

Order but Not Execute in Order

Tiantian Gong
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN, USA
tg@purdue.edu

Aniket Kate
Purdue University / Supra Research
West Lafayette, IN, USA
aniket@purdue.edu

Abstract—This work aims to address the general order manipulation issue in blockchain-based decentralized exchanges (DEX) by exploring the benefits of employing a novel combination of order-fair atomic broadcast (of-ABC) mechanisms for transaction ordering and frequent batch auction (FBA) for breaking the order while executing those transactions. In of-ABC, transactions submitted to a sufficient number of blockchain validators are ordered before or along with later transactions. FBA then executes transactions with a uniform price double auction that prioritizes price instead of transaction order within the same committed batch.

To demonstrate the merits of our order-but-not-execute-in-order design, we compare the welfare loss and liquidity provision in DEX under FBA and its continuous counterpart, the Continuous Limit Order Book (CLOB). Assuming that the exchange is realized over an of-ABC protocol, we find that (1) FBA always achieves better social welfare when no party is privately informed about asset valuations. Even otherwise, FBA incurs less welfare loss compared to CLOB when (2) price takers and public information reflecting asset value changes arrives sufficiently frequently compared to private information, or (3) the priority fees are small, or (4) the market is more balanced on both sides. Our empirical analysis on dYdX transactions indicates additional 8% – 83% costs when transactions are executed continuously. Further, our findings also indicate that liquidity provision is better under FBA under similar conditions.

Index Terms—General order manipulations, decentralized exchange, frequent batch auction, welfare loss, liquidity provision.

I. INTRODUCTION

Conventional blockchain consensus processes, or in other words atomic broadcast (ABC) protocols, only ensure that any two honest validator nodes store the same prefix of transactions in their logs. They do not give any guarantee about how the transactions are exactly ordered on the blockchain. The adversary can indeed select a transaction ordering that is more suitable or profitable to itself. This becomes particularly important as decentralized finance (DeFi) applications proliferate, where the lack of fairness in ordering transactions may lead to severe consequences for victim system users [9].

We especially inspect decentralized exchange (DEX) systems that enable users to trade crypto assets via blockchain transactions. They can be implemented as layer-one blockchains [22], [28] or layer-two applications [1], [17] on general-purpose blockchains [11]. Like other blockchain tasks, the core of both approaches is ordering transactions with an ABC primitive and executing transactions according to the order. In DEXes, the unfair ordering of ask and bid offers is

naturally tied to direct monetary gains for manipulators and losses to victims.

Ordering transactions fairly inside and across blocks in blockchain systems has gained traction in the past few years. If the adversary can delay the victim transaction before it reaches the validator nodes (or their mempools), there is inherently nothing that can be done in terms of offering fairness. Hence, most order fairness solutions focus on achieving some level of fairness based on the receiving time of transactions at the validator nodes.

Even if we consider fairness only after the validator nodes receive the transactions, it is impossible to always ensure global receiver order fairness in consensus [20]: validators running the protocols can collectively have cyclic views on the receiving order of transactions. The good news is that relaxed order-fairness can be achieved [7], [19], [20] where transactions received by sufficiently many parties first are ordered at least in the same batch as those that are received later. We address these protocols as order-fair ABC or of-ABC.

However, without general receiver order fairness, order manipulation is feasible in of-ABC through speed technologies including faster connectivity to validators and higher priority fees. Essentially this is because fair ordering inside each block is a gray area. Combined with serial or continuous processing (continuous limit order book, CLOB), as we later illustrate in §II-B, one can potentially still successfully front-run a victim transaction inside a block after observing its appearance with a high probability. We, therefore, seek to divorce *execution order* (i.e., an order in which transactions are executed) from consensus-layer transaction ordering with frequent batch auction (FBA) (or uniform price double auction (UPDA) [5], [13]). In FBA, orders are processed in batches using uniform-price auctions: trades are matched according to price, and all matched counterparties settle trades at the same price.

Combined with of-ABC, FBA has the potential to counter order manipulations since it effectively renders exact intra-block ordering superficial. Note that, here, without fair batch ordering or other tools such as transaction masking [3], [23], [26], [35], FBA alone as an execution model is *not* always an effective countermeasure to manipulations. Intuitively, a victim transaction may never be committed even if FBA is the processing model. Also note that if incoming transactions have distinct asks and bids (i.e., no need for tie-breaking), full-fledged of-ABC is not needed and fair inclusion or censorship

resistance suffices.

A. Contribution

We explore the defense against general order manipulations in DEXes with a novel combination of employing of-ABC for *ordering* and FBA for *execution* and compare the welfare loss and bid-ask spread under CLOB and FBA processing.

Rationale. We model a *single DEX*, many *arbitrageurs* who can apply market-making and front-running strategies, *common investors* who submit inelastic trading orders, and *informed traders* who submit trades after observing publicly or privately available information about asset valuation jumps. Arbitrageurs are addressed as *market makers* (MM, or liquidity providers) when applying market-making strategy, and as *front-runners* when front-running investors, traders, and MM. Our focus is then on how MMs set their quotes, which decide the amount by which the ask price exceeds the bid price (i.e., the bid-ask spread).

On the one hand, common investors are price takers and thus the source of profits for MMs. On the other, informed traders and front-runners can cause losses to MMs by reacting to information faster. This is also called *adverse selection risk*. Hence, the arrival rates of investors and public or private information about asset valuation changes help MMs determine the bid-ask spread. An MM does not set it too high considering that other arbitrageurs can improve on it to profitably trade with common investors. The MM does not set it too small either to absorb the potential loss from adverse selection. In the latter scenario, the markups for tolerating the adverse selection is the *welfare loss* of our interest. It is considered as a loss of common investors' and traders' welfare because this portion of the spreads does not need to be paid when there is no arbitraging.

Results. For **welfare loss**, (1) if there is *no* private information in DEXes, then FBA always imposes a smaller (zero) welfare loss compared with CLOB. When a specific DEX design allows the existence of privately informed parties (e.g., a board member or developer capable of effectively dictating protocol updates), adverse selection is present under FBA, causing it to inflict positive welfare loss.

In this setting with private information, we find that (2) FBA imposes less welfare loss if common investors and public information concerning asset value changes arrive sufficiently often compared to private information. Because under FBA, MMs have more time to respond to public information, and less private information reduces adverse selection. (3) The smaller the transaction priority fees [12] are, the higher the markups under CLOB are, as compared to under FBA.¹ Because the profits from front-running increase as costs decline, resulting in the MMs charging higher markups to counter adverse selection. (4) A more balanced market decreases the welfare loss for FBA. In essence, when adequately many transactions are accumulated and matched among themselves,

the order book is not eaten up, and the average welfare loss decreases. In terms of **liquidity provision**, FBA has smaller bid-ask spreads under similar but harsher conditions. Overall, if the public blockchain realizing the DEX function hardly has any private information, FBA provides lower welfare loss and better liquidity. For exchange dYdX [17], we note that empirically, there is a 8% – 83% increase in transaction costs if the transactions were executed sequentially.

Intuition. We consider FBA for another reason aside from the inspirations from discussions in centralized exchange context [5], [13]: FBA is proposed as a discrete alternative to continuous processing to counter order manipulations implemented via high-frequency trading [5], [13]. Blockchains inherently already treat time as discrete when ordering and batching transactions into blocks as in FBA. When transactions are executed sequentially as in CLOB, one can observe and act on the “future” if the pending transaction pool is not fully hidden. Latencies in block generation and message transmission along with priority fees allow even more space for latency arbitrage rents in DEXes. Further, a common critique of FBA, the non-execution risks caused by non-transparent pre-trade order book, ceases to exist in many public blockchains where transactions are overt.²

Organization of contents. We describe the model details in §II-A. We include the definitions of of-ABC and solution concepts adopted for solving the trading game in §II-B. In §III, we describe and solve the trading game under CLOB and FBA. Then in §IV, we compare their welfare loss along with liquidity provision. We mention other related works in §V, and conclude the discussion in §VI.

II. MODEL AND PRELIMINARIES

We now specify the DEX, the players in the trading system, and the trading target asset, especially how its price and fundamental values evolve. We also introduce game theory concepts relevant to solving the trading game.

A. System model

DEX. A set of n processes called validators run a blockchain system based on of-ABC and hosting the DEX. Up to f of the validators are Byzantine. They may behave arbitrarily but are computationally bounded, and cannot break standard cryptographic primitives including digital signature schemes. Validators communicate via reliable authenticated point-to-point channels. The network is partially synchronous where the network imposes some known bounded message delay only after a global stabilization time (GST). In the system, the largest block generation interval is a known constant $I > 0$ measured in time units consistent with the trading system. We let I be the time units that the protocol takes to output after GST.

Trading system. We blend the dynamic models in Eibelshäuser and Smetak [10] and Budish et al. [5] with the

¹Average fee per transaction is \$0.82 for Ethereum between 08/17-09/17/2023, during which the average daily price changes of Ether is \$18.81.

²In centralized exchanges employing FBA [8], quotes are hidden until being matched.

blockchain-based decentralized exchanges. Users submit transaction orders by sending messages to one or more validators. Batch length in FBA equals a multiple of the block generation interval I .

We consider an asset X with changing fundamental value V_t at time t ($t \in [0, T]$, for some $T > 0$). We assume an observable signal that equals the asset's fundamental value and evolves according to a compound Poisson jump process, drawn from a symmetric distribution F_{jp} with arrival rate λ_{jp} , bounded support, and zero mean. The fundamental value jump can be observed in the form of both public and private information. We capture the absolute value of the jump with random variable J . There are three types of risk-neutral³ trading players:

- Investors who arrive stochastically with probability λ_i and have inelastic demand, with buying and selling being equally likely.
- Informed traders who can observe both public information arriving stochastically with probability λ_{pb} and private information arriving stochastically with probability λ_{pr} . Both types of information affect V_t positively or negatively with equal probability.
- r arbitrageurs who can apply market-making or front-running strategy. They intend to sell at a price higher than V_t or buy at a price lower than V_t .

The arbitrageurs here can be trading firms, and arbitrage bots, among others. A front-running arbitrageur can front-run MMs, investors, and traders. Unlike the modeling in centralized exchanges, the front-runner now can act after others have already submitted transactions.

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

Fees. The exchange collects fees from both sides of each settled trade. There is a base fee and priority fee F which can promote the order of a transaction during tie-breaking. In analysis, we disregard the base fee since it is the same for all.

B. Definitions - fair ordering

As mentioned earlier, FBA alone is not effective in countering order manipulations, and of-ABC is adopted for transaction ordering. We present the differential flavor of of-ABC, which is shown to be equivalent to batch order fairness [19].

Definition 1 (Differentially of-ABC [7]). *A secure κ -differentially of-ABC protocol satisfies the following properties:*

- 1) **Agreement:** *If a message m is delivered by some correct process, then m is eventually delivered by every correct process.*

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

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

Here $b(m; m_0)$ counts the number of processes broadcasting m before m_0 .

Front-running success probability. Suppose arbitrageur j decides to front-run user i with transaction m_j after seeing i 's transaction m_i . To compute j 's success probability, we make the following assumptions on the latencies of different communication links. The links connecting validators experience latencies that follow distribution F_v . The communication links between common users, i.e., investors and traders, and validators have the same latency distribution F_{it} . And the links between arbitrageurs and validators have the same latency distribution F_a . If F_a is the same as F_{it} , then arbitrageurs have the same connections to validators as common users. We assume the arbitrageurs invest some constant $c \geq 0$ in establishing the communication links and other setups.

Let D be the random variable capturing the difference of latencies for independently delivering the messages m_i and m_j on each communication link between validators. Let D follow distribution \tilde{F}_{lt} . For example, if F_v is instantiated with normal distribution $N(1, 1)$, then \tilde{F}_{lt} follows distribution $N(0, 2)$. Let \tilde{F}_{lt}^C be the CDF of \tilde{F}_{lt} . Assuming the worst case that j sees m_i immediately after it arrives at some validator, j then immediately delivers m_j at a validator, and j always wins when neither transaction is broadcast first by more than $(2f + \kappa)$ validators, we denote j 's winning probability as p^* and compute it as follows:

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

We have $(n-1)$ as the last index instead of n because m_i first arrives at a validator before being observed by arbitrageur j . If Byzantine validators do not relay messages, we replace $(n-1)$ with $(n-f-1)$. In the above example where $F_v \sim N(1, 1)$ and $\tilde{F}_{lt} \sim N(0, 2)$, we have $p^* = 0.75$ for $n = 10, f = 3, \kappa = 1$ and $p^* = 0.95$ for $n = 31, f = 10, \kappa = 1$.

C. Definitions - solution concepts

In the trading game, r arbitrageurs are the strategic players and aim to maximize their utilities by playing the best strategy. A *strategy* is a probabilistic distribution over possible actions, with all mass condensed at one action for a pure strategy. A *solution concept* then describes a profile or snapshot of all players' strategies with certain desired properties, e.g., Nash equilibrium discourages unilateral deviation. We naturally adopt stationary Markov Perfect Equilibria (MPE) [24] for

CLOB since the parameters of player and information arrival rates in the stochastic game are time-independent.

Definition 2 (Stationary MPE [24]). *A Nash equilibrium (NE) is a strategy profile \vec{s} where no player increases utility by unilaterally deviating from \vec{s} . A subgame perfect equilibrium (SPE) is a strategy profile \vec{s} that forms an NE for any subgame of the original game. An MPE is an SPE in which all players play Markov strategies, i.e., strategies that depend only on the current state of the game. A stationary MPE is an MPE where strategies are time-independent.*

We utilize a weaker notion, Order Book Equilibrium (OBE) for FBA since stationary MPE may not exist for FBA [6]. Intuitively, under FBA, other arbitrageurs do not have the incentive to undercut when an arbitrageur provides liquidity at the bid-ask spread that equals costs from market-making. Since others do not undercut, the arbitrageur has the incentive to widen the spread to increase profits. But this would result in others undercutting the widened quotes.

Definition 3 (OBE [6]). *Given state S_t , an OBE at time t is a set of orders submitted by all arbitrageurs such that the following hold: there exist (1) no safe profitable price improvements and (2) no other robust profitable deviations.*

Here, a profitable price improvement is safe if it remains strictly profitable after other arbitrageurs take profitable responses, e.g., liquidity withdrawals, after the improvement. A profitable deviation is robust if it remains strictly profitable after other arbitrageurs react with profitable price improvements or liquidity withdrawals. Price improvements are liquidity provisions improving current quotes and liquidity withdrawals are cancellations of limit orders. See [6] for formal justifications for OBE. OBE is weaker than MPE in the sense that it allows the existence of unilateral deviations that increase utility as long as they can be made unprofitable by others' reactions.

III. DEX UNDER CLOB AND FBA

We now model the DEXes under CLOB and FBA mechanisms. We first detail the events and then provide the equilibrium analysis with a focus on welfare loss.

A. Order of events

We abstract the DEX as run by validators running an of-ABC protocol. Arbitrageurs, investors, and traders submit transactions by sending messages to one or more validators. Validators then broadcast received messages to each other. In the following stochastic trading game \mathbb{T} , we capture the arrival of the three types of players and the validators' ordering and executing transactions. Step ③ ensures κ -differential order fairness.

- ① Repeat the following trading game for asset X with initial value V_0 .
- ② Arbitrageurs submit orders to the exchange. They can submit standard limit orders, withdrawals, and fill-or-kill or immediate-or-cancel (IOC) orders which automatically withdraw the portion not executed.

③ Nature then moves to trigger one of the following events:

- (1) An investor arrives with probability λ_i and submits an IOC order to the exchange. This may change order book quotes (\vec{b}_t, \vec{a}_t) at time t according to Bayesian updating but not the fundamental value.
- (2) A private information event occurs with probability λ_{pr} , resulting in a fundamental value jump, and an informed trader submits an IOC order to the exchange. This may change the order book quotes.
- (3) A public information event occurs with probability λ_{pb} , resulting in a fundamental value jump, and arbitrageurs submit withdrawals, provide liquidity, or front-run stale quotes.
- (4) Null event. The fundamental value and order books do not change.

④ Each validator receiving a transaction message broadcasts it. Go to step ② until the validators can order the transactions according to the of-ABC protocol. Attached priority fees help break ties, e.g., messages in the same strongly connected component in of-ABC algorithms [7], [19].

⑤ **CLOB.** After outputting a block, the validators running the exchange execute the transactions sequentially in the proposed order.

FBA. Depending on the auction frequency, after outputting one or multiple blocks, the validators execute the transactions by clearing the market with a UPDA: (1) the validators first batch the orders in the current block and all previous outstanding orders; (2) they aggregate the bids and asks; (3) if there are intersections, the market clears where supply meets demand, at a uniform price. When there are conflicting ties, priority fees can lift the execution order of transactions and further ties can be broken uniformly at random. Unmatched orders that are not canceled enter into the next trading game as outstanding orders.

B. MPE under CLOB

As described before, we aim to solve for the markup of MMs. It is contingent on the profits from satisfying investors' orders and the costs of defending against adverse selection. We denote the expected fundamental value of asset X conditioned on history and a new sell or buy order respectively as $\mathbb{E}[V_t | \mathcal{H}_t, \text{buy}]$ and $\mathbb{E}[V_t | \mathcal{H}_t, \text{sell}]$. Let Q be the maximum number of units needed by investors and p_j be the probability of an investor transacting j units ($j = 1, \dots, Q$). We state the results under CLOB as follows.

Theorem III.1. *There exists a stationary MPE in trading game \mathbb{T} under CLOB processing. Bid and ask prices at the k -th level of the LOB in equilibrium satisfy*

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

where s_k satisfies

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

Here, $\bar{J}_k = \mathbb{P}[J > \frac{s_k}{2}] \mathbb{E}[J - \frac{s_k}{2} | J > \frac{s_k}{2}]$, and g_k is the probability that an arbitrageur front-runs traders and investors at the k -th level. In equilibrium, g_k is then updated to take the value that maximizes profits from front-running traders and investors, i.e., $\lambda_{pr} p^* \frac{g_k}{g_k(r-2)+1} \bar{J}_k - (\lambda_i + \lambda_{pr}) g_k F$. The expected price impact of the first unit of an incoming order is $\Delta = \bar{J}_1 \frac{\lambda_{pr}}{\lambda_{pr} + \lambda_i}$ with $\bar{J}_k = \mathbb{P}[J > \frac{s_k}{2}] \mathbb{E}[J | J > \frac{s_k}{2}]$; the expected markup from liquidity providers is $(\lambda_{pr} + \lambda_i) (\frac{s_1}{2} - \Delta)$.

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

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

$$\begin{aligned} & \underbrace{\lambda_i \sum_{j=k}^Q p_j \frac{s_k}{2}}_{\text{Profits from investor}} - \underbrace{\lambda_{pr} \bar{J}_k}_{\text{Loss induced by } \lambda_{pr}} - \underbrace{(\lambda_{pb} \frac{r-1}{r} \bar{J}_k + \lambda_{pb} F)}_{\text{Loss induced by } \lambda_{pb}} \\ &= \underbrace{\lambda_{pb} \frac{1}{r} \bar{J}_k - \lambda_{pb} F}_{\text{Profits from front-running market-makers}} \\ &+ \underbrace{\lambda_{pr} p^* \frac{g_k}{g_k(r-2)+1} \bar{J}_k - (\lambda_i + \lambda_{pr}) g_k F}_{\text{Profits from front-running investors and traders}} \quad (1) \end{aligned}$$

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

In Equation (1), the left-hand side is the profits from market-making and the right-hand side is the returns from sniping stale quotes of market-makers and front-running private traders, which are the extra rents present in DEXes. The bid and ask prices at k -th level of LOB in equilibrium then satisfy this spread s_k . To update g_k stored in the current state, we can lay out the right-hand side as a function of g_k and solve for g_k that maximizes the function value in range $[0, 1]$ for a front-running arbitrageur, by taking the first and second derivatives of the function. More specifically, after solving Equation (1), we can express each $\frac{s_k}{2}$ and \bar{J}_k . Maximizing the right-hand side of Equation (1) gives the value for g_k . One can solve it analytically or numerically if closed-form formulas do not exist for specific distributions of the jump J .

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

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

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

Finally, the welfare loss for arbitrageurs is the costs for implementing front-running, $r \cdot c + \sum_{k=1}^Q g_k (r-1) \cdot p^* F$. The first term is the cost of establishing faster communication links with validators. The second term is the unnecessary priority fees attached in scenarios where one can successfully front-run without paying priority fees due to faster transaction dissemination. \square

The spread at each level of the order book consists of profits for market-making and the part to absorb the price impacts Δ from orders driven by private information. Price impact Δ exists because arbitrageurs cannot distinguish between common trades that do not affect asset fundamental values and privately informed trades. The expected welfare loss of investors and traders is contained in the profits, i.e., $(\lambda_{pr} + \lambda_i) (\frac{s_1}{2} - \Delta)$, which we address as markups. They are affected by the arrival rates of investors (λ_i), traders (λ_{pr}), and public information (λ_{pb}), the front-running probability (g) and its success probability (p^*), priority fees F , jump size, the number of arbitrageurs (r), and transaction sizes.

In general, as demonstrated in Fig. 1, the markup from MMs in equilibrium increases with the jump size, public information releases, the front-running probability, and its success probability. It decreases with private information arrivals, fees, and the number of arbitrageurs. The latter parameter is not depicted in the graph, but the relationship is apparent from Theorem III.1. Finally, for a specific front-running probability g , the markup first increases as the investor arrival rate rises and then decreases as it continues to grow. This is because λ_i raises market-making profits from common investors. In the meantime, it also lowers the profits from front-running investors and traders due to increased costs. Since arbitrageurs can choose freely between market-making and front-running, the profits from either strategy are equal in equilibrium. For example, if market-making is more profitable, more arbitrageurs




Fig. 1: How expected markups at the first level of the LOB change with parameters under CLOB. Each line is labeled with the corresponding parameter. For CLOB, the two probabilities g_1 and p^* are in the range $[0, 1]$, so we amplify the two lines on the top.

adopt the market-making strategy and reduce the markup to the equilibrium level. This also implies that as λ_i rises, arbitrageurs should adjust g accordingly to maximize profits.

We next examine special settings. When there is no private information ($\lambda_{pr} = 0$) in the DEX system, there is no price impact brought about by an incoming order ($\Delta = \frac{\lambda_{pr}}{\lambda_{pr} + \lambda_i} = 0$). The first-level spread satisfies $\lambda_i \frac{s_1}{2} - \lambda_{pb} \bar{J}_1 = 0$ since $g_1 = 0$ when $\lambda_{pr} = 0$. Because it is not meaningful to front-run common investors whose orders do not change the fundamental valuation of assets. In this setting, when fixing the valuation jump distribution and investor arrival rate, higher arrival rates of public information increase the spread and the markups. When there is no public information ($\lambda_{pb} = 0$), the first-level spread satisfies $\lambda_i \frac{s_1}{2} - \lambda_{pr} \bar{J}_1 - [\lambda_{pr} p^* \frac{g_1}{g_1(r-2)+1} \bar{J}_1 - (\lambda_i + \lambda_{pr}) g_1 F] = 0$. Fixing other parameters, higher arrival rates of private information increase the spread and Δ . There is one special case: when λ_{pr} tends to zero and the front-running cost F tends to the jump size, g_1 tends to 0 and the spread tends to the adverse price impact, resulting in markup tending 0. Intuitively, in this special setting, front-running opportunities are scarce and costly, where the fee F functions as Tobin tax [32] and discourages arbitraging. As a result, arbitrageurs compete as market-makers and reduce the markup in equilibrium.

C. OBE under FBA

In the following, we only need to process excessive demand or supply since only those transactions need to be fulfilled by MMs. We assume the withdrawals and updates of existing quotes can be completed in time during the batch auction interval. Let Z_I denote the excess demand (demand minus supply) during a batch interval and $Z_I \leq Q + 1$ ($Q \in \mathbb{N}$) is bounded. We borrow \bar{J}_k and \tilde{J}_k from Theorem III.1 and formally state the result for FBA in Theorem III.2. We focus on the ask quotes in the proof, but we only need to adapt signs for analyzing bid quotes.

Theorem III.2. *There exists an OBE in pure strategies in trading game Γ under FBA processing. If $|Z_I| \leq Q + 1$, bid and ask quotes in equilibrium satisfy*

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

where $\Delta_k = \tilde{J}_k \frac{\lambda_{pr}}{\lambda_{pr} + \lambda_i}$ is the expected price impact from informed traders,

$$M_k = \sum_{u=k}^Q \Delta_u \prod_{v=k}^u \alpha_v, k = 1, \dots, Q$$

and $M_{Q+1} = 0$ are the markups from MMs, $\alpha_k = \frac{q_{k+1}}{q_k + q_{k+1}}$ and $q_k = \mathbb{P}[Z_I = k | |Z_I| \leq Q + 1]$. The expected markup per unit time is $\frac{2}{I} \sum_{k=1}^Q k q_k M_k$.

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

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

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

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

k -th level. We show that the stated M_k is the OBE. (i) Suppose there exists a safe profitable price improvement on the k -th quote by ϵ , i.e., $\bar{a}^k = a^k - \epsilon$. First, consider an arbitrageur who does not own quotes and inserts a new k -

th quote. If $Z_I = k$, then the arbitrageur expects profits, and if $Z_I > k$, then a loss is expected because the settlement price would be below \bar{a}^k . Let $\Delta_k = \tilde{J}_k \frac{\lambda_{pr}}{\lambda_{pr} + \lambda_i}$, and $q_k = \mathbb{P}[Z_I = k | |Z_I| \leq Q + 1]$, and we can express the profits as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The expected markup or welfare loss of investors and traders is influenced by the arrival rates of investors (λ_i), informed traders (λ_{pr}), the jump size, and the excessive demand. As demonstrated in Fig. 2, the markup from MMs in equilibrium increases with the jump size, private information releases, and excessive demand. It decreases with investor arrivals.

IV. WELFARE LOSS AND LIQUIDITY PROVISION

We compare the welfare and liquidity under CLOB and FBA in equilibrium in §IV-A and §IV-B, and show an example with




Fig. 2: How expected markups at the first level of the LOB change with parameters under FBA.


small parameters in §IV-D.

A. Welfare loss


Special cases. When there are no privately informed traders ($\lambda_{pr} = 0$) but exists public information, FBA is strictly better than CLOB because the markup in FBA becomes zero while the markups for CLOB are still positive. As to be shown next in Fig. 3 and 5, FBA always has less welfare loss when $\lambda_{pr} = 0$. When there is no public information ($\lambda_{pb} = 0$) but exists privately informed traders, FBA has positive markups that increase with λ_{pr} . As mentioned in §III-B, the markups under CLOB tend to zero in the special scenario of small λ_{pr} . This is also portrayed in Fig. 3 where the markups for both processing models approach zero. Otherwise, the markup for CLOB also increases with λ_{pr} .

General comparison. The common parameters affecting markups in both processing models are the arrival rates of common investors and public and private information. We next demonstrate how they affect the differences between the markups under CLOB and FBA in four different settings (a)-(d). In setting (a), we pick the approximated worst case for the remaining effective parameters for both CLOB and FBA. By “approximated”, we mean that when the worst case for a parameter is infinity, we pick a large enough number instead. This means a high front-running success probability approaching 1 and small priority fees approaching 0 for CLOB, and high excessive demand for FBA. Parameters in settings (b)-(d) are set similarly to reflect the combinations of best and worst case scenarios for the two models. In FBA, the excess demand Z_I follows a truncated Skellam distribution since the arrival rates of investors and traders follow the compound Poisson jump process. To reduce parameters, when computing the markup differences, we only calculate the upper bound of the markup for FBA. This means that FBA can perform strictly better than the predictions.


Public versus private information. (1) First, as shown in Fig. 3, a higher public information arrival rate increases the welfare loss under CLOB. FBA performs better when λ_{pb} is




(a) Bad case for both CLOB and FBA.



(b) Bad case for CLOB and good case for FBA.




(c) Good case for CLOB and bad case for FBA.




(d) Good case for both CLOB and FBA.


Fig. 3: The markup difference between CLOB and FBA with respect to public and private information arrivals. Positive regions are where FBA has fewer markups, i.e., less welfare loss. The investor arrival rate λ_i is set to be 5000. Increasing (decreasing) λ_i pushes the surface up (down).




(a) Bad case for both CLOB and FBA.



(b) Bad case for CLOB and good case for FBA.




(c) Good case for CLOB and bad case for FBA.




(d) Good case for both CLOB and FBA.


Fig. 4: The markup difference between CLOB and FBA with respect to public information and investor arrivals. The private information arrival rate λ_{pr} is set to be 5000. Increasing (decreasing) λ_{pb} pushes the surface down (up).




(a) Bad case for both CLOB and FBA.



(b) Bad case for CLOB and good case for FBA.



(c) Good case for CLOB and bad case for FBA.



(d) Good case for both CLOB and FBA.

Fig. 5: The markup difference between CLOB and FBA with respect to private information and investor arrivals. The public information arrival rate λ_{pb} is set to be 5000. Increasing (decreasing) λ_{pb} pushes the surface up (down).

high compared to λ_{pr} . (2) Private information increases the welfare loss for FBA while decreasing CLOB's markup. In the bad case for FBA where there is large excessive demand, FBA realizes higher social welfare only when λ_{pr} is small. This implies that if the DEX experiences a more one-sided market, FBA achieves better social welfare if sufficiently more market participants are publicly informed compared to privately informed parties. In the good case for FBA where submitted orders are mostly settled among themselves, λ_{pb} only needs to be greater than λ_{pr} by a smaller amount for FBA to have a lower welfare loss. This means that if the DEX is more balanced on both market sides, FBA almost always attains better welfare.

Investor arrivals versus public information. We know from Theorem III.2 that the markups for FBA do not depend on public information while markups under CLOB increase with λ_{pb} (Fig. 1). As a result, FBA performs better in terms of welfare as λ_{pb} increases. This is also evident in Fig. 4. Investor arrivals have a mixed effect. FBA experiences a smaller price impact as λ_i grows larger, diminishing its markup. CLOB also faces a smaller price impact. And larger λ_i decreases the profits from front-running and more arbitrageurs compete as MMs, reducing the markups. In both the bad and good cases for FBA, larger λ_i or λ_{pb} means better performance. This implies that FBA realizes better social welfare if sufficiently


many market participants are publicly informed or are price takers.

Investor arrivals versus private information. According to the previous analysis, the price impact at the k -th level of the order book, $\Delta_k = \tilde{J}_k \frac{\lambda_{pr}}{\lambda_{pr} + \lambda_i}$, decreases with investor arrival rate and increases with private information. FBA's welfare loss then behaves the same way. CLOB's induced welfare loss decreases with λ_{pr} and also decreases with λ_i after some point (Fig. 1). As shown in Figure 5, in the bad case for FBA, its markups are amplified by the excessive demand and larger λ_i absorbs this effect. In the good case for FBA, its markups are already small even when λ_i is minute. Overall, FBA achieves better welfare when λ_i is sufficiently high compared with the private information arrival rate.


B. Bid-ask spread comparison

We now turn to compare the two execution models from a liquidity provision perspective, with the bid-ask spread being the proxy quantity that we examine. The spread consists of the price impact from orders driven by information about assets' valuation changes, and markups from MMs.


We present the figures depicting how λ_i , λ_{pb} , λ_{pr} affect the spreads of CLOB and FBA in Figure 6-8. Similar to the analysis with welfare loss, λ_{pr} approaching 0 always benefits liquidity provision in FBA. For a larger λ_{pr} , FBA has better




(a) Bad case for both CLOB and FBA.



(b) Bad case for CLOB and good case for FBA.




(c) Good case for CLOB and bad case for FBA.




(d) Good case for both CLOB and FBA.


Fig. 6: The spread difference between CLOB and FBA with respect to public and private information arrivals. The investor arrival rate λ_i is set to be 5000. Increasing (decreasing) λ_i pushes the surface up (down).




(a) Bad case for both CLOB and FBA.



(b) Bad case for CLOB and good case for FBA.




(c) Good case for CLOB and bad case for FBA.




(d) Good case for both CLOB and FBA.


Fig. 7: The spread difference between CLOB and FBA with respect to public and private information arrivals. The private information arrival rate λ_{pr} is set to be 5000. Increasing (decreasing) λ_{pb} pushes the surface down (up).




(a) Bad case for both CLOB and FBA.



(b) Bad case for CLOB and good case for FBA.



(c) Good case for CLOB and bad case for FBA.



(d) Good case for both CLOB and FBA.

Fig. 8: The spread difference between CLOB and FBA with respect to public and private information arrivals. The public information arrival rate λ_{pb} is set to be 5000. Increasing (decreasing) λ_{pb} pushes the surface up (down).

liquidity provision only when λ_i, λ_{pb} are sufficiently high with respect to λ_{pr} . When the market is thin or one-sided and more orders are fulfilled against the MMs' orders, this requirement on λ_i and λ_{pb} is harsher. When the DEX has a more balanced market and a larger proportion of the orders can be filled among themselves, the requirement is looser.

C. Empirical analysis

We sample 1,307,803 BTC-USD transactions and 1,551,746 ETH-USD transactions on dYdX [17] from May 2021 to September 2023 via Tardis [31]. We then simulate CLOB and FBA processing on the order book at the receiving time (measured in nanoseconds) of each transaction. The simulation code and result summary are available here [15]. We compute the realized spread [16] as the welfare loss. We trim outliers in the computed realized spread value with three median absolute deviations for a more robust comparison.

For BTC-USD, the realized spread of CLOB has a mean of 14.61 and a median of 11; the realized spread of FBA has mean values (8.48, 11.04, 12.15) and median values (6, 7, 9) for auction frequency of 5, 10, and 15 seconds. CLOB inflicts 20%-83% more transaction costs. As shown in Figure 9 and 10, the realized spread for FBA, especially with 5-second auction frequency is more concentrated on the smaller end. The actual clearing price is on average 1.13, 2.03, and 2.41 better than the settled trades' posted prices under FBA with

auction frequency of 5, 10, and 15 seconds. A longer auction period allows the arrival of more transactions, bringing about more and at least not worse trading opportunities.




Fig. 9: Distribution of realized spread (with outliers trimmed) from simulations on sampled BTC-USD transactions.

For ETH-USD, the realized spread of CLOB has a mean value of 1.16 and a median value of 0.90. FBA has a mean realized spread of (0.74, 0.99, 1.07) and a median realized

spread of (0.50, 0.70, 0.70) for auction frequency of 5, 10, and 15 seconds. CLOB has 8%-80% more transaction costs. The clearing price is on average 0.11, 0.15, and 0.23 better than the settled trades' posted prices under FBA with auction frequency of 5, 10, and 15 seconds. Compared with BTC-USD, ETH-USD has much smaller spreads on each level of the order book so the realized spread has a much smaller size.




Fig. 10: Distribution of realized spread (with outliers trimmed) from simulations on sampled ETH-USD transactions.

D. An example with small parameters

1) *Welfare loss:* Without loss of generality, we consider a unit order for CLOB and a specific jump size J . Under CLOB, let $a = 1 + p^* \frac{g_1}{g_1(r-2)+1}$ and the spread in Equation (1) satisfies $\frac{s}{2} = \frac{(\lambda_{pb} + a\lambda_{pr})J - (\lambda_i + \lambda_{pr})g_1F}{\lambda_{pb} + a\lambda_{pr} + \lambda_i}$. And the price impact from informed trader is $\Delta = J \frac{\lambda_{pr}}{\lambda_{pr} + \lambda_i}$. Then the markup can be computed as

$$M_{CLOB} = J \frac{\lambda_i \lambda_{pb} + (a-1)\lambda_i \lambda_{pr}}{(\lambda_i + a\lambda_{pr} + \lambda_{pb})(\lambda_{pr} + \lambda_i)} - \frac{(\lambda_i + \lambda_{pr})g_1F}{\lambda_{pb} + a\lambda_{pr} + \lambda_i}$$

and the expected markup is $J \frac{\lambda_i \lambda_{pb} + (a-1)\lambda_i \lambda_{pr}}{\lambda_i + a\lambda_{pr} + \lambda_{pb}} - \frac{(\lambda_i + \lambda_{pr})^2 g_1F}{\lambda_{pb} + a\lambda_{pr} + \lambda_i}$. This increases with the jump size J and decreases with priority fee F . For simplicity, we can measure F relative to the jump, i.e., let $F = xJ$ for some $x < 1$.

Under FBA, $\Delta_k = J \frac{\lambda_{pr}}{\lambda_{pr} + \lambda_i}$ for each level k , and $\frac{2}{T} \sum_{k=1}^Q k q_k M_k$ is the expected markups per unit time. Suppose we consider $Q = 2$ for simplicity, then the expected markups become $\frac{2}{T} J \frac{\lambda_{pr}}{\lambda_{pr} + \lambda_i} (q_1(\alpha_1 + \alpha_1 \alpha_2) + 2q_2 \alpha_2)$. For simplicity and without loss of generality, we let $q_3 = q_2 = 1/16$, $q_1 = 1/8$, FBA is better if $\frac{\lambda_i \lambda_{pb} + (a-1)\lambda_i \lambda_{pr} - (\lambda_i + \lambda_{pr})^2 g_1 x}{\lambda_i + a\lambda_{pr} + \lambda_{pb}} > \frac{\lambda_{pr}}{T(\lambda_{pr} + \lambda_i)}$, i.e.,

$$\lambda_{pb} > \frac{\lambda_{pr}(\lambda_i + a\lambda_{pr})}{T\lambda_i(\lambda_{pr} + \lambda_i) - \lambda_{pr}} - \frac{I(\lambda_i + \lambda_{pr})[(a-1)\lambda_i \lambda_{pr} - (\lambda_i + \lambda_{pr})^2 g_1 x]}{I\lambda_i(\lambda_{pr} + \lambda_i) - \lambda_{pr}} \quad (2)$$

Note that $q_1 + q_2 + q_3$ is smaller than 1 because the excess demand follows the Skellam distribution. Intuitively, users' transactions can be executed against each other and the MMs only need to satisfy excessive demands. We depict the regions where FBA induces less welfare loss for common investors and traders in Figure 11a. We intentionally let x or F be not too small, i.e., $x = 0.15$, in the figure to make the regions where CLOB imposes fewer markups more visible in this example. This means that if the jump $J = \$1$, the priority fee is $\$0.15$. When the priority fee F decreases, the region where FBA has fewer markups expands.

2) *Spread:* In the same setting with constant jump size, under CLOB, the bid-ask spread is $s = \frac{(\lambda_{pb} + a\lambda_{pr})J - (\lambda_i + \lambda_{pr})g_1F}{\lambda_{pb} + a\lambda_{pr} + \lambda_i}$. Under FBA, we denote the bid-ask spread as s_F and $s_F = 2(\Delta + M_1)$. Consider $Q \geq 1$. Same as before, although Z_I follows a Skellam distribution, for simplicity and without loss of generality, we consider $q_1 = \frac{1}{8}$ and $q_2 = \dots = q_{Q+1} = \frac{1}{8Q}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} M_1 &= \sum_{u=1}^Q \Delta_u \prod_{v=1}^u \alpha_v = \Delta(\alpha_1 + \alpha_1 \alpha_2 + \dots + \alpha_1 \dots \alpha_Q) \\ &= \Delta \frac{1}{\frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{8Q}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} + \dots + \frac{1}{2^{Q-1}}\right) = \Delta \frac{2}{Q+1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2^Q}\right) \end{aligned}$$


Let a transaction be fulfilled with transactions submitted by other common investors or traders with probability $q_0 = 1 - 2 \sum_{j=1}^{Q+1} q_j$. FBA provides a smaller bid-ask spread in expectation when $(1 - q_0)s > s_F$. This gives

$$2(1 - q_0) \frac{\lambda_{pr}}{\lambda_{pr} + \lambda_i} \left(1 + \frac{2}{Q+1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2^Q}\right)\right) < \frac{\lambda_{pb} + a\lambda_{pr} - (\lambda_i + \lambda_{pr})g_1 x}{\lambda_{pb} + a\lambda_{pr} + \lambda_i} \quad (3)$$

We depict the regions where FBA has a smaller expected bid-ask spread in Figure 11b. When there is no private information, the spread under FBA is constant while the spread under CLOB increases with λ_{pb} . We can also consider general parameterization for Z_I 's distribution. When $\sum_{u=1}^Q \prod_{v=1}^u \alpha_v$ decreases, the region where FBA has smaller spreads expands. In Figure 11c, we demonstrate the regions where FBA has smaller spreads when the market is extremely thin, i.e., a single transaction appears in the batch and potentially trades multiple units. This means that each investor or trader directly trades with the MM. This implies that liquidity provision under FBA worsens as the market becomes thinner or more unbalanced.

V. RELATED WORK

Mitigate transaction order manipulation problem. Except for taxing front-running [9], there are mainly three other defenses against order manipulations. The first mitigation approach is extending the security definition of consensus or ABC problem to include order fairness [7], [20]. Kelkar et al. [20] define batch order fairness and present an asynchronous batch order-fair ABC protocol tolerating up to one-fourth Byzantine faults with $O(n^4)$ communication complexity, which is later improved in Themis [19]. Here n is



(a) Example regions where FBA has less welfare loss when $F = 0.15J, p^* = 0.8, r = 35$, truncated at $\lambda_{pr} = 3, \lambda_{pb} = 3$. (b) Example regions where FBA has smaller bid-ask spreads under the same parameters as Figure 11a and additionally, $q_0 = 0.5, Q = 100$. (c) Example regions where FBA has smaller bid-ask spreads in an extremely thin market under the same parameters as Figure 11a with $Q = 100$.

Fig. 11: Examples with small parameters.

the total number of parties. Cachin et al. [7] introduce an equivalent receiver order fairness concept, differential order fairness (Definition 1), and present an of-ABC protocol in an asynchronous network. The protocol induces quadratic communication complexity and has optimal fault tolerance of up to one-third of faults.

Mask transactions. The second approach is blinding the transaction contents through encryption [3], [23], [26], [35] or commitments [25] until after they have been committed [23], [26]. This eliminates manipulations dependent on transaction contents. Ferveo [3] constructs a publicly verifiable distributed key generation (DKG) scheme and combines it with a threshold encryption scheme [30] for Tendermint-based [4] Proof-of-Stake protocols to achieve mempool privacy, where transactions are encrypted until finalization. Ferveo has a high bandwidth overhead from threshold encryption and the constructed DKG protocol. F3B [35] also lets clients threshold-encrypt symmetric transaction encryption keys which are revealed by a committee after transactions are committed. To improve efficiency, Fino [23] adds to a DAG-based state machine replication protocol a threshold secret sharing [34] and threshold encryption [30] layer for users to share their transaction encryption keys. FairBlock [26] employs an Identity-based Encryption (IBE) scheme for blinding transactions: a committee of trusted keepers runs a DKG protocol [14], [18], [27] to generate master secret key shares for each keeper, which are tied to a master public key.

Masking transactions does not hide network-level meta-data and does not stop validators from oblivious manipulations independent of transaction contents, e.g., ordering a transaction before others or removing transactions from certain IP addresses, and does not eliminate profitable order manipulations based on inference of transaction contents. Besides, hostile arbitrage strategies in anticipation of future orders instead of explicit observations of transaction arrival can still be performed, e.g., traditional front-running.

Manipulation-aware DEX design. The third approach is

from a market design perspective. Fair-TraDEX [25] combines FBA with commit-then-reveal style transaction masking where users commit to transactions and later reveal the contents upon finalization. Similarly, Injective [21] and Penumbra [28] utilize FBA for executing transactions on proof-of-stake blockchains, with Penumbra being a private chain. In P2DEX [2] servers run a secure multi-party computation (MPC) protocol to match orders. This introduces computation overhead and latencies and adds constraints inherent to the adopted MPC machinery. SPEEDEX [29] approximates the clearing price in a block in general equilibrium where demand meets supply, given a set of static orders. The equilibrium does not aim to capture participants' strategies, acquired information, or dynamic sequential moves. Xavier et al. [33] alternatively consider a greedy sequencing rule in two-token constant product automatic market maker (AMM). Since this sequencing rule ensures good properties only inside a block, sequencers can still push submitted transactions to future blocks.

VI. CONCLUDING REMARKS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

We explore the adoption of frequent batch auction (FBA) as a market design response to mitigate general order manipulations in decentralized exchanges (DEXes) constructed using the of-ABC mechanism. The core idea behind FBA is settling trades in the same batch at the same price, while of-ABC ensures batch order fairness or its equivalence. To demonstrate the benefits of adopting FBA, we compare the welfare loss under FBA and the current mainstream processing model in financial markets, CLOB, at their respective market equilibria. Our analysis reveals that FBA leads to a lower welfare loss under specific conditions. This includes scenarios where common investors and public information regarding asset valuation arrive sufficiently frequently compared to private information, when the priority fees for transaction inclusion are small relative to the asset's valuation jump size, or when the market is more balanced.

The performance improvement in these settings can be attributed to several intrinsic factors. When public information

is revealed frequently, MMs have time to react to it under FBA but have to increase markups to counter the increasing adverse selection risk under CLOB. With sufficiently frequent common investors or a balanced market, the welfare loss of FBA is largely reduced. When the priority fees are small, MMs face high adverse selection risks and arbitrageurs are incentivized to front-run instead of competing in market-making, also allowing for higher markups.

In future research, several avenues of investigation could be pursued as extensions of this paper. It can be interesting to (1) empirically and theoretically analyze the benefits and downsides of front-running in DEXes in terms of market efficiency and quality, (2) compare other aspects of the FBA and CLOB processing models in the DEX context, e.g., price discovery, (3) introduce competition among DEXes instead of modeling a single exchange, and (4) devise and solve for stronger solution concepts for the stochastic trading game.

VII. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation (NSF) under grant CNS1846316 and a Purdue Research Foundation (PRF) research grant.

REFERENCES

- [1] Adams, H., Zinsmeister, N., Salem, M., Keefer, R., Robinson, D.: Uniswap v3 core. Tech. rep., Uniswap, Tech. Rep. (2021)
- [2] Baum, C., David, B., Frederiksen, T.K.: P2dex: privacy-preserving decentralized cryptocurrency exchange. In: Applied Cryptography and Network Security: 19th International Conference, ACNS 2021, Kamakura, Japan, June 21–24, 2021, Proceedings, Part I. pp. 163–194. Springer (2021)
- [3] Bebel, J., Ojha, D.: Ferveo: Threshold decryption for mempool privacy in bft networks. Cryptology ePrint Archive (2022)
- [4] Buchman, E.: Tendermint: Byzantine fault tolerance in the age of blockchains. Ph.D. thesis, University of Guelph (2016)
- [5] Budish, E., Cramton, P., Shim, J.: The high-frequency trading arms race: Frequent batch auctions as a market design response. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **130**(4), 1547–1621 (2015)
- [6] Budish, E., Lee, R.S., Shim, J.J.: A theory of stock exchange competition and innovation: Will the market fix the market? Tech. rep., National Bureau of Economic Research (2019)
- [7] Cachin, C., Mićić, J., Steinhauer, N.: Quick order fairness. In: International Conference on Financial Cryptography and Data Security. Springer (2022)
- [8] Corporation, T.S.E.: Taiwan stock exchange, <https://www.twse.com.tw/en/>
- [9] Daian, P., Goldfeder, S., Kell, T., Li, Y., Zhao, X., Bentov, I., Breidenbach, L., Juels, A.: Flash boys 2.0: Frontrunning in decentralized exchanges, miner extractable value, and consensus instability. In: IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy. pp. 910–927. IEEE (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1109/SP40000.2020.00040>
- [10] Eibelshäuser, S., Smetak, F.: Frequent batch auctions and informed trading (2022)
- [11] Ethereum: Ethereum yellow paper, <https://github.com/ethereum/yellowpaper>
- [12] ethereum.org: Priority fees in ethereum, <https://ethereum.org/en/developers/docs/gas/#priority-fee>
- [13] Farmer, D., Skouras, S.: Review of the benefits of a continuous market vs. randomised stop auctions and of alternative priority rules (policy options 7 and 12). Manuscript, Foresight. Government Office for Science (2012)
- [14] Gennaro, R., Jarecki, S., Krawczyk, H., Rabin, T.: Secure distributed key generation for discrete-log based cryptosystems. *Journal of Cryptology* **20**, 51–83 (2007)
- [15] Gong, T.: Simulation source code, <https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1IZ-hYoas91JASxszBWweJ5AGVqipsWXK?usp=sharing>
- [16] Indriawan, I., Pascual, R., Shkilko, A.: On the effects of continuous trading. Available at SSRN 3707154 (2020)
- [17] Juliano, A.: dydx. <https://github.com/dydxprotocol> (2023)
- [18] Kate, A., Goldberg, I.: Distributed private-key generators for identity-based cryptography. In: International Conference on Security and Cryptography for Networks. pp. 436–453. Springer (2010), https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-15317-4_27
- [19] Kelkar, M., Deb, S., Long, S., Juels, A., Kannan, S.: Themis: Fast, strong order-fairness in byzantine consensus. Cryptology ePrint Archive (2021)
- [20] Kelkar, M., Zhang, F., Goldfeder, S., Juels, A.: Order-fairness for byzantine consensus. In: Annual International Cryptology Conference. pp. 451–480. Springer (2020), https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-56877-1_16
- [21] Labs, I.: Injective, <https://injective.com/about>
- [22] Labs, M.: sui. <https://github.com/MystenLabs/sui> (2023)
- [23] Malkhi, D., Szalachowski, P.: Maximal Extractable Value (MEV) Protection on a DAG. arXiv e-prints pp. arXiv–2208 (2022), <https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.00940>
- [24] Maskin, E., Tirole, J.: Markov perfect equilibrium: I. observable actions. *Journal of Economic Theory* **100**(2), 191–219 (2001)
- [25] McMenamin, C., Daza, V., Fitz, M., O’Donoghue, P.: Fairtrader: A decentralized exchange preventing value extraction. In: Proceedings of the 2022 ACM CCS Workshop on Decentralized Finance and Security. pp. 39–46 (2022)
- [26] Momeni, P.: Fairblock: Preventing blockchain front-running with minimal overheads. Master’s thesis, University of Waterloo (2022), https://uwspace.uwaterloo.ca/bitstream/handle/10012/18554/Momeni_Peyman.pdf
- [27] Pedersen, T.P.: A threshold cryptosystem without a trusted party. In: Advances in Cryptology—EUROCRYPT’91: Workshop on the Theory and Application of Cryptographic Techniques Brighton, UK, April 8–11, 1991 Proceedings 10. pp. 522–526. Springer (1991)
- [28] Penumbra: Penumbra zswap, <https://protocol.penumbra.zone/main/zswap.html>
- [29] Ramseyer, G., Goel, A., Mazières, D.: Speedex: A scalable, parallelizable, and economically efficient digital exchange. arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.02719 (2021)
- [30] Shoup, V., Gennaro, R.: Securing threshold cryptosystems against chosen ciphertext attack. In: Advances in Cryptology—EUROCRYPT’98: International Conference on the Theory and Application of Cryptographic Techniques Espoo, Finland, May 31–June 4, 1998 Proceedings 17. pp. 1–16. Springer (1998)
- [31] Tardis.dev: Tardis.dev node. <https://github.com/tardis-dev/tardis-node> (2023)
- [32] Tobin, J.: A proposal for international monetary reform. *Eastern economic journal* **4**(3/4), 153–159 (1978)
- [33] Xavier Ferreira, M.V., Parkes, D.C.: Credible decentralized exchange design via verifiable sequencing rules. In: Proceedings of the 55th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing. pp. 723–736 (2023)
- [34] Yang, L., Park, S.J., Alizadeh, M., Kannan, S., Tse, D.: {DispersedLedger}:{High-Throughput} byzantine consensus on variable bandwidth networks. In: 19th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 22). pp. 493–512 (2022)
- [35] Zhang, H., Merino, L.H., Estrada-Galinanes, V., Ford, B.: Flash freezing flash boys: Countering blockchain front-running. In: 2022 IEEE 42nd International Conference on Distributed Computing Systems Workshops (ICDCSW). pp. 90–95. IEEE (2022)