

Title: Proof dark pool % have been decreasing the last 40 days

Author: PeroPotto

Created 2021-10-06 13:09:54 UTC

Permalink: /r/DDintoGME/comments/q2k4z1/proof\_dark\_pool\_have\_been\_decreasing\_the\_last\_40/

Url: [https://www.reddit.com/r/DDintoGME/comments/q2k4z1/proof\\_dark\\_pool\\_have\\_been\\_decreasing\\_the\\_last\\_40/](https://www.reddit.com/r/DDintoGME/comments/q2k4z1/proof_dark_pool_have_been_decreasing_the_last_40/)

Hi apes, I hope you're as jacked to the tits as I am. Many apes are probably wondering how DRS is affecting dark pool percentages, and I did too. I've seen the numbers decrease, but I wanted to make it official, for the skeptics out there.

I'm no expert at this, I've done 2 semesters at Uni with statistics. Please gimme a shout if you want any info, or if I did anything wrong.

**\*\*TADR:\*\*** medium-strong correlation, showing that dark pool % has definitely decreased last 40 days. Whether this is DRS or not, I cannot say, but it seems plausible.

**\*\*Method:\*\*** I did a correlation analysis between dates and dark pool percentage the last 40 bank days (took numbers from chartexchange). I changed the dates to 1 thru 40 (August 10th is 1, October 5th is 40), to make it easier. Then I added all the dark pool percentages to the corresponding days. I used Pearson's correlation coefficient, and Spearman's showed a slightly stronger correlation (-0.51 vs -0.52).

While I don't remember exactly when DRS started (if comments apes can gimme the date I can do a more accurate analysis), so I based it on the last 40 bank days. I compared this to the 40 days before that (June 14th to August 9th), and GREAT NEWS: THERE was no statistically significant correlation 80 to 40 days ago (so the correlation should be caused by something specific to the last 40 days). When I say no statistically significant correlation, I mean that the probability of the results being due to random circumstances is high, 61,7%. This means there's no clear relationship between the variables.

**\*\*Results:\*\*** Because named the dates like I did, the correlation should be \*negative\* if there's a relationship between the variables. The later dates have higher numbers, but the DP % is expected to decrease. The correlation was -0.509, which means that a higher number for date (later date), should see lower DP numbers. This is as expected IMO, and good news. It could mean DRS is working, and squeezing the hedge bastards.

$*r^*(38) = -.51, p < .001$

When it comes to the strength of the correlation, some classify -0.51 as strong, while others classify it as moderate. I don't know what is proper in this case, but either way it's good.

[This is the correlation in the last 40 days. The sig. means there's a 1% or lower chance of the results being random. So there's a 99% chance there was a relationship between dates and the % of trades going thru dark pools](<https://preview.redd.it/ebg4wnd7xtr71.png?width=786&format=png&auto=webp&s=4762388602ed92904f1e3f27171ab95a8276502a>)

[Here's the correlation from June 14th -August 9th. A correlation of 0.082 is microscopic, and the sig at 0.617 means there's a 61,7% chance of this correlation being random, and not due to any relationship between the variables.](<https://preview.redd.it/thg29qg9xtr71.png?width=986&format=png&auto=webp&s=1ffa735bf8ea4d9e9410314f76e488d7ecf6df18>)

DRS is the silver bullet. Hedgies are fuk