

Intraday Tick Simulator

Mathematical Foundations

Philippe Damay

di.simtick Module for KDB-X

January 21, 2026

Abstract

This document provides a comprehensive mathematical framework of an intraday tick simulator that generates realistic trade and quote data. The simulator combines a self-exciting Hawkes process for modeling trade arrival times with Geometric Brownian Motion (GBM) and Merton jump-diffusion for price dynamics.

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Random Number Generation	3
3	Trade Arrival Times: Hawkes Process	3
3.1	Model Specification	3
3.2	Stability Condition	4
3.3	Recursive Formulation	4
3.4	Time-Varying Baseline Intensity	4
3.5	Ogata Thinning Algorithm	5
4	Price Dynamics	5
4.1	Geometric Brownian Motion	5
4.2	Merton Jump-Diffusion	6
5	Trade Quantity Generation	7
5.1	Lognormal Model	7
5.2	Constant Model	7
6	Quote Generation	7
6.1	Methodological Note: Trade-First vs. Quote-First Simulation	7
6.2	Quote Generation Algorithm	8
6.3	Bid-Ask Spread Model	8
6.4	Quote Dynamics	9
6.5	Pre-Trade Quote	9
7	References	10

1 Introduction

Market microstructure simulation requires capturing several stylized facts of high-frequency financial data:

- **Trade clustering:** Trades tend to arrive in bursts rather than uniformly
 - **Intraday seasonality:** Trading activity varies throughout the day (high at open/close, low at midday)
 - **Price continuity:** Prices follow continuous stochastic processes with occasional jumps
 - **Bid-ask dynamics:** Quotes must be consistent with executed trades
- Our simulator addresses these requirements through a modular architecture:
- **Arrival times:** Hawkes process with time-varying baseline intensity
 - **Price dynamics:** GBM or Merton jump-diffusion at irregular time intervals
 - **Trade sizes:** Lognormal distribution
 - **Quote generation:** Consistent bid-ask spreads with realistic microstructure

2 Random Number Generation

The simulator requires standard normal random variates. We employ the Box-Muller transform, which converts pairs of uniform random variables to pairs of independent standard normals.

Box-Muller Transform: Let $U_1, U_2 \sim \text{Uniform}(0, 1)$ be independent. Define:

$$R = \sqrt{-2 \ln U_1} \tag{1}$$

$$\Theta = 2\pi U_2 \tag{2}$$

Then

$$Z_1 = R \cos \Theta \tag{3}$$

$$Z_2 = R \sin \Theta \tag{4}$$

are independent standard normal random variables, i.e., $Z_1, Z_2 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. The Box-Muller transform produces valid standard normal variates.

Implementation note: The transform requires an even number of uniform inputs. When n normal variates are needed, we generate $m = 2\lceil(n+1)/2\rceil$ uniforms and truncate the output.

3 Trade Arrival Times: Hawkes Process

3.1 Model Specification

Trade arrivals exhibit *self-excitation*: each trade increases the probability of subsequent trades, capturing the clustering observed in real markets.

Definition 1 (Hawkes Process). *A univariate Hawkes process $N(t)$ is a counting process with conditional intensity:*

$$\lambda(t) = \lambda_0(t) + \sum_{t_i < t} \alpha e^{-\beta(t-t_i)} \tag{5}$$

where:

- $\lambda_0(t)$ is the baseline (background) intensity
- $\alpha > 0$ is the excitation parameter (jump in intensity per event)
- $\beta > 0$ is the decay rate
- $\{t_i\}$ are the event times prior to t

3.2 Stability Condition

Proposition 1 (Stationarity). *The Hawkes process is stationary if and only if the branching ratio satisfies:*

$$\frac{\alpha}{\beta} < 1 \quad (6)$$

When $\alpha/\beta \geq 1$, the process explodes (intensity diverges to infinity). The ratio α/β represents the expected number of “offspring” events triggered by each “parent” event.

3.3 Recursive Formulation

For computational efficiency, we maintain the excitation term recursively. Define:

$$R(t) = \sum_{t_i < t} \alpha e^{-\beta(t-t_i)} \quad (7)$$

Then between events:

$$R(t + \Delta t) = R(t) \cdot e^{-\beta\Delta t} \quad (8)$$

Upon event arrival at time t :

$$R(t^+) = R(t^-) + \alpha \quad (9)$$

The total intensity is:

$$\lambda(t) = \lambda_0(t) + R(t) \quad (10)$$

3.4 Time-Varying Baseline Intensity

To capture intraday seasonality, we modulate the baseline intensity:

$$\lambda_0(t) = \mu \cdot s\left(\frac{t}{T}\right) \quad (11)$$

where μ is the base intensity parameter, T is the session duration, and $s : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is a shape function.

The shape function interpolates between three multipliers using cosine interpolation:

$$s(p) = \begin{cases} m_{\text{mid}} + (m_{\text{open}} - m_{\text{mid}}) \cos\left(\frac{\pi p}{2\tau}\right) & \text{if } p < \tau \\ m_{\text{mid}} + (m_{\text{close}} - m_{\text{mid}}) \sin\left(\frac{\pi(p-\tau)}{2(1-\tau)}\right) & \text{if } p \geq \tau \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

where:

- $p = t/T \in [0, 1]$ is progress through the trading day
- τ is the transition point (0.5 for symmetric U-shape, 0.3 for asymmetric J-shape)
- $m_{\text{open}}, m_{\text{mid}}, m_{\text{close}}$ are the multipliers at open, midday, and close

Cosine interpolation provides smooth transitions compared to linear interpolation, avoiding discontinuities in the intensity derivative.

3.5 Ogata Thinning Algorithm

Simulating a Hawkes process with time-varying intensity requires the *thinning* (or *acceptance-rejection*) method.

Algorithm 1 Ogata Thinning for Hawkes Process

```

1: Input: Parameters  $\mu, \alpha, \beta$ , duration  $T$ , shape function  $s(\cdot)$ 
2: Output: Event times  $\{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n\}$ 
3:
4: Compute upper bound:  $\lambda_{\max} = \mu \cdot \max(s) \cdot \left(1 + 3\frac{\alpha}{\beta}\right)$ 
5: Initialize:  $t \leftarrow 0$ ,  $R \leftarrow 0$ ,  $\text{times} \leftarrow []$ 
6: while  $t < T$  do
7:   Draw  $U_1 \sim \text{Uniform}(0, 1)$ 
8:    $\Delta t \leftarrow -\frac{\ln U_1}{\lambda_{\max}}$                                  $\triangleright$  Exponential with rate  $\lambda_{\max}$ 
9:    $t \leftarrow t + \Delta t$ 
10:  if  $t \geq T$  then
11:    break
12:  end if
13:   $R \leftarrow R \cdot e^{-\beta \Delta t}$                                  $\triangleright$  Decay excitation
14:   $\lambda \leftarrow \mu \cdot s(t/T) + R$                                  $\triangleright$  Current intensity
15:  Draw  $U_2 \sim \text{Uniform}(0, 1)$ 
16:  if  $U_2 < \lambda / \lambda_{\max}$  then                                 $\triangleright$  Accept with probability  $\lambda / \lambda_{\max}$ 
17:    Append  $t$  to  $\text{times}$ 
18:     $R \leftarrow R + \alpha$                                           $\triangleright$  Excitation jump
19:  end if
20: end while
21: return  $\text{times}$ 

```

The thinning algorithm requires $\lambda_{\max} \geq \lambda(t)$ for all t . We compute:

$$\lambda_{\max} = \mu \cdot \max(m_{\text{open}}, m_{\text{mid}}, m_{\text{close}}) \cdot \left(1 + 3\frac{\alpha}{\beta}\right) \quad (13)$$

The factor $(1 + 3\alpha/\beta)$ accounts for excitation bursts. The expected steady-state excitation is α/β ; we use $3\times$ this value as a buffer for transient peaks.

Proposition 2. *The thinning algorithm produces a valid realization of the Hawkes process.*

Proof sketch. The algorithm generates a homogeneous Poisson process with rate λ_{\max} , then accepts each candidate event with probability $\lambda(t)/\lambda_{\max}$. By the thinning theorem, the accepted points form an inhomogeneous Poisson process with intensity $\lambda(t)$. Since each acceptance updates $\lambda(t)$ via the excitation term R , the self-exciting dynamics are correctly captured. \square

4 Price Dynamics

4.1 Geometric Brownian Motion

The baseline price model is Geometric Brownian Motion (GBM), which ensures positive prices and captures the multiplicative nature of returns.

Definition 2 (GBM). *Under GBM, the price process S_t satisfies:*

$$dS_t = \mu S_t dt + \sigma S_t dW_t \quad (14)$$

where μ is the drift, σ is the volatility, and W_t is a standard Brownian motion.

Applying Itô's lemma to $\ln S_t$:

$$d(\ln S_t) = \left(\mu - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \right) dt + \sigma dW_t \quad (15)$$

Integrating from t to $t + \Delta t$:

$$S_{t+\Delta t} = S_t \exp \left[\left(\mu - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \right) \Delta t + \sigma \sqrt{\Delta t} \varepsilon \right] \quad (16)$$

where $\varepsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$.

For a sequence of times $\{t_0, t_1, \dots, t_n\}$ with irregular spacing, we compute:

$$S_{t_i} = S_0 \prod_{j=1}^i \exp \left[\left(\mu - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \right) \Delta t_j + \sigma \sqrt{\Delta t_j} \varepsilon_j \right] \quad (17)$$

where $\Delta t_j = t_j - t_{j-1}$ and $\varepsilon_j \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ are independent.

The drift μ and volatility σ are specified in annualized terms. For a trading session:

$$\Delta t_j^{\text{years}} = \frac{\Delta t_j^{\text{seconds}}}{N_{\text{days}} \times T_{\text{session}}} \quad (18)$$

where N_{days} is the number of trading days per year (typically 252) and T_{session} is the session duration in seconds.

4.2 Merton Jump-Diffusion

To capture discontinuous price movements (e.g., from news events), we extend GBM with compound Poisson jumps.

Definition 3 (Merton Jump-Diffusion). *The price process satisfies:*

$$\frac{dS_t}{S_t} = \mu dt + \sigma dW_t + (e^J - 1) dN_t \quad (19)$$

where:

- N_t is a Poisson process with intensity λ_J (jumps per day)
- $J \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_J, \sigma_J^2)$ is the log-jump size

For small time intervals, the probability of a jump is:

$$P(\text{jump in } \Delta t) = 1 - e^{-\lambda_J \Delta t} \approx \lambda_J \Delta t \quad (20)$$

The discrete update becomes:

$$S_{t+\Delta t} = S_t \cdot \underbrace{\exp \left[\left(\mu - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \right) \Delta t + \sigma \sqrt{\Delta t} \varepsilon \right]}_{\text{diffusion}} \cdot \underbrace{\exp \left[\mathbf{1}_{\{U < p_J\}} \cdot (\mu_J + \sigma_J \varepsilon_J) \right]}_{\text{jump}} \quad (21)$$

where:

- $p_J = 1 - e^{-\lambda_J \Delta t^{\text{days}}}$
- $U \sim \text{Uniform}(0, 1)$
- $\varepsilon, \varepsilon_J \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ independent
- $\mathbf{1}_{\{\cdot\}}$ is the indicator function

5 Trade Quantity Generation

Trade sizes in real markets exhibit a skewed distribution: many small trades and occasional large block trades.

5.1 Lognormal Model

Definition 4 (Lognormal Trade Size). *Trade quantity Q follows:*

$$Q = \max(1, \lfloor e^X \rfloor), \quad X \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_Q, \sigma_Q^2) \quad (22)$$

To achieve a target average quantity \bar{Q} , we use the lognormal mean formula:

$$\mathbb{E}[e^X] = e^{\mu_Q + \sigma_Q^2/2} = \bar{Q} \quad (23)$$

Solving for μ_Q :

$$\mu_Q = \ln(\bar{Q}) - \frac{\sigma_Q^2}{2} \quad (24)$$

The floor and max operations ensure integer quantities ≥ 1 .

5.2 Constant Model

For testing or deterministic scenarios, a constant quantity model is also available:

$$Q = \bar{Q} \quad (25)$$

where \bar{Q} is the `avgqty` parameter. This is selected by setting `qtypemodel` to `constant`.

6 Quote Generation

6.1 Methodological Note: Trade-First vs. Quote-First Simulation

Our simulator employs a **trade-first** approach: we generate trade arrivals and prices, then construct quotes that are consistent with these trades. This is a deliberate simplification.

In real markets, the causal flow is reversed:

- Market participants submit **limit orders** to a limit order book (LOB)
- The LOB maintains bid and ask queues at each price level
- **Trades occur** when incoming market orders or aggressive limit orders match against resting orders
- Queue dynamics (arrivals, cancellations, executions) determine price discovery

A fully realistic simulator would model:

- **Order flow:** Poisson or Hawkes arrival of limit/market/cancel orders
- **Queue dynamics:** Orders waiting at each price level, priority by time
- **Price formation:** Mid-price moves when queues deplete
- **Market impact:** Large orders walking through the book
- **Strategic behavior:** Quote stuffing, spoofing, optimal execution

Such models (e.g., Queue-Reactive models, agent-based LOB simulators) are significantly more complex and computationally expensive.

For many applications, the trade-first approach provides adequate realism:

- **Backtesting strategies:** If the strategy does not model queue position or market impact, trade-level data suffices
- **Statistical analysis:** Trade clustering, volatility estimation, and price dynamics are captured
- **System testing:** Database ingestion, time-series processing, and visualization can be tested with synthetic data
- **Computational efficiency:** Orders of magnitude faster than LOB simulation

The key limitation is that our quotes are *ex-post consistent* with trades rather than *causally generative*. This means:

- We cannot simulate realistic queue depletion or price impact
- Spread dynamics are imposed rather than emergent
- The simulator is unsuitable for market-making or optimal execution research

6.2 Quote Generation Algorithm

Given the trade-first approach, our quote generator ensures:

- Each trade has a valid quote immediately preceding it
- The trade price lies within the bid-ask spread
- Quotes evolve as a random walk between trades

6.3 Bid-Ask Spread Model

The spread is modeled as a fraction of the mid-price:

$$\text{spread}_t = s_{\text{base}} \cdot P_t \cdot m_{\text{spread}}(t) \quad (26)$$

where:

- s_{base} is the base spread (e.g., $0.001 = 10$ basis points)
- P_t is the current price
- $m_{\text{spread}}(t)$ is an intraday multiplier (spreads widen at open/close)

The spread multiplier interpolates linearly:

$$m_{\text{spread}}(p) = \begin{cases} m_{\text{open}}^s + (m_{\text{mid}}^s - m_{\text{open}}^s) \cdot 2p & \text{if } p < 0.5 \\ m_{\text{mid}}^s + (m_{\text{close}}^s - m_{\text{mid}}^s) \cdot 2(p - 0.5) & \text{if } p \geq 0.5 \end{cases} \quad (27)$$

6.4 Quote Dynamics

For computational efficiency and full vectorization, intermediate quotes use **price interpolation** rather than a sequential random walk. Given consecutive trades at times t_i and t_{i+1} with prices P_i and P_{i+1} , intermediate quotes are generated at evenly spaced times with mid-prices that interpolate toward the upcoming trade:

$$M_k = P_i + \frac{k}{K+1}(P_{i+1} - P_i) + \delta_M \cdot M_k \cdot \varepsilon_k \quad (28)$$

where:

- $k = 1, \dots, K$ indexes the intermediate quotes within the gap
- K is the number of intermediate quotes (capped at a maximum, e.g., 10)
- δ_M is a small noise constant (e.g., 0.0001)
- $\varepsilon_k \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$

This approach:

- Ensures quotes naturally converge toward where the next trade will execute
- Eliminates sequential dependencies, enabling full vectorization
- Maintains realistic microstructure (quotes “anticipate” trades)

The bid and ask are then:

$$B_k = M_k - \frac{\text{spread}_k}{2} \cdot (1 + 0.1|\varepsilon'_k|) \quad (29)$$

$$A_k = M_k + \frac{\text{spread}_k}{2} \cdot (1 + 0.1|\varepsilon'_k|) \quad (30)$$

where $\varepsilon'_k \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ adds randomness to the spread width.

6.5 Pre-Trade Quote

For each trade at time t_{trade} with price P_{trade} , we generate a quote at time:

$$t_{\text{quote}} = t_{\text{trade}} - \Delta t_{\text{offset}} - U \cdot \Delta t_{\text{offset}} \quad (31)$$

where Δt_{offset} is the minimum pre-trade offset and $U \sim \text{Uniform}(0, 1)$.

The quote is centered on the trade price:

$$B_{\text{pre}} = P_{\text{trade}} - \frac{\text{spread}}{2} \quad (32)$$

$$A_{\text{pre}} = P_{\text{trade}} + \frac{\text{spread}}{2} \quad (33)$$

This ensures the trade price is executable given the prevailing quote.

7 References

1. Data Intellect Github. “kdbx-modules”.
<https://github.com/DataIntellectTech/kdbx-modules/tree/main>
2. KDB-X Documentation. “Modules”.
<https://code.kx.com/kdb-x/modules/module-index.html>
3. Bacry, E., Mastromatteo, I., and Muzy, J.F. (2015). “Hawkes processes in finance.” *Market Microstructure and Liquidity*, 1(1), 1550005.