

---

# Theories of Liquidity

---

# Theories of Liquidity

---

**Dimitri Vayanos**

*London School of Economics  
CEPR and NBER  
UK*

*d.vayanos@lse.ac.uk*

**Jiang Wang**

*Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
CAFR and NBER  
USA*

*wangj@mit.edu*

**now**

the essence of **know**ledge

Boston – Delft

## Foundations and Trends<sup>®</sup> in Finance

*Published, sold and distributed by:*

now Publishers Inc.  
PO Box 1024  
Hanover, MA 02339  
USA  
Tel. +1-781-985-4510  
[www.nowpublishers.com](http://www.nowpublishers.com)  
[sales@nowpublishers.com](mailto:sales@nowpublishers.com)

*Outside North America:*

now Publishers Inc.  
PO Box 179  
2600 AD Delft  
The Netherlands  
Tel. +31-6-51115274

The preferred citation for this publication is D. Vayanos and J. Wang, Theories of Liquidity, Foundations and Trends<sup>®</sup> in Finance, vol 6, no 4, pp 221–317, 2011

ISBN: 978-1-60198-598-9

© 2012 D. Vayanos and J. Wang

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission of the publishers.

Photocopying. In the USA: This journal is registered at the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923. Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use, or the internal or personal use of specific clients, is granted by now Publishers Inc for users registered with the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC). The 'services' for users can be found on the internet at: [www.copyright.com](http://www.copyright.com)

For those organizations that have been granted a photocopy license, a separate system of payment has been arranged. Authorization does not extend to other kinds of copying, such as that for general distribution, for advertising or promotional purposes, for creating new collective works, or for resale. In the rest of the world: Permission to photocopy must be obtained from the copyright owner. Please apply to now Publishers Inc., PO Box 1024, Hanover, MA 02339, USA; Tel. +1-781-871-0245; [www.nowpublishers.com](http://www.nowpublishers.com); [sales@nowpublishers.com](mailto:sales@nowpublishers.com)

now Publishers Inc. has an exclusive license to publish this material worldwide. Permission to use this content must be obtained from the copyright license holder. Please apply to now Publishers, PO Box 179, 2600 AD Delft, The Netherlands, [www.nowpublishers.com](http://www.nowpublishers.com); e-mail: [sales@nowpublishers.com](mailto:sales@nowpublishers.com)

**Foundations and Trends<sup>®</sup> in  
Finance**

Volume 6 Issue 4, 2011

**Editorial Board**

**Editor-in-Chief:**

**George M. Constantinides**

*Leo Melamed Professor of Finance*

*The University of Chicago*

*Graduate School of Business*

*5807 South Woodlawn Avenue*

*Chicago IL 60637*

*USA*

*[gmc@gsb.uchicago.edu](mailto:gmc@gsb.uchicago.edu)*

**Editors**

**Franklin Allen**

*Nippon Life Professor of Finance and Economics,*

*The Wharton School, The University of Pennsylvania*

**Andrew W. Lo**

*Harris & Harris Group Professor, Sloan School of Management,*

*Massachusetts Institute of Technology*

**René M. Stulz**

*Everett D. Reese Chair of Banking and Monetary Economics,*

*Fisher College of Business, The Ohio State University*

## Editorial Scope

**Foundations and Trends<sup>®</sup> in Finance** will publish survey and tutorial articles in the following topics:

- Corporate Finance
  - Corporate Governance
  - Corporate Financing
  - Dividend Policy and Capital Structure
  - Corporate Control
  - Investment Policy
  - Agency Theory and Information
- Financial Markets
  - Market Microstructure
  - Portfolio Theory
  - Financial Intermediation
  - Investment Banking
  - Market Efficiency
  - Security Issuance
  - Anomalies and Behavioral Finance
- Asset Pricing
  - Asset-Pricing Theory
  - Asset-Pricing Models
  - Tax Effects
  - Liquidity
  - Equity Risk Premium
  - Pricing Models and Volatility
  - Fixed Income Securities
- Derivatives
  - Computational Finance
  - Futures Markets and Hedging
  - Financial Engineering
  - Interest Rate Derivatives
  - Credit Derivatives
  - Financial Econometrics
  - Estimating Volatilities and Correlations

### Information for Librarians

Foundations and Trends<sup>®</sup> in Finance, 2011, Volume 6, 4 issues. ISSN paper version 1567-2395. ISSN online version 1567-2409. Also available as a combined paper and online subscription.

Foundations and Trends® in  
Finance  
Vol. 6, No. 4 (2011) 221–317  
© 2012 D. Vayanos and J. Wang  
DOI: 10.1561/05000000014



## Theories of Liquidity

Dimitri Vayanos<sup>1</sup> and Jiang Wang<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *London School of Economics, CEPR and NBER, UK, [d.vayanos@lse.ac.uk](mailto:d.vayanos@lse.ac.uk)*

<sup>2</sup> *Massachusetts Institute of Technology, CAFR and NBER, USA, [wangj@mit.edu](mailto:wangj@mit.edu)*

### Abstract

We survey the theoretical literature on market liquidity. The literature traces illiquidity, i.e., the lack of liquidity, to underlying market imperfections. We consider six main imperfections: participation costs, transaction costs, asymmetric information, imperfect competition, funding constraints, and search. We address three questions in the context of each imperfection: (a) how to measure illiquidity, (b) how illiquidity relates to underlying market imperfections and other asset characteristics, and (c) how illiquidity affects expected asset returns. We nest all six imperfections within a common, unified model, and use that model to organize the literature.

## Contents

---

|          |  |           |
|----------|--|-----------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>Introduction</b>                    | <b>1</b>  |
| <b>2</b> | <b>Model</b>                           | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>3</b> | <b>Perfect-Market Benchmark</b>        | <b>13</b> |
| 3.1      | Equilibrium                            | 13        |
| 3.2      | Illiquidity and its Effect on Price    | 16        |
| <b>4</b> | <b>Participation Costs</b>             | <b>21</b> |
| 4.1      | Equilibrium                            | 22        |
| 4.2      | Participation Costs and Illiquidity    | 24        |
| 4.3      | Literature                             | 25        |
| <b>5</b> | <b>Transaction Costs</b>               | <b>29</b> |
| 5.1      | Equilibrium                            | 30        |
| 5.2      | Transaction Costs and Illiquidity      | 32        |
| 5.3      | Literature                             | 33        |
| <b>6</b> | <b>Asymmetric Information</b>          | <b>39</b> |
| 6.1      | Equilibrium                            | 40        |
| 6.2      | Asymmetric Information and Illiquidity | 42        |
| 6.3      | Literature                             | 45        |

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>7 Imperfect Competition</b>            | <b>49</b> |
| 7.1 Equilibrium                           | 50        |
| 7.2 Imperfect Competition and Illiquidity | 52        |
| 7.3 Literature                            | 54        |
| <b>8 Funding Constraints</b>              | <b>63</b> |
| 8.1 Equilibrium                           | 64        |
| 8.2 Funding Constraints and Illiquidity   | 67        |
| 8.3 Literature                            | 69        |
| <b>9 Search</b>                           | <b>75</b> |
| 9.1 Equilibrium                           | 76        |
| 9.2 Search and Illiquidity                | 77        |
| 9.3 Literature                            | 79        |
| <b>10 Conclusion</b>                      | <b>83</b> |
| <b>Acknowledgments</b>                    | <b>85</b> |
| <b>References</b>                         | <b>87</b> |



# 1

---

## Introduction

---

Under the standard Arrow–Debreu paradigm, trading in financial markets involves no frictions and liquidity is perfect. In practice, however, frictions of varying importance are present in all markets and reduce liquidity. A large and growing theoretical literature traces illiquidity, i.e., the lack of liquidity, to underlying market imperfections such as asymmetric information, different forms of trading costs, and funding constraints. It also studies how imperfections affect expected asset returns through their influence on liquidity. This literature is complemented by a large and growing empirical literature that estimates measures of illiquidity and relates them to asset characteristics and asset returns.

In this paper, we survey the theoretical literature on market liquidity. We focus on six main imperfections studied in the literature: participation costs, transaction costs, asymmetric information, imperfect competition, funding constraints, and search. These imperfections map into six different theories of illiquidity. We address three basic questions in the context of each imperfection: (a) how to measure illiquidity, (b) how illiquidity relates to underlying market imperfections and other asset characteristics, and (c) how illiquidity affects expected asset returns.

## 2 Introduction

The theoretical literature on market liquidity often employs different modeling assumptions when studying different imperfections. For example, papers on trading costs typically assume life-cycle or risk-sharing motives to trade, while papers on asymmetric information often rely on noise traders. Some papers on asymmetric information further assume risk-neutral market makers who can take unlimited positions, while papers on other imperfections typically assume risk aversion or position limits. Instead of surveying this literature in a descriptive manner, we use a common, unified model to study all six imperfections that we consider, and for each imperfection we address the three basic questions within that model. Our model generates many of the key results shown in the literature, and serves as a point of reference for surveying other results derived in different or more complicated settings. We use the same model in Vayanos and Wang (2012b), where we survey both the theoretical and the empirical literature on market liquidity. This paper focuses on the theoretical literature only, surveys it more extensively, and analyzes the model in greater depth.

Our model has three periods,  $t = 0, 1, 2$ . In Periods 0 and 1, risk-averse agents can trade a riskless and a risky asset that pay off in Period 2. In Period 0, agents are identical so no trade occurs. In Period 1, agents can be one of two types. Liquidity demanders receive an endowment correlated with the risky asset's payoff, and need to trade to share risk. They can trade with liquidity suppliers, who receive no endowment. Agents learn whether or not they will receive the endowment in an interim period  $t = 1/2$ . While we model heterogeneity through endowments, our analysis would be similar for other types of heterogeneity, e.g., different beliefs or investment opportunities. Market imperfections concern trade in Period 1. We consider six imperfections, studied extensively in the theoretical literature:

1. *Participation costs*: In the perfect-market benchmark, all agents are present in the market in all periods. Thus, a seller, for example, can have immediate access to the entire population of buyers. In practice, however, agents face costs of market participation, e.g., to monitor market movements and have ready access to a financial exchange. To model costly

participation, we assume that agents must incur a cost to trade in Period 1. Consistent with the notion that participation is an ex-ante decision, we assume that agents must decide whether or not to incur the cost in Period 1/2, i.e., after learning whether or not they will receive an endowment but before observing the price in Period 1. A related imperfection is that of entry costs, e.g., learning about an asset. The cost would then concern buying the asset in Period 0.

2. *Transaction costs*: In addition to costs of market participation, agents typically pay costs when executing transactions. Transaction costs drive a wedge between the buying and selling price of an asset. They come in many types, e.g., brokerage commissions, exchange fees, transaction taxes, bid-ask spreads, and price impact. Some types of transaction costs, such as price impact, can be viewed as a consequence of other market imperfections, while other types, such as transaction taxes, can be viewed as more primitive. We assume that transaction costs concern trade in Period 1. The difference with participation costs is that the decision whether or not to incur the transaction costs is contingent on the price in Period 1.
3. *Asymmetric information*: In the perfect-market benchmark, all agents have the same information about the payoff of the risky asset. In practice, however, agents can have different information because they have access to different sources of information or have different abilities to process information from the same source. To model asymmetric information, we assume that some agents observe in Period 1 a private signal about the asset payoff. We assume that these agents are the liquidity demanders. This assumption is without loss of generality in our model. It allows us to determine how the supply of liquidity is influenced by the concern of liquidity suppliers about trading against better-informed agents.
4. *Imperfect competition*: In the perfect-market benchmark, agents are competitive and have no effect on prices. In many markets, however, some agents are large relative to others

#### 4 Introduction

in the sense that they can influence prices, either because of their size or because of their information advantage. We model imperfect competition by assuming that some agents can exert market power in Period 1. We mainly focus on the case where liquidity demanders behave as a single monopolist, and consider, more briefly, monopolistic behavior by liquidity suppliers. We consider both the cases where liquidity demanders have no private information on asset payoffs, and so information is symmetric, and where they observe a private signal.

5. *Funding constraints*: Agents' portfolios often involve leverage, i.e., borrow cash to establish a long position in a risky asset, or borrow a risky asset to sell it short. In the perfect-market benchmark, agents can borrow freely provided that they have enough resources to repay the loan. But as the Corporate Finance literature emphasizes, various frictions can limit agents' ability to borrow and fund their positions. We derive a funding constraint by assuming that agents cannot pledge some of their future income. Because our focus is on how the funding constraint influences the supply of liquidity, we impose it on liquidity suppliers only, i.e., assume that only they are unable to pledge their income.
6. *Search*: In the perfect-market benchmark, the market is organized as a centralized exchange. Many markets, however, have a more decentralized form of organization. For example, in over-the-counter markets, investors negotiate prices bilaterally with dealers. Locating suitable counterparties in these markets can take time and involve search. To model decentralized markets, we assume that agents do not meet in a centralized exchange in Period 1, but instead must search for counterparties. When a liquidity demander meets a supplier, they bargain bilaterally over the terms of trade.

We determine how each imperfection affects measures of illiquidity in Period 1. We consider two such measures. The first is  $\lambda$ , defined

as the regression coefficient of the return between Periods 0 and 1 on liquidity demanders' signed volume in Period 1. This measure characterizes the price impact of volume, which has a transitory and a permanent component. The second is price reversal, defined as minus the autocovariance of returns. This measure characterizes the importance of the transitory component in price, which in our model is entirely driven by volume. Lambda and price reversal have been derived in theoretical models focusing on specific market imperfections, and have been widely used in empirical work ever since.

In addition to the effect of imperfections on illiquidity in Period 1, we determine their effect on the ex-ante expected return as of Period 0, i.e., how does the expected return that agents require to buy the risky asset in Period 0 depend on the imperfections that they anticipate to face in Period 1. Many of the effects of imperfections that we derive within our model have been derived in the literature, albeit in a less systematic and unified manner. We highlight the links with the literature, and use more generally our model to organize and survey it. Many models in the literature can be viewed as enrichments of our model in terms of, e.g., information structure, agent characteristics, and dynamics.

Deriving the effects of the imperfections in a systematic manner within a unified model delivers new insights. We show, for example, that most imperfections raise lambda, but fewer raise price reversal. Thus, lambda is a more accurate measure of the imperfections. Intuitively, lambda measures the price impact per unit trade, while price reversal concerns the impact of the entire trade. Market imperfections generally raise the price impact per unit trade, but because they also reduce trade size, the price impact of the entire trade can decrease. We show additionally that imperfections do not always raise expected returns. The literature has shown this result for some imperfections; we examine its validity across all imperfections and identify those under which it is more likely to hold.

Our survey does not cover some important issues, either because they represent open questions on which research so far has been limited, or because covering them would detract from our main focus. Nevertheless, it is important to recognize these issues, both to put

## 6 *Introduction*

our survey in perspective and to outline promising areas for future research.

A first issue concerns the horizon of liquidity effects. The market microstructure literature focuses on liquidity effects that manifest themselves over short horizons, from minutes or hours to days or weeks. At the same time, recent work on the limits of arbitrage finds that flows can affect returns even at the longer horizons used in asset-pricing analysis, e.g., months, quarters or years. We view both horizons as relevant for the purposes of our survey — provided that the price movements under consideration are temporary departures from fundamental value caused by flows. Our model can accommodate both horizons simply by changing the length of a “period.” At the same time, that length is exogenous in our model and should be derived endogenously. That would require a more detailed description of market imperfections and agents’ trading needs, as well as an extension of the model along the inter-temporal dimension. Such an extension would also allow for a more complete analysis of the joint dynamics of liquidity and asset returns.

A second issue concerns the interactions between market imperfections. Most of the theoretical literature considers one imperfection at a time and does not allow for interactions. Our model also does not cover interactions, except between imperfect competition and asymmetric information. Other interactions, such as between funding constraints and asymmetric information, are interesting and have received some attention in the literature.

A related but more fundamental issue concerns the underlying economic causes of the imperfections and the ways in which imperfections are linked. Following much of the literature, we treat each imperfection as primitive. Yet, some imperfections could be the consequence of other more fundamental ones. For example, some types of transaction costs, such as price impact, can be viewed as a consequence of other imperfections, such as participation costs or asymmetric information. Moreover, if participation costs are costs to monitor market information, then costly participation could be linked to asymmetric information. Asymmetric information could also underlie the contracting frictions that give rise to funding constraints. Endogenizing some

market imperfections from more fundamental frictions could further streamline, clarify and deepen the study of market liquidity. In particular, various forms of informational problems could be the underlying economic cause for various forms of imperfections.

An additional imperfection implicit in our model is that agents cannot contract ex-ante on whether they are liquidity demanders or suppliers ex-post. If they could write contracts conditional on their future trading needs, then there would be no trade ex-post and the other imperfections would not matter. Understanding the origin of this additional imperfection, and of trade more generally, is important.

A fourth issue concerns the design of the market. While we consider ways in which markets deviate from the Walrasian ideal, we do not study market design in depth. The market microstructure literature studies various dimensions of market design and shows that they can affect market performance. Such dimensions include whether liquidity is supplied by dedicated market makers or an open limit-order book, whether limit orders are visible to all traders, whether transactions are disclosed to all traders after they are executed, etc. While we survey some of that work, we conduct our analysis at a more aggregate level with less market detail, so that we can derive some key effects within a tractable unified model. The downside is that our model is not well suited for very short horizons of seconds or minutes. Our model is also not well suited for addressing the benefits of different market designs.

Related to market design is the broader institutional context. A large fraction of trading activity in financial markets is generated by specialized financial institutions, and these institutions can be important suppliers or demanders of liquidity. Following much of the literature, we model instead liquidity suppliers and demanders as individuals, thus ignoring contracting frictions and other institutional complexities. (We only consider such frictions briefly in the context of funding constraints.) The liquidity shock in our model could result from institutional frictions, but only in reduced form. The importance of financial institutions in affecting asset prices is emphasized in a rapidly growing literature on the limits of arbitrage.

Finally, we do not perform any analysis of welfare or policy (even though our model could be used for that purpose as well). For example,

## 8 *Introduction*

we do not examine how imperfections affect the welfare of different agents and what policy actions could mitigate these effects. We survey, however, some papers that consider welfare and policy issues.

Our survey is related to both market microstructure and asset pricing. We emphasize fundamental market imperfections covered in the market microstructure literature, but abstract away from the level of market detail often adopted in that literature. At the same time, we study how market imperfections affect expected asset returns — an asset-pricing exercise. Surveys with greater focus on market microstructure include the book by O'Hara (1995) for the theory, the article by Hasbrouck (2007) for the empirics, and the articles by Madhavan (2000), Biais et al. (2005), and Parlour and Seppi (2008) for both theory and empirics. Amihud et al. (2005) survey theoretical and empirical work on market liquidity and asset-pricing effects. They mainly focus on transaction costs and not on other market imperfections. We consider instead six imperfections including transaction costs, both in this survey which focuses on the theory and in Vayanos and Wang (2012b) which also surveys empirical work. Gromb and Vayanos (2010) survey the theoretical literature on the limits of arbitrage.



## References

---

- Acharya, V. and L. Pedersen (2005), 'Asset pricing with liquidity risk'. *Journal of Financial Economics* **77**(2), 375–410.
- Acharya, V. and S. Viswanathan (2011), 'Leverage, moral hazard, and liquidity'. *Journal of Finance* **66**, 99–138.
- Admati, A. (1985), 'A noisy rational expectations equilibrium for multi-asset securities markets'. *Econometrica* **53**, 629–658.
- Admati, A. and P. Pfleiderer (1988), 'A theory of intraday patterns: Volume and price variability'. *Review of Financial Studies* **1**, 3–40.
- Admati, A. and P. Pfleiderer (1991), 'Sunshine trading and financial market equilibrium'. *Review of Financial Studies* **4**(3), 443–481.
- Adrian, T., E. Etula, and H. S. Shin (2009), 'Risk appetite and exchange rates'. Working paper, Princeton University.
- Afonso, G. and R. Lagos (2011), 'Trade dynamics in the market for Federal Funds'. Working paper, New York University.
- Aiyagari, R. and M. Gertler (1991), 'Asset returns with transaction costs and uninsurable individual risks: A stage III exercise'. *Journal of Monetary Economics* **27**, 309–331.
- Aiyagari, R. and M. Gertler (1999), 'Overreaction of asset prices in general equilibrium'. *Review of Economic Dynamics* **2**, 3–35.

- Akerlof, G. A. (1970), 'The market for lemons: Quality uncertainty and the market mechanism'. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **84**(3), 359–369.
- Albagli, E. (2011), 'Amplification of uncertainty in illiquid markets'. Working paper, University of Southern California.
- Allen, F. and D. Gale (1994), 'Limited market participation and volatility of asset prices'. *American Economic Review* **84**(4), 933–955.
- Allen, F. and D. Gale (2000), 'Bubbles and crises'. *Economic Journal* **110**, 236–255.
- Almgren, R. (2003), 'Optimal execution with nonlinear impact functions and trading-enhanced risk'. *Applied Mathematical Finance* **10**, 1–18.
- Almgren, R. and N. Chriss (1999), 'Value under liquidation'. *Risk* **12**, 61–63.
- Amihud, Y. and H. Mendelson (1980), 'Dealership market: Market-making with inventory'. *Journal of Financial Economics* **8**, 31–53.
- Amihud, Y. and H. Mendelson (1986), 'Asset pricing and the bid-ask spread'. *Journal of Financial Economics* **17**, 223–249.
- Amihud, Y., H. Mendelson, and L. Pedersen (2005), 'Liquidity and asset pricing'. *Foundations and Trends in Finance* **1**, 269–364.
- Ang, A., D. Papanikolaou, and M. Westerfield (2011), 'Portfolio choice with illiquid assets'. Working paper, Columbia University.
- Attari, M., A. Mello, and M. Ruckes (2005), 'Arbitraging arbitrageurs'. *Journal of Finance* **60**(5), 2471–2511.
- Back, K. (1992), 'Insider trading in continuous time'. *Review of Financial Studies* **5**(3), 387–409.
- Back, K. and S. Baruch (2004), 'Information in securities markets: Kyle meets Glosten and Milgrom'. *Econometrica* **72**, 433–465.
- Back, K. and S. Baruch (2011), 'Strategic liquidity provision in limit order markets'. Working paper, Rice University.
- Back, K., C. Cao, and G. Willard (2000), 'Imperfect competition among informed traders'. *Journal of Finance* **55**(5), 2117–2155.
- Back, K. and H. Pedersen (1998), 'Long-lived information and intraday patterns'. *Journal of Financial Markets* **1**, 385–402.
- Bagehot, W. (1971), 'The Only Game in Town'. *Financial Analysts Journal* **22**, 12–14.

- Balduzzi, P. and A. Lynch (1999), 'Transaction costs and predictability: Some utility cost calculations'. *Journal of Financial Economics* **52**, 47–78.
- Baruch, S. (2002), 'Insider trading and risk aversion'. *Journal of Financial Markets* **5**, 451–464.
- Basak, S. and B. Croitoru (2000), 'Equilibrium mispricing in a capital market with portfolio constraints'. *Review of Financial Studies* **13**, 715–748.
- Basak, S. and B. Croitoru (2006), 'On the role of arbitrageurs in rational markets'. *Journal of Financial Economics* **81**, 143–173.
- Basak, S. and D. Cuoco (1998), 'An equilibrium model with restricted stock market participation'. *Review of Financial Studies* **11**(2), 309–341.
- Beber, A., J. Driessen, and P. Tuijp (2012), 'Pricing liquidity risk with heterogeneous investment horizons'. Working paper, Cass Business School.
- Bernanke, B. and M. Gertler (1989), 'Agency costs, net worth, and business fluctuations'. *The American Economic Review* **1**, 14–31.
- Bernhardt, D. and E. Hughson (1997), 'Splitting orders'. *Review of Financial Studies* **10**(1), 69–102.
- Bertsimas, D. and A. Lo (1998), 'Optimal control of execution costs'. *Journal of Financial Markets* **1**, 1–50.
- Bhattacharya, U. and M. Spiegel (1991), 'Insiders, outsiders, and market breakdowns'. *Review of Financial Studies* **4**, 255–282.
- Biais, B. (1993), 'Price formation and equilibrium liquidity in fragmented and centralized markets'. *Journal of Finance* **48**, 157–185.
- Biais, B., L. Glosten, and C. Spatt (2005), 'Market microstructure: A survey of microfoundations, empirical results and policy implications'. *Journal of Financial Markets* **8**, 217–264.
- Biais, B., F. Heider, and M. Hoerova (2012), 'Risk-sharing or Risk-taking? Counterparty risk, incentives and margins'. Working paper, University of Toulouse.
- Biais, B., J. Hombert, and P.-O. Weill (2011). Trading and liquidity with limited cognition.

90 *References*

- Biais, B., D. Martimort, and J.-C. Rochet (2000), ‘Competing mechanisms in a common value environment’. *Econometrica* **68**(4), 799–837.
- Blouin, M. and R. Serrano (2001), ‘A decentralized market with common values uncertainty: Non-steady states’. *Review of Economic Studies* **68**, 323–346.
- Brown, D. and R. Jennings (1990), ‘On technical analysis’. *Review of Financial Studies* **2**, 527–552.
- Brunnermeier, M. and L. Pedersen (2005), ‘Predatory trading’. *Journal of Finance* **60**(4), 1825–1863.
- Brunnermeier, M. and L. Pedersen (2009), ‘Market liquidity and funding liquidity’. *Review of Financial Studies* **22**, 2201–2238.
- Buffa, A. (2011), ‘Insider trade disclosure, market efficiency, and liquidity’. Working paper, London Business School.
- Burdett, K. and M. O’Hara (1987), ‘Building blocks: An introduction to block trading’. *Journal of Banking and Finance* **11**, 193–212.
- Buss, A. and B. Dumas (2011), ‘The equilibrium dynamics of liquidity and illiquid asset prices’. Working paper, Goethe University Frankfurt.
- Buss, A., R. Uppal, and G. Vilkov (2011), ‘Asset prices in general equilibrium with transactions costs and recursive utility’. Working paper, Goethe University Frankfurt.
- Caldentey, R. and E. Stacchetti (2010), ‘Insider trading with a random deadline’. *Econometrica* **78**, 245–283.
- Cao, H., M. Evans, and R. Lyons (2006), ‘Inventory information’. *Journal of Business* **79**, 325–364.
- Carlin, B., M. Lobo, and S. Viswanathan (2007), ‘Episodic liquidity crises: Cooperative and predatory trading’. *Journal of Finance* **62**(5), 2235–2274.
- Casamatta, C. and S. Pouget (2011), ‘Fund managers’ contracts and financial markets’ short-termism’. Working paper, University of Toulouse.
- Cespa, G. and T. Foucault (2011), ‘Learning from prices, liquidity spillovers and endogenous market segmentation’. Working paper, HEC Paris.

- Cespa, G. and X. Vives (2012), 'Expectations, illiquidity, and short-term trading'. Working paper, City University.
- Chabakauri, G. (2012), 'Asset pricing in general equilibrium with constraints'. Working paper, London School of Economics.
- Chau, M. and D. Vayanos (2008), 'Strong form efficiency with monopolistic insiders'. *Review of Financial Studies* **21**, 2275–2306.
- Chowdhry, B. and V. Nanda (1991), 'Multimarket trading and market liquidity'. *Review of Financial Studies* **4**(3), 483–511.
- Cohen, K. J., S. F. Maier, R. A. Schwartz, and D. K. Whitcomb (1981), 'Transaction costs, order placement strategy, and the existence of the bid-ask spread'. *Journal of Political Economy* **89**, 287–305.
- Constantinides, G. M. (1986), 'Capital market equilibrium with transaction costs'. *Journal of Political Economy* **94**(4), 842–862.
- Copeland, T. and D. Galai (1983), 'Information effects on the bid-ask spread'. *Journal of Finance* **38**, 1457–1469.
- Cuoco, D. (1997), 'Optimal consumption and equilibrium prices with portfolio constraints and stochastic income'. *Journal of Economic Theory* **72**(1), 33–73.
- Danielsson, J., H. S. Shin, and J.-P. Zigrand (2012), 'Balance sheet capacity and endogenous risk'. Working paper, London School of Economics.
- Davis, M. H. A. and A. Norman (1990), 'Portfolio selection with transaction costs'. *Mathematics of Operations Research* **15**, 676–713.
- De Long, B., A. Shleifer, L. Summers, and R. Waldmann (1990), 'Noise trader risk in financial markets'. *Journal of Political Economy* **98**, 703–738.
- DeMarzo, P. and B. Urošević (2006), 'Ownership dynamics and asset pricing with a large shareholder'. *Journal of Political Economy* **114**(4), 774–815.
- Demsetz, H. (1968), 'The cost of transacting'. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **82**, 33–53.
- Detemple, J. and S. Murthy (1997), 'Equilibrium asset prices and no-arbitrage with portfolio constraints'. *Review of Financial Studies* **10**(4), 1133–1174.

92 *References*

- Diamond, D. and R. Verrecchia (1981), ‘Information aggregation in a noisy rational expectations economy’. *Journal of Financial Economics* **9**, 221–235.
- Diamond, P. A. (1982), ‘Aggregate demand management in search equilibrium’. *Journal of Political Economy* **90**, 881–894.
- Dow, J. and G. Gorton (1994), ‘Arbitrage chains’. *Journal of Finance* **49**(3), 819–49.
- Duffie, D. (2010), ‘Presidential address: Asset price dynamics with slow-moving capital’. *Journal of Finance* **65**, 1237–1267.
- Duffie, D., N. Garleanu, and L. Pedersen (2002), ‘Securities lending, shorting, and Pricing’. *Journal of Financial Economics* **66**, 307–339.
- Duffie, D., N. Garleanu, and L. Pedersen (2005), ‘Over-the-counter markets’. *Econometrica* **73**, 1815–1847.
- Duffie, D., N. Garleanu, and L. Pedersen (2008), ‘Valuation in over-the-counter markets’. *Review of Financial Studies* **20**, 1865–1900.
- Duffie, D., S. Malamud, and G. Manso (2009), ‘Information percolation with equilibrium search dynamics’. *Econometrica* **77**, 1513–1574.
- Duffie, D. and G. Manso (2007), ‘Information percolation in large markets’. *American Economic Review Papers and Proceedings* **97**, 203–209.
- Duffie, D. and B. Strulovici (2011), ‘Capital mobility and asset pricing’. Working paper, Stanford University.
- Dumas, B. and E. Luciano (1991), ‘An exact solution to a dynamic portfolio choice problem under transactions costs’. *Journal of Finance* **46**(2), 577–595.
- Easley, D. and M. O’Hara (1987), ‘Price, trade size, and information in securities markets’. *Journal of Financial Economics* **19**, 69–90.
- Easley, D. and M. O’Hara (1992), ‘Time and the process of security price adjustment’. *Journal of Finance* **47**, 576–605.
- Easley, D. and M. O’Hara (2004), ‘Information and the cost of capital’. *Journal of Finance* **59**, 1553–1583.
- Edirisinghe, C., V. Naik, and R. Uppal (1993), ‘Optimal replication of options with transaction costs and trading restrictions’. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* **28**, 117–138.
- Eisfeldt, A. (2004), ‘Endogenous liquidity in asset markets’. *Journal of Finance* **59**, 1–30.

- Ellul, A. and M. Pagano (2006), 'IPO underpricing and after-market liquidity'. *Review of Financial Studies* **19**, 381–421.
- Fardeau, V. (2011), 'Strategic liquidity provision and predatory trading'. Working paper, London School of Economics.
- Fishman, M. and K. Hagerty (1992), 'Insider trading and the efficiency of stock prices'. *RAND Journal of Economics* **23**, 106–122.
- Fleming, W., S. Grossman, J.-L. Vila, and T. Zariphopoulou (1990), 'Optimal portfolio rebalancing with transactions costs'. Working paper, Brown University.
- Foster, D. and S. Viswanathan (1996), 'Strategic trading when agents forecast the forecasts of others'. *Journal of Finance* **51**(4), 1437–1478.
- Foucault, T. (1999), 'Order flow composition and trading costs in a dynamic limit order market'. *Journal of Financial Markets* **2**, 99–134.
- Foucault, T., O. Kadan, and E. Kandel (2005), 'Limit order book as a market for liquidity'. *Review of Financial Studies* **18**(4), 1171–1217.
- Garleanu, N. (2009), 'Portfolio choice and pricing in illiquid markets'. *Journal of Economic Theory* **144**, 532–564.
- Garleanu, N. and L. Pedersen (2004), 'Adverse selection and the required return'. *Review of Financial Studies* **17**(3), 643–665.
- Garleanu, N. and L. Pedersen (2011), 'Margin-based asset pricing and deviations from the law of one price'. *Review of Financial Studies* **24**(6), 1980–2022.
- Garman, M. (1976), 'Market microstructure'. *Journal of Financial Economics* **3**, 257–275.
- Geanakoplos, J. (1997), 'Promises, promises'. In: B. Arthur, S. Durlauf, and D. Lane (eds.): *The Economy as an Evolving Complex System II*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, pp. 285–320.
- Geanakoplos, J. (2003), 'Liquidity, default and crashes: Endogenous contracts in general equilibrium'. In: M. Dewatripont, L. Hansen, and S. Turnovsky (eds.): *Advances in Economics and Econometrics: Theory and Applications II, Econometric Society Monographs: Eighth World Congress*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, pp. 170–205.
- Geanakoplos, J. and A. Fostel (2008), 'Leverage cycles and the anxious economy'. *American Economic Review* **98**, 1211–1244.

- Glosten, L. (1989), 'Insider trading, liquidity and the role of the monopolist specialist'. *Journal of Business* **62**(2), 211–235.
- Glosten, L. (1994), 'Is the electronic open limit order book inevitable?'. *Journal of Finance* **49**, 1127–1161.
- Glosten, L. and P. Milgrom (1985), 'Bid, ask, and transaction prices in a specialist market with heterogeneously informed traders'. *Journal of Financial Economics* **14**, 71–100.
- Goettler, R., C. Parlour, and U. Rajan (2005), 'Equilibrium in a dynamic limit order market'. *Journal of Finance* **60**, 2149–2192.
- Goldsmith, D. (1976), 'Transaction costs and the theory of portfolio selection'. *Journal of Finance* **31**, 1127–1139.
- Golosov, M., G. Lorenzoni, and A. Tsyvinski (2011), 'Decentralized trading with private information'. Working paper, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Gromb, D. and D. Vayanos (2002), 'Equilibrium and welfare in markets with financially constrained arbitrageurs'. *Journal of Financial Economics* **66**, 361–407.
- Gromb, D. and D. Vayanos (2010), 'Limits of arbitrage'. *Annual Review of Financial Economics* **2**, 251–275.
- Gromb, D. and D. Vayanos (2011a), 'The dynamics of financially constrained arbitrage'. Working paper, INSEAD.
- Gromb, D. and D. Vayanos (2011b), 'Financially constrained arbitrage and cross-market contagion'. Working paper, INSEAD.
- Grossman, S. (1976), 'On the efficiency of competitive stock markets when traders have diverse information'. *Journal of Finance* **31**, 573–585.
- Grossman, S. and M. Miller (1988), 'Liquidity and market structure'. *Journal of Finance* **43**, 617–637.
- Grossman, S. and J. Stiglitz (1980), 'On the impossibility of informationally efficient markets'. *American Economic Review* **70**(3), 393–408.
- Grossman, S. and J.-L. Vila (1992), 'Optimal investment strategies with leverage constraints'. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* **27**, 151–168.
- Grundy, B. and M. McNichols (1989), 'Trade and the revelation of information through prices and direct disclosure'. *Review of Financial Studies* **2**, 495–526.



- Guo, M. and H. Ou-Yang (2010), 'A continuous-time model of risk-averse strategic trading with dynamic information'. Working paper, Chueng-Kong Graduate School of Business.
- Hart, O. and J. Moore (1994), 'A theory of debt based on the inalienability of human capital'. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* **101**, 841–879.
- Hart, O. and J. Moore (1995), 'An analysis of the role of hard claims in constraining management'. *American Economic Review* **85**, 567–585.
- Hasbrouck, J. (2007), *Empirical Market Microstructure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- He, H. and J. Wang (1995), 'Differential information and dynamic behavior of stock trading volume'. *Review of Financial Studies* **8**(4), 919–972.
- He, Z. and A. Krishnamurthy (2012), 'A model of capital and crises'. *Review of Economic Studies* **79**, 735–777.
- Heaton, J. and D. J. Lucas (1996), 'Evaluating the effects of incomplete markets on risk sharing and asset pricing'. *Journal of Political Economy* **104**, 443–487.
- Hellwig, M. (1980), 'On the aggregation of information in competitive markets'. *Journal of Economic Theory* **22**, 477–498.
- Hirshleifer, J. (1971), 'The private and social value of information and the reward to inventive activity'. *American Economic Review* **61**, 561–574.
- Ho, T. and H. Stoll (1980), 'On dealer markets under competition'. *Journal of Finance* **35**(2), 259–267.
- Ho, T. and H. Stoll (1981), 'Optimal dealer pricing under trading transactions and return uncertainty'. *Journal of Financial Economics* **9**, 47–73.
- Holden, C. and A. Subrahmanyam (1992), 'Long-lived private information and imperfect competition'. *Journal of Finance* **47**(1), 247–270.
- Holden, C. and A. Subrahmanyam (1994), 'Risk aversion, imperfect competition, and long-lived information'. *Economic Letters* **44**, 181–190.
- Hombert, J. and D. Thesmar (2011), 'Overcoming limits of arbitrage: Theory and evidence'. Working paper, HEC.
- Huang, J. and J. Wang (2009), 'Liquidity and market crashes'. *Review of Financial Studies* **22**, 2607–1643.

- Huang, J. and J. Wang (2010), 'Market liquidity, asset prices, and welfare'. *Journal of Financial Economics* **95**, 107–127.
- Huang, M. (2003), 'Liquidity shocks and equilibrium liquidity premia'. *Journal of Economic Theory* **109**, 104–129.
- Huberman, G. and W. Stanzl (2005), 'Optimal liquidity trading'. *Review of Finance* **9**, 165–200.
- Huddart, S., J. Hughes, and C. Levine (2001), 'Public disclosure and dissimulation of insider trades'. *Econometrica* **69**(3), 665–681.
- Jackson, M. (1991), 'Equilibrium, price formation, and the value of private information'. *Review of Financial Studies* **4**(1), 1–16.
- Jang, B.-G., H. K. Koo, H. Liu, and M. Loewenstein (2007), 'Liquidity premia and transaction costs'. *Journal of Finance* **62**, 2329–2366.
- Jouini, E. and H. Kallal (1995), 'Martingales and arbitrage in securities markets with transaction costs'. *Journal of Economic Theory* **66**, 178–197.
- Jurek, J. and H. Yang (2007), 'Dynamic portfolio selection in arbitrage'. Working paper, Princeton University.
- Keim, D. and A. Madhavan (1996), 'The upstairs market for large-block transactions: Analysis and measurement of price effects'. *Review of Financial Studies* **9**, 1–36.
- Kiyotaki, N. and J. Moore (1997), 'Credit Cycles'. *Journal of Political Economy* **105**, 211–248.
- Klemperer, P. and M. Meyer (1989), 'Supply function equilibria in oligopoly under uncertainty'. *Econometrica* **57**, 1243–1277.
- Kondor, P. (2009), 'Risk in dynamic arbitrage: Price effects of convergence trading'. *Journal of Finance* **64**, 638–658.
- Kyle, A. (1985), 'Continuous auctions and insider trading'. *Econometrica* **53**(6), 1315–1336.
- Kyle, A. (1989), 'Informed speculation with imperfect competition'. *Review of Economic Studies* **56**, 317–356.
- Kyle, A. and W. Xiong (2001), 'Contagion as a wealth effect'. *Journal of Finance* **56**, 1401–1440.
- Laffont, J.-J. and E. Maskin (1990), 'The efficient market hypothesis and insider trading on the stock market'. *Journal of Political Economy* **98**, 70–93.

- Lagos, R. and G. Rocheteau (2009), 'Liquidity in asset markets with search frictions'. *Econometrica* **77**, 403–426.
- Lagos, R., G. Rocheteau, and P.-O. Weill (2012), 'Crises and liquidity in over the counter markets'. *Journal of Economic Theory* **146**, 2169–2205.
- Leland, H. (1992), 'Insider trading: Should it be prohibited'. *Journal of Political Economy* **100**, 859–887.
- Leland, H. and M. Rubinstein (1985), 'Option pricing and replication with transaction costs'. *Journal of Finance* **40**(5), 1283–1301.
- Liu, H. (2004), 'Optimal consumption and investment with transaction costs and multiple risky assets'. *Journal of Finance* **59**(1), 289–338.
- Liu, H. and M. Loewenstein (2002), 'Optimal portfolio selection with transaction costs and finite horizons'. *Review of Financial Studies* **15**, 805–835.
- Liu, H. and Y. Wang (2012), 'Over-the-counter markets: Market making with asymmetric information, inventory risk and imperfect competition'. Working paper, Washington University.
- Liu, J. and F. Longstaff (2004), 'Losing money on arbitrage: Optimal dynamic portfolio choice in markets with arbitrage opportunities'. *Review of Financial Studies* **17**(3), 611–641.
- Lo, A., H. Mamaysky, and J. Wang (2004), 'Asset prices and trading volume under fixed transactions costs'. *Journal of Political Economy* **112**, 1054–1090.
- Longstaff, F. (2001), 'Optimal portfolio choice and the valuation of illiquid securities'. *Review of Financial Studies* **14**(2), 407–431.
- Longstaff, F. (2009), 'Portfolio claustrophobia: Asset pricing in markets with illiquid assets'. *American Economic Review* **99**, 1119–1144.
- Luttmer, E. G. (1996), 'Asset pricing in economies with frictions'. *Econometrica* **64**, 1439–1467.
- Lynch, A. and P. Balduzzi (2000), 'Predictability and transaction costs: The impact on rebalancing rules and behavior'. *Journal of Finance* **55**, 2285–2310.
- Lynch, A. and S. Tan (2011), 'Explaining the magnitude of liquidity premia: The role of return predictability, wealth shocks and state-dependent transaction costs'. *Journal of Finance* **66**, 1329–1368.

- Madhavan, A. (2000), 'Market microstructure: A survey'. *Journal of Financial Markets* **3**, 205–258.
- Mankiw, N. and S. Zeldes (1991), 'The consumption of stockholders and nonstockholders'. *Journal of Financial Economics* **29**, 97–112.
- Mayshar, J. (1979), 'Transaction costs in a model of capital market equilibrium'. *Journal of Political Economy* **87**, 673–700.
- Mehra, R. and E. C. Prescott (1985), 'The equity premium: A puzzle'. *Journal of Monetary Economics* **15**(2), 145–161.
- Merton, R. (1971), 'Optimum consumption and portfolio rules in a continuous-time model'. *Journal of Economic Theory* **3**, 373–413.
- Merton, R. (1987), 'Presidential address: A simple model of capital market equilibrium with incomplete information'. *Journal of Finance* **42**, 483–510.
- Milbradt, K. (2012), 'Level 3 assets: Booking profits, concealing losses'. *Review of Financial Studies* **25**, 55–95.
- Mildenstein, E. and H. Schleef (1983), 'The optimal pricing policy of a monopolistic marketmaker in equity market'. *Journal of Finance* **38**, 218–231.
- Mitchell, M., L. Pedersen, and T. Pulvino (2007), 'Slow moving capital'. *American Economic Review, Papers and Proceedings* **97**, 215–220.
- Mortensen, D. (1982), 'Property rights and efficiency in mating, racing, and related games'. *American Economic Review* **72**, 968–979.
- Naik, N., A. Neuberger, and S. Viswanathan (1999), 'Trade disclosure regulation in markets with negotiated trade'. *Review of Financial Studies* **12**, 873–900.
- Obizhaeva, A. and J. Wang (2006), 'Optimal trading strategy and supply/demand dynamics'. Working paper, University of Maryland.
- O'Hara, M. (1995), *Market Microstructure Theory*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers.
- O'Hara, M. (2003), 'Liquidity and price discovery'. *Journal of Finance* **58**, 1335–1354.
- Pagano, M. (1989a), 'Endogenous market thinness and stock price volatility'. *Review of Economic Studies* **56**, 269–287.
- Pagano, M. (1989b), 'Trading volume and asset liquidity'. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* **104**, 255–274.

- Pagano, M. and A. Roell (1996), 'Transparency and liquidity: A comparison of auction and dealer markets with informed trading'. *Journal of Finance* **51**, 579–611.
- Pagnotta, E. and T. Philippon (2012), 'Competing on speed'. Working paper, New York University.
- Parlour, C. (1998), 'Price dynamics in limit order markets'. *Review of Financial Studies* **1**, 789–816.
- Parlour, C. and D. Seppi (2008), 'Limit order markets: A survey'. In: A. Boot and A. Thakor (eds.): *Handbook of Financial Intermediation and Banking*. North Holland.
- Pavlova, A. and R. Rigobon (2008), 'The role of portfolio constraints in the international propagation of shocks'. *Review of Economic Studies* **75**, 1215–1256.
- Pissarides, C. (1985), 'Short-run equilibrium dynamics of unemployment, vacancies, and real wages'. *American Economic Review* **75**, 676–690.
- Pritsker, M. (2005), 'Large investors: Implications for equilibrium asset, returns, shock absorption, and liquidity'. Working paper, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve.
- Qiu, W. and J. Wang (2010), 'Asset pricing under heterogeneous information'. Working Paper, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Repullo, R. (1999), 'Some remarks on Leland's model of insider trading'. *Economica* **66**(263), 359–374.
- Rostek, M. and M. Weretka (2011), 'Dynamic thin markets'. Working paper, University of Wisconsin.
- Rosu, I. (2009), 'A dynamic model of the limit-order book'. *Review of Financial Studies* **22**, 4601–4641.
- Rytchkov, O. (2011), 'Asset pricing with dynamic margin constraints'. Working paper, Temple University.
- Shleifer, A. and R. Vishny (1992), 'Liquidation values and debt capacity: A market equilibrium approach'. *Journal of Finance* **47**, 1343–1366.
- Shleifer, A. and R. Vishny (1997), 'The limits of arbitrage'. *Journal of Finance* **52**, 35–55.

- Soner, M., S. Shreve, and J. Cvitanic (1995), 'There is no nontrivial hedging portfolio for option pricing with transaction costs'. *Annals of Applied Probability* **5**, 327–355.
- Stoll, H. (1978), 'The supply of dealer services in securities markets'. *Journal of Finance* **33**, 1133–1151.
- Suominen, M. and K. Rinne (2011), 'A structural model of short-term reversals'. Working paper, Aalto University.
- Tuckman, B. and J.-L. Vila (1992), 'Arbitrage with holding costs: A utility-based approach'. *Journal of Finance* **47**, 1283–1302.
- Tuckman, B. and J.-L. Vila (1993), 'Holding costs and equilibrium arbitrage'. Working paper 1153, Anderson Graduate School of Management, UCLA.
- Vayanos, D. (1998), 'Transaction costs and asset prices: A dynamic equilibrium model'. *Review of Financial Studies* **11**, 1–58.
- Vayanos, D. (1999), 'Strategic trading and welfare in a dynamic market'. *Review of Economic Studies* **66**, 219–254.
- Vayanos, D. (2001), 'Strategic trading in a dynamic noisy market'. *Journal of Finance* **56**, 131–171.
- Vayanos, D. (2004), 'Flight to quality, flight to liquidity, and the pricing of risk'. Working paper, London School of Economics.
- Vayanos, D. and J.-L. Vila (1999), 'Equilibrium interest rate and liquidity premium with transaction costs'. *Economic Theory* **13**, 509–539.
- Vayanos, D. and J. Wang (2012a), 'Liquidity and expected returns under asymmetric information and imperfect competition'. *Review of Financial Studies* **25**, 1339–1365.
- Vayanos, D. and J. Wang (2012b), 'Market liquidity — theory and empirical evidence'. In: G. Constantinides, M. Harris, and R. Stulz (eds.): *Handbook of the Economics of Finance*. North Holland, Amsterdam. forthcoming.
- Vayanos, D. and T. Wang (2007), 'Search and endogenous concentration of liquidity in asset markets'. *Journal of Economic Theory* **136**(1), 66–104.
- Vayanos, D. and P.-O. Weill (2008), 'A search-based theory of the on-the-run phenomenon'. *Journal of Finance* **63**, 1361–1398.
- Venter, G. (2011), 'Financially constrained strategic arbitrage'. Working paper, Copenhagen Business School.

- Vives, X. (1995), 'The speed of information revelation in a financial market mechanism'. *Journal of Economic Theory* **67**, 178–204.
- Wang, J. (1993), 'A model of intertemporal asset prices under asymmetric information'. *Review of Economics Studies* **60**, 249–282.
- Wang, J. (1994), 'A model of competitive stock trading volume'. *Journal of Political Economy* **102**, 127–168.
- Weill, P.-O. (2007), 'Leaning against the wind'. *Review of Economic Studies* **74**, 1329–1354.
- Weill, P.-O. (2008), 'Liquidity premia in dynamic bargaining markets'. *Journal of Economic Theory* **140**, 66–96.
- Wilson, R. (1979), 'Auctions of shares'. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* **93**, 675–689.
- Wolinsky, A. (1990), 'Information revelation in a market with pairwise meetings'. *Econometrica* **58**, 1–23.
- Xiong, W. (2001), 'Convergence trading with wealth effects: An amplification mechanism in financial markets'. *Journal of Financial Economics* **62**, 247–292.
- Yuan, K. (2005), 'Asymmetric price movements and borrowing constraints: A REE model of crisis, contagion, and confusion'. *Journal of Finance* **60**(1), 379–411.
- Zhu, H. (2012), 'Finding a good price in opaque over-the-counter markets'. *Review of Financial Studies* **25**(4), 1255–1285.