

## Lecture 5. Strategic Trade Models

## 1. The Kyle (1995) Model

There is a single informed trader who trades repeatedly. She strategically (a) sets "trade size" taking into account the **adverse price concession** associated with larger quantities and (b) splits her orders and spreads out them over time to minimize the "trade impact".

*Remark 1.1.* In the sequential trade model, there are “many” informed agents and each trader can trade “only once” when she is drawn as an arriving trader. Trading behaviors are not strategic in that the trader does not care about the outcome of his order size on subsequent trades.

## 2. Single-Period Case

### *2.1. Assumptions*

Assume that (a) security value is  $v \sim N(p_0, \sigma_v^2)$ , (b) an informed trader knows  $v$  in advance and submits a net order flow  $x$ ; i.e.,  $x > 0$  means a buy order, and  $x < 0$  means a sell order, (c) a noise trader submits a net order flow  $u \sim N(0, \sigma_u^2)$ , independent of  $v$ , (d) a dealer observes a total net order flow  $y = x + u$  and sets a price,  $p$ , and (e) all trades are cleared at  $p$ .  $\text{BID-ASK } X.$   $\text{거래량 } p\text{와 } y\text{는 } ?$

## 2.2. The Informed Trader's Decision

Since the informed trader wants to trade aggressively (e.g., buying a large quantity if  $v > p$ ), the dealer uses a linear price rule, i.e.,

- 71(8).

$$\underline{p = \lambda y + \mu}, \quad v > p \rightarrow \text{informed } x \uparrow$$

where  $\lambda (> 0)$  and  $\mu$  are constant. The pricing rule (2.1) implies that the dealer protects himself picked-off by setting a price that is increasing in the informed trader's net order flow.

- The informed trader knows the dealer's pricing rule. So, the informed trader's profit is

$$\begin{array}{lll} \pi & = & (v-p)x \quad \leftarrow \quad \begin{matrix} v > p \\ x > 0 \end{matrix} \quad \begin{matrix} v < p \\ x < 0 \end{matrix} \\ & = & [v - \lambda(x+u) - \mu]x. \quad \oplus. \end{array}$$

Since  $v$  is “constant” for the informed trader, her expected profit is

$$\begin{aligned} E[\pi] &= (\nu - \lambda x - \mu)x, \\ &= (\nu - \mu)x - \lambda x^2. \end{aligned}$$

informed trader of  $\pi_{\text{true}}$   
 $V \in \pi_{\text{true}} (\text{Buy or Sell})$   
 $\mu \text{ of } V \cdot V + E(\mu) = 0$  -  
 (2.2)

Then, the informed trader strategically chooses her order flow  $x$  to maximize  $E[\pi]$  in (2.2): i.e.,

$$\max_x(v - \mu)x - \lambda x^2.$$

$$P = \lambda x + \mu$$

- The first-order condition (FOC) is

$$x = \frac{v - \mu}{2\lambda}, \quad (2.3)$$

which means that *the informed trader's optimal decision about the order flow  $x$  is endogenous of the dealer's decision about setting the values of  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$ .*

### 2.3. The Dealer's Decision

**Theorem 2.1.** Suppose that  $X$  and  $Y$  are bivariate normal random variables with means  $\mu_X$  and  $\mu_Y$ , variances  $\sigma_X^2$  and  $\sigma_Y^2$ , and covariance  $\sigma_{XY}$ . Then, the conditional expectation of  $Y$  given  $X$  is

$$E[Y|X] = \mu_Y + \frac{\sigma_{XY}}{\sigma_X^2}(X - \mu_X).$$

The dealer cannot directly observe the informed trader's order flow  $x$ ; instead he conjectures that the informed order flow is linear in  $v$ , i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} x &= \alpha + \beta v, \\ u &\sim N(0, \sigma_u^2) \\ v &\sim N(p_0, \sigma_v^2) \\ x &\sim N(\alpha + \beta p_0, \sigma_u^2 + \beta^2 \sigma_v^2) \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

where  $\beta > 0$ . For the total order flow  $y = x + u$  with  $x = \alpha + \beta v$ , the dealer, who does not know  $v$ , obtains that

$$\begin{aligned} E[y] &= E[\alpha + \beta v + u] \\ &= \alpha + \beta p_0, \\ y &= x + u \\ &= \alpha + \beta v + u \\ &\sim N(\alpha + \beta p_0, \sigma_u^2 + \beta^2 \sigma_v^2). \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} Var[y] &= Var[\alpha + \beta v + u] \\ &= \beta^2 Var[v] + Var[u] + 2\beta Cov[u, v] \\ &= \beta^2 \sigma_v^2 + \sigma_u^2, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} Cov[y, v] &= Cov[\alpha + \beta v + u, v] \\ &= \beta Cov[v, v] + Cov[u, v] \\ &= \beta \sigma_v^2. \end{aligned}$$

- Since  $y \sim N(\alpha + \beta p_0, \beta^2 \sigma_v^2 + \sigma_u^2)$  and  $v \sim N(p_0, \sigma_v^2)$ , it shows

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dealer : } E[v|y] &= E[v] + \frac{Cov[v, y]}{Var[y]}(y - E[y]) \\ &= p_0 + \frac{\beta \sigma_v^2}{\beta^2 \sigma_v^2 + \sigma_u^2}(y - \alpha - \beta p_0) \\ &= \left( \frac{\beta \sigma_v^2}{\beta^2 \sigma_v^2 + \sigma_u^2} \right) y + \left( \frac{-\alpha \beta \sigma_v^2 + p_0 \sigma_u^2}{\beta^2 \sigma_v^2 + \sigma_u^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

① Informed  
trader  
 $\lambda, \mu$  of  $v$

② dealer:  
 $x$  of  $v$   
( $\alpha, \beta$ )

$\Downarrow$   
And movemental etc.  
yielding  
etc.  
etc.  
etc.  
etc.

Since all trades clear at an informationally efficient price, it must hold  $E[v|y] = p$ : i.e.,

$$\left( \frac{\beta \sigma_v^2}{\beta^2 \sigma_v^2 + \sigma_u^2} \right) y + \left( \frac{-\alpha \beta \sigma_v^2 + p_0 \sigma_u^2}{\beta^2 \sigma_v^2 + \sigma_u^2} \right) = \lambda y + \mu,$$

$$\lambda = \frac{\beta \sigma_v^2}{\beta^2 \sigma_v^2 + \sigma_u^2} \text{ and } \mu = \frac{-\alpha \beta \sigma_v^2 + p_0 \sigma_u^2}{\beta^2 \sigma_v^2 + \sigma_u^2}.$$

dealer's  
pricing  
decision.

$\alpha, \beta$  = dealer's  
informed order flow.  
dealer's optimal (2.5)  
pricing decision:  $x$  of  $v$  ( $\alpha, \beta$ )

- From (2.5), one knows that the dealer estimates the informed order flow  $x$  (i.e.,  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ ) and then strategically decides his price rule  $p$  (i.e.,  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$ ). That is, the dealer's optimal decision about the price is endogenous of the informed trader's order flow  $x$ .

*Remark 2.2.* The dealer knows the informed trader's optimization process, given in (2.3), and solves for  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  in (2.4) as

$$\frac{v - \mu}{2\lambda} = \alpha + \beta v$$

$\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \mu$  unknown.  
 $y$  (true value)  $\neq$   $v$  (informed value).

for all  $v$ , yielding that

$$\alpha = -\frac{\mu}{2\lambda} \text{ and } \beta = \frac{1}{2\lambda}. \quad (2.6)$$

Solving (2.5) and (2.6) leads to

$$\alpha = -\frac{p_0 \sigma_u}{\sigma_v}, \beta = \frac{\sigma_u}{\sigma_v}, \lambda = \frac{\sigma_v}{2\sigma_u}, \text{ and } \mu = p_0.$$

#### 2.4. Equilibrium

In equilibrium where the informed trader acts strategically in response to the dealer's strategic movement, the informed trader's expected profit is given by

$$\begin{aligned} E[\pi] &= (v - \lambda x - \mu)x \\ &= \left( v - \lambda \left( \frac{v - \mu}{2\lambda} \right) - \mu \right) \left( \frac{v - \mu}{2\lambda} \right) \\ &= \frac{(v - \mu)^2}{4\lambda} \\ &= \frac{(v - p_0)^2 \sigma_u}{2\sigma_v} \end{aligned}$$

Expected value  
informed trader's true prob.

So,  $E[\pi]$  is increasing in (a) the divergence between the true value  $v$  and the mean  $p_0$  and (b) the variance of noise trading, i.e.,  $\sigma_u^2$ .

- Interestingly, (b) implies that the noise trading provides "camouflage" for the informed trader; e.g., all else equal, the informed trader trading on her private information can make more money in widely held and frequently traded stock.

dealer's strategy  
informed trader's strategy  
uninformed trader's strategy  
→ informed trader's strategy identifies itself  
as a signal.

get  $v$  as signal  
dealer's pricing setting  
But ↑ →  $v$  ↑ →  $y$  ↑ →  $x$  ↑  
signals real price credit risk.  
→  $v$  ↑ →  $y$  ↑ →  $p$  ↑  
→  $E[\pi]$  ↑ ( $\because (v - p_0) \uparrow$ ).



transaction to transaction.  
evenly spaced duration (X).

### 3. Multiple Rounds of Trading

*7/24.* Consider the case of  $N$  auctions that are equally spaced over a unit interval of time; i.e., the time interval between auctions is  $\Delta t = 1/N$ . The noise trader's order flow arriving at the  $n$ th auction, denoted by  $\Delta u_n$ , follows  $\Delta u_n \sim N(0, \sigma_u^2 \Delta t)$ . *Brownian motion.*

- In equilibrium, Kyle (1995) shows that (a) the informed trader's demand is  $\Delta x_n = \beta_n(v - p_{n-1})\Delta t$ , where  $\beta_n$  is trading intensity per unit time, (b) the price at the  $n$ th auction is  $p_n = p_{n-1} + \lambda_n(\Delta x_n + \Delta u_n)$ , and (c) market efficiency requires  $p_n = E[v|y_n]$ , where  $y_n$  is the cumulative order flow over time until the  $n$ th auction.

*7/26.* *in 20.*

*serially correlated.  
information set.*

*Remark 3.1.* The informed trader tends to trade on the same side of the market; i.e., she buys on average if information is favorable but sells on average if information is negative. So, the informed trader's order flow is positively correlated, i.e.,

$$\text{Cov}[\Delta x_i, \Delta x_j] > 0$$

*informed order flow  
positive autocorrelation.*

for any pair of auctions  $i$  and  $j$ . The noise trader's order flow is serially uncorrelated, however.

*↳ exogenous shock.*

**Proposition 3.2.** In equilibrium, the conditional expectation of the incremental total order flow,  $E[\Delta y_n|y_{n-1}]$ , is zero, where  $\Delta y_n = y_n - y_{n-1}$  and  $y_n = x_n + u_n$ . That is, the total order flow series  $\{y_n\}_{n=1}^N$  is serially uncorrelated.

*Proof.* It shows

$$\begin{aligned}
 E[\Delta y_n|y_{n-1}] &= E[\Delta x_n + \Delta u_n|y_{n-1}] \\
 &= E[\Delta x_n|y_{n-1}] \\
 &= E[\beta_n(v - p_{n-1})\Delta t|y_{n-1}] \\
 &= \beta_n E[v - p_{n-1}|y_{n-1}] \Delta t \\
 &= \beta_n (E[v|y_{n-1}] - p_{n-1}) \Delta t \\
 &= 0,
 \end{aligned}$$

$E(\Delta y_n|y_{n-1})$   
 $= E(y_n - y_{n-1}|y_{n-1})$   
 $= E(y_n|y_{n-1}) - y_{n-1} = 0$   
 $E(y_n|y_{n-1}) = y_{n-1}$ .  
 $\Rightarrow y_n$  is unpredictable.  
uncorrelated.  
*( $\Delta x_n = L_t$ )*  
 *$\Delta u_n = X$ .*  
 *$\Delta y_n = X$ .*

since market efficiency implies  $E[v|y_{n-1}] = p_{n-1}$ . Since  $E[\Delta y_n|y_{n-1}] = 0$  implies  $E[y_n|y_{n-1}] = y_{n-1}$ , one sees that the best forecast of the total order flow at the  $n$ th auction is the total order flow at the  $(n-1)$ th auction; put differently,  $y_n$  is unpredictable.  $\square$

- The total order flow is “uncorrelated,” but the informed order flow is “positively correlated.”

This suggests that the informed trader can hide behind the uninformed order flow. That is, the informed trader trades over time so that the dealer cannot predict (on the basis of the total order flow) what she will do next. In equilibrium, the Kyle model implies that the informed trader splits her order flow, distributing it over the  $N$  auctions, which corresponds to the real-world practice of splitting orders.

*milgrom 2025  
informed (real) dealer  
uninformed (real) dealer  
splitting strategy.*

informed : correlated  
uninformed : unco 4  
total order : unco  
(dealer)

*→ informed trader and real  
→ real uninformed and real total order strategy  
(order splitting).*

*2025 market year identity  
same year profit of 2025  
exchanging strategy 2025 year*