Therefore, for any swap (either of instant-swap or lock-swap) of size ΔA to any other asset, the actual size of the trade is $\gamma \Delta A$. In case of the instant-swaps the fees are added to the pool after the swap is executed. For lock-swaps, the fees are added to the pool after the lock is executed. Note that in case a lock-swap is cancelled, the user still has to pay the fees. Appendix A.2, describes the protocol with the fees included.

6 Extension to more than two pairs

In this section, we extend our model so that one can execute a multi-swap which involves more than two pairs of asset. For simplicity, we assume 4 assets, A , B , C , and D . Let $\langle A^1, B^1 \rangle$, denote the balances of the A and B assets on shard 1, $\langle B^2, C^2 \rangle$, the balances of the B and C assets on shard 2, and $\langle C^3, D^3 \rangle$ the balances of the C and D assets on shard 3. The aim is to execute a multi-swap of size ΔA from A to D , such that it guarantees an output of at least size $\widetilde{\Delta D}$. Since the A and D tokens are different shards, then the multi-swap is executed by two lock-swaps for $A \rightarrow B$ on shard 1, and $B \rightarrow C$ on shard 2, followed by a lock-swap for $C \rightarrow D$ on shard 3.

$$\langle \Delta A, \Delta D \rangle \rightarrow \underbrace{\langle \Delta A, \Delta B \rangle}_{\text{lock-swap}} \text{ and } \underbrace{\langle \Delta B, \Delta C \rangle}_{\text{lock-swap}} \text{ and } \underbrace{\langle \Delta C, \Delta D \rangle}_{\text{lock-swap}}$$

In this case, we assume that there is a virtual AMM for $\langle A^1, B^1 \rangle$, and $\langle B^2, C^2 \rangle$. The execution is similar to what described for the case of 2 shards. That is, first a lock-swap is executed on shard 1, then given the amount of ΔB , a lock-swap is executed on shard 2. Finally, if the amount of ΔD asset in the last instant-swap meets the criteria specified by the user, all the swaps are executed and the locks are resolved in every shard, and if the criteria is not met, then the entire lock-swaps are resolved and the liquidities are added to the pools.

7 Conclusion

The primary purpose of the proposed swapping mechanism is to advance AMM and DeFi across and beyond the current blockchain ecosystem. Within the blockchain ecosystem, the mechanism provides an execution framework that guarantees fixed prices across liquidity pools independent of whether the liquidity pools sit on completely independent blockchains or shards. In addition, the guaranteed fixed prices are a feature rather than a consequence of the underlying blockchain, a property that may improve the adoption of DeFi in traditional finance.

Another challenge and obstacle for a broad uptake of AMM solutions within and beyond the blockchain ecosystem is frontrunning. On Ethereum and similar blockchain platforms, the AMM transactions are transparent to all but added to the blockchain consensus model by one or more actors, such as “mempool operators” or “block producers”. The problem is that these actors can delay and frontrun a valuable transaction. This is clearly a problem that needs to be solved and an important research agenda. Though the recent introduction of advanced privacy-preserving technologies to blockchain provides a solution. A prime example of this is the Partisia Blockchain, where generic zero-knowledge technologies keep transactions hidden until they are fully executed. Hereby, the arbitrage opportunity is effectively addressed².

References

- Adams, H. (2020). Uniswap whitepaper. URL: https://hackmd.io/C-DvwDSfSxuh-Gd4WKE_ig.
- Adams, H., N. Zinsmeister, and D. Robinson (2020). Uniswap v2 core. 2020. URL: <https://uniswap.org/whitepaper.pdf>.
- Angeris, G. and T. Chitra (2020). Improved price oracles: Constant function market makers. In *Proceedings of the 2nd ACM Conference on Advances in Financial Technologies*, pp. 80–91.
- Egorov, M. (2019). Stableswap-efficient mechanism for stablecoin liquidity. Retrieved Feb 24, 2021.
- Kokoris-Kogias, E., P. Jovanovic, L. Gasser, N. Gailly, E. Syta, and B. Ford (2018). Omniledger: A secure, scale-out, decentralized ledger via sharding. In *2018 IEEE symposium on security and privacy (SP)*, pp. 583–598. IEEE.
- Luu, L., V. Narayanan, C. Zheng, K. Baweja, S. Gilbert, and P. Saxena (2016). A secure sharding protocol for open blockchains. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security*, pp. 17–30.
- Martinelli, F. and N. Mushegian (2019). Balancer: A non-custodial portfolio manager, liquidity provider, and price sensor.

²For more see the template smart contract for “Instant swap” on Partisia Blockchain <https://gitlab.com/partisiablockchain/language/example-contracts>. Template smart contracts for keeping the “lock” hidden until it has been executed will soon be available via the same link.

Zamani, M., M. Movahedi, and M. Raykova (2018). Rapidchain: Scaling blockchain via full sharding. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security*, pp. 931–948.

A Appendix

A.1 The protocol

Let, A and B be a pair of asset on the first shard with balances $\langle A^1, B^1 \rangle$, and A, C be a pair of asset with a pool on the second shard with the balances of $\langle A^2, C^2 \rangle$. The aim is to execute a multi-swap of size ΔB from B to C , such that it guarantees an output of at least size $\widetilde{\Delta C}$ of the C asset. Let $\langle A_L^1, B_L^1 \rangle$, to denote the state of the pool after a lock-swap. In what follows we describe the procedure for any swap of the form $\Delta B \rightarrow \Delta A$. Note that, such a swap can be either a lock-swap or an instant-swap, and further it can be a part of a multi-swap.

Protocol 4 Instant-swap for $B \rightarrow A$ swap

Input: Asset ΔB

- 1: **if** pool is not partially-locked **then**
 - 2: Compute $\Delta A = A^1 - \frac{A^1 \times B^1}{B^1 + \Delta B}$.
 - 3: Set $\langle A^1, B^1 \rangle = \langle A^1 - \Delta A, B^1 + \Delta B \rangle$.
 - 4: Set $\langle A_L^1, B_L^1 \rangle = \langle A_L^1 - \Delta A, B_L^1 + \Delta B \rangle$
 - 5: **if** the pool is partially-locked **then then**
 - 6: Compute $\Delta A^1 = A^1 - \frac{A^1 \times B^1}{B^1 + \Delta B}$.
 - 7: Compute $\Delta A^2 = A_L^1 - \frac{A_L^1 \times B_L^1}{B_L^1 + \Delta B}$.
 - 8: Let $\Delta A = \min\{\Delta A^1, \Delta A^2\}$.
 - 9: Set $\langle A^1, B^1 \rangle = \langle A^1 - \Delta A, B^1 + \Delta B \rangle$.
 - 10: Set $\langle A_L^1, B_L^1 \rangle = \langle A_L^1 - \Delta A, B_L^1 + \Delta B \rangle$.
-

Protocol 5 Lock-swap for $B \rightarrow A$ swap

Input: Asset ΔB

- 1: **if** pool is not partially-locked **then**
 - 2: Compute $\Delta A = B^1 - \frac{A^1 \times B^1}{B^1 + \Delta B}$.
 - 3: Lock ΔA , and ΔB .
 - 4: Set $\langle A^1, B^1 \rangle = \langle A^1, B^1 \rangle$.
 - 5: Set $\langle A_L^1, B_L^1 \rangle = \langle A_L^1 - \Delta A, B_L^1 + \Delta B \rangle$.
 - 6: **if** the pool is partially-locked **then then**
 - 7: Compute $\Delta A^1 = A^1 - \frac{A^1 \times B^1}{B^1 + \Delta B}$.
 - 8: Compute $\Delta A^2 = A_L^1 - \frac{A_L^1 \times B_L^1}{B_L^1 + \Delta B}$.
 - 9: Let $\Delta A = \min\{\Delta A^1, \Delta A^2\}$.
 - 10: Lock ΔA .
 - 11: Set $\langle A^1, B^1 \rangle = \langle A^1, B^1 \rangle$.
 - 12: Set $\langle A_L^1, B_L^1 \rangle = \langle A_L^1 - \Delta A, B_L^1 + \Delta B \rangle$.
-

Protocol 6 Lock-resolve for $B \rightarrow A$ swap

- 1: **if** executing the lock **then**
 - 2: Let $\langle A^1, B^1 \rangle = \langle A^1 - \Delta A, B^1 + \Delta B \rangle$.
 - 3: **if** cancelling the lock **then**
 - 4: Let $\langle A_L^1, B_L^1 \rangle = \langle A_L^1 + \Delta A, B_L^1 - \Delta B \rangle$.
-

A.2 Including the fees

In this section, we modify the protocol such that it includes the fees. Let $(1 - \gamma)$, denote the fees for each swap. For each swap, we first deduct the $(1 - \gamma)$ from the input asset, and use the rest to execute the swap. The fees are added to the pools after the swaps are executed. In case of a lock-swap being cancelled the user still has to pay the fees.

Protocol 7 Instant-swap for $A \rightarrow B$ swap including fees $(1 - \gamma)$

Input: Asset ΔA

- 1: **if** pool is not partially-locked **then**
 - 2: Compute $\Delta B = B^1 - \frac{A^1 \times B^1}{A^1 + \gamma \Delta A}$
 - 3: Set $\langle A^1, B^1 \rangle = \langle A^1 + \Delta A, B^1 - \Delta B \rangle$.
 - 4: Set $\langle A_L^1, B_L^1 \rangle = \langle A_L^1 + \Delta A, B_L^1 - \Delta B \rangle$
 - 5: **if** the pool is partially-locked **then then**
 - 6: Compute $\Delta B^1 = B^1 - \frac{A^1 \times B^1}{A^1 + \gamma \Delta A}$.
 - 7: Compute $\Delta B^2 = B_L^1 - \frac{A_L^1 \times B_L^1}{A_L^1 + \gamma \Delta A}$.
 - 8: Let $\Delta B = \min\{\Delta B^1, \Delta B^2\}$.
 - 9: Set $\langle A^1, B^1 \rangle = \langle A^1 + \Delta A, B^1 - \Delta B \rangle$.
 - 10: Set $\langle A_L^1, B_L^1 \rangle = \langle A_L^1 + \Delta A, B_L^1 - \Delta B \rangle$.
-

Protocol 8 Lock-swap for $A \rightarrow B$ swap including fees $(1 - \gamma)$

Input: Asset ΔA

- 1: **if** pool is not partially-locked **then**
 - 2: Compute $\Delta B = B^1 - \frac{A^1 \times B^1}{A^1 + \gamma \Delta A}$
 - 3: Lock ΔA , and ΔB .
 - 4: Set $\langle A^1, B^1 \rangle = \langle A^1, B^1 \rangle$.
 - 5: Set $\langle A_L^1, B_L^1 \rangle = \langle A_L^1 + \Delta A, B_L^1 - \Delta B \rangle$.
 - 6: **if** the pool is partially-locked **then then**
 - 7: Compute $\Delta B^1 = B^1 - \frac{A^1 \times B^1}{A^1 + \gamma \Delta A}$.
 - 8: Compute $\Delta B^2 = B_L^1 - \frac{A_L^1 \times B_L^1}{A_L^1 + \gamma \Delta A}$.
 - 9: Let $\Delta B = \min\{\Delta B^1, \Delta B^2\}$.
 - 10: Lock ΔB .
 - 11: Set $\langle A^1, B^1 \rangle = \langle A^1, B^1 \rangle$.
 - 12: Set $\langle A_L^1, B_L^1 \rangle = \langle A_L^1 + \Delta A, B_L^1 - \Delta B \rangle$.
-

Protocol 9 Lock-resolve for $A \rightarrow B$ swap

- 1: **if** executing the lock **then**
 - 2: Let $\langle A^1, B^1 \rangle = \langle A^1 + \Delta A, B^1 - \Delta B \rangle$.
 - 3: **if** cancelling the lock **then**
 - 4: Let $\langle A_L^1, B_L^1 \rangle = \langle A_L^1 - \gamma \Delta A, B_L^1 + \Delta B \rangle$.
-