

# Optimal Execution under Adaptive Conjectures

Ryosuke ISHII

## 1 Introduction

In a strand of researches about the optimal execution problem, Ishii [17] introduced market participants other than the institutional investor and constructed a general equilibrium model. But the trade concentration on the final period takes place over a wide range of parameters in this model. In the case where the small investors are passive, the institutional investor will sell equally-divided amounts of securities at each period. Is it distant to assume the rational expectation about the others' orders placed off the equilibrium path? One can think that it is natural to base the decision on thing of the past under similar circumstances.

## 2 Model

There are one institutional investor (that we call II in what follows) and a lot of small investors ( $SI$ ). They can trade at times  $t=1, 2, \dots, T$ . II has to sell  $W_1$  units of security over this time period. Trades occur at  $t=1, 2, \dots, T$ , and those who have one unit of securities obtain dividends  $\tilde{F}$  at  $t=T+1$ .

$$\tilde{F} = F + \varepsilon, \tag{1}$$

where  $F$  is observed by all traders at  $t=0$ .  $\varepsilon$  follows a normal distribution that has a mean 0 and a variance  $\sigma_F^2$  at  $t=T+1$ .

II places a market order  $S_t$  at every period  $t=1, 2, \dots, T$ . II is risk neutral. That is, he maximizes

$$\sum_{t=1}^T P_t S_t \text{ s. t. } \sum_{t=1}^T S_t = W_1. \tag{2}$$

We define  $W_{t+1} = W_t - S_t$  ( $t=1, 2, \dots, T$ ).

There are infinitely many SIs. They are uniformly distributed whose population is 1. The measure of each SI is 0. SIs have no position at  $t=0$ . They can borrow some money or securities and place limit orders at  $t=1, 2, \dots, T$ . They face no liquidity constraint. The interest rate is 0 for simplicity. We denote the quantity possessed by a representative SI<sup>1</sup> at

the end of  $t$  as  $B_t$ . He places his orders “passively.” That is, he maximizes

$$E[-\exp\{-\rho \sum_{u=1}^t (\bar{F}-P_u)B_u\}|F], \quad (3)$$

at each period  $t$ .

The price  $P_t$  is determined to conform the amount of all buy order to all sell order at every  $t=1, 2, \dots, T$ :

$$S_t = B_t. \quad (4)$$

### 3 Rational Equilibrium (Benchmark Model)

Prior to the consideration of II's evolutionary decision making, we will see a rational equilibrium, where II comprehend the inventory effect. Taking the result in advance, II even up  $W_1$  and sell off equally :

$$S_t = \frac{W_1}{T} \text{ (for all } t\text{)}. \quad (5)$$

#### 3.1 Decision Making of SIs

The conditional expectation and the conditional variance that the representative SI has at  $t(t=1, 2, \dots, T)$  are

$$E[\sum_{u=1}^t (\bar{F}-P_u)B_u|F] = \sum_{u=1}^t (F-P_u)B_u, \text{ and} \quad (6)$$

$$Var[\sum_{u=1}^t (\bar{F}-P_u)B_u] = \sigma_F^2 (\sum_{u=1}^t B_u)^2. \quad (7)$$

The first order condition is

$$-\rho (F-P_t - \rho \sigma_F^2 \sum_{u=1}^t B_u) E[-\exp\{-\rho \sum_{u=1}^t (\bar{F}-P_u)B_u\}|F] = 0 \quad (8)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow B_t = \frac{F-P_t}{\rho \sigma_F^2} - \sum_{u=1}^{t-1} B_u. \quad (9)$$

Rearranging this term with the use of  $B_t = S_t$ , we obtain

$$P_t = F - \rho \sigma_F^2 \sum_{u=1}^t S_u. \quad (10)$$

### 4 Decision Making of II

#### 4.1 Period $T$

By II's sellout constraint  $S_T = W_T$

$$S_T = W_T. \quad (11)$$

By the market clearing condition,

$$P_T = F - \rho\sigma_F^2 \sum_{u=1}^{T-1} S_u - \rho\sigma_F^2 W_T. \quad (12)$$

Therefore the continuation selling amount is

$$V_T = (F - \rho\sigma_F^2 \sum_{u=1}^{T-1} S_u - \rho\sigma_F^2 W_T) W_T. \quad (13)$$

#### 4.2 Induction Hypothesis of Period $t+1$ ( $t = T-1, T-2, \dots, 1$ )

$$V_{t+1} = \left( F - \rho\sigma_F^2 \sum_{u=1}^t S_u - \frac{T-t+1}{2(T-t)} \rho\sigma_F^2 W_{t+1} \right) W_{t+1}. \quad (14)$$

#### 4.3 Period $t$

The II's optimization problem at the period  $t$  is:

$$\max_{S_t} P_t S_t + V_{t+1}$$

$$= \max \left( F - \rho\sigma_F^2 \sum_{u=1}^t S_u \right) S_t + \left( F - \rho\sigma_F^2 \sum_{u=1}^t S_u - \frac{T-t+1}{2(T-t)} \rho\sigma_F^2 (W_t - S_t) \right) (W_t - S_t). \quad (15)$$

The first order condition is

$$\begin{aligned} & -\rho\sigma_F^2 S_t + F - \rho\sigma_F^2 \sum_{u=1}^t S_u \\ & + \left( -\rho\sigma_F^2 + \frac{T-t+1}{2(T-t)} \rho\sigma_F^2 \right) (W_t - S_t) \\ & - \left( F - \rho\sigma_F^2 \sum_{u=1}^t S_u - \frac{T-t+1}{2(T-t)} \rho\sigma_F^2 (W_t - S_t) \right) \\ & = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Therefore

$$S_t = \frac{1}{T-t+1} W_t, \quad (17)$$

$$V_t = \left( F - \rho\sigma_F^2 \sum_{u=1}^{t-1} S_u - \frac{T-t+2}{2(T-t+1)} \rho\sigma_F^2 W_t \right) W_t. \quad (18)$$

Now we obtain the following results:

$$S_1 = S_2 = \dots = S_T = \frac{W_1}{T}, \quad (19)$$

$$P_t = F - \frac{t}{T} \rho\sigma_F^2 W_1. \quad (20)$$

■

## 5 Evolutionary Decision Making

We consider the evolutionary situation where II makes a decision on the execution problem without any regard for the inventory effect.

Periodically II, SIs and the noise trader play the execution problem a number of times. The strategies of all traders are arbitrarily fixed. In each round, all traders change their strategies to the best responses under the condition in which every trader expects others' orders would be the same orders as the ones at the last round. For example, when II's market orders are  $(S_t)_{t=1}^T$  at the round before the last round, then SIs' orders are

$$B_t = \frac{F - P_t}{\rho\sigma_F^2} - \sum_{u=1}^{t-1} S_u, \quad (21)$$

at the last round. Observing this, II's orders at the present round are

$$\arg \max_{(S_t)_{t=1}^T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left( F - \rho\sigma_F^2 \sum_{u=1}^{t-1} S_u - \rho\sigma_F^2 S_t \right) S_t. \quad (22)$$

We are going to specify the absorbing state in this dynamic.

**Theorem 1** *There is a unique absorbing state, where II executes more amount of securities in earlier period:*

$$\begin{aligned} S_t &= \frac{2^{T-t}}{2^T - 1} W_1, \text{ and} \\ P_t &= F - \frac{2^T - 2^{T-t}}{2^T - 1} \rho\sigma_F^2 W_1, \\ &\text{for all } t. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

*Proof.* Suppose  $S_t > 2S_{t+1}$  for some  $t$  ( $t=1, 2, \dots, T-1$ ). Then II becomes better off than before by changing the orders at  $t$  and  $t+1$  to  $S'_t = S_t - \Delta$  and  $S'_{t+1} = S_{t+1} + \Delta$  respectively for some small  $\Delta > 0$  and not changing the orders at other periods, which results in improvement in

$$(S_t - 2S_{t+1} - \Delta)\rho\sigma_F^2 \Delta > 0. \quad (24)$$

The same is equally true of the case  $S_t < 2S_{t+1}$ . There exist selection pressures toward (23). Meanwhile, suppose that (23) holds. If II changes his orders at the period  $t$  and  $u$  to  $S'_t = S_t - \Delta$ ,  $S'_u = S_u + \Delta$  and if he does not change the orders at other periods for any  $t \neq u$ ,  $\Delta \neq 0$ , then he has to be worse off.

$$-\rho\sigma_F^2 \Delta^2 < 0. \quad (25)$$

## 6 Concluding Comments

In the case of evolutionary decision making, the faster trading takes place. The prices become lower.

## Note

- 1 When all SIs place the identical orders, the aggregate SIs' order is the same as in the case where one trader with the risk aversion  $\rho$  places his order. So we can call this virtual trader a "representative SI."

## References

- [ 1 ] Almgren, Robert, and Neil Chriss, 2000, Optimal execution of portfolio transactions, *Journal of Risk*, 3, 5-39.
- [ 2 ] Almgren, Robert, 2003, Optimal execution with nonlinear impact functions and trading-enhanced risk, *Applied Mathematical Finance*, 10, 1-18.
- [ 3 ] Almgren, Robert, and Julian Lorenz, 2007, Adaptive arrival price, *Algorithmic Trading III: Precision, Control, Execution*.
- [ 4 ] Bertsimas, Dimitris, and Andrew W. Lo, 1998, Optimal control of execution costs, *Journal of Financial Markets*, 1, 1-50.
- [ 5 ] Chan, L., and J. Lakonishok, 1995, The behavior of stock prices around institutional trades, *Journal of Finance*, 50, 1147-1174.
- [ 6 ] Keim, D. B., and A. Madhavan, 1995, Anatomy of the trading process: Empirical evidence on the behavior of institutional traders, *Journal of Financial Economics*, 37, 371-398.
- [ 7 ] Keim, D. B., and A. Madhavan, 1996, The upstairs market for large-block transactions: Analysis and measurement of price effects, *Review of Financial Studies*, 9, 1-36.
- [ 8 ] Keim, D. B., and A. Madhavan, 1997, Transactions costs and investment style: An inter-exchange analysis of institutional equity trades, *Journal of Financial Economics*, 46, 265-292.
- [ 9 ] Keim, D. B., and A. Madhavan, 1998, The costs of institutional equity trades, *Financial Analysts Journal*, 54, 50-69.
- [10] Kissell, Robert, and Roberto Malamut, 2005, Understanding the profit and loss distribution of trading algorithms, *Algorithmic trading: Precision, Control, Execution*.
- [11] Kissell, Robert, and Roberto Malamut, 2006, Algorithmic decision making framework, *Journal of Trading*, 1, 12-21.
- [12] Albert S. Kyle, 1985, Continuous Auctions and Insider Trading, *Econometrica*, Vol. 53, No. 6, 1315-1336.
- [13] Nöldeke, G. and Samuelson, L., 1993. An Evolutionary Analysis of Backward and Forward Induction, *Games and Economic Behavior* 5, pp. 425-454.
- [14] Harris, Lawrence, and Eitan Gurel, 1986, Price and Volume Effects Associated with Changes in the S&P 500 List: New Evidence for the Existence of Price Pressures, *Journal of Finance*, 41, 815-829.
- [15] Ho, T., and H. Stoll, 1983, The Dynamics of Dealer Markets Under Competition, *Journal of Finance*, 38, 1053-1074.
- [16] Huberman, Gur, and Werner Stanzl, 2000, Optimal liquidity trading, *Yale ICF Working Paper*

No. 00-21.

[17] Ishii, R., 2008, Optimal Execution in a Market with Small Investors, *KIER Discussion Paper Series*, Kyoto Institute of Economic Research, Discussion Paper No. 653

[18] Obizhaeva, Anna, and Jiang Wang, 2005, Optimal trading strategy and supply/demand dynamics, *AFA 2006 Boston Meetings Paper*.