



MASTERTHESIS IN THE STUDY PROGRAM  
INFORMATIK – SOFTWARE AND INFORMATION  
ENGINEERING

---

# Influence of network-topologies on equilibrium in continuous double-auctions.

---

WRITTEN BY

JONATHAN THALER, BSc  
Student Id

SUPERVISED BY

PROF. (FH) DR. RER. NAT., DIPL. MATH.  
HANS-JOACHIM VOLLBRECHT

DORNBIRN, JULY 1, 2015

# **Statuatory Declaration**

I declare that I have developed and written the enclosed work completely by myself, and have not used sources or means without declaration in the text. Any thoughts from others or literal quotations are clearly marked. This Master Thesis was not used in the same or in a similar version to achieve an academic degree nor has it been published elsewhere.

# **Widmung**

Ich widme diese Arbeit meinen beiden liebenvollen Eltern, die den verlorenen Sohn nach 11 Jahren in Wien wie selbstverständlich wieder mit offenen Armen zu Hause in Vorarlberg aufgenommen haben und ihm so ein entspanntes Masterstudium ermöglichten und ihm dadurch halfen ein völlig neues Kapitel in seinem Leben aufzuschlagen.

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Theory</b>	<b>11</b>
2.1	Equilibrium . . . . .	11
2.1.1	Economics . . . . .	11
2.1.2	Equilibrium theory vs. dynamic process . . . . .	12
2.2	Continuous Double Auction . . . . .	13
2.2.1	Motivation . . . . .	13
2.2.2	Definition . . . . .	13
2.2.3	Characterization . . . . .	14
2.2.4	The continuous double-auction process . . . . .	15
2.2.5	Zero-intelligence agents . . . . .	16
2.2.6	Other work in this field . . . . .	16
2.3	Systemic Risk . . . . .	16
2.4	Leverage . . . . .	17
2.4.1	Definition . . . . .	17
2.4.2	Dangers . . . . .	17
2.5	Complex Networks . . . . .	18
2.5.1	Network-Generating Algorithms . . . . .	18
<b>3</b>	<b>The Leverage Cycle</b>	<b>19</b>
3.1	Geanakoplos . . . . .	19
3.2	Breuer et al. . . . .	21
3.2.1	States . . . . .	22
3.2.2	Collateralized asset market . . . . .	22
3.2.3	Utility-Functions . . . . .	23
3.2.4	Auction Mechanism . . . . .	24
3.2.5	Equilibrium . . . . .	25
3.2.6	Endogenous leverage . . . . .	26
3.3	Static Equilibrium vs. Process-oriented Equilibrium . . . . .	27

<b>4 Hypothesis</b>	<b>29</b>
4.1 Definition . . . . .	29
4.2 Motivation . . . . .	30
4.2.1 Proof . . . . .	30
4.3 Predictions . . . . .	31
<b>5 Implementation</b>	<b>32</b>
5.1 Requirements . . . . .	32
5.2 Functionality . . . . .	35
5.2.1 Emulate [BSV13] functionality . . . . .	35
5.2.2 Inspection . . . . .	35
5.2.3 Networks . . . . .	36
5.2.4 Replications . . . . .	36
5.2.5 Experiments . . . . .	36
5.3 Architecture . . . . .	37
5.3.1 Frontend . . . . .	38
5.3.2 Controller . . . . .	39
5.3.3 Backend . . . . .	39
5.4 Agents . . . . .	40
5.5 Markets . . . . .	41
5.5.1 Asset/Cash . . . . .	42
5.5.2 Bond/Cash . . . . .	43
5.5.3 Asset/Bond . . . . .	45
5.6 BP Mechanism . . . . .	47
5.7 Simulation . . . . .	47
5.7.1 Sweeping and Matching . . . . .	47
5.8 Performance improvement . . . . .	49
5.8.1 Local and Global Offer-book . . . . .	49
5.8.2 Matching probabilities . . . . .	49
5.9 Calculating theoretical Equilibrium . . . . .	53
<b>6 Results</b>	<b>55</b>
6.1 Validating simulation results . . . . .	55
6.1.1 References . . . . .	56
6.1.2 Thesis results . . . . .	56
6.1.3 Performance and termination measurements . . . . .	58
6.2 Experiments configuration . . . . .	58
6.3 Fully-Connected . . . . .	59
6.4 Ascending-Connected topology . . . . .	61
6.4.1 Ascending-Connected Importance Sampling . . . . .	62

<b>CONTENTS</b>	<b>4</b>
-----------------	----------

<b>7 Interpretation</b>	<b>65</b>
7.1 Validating the Hypothesis . . . . .	65
7.2 Analysing artefacts . . . . .	66
7.2.1 Dynamics of a single run . . . . .	66
7.3 Extending the Hypothesis . . . . .	70
7.3.1 Approaching fully connectedness . . . . .	70
7.3.2 Re-Enabling trading . . . . .	71
<b>8 A new Market</b>	<b>72</b>
8.1 Definition . . . . .	72
8.1.1 Products . . . . .	72
8.1.2 Price-Range . . . . .	72
8.1.3 Bid-Offering . . . . .	73
8.1.4 Ask-Offering . . . . .	73
8.1.5 Match . . . . .	74
8.2 Results . . . . .	74
8.2.1 Fully-Connected topology . . . . .	75
8.2.2 Ascending-Connected topology . . . . .	76
8.3 Interpretation of results . . . . .	78
8.4 Simulation and Market dynamics . . . . .	79
8.4.1 Fully-Connected with new Market . . . . .	80
8.4.2 Ascending-Connected with new market enabled after 1,000 successive failed matching-rounds . . . . .	83
8.4.3 Ascending-Connected with new Market . . . . .	84
8.5 Conclusions on new Market . . . . .	88
<b>9 Conclusion, Summary and further Research</b>	<b>89</b>
9.1 Conclusion . . . . .	89
9.2 Summary . . . . .	89
9.3 Further Research . . . . .	89
9.3.1 In-depth analysis of market-activities . . . . .	89
9.3.2 Imporance-Sampling . . . . .	89
9.3.3 Experiments with real subjects . . . . .	89
9.3.4 Mathematical proof of hypothesis . . . . .	89
9.3.5 Equilibrium definition for continous double-auction pro- cess . . . . .	90
<b>A Topologies</b>	<b>91</b>
A.1 Fully-Connected . . . . .	91
A.2 Half-Fully Connected . . . . .	93
A.3 Ascending-Connected . . . . .	94

A.4	Ascending-Connected with short-cuts . . . . .	96
A.4.1	Full short-cuts . . . . .	96
A.4.2	Regular short-cuts . . . . .	97
A.4.3	Random short-cuts . . . . .	99
A.5	Hub-based topologies . . . . .	100
A.5.1	3 Hubs . . . . .	100
A.5.2	3 Median Hubs . . . . .	102
A.5.3	Median Hub . . . . .	103
A.5.4	Maximum Hub . . . . .	105
A.6	Small-World and Scale-Free topologies . . . . .	105
A.6.1	Erdos-Renyi . . . . .	105
A.6.2	Barbasi-Albert . . . . .	109
A.6.3	Watts-Strogatz . . . . .	111
<b>B</b>	<b>Results for Hub-Based, Scale-Free and Small-World</b>	<b>114</b>
B.1	Half-Fully Connected . . . . .	114
B.2	Ascending-Connected with short-cuts . . . . .	115
B.2.1	Random short-cuts . . . . .	115
B.2.2	2 short-cuts . . . . .	116
B.2.3	5 full short-cuts . . . . .	117
B.2.4	15 full short-cuts . . . . .	118
B.2.5	30 full short-cuts . . . . .	119
B.2.6	5 regular short-cuts . . . . .	120
B.2.7	15 regular short-cuts . . . . .	121
B.2.8	30 regular short-cuts . . . . .	122
B.3	Hub-Based topologies . . . . .	123
B.3.1	3-Hubs . . . . .	124
B.3.2	1-Median Hub . . . . .	124
B.3.3	3-Median Hubs . . . . .	125
B.3.4	Maximum Hub . . . . .	125
B.4	Scale-Free and Small-World topologies . . . . .	125
B.4.1	Erdos-Renyi . . . . .	126
B.4.2	Barbasi-Albert . . . . .	127
B.4.3	Watts-Strogatz . . . . .	128
<b>C</b>	<b>Increasing the matching-probabilities in Ascending-Connected topology</b>	<b>129</b>
<b>Figures</b>		<b>129</b>
<b>Glossary</b>		<b>136</b>

*CONTENTS*

6

**Bibliography**

**138**

# Abstract

In the paper of [BSV13] a model for endogenous leverage in a continuous double-auction is introduced and it is shown under which circumstances holdings and trading prices approach an equilibrium. One main criteria is the trading network the agents use where Breuer et al. examine only two topologies and report that the prices come to an equilibrium only in the case of a fully connected network. They leave the question open on how the model behaves with different kind of networks and which network topology exactly allows an equilibrium to be reached for further research. This thesis builds upon this model and gives a hypothesis for a necessary condition a network must satisfy to allow the model to approach an equilibrium. Then a few network-topologies are examined in regard of their ability to allow equilibria to be reached or not through computer-driven simulation. As will be shown in this thesis through validation by computer-driven simulation the hypothesis turns out to be correct only after extending the simulation-model by an additional market. This result raises questions this thesis tries to answer about market-mechanisms and market-types when agents don't trade in a fully informed network.

# Chapter 1

## Introduction

TODO: überarbeiten, passt so noch nicht In 2008 the so called "Subprime Mortgage Crisis" struck the world. It was caused by declining house prices which rose during the US Housing Market Bubble in 2006 to an all-time high. Borrowers used their asset as collateral for the mortgage which constantly increased in value which guaranteed them a low payment-rate because the rate was coupled to the value of the asset. Banks granted "subprime" mortgages to more and more highly risky borrowers. In 2007 borrowers started to default which led to falling prices as the banks reclaimed the collateral and wanted to sell it again on the market to compensate for the loss. This led to a flood of assets which led to a decline of housing prices overall. As the prices fell dramatically the payment-rates rose dramatically to compensate for the cheaper asset. This in turn resulted in even more borrowers going default which resulted in a dramatic downward spiral. Even worse the banks were selling these collateralized products between each other and even insured themselves against defaults of borrowers which led to an even more dramatic kick-back.

This mechanism of borrowing money to buy goods which in turn act as a security for the borrowed money is called leverage which was determined as the primary driving force behind systemic risk in the aftermath of the "Subprime Mortgage Crisis". See Chapter 2.1 "Leverage and Systemic Risk" for a more in-depth discussion.

Up until 2010 leverage was always exogenous in the literature on collateralized credit but recently Geanakoplos and Zame ( TODO: cite) proposed theories which endogenized leverage within a general equilibrium framework.

[BSV13] developed a simulation on top of the model of Geanakoplos in which zero-intelligence agents trade assets and loans in a continuous double auction. They wanted to better understand the dynamic of such a theoretical

process and how prices develop instead of being predicted through an equilibrium theory. They TODO: zitierne "ask whether the competitive theory of trade in leveraged assets has descriptive and predictive power in a double auction environment."

4 contributions: 1. double auctions for leveraged assets is new 2. details of institutional specification matter a lot 3. limits of the endogenous leverage model 4.

They could show that in their simulation trading prices and wealth-distribution approach the theoretical equilibrium of Geanakoplos. In their simulation only a fully connected network and a hub-network of agents was investigated where the equilibrium was only reached in the case of the fully connected network. See Chapter 3. "The Leverage Cycle" for a thorough description of the simulation-model of [BSV13].

This thesis investigates more topologies of networks and their states of equilibrium. Furthermore it presents a hypothesis about the necessary property a topology of a network must satisfy to reach the theoretical equilibrium predicted in the theory of Geanakoplos. Interestingly it is shown experimentally that the hypothesis alone does not guarantee the reach of the theoretical equilibrium but further mechanisms needs to be implemented. See Chapter 4 "Hypothesis" and Chapter 6 "Results" for an in-depth explanation of both the hypothesis and why it does not hold and needs to be extended by means of an additional market-mechanism.

For experimental investigation a software was built for this thesis which implemented the exact simulation model of [BSV13] but extended it further to be applicable to arbitrary topologies. See Chapter 5 "Implementation" on details of the software.

In Chapter 2 "Theory" the theoretical background involved with this thesis is presented. First Leverage and systemic risk and its implications are discussed. Then an introduction into the mechanics of Continuous Double Auction as market-mechanisms and equilibrium theory in economics is given. Finally an overview of abstract networks, network-generating algorithms and and their properties is given.

In Chapter ?? "The Leverage Cycle" the theoretical model [BSV13] built their simulation upon is discussed in-depth.

In Chapter 4 "Hypothesis" all topologies which are investigated are introduced and the conjecture about the type of topology necessary to reach the theoretical equilibrium is presented and discussed whether the given topologies could ever approach it or not.

Chapter 5 "Implementation" gives an in-depth explanation of the implementation of the computer-driven simulation presented in [BSV13] including a description of the architecture, implementation of the markets and trading mechanisms.

Chapter 6 "Results" shows the results of simulations of all implemented topologies.

Chapter 7 "Interpretation and Discussions" connects the content of the previous chapters to show that the initial hypothesis of Chapter 4 does not satisfy the equilibrium and shows how it can be reached by introducing an additional market. Then results of simulations with this market are given and discussed where will be shown that using the additional market an equilibrium will be reached but that it is different from the theoretical predictions.

In Chapter 8 "Conclusions" a short sum-up of the thesis and questions left for further research are presented.

# **Chapter 2**

# **Theory**

In this chapter the theory necessary to understand the fundamentals of the thesis is covered.

## **2.1 Equilibrium**

This thesis investigates whether the simulation-model presented in chapter 3 reaches equilibrium for a given configuration or not. Equilibrium is a fundamental property in all kind of complex systems and indicates a state where the change-rates of all time-dependent variables are 0 and stay at 0 from some point  $t$ . Because the model upon which the simulation is based is rooted in economics a short definition of equilibrium in economics is necessary.

### **2.1.1 Economics**

Equilibrium theory in economics is the theory of finding prices which will result in an equilibrium by clearing the markets. Clearing is the process of finding a price in which all demands are matched to the given supplies thus clearing the market by leaving no unmatched demands or supplies. In other words it tries to find a price which satisfies all offers. Thus equilibrium in economics is reached when supplies equals demands.




Figure 1: Illustrative supply and demand curves. Diagram taken from [PMNP06]

In this diagram the equilibrium price which clears the market is at 25\$ because this price satisfies the constraint buyer-price  $\geq$  seller-price for all traders, thus all traders match and the market is cleared. The constraint buyer-price  $\geq$  seller-price is a fundamental law of economics and imposes an ordering on the prices of the market and is rooted in the fact that a buyer values the good it wants to buy more than the seller and has to pay at least the amount of money the seller wants for it, or more.

### 2.1.2 Equilibrium theory vs. dynamic process

It is important to note that equilibrium theory in economics is inherently non-dynamic and models no dynamic process of any kind over time. It is just a framework by providing formulas for calculating equilibrium prices but does not describe the dynamic process of how these equilibrium prices are settled. However the simulation in this thesis and the model by [BSV13] upon which it is built as defined in chapter 3 is a dynamic process which tries to approach the equilibrium predicted by the economics theory through a trading-process over time as defined in the following section and in chap-

ter 3. Thus both parts are necessary: the equilibrium theory to predict the theoretical equilibrium prices and the dynamic simulation-process in investigating whether the equilibrium prices can actually be reached and how these prices are settled over time.

## 2.2 Continuous Double Auction

### 2.2.1 Motivation

The continuous double-auction (CDA) is a type of auction upon which the model of [BSV13] presented in chapter 3 "The Leverage Cycle" and thus the thesis-software is based. The reasons why [BSV13] chose the continuous double-auction as the auction-mechanism is:

"Experimental economists believe that the continuous double auction is a trading institution that comes close to an environment which abstract equilibrium theories of competitive trading try to describe. It is an institution that allows for competitive bidding and trade on both sides of the market over time. One of the discoveries of experimental economists is that in many experiments double auctions converge to states where trading activity comes to a halt. In these final states prices and allocations often are similar to what equilibrium theory predicts."

### 2.2.2 Definition

To explain the details of the *continuous* double-auction one has to start with the double-auction (DA) alone. The DA is a market institution which defines rules how traders can exchange good for some numeraire between each other. As the name implies the DA is an auction which coordinates messages between traders which include some price information. Thus a DA is a multilateral process in which during multiple round TODO: plural traders can enter offer TODO: plural into an offer-book and accept offers made by others. Traders can be distinguished between seller and buyer and send their messages/place their offers in a given price-range according to their limit-price. Depending on the type of the DA at some point a clearing of the market happens thus leading to the actual exchange between the traders and thus a change in the allocation of their goods and cash.

### 2.2.3 Characterization

It is important to note that there exists not such a single thing as the "double auction" as there are many variants of it where they can all be differentiated in the way when and how traders place their offers and when and how the auction clears the market. The following questions must be answered when characterizing a double-auction instance:

- When does the clearing happen?
- When do offers of traders arrive?
- What information is available to each trader about current offers and other traders?
- How are unmatched offers treated?
- How are the trades priced?
- Are there one or multiple trading-periods?

[PMNP06] provide a range of questions to characterize different kinds of double-auctions. The questions relevant for the DA instance found in this thesis are cited in combination with the questions mentioned above. They are then answered to give a better understanding of the various types of DA and to understand the difference of the *continuous* double-auction used in this thesis as compared to the other variants.

**When does the clearing happen? Is it periodic or continuous?**  
 Clearing happens at the end of a round where the first match of two random traders on a random market is searched. It is continuous because traders agree on each others offers and exchange the traded goods immediately. In a periodic DA clearing happens at discrete time slots during the trading-process after multiple rounds.

**When do offers of traders arrive? Do offers arrive over time?**  
 Traders place their offers simultaneously at the beginning of each round. Offers do not arrive over time.

**What information about other traders offers does each trader have?**  
 None. The traders are not able to look into the offer-book or to communicate with other traders. They act only as zero-intelligence agents as introduced below.

**How are unmatched offers treated? What happens to unmatched bids and asks when a match occurs?** They are all deleted. Prices are placed randomly as will be seen in 3 "The Leverage Cycle" and if they haven't matched in the current round they won't match in the future ones thus they are all deleted from the offer-book.

**How are the trades priced? Are trades priced using discriminatory or uniform pricing and how are the uniform or discriminatory prices determined?** Discriminatory pricing is used. In uniform pricing one price is chosen and applied to all trades which clears the market where in discriminatory pricing the prices are determined individually for each trade. The transaction-price where the buyer and seller meet is the half-way price between the offers of both. Another possibility for the transaction-price as reported in [GS93] would be to select the price of the offer which was placed first.

**Are there one or multiple trading-periods? Is the market one-shot or repeated?** It is one-shot. A repeated DA comprises of multiple trading-periods where traders are endowed with new allocations and may or may not keep their final allocations after each period. This is not the case in this thesis where only one trading-period is simulated. This is not to be confused with Round as there are many rounds within one trading-period.

#### 2.2.4 The continuous double-auction process

The following points summarise the workings of the instance of CDA used in this thesis:

1. Endow all traders with initial goods and numeraire.
2. Open all markets.
3. Execute rounds as long as traders are able to trade.
4. In each round every trader is allowed to place one buy and one sell offer on all opened markets.
5. After all offers have been placed the auction clears the markets.
6. In clearing the first match between random traders on a random market is searched where  $\text{buyer-price} \geq \text{seller-price}$ .

7. On a match the offered amount is transferred and both traders meet at the half-way price.
8. Upon a match all the other offers on all markets are deleted and a new round starts.

### 2.2.5 Zero-intelligence agents

The traders in this thesis are zero-intelligence agents as introduced by Gode and Sunder in their influential paper [GS93]. These are traders which place offers strictly in a range which increases their utility and do not learn nor can adopt to the behaviour of other agents or changing conditions on the market. They are completely deterministic in a way that they never change their behaviour.

When using zero-intelligence agents the question about the allocative efficiency of the market must be raised: "Are zero-intelligence agents able to achieve or come close to 100% allocative efficiency?". According to [GS93] this is the case if:

"Imposing a budget constraint [...] is sufficient to raise the allocative efficiency of these auctions close to 100 percent. Allocative efficiency of a double auction derives largely from its structure, independent of traders' motivation, intelligence, or learning."

Because the model used in this thesis which is presented in chapter 3 is "imposing a budget constraint" the potential of coming close to 100% allocative efficiency is given. Results given in chapter 6 show that this is really the case.

### 2.2.6 Other work in this field

TODO: überhaupt notwendig?

TODO: cite other papers. friedman not available but cited by 3rd parties.  
<http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1883617>

## 2.3 Systemic Risk

TODO: auslassen, ist ein gigantisches und extrem komplexes thema und hat nur ganz abstrakt etwas mit der thesis zu tun. WENN NOCH ZEIT: Market Dynamics and Systemic Risk lesen und falls es etwas konkretes mit der thesis zu tun hat.

WIKI: It refers to the risks imposed by interlinkages and interdependences in a system or market, where the failure of a single entity or cluster of entities can cause a cascading failure, which could potentially bankrupt or bring down the entire system or market.

[Bor10]

TODO: anatomy of a crash in geanakoplos: causal-loop diagramm zeichnen mit den reinforcement or dampening circles

## 2.4 Leverage

Leverage in economics is a major part in the model of this thesis as defined in chapter 3 and thus a short introduction and overview of its meaning and implications is given.

### 2.4.1 Definition

Leverage is "any technique to multiply gains and losses" as defined by [Bri12]. There are different types of leverage where in this context only the so called *financial leverage* is of interest. In leverage money is borrowed to buy some good where the leverage is the ratio of the total debt to the traders equity. The greater the debt or the smaller the equity of the trader the higher the leverage.

$$\text{leverage} = \frac{\text{total debt}}{\text{trader equity}}$$

As an example an agent wants to buy a house for 500€ but has only 50€ in cash. Thus the agent borrows 450€ to finance the house thus creating a leverage of  $\frac{500}{50} = 10$ .

### 2.4.2 Dangers

As stated above leverage not only multiplies gains but also losses. If house prices rise by 25% this will result in a gain of 125€ or 250% return on the agents investment when selling the house. However if house prices decline by 15% this will result in a loss of 75€ or 150% loss on the agents investment - in this case the agent has lost more money than it initially invested. The leveraged loss can become a serious issue in financed housing because of margin requirements towards the lender. The margin requirement is the minimum margin the house-buyer has to maintain independent of the gains or losses of the house. Thus if the house-price drops to 475€ then the net

value of the margin is 25€ and the agent needs to bring in back 25€ to meet the margin requirements. If the losses are higher or the agent is not able to compensate them the house has to be sold.

## 2.5 Complex Networks

small-world power-law distribution generation algorithms dient hauptsächlich zur kategorisierung

TODO: In "State of the art" an overview of abstract networks and their properties is given. Also network-generating algorithms are presented and discussed. Because continuous double-auctions are the type of market which is used for matchings a short introduction is given on this topic too.

TODO: ziel hier eine theoretische übersicht über netzwerk-theorie zu geben wobei hauptaugenmerk auf die entwicklungen der letzten jahre (scale-free, small-world, ...)

Regular Graphs: [AlB99, vgl.] [New03, vgl.]

Random Graphs: but since then, most large scale networks with no apparent design principle were described as random graphs introduced by two Hungarian mathematicians Paul Erdos and Alfred Renyi [ER59, vgl.] [ER60, vgl.] Have small-world properties.

Small World Graphs or Average Path Length: Stanley Milgram [TM69] [Mil67] [Kle00]

Clustering Coefficient or Transitivity [WS98]

Degree Distribution [AlB02] Generally, it was believed that the degree distribution in most networks follows a Poisson distribution but in reality, real world networks have a highly skewed degree distribution following power-laws. Power-laws are expressions of the form  $y / x$ , where  $x$  is a constant,  $x$  and  $y$  are the measures of interest [152].

Small World and Scale Free Network: A small world network as deined by Watts and Strogatz [WS98], is a network with high clustering coefficient and small average path length. A scale free network as deined by Barabasi and Albert [AlB02], is a network where the degree distribution follows a power law.

Complex Networks: are Small-World and/or Scale-Free [BW00] [ASBS00] [Kle02] <http://www.cs.princeton.edu/chazelle/courses/BIB/big-world.htm>

introduce Metrics: - Average degree - average path-length - average clustering coefficient - network diameter - graph density

Mathematical stuff [New06] [ACL01] [EMB02] [GP04]

### 2.5.1 Network-Generating Algorithms

- fully connected - ascending connected - ascending connected with shortcuts
- hubs - erdos-renyi - barbasi-albert - watts-strogatz

TODO: reference to appendix a for concrete pictures of topologies

# Chapter 3

## The Leverage Cycle

In this chapter the model for the simulation is given. All the following chapters build upon this model where the thesis-software is an implementation of it.

### 3.1 Geanakoplos

The model of [BSV13] which is discussed in the next section is based upon the works of John Geanakoplos article [Gea09] "The Leverage Cycle" thus for a better understanding a short overview of the innovations and influences found therein is given.

The work of Geanakoplos focuses on asset-pricing, the influence of leverage on asset-prices and how leverage affects crises. He claims that because of leverage during boom times the asset-prices are too high because of massive leverage and during bad times the asset-prices are too low because of a massive drop in leverage. That is what he terms "the leverage cycle". Further he predicts that leverage cycles will occur although people remember past ones unless the central bank tries to stop those cycles by regulating leverage. Geanakoplos proposes a theory of equilibrium leverage and asset pricing which gives a central bank a tool for regulating leverage during boom times to prevent asset-prices skyrocketing and reinforce leverage in down times to lift the asset-prices which are too low to a reasonable level.

For Geanakoplos all crises start with scary bad news which are then the reason why asset-prices drop below a price which is lower than everyone expected. He introduces the so-called "natural buyer" which is an agent who values the asset more than the public. This can be because the agent is less risk averse, get more utility out of it, use the asset more efficient. In the end the details matter not, the natural buyer is just more optimistic

than the public. To prevent a too specific distinction between the natural buyer and the public Geanakoplos introduces a range of optimism  $h \in H = [0..1]$  in which all agents are ordered by their optimism  $h$  where the extreme pessimists reside at the lower end of 0.0 and the extreme optimists ate the upper end of 1.0. Each agent assigns the probability that good news will occur according to its optimism  $h$  where the extreme optimist thinks that good news will happen for sure and the extreme optimist think that it will never occur thus the more optimistic an agent, the more a natural buyer it is. If the natural buyers drops out of the business then the asset-prices drop as the natural buyers are the only ones willing to drive asset-prices up through leverage as they value the asset-prices the most. Thus the natural buyers buy as many assets they can and buy even more assets through borrowing and using the assets as security thus creating leverage. Because of this mechanics Geanakoplos emphasises that it is of very importance who lost money in a crisis - the public or the natural buyers whereas a loss for the natural buyers is the real catastrophe.

Geanakoplos then introduces a two-period economy which is the base for the economy used by Breuer et al. in their model. In the first period each agent of the previously mentioned continuum  $H$  is endowed with one consumption good C and one asset Y and can then trade with each other. The second period can be one of two states: U(p) and D(own) whereas in the up-state the asset Y is worth 1.0 and in the Down-State only 0.2. The agents differ only in their optimism  $h$  by which they assign the probability that the up-state will happen tomorrow in the second period. According to this they trade on the market according to their utility-function which depends on their optimism  $h$ . The following formula gives the utility-function of each agent which gives the price of an asset which is how much an agent values it - obviously the more optimistic the higher the price.

$$\text{price} = h + (1 - h)0.2$$

Now if  $\text{price}$  is larger than some given price  $p$  then the agent will want to buy the asset as the agent values it more than the given price  $p$  but can buy it for a lower price thus making an expected profit. If the  $\text{price}$  is less than the given price  $p$  the agent is going to sell the asset as the value the agent assigns to it is lower than the given price  $p$  thus the agent can make an expected profit in selling it.

Geanakoplos introduces a loan market where agents can lend and borrow money through loans to be able to further buy assets after they have ran out of cash. A loan can be sold and bought for  $j = 0.2$  and because

lenders worry about default each loan needs to be backed up by an asset as security. Loans need to be paid back at the beginning of the second state. Regarding the up-state the borrower will pay back the initial value of the loan which is  $j = 0.2$ . In the down-state either 0.2 or the asset will be given back thus it is a risk-less loan as the borrower lost no money in the down-state. TODO: genauer begründen wieso risk-free (an breuer-paper anlehnen) Geanakoplos then predicts the so called *marginal buyer* around  $h = 0.69$ . All agents with  $h < 0.69$  are pessimists and sell their assets. All agents above  $h > 0.69$  are optimists and buy all the assets the pessimists sell either through cash or buy borrowing money from the pessimists through loans and using the borrowed money to buy further assets which then in turn act as security - the leverage is endogenous.

Geanakoplos then makes the distinction between not only one  $j = 0.2$  loan but multiple loans with  $j > 0.2$  where in the up-state they promise their initial value  $j$  and in the down-state they deliver only 0.2 thus those loans with  $j > 0.2$  are risky loans. He then shows that if there exist markets for all type of bonds which include the risk-less bond  $j = 0.2$  then only the risk-less bond will be traded. TODO: show min-gleichungen: dass immer das kleinere zurückgezahlt wird

TODO: handle equilibrium theory presented. zuerst einmal alles hier hinein, falls es theoretisch wird, dann in theory hinein nehmen - wird wahrscheinlich der fall sein. erklären wie bzw. was die equilibrium theory bei geanakoplos ist und kurz erläutern. TODO: zuerst wikipedia-artikel und equilibrium-theory genauer herausarbeiten

Note that this is only a small part of the quite involved economic theory. Geanakoplos does not stop at this point but this overview is already enough to get the basic influences found in the work of [BSV13].

## 3.2 Breuer et al.

As already outlined the model of Breuer is heavily influenced by the work of Geanakoplos with the major difference that it is not a pure static equilibrium theory but is a simulation-process which approaches the equilibrium iteratively over time. Also a major achievement is that not only assets and bonds are traded against cash but the model has been extended by an additional market which allows collateralized assets to be traded. According to the authors of [BSV13] this is the first time that the trading of leveraged assets was investigated in a continuous double-auction environment. It is also of very importance to note that although the up- and down-states are in this

model too they are actually never realized, act only as a model and thus only the first period is simulated TODO: dieser satz macht wenig sinn, anders formulieren. Furthermore agents are not an infinite continuum but finite entities because the equilibrium-solving is done as an iterative simulation-process in software and thus finite agents are required.

The major differences to the approach of Geanakoplos are:

1. Collateralized assets are traded in addition to the other markets.
2. Up- and down-states are never realized but only the first period is simulated.
3. There are a finite number of agents as opposed to a continuum.
4. Equilibrium with risk-free bonds not available.
5. It is an auction-process over time which iteratively approaches theoretical equilibrium where Geanakoplos is a static equilibrium theory. The mechanism used in this auction is a continuous double-auction.

In the following sections some details which are different to the model of Geanakoplos or need more explanation are discussed.

### 3.2.1 States

Both the up- and the down-state are the same as in Geanakoplos where the Up-State is denoted with pU and the Down-State is denoted as pD. Assets are worth 1.0 in pU and 0.2 in pD which is the same as in [Gea09]. Agents denote with their optimism how likely the up-state will occur.

### 3.2.2 Collateralized asset market

One of the major inventions of the work of Breuer et al. is the introduction of a market for collateralized assets which has never been studied in continuous double-auction simulations so far. This market enables an agent which is out of cash but high on assets to buy additional assets by selling bonds and thus borrowing money which the agent uses to buy the wanted assets and in return using them as security for collateral constraints. For this mechanism to work Breuer et al. had to overcome two major difficulties.

1. Coordination of asset and bond markets - the buying of an asset and the selling of a bond needs to be coordinated across both markets and happen at the same time.

2. Reversibility of suboptimal trades - earlier trades could have been sub-optimal for an agent because it couldn't fully anticipate the behaviour of other agents and thus needs to get out of old trades. Technically speaking this would require to free collateralized assets thus unlocking them and transferring them in to the state of a real asset (no more collateralized, thus being completely owned by the agent).

Breuer et al. proposed solutions to this two difficulties:

**ABM mechanism** The straight-forward solution to the coordination of the asset and bond markets would be to condition a buy offer of an asset to a sell offer of a bond. Breuer et al. reported a problem that "Separate utility improvement in each of the coupled trades is more restrictive than a net sum utility improvement of all coupled trades." which prevents theoretical equilibrium to be reached. Thus they define the market to traded assets directly against bonds thus reducing the involved agents from three to two and removing the coordination-problem because only one product with one price is traded any-more which further resolves the problem with the restrictiveness of utility in the case of two products.

**Bond pledgeability** This problem of reversibility of suboptimal trades was solved in allowing to uncollateralize an asset by buying a bond. Breuer et al. called this mechanism "bond pledgeability" (BP) and showed that without this mechanism the simulation never converges towards the theoretical equilibrium. See chapter 5 "Implementation" for details on the implementation of this mechanism.

### 3.2.3 Utility Functions

In this section the utility-functions for each market are given. See chapter 5 "Implementation" for more details on the markets.

**Asset/Cash market** The asset market is the same as in [Gea09] where assets are just bought and sold against cash.

$$p = h + (1 - h)pD$$

**Bond/Cash market** The bond market acts the same way as described in [Gea09]. Collateral acts as enforcement of financial promises and thus for a given amount of loans the same amount of assets must be held as securities. A loan can be bought for a given price which is the face-value  $V$ . This face-value

has to be paid by the borrower in up-state whereas only  $pD$  has to be paid in down-state. Again note that up- and down-states are never realized but influence the utility-functions. Risk-less as well as risky bonds are available in the model of [BSV13] where the risky bonds are also those with face-value  $V > 0.2$ . Although breuer et al. allowed more than one loan simultaneously in their model this is not implemented in the thesis-software as it is not the primary focus of this work and would have required substantial changes in the software.

$$p = hV + (1 - h)pD$$

**Asset/Bond market** The Asset/Bond market trades asset against bonds thus the utility-function is just the ratio of the Asset/Cash utility to the Bond/Cash utility which gives the amount of bonds one asset is worth for a given optimism  $h$ .

$$p = \frac{\text{utility Asset/Cash}}{\text{utility Bond/Cash}}$$

### 3.2.4 Auction Mechanism

The auction mechanism used is a continuous double-auction on all markets open at the same time with a finite number of agents. To prevent a bias

**Bidding** To prevent a bias one agent is picked at random and then submits offerings on all markets while respecting the following constraints.

- If the agent has no more assets it can't sell them either through cash or bonds.
- The agent cannot buy more assets or bonds than it owns cash.
- When placing sell-offers of bonds or assets there must not remain bonds which have no collateral as security.

**Matching** Again to prevent a bias pick one market at random and pick at random the buy or sell offers on this market too and compare them with the offers of the previously selected random agent. According to the double-auction mechanism a match occurs only if:

$$\text{buy-price} \geq \text{sell-price}$$

In this case the offers are deleted from the offering-book and the matching-price is calculated at the half-way price as defined for double-auctions:

$$\text{matching-price} = \frac{\text{buy-price} + \text{sell-price}}{2}$$

If no match occurs by the currently picked random agent pick another agent at random and continue as above with submitting its offers on all markets.

### 3.2.5 Equilibrium

Breuer et al. reported equilibria for prices and allocations both of bonds and assets where the equilibria are fundamentally different whether a risk-free bond is available or not.

**Risk-free bond** If a risk-free bond with a face-value of  $V \leq 0.2$  is available then the agents are divided into two subgroups by  $i^*$ :

1. Agents with  $0 < i \leq i^*$  are pessimists and hold only cash or the risk-free bond with highest face-value.
2. Agents with  $i^* < i \leq 1$  are optimists and are maximally short in risk-free bonds with highest face-value and hold only assets.

Below the formulas reported in [BSV13] are given for calculating  $i^*$ , the asset-price  $p$  and the bond-price  $q$  in equilibrium.

$$i^* = \frac{p - 0.2}{0.8}$$

$$p = \frac{1+q-i^*}{i^*}$$

$$q = 0.2$$

**Risky bond** When only a risky bond with face-value  $V > 0.2$  is available then the agents divide into three instead of two subgroups separated by  $i_1$  and  $i_2$ :

1. Agents with  $0 < i \leq i_1$  are pessimists and hold only cash.
2. Agents with  $i_1 < i \leq i_2$  are median agents and hold only bonds with the lowest face-value.
3. Agents with  $i_2 < i \leq 1$  are optimists and hold only assets and are maximally short in risky bonds with the lowest face-value.

Below the formulas reported in [BSV13] are given for calculating  $i_1$ ,  $i_2$ , the asset-price  $p$  and the bond-price  $q$  in equilibrium. Note that in this thesis equilibria are always calculated for a risky bond with a face-value of  $V = 0.5$ .

$$i_1 = \frac{q-0.2}{V-0.2}$$

$$i_2 = \frac{0.2(p-q)}{0.8q-(V-0.2)p}$$

$$p = \frac{1}{i_1} - 1$$

$$q = p^{\frac{i_2-i_1}{1-i_1}}$$

Note that this case is not discussed in [Gea09] where it is excluded by assumption.

Note that those equations both of the risk-free and risky case are solved iteratively through the simulation-process but can also be solved using Linear Programming (LP) which was used by [BSV13] to calculate the theoretical equilibrium using these formulas and comparing the results with the results of their simulation-runs.

See chapter 6 "Results" for equilibrium results found in Breuer et al.

### 3.2.6 Endogenous leverage

Endogenous leverage is the central topic of the models both of Geanakoplos and obviously of Breuer et al. as they've built their model upon the one of Geanakoplos. Because it may seem not immediately clear where and how leverage is endogenous in the model of Breuer et al. this section tries to outline where this is the case and how it is implemented.

In the work of [BSV13] it is noted that

"In this theory the amount that can be borrowed against a particular asset to purchase it is determined in the market."

and furthermore

"Leverage, the percentage of the value of the real asset that can be borrowed to purchase it, is determined by contract selection through the market. Leverage is endogenous."

When an agent buys an asset by borrowing money through selling bonds on the Asset/Bond market then the agent is using leverage to finance the asset trade. Buyers are buying an asset if the utility increases thus assigning the asset a higher value than the seller but still the buyer is paying less than the value he assigns the asset. According to the definition of leverage in chapter 2 the leverage ratio is:

$$\text{leverage-ratio} = \frac{\text{buyer utility-price}}{\text{buyer-price-matching-price}}$$

The buyer assigns the asset the value given by the agents utility-price thus the leverage-ratio is then the ratio of this value to the difference between the buyers-price and the price the agent really pays, which is less due to the mechanics of the double-auction. The value in the denominator is the amount the agent does not finance by borrowing - in the case of this model this value is never paid by the agent and is just the expected win if the up-state occurs. This is the leverage which drives up the asset-prices as noted by Geanakoplos.

Because the leverage is covered implicitly by the model and not by parameters which are set exogenous from an experimenter the leverage is regarded as endogenous, coming from within the simulation-model itself.

TODO: noch beschreiben, was contract-selection ist und collateral equilibrium has both: contract selection and a collateral premium for the real asset. TODO: endogenizing leverage. prices of assets and debt are distorted through leverage.

Note that the higher the face-value of a bond the higher the utility-price can get thus due to the Asset/Bond utility-function the cheaper an asset is traded against bonds. Geanakoplos and Breuer et al. showed that in case of a risk-free bond is available on the bond market then the one with the highest face-value will be selected and in case of only risky bonds are available only the

### 3.3 Static Equilibrium vs. Process-oriented Equilibrium

The model of Geanakoplos is static equilibrium theory. Such a theory provides formulas with which for a given price traders maximize their utility. This is inherently static as time is not modelled in this process. Breuer et al. developed a model which tries to reach the equilibrium proposed by Geanakoplos in [Gea09] through a trading process between a finite number of agents over time.

TODO: theoretisches: utiliy-funktionen und clearing preis, in der simulation: ungeklärt, immer individuell, "steckenbleiben" vs. gleichgewicht, am ende an theoretischem gleichgewicht orientiert TODO: What is equilibrium in a process? It is NOT when no agents are able to trade anymore. TODO: Can we give an equilibrium-definition for the dynamic-process? HV: hier ein paar schlueue gedanken dazu?

# Chapter 4

## Hypothesis

In this chapter the question of the importance of fully-connectedness for reaching the equilibrium is raised where the question is whether it is really necessary to have a fully-connected network to reach equilibrium or not. We challenge this and claim that a much lower connectivity but a very special one is required and present a definition for it in a hypothesis which states that if a network satisfies the postulated properties of the hypothesis then using this network in the simulation will result in approaching the same equilibrium as found in fully-connected networks.

### 4.1 Definition

$$\text{fully-connectedness equilibrium} \iff \forall \text{ agent-pairs } (a_1, a_n) \exists \text{ path } P \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{n-1}, a_n\} \mid h(a_i) < h(a_{i+1})$$

*If and only if for all agents exists a path between two agents in which each visited agent has a larger optimism factor than the previous one then the same equilibrium as in fully-connectedness will be reached.*

The most minimal configuration of agents which satisfies this hypothesis is a graph of agents where each agent is connected to the agent with the next higher optimism-factor. This is the same as the Ascending-Connected topology - see appendix A "Topologies" - which is the major network of interest in this thesis (besides the fully-connected one) as it is the most minimal topology which satisfies the hypothesis.

## 4.2 Motivation

The motivation behind the hypothesis is the fact that according to the double-auction definition - see chapter 2 "Theory" - for a match to happen the buyer-price must be larger or equal to the seller-price. This can only be the case when the buyer has a higher optimism-factor than the seller due the way agents place their prices - see chapter 3 "The Leverage Cycle".

### 4.2.1 Proof

The proofs are given for the Asset/Cash market only because the equations of the Loan/Cash market work exactly the same way where only the absolute numbers are different. The Asset/Bond market is the same too as the limit-price is just the ratio of the limit-prices of asset and bond thus resulting in the same linear ordering of the limit-prices.

**Visual proof** In figure 2 the price-ranges of both a seller and buyer are given where  $h(s)$  and  $h(b)$  denote the optimism-factors of the seller and buyer respectively. The seller places its offerings in the price-range of  $[h(s)..pU]$  as it wants to sell the good above the expected price to make a profit. The buyer places its offerings in the price-range of  $[pD..h(b)]$  as it wants to buy the goods below the expected price to make a profit. The resulting matching-range on which the prices can meet - again buyer-price  $\geq$  seller-price - is marked by the red rectangle. It is easy to see that a match with these mechanics can occur only if the optimism-factor of the buyer  $h(b)$  is strictly higher than the one of the seller  $h(s)$ .




Figure 2: Matching of buyers and sellers price-ranges. The red rectangle marks the matching-range.

**Formal proof** TODO

### 4.3 Predictions

The following topologies found in appendix A "Topologies" satisfy the definition of the hypothesis:

- Fully-Connected
- Half-Fully connected
- Ascending-Connected
- Ascending-Connected with all kind of short-cuts
- Erdos-Renyi and Watts-Strogatz with the correct parametrization by pure chance.

It is expected that according to the hypothesis all of these topologies will reach the equilibrium found in fully-connectedness. All other topologies do not satisfy the hypothesis and are expected to clearly fail reaching the equilibrium of the Fully-Connected topology.

See chapter 6 "Results" and chapter ?? "Interpretation" whether the results reflect the hypothesis or not.

# Chapter 5

## Implementation

For this thesis a software was written to be able to investigate the behaviour and results of the different types of networks and get visual and numerical results to be embedded in this written text. In this chapter the implementation-details of the software are discussed.

### 5.1 Requirements

The author of this thesis had access to the software of [BSV13] which was written in C++ therefore the question is why a new software had to be written and why not the original could be used. The reason for it was that the original software supported only a very narrow feature-set focusing only on the numerical results of a fully-connected network. Thus a complete redevelopment in Java was the option used. The following requirements were identified:

- Java based.
- Comprehensive GUI functionality.
- Emulate the functionality of [BSV13] and its results.
- Represent arbitrary networks in the simulation.
- Step-through forward and backwards in a simulation-run.
- Run replications of simulations.
- Store results of replications to be opened again for later usage.
- Command-line mode to run previously defined number of replications.

**Java based** The original software was written in C++ which offers very much power and highest speed if used correctly but comes with a very high responsibility regarding memory-management. Java offers a much more relaxed programming model regarding memory-management as it is garbage collected. This does not mean that the programmer can waste memory without giving thought to it but that not as many aufwand into it. debugging is easier. The most compelling argument for Java are the vast libraries which are included in the JDK which are missing in standard C++. As complete GUI-functionality for the whole software is a requirement Java is the way to go. Although multi-purpose libraries like Boost and GUI-frameworks like Qt are available for C++ too, it takes quite some time to set them up correctly for the target platform one develops for which implies that in C++ the development would always have been for just one platform whereas Java runs on every platform - if not platform-dependent stuff was used - without recompilation. As one will see later in the "Command-line mode"-Feature this is a major requirement to make this feature practical. Thus the reasons for using Java were:

- Platform-independence which applies to 3rd party libraries too.
- GUI-framework provided by JDK.
- Relaxed memory-management which emphasises fast iterations and easy debugging.
- Support for smooth XML-Serialization.
- 3rd party libraries for network-modelling and -visualization.

**GUI functionality** All functionality should be accessible through a GUI where some features e.g. "Inspection" are only possible to use through a GUI.

**Emulate [BSV13] functionality** Of course the whole software should be a super-set of the functionality of the one found in [BSV13] so this was the point to start from.

**Arbitrary networks** It should be possible to restrict trading between the agents to arbitrary networks. As network-modelling and -visualization library JUNG is used.

**Step-through simulation** The software should support to go through a simulation-run step-by-step and storing all steps of the simulation to jump back and forth between steps.

**Real-time visualisation and information** The original C++ software didn't provide real-time information about the current wealth-distribution and market-dynamics and provided the user just with the numerical results in the end through the means of a command-line output. For better understanding of dynamics of both wealth and markets a real-time visualisation of both are necessary together with extensive information on the current state like the offering-book, agent-information, network-activity, history of matches and the current equilibrium. Also the real-time visualisation is necessary to provide this written part of the thesis with diagrams of various results and processes.

**Replications** Because the whole trading-process includes randomness the results are subject to noise thus replications are an absolute must-have feature to be able to give reliable results. Each replication is independent from all others thus it is a candidate for parallel programming to speed up the already very time-consuming process of running replications. According to the number of CPU-cores the software should spawn threads up to the number of cores and run replications in parallel thus speeding up by a considerable amount of time.

**Store results** When running a bunch of replications for a given set-up the results of it should be automatically stored as XML to be accessible for later inspection thus conserving state and eliminating the necessity to re-run time-consuming simulation-runs with a high number of replications.

**Command-line mode** As already described replications are required to be implemented for parallel processing where up to the number of CPU-cores replications can run in parallel. When running a vast number of replications one does not need to GUI-functionality and most probably the machine is so occupied by the heavy work-load that a fließender usage of GUI would be not possible any-more. Thus replications should be runnable through a separate command-line mode of the thesis-software which reads information from a XML-File in which one can specify multiple simulation set-ups for which replications should be run. The command-line mode iterates through all configurations and runs the required replications and writes the result out

for a later inspection. Obviously the more CPU-cores the faster a simulation-run with e.g. 50 replications finishes. For this reason most of the final replication-runs were done on a 40-core machine of the FH Vorarlberg which runs on Linux on which the thesis-software could be run easily because of Java's platform-independence.

## 5.2 Functionality

In this section the functionality of the thesis-software is explained to get an understanding of the implemented features. All features are available through the GUI unless stated otherwise. For inspection, replications and experimenter an individual tab is available inside the main window so they can be used in parallel.

### 5.2.1 Emulate [BSV13] functionality

Of course the starting point was to emulate the features of the [BSV13] paper so all three markets were implemented together with "Bonds Pledgeability". In a first iteration the implementation was lacking the BP-feature which resulted in quite chaotic results which didn't come even close to the equilibrium shown in [BSV13] which is a proof for the very importance of BP. TODO: Noch unvollständig

### 5.2.2 Inspection

Inspection allows for a given simulation-configuration to step through the whole process match-by-match, keep track of the successful matches and the wealth-distribution of the agents at this time and to jump back to each successful match. Through an offer-book the state and current offerings of all agents at a given time of the simulation (including past successful matches) can be inspected and compared by opening multiple offer-book windows. Furthermore this feature provides the user with statistics of successful, failed and total matches and the current equilibrium. Very much attention was paid to the implementation of the real-time visualisation of the agents wealth-distribution and the market-activities as visualisation is of very importance for a successful inspection and interpretation of a dynamic process. To be able to compare the visual results of 2 different simulation-configurations there exist 2 "Inspection" tabs in the main window.

### 5.2.3 Networks

This functionality allows to model different kind of network-topologies as described in appendix A "Topologies" to restrict trading only to this kind of neighbourhood. Obviously network-topologies are graphs and thus it would have been required to implement a graph-library but that was not implemented self but the graph-library JUNG was used as it supported all the required features like visualisation, neighbourhood- and path-queries.

### 5.2.4 Replications

To get robust results replications are used to reduce the influence of random noise. This feature allows to let run a specific simulation configuration for a given number of replications in parallel. The specific simulation-configuration serves as a template - especially the network-topology - and each replication does a clone of the network together with the agents to be able to run in parallel without the need of synchronization. It was tried to implement the network as a shared network between all replications but because the agents serve as nodes this was not feasible and would have required a very fundamental re-factoring of already existing functionality. Thus the higher requirements in memory and time for cloning was accepted for a more elegant solution. When replications are processed running ones can be inspected and information can be queried using the GUI. It is possible to cancel one replication, cancel a whole task which reduces thread-load, inspect wealth-distribution, see the failed and successful matches and statistics of already finished replications. Whenever a replication is finished it is added to the pool of results and the median result is re-calculated and visualized and informations updated. When all replications have finished the results are written to a new XML-file in the results-folder of the software. This result-file can be opened using the experiments-feature which is described next. A simulation-configuration can be saved as a separate new experiment-file or added to an existing experiment-file - see next section for experiments.

### 5.2.5 Experiments

The experiments-feature allows to open experiment-files and result-files of replication- and experiment-runs. An experiment-file is just a collection of simulation-configurations to be run for a given number of replications. When an experiment-file is opened all simulation-configurations are displayed in a list and each of them can be opened as a new replication-tab which in turn can be run as explained in section "Replications". To be able to conveniently

run all simulation-configurations of an experiment-file without needing user-interaction a command-line feature was implemented. For this purpose the jar-file LeverageCycleCMD.jar was built. Start an experiment-run by using the following command:

```
java -jar LeverageCycleCMD.jar PATH-TO-EXPERIMENT-FILE  
MAX-THREADS-OPTIONAL
```

Note that the number of threads to use is optional and when omitted the number of CPU-cores found on the system is used.

Each replication-run of a given simulation-configuration in the experiment-file produces a result-file with the name provided in the configuration. These result-files are dubbed result-files of experiment-runs as previously stated but are the same as the result-file of a replication-run as discussed in the section "Replications". When opening a result-file a new tab is added to the main-window and the statistics of the run together with equilibrium-statistics are displayed. Furthermore the wealth-distribution and market-activities are visualized and it is possible to view the statistics of each individual replication. Furthermore the user can display the network-topology used for this simulation-configuration which is important as random networks are different when created new.

### 5.3 Architecture

In this section the basic architecture of the thesis-software is discussed. It is important to note that this thesis is a fat-client and has its major emphasis not on the software-development aspect but on the visual- and numerical results where the accompanying software is just a tool for the means to calculate theses required results. Thus the architecture is guided by a simple division of layers into front-end, controller and back-end. The front-end is responsible for input and output of the user through GUI or command-line. The controller-layer provides encapsulated chunks of functionality of the back-end to the front-end. It is necessary to abstract, encapsulate and combine the stateful nature of communication with the back-end into a separate layer instead of polluting the front-end with it and creating unnecessary dependencies. The back-end layer provides the functionality where the real work is done e.g. simulation is executed. Theoretically the dependencies are top-down where the front-end includes only controller-functionality, the controller includes only back-end functionality and the back-end has no dependencies to the preceding layers. In this thesis-software a more pragmatic

approach was chosen so this dogma was not followed where over-engineering and over-complication would have resulted when sticking strictly to the separation of dependencies. Thus in very few cases the controller- and back-end layer include front-end layer functionality to create different types of network topologies in a more convenient way. Also the front-end accesses instances of pure back-end classes for graphical visualisation and information purposes. Despite the seemingly flawed architecture the development-process has proven to be very smooth and expansions and refactorings went quite smoothly and always resulted in a better and clearer structure with reduced code-smell which is always a sign for a good architecture.




Figure 3: Package-diagram with most important classes and associations illustrating the architecture. (Note that the software contains many more classes and associations which are omitted for clarity reasons as this diagram should provide only a basic overview and would contain by far too much information if everything would have been included.)

### 5.3.1 Frontend

The front-end contains the GUI functionality through which the user interacts with the program and the real-time visualisation of wealth-distribution

and market-activity. Because data like the offer-book, agent/replication/equilibrium-information and network-visualization is required in different contexts much emphasis was put on massive re-use of GUI components through the use of sub-classing and aggregation already provided by SWING. Thus many small components were implemented and aggregated together to create bigger chunks of logical functionality. In the package-diagram 3 only the most important panels are shown. Those provide the main entry-point for the user to the given functionality as indicated by their names. TODO: noch aufzählung und beschreibung der wichtigsten panels (inspection/replication/experiments panel)

### 5.3.2 Controller

The controller package is rather slim and contains the steering functionality to drive inspections, replications and experiments. Inspections are driven by the class *InspectionThread* which allows to advance the simulation step-by-step using the consumer-producer paradigm through lock and wait functionality provided by Java through the use of its monitors. The classes *ReplicationsRunner* and *ReplicationTask* encapsulate functionality to run a number of replications for a given simulation-configuration in parallel, calculating the current median for all important values on-line and writing results to xml-files. Experiments are executed from the command-line through the use of the class *ExperimentCMDRunner* where it cycles through all simulation-configurations of a experiment-configuration and uses *ReplicationsRunner* to execute it in parallel. TODO: anstatt in prosa auzuzählen: itemize oder klassen und beschreiben dort

### 5.3.3 Backend

The back-end contains the domain-specific functionality for the simulation. The important classes can be seen in the package-diagram 3 but for better clarity each one is introduced briefly.

- Auction - holds the state and operations for a single simulation-run. This class does the sweeping and clearing discussed in section "Simulation", determines whether trading is still possible or not and calculates current equilibrium. allows to run a matching-round
- Agent - encapsulates the functionality and state necessary for the agents in the simulation. See next section "Agents" for a more in-depth discussion.

- AgentNetwork - holds the connections between the agents and provides functionality to query neighbourhood, paths and connections between agents and random and sequential in-order iterator over all agents.
- Offering - encapsulates the data necessary for offerings where there are two subclasses *BidOffering* and *AskOffering* to differentiate between the two types of offerings. See the section "Markets" on details of offerings.
- Match - provides the functionality to create a match out of given offers and returning an instance of *Match* through a factory-method. The *Match* instance holds the price, amount and the offers which have matched. See section "Sweeping and Matching" on more details.
- Transaction - encapsulates functionality to search for a match within a given neighbourhood, is used by *Auction* class to sweep through the agents and is returned after a matching-round and provides necessary information about whether it was successful or not.

## 5.4 Agents

Although agents are used in this software it is not an agent-based simulation in the classical way as these agents are zero-intelligence ones and have no states of behaviour. That is each agent makes bid- and ask-offers on all markets if the constraints allow it where the prices are selected from random ranges which improve the utility of the agent - that means it makes always offers which would result in a profit.

Each agent is characterized by its state where the main variables are:

- Id - the unique id of the agent in the range of the natural numbers in the range of [1..number of agents].
- Optimism-factor  $h$  - defines how optimistic the agent is in the range of [0..1] where 0 is most pessimistic and 1 is most optimistic. The distribution of the optimism-factor among the agents is linearly ascending with the id and is defined through the following equation:  

$$\text{optimism-factor} = \frac{id}{\text{number of agents}+1}$$
- Cash holdings - the current cash holdings of the agent.
- Assets holdings - the current asset holdings of the agent not including the assets granted as securities for giving loans.

- Loan given - the amount of loans bought from / granted to other agents. For a given amount of loans the equal amount of assets are granted as security to the buyer of the loan. Thus this variable increases the amount of assets the agent can trade with.
- Loan taken - the amount of loans sold to other agents. For a given amount of loans the equal amount of assets the equal amount of assets are granted as security to the buyer of the loan. Thus this variable decreases the amount of assets the agent can trade with as this amount of loans needs to be kept as securities.

There are three important derived variables which are calculated from the previous ones:

- Collateralized assets - is the amount of assets which are bound through collateral obligations because of taken bonds.  

$$\text{collateralized assets} = \max(0, \text{loans taken} - \text{loans given})$$
- Free assets - is the amount of assets which are unbound and act not as security and are owned completely by the agent.  

$$\text{free assets} = \text{Assets holding} - \text{Collateralized assets}$$
- Loans - is the net number of loans and calculated through  $\text{loans} = \text{loans given} - \text{loans taken}$ . Thus this value is positive if the agent has granted more loans to other agents than received and it is negative if the agent has received more loans from other agents than granted.

Note that all variables cannot go negative except loans.

## 5.5 Markets

In this section all markets and their implementations are described. Each market is completely characterised by the following points:

- Products - the products traded on the corresponding market.
- Price-ranges - the price-ranges in which an agent places profit-making offers on the market.
- Bid- and Ask-Offerings - define the pre-conditions for an agent to make offerings on the market and the amount and the prices generated during an offer. Note that in case of bid-offerings the price of the profit-

making offer is drawn randomly between the minimum price and the limit-price because when buying one wants to buy below the expected value to make a profit where in case of ask-offerings the price is drawn randomly between the limit-price and maximum price because when selling one wants to sell above the expected value to make a profit.

- Match-Table - In case of a match between two agents the wealth-exchange is declared where the wealth is increased/decreased as indicated by the +/- signs.

### 5.5.1 Asset/Cash

#### Products

Free assets are traded against cash. The buyer gets a specific amount of free assets for a given amount of cash where the seller gives away the specific amount of free assets and gets the given amount of cash.

#### Price-Range

**minimum** The minimum value of one asset in cash is the down-value  $pD$  tomorrow as defined in chapter 3 "The Leverage Cycle". This value is obviously a constant for all agents.

$$\min \text{ asset-price} = pD$$

**maximum** The maximum value of one asset in cash is the up-value  $pU$  tomorrow as defined in chapter 3 "The Leverage Cycle". This value is obviously a constant for all agents.

$$\max \text{ asset-price} = pU$$

**limit** The limit-price of an asset in cash depends on the optimism-factor  $h$  of the agent where the most optimistic agent assigns  $pU$  and the most pessimistic  $pD$  as the price. Thus applying linear interpolation one receives the following equation.

$$\text{limit-price asset} = h * pU + (1.0 - h) * pD$$

### Bid-Offering

As amount one TRADING-UNIT of assets is selected but if there is not enough cash left to buy one TRADING-UNIT of assets then no bid-offer is made.

Table 1: Bid-Offering parameters of Asset/Cash market

Pre-Condition	<i>cash holdings &gt; price of TRADING-UNIT assets</i>
Asset-Price	random( <i>min asset-price, limit-price asset</i> )
Asset-Amount	TRADING-UNIT

### Ask-Offering

Ask offers are generated only when the agent has at least one TRADING-UNIT of free assets left. As amount one TRADING-UNIT of assets is selected - in the thesis-implementation 0.1 - but if there are fewer free assets left then no offer is made.

Table 2: Ask-Offering parameters of Asset/Cash market

Pre-Condition	<i>free assets &gt; TRADING-UNIT</i>
Asset-Price	random( <i>limit-price of asset, max asset-price</i> )
Asset-Amount	TRADING-UNIT

### Match

Table 3: Wealth-Exchange during a match on Asset/Cash market

	Seller	Buyer
Assets holdings	- matching-amount	+ matching-amount
Cash holdings	+ matching-price	- matching-price

#### 5.5.2 Bond/Cash

##### Products

Bonds are traded against cash. The buyer grants the seller a loan in buying a bond from the seller thus the buyer gets a given bond-amount from the seller and gives a given cash-amount to the seller. For a given amount of sold bonds the equal amount of assets need to be hold as securities.

### Price-Range

**minimum** The minimum value of one bond in cash is the down-value  $pD$  tomorrow as defined in chapter 3 "The Leverage Cycle". This value is obviously a constant for all agents.

$$\min \text{ bond-price} = pD$$

**maximum** The maximum value of one bond in cash is the face-value  $V$  tomorrow as defined in chapter 3 "The Leverage Cycle". This value is obviously a constant for all agents.

$$\max \text{ bond-price} = \text{facevalue } V$$

**limit** The limit-price of a bond in cash depends on the optimism-factor  $h$  of the agent where the most optimistic agent assigns *facevalue*  $V$  and the most pessimistic  $pD$  as the price. Thus applying linear interpolation one receives the following equation.

$$\text{limit-price bond} = h * V + (1.0 - h) * pD$$

### Bid-Offering

Bid offers are generated only when the agent has any cash holdings. As amount one TRADING-UNIT of bonds is selected but if there is not enough cash left to buy one TRADING-UNIT of bonds then the amount of bonds is selected which can be bought with the remaining cash holdings.

Table 4: Bid-Offering parameters of Bond/Cash market

Pre-Condition	$\text{cash holdings} > 0$
Bond-Price	$\text{random}(\min \text{ bond-price}, \text{limit-price of bonds})$
Bond-Amount	$\min\left(\frac{\text{cash holdings}}{\text{Bond-Price}}, \text{TRADING-UNIT}\right)$

### Ask-Offering

Ask offers are generated only when the agent has any free assets because when selling the agent needs to reserve as many free assets as security as bonds sold. As amount one TRADING-UNIT of bonds is selected but if there are fewer free assets left then the remaining amount of free assets is selected.

Table 5: Ask-Offering parameters of Bond/Cash market

Pre-Condition	<i>free assets &gt; 0</i>
Bond-Price	<i>random(limit-price of bonds, max bond-price)</i>
Bond-Amount	<i>min(free assets, TRADING-UNIT)</i>

## Match

Table 6: Wealth-Exchange during a match on Bond/Cash market

	Seller	Buyer
Loan Given	N/A	+ matching-amount
Loans Taken	+ matching-amount	N/A
Cash holdings	+ matching-price	- matching-price

### 5.5.3 Asset/Bond

#### Products

Assets are traded against bonds. The buyer gets a specific amount of free assets for a given amount of bonds where the seller gives away the specific amount of free assets and gets the given amount of bonds.

#### Price-Range

**minimum** The minimum value of one asset in bonds is defined as the ratio of the minimum asset-price in cash to the maximum bond-price in cash. This value is obviously a constant for all agents.

$$\text{min asset/bond price} = \frac{\text{minimum asset-price}}{\text{maximum bond-price}} = \frac{pD}{V}$$

**maximum** The maximum value of one asset in bonds is defined in the ratio of the maximum asset-price in cash to the minimum bond-price in cash.

$$\text{max asset/bond price} = \frac{\text{maximum asset-price}}{\text{minimum bond-price}} = \frac{pU}{pD}$$

**limit** The limit-price in bonds of an asset in bonds depends on the optimism-factor  $h$  and is just the ratio of the limit-price of the asset to the limit-price of the loans.

$$\text{limit-price asset/bond} = \frac{\text{limit-price asset}}{\text{limit-price bonds}}$$

### Bid-Offering

Bid offers are generated only when the agent is not negative on free assets after the trade. As amount one TRADING-UNIT of a assets is selected. To calculate the free assets after a match the following steps are performed:

1. Start with current free assets holdings.
2. Subtract current collateral obligations.
3. Subtract taken loans after trade.
4. Add assets bought through trade.

Table 7: Bid-Offering parameters of Asset/Bond market

Pre-Condition	$free assets \geq 0 \text{ after trade}$
Asset/Bond-Price	random( <i>min asset/bond price, limit-price of asset/bond</i> )
Asset/Bond-Amount	TRADING-UNIT

### Ask-Offering

Bid offers are generated only when the agent is not negative on free assets after the trade. As amount one TRADING-UNIT of bonds is selected. To calculate the free assets after a match the following steps are performed:

1. Start with current free assets holdings.
2. Subtract current collateral obligations.
3. Add given loans after trade.
4. Subtract assets sold through trade.

Table 8: Bid-Offering parameters of Asset/Bond market

Pre-Condition	$free assets \geq 0 \text{ after trade}$
Asset/Bond-Price	random( <i>limit-price of asset/bond, max asset/bond price</i> )
Asset/Bond-Amount	TRADING-UNIT

## Match

Table 9: Wealth-Exchange during a match on Asset/Loan market

	Seller	Buyer
Loan Given	+ matching-amount	N/A
Loans Taken	N/A	+ matching-amount
Asset holdings	- matching-price	+ matching-price

## 5.6 BP Mechanism

TODO: explain how BP is implemented and how it would looks without BP

## 5.7 Simulation

In this section a few details of the simulation-implementation are discussed as they are not so obvious but interesting and important enough to be mentioned.

As noted above in the section "Markets" bonds and assets are always traded in chunks of TRADING-UNITS which is 0.1 in case of assets and 0.2 in case of bonds. Note that it is nothing unusual to scale the initial wealth-endowments to 1.0 and trade fractions of them as in the end the absolute endowment does not matter but the distribution over the agents so a transformation to natural numbers would not gain anything. What is much more important is that the system conserves wealth: no wealth is lost and no wealth is created *ex nihilo*. This is guaranteed by the equations and pre-conditions found in section "Markets".

### 5.7.1 Sweeping and Matching

**Sweeping** Sweeping is the process of generating a successful match by running through the agents and apply matching between their offers. Because offering-prices are created randomly in specific ranges it could happen that no offers match. To elevate this problem not only 1 but up to 500 sweeps are done when calculating the next successful match.

**Matching** Matching is the process of finding a match of a given agent in the sweeping-process with the offerings of its neighbourhood. Note that a match

---

**Algorithm 1** Sweeping Pseudocode

---

```

1: clear best offerings of all agents
2: while sweeps < 500 do
3:   clear global offerings of previous sweep
4:   shuffle agents
5:   generate offerings for all agents
6:   for all shuffled agents do
7:     find match in neighbourhood
8:     if match found then
9:       execute match
10:      exit sweeping
11:    if no trading possible then
12:      exit sweeping

```

---



---

**Algorithm 2** Matching Pseudocode

---

```

1: get best offerings of neighbourhood
2: for all neighbourhood offerings do
3:   randomly check sell or buy offerings first
4:   if buy-price  $\geq$  sell-price then
5:      $m \leftarrow \text{new Match}$ 
6:      $m.\text{price} = \frac{\text{buy-price} + \text{sell-price}}{2}$ 
7:      $m.\text{amount} = \min(\text{buy-amount}, \text{sell-amount})$ 
8:      $m.\text{normPrice} = m.\text{price} * m.\text{amount}$ 
9:   exit matching

```

---



---

**Algorithm 3** Get Best Offerings of Neighbourhood Pseudocode

---

```

1: bestOfferings  $\leftarrow$  null
2: a  $\leftarrow$  current agent
3: for all neighbours of a do
4:   n  $\leftarrow$  next neighbour of a
5:   neighbourOfferings  $\leftarrow$  n.currentOfferings
6:   for all neighbourOfferings do
7:     nO  $\leftarrow$  next offering in neighbourOfferings
8:     for all bestOfferings do
9:       bO  $\leftarrow$  next offering in bestOfferings
10:      if nO.price dominates bO.price then
11:        bO  $\leftarrow$  nO

```

---

can only occur on one specific market between two agents thus satisfying only one buy- and one sell-offer.

Note that as defined in the double-auction theory - see chapter 2 "Continuous Double-Auction" - the agents meet at the half-way price. This guarantees that not more than the previously defined amount is traded which again conserves the wealth. Care must be taken when calculating the real price of the match as all offering prices are for 1.0 Unit of the traded good. Thus to obtain the real matching-price the previously calculated half-way price needs to be scaled by the matching-amount to obtain the price for the given matching-amount. Also note that if one match is found on any market then the sweeping and matching is terminated and a successful match is returned thus the agents can place offers on all markets although the sum of the offers would be infeasible because only one offer will be satisfied and the other ones are thrown away.

## 5.8 Performance improvement

### 5.8.1 Local and Global Offer-book

It is easy to see that the calculation of the best neighbourhood can be quite costly the more neighbours an agent has. For of the ascending-connected topology this is not a big deal but in the case of the fully-connected topology the impact is serious. Because fully-connected is an important topology as it serves as a benchmark for the others an optimisation was implemented specially suited for this kind of topology: the introduction of a global offer-book. Instead of calculating the best offerings within the neighbourhood all offers are checked against each other in a global offering-list during the time of offering-creation. After all offers have been generated this list contains only the best sell and ask offerings for each market. The step of calculating the best neighbourhood can then be omitted in the case of fully-connectedness because it would be the same as the global best-offerings list thus saving a substantial amount of processing time.

### 5.8.2 Matching probabilities

**General matching** For a match to happen the buyer-price must be larger or equal the seller-price. Thus as shown in chapter 4 a price higher than the seller-price can only be placed by a buyer which has a strictly larger optimism-factor than the seller because only then their offering-ranges have a chance to cover each other partly. Thus matching in general works between a seller with

lower optimism-factor and a buyer with higher optimism-factor. As noted in chapter 3 "The Leverage Cycle" agents place offering-prices randomly in their ranges which are specified in this chapter in section "Markets" so matching is also subject to randomness. To investigate the matching-probabilities one must look at the coverage probabilities of the matching-ranges. The limit-price of bidders increase with rising optimism-factor and thus the width of the bidding-range decreases because bidders make their offers in the range of [limit-price.. $pU$ ]. The situation is the inverse for askers as their limit-price increases too but the width of their asking-range increases because they place their offers in the range of [ $pD$ ..limit-price]. Thus obviously the larger the difference in the optimism-factor between a seller and a buyer - again note that buyers optimism-factors are strictly larger than those of their corresponding sellers - the more likely a match will happen as both ranges increase and cover much more total distance thus increasing the probability that prices will be drawn which match. The following formulas derive the probabilities that an asker and a bidder with a given limit-price will match on the Asset/Cash market. First the coverage-range is calculated by subtracting the limit-price of the asker from the one of the bidder as the one of the bidder must be larger. Then the probabilities of the asker and of the bidder to fall into the range of the coverage-range is calculated. Finally the probability that both the asker and bidder range will match is calculated by multiplying the previously calculated probabilities. Note that a division by 2 needs to be done because of symmetrical reasons because it does not matter where in the range the prices will meet but because the buy-price has to be larger or equal than the seller-price only the half-range is available.

$$\text{coverage-range} = \text{limit-price bidder} - \text{limit-price asker}$$

$$p(\text{asker}) = \frac{\text{coverage-range}}{pU - \text{limit-price asker}}$$

$$p(\text{bidder}) = \frac{\text{coverage-range}}{\text{limit-price bidder} - pD}$$

$$p(\text{asker}|\text{bidder}) = \frac{p(\text{asker}) * p(\text{bidder})}{2}$$

**Matching in ascending-connectedness** When considering the Ascending-Connected topology matching-probabilities become quite an issue as each agent has only 2 neighbours where the one with lower optimism-factor is the seller and the one with higher optimism-factor is the buyer. Thus compared to fully-connectedness where agents - depending on their optimism-factor - have multiple buyers and sellers the matching-probabilities are likely to be

very low. To get a better understanding of the matching-probabilities in ascending-connectedness three diagrams visualizing them are shown below. Note that for clarity only 30 agents are considered on the Asset/Cash market. The following figure 4 visualizes the probabilities of pairwise neighbours to fall into their coverage-range as calculated by the formulas given above.




Figure 4: Pairwise probabilities of falling into coverage-range of 30 agents in Ascending-Connected topology on Asset/Cash market

The first bidder with optimism-factor of 0.034 has a probability of 1.0 that the generated buy-prices fall into the range of its asker-neighbour with optimism-factor of 0. In turn the first asker with optimism-factor of 0 has a probability of 0.033 that its generated sell-prices fall into the range of its bid-neighbour with optimism-factor of 0.034. Thus the probabilities decrease for the bidders with increasing optimism-factor as their offering-range gets smaller and smaller where the probabilities increase for the askers with increasing optimism-factors as their offering-range gets wider and wider. This leads to the highest matching-probabilities at the edges and the lowest around the center.

The following figure 5 visualizes the combined probabilities that asker and bider match their ranges.




Figure 5: Pairwise matching-probabilities of 30 Agents in Ascending-Connected topology on Asset/Cash market

To see the influence of increasing number of agents the following figure 6 visualizes the combined probabilities of 50 agents.




Figure 6: Pairwise matching-probabilities of 50 Agents in Ascending-Connected topology on Asset/Cash market

Looking at these diagrams one can derive the following facts about the matching-probabilities in Ascending-Connected topology:

1. Matching-probabilities are continuous and symmetric, are reduced towards the center of the optimism-scale and have their maximum at the very edges.
2. The more agents in the network the lower the matching-probabilities.

The lower matching-probabilities result in longer simulation-runs and more inefficiencies towards the end where free assets are kept by optimists instead of traded as the matching-probabilities decrease so much that no more trading will occur. To elevate this problem one can adjust the matching-probabilities by transforming the price-ranges. It is of very importance that the shape of the matching-probabilities distribution must be exactly the same. Only the absolute values of the probabilities are increased where the edges are at the maximum of 1.0. This is mathematically quite involved and was not developed by myself but by Supervisor Mr. Vollbrecht. The formulas and explanations have been moved to appendix C "Increasing the matching-probabilities in Ascending-Connected topology" This variant is dubbed "Ascending-Connected topology with Importance Sampling". See chapter 6 "Results" for the performance and results of this variant.

## 5.9 Calculating theoretical Equilibrium

TODO: diese kurze abhandlung bringt eigentlich nicht wirklich was, müsste wesentlich mehr zeit hineinstecken, die ich nicht übrig habe und wirklich wesentlich ist es für die thesis nicht.

Theoretical equilibrium is known and specified through the equations given below. This theoretical equilibrium is only applicable for an infinite number of agents whereas in the simulation a finite set of agents is used for which the theoretical equilibrium must be found too. For this purpose [BSV13] developed an algorithm in MATLAB which searches the finite solution-space for the given equilibrium. This section gives a short overview of how the algorithm solves this task and is based on an existing document written by Martin Jandacka and the MATLAB code which both were available to the author of this thesis. Thus this section is only a simplified summary and the algorithm and the method behind it was not developed by the author of this thesis.

For given asset prices  $q$  and bond-prices  $q$  each agent optimises its expected utility. As can be seen in the section "Markets" the utility-functions are linear which makes this optimization problem a linear one which can be solved by Linear Programming (LP). The only feasible vertices are:

- Cash only - hold by pessimists
- Bonds only - hold by medianists
- Assets financed by Bonds (no free assets) - hold by optimists

Thus the two agents  $i_1$  and  $i_2$  are searched where  $i_1$  marks the end of the pessimists and  $i_2$  the beginning of the optimists. This is done by iterating through all possible combinations of  $i_1$  and  $i_2$  and checking if they generate equilibrium on the market or not. Thus time dependence is  $O(n^2)$  where  $n$  is the amount of agents.

# Chapter 6

## Results

In this chapter the results of the experiments are given. Each topology-type introduced in appendix A "Topologies" was simulated where in this chapter only Fully-Connected and Ascending-Connected topologies are handled as the Ascending-Connected topology - both with and without importance sampling - is the most minimal network which satisfies the requirements for the hypothesis. The results for the other topologies can be found in appendix B "Results for Hub-Based, Scale-Free and Small-World Topologies".

Note: The numbers in tables resemble always a median-value with the standard-deviation given in parentheses.

### 6.1 Validating simulation results

As a point-of-reference and as an experimental proof for the correctness of the implementation of the thesis-software the results of a validation against both the theoretical equilibrium and the equilibrium found in [BSV13] are given. Because equilibrium differs across the number of agents and the type of bond traded to be comparable the same amount of agents and the same bond-type has to be used in the experiments. Thus 1000 agents and a bond with face-value of 0.5 were chosen because [BSV13] report their equilibria for this number of agents and bonds with face-value between 0.1 to 0.5.

### 6.1.1 References

Table 10: Theoretical equilibrium for 1,000 agents and 0.5 bond

Asset-Price p	0.715
Bond-Price q	0.374
Marginal agent i1	0.583
Marginal agent i2	0.802

Table 11: Equilibrium in [BSV13] for 1,000 agents and 0.5 bond

Asset-Price p	0.716
Bond-Price q	0.375
Marginal agent i1	0.583
Marginal agent i2	0.801
Pessimist Wealth	1.716
Medianist Wealth	4.578
Optimist Wealth	5.032

### 6.1.2 Thesis results




Figure 7: Wealth-Distribution of thesis-implementation of Fully-Connected topology for 1,000 agents and 0.5 bond

Table 12: Equilibrium of thesis-implementation for 1,000 agents and 0.5 bond

Asset-Price p	0.700 (0.005)
Bond-Price q	0.389 (0.002)
Marginal agent i1	0.616 (0.004)
Marginal agent i2	0.805 (0.001)
Pessimist Wealth	1.582 (0.01)
Medianist Wealth	4.578 (0.031)
Optimist Wealth	5.105 (0.025)

Table 13: Difference of Fully-Connected topology price-equilibrium as given in table 12 to theoretical equilibrium as given in table 10

	Result	Reference	difference to Reference
Asset-Price p	0.700	0.715	-2.1%
Bond-Price q	0.389	0.374	+4.0%
Marginal agent i1	0.616	0.583	+5.6%
Marginal agent i2	0.805	0.802	+0.4%

Table 14: Difference of Fully-Connected topology wealth-equilibrium as given in table 12 to wealth-equilibrium as given in [BSV13] from table 11

	Result	Reference	difference to Reference
Pessimist Wealth	1.582	1.716	-7.8%
Medianist Wealth	4.578	4.578	0.0%
Optimist Wealth	5.105	5.032	+1.5%

Although marginal agent i1 and bond-price q are quite different than from theoretical equilibrium and the pessimists wealth is 7.8% less than given in [BSV13] these results are nonetheless accepted as reaching the equilibrium. The differences emerge from the reasons that the thesis-simulation runs were terminated earlier than in [BSV13] which results in the i1 and i2 edges to be not as sharp as reported in [BSV13]. It would be necessary to run the simulation an order of magnitude longer as the matching probabilities are reduced rapidly when only direct neighbours are able to trade any more within a network of 1000 agents. See section 5.8 "Performance improvement" for details on matching-probabilities.

### 6.1.3 Performance and termination measurements

As noted in section 5.7.1 "Sweeping and Matching" a matching-round performs up to 500 offering-rounds where during one round all agents make an offer to find a match. If a match occurs during one offering-round the current matching-round is terminated and marked as successful. If no match occurs during all 500 offering-rounds the current matching-round is terminated too but marked as failed. Thus the following terminology is defined:

**Successful matching-round** a match occurred within maximal 500 offering-rounds where in each offering-round all agents make an offer.

**Failed matching-round** no match occurred within 500 offering-rounds where in each offering-round all agents make an offer.

**Termination criteria** after 1,000 successive failed matching-rounds it is expected that no more trading will occur thus the simulation is terminated.

Table 15: Performance of thesis-implementation with 1000 agents and 0.5 bond

Successful matching-rounds	19,300.04 (101.68)
Failed matching-rounds	10,306.78 (2914.11)
Total matching-rounds	29,606.82 (2938.82)
Ratio successful/total	0.65
Ratio failed/total	0.35

## 6.2 Experiments configuration

In the following experiments 100 agents were used, all markets (Asset/Cash, Bond/Cash, Asset/Bond) were enabled, a bond with face-value of 0.5 was selected and in each experiment 50 replications were run. A replication was terminated after 1000 failed matching-rounds in a row. Note that if trading is not possible any more before this criteria is met the simulation is terminated and thus it is possible that it halts earlier as can be seen for the Ascending-Connected Importance Sampling topology.

[BSV13] showed that equilibrium can be reached already with 30 agents so this was the minimum number of agents to start with but for a smoother visual result 100 were chosen. Also one simulation-run takes not very much

time with 100 as compared to the 1,000 agents thus it is a very good match between visual accurateness and processing-power requirements.

The 0.5 bond was selected because it is a risky one which is important as with risk-less loans which have a face-value less than or equal 0.2 the results are indifferent and not unique and won't show the characteristic distribution of equilibrium.

As already described in section 5.7.1 "Sweeping and Matching" the whole simulation-process is a random-process with an equilibrium different for each topology as the fixed-point solution thus one needs replications to reduce noise. The number of 50 replications was chosen because it is a good match between processing-power requirements and overall reduction of noise. Thus increasing the number e.g. to 100 or 200 would not result in much better results - both visual and numerical - but would need much longer to run. All facts can already be seen and derived when using 50 replications thus for all figures 50 replications were used unless stated otherwise e.g. a single run.

Table 16: Configuration for all experiments

Agent-Count	100
Bond-Type	0.5
Replication-Count	50
Matching-Round	max. 500 offering-rounds
Terminate after	1,000 failed successive matching-rounds

Table 17: Theoretical Equilibrium for 100 agents and 0.5 bond

Asset-Price p	0.717
Bond-Price q	0.375
Marginal agent i1	0.584
Marginal agent i2	0.802

### 6.3 Fully-Connected

This topology serves as the major point-of-reference for the other experiments as it reaches the theoretical equilibrium for 1,000 agents as demonstrated and explained.




Figure 8: Wealth-distribution of Fully-Connected topology

Table 18: Equilibrium of Fully-Connected topology

Asset-Price p	0.689 (0.01)
Bond-Price q	0.384 (0.004)
Marginal agent i1	0.603 (0.007)
Marginal agent i2	0.803 (0.003)
Pessimist Wealth	1.597 (0.015)
Medianist Wealth	4.565 (0.113)
Optimist Wealth	5.021 (0.064)

Table 19: Performance of Fully-Connected topology

Successful matching-rounds	1916.14 (31.42)
Failed matching-rounds	4448.66 (1668.93)
Total matching-rounds	6364.8 (1679.21)
Ratio successful/total	0.3
Ratio failed/total	0.7

Table 20: Difference to theoretical equilibrium

	Result	Reference	difference to Reference
Asset-Price p	0.689	0.717	-3.9%
Bond-Price q	0.384	0.375	+2.4%
Marginal agent i1	0.603	0.584	+3.2%
Marginal agent i2	0.803	0.802	+0.1%

## 6.4 Ascending-Connected topology




Figure 9: Wealth-distribution of Ascending-Connected topology

Table 21: Equilibrium of Ascending-Connected topology

Asset-Price p	0.711 (0.016)
Bond-Price q	0.391 (0.005)
Marginal agent i1	0.646 (0.012)
Marginal agent i2	0.850 (0.008)
Pessimist Wealth	1.166 (0.072)
Medianist Wealth	1.869 (0.243)
Optimist Wealth	4.307 (0.07)

Table 22: Performance of Ascending-Connected topology

Successful matching-rounds	36,940.96 (1948.69)
Failed matching-rounds	1176.08 (98.01)
Total matching-rounds	38,117.04 (1934.06)
Ratio successful/total	0.97
Ratio failed/total	0.03

Table 23: Difference to theoretical equilibrium

	Result	Reference	difference to Reference
Asset-Price p	0.711	0.717	-0.8%
Bond-Price q	0.391	0.375	+4.2%
Marginal agent i1	0.646	0.584	+10.6%
Marginal agent i2	0.850	0.802	+6.0%

Table 24: Difference to Fully-Connected topology equilibrium

	Result	Reference	difference to Reference
Asset-Price p	0.711 (0.016)	0.689 (0.01)	+3.2% (+60%)
Bond-Price q	0.391 (0.005)	0.384 (0.004)	+1.8% (+25%)
Marginal agent i1	0.646 (0.012)	0.603 (0.007)	+6.9% (+71%)
Marginal agent i2	0.850 (0.008)	0.803 (0.003)	+6.0% (+166%)
Pessimist Wealth	1.166 (0.072)	1.597 (0.015)	-27.0% (+380%)
Medianist Wealth	1.869 (0.243)	4.565 (0.113)	-59% (+115%)
Optimist Wealth	4.307 (0.070)	5.021 (0.064)	-14.2% (+9.3%)

#### 6.4.1 Ascending-Connected Importance Sampling




Figure 10: Wealth-distribution of Ascending-Connected Importance Sampling topology

Table 25: Equilibrium of Ascending-Connected Importance Sampling topology

Asset-Price p	0.691 (0.009)
Bond-Price q	0.383 (0.004)
Marginal agent i1	0.614 (0.009)
Marginal agent i2	0.799 (0.006)
Pessimist Wealth	1.497 (0.072)
Medianist Wealth	3.934 (0.505)
Optimist Wealth	4.519 (0.051)

Table 26: Performance of Ascending-Connected Importance Sampling topology

Successful matching-rounds	49,881.6 (1733.33)
Failed matching-rounds	1.0 (0.00)
Total matching-rounds	49,882.6 (1733.33)
Ratio successful/total	0.9999
Ratio failed/total	0.0001

Note that in this case the matching-probabilities are such that upon the first failed matching-round the equilibrium is reached as no agent can trade with each other any more which results in just one single failed matching-round.

Table 27: Difference to theoretical equilibrium

	Result	Reference	difference to Reference
Asset-Price p	0.691	0.717	-3.6%
Bond-Price q	0.383	0.375	+2.1%
Marginal agent i1	0.614	0.584	5.1%
Marginal agent i2	0.799	0.802	-0.4%

Table 28: Difference to Fully-Connected topology equilibrium

	Result	Reference	difference to Reference
Asset-Price p	0.691 (0.009)	0.689 (0.01)	+0.3% (-10%)
Bond-Price q	0.383 (0.004)	0.384 (0.004)	-0.3% (0.0%)
Marginal agent i1	0.614 (0.009)	0.603 (0.007)	+1.8% (28.6%)
Marginal agent i2	0.799 (0.006)	0.803 (0.003)	-0.5% (+100%)
Pessimist Wealth	1.497 (0.072)	1.597 (0.015)	-6.2% (+380%)
Medianist Wealth	3.934 (0.505)	4.565 (0.113)	-13.8% (+346%)
Optimist Wealth	4.519 (0.051)	5.021 (0.064)	-10% (-20.3%)

# **Chapter 7**

## **Interpretation**

In this chapter the interpretation of the results of chapter 6 "Results" are given and discussed where the central question is whether the Ascending-Connected topology satisfies the hypothesis or not. Thus only this topology is handled - both with and without importance sampling - because it is the most minimal network which satisfies the requirements for the hypothesis. The interpretations for the results of Hub-, Scale-Free and Small-World Topologies are handled in appendix B "Results for Hub-Based, Scale-Free and Small-World" but only to a minimal extent as they turn out to fall far from satisfying the hypothesis and the equilibrium because almost all of them do not meet the requirements but show interesting behaviour.

### **7.1 Validating the Hypothesis**

When comparing the results of Ascending-Connected topology with and without importance sampling from Chapter 6 "Results" of figure 10 and 9 with the results of the Fully-Connected topology of figure 8 it becomes immediately clear that the equilibrium is different from the one of the Fully-Connected network and thus theoretical equilibrium is not reached in the case of Ascending-Connected topology neither with or without importance sampling. Although the visual results come quite close to the Fully-Connected one - there is a clear distinction between pessimists, medianists and optimists and the wealth-distribution looks about the same as in fully-connected - there remain serious artefacts in the range of the pessimists. Thus the hypothesis is proven wrong by experiment.

## 7.2 Analysing artefacts

Obviously the artefacts in the range of the pessimists indicate a miss-allocation of wealth, which are in fact collateralized assets. Pessimists, as noted in Chapter 3 "The Leverage Cycle", are maximally short on assets and bonds and hold only cash, thus it is clearly a miss-allocation. As will be shown it comes from the fact that the pessimists want to sell but no neighbour is able to buy any more - a scenario which is not possible in Fully-Connected topology and is thus unique to Ascending-Connected networks with and without importance sampling.

### 7.2.1 Dynamics of a single run

To better understand how such artefacts arise one needs to investigate the dynamics of a single run of the Ascending-Connected topology. The tools used are both the market-activity and wealth-distribution diagrams where the former one shows during which points in time - which are the successful matching-rounds - of the simulation each market is active. Being active means a successful match on a given market which implies that in a successful matching-round only one market can be active as only one match on a specific market happens during a successful matching round. Because of this a moving window of size 100 is used to create a moving-average filter over all active markets where the result is normalized and all market-activity sums to 1.0 at each point in time of the diagram. This allows for a very good visual analysis of distinct trading-stages because noise is reduced but the overall trend of a market can be still seen clearly.

3 trading-stages can be identified in the market-activity diagram of Ascending-Connected topology.



Figure 11: Market-activity stages of Ascending-Connected topology

**Stage 1** The allocations are very chaotic overall but pessimists can be identified already as they sell their free assets against cash thus holding primarily cash but lots of collateralized assets are in the pessimists-range as well. Real distinction of optimists is not yet visible and medianists are far from showing up.

The Asset/Cash and Loan/Cash markets are very dominant in this stage as the pessimists try to get cash for their free assets where the Asset/Loan market is hardly active but contributes enough to create the miss-allocation of the collateralized assets in the pessimists-range already.




Figure 12: Wealth-Distribution of Ascending-Connected topology during Stage 1

**Stage 2** The pessimists which hold collateralized assets try to trade them up to the optimists which looks like waves when visualizing it in the thesis-software. The optimists are now about to emerge as most of them are maximally short on cash and hold either free or collateralized assets. The medianists are still not visible yet.

The Asset/Cash market seems to go down in the long term while the Loan/Cash and Asset/Loan markets seems to increase. This is because fewer and fewer assets can be traded against cash because the optimists are already very low on cash thus the Asset/Loan market is naturally increasing as they can trade only on this market any more.




Figure 13: Wealth-Distribution of Ascending-Connected topology during Stage 2

**Stage 3** The pessimists lie dormant and are completely inactive. The medianists begin to show up holding only bonds and the real optimists begin to crystallize holding only collateralized assets. These two frontiers move towards each other as only collateralized assets can be traded any more as both medianists and optimists hold only collateralized assets and bonds.

The Asset/Cash market lies dormant because the pessimists are no more able to trade and the optimists are maximally low on cash. The Loan/-Cash market is inactive too whereas the Asset/Loan market takes over and dominates 100% as only collateralized assets are traded any more as stated above.




Figure 14: Wealth-Distribution of Ascending-Connected topology during Stage 3

**Deriving the emerging of the artefacts** The wealth stabilizes from both the left and the right end of the optimism-scale towards the i2-point

where medianists become optimists - around this point the last trades will happen.

Pessimists try to sell all their assets against cash to the neighbour with higher optimism-factor.

Optimists try to buy as much assets as they can get from the neighbour with lower optimism-factor. In the beginning they use cash and after they've run out of cash they buy assets against bonds.

The medianists serve as connection between the pessimists and optimists transferring the assets to the optimists by buying from agents with lower optimism and selling to higher ones either through asset against cash or asset against bond.

Thus the assets move from the pessimists through the ascending chain of optimism to the optimists as no direct connection between these two groups exists with the medianists in between. Thus waves of uncollateralized assets can be seen moving from pessimists to optimists.

It is important to understand that all agents despite their optimism factor make offers on all markets if they are able to and their cash, collateral or bond constraints are satisfied. This implies that pessimists trade bonds as well as assets against bonds although they turn out to be pessimists. Note that the agents are not defined exogenous as pessimists/medianist/optimists but this property emerges during the simulation.

Thus pessimists gain wealth in collateralized assets too which can be seen by the green spikes with the same amount of negative bonds as those assets are bought against bond. Of course they try to sell it to neighbours with higher optimism factor but this is only possible if these neighbours are able to buy which they can only if they hold enough positive bonds to buy the offered asset for the offered amount of bonds.

Whether an agent has enough wealth to buy from a seller is more or less random and depends on its trading history. Matching happens randomly and thus it is possible that the neighbourhood of a seller "dries up" as the potential buyers sold all their goods to the next agent with higher optimism factor and become thus unable to buy from the potential seller because they have no more positive bonds to buy assets against bonds. In such a case a potential pessimist seller of collateralized assets is then cut from its environment and becomes unable to trade any more resulting in a miss-allocation in collateralized assets.

It is also possible for a group of agents to get cut from its environment through this random trading-process. In this case the agents within this

"island" still trade between each other resulting in the uncollateralizing of assets which immediately are traded towards optimists but as soon as a point is reached where no buyer is available with enough positive bonds to buy collateralized assets this island is also incapable of trading any more resulting in an island of miss-allocated wealth.

An important fact to notice is that the artefacts must not necessarily show up. It is possible for a single run to finish without these artefacts showing up. This is due to the random-process of sweeping and matching and thus the artefacts are subject to this random process too as noted in section 5.8 "Sweeping and Matching". Importance sampling elevates this problem a bit as it allows for more trades as the matching probabilities are very much increased but fails in the end for the same reason as the simulation without it - the artefacts are just "smaller" but show up almost always.




Figure 15: Final wealth-distribution of Ascending-Connected topology after a single run

## 7.3 Extending the Hypothesis

After it has become clear that the hypothesis is wrong the question arises what needs to be done to correct it. It is clear that a mechanism needs to be found which prevents or resolves the arising of the artefacts within the pessimist wealth-range. Obviously two solutions are available.

### 7.3.1 Approaching fully connectedness

Increasing the connectedness of the topology increases the probability of global-optimal trades and allows more agents to trade between each other and thus the probability of resolving islands or artefacts of wealth miss-allocation

is increased with the density of connectedness. The experiments of ascending-connected topology with short-cuts were designed to develop an understanding how the simulation behaves with increasing connectedness and also how the two types of fully- and regular-connectedness influence the results. It seems that full short-cuts seem to help dramatically in reducing the miss-allocations where the number of full short-cuts seems to be dependent on the number of agents which this thesis leaves for further research. See section B.2 "Ascending-Connected with short-cuts" in appendix B for a short overview of the results and interpretation of short-cut based Ascending-Connected topologies.

Of course in real environments approaching fully connectedness is not always possible and thus only the other mechanism is left as an option to resolve the artefacts.

### 7.3.2 Re-Enabling trading

Another way to look at the arising of the artefacts is in identifying them as suboptimal trades. [BSV13] were confronted with this circumstance when they introduced the Asset/Bond Market where they found that the equilibrium was fundamentally different from the theoretical one because agents were trapped in suboptimal trades and couldn't reverse their decisions made earlier. The trades were suboptimal because each agent assigns depending on its optimism factor a different bond-value to each asset. As a solution they introduced the "Bonds-Pledgeability" (BP) mechanism which allows to trade bonds in both ways instead of only gathering them and not being able to sell them - see chapter 3 "The Leverage Cycle" for a more in-depth discussion of the BP-Mechanism.

Thus if those artifacts are treated as suboptimal trades one needs to introduce a mechanism similar to BP to allow the reversibility of suboptimal trades in the context of collateralized assets. The only possibility without altering the network-topology is to re-enable the pessimists to trade their collateralized assets against cash as all pessimists hold cash and are thus able to buy and sell collateralized assets against cash. This new mechanism is expected to repair the miss-allocated wealth and to restore the validity of the previously disproved hypothesis.

See Chapter 8 "A new Market" for the implementation and results of this new mechanism.

# Chapter 8

## A new Market

As already introduced in section 7.3.2 "Re-Enabling trading" a new market is necessary to repair the miss-allocation of collateralized assets in the range of the pessimist agents by enabling the agents to trade collateralized assets against cash.

### 8.1 Definition

#### 8.1.1 Products

Collateralized assets are traded against cash. The buyer gets a specific amount of collateralized assets for a given amount of cash where the seller gives away the specific amount of collateralized assets and gets the given amount of cash.

#### 8.1.2 Price-Range

As within all other three markets the price-ranges of the offers must be defined. Note that all prices must be obviously in the unit of cash according to the previously defined products.

**minimum** When calculating the minimum price of a collateralized asset - that is how much is the collateralized asset minimally worth - it is important to include the collateral-aspect of the asset. Thus one starts with the minimum asset-price in cash which is the down-price  $pD$  and subtracts the maximum possible amount of cash which is bound through a bond as collateral which is the face-value  $V$ . This value is a constant for all agents.

$$\min \text{ collateralized asset-price} = \min(0, pD - V)$$

**maximum** To calculate the maximum price of a collateralized asset - that is how much is the collateralized asset maximally worth - one needs to include the collateral-aspect of the asset too. Equal to calculating the minimum one starts now with the maximum asset-price in cash which is the up-price  $pU$  and subtracts the minimum possible amount of cash which is bound through a bond as collateral which is the face-value  $pD$ . This value is a constant for all agents.

$$\text{max collateralized asset-price} = pU - pD$$

**limit** Applying the same rules as in minimum and maximum to the limit price calculation one needs to subtract the limit-price of loans from the limit-price of asset to receive the limit-price of a collateralized asset. This value is individual for each agent as the limit-prices differ across the agents both for assets and loans.

$$\text{limit-price of collateralized asset} = \text{limit-price of asset} - \text{limit-price of loan}$$

### 8.1.3 Bid-Offering

The way bid-offers are generated is very similar to the Bond/Cash market. Bid offers are generated only when the agent has any cash holdings. The price is drawn randomly between the minimum price and the limit-price because when buying one wants to buy below the expected value to make a profit. As amount one TRADING-UNIT of an asset is selected - in the thesis-implementation 0.1 - but if there is not enough cash left to buy one TRADING-UNIT of assets then the amount of assets is selected which can be bought with the remaining cash holdings.

Table 29: Bid-Offering parameters

Pre-Condition	$\text{cash holdings} > 0$
Asset-Price	$\text{random}(\min \text{ coll. asset-price}, \text{limit-price of coll. asset})$
Asset-Amount	$\min\left(\frac{\text{cash holdings}}{\text{Asset-Price}}, \text{TRADING-UNIT}\right)$

### 8.1.4 Ask-Offering

The way ask-offers are generated is very similar to the Bond/Cash market. Ask offers are generated only when the agent has any collateralized assets. The price is drawn randomly between the limit-price and maximum price because when selling one wants to sell above the expected value to make a

profit. As amount one TRADING-UNIT of an asset is selected - in the thesis-implementation 0.1 - but if there are fewer collateralized assets left then the remaining amount of collateral is selected. See Chapter 5 "Implementation" for the equation of collateral holdings.

Table 30: Ask-Offering parameters

Pre-Condition	<i>collateralized assets &gt; 0</i>
Asset-Price	random( <i>limit-price of coll. asset, max coll. asset-price</i> )
Asset-Amount	min( <i>collateralized assets, TRADING-UNIT</i> )

### 8.1.5 Match

Below the wealth-exchange table is given in case of a match between two agents on the new market. Note that the wealth is increased/decreased as given by the +/- signs.

Table 31: Wealth-Exchange on match

	Seller	Buyer
Loan Given	+ matching-amount	N/A
Loans Taken	N/A	- matching-amount
Assets holdings	- matching-amount	+ matching-amount
Cash holdings	+ matching-price	- matching-price

## 8.2 Results

Of most importance are the results of the simulation when using the new market. The plain results are given in this section where the interpretation of the results are given in the following section.

As experiment-configuration the same is used as given in Chapter 6 "Results" except that the new market is now activated too.

Table 32: Configuration for all experiments

Agent-Count	100
Bond-Type	0.5
Replication-Count	50
Matching-Round	max. 500 offering-rounds
Terminate after	1000 failed successive matching-rounds

### 8.2.1 Fully-Connected topology




Figure 16: Wealth-Distribution of Fully-Connected topology with Collateral/Cash market

Table 33: Equilibrium of Fully-Connected topology with Collateral/Cash market

Asset-Price p	0.688 (0.008)
Bond-Price q	0.381 (0.002)
Marginal Agent i1	0.597 (0.005)
Marginal Agent i2	0.803 (0.003)
Pessimist Wealth	1.597 (0.009)
Medianist Wealth	4.76 (0.1)
Optimist Wealth	4.963 (0.052)

Table 34: Performance of Fully-Connected topology with Collateral/Cash market

Successful matching-rounds	1916.14 (31.42)
Failed matching-rounds	4448.66 (1668.93)
Total matching-rounds	6364.8 (1679.21)
Ratio successful/total	0.3
Ratio failed/total	0.7

Table 35: Difference of Fully-Connected topology to theoretical equilibrium as given in Table 17 of Chapter 6 "Results"

	Result	Reference	difference to Reference
Asset-Price p	0.688	0.717	-4.0%
Bond-Price q	0.381	0.375	+1.6%
Marginal Agent i1	0.597	0.584	+2.2%
Marginal Agent i2	0.802	0.803	+0.1%

Table 36: Difference of Fully-Connected topology to equilibrium without Collateral/Cash market as given in Table 18 of Chapter 6 "Results"

	Result	Reference	difference to Reference
Asset-Price p	0.688 (0.008)	0.689 (0.01)	-0.1% (-20%)
Bond-Price q	0.381 (0.002)	0.384 (0.004)	-0.7% (-50%)
Marginal Agent i1	0.597 (0.005)	0.603 (0.007)	-1.0% (-28%)
Marginal Agent i2	0.803 (0.003)	0.803 (0.003)	0.0% (0%)
Pessimist Wealth	1.597 (0.009)	1.597 (0.015)	0.0% (-40%)
Medianist Wealth	4.76 (0.1)	4.565 (0.113)	+4.2% (-11%)
Optimist Wealth	4.963 (0.052)	5.021 (0.064)	-1.1% (-19%)

### 8.2.2 Ascending-Connected topology




Figure 17: Wealth-Distribution of Ascending-Connected topology with Collateral/Cash market

Table 37: Equilibrium of Ascending-Connected topology

Asset-Price p	0.713 (0.013)
Bond-Price q	0.383 (0.005)
Marginal Agent i1	0.584 (0.0)
Marginal Agent i2	0.782 (0.0)
Pessimist Wealth	1.671 (0.0)
Medianist Wealth	5.032 (0.013)
Optimist Wealth	4.508 (0.006)

Table 38: Performance of Ascending-Connected topology

Successful matching-rounds	51,838.74 (1613.36)
Failed matching-rounds	1124.76 (28.31)
Total matching-rounds	52,963.5 (1612.31)
Ratio successful/total	0.98
Ratio failed/total	0.02

Table 39: Difference of Ascending-Connected topology to theoretical equilibrium as given in Table 17 of Chapter 6 "Results"

	Result	Reference	difference to Reference
Asset-Price p	0.713	0.717	-0.5%
Bond-Price q	0.383	0.375	+2.1%
Marginal Agent i1	0.584	0.584	0.0%
Marginal Agent i2	0.782	0.802	-2.5%

Table 40: Difference of Ascending-Connected topology to equilibrium without Collateral/Cash market as given in Table 21 of Chapter 6 "Results"

	Result	Reference	difference to Reference
Asset-Price p	0.713 (0.013)	0.711 (0.016)	+0.3% (19%)
Bond-Price q	0.383 (0.005)	0.391 (0.005)	-2.0% (0%)
Marginal Agent i1	0.584 (0.0)	0.646 (0.012)	-9.6% (-100%)
Marginal Agent i2	0.782 (0.0)	0.85 (0.008)	-8.0% (-100%)
Pessimist Wealth	1.671 (0.0)	1.166 (0.072)	+43.3% (-100%)
Medianist Wealth	5.032 (0.013)	1.869 (0.243)	+169.2% (95%)
Optimist Wealth	4.508 (0.006)	4.307 (0.07)	+4.6% (-91%)

Table 41: Difference of Ascending-Connected to equilibrium of fully-connected topology with Collateral/Cash market as given above

	Result	Reference	difference to Reference
Asset-Price p	0.713 (0.013)	0.688 (0.008)	+3.6% (+62%)
Bond-Price q	0.383 (0.005)	0.381 (0.002)	+0.5% (+150%)
Marginal Agent i1	0.584 (0.0)	0.597 (0.005)	-2.2% (-100%)
Marginal Agent i2	0.782 (0.0)	0.803 (0.003)	-2.6% (-100%)
Pessimist Wealth	1.671 (0.0)	1.597 (0.009)	+4.6% (-100%)
Medianist Wealth	5.032 (0.013)	4.76 (0.1)	+5.7% (-87%)
Optimist Wealth	4.508 (0.006)	4.963 (0.052)	-9.2% (88%)

Table 42: Difference of Ascending-Connected to equilibrium of fully-connected without Collateral/Cash market as given in Table 18 of Chapter 6 "Results"

	Result	Reference	difference to Reference
Asset-Price p	0.713 (0.013)	0.689 (0.01)	+3.5% (+30%)
Bond-Price q	0.383 (0.005)	0.384 (0.004)	-0.3% (+25%)
Marginal Agent i1	0.584 (0.0)	0.603 (0.007)	-3.2% (-100%)
Marginal Agent i2	0.782 (0.0)	0.803 (0.003)	-2.6% (-100%)
Pessimist Wealth	1.671 (0.0)	1.597 (0.015)	+4.6% (-100%)
Medianist Wealth	5.032 (0.013)	4.565 (0.113)	+10.23% (88%)
Optimist Wealth	4.508 (0.006)	5.021 (0.064)	-10.22% (91%)

### 8.3 Interpretation of results

When interpreting the results the following questions must be answered:

- Does the Fully-Connected topology reach the theoretical equilibrium as well?
- Does the new market repair the miss-allocation of wealth in the pessimists-range?
- If not why? If yes, does the Ascending-Connected topology approach theoretical equilibrium now?

**Does the Fully-Connected topology reach the theoretical equilibrium as well?** Yes it does. Both visual and statistical results show that it

reaches the theoretical equilibrium. The medianist wealth is slightly higher with the new market but that difference, as well as the variations in the other variables are not statistically significant.

**Does the new market repair the miss-allocation of wealth in the pessimists-range?** Yes it does. The visual results are clear with no miss-allocations showing up within 50 replications. If there would have been miss-allocations within any replication they would have shown up in the final result.

**If yes, does the Ascending-Connected topology approach theoretical equilibrium now?** The miss-allocations are repaired but it does not approach theoretical equilibrium. Both visual and statistical results show that it misses to reach the theoretical and Fully-Connected topology with or without new market equilibrium. Because of the way the new market works the wealth-distributions in medianists and pure optimists show a different shape than in Fully-Connected and thus the theoretical equilibrium is not reached. The reason for the different shape of the wealth-distributions is rooted in the way the market-dynamics work which is discussed in the following section.

## 8.4 Simulation and Market dynamics

When implementing a new market the market-dynamics are of very importance and thus the following questions must be answered.

- Can the trading stages 1-4 be identified too as given in [BSV13]?
- How does trading progresses with this new market? Is it the same as without the new market?
- How does the new market resolve the miss-allocation (with and without deferred activation)?
- When and how much is each market active?
- How do the market-activities change when a new market is introduced?

To answer these questions one must look closely at the market-dynamics. There are trading stages to be identified but due to the new market and the different topology they are expected to be quite different from the ones found

in [BSV13]. The method used to find these stages is through observation of a single run and refining and validating the derived facts over many additional runs. Note that replications provide no real value here as one needs to look very carefully into the dynamics of single runs instead of the mean of multiple runs.

#### 8.4.1 Fully-Connected with new Market

4 Stages were identified which are quite different from the ones given in [BSV13] as the new market makes quite a big impact.




Figure 18: Market-activity stages of Fully-Connected topology with Collateral/Cash market

**Stage 1** In this stage the pessimists become visible rapidly as they sell their assets and increase their cash wealth. One can get also a sense of the more optimistic range of agents as they gather assets both free and collateralized. The medianists are not visible yet.

The Asset/Cash market dominates but goes down slowly as fewer and fewer pessimists trade assets against cash compared to the very beginning. The Bond/Cash market fluctuates around the same point as loans are traded more or less equally the same. The Collateral/Cash market begins quite low and raises as more and more collateralized assets are created by pessimists and need to be sold again using the new market. The Asset/Bond market is hardly active as there is no strong need for its features yet.




Figure 19: Wealth-Distribution of Fully-Connected topology with Collateralal/Cash market during Stage 1

**Stage 2** The collateralized assets are traded from the pessimists towards the optimists and the optimists crystallize themselves even more but no medianists are visible yet.

The Asset/Cash market continues to go down as the cash holdings of the pessimists begin to decline. The Bond/Cash market fluctuates around the same point as before. Now the Collateral/Cash market becomes very active as more and more collateralized assets need to be traded towards the optimists. At the beginning of this stage the Asset/Bond market is hardly active but raises fast towards the end of it as the optimists are then out of cash and need to distribute the collateralized assets between each other and the yet to come medianists.




Figure 20: Wealth-Distribution of Fully-Connected topology with Collateralal/Cash market during Stage 2

**Stage 3** The pessimists have gone inactive as they hold no more wealth they can trade. The i1-point is emerging and the medianists and pure optimists begin to show up.

Because the pessimists are inactive now and hold no more assets the Asset/Cash and Collateral/Cash markets go down and decline completely. The Bond/Cash market goes down but does not decline as bonds are still traded because of the emerging of medianists. The medianists and pure optimists which are emerging have no other possibility than to trade on the Asset/Bond market to further distribute their collateralized assets among each other which is the reason for the raise of the Asset/Bond market above all others and its heavy domination. Despite the heavy domination of the Asset/Bond market still a few bonds are traded against cash in the range of the medianists.




Figure 21: Wealth-Distribution of Fully-Connected topology with Collateral/Cash market during Stage 3

**Stage 4** Finally the i2-point has emerged and both i1 and i2 are finalizing. The only active agents remaining are around these two points where the pure optimists trade with the medianists to finalize i2 and the medianists with the next closest pessimists to finalize i1 where the very last transactions occur around i1.

The Asset/Bond market goes down until i2 has finalized as the collateralized asset allocation has nearly reached its equilibrium. The Bond/Cash market goes up as agents around i1 are still refining the point as the equilibrium of the medianists is not reached yet. Thus bonds are traded against cash as i1 is the connecting point between pessimists with cash and medianists with bonds which enables the Bond/Cash market to trade again.




Figure 22: Wealth-Distribution of Fully-Connected topology with Collateral/Cash market during Stage 4

#### 8.4.2 Ascending-Connected with new market enabled after 1,000 successive failed matching-rounds

Using the thesis-software it is possible to start a simulation-run on Ascending-Connected topology without the Collateral/Cash market and enabling it after 1,000 successive failed matching-rounds which gives interesting hints about how the spikes of collateralized assets in the pessimists-range are resolved and distributed over the already existing pure optimists.

Of course there are the same 3 stages to be found as described already in section 7.2.1 "Dynamics of a single run" whereas the deferred enabling of the Collateral/Cash market adds 2 new stages.




Figure 23: Market-activity stages of Ascending-Connected topology with deferred activated Collateral/Cash market

**Stage 4** The collateralized assets are traded against cash and sum up at the i1-point where the first agent has no more cash.




Figure 24: Wealth-Distribution of Ascending-Connected topology with deferred activated Collateral/Cash market during Stage 4

**Stage 5** Now the Asset/Bond market becomes 100% dominant again and the collateralized assets are traded through the medianists towards the pure optimists as they have no more cash and can only trade anymore on this remaining active market.




Figure 25: Wealth-Distribution of Ascending-Connected topology with deferred activated Collateral/Cash market during Stage 5

### 8.4.3 Ascending-Connected with new Market

4 stages were identified where only 3 of them can be seen in the Market-Dynamics diagram as stage 3 and 4 have indifferent market-activities.




Figure 26: Market-activity stages of Ascending-Connected topology with Collateral/Cash market

**Stage 1** Pessimists and optimists begin to emerge where the pessimists are gathering cash and collateralized assets and the optimists are gathering free assets against cash and a few collateralized assets. There are no medianists visible yet.

The Asset/Cash and Bond/Cash markets start around 40% slightly decreasing because the pessimists are slowly going low on assets. The Collateral/Cash market starts around 10% with increasing tendency because the amount of collateralized assets which move towards the optimists increases. The Asset/Bond market is hardly active as its features are not yet very necessary.




Figure 27: Wealth-Distribution of Ascending-Connected topology with Collateral/Cash market during Stage 1

**Stage 2** In the pessimist-range large amount of collateralized assets have gathered which are traded now towards the optimists as the pessimists try

get maximally short on any assets and maximally plus on cash. Those collateralized assets are traded towards the i1-point - that is the first agent who holds no more cash - which can be seen by a spike in the wealth-distribution of figure 28 around 0.65. There are no medianists visible yet.

The Collateral/Cash market raises above the Asset/Cash and Bond/-Cash markets and either fluctuates or stays quite constant. In figure 26 the fluctuating variant is shown. If the market fluctuates the Asset/Cash and Bond/Cash fluctuate inverse in that if Collateral/Cash market raises they go down and vice versa. If the Collateral/Cash market stays quite constant in this stage it raises above 90% and Asset/Cash and Bond/Cash markets decline to 0%. Why the Collateral/Cash market either fluctuates or stays constant is not clear but is most probably dependent on the allocation of collateralized assets in the pessimists-range. The Asset/Bond market becomes a bit more active as more collateralized assets are traded.




Figure 28: Wealth-Distribution of Ascending-Connected topology with Collateral/Cash market during Stage 2

**Stage 3** Pessimists are now final and won't change any more. The optimists-range is now clearly visible and holds a large amount of collateralized assets from the pessimists which needs now to be traded and distributed to the remaining optimists. Medianists are still not visible yet.

Because the pessimists are no more able to trade and the optimists hold no more cash the activity of the Collateral/Cash market drops rapidly and Asset/Bond market raises to 100% activity as only collateralized-assets are tradeable any more.




Figure 29: Wealth-Distribution of Ascending-Connected topology with Collateral/Cash market during Stage 3

**Stage 4** Medianists begin to show up and to distinguish themselves from the pure optimists. This is no more visible on the market-dynamics as only Asset/Bonds are traded any more and thus only this market is active any more.




Figure 30: Wealth-Distribution of Ascending-Connected topology with Collateral/Cash market during Stage 4

After these observations made one can answer the questions.

**Can the trading stages 1-4 be identified too as given in [BSV13]?**  
There are 4 stages in the case of both Fully-Connected and Ascending-Connected topology with the new market which are not the ones given in [BSV13] but show up by pure chance and depend also a bit on the point-of-view on how to separate the stages from each other.

**How does trading progress with this new market? Is it the same as without the new market?** The progression of the trading is obviously very different with the new market as compared to the market-activities without as the usage of the new market changes the dynamics completely.

**How does the new market resolve the miss-allocation (with and without deferred activation)?** It becomes active during the formation of the pessimists agents as they gather collateralized assets wealth which must be traded towards the optimists. The collateralized assets are traded from neighbour to neighbour until they reach the optimists-region.

**When and how much is each market active?** This can be seen clearly in the market-activity diagrams.

**How do the market-activities change when a new market is introduced?** They have less share on the overall activity and thus the new market is quite a heavy competitor in the overall share. The Asset/Bond market though is still the market on which the final trades occur.

## 8.5 Conclusions on new Market

The equilibrium of the Ascending-Connected topology with the new market is different than the Fully-Connected one which reaches the theoretical equilibrium. Thus the hypothesis is still wrong because it predicted the Ascending-Connected topology to reach the theoretical equilibrium. This thesis can only speculate on the reason for this it is most probably rooted in the fundamental different trading dynamics of Ascending-Connected topology compared to Fully-Connected as can be seen in the market-dynamics. This thesis leaves the question of market-dynamics open for further research.

# **Chapter 9**

## **Conclusion, Summary and further Research**

### **9.1 Conclusion**

### **9.2 Summary**

### **9.3 Further Research**

#### **9.3.1 In-depth analysis of market-activities**

je nach markt-aktivität kommt sicher ein anderes gleichgewicht heraus bzw. ist das so? hier bedarf es sicher weiterer forschungen und ist sicher auch ein ergiebiges und interessantes thema.

#### **9.3.2 Imporance-Sampling**

importance-sampling allgemein

#### **9.3.3 Experiments with real subjects**

experimentelle simulationen mit echten menschen: einschränken der handelsbeziehungen wie lokal bzw. global muss die vernetzung sein (ascending-connected full shortcuts)

#### **9.3.4 Mathematical proof of hypothesis**

beweisbarkeit der ascending-connected (MIT/OHNE neuem Markt)

### **9.3.5 Equilibrium definition for continuous double-auction process**

# Appendix A

## Topologies

In this chapter all simulated topologies are visualized and explained shortly. All topologies are demonstrated with  $N = 30$  Agents instead of 100 for better visibility and clarity of the connections and nodes. All topologies have one connected component because otherwise equilibrium cannot be reached. Note that Erdos-Renyi could produce more than one connected component depending on the parameters to create it. The agents are always arranged in clockwise increasing optimism factor unless stated otherwise. All connections are undirected and there are no self-loops.

### A.1 Fully-Connected

Each agent is connected with each other agent. Included as major point-of-reference as [BSV13] developed their model and equilibrium for fully-connected networks.




Figure 31: Fully-Connected topology

Table 43: Network metrics Fully-Connected topology

Avg. degree	29
Avg. path-length	1
Avg. clustering coefficient	1
Network diameter	1
Graph density	1
Edge count	$\frac{N(N-1)}{2}$

## A.2 Half-Fully Connected

Agents with optimism-factor 0.5 to 1.0 are fully-connected and the others are connected to the agent with the next higher optimism-factor. The agents with highest and lowest optimism-factor are connected too, creating a closed circle. Included to investigate the influence of isolated agents.




Figure 32: Half Fully-Connected topology

Table 44: Network metrics Half Fully-Connected topology

Avg. degree	8.067
Avg. path-length	4.007
Avg. clustering coefficient	0.491
Network diameter	9
Graph density	0.278
Edge count	$\frac{\frac{N}{2}(\frac{N}{2}-1)}{2} + \frac{N}{2} + 1$

### A.3 Ascending-Connected

Each agent is connected to the agent with the next higher optimism-factor. The agents with highest and lowest optimism-factor are not connected thus this network is not a closed circle. Included because it is the most minimal network which satisfies the theory and is therefore the major network of interest throughout the thesis.




Figure 33: Ascending-Connected topology

Table 45: Network metrics Ascending-Connected topology

Avg. degree	1.933
Avg. path-length	10.33
Avg. clustering coefficient	0
Network diameter	29
Graph density	0.067
Edge count	$N - 1$

## A.4 Ascending-Connected with short-cuts

### A.4.1 Full short-cuts

Each agent is connected to the  $K$  next neighbours in the clockwise arrangement. Thus agent  $N - K + 1$  is connected to  $K - 1$  higher optimism-agents and wraps around to the agent with lowest optimism-factor. Included to analyse the influence of increasing connectivity.




Figure 34: Ascending-Connected 5 full short-cuts topology

Table 46: Network metrics Ascending-Connected 5 full short-cuts topology

Avg. degree	10
Avg. path-length	1.966
Avg. clustering coefficient	0.667
Network diameter	3
Graph density	0.345
Edge count	$NK$

### A.4.2 Regular short-cuts

The topology starts ascending-connected and each agent is additionally connected to one next neighbour in the clockwise arrangement where the distance to the next neighbour is K agents. Included to analyse the influence of trading-links to agents with much higher optimism-factor.




Figure 35: Ascending-Connected 5 regular short-cuts topology

Table 47: Network metrics Ascending-Connected 5 regular short-cuts topology

Avg. degree	3.867
Avg. path-length	2.839
Avg. clustering coefficient	0
Network diameter	6
Graph density	0.133
Edge count	$2N$

### A.4.3 Random short-cuts

Starting with an ascending-connected network this topology adds one additional short-cut from each agent to another random agent with a given probability where a probability of 0.0 results in only the ascending-connectedness and a probability of 1.0 in each agent having an additional random short-cut. Self-loops and multi-edges are not allowed. Included to analyse the influence of randomness in ascending-connected topologies.




Figure 36: Ascending-Connected random short-cuts probability 1.0 topology

Table 48: Network metrics Ascending-Connected random short-cuts topology

Avg. degree	3.867
Avg. path-length	2.506
Avg. clustering coefficient	0.056
Network diameter	5
Graph density	0.133
Edge count	min $N$ , max $2N$

## A.5 Hub-based topologies

### A.5.1 3 Hubs

The agents are separated into 3 groups based upon their optimism-factor. Group 1 ranges from 0.0 to 0.33, group 2 from 0.33 to 0.66 and group 3 from 0.66 to 1.0. All agents within a group are fully-connected where the groups are interconnected between each other through a hub which is the agent with the highest optimism-factor of each group that is: 0.33, 0.66 and 1.0. Included as a point-of-reference as this topology was discussed too in [BSV13].




Figure 37: 3 Hubs topology

Table 49: Network metrics 3 Hubs topology

Avg. degree	9.2
Avg. path-length	2.241
Avg. clustering coefficient	0.976
Network diameter	3
Graph density	0.371
Edge count	$3(\frac{\frac{N}{3}(\frac{N}{3}-1)}{2}) + 3$

### A.5.2 3 Median Hubs

There are 3 agents which act as median hubs which are the agent with the median optimism-factor and the next lower and higher ones. All three are connected to each other where the rest of the agents are randomly connected to one hub so that each hub has the same amount of agents. Included to see what happens if all agents can only trade through median agents which are the most active ones in the Fully-Connected topology.




Figure 38: 3 Median Hub topology

Table 50: Network metrics 3 Median Hub topology

Avg. degree	2
Avg. path-length	2.49
Avg. clustering coefficient	0.018
Network diameter	3
Graph density	0.069
Edge count	$N$

### A.5.3 Median Hub

All agents are connected to the agent with the median optimism-factor. Included for the same reason as in 3 median hubs but with just one median hub.




Figure 39: Median Hub topology

Table 51: Network metrics Median Hub topology

Avg. degree	1.933
Avg. path-length	1.933
Avg. clustering coefficient	0
Network diameter	2
Graph density	0.067
Edge count	$N - 1$

### A.5.4 Maximum Hub

Looks the same as 1 Median Hub but all edges are connected to the agent with the highest optimism-value. Has thus also the same metrics as the optimism-values have no functional influence on the metrics. Included just out of curiosity and has no real value as it is obviously clear that equilibrium is impossible to be reached in this case.

## A.6 Small-World and Scale-Free topologies

### A.6.1 Erods-Renyi

Each possible edge is included with a given probability where self-loops and multi-edges are omitted. See section 2.5 for a discussion of this topology. Included to investigate the influence of small-world an scale-free effects upon equilibrium and because of the randomness of the network.




Figure 40: Erdos-Renyi topology with inclusion-probability of 0.2

Table 52: Network metrics Erdosy-Renyi 0.2

Avg. degree	6.8
Avg. path-length	1.913
Avg. clustering coefficient	0.266
Network diameter	3
Graph density	0.234
Connected component	1




Figure 41: Erdos-Renyi topology with inclusion-probability of 0.1

Table 53: Network metrics Erdosy-Renyi 0.1

Avg. degree	2.933
Avg. path-length	3.262
Avg. clustering coefficient	0.103
Network diameter	7
Graph density	0.101
Connected component	1




Figure 42: Erdos-Renyi topology with inclusion-probability of 0.05

Table 54: Network metrics Erdosy-Renyi 0.05

Avg. degree	1.6
Avg. path-length	3.052
Avg. clustering coefficient	0
Network diameter	8
Graph density	0.055
Connected component	11

### A.6.2 Barabasi-Albert

One starts with  $m_0$  nodes and attaches each new node randomly to  $m$  existing nodes where the selection-probability of a node depends on its degree. See section 2.5 for a discussion of this topology. Included to investigate the influence of small-world and scale-free effects upon equilibrium and because of the randomness of the network.




Figure 43: Barabasi-Albert topology with  $m_0=3$ ,  $m=1$

Table 55: Network metrics Barabasi-Albert m0=3, m=1

Avg. degree	1.98
Avg. path-length	4.684
Avg. clustering coefficient	0
Network diameter	11
Graph density	0.02





Figure 44: Barabasi-Albert topology with m0=9, m=3

Table 56: Network metrics Barabasi-Albert m0=9, m=3


Avg. degree	4.733
Avg. path-length	2.11
Avg. clustering coefficient	0.279
Network diameter	4
Graph density	0.163

### A.6.3 Watts-Strogatz

Creates N nodes and connects each to K neighbours and rewire each then existing edge with a probability of 0.2 to a younger node. See section 2.5 for a discussion of this topology. Included to investigate the influence of small-world and scale-free effects upon equilibrium and because of the randomness of the network.

Figure 45: Watts-Strogatz topology with  $k=2$ ,  $p=0.2$ Table 57: Network metrics Watts-Strogatz  $k=2$ ,  $p=0.2$ 

Avg. degree	4
Avg. path-length	2.883
Avg. clustering coefficient	0.259
Network diameter	6
Graph density	0.138

Figure 46: Watts-Strogatz topology with  $k=4$ ,  $p=0.5$ Table 58: Network metrics Watts-Strogatz  $k=4$ ,  $p=0.5$ 

Avg. degree	8
Avg. path-length	1.823
Avg. clustering coefficient	0.241
Network diameter	3
Graph density	0.276

## Appendix B

### Results for Hub-Based, Scale-Free and Small-World

#### B.1 Half-Fully Connected




Figure 47: Wealth-Distribution of Half-Fully Connected topology

Table 59: Equilibrium of Half-Fully Connected topology

Asset-Price p	0.651 (0.027)
Bond-Price q	0.362 (0.013)
Marginal agent i1	0.640 (0.015)
Marginal agent i2	0.833 (0.09)
Pessimist Wealth	1.22 (0.096)
Medianist Wealth	2.258 (0.409)
Optimist Wealth	4.526 (0.071)

Table 60: Performance of Half-Fully Connected topology

Successful matching-rounds	14,218.9 (4621.74)
Failed matching-rounds	1034.12 (22.99)
Total matching-rounds	15,253.02 (4633.44)
Ratio successful/total	0.93
Ratio failed/total	0.07

The equilibrium is clearly distinct from the theoretical and Fully-Connected one as miss-allocation can be found within the pessimists-range. Also the i1- and i2-points and the wealth-distributions differ both numerically and visually.

## B.2 Ascending-Connected with short-cuts

### B.2.1 Random short-cuts




Figure 48: Wealth-Distribution of Ascending-Connected random short-cuts topology

Table 61: Equilibrium of Ascending-Connected random short-cuts topology

Asset-Price p	0.731 (0.019)
Bond-Price q	0.393 (0.009)
Marginal agent i1	0.649 (0.005)
Marginal agent i2	0.804 (0.004)
Pessimist Wealth	1.441 (0.03)
Medianist Wealth	4.282 (0.278)
Optimist Wealth	4.974 (0.038)

Table 62: Performance of Ascending-Connected random short-cuts topology

Successful matching-rounds	8314.78 (229.85)
Failed matching-rounds	1182.06 (29.23)
Total matching-rounds	9496.84 (228.23)
Ratio successful/total	0.87
Ratio failed/total	0.13

Random short-cuts seem to reduce the miss-allocation of pessimists-wealth a bit but lead to a fundamental different equilibrium than the theoretical or fully-connected one as can clearly be seen both visually and numerically.

### B.2.2 2 short-cuts




Figure 49: Wealth-Distribution of Ascending-Connected 2 short-cuts topology

Table 63: Equilibrium of Ascending-Connected 2 short-cuts topology

Asset-Price p	0.662 (0.024)
Bond-Price q	0.376 (0.006)
Marginal agent i1	0.608 (0.018)
Marginal agent i2	0.805 (0.028)
Pessimist Wealth	1.441 (0.21)
Medianist Wealth	3.978 (1.442)
Optimist Wealth	4.514 (0.063)

Table 64: Performance of Ascending-Connected random short-cuts topology

Successful matching-rounds	37,093.64 (12,864.4)
Failed matching-rounds	1021. (18.85)
Total matching-rounds	38,115.54 (12,851.53)
Ratio successful/total	0.97
Ratio failed/total	0.03

This topology reduces the miss-allocation in the pessimists-range dramatically but doesn't solve it yet. Unfortunately it leads to a dramatically different wealth-distribution within the medianists and optimist.

### B.2.3 5 full short-cuts




Figure 50: Wealth-Distribution of Ascending-Connected 5 full short-cuts topology

Table 65: Equilibrium of Ascending-Connected 5 full short-cuts

Asset-Price p	0.656 (0.019)
Bond-Price q	0.371 (0.003)
Marginal agent i1	0.594 (0.0)
Marginal agent i2	0.792 (0.0)
Pessimist Wealth	1.649 (0.002)
Medianist Wealth	5.013 (0.018)
Optimist Wealth	4.746 (0.011)

Table 66: Performance of Ascending-Connected 5 full short-cuts topology

Successful matching-rounds	16,971.34 (228.0)
Failed matching-rounds	1026.92 (22.68)
Total matching-rounds	17,998.26 (225.23)
Ratio successful/total	0.94
Ratio failed/total	0.06

As can be clearly seen this topology seems to be able to solve miss-allocations in the pessimists-range seen in Ascending-Connected topology but is still different than the theoretical and Fully-Connected equilibrium.

#### B.2.4 15 full short-cuts




Figure 51: Wealth-Distribution of Ascending-Connected 15 full short-cuts topology

Table 67: Equilibrium of Ascending-Connected 15 full short-cuts topology

Asset-Price p	0.658 (0.024)
Bond-Price q	0.366 (0.009)
Marginal agent i1	0.601 (0.004)
Marginal agent i2	0.802 (0.0)
Pessimist Wealth	1.649 (0.004)
Medianist Wealth	4.811 (0.092)
Optimist Wealth	4.957 (0.021)

Table 68: Performance of Ascending-Connected 15 full short-cuts topology

Successful matching-rounds	4498.08 (58.67)
Failed matching-rounds	1024.78 (17.3)
Total matching-rounds	5522.860 (64.72)
Ratio successful/total	0.81
Ratio failed/total	0.19

This topology comes very close to the theoretical equilibrium but is still a bit different as can be seen in the curved wealth-distributions of the pure optimists.

### B.2.5 30 full short-cuts




Figure 52: Wealth-Distribution of Ascending-Connected 30 full short-cuts topology

Table 69: Equilibrium of Ascending-Connected 30 full short-cuts topology

Asset-Price p	0.681 (0.012)
Bond-Price q	0.378 (0.006)
Marginal agent i1	0.603 (0.006)
Marginal agent i2	0.802 (0.1)
Pessimist Wealth	1.649 (0.009)
Medianist Wealth	4.702 (0.112)
Optimist Wealth	5.004 (0.025)

Table 70: Performance of Ascending-Connected 30 full short-cuts topology

Successful matching-rounds	2211.08 (35.88)
Failed matching-rounds	1014.68 (10.55)
Total matching-rounds	3225.76 (40.18)
Ratio successful/total	0.68
Ratio failed/total	0.32

This topology is very close to the theoretical and Fully-Connected equilibrium although it differs in asset-price p and in the wealth-distributions. Of course with 30 fully short-cuts in a network of 100 agents one is already very close to fully connectedness.

### B.2.6 5 regular short-cuts




Figure 53: Wealth-Distribution of Ascending-Connected 5 regular short-cuts topology

Table 71: Equilibrium of Ascending-Connected 5 regular short-cuts topology

Asset-Price p	0.665 (0.016)
Bond-Price q	0.364 (0.007)
Marginal agent i1	0.595 (0.003)
Marginal agent i2	0.792 (0.0)
Pessimist Wealth	1.649 (0.003)
Medianist Wealth	4.991 (0.045)
Optimist Wealth	4.727 (0.011)

Table 72: Performance of Ascending-Connected 5 regular short-cuts topology

Successful matching-rounds	14,570.44 (157.61)
Failed matching-rounds	1064.24 (29.88)
Total matching-rounds	15,634.68 (166.21)
Ratio successful/total	0.93
Ratio failed/total	0.07

As can be seen in the visual results this topology shows a different equilibrium than the theoretical and Fully-Connected one.

### B.2.7 15 regular short-cuts




Figure 54: Wealth-Distribution of Ascending-Connected 15 regular short-cuts topology

Table 73: Equilibrium Ascending-Connected 15 regular short-cuts topology

Asset-Price p	0.705 (0.020)
Bond-Price q	0.357 (0.018)
Marginal agent i1	0.586 (0.023)
Marginal agent i2	0.802 (0.0)
Pessimist Wealth	1.649 (0.051)
Medianist Wealth	4.146 (0.101)
Optimist Wealth	4.997 (0.007)

Table 74: Performance of Ascending-Connected 15 regular short-cuts topology

Successful matching-rounds	4373.28 (50.13)
Failed matching-rounds	1129.24 (19.2)
Total matching-rounds	5502.52 (52.11)
Ratio successful/total	0.79
Ratio failed/total	0.21

The equilibrium of this topology is falls very far from the theoretical and Fully-Connected one.

### B.2.8 30 regular short-cuts




Figure 55: Wealth-Distribution of Ascending-Connected 30 regular short-cuts topology

Table 75: Equilibrium of Ascending-Connected 30 regular short-cuts topology

Asset-Price p	0.710 (0.021)
Bond-Price q	0.398 (0.008)
Marginal agent i1	0.589 (0.021)
Marginal agent i2	0.802 (0.0)
Pessimist Wealth	1.479 (0.049)
Medianist Wealth	3.713 (0.125)
Optimist Wealth	5.0 (0.0)

Table 76: Performance of Ascending-Connected 30 regular short-cuts topology

Successful matching-rounds	5427.02 (90.82)
Failed matching-rounds	1139.04 (27.74)
Total matching-rounds	6566.06 (96.04)
Ratio successful/total	0.82
Ratio failed/total	0.18

The equilibrium of this topology is falls very far from the theoretical and Fully-Connected one.

### B.3 Hub-Based topologies

The Hub-Based Topologies fail to come even close to equilibrium due to reasons given in chapter 4 "Hypothesis". This can be seen also very clearly in the visual results and thus no performance- and equilibrium-tables are listed as they would not make any sense.

### B.3.1 3-Hubs




Figure 56: Wealth-Distribution of 3-Hubs topology

### B.3.2 1-Median Hub




Figure 57: Wealth-Distribution of 1 Median-Hub topology

### B.3.3 3-Median Hubs




Figure 58: Wealth-Distribution of 3 Median-Hubs topology

### B.3.4 Maximum Hub




Figure 59: Wealth-Distribution of Maximum-Hub topology

## B.4 Scale-Free and Small-World topologies

This topologies fail to come even close to equilibrium too due to reasons given in chapter 4 "Hypothesis". This can be seen also very clearly in the visual results and thus no performance- and equilibrium-tables are listed as they would not make any sense.

### B.4.1 Erdos-Renyi

Note that with the correct parametrization this topology could satisfy the hypothesis by pure chance. The result would be a pure random network as an Ascending-Connected topology with random short-cuts but as already showed above this Ascending-Connected random short-cuts network fails from producing the theoretical and Fully-Connected equilibrium.




Figure 60: Wealth-Distribution of Erdos-Renyi 0.2 topology




Figure 61: Wealth-Distribution of Erdos-Renyi 0.1 topology




Figure 62: Wealth-Distribution of Erdos-Renyi 0.05 topology

#### B.4.2 Barbasi-Albert






Figure 63: Wealth-Distribution of Barabasi-Albert  $m_0=3$ ,  $m=1$  topology

Figure 64: Wealth-Distribution of Barabasi-Albert  $m_0=9$ ,  $m=3$  topology

#### B.4.3 Watts-Strogatz

Note that with the correct parametrization this topology could satisfy the hypothesis by pure chance too. The result would be a pure random network as an Ascending-Connected topology with random short-cuts but as already showed above this Ascending-Connected random short-cuts network fails from producing the theoretical and Fully-Connected equilibrium.

Figure 65: Wealth-Distribution of Watts-Strogatz  $k=2$ ,  $b=0.2$  topology

## **Appendix C**

### **Increasing the matching-probabilities in Ascending-Connected topology**

TODO: genaue analyse und formeln. ABER: ist dafür genug zeit oder soll das auf further research and conclusions geschoben werden?

# Figures

1	Illustrative supply and demand curves. Diagram taken from [PMNP06] . . . . .	12
2	Matching of buyers and sellers price-ranges. The red rectangle marks the matching-range. . . . .	30
3	Package-diagram with most important classes and associations illustrating the architecture. (Note that the software contains many more classes and associations which are omitted for clarity reasons as this diagram should provide only a basic overview and would contain by far too much information if everything would have been included.) . . . . .	38
4	Pairwise probabilities of falling into coverage-range of 30 agents in Ascending-Connected topology on Asset/Cash market . . . . .	51
5	Pairwise matching-probabilities of 30 Agents in Ascending-Connected topology on Asset/Cash market . . . . .	52
6	Pairwise matching-probabilities of 50 Agents in Ascending-Connected topology on Asset/Cash market . . . . .	52
7	Wealth-Distribution of thesis-implementation of Fully-Connected topology for 1,000 agents and 0.5 bond . . . . .	56
8	Wealth-distribution of Fully-Connected topology . . . . .	60
9	Wealth-distribution of Ascending-Connected topology . . . . .	61
10	Wealth-distribution of Ascending-Connected Importance Sampling topology . . . . .	62
11	Market-activity stages of Ascending-Connected topology . . . . .	66
12	Wealth-Distribution of Ascending-Connected topology during Stage 1 . . . . .	67
13	Wealth-Distribution of Ascending-Connected topology during Stage 2 . . . . .	68

14	Wealth-Distribution of Ascending-Connected topology during Stage 3 . . . . .	68
15	Final wealth-distribution of Ascending-Connected topology after a single run . . . . .	70
16	Wealth-Distribution of Fully-Connected topology with Collateral/Cash market . . . . .	75
17	Wealth-Distribution of Ascending-Connected topology with Collateral/Cash market . . . . .	76
18	Market-activity stages of Fully-Connected topology with Collateral/Cash market . . . . .	80
19	Wealth-Distribution of Fully-Connected topology with Collateral/Cash market during Stage 1 . . . . .	81
20	Wealth-Distribution of Fully-Connected topology with Collateral/Cash market during Stage 2 . . . . .	81
21	Wealth-Distribution of Fully-Connected topology with Collateral/Cash market during Stage 3 . . . . .	82
22	Wealth-Distribution of Fully-Connected topology with Collateral/Cash market during Stage 4 . . . . .	83
23	Market-activity stages of Ascending-Connected topology with deferred activated Collateral/Cash market . . . . .	83
24	Wealth-Distribution of Ascending-Connected topology with deferred activated Collateral/Cash market during Stage 4 . . . . .	84
25	Wealth-Distribution of Ascending-Connected topology with deferred activated Collateral/Cash market during Stage 5 . . . . .	84
26	Market-activity stages of Ascending-Connected topology with Collateral/Cash market . . . . .	85
27	Wealth-Distribution of Ascending-Connected topology with Collateral/Cash market during Stage 1 . . . . .	85
28	Wealth-Distribution of Ascending-Connected topology with Collateral/Cash market during Stage 2 . . . . .	86
29	Wealth-Distribution of Ascending-Connected topology with Collateral/Cash market during Stage 3 . . . . .	87
30	Wealth-Distribution of Ascending-Connected topology with Collateral/Cash market during Stage 4 . . . . .	87
31	Fully-Connected topology . . . . .	92
32	Half Fully-Connected topology . . . . .	93
33	Ascending-Connected topology . . . . .	95
34	Ascending-Connected 5 full short-cuts topology . . . . .	96
35	Ascending-Connected 5 regular short-cuts topology . . . . .	98

36	Ascending-Connected random short-cuts probability 1.0 topology . . . . .	99
37	3 Hubs topology . . . . .	101
38	3 Median Hub topology . . . . .	102
39	Median Hub topology . . . . .	104
40	Erdos-Renyi topology with inclusion-probability of 0.2 . . . . .	106
41	Erdos-Renyi topology with inclusion-probability of 0.1 . . . . .	107
42	Erdos-Renyi topology with inclusion-probability of 0.05 . . . . .	108
43	Barbasi-Albert topology with $m_0=3$ , $m=1$ . . . . .	109
44	Barbasi-Albert topology with $m_0=9$ , $m=3$ . . . . .	110
45	Watts-Strogatz topology with $k=2$ , $p=0.2$ . . . . .	112
46	Watts-Strogatz topology with $k=4$ , $p=0.5$ . . . . .	113
47	Wealth-Distribution of Half-Fully Connected topology . . . . .	114
48	Wealth-Distribution of Ascending-Connected random short-cuts topology . . . . .	115
49	Wealth-Distribution of Ascending-Connected 2 short-cuts topology . . . . .	116
50	Wealth-Distribution of Ascending-Connected 5 full short-cuts topology . . . . .	117
51	Wealth-Distribution of Ascending-Connected 15 full short-cuts topology . . . . .	118
52	Wealth-Distribution of Ascending-Connected 30 full short-cuts topology . . . . .	119
53	Wealth-Distribution of Ascending-Connected 5 regular short-cuts topology . . . . .	120
54	Wealth-Distribution of Ascending-Connected 15 regular short-cuts topology . . . . .	121
55	Wealth-Distribution of Ascending-Connected 30 regular short-cuts topology . . . . .	122
56	Wealth-Distribution of 3-Hubs topology . . . . .	124
57	Wealth-Distribution of 1 Median-Hub topology . . . . .	124
58	Wealth-Distribution of 3 Median-Hubs topology . . . . .	125
59	Wealth-Distribution of Maximum-Hub topology . . . . .	125
60	Wealth-Distribution of Erdos-Renyi 0.2 topology . . . . .	126
61	Wealth-Distribution of Erdos-Renyi 0.1 topology . . . . .	126
62	Wealth-Distribution of Erdos-Renyi 0.05 topology . . . . .	127
63	Wealth-Distribution of Barbasi-Albert $m_0=3$ , $m=1$ topology .	127
64	Wealth-Distribution of Barbasi-Albert $m_0=9$ , $m=3$ topology .	128
65	Wealth-Distribution of Watts-Strogatz $k=2$ , $b=0.2$ topology .	128

# List of Tables

1	Bid-Offering parameters of Asset/Cash market . . . . .	43
2	Ask-Offering parameters of Asset/Cash market . . . . .	43
3	Wealth-Exchange during a match on Asset/Cash market . . . . .	43
4	Bid-Offering parameters of Bond/Cash market . . . . .	44
5	Ask-Offering parameters of Bond/Cash market . . . . .	45
6	Wealth-Exchange during a match on Bond/Cash market . . . . .	45
7	Bid-Offering parameters of Asset/Bond market . . . . .	46
8	Bid-Offering parameters of Asset/Bond market . . . . .	46
9	Wealth-Exchange during a match on Asset/Loan market . . . . .	47
10	Theoretical equilibrium for 1,000 agents and 0.5 bond . . . . .	56
11	Equilibrium in [BSV13] for 1,000 agents and 0.5 bond . . . . .	56
12	Equilibrium of thesis-implementation for 1,000 agents and 0.5 bond . . . . .	57
13	Difference of Fully-Connected topology price-equilibrium as given in table 12 to theoretical equilibrium as given in table 10	57
14	Difference of Fully-Connected topology wealth-equilibrium as given in table 12 to wealth-equilibrium as given in [BSV13] from table 11 . . . . .	57
15	Performance of thesis-implementation with 1000 agents and 0.5 bond . . . . .	58
16	Configuration for all experiments . . . . .	59
17	Theoretical Equilibrium for 100 agents and 0.5 bond . . . . .	59
18	Equilibrium of Fully-Connected topology . . . . .	60
19	Performance of Fully-Connected topology . . . . .	60
20	Difference to theoretical equilibrium . . . . .	60
21	Equilibrium of Ascending-Connected topology . . . . .	61
22	Performance of Ascending-Connected topology . . . . .	61
23	Difference to theoretical equilibrium . . . . .	62
24	Difference to Fully-Connected topology equilibrium . . . . .	62

25	Equilibrium of Ascending-Connected Importance Sampling topology . . . . .	63
26	Performance of Ascending-Connected Importance Sampling topology . . . . .	63
27	Difference to theoretical equilibrium . . . . .	63
28	Difference to Fully-Connected topology equilibrium . . . . .	64
29	Bid-Offering parameters . . . . .	73
30	Ask-Offering parameters . . . . .	74
31	Wealth-Exchange on match . . . . .	74
32	Configuration for all experiments . . . . .	74
33	Equilibrium of Fully-Connected topology with Collateral/Cash market . . . . .	75
34	Performance of Fully-Connected topology with Collateral/-Cash market . . . . .	75
35	Difference of Fully-Connected topology to theoretical equilibrium as given in Table 17 of Chapter 6 "Results" . . . . .	76
36	Difference of Fully-Connected topology to equilibrium without Collateral/Cash market as given in Table 18 of Chapter 6 "Results" . . . . .	76
37	Equilibrium of Ascending-Connected topology . . . . .	77
38	Performance of Ascending-Connected topology . . . . .	77
39	Difference of Ascending-Connected topology to theoretical equilibrium as given in Table 17 of Chapter 6 "Results" . . . . .	77
40	Difference of Ascending-Connected topology to equilibrium without Collateral/Cash market as given in Table 21 of Chapter 6 "Results" . . . . .	77
41	Difference of Ascending-Connected to equilibrium of fully-connected topology with Collateral/Cash market as given above . . . . .	78
42	Difference of Ascending-Connected to equilibrium of fully-connected without Collateral/Cash market as given in Table 18 of Chapter 6 "Results" . . . . .	78
43	Network metrics Fully-Connected topology . . . . .	92
44	Network metrics Half Fully-Connected topology . . . . .	94
45	Network metrics Ascending-Connected topology . . . . .	95
46	Network metrics Ascending-Connected 5 full short-cuts topology	97
47	Network metrics Ascending-Connected 5 regular short-cuts topology . . . . .	98
48	Network metrics Ascending-Connected random short-cuts topology . . . . .	100

49	Network metrics 3 Hubs topology . . . . .	101
50	Network metrics 3 Median Hub topology . . . . .	103
51	Network metrics Median Hub topology . . . . .	104
52	Network metrics Erdosy-Renyi 0.2 . . . . .	106
53	Network metrics Erdosy-Renyi 0.1 . . . . .	107
54	Network metrics Erdosy-Renyi 0.05 . . . . .	108
55	Network metrics Barbsi-Albert m0=3, m=1 . . . . .	110
56	Network metrics Barbsi-Albert m0=9, m=3 . . . . .	111
57	Network metrics Watts-Strogatz k=2, p=0.2 . . . . .	112
58	Network metrics Watts-Strogatz k=4, p=0.5 . . . . .	113
59	Equilibrium of Half-Fully Connected topology . . . . .	115
60	Performance of Half-Fully Connected topology . . . . .	115
61	Equilibrium of Ascending-Connected random short-cuts topology . . . . .	116
62	Performance of Ascending-Connected random short-cuts topology . . . . .	116
63	Equilibrium of Ascending-Connected 2 short-cuts topology . . . . .	117
64	Performance of Ascending-Connected random short-cuts topology . . . . .	117
65	Equilibrium of Ascending-Connected 5 full short-cuts . . . . .	118
66	Performance of Ascending-Connected 5 full short-cuts topology	118
67	Equilibrium of Ascending-Connected 15 full short-cuts topology	119
68	Performance of Ascending-Connected 15 full short-cuts topology	119
69	Equilibrium of Ascending-Connected 30 full short-cuts topology	120
70	Performance of Ascending-Connected 30 full short-cuts topology	120
71	Equilibrium of Ascending-Connected 5 regular short-cuts topology . . . . .	121
72	Performance of Ascending-Connected 5 regular short-cuts topology . . . . .	121
73	Equilibrium Ascending-Connected 15 regular short-cuts topology . . . . .	122
74	Performance of Ascending-Connected 15 regular short-cuts topology . . . . .	122
75	Equilibrium of Ascending-Connected 30 regular short-cuts topology . . . . .	123
76	Performance of Ascending-Connected 30 regular short-cuts topology . . . . .	123

# Glossary

**allocative efficiency** Is a state in which all products match the consumers preferences. In other words it means that goods are distributed optimally between all consumers reflecting the wants and tastes of the agents involved. If allocative efficiency is at 100% then it is not possible any more to increase the utilities of *both* traders in a case of a trade thus traders are no more willing to trade. In other words if two agents trade at an allocative efficiency of 100% then one agent will decrease its utility and will lose.. 15

**auction** Is a market institution in which messages from traders include some price information.. 12

**buyer** A trader who is willing to buy a given amount of good for a given price.. 12

**clearing** Is the process of finding a price in which all demands are matched to the given supplies thus clearing the market by leaving no unmatched demands or supplies.. 12

**good** A generic object which is traded between agents. Can be an asset, food, gold,... 12

**limit-price** Is the private price a trader assigns to a good they want to exchange. This private price is different from the price in the offering and is higher in case of the buyer and lower in the case of the seller.. 12

**market institution** Defines how exchange between traders takes place by defining rules what traders can do.. 12

**numeraire** A generic form of money.. 12

**offer** A tuple of price and quantity on a given market which signals the willingness to trade by these given quantities.. 12

**offer-book** Keeps all offers made by the traders.. 12

**round** In each round all traders have the opportunity to place an offer. At the end of each round matching is applied and if a successful match is found the unmatched offers are deleted from the offer-book.. 12, 14

**seller** A trader who is willing to sell a given amount of good for a given price.. 12

**transaction-price** Is the price upon a buyer and a seller agree when trading with each other.. 14

**zero-intelligence agents** Place offers strictly in a range which increases their utility and do not learn. They are completely deterministic in a way that they never change their behaviour.. 13

# Bibliography

- [ACL01] William Aiello, Fan R. K. Chung, and Linyuan Lu. Random evolution in massive graphs. In *FOCS*, page 510–519, 2001.
- [AlB99] Réka Albert and Albert lászló Barabási. Statistical mechanics of complex networks. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, page 2002, 1999.
- [AlB02] Réka Albert and Albert lászló Barabási. Emergence of scaling in random networks. *Science*, page 286(5439):509–512, 2002.
- [ASBS00] L. A. N. Amaral, A. Scala, M. Barthélemy, and H. E. Stanley. Classes of small-world networks. In *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, page 97(21):11149–11152, 2000.
- [Bor10] Milan Boran. Market dynamics and systemic risk. *23rd Australasian Finance and Banking Conference 2010*, 2010.
- [Bri12] Eugene F. Brigham. Fundamentals of financial management. 2012.
- [BSV13] Thomas Breuer, Martin Summer, and Hans-Joachim Vollbrecht. Endogenous leverage and asset pricing in double auctions. 2013.
- [BW00] A. Barrat and M. Weigt. On the properties of small-world network models. In *The European Physical Journal B - Condensed Matter and Complex Systems*, page 13(3):547–560, 2000.
- [EMB02] Holger Ebel, Lutz-Ingo Mielsch, and Stefan Bornholdt. Scale-free topology of e-mail networks. *Phys. Rev. E*, page 66:035103, 2002.
- [ER59] P. Erdős and A Rényi. On random graphs. In *Publicationes Mathematicae*, pages 6:290—297, 1959.

- [ER60] P. Erdős and A Rényi. On the evolution of random graphs. In *PUBLICATION OF THE MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE OF THE HUNGARIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES*, pages 17–61, 1960.
- [Gea09] John Geanakoplos. The leverage cycle. Jul 2009.
- [GP04] M. Gaertler and M. Patrignani. Dynamic analysis of the autonomous system graph. In *IPS 2004, International Workshop on Inter-domain Performance and Simulation*, page pages 13–24, 2004.
- [GS93] Dhananjay K Gode and Shyam Sunder. Allocative efficiency of markets with zero-intelligence traders: Market as a partial substitute for individual rationality. *Journal of Political Economy*, 101(1):119–37, 1993.
- [Kle00] Jon Kleinberg. The small-world phenomenon: An algorithmic perspective. In *in Proceedings of the 32nd ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 163–170, 2000.
- [Kle02] Judith S. Kleinfeld. Could it be a big world after all ? *Society*, page 39(2):61–66, 2002.
- [Mil67] Stanley Milgram. The small world problem. *Pyschology Today*, page 1:61–67, 1967.
- [New03] M. E. J. Newman. The structure and function of complex networks. *SIAM REVIEW*, 45:167–256, 2003.
- [New06] M. E. J. Newman. Finding community structure in networks using the eigenvectors of matrices. *Physical Review E (Statistical, Nonlinear, and Soft Matter Physics)*, 74(3), 2006.
- [PMNP06] Simon Parsons, Marek Marcinkiewicz, Jinzhong Niu, and Steve Phelps. Everything you wanted to know about double auctions, but were afraid to (bid or) ask. 2006.
- [TM69] J. Travers and Stanley Milgram. An experimental study of the small world problem. *Sociometry*, page 32:425–443, 1969.
- [WS98] D. J. Watts and S. H. Strogatz. Collective dynamics of 'small-world' networks. In *Nature*, page 393:440–442, June 1998.