

Expected IL for Uniswap v3 positions

0xAlbert.eth folch.eth 0xOli

February 21, 2023

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Simulation parameters	2
2	Technical details	3
2.1	Expected IL	3
2.2	Time in-the-money	4
3	Monte Carlo simulation results	5
3.1	EIL for 168 hours (7 days)	5
3.2	EIL for 7200 hours (30 days)	5
3.3	Expected prices	6
3.4	Unit impermanent loss per liquidity (UIL)	6
4	Conclusion	6

1 Introduction

Impermanent loss (IL) or divergence-loss, is a phenomena experienced by LP providers on almost all types of AMM platforms, especially when providing liquidity for non-mean reverting assets. The effects of IL have been studied extensively because of their negative impact on LP providers’ returns [Loe+21]. When modelling an asset’s price with a geometric brownian motion (GBM), IL can be estimated numerically by using iterative techniques such as the Monte Carlo method. The result of this estimation is referred to as “expected impermanent loss” (EIL). Previous work wrongly concluded that the computation of EIL for Uniswap v3 positions is analytically intractable, due to the complexity of the math expressions involving the GBM [Dan22]. However, a recent paper provided a framework for the analytical computation of EIL for Uniswap v3 positions [HP22]. Subsequent work [DZ22] introduced the “unit impermanent loss per liquidity” (UIL) and static replication formulas. We implement these ideas and present the results obtained with Monte Carlo simulations.

1.1 Simulation parameters

- Number of simulations: 1000
- Initial price: 1000 (Units of numéraire asset, e.g. DAI or USDC)
- Drift (μ): 0.000075
- Standard deviation (σ): 0.001

2 Technical details

2.1 Expected IL

The integrals in the analytical computation of EIL are calculated using the “*integrate*” R function, which is based on QUADPACK routines dqags and dqagi by R. Piessens and E. deDoncker-Kapenga [PU83].

```
function(f, lb, ub, P, Pa, Pb, mu, sigma, T) {  
  
  integral <- integrate(  
    f,  
    # Lower integration bound  
    lb,  
    # Upper integration bound  
    ub,  
    subdivisions = 5000,  
    abs.tol = 1e-5,  
    rel.tol = 1e-7,  
    stop.on.error = F,  
    T,  
    P,  
    Pa,  
    Pb,  
    mu,  
    sigma  
  )$value;  
  
  coefficient <- (1 / (sigma * sqrt(2 * pi * T)))  
  return(coefficient * integral)  
}
```

2.2 Time in-the-money

The two-dimensional integrals for the computation of “*time in-the-money*” (\mathcal{T}) are calculated using the `dblquad` function from the `pracma` library.

```
function(P, Pa, Pb, mu, sigma, T) {  
  
  lower_bound <- log(Pa / P)  
  upper_bound <- log(Pb / P)  
  
  f <- function(x, y, mu, sigma) {  
    t <- y  
    first_term <- -(x - (mu - (sigma^2 / 2)) * t)^2  
    second_term <- (2 * t * (sigma^2))  
    exp(first_term / second_term) / sqrt(t)  
  }  
  
  integral <- dblquad(  
    f,  
    # Lower integration bound  
    log(Pa / P),  
    # Upper integration bound  
    log(Pb / P),  
    0,  
    T,  
    tol=1e-5,  
    subdivs=5000,  
    mu=mu,  
    sigma=sigma  
  )  
  
  result <- (1 / (sigma * (sqrt(2 * pi)))) * integral[1]  
  
  return(result)  
}
```

3 Monte Carlo simulation results

3.1 EIL for 168 hours (7 days)

Table 1: Results for setting $\mu = 7.5\text{e-}5$, $1.5\text{e-}4$ and $\sigma = 0.001$ and $\sigma = 0.002$ for 7 days ($T = 168$ hours) of providing liquidity with initial price \$1000.

		$\sigma = 0.001$			$\sigma = 0.002$			
			Formula		Simulation	Formula		Simulation
μ	r	CE	\mathcal{T}	EIL	IL	\mathcal{T}	EIL	IL
7.50e-05	1.001	2000	16.92	-0.0072	-7.16e-03	9.72	-0.0112	-1.12e-02
	1.010	200	110.61	-0.0052	-5.23e-03	77.77	-0.0092	-9.21e-03
	1.100	21	168.00	-8.71e-04	-8.71e-04	167.99	-0.0022	-2.21e-03
	1.200	11	168.00	-4.66e-04	-4.66e-04	168.00	-0.0012	-1.18e-03
	2.000	3	168.00	-1.38e-04	-1.38e-04	168.00	-3.51e-04	-3.51e-04
	5.000	2	168.00	-7.20e-05	-7.20e-05	168.00	-1.85e-04	-1.85e-04
1.50e-04	1.001	2000	11.76	-0.0124	-1.24e-02	8.71	-0.0145	-1.45e-02
	1.010	200	78.75	-0.0103	-1.03e-02	69.16	-0.0124	-1.24e-02
	1.100	21	168.00	-0.0021	-2.14e-03	167.94	-0.0035	-3.46e-03
	1.200	11	168.00	-0.0011	-1.15e-03	168.00	-0.0019	-1.85e-03
	2.000	3	168.00	-3.41e-04	-3.41e-04	168.00	-5.50e-04	-5.50e-04
	5.000	2	168.00	-1.31e-04	-1.31e-04	168.00	-2.91e-04	-2.91e-04

3.2 EIL for 7200 hours (30 days)

Table 2: Results for setting $\mu = 7.5\text{e-}5$, $1.5\text{e-}4$ and $\sigma = 0.001$ and $\sigma = 0.002$ for 30 days ($T = 720$ hours) of providing liquidity with initial price \$1000.

		$\sigma = 0.001$			$\sigma = 0.002$			
			Formula		Simulation	Formula		Simulation
μ	r	CE	\mathcal{T}	EIL	IL	\mathcal{T}	EIL	IL
7.50e-05	1.001	2000	21.27	-0.0130	-1.30e-02	13.36	-0.0175	-1.75e-02
	1.010	200	154.71	-0.0109	-1.09e-02	113.66	-0.0154	-1.54e-02
	1.100	21	336.00	-0.0026	-2.58e-03	334.31	-0.0052	-5.19e-03
	1.200	11	336.00	-0.0014	-1.38e-03	336.00	-0.0028	-2.79e-03
	2.000	3	336.00	-4.11e-04	-4.11e-04	336.00	-8.30e-04	-8.30e-04
	5.000	2	336.00	-2.18e-04	-2.18e-04	336.00	-4.40e-04	-4.40e-04
1.50e-04	1.001	2000	12.39	-0.0249	-2.49e-02	10.91	-0.0261	-2.61e-02
	1.010	200	86.72	-0.0226	-2.26e-02	91.18	-0.0239	-2.39e-02
	1.100	21	335.83	-0.0077	-7.67e-03	329.03	-0.0101	-1.01e-02
	1.200	11	336.00	-0.0041	-4.10e-03	336.00	-0.0055	-5.47e-03
	2.000	3	336.00	-0.0012	-1.22e-03	336.00	-0.0016	-1.63e-03
	5.000	2	336.00	-6.46e-04	-6.46e-04	336.00	-8.62e-04	-8.62e-04

3.3 Expected prices

Table 3: Expected price of the asset, for 7 ($\mathcal{T} = 168$ hours) and 30 days ($\mathcal{T} = 720$ hours).

μ	$\mathcal{T} = 168$	$\mathcal{T} = 720$
0.000075	1012.68	1055.485
0.000150	1025.52	1114.048

3.4 Unit impermanent loss per liquidity (UIL)

Table 4 - Unit impermanent loss per liquidity (UIL).

sigma	Formula		Static replication	
	UIL^R	UIL^L	UIL^R	UIL^L
0.001	-0.0733081429997792	-0.674402053309331	-0.0733081429997886	-0.674402053309333
0.005	-0.10354377675798	-0.674610528493785	-0.10354377675799	-0.67461052849379

4 Conclusion

The method introduced by [HP22] provides a reliable way to determine the expected value of impermanent loss under a geometric brownian motion assumption. The model is sensitive to parameters such as drift and volatility as see in Table 1 and 2. The expected value of impermanent loss computed analytically converges with the result of the Monte Carlo simulation with low error rate. [DZ22] characterizes analytically the option-like payoff structure of impermanent loss for concentrated liquidity positions and provides formulas for static replication of the impermanent loss with a combination of European options. Table 4 reports the result of the computation obtained with the analytical approach and highlights the high accuracy of the replication formulas.

References

- [Dan22] Danr. *Expected Impermanent Loss in Uniswap V2 & V3*. Available at <https://medium.com/gammaswap-labs/expected-impermanent-loss-in-uniswap-v2-v3-7fb81033bd81>. Mar. 2022.
- [DZ22] J. Deng and H. Zong. “Static Replication of Impermanent Loss for Concentrated Liquidity Provision in Decentralised Markets”. In: *Cornell.edu* (2022). URL: <http://arxiv-export-lb.library.cornell.edu/pdf/2205.12043>.
- [HP22] S. Hashemseresht and M. Pourpouneh. “Concentrated Liquidity Analysis in Uniswap V3”. In: *DeFi’22: Proceedings of the 2022 ACM CCS Workshop on Decentralized Finance and Security* (Nov. 2022), pp. 63–70. URL: <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3560832.3563438>.
- [Loe+21] S. Loesch et al. “Impermanent Loss in Uniswap v3”. In: *arXiv.org* (2021). URL: <https://arxiv.org/ftp/arxiv/papers/2111/2111.09192.pdf>.
- [PU83] R. Piessens and C. W. Uberhuber. *QUADPACK: a subroutine package for automatic integration*. Springer, 1983. ISBN: 3-540-12553-1.