FROM AMMs TO INTENTS

The New DeFi Execution Stack and the Economics of Orderflow

Market Structure Report

May 2026

Rushi Chavan
Independent Research Analyst

Research Coverage :
DeFi Execution Infrastructure • Market Microstructure • On-Chain Liquidity Dynamics • Token Value Accrual

This report is for informational purposes only and does not constitute investment advice. All figures are as of the date of publication. The author holds no positions in the tokens discussed and has no commercial relationship with the protocols mentioned.

Executive Summary

For five years, the dominant paradigm in decentralized finance held that economic value accrued to protocols capable of bootstrapping the deepest liquidity pools. That assumption is no longer valid. As on-chain liquidity fragments across a multipolar landscape of rollups, appchains, and alternative L1s, the marginal competitive advantage of holding capital in an automated market maker pool has collapsed toward zero. AMMs are not being replaced; they are being commoditized. The value has moved up the stack.

This report argues that DeFi is undergoing a structural paradigm shift from liquidity-centric architectures to execution-centric architectures. The competitive battlefield is no longer "who owns the pools" but "who owns the path." Economic rent is migrating to entities that control user intent, orderflow routing, solver infrastructure, and execution quality. The future winners in DeFi will not be liquidity venues. They will be execution venues and orderflow monopolists.

The transition is measurable. By March 2026, total value locked across DeFi protocols reached approximately $118 billion, yet the composition revealed a critical divergence. Real-world asset protocols overtook decentralized lending as the largest sector, while DEX liquidity's share of total DeFi TVL stagnated at roughly 18 percent. Simultaneously, intent-based protocols, including CoW Protocol, UniswapX, 1inch Fusion, and Across, now collectively handle billions in monthly volume through solver auction mechanisms. The volume flowing through intent-based execution layers is growing at a rate that suggests a majority of non-retail DeFi volume will route through declarative rather than imperative architectures by 2027.

The economic logic driving this shift is rigorous. AMMs, by design, are passive liquidity venues that sell options to arbitrageurs without charging the proper premium. The adverse-selection cost borne by liquidity providers, formalized in the academic literature as Loss-Versus-Rebalancing (LVR), scales quadratically with volatility and linearly with pool gamma. Empirical estimates suggest LVR in high-volatility ETH-USDC pools has exceeded fee revenue by 150 to 300 basis points annually during volatile regimes, meaning concentrated liquidity providers have been systematically losing money relative to a continuously rebalanced portfolio. Uniswap v3's concentrated liquidity innovation improved capital efficiency at the cost of transforming passive LPs into unhedged option sellers, a structural mismatch that sophisticated solvers now exploit as a matter of routine.

The intent paradigm resolves this by abstracting execution from the user. Rather than instructing a specific swap path, the user signs a declarative message specifying an outcome constraint: "I want at least Y of token B on chain C within T seconds." A network of professional solvers, often institutional market makers with multi-million-dollar balance sheets and sub-second cross-chain inventory management, competes to fulfill the intent at the best price. The winning solver captures the spread between the user's minimum acceptable return and the true execution cost, while the user receives price improvement, MEV protection, and gasless execution.

This replicates, almost precisely, the evolution of US equity market structure from the 1990s to the present. The New York Stock Exchange and NASDAQ once dominated as liquidity-centric venues. Then electronic communication networks and wholesale market makers emerged, internalizing retail orderflow and capturing the bid-ask spread. In 2024, payment for order flow in US equities generated approximately $2.3 billion in annual revenue for brokerages, with Citadel Securities, Virtu Financial, and Susquehanna controlling over 70 percent of retail wholesaling. DeFi is now replicating this architecture, but at a global scale and without the regulatory guardrails that mandate best execution in TradFi.

The investment implications are profound. Generic AMM governance tokens face structural multiple compression because their value proposition rests on volume-dependent fee generation from a commodity layer. Intent protocols and aggregator tokens possess network-effect moats but are vulnerable to wallet vertical integration. Solver infrastructure will consolidate into an oligopoly of 3 to 5 major institutional players, creating equity-like value accrual for the dominant firms. Wallets and distribution layers own the customer relationship, which is the scarcest resource in a world of commoditized liquidity. Shared sequencers and interoperability layers capture cross-chain settlement rent, positioning them as the exchanges of the rollup era.

This report maps the new DeFi execution stack through five proprietary analytical frameworks: the Value Chain Layer Model, the Economic Rent Gradient, the Capital Flow Decomposition, the Solver Oligopoly Thesis, and the Execution Quality Moat Index. Each framework is grounded in quantitative market data, on-chain protocol financials, and comparative market structure analysis from TradFi. Every claim is supported by either empirical observation, mathematical derivation, or historical precedent. All data and citations reflect information publicly available on or before 12 May 2026.

The critical question for institutional allocators is no longer "where is the liquidity?" It is "who controls the orderflow, how is execution priced, and what share of the economic surplus can each layer defend against competition?" The answers determine where value will accumulate in the next phase of DeFi's maturation.

Section I: The Commoditization of On-Chain Liquidity

1.1 The AMM Revolution and Its Structural Limits

Automated market makers were the foundational innovation that enabled DeFi's first growth cycle. Uniswap v2 introduced the constant product market maker (CPMM) in November 2018, replacing the need for active market makers with a passive, deterministic pricing function. The formula x times y equals k guaranteed that any trade could execute against a pool as long as the product of reserves remained constant. For long-tail assets that lacked sufficient trading volume to support an order book, this was a genuine breakthrough in capital efficiency.

The CPMM model, however, contained a fundamental structural flaw: it was blind to external price discovery. Because the pool price moved only in response to trades executed against the pool, any price movement on centralized exchanges or other venues created an arbitrage gap. When a volatile event shifted the true market price of ETH by 2 percent, arbitrageurs could trade against the pool at the stale price, extract the difference, and push the pool price toward the new equilibrium. The liquidity provider, who had deposited capital into the pool, bore this cost without being compensated for the optionality they were implicitly selling.

Uniswap v3, launched in May 2021, attempted to address capital inefficiency through concentrated liquidity. Rather than spreading capital uniformly across the entire price curve, LPs could deposit within specific price ranges, multiplying effective depth by 10 to 100 times for the same notional capital. The result was genuinely lower slippage for traders. But the innovation came at a cost: it transformed passive LPs into active managers who needed to continuously rebalance positions, hedge directional exposure, and monitor volatility regimes. Most retail participants lacked the infrastructure to do this profitably.

Uniswap v4, announced in June 2023 and expected to see significant adoption by early 2026, introduced hooks, custom logic that could be injected at various points in the pool lifecycle. Hooks enable dynamic fees, limit orders, and time-weighted average market maker functionality. They are a powerful generalization of the AMM primitive. Yet they remain fundamentally AMM-centric: they manage localized liquidity curves, not global execution optimization. They do not solve cross-chain routing, intent matching, or MEV protection. They are an evolution of the substrate, not a replacement for the stack above it.

1.2 Quantifying Loss-Versus-Rebalancing

The adverse-selection cost of AMM liquidity provision has been formalized in the academic literature as Loss-Versus-Rebalancing (LVR), introduced by Milionis, Moallemi, Roughgarden, and Zhang in 2022. LVR quantifies the expected loss to a liquidity provider relative to a continuously rebalanced portfolio that tracks the external market price. The intuition is straightforward: because AMM prices lag primary market prices, informed arbitrageurs can systematically trade against the pool at stale prices, extracting value that the LP would have captured through continuous rebalancing.

The instantaneous LVR rate is given by:

$dLVR_t = \frac{1}{2} \times \sigma^2 \times S_t^2 \times \Gamma(S_t) \times dt$

Where:

- **σ** = Instantaneous volatility of the underlying asset
- **S_t** = Spot price of the underlying asset at time *t*
- **$\Gamma(S_t)$** = Gamma (curvature) of the liquidity position evaluated at the current spot price
- **dt** = Infinitesimal time interval

The quadratic dependence on volatility is critical. Because LVR is proportional to **σ^2**, it does not increase linearly with market turbulence, it accelerates. For example, a liquidity pool with **60% annualized volatility** experiences an LVR rate that is **four times higher** than a pool with **30% annualized volatility**, assuming all other variables remain constant.

For a concentrated liquidity position in Uniswap v3, the gamma is concentrated within the price band, meaning the adverse-selection cost is amplified precisely where the capital is deployed. A 2025 empirical study analyzing Uniswap v2 data with zero collateral yield found that LVR in major ETH-stablecoin pools routinely exceeded fee revenue during high-volatility periods by margins of 150 to 300 basis points annually. Another study modeling AMM positions as portfolios of perpetual American continuous-installment options proved that the LVR cost is analytically identical to the continuous funding fees (theta) earned by the embedded option, establishing a rigorous option-theoretic interpretation of the LP's adverse-selection cost.

The practical implication is severe. A liquidity provider in a high-volatility, concentrated Uniswap v3 position is, on average, selling options to arbitrageurs at a price below fair value. The trading fees collected, typically 5 to 30 basis points per trade, are insufficient to offset the LVR drag when volatility spikes. This is not a temporary market condition. It is a structural feature of the AMM design. Unless the pool can sustain fee revenue in excess of $(1/2) \times \sigma^2 \times S^2 \times \Gamma$, the LP is losing money on an expected-value basis relative to a continuously rebalanced benchmark.

1.3 Liquidity Fragmentation and Capital Efficiency

The rollup-centric roadmap has Balkanized on-chain liquidity. As of March 2026, Ethereum mainnet holds approximately $58 billion in TVL, representing 49 percent of total DeFi capital, down from 58 percent one year prior. Solana has surged to $22 billion (19 percent), Base to $14 billion (12 percent), and Arbitrum and Optimism each hold approximately 8 percent. Application-specific chains such as dYdX ($4.2 billion) and Hyperliquid ($3.1 billion) have further fragmented the landscape.

For a user wishing to swap USDC for ETH, this means navigating bridging risks, gas token requirements, and varying latency environments. AMMs provide localized liquidity on each chain but lack the intelligence to optimize across a global liquidity graph. The computational complexity of optimal routing across 15 chains, 50 pools, bridge costs, and slippage curves exceeds what any manual user can optimize. Even sophisticated aggregators struggle to model the dynamic interplay between bridge latency, MEV exposure, and gas price volatility across multiple domains simultaneously.

Capital efficiency metrics reveal the deterioration. The ratio of daily trading volume to total value locked, a measure of how productively capital is deployed, has declined across major AMMs as liquidity has fragmented. A pool with $10 million TVL on Arbitrum and a $10 million TVL equivalent on Base functions as two separate $10 million pools, not one $20 million pool, because cross-chain latency prevents atomic arbitrage between them. The effective liquidity depth is reduced, slippage increases, and capital sits idle.

1.4 The LP Economics Death Spiral

The combination of LVR, fee compression, and liquidity fragmentation creates a death spiral for retail liquidity providers. Consider the economics of a typical ETH-USDC concentrated liquidity position:

1. Trading fee revenue: 5 to 30 basis points per trade, annualized to roughly 200 to 800 basis points depending on turnover.
2. LVR cost: In a 50 percent volatility regime, the instantaneous rate implies annualized adverse-selection costs of 400 to 1,200 basis points for typical position widths.
3. Gas and rebalancing costs: On Ethereum mainnet, rebalancing a concentrated position can cost $50 to $200 in gas per adjustment. On L2s, this is lower but still material for smaller positions.
4. Impermanent loss (price divergence): The standard deviation of ETH-USDC prices over a quarter often exceeds 15 percent, translating to significant directional exposure for unhedged LPs.

The net result is that the median retail LP in a concentrated position has experienced negative expected returns during volatile regimes relative to simply holding the assets. Sophisticated market makers, armed with delta-hedging infrastructure, low-latency price feeds, and inventory management across venues, can operate profitably. But they are the exception. The retail LP is the rule, and the rule is losing.

This dynamic explains why liquidity mining incentives -- token emissions used to bootstrap pools -- have proven unsustainable. Protocols realized that deep liquidity was a prerequisite for user retention, so they issued governance tokens to LPs. The vampire attacks of 2020 demonstrated that liquidity is mercenary: it flows to the highest yield, not the deepest moat. Once emissions taper, the liquidity exits. The lesson is that liquidity cannot be owned; it can only be rented, and the rent is denominated in inflationary tokens that dilute existing holders.

1.5 Why Liquidity Is Becoming a Commodity

The final factor driving commoditization is the declining marginal utility of additional liquidity depth. In a CPMM, doubling the pool size reduces slippage by 50 percent for a given trade size. But in a concentrated liquidity model, the relevant metric is the depth within the active tick range, not the total TVL. A pool with $5 million in the active range provides better execution than a pool with $50 million spread across a wide band. Additional capital beyond the optimal depth generates diminishing returns for traders and imposes increasing LVR costs for LPs.

As intent-based execution grows, solvers increasingly fulfill trades from their own inventory rather than routing through AMMs. A solver with a robust balance sheet can internalize a $5 million trade instantly, offering zero slippage, without touching a liquidity pool. The solver captures the spread, the user receives better execution, and the AMM is bypassed entirely. This is not a theoretical possibility. It is the dominant execution pathway for large trades on CoW Protocol and UniswapX today.

In this environment, AMMs are no longer the frontier of DeFi innovation. They are the substrate: the dumb pipes of localized liquidity that solvers route to and around at will. The value has moved up the stack to those who can intelligently route execution. Liquidity is abundant, fragmented, and cheap. What is scarce is the intelligence to use it efficiently, and the customer relationship that determines where orderflow is directed.

Section II: The Intent Paradigm

2.1 Definitional Framework: Imperative vs. Declarative Execution

Traditional blockchain transactions are imperative. The user specifies precisely how to achieve an outcome: "Swap 10,000 USDC for ETH on Uniswap v3, 0.05% fee tier, on Arbitrum, with 1% slippage tolerance." This instruction binds execution to a specific venue, path, and set of parameters. The user bears the full cognitive load of route optimization, gas estimation, and MEV risk assessment. It is the computational equivalent of driving a manual transmission vehicle on a multi-lane highway during a snowstorm.

An intent is declarative. The user specifies a desired outcome subject to constraints: "I want to end up with at least 3.2 ETH in my wallet on Base within the next 30 seconds, using whatever path is optimal." The user does not care about the routing, the bridges, the intermediate AMMs, or the gas tokens consumed. They grant permission to a network of specialized agents to determine the optimal execution path, subject to the constraint that the final state must satisfy the stated condition.

The difference is not merely semantic. An imperative transaction is an atomic execution instruction bound to a specific venue. An intent is an optionality contract. The user signs a cryptographic message granting a solver the right to execute a state transition, but only if the outcome meets the constraint. This transfers the execution risk from the user to the solver, while the user retains the economic benefit of competitive pricing.

2.2 The Intent as an Optionality Contract

From a financial economics perspective, an intent is best understood as a European-style option with an embedded auction mechanism. The user writes a contract that says: "I will sell 10,000 USDC to whoever can deliver at least 3.2 ETH to my Base wallet within 30 seconds." Multiple solvers compete to buy this option by bidding the best price. The solver who can fulfill the intent at the highest effective price (lowest cost to the user) wins the right to execute.

This structure has several important properties. First, the user is protected from adverse execution: if no solver can meet the minimum constraint, the intent expires unfilled and the user loses nothing. Second, the solver absorbs the execution risk, including price movement during the auction window, gas price volatility, and bridge failure. Third, the auction mechanism forces solvers to compete away their surplus, passing execution cost savings to the user in the form of price improvement.

The optionality is bounded by the constraints specified in the intent. These typically include minimum acceptable output, maximum acceptable input, deadline, permitted chains, and trust assumptions. The solver has discretion within these bounds but no ability to violate them, because the settlement contract enforces the constraints cryptographically. This is a trust-minimized but not trustless system: the user must trust the settlement contract and the solver network, but not any individual solver.

2.3 Architectural Components of the Intent Stack

The DeFi execution stack can be decomposed into five distinct layers, each with its own economic function, competitive dynamics, and value capture potential. This framework, which we call the Value Chain Layer Model, provides the structural backbone for the remainder of this report.

Layer 1: User Layer (Distribution)

Actors: Wallets (MetaMask, Phantom, Rabby), frontend interfaces, consumer dApps, institutional trading platforms.

Role: The point of interaction with the end-user. This layer captures the user's intent by generating the signed message.

Economics: This layer owns the customer relationship. In a world of commoditized liquidity, distribution is the scarcest resource. Wallets possess the ultimate moat: the ability to route user signatures and default to specific execution pathways. Switching costs for users are high because wallets contain identity, transaction history, token approvals, and social graph data.

Layer 2: Intent Layer (Aggregation and Matching)

Actors: Intent protocols (CoW Protocol, UniswapX, 1inch Fusion), orderflow auction mechanisms, RFQ systems.

Role: Receives the intent from the User Layer, standardizes it, and broadcasts it to the Solver Layer. Runs the auction to find the best execution bid.

Economics: Extracts a margin by facilitating the match. The value capture here is dependent on network effects: the intent layer with the most orderflow attracts the best solvers, yielding better prices, which attracts more orderflow. This is a classic two-sided marketplace with strong flywheel dynamics.

Layer 3: Solver Layer (Execution and Pricing)

Actors: Solvers, searchers, institutional market makers (Wintermute, GSR, Cumberland), RFQ providers, proprietary trading firms.

Role: Computes the optimal routing path. Solvers may use their own balance sheet (internalization) to fill the trade directly, or they may route through the Liquidity Layer. They take on principal risk to execute the trade.

Economics: Solvers capture the spread between the user's expectation and the actual execution cost, minus any fees paid to the Intent Layer. This is a high-barrier, low-margin, high-volume business. Oligopolistic dynamics will emerge due to infrastructure costs, balance sheet requirements, and execution algorithm sophistication.

Layer 4: Settlement Layer (Verification and Finality)

Actors: Ethereum L1, rollups (Arbitrum, Optimism, Base), shared sequencers (Espresso, Astria), interoperability protocols (LayerZero, Across, ERC-7683).

Role: The final destination where state transitions are verified and finalized. The solver executes the transaction on this layer.

Economics: Captures base L1 gas fees or L2 sequencing fees. Shared sequencers and interoperability layers capture the cross-chain settlement rent. This layer benefits from volume regardless of which solver or intent protocol wins.

Layer 5: Liquidity Layer (Commoditized Capital)

Actors: AMMs (Uniswap, Curve), CLOBs, lending vaults, proprietary market maker inventory.

Role: The actual pools of capital that solvers interact with if they do not internalize the flow.

Economics: Severe commoditization. LPs suffer from adverse selection. AMMs are forced to compete on sub-basis-point fees to attract solver routing. Value capture is minimal and trending toward zero for generic pools.

2.4 Protocol Implementations

The intent paradigm is not a theoretical abstraction. By May 2026, it has been implemented by several major protocols with measurable adoption.

CoW Protocol pioneered batch auctions for intent settlement. Multiple orders are batched together and settled at uniform clearing prices, enabling Coincidence of Wants (CoW) matching where opposing orders clear directly without touching an AMM. By 2025, CoW Protocol had hit $10 billion in monthly volumes. The protocol's solver network competes to find the most efficient settlement, with surplus captured by the user rather than extracted as MEV.

UniswapX extends Uniswap's brand and liquidity into the intent layer. Fillers (solvers) compete via Dutch auctions to fill user orders. The protocol integrates with Uniswap v4 pools as backstop liquidity while also accessing off-chain and cross-chain sources. Cross-chain swaps are enabled through the Across Protocol integration, co-developed with ERC-7683, a standard for cross-chain intents.

1inch Fusion and Fusion+ extend 1inch's aggregator model into intent-based execution. Resolvers (1inch's term for solvers) compete to fill orders. Fusion+ adds cross-chain support across 13+ networks with true bridgeless swaps, where the resolver handles the cross-chain complexity entirely. The resolver model is functionally equivalent to a decentralized RFQ system.

Across Protocol focuses on intent-based cross-chain bridging, where solvers front capital to complete transfers in seconds. The protocol's relayer network competes to provide fast, low-cost cross-chain execution, with the ERC-7683 standard enabling interoperability across intent protocols.

2.5 Adoption Metrics and Growth Trajectories

The growth of intent-based execution is quantifiable. By early 2026, the major intent protocols collectively handle billions in monthly volume. CoW Protocol alone processes $10 billion or more per month. UniswapX, launched in late 2023, has grown rapidly to become a significant share of Uniswap's total volume, particularly for large trades and cross-chain swaps. 1inch Fusion+ has extended intent execution across 13+ networks, capturing the cross-chain execution premium.

The user experience improvements are driving adoption. Intent-based swaps eliminate gas management, route selection, and MEV exposure. Users sign a single message and receive the best available execution price. Solvers compete to provide price improvement, meaning users often receive better rates than the AMM quote. During routine market conditions, the auction process takes 5 to 30 seconds, slower than a direct AMM swap but faster than manual cross-chain bridging and routing.

However, the model is not without limitations. During extreme volatility, solver competition decreases because the risk of adverse price movement during the auction window increases. Solvers withdraw from the market or demand wider spreads, degrading execution quality precisely when users need it most. This creates a regime-switching dynamic: intents dominate during normal conditions, while direct AMM execution or centralized exchange routing may be preferable during crisis periods.

Section III: The DeFi Execution Stack, A Value Chain Framework

3.1 The Five-Layer Model and Capital Flow Decomposition

To understand where economic value accumulates in the intent-based architecture, we introduce the Capital Flow Decomposition framework. This model traces how a single dollar of trading volume propagates through the execution stack, identifying the fee extraction at each layer and the residual value that flows to the next.

Consider a $100,000 cross-chain swap from USDC on Ethereum to ETH on Base, executed through an intent protocol. The following decomposition is illustrative but grounded in actual protocol mechanics as of May 2026:

User Layer (Wallet): The wallet captures the customer relationship. It may charge a frontend fee (typically 0.1% to 0.5% of notional) or sell the orderflow to a specific solver network for a payment-for-order-flow (PFOF) rebate. Estimated capture: $50 to $200 on this trade.

Intent Layer (Protocol): The intent protocol runs the auction and facilitates settlement. It may charge a protocol fee (0.01% to 0.05%) or capture value through the auction mechanism itself. Estimated capture: $10 to $50.

Solver Layer (Execution): The solver captures the spread between the user's minimum acceptable price and the true execution cost. The solver may internalize the trade from inventory (capturing the full bid-ask spread) or route through AMMs and bridges (capturing a narrower margin). Estimated capture: $100 to $300, depending on market conditions and solver sophistication.

Settlement Layer (Chain): The Ethereum L1 and Base L2 capture gas fees and sequencing fees. A cross-chain intent requires settlement on both chains plus bridge messaging fees. Estimated capture: $20 to $80.

Liquidity Layer (AMM): If the solver routes through an AMM, the pool captures a trading fee (0.05% to 0.3%). If the solver internalizes, the AMM captures zero. Estimated capture: $0 to $300, highly variable.

Total economic rent extracted from the $100,000 trade: approximately $180 to $630. The user receives execution quality improvement relative to direct AMM routing that typically exceeds the total cost, making the intent economically rational despite the multi-layer fee extraction.

3.2 Network Effects and Switching Costs by Layer

Not all layers of the execution stack are equally defensible. We assess each layer across four dimensions: commodity risk, switching costs, network effects, and pricing power. The resulting Economic Rent Gradient determines where value is likely to accumulate over time.

Liquidity Layer: Commodity risk is very high. AMM pools are fungible: a USDC-ETH pool on Uniswap v3 is economically equivalent to a USDC-ETH pool on SushiSwap at the same fee tier. Switching costs for solvers are negligible; they route to the cheapest venue. Network effects are weak because liquidity is mercenary and flows to the highest yield. Pricing power is minimal, and fee compression is relentless. Economic rent capture: Low and declining.

Settlement Layer: Commodity risk is moderate. L1 and L2 blockspace is partially differentiated by latency, cost, and security guarantees. Switching costs for users are moderate (bridge assets, re-establish approvals). Network effects are moderate: developers and users coalesce around chains with the most activity. Pricing power is moderate but constrained by competition between L2s. Economic rent capture: Medium, benefiting from structural volume growth.

Intent Layer: Commodity risk is moderate. Intent protocols are software-based and can be replicated, but the auction mechanism and solver network require time to build. Switching costs for users are moderate because changing default protocols requires re-establishing trust. Network effects are strong: more orderflow attracts better solvers, yielding better prices, attracting more orderflow. Pricing power is moderate because the protocol can charge fees but faces competition from free alternatives. Economic rent capture: Medium-High, contingent on sustainable network effects.

Solver Layer: Commodity risk is low. Solver execution quality is highly differentiated based on balance sheet size, cross-chain infrastructure, algorithm sophistication, and inventory management. Switching costs for intent protocols are high because finding a new solver with equivalent performance is non-trivial. Network effects are strong among solvers: the best solvers attract the most orderflow, enabling them to internalize more trades and improve pricing. Pricing power is high because the solver market will consolidate into an oligopoly. Economic rent capture: High.

Wallet Layer: Commodity risk is very low. Wallets own the user relationship, private keys, transaction history, and identity. Switching costs are extremely high because migrating a wallet requires re-establishing every token approval, DeFi position, and social connection. Network effects are strong: the dominant wallet becomes the default interface for new users. Pricing power is very high because the wallet controls the routing of every intent. Economic rent capture: Very High.

3.3 The Fee-Flow Decomposition and Marginal Value Analysis

The marginal value of each layer can be understood by asking: what happens if this layer is removed or disintermediated?

If the Liquidity Layer is removed, solvers internalize more trades. The user experience improves because execution is faster and cheaper. The solver captures more rent. This is exactly what is happening: AMMs are being bypassed, not replaced.

If the Settlement Layer is removed, the entire system collapses. There is no trust-minimized finality. However, users can switch between L1 and L2 alternatives, so the settlement layer has high structural importance but limited pricing power per transaction.

If the Intent Layer is removed, wallets and solvers must negotiate directly. This is viable and already happening in some vertical integrations. The intent layer provides standardization and trust minimization, but its value is not existential. It is a convenience layer that can be absorbed by wallets or solvers.

If the Solver Layer is removed, execution quality collapses. No entity has the balance sheet, infrastructure, and algorithmic sophistication to provide competitive pricing. The solver layer is the most technically indispensable layer above settlement.

If the Wallet Layer is removed, the user cannot access the system. The wallet is the existential gatekeeper. It is the only layer that the user cannot bypass without fundamentally changing how they interact with the blockchain.

3.4 The Long-Term Equilibrium: Oligopolistic Backends, Monopolistic Frontends

The equilibrium of the DeFi execution stack will mirror the US equity market structure, but with important differences. In TradFi, over 90 percent of retail orders are routed to wholesalers, with Citadel, Virtu, and Susquehanna controlling over 70 percent of the payment-for-order-flow market. The frontend is dominated by brokerages (Schwab, Fidelity, Robinhood) that sell orderflow to the wholesalers.

In DeFi, the same structure is emerging. We project that by 2030, 3 to 4 major wallets will control approximately 80 percent of retail orderflow, and 3 to 4 major institutional solvers will internalize the majority of intent execution. AMMs will function as dark pools of last resort:

venues that solvers touch only when their own inventory is insufficient or when the fee structure makes routing profitable.

The critical difference is regulatory. In the United States, the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority mandate best execution and regulate payment for order flow. In DeFi, no such regulator exists. The battle for orderflow will be a digital Wild West, with solvers competing on price improvement up to the point of marginal return, and wallets extracting maximum rent from routing. Users may receive better execution than in the unregulated AMM era, but they will also face opaque fee extraction that lacks the disclosure requirements of TradFi.

Section IV: Orderflow Economics and Comparative Market Structure

4.1 The TradFi Analogue: Evolution of US Equity Market Structure

The structural transformation of DeFi execution closely parallels the evolution of US equity markets from the 1960s to the present. Understanding this analogue provides both predictive power and risk assessment for institutional allocators.

In the 1960s and 1970s, the New York Stock Exchange operated as a monopolistic liquidity venue. Orders were routed to the exchange floor, where specialists maintained orderly markets. Value accrued to the exchange itself and to the specialist firms that controlled the order book. This was the liquidity-centric era of equities, structurally analogous to Uniswap v2's dominance in DeFi.

The 1970s and 1980s saw the emergence of electronic communication networks (ECNs) such as Instinet and NASDAQ. These venues fragmented liquidity but improved execution speed and reduced costs. The analogue in DeFi is the aggregator era: 1inch, Paraswap, and Matcha emerged to split orders across multiple AMM pools, but failed to capture significant economic rent because they competed in a race to the bottom on frontend fees.

The 1990s and 2000s introduced high-frequency trading and wholesale market makers. Firms like Citadel Securities and Virtu Financial realized that retail orderflow was systematically less informed than institutional orderflow. By paying brokerages for the right to execute retail orders, these wholesalers could internalize the trades, capture the bid-ask spread, and provide price improvement to the retail user. This is the payment-for-order-flow (PFOF) model, and it is the direct TradFi analogue of the DeFi intent layer and solver network.

By 2024, the PFOF market in US equities had grown to approximately $2.3 billion in annual revenue for brokerages. Robinhood alone generated roughly $2.6 billion in transaction-based revenues in 2025, with the majority derived from PFOF. Citadel Securities controlled approximately 41 percent of all PFOF payments, with Virtu at 11 percent and

Susquehanna at 18 percent. The market is a concentrated oligopoly, with scale economies in market making creating natural barriers to entry.

4.2 DeFi Orderflow Auction Mechanics

DeFi intent protocols have implemented several auction mechanisms, each with distinct economic properties.

Dutch Auctions (UniswapX): The user specifies a starting price and a decay function. The price improves over time until a solver accepts the fill. The mechanism incentivizes solvers to fill early if they have confident execution costs, but it also creates a waiting game where solvers delay to capture more surplus. The Dutch auction minimizes gas costs because the first solver to accept wins, but it may result in suboptimal execution if solvers are overly cautious.

Batch Auctions (CoW Protocol): Multiple intents are collected into a batch and settled simultaneously at a uniform clearing price. Solvers compete to propose the best settlement solution, and the winning solution is selected by a scoring rule. The batch mechanism enables Coincidence of Wants matching, where two users with opposing intents can clear directly without AMM fees. It also provides MEV protection because the entire batch is settled atomically, preventing sandwich attacks on individual orders.

RFQ Systems (1inch Fusion, Hashflow): Resolvers provide binding quotes for specific intents. The user receives the best quote from the resolver network and can accept it. RFQ systems offer the fastest execution because there is no auction phase, but they provide less MEV protection than batch auctions because the resolver may route through public mempools.

4.3 The Internalization Incentive

The most important economic dynamic in the intent stack is the internalization incentive. Solvers prefer to fill trades from their own inventory rather than routing through AMMs because internalization captures the full bid-ask spread.

Consider a solver with inventory on both sides of the trade. A user wants to sell 100 ETH for USDC. The solver already holds USDC and is willing to buy ETH at a discount to the market price. The solver quotes the user a price slightly better than the AMM rate, say 0.05 percent improvement. The user accepts, the solver transfers USDC and receives ETH, and no AMM is touched. The solver has captured a 0.05 percent spread, the user has received better execution, and the AMM has earned zero.

This is the exact business model of TradFi wholesale market makers. Citadel Securities and Virtu Financial maintain massive inventories of equities and ETFs. When they receive retail orderflow from Robinhood, they fill the orders from inventory whenever possible, capturing the spread. They only route to exchanges when the order size exceeds their inventory capacity or when the exchange offers better execution.

The internalization incentive means that AMMs are not competitors to solvers. They are backup liquidity sources. The solver's primary goal is to internalize, and the AMM is the lender of last resort. This is a profound inversion of the DeFi value chain. In the AMM era, liquidity was the scarce resource and the source of competitive advantage. In the intent era, liquidity is abundant, and the scarce resource is the balance sheet and inventory management capability that enables internalization.

4.4 Fee-Flow Decomposition: A Quantitative Model

We can model the fee-flow decomposition using a simple algebraic framework. Let V be the notional trade volume, and let the execution stack extract fees at each layer.

Definitions

- $\mathbf{F_{(w)}}$ = Wallet fee or Payment for Order Flow (PFOF) capture (0.05%–0.50%)
- $\mathbf{f_{(i)}}$ = Intent protocol fee (0.01%–0.05%)
- **s** = Solver spread capture (0.03%–0.30%)
- **g** = Gas and settlement fees (fixed, approximately $20–$80 per cross-chain trade)
- $\mathbf{f_{(a)}}$ = AMM trading fee (0.05%–0.30%, only if the trade is routed through an AMM)
- **V** = Trade value
- **p** = Probability that the trade is routed through an AMM ($0 \leq p \leq 1$)

Total Cost to the User

$$C = V \times (F_{(w)} + f_{(i)} + s) + g + V \times p \times f_{(a)}$$

User Price Improvement Relative to Direct AMM Execution

$$PI = V \times (f_{(a)} - s - f_{(i)}) - g$$

For the intent to be rational, PI must be positive. This requires that the solver's spread capture plus the intent protocol fee be less than the AMM fee saved, net of gas costs. For large trades, this is typically satisfied because the AMM fee scales with volume while gas is fixed. For small trades, the fixed gas cost may dominate, making direct AMM execution cheaper.

This model reveals a critical threshold: the AMM-to-intent crossover point. For deep major pairs (ETH-USDC) on a single chain, the crossover is high because AMM pool depth is plentiful and gas costs are low. For mid-cap pairs or cross-chain trades, the crossover is low because solvers can source RFQ inventory that no public pool holds, and the gas cost of manual bridging overwhelms the solver fee.

4.5 Cross-Chain Settlement Economics

Cross-chain intents introduce additional economic complexity. The solver must manage inventory across multiple chains, bridge assets efficiently, and account for bridge latency and failure risk. The settlement layer captures fees through multiple mechanisms:

L1 Gas Fees: Ethereum mainnet gas fees vary with network congestion. A cross-chain intent that settles on L1 may incur $20 to $100 in gas, depending on the complexity of the settlement transaction.

L2 Sequencing Fees: Rollups charge sequencing fees for transaction inclusion. Base, Arbitrum, and Optimism each have their own fee markets, with costs typically 10 to 100 times lower than L1 but still material for high-frequency operations.

Bridge Fees: Interoperability protocols charge fees for cross-chain messaging. LayerZero, Axelar, and Across each have different fee structures, with Across typically charging a flat fee plus a percentage of the transferred amount.

Shared Sequencer Rent: Emerging shared sequencer networks (Espresso, Astria) offer the potential for cross-chain atomic inclusion. If adopted, these networks would capture sequencing fees across multiple rollups, positioning them as the infrastructure layer of the multi-chain economy. The economics are analogous to an exchange that operates across multiple asset classes: the exchange captures a fee on every transaction regardless of which asset is traded.

Section V: Execution Quality as Competitive Moat

5.1 The Execution Quality Metrics

In the AMM era, users and analysts judged protocols by total value locked. TVL was the proxy for depth, and depth was the proxy for execution quality. This metric is no longer sufficient. In the intent era, execution quality is multidimensional and must be assessed across four axes: price improvement, fill rates, latency, and MEV mitigation.

Price Improvement (PI) is the difference between the quoted AMM price and the price the solver actually delivers to the user. Positive PI occurs when the solver internalizes at a better rate than the pool or finds a Coincidence of Wants match. On CoW Protocol, typical PI ranges from 5 to 50 basis points for common pairs, with larger improvements on high-volatility days when AMMs are stale. PI is the primary user acquisition tool for intent-based frontends because it is immediately visible to the user.

Fill Rates measure the percentage of intents successfully solved without reverting. High latency or complex cross-chain intents result in failed fills when solvers cannot meet the deadline constraint. Fill rates above 95 percent are necessary for user trust; below 90 percent, users abandon the protocol. Cross-chain intents currently have lower fill rates than same-chain intents due to bridge failures and settlement delays.

Latency is the time from intent signature to final settlement. Same-chain intents typically settle in 5 to 30 seconds, depending on the auction mechanism. Cross-chain intents may take 30 seconds to 5 minutes, depending on the bridge and finality requirements. This latency is a friction point for high-frequency traders and arbitrageurs but is acceptable for retail users and institutional rebalancing flows.

MEV Mitigation measures the protocol's ability to prevent sandwich attacks and front-running. Batch auction mechanisms (CoW) provide the strongest protection because the entire batch settles atomically at a uniform price. Dutch auctions (UniswapX) provide moderate protection because the intent is not revealed until the solver commits. RFQ systems provide the weakest protection because the resolver may route through public mempools.

5.2 The Solver Oligopoly Thesis

Solving requires massive infrastructure investment: maintaining full nodes across 20 or more chains, running complex optimization algorithms that evaluate thousands of potential execution paths in milliseconds, and deploying millions of dollars in capital to facilitate internalization. This is not a business for retail participants. The solver market will consolidate into an oligopoly of 3 to 5 major institutional market makers, for three structural reasons.

First, balance sheet scale creates a feedback loop. A solver with $50 million in cross-chain inventory can internalize more trades than a solver with $5 million. The larger solver wins more auctions, captures more spread, and can reinvest profits in inventory expansion. The smaller solver is forced to route through AMMs, where margins are thinner, creating a competitive disadvantage.

Second, execution algorithm sophistication is a cumulative advantage. Solvers that have processed millions of intents have trained their routing algorithms on a dataset that new entrants cannot replicate. Machine learning models that predict price movement, gas spikes, and bridge latency improve with data volume, creating a classic data network effect.

Third, trust and reputation are sticky. Intent protocols and wallets prefer to work with solvers that have a history of reliable execution. A new solver must post a larger bond and accept tighter margin constraints to compete with established players, raising the effective cost of entry.

The result is an oligopoly with pricing power. The top solvers will extract the majority of solver-layer economic rent, while marginal solvers will be forced to specialize in niche markets or exit. This is the exact dynamic that produced Citadel Securities' dominance in US equity wholesaling, where a single firm controls 41 percent of retail orderflow execution.

5.3 Solver Unit Economics

Solver profitability can be modeled as a function of volume, margin, and fixed costs. Let Q be the monthly volume processed, m be the average margin per dollar of volume, and F be the fixed monthly infrastructure cost.

$$\text{Profit} = Q \times m - F$$

For a major solver processing $1 billion per month at an average margin of 5 basis points, revenue is $500,000. Fixed costs include node infrastructure ($50,000 to $100,000 per month), engineering salaries ($200,000 to $500,000 per month for a team of 5 to 10), and capital costs (opportunity cost of inventory, which may be partially offset by yield farming). Net margins are thin but positive at scale.

The unit economics are volume-sensitive. At $100 million per month and 5 basis points, revenue is only $50,000, likely insufficient to cover fixed costs. This means the solver business has a minimum efficient scale. Solvers that cannot achieve at least $500 million in monthly volume will struggle to operate profitably, reinforcing the oligopoly thesis.

The margin structure varies by trade type. Large, common pairs (ETH-USDC) have thin margins because competition is intense. Mid-cap pairs have wider margins because fewer solvers have the inventory. Cross-chain trades have the widest margins because they require bridge risk management and multi-chain inventory, which fewer solvers can provide.

5.4 The Wallet as Gatekeeper

The wallet owns the user. This is the most important structural fact in the intent economy. When a user opens MetaMask and clicks "swap," MetaMask controls the default routing. If MetaMask decides to route all intents through a specific solver network or intent protocol, that network captures the volume. The user is typically unaware of the routing decision and does not care, as long as execution quality is acceptable.

This gives wallets extraordinary power. They are the gatekeepers of the entire execution stack. They can charge frontend fees, sell orderflow to solver networks, or build their own intent layers and capture the full margin. MetaMask already charges swap fees on its frontend. Phantom has integrated in-app swapping with native routing. Coinbase Wallet leverages Coinbase's institutional infrastructure for execution.

The regulatory vector is the primary risk. In TradFi, the SEC's Rule 606 requires brokerages to disclose order routing and payment for order flow. In DeFi, no such requirement exists. However, regulatory scrutiny is increasing. The Markets in Crypto-Assets (MiCA) regulation in the European Union, enacted in 2024, imposes disclosure requirements on crypto asset service providers. The SEC has taken various enforcement actions against DeFi protocols in 2023 and 2024. If wallets are classified as brokerages, they may face PFOF disclosure requirements, best execution obligations, and licensing constraints.

Despite regulatory risk, the wallet layer's economic position is the strongest in the stack. The wallet is the closest thing to a TradFi brokerage stock in DeFi. A wallet token that captures PFOF revenue or routing fees would command a massive premium, assuming it can navigate regulatory constraints.

Section VI: MEV Restructuring and Surplus Capture

6.1 The AMM-Era MEV Landscape

Maximal extractable value reached a scale by 2026 that can no longer be dismissed as a marginal phenomenon. On Ethereum alone, sandwich attacks extracted approximately $290 million in 2025, representing roughly 51 percent of all MEV volume. On Solana, sandwich bots pulled between $370 million and $500 million from users over a 16-month window. Total MEV extraction across Ethereum, its rollups, and fast-finality chains like Solana is estimated to exceed $3 billion annually by early 2026, double the figure from two years prior.

The MEV problem has also become a scaling bottleneck. Flashbots has documented that MEV-related search spam can consume more than 50 percent of gas on major L2s while paying a disproportionately small share of fees. On some L2s, bots burn over half the gas merely searching for extraction opportunities. This is not just an economic fairness issue; it is a throughput and cost issue that degrades the user experience for everyone.

The fundamental source of MEV is mempool transparency. When a user submits an imperative transaction to the public mempool, the transaction details are visible to all participants before execution. Searchers can construct sandwich attacks, arbitrage opportunities, and liquidation strategies with full information. The user is the exit liquidity for the extractor.

6.2 Intents as MEV Redistribution

Intent-based execution does not eliminate MEV. It restructures it. The user's intent is not broadcast to the public mempool. Instead, it is shared with a private solver network through an encrypted channel or a batch auction. The solver competes to capture the execution right, and the surplus is distributed differently than in the AMM era.

In a batch auction (CoW Protocol), the "MEV" that would have been extracted by a third-party searcher is instead captured by the protocol as surplus and redistributed to the user. The batch settles at a uniform clearing price, which means no individual transaction can be sandwiched. The solver's profit is constrained by competitive bidding, not by extraction from the user.

In a Dutch auction (UniswapX), the solver captures the spread between the decaying price and the true execution cost. This is analogous to the MEV that a searcher would have extracted, but it is captured by the solver rather than a third-party attacker. The user receives a guaranteed minimum price, and the solver bears the risk of adverse execution.

The net effect is that MEV is transformed from an adversarial extraction into a competitive auction. The user is better off because the auction forces solvers to compete away their surplus, while the AMM-era MEV extraction was unilateral. The user receives price improvement, MEV protection, and gasless execution, while the solver earns a thin but positive margin.

6.3 Coincidence of Wants and Surplus Capture

CoW Protocol popularized the concept of Coincidence of Wants (CoW) matching. If User A wants to sell ETH for USDC, and User B wants to sell USDC for ETH, a solver can match them directly, bypassing AMMs entirely. The solver captures the AMM fee as pure surplus.

The CoW rate, the percentage of batch volume that clears directly between users rather than through AMMs, is a critical metric for intent protocol efficiency. Higher CoW rates mean lower costs for users, higher surplus capture, and less AMM volume. As intent protocol adoption grows, the CoW rate increases because larger batch sizes create more opportunities for direct matching. This is a positive feedback loop: more users yield more matches, which attracts more users.

The surplus captured through CoW matching is not trivial. On a $1 billion monthly volume protocol, a 20 percent CoW rate means $200 million in volume that clears without AMM fees. At an average AMM fee of 0.2 percent, this represents $400,000 in surplus per month that is captured by users rather than paid to LPs. As CoW rates rise, AMM fee revenue falls, accelerating the commoditization of the Liquidity Layer.

6.4 Cross-Chain MEV and State Arbitrage

As intents span multiple chains, MEV extraction becomes a cross-chain game. Solvers who can bridge assets fastest, or who hold inventory on multiple chains, can capture arbitrage opportunities that exist between rollups. The concept of MEV shifts from "within-chain transaction reordering" to "cross-chain state arbitrage."

Consider a price discrepancy between ETH on Arbitrum and ETH on Base. A solver with inventory on both chains can buy the cheaper ETH, bridge it, and sell the more expensive ETH, capturing the spread. This is cross-chain arbitrage, and it is a natural function of the solver layer. The solver's inventory and bridge infrastructure give it an advantage over standalone arbitrageurs who must source capital on each chain independently.

The cross-chain MEV dynamic creates a winner-take-most structure. Solvers with the most multi-chain inventory and the fastest bridge access will capture the majority of cross-chain arbitrage. This is another factor driving solver consolidation: the solver with the broadest chain coverage has a structural advantage that smaller competitors cannot replicate without massive capital deployment.

6.5 Winners and Losers in the New MEV Paradigm

The restructuring of MEV creates clear winners and losers. Generalized front-running searchers, whose business model depends on public mempool visibility, are the primary losers. Their extraction opportunities vanish as orderflow migrates to private solver networks. Public mempool validators also lose revenue because flow is routed privately to solvers, reducing the priority fees and MEV payments that validators receive.

Solvers are the primary winners. They internalize the MEV that was previously extracted by searchers, converting it into a competitive spread that they capture as profit. Wallets also win because they can sell the orderflow to solver networks, creating a new revenue stream. Users win because they receive price improvement and MEV protection, though they may pay higher effective fees through wallet PFOF arrangements.

The long-term equilibrium is one where MEV is no longer a zero-sum extraction from users but a competitive surplus that is distributed among solvers, wallets, and users according to market power. The user is better protected than in the AMM era but may still face opaque fee extraction if wallet routing lacks transparency.

Section VII: Token Value Accrual in the Execution Era

7.1 The Governance Token Problem

The shift to the execution stack forces a ruthless re-evaluation of token value accrual. Most DeFi tokens were structured as governance tokens for AMMs, a design that created a structural mismatch with cash flow rights. Governance tokens confer voting rights but no legal claim to protocol revenue. The "fee switch", a governance mechanism that would divert trading fees to token holders, has been discussed for years but rarely implemented, and even when implemented, the value capture is tenuous.

The problem is that governance is not a moat. Any fork can replicate the code, launch a new pool, and attract liquidity through token emissions. The governance token's value is contingent on the protocol's ability to maintain network effects, but in a world of commoditized liquidity, network effects are weak. Users and LPs are mercenary; they flow to the highest yield.

7.2 AMM Token Valuation: Multiple Compression Drivers

Generic AMM tokens (UNI, CRV, BAL) face severe multiple compression in the intent era. The valuation model for these tokens rested on three assumptions: (1) volume would grow with DeFi adoption, (2) the protocol would capture a percentage of volume as fees, and (3) the fee switch would eventually direct revenue to token holders. All three assumptions are now under pressure.

Volume growth is not sufficient because solvers are internalizing an increasing share of trades. The volume that reaches AMMs is the residual flow that solvers cannot internalize, and this residual is shrinking as solver balance sheets grow. If an AMM raises fees to capture more value, solvers will route around it to a cheaper AMM or internalize the trade. AMM tokens possess no economic moat and weak pricing power.

Even if the fee switch is activated, the fees are extracted from commoditized liquidity. The present value of a fee stream from a commodity business is low. Uniswap's $4 billion in daily volume is impressive, but if solvers internalize 30 percent of that volume and route another 40 percent to low-fee competitors, the addressable fee pool shrinks dramatically. The token's value would be better approximated by a utility ETF than a growth stock.

7.3 Intent and Aggregator Tokens: Network Effect Dependence

Intent layer tokens (1INCH, COW) and aggregator tokens face a different challenge. Their value depends on the protocol's ability to maintain network effects in the auction mechanism. If the protocol can charge a fee on the orderflow auction and distribute it to token stakers, it creates a genuine yield mechanism. However, this depends on volume, and volume depends on the protocol's position as the default matching engine.

The boundary between aggregator and wallet is blurring. If wallets build their own intent layers, standalone aggregator tokens face existential risk. MetaMask could integrate its own solver network and bypass CoW Protocol entirely. Phantom could build native batch auctions. The wallet's distribution advantage is insurmountable for a standalone aggregator that lacks a user-facing interface.

The value accrual model for intent tokens requires a tokenomics design that distributes revenue to stakers who provide solver collateral or insurance. This creates a real yield mechanism based on execution fees. However, the token is fundamentally a B2B infrastructure utility, highly sensitive to the oligopolistic nature of solvers. If only 3 to 5 solvers dominate, the protocol's bargaining power is limited, and fee extraction is constrained.

7.4 Solver Network Tokens: Equity-Like Characteristics

Protocols that build decentralized solver networks have the strongest potential for value accrual above the settlement layer. The token is used as a bond to ensure solver honesty, with slashing for bad execution. This creates a real yield mechanism based on execution fees and a genuine economic function: the token is the security deposit that enforces solver accountability.

However, the token is not a pure utility. It is equity-like because its value depends on the profitability and market power of the solver network. If the solver network is profitable, the token captures value through fee sharing and collateral demand. If the solver network is unprofitable, the token's yield collapses.

The oligopolistic nature of the solver market is both a risk and an opportunity. If the protocol can become the dominant solver network, the token captures oligopoly rents. If the protocol is marginalized by institutional solvers that bypass the network, the token's value is destroyed.

7.5 Wallet and Distribution Tokens: The Ultimate Premium

The wallet owns the user. A wallet token that captures PFOF revenue or routing fees is the closest thing in DeFi to a TradFi brokerage stock. Schwab and Robinhood trade at premium multiples because their customer relationships generate recurring, high-margin revenue. A wallet token with similar economics would command a comparable premium.

However, most leading wallets do not have tokens, or their tokens are purely for governance. MetaMask, the dominant Ethereum wallet, has no token. Phantom, the dominant Solana wallet, has no token. The emergence of a wallet token that legally and mechanically captures orderflow monetization would be a significant event in DeFi tokenomics.

The regulatory risk is substantial. If wallets are classified as brokerages, they may face licensing requirements, best execution obligations, and restrictions on PFOF. The European Union's MiCA regulation already imposes requirements on crypto asset service providers. The SEC has taken enforcement actions against DeFi protocols for operating as unregistered securities exchanges. A wallet token that captures PFOF revenue could be classified as a security, creating compliance costs and restricting its market.

Despite the risks, the wallet layer's economic position is the strongest in the stack. If regulatory clarity emerges, wallet tokens will be the most valuable category in DeFi.

7.6 Infrastructure and Settlement Tokens: Structural Beneficiaries

Ethereum (ETH) remains the ultimate settlement asset. All cross-chain intents eventually settle on L1 or an L2 anchored to L1. ETH captures gas fees, staking rewards, and the economic premium of being the reserve asset of the DeFi ecosystem. The structural shift to intents does not diminish ETH's role; it may enhance it by increasing the volume of settlement transactions.

Shared sequencer tokens, if they emerge, will capture sequencing fees across multiple rollups. Espresso and Astria are building shared sequencer networks that aim to provide cross-chain atomic inclusion. If adopted, these networks would capture a fee on every cross-chain intent, positioning them as the infrastructure layer of the multi-chain economy. The economics are compelling: a small fee on a massive volume base creates a stable, recurring revenue stream.

Interoperability tokens (LayerZero, Across) capture cross-chain messaging fees. As intents become increasingly cross-chain, the demand for interoperability increases. These tokens benefit from volume growth regardless of which intent protocol or solver wins, making them a structural play on the multi-chain thesis.

Section VIII: Competitive Landscape Analysis

8.1 Protocol Archetype Matrix

The competitive landscape of DeFi execution can be analyzed through five archetypes, each with distinct strengths, weaknesses, and strategic imperatives. The matrix below provides a comparative assessment.

Archetype	Strengths	Weaknesses	Strategic Imperative
AMMs (Uniswap, Curve)	Established brand, deep localized liquidity, v4 hooks allow custom logic	Disintermediated by solvers; LPs bleeding capital; no direct user relationship	Defend via vertical integration (UniswapX); become the backstop liquidity layer
Aggregators (1inch, Paraswap)	Existing user base, multi-chain routing tech	Frontend loyalty is zero; wallets integrating native routing; standalone aggregators obsolete	Transition to RFQ/intent models (Fusion); build wallet integrations or die
Intent Protocols (CoW, UniswapX, Hashflow)	Best-in-class execution; MEV protection; batch auction efficiency	Dependent on small solver pool; difficult to enforce fee capture without losing volume	Compete to become the default matching engine; acquire distribution

Solvers (Wintermute, GSR, Proprietary)	Massive balance sheets, low cost of capital, advanced infra	Race to the bottom on price improvement; thin margins; high fixed costs	Vertical integration: build wallets or buy distribution to capture full spread
Wallets (MetaMask, Phantom, Coinbase)	Monopoly on user attention and signature generation; ultimate gatekeepers	Regulatory scrutiny on routing and PFOF; custody risk	Extract rent from entire stack; sell orderflow; build native intent layers

8.2 Strategic Positioning: Offensive vs. Defensive Moves

The competitive dynamics are characterized by vertical integration threats at every layer. Uniswap's launch of UniswapX is a defensive move: it attempts to own the intent layer to prevent disintermediation of its AMM. If UniswapX succeeds, Uniswap captures value from the execution layer even as its AMM is bypassed. If it fails, Uniswap becomes a pure utility with declining volume.

1inch's transition to Fusion and Fusion+ is an offensive move. It leverages the existing aggregator user base to enter the intent layer, extending its position from pure routing to solver networking. However, the risk is that wallets will integrate their own routing, making standalone aggregators redundant.

CoW Protocol has the strongest intent-layer technology but the weakest distribution. Its batch auction mechanism is superior for MEV protection and surplus capture, but it lacks the user-facing interface that drives volume. The strategic imperative is to integrate with wallets and dApps as the default backend, compensating for the lack of a native frontend.

Solvers face a race to the bottom on price improvement, but their long-term strategic play is vertical integration. A solver that builds its own wallet or acquires a frontend can bypass the intent layer entirely, capturing the full spread from user to execution. This is the Citadel model: own the wholesaler, the broker, and the execution technology.

Wallets are the most strategically advantaged. They can extract rent from the entire stack without building any of it. MetaMask charges swap fees on its frontend. Phantom can sell orderflow to the highest-bidding solver. Coinbase Wallet can leverage Coinbase's institutional infrastructure for execution. The wallet's moat is the user relationship, and it is the most durable moat in the stack.

8.3 Market Concentration and Moat Durability

Market concentration in DeFi execution is increasing, not decreasing. We can construct a pseudo-Herfindahl-Hirschman Index (HHI) for each layer by measuring the share of volume controlled by the top players.

Liquidity Layer: The top 5 AMMs (Uniswap, Curve, PancakeSwap, SushiSwap, Balancer) control approximately 75 percent of DEX TVL. HHI is moderate, but declining as new pools and chains fragment liquidity.

Intent Layer: The top 3 intent protocols (CoW Protocol, UniswapX, 1inch Fusion) control approximately 85 percent of intent-based volume. HHI is high and increasing as network effects consolidate volume around the winners.

Solver Layer: The top 5 solvers (including Wintermute, GSR, Cumberland, and 2 to 3 major proprietary firms) control approximately 70 percent of intent execution. HHI is increasing as balance sheet scale and algorithmic sophistication create barriers to entry.

Wallet Layer: The top 3 wallets (MetaMask, Phantom, Coinbase Wallet) control approximately 60 percent of active DeFi users. HHI is moderate but sticky because wallet switching costs are high.

Moat durability is strongest at the Wallet and Solver layers, weakest at the Liquidity Layer. The Wallet layer's moat is based on user lock-in and data accumulation. The Solver layer's moat is based on balance sheet scale and algorithmic data network effects. The Liquidity layer's moat is nonexistent because capital is fungible and mercenary.

Section IX: Scenario Analysis for DeFi Market Structure

9.1 Scenario Framework

We model three distinct equilibrium paths for the DeFi execution stack over the next 5 to 7 years. Each scenario is probability-weighted based on current adoption trajectories, technological readiness, and regulatory trends as of May 2026. The scenarios are designed to be mutually exclusive and collectively exhaustive, with clear invalidation criteria for each.

9.2 Bull Case: The Permissionless Solverscape (Probability: 25%)

Market Structure: Fully open, decentralized solver networks. Anyone can run a solver with minimal capital requirements, and matching is fully on-chain or via decentralized RFQs. Cross-chain execution is atomic and instantaneous, enabled by shared sequencers and universal interoperability standards.

Drivers: Shared sequencers (Espresso, Astria) achieve widespread adoption, enabling cross-chain atomic inclusion. ERC-7683 and successor standards make cross-chain intents seamless. ZK-proofs reduce solver infrastructure costs, enabling permissionless entry. Regulatory clarity permits wallet PFOF without restrictive licensing.

Winners: Users receive near-zero fees and perfect execution. Decentralized solver tokens appreciate as high-yield infrastructure assets. Intent protocols that capture volume through network effects become the dominant matching engines.

Losers: AMMs become pure utility tokens with zero rent capture. Institutional market makers are outcompeted by algorithmic decentralized solvers. Centralized exchanges lose market share to on-chain execution.

Revenue Distribution: Heavily concentrated in the Solver Layer and Settlement Layer. The Intent Layer captures moderate fees through protocol auctions. Wallets capture less PFOF because solver competition is intense and margins are thin.

Token Implications: Solver infrastructure tokens experience a surge in value as they become the backbone of execution. AMM tokens trade at book value or below. Wallet tokens appreciate moderately but face fee compression from competition.

Invalidation Criteria: If shared sequencers fail to achieve adoption within 24 months, if cross-chain bridge failures persist, or if regulatory restrictions prevent permissionless solver operation, this scenario is invalidated.

9.3 Base Case: The TradFi Mirror (Probability: 60%)

Market Structure: Oligopolistic. Three to four major wallets control approximately 80 percent of retail orderflow. Three to four major institutional solvers internalize the majority of trades. AMMs function as dark pools of last resort. Payment for order flow becomes standard practice in DeFi.

Drivers: Solver infrastructure costs remain high, preventing permissionless entry. Institutional market makers (Wintermute, GSR, Cumberland) dominate due to balance sheet scale. Wallets consolidate through M&A and user acquisition. Regulatory clarity permits PFOF but imposes disclosure requirements.

Winners: Wallets capture PFOF revenue and trade at high multiples analogous to TradFi brokerages. Institutional solvers capture spread and build durable moats. L1 and L2 sequencers benefit from structural volume growth.

Losers: Retail LPs are completely priced out by adverse selection and exit the market. Standalone aggregators are obsoleted by native wallet routing. Generic AMM governance tokens face multiple compression to utility valuations.

Revenue Distribution: Wallets capture approximately 20 percent of economic rent. Solvers capture 50 percent. Settlement captures 20 percent. Liquidity captures 10 percent.

Token Implications: Wallet tokens trade at high multiples if they can legally capture PFOF. AMM tokens trade like utility ETFs with low growth prospects. Solver tokens behave like equity in a concentrated industry.

Invalidation Criteria: If wallet consolidation stalls, if regulatory bans on PFOF are imposed, or if a technological breakthrough eliminates solver infrastructure costs, this scenario is invalidated.

9.4 Bear Case: The Fragmentation Collapse (Probability: 15%)

Market Structure: Cross-chain interoperability fails to scale safely. Bridges remain vulnerable to hacks and latency failures. Intents work only locally on individual L2s. Users retreat to centralized exchanges for multi-chain routing.

Drivers: Major bridge hacks destroy user confidence. Shared sequencers fail to deliver on latency promises. Regulatory restrictions fragment the market by jurisdiction. Solvers cannot achieve cross-chain scale, limiting intent execution to single-chain swaps.

Winners: Centralized exchanges (Binance, Coinbase) capture volume that flees on-chain complexity. L1 native DEXs with deep local liquidity retain market share. Simple, single-chain AMMs remain viable.

Losers: Intent protocols fail to achieve cross-chain adoption. Solvers cannot scale. Wallets lose volume to CEXs. L2 and intent-layer tokens crash.

Revenue Distribution: Captured by CEXs and L1 validators. Intent-based execution remains a niche for sophisticated users.

Token Implications: Crash in L2 and intent-layer tokens. Flight to quality in native L1 tokens (ETH, SOL) and CEX tokens (BNB, COIN).

Invalidation Criteria: If cross-chain bridge security improves, if ERC-7683 achieves widespread adoption, or if a major CEX faces regulatory shutdown, this scenario is invalidated.

9.5 Sensitivity Analysis

The equilibrium of the DeFi execution stack is sensitive to four key variables:

1. **Cross-Chain Latency:** If bridge latency falls below 10 seconds consistently, cross-chain intent volume explodes and the Bull Case becomes more likely. If latency remains above 60 seconds, the Bear Case gains probability.
2. **Regulatory Stance on PFOF:** If the SEC or EU bans PFOF in crypto, wallet revenue models collapse and the Base Case is invalidated. If PFOF is permitted with disclosure, the Base Case is reinforced.
3. **Solver Capital Requirements:** If ZK-proofs or other innovations reduce the balance sheet needed to run a solver by 90 percent, the Bull Case becomes more likely. If capital requirements remain high, the Base Case is reinforced.
4. **AMM Fee Compression:** If AMM fees compress to 0.01 percent or below, AMMs become pure utilities faster, accelerating the shift to intents. If AMMs successfully maintain 0.3 percent fees, the transition is slower.

Section X: Institutional Investment Framework

10.1 Value Chain Positioning: Where Economic Value Accumulates

The fundamental investment question in DeFi execution is not "which protocol has the best technology?" It is "which layer of the stack can defend the highest economic rent per dollar of volume?" The answer, based on the analysis in this report, is unambiguous: value accumulates at the edges of the stack, not the middle.

The Wallet Layer and the Solver Layer are the primary rent extractors. The Settlement Layer is a structural beneficiary. The Intent Layer is a marketplace with moderate but contestable value capture. The Liquidity Layer is a commodity with declining returns.

Investors should think in terms of value chain positioning rather than individual token picking. A position in a wallet-adjacent infrastructure asset is a bet on distribution monopolies. A position in a solver network is a bet on execution oligopolies. A position in a generic AMM token is a bet on commodity utilities.

10.2 Public Market Opportunities

Protocol Archetypes and Valuation Considerations:

Settlement Layer Assets (ETH, SOL): These are the most structurally sound public market positions. ETH captures gas fees, staking yield, and the economic premium of being the ultimate settlement asset. SOL benefits from high transaction velocity and growing DeFi TVL. Valuation should be based on fee multiples, staking yield, and network activity metrics rather than speculative price targets.

Wallet-Adjacent Tokens: As of May 2026, most dominant wallets do not have tokens. However, tokens that enable wallet infrastructure, account abstraction (ERC-4337), or social recovery may capture indirect value. The investment case is speculative but asymmetric: if a major wallet launches a revenue-sharing token, the upside is substantial.

Intent Protocol Tokens (1INCH, COW): These tokens are viable only if the protocol can enforce fee capture and resist wallet vertical integration. Valuation should be based on volume multiples, fee potential, and network effect durability. The risk of obsolescence is high if wallets build native intent layers.

Solver Network Tokens: These are equity-like instruments with high sensitivity to solver profitability. The investment case depends on the protocol's ability to attract and retain dominant solvers. Valuation should be based on execution fee yield, collateral demand, and slashing revenue.

Generic AMM Tokens (UNI, CRV, BAL): These face structural headwinds. The investment case is not zero, they retain optionality from fee switch activation and treasury value -- but they should be treated as low-growth utility plays rather than compounders. Valuation should be conservative, based on book value and fee potential rather than growth multiples.

10.3 Private Market Opportunities

The highest-risk-adjusted returns in the DeFi execution stack may be in private market investments rather than public tokens.

Wallet Infrastructure: Direct equity investments in dominant wallets (MetaMask/Consensys, Phantom, Coinbase Wallet) provide exposure to the most defensible layer of the stack. These are not token investments but equity investments in companies that own the customer relationship.

Solver Networks: Proprietary solver firms (Wintermute, GSR, Cumberland) are the Citadel and Virtu of DeFi. They generate cash flow from spread capture and are building the infrastructure that will dominate execution. Direct investment or revenue-sharing agreements with these firms provide exposure to solver oligopoly rents.

Shared Sequencers: Espresso and Astria are building the infrastructure layer of the multi-chain economy. Their tokens, if and when launched, will capture sequencing fees across multiple rollups. The investment case is analogous to early-stage exchange infrastructure: high risk, high potential return.

RFQ Protocols: Protocols that attract institutional liquidity through RFQ mechanisms (Hashflow, AirSwap) provide exposure to the B2B trading layer. These protocols are less dependent on retail network effects and more dependent on institutional relationships.

10.4 Leading Indicators to Monitor

Institutional allocators should track the following KPIs to assess the pace of the transition from AMMs to intents:

Intent Volume Share: The percentage of total DEX volume executed through intent protocols (CoW, UniswapX, Fusion). If this share exceeds 30 percent, the transition is accelerating. If it stalls below 15 percent, the Base Case may be delayed.

Solver Concentration: The number of active solvers and the Gini coefficient of solver volume. If the top 3 solvers control more than 70 percent of volume, oligopoly is confirmed. If the solver base remains broad and permissionless, the Bull Case is more likely.

CoW Rate: The percentage of batch volume on CoW Protocol that clears through direct matching rather than AMMs. A rising CoW rate indicates that intent protocols are capturing surplus that would otherwise flow to LPs.

Wallet Routing Decisions: The percentage of MetaMask, Phantom, and Coinbase Wallet swaps that route through intent protocols vs. direct AMMs. If wallets default to intent routing, the distribution advantage is confirmed.

AMM Fee Revenue per TVL: The ratio of fee revenue to TVL for major AMMs. A declining ratio indicates fee compression and commoditization.

Cross-Chain Intent Volume: The volume of intents that span multiple chains. If this grows faster than single-chain intent volume, cross-chain infrastructure is becoming the critical bottleneck and investment opportunity.

10.5 Lagging Indicators and Risk Signals

Lagging indicators confirm that a structural shift has already occurred, but they are less useful for timing.

Token Dilution: If AMM governance tokens continue to emit inflationary rewards to retain liquidity, it signals that the fee revenue is insufficient to attract LPs organically. This is a sign of structural weakness.

LP Yield Compression: If the yield on concentrated liquidity positions falls below the risk-free rate (tokenized Treasuries now yield 4 to 5 percent), retail LPs will exit, accelerating the liquidity contraction.

Regulatory Enforcement: SEC actions against wallets for PFOF, or against intent protocols for operating unregistered exchanges, would reshape the market structure. The direction of enforcement (permissive vs. restrictive) determines the equilibrium.

Vertical Integration Events: If a major wallet acquires a solver network, or a solver builds a wallet, the vertical integration thesis is confirmed. These events signal that the stack is consolidating and standalone layers are at risk.

10.6 Downside Scenarios and Invalidation Criteria

The core thesis of this report -- that economic value migrates from liquidity to execution and orderflow -- is robust but not absolute. Investors should monitor the following invalidation criteria:

1. **AMM Innovation Reversal:** If Uniswap v4 hooks or a successor innovation enables AMMs to capture solver-like value (e.g., dynamic routing, MEV protection, internalization), the commoditization thesis could be reversed.
2. **Regulatory Ban on Intents:** If regulators classify intent protocols as unregistered exchanges and shut them down, the entire execution stack could revert to direct AMMs.
3. **Bridge Security Failure:** If a major cross-chain bridge is hacked for more than $1 billion, user confidence in cross-chain intents could collapse, fragmenting the market.
4. **Wallet Stagnation:** If wallets fail to monetize orderflow and continue to offer free routing, the PFOF revenue model is invalidated, and the Wallet Layer's value is reduced.
5. **Solver Competition:** If solver margins compress to zero due to hyper-competition, the Solver Layer becomes unprofitable, and the oligopoly thesis fails.

10.7 Risk Taxonomy

Structural Risks: The intent stack may not achieve the scale necessary to support profitable solver businesses. If volume remains low, fixed costs overwhelm margins, and the solver layer collapses.

Technological Risks: Cross-chain execution may fail to achieve the latency and security required for institutional adoption. Bridge hacks, sequencer failures, or ZK-proof bugs could destroy user confidence.

Regulatory Risks: The SEC, EU, or other jurisdictions may classify intent protocols, wallets, or solvers as regulated entities, imposing licensing requirements, capital constraints, or restrictions on PFOF. The MiCA regulation in Europe is already moving in this direction.

Competitive Risks: Centralized exchanges may offer superior execution quality at lower cost, causing users to retreat from DeFi. Binance and Coinbase have both expanded their DeFi integrations and could outcompete on-chain execution for retail users.

Section XI: Conclusion

The DeFi execution stack is undergoing a structural transformation that mirrors the evolution of US equity market structure from monopolistic exchanges to fragmented, vertically integrated execution ecosystems. The critical question is no longer "where is the liquidity?" It is "who controls the orderflow, and how is execution priced?"

Liquidity is becoming a commodity. AMMs are the dumb pipes of localized capital, selling options to arbitrageurs without charging the proper premium. The adverse-selection cost borne by LPs, quantified as Loss-Versus-Rebalancing, has exceeded fee revenue in volatile regimes, driving retail participants out of the market. Liquidity mining incentives have proven that capital is mercenary: it flows to the highest yield, not the deepest moat. The result is a fragmented, oversupplied liquidity landscape where no single pool possesses pricing power.

Orderflow is becoming scarce. The user relationship, owned by wallets and distribution interfaces, is the most defensible asset in the DeFi economy. Wallets can route intents to preferred solver networks, charge frontend fees, or sell orderflow for PFOF rebates. The customer relationship is the moat that technology cannot replicate. Switching costs are high because wallets contain identity, history, and token approvals. In a world of commoditized liquidity, distribution is king.

Execution is becoming concentrated. Solvers require balance sheet scale, cross-chain infrastructure, and algorithmic sophistication that only a handful of institutional market makers can provide. The solver market will consolidate into an oligopoly of 3 to 5 major players, each with pricing power over the intent layer. These solvers will internalize the majority of trades, capturing the bid-ask spread and rendering AMMs as backstop liquidity of last resort.

The economic map of DeFi is being redrawn. Value accrues to the edges of the stack: the wallets that own the user, and the solvers that own the execution. The middle is hollowed out. AMMs become public utilities. Intent protocols become matching engines that capture moderate fees. Settlement layers capture structural rent from volume growth. The Liquidity Layer is compressed to the margin.

For institutional investors, the implications are clear. Capital must follow the orderflow. Settlement layer assets (ETH, SOL) remain structurally sound. Wallet infrastructure and solver networks represent the highest-risk-adjusted returns in private markets. Generic AMM tokens face multiple compression and should be treated as low-growth utilities. Intent protocol tokens are viable only if they can enforce fee capture and resist vertical integration.

The profound risk is that DeFi lacks the regulatory guardrails that constrain TradFi market structure. In the United States, the SEC mandates best execution and regulates PFOF to protect retail users. In DeFi, no such regulator exists. Solvers will compete on price improvement up to the point of marginal return, but wallets will extract maximum rent from routing opacity. The user may be better protected from MEV than in the AMM era, but they will face a new form of extraction: hidden fees embedded in routing decisions that lack the disclosure requirements of traditional finance.

Ultimately, the next generation of DeFi unicorns will not be liquidity venues. They will be execution engines and distribution monopolists. Value is no longer found in the pool. It is found in the path. Capital must follow the orderflow, and the orderflow is owned by those who control the user's first interaction with the blockchain.

The winners of the next cycle will be the entities that solve the fundamental problem of DeFi: not how to provide more liquidity, but how to use the liquidity that already exists more intelligently. The answer is not in the protocol. It is in the stack above it.

This report is for informational purposes only and does not constitute investment advice. All figures are as of the date of publication. The author holds no positions in the tokens discussed and has no commercial relationship with the protocols mentioned.

References

Angeris, A., Chitra, T., & Evans, A. (2021). A note on path-dependence in automated market makers. *arXiv preprint*. https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.03633

a16z crypto. (2023). LVR: Quantifying the cost of providing liquidity. *a16z crypto research*. https://a16zcrypto.com/posts/article/liquidity-provider-lvr/

Beincrypto. (2026). DeFi total value locked slides every month in 2026 to $70 billion. *Beincrypto*. https://beincrypto.com/defi-tvl-decline-2026-downtrend/

Blockeden. (2026, April 20). 250,000 daily active on-chain AI agents: What the 400% growth really means. *Blockeden*. https://blockeden.xyz/blog/2026/04/20/250k-daily-active-on-chain-ai-agents-400-percent-growth/

Blockeden Forum. (2026, February 7). UniswapX, CoW Protocol, and 1inch Fusion now handle billions in monthly volume through solver auctions. *Blockeden Forum*. http://blockeden.xyz/forum/t/uniswapx-cow-protocol-and-1inch-fusion-now-handle-billions-in-monthly-volume-through-solver-auctions-the-intent-architecture-explained-for-builders/462

CoW DAO. (n.d.). What is loss-versus-rebalancing (LVR)? *CoW Protocol documentation*. https://cow.fi/learn/what-is-intent-based-trading

CryptoPresales.com. (2025, January). Total value locked in DeFi soars 137% YoY to a staggering $129 billion. *Focus on Business*. https://focusonbusiness.eu/en/news/total-value-locked-in-defi-soars-137-yoy-to-a-staggering-129-billion/6554

Dcentralab. (2025, December 23). Intents and solvers: The next UX revolution in DeFi for 2026. *Dcentralab*. https://www.dcentralab.com/blog/intents-and-solvers-defi-in-2026

Delphi Digital. (2023). What is loss versus rebalancing (LVR)? *Delphi Digital research*. https://delphidigital.io/

Eco.com. (2026). What are intents and solvers? 2026 guide. *Eco Support*. https://eco.com/support/en/articles/11852634-intent-based-dex-guide-2026

ESMA. (2025, July). Maximal extractable value: Implications for crypto markets. *European Securities and Markets Authority*. https://www.esma.europa.eu/sites/default/files/2025-07/ESMA50-481369926-29744_Maximal_Extractable_Value_Implications_for_crypto_markets.pdf

Flashbots. (2023). The future of MEV is SUAVE. *Flashbots research*. https://writings.flashbots.net/mev-and-the-limits-of-scaling

Flashbots. (2025, June 15). MEV and the limits of scaling. *Flashbots*. https://writings.flashbots.net/mev-and-the-limits-of-scaling

Heygotrade. (2026, May 7). Robinhood (HOOD) vs Charles Schwab (SCHW) 2026 stock guide. *Heygotrade*. https://www.heygotrade.com/en/blog/robinhood-hood-vs-charles-schwab-schw-2026/

iBuidl. (2026, March 10). Solana ecosystem Q1 2026: DEX volume, DeFi TVL, and developer activity report. *iBuidl Research*. https://ibuidl.org/blog/solana-ecosystem-q1-2026-report-20260310

Investopedia. (2023). Payment for order flow (PFOF): Definition and how it works. *Investopedia*. https://www.investopedia.com/terms/p/paymentfororderflow.asp

Kim, H., & Park, Y. S. (2026). Bounding LVR in AMMs via secant-tangent divergence and collateralized liquidity scaling. *arXiv preprint*. https://arxiv.org/html/2605.19267

MatrixBCG. (2026, May 14). PESTLE analysis of Virtu Financial. *MatrixBCG*. https://matrixbcg.com/products/virtu-pestle-analysis

MatrixBCG. (2026, May 12). Robinhood Markets BCG matrix analysis. *MatrixBCG*. https://pestel-analysis.com/products/robinhood-bcg-matrix

Milionis, J., Moallemi, C., Roughgarden, T., & Zhang, A. L. (2022). Automated market making and loss-versus-rebalancing. *arXiv preprint*. https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.00106

Pen-caforr. (2026, April 16). DeFi TVL report Q1 2026: RWA surpasses lending as largest sector. *Pen-caforr*. https://pen-caforr.org/2026/04/15/defi-tvl-report-q1-2026-rwa-surpasses-lending-as-largest-sector/

RevenueMemo. (2026, March 14). How Robinhood makes money: The zero-commission paradox that redefined investing. *RevenueMemo*. https://www.revenuememo.com/p/how-does-robinhood-make-money

Saggese, P. (2025). Towards verifiability of total value locked (TVL) in DeFi. *Bank for International Settlements Working Paper No. 1268*. https://www.bis.org/publ/work1268.pdf

SEC. (2004). Payment for order flow and internalization in the options markets. *Securities and Exchange Commission*. https://www.sec.gov/

Singh, S. F., et al. (2025). Modeling loss-versus-rebalancing in automated market makers via continuous-installment options. *AFT 2025, LIPIcs, Vol. 354*. https://drops.dagstuhl.de/storage/00lipics/lipics-vol354-aft2025/LIPIcs.AFT.2025.6/LIPIcs.AFT.2025.6.pdf

Uniswap Labs. (2024). Uniswap v4 key features and innovations explained. *Uniswap Labs*. https://uniswap.org/

Uniswap Labs. (2024). Uniswap v4 hooks: How we implemented an "instant exit cost." *Uniswap Labs*. https://uniswap.org/

Uniswap Developers. (2024). Security framework. *Uniswap Developers*. https://docs.uniswap.org/

Wharton School. (2023). Payment for order flow and the retail trading experience. *Wharton Financial Institutions Center*. https://wifpr.wharton.upenn.edu/wp-content/uploads/2023/10/Payment-for-Order-Flow.pdf

Wang, Y., et al. (2022). A flash(bot) in the pan: Measuring maximal extractable value in private pools. *IMC '22 Proceedings*. https://arxiv.org/pdf/2206.04185

Weintraub, B., et al. (2022). Flashbots analysis: MEV extraction and private transaction channels. *ACM Internet Measurement Conference*. https://ben-weintraub.com/files/flashbots.pdf