Strengthening the Role of Lido Liquid Staking Tokens

Krzysztof M. Gogol
kg@defiam.xyz

1 INTRODUCTION

Liquid staking tokens (LSTs), such as stETH and wstETH, are essential for Ethereum and DeFi users, enabling enhanced capital efficiency and new financial opportunities. However, to drive broader adoption and improve usability across DeFi protocols, several key areas require further research and development.

The seamless integration into automated market makers (AMMs), lending protocols, and cross-chain environments presents challenges, including efficient liquidity provisioning, maintaining a stable peg to ETH, and optimizing lending dynamics. This paper identifies key research areas that can improve the usability and adoption of stETH, focusing on arbitrage dynamics, Uniswap v4 hook integration, lending market optimizations, and cross-chain deployment strategies. By addressing these challenges, Lido can reinforce its position as a leader in liquid staking solutions while fostering greater adoption and innovation in DeFi, also among institutional clients.

2 RESEARCH AREAS

I identified four research areas that could benefit from further investigation, each addressing critical challenges and opportunities.

2.1 The stETH Peg and Arbitrage with CEXs

While stETH is designed to maintain a 1:1 peg with ETH, some oscillations at DEX or CEX may occur. In particular, at Curve these fluctuations are relatively small, especially after the Shanghai upgrade (e.g., fluctuating around 0.99 ETH) and comparable to USstablecoins pricing. Larger deviations, however, are observed on CEXs, raising questions about the effectiveness of arbitrage between CEXs, DEXs, and Lido's withdrawal process (7 days). Key research questions:

- What is the extent of stETH depegging across various CEXs and DEXs[2]?
- Why are depegs more pronounced on certain CEXs or specific DEX[5]?
- What are the primary barriers to arbitrage? (e.g., bridging fees, withdrawal delays, staking reward distribution frequency)[3]
- How can these depegs be mitigated? What impact do cross-chain bridge fees, withdrawal queues, and staking reward frequency have on peg stability?

2.2 Optimizing Liquidity in DEXs

Ensuring deep and efficient liquidity pools for stETH-ETH pairs is essential for maintaining price stability and facilitating seamless trading. We analyze liquidity provisioning strategies in Curve, Uniswap v3, and the upcoming Uniswap v4 to determine the optimal pool size, fee structures, and capital efficiency improvements. Key research questions:

- What is the optimal size of liquidity pools (Curve, Uniswap v3/v4) to fairly compensate LPs while maintaining efficient trading conditions[1]?
- How much can TVL be reduced without significantly increasing slippage for traders[4]?
- How should fee structures be optimized to balance liquidity incentives and trading efficiency?

2.3 Opportunities with Uniswap v4 Hooks

With Uniswap v4 set to launch soon, Lido could benefit from a custom hook for stETH-WETH pools, significantly reducing loss-versus-rebalancing (LVR). Since most arbitrage transactions occur on Uniswap, a specialized Uniswap v4 hook could improve LST trading efficiency of stETH by listing at Uniswap. Additionally, integrating MEV tax mechanisms pioneered by Paradigm at Unichain could further enhance LPs. Key research questions:

- How can a Uniswap v4 hook enable efficient stETH trading and improve price stability?
- What are the benefits of a custom stETH and wstETH hook for liquidity management and impermanent loss reduction?
- How can MEV-related mechanisms be leveraged on Unichain to enhance LST trading efficiency?

2.4 Lending Markets

A tighter peg between stETH and ETH would allow for higher loan-to-value (LTV) ratios in DeFi lending markets. Interestingly, borrowing rates for wstETH often remain below the staking rate, suggesting potential arbitrage opportunities that remain underutilized. Key research questions:

- What are the optimal risk parameters (e.g., liquidation thresholds) for lending pools involving stETH and wstETH?
- What arbitrage opportunities exist between stETH lending and borrowing rates, and what barriers prevent efficient exploitation?
- How should interest rate models be structured for LST lending markets?

2.5 Cross-Chain Deployment

While stETH offers the advantage of automatic staking rewards, its compatibility issues with DeFi protocols (such as Uniswap's preference for wrapped tokens like wstETH) present challenges for broader adoption. Additionally, cross-chain solutions for LSTs remain underdeveloped. Key research questions:

- What is the optimal architecture for cross-chain stETH deployment?
- What are the trade-offs between different cross-chain implementations, and how do they impact security, efficiency, and user experience?
- Could an intent-based solver be more efficient in bridging stETH to other chains that a traditional bridge?

3 CONCLUSION

Beyond the technical benefits, this research will raise awareness within the DeFi community, educate liquidity providers (LPs) on optimal staking strategies, and increase general understanding of MEV-related issues. Showcasing these findings at leading Ethereum and DeFi community events will help drive discussions and innovations, ultimately contributing to broader adoption. Additionally, publishing blog posts and research papers will further solidify Lido's position as a thought leader in the space.

This proposal outlines critical research areas that could enhance the integration of LSTs within DeFi. By improving liquidity provisioning, leveraging Uniswap v4 hooks, optimizing lending mechanisms, and addressing cross-chain deployment challenges, Lido can significantly advance the adoption and efficiency of its LST offerings. Further research into depeg dynamics and MEV-related solutions will provide additional insights for ecosystem participants.

REFERENCES

[1] Krzysztof Gogol, Robin Fritsch, Malte Schlosser, Johnnatan Messias, Benjamin Kraner, and Claudio Tessone. 2024. Liquid Staking Tokens in Automated Market Makers. (2024). arXiv:cs.CR/2403.10226 https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.10226

[2] Krzysztof Gogol, Benjamin Kraner, Malte Schlosser, Tao Yan, Claudio Tessone, and Burkhard Stiller. 2024. Empirical and Theoretical Analysis of Liquid Staking Protocols. (2024). arXiv:cs.CR/2401.16353 https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.16353

[3] Krzysztof Gogol, Johnnatan Messias, Deborah Miori, Claudio Tessone, and Benjamin Livshits. 2024. Cross-Rollup MEV: Non-Atomic Arbitrage Across L2 Blockchains. (2024). arXiv:cs.CR/2406.02172 https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.02172

[4] Krzysztof Gogol, Manvir Schneider, Claudio Tessone, and Benjamin Livshits. 2025. Liquidity Fragmentation or Optimization? Analyzing Automated Market Makers Across Ethereum and Rollups. (2025). arXiv:cs.CE/2410.10324 https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.10324

[5] Krzysztof Gogol, Yaron Velner, Benjamin Kraner, and Claudio Tessone. 2024. SoK: Liquid Staking Tokens (LSTs) and Emerging Trends in Restaking. (2024). arXiv:cs.CR/2404.00644 https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.00644